

***Full-Length Research Paper*****Techniques for Conservation Tillage under 15–25% Slope: Soil and Water Conservation, Maize Yield and Yield Components in Basketo Zone, Southern Ethiopia****Wudnesh Naba^{1*}, Birhanu Wolde²**

¹*Southern Agricultural Research Institute, Areka Agricultural Research Center, Natural Resource Research Work Process, Soil and Water Conservation Researcher_P.O. Box 79, Areka, Ethiopia*

²*Southern Agricultural Research Institute, Arba Minch Agricultural Research Center, Natural Resource Research Work Process Soil and Water Conservation Researcher P. O. Box 2228, Arba Minch, Ethiopia*

*Corresponding author: wudnesh2017@gmail.com

Abstract

In steeply sloping regions of Ethiopia, water erosion is the primary cause of soil erosion and land degradation. Poor management of watersheds, inappropriate farming practices, and heavy rainfall all contribute to a continuous process of soil nutrient depletion in mountainous places. A quick loss of soil organic matter, soil deterioration, and a decline in environmental quality could result from the main farmer practice restrictions during plowing. To maintain agricultural productivity and environmental quality, a better farming system is therefore a significant method. This study was conducted in 3 farmer's fields to investigate the significance of different cultivation practices on soil loss and maize yield under a slope of 19 % during cropping season in 2016 and 2018 at Motkesa Kebele of Basketo Zone, southern Ethiopia. The trial was laid out using a randomized complete block design through four treatments replicated three times on run-off plots. Experimental treatments used in the area were (strip tillage, zero tillage, reduced tillage and farmer practice) with maize planting at a spacing of 25cm by 75cm between plants and between rows respectively. According to the research result zero tillage decreased mean soil loss by 70% -74 % compared with conventional tillage ($P < 0.05$) and zero tillage has a great potential of controlling soil erosion on steep lands. Additionally, zero tillage was effective in conserving soil moisture increased (36-42%) compared with conventional tillage practices. According to the results of our research data, we advise that in smallholder household farms, the implementation of conservation agriculture has a cost-effective production management method, saves raw materials, increases yield, and reduces manual labor. Further studies are also encouraged in the same agroecology to promote the conservation agriculture system.

Keywords: *Conservation tillage; maize yield and yield components; soil moisture, soil loss*

Received: 20 February, 2023; Accepted: 28 May, 2023; Published: June, 2023

1. INTRODUCTION

Soil erosion in sloppy areas is an enduring problem for continuousness when the forest resource cover has been diminished and agriculture only depends on annual crops is implemented (Tuahn *et al.*, 2014). FAO (1984) and Hurni (1993) also reported annual soil loss from Ethiopian highlands to be 200-300 tons ha⁻¹ year⁻¹. Similarly, Hurni *et al.* (2016) Dijo watershed is the largest watershed in the Rift Valley Basin of Ethiopia. Land degradation in the form of soil erosion is the major problem affecting agricultural productivity.

Conferring to Hurni *et al.* (2008), the original model effect due to erosion of cultivated fields in Ethiopia under normal conditions was 42 tons/ha/year. Soil erosion from the steep lands is the dominant cause of soil loss, disturbances deterioration of the ecosystem and reduction of crop production in our study areas. The reduction of soil quality that accompanies erosion can reduce the productivity of agricultural land (Montgomery, 2007).

Conservation agriculture has greater impacts on soil erosion, runoff and infiltration (Leys *et al.*, 2010). The conservation tillage technique based on decomposable residue covered with zero tillage and sub-soiling in the crop-free period can efficiently decrease soil disturbance of the plow layer, grow the surface cover and soil organic matter content and encourage the storage of soil moisture (David *et al.*, 2005; Zhao *et al.*, 2016). CA could be a solution to the problem of the steep slopes of how to produce annual crops without eroding the soil does not necessarily need heavy investments for its implementation, and can help small-scale farmers stabilize their yields over time (Erenstein, 2003). Conservation practices also have to advance farmer production and profits and safeguard the production system against changes in climate and a significant increase in yield from 3.6 to 4.4 t/ha in CA practices (Mkoga *et al.*, 2010).

Conservation agriculture has been encouraged and practiced as a solution for agricultural sustainability problems caused by soil erosion and fertility decline (Bram *et al.*, 2016) and reduces farmers' exposure to drought, income and address low draught power ownership levels (Mashingaidze *et al.*, 2012). Therefore it is a substantial approach to create a better farming system to sustain environmental quality and agricultural production. This study was conducted in 3 farmer's fields to investigate the significance of different cultivation practices on soil loss and

maize yield under a slope of 19 % during cropping season in 2016 and 2018 at Motkesa Kebele of Basketo Zone, southern Ethiopia.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Description of study area

The study was conducted in the Basketo zone which is one of the zones of South Ethiopia Regional State; its capital is Laska, which is 626 km from Addis Ababa. The average daily temperature ranges from 15 °C-27 °C and mean yearly rainfall ranges from 1000 mm-1400 mm. The Basketo Zone is located from 780-2200m above sea level within 6018'00.5''N latitude and 36033'41.9''E longitude. The zone has three ecological zones; low land (54%), highland (1%) and midland (45%) climatic zone (Vaughan 2011, SNNPR, 2011).




Figure 1. Map of the study area

2.2 Research Design

A field experiment was conducted on the effect of different tillage practices on soil loss and maize production under a slope of 19 % during cropping season in 2016 and 2018 at Motikesa Kebele of Basketo zone, southern Ethiopia. The experiment has a randomized complete block design with four treatments replicated three times on run-off plots. Experimental treatments used in the area were (strip tillage, zero tillage, reduced tillage and conventional tillage) with maize planting at the spacing of 25cm by 75cm between plants and between rows, respectively.

Strip tillage tilling a strip of about 40cm wide and 30cm deep on a seeding line only. Zero tillage involved making a hole with a hand hoe for seed placement without primary tillage. This system involves opening a narrow slot only wide and deep enough to obtain proper seed coverage with 30% mulch covering of planting area. Conventional tillage is making tillage frequency to plant maize 4 times plow land. Reduced tillage is a tillage type that was only two times plow land to plant maize. Planting of maize variety 540 was done during the main rainy season from the beginning of March up to the end of April each season at a spacing of 75cm × 25cm.

2.3 Methods of data collection

2.3.1 Determining of soil loss

The test field was built in February 2016 on three farmers' land on a slope of 19%. Each runoff field (catch pit) had a length of 5 m, a width of 1 m, and a 0.5m depth made from plastic sheets were set up in each plot and soil collected in the catch pit was measured after the end of rainfall. The plots were bounded by corrugated iron sheets, buried to a depth of 20cm and protruding 10cm above the ground to prevent runoff water from outside the plots from entering the plots and from runoff plots from flowing out unmonitored.

2.3.2 Determining Soil moisture content

The stored moisture contents in the soil were determined by gravimetric (mass) methods. The gravimetric water content is the mass of water in a unit mass of dry soil (g of water/g of dry soil). The wet weight of the soil sample is determined; the sample is dried at 105°C for 24 hours to constant weight and reweighed (Gardner, 1986). Measuring soil moisture measurements was conducted at three periods (initial, development and mid-stage) after rainfall of 10 days to evaluate the amount of soil water during dry periods. The composite soil sample was taken by making "x" around the field to collect soil from various places on the field.

An auger was used for soil sampling from the depth of 0-20cm and 20- 40 cm because 70% of moisture extraction was taken from the rooting depth (0.4m). The soil sample collected from the two different locations or depths was mixed in a plastic container. The amount of the wet soil was measured and put in an oven at 105°C for 24 hours and then reweighted of dried soil

samples. The soil water stored (%) in each 0.4m incremental depth down was determined gravimetrically. Volumetric water content can be calculated from gravimetric water using the following equation:

$$SMC = \frac{W_w - W_d}{W_d} * 100$$

Where:

SMC = Soil moisture content, dry base (%)

W_w = Weight of the wet soil (gm)

W_d = Weight of the dry soil (gm)

Volumetric soil water content (cm³/cm³) is determined as:

$$\theta = w * \rho_d$$

Where:

w = gravimetric water content

ρ_d = bulk density (g/cm³)

2.3.3 Agronomic data parameters

Agronomic parameters including grain yield, above-ground biomass, and plant height data were collected. To measure plant height six stands from each plot were randomly selected and measured. Dried above-ground biomass of the six plants from each plot was measured and it was converted to a hectare base. From each, plot the number of six plants randomly selected during harvesting time was cut and grain yield was threshed and weighted.

2.3.4 Statistical analysis

Data collected were processed using Microsoft Excel and statistically analyzed using Analysis of variance was performed using the GLM procedure of SAS Statistical Software Version 9.1. Effects were tested under (P = 0.05). Means were separated using Fisher's Least Significant Difference (LSD) test.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Means of Soil loss in the study site

As shown in below Table 1 the mean soil loss of year one was significant ($P < 0.05$) difference between zero tillage (18.5 ton/ha-1) and strip tillage (26.2 ton/ha -1) compared with conventional (69.2 ton/ha-1) and reduced tillage (57.7 ton/ha-1). But there was no significant difference ($p>0.05$) between reduced (57.7 ton/ha-1) with conventional tillage (69.2 ton /ha/-1 year) and strip (26.2 ton/ha -1) with zero tillage (18.5 ton/ha-1).

Table 1. Soil loss means in 2016 and 2018 year data

Treatments	Soil loss data t/ha ⁻¹ /year ⁻¹ (2016)	Soil loss data t/ha ⁻¹ /year ⁻¹ (2018)	Combined analysis of soil loss for two years t/ha ⁻¹ /year
Zero	18.6b	24b	21.33b
Strip	27.33b	29.33b	28.33b
Reduced	65.33a	52.33a	58.8a
Conventional	71.66a	58.66a	65.16a
Lsd, (%)	26.43	18.22	14.27
Cv, (%)	20.43	15.7	20

In year two there was also a significant ($P < 0.05$) difference between zero (27.8 ton /ha/-1) compared with conventional (58 ton/ha/-1) and reduced tillage (51.5ton/ha/-1). Significant ($P < 0.05$) difference between strips (25.7ton/ha-1) compared with conventional (58 ton/ha/-1) but no significant ($P > 0.05$) difference between reduced (51.5ton/ha-1). In both years, there was a significant difference between zero and strip tillage compared with conventional tillage. These results show that the soil loss was largest from conventional tillage and lowest from zero and strip tillage. Soil loss was significantly affected by the tillage practices (Table 1). Studies showed that conservation tillage systems such as zero tillage with surface mulch, strip tillage and reduced tillage decreased mean soil loss by 74%, 62%, and 17% compared to conventional treatments under a slope of 19 % in the first year and in the second year 70%, 56% and 12% soil loss reduction in percent. In high-rainfall areas, the soils are susceptible to soil erosion and fertility decline (Kagabo *et al.*, 2013). Conservation agriculture consists of as little disturbing the soil as possible, keeping the soil covered potential remedy for soil degradation (Bayala *et al.*, 2012).

Several studies revealed that conservation tillage (any tillage system that maintains at least 30% of cover on the soil surface, e.g. no-tillage (Zhang *et al.*, 2007).

Conventional tillage has been asserted to lead to land degradation resulting from common, but exploitative farming practices such as plowing that destroys the soil structure & degrades organic matter, burning or removing crop residues, and mono-cropping among others (Rusinamhodzi *et al.*, 2011). Soil erosion & the loss of organic matter are associated with conventional tillage practices (Chivenge *et al.*, 2007), which leave the soil bare and unprotected in times of heavy rainfall wind & heat (Derpach, 2003).

Conservation agriculture has significant potential to improve rainfall use efficiency through increased water infiltration and decreased evaporation from the soil surface, with associated decreases in runoff and soil erosion (Thierfelder and Wall, 2010).

3.2 Yield and yield components of the Maize

As shown in the table above there was no significant ($P > 0.05$) difference between the treatments for the first and second years within maize yield and components. This result shows conservation agriculture improves farmers' yield in the long term at the same time conserving the environment.

Table 2. Least square means of maize yield and yield components under the different treatments

Treatment	2016 Year Data			2011 Year Data		
	Grain yield (Ton/ha)	Dry matter biomass (Ton/ha)	Plant height (CM)	Grain yield (Ton/ha)	Dry matter biomass (Ton/ha)	Plant height (CM)
Zero tillage	4.97	7	198.4	4.75	8.87	209
Strip tillage	4.87	6.12	181.6	4.2	8.26	211
Reduced tillage	4.52	6.2	197.5	4.35	8.82	208
Conventional tillage	4.1	7.5	196.2	4.3	8.65	193
Lsd (%)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Cv (%)	23	21	7	16	24	11

LSD, least significant difference; CV, coefficient of variation

Producers will discover that the welfare of CA will get up later rather than earlier (Chivenge *et al.*, 2007; Thierfelder and Wall, 2010) since CA takes time to accumulate enough organic matter and have soils become their fertilizer, the process does not start to work overnight. But if producers make it through the first few years of production, results will start to become more satisfactory. Even though conservation agriculture has been successfully implemented in fertile soil, its performance on degraded soil remains unclear (Siziba, 2008).

In conservation agriculture most studies agree there are yield benefits in the medium to long term which are more pronounced in lower rainfall environments (Pittelkow *et al.*, 2015); Steward *et al.*, 2018). CA not plow as conventional tillage and thus does not incorporate the manure, which may lead to partial efficiencies in the mobilization, access, uptake and cycling of nutrients from manure (Powell *et al.*, 2004; Rufino *et al.*, 2007).

In conventional tillage plough increases the amount of oxygen in the soil and increase the aerobic process more nutrient is available for crops but soil loss is depleted more quickly of its nutrients. As a principle of conservation tillage applied in semi-arid, humid and sub-humid areas but applied in wetlands or soil with poor drainage lands can challenge adoption. CA increases yield over time but farmers may not see yield benefits immediately.

Comparisons made between local cultivation and SWC measures at experimental sites in Ethiopia showed that Soil loss is reduced significantly for the majority of SWC treatments, but, production rarely increased as a result of SWC in three to five years (Herweg and Ludi, 1999).

3.3 Soil moisture content in the soil at different maize growth stages

As shown below in Table 3 there was a significant ($P < 0.05$) difference between zero with conventional and the others have no significant ($P > 0.05$) difference between treatments in 2016 years at mid-period in soil moisture content.

Table 3. Effect of treatments on soil moisture conservation during at different seasons

Treatments	2016 years	2018 year	
	At mid period SMC (%)	At planting SMC (%)	At mid period SMC (%)
Zero	53a	27.75	59.5a
Strip	44ab	29.75	52.5ab
Reduced	37b	26.5	45.7bc
Conventional	33.7b	26.33	34c
LSD (%)	12.75	NS	13.3
CV (%)	13.7	15	12.5

In the 2018 year, there was also a significant ($P < 0.05$) difference between zero with conventional tillage and reduced tillage but there were no significant differences between the treatments at mid-period and at planting time there were no significant differences between all treatments. These results show that zero tillage has the potential for soil moisture-holding capacity compared with other treatments. The advantage of CA over tillage agriculture in terms of the greater soil moisture-holding capacity and therefore duration of plant-available soil moisture is illustrated by Derpsch *et al.* (1991), who show that soil moisture conditions in rooting zones through growing seasons under CA are better than under both minimum and conventional tillage. Thus crops under CA systems can continue towards maturity for longer than those under conventional tillage. In addition, the period in which available nutrients can be taken up by plants is extended, increasing the efficiency of use. The greater volume and longer duration of soil moisture's availability to plants (between the soil's field capacity and wilting point) have significant positive outcomes both for farming stability and profitability.

3.4 Cost and benefit analysis

Economic analysis indicated that the net benefit/ha of treatments among the different tillage systems zero tillage recorded was a higher net return than conventional tillage systems (Table 4). This indicates higher profit and lower expenditure in terms of lab power.

Table 4. Estimated economic costs and benefit analysis of treatments

Treatments	Grain yield (Ton/ha)	Adjusted yield (ton/ha)	Unit price /kg	Gross benefit(ha)	Total costs that vary(ha)	Net benefits/ha	Benefit cost ratio
Zero	4.97	4.47	10	44,700	11890	32810	2.75
Strip	4.87	4.38	10	43800	13990	29810	2.1
Reduced	4.52	3.8	10	38000	15000	23000	1.5
Conventional	4.1	3.69	10	36,900	16990	19910	1.1

According to Friedrich et al. (2016), CA is a strategy for producing agricultural crops at high and sustained production levels with acceptable earnings while also protecting the environment.

Conclusions

The findings indicate that, over the two consecutive years, there was no discernible difference ($P > 0.05$) between the treatments for maize yield and yield components. In the research area, zero tillage has, nevertheless, demonstrated superior outcomes in terms of soil moisture content and soil loss. There was a lot of soil erosion and loss in the farmed land areas on steep slopes. According to the current study's findings, conventional tillage causes a significant amount of soil loss, leaving the soil exposed after crop residues are removed and vulnerable to wind and rainstorms that erode organic materials and ruin the soil's structure. However, conservation tillage, which involves little soil disturbance and leaves the soil covered, is a viable treatment for soil deterioration. It involves zero tillage and stripping. By increasing water infiltration and reducing surface evaporation, zero tillage can significantly increase the efficiency of using rainwater in low-lying areas while simultaneously reducing runoff and soil erosion. It has been demonstrated that, in comparison to conventional tillage, zero tillage reduced mean soil loss by 70% to 74%. This suggests that zero tillage may be able to control soil erosion on steep terrain. In addition, compared to traditional tillage techniques, zero tillage proved successful in preserving an increase in soil moisture of 36-42%. One more benefit of conservation tillage is that it lessens the requirement for terraces. Under drier regions with a 19% slope, zero tillage is

advised as a preferable way to minimize soil loss and preserve soil moisture. Therefore, even though further research needs to be done to provide a solid foundation for the advice, it is still necessary to share the findings of the current study with the end users. .

REFERENCES

- Acharya C L and Sharma PD (1994). Tillage and mulch effects on soil physical environment, root growth, nutrient uptake and yield of maize and wheat on an Alfisol in north-west India. *Soil Till. Res.*, 32(4):291-302
- Bayala J, Sileshi GW, Coe R, Kalinganire A, Tchoundjeu Z, Sinclair F, Garrity D (2012). Cereal yield response to conservation agriculture practices in drylands of West Africa: A quantitative synthesis. *J. Arid Environ.*, 78, 13-25.
- CFU (2007). Conservation Farming & Conservation Agriculture Handbook for hoe Farmers in Agro Ecological Regions I & IIa – Flat Culture
- Chivenge P, Murwira H, Giller K, Mapfumo P, Six J (2007). Long-term impact of reduced tillage and residue management on soil carbon stabilization: implications for conservation agriculture on contrasting soils. *Soil Till. Res.* 94(2):328-337.
- Chivenge, PP, Musra H K, Giller K E, Maptumo P, Sex J (2007). Long term impact of reduced tillage and residue management on soil carbon stabilization: implication for conservation Agriculture on contrasting soils. *Soil Tillage Res.* 94(2007); 328-337.
- David C, Jeuffroy MH, Laurent F, Mangin M, Meynard JM (2005). The assessment of a decision making tool for managing the nitrogen fertilization of organic winter wheat. *European Journal of Agronomy*, 23, 225–242.
- Derpsch R (2003). Conservation tillage, no-tillage and related technologies. Conservation agriculture, Springer: pp. 181-190.
- Derpsch R, Roth CH, Sidiras N, Köpke U (1991). Controle da erosão no Paraná Brasil: Sistemas decobertura do solo, plantio direto e prepare conservacionista do solo. GTZ, Eschborn, SP 245.
- Erenstein O (2003) Smallholder Conservation Farming in the Tropics and Sub-Tropics: A Guide to the Development and Dissemination of Mulching with Crop Residues and Cover Crops. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 100, 17-37. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809\(03\)00150-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809(03)00150-6).
- FAO (1984). World reference for soil resource. Rome, Italy.
- Farid, ATM and Hossain SMS (1988). Diagnosis of farming Practices and their impact on soil resource loss and economic loss in the hill tract areas of Bangladesh BARI
- Farooq M, Flower KC, Jabran K, Wahid A, Siddique KHM (2018). Crop yield and weed management in rainfed conservation agriculture. *Soil Tillage Res* 117:172–183.
- Herweg, Karl, Eva Ludi (1999). The performance of selected soil and water conservation measures—case studies from Ethiopia and Eritrea. CATENA. Volume 36, Issues 1–2, June 1999, Pages 99-114.
- Hurni H, Herweg K, Portner B, Liniger H (2008) Soil Erosion and conservation in global agriculture. In: Braimoh AK, Vlek PLG (eds) Land use and soil resources. Springer, Dordrecht, pp 41–71.
-

- Hurni H (1993). Land degradation, famine and land resource scenario in Ethiopia
- Kagabo, Stroosnijder L, Visser S, Moore D (2013). Soil erosion, soil fertility and crop yield on slow-forming terraces in the highlands of Buberuka, Rwanda. *Soil Till. Res.* 128:23-29.
- Kamwendo M L (2016). The effect of conservation farming on soil physical properties in Malawi. M. Sc. Thesis. Interuniversity Program on Physical Land Resources. Ghent University, Belgium.
- Lanckriet S, Araya T, Cornelis W, Verfaillie E, Poesen J, Govaerts B, Bauer H, Deckers J, Haile M, Nyssen J (2012). Impact of conservation agriculture on catchment runoff and soil loss under changing climate conditions in May Zeg-zeg (Ethiopia). *J. Hydrol.* 475:336-349.
- Leys A, Govers G, Gillijns K, Berckmoes E, Takken I (2010). Scale effects on runoff and erosion losses from arable land under conservation and conventional tillage: The role of residue cover, *Journal of Hydrology*, 390,143-154, doi: 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2010.06.034.
- Li L, Huang, Zhang R, Bill B, Guangdi L, Kwong YC (2018).Benefits of Conservation Agriculture on Soil and Water Conservation and Its Progress in China. *Agric. Sci. China*, 10(6):850-859.
- Mashingaidze N, Madakadze C, Twomlow S, Nyamangara J, Hove L (2012). Crop yield and weed growth under conservation agriculture in semi-arid Zimbabwe. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 124:102–110.
- Mkoga Z J, Tumbo S D, Kihupi N, Semoka J (2010). Extrapolating effects of conservation tillage on yield, soil moisture and dry spell mitigation using simulation modeling. *Phys. Chem. Earth Parts 35*, 686–698, DOI: 10.1016/j.pce.2010.07.036.
- Montgomery M (2007). *The Discourse of Broadcast News: A Linguistic Approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Pimental D. (1993), *World Soil Conservation*, Cambridge University press, New York. pp. 27-61
- Pittelkow, C M, Liang X, Linquist B A, Van Groenigen KJ, Lee J, Lundy M E (2015). Productivity limits and potentials of the principles of conservation agriculture. *Nature* 517, 365–368. doi: 10.1038/nature13809.
- Powell JM, Pearson R A, Hiernaux P H (2004). Crop-livestock interactions in the West African Drylands. *Agronomy Journal*, 96, 469-483.
- Powell J M, Pearson R A, Hiernaux P H (2004). Crop-livestock interactions in the West African Drylands. *Agronomy Journal*, 96: 469-483.
- Derpsch Rolf (2008). No-tillage and conservation agriculture: a progress report. In: T. Goddard et al., editors, No-till farming systems. *World Association of Soil and Water Conservation*, Bangkok 3, p. 7–39
- Rufino M.C, P. Tiftonell, M.T. van Wijk , A. Castellanos-Navarrete, R.J. Dolve, N. de Ridder, K.E. Giller, 2007. Manure as a key resource within smallholder farming systems: Analysing farm-scale nutrient cycling efficiencies with the NUANCES framework. *Livestock Science*, 112: 3, 273-287
- Rusinamhodzi L, Corbeels M, Van Wijk MT, Rufino MC, Nyamangara J, Giller KE (2011) A meta-analysis of long-term effects of conservation agriculture on maize grain yield under rain-fed conditions. *Agron Sustain Dev* 31:657–673.
- Sarah Vaughan, 2003. "Ethnicity and Power in Ethiopia" Archived August 13, 2011, at the Wayback Machine (University of Edinburgh: Ph.D. Thesis, 2003), pp. 251 – 260.
-

- Siziba S (2008).Assessing the adoption of conservation agriculture in Zimbabwe’s smallholder sector. In Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, PhD German: University of Hohenheim Southern Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples' Region, Ethiopia Livelihood Profiles: Archived 2011-07-23 at the Wayback Machine, USAID/FEWSNET, p. 27 (accessed 11 January 2011).
- Steward P R, Dougill A J, Thierfelder C, Pittelkow C M, Stringer L C, Kudzala M, Shackelford G E (2018). The adaptive capacity of maize-based conservation agriculture systems to climate stress in tropical and subtropical environments: a meta-regression of yields. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 251, 194-202.
- Thierfelder C, Wall PC (2016). Effects of conservation agriculture techniques on infiltration and soil water content in Zambia and Zimbabwe. *Soil Till. Res.*, 105 (2):217-227.
- Tuan, V D, Hilger T, MacDonald L, Clemens G, Shiraishi E, Vien T D, Cadisch G. (2014). Mitigation potential of soil conservation in maize cropping on steep slopes. *Field Crops Research*, 156: 91-102.
- Zhang FS, Cui ZL, Wang JQ, Li CJ, Chen XP (2007). Current Status of soil and plant nutrient management in China and improvement strategies. *Chinese Bull. Bot.* 24:687–694.