

## **Information on Seasonal and Varietal Differences Provide Opportunities for Improving Nitrogen Use efficiency and Nitrogen Management in Irrigated Paddy Rice in Kenya**

Joseph P Gweyi-Onyango<sup>1\*</sup>, Richard Mose<sup>1</sup>, Winnie Ntinyari<sup>1</sup>, Symon Njinju<sup>2</sup> and Cargele Masso<sup>3</sup>

1-Department of Agricultural Science and Technology, Kenyatta University, Kenya; 2- Kenya Agricultural Livestock Research Organization; Kenya; 3- IITA, Yaounde, Cameroon

\*corresponding author – [gweyi.joseph@ku.ac.ke](mailto:gweyi.joseph@ku.ac.ke)

### **Abstract**

Nitrogen plays key role in plant growth and development. Despite being abundant in the atmosphere, it is one of the limiting plant growth nutrient. Additional N has been shown to increase yield of rice with temptation of over-supply by some farmers, with a resultant lower N use efficiency, higher costs and environmental pollution. Apart from nitrogen rates, there are factors such as temperature, stage of crop growth during nitrogen fertilization as well as cultivar responses to N application that affect yields and N efficiencies. The current results showed differences in NUES amongst cultivars and rates of N application across the sites.

*Key words: grain filling, temperature, Nitrogen use efficiency, Nitrogen agronomic efficiency, N-mining*

### **Introduction**

To maximize grain yield, farmers (particularly in developed world) have often applied a higher amount of N fertilizer than the minimum required for maximum crop growth (Lemaire and Gastal., 1997). The scenario is however different in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), where the situation is characterized by inadequate N fertilizer input compounded with poor soil fertility are the determinants of rice production. There is need to synchronize fertilizer application and plant nutrient demand to avoid pollution or nutrient mining.

### **Materials and Methods**

The experiment was a split plot design with varieties as main plot and N forms constituting subplots and replicated three times in two sites Kenya. The N content in the plant tissue was determined by Kjeldahl (Bremner, 1996) while Agronomic use efficiency was determined through use of the following equation; Difference method.  $NAE = (GY1) - (GY0) / R$ ; GY1 = Grain yield from fertilized plots; GY0 = Grain yield from unfertilized plots; R = rate of fertilizer N applied- where NAE- Nitrogen Agronomic efficiency. NHI was computed according to Muchow (1988), as the ratio between N uptake in the grain and N uptake in the straw.

### **Results and Discussion**

The results revealed NAE to be within the ranges reported by previous workers. For instance, Rahman et al. (2014) reported an NAE of 23.6-17.7g g<sup>-1</sup> for N rates ranging between 40-80 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. While NUES ranged between 26- 158 (depending on variety). The two ranges fall within what Masso et al. (2017) referred to as spatial paradox of “too little” and “too much” N scenarios respectively, perpetuating food insecurity quantitatively and qualitatively.

**Table 1. Mean Nitrogen harvest indices (NHI), nitrogen agronomic efficiency (NAE) and nitrogen use efficiencies (NUE) of rice varieties as affected by nitrogen rates.**

N rates kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	NERICA 4			NERICA 10		
	NHI	NAE	NUE	NHI	NAE	NUE
0	0.69 <sup>a</sup>	-	-	0.68 <sup>a</sup>	-	-
26	0.69 <sup>a</sup>	23.37 <sup>a</sup>	107.13 <sup>ab</sup>	0.74 <sup>a</sup>	25.68 <sup>a</sup>	158.16 <sup>a</sup>
52	0.74 <sup>a</sup>	24.49 <sup>a</sup>	182.55 <sup>ab</sup>	0.69 <sup>a</sup>	25.50 <sup>a</sup>	45.90 <sup>ab</sup>
78	0.76 <sup>a</sup>	24.57 <sup>a</sup>	30.70 <sup>a</sup>	0.81 <sup>a</sup>	26.22 <sup>a</sup>	26.18 <sup>b</sup>
LSD	0.15	0.39		0.10	1.22	

Values followed by same letters within the same column are not statistically different at  $p \leq 0.05$

The case of “too much” are likely to contribute to nutrient pollution and eutrophication (Marler and Wallin 2006). In case of “too little”; scenario as in SSA case, Kenya included, higher NUE could imply nutrient mining and land degradation.

### Acknowledgement

The authors wish to acknowledge the support of International Nitrogen Management Initiative (INMS) for financial support.

### References

- Bremner, J. M (1996). Nitrogen-Total. In *Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 3, Chemical Methods*; Sparks, D. L., Ed.; Soil Science Society of America, American Society of Agronomy: Madison, WI, pp 1085–1121.
- Lemaire G and Gastal F (1997). Nitrogen uptake and distribution in plant canopies. In: Lemaire, G. (Ed.), *Diagnosis of the Nitrogen Status in Crops*. Springer–Verlag, Berlin, pp. 3–43
- Marler J B, Wallin J R (2006). „Human health, the nutritional quality of harvested food and sustainable farming systems.“ (Nutrition Security Institute: Bellevue)
- Masso C, Baijukya F, Ebanyat P, Bouaziz S, Wendt J, Bekunda M, and Vanlauwe B (2017). Dilemma of nitrogen management for future food security in sub-Saharan Africa – a review. *Soil Research*. 55: 425–434
- Muchow, R.C.(1998). Nitrogen Utilization Efficiency in corn and Sorghum. *Field Crops Res.*56.209-216.
- Rahman M M, Islam M A, Azirui M S and Boyce A N (2018). Agronomic and Nitrogen Recovery Efficiency of Rice Under Tropical Conditions as Affected by Nitrogen Fertilizer and Legume Crop Rotation. *The Journal of Animal and Plant Sciences*, 24(3) 891-896.
- Tittonell, P., and Giller, K. E. (2013). When yield gaps are povertytraps: The paradigm of ecological intensification in African smallholder agriculture. *Field Crops Research*, 143, 76–90.