



# Characterization and suitability assessment of soils underlain by mica-schist for yam and cocoyam production in rainforest area Southwestern, Nigeria

Ruth Oluwakemi Adegbenro<sup>1\*</sup>, Julius Olayinka Ojetade<sup>2</sup>, Oladaele Abdulahi Oguntade<sup>1</sup>, Odelana Oluwatoyin Blessing<sup>1</sup> and Olubunmi Mary Faturoti<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Department of Crop Production, College of Agricultural Sciences, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ayetoro Campus, Nigeria.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Soil Science and Land Resources Management, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.

\* Corresponding author E-mail: ruth.adegbenro@oouagoiwoye.edu.ng

# Article info

Received 17/12/2023; received in revised form 29/12/2023; accepted 19/1/2024 DOI: 10.6092/issn.2281-4485/18723 © 2024 The Authors.

# Abstract

This study was conducted to assess the suitability of the soils underlain by mica-schist for sustainable production of yam and cocoyam. The study was carried out in 2014, in an area located approximately between 7°32' N and 7°33' N and longitudes 4°32' E and 4°40' E within the Teaching and Research Farm (T&R-F) of Obafemi Awolowo University (OAU), Kajola, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. Four profile pits were established, described and sampled with one at different physiographical units following the guideline for soil profile description according to FAO/UNESCO (2006) guideline. The soil samples collected were analyzed for particle size distribution, pH, total nitrogen, available phosphorus, exchangeable bases, and organic matter using standard method. Land characteristics obtained were matched with the crop requirements for yam and cocoyam to obtain the soils' suitability classes using parametric method. The result showed that all the soils are well drained and deep. The texture of the soils ranged from sandy loam to sandy clay loam at the surface and sandy clay loam to clay at subsurface. Soil reaction ranged from highly acidic to slightly acidic (4.2 - 5.8 water and 3.8 - 5.4 pH KCl) with low to moderate amounts of organic matter (1.2% to 2.9%) and available nitrogen (0.07 – 0.2%). Available phosphorus varied from 2.0 - 10.6 mg/kg in all the horizons in the profiles with the highest values at the surface soil horizons, an indication that soil organic matter contributes significantly to the available P in these soils. The exchangeable bases were low and the relative abundance of the exchangeable bases followed the order: Ca> Mg > Na>K at the exchangeable site. Suitability evaluation of the soils was carried out using parametric approach. The result showed that all the soil mapping units were permanently not suitable (N2) for cocoyam and yam production for actual suitability evaluation. With the appropriate fertility management, the soils of mapping unit 2 was classified as moderately suitable (S2) for yam production while soils of mapping units 1 and 3 were classified as marginally suitable (S3) for yam production. Soils of mapping unit 4 was classified as presently not suitable (N1) for yam production. After improvement for cocoyam production, soils of mapping unit 1 and 2 were classified as marginally suitable (S3) while soils of mapping units 3 and 4 were presently not suitable (N1). The soils were limited by wetness, texture, shallow depth and low fertility (N, P and K). Therefore, Combined application of organic fertilizer with guided inorganic fertilizers (N-P-K) should be encouraged for optimum productivity.

# Keywords

Characterization, Suitability, yam, Cocoyam, Rainforest, Southwestern, Nigeria

The journal is hosted and mantained by <u>ABIS-AlmaDL.</u> Works are licensed under <u>CC BY 4.0</u>

# Introduction

Soil is a life-supporting system upon which human beings have been dependent from the dawn of civilization. It is a non-renewable natural resource, hence comprehensive information on its potentials, limitations and capabilities, is required for a variety of purposes; such as project area development, soil conservation in catchment areas, sustainable agriculture, reclamation of degraded lands, etc. (Adegbenro et al. 2022). Healthy soil is important to blossoming agriculture. Esu (2004) noted that one of the ways to accomplish sustainable agriculture in a sustainable environment is to examine soil properties and in particular through soil characterization and land evaluation for several land utilization types. Soils of southwestern Nigeria are dominantly formed in basement complex rocks areas and the landscape is characterized by undulating topography (Obi et al., 2009). Soils derived from fine-grained biotite gneiss and schist are very extensive in southwestern Nigeria (Smyth and Montgomery, 1962) and are highly vital on the account of their suitability for both arable and tree crops. Moreso, the world's population is increasing and the pressure on land is increasing on farmland with the result that fallow periods are becoming shorter in some areas, while intensive agriculture is fast replacing the age-old peasant system. In order to meet the increasing demand for food, the farming community has to produce more, in order to increase food production and provide food security; crops need to be grown in areas where they are best suited in order to get optimum yields, and this can be done with the aid of land suitability analysis (Gelleh et al, 2018). Based on a study, land suitability analysis is a method of land evaluation, which measures the degree of appropriateness of land for a certain use (Halder, 2013). Poor knowledge and appraisal of suitability of parcels of land for agricultural production is a major problem of agricultural development in Nigeria. The result is poor farm management practices, low yield and unnecessarily high cost of production (Aderonke and Gbadegesin, 2013).

In Nigeria, yam (*Dioscorea spp.*) and cocoyam are crops of economic importance. They are considered crops of strategic importance and important staple food crops playing dominant roles in the rural economy of southwestern Nigeria. Yams are a staple tuber crop for many of the poorest in West Africa, South East Asia, the Caribbean and Oceania. In many of these areas' yams are also culturally important. Up to 95% of the world's yams are produced in West Africa (FAO, 2009). Nigeria is one of the leading producers of yam in in the world, accounting for about 65% to 67.5% of the world production (Apu et al., 2020). Yam is one of the main staple crops grown in Nigeria. Its demand for domestic consumption, ceremonial purpose, pharmaceutical needs, economic growth and export for foreign exchange return is on the increase alongside with its low production (Samson and Ityavnongo, 2021). Cocoyam (Colocasia esculentus) otherwise known as Taro is an herbaceous perennial plant belonging to the family Araceae and grown primarily for their edible roots. They are actually of two species namely Colocasia which is basically cultivated as food crops and Xanthosoma species which is comprised of a large spherical corm from which a few large leaves emerge. According to research, the global production of cocoyam has been estimated to be approximately 60 per cent in Africa and 40 per cent in Asia, with little quantities in the Caribbean and Oceania, over an area of 983 million hectares with an average yield of 5.314mt/ha (FAO, 1991). In a lot of developing countries, roots and tubers such as cocoyam, yam, cassava, and sweet potatoes are important crops that generate income and provide food security for the populace. In Nigeria, cocoyam is cultivated mainly predominantly as annuals, mainly for their edible starchy storage underground stems known as corms and cormels. Cocoyam corms are good sources of carbohydrates with starch that is easily digestible and it's nutritionally superior to its major competitor roots and tubers like cassava and yam in terms of digestibility, contents of crude protein and essential minerals, such as Ca, Mg, and P. The country maintains the lead among cocoyam producing nations, with an annual production of 4.55 million metric tonnes in 2012, representing 61.2 and 43.1% total production in West Africa, respectively (ODNRI, 1989). Also, in Nigeria cocoyam ranks third after cassava and yam among staple root and tuber crops in terms of importance, total output and production area. It has high economic potential not only as food but also as an agro-industrial raw material for pharmaceutical and livestock industries. This crop is very important and can generate income and provide food security for the populace. Cocoyam is actually under exploited in Osun State in as much as it has enormous health benefits over its competitor root crops such as cassava and yam which are eventually given more emphasis. These health benefits are in terms of certain minerals such as Ca, Mg, and P. Also, it aids digestion more than its

competitor crops which include cassava and yam. The State can increase the production of this root and tuber crop in order to provide food security especially for the teaming population within Osun State and the country at large. This can, however, be done with the aid of a land suitability analysis in order to identify most suitable land for the production of cocoyam within the state. The rationale for the choice of land suitability for yam and cocoyam production emanated from the fact that the production of these root and tuber crops within the State has not been given much attention for long despite its nutritive and economic value; emphasis is rather placed more on the production of maize and cassava. Several studies have been done on characterization and suitability of southwestern soils for different crops (Adegbenro et al, (2022); Ujoh and Igbawua, (2019); Ikusemoran and Hajjatu (2010); Awoniyi and Omonona, (2006); ), however there is dearth of information on characterization of soils derived from fine-grained biotite gneiss and schist in the rainforest region of southwestern Nigeria and their suitability for yam and cocoyam production. Therefore, the objectives of this study were to characterize and assess soils underlain by mica schist with a view to encourage sustainable production of yam and cocoyam in the area.

## Materals and methods

The study was conducted in 2012 on soil underlain by mica schist (Smyth Montgomery 1962) at the Teaching and Research Farm, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. It is a region within the southwestern part of Nigeria, which lies between latitudes 7°32' N and 7°33' N and longitudes 4°32' E and 4°40' E. The elevation of the area ranged from 265 to 296 meters above mean sea level. The area has hot, humid tropical climate with distinct dry and bimodal rainy season. The mean annual rainfall is 1400mm and temperature is 27.9°C (Okusami and Oyediran, 1981). The vegetation of the area consists of cacao, oil palm and citrus. Four profile pits were established, described and sampled with one at different physiographical units following the guideline for soil profile description according to FAO/UNESCO (2006) guideline. Soils samples were taken from the identified genetic horizons of each of the soil profiles, starting from the lowest to the uppermost, in order to prevent contamination. Data collected from the analyses were subjected to descriptive and inferential statistics.

# Laboratory analysis

The soil samples were air dried, crushed gently in a ceramic mortar and passed through 2 mm sieve to separate gravel content and obtain the less than 2 mm for laboratory analyses. Particle fractions size distribution was evaluated by the modified Bouyoucos hydrometer method (Bouyoucos, 1962) as reported by Gee and Or (2002). Soil pH was determined in 1:1 soil water suspension using a glass electrode pH meter (Mclean 1965). Soil organic carbon (SOC) was determined by the Walkley Black method (Walkley and Black, 1934) using the chromic acid digestion (Allison, 1965) as reported by Nelson and Sommers (1996). Exchangeable cations were extracted using 1.0 N NH<sub>4</sub>OAC (pH. 7.0) and read using flame photometer for Na and K, and atomic absorption spectrophotometer for calcium and magnesium (Rhoades, 1982). Total exchangeable acidity and Al were determined by titration method using 1.0 M KCl (Sims, 1996) and titrated with 0.05N NaOH solution (Black, 1975). The organic carbon was determined by the Walkley-Black method (Nelson and Sommers, 1996), total nitrogen was determined by the kjeldahl digestion and distillation method (Bremner, 1996) while the available phosphorus was determined by the Bray-1 method (Kuo, 1996).

#### Suitability evaluation

The FAO framework for soil suitability evaluation was used for the study (Sys *et al.*, 1993) Land characteristics recognized on the field were combined with those determined in the laboratory to make the preferred land qualities which were used as basis for the land assessment. A numerical rating of the land characteristics in a normal scale from a maximum (normally 100) to a minimum value (20) was employed. If a land characteristic was optimal for the considered land utilization type, the maximal rating of 100 was attributed; if the land characteristic was unfavorable, a minimal rating of 20 was applied. The index of suitability (actual and potential) was calculated using the square root method:

$$IP = A \ge \sqrt{[(B/100) \ge (C/100) \ge ... \ge (F/100)]}$$
[1]

where: IP = land index A = overall lowest characteristic rating B, C...F = lowest characteristics ratings for each land quality group (Udoh *et al.*, 2006). For actual (current) aggregate suitability, all the lowest characteristic ratings for each land quality group were substituted into the aggregate suitability equation above. However, in the case of potential aggregate suitability, it was assumed that the corrective fertility measures

would no longer have fertility constraints. Therefore, other qualities except fertility (f) were used to calculate the potential aggregate suitability

# **Results and Discussion**

## Characteristics of the soil

Table 1 showed that the profiles were very deep and were all considered suitable for yam and cocoyam production. The texture of the surface ranged from loamy sand to clay and sandy clay to clay at subsurface. The sand particles seemed to be the most dominant size fraction with a range from 36% to 85% but decreased with depth. The high sand particles fraction could have been responsible for the well-drained nature of the soils (Smyth and Montgomery, 1962; Amusan, 1991; Usman *et al.*, 2020). The clay content varied from 2 to 52 % which increased with depth of the in all the profiles except the soils at the valley bottom. This is an evidence of illuviation. The contents of silt in the soils were comparatively lower than those of the sand fraction.

There was no consistent pattern of distribution of silt in all the profiles, the values ranged between 5 to 17 %. The low silt content of the soils irrespective of their location is in line with the reports of several researchers who worked in similar environment in the basement complex area of Southwest Nigeria (Okusami and Oyediran, 1985). The silt/clay ratios of 0.22 to 0.25, 0.20 to 0.24, 0.20 to 0.25 and 7.50 to 17.00 were observed in mapping unit 1,2, 3 and 4 respectively. The soils of the study area were characterized by low degree of weathered when compared with the findings of Van Wambeke (1962), who reported that 'old' parent materials usually have silt/clay ratios below 0.15 while silt/clay ratios above 0.15 indicate 'young' parent material. Also, Asomoa (1985) reported that soils with silt/clay ratios of less than 0.25 were at an advanced stage of weathering while those with ratios greater than 0.25 indicated a low degree of weathering. However, soils of Jago had silt/ clay ratio above 0.15 and 0.25 indicating that the soil was relatively young.

| Horizon    | Donth (am)        | Particle S  | Size Distribu | ution (%)    | Textural  | Silt/Clay | Colour<br>(moist) |  |
|------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|--|
| Honzon     | Depth (cm)        | sand        | silt          | clay         | Class     | ratio     |                   |  |
|            |                   |             | Profile 1: U  | pper Slope   |           |           |                   |  |
| AP         | 0-18              | 79          | 5             | 20           | SC        | 0.25      | 5YR3/4            |  |
| AB         | 18-56             | 39          | 11            | 50           | С         | 0.22      | 7.5YR 4/4         |  |
| Bt         | 56-110            | 36          | 12            | 52           | С         | 0.23      | 5YR 4/8           |  |
| Bt2        | 110-144           | 41          | 11            | 48           | С         | 0.23      | 5YR 5/6           |  |
| BC         | 144-186           | 44          | 10            | 46           | С         | 0.22      | 5YR 4/8           |  |
|            |                   |             | Profile 2:    | Mid slope    |           |           |                   |  |
| AP         | 0-13              | 63          | 6             | 32           | SCL       | 0.20      | 7.5YR 4/2         |  |
| AB         | 13-25             | 49          | 9             | 42           | SC        | 0.20      | 7.5YR 4/4         |  |
| Bt         | 25-49             | 42          | 11            | 47           | С         | 0.23      | 5YR 5/8           |  |
| BC         | 49-116            | 42          | 11            | 46           | С         | 0.24      | 5YR 4/8           |  |
|            |                   |             | Profile 3: L  | ower Slope   |           |           |                   |  |
| AP         | 0-20              | 64          | 7             | 29           | SCL       | 0.24      | 7.5YR 3/2         |  |
| AB         | 20-63             | 50          | 9             | 41           | SC        | 0.20      | 5YR 4/6           |  |
| B2         | 63-106            | 50          | 10            | 40           | SC        | 0.25      | 5YR 4/8           |  |
| 2B         | 106-162           | 52          | 9             | 39           | SCL       | 0.23      | 5YR 4/8           |  |
|            |                   | ]           | Profile 4: Va | alley bottom |           |           |                   |  |
| Ар         | 0-8               | 82          | 17            | 1            | LS        | 17.0      | 10YR 5/6          |  |
| AB         | 8-19              | 83          | 15            | 2            | LS        | 7.50      | 10YR 5/6          |  |
| BCg        | 19-25             | 85          | 13            | 2            | LS        | 13.0      | 10YR 4/3          |  |
| SC = Sandy | Clay - C = Clay - | - SCL = San | dy Clay Loa   | m - LS = L   | oamy sand |           |                   |  |

**Table 1.** Physical properties of the soils

The chemical properties of the soils studied are at the surface of most of the profiles could be presented in Table 2. The pH of the soils was slightly attributed to more decomposable plant materials on the acidic ranging from 4.2 - 5.8 and 3.8 - 5.4 in water and surface soil (Lal, 1991). The total nitrogen content was KCl solution respectively. The higher pH could be low and varied from 0.07 - 0.20 % and the values attributed to higher rate of phytocycling (Amusan, decreased with depth. The values were low to medium 1991). The pH difference (pH KCl - pH H<sub>2</sub>O) is negative in all horizons of the soils and this suggests that silicate clay mineralogy is dominant over oxidic Available phosphorus varied from 2.0 - 10.6 mg/kg in mineralogy (van Ray and Peech, 1972) or negatively charged (Mekaru and Uehara, 1972). The organic matter the surface soil horizons, an indication that soil organic content was low (0.4 - 1.74 %). The soil organic matter ranged from 1.3% to 2.9% with the highest values observed at the surface horizons. The soil organic matter content of all profiles was low to medium and this may be due to the prevalence of tropical conditions where the degradation of organic matter occurs at faster less organic carbon in the soils (Nayak et al., 2002). The well-drained and acidic conditions of the soils. value decreased with depth. The higher SOM content

compared with the critical value of plant nutrient of 0.20 % and in close association with organic matter. all the horizons in the profiles with the highest values at matter contributes significantly to the available P in these soils. The available P values were all considered low in most of the horizons as they were below the 10 mg/kg critical limit recommended for most commonly cultivated crops in the area (Obigbesan, 2009). The low value of available P might be due to the fixation of rates coupled with low vegetation cover, thereby leaving phosphorus by iron and aluminum sesquioxides under

Table 2. Chemical properties of the soils

|         | 1 1     | 5                |     |      |     |      |                 |          |         |     |     |     |       |     |     |      |
|---------|---------|------------------|-----|------|-----|------|-----------------|----------|---------|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|------|
| Horizon | Depth   | p                | Н   | Н    | OM  | TN   | AP              | Na       | Κ       | Mg  | Ca  | Н   | Al    | TEA | TEB | ECEC |
| TIONZON | cm      | H <sub>2</sub> O | KCl |      | %   |      | mg/kg           |          |         |     |     | Cmo | ol/kg |     |     |      |
|         |         |                  |     |      |     |      | D (1            | 4 11     | 1       |     |     |     |       |     |     |      |
| AP      | 0-18    | 5.8              | 5.4 | -0.4 | 2.9 | 0.20 | Profile<br>10.6 | 0.1      | 0.3     | 2.6 | 4.7 | 1.1 | 0.3   | 1.4 | 5.2 | 6.6  |
|         |         |                  |     |      |     |      |                 |          |         |     |     |     |       |     |     |      |
| AB      | 18-56   | 5.5              | 5.1 | -0.4 | 2.8 | 0.14 | 3.7             | 0.2      | 0.4     | 2.9 | 6.9 | 0.6 | 0.3   | 0.9 | 7.6 | 8.4  |
| Bt      | 56-110  | 5.5              | 5.4 | -0.2 | 2.3 | 0.12 | 3               | 0.2      | 0.1     | 1.7 | 6.7 | 0.7 | 0.3   | 1.0 | 7.1 | 8.1  |
| Bt2     | 110-144 | 5.6              | 5.4 | -0.3 | 2.2 | 0.11 | 2               | 0.2      | 0.2     | 2.6 | 5.3 | 0.3 | 0.3   | 0.6 | 5.7 | 6.3  |
| BC      | 144-186 | 5.5              | 5.1 | -0.4 | 2.1 | 0.11 | 2               | 0.2      | 0.2     | 2.3 | 5.5 | 0.6 | 0.2   | 0.8 | 6.1 | 6.9  |
|         |         |                  |     |      |     |      | Drofil          | : 2: Mid | alono   |     |     |     |       |     |     |      |
| AP      | 0-13    | 5.7              | 5.1 | -0.6 | 2   | 0.11 | 6.3             | 0.2      | 0.3     | 2   | 6.2 | 0.8 | 0.2   | 1.0 | 7.0 | 8.0  |
| AB      | 13-25   | 5.3              | 4.7 | -0.6 | 2.3 | 0.12 | 7.7             | 0.2      | 0.4     | 2.3 | 6   | 0.7 | 0.2   | 0.9 | 6.8 | 7.6  |
| Bt      | 25-49   | 5.1              | 4.9 | -0.0 | 1.5 | 0.12 | 3.2             | 0.2      | 0.4     | 2.3 | 5   | 0.3 | 0.2   | 0.6 | 5.6 | 6.2  |
|         |         |                  |     |      |     |      |                 |          |         |     |     |     |       |     |     |      |
| BC      | 49-116  | 5.2              | 5.1 | -0.1 | 1.3 | 0.07 | 2.6             | 0.2      | 0.4     | 2.3 | 6.5 | 0.5 | 0.3   | 0.8 | 7.2 | 7.9  |
|         |         |                  |     |      |     |      | Profile         | 3: Lowe  | r slope |     |     |     |       |     |     |      |
| AP      | 0-20    | 4.7              | 4.2 | -0.5 | 2.3 | 0.12 | 8.7             | 0.2      | 0.4     | 3.5 | 5.4 | 0.4 | 0.3   | 0.7 | 6.2 | 6.9  |
| AB      | 20-63   | 4.7              | 4.5 | -0.2 | 2.4 | 0.12 | 10.2            | 0.2      | 0.3     | 5.2 | 7.6 | 0.3 | 0.3   | 0.6 | 8.3 | 8.9  |
| B2      | 63-106  | 4.8              | 4.7 | -0.1 | 1.7 | 0.1  | 5.8             | 0.2      | 0.3     | 2.9 | 5   | 0.2 | 0.3   | 0.5 | 5.6 | 6.2  |
| 2B      | 106-162 | 4.2              | 3.8 | -0.4 | 2   | 0.1  | 7               | 0.2      | 0.1     | 2   | 4.1 | 0.7 | 0.4   | 1.1 | 4.5 | 5.6  |
|         |         |                  |     |      |     |      |                 |          |         |     |     |     |       |     |     |      |
|         |         |                  |     |      |     |      | Profile 4       | Valley   | bottom  |     |     |     |       |     |     |      |
| Ар      | 0-8     | 5.4              | 5.2 | -0.2 | 2   | 0.1  | 6.7             | 0.2      | 0.2     | 1.8 | 3.8 | 1.6 | 0.4   | 2.0 | 4.2 | 6.2  |
| AB      | 8-19    | 5.5              | 5.2 | -0.3 | 1.5 | 0.08 | 3.9             | 0.2      | 0.1     | 1.7 | 5   | 1.0 | 0.4   | 1.4 | 5.4 | 6.8  |
| BCg     | 19-25   | 5.5              | 5.0 | -0.5 | 2.3 | 0.12 | 7.9             | 0.1      | 0.1     | 2.4 | 3.8 | 0.9 | 0.3   | 1.2 | 4.2 | 5.4  |

(Onvekwere et al., 2001). The exchangeable bases were low, ranging from 4.2 to 8.3 cmol/kg. Smyth and Montgomery (1962) reported that the soils of the upland area of central western Nigeria have low exchange capacity in keeping with the essentially kaolinitic nature of their clay content. Relatively low amounts of exchangeable bases were present in all the profile pits examined. The exchangeable calcium for the soil varied from 3.8 to 6.9 cmol/kg while the exchangeable magnesium (Mg2+) content varied from 1.7 to 5.2 cmol/kg soil. The soil Ca and Mg were higher than critical levels of 1.5 and 0.28 cmol/kg for Ca and Mg, respectively in soils of southwestern Nigeria (Enwezor et al., 1990; Uponi and Adeoye, 2000). This implied that soils in this region can supply adequate amount of Ca and Mg needed for optimal growth of yam and cocoyam. Exchangeable potassium (K) contents ranged between 0.1 and 0.4 cmol/kg. The soil K levels were low to moderate compared to the critical level of 0.3 cmol/kg soil. This indicates that the

soil K content were low and would therefore need the use of K supplying fertilizer. The sodium content ranged from 0.1 - 0.2 cmol/kg. Uwitonze (2016), reported that when the value of Na content is < 1 cmol/kg, it cannot be detrimental to plant roots. The cations occur in the order: Ca> Mg >K >Na at the exchangeable site. The low values of exchangeable bases of the soils may be attributed to high rainfall intensity, intensity of weathering, leaching and lateral translocation of bases (Solarin, 2000). Amhakhian and Osemwota (2011) shown that exchangeable cations were lost from the exchangeable complex in the following order Ca<Mg<K<Na.

# Suitability evaluation of the soils for cocoyam production

The suitability ratings of the land characteristics (Table 5) were obtained by comparing their values with the land requirement for yam and cocoyam production

|    | т 1                       |                                      | S1               | Soil S2     | S3           | N1        | N2     |
|----|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|--------|
|    | Land                      | Qualities                            | (>95%)           | (85%)       | (50%)        | (<50%)    | (<25%) |
|    | $C^{1}$                   | Annual Rainfall (mm)                 | <u>&gt; 2000</u> | 1300 - 2000 | 1000 - 1299  | <1000     |        |
|    | Climate (c)               | Annual Temperature ( <sup>0</sup> C) | 21 - 25          | 25 - 30     | 30 - 35      | >35       |        |
|    | Topography (t)            | Slope (%)                            | 0-4              | 4-6         | 2-4          | 0 - 2     |        |
|    | Drainage (w)              |                                      | WD               | MD          | IMD          | PD        | VPD    |
|    | Physical properties (s)   | Texture                              | L                | SL          | SCL          | С         |        |
| A) |                           | Soil depth (cm)                      | >40              | 31 - 40     | 21 – 30      | <20       |        |
|    |                           | рН                                   | 7.5 – 5.2        | 5.2 - 4.1   | 3.9 -        | 4.1       | <3.9   |
|    | Nutrient availability (f) | Nitrogen (%)                         | >0.6             | 0.3 - 0.5   | 0.1 - 0.2    | <0.1      |        |
|    |                           | Phosphorus (mg/kg)                   | 60 - 43          | 6 - 42      | 4 - 5        | <4        | -      |
|    |                           | Potassium (cmol/kg)                  | >0.05            | 0.03 - 0.04 | 0.01 - 0.002 | < 0.01    |        |
|    | Nutrient retention (n)    | O.M.                                 | >1.3             | 0.8 – 1.3   | 0.4 - 0.7    | <0.4      |        |
|    |                           | Annual Rainfall (mm)                 | 1000 - 1800      | 750 - 600   | 600 - 550    | 550 - 500 | <500   |
|    | Climate (c)               | Annual Temperature ( <sup>0</sup> C) | 25 - 35          | 30 - 35     | 15-20        | >15       | <15    |
|    | Topography (t)            | Slope (%)                            | 0-4              | 4 - 8       | 8-16         | >16       |        |
|    | Drainage (w)              |                                      | WD               | MD          | ID           | PD        | VPD    |
|    | Physical properties (s)   | Texture                              | L, SCL           | SL          | SC           | С         |        |
| 3) |                           | Soil depth (cm)                      | >40              | 31 - 40     | 21 - 30      | <20       |        |
|    |                           | рН                                   | 7.5 - 5.2        | 5.2 - 4.1   | 3.9 - 4.1    | <3.9      |        |
|    | Nutrient availability (f) | Nitrogen (%)                         | >0.6             | 0.3 - 0.5   | 0.1 - 0.2    | < 0.1     |        |
|    | ,                         | Phosphorus (mg/kg)                   | >25              | 6 - 25      | <6           | -         | -      |
|    |                           | Potassium (cmol/kg)                  | > 2.0            | < 2.0       | <1.0         | >0.5      | < 0.5  |
|    | Nutrient retention (n)    | O.M.                                 | >1.5             | > 0.8       | > 0.5        | < 0.3     |        |

Table 3. Land requirements for cocoyam (A) and yam (B) productions

(Table 3) using the ratings for the limited characteristics in Table 5. Aggregate suitability ratings (potential and actual) were computed using the linear parametric approach. The result showed that all the soil mapping units were permanently not suitable (N2) for cocoyam and yam production for actual suitability evaluation. With the appropriate fertility management, the soils of mapping unit 2 was classified as moderately suitable (S2) for yam production while soils of mapping units 1 and 3 were classified as marginally suitable (S3) for yam production. Soils of mapping unit 4 was classified as presently not suitable (N1) for yam production. After improvement for cocoyam production, soils of mapping unit 1 and 2 were classified as marginally suitable (S3) while soils of mapping units 3 and 4 were presently not suitable (N1).

**Table 4.** Qualitative land suitability classes for the different land indices

| Definition               | Land Index  |
|--------------------------|---|
| Highly suitable          | 75 – 100  |
| Moderately suitable      | 50 - 75   |
| Marginally suitable      | 25 - 50   |
| Presently not suitable   | 12.5 – 25   |
| Permanently not suitable | 0.00 – 12. 5  |
|                          | Highly suitable<br>Moderately suitable<br>Marginally suitable<br>Presently not suitable |

 Table 5. Suitability evaluation of the soil units for cocoyam (A) and yam (B) productions

|    | Land                         | Qualities               | Soil 1 | Soil 2 | Soil 3  | Soil 4 |
|----|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|--------|---------|--------|
|    | Climate (c)                  | Annual Rainfall (mm)    | 85     | 85     | 85      | 85     |
|    | Chinate (C)                  | Annual Temperature (0C) | 85     | 85     | 85      | 85     |
|    | Topography (t):              | Slope (%)               | 95     | 85     | 40      | 25     |
|    | Drainage (w)                 |                         | 100    | 100    | 85      | 25     |
|    |                              | Texture                 | 40     | 50     | 50      | 85     |
|    | Soil physical properties (s) | Soil depth (cm)         | 100    | 100    | 100     | 25     |
|    |                              | pH                      | 95     | 95     | 85      | 95     |
| A) |                              | Nitrogen (%)            | 40     | 40     | 40      | 40     |
|    | Fertility (f)                | Phosphorus (ppm)        | 50     | 50     | 85      | 85     |
|    |                              | Potassium (cmol/kg)     | 40     | 40     | 40      | 40     |
|    | Nutrient retention (n)       | Organic matter (%)      | 100    | 100    | 100     | 100    |
|    | T 1                          | a                       | 09     | 10     | 08      | 02     |
|    | Index                        | b                       | 32     | 39     | 22      | 5      |
|    |                              | a                       | N2csf  | N2ctsf | N2ctwsf | N2ctws |
|    | Class                        | b                       | S3csf  | S3ctsf | N1ctwsf | N1ctws |
|    |                              | Annual Rainfall (mm)    | 100    | 100    | 100     | 100    |
|    | Climate (c)                  | Annual Temperature (0C) | 100    | 100    | 100     | 100    |
|    |                              | Relative humidity (%)   | 100    | 100    | 100     | 100    |
|    | Topography (t):              | Slope (%)               | 75     | 75     | 100     | 100    |
|    | Drainage (w)                 |                         | 100    | 100    | 50      | 25     |
|    |                              | Texture                 | 50     | 85     | 85      | 85     |
|    | Soil physical properties (s) | Soil depth (cm)         | 100    | 100    | 100     | 50     |
| D) |                              | pH                      | 100    | 100    | 50      | 100    |
| B) |                              | Nitrogen (%)            | 50     | 50     | 50      | 50     |
|    | Fertility (f)                | Phosphorus (ppm)        | 50     | 50     | 85      | 85     |
|    |                              | Potassium (cmol/kg)     | 25     | 25     | 25      | 10     |
|    | Nutrient retention (n)       | Organic matter (%)      | 100    | 100    | 100     | 100    |
|    | т 1                          | a                       | 8      | 10     | 8       | 3      |
|    | Index                        | b                       | 43     | 69     | 46      | 16     |
|    | <u></u>                      | a                       | N2tsf  | N2tsf  | N2wsf   | N2wsf  |
|    | Class                        | b                       | S3tsf  | S2tsf  | S3wsf   | N1wsf  |

 $\mathbf{a}$  = actual suitability when nutrient characteristic (f) is not corrected by fertilizer application

 $\mathbf{b}$  = potential suitability after correction of nutrient characteristic (f) by fertilizer application.

# **Conclusions**

Soils of the studied area were characterized and evaluated for yam and cocoyam production. The soils were moderately acidic to highly acidic. The soils are deficient in macro nutrients, their values were below the critical level required for optimum yam and cocoyam production. Land suitability evaluation result revealed that currently, the soils are permanently not suitable (N2) for cocoyam and yam production. Potentially, that is, with good management practices, the soils would be presently not suitable (N1), marginally suitable (S3) and moderately suitable (S2). The soils were limited by wetness, texture, shallow depth, low soil organic matter and low fertility (N, P and K). Therefore, combined application of organic fertilizer with guided inorganic fertilizers (N-P-K) should be encouraged for optimum productivity in the area. In addition, the application of acidifying fertilizer should be avoided

#### <u>References</u>

ADEGBENRO R.O., OJETADE J.O., MUDA S.A., AMUSAN S.A. (2022) Suitability assessment of soils developed in coarse-grained granite and gneiss in humid rainforest area of Southwestern Nigeria, for maize and cassava production. Ghana Jnl Agric. Sci. 57 (2):62–75 https://dx.doi.org/ 10.4314/gjas.v57i2.6

ADERONKE D.O., GBADEGESIN G.A. (2013) Spatial variability in soil properties of a continuously cultivated land. African Journal of Agricultural Research, 8(5):475-483.

ALLISON L.E. (1965) Organic Carbon. In: C. A. Black, Ed., Methods of Soil Analysis, Part 2, Chemical and Microbiological Properties, American Society of Agronomy, Madison, WI. 1367-1378.

AMHAKHIAN S.O., OSEMWOTA I.O. (2011) Physical and chemical properties of soils in Kogi State, Guinea Savanna Zone of Nigeria. Nigeria Journal of Soil Science 22 (1):44-47.

AMUSAN A.A (1991) Pedogenesis in granitic gneiss of humid Tropical southwestern Nigeria. Ph.D. Thesis. Submitted to the Department of Soil Science, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. 1991.

APU U., ANI N., AGBAREVO M.N.B., UGOAJA C.I., EKWE K.C. OBINNA L.O. (2020) Determinants of sustainable use of improved yam production practices among farmers in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. Nigerian Agricultural Journal, 51:279.

ASOMOA G.K. (1985) Particle size free iron oxide distribution in some latosols and ground water laterite in Ghana. Geoderma, 10: 285-297.

AWONIYI O.A., OMONONA B.T. (2006) Production efficiency in yam based enterprises in Ekiti state, Nigeria. Journal of Central European Agriculture 7:27.

BLACK C.A. (1975) Methods of Soil Analysis Agronomy (ed.) No 9 part 2. Ame. Soc. Agronomy Madison, Wisconsin.

Bouyoucos G.J. (1962) Hydrometer method improved for making particle size analyses of soils Agronomy journal, 54(5):464-465.

BREMNER J.M. (1996) Total Nitrogen. In Sparks, D. L. (ed.), Methods of Soil Analysis Part 3: SSSA Book Series No.
5. Soil Science Society of America Inc., American Society of Agronomy Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, 1085 – 1122.

ESU I.E. (2004) Soil characterization and mapping for food security and sustainable environment in Nigeria. In: Salako, F.K., et al. (eds.). Managing soil resources for food security and sustainable environment. Proceeding of 29th Annual Conference of the Soil Science Society of Nigeria, University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Nigeria. 6-10. December 2004. 9-17.

FAO (2009). FAOSTAT Crop production data. http://faostat.fao.org.

FAO (1991) Year Book

FAO/UNESCO (2006) A Framework for International Classification, Correlation and Communication. World Soil Resources Reports. No. 103, FAO, Rome.

GEE G., OR D. (2002) Particle-Size Analysis. In Methods of Soil Analysis: Physical Methods, edited by J.H. Dane, 255–93. Madison: Soil Science Society of America.

GELLEH I., OKEKE D.U., BABALOGBON H., AYODEJI B., MANGUT Y. SILAS (2018) Land Suitability Analysis for the Production of Cocoyam in Benue State, Nigeria. Earth Sciences Malaysia, 2(2): 25-30.

HALDER J.C. (2013) Land suitability assessment for crop cultivation by using remote sensing and GIS, Journal of Geography and Geology, 5(30):65-74.

KUO S. (1996) Phosphorus. In: D.L. Sparks et al. (eds.) Methods of soil analysis. Part 3. Chemical methods. SSSA, Madison, WI. 869-919.

IKUSEMORAN M., HAJJATU T. (2010).Site suitability for yam, rice and cotton production in Adamawa state of Nigeria: a geographic information system (GIS) approach. FUTY Journal of the Environment 4, <u>https://doi.org/10.4314/</u> fjc.v4i1.48004

LAL R. (1991) Tillage and Agricultural Sustainanbility. Soil and Tillage Research 20:133-146.

NAYAK, A. K., GANGWAR, B. and Shukla, A. K. (2012). Long-Term Effect of Different Integrated Nutrient Management on Soil Organic Matter and its Fraction and

Sustainability of Rice-Wheat-System in Indo Gangetic Plains of India. Field Crops. 127: 129-139.

NELSON D.W.. SOMMERS L.E. (1996) Organic carbon In: Page et al. (Eds): Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2 Agron 9. Madison WI. 538 – 580.

McLEAN E.O. (1965). Aluminum. In : Methods of soil analysis. C. A. Black (ed). Agronomy No 9. America Society of Agronomy 978-998.

MEKARU T., UEHARA G. (1972). Anion adsorption in ferruginous tropical soils. Soil Science Society of America proceedings, 36: 296-300.

OBI J.C., AKINBOLA G.E., ANOZIE H.F. (2009) Distribution of dithionite and oxalate-extractable iron oxides of a catena in the basement complex of Southwestern Nigeria. Nigeria Journal of Soil Science, 19(1):100-108.

OBIGBESAN G.O. (2009). Impact of Liebig's Reseach on the development of Agriculture in Africa. A paper presented at the 33<sup>nd</sup> Conference of the Soil Science Society of Nigeria at Ado-Ekiti. 51.

OKUSAMI T.A., OYEDIRAN G.O. (1985) Slope – Soil Relationship on an Aberrant Toposequence in Ife area of Southwestern Nigeria: Variabilities in soil properties. Ife Journal of Agriculture, 7(1-2):1-15.

ONYEKWERE I.N., AKPAN IDIOK A.U., AMALU U. C., ASAWALAM D.O., EZE P.C. (2001) Constraints and opportunities in Agricultural utilization of some wetland soils in Akwa Ibom State. In: management of wetland soils for sustainable agriculture and environment. Proceedings of the 27<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of Soil Society of Nigeria (SSSN) 139-149. S.O. Ojeniyi, I.E. Esu, U.C. Amalu, F.O.R. Akamigboi, I.J. Ibagan and B.A Ragi (eds).

ODNRI - Overseas Development Natural Resources Institute (1989) Nigeria profile of agricultural potential. United Kingdom, 15.

RHOADES J.D. (1982) Cation exchange capacity. p. 149-157. In A.L. Page, R. H. Miller, and D. R. Keeney (eds.) Methods of soil analysis. Part 2. Chemical and microbiological properties. 2nd ed. Agron. Monogr. 9. ASA and SSSA, Madison, WI.

SAMSON V.M., ITYAVNONGO K.M. (2021) Quantification of Soil and Nutrient Loss Due to Yam Harvesting: A case study in Two Local Government Areas in Benue State Nigeria. Nigeria Journal of Soil Science 31 (3), 42-47. SIMS J.T. (1996). Lime Requirement. In Sparks, D. L. (ed.), Methods of Soil Analysis Part 3: SSSA Book Series No. 5. Soil Science Society of America Inc., American Society of Agronomy Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, 491 – 516.

SOLARIN L.O. (2000). Impact Assessment of Sagamu cement factory on adjoining soils in southwest Nigeria. M.Sc. thesis, River State University of Science and Technology, Port-Harcourt, Nigeria.

SMYTH A.J.. MONTGOMERY R.F. (1962) Soils and Landuse in Central Western Nigeria, Western Nigerian Government Press, Ibadan, 217.

SYS C.E., VAN RANST E., DEBAVEYE J., BEERNEART F. (1993) Land Evaluation: Part III. Crop Requirements, Agricultural Publication No, International Training Centre for post graduate soil scientists, University Ghent, Brussels, Belgium. 166.

UDOH B.T., OGUNKUNLE A.O., OLALEYE A.O. (2006) Land suitability evaluation for banana/plantain (Musa spp.) cultivation in Akwa Ibom State of Nigeria. Journal of Research in Agriculture, 3(3): 1-6.

<u>UJOH F., IGBAWUA T.</u>, PAUL M.O. (2019) Suitability mapping for rice cultivation in Benue state, Nigeria using Satellite Data. Geo-spatial Information Science, 22(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/10095020.2019.1637075

UPONI J.I., ADEOYE G.O. (2000) Soil Testing and Plant Analysis: anoverview. Agronomy in Nigeria pp.177.

USMAN M. (2020) Evaluation of physical and chemical properties of soils in selected parts of Yobe State, Nigeria. Amazonian Journal of Plant Research, 4(3): 632-638.

UWITONZE P., MSANYA B.M., MTAKWA P.W., UWINGABIRE S., SIRIKARE S. (2016) Pedological characterization of soils developed from volcanic parent materials of Northern Province of Rwanda, Agriculture for Fish, 5(6): 225-236.

VAN RAIJ, PEECH (1972) Electrochemical properties of some oxisols and alfisols of the tropics. Soil Science. 36: 587-593.

VAN WAMBEKE A. R. (1962) Criteria for classifying Tropical soils by age. Journal of Soil Science 13: 124-132.