Organic wastes from bioenergy and ecological sanitation as soil fertility improver: a field experiment in a tropical Andosol

Ariane Krause [1, 3], Thomas Nehls [2], Eckhard George [3], and Martin Kaupenjohann [4]

[1]{Postgraduate program „Microenergy Systems“, Center for Technology & Society, Technische Universität (TU) Berlin, Sekr. HBS 1, Hardenbergstr. 16-18, 10623 Berlin, Germany}

[2]{Department of Ecology - Soil Protection, TU Berlin, Sekr. BH 8-1, Ernst-Reuter-Platz 1, 10587 Berlin, Germany}

[3]{Leibniz Institute of Vegetable and Ornamental Crops (IGZ), Theodor-Echtermeyer-Weg 1, 14979 Großbeeren, Germany}

[4]{Department of Ecology - Soil Science, TU Berlin, Sekr. BH 10-1, Ernst-Reuter-Platz 1, 10587 Berlin, Germany}

Correspondence to: Ariane Krause (krause@ztg.tu-berlin.de)

Abstract

Andosols require the regular application of phosphorus (P) to sustain crop productivity. On an Andosol in NW Tanzania, we studied the short-term effects of amending standard compost, biogas slurry and CaSa-compost (containing biochar and sanitized human excreta) on (i) the soil's physico-chemical properties, on (ii) biomass growth and crop productivity, and on (iii) the plants' nutrient status. The practice-oriented experiment design included intercropping of seven locally grown crop species planted on 9 m^2 plots with five repetitions arranged as a Latin rectangle. Differences in plant growth (biomass production and crop yield e.g. of *Zea mays*) and crop nutrition (total C, N, P, K, Ca, Mg, Zn, etc.) were related to pH, CEC, total C and the availability of nutrients (N, P, K, etc.) and water (water retention characteristics, bulk density, etc.) in the soil. None of the amendments had any significant effect on soil water availability, so the observed variations in crop yield and plant nutrition are attributed to nutrient availability. Applying CaSa-compost increased the soil pH from 5.3 to 5.9 and the level of available P from 0.5 to 4.4 mg per kg. Compared to the control, adding biogas slurry, standard compost and CaSa-compost increased the aboveground biomass of Zea mays by, respectively, 140, 154 and 211 %. The grain yields of maize on soil treated with biogas slurry, standard compost and CaSa-compost were, respectively, 2.63, 3.18 and 4.40 t ha^{-1}, compared to only 1.10 t ha^{-1} on unamended plots. All treatments enhanced crop productivity and increased the uptake of nutrients into the maize grains. The CaSa-compost was most effective in mitigating P deficiency and soil acidification. We conclude that all treatments are viable as substitute for synthetic fertilisers. Nevertheless, further steps are required to integrate the tested soil amendments into farm-scale nutrient management and to balance the additions and removals of nutrients, so that the loop can be closed.

Keywords: composted biochar, biogas slurry, EcoSan, Terra Preta practices, soil improvement, waste as resource, liming effect, hydraulic properties, crop nutrition, intercropping system, smallholder agriculture, Karagwe, Tanzania

Annotation: Some information is provided as supplementary materials; the respective figures and tables are indicated by an S (e.g. Table S1).

1 Introduction

1.1 Challenges cultivating Andosols

Andosols occupy just 1-2 % of the land area worldwide. They are common in high altitude tropical environments, such as in the East African Rift Valley (Chesworth, 2008; Perret and Dorel, 1999). Their high inherent fertility suits them especially well for the cultivation of high value crops such as coffee, tobacco and banana. These soils feature a low bulk density, variable charge characteristic (strongly dependent on the soil's pH), a low base saturation (BS), thixotropy, a strong capacity to retain phosphorus (P), a high pore volume, a high level of available water, a tendency to form micro aggregates, and a pronounced shrinking (Chesworth, 2008; Dörner, 2011; Driessen et al., 2000; Zech, 2014). The dominant minerals in these soils are allophanes, imogolites, ferrihydrites and halloysites, and the concentrations of aluminium (Al), iron (Fe) and silicon (Si) are all high (Chesworth, 2008). Metal-humus complexes are frequently formed when the pH exceeds 5, while under more acid conditions Al-humus complexes in combination with silica predominate (Chesworth, 2008; Driessen et al., 2000). These structures serve to protect soil organic matter from degradation, thus fostering C-sequestration (Driessen et al., 2000; Chesworth, 2008; Abera and Wolde-Meskel, 2013). The total carbon concentration of these soils is often > 6 % throughout their profile (Chesworth, 2008).

Andosols are rather sensitive to land use management (Dörner, 2011). For example, shifting cultivation practices tend to deplete soil fertility unless organic matter is deliberately added, while intensive mechanized cultivation risks compacting the soil with the hydraulic properties of the soil being readily compromised (Perret and Dorel, 1999; Dorel et al., 2000).

Plants on Andosols typically suffer from P deficiency (Buresh et al*.,* 1997), as the soils have a high P fixation potential (Batjes, 2011). Thus, crop productivity and sustainable land use require consistent P replenishment, which generates a strong demand in Sub-Saharan Africa for appropriate soil amenders. Fertility amelioration measures have included both liming to increase P availability, and applying either manure and/or other organic matter, or synthetic P fertiliser (Driessen et al., 2000; Tonfack et al., 2009).

1.2 Organic waste materials as soil amenders on Andosols in Karagwe, Tanzania

Andosols with strong P retention potential are also present in Karagwe (Kagera region, NW Tanzania), which is geographically located nearby volcanic areas of the East African Rift Zone (Batjes, 2011). Soil constraints for farmers in this region are the low soil pH (3.8-4.2), the low availability of nutrients (especially P) and widespread soil erosion (Krause et al., 2015). Small-scale farmers often have financially or logistically restricted access to rock phosphates or synthetic fertilisers and lack of sufficient amounts of organic matter to replenish Andosols (Buresh et al. 1997).

However, practices like ecological sanitation (EcoSan) and bioenergy production can contribute to local matter and nutrient cycling with Andosols receiving organic waste products (Krause et al., 2015). Human excreta constitute a valuable source of plant nutrients, available in every human settlement. EcoSan technologies can be implemented for the collection and sanitisation of toilet wastes (Esrey et al., 2001), such as urine diverting dry toilets (UDDT), composting toilets, and pasteurization of faeces to secure human health (Schönning and Stenström, 2004). The latter was recently tested in Karagwe in an EcoSan-pilot project named "Carbonization and Sanitation" (CaSa) (Krause et al., 2015). In the CaSa-approach, so-called microgasifier stoves (Mukunda et al., 2010) provided the heat for thermal sanitation of human faeces. In addition, further projects have been locally initiated to implement bioenergy technologies for cooking such as small-scale biogas digesters (Becker and Krause, 2011) and microgasifier stoves (Ndibalema and Berten, 2015). Hence, increasing dissemination of these technologies will supply waste matter such as biogas slurry from anaerobic digestion, powdery charcoal residues from gasification, and ashes (Krause et al., 2015).

These locally available resources can be directly applied to the soil or they can be processed as compost. The benefit of charcoal as a soil amender ("biochar") has been deduced from the fertility of Terra Preta soils (Sombroek, 1966; Lehmann and Joseph, 2009). CaSa-compost is a product following this ancient example of co-composting (pasteurised) human faeces, kitchen waste, harvest residues, terracotta particles, ashes, and urine mixed with char residues from gasification (Krause et al., 2015).

However, there is also reasonable doubt, that application of biochar is recommendable in all situations and on all soils. Mukherjee and Lal (2014) pointed out that especially field-scale data on crop response and soil quality lack for various soil-biochar combinations. From past experiments using biochar as soil amendment (Herath et al., 2013; Kammann et al., 2011; Kimetu et al., 2008; Liu J. et al., 2012; Major et al., 2010; Nehls, 2002; Petter et al., 2012; Schulz et al. 2013) and from meta-analysis by Biederman and Harpole (2013), Jefferey et al. (2011), and Liu, X. et al. (2013) the following lessons can be learned for future experiments: (i) pot experiments lead to over-estimations of possible positive impacts on biomass growth compared to field experiments; (ii) soil chemical *and* soil hydraulic properties should be examined at the same time to be able to distinguish the observed effects; (iii) assessment of biomass growth should be combined with the assessment of crop yield and the evaluation of plant nutrition; (iv) locally typical and economically relevant plants should be selected and cultivated according to local practice to assess a practical relevance of biochar application in the local agroecosystem and (v) long-term as well as short-term experiments are needed. Although the latter are often criticized to not enhance knowledge on changes of soil hydraulic properties as well as on soil organic matter and C-sequestration, they are of high practical relevance to farmers who rely on their harvests immediately.

In this study, we assessed if and how locally available organic waste materials change the availability of nutrients and water in the soil and improve the crop productivity in a one-season, practice-oriented field experiment. In particular, our **objectives** were (i) to examine the effect of CaSa-Compost, standard compost, and biogas slurry on the physico-chemical properties of the soil, and (ii) to assess their impact on biomass growth, crop yield and (iii) plant nutrition.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Field site

The experimental site (see Fig. S2-S4) is located in the Ihanda ward, Karagwe district, Kagera region, NW Tanzania (1°33.987' S, 31°07.160' E; 1577 m. a. s. l.), a hilly landscape characterized by a semi-arid, tropical climate (Blösch, 2008). The annual rainfall ranges from 1000-2100 mm and the mean annual potential evapotranspiration is ~ 1200 mm (FAO Kagera, online). The pattern of rainfall is bimodal, featuring a long rainy season from March to May and a short one from October to November (Tanzania, 2012). The predominant cropping system comprises banana, intercropped with beans and coffee. Prior to the experiment, the soil was surveyed by sampling the edges of the field (Table 1 and Fig. S1). Stone and gravel concentrations increased with soil depth. The bulk density (ρ_B) of the top-soil lay within the range expected for an Andosol. The soil's total carbon (C_{tot}) and total nitrogen (N_{tot}) concentrations were classified, respectively, as medium and adequate, and its C/N ratio is suitable for cropping (Landon, 1991). The soil pH was in the range 3.6-3.8. The effective cation exchange capacity (CEC_{eff}) of dry matter (DM) in the soil was only 8-17 cmol kg^{-1} compared to a typical range of 10-40 cmol kg^{-1} of DM (Chesworth, 2008). The soil's BS was quite high (Ca saturation of up to 70 %). Comparable levels of CEC_{eff} and BS have been recorded in both in Kenyan Ultisols cultivated for about 35 years (Kimetu et al., 2008) and in an Ethiopian Andosol (Albera and Wolde-Meskel, 2013). The quantity of available P in the top-soil was 0.7 mg kg^{-1} (classified as "very low" according to KTBL, 2009), whereas that of potassium (K) was "very high" (244.7 mg kg^{-1}).

2.2 Plot preparation and soil amendments

We arranged a series of 3 m x 3 m plots in the form of a Latin rectangle (Richter *et al.,* 2009), with the five columns and five rows each separated from one another by a 0.5 m deep trench. Each of the four treatments was applied to a single row and a single column and thus studied with five replications (Fig. 1). The treatments were: (1) untreated (control), (2) biogas slurry in a weekly application (from weeks 4-9 after sowing) of 1.7 $dm^3 m^{-2}$ on a cover of cut grass, (3) standard compost with a pre-sowing application of 15.0 $dm^3 m^{-2}$, and (4) CaSa-compost with a pre-sowing application of 8.3 $dm^3 m^{-2}$, passed through a 20 mm sieve. Macro- and micronutrients of the amendments were analysed according to standard methods as described in Krause et al. (2015). Values are given in dry matter (g kg^{-1}) as well as in the practice-oriented fresh matter concentrations (g dm^{-3}) in Table 2.

The employed biogas slurry derived from anaerobic digestion of banana tree stumps and cow dung (mixture 1:1 by volume). According to local practice, biogas slurry amended plots were covered with cut grasses prior to sowing. Therefore, the nutrient content of grass was analysed as well.

Standard compost was processed by local farmers during three months from fresh and dried grasses (0.91 $m^3 m^{-3}$), kitchen waste (0.06 $m^3 m^{-3}$), and ash (0.03 $m^3 m^{-3}$). The compost heap was regularly watered and covered with soil and grasses to mitigate evaporation.

CaSa-compost contained pasteurized human faeces (0.15 $m^3 m^{-3}$), biochar from gasification (0.17 $m^3 m^{-3}$; eucalyptus-sawdust, pyrolysis at T> 500°C, residence time ≥ 120 min), kitchen waste and harvest residues (0.15 $m^3 m^{-3}$; beans straw, banana peels), mineral material (0.31 $m^3 m^{-3}$; ash from eucalyptus wood, brick particles, local soil to add minerals and soil microorganisms), and lignin and cellulose sources (0.22 $m^3 m^{-3}$; sawdust, grasses). Stored urine, mixed with sawdust or biochar, was added to the compost as well (0.12 $m^3 m^{-3}$). Every week, 60-80 dm^3 of the above-mentioned matters were added to the shaded and grass-covered compost heap.

We adjusted the amendments so that each treatment delivered a comparable quantity of mineral nitrogen (N_{min}). The N_{min} demand per cropping season ($N_{min,demand}$) was estimated as 17.5 g m^{-2}, following KTBL (2009). According to Horn et al. (2010), 33 % of organic nitrogen contained in organic fertilisers ($N_{org,fertiliser}$) is mineralized during the course of a cropping season. The amount of materials to be amended to the soil, $m_{fertiliser}$ (kg m^{-2}), was calculated based on the quantity of N_{min} present in the top 90 cm of the soil ($N_{min,soil}$ with about 7.5 g m^{-2}, see Table 3), and that provided by the amendments as follows:

$$m_{fertiliser} = \frac{N_{min,demand} - N_{min,soil}}{N_{min,fertilizer} + 0.33 \cdot N_{org,fertilizer}} \quad \text{Eq. (1)}$$

Then, the addition of the other plant nutrients (Table 3) were calculated according to Table 2.

Before planting, we hoed the soil by hand, as it is common local practice. We applied the composts by first spreading evenly, then incorporating with a fork hoe. Planting was carried out at the beginning of the rainy season (March 2014), and the plots were mulched in mid April (terminating rainy season) to minimize evaporative loss. We harvested the crops during June and July. Precipitation was recorded on a daily basis, while the air temperature and relative humidity prevailing 2 m above-ground were measured every 15 minutes.

We divided each plot into two 4.5 m^2 sections (Fig. 1), one used to cultivate maize cv. Stuka, and the other planted with a mixture of common bean cv. Lyamungu 90, carrot cv. Nantes, cabbage cv. Glory of Enkhuizen and local landraces of onion. In addition African egg plant *(Solanum aethiopicum*) and sweet pepper were planted as important parts of the chosen local adjusted intercropping practice. However, these two plant species are perennial, biomass harvest exceeded the experimental timeframe, and therefore we excluded them from analysis.

The maize was sown on March 4 with two grains per dibbing hole and thinned after germination. Carrot seed was directly sown into the plot on March 6 and the beans were sown on March 14; carrot was thinned after 40 days. The other species were transplanted as seedlings in mid March. The maize and beans were entirely rain-fed, while the other crops were irrigated as required. The plots were hand-weeded once a week, and insects were controlled by spraying with a mixture of ash and "moluku" (prepared from the leaves of the Neem tree and the Fish Poison tree suspended in soapy water).

We sampled the soil (two samples per plot) using a 1 m Pürckhauer universal gauge auger on three occasions during the experiment: the first prior to sowing (t_0, beginning of February), the second at the end of the rainy season (t_1, end of April), and the final one after harvest (t_2, beginning of July). The soil sample was divided into three sub-samples: 0-30 cm, 30-60 cm and 60-90 cm. The two samples from each plot were combined. For the t_0 sample, 16 sampling sites were selected, from which four bulks were prepared for each soil layer to represent each quarter of the field. At t_1, all 25 plots were sampled, but at t_2 the sampling involved three of the five plots per each treatment.

2.3 Soil analyses

Water retention curve (WRC) and ρ_B were determined from undisturbed soil samples taken using a 0.1 dm^3 stainless steel cylinder. In the field, we monitored the top-soils' volumetric water content (θ) [m^3 m^{-3}] twice a week over the first six weeks after sowing at five points per plot, using a TDR probe (Field Scout 100, 8" rods, Spectrum Technologies, Aurora, USA). Furthermore, θ for each of the three soil layers was determined gravimetrically at t_0, t_1 and t_2. We performed double ring infiltration experiments to determine the infiltration rate (IR) as well as the field capacity (FC) for the untreated soil at t_0 and for the treated soils at t_2 following Landon (1991). The WRC was measured using pressure plates as well as using the laboratory evaporation method (Hyprop, UMS, Munich, Germany). The latter data was used to derive the general form of the Andosol's WRC and to parameterise the Peters–Durner–Iden (PDI) model (Peters et al., 2015) (Fig. 2). The available water capacity (AWC) was calculated as $\theta_{pF\ 1.8}$ - $\theta_{pF\ 4.2}$. The porosity (e) and pore volume (PV) were calculated from dry bulk density and particle density (ρ_p) measured using a Multipycnometer (Quantchrome, Boynton Beach, USA).

We measured N_{min} and pH of the soil *in situ* at both t_0 and t_1, while at t_2 only the pH was taken; the method involved the suspension of 50 g soil in 100 mL 0.1 M KCl, which was assayed using, respectively, an AgroQuant 114602 test strip (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) and a pH 330i glass electrode (WTW, Weilheim, Germany). Further chemical analyses were carried out on air- or oven-dried t_0 and t_2 samples, which were first passed through a 2 mm sieve. The oven-dried samples were used to determine the concentration of C_{tot}, N_{tot} and total sulfur (S_{tot}), following ISO DIN 10694 (1995) and ISO DIN 13878 (1998) protocols, using an Elementar Vario ELIII CNS-Analyzer (Elementar, Hanau, Germany). Concentrations of calcium acetate lactate (CAL) soluble P (P_{CAL}) and K (K_{CAL}) were determined with an iCAP 6000 ICP-OES device (Thermo

Scientific, Waltham, USA) from air-dried soil suspended in CAL solution (0.05 M calcium acetate/calcium lactate and 0.3 M acetic acid) following the protocol given in chapter A 6.2.1.1 of VDLUFA (2012). Cations such as Al^{3+}, Ca^{2+}, Mg^{2+}, Fe^{2+}, Mn^{2+}, and Zn^{2+} were exchanged with ammonium chloride (NH_4Cl) and their concentration measured using ICP-OES, following the protocol given in chapter A3.2.1.8 of König (2006). We calculated CEC_{eff} from the sum of the ion equivalents of K, Al, calcium (Ca), magnesium (Mg), manganese (Mn) and hydrogen (H). The BS represented the ratio between the sum of the ion equivalents of K, Ca and Mg and CEC_{eff}.

2.4 Biomass production

We harvested maize plants 14 weeks after the two-leaf stage, and the other crops at maturity. For maize, bean, cabbage, carrot and onion, the above-ground biomass was considered as "harvest product" [weight of fresh mass (FM) in g $plant^{-1}$], while "market product" represented the weight of maize grain, bean seed and onion bulb after a week's drying in the sun [air-dried mass in g $plant^{-1}$]. For maize, we measured the stem diameter and plant height, and for bean, we determined the pod number per plant. In each case, a random sample of plants was used, avoiding plants at the edge of the plot. The overall numbers of samples were: onion (10/20 plants), cabbage (all plants producing a head), bean (8/16 plants), and maize (5/24 plants, excluding plants without cobs). For the carrot, the weight of the whole set of plants on a plot was determined. To estimate the total production per plot (Fig. 3), we multiplied means of weight per plant and the total number of harvested plants per plot. Total above-ground biomass production was estimated for 19 maize, 16 bean, 6 cabbages, and 20 onion plants per plot for all the treatments (except for no cabbages on the control). Values for market products were estimated for developed maize cops, onion bulbs, cabbage heads, and carrots.

2.5 Plant nutritional status

Measurements of plant nutritional status were only made on maize; the plants were divided into the shoot, the corncob and the grains. Five harvested plants per treatment were bulked to give a single sample for each plant fraction per plot. The water content of the biomass was determined gravimetrically. Following oven drying, the material was ground, passed through a 0.25 mm sieve and analysed for C_{tot} and N_{tot} as above. We assessed concentration of P_{tot}, K_{tot}, Ca_{tot}, Mg_{tot}, Zn_{tot}, B_{tot}, Cu_{tot}, Fe_{tot}, Mn_{tot}, and Mo_{tot} after microwave digestion with nitric acid (HNO_3) and hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2) using an iCAP 6300 Duo MFC ICP-OES device (Thermo Scientific, Waltham, USA), following the protocol given in chapter 2.1.1. of VDLUFA (2011.)

In addition, we conducted a vector nutrient analysis on harvest product, nutrient concentration and nutrient uptake following Imo (2012). Uptake and concentrations of the various nutrient elements were plotted based on the following scheme: the lower horizontal x axis represented the nutrient uptake, the vertical y axis the nutrient concentration and the z axis the biomass (Isaac and Kimaro, 2011). The control treatment's performance were normalized to 100, so that the levels of biomass production and nutrient concentration reflected the effect of the various soil treatments (Kimaro et al., 2009). Nutrient diagnosis was based on both the direction (increase, decrease or no change) and the length of the vectors (strength of response) following Isaac and Kimaro (2011).

2.6 Nutrient balance

For the section of the plots, which were cultivated with maize, we estimated changes in the soil nutrient status (Δ Nut) for each treatment, according to:

$$\Delta\, Nut = Nut_{app} - Nut_{up} = \Delta\, Nut_{av} + \Delta\, Nut_{nav} \qquad \text{Eq. (2)}$$

where Nut_{app} represented nutrients supplied by the treatment (*nut*rient *app*lication), Nut_{up} nutrients taken *up* by the maize plants, Δ Nut_{av} the changes in the soil's available nutrient stock (where "available" referred to the nutrients being extractable with CAL solution), Δ Nut_{nav} the change in the soil's nutrient stock, which was "non-available" either through leaching, interflow, surface run-off, soil erosion, P-fixation, not yet mineralized, etc. The balance was calculated for P and K, firstly per plot and then per treatment as an average of three plots.

2.7 Statistical analysis

Analyses of variance (ANOVA) were performed using STATISTICA software (StatSoft Inc., Tulsa, Oklahoma, USA). The main effect was considered to be the soil treatment. Means were compared using the Tukey "honest significant difference" (HSD) test, with the $\alpha=0.05$.

According to the design of the experiment as Latin rectangle, the number of replication of the four treatments did not differ and was n=5 for all treatments. However, we had to eliminate one outlier in the control treatment so that for statistical analyses n was 4. Hence, n=5 (for biogas slurry, compost and CaSa-compost treatment) was combined with n=4 (for the control treatment) for all parameters we collected during harvesting, e.g. biomass growth and crop yields. Because of financial restrictions we had to use a block design with n=3 for all soil chemical and physical parameters as well as examinations of nutrient content in the maize plants.

3 Results and Discussion

Between March and May, the mean air temperature was 21.6 °C (maximum 48.9 °C, minimum 13.5 °C) (Fig. S8) and the total rainfall was ~ 360 mm, of which 85 % fell before the end of April (Fig. S7).

3.1 The physico-chemical status of the soil

None of the amendments significantly affected the studied soil **hydraulic properties** IR (18-36 cm h^{-1}) and FC (0.28 and 0.20 $m^3\ m^{-3}$ in the top-soil and in the sub-soil respectively) as measured with the double ring infiltration experiments. Also the WRC were not significantly influenced by the amendments and still show the typical shape of an Andosol (Fig. 2). This might be due to the low application dose of the amendments that did not influence ρ_B of the Andosol (0.99 and 1.02 g cm^{-3}). Nevertheless, we had the subjective impression during fieldwork, that CaSa-compost aided workability of the soil by making it more friable.

The top-soil's PV was estimated as 0.59-0.63 $m^3\ m^{-3}$ and might have been homogenized throughout the treatments by tillage (i.e. with hand hoe) and then compaction (e.g. by walking on the plots when working). The calculated FC and AWC derived from the studied WRC were, respectively, ~0.35 and 0.13 $m^3\ m^{-3}$ and exhibited a low site heterogeneity with the coefficient of variance for $\theta_{pF\ 1.8}$ between 1.3 % in the control and

2.8 % in plots treated with CaSa-compost. The θ did not vary significantly across the three soil layers at neither t_0 nor t_1. At t_2, θ was lower in the top-soils of plots treated with the CaSa-compost (0.13 m^3 m^{-3}) and on biogas slurry and standard compost treated plots (0.16 m^3 m^{-3}) compared to the control plots (0.17 m^3 m^{-3}). These differences at the end of the growing season might be rather caused by higher evapotranspiration and interception losses due to higher biomass growth (see below) than by different soil hydraulic properties.

Similar findings are reported for the application of uncomposted biochar (10-17.3 t ha^{-1}) to a New Zealand Andosol which failed to influence either ρ_B, PV or AWC (Herath et al., 2013). Biochar application had also little effect on AWC either in a high clay content soil (Asai et al., 2009), or in soils featuring a high carbon concentration or a low ρ_B (Abel et al., 2013). Hence, our results imply that none of the amendments altered the availability of moisture significantly, meaning that the observed treatment effects on crop yield and plant nutrition were most likely related to different nutrient availability.

The **chemical status** of the soil prior at t_0 is given in Tables 1 and 2. There was a significant treatment effect on P_{CAL} and pH in the top-soil (Table 4). The CaSa-compost treatment improved P_{CAL} at t_2 (4.4 vs 0.5 mg kg^{-1} in soil DM), but the level of P remained "very low" as in the remaining plots (classified based on KTBL, 2009). According to Finck (2007), a level of 10-30 mg kg^{-1} in DM is needed to ensure an adequate supply of P, while Landon (1991) has suggested that 13-22 mg kg^{-1} in DM should be adequate for most African soils. Possible explanations for the observation that only the CaSa-compost treatment altered P_{CAL} are: (i) that the treatment provided more P (1.7 g P dm^{-3} in FM) than the others did (0.3 and 0.5 g P dm^{-3} in FM, respectively, in the biogas slurry and in the standard compost treatment (Table 2); (ii) that the provision of biochar promoted nutrient capturing in the soil by adsorption of P on the biochar particles (Gronwald et al., 2015; Kammann et al., 2015); and (iii) that the availability of the recycled P was promoted by liming (Batjes and Sombroek, 1997).

The latter can be supported by our findings, that the top-soil pH was higher at t_2 in the CaSa-compost treatment than in the control plots (5.9 vs 5.3) (Table 4). The optimal top-soil pH range for cropping is, according to Horn et al. (2010), 5.5-6.5. Glaser and Birk (2012) have shown that the highly productive Central Amazonian Terra Preta soils have a pH between 5.2 and 6.4. Through influencing soil pH, the addition of biochar is particularly effective in soils suffering from poor P availability (Biedermann and Harpole, 2013). In an earlier publication, Krause et al. (2015) derived estimates for the liming potential of the present soil amendments and found 100 kg of DM of biogas slurry, standard compost and CaSa-compost being equivalent to, respectively, 6.8, 1.4 and 4.7 kg of CaO. The applied equivalents in this study were 0.03, 0.07, and 0.2 kg m^{-2} of CaO for biogas slurry, standard compost, and CaSa-compost. We found, that the application of CaSa-compost had an *immediate* effect on soil pH. Finck (2007) recommended the application of lime equivalent to 0.1-0.2 kg m^{-2} of CaO every three years to maintain the soil pH. Thus, amending CaSa-compost in the applied rate was in the range for soil melioration if application of the treatment is repeated every three years.

Neither concentration of total organic carbon (TOC) in the soil nor CEC_{eff} was altered significantly by the amendments (Table 3). Similarly, Liu et al. (2012) reported that the CEC_{eff} is hardly disturbed by a single dose of biochar. From the volume of CaSa-compost applied (8.3 dm^3 m^{-2}) and its composition (Sect. 2.2), we estimated the quantity of dry biochar supplied by ~ 2.2 kg m^{-2}, equivalent to a C_{tot} supplement of ~1.3-1.6 kg m^{-2}, a level which was modest compared to common applications of biochar ranging from five to 20 kg m^{-2} (Kammann et al., 2011, Herath et al., 2013). Liu et al. (2012) have suggested a rate of 5 kg m^{-2} as the minimum necessary to significantly and sustainably increase TOC in the soil. Nevertheless, Kimetu et al. (2008) were able to show that treating a highly degraded soil in the highlands of Western Kenya with just 0.6 kg C m^{-2} for three consecutive seasons, was effective in increasing the quantity of organic matter in the soil by 45 %.

For an acid soil, the concentration of exchangeable Al was unexpectedly low. The slope of a linear regression of the concentration of exchangeable Al against the pH is two and not three (Fig. S6), as predicted if the dominant form of Al in the soil is Al_3^+ (reflecting the reaction equilibrium $Al(OH)_3 + 3H^+ = Al_3^+ + 3\ H_2O$). Andosols are known to accumulate organic matter through the formation of metal-humus and allophane-organo complexes. At pHs above 5, the latter structures dominate (Chesworth, 2008). Thus, most likely the observed low concentration of exchangeable Al reflected the presence of complexes involving Al and organic matter.

3.2 Biomass production

Amending compost significantly increased the harvested biomass of onion. The mass of the bulbs produced in plots provided with standard compost or CaSa-compost was, respectively, 52.8 and 54.4 g $plant^{-1}$, compared to only 22.2 g $plant^{-1}$ for the untreated plots (Fig. 3; further see Fig. S5 for visual impressions). In contrast, the soil amendments had no effect on the yield of carrots. Cabbage plants grown on the untreated soil remained small and did not develop any heads. In contrast, amending CaSa-compost, standard compost or biogas slurry delivered average yields of heads of, respectively, 1,020, 825, and 720 g $plant^{-1}$.

The above-ground biomass of the bean plants was significantly highest from those plots amended with CaSa-compost with 78 g $plant^{-1}$, compared to 32, 22, and 12 g $plant^{-1}$ grown on plots containing, respectively, standard compost, biogas slurry, and no amendment. There were also significant differences between the treatments with respect to the average pod number per plant, ranging from 18.8 for plants grown on CaSa-compost to only 4.7 for those grown in the control soil.

The CaSa-compost also promoted a greater stem diameter and height of the maize plants (respectively 22.8 mm and 1950 mm), compared to the 16.1 mm and 1423 mm achieved by the plants grown on unamended soil. The treatment with biogas slurry, standard compost and CaSa-compost increased the per unit area above-ground biomass accumulated by maize to, respectively, 140, 154 and 211 % compared to plants in the control treatment (Table 5). The amendments led to grain yields of 263 (biogas slurry), 318 (standard compost) and 440 g m^{-2} (CaSa-compost) compared to 110 g m^{-2} from the control plots.

The grain yield from the control plots was below both the average national Tanzanian yield (2012: 124 g m^{-2}) and that for East Africa (180 g m^{-2}), while the yield from the CaSa-compost treated plots matched those obtained in Croatia (434 g m^{-2}) or Cambodia (441 g m^{-2}) (FAOSTAT, 2012). A field experiment in the Dodoma region of Tanzania produced a grain yield of about 100 g m^{-2} from unfertilised plots and 380-430 g m^{-2} from mineral fertilised plots (Kimaro et al., 2009), while in the Morogoro region the same maize cultivar yielded 117, 257 and 445 g m^{-2} from plots supplemented with, respectively, 0, 15 and 80 g N m^{-2} (Mourice et al., 2014). Thus, the benefit of providing CaSa-compost matched that of a higher (i.e. extremely high) input of synthetic N fertiliser, however, provided by locally available nutrients.

The observed benefits of CaSa-compost were largely in line with the known effects of biochar amendments to soils. Two meta-analyses have suggested that for various crops, the addition of 2±0.5 kg m^{-2} biochar induces a

-3 % to +23 % crop yield response compared to unamended control plots (Jeffery et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2013). Maize responds to the supplement by increasing its grain yield by 16 % and its biomass by 14 %. On acidic soils (pH of < 5.0), the positive effect of biochar is between 25 and 35 %. The positive effect of the CaSa-compost on the soil and on biomass growth was most probably due to it's liming effect, which improved the availability of various nutrients, in particular that of P. The positive effects of applying CaSa-compost may last for several cropping seasons, as shown by Major et al. (2010) in a four year study.

Furthermore, we experienced that biogas slurry may not be suitable as a soil amender for bean crops, since the plants did not appear to respond well compared to compost or CaSa-compost. Although most of recent work using biogas slurry as soil amender observed positive plant response in terms of productivity (Baba et al., 2013; Clements et al., 2012; Garfí et al., 2011; Komakech et al., 2015) others also revealed decreasing yields (e.g. Sieling et al., 2013). Salminen et al. (2001) attributed observed negative plant response to organic acids and ammonia contained in biogas slurry, which can be phytotoxic for plants if not applied in moderate quantities. Nevertheless, composting could reduce the before-mentioned substances as shown by Abdullahi et al. (2008). Therefore, this material should be combined with other organic matter.

3.3 Analysis of plant nutritional responses

The shoot, grain and corncob biomass produced by the maize crop was responsive to the soil amendments, whereas their water content was not significantly affected. According to Finck (2007), the concentrations of each of the nutrients were below recommended levels. However, compared to the outcomes of the experiment in Kenya reported by Kimetu et al. (2008), the grain concentrations of both N and K were slightly higher, while those of P, Ca and Mg were similar. In our experiment, the dry shoot material was deficient with respect to both P (0.7-0.9 g kg^{-1}, instead of recommended concentrations of 2.0-3.5 g kg^{-1}) and N (8-11 g kg^{-1}, compared to a recommended range of 15-32 g kg^{-1}) (Bergmann, 1999; Marschner, 2011). Only the nutrient concentrations in the maize grains responded significantly to the treatments especially for K ($p=0.03$) and P ($p=0.08$) (Table 6). Here, we observed a dilution effect for K while concentration of P was slightly increased in maize grains grown on plots amended with CaSa-compost. With respect to the N concentration, there was no significant treatment effect, since the N inputs had been adjusted *a priori* so that each treatment offered the same amount of N.

The vector nutrient analysis illustrated primarily the response of maize to mitigated P deficiency, with the longest arrow indicating the largest response (Fig. 4). Here, an increase to each of the three parameters (biomass growth, nutrient concentration, nutrient uptake) was generated by an increased supply of the limiting nutrient P. This is because, (i) more P was supplied with CaSa-compost (see Sect. 3.1) and (ii) its availability was increased due to the raised soil pH (Batjes, 2011). Furthermore, nutrient uptake by maize was proportional to biomass growth. Hence, plants grown on plots amended with CaSa-compost were able to take up significantly greater amounts of N, P, K, Ca, Mg and Zn in their grains than those grown on the other plots (Fig. 4).

As the native soil's K_{CAL} was already very high, and further K was provided by the amendments (Table 3) an antagonistic effect on nutrient uptake between K and Ca as well Mg would have been possible (Finck, 2007). However, observed changes in concentrations of Ca and Mg were not significant, but there was a significant decrease in K concentration in maize grains. However, this might possibly be due to the dilution imposed by growth stimulation.

3.4 Nutrient balancing

On the plots treated with biogas slurry, standard compost and CaSa-compost, Nut_{app} of P varied with, respectively, 4.2, 6.8 and 13.8 g m^{-2}. This can be assessed a low to high application compared to a recommended fertiliser rate of 7.0-8.4 g m^{-2} yr^{-1} for maize on P-deficient soils (KTBL, 2009; Finck, 2007). On the contrary, Nut_{app} of K was very high with, respectively, 53.8, 46.5 and 63.2 g m^{-2}, compared to a recommended dosedose of 9.3-12.4 g m^{-2} yr^{-1} for maize on soils with high K-content (*ibid.*). On the plots treated with biogas slurry, plants took up ~19 % of the total applied P; the equivalents for the standard compost and CaSa-compost treatments were ~16 % and ~12 %, respectively. These rates are consistent with the ~15 % reported by Finck (2007) as being available in the first year after fertiliser application. With respect to K, Nut_{up} was about ~10 % of Nut_{app} in the biogas slurry treatment, ~18 % in the standard compost treatment and ~17 % in the CaSa-compost treatment. These rates differ greatly from the ~60 % figure suggested by Finck (2007). The disparity relates most likely to the soil's high level of K_{CAL}.

Following the results of nutrient balancing we estimate that soil P_{tot} and K_{tot} were both depleted (Δ Nut < 0) on the control plots (Table 7). In the biogas slurry, standard compost and CaSa-compost treated plots, Δ Nut was positive for both P and K . However, the only significant change to the top-soil's P_{CAL} was recorded in the CaSa-compost treatment (Sect. 3.1.). Hence, about 1.1 g P m^{-2} was assignable to Δ Nut_{av} in the plots supplied with CaSa-compost, with the rest being "non-available". Some of the latter may include P that had not been released through mineralization of the organic matter, while some may have been immobilized in the form of metal-humus complexes, which are characteristic for Andosols (Zech, 2014) (i.e. assignable to Δ Nut_{nav} in both cases). Leaching of P is insignificant, since P rather gets immobilized (Finck, 2007). We assume that some of the K provided by the amendments may have been leached during the rainy season as mentioned by Finck (2007) for light soils such as the present Andosol. There were no signs of significant losses through soil erosion visible on the experimental site.

From our findings we recommend the addition of urine and sanitized faeces to the compost, since the matters provide a ready source of nutrients accelerating for example compost's N_{min} and total P content (compare Table 2). Given that biochar can capture both nitrate and phosphate, as shown by Gronwald et al. (2015) and Kammann et al. (2015), we assume that combining urine and biochar as compost additives enriches compost with N and P and reduces nutrient loss during and after composting. Especially, the loss of N in the form of the green house gas N_2O can be reduced as shown by Larsen and Horneber (2015). In addition, urine can contribute to the moisture required for successful composting.

4 Conclusions

To summarise: for beans and maize, crop biomass production and economic yield were significantly improved by the application of CaSa-compost. For cabbage and onion, all three of the tested amendments were beneficial. The amendments, and especially CaSa-compost, improved the nutrient availability, as revealed by vector nutrient analysis. This can be attributed to changes in soil pH and the addition of nutrients.

Of particular significance was the observation that the P deficiency affecting the local Andosol could be mitigated using CaSa-compost. The increase in available P achieved by the CaSa-compost treatment was more than sufficient to supply the crops' requirement. Thus we conclude that a gradual increase in soil P could be achieved by a regular application of the CaSa-compost.

The chosen rates of biogas slurry and standard compost supplementation were sufficient to maintain the soil's pH, whereas the CaSa-compost raised the soil pH, improving its productivity immediately. Thus we conclude that a continuous program of composting and compost amendments over decades would probably fully ameliorate the soil.

We further conclude, that the application of local available biogas slurry needs to be tested for several crops before recommending the widespread utilization of this matter as it may contain substances, which could be phytotoxic for plants if not applied in moderate quantities. In addition, composting of biogas slurry prior to soil amendment, possibly with and without biochar, is of certain practical relevance but needs preceding scientific investigation to study the specific metabolisms taking place and to identify the consequent N-recovery-efficiency.

Finally, we conclude that all the treatments, but especially CaSa-compost, are viable as substitutes for synthetic commercial fertilisers. We further conclude that local smallholders with 6 people per household can produce CaSa-compost at an estimated rate of ~5.1 m^3 yr^{-1}, which would be sufficient to fertilise an area of ~1,850 m^2 at the rate of 8.3 dm^3 m^{-2} over the course of three years. By this means, it would be possible to fertilise about 30 % of the average area cultivated by smallholders in Karagwe. Therefore, CaSa-approach needs to be integrated into farm-scale nutrient management by conducting a detailed analysis of nutrient flows in the farm-household-system and studying all potential additions and removals of nutrients to and from the planted land.

Copyright statement

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The authors do not have to declare any conflict of interest.

Author's contribution

A. Krause and M. Kaupenjohann designed the experiment and planned, discussed and evaluated soil chemical analysis. A. Krause carried out the experiment with the assistance of local workers. A. Krause and T. Nehls planned, discussed and evaluated the soil physical experiments that A. Krause conducted. E. George gave valuable advice for the fertilizing strategy, analysis of plant nutritional status and data analysis in general. A. Krause prepared the manuscript including drafting the text and preparing figures and tables; all co-authors cooperated by correcting the text and promoting the professional discussions.

Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks to Ibrahim B. Bitakwate (agricultural technician at MAVUNO Project) and Adam T. Bitakwate (BiogaST leader and CaSa coordinator at MAVUNO Project) who participated essentially in this research work for many years, by sharing their ideas, opinions and experiences as well as land, seeds and labour for the experiment. We also acknowledge advice received by Anja Müller, Bruno Glaser, Haiko Pieplow, Hans-Peter Schmidt, and Jürgen Reckin during planning and designing the experiment. We are grateful to all colleagues at MAVUNO Project who assisted with the field work (Asumani, Carolin, Fabian, Happiness, Hilde, Isabel, Mzee, Silvanus); special thanks to Jackson Alexander and Jovin Bitakwate who prepared the composts and Edison Simon for working with the biogas digester. Furthermore, we are thankful for the technical assistance in the analytical laboratories at TU and IGZ, for support with the statistical work, and for continuous discussions with different members of our research groups at TU and IGZ. We also thank Hans-Böckler-Foundation for financially supporting the PhD scholarship and travel costs and Lusi Ajonjoli for the info graphic in Fig. 1.

Edited by: R. Köbner

References

Abdullahi, Y.A., Akunna, J.C., White, N.A., Hallett, P.D., and Wheatley, R.: Investigating the effects of anaerobic and aerobic post-treatment on quality and stability of organic fraction of municipal solid waste as soil amendment, Bioresource Technol., 99 (18), 8631-8636, doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2008.04.027, 2008.

Abel, S., Peters, A., Trinks, S., Schonsky, H., Facklam, M., and Wessolek, G.: Impact of biochar and hydrochar addition on water retention and water repellency of sandy soil, Geoderma, 202, 183-191, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2013.03.003, 2013.

Abera, G., and Wolde-Meskel, E.: Soil Properties, and Soil Organic Carbon Stocks of Tropical Andosol under Different Land Uses, Open J. Soil Sci., 3, 153-162, doi:10.4236/ojss.2013.33018, 2013.

Asai, H., Samson, B. K., Stephan, H. M., Songyikhangsuthor, K., Homma, K., Kiyono, Y., Inoue, Y., Shiraiwa, T., and Horie, T.: Biochar amendment techniques for upland rice production in Northern Laos: 1. Soil physical properties, leaf SPAD and grain yield, Field Crop. Res., 111(1-2), 81–84, doi:10.1016/j.fcr.2008.10.008, 2009.

Baba, Y., Tada, C., Watanabe, R., Fukuda, Y., Chida, N., and Nakai, Y.: Anaerobic digestion of crude glycerol from biodiesel manufacturing using a large-scale pilot plant: Methane production and application of digested sludge as fertiliser, Bioresource Technol., 140, 342- 348, doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2013.04.020, 2013.

Batjes, N. H.: Global distribution of soil phosphorus retention potential, ISRIC Report 2011/06, Wageningen University and Research Centre, The Netherlands, 41 pp., 2011.

Batjes, N. H. and Sombroek, W. G.: Possibilities for carbon sequestration in tropical and subtropical soils, Glob. Change Biol., 3(2), 161-173, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2486.1997.00062.x, 1997.

Becker, P. and Krause, A.: Development of adaptive technologies in the project Biogas Support for Tansania „BiogaST“, Proceedings of the International Conference “Micro Perspectives for Decentralized Energy Supply 2011”, pp. 236-237, Technische Universität Berlin, ISBN 978-3-7983-2319-3, 2011.

Bergmann, W. (Ed.): Ernährungsstörungen bei Kulturpflanzen: Entstehung, visuelle und analytische Diagnose (Nutrition disorders of cultivated crops: origin, visual and analytical diagnostics), 3rd edition, Springer Spektrum, Heidelberg, Germany, 835 pp., 1999.

Biederman, L. A. and Harpole, W. S.: Biochar and its effects on plant productivity and nutrient cycling - a meta□analysis, GCB Bioenergy, 5(2), 202-214, doi:10.1111/gcbb.12037, 2013.

Blösch, U.: Thicket Clumps: a characteristic feature of the Kagera savana landscape, East Afr. J. of Vegetat. Sci., 19, 31-44, doi: 10.3170/2007-8-18315, 2008.

Buresh, R. J., Smithson, P. C., and Hellums, D. T.: Building soil phosphorus capital in Africa, in: Replenishing soil fertility in Africa, Special Publication 51, Soil Science Society of America and American Society of Agronomy (SSSA), Chicago, United States, 111-149, doi:10.2136/sssaspecpub51.c6, 1997.

Chesworth, W. (Ed.): Encyclopedia of soil science, Springer Science & Business Media, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 902 pp., doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-3995-9, 2008.

Clements, L.J., Salter, A.M., Banks, C.J., and Poppy, G.M.: The usability of digestate in organic farming. Water Sci. Technol., 66, 1864-1870, 2012.

Dörner, J., Dec, D., Zúñiga, F., Sandoval, P., and Horn, R.: Effect of land use change on Andosol's pore functions and their functional resilience after mechanical and hydraulic stresses, Soil Till. Res., 115, 71-79, doi:10.1016/j.still.2011.07.002, 2011.

Dorel, M., Roger□Estrade, J., Manichon, H., and Delvaux, B.: Porosity and soil water properties of Caribbean volcanic ash soils, Soil Use Manage., 16(2), 133-140, doi:10.1111/j.1475-2743.2000.tb00188.x, 2000.

Driessen, P., Deckers, J., Spaargaren, O., and Nachtergaele, F.: Lecture notes on the major soils of the world, World Soil Resources Reports No. 94, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Rome, Italy, 307 pp., 2000.

Esrey, S.A., Andersson, I., Hillers, A., and Sawyer, R.: Closing the Loop - Ecological sanitation for food security, Publications on Water Resources No. 18. Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), Sweden/Mexico, ISBN 91-586-8935-4, 2001.

FAOSTAT: Final data for 2012, item “maize”, country “all”, element “yield”, Statistical Databases of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), 2012, http://faostat.fao.org/site/567/DesktopDefault.aspx?PageID=567#ancor, last access: 22 Dec 2014.

Finck, A.: Pflanzenernährung und Düngung in Stichworten (Plant nutrition and fertilization in keywords), 6th edition, Gebr. Borntraeger, Schweitzerbart Science publishers, Stuttgart, Germany, 253 pp., 2007.

Garfí, M., Gelman, P., Comas, J., Carrasco, W., and Ferrer, I.: Agricultural reuse of the digestate from low-cost tubular digesters in rural Andean communities, Waste Manage., 31 (12), 2584-2589, doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2011.08.007, 2011.

Glaser, B. and Birk, J. J.: State of the scientific knowledge on properties and genesis of Anthropogenic Dark Earths in Central Amazonia (terra preta de Índio), Geochim. Cosmochim. Ac., 82, 39–51, doi:10.1016/j.gca.2010.11.029, 2012.

Gronwald, M., Don, A., Tiemeyer, B., and Helfrich, M.: Effects of fresh and aged biochars from pyrolysis and hydrothermal carbonization on nutrient sorption in agricultural soils, SOIL Discuss., 2, 29-65, doi:10.5194/soild-2-29-2015, 2015.

Herath, H. M. S. K., Camps-Arbestain, M., and Hedley, M.: Effect of biochar on soil physical properties in two contrasting soils: An Alfisol and an Andisol, Geoderma, 209, 188–197, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2013.06.016, 2013.

Horn, R., Brümmer, G. W., Kandeler, E., Kögel-Knabner, I., Kretzschmar, R., Stahr, K., and Wilke, B. M.: Scheffer/Schachtschabel - Lehrbuch der Bodenkunde (Textbook of soil science), 16th edition, Springer Spektrum, Heidelberg, Germany, 570 pp., 2010.

Imo, M.: Analysis of Nutritional Interactions in Cropping Systems, chapter 13 in: Crop Production Technologies, Sharma, P. and Abrol, V. (Eds.), InTech Open Access Publisher, 221-242, doi:10.5772/1109, 2012.

Isaac, M. E. and Kimaro, A. A.: Diagnosis of Nutrient Imbalances with Vector Analysis in Agroforestry Systems; J. Environ. Qual., 40, 860–866; doi:10.2134/jeq2010.0144, 2011.

ISO DIN 10694: Soil quality - Determination of organic and total carbon after dry combustion (elementary analysis) (ISO 10694:1995), International Organization for Standardization (ISO), Geneva, Switzerland, 1995.

ISO DIN 13878: Soil quality - Determination of total nitrogen content by dry combustion ("elemental analysis") (ISO 13878:1998), Association Française de Normalisation (AFNOR), La Plaine Saint-Denis Cedex, France, 1998.

Jeffery, S., Verheijen, F. G. A., Van Der Velde, M., and Bastos, A. C.: A quantitative review of the effects of biochar application to soils on crop productivity using meta-analysis, Agr. Ecosyst. Environ., 144, 175–187, doi:10.1016/j.agee.2011.08.015, 2011.

Kammann, C. I., Linsel, S., Gößling, J. W., and Koyro, H. W.: Influence of biochar on drought tolerance of Chenopodium quinoa Willd and on soil–plant relations, Plant Soil, 345(1-2), 195-210, doi: 10.1007/s11104-011-0771-5, 2011.

Kammann, C. I., Schmidt, H. P., Messerschmidt, N., Linsel, S., Steffens, D., Müller, C. Koyro, H. W., Conte, P., and Stephen, J.: Plant growth improvement mediated by nitrate capture in co-composted biochar, Nature Sci. Rep., 5:11080, 12 pp., doi:10.1038/srep11080, 2015.

Kimaro, A. A., Timmer, V. R., Chamshama, S. A. O., Ngaga, Y. N., and Kimaro, D. A.: Competition between maize and pigeonpea in semi-arid Tanzania: Effect on yields and nutrition of crops, Agr. Ecosyst. Environ., 134, 115–125, doi:10.1016/j.agee.2009.06.002, 2009.

Kimetu, J. M., Lehmann, J., Ngoze, S. O., Mugendi, D. N., Kinyangi, J. M., Riha, S., and Pell, A. N.: Reversibility of soil productivity decline with organic matter of differing quality along a degradation gradient, Ecosystems, 11(5), 726-739, doi:10.1007/s10021-008-9154-z, 2008.

König, N. (Ed.): B 3.2.1. Druckaufschluss mit HNO3, in: Handbuch Forstliche Analytik (HFA) – Grundwerk, Loseblatt-Sammlung der Analysemethoden im Forstbereich, 2nd edition, published by Gutachterausschuss Forstliche Analytik (GFA), German Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture (BMEL), Göttingen, Germany, 425-429, 2006.

Komakech, A. J., Zurbrügg, C., Semakula, D., Kiggundu, N., and Vinnerås, B.: Evaluation of the Performance of Different Organic Fertilisers on Maize Yield: A Case Study of Kampala, Uganda, J. Agr. Sci., 7(11), 28, doi:10.5539/jas.v7n11pxx, 2015.

Krause, A., Kaupenjohann, M., George, E., and Köppel, J..: Nutrient recycling from sanitation and energy systems to the agroecosystem - Ecological research on case studies in Karagwe, Tanzania, Afr. J. Agric. Res., 10(43), 4039-4052, doi: 10.5897/AJAR2015.10102, 2015.

KTBL: Faustzahlen für die Landwirtschaft (Rule-of-thumb figures for agriculture), published by Kuratorium für Technik und Bauwesen in der Landwirtschaft (KTBL), 14th edition, Darmstadt, Germany, 1280 pp., 2009.

Landon, J. R.: Booker tropical soil manual: a handbook for soil survey and agricultural land evaluation in the tropics and subtropics, 1st paperback edition, Longman Scientific & Technical Ltd., Essex, England, pp. 474, 1991.

Larsen, O. and Horneber, D.: Einfluss von Biokohle auf Treibhausgasemissionen während der Kompostierung, in: Book of Abstracts of the scientific Workshop „Biokohle im Gartenbau – Verwertung von organischen Reststoffen zur Schließung von Energie- und Stoffkreisläufen“, Berlin, Germany, 23-24 June, 33-34, 2015.

Lehmann, J. and Joseph, S.: Biochar for Environmental Management - Science and Technology, 1st edition, Earthscan, London, United Kingdom, 416 pp., 2009.

Liu, J., Schulz, H., Brandl, S., Miehtke, H., Huwe, B., and Glaser, B.: Short‐term effect of biochar and compost on soil fertility and water status of a Dystric Cambisol in NE Germany under field conditions, J. Plant Nutr. Soil Sc., 175, 698-707, doi:10.1002/jpln.201100172, 2012.

Liu, X., Zhang, A., Ji, C., Joseph, S., Bian, R., Li, L., and Paz-Ferreiro, J.: Biochar's effect on crop productivity and the dependence on experimental conditions—a meta-analysis of literature data, Plant Soil, 373(1-2), 583-594, doi:10.1007/s11104-013-1806-x, 2013

Major, J., Rondon, M., Molina, D., Riha, S. J., and Lehmann, J.: Maize yield and nutrition during 4 years after biochar application to a Colombian savanna oxisol, Plant Soil, 333(1-2), 117-128, doi:10.1007/s11104-010-0327-0, 2010.

Marschner, P. (Ed.): Marschner's mineral nutrition of higher plants, 3rd edition, Academic press, Waltham, United States, 651 pp., 2011.

Mourice, S. K., Rweyemamu, C. L., Tumbo, S. D. and Amuri, N.: Maize cultivar specific parameters for decision support system for agrotechnology transfer (DSSAT) application in Tanzania, Am. J. Plant Sci., 5, 821-833, doi:10.4236/ajps.2014.56096, 2014.

Mukunda, H.S., Dasappa, S., Paul, P.J., Rajan, N.K., Yagnaraman, M., and Ravi, K.D., Deogaonkar, M.: Gasifier stoves – science, technology and field outreach, Curr. Sci. India, 98(5), 627-638, 2010.

Ndibalema, A. and Berten, A.: Lowtech-micro-gasifiers as a solution for deforestration and health problems caused by indoor air pollution, Practitioner proceedings of the International Conference "Micro Perspectives for Decentralized Energy Supply 2013" at Technische Universität Berlin, pp. 31-33. Edition Lalla Moulati, Alger, Algerie, 2015.

Nehls, T.: Fertility improvement of a Terra Firme Oxisol in Central Amazonia by charcoal applications, Final thesis in Geoecology, University of Bayreuth, Institute of Soil Science and Soil Geography, 81 pp., 2002.

Perret, S. and Dorel, M.: Relationships between land use, fertility and andisol behaviour: examples from volcanic islands, Soil Use Manage., 15(3), 144-149, doi:10.1111/j.1475-2743.1999.tb00080.x, 1999.

Peters, A., Iden, S.C. and Durner, W.: Revisiting the simplified evaporation method: Identification of hydraulic functions considering vapor, film and corner flow. J Hydrol, 527, 531-542, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.05.020, 2015.

Petter, F.A., Madari, B.E., Silva, M.A.S.D., Carneiro, M.A.C., Carvalho, M.T.D.M., Júnior, M., ... and Pacheco, L.P.: Soil fertility and upland rice yield after biochar application in the Cerrado, Pesqu. Agropecu. Bras., 47(5), 699-706, doi:10.1590/S0100-204X2012000500010, 2012.

Richter, C., Piepho, H. P., and Thöni, H.: The 'Latin Rectangle' - its layout, randomisation, and analysis combined with a revision of the commonly used German terminology, Pflanzenbauwissenschaften, 13(1), 1-14, ISSN 1431-8857, 2009.

Salminen, E., Rintala, J., Härkönen, J., Kuitunen, M., Högmander, H., and Oikari, A.: Anaerobically digested poultry slaughterhouse wastes as fertiliser in agriculture, Bioresource Technol., 78 (1), 81-88, doi:10.1016/S0960-8524(00)00160-7, 2001.

Schönning, C. and Stenström, A.T.: Guidelines for the safe use urine and faeces in ecological sanitation systems, Swedish Institute for infectious disease control, EcoSanRes Programme, SEI, ISBN 91-88714-93-4, 2004.

Schulz, H., Dunst, G. and Glaser, B.: Positive effects of composted biochar on plant growth and soil fertility. Agronomy for sustainable development, 33(4), 817-827, doi: 10.1007/s13593-013-0150-0, 2013.

Sieling, K., Herrmann, A., Wienforth, B., Taube, F., Ohl, S., Hartung, E., and Kage, H.: Biogas cropping systems: Short term response of yield performance and N use efficiency to biogas residue application., Eur. J. Agron., 47, 44-54, doi:10.1016/j.eja.2013.01.002, 2013.

Sombroek W.: Amazon Soils - A Reconnaissance of Soils of the Brazilian Amazon Region, Dissertation, Agricultural State University of Wageningen, Centre for Agricultural Publications and Documentation, The Netherlands, 1966.

Tanzania, United Republic: National Sample Census of Agriculture 2007/2008 - Regional Report - Kagera Region, vol. Vh, published by various ministries of Tanzania and Zanzibar, Prime Minister's office, regional administration and local governments, National Bureau of Statistics and the Chief Government Statistician, Zanzibar, July, 339 pp., 2012.

Tonfack, L. B., Bernadac, A., Youmbi, E., Mbouapouognigni, V. P., Ngueguim, M., and Akoa, A.: Impact of organic and inorganic fertilizers on tomato vigor, yield and fruit composition under tropical andosol soil conditions, Fruits, 64(03), 167-177, doi:10.1051/fruits/2009012, 2009.

VDLUFA: Methodenbuch - Band VII, Umweltanalytik, chapter A 2.1.1., 4th edition, published by Verband deutscher landwirtschaftlicher Untersuchungs- und Forschungsanstalten e. V. (VDLUFA; Association of German Agricultural Analytic and Research Institutes), Darmstadt, Germany, 690 pp., 2011.

VDLUFA: Methodenbuch - Band I, Bodenuntersuchung, chapter A 6.2.1.1., 4th edition, published by VDLUFA, Darmstadt, Germany, 1570 pp., 2012.

Zech, W., Schad, P., and Hintermaier-Erhard, G.: Böden der Welt: ein Bildatlas (Soils of the wordl: a visual atlas), 2nd edition, Springer Spektrum, Heidelberg, Germany, 164 pp., 2014.

Tables

Table 1. The characteristics of the investigated *vitric* Andosol in Karagwe, Tanzania.

			Aggregate size distribution												
	Depth	Color	clay	silt	sand	structure	pH	ρ_B	FC_{field}	FC_{lab}	CEC_{eff}	BS	TOC	N_{tot}	C/N
	cm	Munsell	%	%	%		KCl	kg dm^{-3}	m^3 m^{-3}	m^3 m^{-3}	cmol kg^{1}	%	%	%	
Ap	20	2.5 YR 3/2	3.2	16.1	80.7	Very crumbly	3.8	0.94	0.38	0.35	16.7	99.6	3.5	0.3	12.9
Ah	37	2.5 YR 3/2	3.6	13.0	83.4	Blocky subangular to crumbly	3.8	0.88							
B1	53	2.5 YR 2.5/3	2.2	16.3	81.5	Crumbly to blocky subangular	NA	1.08	0.36	NA	11.2	97.1	2.7	0.2	13.3
B2	74	2.5 YR 3/3	2.2	20.1	77.8	Macro: prismatic; micro: blocky subangular	NA	NA	NA	NA	8.0	94.5	2.0	0.2	12.5
C	100+	NA	NA	NA	NA	No aggregates, subangular gravel	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Water holding capacity (WHC) was determined in the field (FC_{field}) and in the laboratory (FC_{lab}). ρ_B: bulk density, CEC: cation exchange capacity, BS: base saturation, TOC: total organic carbon, NA: not analysed

Table 2: The characteristics of the tested soil amendments according to Krause et al. (2015).

		C_{tot}	N_{tot}	N_{min}	S_{tot}	P_{tot}	K_{tot}	Mg_{tot}	Ca_{tot}	Al_{tot}	Fe_{tot}	Zn_{tot}	Mn_{tot}
		in dry matter											
		g kg^{-1}	g kg^{-1}	g kg^{-1}	g kg^{-1}	g kg^{-1}	g kg^{-1}	g kg^{-1}	g kg^{-1}	g kg^{-1}	g kg^{-1}	mg kg^{-1}	mg kg^{-1}
Gras		426	1.9	ua.	1.7	1.0	13.8	2.8	8.6	4.9	4.0	24.1	172
Biogas slurry		348 ± 6	19.9 ± 0.1	16.0 ± 0.8	3.1 ± 0.02	7.6 ± 0.2	92.9 ± 8.4	12.2 ± 0.1	17.4 ± 0.9	4.0 ± 0.7	4.3 ± 0.1	115.3 ± 1.7	283 ± 9
Compost		91 ± 8	5.3 ± 0.2	0.12 ± 0.04	1.2 ± 0.1	1.2 ± 0.1	8.5 ± 1.2	3.2 ± 0.2	10.0 ± 1.2	77.5 ± 1.6	65 ± 10	59.5 ± 4.3	641 ± 106
CaSa-compost		116 ± 11	6.0 ± 0.5	0.36 ± 0.07	1.3 ± 0.1	3.2 ± 0.2	14.6 ± 1.4	5.1 ± 0.5	29.6 ± 2.8	54.5 ± 1.4	84 ± 18	67.0 ± 4.7	480 ± 48
	pH	in fresh matter											
	in KCl	g dm^{-3}	g dm^{-3}	g dm^{-3}	g dm^{-3}	g dm^{-3}	g dm^{-3}	g dm^{-3}	g dm^{-3}	g dm^{-3}	g dm^{-3}	mg dm^{-3}	mg dm^{-3}
Gras		25 ± 13	0.1 ± 0.1	ua.	0.1 ± 0.1	0.1 ± 0.03	0.8 ± 0.4	0.2 ± 0.1	0.5 ± 0.3	0.3 ± 0.2	0.2 ± 0.1	1.4 ± 0.7	10 ± 5
Biogas slurry	7.7	15 ± 1	0.9 ± 0.04	0.7 ± 0.05	0.1 ± 0.01	0.3 ± 0.02	4.1 ± 0.4	0.5 ± 0.03	0.8 ± 0.1	0.2 ± 0.03	0.2 ± 0.01	5.1 ± 0.3	12 ± 1
Compost	7.4	33 ± 6	1.9 ± 0.3	0.04 ± 0.02	0.4 ± 0.1	0.5 ± 0.1	3.1 ± 0.7	1.1 ± 0.2	3.6 ± 0.7	28.1 ± 4.5	24 ± 5	21.6 ± 3.7	233 ± 53
CaSa-compost	7.5	60 ± 7	3.1 ± 0.3	0.2 ± 0.04	0.7 ± 0.1	1.7 ± 0.1	7.6 ± 0.9	2.7 ± 0.3	15.4 ± 1.7	28.3 ± 1.8	44 ± 10	34.9 ± 3.2	250 ± 29

Analyses as described in Krause et al. (2015): total concentrations of nutrients, P_{tot}, K_{tot}, Ca_{tot}, Mg_{tot}, Zn_{tot}, Mn_{tot}, Al_{tot}, and Fe_{tot}, were determined using HNO_3-digestion under pressure (König, 2005) and iCAP 6000 ICP-OES-device (Thermo Scientific, Waltham, USA). Total concentrations of C, N, S were analyzed according to ISO DIN 10694 (1995) for C_{tot} ISO DIN 13878 (1998) for N_{tot}, and DIN ISO15178 (HBU 3.4.1.54b) for S_{tot}, and using Vario ELIII CNS-Analyzer (Elementar, Hanau, Germany). Mineral nitrogen (N_{min}) was extracted with potassium chloride (KCl) and analyzed using test strips (AgroQuant 114602 Soil Laboratory, Merck, Darmstadt, Germany). The method involved the suspension of 50 g material of the amenders in 100 ml 0.1 M KCl. Within the same solution, pH was measured by using a glass electrode (pH 330i, WTW, Weilheim, Germany). Values are displayed with mean value and standard deviation with n=1, 2 and 5, respectively, for grasses, biogas slurry, and compost as well as CaSa-compost.
The dominant form of available N_{min} was NH_4 for biogas slurry and NO_3 for compost as well as CaSa-compost respectively.

Table 3. Soil nutrient status before applying the amendments and the nutrient loads of the amendments.

	FM	FM	DM	N_{min}	P	K	Mg	Ca	Al	Zn	Mn
	$dm^3\ m^{-2}$	$kg\ m^{-2}$	$kg\ m^{-2}$	$g\ m^{-2}$	$g\ m^{-2}$	$g\ m^{-2}$	$g\ m^{-2}$	$g\ m^{-2}$	$g\ m^{-2}$	$g\ m^{-2}$	$g\ m^{-2}$
Soil (0-90 cm)	900	1039	869	7.5	0.4	141	1107	2761	60	n.d.	NA
Biogas slurry	10.2	10.2	0.4	4.9	3.4	41.3	5.4	7.7	1.8	0.05	0.13
Gras	15.6	1.2	0.9	5.8	0.9	12.5	2.6	7.8	4.4	0.02	0.16
∑ Biogas*	25.8	11.4	1.3	10.7	4.3	53.8	8.0	15.5	6.2	0.07	0.29
Compost	15.0	8.2	5.4	10.4	6.8	46.5	17.2	54.4	421.5	0.32	3.49
CaSa-compost	8.3	6.4	4.3	9.5	13.8	63.2	22.2	128.1	236.2	0.29	2.08

Concentrations in the dry soil were analysed as described in Sect. 2.3.; calculations of the content in fresh matter of the treatments derived concentrations provided by Krause et al. (2015), see Table 2 for description of methods.

* For the biogas slurry treatment, the nutrient load was derived from both grasses and slurry (∑ Biogas).

Non common abbreviations: DM: dry matter; FM: fresh matter; NA: not analysed, n.d.: not detectable,

Table 4. Chemical analysis of the untreated Andosol in Karagwe, Tanzania and the amended top-soil (0-30 cm) horizons sampled at the end of the experiment.

Treatment	pH in KCl		P_{CAL} mg kg^{-1}	
Control Andosol	5.3	a	0.5	a
Biogas slurry	5.4	ab	0.7	a
Compost	5.5	ab	1.1	a
CaSa-compost	5.9	b	4.4	b

Different letters reflect means differing significantly from one another (HSD, Tukey test, α=0.05; n=3).

Table 5. Harvest and market products of maize and in relation to the untreated control (100 %)

	Harvest product Total above-ground biomass, FM			Market product Maize grains, air-dry		
	$g\ m^{-2}$	%		$g\ m^{-2}$	%	
Control Andosol	1595	100	a	110	100	a
Biogas slurry	2229	140	a	263	238	ab
Compost	2464	154	ab	318	288	bc
CaSa-compost	3372	211	b	438	397	c

Different letters reflect means differing significantly from one another (HSD, Tukey test, $\alpha=0.05$) with $n=4$ for control, and $n=5$ for other treatments.

Table 6. Nutrient concentration in dry matter of maize grains compared to levels reported in literature.

	N_{tot}	P_{tot}	K_{tot}	Ca_{tot}	Mg_{tot}
	g kg^{-1}	g kg^{-1}	g kg^{-1}	g kg^{-1}	g kg^{-1}
Control Andosol	15.9	2.3	4.4	0.1	1.0
Biogas slurry	16.5	2.6	4.0	0.1	1.0
Compost	15.6	2.5	3.6	0.1	1.0
CaSa-compost	16.8	3.0	3.9	0.1	1.1
p (n=3)	*0.58*	*0.08*	*0.03*	*0.71*	*0.34*
Finck, 2007	17.5	4.0	4.9	2.1	1.4
Kimetu et al., 2008 (Kenya):					
Control	11.8	2.3	2.7	0.03	0.9
Biochar	12.5	2.2	2.6	0.1	0.8

Table 7. Changes in the soil nutrient status (Δ Nut) along with nutrients applied by the treatment (Nut_{app}) and the nutrients taken up by the crop (Nut_{up}).

	$Nut._{app}$	$Nut._{up}$	Δ Nut.	$Nut._{app}$	$Nut._{up}$	Δ Nut.
	P	P	P	K	K	K
	g m^{-2}	g m^{-2}	g m^{-2}	g m^{-2}	g m^{-2}	g m^{-2}
Control Andosol	-	0.4	- 0.4	-	3.3	- 3.3
Biogas slurry	4.2	0.8	3.5	53.8	5.2	48.5
Compost	6.8	1.1	5.7	46.5	8.5	38.0
CaSa-compost	13.8	1.7	12.3	63.5	10.7	52.5

Data based on three plots for each treatment.

Figures



Fig. 1. The experiment design: the plots were arranged as a Latin rectangle with five columns and five rows (left side of the figure) and each plot was divided into two 4.5 m2 sections for the cultivation of seven selected crops in an intercropping system (right side of the figure); note that urine treatment was a *posteriori* excluded from the analysis due to technical problems.



Fig. 2. Water retention curve (WRC) of the untreated Andosol and for the soil treated with biogas slurry, standard compost, and CaSa-compost. The PDI-model for the control Andosol was fitted to data measured using the simplified evaporation method. Error indicators belong to “Andosol ceramic plate”. Plot data is provided in Tables S1 and S2.



Fig. 3a+3b. Total above-ground biomass production and marketable yields of food crops given as g per plot. Each plot comprised a 4.5 m^2 area sown to maize and a 4.5 m^2 area inter-cropped with onions, beans, cabbage, carrots, African egg plant and pepper. Different letters reflect means differing significantly from one another (HSD, Tukey test, α=0.05; n=4 for the untreated control plots and n=5 for the amended plots). Plot data is provided in Table S3.



Fig. 4. Vector nutrient analysis for maize, showing the responses of air-dry grain yield (g plant^{-1}), relative nutrient concentration in DM (with the untreated Andosol = 100 %) and relative nutrient uptake (with the untreated Andosol = 100 %). Different letters reflect means differing significantly from one another (HSD, Tukey test, $\alpha=0.05$; $n=3$). The arrow indicates the largest response and depicts a primary response of maize plants to mitigated P-deficiency. Plot data is provided in Table S4.

List of abbreviations

<u>Chemical elements:</u>

Al	Aluminium
C	Carbon
C_{tot}	Total carbon *(exemplarily also for total concentration of other elements)*
Ca	Calcium
Cu	Copper
H	Hydrogen
Fe	Iron
K	Potassium
K_{CAL}	CAL-soluble K *(likewise P_{CAL})*
Mg	Magnesium
Mn	Manganese
N	Nitrogen
N_{min}	Mineral nitrogen
N_{org}	Organic nitrogen
P	Phosphorus
S	Sulphur
Si	Silicon
Zn	Zinc

<u>Terms used in context of physico-chemical analyses:</u>

ANOVA	Analyses of variance
AWC	Available water capacity
BS	Base saturation
CAL	Calcium acetate lactate
CEC_{eff}	Effective cation exchange capacity
DM	Dry matter
FC	Field capacity
FM	Fresh mass
HSD	Honest significant difference

ICP-OES	Inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometry
IR	Infiltration rate
pF	Decadic logarithm of the negative pressure head
PV	Pore volume
t_0	Time of sampling beginning of February
t_1	Time of sampling end of April
t_2	Time of sampling beginning of July
WRC	Water retention capacity
ρ_B	Bulk density
ρ_p	Particle density
θ	Volumetric water curve

Terms used in context of calculations in Eq. 1:

D_{Nmin}	Demand of Nmin per cropping season
$m_{material}$	Amount of materials to be amended to the soil
Δ Nut	Changes in the soil nutrient status
Nut_{app}	Quantity of nutrient supplied by the treatment
Nut_{up}	Quantity of nutrient taken up by the plants
ΔNut_{av}	Changes in the soil's available nutrient stock
ΔNut_{nav}	Change in the soil's nutrient stock which was “non-available”

Other non-common abbreviations:

Biochar	Charcoal used as soil amendment
CaSa	Project “Carbonization and Sanitation”
CaSa-compost	Product of CaSa-project containing composted biochar and sanitized excreta
cv.	Cultivar
m.a.s.l.	Meter above sea level
NW	Northwest
TU	Technische Universität
UDDT	Urine diverting dry toilet