

# International Journal of Plant & Soil Science 4(6): 521-534, 2015; Article no.IJPSS.2015.051



### SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org

### Reaction Classes and Phosphorus and Potassium Contents of Soils in Major Potato Growing Areas of West Shoa Zone as Determined through Different Methods

### Tesfaye Balemi<sup>1\*</sup>, Ibrahim Hamza<sup>1</sup> and Abate Bayeh<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Horticulture and Plant Sciences, College of Agriculture and Veterinary Science, Ambo University, P.O.Box, 19, Ethiopia.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Chemistry, College of Natural and Computational Science, Ambo University, P.O.Box, 19, Ethiopia.

### Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. Authors TB and IH designed the study and collected soil samples from the respective study sites. Author AB. managed the literature searches. Author TB additionally did the laboratory analyses of the samples and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors TB and IH further improved the manuscript to its current shape. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

### **Article Information**

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2015/13405

Editor(s):

(1) Marco Trevisan, Institute of Agricultural Chemistry and Environmental Research Centre BIOMASS, Faculty of Agriculture,
Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Italy.

Reviewers:

(1) Anonymous, University of Missouri Extension, USA.

(2) Anonymous, Ekiti State University, Nigeria.

Complete Peer review History: http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history.php?iid=778&id=24&aid=7119

Original Research Article

Received 16<sup>th</sup> August 2014 Accepted 15<sup>th</sup> October 2014 Published 8<sup>th</sup> December 2014

### **ABSTRACT**

Poor soil fertility management has been one of the major factors constraining potato productivity on farmers' field in Ethiopia, creating a wide gap between the actual yield and potential yield. A study was conducted in West Shoa Zone, Ethiopia to investigate the reaction classes as well as phosphorus and potassium contents of soils of farmers managed potato farms. Soil samples, from a depth of 0-30 cm, were collected from six districts during the *Belg* (March-June) cropping season to determine pH, phosphorus and potassium contents. Soil pH was determined using both water and 0.01 M calcium chloride solutions. Available phosphorus content in the soil was determined using both CAL and Olsen methods. Potassium content of the soil was determined both by

extracting the potassium with Calcium Acetate Lactate (CAL) solution as well as by 1 M ammonium acetate solution. Results showed that the soil pH in all the districts was generally low, the average soil pH determined in CaCl<sub>2</sub> suspension ranged between 4.9-5.5. Most of the fields sampled in Chelia, Welmera, Ejere, Tikur-Inchini and Jibat districts had *low* and *very low* CAL-P value while all the fields sampled in Jeldu district had CAL-P only in the *target*, *high* and *very high* classes. 58.5% of the sampled fields had a CAL-K value in the *very high* class and above. 56% of the sampled fields had an ammonium acetate extractable K content in a class ranging from *moderately high* to *very high*. Nearly 70% of the fields had *low, very low* and *extremely low* according to Olsen P test. Only 9.5% of the surveyed field soil was rated as having *low* or *very low* Olsen P while 80.5% had K content of *target* value and above.

Keywords: Available phosphorus; available potassium; soil pH; West Shoa Zone.

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

In Ethiopia, potato growers pay less attention to soil fertility management [1] and this has been one of the major factors constraining potato productivity on farmers' field, creating a huge gap between actual yield and potential yield [2]. In the central highlands of Ethiopia, where farmers grow potato twice a year, a conspicuous decline in the soil fertility status is being observed since the concept of maintenance fertilization is absent among farmers and crop residues are usually removed from the field further worsening the situation. Attempts have been made in the past as well as currently to improve Ethiopian soils productivity through encouraging the use of mineral fertilizers. However, following the government withdrawal from fertilizer subsidy, the application of fertilizer, especially by resource poor farmers has tremendously declined due to escalated fertilizer price, thus further posing a negative impact on soil fertility and hence on crop yield.

An important aspect of soil fertility management, which is often overlooked, is to decide the appropriate fertilizer type and rate to use, based on soil test results. The availability of limited number of soil testing laboratories in the country and their limited capacity could be the reason to until very recently remain with blanket fertilizer recommendations for all crops. However, it is significant to note that fertilizer response is directly related to the nature of soil, emphasizing that soil varying in fertility status results in different crop response to applied fertilizers [3]. Fertilizer recommendation should also consider textural classes of soil as nutrients can easily be lost through leaching in sand dominated soils than clay dominated ones [4]. It was with this assumption that most European countries and Americans follow soil nutrient index based fertilizer application [4] for soils of different

textural classes. A sound soil fertility management programme should provide crops with an adequate amount and in balanced proportion of all essential nutrients to attain optimum crop yields and crop quality and this call for determination of soil nutrient contents and their textural classes before running into recommendations.

Although, the application of mineral fertilizers has been reported to tremendously increase potato growth and yield [5], the type and quantity of fertilizer to be applied for economically acceptable yield cannot be known unless the initial soil fertility regime of a specific area is determined through soil testing. Moreover, the national blanket recommendation for the crop which is currently being used throughout the country is not based on local soil conditions and so undermines the concept of economics of fertilizer application. This study was undertaken to partly address some of these gaps at least in some field sites of selected districts of West Shoa Zone. The objective of the study was, therefore, to evaluate the nutrient status of soils in the major potato growing areas of Western Shoa Zone to lay a baseline information for soil index based suitable fertilizer recommendations for higher and sustainable crop yield in the sub-region.

### 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Description of the Study Area

The study was conducted during the *Belg* cropping season (March-June) of 2012. The study districts were all located in the highland parts of West Shoa Zone (Fig. 1). In terms of climatic condition, the study area is characterized as given in Table 1.

### 2.2 Soil Sample Collection

Soil samples were collected from six purposively selected major potato growing districts of West Shoa Zone, Ethiopia namely Jeldu, Tikur Inchini, Jibat, Cheliya, Welmera and Ejere districts during the *Belg* (March-June) cropping season of 2012. From each district 10 to 11 field sites were sampled except for Tikur-Inchini and Jibat as well as Womera and Ejere, where 10 samples were collected for the two districts altogether. The soil samples (0-30 cm depth) were taken into polyethylene bags in a zig-zag manner from 10-15 spots per field site using auger and later on made into one composite sample. The soil samples were immediately air dried and sieved through a 2 mm sieve.

### 2.3 Determination of Soil Parameters

### 2.3.1 Determination of soil pH

Soil pH was determined using both water and 0.01 M calcium chloride solutions. The ratio between the soil and the water/calcium chloride solution was mainatained at 1: 2.5. With both methods 20 g of soil was mixed with 50 mL of the respective solution. The content was stirred for few minutes and the solution was allowed to stand for about 2 hrs. After clear suspension was obtained the pH was measured using precalibirated portable pH meter.




Fig. 1. Map of the study districts

Table 1. Important meteorological and other data of the study area

District	Annual Average Total Rain Fall (mm)	Annual Average Temperature (°C)	Altitude Range (masl)	
Jeldu	812-699	17-25	1900-3206	
Tikur-Inchini	1000-1800	6-24	2200-3023	
Jibat	800-1500	18-24	1600-3200	
Cheliya	900-1400	10-25	1500-3051	
Ejere	900-1200	22-28	2060-3185	
Welmera	760-1062	7-24	2200-2400	

Source: West Shoa Zone Agriculture Office

### 2.3.2 Determination of soil phosphorus and potassium content

Available phosphorus content in the soil was determined using both CAL method [6] in which Calcium Acetate and Lactate (composed of calcium lactate pentahydrate, calcium acetate hydrate and acetic acid) solution was used as an extractant and the Olsen method [7] in which sodium bicarbonate (0.5 M NaHCO<sub>3</sub> at a pH=8.5) was used as an extracting solution. P concentration in the extract was measured using spectrophotometer (µQuant MQX200) at 405 and 882 nm for CAL and Olsen methods, respectively following the addition of appropriate color reagents. Likewise, the potassium content of the soil was determined both by extracting the potassium with Calcium Acetate Lactate (CAL) solution as well as by 1 M ammonium acetate solution according to [8]. Both the potassium extracted using CAL solution and 1 M ammonium acetate solution was measured using flame photometer (Eppendorf Elex 6361. Flammenphotometer).

### 2.4 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (mean, range, percentage) were used to explore the data. The data obtained were further classified in to very low, low, target, high, very high and excess based on the information described in literatures. The Pearson correlation coefficients were also determined through running correlation analysis using sigma plot version 10 in order to evaluate relationships between mineral nutrients in soil determined through different methods.

### 3. RESULTS

### 3.1 Soil pH

The results of soil pH measurements for each field site are presented in Table 2, Figs. 2 and 3. The soil pH determined using 1:2.5 soil: CaCl<sub>2</sub> suspension was generally lower (on average by 0.4) as compared to the one determined using 1:2.5 soil: water suspension. The average soil pH of the surveyed districts ranged between 5.3-5.8 in water suspension and between 4.9-5.5 in CaCl<sub>2</sub> suspension. The soil pH in all the districts was generally low except for Welmera and Eiere districts, which had relatively higher average soil pH of 5.8 in water suspension and 5.5 in CaCl<sub>2</sub> suspension. 50% of the soil in these two districts was in the moderately acidic range (Fig. 2, Table 2). The results of soil pH determined using 1:2.5 soil: CaCl<sub>2</sub> suspension, indicated that two sites (both at tullu kosoru kebele) in Cheliya district, one site at Ejere district (Ilu aga) and two site at Jeldu districts (Chilanko and Galesa gota Gesher kebeles) showed an extreme acidity (3.4-4.4). According to [9] of soil reaction classification, the soil pH results in water suspension showed that 22% of the soils surveyed were characterized as very strongly acidic, 34% as strongly acidic, 27% as moderately acidic and the rest 17% of the soil as being slightly acidic (Fig. 4a). On the other hand, according to the same classification, the soil pH results in 0.01 M calcium chloride suspension showed that 12% of the soils were extremely acidic, 41.5% were very strongly acidic, 27% were strongly acidic whereas 19.5% were moderately acidic for the whole survey area. In four of the districts, except Welmera and Ejere, 60% of the soils were either extremely acidic or very strongly acidic as measured in calcium chloride suspension (Fig. 3).

Table 2. The soil pH of the different districts in West Shoa Zone as determined by 1:2.5 soil: water and 1:2.5 soil: CaCl<sub>2</sub> suspensions

SI. Name of Districts No		No. of field sites sampled per district	Soil pH (1:2.5 soil water suspension)		Soil pH (1:2.5 soil CaCl <sub>2</sub> suspension)	
			Range	Average	Range	Average
1	Jeldu	11	4.8-5.9	5.3	4.4-5.5	4.9
2	Tikur Inchini and Jibat	10	5.0-6.1	5.4	4.5-5.7	4.9
3	Cheliya	10	4.7-6.3	5.5	4.2-5.9	5.0
4	Welmera and Ejere	10	4.9-6.3	5.8	4.4-5.9	5.5




Fig. 2. pH (H<sub>2</sub>O) of soils in different districts of West Shoa Zone




Fig. 3. pH (CaCl<sub>2</sub>) of soils in the different districts in West Shoa Zone

### 3.2 Soil Available Phosphorus

Available phosphorus (P) content in the soil determined through both Calcium Acetate and Lactate (CAL) and Olsen methods are presented in Figs. 5. 6 and 7 and Table 3. The results showed that the available P value was clearly higher for the calcium acetate lactate extracted soils (CAL-P) method than for the sodium bicarbonate extracted soils (Olsen P). At Jeldu district the average CAL-extractable P value was 5-fold higher than that of Olsen-P value while the average CAL-extractable P values at Tikur Inchini-Jibat districts, Welmera-Ejere districts and Cheliva district were 2.6, 1.7 and 1.2 times higher, respectively. The average extractable P value was the highest for Jeldu district and the lowest for Tikur Inchini and Jibat districts while Olsen P was the highest for Cheliya district and the lowest for Tikur Inchini and Jibat districts (Figs. 5 and 6, Table 3). Based on CAL-P soil test classification, most of the field sites sampled in Chelia, Welmera, Ejere Tikur-Inchini and Jibat districts had low and very low CAL-P value while all the field sites sampled in Jeldu district had CAL-P only in target, high and very high classes and not in low/very low classes (Fig. 5). At Cheliva an extremely very high CAL-P value was recorded at one site (Code 24). According to CAL-P soil class indexing, 46% of all field sites surveyed had low/very low CAL-P value whereas 54% had CAL-P value ranging from target to very high classes. On the other hand, according to [10] of Olsen P indexing, 70% of the field sites surveyed had Olsen P value from low to extremely low range whereas 30% of the field sites had Olsen P value from target to an extremely high range (Figs. 6, 7).

#### 3.3 Soil Potassium Contents

Data on potassium content in the soil extracted with CAL and ammonium acetate solutions are presented in Table 4 and Figs. 8 and 9. The results showed that the soil potassium content was clearly higher for ammonium acetate extracted soils than for calcium acetate lactate extracted one. The average ammonium acetate extractable potassium content of the soil was 1.5-1.7 fold higher than that of calcium acetate lactate extracted ones. The average CAL as well as ammonium acetate extractable potassium content of the soil slightly varied among the districts; however, they considerably varied between sites in each district. The average K content of the surveyed areas determined using calcium acetate lactate and ammonium acetate

as an extractant ranged between 475-625.6 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> soil and 797.8-928 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> soil, respectively. With both extraction methods, the average K content was the highest for Tikur-Inchini and Jibat districts followed by Welmera and Ejere districts. Soils from Cheliya and Jeldu districts had relatively lower potassium content with both methods. According to CAL-extractable soil potassium indexing, out of the 41 field sites surveyed only one field site (Ilu aga in Ejere district) had a very low potassium status (Table 5). Moreover, three of the sampled field sites, one field site in Ejere district (Ilu aga kebele) and two field sites in Cheliya district (both in Tullu kosoru kebele) had a low CAL-K status. All the other sampled field sites (37 sites) in all the districts showed a CAL-K status of target value and above. 58.5% of the sampled fields had a CAL-K value in the very high class or above indicating that more than half of the sampled field sites were very rich in potassium content (Fig. 10a). In 9 of the sampled field sites, the CAL-K status was even far beyond the very high class may be classified as extremely very high (Fig. 8). According to [10] ammonium acetate extractable soil potassium indexing, 9.8% of the sampled field sites had very low to low ammonium acetate extractable K content (Fig. 10b). Another 9.8% of the sampled field sites had ammonium acetate extractable K content of a target class whereas 56% of the sampled field sites had an ammonium acetate extractable K content in a class ranging from moderately high to very high (Figs. 8 and 10b).

#### 4. DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Soil pH

The soil pH of all the surveyed districts except Welmera and Ejere districts were very low (Table 2, Figs. 2 and 3). In such lower soil pH, availability of nutrients such as phosphorus can negatively be influenced unless the soils are reclaimed through lime application. Lower soil pH reduces availability of phosphorus for plant uptake since phosphorus precipitate as AI or Fe phosphates. Such lower pH can also result in toxicity of micronutrients such as manganese. In the current study, very low soil pH (4.2) resulted manganese excessive uptake accumulation in plant tissue (350 mg/kg d.m), which was nearly twice the optimum range (21-200 mg/kg d.m) for potato according to [11]. Such higher manganese concentration can potentially result in manganese toxicity in potato crop. The results observed in the current study showed a significant negative relationship between Manganese (Mn) concentration in plants tissue and soil pH (Fig. 11) demonstrating the association of lower soil pH with manganese toxicity.




Fig. 4. Reaction of soils in pH classes in the major potato growing areas of West Shoa Zone (n=41). ((a) in water suspension and (b) in 0.01 M calcium chloride)




Fig. 5. CAL-extractable phosphorus content of soils of different districts in West Shoa Zone




Fig. 6. NaHCO₃-extractable phosphorus (Olsen-P) content of soils of different districts in West Shoa Zone




Fig. 7. Classification of soils of surveyed area in terms of CAL-P index (a) and Olsen P index (b)

Table 3. CAL and Olsen extractable phosphorus contents of soils collected from different districts in West Shoa Zone

SI. No	Name of Districts	No. of field sites per		tractable P P kg <sup>-1</sup> soil)	Olsen P (mg P kg <sup>-1</sup> soil)		
		district	Range	Average	Range	Average	
1	Jeldu	11	86-355	150.7	10-87	31.0	
2	Tikur Inchini and Jibat	10	12-97	49.1	7-50	19.1	
3	Cheliya	10	15-437	73.7	10-331	61.9	
4	Welmera and Ejere	10	18-209	76.0	7-150	44.6	




Fig. 8. CAL-extractable K content of soils of different districts in West Shoa Zone




Fig. 9. Ammonium acetate-extractable K content of soils of different districts in West Shoa Zone

Table 4. CAL and ammonium acetate extractable potassium contents of soil of different districts in West Shoa Zone

SI. No	Name of Districts	No. of field sites per district		actable K g <sup>-1</sup> soil)	Ammonium acetate extractable K (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> soil)	
			Range	Average	Range	Average
1	Jeldu	11	185-942	475.0	350-1466	797.8
2	Tikur Inchini and Jibat	10	269-1373	625.6	426-1857	928.1
3	Cheliya	10	84-975	481.6	165-1507	811.4
4	Welmera and Ejere	10	58-1543	566.0	151-2283	847.9




Fig. 10. Classification of soils of surveyed area in terms of CAL-K index (a) and ammonium acetate extractable-K index (b)





Fig. 11. Relationship between soil pH and Mn concentration in potato leaves

# 4.2 Soils Phosphorus and Potassium Status

The CAL-P values were generally higher compared to Olsen P values although the factor of difference varied with field sites and districts probably due to variation in soil characteristics

specifically soil pH [12] and soil texture [13]. The analysis of soil textural class of the study area showed that there was a considerable variability in soil pH (Figs. 2 and 3) as well as in clay, silt and sand contents of the soils (data not shown). As average of all the sampled fields, the CAL-P value was higher than the Olsen P value by a

factor of 4.8, 2.6, 1.2 and 1.7 for Jeldu, Tikur and Welmera-Eiere Inchini-Jibat. Cheliva districts. Surprisingly, in few field sites especially in Jeldu as well as Tikur Inchini and Jibat districts a considerable difference between CAL-P value and Olsen-P value was observed, presumably due to difference in soil pH (Figs. 2 and 3) and soil texture (data not presented). However, the CAL-P and Olsen P values determined for all the sampled fields in the present study significantly correlated (Fig. 12), despite the variation in the extend of P extraction capacity of the two methods. However, [13] observed that Olsen method was able to extract only half of the P that was extracted by Bray-1 and accounted the weak relationship (less correlation) between the two methods in different soils to difference in soil texture. The variation between calcium acetate lactate and sodium bicarbonate methods in the extent of the available P extraction ability from the soils of Jeldu and Cheliya districts might be attributed to difference in soil types, especially in soil texture [13]. The fact that most of the sampled fields, except those in Welmera and Ejere districts, showed a very low and low P class demonstrates that most of the soils in the major potato growing regions of West Shoa Zone were poor in available phosphorus, which might be related to the acidic nature of the soil (Table 2. Figs. 2 and 3), since in such soils phosphorus can be fixed in the form of AI and Fe-phosphates or strongly adsorbed to oxides or hydroxides of these elements [14]. The leaf P concentration (data not presented) from the same surveyed fields was below the optimum range for potato and this agrees with the low or very low soil P test value for most of the districts presented in Table 3 and Figs. 5 and 6. The fact that potassium extracted using 0.01 M ammonium acetate solution was higher than the ones extracted using CAL (calcium acetate and lactate) solution was on average higher by a factor of 1.7 agrees with the results of [15], who also observed two-fold higher extraction capacity of acidic ammonium acetate solution over the calcium acetate lactate solution, which was relatively a weak extractant. However, despite the difference in the amount of K extracted, the potassium content determined through both extraction methods showed highly significant positive correlation (Fig. 12), indicating that the extraction methods were not influenced by differences in soil pH and organic matter contents between the field sites, unlike the observation of [15], who reported that the amount of K extracted by the two methods was strongly influenced by organic matter content. Most of the surveyed fields had potassium content above the target level (Figs. 8 and 9) despite the absence of potassium fertilizer application in all the districts in particular and in Ethiopia in general. This confirms the long existing general view that the parent materials from which most Ethiopian soils are formed was rich in potassium. Some soils even had very high potassium content. However, few pocket areas (three field sites) have shown low potassium content (Figs. 8 and 9).






Fig. 12. Relationship between CAL-P and Olsen-P (left) and ammonium acetate extractable and CAL-extractable soil potassium content (right)

Table 5. Soil pH and Soil nutrient content in selected field sites of major potato growing districts of West Shoa Zone

O1	-							=	
02         Galesa Qoftu         5.5         5.1         136         19         697         1090           03         Chilanko-1         5.6         5.2         186         16         720         1161           04         Chilanko-2         13         4.8         4.4         104         30         185         350           05         Edensa Gelan-1         5.9         5.5         355         87         801         1251           06         Edensa Gelan-2         70         5.5         5.1         110         22         452         756           07         Edensa Gelan-1         5.7         5.3         212         56         942         1466           09         Kolu Gelan-2         4.9         4.6         108         20         305         567           10         Chilanko-4         5.0         4.5         86         10         228         415           11         Galesa Qota Gesher-2         5.0         4.4         89         13         241         492           12         Birbira fi Doguma         5.1         4.6         87         8         469         701           14         Maganur <th>Code</th> <th>Field site</th> <th></th> <th>Soil pH (in water suspension)</th> <th>Soil pH (in CaCl<sub>2</sub> suspension)</th> <th>P-CAL (mg/kg soil)</th> <th>Olsen P (mg/kg soil)</th> <th>K-CAL (mgkg<sup>-1</sup> soil)</th> <th>Ammonium Acetate Extractable K (mg /kg soil)</th>	Code	Field site		Soil pH (in water suspension)	Soil pH (in CaCl <sub>2</sub> suspension)	P-CAL (mg/kg soil)	Olsen P (mg/kg soil)	K-CAL (mgkg <sup>-1</sup> soil)	Ammonium Acetate Extractable K (mg /kg soil)
Schilanko-1									726
04         Chilanko-2         15         4.8         4.4         104         30         185         350           05         Edensa Gelan-1         15         5.9         5.5         355         87         801         1251           06         Edensa Gelan-2         10         5.5         5.1         110         22         452         756           07         Edensa Gelan-3         10         5.0         4.6         175         54         241         503           08         Kolu Gelan-1         5.7         5.3         212         56         942         1466           09         Kolu Gelan-2         4.9         4.6         108         20         305         567           10         Chilanko-4         5.0         4.5         86         10         228         415           11         Galesa Qota Gesher-2         5.0         4.4         89         13         241         492           12         Birbira fi Doguma         5.3         4.9         97         10         276         426           13         Ula Lankiso         5.1         4.6         87         8         469         701									
09         Kolu Gelan-2         4.9         4.6         108         20         305         567           10         Chilanko-4         5.0         4.5         86         10         228         415           11         Galesa Qota Gesher-2         5.0         4.4         89         13         241         492           12         Birbira fi Doguma         5.3         4.9         97         10         276         426           13         Ula Lankiso         5.1         4.6         87         8         469         701           14         Maganur         7         4.6         87         8         469         701           14         Maganur         8         5.1         4.6         87         8         469         701           14         Maganur         9         5.0         4.5         85         9         569         839           16         Buyema Qochore         19         5.0         4.5         85         9         569         839           17         Bilo Abaye         19         5.6         5.0         24         21         536         809           18         Togo W			*						
09         Kolu Gelan-2         4.9         4.6         108         20         305         567           10         Chilanko-4         5.0         4.5         86         10         228         415           11         Galesa Qota Gesher-2         5.0         4.4         89         13         241         492           12         Birbira fi Doguma         5.3         4.9         97         10         276         426           13         Ula Lankiso         5.1         4.6         87         8         469         701           14         Maganur         7         4.6         87         8         469         701           14         Maganur         8         5.1         4.6         87         8         469         701           14         Maganur         9         5.0         4.5         85         9         569         839           16         Buyema Qochore         19         5.0         4.5         85         9         569         839           17         Bilo Abaye         19         5.6         5.0         24         21         536         809           18         Togo W			Ę						
09         Kolu Gelan-2         4.9         4.6         108         20         305         567           10         Chilanko-4         5.0         4.5         86         10         228         415           11         Galesa Qota Gesher-2         5.0         4.4         89         13         241         492           12         Birbira fi Doguma         5.3         4.9         97         10         276         426           13         Ula Lankiso         5.1         4.6         87         8         469         701           14         Maganur         5.1         4.6         87         8         469         701           14         Maganur         5.1         4.6         74         10         563         853           15         Walda Hidhe-1         16         Buyema Qochore         17         5.0         4.5         85         9         569         839           16         Buyema Qochore         17         5.6         5.0         24         21         536         809           18         Togo Wixate         17         18         6.1         5.7         42         50         672         9			<u>is</u>						
09         Kolu Gelan-2         4.9         4.6         108         20         305         567           10         Chilanko-4         5.0         4.5         86         10         228         415           11         Galesa Qota Gesher-2         5.0         4.4         89         13         241         492           12         Birbira fi Doguma         5.3         4.9         97         10         276         426           13         Ula Lankiso         5.1         4.6         87         8         469         701           14         Maganur         5.1         4.6         87         8         469         701           14         Maganur         5.1         4.6         74         10         563         853           15         Walda Hidhe-1         16         Buyema Qochore         17         5.0         4.5         85         9         569         839           16         Buyema Qochore         17         5.6         5.0         24         21         536         809           18         Togo Wixate         17         18         6.1         5.7         42         50         672         9			'n						
09         Kolu Gelan-2         4.9         4.6         108         20         305         567           10         Chilanko-4         5.0         4.5         86         10         228         415           11         Galesa Qota Gesher-2         5.0         4.4         89         13         241         492           12         Birbira fi Doguma         5.3         4.9         97         10         276         426           13         Ula Lankiso         5.1         4.6         87         8         469         701           14         Maganur         5.1         4.6         87         8         469         701           14         Maganur         5.1         4.6         74         10         563         853           15         Walda Hidhe-1         10         50         5.1         28         27         875         1251           17         Bilo Abaye         10         5.6         5.0         24         21         536         809           18         Togo Wixate         13         5.5         4.9         14         10         654         1058           20         Tutu Jibat			戾						
10 Chilanko-4 11 Galesa Qota Gesher-2 12 Birbira fi Doguma 13 Ula Lankiso 14 Maganur 15 Walda Hidhe-1 16 Buyema Qochore 17 Bilo Abaye 18 Togo Wixate 19 Mugno Abayi (Jibat) 20 Tutu Jibat 21 Walda Hindhe-2 22 Rafiso Alenga-1 23 Rafiso Alenga-1 24 Alle Ula Dhabi 25 Jasro Dire Geda-1 26 Jarso Dire Geda-2 27 Bilo fi Kaku 28 Tulu Kosoru-1 29 Tulu Kosoru-2 29 Tulu Kosoru-2 20 Kurkusami Robgebya 30 Kurkurfa Ilu Barga 31 Kurkurfa Ilu Barga 32 Kurkurfa Ilu Barga 33 Kurkurfa Ilu Barga 34 L9 31 4.4 34 Ilu Aga, Ejere 35.0 4.4 489 13 241 492 228 415 36 10 228 415 36 410 228 415 36 410 228 415 36 410 228 415 36 410 228 415 36 410 228 415 36 410 228 415 36 410 228 415 36 410 228 415 36 410 228 415 36 410 228 415 36 410 228 416 37 426 38 469 701 36 466 37 8 469 701 36 563 853 38 459 389 399 310 563 38 457 38 469 701 36 563 38 457 38 469 701 36 563 37 44 50 38 59 38 457 38 469 701 36 563 38 49 37 40 37 42 50 38 67 2 39 48 415 38 469 701 36 563 38 49 37 40 37 42 50 38 40 39 437 31 40 43 960 449 43 960 449 43 960 449 43 960 449 43 960 449 43 960 449 43 960 449 45 566 47 410 48 43 960 491 495 497 495 497 497 497 497 497 497 497 497 497 497			ř						
11   Galesa Qota Gesher-2   5.0   4.4   89   13   241   492     12   Birbira fi Doguma   5.3   4.9   97   10   276   426     13   Ula Lankiso   5.1   4.6   87   8   469   701     14   Maganur   8   5.1   4.6   74   10   563   853     15   Walda Hidhe-1   12   12   15   5.0   4.5   85   9   569   839     16   Buyema Qochore   17   17   18   18   18   17   125   243     17   Bilo Abaye   17   18   18   17   125   14     18   Togo Wixate   18   17   125   243     19   Mugno Abayi (Jibat)   17   18   18   189   324     10   Galesa Qota Gesher-2   19   5.3   4.9   4.4   18   7   58   151     18   Togo Wixate   17   18   18   7   58   151     19   Mugno Abayi (Jibat)   17   18   18   7   58   151     10   Galesa Qota Gesher-2   18   17   12   10     10   Cale Alega									
12 Birbira fi Doguma									
13 Ula Lankiso 14 Maganur 15 Walda Hidhe-1 16 Buyema Qochore 17 Bilo Abaye 18 Togo Wixate 19 Mugno Abayi (Jibat) 19 Walda Hindhe-2 10 Tutu Jibat 10 Tutu Jibat 11 Walda Hindhe-2 11 Walda Hindhe-2 12 Rafiso Alenga-1 13 Rafiso Alenga-1 14 Maganur 15 S.5 S.0 15 S.5 S.0 16 S.0 17 S.1 18 Togo Wixate 19 Mugno Abayi (Jibat) 19 Mugno Abayi (Jibat) 10 Tutu Jibat 10 Comparison of the first street of the first stre									
14         Maganur         ge st         5.1         4.6         74         10         563         853           15         Walda Hidhe-1         15         5.0         4.5         85         9         569         839           16         Buyema Qochore         16         5.7         5.1         28         27         875         1251           17         Bilo Abaye         17         5.6         5.0         24         21         536         809           18         Togo Wixate         18         6.1         5.7         42         50         672         998           19         Mugno Abayi (Jibat)         19         5.5         4.9         14         10         654         1058           20         Tutu Jibat         5.7         5.2         4.7         12         7         269         491           21         Walda Hindhe-2         5.7         5.2         28         27         1373         1857           22         Rafiso Alenga-1         5.9         5.5         40         43         960         1491           23         Rafiso Alenga-2         5.9         5.5         5.0         24 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>-</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>			-						
20			anc ts						
20	15		اج آج	5.0		85	9	569	839
20	16	Buyema Qochore	hir	5.7	5.1	28	27	875	1251
20	17	Bilo Abaye	<u> </u>	5.6		24			
20			ur l baj						
20			≒ ≅ ≔						
22       Rafiso Alenga-1       5.9       5.5       40       43       960       1491         23       Rafiso Alenga-2       5.5       5.0       24       29       316       566         24       Alle Ula Dhabi       5.5       5.0       24       29       316       566         24       Alle Ula Dhabi       5.5       5.9       437       331       895       1507         25       Jasro Dire Geda-1       5.8       5.4       71       67       975       1495         26       Jarso Dire Geda-2       5.9       5.3       63       80       457       830         27       Bilo fi Kaku       5.2       4.7       22       27       430       792         28       Tulu Kosoru-1       5.4       4.9       22       23       166       288         29       Tulu Kosoru-2       4.8       4.2       18       17       125       243         30       Tulu Kosoru-3       4.7       4.2       15       10       84       165         31       Jarso       5.2       4.7       25       35       408       739         32       Kurkusami Robgebya			_						
23       Rafiso Alenga-2       5.5       5.0       24       29       316       566         24       Alle Ula Dhabi       5.5       5.9       437       331       895       1507         25       Jasro Dire Geda-1       5.8       5.4       71       67       975       1495         26       Jarso Dire Geda-2       5.9       5.3       63       80       457       830         27       Bilo fi Kaku       5.2       4.7       22       27       430       792         28       Tulu Kosoru-1       5.4       4.9       22       23       166       288         29       Tulu Kosoru-2       4.8       4.2       18       17       125       243         30       Tulu Kosoru-3       4.7       4.2       15       10       84       165         31       Jarso       5.2       4.7       25       35       408       739         32       Kurkusami Robgebya       5.6       5.3       33       18       189       324         33       Kurkurfa Ilu Barga       5.2       5.8       170       150       1431       2144         34       Ilu Aga, Ejere									
24       Alle Ula Dhabi       9       6.3       5.9       437       331       895       1507         25       Jasro Dire Geda-1       5       5.8       5.4       71       67       975       1495         26       Jarso Dire Geda-2       5       5.9       5.3       63       80       457       830         27       Bilo fi Kaku       5       5.2       4.7       22       27       430       792         28       Tulu Kosoru-1       5.4       4.9       22       23       166       288         29       Tulu Kosoru-2       4.8       4.2       18       17       125       243         30       Tulu Kosoru-3       4.7       4.2       15       10       84       165         31       Jarso       5.2       4.7       25       35       408       739         32       Kurkusami Robgebya       5.6       5.3       33       18       189       324         33       Kurkurfa Ilu Barga       5.2       5.8       170       150       1431       2144         34       Ilu Aga, Ejere       4.9       4.4       18       7       58       151									
30     Tuliu Kosoru-3     4.7     4.2     15     10     84     165       31     Jarso     5.2     4.7     25     35     408     739       32     Kurkusami Robgebya     5.6     5.3     33     18     189     324       33     Kurkurfa Ilu Barga     5.2     5.8     170     150     1431     2144       34     Ilu Aga, Ejere     4.9     4.4     18     7     58     151			ಕ						566
30     Tuliu Kosoru-3     4.7     4.2     15     10     84     165       31     Jarso     5.2     4.7     25     35     408     739       32     Kurkusami Robgebya     5.6     5.3     33     18     189     324       33     Kurkurfa Ilu Barga     5.2     5.8     170     150     1431     2144       34     Ilu Aga, Ejere     4.9     4.4     18     7     58     151			Ë						
30     Tuliu Kosoru-3     4.7     4.2     15     10     84     165       31     Jarso     5.2     4.7     25     35     408     739       32     Kurkusami Robgebya     5.6     5.3     33     18     189     324       33     Kurkurfa Ilu Barga     5.2     5.8     170     150     1431     2144       34     Ilu Aga, Ejere     4.9     4.4     18     7     58     151			<u>is</u> c						
30       Tulu Kosoru-3       4.7       4.2       15       10       84       165         31       Jarso       5.2       4.7       25       35       408       739         32       Kurkusami Robgebya       5.6       5.3       33       18       189       324         33       Kurkurfa Ilu Barga       5.2       5.8       170       150       1431       2144         34       Ilu Aga, Ejere       4.9       4.4       18       7       58       151			D T						
30       Tulu Kosoru-3       4.7       4.2       15       10       84       165         31       Jarso       5.2       4.7       25       35       408       739         32       Kurkusami Robgebya       5.6       5.3       33       18       189       324         33       Kurkurfa Ilu Barga       5.2       5.8       170       150       1431       2144         34       Ilu Aga, Ejere       4.9       4.4       18       7       58       151			<u>Ş</u>						
30       Tulu Kosoru-3       4.7       4.2       15       10       84       165         31       Jarso       5.2       4.7       25       35       408       739         32       Kurkusami Robgebya       5.6       5.3       33       18       189       324         33       Kurkurfa Ilu Barga       5.2       5.8       170       150       1431       2144         34       Ilu Aga, Ejere       4.9       4.4       18       7       58       151			Je l						
31     Jarso     5.2     4.7     25     35     408     739       32     Kurkusami Robgebya     5.6     5.3     33     18     189     324       33     Kurkurfa Ilu Barga     5.2     5.8     170     150     1431     2144       34     Ilu Aga, Ejere     4.9     4.4     18     7     58     151			$\overline{\mathbf{o}}$						
32       Kurkusami Robgebya       5.6       5.3       33       18       189       324         33       Kurkurfa Ilu Barga       5.2       5.8       170       150       1431       2144         34       Ilu Aga, Ejere       4.9       4.4       18       7       58       151									
33 Kurkurfa Ilu Barga <b>5</b> 5.2 5.8 170 150 1431 2144 34 Ilu Aga, Ejere 4.9 4.4 18 7 58 151									
34 Ilu Aga, Ejere <u>2</u> 4.9 4.4 18 7 58 151			ts						
			: <u>5</u>						
36 Dufa (welmera)							21		
37 Dufa (Welmera)									
38 Dufa (Welmera)			ere						
39 Talacho Ganreli 👼 5.9 5.7 209 105 1543 2283			ij̈́						
(Welmera)	39	Talacho Ganreli	era	5.9	5.7	209	105	1543	2283
(Weimera) 6.3 5.9 40 17 365 481	40		<u>Ē</u>	63	5.0	40	17	365	<b>4</b> 81
41 Barfata Tokofa Roge <b>&gt;</b> 6.1 5.5 40 23 330 598			×e						
(Welmera)				J	5.5		_0	550	300

# 5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The soil pH of all the surveyed area was in the acidic range with most of the soils (80.5%) either in the strongly acidic, very strongly acidic or extremely acidic range. The results of the soil analysis revealed that nearly 70% of the soil phosphorus status was rated as low, very low and extremely low according to Olsen P test whereas only 9.5% of the surveyed soil was rated as having low or very low potassium status and the rest 80.5% of the surveyed soils were rated as having potassium status of target value and above. Since most of the surveyed area had a low soil pH, which can result in deficiency of phosphorus and toxicity of manganese and aluminum, multi-location field experiment should be conducted in low pH spot areas to investigate effect of lime application in reclaiming the soil acidity, and in enhancing P availability, crop growth and yield. Phosphorus fertilizer trials also need to be executed on sites having low P-status to assess yield response to applied mineral P fertilizer and the extent of P fertilizer recovery. Since few pocket areas in the current investigation showed lower potassium content, crop response to potassium fertilizer application in those particular areas should be assessed through conducting multi-location field experiments.

### **REFERENCES**

- Gildemacher P, Kaguongo W, Ortiz O, Tesfaye A, Woldegiorgis G, Wagoire W, Kakuhenzire R, Kinyae P, Nyongesa M, Struik, P. Improving potato production in Kenya, Uganda and Ethiopia: A System diagnosis. Potato Research 2009;52:173-205.
- Elmar S. Tackling Low Potato Yields in Eastern Africa: An Overview of Constraints and Potential Strategies. In: Gebremedhin Woldgiorgis, Steffen Schulz and Baye Berihun (Eds.). Seed Potato Tuber Production and Dissemination: Experience, Challenges and Prospects.Proceedings of the National Wokshop on Seed Potato Tuber Production and Dissemination, 12-14 March 2012, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia; 2013.
- Boshour II, Sayegh AH. Methods of Analysis for Soil of Arid and Semi-Arid Regions. Food and Agricultural

- Organizations of The United Nations. Rome, Italy; 2007.
- MAFF (Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food). Fertilizer recommendations for agricultural and horticultural crops (RB 209). 2000;94.
- Berga. Lemega, Gebremedhin 5. Woldegiorgis, Teressa Jalleta and Bereke-Tsehai Tuku. Horticulture Research and Development in Ethiopia. Edward Hearth and Lemma Desalegne (eds.). Proceedings of the 2nd National Workshop Horticulture of Ethiopia. 1994;101-119. 1-3 Dec. 1992.
- 6. Schüller H. Die CAL-Methode: eine neue Methode zur Bestimmung des pflanzenverfügbaren Phosphates in Böden. Z. Pflanzenernährung. Bodenk. 1969;123:48-60.
- 7. Olsen SR, Cole CV, Watanabe FS, Dean LA. Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. U.S. Dep. of Agric. Circ. 1954;939.
- Warncke D, Brown JR. Recommended Soil Potassium and Other Basic Cations Test. In: Procedures for the North Central Region. North Central Regional Research Publication No. 221 (Revised). Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station. 2007;31-34.
- Soil Survey Division Staff. Soil Survey Manual. United States Department of Agriculture Handbook No 18, Washington, DC. 1993;437.
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. Fertilizer Recommendations for Agricultural and Horticultural Crops (RB209), 8th ed. London: TSO; 2010.
- Walworth JL, Muniz JE. A compendium of Tissue Nutrient Concentrations in Field Grown Potatoes. American Potato Journal. 1993;70:579 – 597.
- Mallarino AP. Comparison of Mehlich III, Olsen and Bray-P1 Procedures in calcareous soils for Phosphorus. In: Rehm, George (ed.). Proceedings of The Twenty
  –fifth North Central Extension-Industry Soil Fertility Conference, Potash and Phosphate Institute, U.S.A; 1995.
- Wolf, Ann M, Baker DE. Comparison of soil test phosphorus by Olsen, Bray-P1, Mehlich I, and Mehlich III methods. Communication soil Sci. Plant Anal. 1985;16:467-484.

- Kochian LV, Hoekenga OA, Pineros MA. How do crop plants tolerate acid soils? Mechanisms of aluminium tolerance and phosphorus efficiency. Annual Review of Plant Biology. 2004;55;459-493.
- Njukeng NJ, Nkeng EG. Ehabe1 E. E. and Schnug E. A Comparative Study on the

use of Calcium Acetate Lactate, Calcium Chloride and Acidic Ammonium Acetate-Ethylene Diaminetetra Acetic Acid (AAAc-EDTA) for the Quantification of Extractable, P, K and Mg from Acidic Soils, International Research Journal of Pure & Applied Chemistry. 2013;3(1):22-31.

© 2015 Balemi et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history.php?iid=778&id=24&aid=7119