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A study was conducted in two cropping seasons to assess the effect of biochar on soil physico-chemical properties and yield of cucumber (*Cucumissativus L*) in an intensive cucumber–maize rotation system of Abakaliki, southeastern Nigeria. Five rates of biochar (0, 2.5 t ha-1, 3.75 t ha-1, 5 t ha-1 and 6.25 t ha-1) were used for the study. The study was laid out as a randomized complete block design (RCBD) with five treatments and four replications. Data were collected from plant and soil parameters. Soil samples were collected before and at harvest from different plots for chemical analyses. Results obtained from the study showed significant (P<0.05) improvement in soil properties. Bulk density (BD) was significantly (P<0.05) decreased in biochar amended plots. Total nitrogen (N), available phosphorus (P), organic carbon (C), pHand exchangeable bases (K+, Ca2+, Mg2+ and Na+) were significantly (P<0.05) higher in biochar amended plots relative to the control. Biochar application significantly (P<0.05) increased vine length, number of fruits, fruit length and yield of cucumber compared to the control. On average 6.25 t ha-1 rate of biochar application gave the highest improvement in soil properties while highest increase in yield and other agronomic parameters were observed in 5 t ha-1 rate of application. The study recommended 5 t ha-1 as the maximum rate of biochar application in the study area. Our data indicated that biochar application could be a possible way of improving soil quality and native soil carbon in the degraded Ultisols and intensive cropping system of southeast Nigeria.
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Unprecedented global population growth, the expansion of agricultural frontier and other human activities encroaching on fragile ecosystems in many parts of the world, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, has necessitated the urgent need for increased and sustainable agricultural production. Agriculture is the main source of livelihood and income for two-third of Africa’s population (Ditto, 2013).Imhoff*et al.* (2004) showed that agricultural production must increase significantly to meet the needs of a growing global population with increased per capita consumption of food, fibre, building materials and fuel. Most small holder farms have soils depleted of nutrients and soil organic carbon (SOC), following years of nutrient removal in crop harvest with minimal return of crop nutrients through mineral fertilizer or organic inputs (Smalling*et al.*, 1993). Using burnt and unburnt rice husk dust as soil amendment,Nwite*et al.* (2011) andNjoku and Mbah (2012) reported improved soil properties and increased maize grain yield.

Biochar is a charcoal (carbon-rich solid material) produced under high temperatures (300 to 500∘C) through the process of pyrolysis using crop residues, animal manure, or any type of organic material (Bracmort, 2010). The two main methods of pyrolysis are “fast” pyrolysis (heating of biomass in the absence of oxygen, Chan *et al.* 2007) and “slow” pyrolysis (by natural burning or by the combustion of biomass under oxygen-limited conditions, Sohi*et al.* 2009). Fast pyrolysis yields 60% bio-oil, 20% biochar, and 20% syngas and can be done in seconds, whereas slow pyrolysis can be optimized to produce substantially more char (∼50%), but takes on the order of hours to complete (Odesola and Owoseni, 2010). Lehmann and Joseph (2012) have distinguished the term biochar from charcoal in that it is charred organic matter that is applied to soil not only to improve soil properties but also to promote soil remediation or other environmental services while the charcoal is used as fuel or source of heat, as a filter, as a reductant in iron-making or as a colouring agent in industry or art. Atkinson *et al.* (2010) opined that biochar is an effective carbon (C) sink in the soil because of its high proportion of recalcitrant C with hundreds to thousands of years of stability.

Researches on biochar are expanding rapidly not only because of its potential for carbon sequestration (Lehmann, 2007; Cheng *et al.,* 2008; Sohi and Shackley, 2009; Haefele*et al.,* 2011; Lehmann, 2009) but also for its promise as a technology for immobilizing pollutants (Beesley*et al.,* 2011; Herath*et al.,* 2015) and increasing soil fertility (Lehmann *et al.,* 2003b; Lehman and Joseph, 2009). Previous researches have pointed out to the several co-benefits of biochar as soil amendment, such as the increase of crop yields (Jeffery *et al.,* 2011; Akca and Namli, 2015; ), improvement of nutrient–use efficiency and nutrient retention in soils (Wannok*et al.,* 2007; DeLuca *et al.,* 2009), improvement of water retention capacity of soils - up to 18% increase (Glaser *et al.,* 2002), increase in soil organic matter and pH of acidic soils (Glaser *et al.,* 2002; Lehmann and Rondon, 2006) and decrease of soil N2O emissions (Singh *et al.,* 2010). Similarly, the research findings of Akca and Namli (2015) showed that poultry litter biochar amendment to soils in the agricultural use increased yield of plants and enzyme activities with increasing soil organic matter content as well as improving soil properties. Carter *et al.,* (2013) also posited that the biochar treatments were found to increase the final biomass, root biomass, plant height and number of leaves in all the cropping cycles in comparison to no biochar treatments.

Though previous researchers have really explored the potentials of biochar as soil amendments for agricultural production and improvement of soil quality (Lehmann and Joseph, 2009;Ekebafe*et al.,* 2012;Baronti*et al.,* 2014;Ndor*et al.,* 2015), research on accurate rate of biochar application on a degraded Ultisol and other soil types for specific arable crops is scanty and rather proceeding slowly. Furthermore, biochar’s effect is soil type dependent (Nelissen*et al.,* 2015) and also, biochar effects on soil aggregation is dependent on soil and biochar types (Herath*et al.* 2013).Moreover, biochar properties depend both on feedstock and production conditions, through which biochar’s impact on soil properties is expected to vary (Ronsse*et al.,* 2013).

Studies done on biochar effects on Nigerian soils are very few and scanty. Current review of available literature of biochar in Nigeria indicates that nearly all the biochar research were potted/greenhouse experiments (Ekebafe*et al.,* 2012; Fagbenro*et al.* 2013a; Ekebafe*et al.,* 2014; Fagbenro*et al.,* 2015; Ogundiran*et al.,* 2015; Onwuka*et al.,* 2015). Ndor et al. (2014) focused on the effect of biochar on soil properties and organic carbon sink in degraded soil of southern guinea savanna zone, Nigeria while Yilangai*et al.* (2014) investigated the effect of biochar and crop yield on growth and yield of Tomato (*Lycopersicumesculentus Mill*) in Jos, North central Nigeria. There is urgent need for long-term studies on biochar in field trials to better understand biochar effects and to investigate its behavior in different soil types under varying climatic settings thereby providing a framework information about their potential in improving soil quality and increasing crop productivity, as well as its resultant associated risks (if any). Many of the short-term effects of biochar on plant growth and soil behavior reported from laboratory studies were not observed in the field emphasizing the need for long term field trials to help inform agronomic management decisions involving biochar (Jones *et al.,* 2012). More so, adequate care should be taken on the amount and type of biochar added to the soil for restoring degraded soils (Mekuriaand Noble, 2012).

Soils of southeastern Nigeria are poor in their native availability of nutrients (Unamba-Oparah, 1985; Mbagwu, 1989; Nwite*et al.,* 2008), low in organic matter content (usually <1%) and, hence are structurally degraded (Obalum*et al.* 2012). Soil fertility depletion in small holder farm is the fundamental cause of declining per capita food production (Sanchez *et al.,* 1996).

Agbede and Kalu (1995) as reported by Nwite*et al*. (2012) opined that Nigerian farmers’ access to fertilizer in vegetable growing season is limited by fund, thus the Abakaliki small holder farmers are seriously faced with the problems of scarcity and late distribution which in turn militates against optimum productivity. In the face of these challenges, there is a need for cheaper alternative which is environmentally friendly that can make fertilizer more available to small holder farmers for sustainable agricultural productivity.

Cucumber (*Cucumissativus L*) is a tropical vegetable that grows in warm temperate and cool tropical area. According to Deluca *et al.* (2006), cucumber does well with temperature range of 18oC and 30oC with growth reduction occurring at temperature below 16oC and above 30oC. Recently, interest in the production of cucumber by small holder farmers in Abalaliki, South east Nigeria has increased. The increased interest in cucumber production was due to increased demand and consumption of the vegetable in the study area as a result of increase in population arising from the presence of new a Federal University in the area.

However, the use of biochar as an amendment has not been really explored in the study area. Thus, published articles/information on how various biochar types affect plant growth and crop yield specifically in the production of cucumber in different soil types is not available in the study area and still proceeding rather slowly.

Based on these assumptions we hypothesized that soil biochar amendment in a cucumber (*Cucumissativus L*) crop could:

i) improve soil physical quality through decreasing soil bulk density and increasing porosity,

ii) enhance soil properties and carbon (C) sequestration potential also in a short-term crop;

iii) improve soil nutrient balance in a degraded soil;

iv) improve quality and crop yield.

The study will also recommend appropriate rate of biochar for use in cucumber (*Cucumissativus L*) production in the study area for sustainable agricultural productivity.

**Materials and Methods**

**2.1. Study Area**

This research was carried out during the 2012 and 2013 cropping seasons in the Teaching and Research Farm of Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Resources Management, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Nigeria (Figure 1). Abakaliki (longitude 08o 65΄E, latitude 06o 04΄N, temperature 27 - 31oC, rainfall 1700 - 2000 mm, relative humidity 60 - 80%) experiences bimodal pattern of rainfall (April - July and September – November) with short spell in August called “August break”. The relative humidity is high during rainy season reaching 80% (ODNRI, 1989) and declines to 65% in dry season. The underlying geological material is Shale formation with sand intrusions locally classified as the ‘ASU River’ group. The soil is hydromorphic and belongs to the order Ultisol and classified as TypicHaplustult (FDALR, 1985). Farming is the major activity of people of the area. Land uses include low land traditional rice farming; multiple (annual) cropping (cassava, plantain, cocoyam, maize, vegetables, pepper, melon seed and beans); citrus and oil palm plantations, herbaceous plants, grasses as bush fallow, and natural forest through the crest to lowlands of the upland-inland continuum (Okolo *et al.* 2013). The soil is sandy loam with moderate soil organic carbon (OC) content, low in pH and cation exchange capacity (CEC), with dominance of the exchange complex site by calcium and magnesium (Table 1).

**2.2. Preparation of the Biochar**

The biochar of four different species of hard wood (Iroko: *Chlorophoraexcelsa*, Obeche: *Triplochitonsleroxylon*, Oil palm: *Elaeisguineensis* and Gmelina: *Gmelinaarborea*) bought from a local distributor (pyrolysed at 350°C for 3h) was manually crushed to particle sizes smaller than 2 mm and thoroughly mixed together. Afterwards characterization was carried out according to Biochar material test categories and characteristic of the IBI Biochar Standards *Version* 2.0 (2014) and incorporated at different rates into the soil.

**2.3. Field Methods/preparations**

The site was slashed and cleared of grasses in July 2012. A total land area measuring 11m by 14 m (0.154 ha) was used for the study. The experiment was laid out as a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) with five treatments and replicated four times. The experimental plots measured 2 m by 2 m with 1m plot alley. The soil amendment was a thorough mixture of different hardwood biochar(Iroko: *Chlorophoraexcelsa*, Obeche: *Triplochitonsleroxylon*, Oil palm: *Elaeisguineensis*and Gmelina: *Gmelinaarborea*) applied at different rates and these included:

**T1** = Control; **T2** = 1.0 kg/plot; **T3** = 1.5 kg/plot; **T4** = 2.0 kg/plot and **T5** = 2.5 kg/plot (equivalent to 0, 2.5 t/ha, 3.75 t/ha, 5 t/ha and 6.25 t/ha respectively).

The experimental site was cleared, ploughed, harrowed and made into seed beds with traditional hoe. The treatment (hardwood biochar) were crushed and incorporated into the beds during tillage. Cucumber (*CucumissativusL*, variety “market more”) was sown at three (3) seeds per hill. The seeds were planted at a distance 30 cm and 50 cm and at a depth of 1.5 cm. The cucumber plants were thinned to two plants per hill ten days after germination. The same procedure was equally carried out in 2013 cropping season at the same experimental site.



**2.4. Soil sampling and data collection**

A composite topsoil sample from ten observational points at a depth of 0 - 20 cm was collected from the experimental site with the aid of soil auger after site clearing for initial soil characteristics.At harvest (end of the study), three soil samples were collected from all the plots for chemical analyses to determine the changes that occurred due to treatments application. Similarly, three core samples were collected from each plot at the end of the study for determination of physical properties. The auger soil samples were composited, air dried and used for determination of pre and post nutrient content of the soil. The agronomic data collected at maturity included vine length, number of fruits, fruit length and yield. At maturity nine plants were selected per plot and tagged. Agronomic data (vine length, fruit length, number of fruits and yield) were collected from the tagged plants. The harvested fruits were weighed with the aid of asimple weighing balance.

**2.5. Laboratory analysis**

The pre and post-harvest soil samples were air-dried and sieved with 2 mm sieve, and analysis done using the soil fractions less than 2 mm. Soil pH was measured in a 1:2.5 (soil:0.1 M KCl) suspensions. The soil organic carbon (SOC) was determined by the Walkley and Black method as described by Nelson and Sommers (1982). The total nitrogen was determined by the method described by Bremmer and Mulvancy, (1982). Exchangeable bases (K+, Ca2+, Mg2+ and Na+) were determined by the method of Thomas (1982) while effective cation exchange capacity (ECEC) was obtained by summation ECEC = TEB + TEA(where ECEC = effective cation exchange capacity, TEB = total exchangeable bases and TEA = total exchangeable acidity). Available phosphorus (P) was measured by the Bray II method (Bray and Kurtz, 1945). Particle size distribution was carried out by hydrometer method (Clayton and Tillers, 1986). Bulk density was determined using the core method as described Blake and Hartge (1986). Total porosity was calculated from soil bulk density value with an assumed particle density of 2.65 gcm-3 as follows: TP = 1 - (BD/PD) x 100.

Where TP= Total porosity, BD = Bulk density and PD = Particle density.

**2.7. Data Analysis**

Statistical analysis of all the data was performed using **GENSTAT** 3 7.2 Edition. Significant treatment means was separated and compared using Fisher’s Least Significant Difference (F-LSD) according to Steel and Torrie (1980), and all inferences were made at 5% Levels of probability.

**Results**

Table 1 showed that the soil has low total nitrogen (gkg-1), medium available phosphorus (Mgkg-1) and low organic carbon (gkg-1) according to the ratings of Landon (1991).

Table 1: Some properties of the topsoil (0 – 20 cm) and biochar before amendments (pre-planting)

Parameter Unit Soil Biochar

Sand gkg-1 680 Nd

Silt “ 178 Nd

Clay “ 142 Nd

Bulk density gcm-3 1.60 Nd

pH (0.01M CaCl2) 5.9 7.5

Exchangeable bases cmolkg-1

Na+ “ 0.09 1.81

K+ “ 0.10 3.78

Mg2+ “ 1.70 1.89

Ca2+ “ 2.10 1.55

Total nitrogen gkg-1 0.9 0.88

Available phosphorus gkg-1 3.78 22.01

Organic carbon gkg-1 10.1 64.24

Ash content % Nd 21.0

SSA (Specific surface area) Nd 0.8

Nd = Not determined

The soil is moderately acidic (pH 5.9) (USDA-SCS 1974). Application of biochar significantly (p<0.05) decreased soil bulk density and increased the total porosity for the two cropping seasons (Table 2). The biochar material contained high quantity of organic carbon (64.24) prior to application. Bulk density values ranged between 1.50 - 1.45 gcm-3 and 1.53 - 1.44 gcm-3 in the first and second cropping seasons, respectively. In the first cropping season highest bulk density value of 1.50 gcm-3 was observed in the control (C). This value was 2%, 2%, 3% and 3% higher than the bulk density values in 2.5, 3.75, 5.0 and 6.25 t/ha rate of applications respectively. The table showed non- significant (p>0.05) increase in soil total porosity (TP) among the amended plots in the first cropping season. However a 5% increase over the control was observed across the treatments. The order of increase in soil total porosity in the second cropping season was 6.25 t/ha = 5 t/ha >3.75 t/ha>2.5 t/ha>C.

Table 2: Effect of biochar on soil bulk density (gcm-3) and total porosity (%)

Treatment BD TP BD TP

2012 2013

0 (C) t ha-11.50 43 1.53 42

2.0 “ 1.47 45 1.46 45

3.75 “ 1.47 45 1.45 45

5.0 “ 1.46 45 1.44 46

6.25 “ 1.45 45.3 1.44 46

FLSD = 0.05 0.21 NS 0.28 0.12

C = Control, BD = Bulk density, TP = Total porosity

Results of the study in figures 2 - 5 showed significant (p<0.05) increase in all the soil chemical properties (pH, total nitrogen, organic carbon and available phosphorus) in biochar amended plots compared to the control as shown in their strong R2values. Specifically in the first cropping season, organic carbon (OC) (mgkg-1) in control was 6%, 41%, 42% and 44% lower than OC in 2.5, 3.75, 5.0 and 6.25 t/ha rate of application, respectively.Soil pH was strongly correlated with biochar (*R*2 = 83.6% and 82 % for 2012 and 2013 respectively; Figure 2) treatments. The order of increase in soil pH was 5.0 t/ha>6.25 t/ha>3.75 t/ha>2.5 t/ha>C in the second cropping season.

The trend of increase in total N (gkg-1) in the first cropping season was 6.25>5.0>3.75>2.5 t/ha>C. In the second cropping season, total N in the control was 33%, 33%, 83% and 83% lower than in 2.5, 3.75, 5.0 and 6.25 t/ha rate of application, respectively. The highest correlation (*R*2 = 95%) was obtained between total nitrogen and biochar in the first year while the second year value was *R*2 = 89.7% (Figure 3).

Figure 4 showed higher OC in the first cropping season compared to the second cropping season.

Soil organic carbon was strongly correlated with biochar (*R*2= 82% and *R*2= 78% for first and second year respectively) treatments (Figure 4).

There was a remarkable increase in available phosphorus (P) in amended plots relative to the control in both cropping seasons (Figure 5). The order of increase in available P was 6.25 t/ha = 5.0 t/ha >3.75 t/ha>2.5 t/ha>C and 6.25 t/ha>5.0 t/ha >3.75 t/ha>2.5 t/ha>C in the first and second cropping seasons respectively. Correlation analysis showed that available phosphorus in the first year was most associated with biochar (*R*2 = 89.7%) treatment more than the second year (*R*2 = 87.7%; Figure 5)

Higher exchangeable bases (Ca2+, Mg2+, K+ and Na+) were observed in the amended plots relative to the control in both cropping seasons (Table 3). Potassium (K+) and Ca2+ ranged between 0.08-0.15 and 3.7-5.8 (cmolkg-1) respectively in the first cropping season. In the second cropping season highest values of K+ and Ca2+ were observed in 2.5 kg/plot rate of application. The order of increase in Na+ in the second cropping season was 6.25>3.75>5.0.>2.5 t/ha >C. Similarly, ECEC in the second cropping season was 32%, 8%, 18% and 11% higher than in C, 2.5, 3.75, 5.0 and 6.25 t/ha rate of application, respectively (Table 3).



**Figure 2.Correlation between biochar treatment and soil pH for the two seasons.**



**Figure 3.Correlation between biochar treatment and total nitrogen for the two seasons.**



**Figure 4.Correlation between biochar treatment and organic carbon for the two seasons.**



**Fig. 5.Correlation between biochar treatment and available phosphorus for the two seasons.**

Table 3: Effect of biochar on soil exchangeable bases and Effective cation exchange capacity (cmolkg-1)

Treatment Na+K+Mg2+Ca2+ ECECNa+ K+ Mg2+Ca2+ ECEC

2012 2013

0 (c) t ha-1 0.06 0.08 1.80 3.7 6.6 0.05 0.06 1.60 3.6 6.4

2.5 “ 0.08 0.10 2.00 5.5 8.0 0.07 0.11 2.00 5.2 8.4

3.75 “ 0.09 0.13 2.09 5.5 7.5 0.10 0.15 1.90 5.6 7.9

5.0 “ 0.15 0.13 2.31 5.0 7.9 0.08 0.14 2.40 4.8 8.1

6.25 “ 0.17 0.15 2.34 5.8 8.0 0.10 0.16 2.00 6.4 9.1

FLSD = 0.05 0.10 0.08 1.09 0.13 1.30 0.04 0.10 1.03 1.06 1.20

C = Control

Results of the study (Table 4) showed significantly (p<0.05) higher fruit and vine length in amended plots relative to the control. Fruit length was lower in the first than in the second cropping season. In both seasons highest fruit length (9 7.1 and 17.9 cm) were observed in 5.0 t/ha rate of application. Similarly, higher number of fruits was observed in the amended plots relative to the control. The highest number of fruits (22 and 25) was observed in 5.0 t/ha rate of application in the first and second cropping seasons. The order of increase in the number of harvested fruits in the second cropping season was 5.0>3.75>2.5>6.25 t/ha>C. The table also showed higher cucumber yield in biochar amended plots relative to the control. Application of biochar at 2.0 kg/plot gave the highest yield in both first and second cropping seasons. The highest yield of 6.20 in 5.0 t/ha in the first cropping season was 37%,12%,5% and 47% higher than in C, 1.0.1.5 and 2,5kg/plot rate of application respectively.

Table 4. Effect of biochar on vine length (cm), fruit length (cm), number of fruits and yield (t ha-1) of cucumber

Treatment vine length fruit length number of fruits yield

2102

0 (c) t ha-1 43.4 13.6 16 4.81

2.0 “ 51.7 15.3 19 5.10

3.75 “ 53.4 16.2 20 6.16

5.0 “ 57.3 17.1 22 6.20

6.25 “ 56.8 16.9 20 6.00

FLSD = 0.05 1.69 1.01 1.28 2.13

2013

0 (c) t ha-1 42.2 13.4 18 4.70

2.0 “ 54.6 15.6 21 6.63

3.75 “ 58.6 16.3 23 7.42

5.0 “ 61.6 17.2 25 7.50

6.25 “ 57.2 14.8 20 4.23

FLSD = 0.05 1.20 0.98 1.33 1.22

C = Control

**Discussions**

Decrease in soil BD following addition of biochar in the present study is in line with the earlier reports of Pickikainenm*et al*. (2000), Deluca *et al.,* (2006), Alburquerque*et al.* (2014) and Nelissen*et al.* (2015). The authors observed that addition of biochar into the soil can alter microbial population, shift functional group and reduce BD with a corresponding increase in soil total porosity. Similarly, Brady and Weil (2004) observed that biochar has a lower BD (0.3 Mgm-3) than mineral soil (1.3 Mgm-3) and thus can reduce soil BD to a desirable level for plant growth. Indeed, the addition of biochar reduced bulk density from 1.53 gcm-3 in non-treated soil down to 1.44 gcm-3 in biochar treated soil (Table 2). Addition of organic materials to mineral soils for agricultural purposes tends to reduce bulk density (Manrique and Jones, 1991; Rawls *et al.* 2003) because organic matter have lower particle density, and are more porous in nature (Brady and Weil, 2004; Lehmann and Joseph, 2009; Downie*et al.* (2009); Khalifa and Yousef, 2015). Notably, the lowest biochar application rate (2.5 t/ha) soil treatment in the present study had similar bulk density to untreated soils.

A reduction in soil bulk density using similar rates of biochar application has been reported in other studies utilizing hardwood biochar (Laird *et al.,* 2010; Ndor*et al.,* 2015), rice husk biochar (Haefele*et al.* 2011), wheat straw (Alburquerque*et al.,* 2014); fronds of date palm (Khalifa and Yousef, 2015), and mixed feedstock obtained from prunnings of fruit trees (Castellini*et al.,* 2015). The result of the current study tends to reaffirm the postulation of Atkinson *et al*. (2010) that biochar could possibly be part of a long-term adaptation strategy, as it could affect soil physical properties like soil structure, soil bulk density, porosity, particle density and water storage capacity for sustainable agricultural productivity. Piccolo *et al.* (1996) reported that increased surface area, porosity and low BD in soils amended with biochar can alter water retention, aggregation and increase soil aeration.

The result of the present study is in line with recent researches by Downie*et al.* (2009), Oguntunde*et al.* (2008), Laird *et al.* (2010), Masulili*et al.* (2010); Eastman (2011), Abel *et al.* (2013), Herath*et al.* (2013), Jien and Wang (2013), Hardie*et al.* (2014), Ndor*et al.* (2014), Khalifa and Yousef, (2015), and Castellini*et al.* (2015) which showed that biochar incorporation into the soil alters the physical properties such as structure, pore size distribution and reduce BD with the implication for soil aeration, workability and water holding capacities. Notably, the different rates of biochar application in the present study has the potential of enhancing the physical structure of amended soils making them favorable for the growth of cucumbers and increased aeration and water storage, thus improving the soil quality.

In the present study, pH, total N, OC, available P, exchangeable bases (Ca2+, Mg2+, Na+ and K+) and ECEC were used as chemical or fertility indicators of soil quality for better understanding of the changes that might have occurred as a result of biochar application. The study revealed that the soil was moderately acidic (5.9) before the incorporation of biochar (Table 1). The acidity is typical of the soils of the southeastern part of Nigeria and is attributed to the parent materials, excessive precipitation which leads to leaching losses of most of the cations in the soil and degradation in soil physicochemical properties (Enwezor*et al.,* 1990; FDALR, 1990; Ano and Ubochi, 2007; Mbah and Ezeaku, 2010). The pH values recorded in this study are similar to pH values reported by Banjoko and Sobulo (1990), Iwegbue*et al.* (2006) and Okolo (2014) for some other Nigerian soils. In the present study, addition of different rates of biochar to soil increased pH slightly from 5.7 to 6.4 and 5.5 to 6.9 for the two cropping seasons (Figure 2), with all biochar application rates being equally effective and remarkable. This implies that any slight addition of biochar to an acidic soil will give a resultant positive effect in regulating the soil pH. Excessive acidity in arable soils is undesirable because such acidity encourages among other things toxic conditions and also nutrient cation deficiency. It is therefore very necessary and imperative to neutralize excessive soil acidity in order to create optimum and favorable soil environment for plant growth. The increase in soil pH in this study with the application of different rates of biochar corroborates the study of Glasser*etal*. (2002) and Chan *et al.* (2008a) that biochar serves as liming agent resulting to increased pH. Similarly, Van Zevetan*et al.* (2001) observed that the carbonate content of biochar facilitates liming in soils and can raise soil pH of neutral or acidic soils, as evidenced in the present study. Also, Schulz and Glaser (2012), reported significant increase in pH of an acidic infertile sandy soil (pH = 4.5) amended with 5% of charcoal produced at about 400oC while Vaccari*et al.* (2011) in a recent research with wood biocharpyrolysed at 550oC equally reported an increase in the pH of an acidic (pH = 5.2) silty loam soil at both elevated levels of 30 and 60t/ha.

The application of different rates of biochar in this study had a significantly (p<0.05) positive effect on SOC in the biochar treated plots compared to control for the two cropping seasons, thus supporting our second hypothesis that applications of different rates of biochar will enhance soil properties and carbon (C) sequestration potential also in a short-term crop. Notably, as a pyrolysed product, biochar is protected from rapid microbial degradation and is able to securely sequester carbon, contributing to mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions (Lehmann *et al.* 2006). Recent study by Agegnehu*et al.* (2015) indicated that biochar and composted biochar compost amended soil increased SOC content by a factor of 1.4, and total N content by a factor of 1.3 compared with the initial SOC and N contents, respectively. The result of the present study collaborate the recent findings of Angst *et al.* (2014), Slavich*et al.* (2013) and Stavi and Lal (2013) who reported that SOC was significantly increased due to the applications of different biochars. Lehmann (2007a) predicted that the retention times of carbon in biochar would be at least hundreds, but more likely thousands of years. Haefele*et al.* (2011) reported a 66.5% increase in organic carbon contents at elevated level of 41.3 t ha-1 (about 4%) using rice husk biochar in a near neutral soil. Similarly, Zhang *et al.* (2012) recorded 44% increase in soil organic carbon at 20t ha-1 (about 2%) application rate with a wheat straw biochar. Also, in another research, Khan *et al.* (2013) achieved a 550% increase in total carbon contents in a 5% amendment using sewage sludge biochar in an acidic paddy soil. Randon*et al*. (2007) noted that application of biochar to soil increase soil organic carbon, improve soil physical, chemical, biological properties and supply nutrients to plants. Notably, biochar treatment was strongly correlated with total nitrogen (*R2*= 95% and *R2*= 89.7% for 1st and 2nd year respectively; Figure 3) and SOC (*R2*= 82% and *R2*= 78.4% for 1st and 2nd year respectively; Figure 4).

Application of different rates (0, 5, 10, 20 and 30 t ha-1) of biochar with or without inorganic fertilizer or meat bone meal for two years recorded improved soil organic carbon, nitrate content, water retention capacity and K content (Tammeorg*et al.,* 2014).

The improvement in soil content of total N, available P and basic cations following addition of biochar could be attributed to higher levels of these nutrients in biochar as reported by Preston and Schmidt (2006). Study by Lehmann (2002) showed that biochar contains high levels of essential nutrients, including P, N, C, CEC and a more neutral pH. A biochar produced from corn cobs increased nitrate N in the first ten days of crop growth and thereafter it decreased (Nelson *et al.* 2011), while increase in available nutrients due to application of biochar was reported by Glasser*et al.* (2002). The nature and source of biochar, method of pyrolysis and soil type could play an important role in soil properties. For example, mineralization of N could be enhanced by application of biochar produced from slow pyrolysis rather than fast pyrolysis (Bruun*et al.* 2012), while some studies elsewhere have shown that N in plant-based biochars may be less available than that in biochar from animal manures (Chan *et al.,* 2008; Tagoe*et al.,* 2008). Agegnehu*et al.* (2015) reported that biochar and composted biochar addition increased soil N by 14% and 29%, respectively. This may be due to the amount of N added and low C:N ratio of the soil, which limits N immobilization.

Previous researches by De Luca *et al.* (2009), Major *et al.* (2009) and Xu*et al.* (2013) all observed that available P increased in biochar amended plots, with the source of P coming from the biochar types used. In the present study, biochar application added very significant amount of available P in amended plots compared to the control (*R2*= 89.7% and *R2*= 87.7% for 1st and 2nd year respectively; Figure 5), thus inferring that biochar application contributes to the increase in soil available P. Also, De Luca *et al.,* 2009 and Major *et al.,* 2009 pointed out that the availability of P was likely associated to positively charged sites in biochar that increase soil capacity to retain and exchange phosphate ions.

Effective cation capacity is the sum of the cations a soil can adsorb at its natural pH, and is obtained by the summation of total exchangeable bases (TEB) and total exchangeable acidity (TEA). It was observed that the amendment of the soil with different rates of biochar significantly improved the ECEC of the soil, thus indicating that the retention of non-acidic cations by the soils increased (Agegnehu*et al.* 2015). It can be stated that biochar serving as a soil conditioner tends to increase the availability and retention of plant nutrients in soil, thereby potentially increasing nutrient use efficiency for increased agricultural production in degraded soils. Glaser *et al.* (2002) opined that biochar inherently containing ash, adds nutrients such as K, Ca and Mg to the soil solution thereby

increasing the pH of the soil and providing readily available nutrients for optimum plant growth.

The finding of this study demonstrated positive effects of biochar on SOC content and nutrients levels and is inconformity with the findings of Liu *et al*. (2012) and Agegnehu*et al.* (2015). Both studies reported positive effects of biochar on SOC content and nutrients levels under field studies in DystricCambisol in Northeast Germany and Ferrasol in North Australia respectively.

Improvement in soil properties following application of biochar led to increase in vine length, number of fruits, fruit length and yield of cucumber relative to the control. Similarly, the temperature of the study area is within the range that enhances cucumber growth and yield. Earlier research attributed the effect of biochar on crop yield to associated nutrient retention, increased pH and base saturation, available P and increased plant available water (Glaser *et al.* 2002; Liu *et al.* 2012; Agegnehu*et al.* 2015).

The observed significant response of cucumber to different rates of hardwood biochar in the present study confirms the previous findings of Hoshi 2001, Fagbenro*et al.* (2013a), Carter et al. (2013), Saxena*et al.* (2013), Fagbenro*et al.* (2015) on the stimulating effect of biochars on tree growth.

In this study, 5 t/ha rate of application gave the highest yield, vine length, fruit length and number of leaves for the both cropping seasons.

Yilangai*et al.* (2014) reported significantly higher yield of tomato in beds treated with charcoal than without charcoal. Similarly, biochar application increased vegetable yields by 4.7-25.5% as compared to farmers’ practices (Vinh*et al.* 2014). Akca and Namli (2015) observed that the application of pelletized biochar with 15.15.15 fertilizer greatly increased the development of tomato, pepper and lettuce plants. Biochar application significantly increased growth and yield of French bean as compared to no biochar (Saxena*et al.* 2013). The observed increase in vine length, fruit length, number of fruits and yield with the application of biochar in the present study is in line with the findings of Carter *et al.* (2013) that a rice-husk biochar tested in lettuce-cabbage-lettuce cycle increased final biomass, root biomass, plant height and number of leaves in comparison to no biochar treatments. Akhtar*et al.* (2014) found a positive biochar effect on yield and quality of greenhouse-grown tomato when these were subjected to deficit irrigation and partial root-zone drying**.** Most recently in an experiment using green waste biochar at 0, 10, 30, 50 and 100 t/ha rates of application, Upadhyau (2015) observed increased number of leaves, root length, plant height and final biomass using lettuce and potato as test crops.

Further focus on elaborate research should be given to test various biochars and biochar rates in different soil types and crop species.

Despite numerous reports of positive effects of biochar application to soil and improved crop production, as evidenced in the current study, some researchers elsewhere have reported negative effect of biochar on soil and crop production. In a recent investigation, Bargmann*et al.* (2014) and de Sousa *et al.* (2014) observed that in some cases, biochar application can decrease soil available N and plant tissue N concentration. Also, Jones *et al.* (2012) did not detect differences in soil bulk density three years after biochar addition in a UK field trial, while more recently,Tammeorg*et al.* (2014) did not observe an effect of biochar on soil bulk density and porosity in the field.

It is worthy of mention that the increased agronomic parameters recorded with addition of biochar in the present study is totally in variance with the findings of Schultz *et al.* (2014). In their investigation, Schultz *et al.* (2014) found a negative effect on growth and yield of oat plant with application of biochar on soil, though it was greenhouse experiment and needed field research to negate or affirm their findings.

**Conclusion**

The improvement in soil properties led to increased vine length, number of fruits, fruit length and yield of Cucumber. On the average application of biochar at 6.25 t ha-1 resulted to the highest improvement in soil properties in both seasons while the highest increase in cucumber yield and other agronomic properties were observed in 5 t ha-1 rate of application. This placed 5 t ha-1 as the maximum rate of biochar application in the study area.Our results indicate that different rates of (2.0, 3.75, 5.0 and 6.25 t/ha) biochar application added as soil amendment has the potential of improving soil quality and boosting productivity of cucumber in a degraded Ultisol. This study observed significant increases in cucumber yield and plant available soil nutrients due to biochar application when compared with the control (no addition of biochar), thus indicating that application of biochar amendments provides huge agronomic benefits thereby leading to increased agricultural productivity and environmental sustainability.

Further focus and elaborate research should be given to test various biochars and biochar rates in degraded Ultisol of southeastern Nigeria using different crop species.

More long term and periodic field researches are urgently needed in different soil types and climatic regions to fully understand the benefits of different biochar sources/rates and equally to confirm/negate some of the observations we made in view of fostering robust interdisciplinary scientific research.

**Acknowledgement**

The authors hereby acknowledge the laboratory staff of the Department of Soil Science and Environmental Management, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Nigeria.

**References**

Abel, S., Peters, A., Trinks, S., Schonsky, H., Facklam, M., Wessolek, G. (2013). Impact of

biochar and hydrochar addition on water retention and water repellency of sandy soil. Geoderma 202, 183–191.

Agbede, O.O. and B.A. Kalu (1995). Constraints of small-scale farmers in increasing crop yield:

farm size and fertilizer supply. Nigeria Journal of Soil Science, 11: 139-159.

Agegnehu, G., Bassb , A. M., Nelsona , P. N., Muirheadc , B., Wrightd , G and Bird, M. I. (2015).

Biochar and biochar-compost as soil amendments: Effects on peanut yield, soil properties and greenhouse gas emissions in tropical North Queensland, Australia. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 213 (2015) 72–85.

Akca, M. O and Namli, A. (2015). Effect of poultry biochar on soil enzyme activities and tomato,

pepper and lettuce plant growth. Eurasian Journal of Soil Science, 4 (3) 161 – 168.

Alburquerque, JA, Calero, JM, Barrón, V, Torrent, J, delCampillo, MC, Gallardo, A &Villar, R.

(2014). 'Effects of biochars produced from different feedstocks on soil properties and sunflower growth', *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*, vol. 177, no. 1, pp. 16-25.

Angst, T.E., Six, J., Reay, D.S. amdSohi, S. P. (2014). Impact of pine chip biochar on trace

greenhouse gas emissions and soil nutrient dynamics in an annual ryegrass system in California. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.

Anikwe,M.A.N and Nwobodo, K (2002). Amelioration of heavy clayloam with rice husk dust

and its effect on soil properties and maize yield. Biores. Technol. 74:167-171

Ano, A.O and Ubochi, C,I (2007). Neutralization of soil acidity by manual mechanism in reaction.

Soil Science Laboratories, National Root Crop Research Institute, Umudike, P.M.B 7006 Umuahia, Abia State, Nigeria.

Atkinson, C.J., Fitzgerald, J.D., Hipps, N.A. (2010). Potential mechanisms for achieving

agricultural benefits from biochar application to temperate soils: a review. Plant

Soil 337, 1–18.

Balogun, O.Y. (2000). Senior Secondary School Atlas.2nd edition.Longman, Nigeria. 161pp

Banjoko, A and Sobulo, R.A.(1990). Particle size distribution of Fe, Mn, Zn, Cu and B in some Nigeria soil.’ Nigerian Journal of Science 34: 60–63.

Bargmann, I., Rillig, M.C., Kruse, A., Greef, J.M., Kücke, M. (2014). Effects of hydrochar

application on the dynamics of soluble nitrogen in soils and on plant availability.

J. Plant Nutr. Soil Sci. 177, 48–58.

Baronti S., Vaccari F.P., Miglietta F., Calzolari C., Lugato E., Orlandini S., Pini R., Zulian C.,

Genesio L. (2014). Impact of biochar application on plant water relations in Vitisvinifera (L.). European Journal of Agronomy 53:38–44.

Beesley, L., Moreno-Jimenez, E., Gomez-Eyles, J.L., Harris, E., Robinson, B. and Sizmur, T.

(2011). A Review of Biochars’ Potential Role in the Remediation, Revegetation and Restoration of Contaminated Soils.*Environmental Pollution*, 159, 3269-3282. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2011.07.023>

Blake,G.R and Hartge, K.H (1986). Bulk density.InKluteA.edition.Methods of aoil analysis.

Part 1.Physical and Mineralogical analysis.Madison(WI) , American Soc of Agronomy pp365-376

Bracmort, K. (2010). “Biochar: examination of an emerging concept to mitigate climate change,”

CRS Report for Congress, United States Congressional Research Service.

Brady .N.C and Weil, R.R (2004), Nature and properties of soils. 2nd edition Pearson Prentice

Hall. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey pp 111-112.

Bruun, E. W., Ambus, P., Egsgaard, H. and Hauggaard-Nielsen, H. (2012). Effects of slow and fast

pyrolysis biochar on soil C and N turnover dynamics. Soil Biology and Biochemistry, vol. 46, pp. 73-9.

Carter, S., Shackley, S., Sohi, S., Suy, T.B. and Haefele, S. (2013). The impact of biochar

application on soil properties and plant growth of pot grown lettuce (*Lactuca sativa*) and cabbage (*Brassica chinensis*). Agronomy, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 404-18.

Castellini M., Giglio L, Niedda M, Palumbo A.D., Ventrella D. (2015). Impact of biochar addition

on the physical and hydraulic properties of a clay soil. Soil & Tillage Research 154 (2015), 1–13. doi: 10.1016/j.still.2015.06.016

Chan, K., Dorahy, C. and Tyler, S. (2007). Determining the agronomic value of composts

produced from garden organics from metropolitan areas of New South Wales, Australia. Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture, vol. 47, no. 11, p. 1377.

Chan, K, Van Zwieten, L, Meszaros, I, Downie, A and Joseph, S. (2008a). Agronomic values of

greenwastebiochar as a soil amendment. *Soil Research*, vol. 45, no. 8, pp. 629-34.

Cheng, C., Lehmann, J., Thies, J. E., Burton, S. D. and Engelhard, M. H. (2008). “Oxidation of

black carbon by biotic and abiotic processes,” *Organic Geochemistry*, vol. 37, no. 11, pp. 1477–1488.

Clayton ,O.M and Tillers,G.K. (1979). A chemical method for the determination of heavy metals

content of soil in environmental studies. Paper no 41,CSIRO, Australia,Melborne.pp 902-904.

de, S., ousa, B.A.M., Santos, S.R.R., Gehring, C. (2014). Charcoal in Amazonian paddy

soil—nutrient availability, rice growth and methane emissions. J. Plant Nutr. Soil

Sci. 177, 39–47.

De Luca, T.H., MacKenzie, M.D., Gundale, M.J. (2009). Biochar effects on soil nutrient

transformations. In: Lehmann, J., Joseph, S. (Eds.), Biochar for Environmental Management: Science and Technology. Earthscan Publ., London, pp. 251–270.

De Luca,T, Mckenzie.M., Gundale,M and Holben W (2006). Wildfire produced charcoal directly

influence nitrogen cycling in Pandarosa pine forest. Soil Science Soc.Of American Journal 70: 448-453.

Dittoh,S .(2013). Micro-irrigation based vegetable farming for income, employment food security

in west Africa.Global Food Security vol 2 pp 178-199

Downie.A, Cosky,A and Munroe, P. (2009). Physical properties of biochar.Inbiochar for

environmental management science and technology. EdsJ,Lehmann and S,Joseph. Earth scan-London.Sterling V.A pp13-32.

Eastman, C.M. (2011). Soil physical characteristics of an AericOchraqualf amended with

biochar. In: MSc Thesis. Ohio State University.

Ekebafe, M.O., Oviasogie., P. O., Oko-Oboh, E and Ekebafe, L. O. (2012). Effect of Organic

Waste Amendments on the pH of Soil Supporting the Oil Palm. International Journal of Environmental Sciences Vol. 1 No. 4. 2012. Pp. 239-245.

Ekebafe, M. O., Oviasogie, P., and Aisueni, N. O (2014).Effect of Indigenous Palm Fronds and

Cow dung Biochar and its Blends on Soil Properties II. Growth Assessment of Oil Palm Seedlets.The 2nd International Conference on Sustainable Environment and Agriculture.IPCBEE vol. 76 (2014) © (2014) IACSIT Press, Singapore DOI: 10.7763/IPCBEE. 2014. V76. 18

Enwezor, W.O., Ohiri, A.C., Opuwaribo, E.E and Udo, E.J (1990).A review of soil fertility inveatigation in southeastern Nigeria. Vol. 11, Fed. Dept. of Agric. (FDA) Lagos, Nigeria.Journal of Crop Science (Philipines). 17 (Supplement No. 1) 21.

Fagbenro, J. A., S. O. Oshunsanya, and O. A. Onawumi. (2013a). Effect of saw dust biochar and

NPK 15:15:15 inorganic fertilizer on Moringaoleiferaseedlings grown on an Oxisol.Agrosearch Journal 13 (1): 57–68.

Fagbenro, J. A., Oshunsanya, S. O. and Oyeleye, B. A. (2015). Effects of GliricidiaBiochar and

Inorganic Fertilizer on Moringa Plant Grown in an Oxisol.CommunicationsinSoilScienceandPlantAnalysis, 46:619–626, 2015. Copyright © Taylor & Francis Group, LLC ISSN: 0010-3624 print / 1532-2416 online. DOI: 10.1080/00103624.2015.1005222

Federal department of agricultural land resources (FDALR,1985). Reconaisance soil survey of

Anambra state of Nigeria. Soil Report 1985.Federal department of Agric. and Land Resources, Lagos-Nigeria.

Federal Department of Agriculture Land Resources (FDALR) (1990). The Reconnaissance Soil Survey of Nigeria, (1:650,000), Soils Report. Fed.Dept. Agric. Land Resource, Abuja, Nigeria.

Glasser.B, Lehmann.J and Zech,W (2002). Ameliorating physical and chemical properties of

highly weathered soils in the tropics with charcoal. A review. Biology and Fertility of Soils,35;219-230

Günther, F. (2007) Simple Biochar Production Method: A Two-Barrel Charcoal.

http://www.holon.se/folke

Haefele, S.M., Konboon, Y. and Wongboon, W. (2011).“Effects and fate of biochar from rice

residues in rice-based systems,” *Field Crops Research*, vol. 121, no. 3, pp. 430–440.

Hardie, M., Clothier, B., Bound, S., Oliver, G., Close, D. (2014). Does biochar influence soil

physical properties and soil water availability? Plant Soil 376, 347–361,http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11104-013-1980-x.

Herath, H.M.S.K., Camps-Arbestain, M., Hedley, M. (2013). Effect of biochar on soil physical

properties in two contrasting soils: an Alfisol and an Andisol. Geoderma 209-210, 188–197.

Herath, I., Kumarathilaka, P., Navaratne, A., Rajakaruna, N. and Vithanage, M. (2015).

Immobilization and Phytotoxicity Reduction of Heavy Metals in Serpentine Soil Using Biochar.*Journal of Soils & Sediments*, **15**, 126-138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11368-014-0967-4>

Hoshi, T. (2001). Growth promotion of tea trees by putting bamboo charcoal in soil. In

Proceedings of 2001 international conference on O-cha (Tea): Culture and science, Tokyo,

Japan, ed. N. K. Jain, M. Siddiqi, and J. I. Weisburger 147–50. Chicago: Year Book Medical Publishers.

IBI Biochar Standards *Version* 2.0 (2014). Standardized Product Definition and Product Testing

Guidelines for Biochar that is Used in Soil. The International Biochar Initiative http://www.biochar-international.org/characterizationstandard.

Imhoff, M. L, Lahouan, B., Taylor, R., Colby, R., Roberts, H and William,T. (2004). Global

patterns in human consumption of net primary production. Nature 429 (6994) 870-873.

Iwegbue, C. M. A., Isirimah, N. O., Igwe, C and Williams, E. S (2006). Characteristic levels of heavy metals in soil profiles of automobile mechanic waste dumps in Nigeria. Environmentalist 26: 123-128. Springer science. DOI 10.1007/S10669-006-7482-0

Jien, S.H., Wang, C.S. (2013). Effects of biochar on soil properties and erosion potential in a

highly weathered soil. Catena 110, 225–233.

Jones, D., Rousk, J., Edwards-Jones, G., DeLuca, T., Murphy, D. (2012).Biocharmediated

changes in soil quality and plant growth in a three year field trial. Soil Biol. Biochem. 45, 113–124.

Khalifa, Nahid and Yousef, Lina F. (2015). A short report on changes of quality indicators for a

sandy textured soil after treatment with biochar produced from fronds of date palm. Energy Procedia74 ; 960 – 965

Khan, S., Chao, C., Waqas, M., Arp, H.P.H. and Zhu, Y.-G. (2013). Sewage Sludge Biochar

Influence upon Rice (Oryza sativa L) Yield, Metal Bioaccumulation and Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Acidic Paddy Soil, *Environmental science & technology*, 47(15), pp. 8624-32.

Kimetu.J, Lehmann.J ,Ngoze.S, Mugendi.O,Kimyangi.J, Riha.S,Pell.V.L and Recha.J (2008).

Reversibility of soil productivity decline with organic matter differing quality along a degradation gradient.Ecosystem.11;726-729.

Klute ,A. (1986). Water retention-labooratory methods in Klute ,A (eds) Methods of soil

analysis-physical and mineralogical properties. 2 ednASA,ASSA,Madison.pp 630-660.

Laird, D. A., Fleming, P., Davis, D. D., Horton, R., Wang, B. and Karlen, D. L. (2008).

“Impact of biochar amendments on the quality of a typical Midwestern agricultural soil,” *Geoderma*, vol. 158, no. 3–4, pp. 443– 449, Sep. 2010.

Landon.J (1991).Booker tropical soil manual. A hand book for soil survey and agricultural land

evaluation in the tropics and sub-tropics.John Wiley and sons Incbos 3rd avenue ,New York.pp 454-474.

Lehmann, J., J. P. Da Silva, J. C. Steiner, T. Nehls, W. Zech, and B. Glaser. (2003b). Nutrient

availability and leaching in an archaeological Anthrosol and a Ferralsol of the Central Amazon basin: Fertilizer, manure, and charcoal amendments. *Plant and Soil* 249: 343–57. doi:10.1023*/*A:1022833116184

Lehmann J. and Rondon M. (2006). Bio-char soil management on highly weathered soils in the

humid tropics. In Uphoff, N. (ed.) *Biological Approaches to Sustainable Soil Systems*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, USA. pp. 517-530

Lehmann, J. (2007). “A handful of carbon,” *Nature*, vol. 447, no. 7141, pp. 143–144.

Lehmann, J. (2009). “Biological carbon sequestrationmust and can be a win-win approach,”

*Climatic Change*, vol. 97,no. 3, pp. 459–463.

Lehmann, J. and Joseph, S. (eds) (2009). Biochar for Environmental Management.Earthscan:

London.

Lehmann, J and Joseph, S (eds) (2012). Biochar for environmental management: science and

technology, Earthscan, Sterling . London, VA.

Liu, J., Schulz, H., Brandl, S., Miehtke, H., Huwe, B., Glaser, B. (2012). Short-term effect of

biochar and compost on soil fertility and water status of a DystricCambisol in NE Germany under field conditions. J. Plant Nutr. Soil Sci. 175, 698–707.

Major, J., Steiner, C., Downie, A. and Lehmann, J. (2009). Biochar effects on nutrient leaching. In:

Lehmann, J., Joseph, S. (Eds.), Biochar for Environmental Management: Science and Technology.Earthscan Publ., London, pp. 271–287.

Manrique, L. A. and Jones, C. A. (1991). Bulk Density of Soils in Relation to Soil Physical

and Chemical Properties. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, vol. 55, no. 2, p. 476.

Masulili, A., Utomo, W.H., Syekhfani, Ms. (2010). Rice husk biochar for rice based cropping

system in acid soil. 1. The characteristics of rice husk biochar and its influence on the properties of acid sulfate soils and rice growth in West Kalimantan, Indonesia. J. Agric. Sci. (Canada) 3, 25–33.

Mbagwu, J.S.C., (1989). The agricultural soils of Nigeria: Properties and agronomic significance

for increased productivity. Beitr Trop LandwirtschVeterinarmed, 27: 395-409.

Mbagwu,J.S.C. (1992b). Improving the productivity of a degraded ultisol in Nigeria using

organic and inorganic amendments. Part 3; Changes in physical properties. Biores.Technol 42;167-175.

Mbah, C.N and Ezeaku, P.I (2010).Physicochemical Characteristics of Farmland Affected by Automobile Wastes in Relation to Heavy Metals.Nature and Science Journal. 8 (10) 134-138. http//www.sciencepub.net/nature.

Mclean E.O (1982). Soil Ph and lime requirement . In Page A (eds) .Methods of soil analysis.

Part 2; Chemical and Microbiological properties. Agronomy series No 9,ASSA,SSSA.Madison,WI,USA.

MekuriaWolde and Noble Andrew (2012). The Role of Biochar in Ameliorating Disturbed Soils

and Sequestering Soil Carbon in Tropical Agricultural Production Systems. Applied and Environmental Soil Science. Volume 2013, Article ID 354965, http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/354965

Ndor, E., Amana, S. M. and Asadu, C. L. A. (2015). Effect of Biochar on Soil Properties and

Organic Carbon Sink in Degraded Soil of Southern Guinea Savanna Zone, Nigeria. International Journal of Plant & Soil Science 4(3): 252-258, 2015; Article no.IJPSS.2015.025 ISSN: 2320-7035

Nelissen, Victoria.,Ruysschaert, Greet., Manka’Abusi, Delphine., D’Hose, Tommy., De Beuf,

Kristof., Al-Barri, Bashar., Cornelis, Wim and Boeckx, Pascal (2015). Impact of a woody biochar on properties of a sandy loam soil and spring barley during a two-year field experiment..Europ. J. Agronomy 62 (2015) 65–78.

Nelson.D.W and Sommers. L.E ( 1982). Total carbon and organic matter. In Page ,A.L.,

Miller,R.H and Keeny,D.R eds. Methods of soil analysis.Part 2.2nd edition. Agronomy monograph No 9,ASA,SSA.Madison,WI 539-579.

Nelson, N. O., Agudelo, S. C, Yuan, W. and Gan, J. (2011). Nitrogen and phosphorus availability

in biochar-amended soils. Soil Science, vol. 176, no. 5, pp. 218-26.

Njoku, C and Mbah, C.N (2012). Effect of burnt and unburnt rice husk dust on maize yield and

soilphysico-chemical properties of an Ultisol in Nigeria. Biological Agriculture and Horticulture. First article 1-12.

Nwite,J.C; C. A. Igwe and T. Wakatsuki (2008). Evaluation of *sawah* rice management system in

an inland valley in southeastern Nigeria. I: Soil chemical properties and rice yield. Journal of Paddy and Water Environ. Springer-Verlag 2008.DOI 10.1007/s10333-008-0123-0, March 2008.Pp 299-307.

Nwite J. C., C.A. Igwe and S.E Obalum (2011). The contributions of different Ash sources to the improvement in properties of a Degraded ultisol and maize production in South eastern Nigeria . In American , Eurasian Journal of sustainable Agriculture, S (1): 34-41.

Nwite, J.N and Okolo, C.C. (2012).Effect of different mulching materials on soil properties and grain yield of maize of a TypicHaplustult in Abakaliki. Proceedings of the First

International Agricultural Conference held at Anambra State University, Igbariam Campus, 6th – 9th May 2012. Pp 519-524.

Nwite, J.C., Keke, C.I., Obalum, S.E, Okolo, C.C., Essien, J.B., Anaele, M.U and Igwe, C.A.

(2012). Comparison of various forms of rice waste amendments and NPK (15:15:15) fertilizer for effects on soil chemical properties and leaf nutrient concentration of fluted pumpkin in an Ultisol of Southeastern Nigeria. Proceedings of the First International Agricultural Conference held at Anambra State University, Igbariam Campus, 6th – 9th May 2012. Pp 494 -501.

Obalum, S.E., Watanabe, Y., Igwe, C.A., Obi, M.E and Wakatsuki, T (2012). Carbon stock in

thesolum of some coarse-textured soils under secondary forest, grassland fallow, and bare foothpath in the derived savanna of southeastern Nigeria. Soil Research, 50, 157 – 166. <http://dx.doi.org/10/1071/SR11096>

Odesola, I. F. and Owoseni, T. A. (2010). “Development of local technology for a small-scale

biochar production processes from agricultural wastes,” *Journal of Emerging Trends in Engineering and Applied Sciences*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 205–208.

Ogundiran, M.B., Lawal, O.O. and Adejumo, S.A. (2015).Stabilisation of Pb in Pb Smelting Slag-

Contaminated Soil by Compost-Modified Biochars and Their Effects on Maize Plant Growth.*Journal of Environmental Protection*, 6, 771-780. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/jep.2015.68070>

Oguntunde, P.G., Abiodun, B.J., Ajayi, A.E., Van de Giesen, N. (2008). Effects of charcoal

production on soil physical properties in Ghana. Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science. 171(4):591-596. DOI:10.1002/jpln.200625185.

Okolo, C. C. (2014). Impact of solid minerals mining on selected soil and water properties in Enyigba, Ebonyi State Nigeria.[M.Sc dissertation]. Department of Soil Science, Faculty

of Agriculture, University of Nigeria Nsukka, Nigeria 77p.

Okolo C.C, Ezeaku, P.I, Nwite J.N, Mbah, C.N, and Anikwe, M.A.N (2013). Environmental and

Agronomic Implication of the Levels of Heavy Metals Contamination of the Soils along Enugu-Abakaliki Major Highway in Southeastern Nigeria.Elixir Agriculture 61 (2013) 17040-17046

Olsen, S.R (1982). Phosphorus in Page A.L., Miller,R.H and Keeny D.R eds Methods of soil

analysis. Part 2. 2ndedition . Agronomy Monograph No 9 ASA,SSA,Madisoon WI pp403-430.

Onwuka, M.I., Adiele, P.O. and Ogbonna, K.E. (2015).Improving the soil available phosphorus

and exchangeable calcium of three parent materials of the smallholder farmers using amendments in Abia State, Southeastern Nigeria. International Journal of Advanced Research (2015), Volume 3, Issue 8, 172-183.

Overseas Department of Natural Resources Institute ODNRI (1989). Nigeria profile of agricultural

potentials. Chanthan, UK.

Piccolo.A.,Pietramellara, G and Mbagwu,J.S.C (1996). Effects of coal derived humic substances

on water retention and structural stsbility of mediteranean soils. Soil use Management.12;209-213.

Pietikairenen, J., Kilkkik,O and Frite, H. (2000). Charcoal as a habitat for microbes and its effect

on the microbial community of underlying humus. Oikos 89;231-242.

Preston, C.M and Schmidt, M.W ( 2006). Black(pyrogenic) carbon a synthesis of current

knowledge and uncertainties with specisl consideration of boreal regions. Biogoscience 3; 379-420.

Randon,M.A., Lehmann,J.,Ramirez J and Hurtado,J (2007). Biological nitrogen fixation by

common beans (phaseolus vulgaris L. Science 10;17-23.

Rawls, W. J., Pachepsky, Y. A., Ritchie, J. C., Sobecki, T. M. and Bloodworth, H. (2003).

“Effect of soil organic carbon on soil water retention,” *Geoderma*, vol. 116, no. 1–2, pp. 61–76.

Ronsse, F., Van Hecke, S., Dickinson, D., Prins, W. (2013). Production and characterization

of slow pyrolysis biochar: influence of feedstock type and pyrolysis conditions. GCB Bioenergy 5, 104–115.

Sanchez, P.A, A.M. Izac, I. Valencia and C. Pieri (1996). Soil fertility replenishment in Africa: A concept note. In: Breth (ed.). Proceedings of the workshop on achieving greater impact from Research Investments in Africa.26-30 September. Addis Ababa, Ethiopa.

Saxena, J., Rana, G. and Pandey, M. (2013).Impact of addition of biochar along with Bacillus sp.

on growth and yield of French beans. *ScientiaHorticulturae*, vol. 162, pp. 351-6.

Schulz, H. and Glaser, B. (2012). Effects of biochar compared to organic and inorganic fertilizers

on soil quality and plant growth in a greenhouse experiment. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*, 175(3), pp. 410-422.

Schulz, H., Dunst, G. and Glaser, B. (2014). No Effect Level of Co-Composted Biochar on Plant

Growth and Soil Properties in Greenhouse Experiment. Agronomy, 4, 34 -51; doi: 10.3390/agronomy4010034

Slavich, P., Sinclair, K., Morris, S., Kimber, S., Downie, A., Van, Z., wieten, L. (2013).

Contrasting effects of manure and green waste biochars on the properties of an acidic ferralsol and productivity of a subtropical pasture. Plant Soil 366 (1–2), 213–227.

Smalling ,F. Stoorvogel.J and Windmeijen.P (1993). Calculating soil nutrient balance in

Africaat different scales. Fertilizer Research 35;237-250.

Sohi, S. P. and Shackley, S. (2009). “Biochar: carbon sequestration potential,” December 2009,

Copenhagen, Denmark.

Sohi, S., Lopez-Capel, E., Krull, E and Bol, R. (2009). Biochar, climate change and soil: A review

to guide future research. *CSIRO Land and Water Science Report*, vol. 5, no. 09, pp. 17-31.

Stavi, I., Lal, R. (2013). Agroforestry and biochar to offset climate change: a review. Agron.

Sustain. Dev. 33, 89–96.

Steel R and Torrie J.H ( 1980).Principles and procedures of statistics,with special reference to

biological sciences. McGraw-Hill book co inc.New York xiiipp481.

Tammeorg, P., Simojoki, A., Mäkelä, P., Stoddard, F. L., Alakukku, L. and Helenius, J. (2014).

Short-term effects of biochar on soil properties and wheat yield formation with meat bone meal and inorganic fertiliser on a boreal loamy sand. Agriculture, ecosystems & environment, vol. 191, pp. 108-16.

Thomas G.W (1982) Exchangeable cations. In Page AL., Miller,R.H and Keen D.R (eds)

Methods of soil analysis.Part 2. 2ndedition.Agrornmy Monograph N0 9 ASA and SSA,Madison WI 159-165.

Unamba-Oparah, I., (1985). The potassium status of the sandy soils of northern Imo State of

Nigeria. Soil Science, 139: 437-445.

Upadhyay, K. P. (2015). Colonization of horticultural crops by Arbuscularmycorrhizal fungi.

(PhD thesis) School of Agriculture and Food Sciences, University of Queensland, Australia.

USDA-SCS (1974) Definftions and abbreviation for soil description , West technical service

centre,Poland,Bregon USA.

Vaccari, F.P. ,Baronti, S., Lugato, E., Genesio, L., Castaldi, S., Fornasier, F., Miglietta, F. (2011).

Biochar as a strategy to sequester carbon and increase yield in durum wheat. Eur. J. Agron., 34:231–238.

Vinh, N., Hien, N., Anh, M., Lehmann, J and Joseph, S (2014). Biochar treatment and its effects

on rice and vegetable yields in mountainous areas of northern Vietnam. International Journal of Agricultural and Soil Science, vol. 2, pp. 5-13.

Warnock, D.D., Lehmann, J., Kuyper, T.W. &Rilig, M.C. (2007).Mycorrhizal responses to

biochar in soil – concepts and mechanisms. Plant Soil (2007) 300:9–20

Xu, G., Wei, L.L., Sun, J.N., Shao, H.B., Chang, S.X. (2013). What is more important for

enhancing nutrient bioavailability with biochar application into a sandy soil: direct or indirect mechanism? Ecol. Eng. 52, 119–124.

Yilangai, R.M., Manu, A., Pineau, W., Mailumo, S and Okeke-Agulu, K. (2014). The effect of

biochar and crop veil on growth and yield of Tomato (*Lycopersicumesculentus Mill*) in Jos, North central Nigeria. Current Agriculture Research Journal, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 37-42.

Zhang, A., Liu, Y., Pan, G., Hussain, Q., Li, L., Zheng, J. and Zhang, X. (2012). Effect of biochar

amendment on maize yield and greenhouse gas emissions from a soil organic carbon poor calcareous loamy soil from Central China Plain, *Plant and Soil*, 351, pp. 263-275.

Zhang, Qingzhong., Du, Zhangliu., Lou Yilai and He Xinhua (2014). A one-year short-term

biochar application improved carbon accumulation in large macroaggregate fractions. Catena 127 (2015) 26 -31.<http://dx.doi.org/j.catena.2014.12.009>