

Effectiveness of Selected Soil Conservation Practices on Soil Erosion Control and Crop Yields in the Usambara Mountains, Tanzania

S. B. Mwango^{1*}, B. M. Msanya¹, P. W. Mtakwa¹, D. N. Kimaro²,
J. Deckers³, J. Poesen³, I. Massawe¹, J. Samwel¹

¹Department of Soil Science, Sokoine University of Agriculture, P.O. Box 3008 Chuo Kikuu, Morogoro, Tanzania.

²Department of Agricultural Engineering and Land Planning, Sokoine University of Agriculture, P.O. Box 3003 Chuo Kikuu, Morogoro, Tanzania.

³Department of Earth & Environmental Sciences, KU Leuven, Celestijnenlaan 200 E, B-3001 Heverlee, Belgium

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors.

SB designed the study, wrote the protocol, conducted field work, performed statistical analysis, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. BM designed the study, conducted field work, managed the literature searches and edited drafts. PW designed the study, conducted field work and edited drafts. DN, JD and JP designed the study and edited drafts. IM and JS conducted field work. All authors read and approved the final manuscript

ABSTRACT

Indigenous soil conservation measures such as *miraba* have been widely used in Usambara Mountains for controlling soil erosion but with little success. On-farm runoff experiments were set from 2011 –2014 on Acrisols in Majulai and Migambo villages with contrasting agro-ecological conditions in the Usambara Mountains, Tanzania. The aim was to investigate the effectiveness of *miraba* and *miraba* with various mulching materials in reducing runoff, soil and nutrient losses and improving productivity of maize (*Zea mays*) and beans (*Phaseolus vulgaris*). Results show that mean annual runoff coefficients (mm mm⁻¹) ranged from 0.72 for cropland with no soil conservation measure (control) to 0.15 for cropland with *miraba* and *Tithonia* (*Tithonia diversifolia*) mulching in Majulai village and respectively from 0.68 to 0.13 in Migambo village. Soil loss was significantly ($P = .05$) higher under control than under *miraba* with either *Tughutu* (*Vernonia myriantha*) or *Tithonia* mulching. e.g. 184 vs 20 in Majulai and 124 vs 8 Mg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ for Migambo village in 2012. The P -factors were significantly ($P = .05$) higher under *miraba* sole than under *miraba* with mulching in Majulai village (0.18 vs 0.11) and in Migambo village (0.10 vs 0.05). The annual nutrient losses in kg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ were significantly ($P = .05$) higher under control than under *miraba* with mulching 367 vs 37 total N, 0.8 vs 0.1 P and 14 vs 4 K for Majulai village; 474 vs 26 total N, 0.7 vs 0.1 P and 20 vs 1.2 K for Migambo village in 2012. Maize and bean yields were significantly ($P = .05$) higher under *miraba* with *Tughutu* mulching than under control (e.g. 2.0 vs 0.7 Mg ha⁻¹ for maize in Majulai in 2012). Thus *miraba* with *Tughutu* mulching is more effective in improving crop yields than *miraba* with *Tithonia* and *miraba* sole.

*Corresponding Author: E-mail: sibawaymwango@yahoo.com

Key words: Runoff experiments, indigenous SWC, soil and nutrient losses, *miraba*, RUSLE, maize, beans

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Soil erosion has been reported as a serious problem facing agricultural production all over the world [1; 2; 3; 4, 5]. Soil erosion by water is a major factor causing land degradation in the Usambara highlands of Tanzania and severely affects soil functions resulting in low crop productivity [6; 7]. Soil erosion by water is defined as the detachment and displacement of soil particles by water, resulting in the development of rills and gullies [8]. To overcome the problem of soil deterioration, the Usambara farmers have developed local soil and water conservation (SWC) measures such as *miraba* (rectangular grass bound strips that do not necessarily follow contour lines [10]), micro-ridges and stone bunds as an integral part of their farming systems [7; 9; 10]. Most of the introduced measures have often been rejected or minimally adopted because such measures e.g. bench and *FanyaJuu* terraces (hillside ditches made by throwing excavated soil on the upslope of the ditch, built along the contour lines at appropriate intervals depending on slope) were expensive in terms of labour and money, while also their promoters paid little attention on indigenous practices.

Miraba are widely practised by farmers in the Usambara Mountains. *Miraba* as a SWC measure is traditionally characterized by a wide spacing of grass strips across the slope and usually the spacing depends on the size of farm plots. For decades these SWC technologies were never a subject of scientific writing to allow improvements be made to effectively address problems of soil degradation and low crop productivity [9]. On the other hand, farmers have not been able to adjust these indigenous SWC techniques to rapidly changing farming systems and increasing intensity of land use [11; 9].

On steep slopes like in Usambara Mountains, bench terraces are highly recommended as the most effective soil and water conservation measure in cropland [12; 7; 9; 13]. However, due to low adoption rates in Usambara Mountains, the solution would be to improve and use indigenous SWC technologies such as *miraba* for sustained agricultural productivity in the area.

In the Usambara Mountains *miraba* are established by using either Napier or Guatemala grass. Grass strips forming *miraba* serve as barriers which capture soil particles that have been detached and transported with runoff from the cultivated land. Napier grass is mostly preferred because it is also used as forage for stall feeding, while Guatemala grass is appreciated for its drought resistance and to some extent is also used as forage for stall feeding.

Studies on effectiveness of some SWC technologies such as bench terraces, *FanyaJuu* terraces, grass strips (7; 14) and *miraba* (15; 16) on soil erosion control and agricultural productivity have recently been carried out in Western Usambara Mountains. However, the contribution of indigenous SWC technologies including *miraba* mostly practised in the study area have not fully been investigated for sustained agricultural productivity [9; 15]. Moreover, it has been reported that establishment of *miraba* is far cheaper than the construction of bench terraces. Therefore efforts towards improving this technique are warranted [14; 15; 16].

Several erosion models are available to predict soil loss and to assess soil erosion risk [4; 9]. However, RUSLE, the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation [17] is widely used for estimating potential soil erosion by water especially at regional and national level because of its relative simplicity and robustness [4; 18; 16]. Likewise, this study applied RUSLE model to investigate the effectiveness of *miraba* and *miraba* with *Tithonia* (*Tithonia diversifolia*) and *Tughutu* (*Vernonia myriantha*) mulching materials in reducing runoff, soil and nutrient losses using maize

and beans as test crops. Specifically, the study intended to: (i) quantify soil and nutrient losses under selected soil conservation practices (ii) determine rainfall-runoff responses under selected soil conservation practices (iii) select the best soil conservation practice using the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) and (iv) determine the influence of selected soil conservation practices on crop yield.

2.0 MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 Description of the Study Sites

The study was conducted in Migambo and Majulai villages which represent different agro-ecological zones in Western Usambara Mountains, Lushoto District, Tanzania (Fig. 1) located between longitudes $38^{\circ}15'$ to $38^{\circ}24'$ E and latitudes $4^{\circ}34'$ to $4^{\circ}48'$ S. The area is highly dissected with steep slopes ranging from 20 % to over 50 % and altitude of about 1402 m.a.s.l. in Majulai and 1682 m.a.s.l. in Migambo village. The rainfall characteristics are presented in (Table 1) Migambo is humid cold with mean annual air temperature of $12 - 17^{\circ}\text{C}$ and annual precipitation is 700–1800 mm. Majulai is dry and warm with mean annual air temperature between 16 and 21°C and annual precipitation of 500–2100 mm. The monthly reference evapo-transpiration (ET_o) as estimated by the local climate estimator software (New_LocClim) [19] ranges from 100 mm to 145 mm. Majulai and Migambo villages support a large population density of more than 120.4 persons/km² [20].




Fig. 1. Location map of Majulai and Migambo villages, Lushoto District, Tanzania.
(Adapted from Msita, 2013)

According to the World Reference Base(WRB)[21], the soil type in Majulai site classifies as *Chromic Acrisol* (*Humic, Profondic, Clayic, Cutanic, Colluvic*) whereas in Migambo site the soil is *Haplic Acrisol* (*Humic, Profondic, Clayic, Colluvic*). The main land uses include cultivation on slopes and *in valleys*, settlements on depressions, ridge summits and slopes and forest reserves on ridge summits and upper slopes. Vegetables such as carrots, onions, tomatoes, cabbages, and peas are grown as sole crops in valleys under rain fed or traditional irrigation. Beans are mainly grown during the long rainy season while maize is grown during the short rains. Round potatoes and fruits, namely peaches, plums, pears, avocado and banana are grown on ridge slopes under rain fed mixed farming. Round potatoes are also grown in valleys as sole crop or intercropped with maize.

Table 1: *Rainfall characteristics (mm year⁻¹) in Majulai and Migambo village

Village	Annual rainfall (mm)			Rainfall erosivity (MJ mm ha ⁻¹ hr ⁻¹ year ⁻¹)			
	Dry year	Average year	Wet year	Mean	Median	IQR	N
Majulai	900	1200	1500	12354	10156	9937	37
Migambo	800	1000	1300	6489	5973	2285	28

IQR= Interquartile range, N= number of years of continuous observation (Source: authors' calculation based on rainfall data from Lushoto (for Migambo) and Mlalo (for Majulai) rainfall gauges.

* Rainfall values for dry and wet year have a 5 year return period

2.2 *Miraba* Establishment in Runoff Experiments

Miraba were established by using Napier grass (*Pennisetum purpureum*) barriers in runoff experiments in April 2011 about nine months before data collection started. Napier grass barriers forming *miraba* were established by planting tillers in a single row at 10 cm spacing perpendicular to slope and were maintained to about 50 cm wide strips. In the current study Napier grass barriers across the slope were spaced 5 m apart to mimic the recommended maximum effective width of hand made bench *terraces* [12]. *Along the slope the Napier grass barriers were set at 3 m apart.* It has been documented that soil conservation measures such as *Fanya Juu* and stone bunds tend to progressively form bench terraces when they are at *narrow* spacing [12; 22]. Moreover, the closer the grass strips are, the more effective they become [22]. Progressive bench *terrace* formation is also possible under *miraba* when adjusted to appropriate spacing of grass strips. Natural bench terrace formations as a result of *miraba* implementation are much less expensive compared to mechanical bench terrace construction. Bench terraces are highly recommended for use in Usambara Mountains [23; 6; 7, 9].

2.3 Experimental Design

Closed runoff plots of 22 x 3 m in a randomized complete block design (RCBD) were set along lower ridge slopes at 50 % slope in Majulai and 45 % slope in Migambo village respectively. The plots were enclosed by *miraba* and bounded by that protruded 15 cm above the soil surface to prevent inflow and outflow from the plot borders. The pieces of wood *were* connected to three collector drums (each 220 litres) with hinged lids. Maize (*Zea mays*) and beans (*Phaseolus vulgaris*) were planted in rotation as test crops in 2012 and 2013/14 rainy seasons. Maize was planted during short rains (*vuli*), while beans *were planted* during long rains (*masika*). The treatments included runoff plots (Fig. 2) with: (i) *Miraba* with maize or beans (**MI**) (ii) *Miraba* with *Tithonia* mulching and planted with maize or beans (**MITH**) (iii) *Miraba* with *Tughut* mulching and planted with maize or beans (**MITG**) (iv) plots without SWC measure and planted with maize or beans (Control) (**CO**) (v) Bare plots (**BA**), all replicated three times.

Mulching materials were the leaves of the readily available shrubs in both villages namely *Alizeti Pori* (*Tithonia diversifolia*) and *Tughutu* (*Vernonia myriantha*). *Tithonia* has frequently been reported as a good green manure while also *Tughutu* is known to contain N, P and K [24; 25; 26]. Samples were collected from each mulching material for determination of total N, available P, K^+ , Mg^{2+} , Ca^{2+} and Na^+ .




Fig. 2: Illustration of experimental plots a) Majulai plots layout b) Migambo plots layout c) Majulai plots with maize crop d) Migambo plots and application of farm yard manure

2.4 Rainfall Data Collection

Daily rainfall was measured from 1st January 2012 to 16th February 2014 using standard rain gauges and tipping buckets with a CR10 data logger (Campbell Scientific, Logan UT) installed at the experimental sites in Migambo and Majulai villages.

2.5 Runoff, Sediment and Nutrient Loss Determination

Runoff and sediment was collected daily from 1st January 2012 to 16th February 2014. Beans were grown during the long rains, weeds were left to grow in the field during off season, and maize was grown in short rains. Runoff volume was estimated by measuring the depth of water in cm in the collecting drums and then converted to volume of water in litres. Sediment load was estimated by sampling water in collecting drums after vigorously stirring the suspension. The water sampling was done by lowering a one liter plastic bottle from the water surface to the bottom of the drum, and samples of about 100 ml were collected at the bottom, middle and upper part when runoff depth in the drum was above 25 cm. Heavy sediments in the drums were scooped out, weighed and a 1 kg soil sample collected, oven dried for hours at 105 °C and

weighed for dry soil loss calculation. The suspended sediment samples were filtered using Whatman No. 42 filter paper and dried for 24 hours at 105 °C until constant weight was obtained [27] and the soil loss ($\text{Mg ha}^{-1}\text{yr}^{-1}$) was determined. Soil losses from heavy sediments and from suspended materials from each runoff event were added to compute total soil loss for the events. These losses were finally added to compute total soil loss per annum. The soil samples for nutrient loss determination were collected by decanting the suspended sediment in buckets.

In each runoff experimental site a soil profile was excavated and soil samples were collected from each horizon for pedological characterization. Undisturbed core soil samples were taken at 0-5 cm, 45-50 cm and 95-100 cm soil depth by Kopecky's core rings (100 cm^3) for bulk density, gravimetric moisture and available moisture determinations. The soil was classified to Tier-2 according to the World Reference Base for Soil Resources WRB [21].

2.6 Crop Yields

Maize (*Zea mays*) PANNAR 67 variety and beans (*Phaseolus vulgaris*) Kilombero variety were planted in runoff plots during the 2012 and 2013/14 rain seasons with maize in the short rains (*vuli*) and beans in the long rains (*masika*) at the recommended spacing of 30 cm within rows and 75 cm between rows for maize and 25 cm within rows and 50 cm between rows for beans. Beans were always planted one month before the maize was harvested in Migambo and two weeks before harvesting maize in Majulai village. Farmyard manure with 1.7% N, 0.4% P and 1.9 % K was basal and spot applied at the rate of 3.6 Mg ha^{-1} air-dry weight, DAP 18: 46: 0 NPK ratio and Urea 46 % N were applied at the rate of 80 kg ha^{-1} , but Urea was not applied for beans. At maturity maize and bean grains were harvested and dried to about 13% moisture content.

2.7 Soil Analysis

Soil analysis was done following Moberg's [28] Laboratory Manual. Organic carbon (OC) was measured using the dichromate oxidation method, total nitrogen (TN) by Kjeldahl method, available phosphorus (Bray-I), exchangeable bases (Ca^{2+} and Mg^{2+}) by atomic absorption spectrophotometer, exchangeable Na^+ and K^+ by flame photometer and pH water by normal laboratory pH meter.

2.8 Determination of the RUSLE Factors

The RUSLE equation expresses average annual soil loss $\text{Mg ha}^{-1}\text{ year}^{-1}$ caused by sheet and rill erosion [17]: $A = RKLSCP$(1)

Where A is the long term average soil loss ($\text{Mg ha}^{-1}\text{ year}^{-1}$), R is rainfall erosivity factor ($\text{MJ mm ha}^{-1}\text{ h}^{-1}\text{ year}^{-1}$), K is the soil erodibility factor ($\text{Mg ha MJ}^{-1}\text{ mm}^{-1}$), LS is dimensionless factor combining slope steepness (S) and slope length (L), C and P are dimensionless factors accounting respectively for crop cover and management and conservation practices. The equation developed by Vrieling et al. [29] was used to calculate R factor. Such that $R = 50.7\text{ MFI} - 1405$(2)

Where MFI is the Modified Fournier Index calculated from $\text{MFI} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (p^n) / P$(3)

Where p is the average monthly rainfall (mm) and P is the average annual rainfall (mm). In the absence of any cover crop or soil protection measure, as for the bare plot, C and P factors are equal to 1. Thus K factor was calculated from $K = A_{\text{bare plot}} / (RLS)$(4)

According to Mitchell and Bubenzer, [30] $LS = [0.065 + 0.0456s + 0.006541s^2] \times (l/22)^{1/2}$(5)

Where: s , is the slope gradient in %; l , is the plot length in m; constant $1/2$, is used where slope steepness is $\geq 5\%$

The effectiveness of **soil conservation practices** on reducing soil loss was determined by the use of C and P factors when compared to the bare plots. The C factor in the long rain season was a function of the bean crop cover; in the off season the C factor **was determined** by weed cover, while in **the** short rains maize cover was considered. **The** C factor was **calculated** as the ratio between the seasonal or annual soil losses of the control plot to the seasonal or annual soil losses of the bare plot. The P factor was **calculated** as the ratio between the seasonal or annual soil **losses** under *miraba* plots to the seasonal or annual soil **losses** under control plots.

$$C(\text{CO plot}) = A(\text{CO plot}) / A(\text{BA plot}) \dots \dots \dots (6)$$

$$P(\text{MI plot}) = A(\text{MI plot}) / A(\text{CO plot}) \dots \dots \dots (7)$$

$$P(\text{MITH plot}) = A(\text{MITH plot}) / A(\text{CO plot}) \dots \dots \dots (8)$$

$$P(\text{MITG plot}) = A(\text{MITG plot}) / A(\text{CO plot}) \dots \dots \dots (9)$$

Where: $A(\text{CO plot})$, is the soil loss ($\text{Mg ha}^{-1} \text{ season}^{-1}$ or $\text{Mg ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) under control plots; $A(\text{BA plot})$, is the soil loss ($\text{Mg ha}^{-1} \text{ season}^{-1}$ or $\text{Mg ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) under control plots; $A(\text{MI, MITH and MITG plot})$, are respectively the soil loss ($\text{Mg ha}^{-1} \text{ season}^{-1}$ or $\text{Mg ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) under *miraba*, *miraba* with *Tithonia* mulching and *miraba* with *Tughutu* mulching. The effectiveness of **soil conservation practices** on reducing soil loss was determined by the percent of C and P factors with reference to bare plots. The effectiveness of **soil conservation practices** on reducing nutrient losses was also calculated in percentages **in respect of bare plots**.

2.9 Statistical Analysis

Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance was conducted to test data normality using GenStat software [31]. Rainbow software [32] was used to analyze the annual rainfall probabilities of exceedance frequencies at 20% wet years, 50% for normal years and 80% for dry years based on 37 years of observations (1975-2011) for Majulai and 28 years (1986-2013) for Migambo village. The relationships between daily rainfall and daily runoff were determined by Linear Regression Analysis with threshold runoff values obtained from the X-axis intercept. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) in GenStat statistical software [31] was performed where Least Significant Difference ($\text{LSD}_{0.05}$) was used to detect mean differences between treatments.

3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Rainfall Erosivity between the Two Villages with Contrasting Climatic Conditions

The annual and seasonal rainfalls recorded during the two consecutive years are presented in **Table 2**, while rainfall distribution in **Fig. 3**. It can be seen in Migambo village that 2012 was a dry year while 2013 corresponded to a normal year, whereas in Majulai village 2012 was a normal year while 2013 corresponded to a dry year. As the rainfall depth was higher in Majulai village than Migambo village in 2012, rainfall erosivity R factor **was** also higher in Majulai, while in 2013 higher values of rainfall depth and R factor were observed in Migambo village (**Table 2**).




Fig. 3: Rainfall distribution in Majulai and Migambo villages and estimated reference evapo-transpiration (ET_o) measured during 2012 and 2013; ET_o determined according to New_LocClim estimator; [19].

3.2 Soil loss in Relation to SWC Measures in the Two Villages with Contrasting Climatic Conditions

From our results (Table 2), Majulai village had significantly ($P < .001$) higher annual soil losses than Migambo in 2012, but in 2013 annual soil losses were significantly ($P < .001$) higher in Migambo than in Majulai village. The difference in soil losses between the two villages can partly be attributed to the rainfall depth (Table 2), as it can clearly be seen that the higher the rainfall depth the higher the soil losses in the studied villages. Similar observations were reported by Kabanza et al. [33], where soil losses in Makonde plateau were much higher than in inland plains and rainfall depth was spotted as the main contributing factor. The relatively steeper slopes in Majulai than in Migambo could also explain the soil loss differences. This is supported by the work of Liu et al. [34] where slope gradients were found to be strong determinants of soil loss. On the other hand, soil losses differed significantly ($P < .001$) between SWC measures in both villages. Soil losses followed the trend: bare plots > cropland with no SWC measures > cropland with miraba sole > cropland with miraba and Tithonia or Tughutu mulching. The reduced soil losses under miraba and miraba with mulches could be explained by the effect of grass barriers forming miraba that captured some soil sediments that were with runoff. This observation is also supported by Wanyama et al. [35] who reported grass strips to effectively trap more than 70 % sediments under natural rainfall. Besides, miraba were progressively forming bench terraces such that the terrace height reached about 1 m in Migambo and 0.7 m in Majulai village after two years of experimentation. The terraces so formed reduced the slope steepness, thereby resulting reduced runoff velocity and increased rate of infiltration. This ultimately reduced runoff volume and sediment losses. Similarly, mulches also reduced runoff velocity, thereby increasing rate of infiltration and reducing runoff volume and sediment losses. Such observations were also reported by Bajracharya et al. and Tiwari et al. [36; 37] in Nepal where mulching was found to reduce annual soil loss by 60 to 90 % in maize – mustard cropping system as compared to conventional farmers' practices.

Table 2: Rainfall and annual soil losses measured in Majulai and Migambo villages Lushoto District, Tanzania

		Majulai		Migambo	
		2012	2013	2012	2013
Rainfall (mm)					
	Long rains (Feb.- May)	329.3	258.0	359.4	552.1
	Offseason rains (Aug – Sept.)	28.7	0	7.1	23.4
	Short rains (Oct. – Jan.)	636.9	165.1	415.8	222.7
	Annual	906	528	718	826
	R (MJ mm ha ⁻¹ h ⁻¹ year ⁻¹)	7774	3857	5859	7247
		Majulai		Migambo	
Soil loss Mg ha ⁻¹ year ⁻¹		2012	2013	2012	2013
Bare plots	Replicates				
	1	254.6	100.6	175.6	177.1
	2	262.7	107.9	182.0	188.3
	3	266.9	105.7	183.6	186.6
	Mean	261.4	104.7	180.4	184.0
Plots with maize or beans	1	179.6	72.9	124.1	133.3
	2	183.3	76.8	124.3	129.8
	3	187.8	77.2	124.4	131.6
	Mean	183.6	75.6	124.3	131.6
Miraba with maize or beans	1	34.7	12.2	13.3	14.9
	2	35.9	11.7	13.4	13.4
	3	33.6	14.3	13.5	14.3
	Mean	34.7	12.7	13.4	14.2
Miraba with Tithonia and maize or beans	1	17.58	5.42	8.02	5.30
	2	20.03	8.20	7.58	4.76
	3	20.05	9.09	7.97	5.18
	Mean	19.22	7.57	7.86	5.08
Miraba with Tughutu and maize or beans	1	18.47	5.62	7.97	5.47
	2	20.10	9.34	7.43	5.18
	3	20.02	9.33	7.24	5.27
	Mean	19.50	8.10	7.55	5.31
LSD ($P = .05$)		4.14	4.06	4.14	4.06
SE		1.39	1.37	1.39	1.37

LSD: least significant different; SE: standard error of means

3.3 Rainfall-Runoff Responses under Selected Soil Conservation Practices

The slope of the regression line was used as a measure of the rainfall-runoff response. The rainfall-runoff response varied between the villages and between soil conservation measures (Fig. 4a). The differences can be explained by the influences of the studied soil conservation measures; bare plots had the highest annual runoff coefficient, while *miraba* with Tithonia and *miraba* with Tughutu mulching had the lowest (Table 4 & Fig. 4). The rainfall threshold values to initiate runoff varied between the soil conservation measures and between the studied villages. These differences were also directly associated with the effects of soil conservation measures and the differences in climatic conditions between the villages (Fig. 3). The rainfall threshold values to initiate runoff follow the trend: *miraba* with Tithonia and *miraba* with Tughutu mulching > *miraba* sole > cropland with no SWC measures > bare land in both villages. *Miraba* with mulching had the highest rainfall threshold values i.e. 5.0 mm in Migambo village and lowest values under bare land i.e. 3.4 mm in Majulai village. The observed rainfall threshold

values are very lowimplying that the soils of Usambara Mountains are very sensitive to runoff and therefore to soil loss. Thus implementation of improved *miraba* with mulching could be a very effective way to curb soil degradation by water erosion in the area.

Table 3: Daily runoff (mm) (Y) response to daily rainfall (mm) (X) for Majulai and Migambo villages in Usambara Mountains, Tanzania

Village/Treatments	Regressions equations	Runoff threshold	R ²	No. of rainfall incidences	No. of runoff observations
Majulai					
Bare plots	$Y=0.230X-0.79$	3.4	0.87	118	353
Control	$Y=0.190X-0.72$	3.8	0.81	118	353
<i>Miraba</i>	$Y=0.065X-0.26$	4.0	0.66	118	353
<i>Miraba</i> +Tithonia	$Y=0.038X-0.15$	4.2	0.51	118	353
<i>Miraba</i> +Tughutu	$Y=0.037X-0.16$	4.2	0.52	118	353
Migambo					
Bare plots	$Y=0.200X-0.76$	3.8	0.93	122	365
Control	$Y=0.160X-0.68$	4.3	0.92	122	365
<i>Miraba</i>	$Y=0.040X-0.19$	4.7	0.81	122	365
<i>Miraba</i> +Tithonia	$Y=0.030X-0.13$	5.0	0.91	122	365
<i>Miraba</i> +Tughutu	$Y=0.027X-0.15$	4.9	0.89	122	365




Fig. 4: a) Rainfall-runoff response curves b) runoff coefficients for different soil and water conservation measures in Usambara Mountains, Tanzania. (Key: BA= Bare plots; CO=Control; MI=Miraba sole, MI+TG=Miraba with *Tughutu* mulching and MI+TH=Miraba with Tithonia mulching).

3.4 Effectiveness of Selected Soil Conservation Practices in Relation to RUSLE Factors

The relative effectiveness of selected soil conservation practices with reference to soil losses from cropland with no SWC measures are presented in Figure 5. It can clearly be seen that miraba sole, miraba with Tithonia and miraba with Tughutumulching were more effective in reducing soil loss in Migambo than in Majulai village. This can be attributed to the differences in rainfall distribution where the poor rainfall distribution in Majulai village (Fig. 3) causes Napier grass in the mirabato die during dry spells, while the reliable rainfall in Migambo makes Napier grass barriers that form mirabato persist throughout the year and thus form denser grass strips than in Majulai village. It is evident from Figure 4 that miraba reduced soil losses by about 80% in Majulai and 90% in Migambo village relative to soil losses from cropland with no SWC measures. On the other hand miraba with Tithonia and Miraba with Tughutu mulching reduced soil losses by 90% in Majulai and 95% in Migambo village relative to soil losses from cropland with no SWC measures (Fig. 5).




Fig.5: The mean relative soil loss with STDEV from 3 replicates under the studied soil conservation practices in Majulai and Migambo villages.

Based on the work by Kabanza et al. [33] RUSLE factors were found to provide better insight than other attributes when assessing the effectiveness of soil conservation measures. The observed K factors were $0.0016 \text{ (Mg h MJ}^{-1} \text{ mm}^{-1})$ for *Chromic Acrisol* in Majulai and $0.0018 \text{ (Mg h MJ}^{-1} \text{ mm}^{-1})$ for *Haplic Acrisol* in Migambo village (Table 5). The observed K factor values are very low, indicating high susceptibility of the studied soils to erosion. More erodible soils such as silt loams have their K factor values ranging from $0.03 - 0.05 \text{ (Mg h MJ}^{-1} \text{ mm}^{-1})$ [e.g. 38; 39]. The P factor values are much higher in Majulai than in Migambo village (Table 4 & 5) indicating that the studied soil conservation practices have stronger effect in Migambo than in Majulai village. This can be explained by the good rainfall distribution in Migambo as compared to Majulai village which experiences long dry spells (Fig. 3) resulting in natural death of *miraba* Napier grass, thus, reducing its effectiveness. Similarly significant differences were observed between soil conservation practices where *miraba* with Tithonia and *miraba* with *Tughutu* mulching were more effective in reducing soil loss than *miraba* sole and control (plots with maize or bean crop). This is due to the fact that grass barriers forming *miraba* and mulches tend to reduce runoff speed and thus increase the rate of infiltration. This tendency was also reported by Duran et al., Reubens et al., Wanyama et al., and Biru et al. [40; 41; 35; 42]. The most effective soil conservation practices in both villages are thus *miraba* with Tithonia and *miraba* with *Tughutu* mulching ($P=0.11$ for Majulai and $P=0.002$ for Migambo village).

Table 4: RUSLE factors for the Majulai and Migambo villages in Usambara Mountains, Tanzania based on soil loss measurements on runoff plots in 2012 and 2013

RUSLE factors		Majulai		Migambo		Sig	
		n	2012	2013	2012	2013	n.
<i>R</i> (MJ mm ha ⁻¹ h ⁻¹ year ⁻¹)		1	7774	3857	5859	7247	ns
<i>K</i> (Mg h MJ ⁻¹ mm ⁻¹)		1	0.0018	0.0015	0.0020	0.0017	ns
<i>C</i> (dimensionless)	Maize and beans	3	0.71	0.70	0.70	0.70	ns
<i>P</i> (dimensionless)							
	<i>Miraba</i>	3	0.19	0.17	0.10	0.10	***
	<i>Miraba</i> + <i>Tithonia</i>	3	0.11	0.10	0.06	0.04	***
	<i>Miraba</i> + <i>Tughutu</i>	3	0.11	0.10	0.06	0.04	***
	LSD (<i>P</i> = .05)		0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	

LSD: least significant different; Sign. ns: not significant; ***: $P < .001$. Mann-Whitney U test for R , K and C factors; Nested ANOVA for P variables

Table 5: RUSLE factors for the Majulai and Migambo villages in Usambara Mountains, Tanzania based on soil loss measurements on runoff plots from 2012-2014 rain seasons

RUSLE factors	Majulai			Migambo			Sign.
	Median	IQR	n	Median	IQR	n	
R (MJ mm ha ⁻¹ h ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹)	5816	1958	2	6553	694	2	ns
K (Mg h MJ ⁻¹ mm ⁻¹)	0.0016	0.0002	2	0.0018	0.0002	2	ns
C (dimensionless)	Mean	STDEV		Mean	STDEV		
Beans/weed/Maize	0.71	0.02	6	0.70	0.005	6	ns
P (dimensionless)	Mean	STDEV		Mean	STDEV		
Miraba	0.18	0.002	6	0.10	0.003	6	***
Miraba+Tithonia	0.11	0.03	6	0.05	0.002	6	***
Miraba+Tughutu	0.11	0.02	6	0.05	0.002	6	***
LSD ($P = .05$)	0.03			0.03			

LSD: least significant different; IQR: inter-quartile range; STDEV: standard deviation; n: number of observations; Sign. ns: not significant; ***: $P < .001$. Friedman test for R, K and C factors; Nested ANOVA for P variables

3.5 Soil Nutrient Losses under the Studied SWC Measures

Soil nutrient losses under soil conservation practices are presented in Figure 6. Soil nutrient losses were significantly ($P < .001$) different between SWC practices. The differences in soil nutrient losses can directly be associated with the effects of soil conservation practices (Table 6). Soil losses followed the trend: bare plots > cropland with no SWC measure > cropland with miraba sole > miraba with Tughutu and miraba with Tithonia mulching (Table 6). Similarly Msita [16] in Migambo village, Tanzania reported lower losses of total N, P and K⁺ in plots with miraba, farmyard manure and Tithonia mulching than in cropland with no SWC measures.

The relative effectiveness of soil conservation practices with reference to soil losses from cropland with no soil conservation measures are presented in Figure 6. There are obvious differences in soil nutrient loss control between soil conservation measures. It is clear that miraba with mulching reduced soil nutrient losses by about 95% in Migambo and 85% in Majulai village, while miraba sole reduced nutrient losses by 90% in Migambo and about 80% in Majulai village (Fig. 6).




Fig.6: The mean relative nutrient loss under the studied soil conservation practices in Majulai and Migambo village

Table 6: Soil nutrient loss (kg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹) under the studied soil conservation practices in the two villages

Village	Treatments	n	OC	N	P	K ⁺	Ca ²⁺	Mg ⁺	Na ⁺
Majulai									
2012	Bare	72	4835.7	478.8	1.0	41.3	80.2	18.0	15.5
	Control	72	3049.7	306.5	0.8	13.6	62.7	18.3	8.8
	<i>Miraba</i>	72	632.7	59.2	0.2	2.7	12.8	4.0	2.3
	<i>Miraba</i> +Tithonia	72	414.7	36.6	0.1	3.8	8.2	2.9	1.4
	<i>Miraba</i> + <i>Tughutu</i>	72	518.3	42.5	0.1	4.1	11.5	4.0	1.5
	Bare	46	2024.3	176.3	0.7	5.9	23.9	8.4	6.5
	Control	46	1496.7	125.7	0.9	6.8	25.9	8.4	4.6
	<i>Miraba</i>	46	260.7	20.3	0.2	1.8	5.5	2.2	0.8
	<i>Miraba</i> +Tithonia	46	158.7	12.6	0.1	1.6	7.7	1.6	0.5
	<i>Miraba</i> + <i>Tughutu</i>	46	187.7	13.9	0.2	1.6	5.1	1.8	0.6
Migambo									
2012	Bare	51	6092.3	548.0	0.8	12.0	371.1	57.2	11.3
	Control	51	4908.7	474.3	0.7	19.7	262.1	46.3	8.8
	<i>Miraba</i>	51	450.0	40.7	0.1	1.9	30.7	4.9	0.8
	<i>Miraba</i> +Tithonia	51	251.7	27.2	0.1	1.7	20.3	4.5	0.5
	<i>Miraba</i> + <i>Tughutu</i>	51	276.7	26.0	0.1	1.2	20.2	4.3	0.5
	Bare	71	6308.7	525.4	1.2	15.9	437.6	74.4	12.6
	Control	71	4418.0	421.6	1.2	19.7	266.8	49.8	8.4
	<i>Miraba</i>	71	531	43.8	0.1	2.8	41.1	6.8	0.9
	<i>Miraba</i> +Tithonia	71	192.7	15.8	0.1	0.9	14.5	3.0	0.3
	<i>Miraba</i> + <i>Tughutu</i>	71	183	16.4	0.1	0.7	15.4	3.1	0.3

3.6 Impact of Selected Soil Conservation Practices on Crop Productivity in the Two Studied Villages

The yields of maize and beans are presented in Table 7. The results show that there is a significant ($P=.05$) difference in crop yields between selected soil conservation practices and between the two studied years in both villages. In Majulai village maize grain yields were higher under *miraba* with *Tughutu* mulching than under *miraba* with Tithonia, *miraba* sole and control in 2012, but there was no maize yield in 2013 due to drought. The trend of bean grain yields followed the trend that: *miraba* with *Tughutu* > *miraba* with Tithonia > *miraba* sole > under the control. The trend was similar in Migambo village where *miraba* with *Tughutu* > *miraba* with Tithonia > *miraba* sole > control for both maize and bean grain yields (Table 7). Maize grain yields were significantly ($P = .05$) higher in 2013 than in 2012, but there were no significant ($P=.05$) differences in bean grain yields between the two years of study. There were also some differences in maize and bean yields between the two villages, with higher yields in Migambo than Majulai (Table 7). The observed crop yields under the studied SWC practices (Table 7) were higher than the average yields according to FAO [43] of 1.5 Mg ha⁻¹ for maize and of 0.7 Mg ha⁻¹ for beans in Tanzania. It is clearly observed that the crop yield differences are highly influenced by the SWC practices (Table 7), and could partly be explained by differences in climatic conditions of the two villages. The rainfall in Majulai is unreliable while Migambo village experiences reliable rainfall with a fair distribution during the growing seasons (Fig. 3).

In 2012, the average maize yields in Majulai village increased by 177% under *miraba* with Tughutu, 128% under *miraba* with Tithonia and 78% under *miraba* sole while there were no maize yields in 2013 due to drought. Bean grain yields in 2012 and 2013 respectively increased by 58% and 85% under *miraba* with Tughutu, 51% and 76% under *miraba* with Tithonia and 37 % and 44 % under *miraba* sole when compared with control. In Migambo village during the same period the average maize yields increased by 149% and 195% under *miraba* with Tughutu, 109% and 147% under *miraba* with Tithonia and 70 % and 90 % under *miraba* sole when compared to control. Studies by Msita [15, 16] reported increased maize yields by 57 % under *miraba* as compared to control in Migambo village, while bean yields did not differ; and the maize yield differences were associated with improved soil properties due to the effects of *miraba*.

Bean grain yields in 2012 and 2013 respectively increased by 48% and 70% under *miraba* with Tughutu, 41% and 58% under *miraba* with Tithonia and 27% and 37% under *miraba* sole when compared with control. It is clear that soil conservation measures contribute to higher crop yields by reducing the loss of plant nutrients and assuring better water supply to the crop. The study by Wickamaet al. [13] in Usambara Mountains observed the average maize and bean yields of 270 % and 583 % higher in well managed farms with good quality terraces, well maintained grass strips, good quality seed for crops, adequate use of manure or fertilizer as compared to the control i.e the farms with no terracing, no grass strips, use of local seed material, little use of manure and no use of fertilizer and no tree cover. The yield differences was reported to be influenced by the sustainable land management categories studied.

Table 7: Impact of selected soil conservation practices on crop yields in Majulai and Migambo villages

Village	SWC measures	N	Mean crop grains		Mean crop grains	
			Yield (Mg ha ⁻¹) in 2012		Yield (Mg ha ⁻¹) in 2013	
			Maize	Beans	Maize	Beans
Majulai						
	Plots with no SWC	3	0.71	0.59	0.0	0.59
Miraba sole		3	1.26	0.81	0.0	0.85
Miraba with Tithonia		3	1.62	0.89	0.0	1.04
Miraba with Tughutu		3	1.97	0.93	0.0	1.09
	LSD (<i>P</i> = .05)		0.15	0.15	0.0	0.15
	SE.		0.05	0.05		0.05
Migambo						
	Plots with no SWC	3	1.57	0.64	1.64	0.67
Miraba sole		3	2.58	0.81	3.12	0.92
Miraba with Tithonia		3	3.18	0.90	4.05	1.06
Miraba with Tughutu		3	3.79	0.95	4.83	1.14
	LSD (<i>P</i> = .05)		0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41
SE			0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14

LSD: least significant different; SE: standard error of means

4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Rainfall erosivity R and soil erodibility K factors did not differ significantly between the studied villages. Soil loss was significantly ($P = .05$) higher under cropland with no soil conservation measures (control) than under *miraba* with mulching. The P factors were significantly ($P = .05$) higher under *miraba* sole than under *miraba* with mulching. The annual nutrient losses were significantly ($P = .05$) higher under control than under *miraba* with mulching. Maize and bean yields differed significantly ($P = .05$) between soil conservation practices in the following order: *miraba* with *Tughutu* mulching > *miraba* with *Tithonia* mulching > *miraba* sole > control. Whereas *miraba* with either *Tughutu* or *Tithonia* mulching showed greater potential in reducing soil and nutrient losses than *miraba* sole, *miraba* with *Tughutu* mulching was more effective in improving crop yields than *miraba* with *Tithonia* and *miraba* sole. Despite that the soils of Usambara Mountains are susceptible to erosion, the C and P factors indicate that these soils are responsive to soil conservation measures. More local shrubs and grasses should be investigated for use as both green manure and soil conservation measure under *miraba*. Further research needs to be conducted to investigate effectiveness of the studied soil conservation practices on watershed to mitigate river stream sedimentation. It is strongly recommended that *Tithonia* and *Tughutu* shrubs be planted in the borders of the farmplots along the slope for easy availability. It is also recommended in Majulai village that drought resistant grasses such Guatemala be used for establishing *miraba* since Napier grass which is mostly preferred for fodder is sensitive to drought.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to the VLIR-UOS supported RIP-DSS SUA Project "Enhancing Indigenous Knowledge on Conservation Agriculture for Poverty Alleviation and Sustainable Livelihood, Usambara Mountains, Lushoto, Tanzania", for providing financial and logistical assistance to the research. The first author is grateful to the Tanzania Commission of Science and Technology (COSTECH) for sponsoring PhD programme that contributed to production of this paper.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Faucette LB, Risse LM, Nearing MA, Gaskin JW, West LT. Runoff, erosion, and nutrient losses from compost and mulch blankets under simulated rainfall. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*. 2004;59: 154- 160.
2. Descheemaerker K, Nyssen J, Poesen J, Raes D, Haile M, Muys B, Deckers S. Runoff on slopes with restoring vegetation: A case study from the Tigray highlands, Ethiopia. *Journal of Hydrology*. 2006;331: 219 – 241.
3. Ajibade LT. Indigenous approach to the control of soil erosion among small scale farmers in Asa L.G.A., Kwara state, Nigeria. *Ethiopian Journal of Environmental Studies and Management*. 2008; 1 (1): 1 - 6.
4. Kimaro DN, Poesen J, Msanya BM, Deckers J. Magnitude of soil erosion on the northern slope of the Uluguru Mountains, Tanzania: Interrill and rill erosion. *CATENA*. 2008;75: 38-44.
5. Jiao P, Xu D, Wang S, Wang Y, Liu K, Tang G. Nitrogen loss by surface runoff from different cropping systems. *Soil Research*. 2012;50: 58–66 *Journal compilation - CSIRO 2012* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/SR11152>.

- 530 6. AHI (African Highlands Initiative). Annual Report. District Agricultural Office Lushoto,
531 Tanzania. 2001.
- 532 7. Tenge AJM. Participatory appraisal for farm-level soil and water conservation planning in
533 West Usambara Highlands, Tanzania. Dissertation for Award of PhD Degree at Wageningen
534 University, Netherlands. 2005; 195 pp.
- 535 8. Govers G, Poesen J. Assessment of the interrill and rill contributions to total soil loss from an
536 upland field plot. *Geomorphology*. 1998; 1:343-354.
- 537 9. Vigiak O, Okoba BO, Sterk G, Stroosnijder L. Water erosion assessment using farmers'
538 indicators in the Western Usambara Mountains, Tanzania. *CATENA*. 2005; 64 (2-3): 307-
539 320.
- 540 10. Msita HB, Kimaro DN, Deckers J, Poesen J. Identification and Assessment of Indigenous
541 Soil Erosion Control Measures in the Usambara Mountains, Tanzania. In: 166 Earl T. Nardali
542 (Ed.), *No Till Farming: Effect on Soil, Pros and Cons and Potential*. Nova Science
543 Publishers, Hauppauge, New York. 2010; 49-74.
- 544 11. Ellis-Jones J, Tengberg A. The impact of indigenous soil and water Conservation practices
545 on soil productivity: Examples from Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. *Land Degradation and*
546 *Development*. 2000; 11 (1): 19-36.
- 547 12. Sheng TC. Bench Terrace Design Made Simple. Department of Earth Resources Colorado
548 State University Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA. 2002; 500 -504.
- 549 13. Wickama J, Okoba B, Sterk G. Effectiveness of sustainable land management measures in
550 West Usambara highlands, Tanzania. *CATENA*. 2014; 118: 91–102.
- 551 14. Kyaruzi LA. Relationship between Soil and Landform Derived Land Qualities and
552 Conservation Agriculture Practices in West Usambara Mountains, Tanzania. MSc
553 Dissertation Sokoine University of Agriculture. 2013; 140 pp.
- 554 15. Effectiveness of *miraba* an indigenous soil and water conservation measures on reducing
555 runoff and soil loss in arable land of western Usambara Mountains. H.B. Msita, D.N. Kimaro,
556 P.W. Mtakwa, B.M. Msanya, S. Dondyene, J. Poesen, and J. Deckers. *Geophysical*
557 *Research Abstracts*. Vol. 14, EGU2012-14122-2, 2012. EGU General Assembly 2012.
- 558 16. Msita HB. Insights into Indigenous Soil and Water Conservation Technologies in Western
559 Usambara Mountains, Tanzania. PhD dissertation KU Leuven Belgium. 2013; 198 pp.
- 560 17. Renard KG, Foster GR, Weesies GA, McCool DK, Yoder DC. Predicting soil erosion by
561 water: a guide to conservation planning with Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE),
562 Agriculture, Handbook No. 703, USDA, ARS, Washington, DC. 1996.
- 563 18. Zarris D, Vlastara M, Panagoulia D. Sediment delivery assessment for a trans-boundary
564 mediterranean catchment: the example of Nestos River catchment. *Water Resources*
565 *Management*. 2011; 25 (14): 3785 – 3803.
- 566 19. FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization). New_LocClim, Local Climate Estimator software,
567 Agro meteorology group FAO/SDRN, Rome, Italy. 2006.
- 568 20. National Bureau of statistics. The 2012 population and housing census. Central statistical
569 office of Tanzania, *Dar es Salaam*. 2012. <http://www.nbs.go.tz/>. (Accessed 09/08/2014).
- 570 21. FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization). World Reference Base for soil resources. A
571 framework for International classification, correlation and communication. *World Soil*
572 *Resources Reports* 106 FAO, Rome, Italy. 2014; 182 pp.
- 573 22. Kaswamila AL. Assessment of the Effectiveness of Soil Erosion Control Measures Using
574 Soil Surface Micro topographic Features in the West Usambara Mountains,
575 Tanzania. *International Journal of Marine, Atmospheric & Earth Sciences*. Florida, USA. 2013;
576 2327-3356.
- 577 23. Shelukindo H. Technical Recommendations for soil and water conservation measures and
578 agroforestry systems. SECAP and TIP, DALDO, Lushoto. 1995.
- 579 24. Wickama JM, Mowo JG. Indigenous nutrient resources in Tanzania. *Managing African Soils*.
580 Issue Paper No. 21. International Institute for Environment and Development, London. 2001;
581 1560 – 3520.

- 582 25. Ikerra ST. Use of Minjingu phosphate rock combined with different organic inputs in
583 improving phosphorus availability and maize yields on a chromic Acrisol in Morogoro,
584 Tanzania. PhD thesis Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro, Tanzania. 2004; 263 pp.
- 585 26. Mowo JG, Janssen BH, Oenema O, German LA, Mrema JP, Shemdoe RS. Soil fertility
586 evaluation and management by smallholder farmer communities in northern Tanzania.
587 Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment. 2006; 116: 47-59.
- 588 27. Yang J, Zhang G, Shi X, Wanga H, Cao Z, Ritsema CJ. Dynamic changes of nitrogen and
589 phosphorus losses in ephemeral runoff processes by typical storm events in Sichuan Basin,
590 Southwest China. Soil & Tillage Research. 2009; 105: 292–299.
- 591 28. Moberg JP. Soil and Plant Analysis Mannual. The Royal Veterinary and Agricultural
592 University, Chemistry Department, Copenhagen, Denmark. 2001; 133 pp.
- 593 29. Vrieling A, Sterk G, de Jong SM. Satellite-based estimation of rainfall erosivity for Africa.
594 Journal of Hydrology. 2010;395: 235-241.
- 595 30. Mitchell JK, Bubenzer GD. Soil loss estimation. In: Kirkby, M.J. and Morgan, R.P.C. (eds):
596 Soil erosion; John Wiley and Sons, Brisbane. 1980.
- 597 31. Genstat. Introduction to Genstat 14 for Windows. Statistical service centre, University of
598 Reading, UK. 2011;41 pp.
- 599 32. Raes D, Willems P, Baguidi F. RAINBOW - a software package for analyzing data and testing
600 the homogeneity of historical data sets. Proceedings of the 4th International Workshop on
601 'Sustainable management of marginal drylands'. Islamabad, Pakistan. 2006; 27-31.
- 602 33. Kabanza AK, Dondeyne S, Kimaro DN, Kafiriti E, Poesen J, Deckers J. Effectiveness of soil
603 conservation measures in two contrasting landscape units of South Eastern Tanzania.
604 Zeitschrift für Geomorphologie. 2013; 57 (3): 269–288. DOI: 10.1127/0372-8854/2013/0057-
605 0102.
- 606 34. Liu Y, Tao Y, Wan KY, Zhang GS, Liu DB, Xiong GY, Chen F. Runoff and nutrient losses in
607 citrus orchards on sloping land subjected to different surface mulching practices in the
608 Danjiangkou Reservoir area of China. Agricultural Water Management. 2012; 110: 34-40.
- 609 35. Wanyama J, Herremans K, Maetens W, Isabirye M, Kahimba F, Kimaro D, Poesen J,
610 Deckers J. Effectiveness of tropical grass species as sediment filters in the riparian zone of
611 Lake Victoria. Soil Use and Management. 2012; 28: 409 - 418.
- 612 36. Bajracharya RM, Atreya K, Sharma S. Minimization of soil and nutrient losses in maize-
613 based cropping systems in the mid-hills of central Nepal, Kathmandu, Nepal. 2005; 1 (1): 1-
614 10.
- 615 37. Tiwari KR, Sitaula BK, Bajracharya RM, Borresen T. Effects of soil and crop management
616 practices on yields, income and nutrient losses from upland farming systems in the Middle
617 Mountains region of Nepal. Nutrients Cycling Agroecosystems. 2010; 86: 241 – 253.
- 618 38. Mtakwa PW, Lal R, Rsharma RB. An evaluation of the universal soil loss equation. and field
619 techniques for assessing soil erosion on a tropical alfisol in western
620 Nigeria. Hydrological Processes. 1987; 1 (2): 199–209.
- 621 39. Poesen JPW. Mechanisms of overland-flow generation and sediment production on loamy
622 and sandy soils with and without rock fragments: Part I, in Overland flow hydraulics and
623 erosion mechanics, AJ. Parsons & AD. Abrahams (eds.) UCL Press, London. 1992.
- 624 40. Dur'an Zuazo VH, Martínez JRF, Pleguezuelo CRR, Martínez RA, Rodríguez BC. Soil-
625 erosion and runoff prevention by plant covers in a mountainous area (Spain): Implications for
626 sustainable agriculture. Environmentalist. 2006; 26: 309-319.
- 627 41. Reubens B, Poesen J, Danjon F, Geudens G, Muys B. The role of fine and coarse roots in
628 shallow slope stability and soil erosion control with a focus on root system architecture: a
629 review. Trees. 2007; 21: 385–402. DOI 10.1007/s00468-007-0132-4.
- 630 42. Birru O, Quraishi S, Bedadi B. Effects of straw mulch and farmyard manure on runoff,
631 erosion, *in-situ* water conservation, and yield and yield components of wheat at the
632 highlands of Bale, south eastern Ethiopia. African Journal of Agricultural Research. 2012;
633 7(44): 5879-5886.

- 634 43. FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization). Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
635 Nation, 2010 FAOSTAT database, Production: Crops. 2010; Available:
636 <http://faostat.fao.org/site/567/DesktopDefault.aspx> (accessed 16/01/2014).
637