

1 **Effect of Urine Sources on Some Soil Health indicators, Maize yield and Its**  
2 **Heavy Metals Uptake in Abakaliki, Southeastern Nigeria**

3  
4 **Abstract:**

5 An experiment was carried out at the Plant and Screen house to study effect of  
6 urine sources on some soil health indicators, maize yield and its heavy metals  
7 uptake. Completely Randomized Design was used with four treatments of control  
8 ( $0\text{kgNha}^{-1}$ ) and  $100\text{kgNh}^{-1}$  each of human, cattle and goat urine sources. The  
9 treatments were replicated five times to give a total of twenty experimental pots  
10 filled with 5kg of soil each. Results showed significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) higher effect of  
11 urine sources on soil pH, total N and organic matter relative to control. Human  
12 urine had significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) higher treatment effect on soil pH, percent total N  
13 and organic matter compared to other sources of urine. Similarly, human urine was  
14 9-10%, 15-27%, 10-47% and 6-5% higher in number of leaves, plant height, grain  
15 yield and leaf area index when compared to those of cattle and goat urine sources.  
16 Significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) higher copper uptake by maize grains was obtained in  
17 control relative to those of urine sources. Copper and lead uptake by maize grains  
18 were 20, 80, 87% and 87, 47, 7% higher in control compared to human, cattle and  
19 goat urine sources. Generally, heavy metals uptake by maize grains is below  
20 recommended safe limits for toxicity.

21 **Key words:** Effect, Maize yield, Heavy metals uptake, Urine sources, Soil  
22 health indicators

23  
24

## INTRODUCTION

25 Traditional agriculture relies heavily on mineral fertilizer NPK for crop  
26 production in Nigeria and other developing countries. Incidentally, use of fertilizer  
27 is confronted with myriads of problems such as unavailability, high cost and  
28 increase in soil acidity as well as contributing to climate change. This, therefore,  
29 makes use of fertilizer counterproductive and there's need to consider alternative  
30 sources of fertilizer. Urine is one of those alternatives due to the fact that it could  
31 be available and cheap. Everyday, both human beings and animals produce urine  
32 which contains some nutrient elements that are needed in plant nutrition and can be  
33 used as fertilizers for plants (Adeoluwa and Sulaiman, 2002). These chemical  
34 elements circulate continuously in natural biogeochemical circles which constitute

35 the only truly sustainable source of soil nutrient (Heinonen-Tanski and Van Wijk-  
36 Sibesma, 2005). As products of ecological sanitation, urine is therefore in many  
37 ways suited for use as fertilizer as they contain essential nutrients needed for plant  
38 growth. For instance, urine contains mineral elements such as Nitrogen,  
39 Phosphorus and Potassium (NPK), Ca and Mg that are needed for plant nutrition  
40 (Marino, 2008). The composition of urine is dependent on age and ration fed to the  
41 animal (Marino, 2008).

42 Generally, urine is usually regarded as menace or nuisance in the  
43 environment especially when poorly disposed. This arises because of the inability  
44 to convert urine, an organic waste to human use in urban and peri-urban centres  
45 (Adeoluwa and Sulaiman, 2012). Improper urine disposal constitute bad odour  
46 problems in the society. These problems come as a result of accumulation of fresh  
47 urine at pH of 6.7 (Hoglung, 2001). In many cases, human urine has been actively  
48 considered as a fertilizer for use in food crop agriculture in many developed  
49 countries. Gardeners in Sweden, Germany and Belgium often use urine water  
50 dilution to raise pot plants and flower bed during the growing season (Heinonen-  
51 Tanski and Van Wijk-Sibesma, 2005). It is equally possible to use pure urine for  
52 soil fertilization. Its agricultural value has been studied with Barley (*Hordeum*  
53 *vulgare L.*) in pot experiments (Kichman and Peterson, 1995) and in the field  
54 (Steineck *et al.*, 1999; Richert *et al.*, 2002) as well as in home gardens with grass,  
55 potatoes and in different unspecified berries, vegetables and ornamentals (Malkki  
56 and Heinonen-Tanski, 1999).

57 Consequently, in view of the worldwide shortage of chemical fertilizers and  
58 its anticipated adverse effect on food production, the zeal to discover and develop  
59 efficient usage of urine cannot be over emphasized. If urine fertilizer is done  
60 carefully at the correct time using moderate quantity and the urine is incorporated  
61 directly (Adeoluwa and Sulaiman, 2012) into the soil, urine nitrogen has the same

62 agricultural value as nitrogen of commercial mineral fertilizer. Barley has been  
63 found to absorb almost all urine nitrogen supplied to the soil under Swedish  
64 climatic conditions at  $100\text{kg ha}^{-1}$  for one growth period of 90-110 days (Richert *et*  
65 *al.*, 2002).

66 There is no doubt that acceptability of urine as fertilizer for crops production  
67 especially when it involves maize for human consumption might face serious  
68 social acceptance problem in Nigeria and in some other parts of the world,  
69 however, there might not be any basis for such resistance if urine used for soil  
70 fertilization is first screened and treated free from any carrier of health hazards. In  
71 Nigeria food crops that grow around urinals or where urine is disposed are  
72 normally eaten by human beings and animals without any complaints of health  
73 problems. The objective of this experiment was to study effect of urine sources on  
74 some soil health indicators, maize yield and its heavy metals uptake under  
75 Abakaliki agroecological environment.

76  
77

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 78 **Experimental site**

79 The research was conducted in 2014 at Plant and Screen House of Teaching  
80 and Research Farm, Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Resources  
81 Management, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki. The area is located by latitude  
82  $06^{\circ} 4'N$  and longitude  $08^{\circ} 65'E$  in the derived savanna of southeast agro-  
83 ecological zone of Nigeria. The area experiences bimodal pattern of rainfall  
84 which is spread from April-July and September-November of each year. There is  
85 a break in August normally referred by residents as “August break”. At the  
86 beginning of rainfall, it is torrential and violent and is characterized by  
87 thunderstorm and lightening. The minimum and maximum rainfalls are 1700  
88 and 2000 mm with a mean of 1800 mm (ODNRI, 1989). The temperature during

89 rainy season is usually low (27°C) but increases to 31 °C in dry season. Relative  
90 humidity is 80% in rainy season which declines to 60% during the cold  
91 Harmattan periods and dry season of the year (ODNRI, 1989) being  
92 characteristics of tropical climate.

93 The soil is derived from sedimentary deposits from cretaceous and tertiary  
94 periods. According to Federal Department of Agricultural Land Resources  
95 (FDALR, 1985), Abakaliki agricultural zone lies within “Asu River” and is  
96 associated with Olive brown shale, fine grained sandstones and mudstone. It is  
97 unconsolidated within 1 m depth (Shale residuum) and belongs to the order  
98 ultisol classified as *typic haplustult*. The area was grown of short vegetation  
99 and medium to tall trees. There is also growth of native grasses, herbs and shrubs  
100 with patches of ground.

### 101 **Experimental Design and Treatment Application**

102 The experimental design used in this study was Completely  
103 Randomized Design (CRD). Human urine of male adult was collected from  
104 researchers immediate family while cattle and goat urine was sourced from  
105 Animal Farm of Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Resources  
106 Management, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki. The animals used were of  
107 matured age. The urine was stored in air-tight plastic containers for 6 months  
108 before application. This was to ensure proper fermentation of urine. Urine  
109 treatments used as fertilizer was based on a mean of 4.55 gN/liter content of  
110 urine (Table 1) as follows:

111 Human urine = 100 LNha<sup>-1</sup> (0.05 litre) equivalent to 100 kg Nha<sup>-1</sup>

112 Cattle urine = 100 LNha<sup>-1</sup> (0.05 litre) equivalent to 100 kg Nha<sup>-1</sup>

113 Goat urine = 100 LNha<sup>-1</sup> (0.05 litre) equivalent to 100 kg Nha<sup>-1</sup>

114 Control = 0 LNha<sup>-1</sup> (0 litre) equivalent to 0 kg Nha<sup>-1</sup>

115 The urine rates were applied to 5kg of soil weighed into pots two weeks  
 116 after germination of maize seeds. These treatments were replicated six times to  
 117 give a total of twenty four experimental pots in the experiment. The pots were  
 118 watered to field capacity as often as moisture is required.

119 The pots were separated by 0.5m spaces while replicates were set 1m apart.

### 120 **Planting of maize**

121 Maize variety (Oba super II hybrid) (*Zea mays* L.) collected from  
 122 Ebonyi State Agricultural Development Programme (EBADEP), Onu Ebonyi  
 123 Izzi, Abakaliki was used as a test crop. The maize seeds were planted at two  
 124 seeds per hole and at 5 cm depth in each pot. Two weeks after germination  
 125 (WAG), thinning was carried out to allow one plant per stand. Weeds were  
 126 removed by handpicking at regular intervals till harvest.

### 127 **Agronomic parameters**

128 A total of twelve tagged maize plants were used for study. When the  
 129 husks were dried, the cobs were harvested, dehusked, shelled and grain yield  
 130 adjusted to 14% moisture content. Plant height was measured with metric  
 131 ruler from the base of plant to tallest plant leaf at tasseling. Leaf area index  
 132 (LAI) was determined by the formular according to Nwite *et al.* (2014).

$$133 \quad LAI = \frac{\text{Leaf area (m}^2\text{)}}{\text{Ground cover (m}^2\text{)}} \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

### 135 **Soil Sampling**

136 Auger sampler was used to collect soil samples at 0-20 cm depth from  
 137 site where soil used for experiment was collected. The samples were bulked and  
 138 used for routine laboratory analysis. Samples were further collected from each  
 139 pot for post-harvest chemical properties determination.

### 140 **Laboratory methods**

141           The samples were dried, ground and passed through 2 mm sieve and used  
142 to determine soil properties. Particle size distribution of the experimental soil  
143 was determined using the Bouyoucous method as outlined in Gee and Or  
144 (2002) procedure. Soil pH determination was carried out in soil/water solution  
145 ratio of 1:2.5. The pH values were read off using pH meter with glass  
146 electrode (Peech, 1965). Total nitrogen was determined using Micro-kjeldahl  
147 procedure (Bremner, 1996). Available phosphorus determination was done  
148 using Bray-2 method as outlined in Page *et al.* (1982). Organic matter was  
149 determined by Walkley and Black (1934) digestion method. Exchangeable  
150 bases of calcium (Ca), Magnesium (Mg), Potassium (K), and Sodium (Na) were  
151 extracted using ammonium acetate (NH<sub>4</sub>OAC) extraction method. Potassium  
152 and sodium were determined using flame photometer. The elements  
153 concentrations in urine were determined by Atomic Absorption  
154 spectrophotometer as well as crop uptake copper (Cu) lead (Pb) using Dewis  
155 and Freitas (1976) procedure.

156

### 157 **Data analysis**

158           Data collected from the experiment were subjected to Analysis of  
159 Variance (ANOVA). Means were separated using Fishers' Least Significant  
160 Difference (FLSD) as outlined in Steel and Torrie (1980). Significance was  
161 reported at 5% probability level.

162

163

164

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION****165 Composition of Urine**

166 Table 1 shows proximate analysis of different urine sources used as  
 167 fertilizer treatment. The urine compositions slightly varied from each other.  
 168 Human urine had the highest values of pH, total solids, urea, total nitrogen,  
 169 potassium and sodium (g/litre) compared to cattle and goat urine, respectively,  
 170 although comparable. Cattle and goat urine contained 0.10 (g/litre) each of  
 171 copper (Cu) and lead (Pb) but was not found in human urine. The comparable  
 172 composition of elemental concentrations in animal urine could be attributed to  
 173 their adult age, omnivorous nature as well as similarity in their dietary needs.

174

**175 Table 1.** Proximate Analysis of Urine

176 <b>Parameter</b>	<b>Human urine</b>	<b>Cattle urine</b>	<b>Goat urine</b>
177 pH	9.2	9.1	9.0
178 Total solids (g/litre)	32	30	29
179 Urea (g/litre)	0.46	0.44	0.42
180 Ammonia (g/litre)	0.02	0.02	0.02
181 Total nitrogen (g/litre)	4.56	4.55	4.53
182 Phosphorus (g/litre)	0.04	0.04	0.03
183 Potassium (g/litre)	0.05	0.03	0.03
184 Sodium (g/litre)	0.30	0.29	0.29
185 Chloride (g/litre)	0.25	0.26	0.24
186 Copper (g/litre)	-	0.10	-
187 Lead (g/litre)	-	-	0.10

188

189 **Properties of Soil before initiation of study**

190 Table 2 shows physicochemical properties of soil before initiation of  
 191 study. Sand fraction was dominant in the particle size distribution. The  
 192 textural class was sandy loam. The pH was 5.0 indicating that soil condition  
 193 was strongly acidic (Landon, 1991). Total nitrogen was 0.13% and rated very  
 194 low (Enwezor *et al.*, 1981) while organic matter with 2.2% value was  
 195 moderate according to Benchmark set by Federal Ministry of Agriculture and  
 196 Water Resources Development (2002) for Nigerian soils. Available  
 197 phosphorus (20.40 mgkg<sup>-1</sup>) was high (Enwezor *et al.*, 1989). Exchangeable  
 198 calcium was of medium value (Asadu and Nweke, 1999) but magnesium,  
 199 potassium and sodium were very low as recommended by Asadu and Nweke  
 200 (1999) for arable soils of Nigeria. Exchangeable calcium and magnesium  
 201 dominated the exchange complex of soil. Cation exchange capacity was very  
 202 low (Asadu and Nweke, 1999).

203 This shows that the soil used for the experiment was low in fertility,  
 204 degraded and simulates most soils in Abakaliki agroecology used for maize  
 205 crop production as well as other crops.

206

207 **Table 2.** Properties of soil before initiation of study

208 <b>Soil properties</b>	<b>Values</b>
209 Sand (gkg <sup>-1</sup> )	750
210 Silt (gkg <sup>-1</sup> )	140
211 Clay (gkg <sup>-1</sup> )	110
212 Texture class	Sandy Loam
213 pH (H <sub>2</sub> O)	5.0
214 Total Nitrogen (%)	0.13
215 Organic matter (%)	2.2



216	Available phosphorus (mgkg <sup>-1</sup> )	20.40
217	Calcium (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )	3.10
218	Magnesium (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )	0.92
219	Potassium (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )	0.17
220	Sodium (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )	0.10
221	Cation exchange capacity (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )	7.50

---

### 222 **Effect of Urine Sources on Some Soil Health Indicators**

223 Effect of urine sources on some soil health indicators is shown in Table 3.  
 224 Urine sources had significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) higher treatment effect on pH when  
 225 compared with the control. Human source of urine had significantly ( $P<0.05$ )  
 226 higher pH than those of cattle and goat urine sources, respectively. On the other  
 227 hand, human urine was 5 and 6% higher in pH than the urine from cattle and  
 228 goat. Similarly, significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) higher treatment effect was obtained in  
 229 percent total nitrogen in human and cattle sources of urine relative to control.  
 230 Furthermore, human urine showed significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) higher treatment effect  
 231 on percent total nitrogen compared to those of cattle and goat sources of urine.  
 232 Available phosphorus obtained in different urine sources slightly varied from  
 233 that of the control. The available phosphorus of human source of urine was 14%  
 234 higher than control and generally marginally higher than those of cattle and goat  
 235 sources of urine. There was significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) higher treatment effect of  
 236 urine sources on percent organic matter relative to control. Urine obtained from  
 237 human and goat was significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) higher in percent organic matter than  
 238 the one from cattle. This represents 21 and 14% increments in percent organic  
 239 matter in human and goat sources of urine compared to that of cattle source.

240 The significant increments of pH, percent nitrogen, organic matter and  
 241 improvement of available phosphorus show that these soil health indicators

242 were released into the soil by urine sources. This finding indicates that urine  
243 could substitute mineral inorganic fertilizer as it could be used as fertilizer to  
244 supply essential and major nutrients to soil on one land and on the other  
245 improve soil health status.

246         These findings are in line with the report of Adeoluwa and Sulaiman  
247 (2012) that urine treatment improved soil fertility. Improvement in percent soil  
248 total nitrogen was particularly reported by Gutser *et al.* (2005) and Schonning  
249 (2001) that urine had short term nitrogen release efficiency. This was further  
250 corroborated by Adeoluwa and Cofie (2012) that urine treatment improved  
251 fertility and general conditions of soil. The general significant increase of all  
252 soil health indicators except available phosphorus of urine sources and superior  
253 performance of human urine treatment indicates that urine sources have great  
254 potential as alternative fertilizer and more potential than other urine sources for  
255 soil treatment. This observation is supported by the report of Benge (2006) and  
256 supported by Adeoluwa and Sulaiman (2012) that human urine was a useful  
257 fertilizer that improved soil fertility and productivity. This by extension  
258 suggests that indeed, urine sources and particularly human urine could serve as  
259 useful alternative fertilizer for crop production.

260         The positive impacts of the urine fertilizer on soil health indicators  
261 indicate an improvement on the soil health status. The human urine source  
262 improved the soil pH keeping it within a safe range of 5.6-6.0 percent, nitrogen  
263 and organic matter at significant levels than other sources. Peverly and Gates  
264 (1973) stated that organic fertilizers perform better with some crops. This is  
265 further supported by Adeoluwa and Cofie (2012) findings that urine fertilizer  
266 improved some health indicators.

267

268

269 **Table 3.** Effect of urine sources on some soil health indicators

270	<b>Treatment</b>	<b>pH (H<sub>2</sub>O)</b>	<b>Total N(%)</b>	<b>P(mgkg<sup>-1</sup>)</b>	<b>OM(%)</b>
271	Control	5.1	0.10	25.60	1.05
272	Human urine	6.0	0.14	29.65	1.76
273	Cattle urine	5.7	0.12	28.24	1.40
274	Goat urine	5.6	0.11	28.30	1.62
275	FLSD(0.05)	0.1	0.02	NS	0.05

276 P – Available phosphorus, OM(%) – Percent organic matter, N(%)–Percent  
 277 Total nitrogen.

278

### 279 **Effect of Urine Sources on Agronomic Yield of Maize**

280 Table 4 shows effect of urine sources on agronomic yield of maize. Urine  
 281 sources had higher number of leaves, plant height, taller maize plants and larger  
 282 leaf area when compared with the control, respectively. Human urine source  
 283 was 9-10%, 15%-27%, 10-47% and 6-5% higher in these maize agronomic yield  
 284 than those of cattle and goat urine sources. The effect of urine sources not  
 285 having any significant effect on agronomic parameters of maize could be linked  
 286 to inherent capability of the maize plant to thrive in degraded soil (Benge,  
 287 2006). It could also be due to release of comparable amounts of nutrients; thus,  
 288 they were practically the same in terms of producing relatively equal maize  
 289 agronomic parameters. The generally higher agronomic yield of maize in urine  
 290 sources relative to control could be attributed to improved soil health status by  
 291 urine treatment. This showed that urine applied as fertilizer could increase  
 292 agronomic yield of maize as well as useful fertilizer alternative for maize crops  
 293 production. The superior performance of human urine source relative to other  
 294 sources of urine in increasing agronomic yield of maize was due to its inherent  
 295 high nutrients (Table 1) in first place and its ability to release same into the soil

296 indicating its great potential as an alternative fertilizer for crop production.  
 297 Bengé (2006) had earlier reported the possibility of improved performance of  
 298 *Jathropa* with improved soil fertility resulting from human urine application.  
 299 This result was corroborated by researchers (Adeoluwa and Sulaiman, 2012)  
 300 that improvement in weights of *Jathropa* plants suggested that human urine  
 301 could be useful fertilizer alternative for some crops.

302 **Table 4.** Effect of urine sources on agronomic yield of maize

303	<b>Treatment</b>	<b>No of leaf</b>	<b>Plant height (cm)</b>	<b>Grain yield (g/pot)</b>	<b>LAI</b>
304	Control	11.2	58.12	2.0	0.60
305	Human urines	13.4	85.08	4.2	0.66
306	Cattle urine	12.2	72.14	3.8	0.62
307	Goat urine	12.0	61.98	2.2	0.63
308	FLSD (0.05)	NS	NS	NS	NS
309	LAI – Leaf area index.				

#### 310 **Effect of Urine Sources on Heavy Metals Uptake by Maize Grains**

311 Effect of urine sources on heavy metals uptake by maize grains is shown  
 312 in Table 5. The result showed significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) higher effect of copper  
 313 uptake by maize grains in control compared to urine sources of human, cattle  
 314 and goat. This accounted for 20, 80 and 37% increments of copper uptake in  
 315 maize grains in control respectively when compared to human, cattle and goat  
 316 sources of urine. Lead uptake by maize grains was 87, 47 and 7% higher in  
 317 control relative to human, cattle and goat sources of urine.

318 The significantly higher copper uptake by maize grains grown in control  
 319 plot compared to those grown in urine sources treated plots could be attributed  
 320 to inputs from soil rather than urine fertilizer. Analysis of urine sources

321 indicated very low presence of copper and lead (Table 1). The same trend of  
 322 higher Cu uptake by maize grains was shown by control in Pb uptake by maize  
 323 grains compared to those obtained under urine sources treatment. These findings  
 324 show that urine could be used as fertilizer for crop production without placing  
 325 man at a risk of ecotoxicity of heavy metals. This finding could be attributed to  
 326 improved health status of soil (Table 3) and low presence of heavy metals in  
 327 urine sources. The likelihood of heavy metals to build up in soil amended with  
 328 urine fertilizer appears to be higher in soils treated with goat and cattle urine  
 329 than human urine. Adewole *et al.* (2008) reported heavy metal uptake by crops  
 330 in their work and noted that these heavy metals were stored in crop parts.  
 331 Anikwe and Nwobodo (2002) and corroborated by Asadu *et al.* (2008) in their  
 332 findings observed that human beings were at risk of heavy metals toxicity if  
 333 they could utilize crops grown around areas contaminated with heavy metals  
 334 due to eco-toxicity. This could be possible through recycling of heavy metals  
 335 through food chain. Heavy metal of lead has the capacity to cause brain, renal or  
 336 reproductive disorders in human beings. The heavy metals of copper and lead  
 337 are below 0.0-2.0 and 0.01 rated as medium to low (LASEPA, 2005) values and  
 338 far below 0.0-5.0 (WHO, 1996) or 2-1500 and 2-300 recommended as normal  
 339 by Alloway (1990). However, the interesting result is that heavy metal uptake  
 340 by maize grains could not be linked to urine treatment of soil.

341  
 342 **Table 5.** Effect of urine sources on heavy metals uptake by maize grains

Treatment	$\longrightarrow$ mgkg <sup>-1</sup> $\longleftarrow$	
	Cu	Pb
Control	0.30	0.30
Human urine	0.04	0.04
Cattle urine	0.24	0.16
Goat urine	0.06	0.28

349 FLSD (0.05) 0.05 NS

---

350

### 351 **Conclusion**

352 This study has shown that urine sources could improve soil health status  
353 and serve as useful alternative fertilizer for maize crop production. Urine  
354 sources significantly improved soil health indicators. Agronomic parameters  
355 responded positively to improved soil health status and performed better in  
356 urine sources than control. Perhaps, the greatest beneficial aspect of use of urine  
357 as fertilizer is low input of heavy metals which keep them below safe limits and  
358 without any danger of eco-toxicity. In view of its superior performance over  
359 other urine sources, human urine could be harvested for treatment of soil for  
360 higher productivity rather than be allowed to be wasted through improper  
361 disposal.

362

### **References**

363 Adeluwa, O. O. and Cofie, O. (2012). Urine as an alternative fertilizer in  
364 Agriculture: Effects in Amaranths (*Amaranthus caudatus*) Production.  
365 Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems 8:1. doi:  
366 10.1017/51742170511000512.

367 Adeluwa, O. O. and Suleiman, O. N. (2012). Effect of human urine on the growth  
368 of performances of *Jathropa curcas* seedlings and some soil health indices.  
369 Nigerian Journal of Soil Science 22 (2):186-193.

370 Adewole, M.B. Adeoye, G.O. and Sridhar, M.K.C. (2008). Effect of inorganic  
371 and organo mineral fertilizers on the uptake of selected heavy metals by  
372 *Helianthus annus L* and *Tithornia diversifolia* (Hems h) under green house  
373 condition. Toxicological and Environ. Chemistry 91(5): 970-980.

374 Alloway, B. J. (1990). Heavy metals on soils. New York: John Wiley and Sons,  
375 Inc 280p.

- 376 Anikwe, M.A.N. and Nwobodo, K. C. A. (2002). Long-term effect of municipal  
377 wastes disposal on soil properties and productivity in sites used for urban  
378 agriculture in Abakaliki, Nigeria. *Bio-resources Technology* 83:24-50.
- 379 Asadu, C. L. A. and Nweke, F. I. (1999). Soils of arable crop fields in sub-Sahara  
380 Africa: Focus on cassava growing areas, collaborative study of cassava in  
381 Africa. Working Paper No. 18. Resources and Crop -Management Division,  
382 IITA, Ibadan, Nigeria. 1782p.
- 383 Benge, M. (2006). Assessment of the potential of *Jathropha curcas*, (*biodiesel*) for  
384 the energy production and other uses in developing countries. Posted on EC  
385 Ho's website with permission of the author. July 2006 and updated August  
386 2006. 2: 22. [http://www.ascension-. publishing.com/B/Z/Jathropha](http://www.ascension-publishing.com/B/Z/Jathropha). Pdf  
387 download on January 9, 2012.
- 388 Bremner, J. M. (1996). Nitrogen-Total. *In*: Sparks, D. L. (ed). *Methods of Soil*  
389 *Analysis. Chemical Methods. American Society of Agronomy* 5(3):1085-  
390 1121.
- 391 Dewis, J. and Freitas, F. (1976). *Physical and Chemical Methods of Soil and Water*  
392 *Analysis. Soil Bulletin 18, FAO, UN, Rome.*
- 393 Enwezor, W. O., Udo, E. J., Usoroh, N. J. Ayoade, K. A., Adepetu, J. A., Chude,  
394 V. O. and Udegbe, C. J. (1989). *Fertilizer Use and Management Practices for*  
395 *Crops in Nigeria, Series No 2. Fertilizer Procurement and Distribution*  
396 *Division, Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Water Resources and Rural*  
397 *Development, Lagos, Nigeria.*
- 398 Enwezor, W.O., Udo, F. J. and Sobulo, R.A. (1981). Fertility status and  
399 productivity of acid sands: *In: Acid sands of Southeastern Nigeria. Soil*  
400 *Science Society of Nigeria.* 1: 56-73.
- 401 Federal Department of Agricultural Land Resources (FDALR) (1985).  
402 Reconnaissance Soil Survey of Anambra State, Nigeria. Soil Report, Kaduna.  
403 3p.
- 404 Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (FMARD) (2002).  
405 *Fertilizer Use and Management Practice for Crops in Nigeria. Produced by the*  
406 *Federal Fertilizer Department. In: Aduayi, E. A., Chude, V. O. Adebusuyi, B.*  
407 *A. and Olayiwola, S. O. (eds), Abuja 2002. 188p.*

- 408 Gee, G. W. and Or, D. (2002). Particle Size Analysis. *In*: Dane. J. H. and Topp, G.  
409 C. (eds). *Methods of Soil Analysis. Physical Methods*. Soil Science Society  
410 America. 5(4):255-293.
- 411 Gutser, R., Ebertseder, T., Weber, A., Schrami, M. and Schmmidhlter, U. (2005).  
412 Short-term and residual availability of nitrogen after long-time application of  
413 organic fertilizers on arable land. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*  
414 168:439-446.
- 415 Heinonen-Tanski, and Van Wijk-Sibesma, C. (2005). Human excreta for plant  
416 production. *Bioresource Technology* 96:403-411.
- 417 Hoglung, C. (2001). Evaluation of microbial health risks associated with the reuse  
418 of source-separated human urine. Royal Institute of Technology (KTH).  
419 Department of Biotechnology, Applied Microbiology, Stokholm Sweden. 43:  
420 62-64.
- 421 Kirchmann, H. and Peterson, S. (1995). Human urine-chemical composition  
422 and fertilizer use efficiency. *Fertilizer Resources* 40:149-154.
- 423 Lagos State Environmental Protection Agency (LASEPA, 2005). Lagos State  
424 Environmental Reports 3: 28-33.
- 425 Landon, J. R. (eds) (1991). Booker, *Tropical Soil Manual. A hand book for*  
426 *Soil Survey and Agricultural Land Evaluation in Tropics and Subtropics*  
427 New York, USA, John Wiley and Sons: Inc. Third Avenue.
- 428 Malkki, S. and Heinonen-Tanski, (1999). Composition of toilets in permanent  
429 houses. *In*: 1 Use of municipal organic wastes. *Proceedings of Nigerian*  
430 *Journal of Forestry Seminar* 292 DIAS-report. 13: 147-154.
- 431 Marino, C. (2008). Urine composition depends on certain factors. *Journal of*  
432 *Soil Science Society of America*. 73:159-219.
- 433 Nwite, J. N. (2013). Evaluation of the productivity of a spent Automobile oil  
434 contaminated soil amended with organic wastes in Abakaliki, Southeastern  
435 Nigeria. Ph.D Thesis, University of Nigeria, Nsukka 130p.
- 436 Nwite, J. N., Okolo, C. C., Ezeaku, P. I. and Enyioko, C. (2014). Effect of  
437 Integrated Nutrient Management on Soil Chemical properties and maize  
438 yield on a sandy loam in Abakaliki, Nigeria. *International Journal of*  
439 *Agriculture and Biosciences* 3(6):278-282.



- 440 Overseas Development of Natural Resources Institute (ODNR) (1989). Nigeria  
441 Profile of Agricultural Potential ODA, United Kingdom. 3p.
- 442 Page, A. L., Miller, R. H. and Keeney, D. R. (1982). Methods of Soil  
443 Analysis. American Society of Agronomy 9:539-579.
- 444 Peech, M. (1965). Hydrogen activity. Methods of Soil Analysis. *In*: Black CA  
445 (ed). American Society of Agronomy 9(1):914-926.
- 446 Perverly, J.H. and Gates, P.B. (1993). Utilization of municipal solid waste and  
447 sludge compost in crop production systems. *In*: Sewage sludge, Land  
448 utilization and the Environment. Proceedings of a conference by American  
449 Society of Agronomy.
- 450 Richert Stintzing, A., Rodhe, L., Akerhieln, H. and Stenieck, S. (2002).  
451 Human urine as a fertilizer and plant nutrients application technique and  
452 environmental effects. *In*: Venglosk, J., Greserova, G. (eds). Proceedings  
453 of 10 International Conference Ramiran 2002 Network. FAO European  
454 System of Cooperative Research Network 161-162 Pp.
- 455 Schonning, C. (2001). Urine diversion-hygienic risks and microbial guidelines  
456 for reuse. Department of Parasitology, Mycology and Environmental  
457 Microbiology. Swedish Institute for Infections.
- 458 Steel, G. D. and Torrie J. H. (1980). Procedures of statistics. A biometrical  
459 approach, 2nd ed. New York, McGraw Hill, Book Company 63p.
- 460 Steineck, S., Richert Stintzing, A., Rodhe, L., Elinquist, H. and Jakobssom,  
461 M. C. (1999). Plant nutrients in human and food refuse. *In*: Proceedings  
462 of Nigerian Journal of Forestry Seminar 292. DIAS report. 13:125-130.
- 463 Walkey, A. and Black, A. (1934). An examination of the Degtjareff method for  
464 determining soil organic matter and a proposed modification of the chronic  
465 acid titration method. Soil Science 37:29-38.
- 466 World Health Organization (WHO, 1996). Guideline for drinking quality water.  
467 Switzerland 1(2&3):50-57.