

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

## Abstract:

The need to find alternative to inorganic fertilizer which is costly and not easily affordable to local farmers necessitates research in rare areas. Thus, this experiment was carried out at the Plant and Screen house to study effect of urine sources on some soil health indicators, maize yield and its heavy metals uptake. Completely Randomized Design was used in laying the experiment. 20kg of sieved soil was treated with different urine sources replicated five times. The result indicates that soil pH, total N and organic matter were significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) higher in different urine sources than control. Human urine had significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) higher treatment effect on soil pH, percent total N and organic matter compared to other sources of urine. Similarly, human urine was 9-10%, 15-27%, 10-47% and 6-5% higher in number of leaves, plant height, grain yield and leaf area index when compared to those of cattle and goat urine sources. Significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) higher copper uptake by maize grains was obtained in control relative to those of urine sources. Copper and lead uptake by maize grains were respectively higher by 20, 80, 87% and 87, 47, 7% in control when compared to human, cattle and goat urine sources. Generally, heavy metals uptake by maize grains is below recommended safe limits for toxicity. Urine from adult animals is recommended as credible alternative for improvement of soil health status and sustainable productivity.

**Key words:** effect, heavy metals uptake, indicators, maize yield, soil health, urine sources.

## INTRODUCTION

Traditional agriculture relies heavily on mineral fertilizer NPK for crop production in Nigeria and other developing countries (Nwite, 2015) and incidentally, use of fertilizer is confronted with problems of unavailability, high cost and increase in soil acidity. As a result, use of fertilizer is considered to be counterproductive and there is need for its alternative source. This alternative source is urine since it is easily affordable as it could be accessed from livestock and man. It has been reported by Adeoluwa and Sulaiman, (2002) that urine contains useful nutrients which if carefully harnessed could sustain soil health status and increase its

36 productivity. Well preserved urine has good quality and could have the same effect  
37 as inorganic fertilizer in optimizing soil fertility **status** (Nwite, 2015). Research  
38 shows that urine contains major nutrients including nitrogen, phosphorus,  
39 potassium as well as calcium and magnesium which is dependent on age and feed  
40 of the animals (Marino, 2008).

41 When there is no planned disposal of urine it naturally constitutes health hazard  
42 due to its pungent odour which could be curtailed through its proper treatment and  
43 conversion in treating soil for higher productivity (Nwite, 2015). This offensive  
44 odour is attributed to freshly accumulated urine at pH of 6.7 (Hoglung, 2001).  
45 Researchers (Heinonen Tanski and Van Wijk-Sibesma, 2005; Kichman and  
46 Peterson, 1995; Steineck *et al.*, 1999; Richert *et al.*, 2002; Malkki and Heinonen-  
47 Tanski, 1999) have shown that human urine source was successfully used as  
48 fertilizer in crop production and raising flowers in Europe and other countries.  
49 Confirmatory studies have been carried out using Barley and under crop and field  
50 trials or even under home gardening (Richert *et al.*, 2002).

51 With the wide spread scarcity of inorganic fertilizer and its associated problems in  
52 food production, there is need for alternative source. If appropriate quantity of  
53 urine is applied to the soil at right time, its nitrogen contents could have the same  
54 value as that of inorganic fertilizer (Adeoluwa and Sulaiman, 2012). For instance,  
55 100kg N per hectare of urine improved Barley production between 90 – 110 days  
56 of planting in Sweden (Richert *et al.*, 2002).

57 Naturally, human being could not easily accept food crops produced with urine due  
58 to suspicion of its health hazard status and safe for consumption. This, **however**,  
59 could be overcome by treating urine for quality assurance and safe from health  
60 hazards (Nwite, 2015). In Nigeria food crops that grow around urinals or where  
61 urine is disposed are normally eaten by human beings and animals without any  
62 complaints of health problems. The objective of this experiment was to study effect

63 of urine sources on some soil health indicators, maize yield and its heavy metals  
64 uptake under Abakaliki agroecological environment.

65  
66

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 67 **Experimental site**

68 The research was conducted in 2014 at Plant and Screen House of Teaching  
69 and Research Farm, Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Resources  
70 Management, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki. The area is located **between**  
71 **latitude (06° 4'N and 08° 65'E) in the South-Eastern** zone of Nigeria. The area  
72 experiences bimodal pattern of rainfall which is spread from April-July and  
73 September-November of each year. There is a break in August normally referred  
74 by residents as “August break”. At the beginning of rainfall, it is torrential  
75 and violent and is characterized by thunderstorm and **lightning**. The  
76 minimum and maximum rainfalls are 1700 and 2000 mm with a mean of 1800  
77 mm (ODNRI, 1989). The temperature during rainy season is usually low (27°C)  
78 but increases to 31 °C in dry season. Relative humidity is 80% in rainy season  
79 which declines to 60% during the cold Harmattan periods and dry season of  
80 the year (ODNRI, 1989) being characteristics of tropical climate.

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

89

## 90 **Experimental Design and Treatment Application**

91 The experimental design used in this study was Completely  
92 Randomized Design (CRD). Human urine of male adult was collected from  
93 **prison inmates** while cattle and goat urine was sourced from **Cattle and**  
94 **Goats' market located at Gariki and Hossana, Abakaliki** respectively. **This**  
95 **was to reduce the time needed to collect enough quantity of urine for the**  
96 **study. Plastic containers of 5litres each were provided to both prison and**  
97 **Animal attendance for the purpose of collection of urine.** The animals used  
98 were of matured age. **The choice of these animals was based on ease of**  
99 **accessibility since every farming family in the locality can afford to keep them.**  
100 **These animals too are omnivorous and have common feeding habit at adult age.**  
101 The urine was stored in air-tight plastic containers for 6 months before  
102 application **to ensure sanitation process.** **The urine treatments were based on**  
103 **hectare equivalence of 20kg soil.**

104 **Human urine = 50,000 mg $ha^{-1}$  equivalent to 100 mg $kg^{-1}$  soil**

105 **Cattle urine = 50000 mg $ha^{-1}$  equivalent to 100 mg $kg^{-1}$  soil**

106 **Goat urine = 50000 mg $ha^{-1}$  equivalent to 100 mg $kg^{-1}$  soil**

107 **Control = 0 mg $ha^{-1}$  equivalent to 0 mg $kg^{-1}$  soil**

108 The urine rates were applied to **20kg** of soil weighed into **perforated**  
109 **polybags** two weeks after germination of maize seeds. These treatments were  
110 replicated six times to give a total of twenty four experimental **polybags** in the  
111 experiment. The **polybags** were watered to field capacity as often as moisture is  
112 required. The **polybags** were separated by 0.5m spaces while replicates were set  
113 1m apart.

## 114 **Planting of maize**

115 Maize variety (Oba super II hybrid) (*Zea mays* L.) collected from  
116 Ebonyi State Agricultural Development Programme (EBADEP), Onu Ebonyi

117 Izzi, Abakaliki was used as a test crop. The maize seeds were planted at two  
118 seeds per hole and at 5 cm depth in each pot. Two weeks after germination  
119 (WAG), thinning was carried out to allow one plant per stand. Weeds were  
120 removed by handpicking at regular intervals till harvest.

### 121 **Agronomic parameters**

122 A total of ten maize plants were randomly selected and tagged for  
123 study. When the husks were dried, the cobs were harvested, dehusked,  
124 shelled and grain yield adjusted to 14% moisture content. Plant height was  
125 measured with metric ruler from the base of plant to tallest plant leaf at  
126 tasseling.

### 127 **Soil Sampling**

128 Auger sampler was used to collect soil samples at 0-20 cm depth from  
129 site where soil used for experiment was collected. The samples were bulked, air  
130 dried and passed through 2mm sieve and used for routine laboratory analysis.  
131 Samples were further collected from each polybag for some post-harvest  
132 chemical properties determination.

133

### 134 **Laboratory methods**

135 Particle size distribution of the experimental soil was determined using  
136 the Bouyoucous method as outlined in Gee and Or (2002) procedure. Soil pH  
137 determination was carried out in soil/water solution ratio of 1:2.5. The pH values  
138 were read off using pH meter with glass electrode (Peech, 1965). Total  
139 nitrogen was determined using Micro-kjeldahl procedure (Bremner, 1996).  
140 Available phosphorus determination was done using Bray-2 method as outlined  
141 in Page *et al.* (1982). Organic matter was determined by Walkley and Black  
142 (1934) digestion method. Exchangeable bases of calcium (Ca), Magnesium  
143 (Mg), Potassium (K), and Sodium (Na) were extracted using ammonium acetate

144 (NH<sub>4</sub>OAC) extraction method. Potassium and sodium were determined using  
145 flame photometer. The compositions of urine were determined by Atomic  
146 Absorption spectrophotometer as well as crop uptake copper (Cu) lead (Pb)  
147 using Dewis and Freitas (1976) procedure.

148

#### 149 **Data analysis**

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

154

155

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Composition of Urine

Table 1 shows some major nutrients and heavy metals composition of urine source. There were variations in values of nutrients and heavy metals in urine source. Nevertheless, human urine have highest values of nutrients when compared to livestock sources although, comparable. Cattle and goat urine contained 0.10  $\text{mgkg}^{-1}$  each of copper (Cu) and lead (Pb) but was not found in human urine. The comparable composition of elemental concentrations in animal urine could be attributed to their adult age, omnivorous nature as well as similarity in their dietary needs.

**Table 1.** Compositions of some major nutrients and heavy metals in urine sources

Parameter	Human urine	Cattle urine	Goat urine
pH $\text{H}_2\text{O}$	9.1	9.0	8.9
Ammonia $\text{mgkg}^{-1}$	0.01	0.01	0.01
Nitrogen %	4.54	4.52	4.51
Phosphorus $\text{mgkg}^{-1}$	0.04	0.03	0.02
Potassium $\text{cmol/kg}^{-1}$	0.05	0.03	0.03
Sodium $\text{cmol/kg}^{-1}$	0.29	0.28	0.28
Copper $\text{mgkg}^{-1}$	-	0.10	-
Lead $\text{mgkg}^{-1}$	-	-	0.10

179 **Properties of Soil before initiation of study**

180 Table 2 shows physicochemical properties of soil before initiation of study.  
181 Sand fraction was dominant in the particle size distribution. The textural  
182 class was sandy loam. The pH was 5.0 which indicates strongly acidic soil  
183 (Landon, 1991). Nitrogen was 0.13% and according to Enwezor *et al.* (1981)  
184 is very low and organic matter which had 2.2% value was moderate using  
185 Benchmark of FMAWRD (2002) for Tropical soils. Phosphorus (20.40  
186 mgkg<sup>-1</sup>) was high (Enwezor *et al.*, 1989). Exchangeable calcium was of  
187 medium value but magnesium, potassium and sodium were very low (Asadu  
188 and Nweke (1999). Cation exchange capacity recorded very low values  
189 (Asadu and Nweke, 1999). It implies that the soil was of low fertility status  
190 as obtained in Abakaliki areas for soils used for maize production as well as  
191 other crops.

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

193 <b>Soil properties</b>	193 <b>Values</b>
194 Sand gkg <sup>-1</sup>	750
195 Silt gkg <sup>-1</sup>	140
196 Clay gkg <sup>-1</sup>	110
197 Texture class	Sandy Loam
198 pH H <sub>2</sub> O	5.0
199 Total Nitrogen %	0.13
200 Organic matter %	2.2
201 Available phosphorus mgkg <sup>-1</sup>	20.40
202 Calcium cmol kg <sup>-1</sup>	3.10
203 Magnesium cmol kg <sup>-1</sup>	0.92
204 Potassium cmol kg <sup>-1</sup>	0.17
205 Sodium cmol kg <sup>-1</sup>	0.10
206 Cation exchange capacity cmol kg <sup>-1</sup>	7.50

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

208 Effect of urine sources on some soil health indicators is shown in Table 3. **Soil**  
209 **health indicators are used in this study to indicate parameters that are**  
210 **determinant of soil fertility status.** Urine sources had significantly ( $P<0.05$ )  
211 higher treatment effect on pH when compared with the control. Human source  
212 of urine had significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) higher pH than those of cattle and goat urine  
213 sources, respectively. On the other hand, human urine was 5 and 6% higher in  
214 pH than the urine from cattle and goat. Similarly, significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) higher  
215 treatment effect was obtained in percent total nitrogen in human and cattle  
216 sources of urine relative to control. Furthermore, human urine showed  
217 significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) higher treatment effect on percent total nitrogen  
218 compared to those of cattle and goat sources of urine. Available phosphorus  
219 obtained in different urine sources slightly varied from that of the control. The  
220 available phosphorus of human source of urine was 14% higher than control and  
221 generally marginally higher than those of cattle and goat sources of urine. There  
222 was significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) higher treatment effect of urine sources on percent  
223 organic matter relative to control. Urine obtained from human and goat was  
224 significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) higher in percent organic matter than the one from cattle.  
225 This represents 21 and 14% increments in percent organic matter in human and  
226 goat sources of urine compared to that of cattle source.

227 The significant increments of pH, percent nitrogen, organic matter and  
228 improvement of available phosphorus show that these soil health indicators  
229 were released into the soil by urine sources. This finding indicates that urine  
230 could substitute mineral inorganic fertilizer as it could be used as fertilizer to  
231 supply essential and major nutrients to soil on one land and on the other  
232 improve soil health status. These findings are in line with the report of  
233 Adeoluwa and Sulaiman (2012) that urine used as fertilizer improved soil health

234 status. Several researchers (Gutser *et al.*, 2005; Schonning, 2001; Adeoluwa and  
 235 Cofie, 2012) reported positive impact of urine on nitrogen which increased and  
 236 sustained soil fertility. Higher significant positive effect of human urine source  
 237 on soil health indicators suggests that it could be more superior to other urine  
 238 sources in improving soil health indicators (Nwite, 2015). This finding had  
 239 earlier been reported by Benge, (2006) and Adeoluwa and Sulaiman (2012).  
 240 This implies that urine sources especially human urine could serve as useful  
 241 alternative fertilizer for crop production.

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

249

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

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

257 P – Available phosphorus, OM % – Percent organic matter, N % -Percent Total  
 258 nitrogen. Treatment means with different letters indicate significant differences  
 259 (P<0.05).

260

261

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

263 Table 4 shows effect of urine sources on agronomic yield of maize. Urine  
264 sources had higher number of leaves, plant height **and** taller maize plants when  
265 compared with the control, respectively. Human urine source was 9-10%, 15%-  
266 27%, **and** 10-47% higher in these maize agronomic **yields** than those of cattle  
267 and goat urine sources. The effect of urine sources not having any significant  
268 effect on agronomic parameters of maize could be linked to inherent capability  
269 of the maize plant (Benge, 2006). Results in Table 1 did not show much  
270 variations on nutrients compositions and this could have influenced maize  
271 agronomic parameters. The generally higher agronomic yield of maize in urine  
272 sources relative to control could be attributed to improved soil health status by  
273 urine treatment. This by implication underscores the usefulness of urine as  
274 credible of alternative to inorganic fertilizer for sustenance of soil fertility status  
275 and in increased maize production that is safe for human consumption. Human  
276 urine increased agronomic yield of maize due to its high nutrients (Table 1) and  
277 its ability to release same into the soil. Benge (2006) and Adeoluwa and  
278 Sulaiman (2012) pointed out that human urine increased soil fertility and  
279 *Jathropha* production.

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

281 <b>Treatment</b>	<b>No of leaf</b>	<b>Plant height (cm)</b>	<b>Grain yield (g/pot)</b>
282 Control	11.2	58.12	2.0
283 <b>Human urine</b>	13.4	85.08	4.2
284 Cattle urine	12.2	72.14	3.8
285 Goat urine	12.0	61.98	2.2
286 FLSD (0.05)	NS	NS	NS

287 LAI – Leaf area index.

288  
289  
290

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

292 Effect of urine sources on heavy metals uptake by maize grains is shown  
293 in Table 5. The result showed significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) higher effect of copper  
294 uptake by maize grains in control compared to urine sources of human, cattle  
295 and goat. This accounted for 20, 80 and 37% increments of copper uptake in  
296 maize grains in control respectively when compared to human, cattle and goat  
297 sources of urine. Lead uptake by maize grains was 87, 47 and 7% higher in  
298 control relative to human, cattle and goat sources of urine.

299 The significantly higher copper uptake by maize grains grown in control plot  
300 compared to those grown in urine sources treated plots could be attributed to  
301 inputs from soil rather than urine fertilizer. Analysis of urine sources indicated  
302 very low presence of copper and lead (Table 1). The same trend of higher Cu  
303 uptake by maize grains was shown by control in Pb uptake by maize grains  
304 compared to those obtained under urine sources treatment. These findings show  
305 that urine could be used as fertilizer for crop production without placing man at  
306 a risk of ecotoxicity of heavy metals. This finding could be attributed to  
307 improved health status of soil (Table 3) and low presence of heavy metals in  
308 urine sources. The likelihood of heavy metals to build up in soil amended with  
309 urine fertilizer appears to be higher in soils treated with goat and cattle urine  
310 than human urine. Adewole *et al.* (2008) reported heavy metal uptake by crops  
311 in their work and noted that these heavy metals were stored in crop parts.  
312 Anikwe and Nwobodo (2002) and corroborated by Asadu *et al.* (2008) in their  
313 findings observed that human beings were at risk of heavy metals toxicity if  
314 they could utilize crops grown around areas contaminated with heavy metals  
315 due to eco-toxicity. This could be possible through recycling of heavy metals  
316 through food chain. Heavy metal of lead has the capacity to cause brain, renal or  
317 reproductive disorders in human beings. The heavy metals of copper and lead

318 are below 0.0-2.0 and 0.01 rated as medium to low (LASEPA, 2005) values and  
 319 far below 0.0-5.0 (WHO, 1996) or 2-1500 and 2-300 recommended as normal  
 320 by Alloway (1990). However, the interesting result is that heavy metal uptake  
 321 by maize grains could not be linked to urine treatment of soil.

322  
 323

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

Treatment	→ mgkg <sup>-1</sup> ←	
	Cu	Pb
Control	0.30a	0.30
Human urine	0.04a	0.04
Cattle urine	0.24b	0.16
Goat urine	0.06c	0.28
FLSD (0.05)	0.05	NS

332 Cu – Copper, Pb – Lead, Treatment means with different letters indicate  
 333 significant differences from each other (P<0.05).

334 **Conclusion**

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

345

346

## References

- 347 Adeluwa, O. O. and Cofie, O. (2012). Urine as an alternative fertilizer in  
348 Agriculture: *In:Effects on* Amaranths (*Amaranthus caudatus*) Production.  
349 Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems 8:1. doi:  
350 10.1017/51742170511000512.
- 351 Adeluwa, O. O. and Suleiman, O. N. (2012). Effect of human urine on the *growth*  
352 *performances* of *Jathropha curcas* seedlings and some soil health indices.  
353 Nigerian Journal of Soil Science 22 (2):186-193.
- 354 Adewole, M.B. Adeoye, G.O. and Sridhar, M.K.C. (2008). Effect of inorganic  
355 and organo mineral fertilizers on the uptake of selected heavy metals by  
356 *Helianthus annus L* and *Tithornia diversifolia* (Hems h) under green house  
357 condition. *Journal of Toxicological and Environmental*. Chemistry 91(5):  
358 970-980.
- 359 Alloway, B. J. (1990). Heavy metals on soils. New York: John Wiley and Sons,  
360 Inc 280p.
- 361 Anikwe, M.A.N. and Nwobodo, K. C. A. (2002). Long-term effect of municipal  
362 wastes disposal on soil properties and productivity in sites used for urban  
363 agriculture in Abakaliki, Nigeria. *Bio-resources Technology* 83:24-50.
- 364 Asadu, C. L. A. and Nweke, F. I. (1999). Soils of arable crop fields in sub-Sahara  
365 Africa: Focus on cassava growing areas, collaborative study of cassava in  
366 Africa. Working Paper No. 18. Resources and Crop -Management Division,  
367 IITA, Ibadan, Nigeria. 1782p.
- 368 Benge, M. (2006). Assessment of the potential of *Jathropha curcas*, (*biodiesel*) for  
369 the energy production and other uses in developing countries. Posted on EC  
370 Ho's website with permission of the author. July 2006 and updated August  
371 2006. 2: 22. [http://www.ascension-](http://www.ascension-publishing.com/B/Z/Jathropha)  
372 [publishing.com/B/Z/Jathropha](http://www.ascension-publishing.com/B/Z/Jathropha). Pdf  
download on January 9, 2012.
- 373 Bremner, J. M. (1996). Nitrogen-Total. *In: Sparks, D. L. (ed). Methods of Soil*  
374 *Analysis. Chemical Methods. American Society of Agronomy* 5(3):1085-  
375 1121.
- 376 Dewis, J. and Freitas, F. (1976). Physical and Chemical Methods of Soil and Water  
377 Analysis. Soil Bulletin 18, FAO, UN, Rome.

- 378 Enwezor, W. O., Udo, E. J., Usoroh, N. J. Ayoade, K. A., Adepetu, J. A., Chude,  
379 V. O. and Udegbe, C. J. (1989). Fertilizer Use and Management Practices for  
380 Crops in Nigeria, Series No 2. Fertilizer Procurement and Distribution  
381 Division, Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Water Resources and Rural  
382 Development, Lagos, Nigeria.
- 383 Enwezor, W.O., Udo, F. J. and Sobulo, R.A. (1981). Fertility status and  
384 productivity of acid sands: *In: Acid sands of Southeastern Nigeria*. Soil  
385 Science Society of Nigeria. 1: 56-73.
- 386 Federal Department of Agricultural Land Resources (FDALR) (1985).  
387 Reconnaissance Soil Survey of Anambra State, Nigeria. Soil Report, Kaduna.  
388 3p.
- 389 Federal Ministry of Agriculture, **Water** and Rural Development (**FMAWRD**)  
390 (2002). Fertilizer Use and Management Practice for Crops in Nigeria.  
391 Produced by the Federal Fertilizer Department. *In: Aduayi, E. A., Chude, V.*  
392 *O. Adebusuyi, B. A. and Olayiwola, S. O. (eds), Abuja 2002. 188p.*
- 393 Gee, G. W. and Or, D. (2002). Particle Size Analysis. *In: Dane. J. H. and Topp, G.*  
394 *C. (eds). Methods of Soil Analysis. Physical Methods. Soil Science Society*  
395 *America. 5(4):255-293.*
- 396 Gutser, R., Ebertseder, T., Weber, A., Schrami, M. and Schmmidhlter, U. (2005).  
397 Short-term and residual availability of nitrogen after long-time application of  
398 organic fertilizers on arable land. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*  
399 *168:439-446.*
- 400 Heinnonen-Tanski, and Van Wijk-Sibesma, C. (2005). Human excreta for plant  
401 production. *Bioresource Technology* 96:403-411.
- 402 Hoglung, C. (2001). Evaluation of **Microbial Health Risks Associated** with the  
403 **Reuse** of **Source-Separated Human** urine. **Ph.D Thesis**, Department of  
404 Biotechnology, Applied Microbiology, **Royal Institute of Technology** (KTH)  
405 **Stolkolm Sweden. 62-64.**
- 406 Kirchmann, H. and Peterson, S. (1995). Human urine-chemical composition  
407 and fertilizer use efficiency. *Fertilizer Resources* 40:149-154.
- 408 Lagos State Environmental Protection Agency (LASEPA, 2005). Lagos State  
409 Environmental Reports 3: 28-33.

- 410 Landon, J. R. (eds) (1991). Booker, Tropical Soil Manual. A hand book for  
411 Soil Survey and Agricultural Land Evaluation in Tropics and Subtropics  
412 New York, USA, John Wiley and Sons: Inc. Third Avenue.
- 413 Malkki, S. and Heinonen-Tanski, (1999). Composition of toilets in permanent  
414 houses. *In: 1 Use of municipal organic wastes. Proceedings of Nigerian*  
415 *Journal of Forestry Seminar 292 DIAS-report. 13: 147-154.*
- 416 Marino, C. (2008). Urine composition depends on certain factors. *Journal of*  
417 *Soil Science Society of America. 73:159-219.*
- 418 Nwite, J.N. (2015). Effect of urine source on soil **chemical** properties and maize  
419 yield in Abakaliki, South-Eastern Nigeria. *International Journal of Advance*  
420 *Agricultural Research 3:31-36.*
- 421 Nwite, J. N. (2013). Evaluation of the productivity of a spent Automobile oil  
422 contaminated soil amended with organic wastes in Abakaliki, Southeastern  
423 Nigeria. Ph.D Thesis, University of Nigeria, Nsukka 130p.
- 424 Overseas Development of Natural Resources Institute (ODNR) (1989). Nigeria  
425 Profile of Agricultural Potential ODA, United Kingdom. 3p.
- 426 Page, A. L., Miller, R. H. and Keeney, D. R. (1982). Methods of Soil  
427 Analysis. *American Society of Agronomy 9:539-579.*
- 428 Peech, M. (1965). Hydrogen activity. *Methods of Soil Analysis. In: Black CA*  
429 *(ed). American Society of Agronomy 9(1):914-926.*
- 430 Perverly, J.H. and Gates, P.B. (1993). Utilization of municipal solid waste and  
431 sludge compost in crop production systems. *In: Sewage sludge, Land*  
432 *utilization and the Environment. Proceedings of a conference by American*  
433 *Society of Agronomy.*
- 434 Richert Stintizing, A., Rodhe, L., Akerhieln, H. and Stenieck, S. (2002).  
435 Human urine as a fertilizer and plant nutrients application technique and  
436 environmental effects. *In: Venglosk, J., Greserova, G. (eds). Proceedings*  
437 *of 10 International Conference Ramiran 2002 Network. FAO European*  
438 *System of Cooperative Research Network 161-162 Pp.*
- 439 Schonning, C. (2001). Urine diversion-hygienic risks and microbial guidelines  
440 for reuse. Department of Parasitology, Mycology and Environmental  
441 Microbiology. Swedish Institute for Infections.

- 442 Steel, G. D. and Torrie J. H. (1980). Procedures of statistics. A biometrical  
443 approach, 2nd ed. New York, McGraw Hill, Book Company 63p.
- 444 Steineck, S., Richert Stintzing, A., Rodhe, L., Elinquist, H. and Jakobsson,  
445 M. C. (1999). Plant nutrients in human and food refuse. *In: Proceedings*  
446 *of Nigerian Journal of Forestry Seminar* 292. DIAS report. 13:125-130.
- 447 Walkey, A. and Black, A. (1934). An examination of the Degtjareff method for  
448 determining soil organic matter and a proposed modification of the chronic  
449 acid titration method. *Soil Science* 37:29-38.
- 450 World Health Organization (WHO, 1996). Guideline for drinking quality water.  
451 Switzerland 1(2&3):50-57.