

1 **Integrated Use of Compost and Nitrogen Fertilizer and their Effects on**  
2 **the Yield and Yield Components of Wheat: A Pot Experiment**

3 Bayu Dume Gari<sup>1\*</sup>, Gezahegn Berecha<sup>2</sup>, Melkamu Mamuye<sup>3</sup>, Obsu Hirko Diriba<sup>4</sup>,

4 Amsalu Nebiyu<sup>2</sup>, Abebe Nigussie<sup>4</sup>, Aleš Hanč<sup>1</sup>, Pavel Švehla<sup>1</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>Department of Agro-environmental Chemistry and Plant Nutrition, Faculty of  
6 Agrobiology, Food and Natural Resources, Czech University of Life Sciences Prague,  
7 Czech Republic.

8 <sup>2</sup>Department of Horticulture and Plant Science, College of Agriculture and Veterinary  
9 Medicine, Jimma University, Jimma, Ethiopia.

10 <sup>3</sup>College of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine-CASCAPE (joint Ethio-Netherland  
11 project) Jimma University, Jimma, Ethiopia.

12 <sup>4</sup>Department of Natural Resource Management, College of Agriculture and Veterinary  
13 Medicine, Jimma University, Jimma, Ethiopia. \*[gari@af.czu.cz](mailto:gari@af.czu.cz)

14 **Abstract**

15 There is a research gap related to the combined effects of compost produced from coffee  
16 husks and inorganic nitrogen fertilizer (urea). The objective of this study was to  
17 evaluate the yield and yield components of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) under the  
18 integrated application of compost and nitrogen fertilizer (urea). A pot experiment was

19 conducted in a lath house to determine the effects of the integrated use of compost  
20 produced from coffee husks and nitrogen fertilizer (urea) on the yield and yield  
21 components of wheat. The experiment consisted of nine treatments: T1, control  
22 (untreated); T2, 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (8.12 g pot<sup>-1</sup>) compost; T3, 10 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (16.24 g pot<sup>-1</sup>) compost; T4, 0 t  
23 ha<sup>-1</sup> compost + 50 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> nitrogen fertilizer (NF) (0.09 g pot<sup>-1</sup>); T5, 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> compost + 50  
24 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> NF; T6, 10 t ha<sup>-1</sup> compost + 50 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> NF; T7, 0 t ha<sup>-1</sup> compost + 100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (0.18 g  
25 pot<sup>-1</sup>) NF; T8, 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> compost + 100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> NF; and T9, 10 t ha<sup>-1</sup> compost + 100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>  
26 NF. The treatments were arranged in a completely randomized design (CRD) with three  
27 replications. The compost was prepared from coffee husks and applied in wet  
28 conditions. The findings showed that the addition of compost had little effect on wheat  
29 yield and yield components in the absence of nitrogen fertilizer (urea). However, the  
30 application of the highest amount of nitrogen fertilizer (urea), which is equivalent to the  
31 recommended field rate (100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) (equivalent to 0.18 g pot<sup>-1</sup>), and compost (5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>)  
32 (equivalent to 8.12 g pot<sup>-1</sup>) led to a significant ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) increase in grain yield. Under this  
33 treatment, the grain yield was 26 g pot<sup>-1</sup> (equivalent to 14.741 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) which is a 66.29%  
34 increase compared with the control (8.9 g pot<sup>-1</sup> (4.969 t ha<sup>-1</sup>)); in the treatment in which  
35 only the recommended amount of nitrogen fertilizer was used (21.98 g pot<sup>-1</sup> (12.273 t ha<sup>-1</sup>)  
36 1)) grain yield increased by 16.74%. Spike length and dry matter yield also significantly  
37 ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) increased with the application of integrated compost and nitrogen fertilizer  
38 (urea). The results of this experiment revealed that compost-based soil management

39 strategies can enhance wheat production, thereby contributing positively to the viability  
40 and benefits of agricultural production systems. However, nutrient-compost  
41 interactions should receive special attention due to the great variability in the properties  
42 of compost, which may depend on the type of organic materials used.

43 **Key words:** Compost application, coffee husk, crop production, yield, biomass, nitrogen  
44 fertilizer

## 45 INTRODUCTION

46 In many Sub-Saharan African countries, increasing wheat production to support the  
47 higher demands of growing populations is still a challenge [1, 2]. Ethiopia is one of the  
48 largest wheat producers in Sub-Saharan Africa and has a favorable climate for growing  
49 wheat. However, over the past decade, there has been a consistent deficit in wheat  
50 production. The fragmented nature of land holdings and limited use of agricultural  
51 inputs, particularly fertilizers, contribute to low levels of wheat productivity in Ethiopia  
52 [3]. This country does not produce its own fertilizer supply, and farmers apply a  
53 common fertilizer, diammonium phosphate (DAP), and urea at a recommended rate of  
54 100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> each, regardless of soil type. Several studies have reported that inorganic  
55 fertilizer application has resulted in increased crop productivity worldwide. However,  
56 the supplementation of crop areas using only two sources of inorganic fertilizers (DAP  
57 and urea) for many years and the complete removal of crop residues from the  
58 production land has led to severe nutrient depletion in Ethiopia. On the other hand, the

59 use of compost alone, as a substitute for inorganic fertilizer, is not enough to maintain  
60 the present levels of crop productivity of high-yielding varieties [4]. Therefore,  
61 integrated nutrient management, in which both compost and inorganic fertilizers are  
62 used simultaneously, is the most effective method, particularly in developing countries  
63 where mineral fertilizers are cost-prohibitive. Few previous studies [5, 6, 7] showed that  
64 wheat productivity could be enhanced through combinations of organic and inorganic  
65 fertilizers. Some trials have been conducted on the agronomic response of wheat to  
66 organic (i.e., farmyard and green manure) and mineral fertilizer integrations. However,  
67 there have not been any investigations on the combined effects of compost produced  
68 from coffee husks and inorganic fertilizer (urea) on the yield and yield components of  
69 wheat. In Ethiopia, 192,000 metric tons of coffee husks are produced and disposed of  
70 per year, and the study area (Jimma) is well-known for coffee production; in this area,  
71 134,400 metric tons of coffee husks per year are simply disposed of into the  
72 environment [8]. Thus, it is very important to use coffee husks for agricultural input by  
73 composting and integrating them with inorganic fertilizers. Therefore, the objective of  
74 this study was to evaluate the yield and yield components of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*  
75 *L.*) under integrated application of compost produced from coffee husks and nitrogen  
76 fertilizer (urea).

77

78

## 79 MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 80 Description of the study area

81 This study was conducted at Jimma University College of Agriculture and Veterinary  
82 Medicine, Southwestern Ethiopia, in a lath house pot experiment. The study area is  
83 located at a latitude of 7°33'N and longitude of 36°57'E. The altitude ranges from 1760  
84 to 1920 m above sea level. The mean annual maximum and minimum temperatures are  
85 26.8 and 11.4°C, respectively, and the maximum and minimum relative humidity values  
86 are 91.4 and 39.92%, respectively. The mean annual rainfall is 1500 mm, and soil is  
87 mainly dominated by Nitisols [9].

### 88 Soil sampling and compost preparation

89 Composite samples were collected from the top 0-30 cm soil layer. The collected soil  
90 samples were air-dried, crushed using a mortar and pestle and then passed through a 2  
91 mm square-mesh sieve. Compost derived from coffee husks was prepared in Jimma  
92 University College of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine (JUCAVM) using the pit  
93 composting method.

### 94 Soil and compost analysis

95 pH and electrical conductivity (EC) were measured in distilled water at a ratio of 1:5  
96 (w:v) [10]. The OC content was determined by the Walkley-Black method, percentage of  
97 OM was obtained by multiplying the percent of soil OC by a factor of 1.724, following  
98 the assumption that OM is composed of 58% carbon and total N was analyzed using the

99 Kjeldahl method [11]. The available phosphorus (P) was determined by the Mehlich 3  
100 method [12]. The CEC and exchangeable bases (Ca, Mg, K and Na) were determined  
101 after extracting the samples with 1M NH<sub>4</sub>OAc at a pH of 7. The Fe content was  
102 determined with an atomic absorption spectrometer (AAS) after extraction with DTPA  
103 solution. The Ca and Mg contents in the extracts were analyzed using AAS, while Na  
104 and K contents were analyzed by flame photometer [11]. The exchangeable acidity of  
105 the soil was determined by the titration method after a 1 M KCl solution (pH 7) was  
106 used to leach the exchangeable H<sup>+</sup> and Al<sup>3+</sup> from the soil sample [13]. The particle size  
107 distribution (texture) of the soil sample was determined by the Boycouos hydrometric  
108 method [11]. The soil bulk density was determined by the undisturbed core sampling  
109 method after drying the soil samples in an oven at 105°C to a constant weight.

#### 110 **Pot experiment set up**

111 A pot experiment was carried out at a controlled lath house. Plastic pots (top and  
112 bottom diameters of 33 cm and 20 cm, respectively) 30 cm in height were filled with air-  
113 dried soil. The experiment consisted of the following nine treatments: T1, control; T2, 5 t  
114 ha<sup>-1</sup> (8.12 g pot<sup>-1</sup>) compost; T3, 10 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (16.24 g pot<sup>-1</sup>) compost; T4, 0 t ha<sup>-1</sup> compost + 50  
115 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (0.09 g pot<sup>-1</sup>) nitrogen fertilizer (NF); T5, 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> compost + 50 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> NF; T6, 10 t  
116 ha<sup>-1</sup> compost + 50 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> NF; T7, 0 t ha<sup>-1</sup> compost + 100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (0.18 g pot<sup>-1</sup>) NF; T8, 5 t  
117 ha<sup>-1</sup> compost + 100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> NF; and T9, 10 t ha<sup>-1</sup> compost + 100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> NF. The treatments  
118 were arranged in a completely randomized design (CRD) with three replications. Ten

119 wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) seeds were sown in each pot and the seedlings were  
120 thinned to keep five plants per pot after germination. After emergence, four plants were  
121 maintained in each pot until harvesting. The plants were regularly watered with  
122 distilled water to maintain field capacity moisture content until the end of maturity.  
123 Plant height was recorded just before harvesting. The aboveground parts of the plants  
124 were harvested at the soil level from each pot. The fresh shoots were dried separately at  
125 70°C for 72 hrs.

#### 126 **Postharvest soil and nutrient uptake analysis**

127 The NO<sub>3</sub>-N in the plant tissues was determined using 2% acetic acid [14]. The plant K  
128 content was determined by a flame photometer after wet digestion with sulfuric acid.  
129 The plant P content was determined photometrically with the molybdenum blue  
130 method. At the end of the experiments (after crop harvest), soil samples were collected  
131 from each pot, air-dried and sieved (<2 mm), and selected chemical properties were  
132 analyzed by following standard procedures [11]. The pH and EC of the soil were  
133 determined in a water suspension at a 1:5 soil:liquid ratio (w:v). The total carbon  
134 content was determined by the Walkley-Black method, and the total N content was  
135 analyzed using the Kjeldahl method [11].

#### 136 **Statistical analysis**

137 The data were subjected to statistical analyses. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA)  
138 was performed to compare variations in the soil properties and plant growth

139 characteristics for each treatment. For all the analyses, treatment means were separated  
140 using the least significant difference (LSD), and treatment effects were declared  
141 significant at the 5% probability level ( $P \leq 0.05$ ). All analyses were performed using SAS  
142 version 9.3.

143

144 Table 1. Selected physicochemical properties of the experimental soils and compost

| Parameter                              | Experimental soil<br>(mean $\pm$ SD) | Compost<br>(mean $\pm$ SD) |
|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Bulk density (gm cm <sup>3</sup> )     | 1.04 $\pm$ 0.01                      | -                          |
| pH-H <sub>2</sub> O (1:5)              | 5.2 $\pm$ 0.02                       | 7.6 $\pm$ 0.03             |
| Exch. acidity (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | 4.9 $\pm$ 0.1                        | -                          |
| EC (dS/cm) (1:5)                       | 0.02 $\pm$ 0.00                      | 4.32 $\pm$ 0.21            |
| Exch. Ca (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )      | 8.08 $\pm$ 1.32                      | 58.35 $\pm$ 0.52           |
| Exch. Mg (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )      | 1.20 $\pm$ 0.2                       | 6.45 $\pm$ 0.02            |
| Exch. K (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )       | 0.8 $\pm$ 0.02                       | 1.98 $\pm$ 0.21            |
| Exch. Na (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )      | 0.02 $\pm$ 0.00                      | 3.05 $\pm$ 0.21            |
| Exch. Fe (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )      | 35.54 $\pm$ 1.12                     | -                          |
| Exch. Al (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )      | 795.00 $\pm$ 0.23                    | -                          |
| CEC (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )           | 24.36 $\pm$ 1.7                      | 68.12 $\pm$ 0.21           |
| Organic carbon (%)                     | 3.97 $\pm$ 0.23                      | 30.80 $\pm$ 6.12           |
| Organic matter (%)                     | 6.85 $\pm$ 0.39                      | 53.10 $\pm$ 1.50           |
| Total nitrogen (%)                     | 0.34 $\pm$ 0.02                      | 1.62 $\pm$ 0.62            |
| Total P (mg/kg)                        | 19.2 $\pm$ 0.14                      | 130.01 $\pm$ 2.25          |
| Available P (mg/kg)                    | 4.52 $\pm$ 0.09                      | 14.45 $\pm$ 1.23           |



## 145    **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### 146    **Soil and compost properties**

147    The physicochemical properties of the experimental soil and compost are shown in  
148    Table 1. The soil had lower available P and total P and higher exchangeable Fe and Al  
149    than the compost. The high pH values of the compost may be due to basic cations, such  
150    as Ca, Mg, Na, and K, which were present in the compost materials. The CEC of the  
151    compost was also high, which may be due to the high negative charge potential of  
152    surface functional groups. The OC concentrations were high in the compost. The  
153    compost contained high levels of both macro- and micronutrient elements. The compost  
154    had especially high amounts of basic cations (Ca, Mg, K, and Na) and total P. These  
155    results are supported by the findings of [15], who reported that compost derived from  
156    coffee husks contained high levels of organic matter and micro- and macronutrients.

### 157    **Wheat growth characteristics and yield components**

158    Compared to the control, the addition of compost increased wheat grain production in  
159    the absence of nitrogen fertilizer (NF). These increases were clearly lower than those  
160    caused by the use of NF without the addition of compost. These results are in  
161    agreement with those of several authors [16,17], who found little response of crop yield  
162    and nutrient status to the application of compost alone, likely due to the carbon-rich  
163    nature of compost. Therefore, most of the previous studies have shown that the  
164    beneficial effects of the addition of compost on crop production are most evident when

165 compost is combined with NF. The detected increases in nutrient efficiency after  
166 amending soil with compost have been mainly related to greater nutrient retention,  
167 minimal nutrient losses, improvements in soil properties (such as increases in WHC and  
168 decreases in soil compaction, leading to the immobilization of contaminants or the  
169 mobilization of nutrients), and the enhancement of soil biological properties, such as the  
170 development of more favorable root environments and microbial activities favoring  
171 nutrient availability. In this study, a significant compost\*NF interaction was observed  
172 for wheat grain production (Table 3). Thus, the highest wheat grain production was  
173 obtained by combining 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> compost and 100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> NF. These values represented an  
174 increase relative to the values of the control soil and the control soil with the addition of  
175 the highest amount of NF. These results demonstrated that the addition of 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>  
176 compost increased grain yield relative to the use of only NF (at the recommended rate).  
177 In this experiment, nutrient losses were not observed, since irrigation was controlled to  
178 avoid leaching, and the compost adsorption capacity might have limited nitrogen  
179 availability in the short term, especially after NF addition. However, under field  
180 conditions, the fact that the addition of compost can limit nutrient losses from leaching  
181 may favor an increase in the availability of nutrients in the soil in the long term. The  
182 substantial increase in the total C and N contents in the compost treatments suggests  
183 that compost may be useful for building C and N contents in soils, particularly those  
184 with inherently low levels of C and N.

185 Table 2. Effect of compost applied alone or mixed with NF on the shoot and root  
186 characteristics of wheat

| Comp<br>(t/ha) | NF<br>(kg/h<br>a) | Shoot<br>length (cm) |                    | Shoot fresh<br>weight (g/plant) |                    | Shoot dry<br>weight (g/plant) |                   | Root<br>length (cm) |                    |
|----------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
|                |                   | Vegetative<br>stage  | Heading<br>stage   | Vegetative<br>stage             | Headin<br>g stage  | Vegetative<br>stage           | Heading<br>stage  | Vegetative<br>stage | Heading<br>stage   |
| 0              | 0                 | 40.1 <sup>e</sup>    | 73.1 <sup>d</sup>  | 5.4 <sup>e</sup>                | 6.1 <sup>f</sup>   | 1.19 <sup>d</sup>             | 3.1 <sup>e</sup>  | 10.0 <sup>e</sup>   | 12.1 <sup>e</sup>  |
| 5              | 0                 | 55.4 <sup>cd</sup>   | 89 <sup>bc</sup>   | 16.1 <sup>d</sup>               | 28.2 <sup>e</sup>  | 3.8 <sup>b</sup>              | 16.2 <sup>d</sup> | 18.8 <sup>a</sup>   | 20.0 <sup>ab</sup> |
| 10             | 0                 | 54.6 <sup>d</sup>    | 81.3 <sup>cd</sup> | 12 <sup>d</sup>                 | 17.7 <sup>e</sup>  | 1.96 <sup>d</sup>             | 7.1 <sup>e</sup>  | 16.2 <sup>bc</sup>  | 16.1 <sup>d</sup>  |
| 0              | 50                | 53.2 <sup>d</sup>    | 82.1 <sup>cd</sup> | 7.8 <sup>c</sup>                | 17.1 <sup>d</sup>  | 1.99 <sup>c</sup>             | 6.8 <sup>d</sup>  | 16.5 <sup>bc</sup>  | 18.2 <sup>bc</sup> |
| 5              | 50                | 69.1 <sup>a</sup>    | 87.2 <sup>bc</sup> | 13.8 <sup>b</sup>               | 21.0 <sup>c</sup>  | 2.10 <sup>c</sup>             | 9.1 <sup>c</sup>  | 14.0 <sup>d</sup>   | 16.1 <sup>cd</sup> |
| 10             | 50                | 50.9 <sup>d</sup>    | 87.1 <sup>bc</sup> | 13 <sup>b</sup>                 | 21.2 <sup>c</sup>  | 2.3 <sup>c</sup>              | 9.0 <sup>c</sup>  | 14.1 <sup>d</sup>   | 19.3 <sup>b</sup>  |
| 0              | 100               | 61.4 <sup>b</sup>    | 92.2 <sup>ab</sup> | 16.2 <sup>a</sup>               | 25.3 <sup>b</sup>  | 3.40 <sup>ab</sup>            | 11.2 <sup>b</sup> | 15.0 <sup>cd</sup>  | 22.0 <sup>a</sup>  |
| 5              | 100               | 65.2 <sup>bc</sup>   | 97.8 <sup>a</sup>  | 17.3 <sup>a</sup>               | 30.1 <sup>a</sup>  | 3.81 <sup>a</sup>             | 15.1 <sup>a</sup> | 17.2 <sup>ab</sup>  | 18.3 <sup>cd</sup> |
| 10             | 100               | 61.6 <sup>b</sup>    | 85.4 <sup>bc</sup> | 14.2 <sup>b</sup>               | 28.5 <sup>ab</sup> | 3.78 <sup>a</sup>             | 12.4 <sup>b</sup> | 16.1 <sup>bc</sup>  | 16.8 <sup>cd</sup> |
| Comp           |                   | ns                   | ns                 | ns                              | ns                 | ns                            | ns                | *                   | ns                 |
| NF             |                   | ns                   | ns                 | **                              | ns                 | ns                            | ns                | ns                  | *                  |
| Comp           |                   | **                   | **                 | **                              | **                 | *                             | **                | ns                  | ns                 |

\*NF

187 ns= nonsignificant; \*\*P < 0.01, \*P < 0.05; Comp=compost, NF= nitrogen fertilizer

188

189 The results indicate that the growth parameters of wheat are influenced by different  
190 integrations of coffee husk compost and nitrogen fertilizer (urea) (Table 2). The highest  
191 shoot length in the heading stage was recorded in the treatment in which nitrogen

192 fertilizer (urea) was applied at the recommended rate (100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) together with 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>  
 193 compost, and the lowest shoot length was recorded in the treatments with no nitrogen  
 194 fertilizer applications. This suggests that wheat growth might be slowed if wheat  
 195 cultivation is not supplemented with mineral fertilizers, regardless of the application of  
 196 compost.

197 Table 3. Effect of compost alone and mixed with NF on the yield and yield  
 198 characteristics of wheat

| Comp rate (t/ha) | NF rate (kg/ha) | Spike length (cm) | No. of grains/s pike | 1000 grain weight (gm) | DMY (g/pot)        | Grain yield (g/pot) |
|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| 0                | 0               | 4.5 <sup>c</sup>  | 20 <sup>e</sup>      | 46.9 <sup>d</sup>      | 10.8 <sup>e</sup>  | 8.9 <sup>s</sup>    |
| 5                | 0               | 7.8 <sup>b</sup>  | 48 <sup>a</sup>      | 57.2 <sup>abc</sup>    | 31.6 <sup>b</sup>  | 21.5 <sup>bc</sup>  |
| 10               | 0               | 6.9 <sup>bc</sup> | 29 <sup>d</sup>      | 60.1 <sup>bc</sup>     | 17.1 <sup>d</sup>  | 12.6 <sup>f</sup>   |
| 0                | 50              | 10.1 <sup>a</sup> | 46 <sup>ab</sup>     | 53.8 <sup>c</sup>      | 18.6 <sup>d</sup>  | 13.9 <sup>e</sup>   |
| 5                | 50              | 9.8 <sup>a</sup>  | 42 <sup>bc</sup>     | 55.2 <sup>abc</sup>    | 28.3 <sup>bc</sup> | 19.2 <sup>cd</sup>  |
| 10               | 50              | 10.4 <sup>a</sup> | 40 <sup>c</sup>      | 58.6 <sup>abc</sup>    | 24.1 <sup>c</sup>  | 17.1 <sup>d</sup>   |
| 0                | 100             | 10.2 <sup>a</sup> | 45 <sup>ab</sup>     | 61.4 <sup>a</sup>      | 25.9 <sup>c</sup>  | 21.98 <sup>bc</sup> |
| 5                | 100             | 12.2 <sup>a</sup> | 52 <sup>a</sup>      | 57.2 <sup>abc</sup>    | 38.4 <sup>a</sup>  | 26.4 <sup>a</sup>   |
| 10               | 100             | 12.3 <sup>a</sup> | 46 <sup>ab</sup>     | 59.1 <sup>ab</sup>     | 26.8 <sup>c</sup>  | 22.4 <sup>b</sup>   |
| Comp             |                 | ns                | *                    | ns                     | ns                 | ns                  |
| NF               |                 | *                 | ns                   | *                      | ns                 | ns                  |
| Comp * NF        |                 | *                 | *                    | *                      | *                  | *                   |

199 ns=nonsignificant; \*P < 0.05; Comp=compost, DMY= dry mass yield

200 A greater spike length (12.3 cm) was observed when wheat was cultivated under 100 kg  
201 ha<sup>-1</sup> nitrogen fertilizer combined with 10 t ha<sup>-1</sup> compost; this treatment was not  
202 significantly different from the treatment that received 50 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> nitrogen fertilizer and  
203 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> compost (12.2 cm). Generally, combinations with 50-100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> nitrogen  
204 fertilizer and 5-10 t ha<sup>-1</sup> compost lead to significantly greater spike lengths and numbers  
205 of grains per spike. However, a smaller spike length was recorded in the treatment with  
206 no nitrogen fertilizer and compost. Similarly, the dry matter yield was significantly  
207 influenced by the different combinations of nutrient sources and rates. The highest  
208 DMY (38.4 g pot<sup>-1</sup>) was observed in the treatment with the combined application of 5 t  
209 ha<sup>-1</sup> compost and 100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> nitrogen fertilizer, and the lowest DMY (10.8 g plot<sup>-1</sup>) was  
210 recorded from the control treatment (no compost or nitrogen fertilizer application).  
211 Fertilizer combinations significantly influenced other yield and yield components, such  
212 as thousand seed weight, grain yield and dry matter yield (Table 3). Thousand seed  
213 weight showed significant variation across treatments. The highest thousand seed  
214 weight (61.4 gm) was recorded when 100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> nitrogen fertilizer alone was applied.  
215 Similar results were reported by different researchers, e.g., Kaur, Sarwar, Rasool and  
216 Brar [18- 21]. Lower thousand seed weights were observed in treatments to which  
217 compost alone was applied (no nitrogen fertilizer), indicating that unless it is integrated  
218 with inorganic fertilizers, the use of compost alone may not fully satisfy crop nutrient  
219 demand, especially in the year of application [22]. Compared to wheat cultivated with

220 no fertilizer application (control), grain yield was more than three times higher when  
221 wheat was cultivated under 100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> nitrogen fertilizer and 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> compost. This  
222 might be because the soil from the study area had poor soil fertility.

### 223 **Plant nutrient concentration**

224 The application of compost significantly increased the shoot concentrations of K and P  
225 and significantly decreased the concentrations of N, Ca, Mg, Cu, Mn and Zn (Table 4).  
226 The sulfur concentration in the shoot was not affected by compost application; however,  
227 there was a significant ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) increase in its concentration with NF application. The  
228 interactive effects of NF and compost treatments were nonsignificant in relation to the  
229 concentrations of all the nutrient elements (Table 4).

### 230 **Plant nutrient uptake**

231 Shoot uptake data and associated statistical analyses for various nutrients are presented  
232 in Table 4. The shoot uptake of all the nutrients except Ca and Mg increased  
233 significantly with the application of compost (Table 4). The uptake of Ca and Mg  
234 remained similar or increased slightly in response to the compost treatments. Fertilizer  
235 application had a significantly positive effect on the uptake of nutrients, except for Ca,  
236 Mg, Mn, and Fe, for which the effect was not significant (Table 4). The plant uptake of  
237 almost all the macro- and micronutrients increased with increasing compost  
238 application, and the decrease in nutrient concentration in the shoots was most directly  
239 related to the increased shoot dry matter yield of the plants (dilution effect) in the

240 compost-treated soil. The decreased concentration of some of the nutrients, however,  
 241 could be due to their adsorption onto the Fe and Al oxides present in the acidic soil.  
 242 Iron and Al oxides are known to have high adsorption capacity for phosphate and  
 243 metallic cations such as Cu, Zn, Mn, Mg and Ca.

244 Table 4 Concentrations of macro- and micronutrients in wheat shoots grown with  
 245 different application rates of compost and NF

| Comp rate<br>(t/ha) | NF<br>(kg/ha) | N                     | P    | K    | S   | Ca  | Mg                     | Cu  | Zn | Mn  | Fe  |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------------|------|------|-----|-----|------------------------|-----|----|-----|-----|
|                     |               | (g kg <sup>-1</sup> ) |      |      |     |     | (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> ) |     |    |     |     |
| 0                   | 0             | 30.05                 | 0.86 | 11.1 | 1.6 | 5.9 | 4.8                    | 3.6 | 46 | 62  | 70  |
| 5                   | 0             | 22.35                 | 0.87 | 16.0 | 1.6 | 4.1 | 2.6                    | 2.9 | 34 | 37  | 97  |
| 10                  | 0             | 17.25                 | 0.86 | 19.4 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 1.9                    | 3.6 | 32 | 47  | 82  |
| 0                   | 50            | 29.4                  | 0.87 | 13.1 | 1.7 | 7.2 | 4.6                    | 4.8 | 56 | 72  | 165 |
| 5                   | 50            | 23.3                  | 0.83 | 18.2 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 2.3                    | 3.1 | 33 | 44  | 86  |
| 10                  | 50            | 21.05                 | 0.94 | 19.6 | 1.6 | 2.9 | 1.8                    | 2.8 | 30 | 42  | 85  |
| 0                   | 100           | 29.45                 | 0.77 | 17.6 | 1.5 | 5.6 | 3.1                    | 4.6 | 47 | 54  | 115 |
| 5                   | 100           | 24.05                 | 0.85 | 19.1 | 1.5 | 3.6 | 2.2                    | 3.0 | 36 | 38  | 106 |
| 10                  | 100           | 23.2                  | 0.98 | 25.2 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 1.9                    | 3.1 | 40 | 47  | 87  |
| Comp rate           |               | ***                   | *    | **   | ns  | *** | ***                    | *** | ** | *** | ns  |
| NF rate             |               | ns                    | ns   | *    | *   | ns  | *                      | ns  | ns | ns  | ns  |
| Comp * NF           |               | ns                    | ns   | ns   | ns  | ns  | ns                     | ns  | ns | ns  | ns  |

246 ns, nonsignificant; \*\*\*P < 0.001, \*\*P < 0.01, \*P < 0.05; TC, total carbon; TN, total nitrogen

247

248

## 249 **Changes in postharvest soil properties**

250 At the end of the experiments (after crop harvest), composite soil samples were  
251 collected and analyzed. The compost had a large influence on the soil properties, which  
252 can explain its effects on plant growth and grain production. The increasing application  
253 of compost significantly increased the pH, EC, TC and TN in the soil (Table 5). The total  
254 C and N contents increased significantly with the compost treatments, although the  
255 increase in the soil C was substantially greater (Table 5), and the fertilizer treatment  
256 significantly increased the total N content. The application of compost significantly  
257 increased soil total C relative to that in the control. Interactions between compost and  
258 soil may enhance soil C storage via the sorption of organic matter to compost [18].  
259 Coffee husk compost offers great potential as a soil amendment, as it is a potential  
260 source of nutrients. The increased soil pH due to compost addition might have  
261 increased the adsorption capacity of metallic cations. The compost had a great influence  
262 on the soil properties, which can explain its effects on plant growth and grain  
263 production. The results of this study highlighted the significant improvement in the soil  
264 amended with compost alone, while the growth and yield of the crops supplemented  
265 with both compost and NF were higher than that of the crops supplemented with only  
266 the highest amount of N, displaying the value of mixed treatments.

267

268



269 Table 5: Effects of compost and fertilizer treatments on pH, EC, total C and total N  
 270 measured after plant harvest

| Compost<br>rate t/ha) | Fertilizer<br>rate kg/ha) | pH-H <sub>2</sub> O | EC (dS/cm) | TC (g kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | TN (g kg <sup>-1</sup> ) |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 0                     | 0                         | 5.20                | 0.164      | 316.12                   | 34.25                    |
| 5                     | 0                         | 5.46                | 0.336      | 319.20                   | 34.15                    |
| 10                    | 0                         | 5.96                | 0.626      | 436.40                   | 35.30                    |
| 0                     | 50                        | 5.11                | 0.188      | 316.21                   | 34.23                    |
| 5                     | 50                        | 5.45                | 0.409      | 439.15                   | 35.26                    |
| 10                    | 50                        | 5.83                | 0.996      | 468.10                   | 38.60                    |
| 0                     | 100                       | 5.24                | 0.250      | 429.30                   | 35.17                    |
| 5                     | 100                       | 5.42                | 0.389      | 430.22                   | 35.28                    |
| 10                    | 100                       | 6.15                | 1.052      | 462.14                   | 38.70                    |
| Comp rate             |                           | ***                 | ***        | ***                      | ***                      |
| NF rate               |                           | *                   | ***        | **                       | *                        |
| Comp x NF             |                           | ns                  | ***        | ns                       | ns                       |

271 ns, nonsignificant; \*\*\*P < 0.001, \*\*P < 0.01, \*P < 0.05; Comp, compost; NF, nitrogen fertilizer

272 While the lath house experiment is a good starting point for evaluating plant responses  
 273 under ideal conditions, the true agronomic potential of coffee husk compost needs to be  
 274 assessed by measuring crop responses to this compost under field conditions.  
 275 Therefore, the use of integrated compost and nitrogen fertilizer is a feasible approach to  
 276 overcome soil fertility constraints. Additionally, the integrated use of nitrogen fertilizers  
 277 and compost may improve the efficiency of mineral fertilizer.

## 278 **Acknowledgments**

279 Financial support for this work was provided by the Capacity building for scaling up of  
280 evidence-based best practices in agricultural production in Ethiopia (CASCAPE)  
281 project. Jimma University College of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine, Jimma,  
282 Ethiopia, provided funding for this research.

## 283 **Data Availability Statement**

284 All relevant data are provided within the paper.

## 285 **Competing Interests**

286 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

## 287 **Author Contributions**

288 Conceptualization: BDG GB MM.

289 Formal analysis: BDG MM.

290 Funding acquisition: GB.

291 Investigation: BDG GB MM OHD AN AN AH PS.

292 Methodology: BDG MM.

293 Project administration: GB.

294 Resources: GB.

295 Writing original draft: BDG.

296 Writing, reviewing & editing: BDG GB MM OHD AN AN AH PS.

297 **REFERENCES**

- 298 1. Abedi T, Alemzadeh A, Kazemeini SA. Effect of organic and inorganic fertilizers on  
299 grain yield and protein banding pattern of wheat. Australian journal of crop science.  
300 2010;4(6):384-89.
- 301 2. Estrada-Campuzano G, Slafer GA, Miralles DJ. Differences in yield, biomass and  
302 their components between triticale and wheat grown under contrasting water and  
303 nitrogen environments. Field Crops Research. 2012;128:167-79.
- 304 3. Agegnehu G, Amede T. Integrated soil fertility and plant nutrient management in  
305 tropical agro-ecosystems: a review. Pedosphere. 2017; 27(4):662-80.
- 306 4. Efthimiadou A, Bilalis D, Karkanis A, Froud-Williams B. Combined  
307 organic/inorganic fertilization enhance soil quality and increased yield,  
308 photosynthesis and sustainability of sweet maize crop. Australian Journal of Crop  
309 Science. 2010;4(9):722-29.
- 310 5. Manna MC, Swarup A, Wanjari RH, Ravankar HN, Mishra B, Saha MN, Singh YV,  
311 Sahi DK, Sarap PA. Long-term effect of fertilizer and manure application on soil  
312 organic carbon storage, soil quality and yield sustainability under sub-humid and  
313 semi-arid tropical India. Field crops research. 2005;14;93(2-3):264-80.
- 314 6. Kaur T, Brar BS, Dhillon NS. Soil organic matter dynamics as affected by long-term  
315 use of organic and inorganic fertilizers under maize–wheat cropping system.  
316 Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems. 2008 ;81(1):59-69.

- 317 7. Sarwar G, Schmeisky H, Hussain N, Muhammad S, Ibrahim M, Safdar E.  
318 Improvement of soil physical and chemical properties with compost application in  
319 rice-wheat cropping system. *Pakistan Journal of Botany*. 2008;40(1):275-82.
- 320 8. Merete W, Haddis A, Alemayehu E, Ambelu A. The potential of coffee husk and  
321 pulp as an alternative source of environmentally friendly energy. *East African*  
322 *Journal of Sciences*. 2014;8(1):29-36.
- 323 9. WRB I. Working Group (2006) World reference base for soil resources. A framework  
324 for international classification, correlation and communication, 2nd edn (World Soil  
325 Resources Reports 103). Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations,  
326 Rome.
- 327 10. van Reeuwijk LP. Procedures for soil analysis. ISRIC, Wageningen, the Netherlands.  
328 Procedures for soil analysis. 3rd ed. ISRIC, Wageningen, the Netherlands.. 1992.
- 329 11. Shaheen SM, Tsadilas CD, Eskridge KM. Effect of common ions on phosphorus  
330 sorption and lability in Greek Alfisols with different pH. *Soil Science*. 2009;174(1):21-  
331 6.
- 332 12. Liu D, Shi Y. Effects of different nitrogen fertilizer on quality and yield in winter  
333 wheat. *Advance Journal of Food Science and Technology*. 2013;5(5):646-9.
- 334 13. Miller RO, Kalra YP. Handbook of reference methods for plant analysis. Handbook  
335 of reference methods for plant analysis. 1998;38:57-62.

- 336 14. Dzung NA, Dzung TT, Khanh VT. Evaluation of coffee husk compost for improving  
337 soil fertility and sustainable coffee production in rural central highland of Vietnam.  
338 *Resources and Environment*. 2013;3(4):77-82.
- 339 15. Kandil AA, El-Hindi MH, Badawi MA, El-Morarsy SA, Kalboush FA. Response of  
340 wheat to rates of nitrogen, biofertilizers and land leveling. *Crop & Enviro*.  
341 2011;2(1):46-51.
- 342 16. Moe K, Mg KW, Win KK, Yamakawa T. Effects of combined application of inorganic  
343 fertilizer and organic manures on nitrogen use and recovery efficiencies of hybrid  
344 rice (Palethwe-1). *American Journal of Plant Sciences*. 2017;8(05):1043.
- 345 17. Kaur T, Brar BS, Dhillon NS. Soil organic matter dynamics as affected by long-term  
346 use of organic and inorganic fertilizers under maize–wheat cropping system.  
347 *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*. 2008;81(1):59-69.
- 348 18. Sarwar G, Schmeisky H, Hussain N, Muhammad S, Ibrahim M, Safdar E.  
349 Improvement of soil physical and chemical properties with compost application in  
350 rice-wheat cropping system. *Pakistan Journal of Botany*. 2008;40(1):275-82.
- 351 19. Rasool R, Kukal SS, Hira GS. Soil physical fertility and crop performance as affected  
352 by long term application of FYM and inorganic fertilizers in rice–wheat system. *Soil  
353 and Tillage research*. 2007;96(1-2):64-72.

- 354 20. Singh Brar B, Singh J, Singh G, Kaur G. Soil organic carbon and physical properties  
355 as affected by long-term application of FYM and inorganic fertilizers in maize–  
356 wheat system. *Soil & Tillage Research*. 2008;101:31-6.
- 357 21. Singh Brar B, Singh J, Singh G, Kaur G. Effects of long term application of inorganic  
358 and organic fertilizers on soil organic carbon and physical properties in maize–  
359 wheat rotation. *Agronomy*. 2015;5(2):220-38.
- 360 22. Diacono M, Rubino P, Montemurro F. Precision nitrogen management of wheat. A  
361 review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*. 2013;33(1):219-41.
- 362
- 363
- 364