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ABSTRACT

In Malawi the demand of the use of mineral acidifying fertilizer by farmers for sustenance of high crop yields is increasing. The soaring demand is a pointer to the loss of humic substances in the soil and the resultant poor soil health. There is potential however to reduce the amount of mineral fertilizer used by the farmers and retain the applied nutrients within the plants rooting zone for increased use efficiency and productivity. This could be achieved through the combined application of humate based fertilizers with mineral fertilizer. Therefore, an experiment was conducted to evaluate the effect of different rates of NPK and humate based fertilizer (HBF) combinations on potato yield and yield components at Tsangano, Bembeke and Dwale Extension Planning Area (EPA) in the 2016/2017 cropping season. Ten treatments were laid out in a randomized complete...
1. INTRODUCTION

Potato is an important food and cash crop in Malawi. Currently, there is great demand for quality potato tubers suitable for different end uses such as crisps, French fries, boiled products and others. Potatoes are efficient in converting natural resources, labour and capital into high quality food. They yield more nutritious food material more quickly on less land than most of the major crops; and the edible food material can be harvested after only 60 days [1]. Despite the increased demand for potato in Malawi, yields and quality of potato tubers obtained by farmers are relatively low. The situation has been attributed to a number of biotic and abiotic stresses. Specifically, [2] identified the following as key constraints: inappropriate fertilizer and soil fertility management, pests and diseases like late blight and bacterial wilt, poor quality seed, use of unimproved seed tubers, and late season drought, exacerbated by the changing climate.

Fertilizer application is essential in potato production for the attainment of optimal quality and yield of tubers. The potato crop has a high nutrient demand due to the prolific development of profuse above ground biomass as well as the production of voluminous tubers below ground per unit area. The crop is a heavy feeder of nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), potassium (K), magnesium (Mg) and calcium (Ca), in addition to micro elements [3]. Optimal tuber yields of potato are exclusively attainable through the supply of adequate and balanced dosages of nutrients [4]. External supply of nutrients through mineral fertilizer application to the soil for potato production in Malawi is centered on three macronutrients (N, P and K). However, nutrient stocks in the soil and fertilizer application usually do not meet the crop nutrient requirements. Soil acidity and alkalinity complicate potato nutrition in areas where potatoes are cultivated in Malawi. Deficiencies of calcium (Ca), magnesium (Mg) and P are common in acid soils while boron (B), manganese (Mn) and zinc (Zn) are reported to be deficient under alkaline conditions [5].

Retention in the soil and absorption by plants of major nutrients like N, P and K in the soil is aided by humic substances [6]. Humic substances have a high cation exchange capacity (CEC) and can, as humic acid (HAs), solubilize micronutrients in the soil thereby enhancing the availability of both macro and micro nutrients for uptake by crops [7]. As such presence of sufficient amount of humic substances in the soil can lead to the reduction in the application rate of mineral fertilizer for crop production [6]. With the depletion of humic material in the soil the distorted high input of N, P and K arises [6]. A documented increasing demand of mineral acidifying fertilizer by farmers in the country for sustenance of high crop yields is a pointer to poor soil health. The pattern is indicative of the loss of humic substances in the soil [6]. Potato growers could reduce amount of mineral fertilizer purchase and maintain the applied nutrients within the plants rooting zone through the combined application of humate based fertilizers with mineral fertilizer. It has been reported that the use of either dry or liquid humic materials to soils radically increases crop fertilizer use efficiency [6]. Other workers have reported better uptake of Ca and Mg upon irrigating crops with liquid suspensions of HAs or fulvic acids (FAs) [6]. Candidate humate based fertilizers like Allwin...
wonder are available that could help address the challenge of declining soil fertility and crop productivity. Allwin wonder, has 18% N, 6% P and 9% K as potassium humate. A study therefore was undertaken to investigate the influence of the application of Allwin wonder on potato yields under Malawian conditions. Specifically the study aimed to determine optimum application rate of Allwin fertilizer for potato production and determine appropriate combination of N, P, K and Allwin fertilizer for potato production.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was conducted at Bembeke, Tsangano Sub-Research stations in Dedza and Ntcheu districts respectively of central Malawi, and Dwale Extension planning area (EPA) in Thyolo district, southern Malawi. The potato varieties used were Thandizo variety at Tsangano and Violet at Bembeke and Dwale EPA. Thandizo variety was used at Tsangano due to limited availability of clean planting materials for violet. Gross plot size for individual materials for violet. Gross plot size for individual plots comprised of two inner rows with 32 planting stations. Inter row spacing was 75 cm with an intra row spacing of 25 cm between planting stations. The experiment was laid out in a randomized complete block design replicated 3 times. Pest and diseases were managed through the application of Dithane M45 and Cypermethrin. Dithane M45 was applied fortnightly at the rate of 25 g/16 litres of clean water as preventive control for late blight. Cypermethrin was also applied fortnightly at the rate of 20 ml/16 litres to control pests especially aphids and potato tuber moths.

Treatments: Different combinations of compound N, P, K fertilizer, straight N fertilizer and Allwin fertilizers were evaluated as described below:

1. Control (No mineral fertilizer and Allwin Wonder)
2. NPK 8:18:15 +6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + 60 kg N ha⁻¹
3. NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + 20 kg N ha⁻¹
4. NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹
5. Allwin (Wonder) @ 5kg ha⁻¹
6. Allwin (Wonder) @ 2.5 kg ha⁻¹
7. NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + 20 kg N ha⁻¹ + Allwin (Wonder) @ 5 kg ha⁻¹
8. NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + 20 kg N ha⁻¹ + Allwin (Wonder) @ 2.5 kg ha⁻¹
9. NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + Allwin (Wonder) @ 5 kg.ha⁻¹
10. NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + Allwin (Wonder) @ 2.5 kg.ha⁻¹

Whole quantities of phosphate and potash were applied at planting together with Allwin.

2.1 Data Collection

Data collected included the following datasets; composite soil samples per site, number of plants harvested per plot, number of marketable size tubers, number of non-marketable size tubers, weight of marketable tubers; weight of non-marketable tubers and tuber general appearance (colour, shape, depth of eyes).

2.2 Laboratory and Data Analysis

Laboratory soil analysis was done in order to characterize the soil. Soil samples were analyzed for organic carbon (OC), total N, available P, K, Mg, Ca and soil pH (H₂O). Soil pH was quantified in water (1:2.5) using pH meter [8]. Soil analysis for P, K, Mg and Ca was done by Mehlich 3 extraction procedures [9] while OC was determined using the colorimetric method [10] and total N was determined by Kjeldahl method [11].

3. RESULTS

3.1 Soil Texture and Nutrient Composition

Table 1 summarizes soil texture and nutrient composition for Bembeke, Tsangano, Dwale sites. At Bembeke the soil texture was predominantly clay. Soil pH was very strongly acid (< 4.5) both between 0-20 cm and 20-40 cm. OC was within the medium range (0.88-2.35%) between 0-20 cm and 20-40 cm. Total N content was low (0.08-0.12%) at both levels across the field. Available P was very low (<8.0 mg kg⁻¹) between (0-20 cm) and low (9-18 mg kg⁻¹) between 20-40 cm. K was very low (<0.05 cmol kg⁻¹) at both levels across the field. Ca was low (< 2 cmol kg⁻¹), Mg was very low (<3.0 cmol kg⁻¹) while Zinc was very low (<1.0 mg kg⁻¹). At Tsangano the soil texture was predominantly sand clay loam (SCL). Soil pH was strongly acid (4.5-5.0) both between 0-20 cm and 20-40 cm. OC was within the medium range (0.88-2.35%) between 0-20 cm and 20-40 cm. Total N content was medium (0.12-0.2) to low (0.08-0.12%) at both levels across the field. Available P was very
low (<8.0 mg kg⁻¹) at both levels. K was very low (<0.05 cmol kg⁻¹) at both levels across the field. Ca was adequate (>2 cmol kg⁻¹), Mg (<3.0 cmol kg⁻¹) and Zinc were very low (<1.0 mg kg⁻¹) at the site. At Dwale EPA the soil texture was predominantly sand clay (SC) to clay (C). Soil pH was strongly acid (4.5-5.0) both between 0-20 cm and 20-40 cm. OC was within the medium range (0.88-2.35%) between 0-20 cm and 20-40 cm. Total N content was low (0.08-0.12%) at both levels across the field. Available P was very high (>34.0 mg kg⁻¹) at both levels. K was medium (0.11-0.4 cmol kg⁻¹) at both levels across the field. Ca was high (>2 cmol kg⁻¹), Mg (<3.0 cmol kg⁻¹) and Zinc were very low (<1.0 mg kg⁻¹) at the site.

3.2 Tuber Yield and Yield Components at Tsangano

Results for tuber yield and yield components for Tsangano are given in Table 2. Fertilizer rates caused significant differences in tuber yield, number of tubers, and number of tubers per plant as well as tuber size. Treatment 2 (recommended fertilizer rate) had the highest tuber yield (20729 kg ha⁻¹). Additionally, Treatment 2 also had the largest tuber size (388.70 g) and highest proportion of marketable tubers (84.00%). Treatments 3, 7, 8 and 10 which had different combination of NPK and Allwin gave comparably high yields that were not significantly different from Treatment 2. Treatment 1, with zero fertilizer, had the lowest yield (7370 kg ha⁻¹) which was also not significantly different from Treatment 2. Treatment 1, with zero fertilizer, had the lowest yield (7370 kg ha⁻¹) which was also not significantly different from Treatment 2.

3.3 Tuber Yield and Yield Components at Dwale EPA

There were significant differences in tuber yield, number of tuber, number of tubers per plant and tuber size among the fertilizer rates at Dwale EPA (Table 3; Plate 1). Treatment 4 had the highest yield (13,956 kg ha⁻¹), highest number of tubers per plant (11.74) and largest tuber size (261 g). Tuber yield from Treatments 2, 9 and 10 were not significantly different from each other. Treatments with high yields had corresponding high number of tubers as well as big tubers. However, application of Allwin (Wonder) alone resulted in lower yields (Treatments 5 and 6) than the control treatment.

3.4 Tuber Yield and Yield Components at Bembeke

Table 4 shows results for tuber yield and yield components at Bembeke. Fertilizer rates caused significant differences in tuber yield, number of tubers, and number of tubers per plant as well as tuber size. Treatment 2 (recommended fertilizer rate) had the highest tuber yield (5,189 kg ha⁻¹). Additionally, Treatment 2 had also the largest tuber size (96.90 g) and highest proportion of marketable tubers (20.70%). In terms of yield, Treatment 2 was followed by Treatments 9, 8 and 7 which had different combinations of N, P, K and Allwin (Wonder). Treatment 6, with 2.5 kg ha⁻¹ of Allwin (Wonder) produced the lowest yield (2,957 kg ha⁻¹) which was also not significantly different from the control treatment.

Plate 1. Visible yield differential amongst treatments for Rep 1 at Dwale EPA
### Table 1. The soils’ physical and chemical properties before the experiment

| Site                  | Depth (cm) | Sand % | Silt % | Clay % | Class | pH | O C % | N % | P mg kg⁻¹ | K cmol kg⁻¹ | Ca cmol kg⁻¹ | Mg cmol kg⁻¹ | Zn mg kg⁻¹ |
|-----------------------|------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|----|------|-----|----------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|
| Bembeke              | 0-20       | 37     | 18     | 45     | CLAY | 4.1| 1.44 | 0.12| 1.03     | 0.03        | 1.54         | 0.06         | 0.07       |
| Bembeke              | 20-40      | 30     | 15     | 55     | CLAY | 4.1| 1.16 | 0.10| 12.8    | 0.02        | 1.33         | 0.09         | 0.19       |
| Tsangano             | 0-20       | 54     | 14     | 32     | SCL  | 4.9| 1.95 | 0.17| 0.55     | 0.04        | 4.30         | 0.46         | 0.18       |
| Tsangano             | 20-40      | 53     | 16     | 31     | SCL  | 4.7| 0.95 | 0.08| 2.08     | 0.04        | 3.23         | 0.28         | 0.31       |
| Dwale EPA, Thyolo    | 0-20       | 43     | 18     | 39     | SCL  | 4.9| 1.05 | 0.09| 98.4     | 0.15        | 3.41         | 0.54         | 0.55       |
| Dwale EPA, Thyolo    | 20-40      | 51     | 16     | 33     | CL   | 4.9| 0.96 | 0.08| 107      | 0.12        | 3.66         | 0.43         | 0.57       |

### Table 2. Tuber yield and yield components for different fertilizer at Tsangano

| Treatment | Number of tubers | Weight of tubers (kg/ha) | Tuber Size (g) |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
|           | <35 mm | >35 mm | Total | Per plant | Proportion >35 mm | <35 mm | >35 mm | Total |
| 1         | 84040  | 123098 | 207138 | 3.88      | 58.90           | 1366   | 6004   | 7370  |
| 2         | 53677  | 279665 | 333341 | 6.25      | 84.00           | 1185   | 19544  | 20729 |
| 3         | 97483  | 235290 | 332773 | 6.24      | 60.00           | 1549   | 7976   | 9525  |
| 4         | 118630 | 235290 | 332773 | 6.24      | 60.00           | 1549   | 7976   | 9525  |
| 5         | 103055 | 221153 | 238657 | 6.24      | 60.00           | 1549   | 7976   | 9525  |
| 6         | 109425 | 221153 | 238657 | 6.24      | 60.00           | 1549   | 7976   | 9525  |
| 7         | 74999  | 255865 | 330864 | 6.20      | 72.70           | 1292   | 16929  | 18222 |
| 8         | 125974 | 220737 | 346711 | 6.20      | 72.70           | 1292   | 16929  | 18222 |
| 9         | 92322  | 221333 | 313656 | 5.88      | 68.80           | 1752   | 13681  | 15433 |
| 10        | 91719  | 268158 | 359877 | 6.75      | 74.60           | 1658   | 19000  | 20658 |
| Mean      | 95132  | 211890 | 307023 | 5.76      | 68.10           | 1698   | 13357  | 15055 |
| F Pr      | 0.303  | 0.003  | 0.024  | 0.024    | 0.023           | 0.185  | <.001  | <.001 |
| LSD(0.05) | 55246  | 77303  | 88691  | 1.663    | 15.13           | 818    | 4549   | 4548  |
| CV (%)    | 33.90  | 21.30  | 16.80  | 16.80    | 12.90           | 28.10  | 19.90  | 17.60 |

Notes: 1=Control (No mineral fertilizer and allwin); 2=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + 60 kg N ha⁻¹; 3=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + 20 kg N ha⁻¹; 4=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹; 5=Allwin (Wonder) @ 5 kg ha⁻¹; 6=Allwin (Wonder) @ 2.5 kg ha⁻¹; 7=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + 20 kg N ha⁻¹ + Allwin (Wonder) @ 5 kg ha⁻¹; 8=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + 20 kg N ha⁻¹ + Allwin (Wonder) @ 2.5 kg ha⁻¹; 9=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + Allwin (Wonder) @ 5 kg ha⁻¹; 10=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + Allwin (Wonder) @ 2.5 kg ha⁻¹.
Table 3. Tuber yield and yield components for different fertilizer at Dwale EPA

| Treatment | Number of tubers | Weight of tubers (kg/ha) | Tuber size (g) |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
|           | <35 mm | >35 mm | Total | Per plant | Proportion >35 mm | <35 mm | >35 mm | Total |
| 1         | 262076 | 89866 | 351941 | 6.60 | 25.50 | 2982 | 3127 | 6109 | 114.50 |
| 2         | 280821 | 159449 | 440271 | 8.26 | 35.90 | 3450 | 7519 | 10970 | 205.70 |
| 3         | 360940 | 175000 | 535940 | 9.48 | 28.40 | 3216 | 6580 | 9796 | 183.70 |
| 4         | 385835 | 240460 | 626291 | 11.74 | 39.00 | 3450 | 10538 | 13956 | 261.70 |
| 5         | 220311 | 100444 | 320756 | 6.01 | 29.80 | 1982 | 3394 | 5376 | 100.80 |
| 6         | 235188 | 95739  | 330927 | 6.20 | 30.40 | 2273 | 3587 | 5860 | 109.90 |
| 7         | 253622 | 154846 | 408468 | 7.66 | 39.20 | 2509 | 6586 | 9095 | 170.50 |
| 8         | 346694 | 159152 | 505846 | 9.48 | 31.30 | 3417 | 6819 | 10236 | 191.90 |
| 9         | 341514 | 222802 | 564316 | 10.58 | 39.20 | 2993 | 8639 | 11632 | 218.10 |
| 10        | 267306 | 228376 | 495681 | 9.29 | 46.20 | 2223 | 7886 | 10109 | 189.50 |
| Mean      | 295431 | 162613 | 458044 | 8.53 | 34.70 | 2846 | 6468 | 9314 | 174.60 |
| F Pr      | 0.032  | <.001  | <.001  | 0.003 | 0.017 | 0.101 | 0.001 | <.001 | <.001 |
| LSD (0.05) | 103939 | 64385  | 131484 | 2.71  | 10.43 | 1166 | 3080 | 3200 | 60.00 |
| CV (%)    | 20.50  | 23.10  | 16.70  | 18.50 | 17.50 | 23.90 | 27.80 | 20.00 | 20.00 |

Notes: 1=Control (No mineral fertilizer and allwin) 2=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + 60 kg N ha⁻¹; 3=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + 20 kg N ha⁻¹; 4=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹; 5=Allwin (Wonder) @ 5 kg ha⁻¹; 6=Allwin (Wonder) @ 2.5 kg ha⁻¹; 7=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + 20 kg N ha⁻¹ + Allwin (Wonder) @ 5 kg ha⁻¹; 8=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + 20 kg N ha⁻¹ + Allwin (Wonder) @ 2.5 kg ha⁻¹; 9=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + Allwin (Wonder) @ 5 kg ha⁻¹; 10=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha⁻¹ + Allwin (Wonder) @ 2.5 kg ha⁻¹.
### Table 4. Tuber yield and yield components for different fertilizer at Bembeke

| Treatment | Number of tubers | Weight of tubers (kg/ha) | Tuber size (g) |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
|           | <35 mm | >35 mm | Total | Per plant | Proportion >35 mm | <35 mm | >35 mm | Total |
| 1         | 203682 | 23172  | 226854 | 4.25     | 10.74            | 2202   | 764    | 2966  | 55.60 |
| 2         | 263254 | 69206  | 332460 | 7.01     | 20.70            | 2861   | 2308   | 5169  | 96.90 |
| 3         | 199625 | 39093  | 238717 | 4.48     | 16.04            | 2662   | 1227   | 3889  | 72.90 |
| 4         | 261881 | 46117  | 30998  | 5.77     | 15.16            | 2678   | 1214   | 3892  | 73.00 |
| 5         | 216513 | 48623  | 265135 | 5.16     | 20.54            | 2039   | 1217   | 3256  | 61.00 |
| 6         | 173739 | 34660  | 208399 | 3.91     | 16.60            | 1832   | 1125   | 2957  | 55.50 |
| 7         | 357860 | 34217  | 392077 | 7.25     | 8.65             | 3165   | 1319   | 4484  | 84.10 |
| 8         | 319366 | 34826  | 354192 | 6.76     | 9.68             | 3481   | 1389   | 4871  | 91.30 |
| 9         | 286055 | 50943  | 336998 | 6.32     | 15.12            | 3457   | 1600   | 5057  | 94.80 |
| 10        | 264388 | 45077  | 309465 | 5.80     | 14.67            | 3003   | 680    | 3683  | 69.10 |
| Mean      | 254636 | 42593  | 297230 | 5.67     | 14.79            | 2738   | 1284   | 4022  | 75.40 |
| F Pr      | <.001  | <.001  | <.001  | <.001    | 0.003            | <.001  | <.001  | <.001 | <.001 |
| LSD<sub>(0.05)</sub> | 65242 | 18312  | 72053  | 1.49     | 5.69             | 749    | 487    | 950   | 17.82 |
| CV (%)    | 14.90  | 25.10  | 14.10  | 15.30    | 22.40            | 16.00  | 22.10  | 13.80 | 13.80 |

Notes: 1=Control (No mineral fertilizer and allwin); 2=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + 60 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>; 3=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + 20 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>; 4=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>; 5=Allwin (Wonder) @ 5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>; 6=Allwin (Wonder) @ 2.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>; 7=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + Allwin (Wonder) @ 5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>; 8=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + Allwin (Wonder) @ 2.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>; 9=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + Allwin (Wonder) @ 5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>; 10=NPK 8:18:15 + 6S @ 250 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + Allwin (Wonder) @ 2.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>
4. DISCUSSION

Generally, the soils at Tsangano, Dwale EPA and Bembeke are strongly acid with low amount of N, P, K and medium content of OC. The strongly acid soils and low level of the nutrients necessitate the external supply of nutrients to increase crop yields. Acidic soils limit crop production by impairing root growth there by reducing nutrient and water uptake [5,12]. These conditions convert available soil nutrients into unavailable form. Furthermore, acidic soils are poor in their basic cations such as Ca, K, Mg and some micronutrients which are essential to crop growth [13]. This is clearly demonstrated in the results whereby, the control treatment (no mineral fertilizer and Allwin) had the least tuber yields across the sites. However, Haile and Boke [12] suggested that the extent of damage posed by soil acidity varies from place to place depending on several factors.

Potatoes have a shallow root system and relatively high demand of most nutrients [14]. Application of fertilizer (NPK, N and Allwin (Wonder)) had an influence on potato tuber yield and yield components. Application of recommended fertilizer rate of NPK 8:18:15 + 6S at 250 kg ha$^{-1}$ + 60 kg N ha$^{-1}$ at Tsangano and Bembeke resulted in high tuber yield as well as high number of big sized tubers for varieties Thandizo and violet respectively. Application of NPK 8:18:15 + 6S at 250 kg ha$^{-1}$ at Dwale EPA produced the highest yield using Violet. The differences in genotypic performance over the different sites is striking in this experiment. Genotype-specific differences in nutrient use efficiency have been reported in potato [15,16] and has been attributed to differences in the root system traits and other genetic factors amongst varieties [17,16]. Nevertheless, different combinations of NPK and humate based Allwin (Wonder) fertilizer (Treatments 7, 8, 9 and 10) also gave comparably high yields and high number of big tubers. The comparably high yields could be attributed to enhanced retention in the soil and absorption by plants of major nutrients like N, P and K due to the addition of humic substances through the combined application of mineral fertilizer and Allwin (Wonder). Humic substances contribute to various soil properties (e.g., chelation, buffering, clay mineral-organic interaction, and cation-exchange capacity), which are essential for soil quality [18,19]. Potentially, the soil’s cation exchange capacity (CEC) was improved and there was solubilization of micronutrients by humic acid in the soil that led to the enhancement of the availability and uptake of both macro and micro nutrients by the potato [7].

5. CONCLUSION

Under the poor soil fertility conditions and the changing climate, the combined application of mineral and the humate based fertilizer can improve potato production in Malawi, above sole application of humate based fertilizer. The yields are comparable with sole application of mineral fertilizer applied at the recommended rate, even in treatments where Allwin was applied in combination with reduced rates of nitrogen at top dress. Therefore, Allwin and NPK combinations offer promising soil fertility management options for potato production. The increase in potato yield is attributable to enhanced retention in the soil and absorption by plants of major nutrients. Additional crucial mechanism that could have optimized crop fertilizer use efficiency associates to a function of humic materials, which is the amelioration of soil toxicity and reduction of the leaching of N compounds to groundwater. Humic substances bind these major plant nutrients in a molecular form thereby reducing their solubility in water, minimizes leaching and hinders volatilization of N to the atmosphere. Further studies however are required to validate the findings coupled with economic analyses to determine the profitability of the strategy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank SDS Ramcides Crop Science Private Limited, India through the Chemicals and Marketing Limited, Malawi for funding the work and the Department of Agricultural Research Services in Malawi for supporting the study.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Woolfe J.A. and Poats S.V. The Potato in the human diet. International Potato Centre (CIP); 1986.
2. Demo, P., Mwenye, O.J., Pankomera, P. and Chimwala, L. Investigation of appropriate fertilizer levels for potato production using different planting spacing in major growing areas of Malawi. CIP-DARS research Collaborative 2008/2009 Progress Report. Lilongwe. Malawi; 2008.
3. Fit, E-M., Hangan, M.C. The effect of differential fertilization upon Desirée and Ostara potatoes production. Research Journal of Agricultural Science; 2010; 42 (3): 137-142.

4. Poljak, M., Horak-Čustič, M., Horvat, T., Čoga, L. and Majić, A. Effects of nitrogen nutrition on potato tuber composition and yield. Cereal Research Communications; 2007; 35: 937-940.

5. Marschner, H. Mineral nutrition of higher plants. Second edition. Academic Press, London; 1995.

6. Pettit, R.E. Organic matter, humus, humate, humic acid, fulvic acid and humin: Their importance in soil fertility and plant health.
http://www.humates.com/pdf/ORGANICMATTERPettit.pdf

7. Kussow, W.R. Humate and Humic Acid. Horticulture Update; ed., Welsh, DF, Extension Horticulture, Texas Cooperative Extension, the Texas A&M University System, College Station, Texas; 2002.

8. Okalebo, J.R., Gathua, K.W. and Woomer, P.L. Laboratory methods of soil and plant analysis: A Working Manual. TSBF-KARI-UNESCO, Nairobi, Kenya. 2000:5-20.

9. Mehlich, A. Mehlich 3 soil test extractant: A modification of Mehlich 2 extractant. Community of Soil Science and Plant Analysis. 1984;15(12): 1409-1416.

10. Schumacher, B.A. Method for the determination of total organic carbon (TOC) in soils and sediments. US Environmental Protection Agency. Environmental Sciences Division 11. Amin, M. and Flowers, T.H. Evaluation of the Kjeldahl digestion method. Journal of Research (Science); 2004;5(2):59-179. National Exposure Research Laboratory, Las Vegas. 2002:3-23

11. Amin, M. and Flowers, T.H. Evaluation of the Kjeldahl digestion method. Journal of Research (Science); 2004;5(2):59-179. National Exposure Research Laboratory, Las Vegas.

12. Haile, W. and Boke S. On-farm verification of lime and NPK fertilisers effects on the tuber yield of irish potato (Solanum tuberosum) on some acidic soils of southern Ethiopia. Journal of Dryland; 2011;4:283-288.

13. Wang J, Raman H, Zhang G, Mendham N, Zou M. Aluminium tolerance in barley (Horidium vulgari L.): Physiological mechanisms, genetics and screening methods. Journal of Zhejiang University Science. 2006;7:769-787.

14. Koch M, Naumann M, Pawelzik E, Gransee A, Thiel H. The importance of nutrient management for potato production part I: Plant Nutrition and Yield. Potato research; 2020;63:97-119. Available:https://doi.org/10.1007/s11540-019-09431-2

15. Sandraña P. Phosphorus uptake and utilization efficiency in response to potato genotype and phosphorus availability. European Journal of Agronomy. 2016;76: 95–106. DOI:10.1016/j.eja.2016.02.003

16. Wacker-Fester K, Uptmoor R, Pfahler V, Dehmer KJ, Bachmann-Pfabe S, Kavka M. Genotype-specific differences in phosphorus efficiency of potato (Solanum tuberosum L.) Frontiers in Plant Sciences; 2019;10:1029. DOI: 10.3389/fpls.2019.01029

17. Trehan SP. Nutrient management by exploiting genetic diversity of potato—A review. Potato Journal. 2005;32:1–15.

18. Selim EM, Mosa AA. Fertigation of humic substances improves yield and quality of broccoli and nutrient retention in a sandy soil. Journal of Plant Nutrition Soil Science; 2012;1-9. DOI:10.1002/jpn.201100062

19. Noroozisharaf A, Kaviani M. Effect of soil application of humic acid on nutrients uptake, essential oil and chemical compositions of garden thyme (Thymus vulgaris L.) under greenhouse conditions. Physiology and Molecular Biology of Plants. 2018;24:423–431.

© 2020 Masamba et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/56794