



Contribution of *Gliricidia sepium* green leaf biomass on maize grain nutrient properties

Alamu Emmanuel Oladeji¹, Njoloma Joyce², Ngumayo Joel³, Akello Juliet¹, Chikoye David¹, Nyoka Isaac², Dale Lewis³, Ray Chazangwe³, Mehreteab Tesfai⁴, and Nagothu Udaya Sekhar⁴

¹International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA), Southern Africa Hub, Lusaka, Zambia ²International Centre for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF), Lilongwe, Malawi ³Community Markets for Conservation (COMACO), Lusaka, Zambia ⁴Norwegian Institute of Bioeconomy Research (NIBIO), Norway

Introduction

Agroforestry practices improves soil health which in turn improves crop nutrient concentrations and quality. This study examined how agroforestry tree (*Gliricidia sepium*) green leaf biomass manure incorporation improved maize grain nutrient compositions.

Objective

The study primary objectives was to:

- Assess the impact of agroforestry-based interventions on the nutrients of the selected maize food crop
- Determine if agroforestry practices result in healthier and nutrient-rich maize produce.

Materials and Methods

The study was conducted in five chiefdoms of Eastern Zambia for three crop-growing seasons (2019–2022) on 13 farmer-led demonstration trial sites.

Three treatments were tested that included Maize under *Gliricidia* alleys with green leaf biomass incorporated at the onset of the cropping season (T1), Chemical fertilized maize (T2) and Unfertilized maize (T3) .

Grain samples were analysed for crop nutrients contents using standard laboratory methods. Grain samples were collected and analysed for crop nutrients.



Figure 1: *Gliricidia* leaf biomass incorporation into the soil (credit-Njoloma Joyce)



Figure 2: Maize from *Gliricidia* leaf biomass incorporated plot at harvest (credit-Njoloma Joyce)

Table 1: Crop nutrients and functional properties analysed

Properties	Parameter analyzed
▪ Nutritional properties	Fat, Ash, Protein, Starch, Crude Fibre, Sugar, Amylose, Total carbohydrate
▪ Antinutritional properties	Phytates and Tannins
▪ Functional properties	Water absorption capacity, Oil Absorption Capacity, Bulk Density of grains, Swelling power and Solubility
▪ Mineral properties	Nitrogen, Sodium, Potassium, Magnesium, Manganese, Copper, Iron and Zinc

Results and Discussion

Table 2: Nutritional, antinutritional, and functional properties of maize by Treatment (N=111)

Parameters	Maize + <i>Gliricidia</i> (T1)	Maize + mineral fertilization (T2)	Maize only (T3)
Nutritional (NP)			
% MC	6.66 b	6.70 b	5.82 a
%Ash	1.29 a	1.35 b	1.29 a
%Protein	7.57 a	8.28 c	7.68 b
%Sugar	3.09 a	3.51 c	3.36 b
%Starch	72.23 b	71.49 a	71.70 a
%Amylose	25.04 b	24.19 a	25.64 c
%Amylopectin	74.96 b	75.81 c	74.36 a
Antinutritional (ANP)			
%Phytic acid	6.04 a	5.41 a	5.82 a
Tannin (mg/g)	6.27 b	6.78 a	6.34 b
Functional (FP)			
% WAC	159.53 a	163.81 b	163.78 ab
BD (g/ml)	1.61 c	1.51 b	1.25 a
SP	7.68 b	7.46 a	7.20 a
%Soluble	14.59a	15.81 ab	18.38 b
Dispersibility	70.64 b	67.369 a	66.32 a

Table 2 shows that Treatments had significant effects ($P < 0.0001$) on all NPs, ANPs, and FPs except %Crude fibre, %Fat, %Total carbohydrate (CHO), and %Metabolizable Energy (ME). Maize under T1 (*Gliricidia* alleys) had higher starch and reduced tannin contents compared T2 (mineral fertilizer) and T3 (maize only).

Table 3: Effect of treatment on the mineral composition of maize (N =111)

Parameter	<i>Gliricidia</i> + Maize (T1)	Fertilized Maize (T2)	Maize only (T3)
N (%)	1.21 b	1.40 c	1.21 b
P (mg/100g)	253.06 b	237.12 a	240.90 b
Ca (mg/100g)	133.48 a	184.00 b	229.58 c
Mg (mg/100g)	73.60 c	71.45 b	59.78 a
K (mg/100g)	351.61 c	275.21 a	220.38 a
Na (mg/kg)	20.57 a	24.17 b	25.88 c
Mn (mg/kg)	15.51 c	11.91 b	6.15 a
Fe (mg/kg)	20.22 c	18.85 b	16.44 a
Cu (mg/kg)	3.35 a	3.78 b	3.52 b
Zn (mg/kg)	14.19 a	22.90 b	31.61 c

Table 3 shows that *Gliricidia* + maize (T1) had higher values for P, Mg, K, Mn and Fe content than both the Fertilized maize (T2) and the control (T3)

Conclusion

The results implies that *Gliricidia sepium* leaf biomass incorporation has potential to improved the basic nutritional properties and reduced the antinutritional component of maize compared to maize only (Control).. Thus, ensuring healthier and nutrient rich maize produce for smallholder farmers

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the financial support from NORAD/ Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway and the support of all farmers that participated in the study.