

Evaluation of Pigeon pea (*Cajanus cajan*) Varieties for Biomass Yield and Quality Parameters under Irrigation in three districts of South Omo, South-Western Ethiopia

Escentific Publishers

*Corresponding Author: Denbela Hidosa, Departments of Livestock Research, Jinka Agricultural Research Center, Jinka, Ethiopia

Rec

A
T
C
t
f
c
h
s
C
e
f
E

Int

The
in I
rou
rou
nut
ma
the
(De
enc
sa €
me

Suspended

10 to 27.46% (Hunegnaw and Birehan, 2016; Denbela *et al.*, 2018; Denbela *et al.*, 2020). It was reported that the dry matter yields

South Omo with an estimate the total population of 79, 419 (CSA, 2010). The population is composed of three ethnic groups of Ham-

333
 /er-
 x of
 i%)
 rict
 ges
 y of
 cat-
 ver,
 and
 ngi-
 ean
 ll is

Suspended

Alfredia
 da
 onedia
 Some

sench and Nyagatom districts of South Omo. Dassench district is situated at a geographical location of 5°14'0"N Latitude, 36°44'01"E Longitude with an elevation range of 350 to 900 meter above sea level with an average temperatures ranging from 25 to 40°C. The annual rainfall is ranging from 350 to 600mm having a bimodal rainfall type with erratic distribution and soil type is Alluvial. According to the population projections for 2016/17 based on the population and housing census conducted in 2007 (CSA, 2008), the Dassench district has a total human population of 70, 133 and whereas, the population of livestock are estimated to be 1, 014, 403 cattle, 753, 568 sheep, 1, 013,971 goats, 23, 412 Poultry and 17, 228 donkeys. The Hamer district is also among the districts found in

bele from Nyagatom district were selected for a participatory on-farm evaluation trial. One APREG in each Kebele with 25 household (20 males and 5 females) was established with active involvements of district pastoral office expertise, Kebele development agents and local leaders. After establishment of APREGs, training was organized for all APREGs members and agricultural extension workers on forage agronomic parameters and forage production techniques, irrigation water management schemes.

Experimental Design and Treatments

The four Pigeon pea varieties namely DZ-16555, DZ-00420, DZBS and Tsegabe were collected from Debire Zeit Agricultural Research

Gs)
 s of
 tive
 Ke-

Center, whereas, the pigeon pea variety which used as local check was purchased from the local market. The tested pigeon pea vari-

eties (AOAC, 1990). Dry matter (DM), crude protein (CP) and ash were

er
c
c
l
t
c
r
f
i
c
I
T
i
h
v
i
v
a
i
r
v
t
E
s
(
c
T
i
F

ral
ure
ber
/an
ari-
ce-
The
red
ifi-
= μ
 μ =
on;
an-
to
em
l in
ult
eld
; it
ver,
nd
05)
55

yields in kg/m to t/ha. To determine the fresh weight of leaf to stem ratio, samples were categorized into leaf and stem first and then the weights of each component was measured separately. The samples were oven dried for 24 hours at a temperature of 105°C and separately weighed to estimate the proportions of these parts. Accordingly, the Leaf to Stem Ratio (LTSR) was estimated based on the dry matter of each component.

Quality Parameter Analysis

The laboratory analysis was done at Debre Birhan Agricultural Research Center, Ethiopia. Three forage sample of each variety was allowed to be oven dried set at a temperature of 65°C for 48 hours

and ground to pass through a 1mm sieve screen for chemical analysis (AOAC, 1990). Dry matter (DM), crude protein (CP) and ash were determined. The results of the chemical analysis are presented in Table 1. The results showed that the DM content of the forage samples was significantly higher ($p < 0.05$) for DZ-16555 and local check varieties than DZ-16575, DZ-00420 and Tsegabe varieties. The higher biomass yield for DZ-16555 variety over other varieties from this study is due to high genetic potential of variety. The previous studied reports were showed that the wider range of biomass yield difference observed between forage species could be attributed due to differences in genetic potential of variety to adapt to given agro-ecologies (Usman *et al.*, 2018). The biomass yield obtained from this study for DZ-16555 and Tsegabe higher than previously

reported values of (6.47t ha⁻¹) and (5.42t ha⁻¹) by Abuye *et al.* (2019) and 13.92-21.84 t ha⁻¹ Denbela *et al.*(2020) from Ethiopia, res; pige age whi exce leaf stuc ies l stuc rept Den

branches per plant at Hamer district than Dassench and Nyagatom districts is due to suitable temperature and favorable soil param-

res; pige age whi exce leaf stuc ies l stuc rept Den
 DZ
 DZ
 Tse
 DZ
 Lo
 SE
 LS
 Ke
 b
 ra
 at
 T
 va

Suspended

Effect of Location on Biomass yield, Plant Height, Branches per Plant and LTSR

The effects of location on biomass yield, plant height, branches per plant and LTSR are presented in Table 2. The results from this study shown that the higher ($p < 0.05$) biomass yield, longer plant height and more branches per plant were obtained from Hamer district than Dassench, Nyagatom districts and however, these parameters were similar ($p > 0.05$) for Dassench and Nyagatom districts. The result from this study for LTSR revealed that the higher ($p < 0.05$) leaf to stem ratio was observed for Dassench district than Hamer and Nyagatom districts. The higher biomass yield, plant height,

Nyagatom districts in 2019 cropping year.

Effect of Location by Variety on Biomass yield, Plant height, Branches per Plant and LTSR

The effect of location by variety on biomass yield, plant height, branches per plant and leaf to stem ratio are presented in Table 3. The result for location by variety revealed that the higher ($p < 0.05$) biomass yield was obtained from Hmer location than Dassench and Nyagatom locations for all pigeon varieties, but it was similar ($p > 0.05$) for Dassech and Nyagatom locations. Conversely, longer ($p < 0.05$) plant height was also observed at Hamer location than Dassench and Nyagatom locations for all varieties except Tseagabe

variety which is significantly ($p < 0.05$) shorter plant height in Nyagatom location than Dassench location. Moreover, more ($p < 0.05$)

Key note: (Means with the same letters (a, b, c, d, e, f, g) across column for biomass yield, Plant height, Branches per Plant and LTSR = Leaf

br.
to
nil
tio
all
to
va
Ha
foi
to
tes
to
ge
en
dif

it
f

h,
l-
:a
.n
l-
r-
0
5
)
t-



DZ-16555	Hamer	27.18 ^b	2.88 ^a	26 ^{bcd}	0.70 ^e
	Nyagatom	7.56 ^{cd}	1.76 ^{de}	18.67 ^{efg}	1.32 ^{bc}
	Dassench	15.36 ^c	1.75 ^{de}	23.33 ^{cdef}	2.14 ^a
	Hamer	37.20 ^a	2.74 ^a	39.67 ^a	0.73 ^{de}
	Nyagatom	11.26 ^{cd}	1.70 ^e	21.33 ^{cdef}	1.64 ^{abc}
SEM	-	4.88	0.21	5.28	0.26
LSD	-	10.01	0.43	10.82	0.53

Table 3: Effect of location by variety on biomass yield, plant height, branches per plant and LTSR at irrigated lowland of Dassench, Hamer and Nyagatom districts in 2019 cropping year.

CP value for pigeon pea DZ-16555 was comparable to the value of 26.41% reported by Mekonnen *et al.*(2016), but it was higher than values reported by Netsanet and Yonatan (2015) and Denbela *et al.*(2018) for Tsegabe, DZ-00420 and DZ-16575 varieties. The animals are needed diets which have high quality protein to acquire desired production. The ruminant animals will be transformed the crude protein in feeds into ammonia by microbial digestion and this ammonia is used as source of nitrogen for rumen microbes to synthesis microbial protein which will be used by host animal (Pazla *et al.*, 2018). Generally, the crude protein contents from present study (1991g/kg– 271g/kg, DM) for all varieties were higher than

the minimum required crude protein levels (70-80g/kg, DM) for normal microbial digestion take place in rumen of ruminant herbi-

SEM	8.51	17.3	11.8	50.60	39.70
LSD	17.88	36.5	2.48	10.64	83.80

vor
pro
eti
rur
(12
rur
thr
cor
qu
(CF
pe
qu
the

Th
qu
ent
AD
cal
val
the
Ne
et
re
re
the
Oo
co
45
lov

ies except local check variety can be classified as medium quality forages class.

Variety	DM%	Ash (g kg,DM ⁻¹)	CP (gkg ⁻¹ , DM)	NDF (gkg ⁻¹ , DM)	ADF (gkg ⁻¹ , DM)
Tsegbe	89.85	88.1	230 ^b	572.6	433.80
DZ-00420	90.33	69.4	215.5 ^{bc}	572.1	431.50
DZ-16575	90.83	70.8	227.8 ^b	553.1	423.80
DZ-16555	77.13	95.2	271.8 ^a	530.9	407.20
Local-check	90.33	79.3	199.1 ^c	608.1	427.70

nutrients which will be used by the plant is known to increase leaf area and rate of photosynthesis and as a consequence, the CP content of subsequently the increased with lower fibers contents.

Conclusion

The higher biomass yield was obtained for the DZ-16555 variety, while lower biomass yield was for local pigeon pea variety. Conversely, DZ-16555 variety gave the higher crude protein and lower NDF and ADF, while pigeon pea local variety gave the lower crude protein and higher NDF and ADF. Pertaining to location effect, the higher biomass yield was obtained from Hamer location, whereas the lower biomass yield was obtained from Nyagatom location. On

the other hand, the result for location by variety showed that the forage biomass yield, plant height, tillers per plant and leaf to stem

3. Adugna, T., Assefa, G., Geleti, D., Gizachewe, L. and Mengistu, A. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,

r
l
y
c
e
b
p

c

c

References

1. Abuye Tulu, Mekonnen Diribsa, Gutu Fekede and Worku Temesgen. (2019). Evaluation of Multi-Environment Forage Yield Trial of Selected Pigeon Pea (*Cajanus cajan*) Genotypes Grown in Western Oromia, Ethiopia Based on GGE Bi-Plot Model, World Journal of Agricultural Sciences 15 (1): 7-14.
2. Admasu Teferi, Abule Erbo and Tessema Zewudu, (2010). Livestock-rangeland management practices and community perceptions towards rangeland degradation in South Omo zone of Southern Ethiopia. Livestock Research for Rural Development, 22(5) 1-8
3. Adugna, T., Assefa, G., Geleti, D., Gizachewe, L. and Mengistu, A. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
4. Cheva- Isarakul, B. (1992). Pigeon pea as a ruminant feed. Asian-Australasian J. Animal Science; 5(3): 549-558.
5. Cook, B. G., Pengelly, B. C., Brown, S. D., Donnelly, J. L., Eagles, D. A., Franco, M. A., Hanson, J., Mullen, B. F., Partridge, I. J., Peters, M., Schultze-Kraft, R. (2005). Tropical forages. CSIRO, DPI&F(Qld), CIAT and ILRI, Brisbane, Australia.
6. Da Silva, R. L. N. V.; de Araújo, G. G. L.; do Socorro, E. P.; Oliveira, R. L.; Neto, A. F. G.; Bagaldo, A. R., (2009). Levels of forage watermelon meal in diets for sheep. Rev. Bras. Zootec., 38 (6): 1142-1148.
7. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
8. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
9. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
10. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
11. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
12. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
13. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
14. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
15. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
16. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
17. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
18. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
19. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
20. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
21. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
22. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
23. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
24. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
25. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
26. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
27. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
28. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
29. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
30. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
31. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
32. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
33. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
34. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
35. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
36. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
37. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
38. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
39. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
40. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
41. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
42. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
43. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
44. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
45. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
46. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
47. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
48. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
49. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
50. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
51. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
52. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
53. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
54. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
55. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
56. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
57. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
58. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
59. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
60. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
61. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
62. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
63. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
64. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
65. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
66. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
67. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
68. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
69. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
70. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
71. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
72. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
73. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
74. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
75. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
76. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
77. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
78. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
79. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
80. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
81. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
82. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
83. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
84. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
85. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
86. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
87. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
88. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
89. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
90. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
91. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
92. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
93. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
94. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
95. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
96. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
97. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
98. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
99. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,
100. (2012). Feed Resource Availability and Quality: In: Adugna, T.,

Citation: Denbela Hidosa. (2021). Evaluation of Pigeon pea (*Cajanus cajan*) Varieties for Biomass Yield and Quality Parameters under Irrigation in three districts of South Omo, South-Western Ethiopia. *Journal of Agriculture and Aquaculture* 3(2).

14. Denbela Hidosa, Adugna Tolera and Ajebu Nurfeta. (2018). 24. Jamarun N, Zain M. (2013). Dasar nutrisi ruminansia. Jasa

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

21.

Feed Resource, Feed Availability and Production Constraints in Maale Woreda in South Omo Zone. J Fisheries Livest Prod 6: 269.

22. Hunegnaw Abebe and Berhan Tamir. (2016). Effects of supplementation with pigeon pea (*Cajanus cajan*), cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata*) and lablab (*Lablab purpureus*) on feed intake, body weight gain and carcass characteristics in Wollo sheep fed grass hay. Int. J. Adv. Res. Biol. Sci. 3(2): 280-295.

23. International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI). (2011). Pigeon pea (*Cajanus cajan*) for livestock feed on small-scale farms. ILRI Forage Factsheet.

pureum). Pak J Nutr 17 (10): 462-70. <https://scialert.net/abstract/?doi=pjn.2018.462.470>.

33. Poppidp and Mclennansr. (1995). Protein and energy utilization by ruminants at pasture. Journal of Animal Science, 73, 278-290.

34. Rao SC, Phillips WA, Mayeux HS and Phatak SC. (2003). Forage and Grazing lands. Potential Grain and Forage Production of Early Maturing Pigeon pea in the Southern Great Plains. Crop Science Society of America 43: 2212-2217.

35. Rao, S. C.; Northup, B. K., (2012). Pigeon pea potential for summer grazing in the southern great plains. Agron. J., 104 (1): 199-203.

36. Saxena KB, MG, Mula MG, Sugui FP, Layaoen HL, Domoguen RL, Pasca
bio JI
Dry I
37. Saxe
tancl
rese
38. Seyo
Eval
niset
phoi
Conf
May
39. Shar
janus
Envi
40. Singl
ener
41. Singl
chan
ter d
Anir
42. SOFEDB (South Omo Zone Finance andf Economy Develop-
ka, Ethio-
e.
guide for
itute Inc.,
018). Per-
essions at
f Biology,
Ruminant,
:ll Univer-
ethods of
1 polysac-
74: 3583-
of dietary
ccharides
35.

Suspended

Benefits of Publishing with EScientific Publishers:

- ❖ Swift Peer Review
- ❖ Freely accessible online immediately upon publication
- ❖ Global archiving of articles
- ❖ Authors Retain Copyrights
- ❖ Visibility through different online platforms

Submit your Paper at:

<https://escientificpublishers.com/submission>