Effect of legume intercropping on N₂O emission and CH₄ uptake during maize production 1 2 in the Ethiopian Rift Valley 3 Shimelis G Raji^{1,2} and Peter Dörsch¹ 4 5 ¹ Faculty for Environmental Sciences and Resource Management, Norwegian University of Life 6 Sciences (NMBU), 1432 Ås, Norway 7 ² College of Agriculture, Hawassa University, P.O, Box 05, Hawassa, Ethiopia 8 9 Correspondence to: Peter Dörsch (peter.doersch@nmbu.no) 10

11 Abstract

12 Intercropping with legumes is an important component of climate smart agriculture (CSA) in sub-13 Saharan Africa, but little is known about its effect on soil greenhouse gas (GHG) exchange. A field experiment was established at Hawassa in the Ethiopian rift valley, comparing nitrous oxide (N_2O) 14 and methane (CH₄) fluxes in minerally fertilized maize (64 kg N ha⁻¹) with and without crotalaria 15 (C. juncea) or lablab (L. purpureus) as intercrops over two growing seasons. To study the effect 16 17 of intercropping time, intercrops were sown either three or six weeks after maize. The legumes were harvested at flowering and half of the above-ground biomass was mulched. In the first season, 18 19 cumulative N₂O emissions were largest in 3-week lablab, with all other treatments being equal or lower than the fertilized maize monocrop. After reducing mineral N input to intercropped systems 20 21 by 50% in the second season, N₂O emissions were comparable with the fully fertilized control. Maize yield-scaled N₂O emissions in the first season increased linearly with above-ground legume 22 23 N-yield (P=0.01), but not in the second season when early rains resulted in less legume biomass 24 because of shading by maize. Growing season N_2O -N emission factors varied from 0.02 to 0.25 in 25 2015 and 0.11 to 0.20% in 2016 of the estimated total N input. Growing season CH₄ uptake ranged from 1.0 to 1.5 kg CH₄-C ha⁻¹ with no significant differences between treatments or years, but 26 setting off the N₂O-associated emissions by up to 69%. Our results suggest that leguminous 27 intercrops may increase N₂O emissions when developing large biomass in dry years, but when 28

mulched, can replace part of the fertilizer N in normal years, thus supporting CSA goals whileintensifying crop production in the region.

31

32 Key words: yield-scaled N₂O emissions, CH₄ uptake, legume-intercropping, maize, Africa

33

34 **1. Introduction**

35 With a rapidly increasing population and declining agricultural land in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), increasing productivity per area (intensification) is the only viable alternative for producing 36 37 sufficient food and feed (Hickman et al., 2014a). Intensification entails increased use of inorganic fertilizers, which may cause emissions of nitrous oxide (N_2O). Abundant ammonium (NH_4^+) may 38 39 also reduce the soil CH₄ sink by competing with CH₄ for the active binding site of methane monooxygenase, the key enzyme of CH₄ oxidation (Bédard and Knowles, 1989). Climate smart 40 agriculture (CSA) is an approach to transform agricultural practices in a changing climate with the 41 triple objective of increasing agricultural productivity, building climate resilience, and reducing 42 GHG emissions (Neufeldt et al., 2013). Potential CSA practices include improved water 43 management, use of improved livestock and crop species, conservation farming, agroforestry and 44 crop diversification as well as improved soil fertility management practices (Makate et al., 2019). 45 Legume intercropping is one way to diversify and intensify cropping systems, while contributing 46 47 to food and nutritional security of smallholder farmers (de Jager et al., 2019). Legume 48 intercropping can also be used to add biologically fixed nitrogen to soils and to build soil carbon 49 and improve soil quality (Bedoussac et al., 2015). As such, it is a powerful approach to reduce 50 greenhouse gas emissions by replacing inorganic fertilizers and GHG emissions associated with 51 their production. However, GHG measurements in SSA crop production systems in general, and 52 in legume intercropping systems in particular, are scarce and proof-of-concept for the mitigation 53 potential of legume intercropping is missing (Kim et al., 2016, Hickman et al., 2014b). Moreover, 54 modelling studies predict significant negative impacts of climate change on crop productivity in Africa (Blanc and Strobl, 2013) and it is largely unknown how these and the countermeasures 55 taken to maintain agricultural productivity will affect GHG emissions. 56

Crop production is a major source of N₂O, the third-most important anthropogenic GHG after CH₄
and CO₂ (IPCC, 2014). Emission rates of N₂O reported for SSA crop production so far are low

59 (Kim et al., 2016) owing to low fertilization rates, but may increase with increasing intensification. Inorganic and organic N added to soil provide ammonium (NH_4^+) and nitrate (NO_3^-) for 60 nitrification and denitrification, respectively, which are the two main processes of microbial N₂O 61 production in soil (Khalil et al., 2004). The rate of N_2O formation depends greatly on the extent 62 and distribution of anoxic microsites in soils, which is controlled by moisture, texture and the 63 distribution of decomposable organic matter and NH_4^+ fueling heterotrophic and autotrophic 64 respiration, respectively (Schlüter et al., 2019, Wrage-Mönnig et al., 2018). The magnitude of soil 65 N_2O emissions depends on O_2 availability as controlled by soil moisture and respiration, 66 availability of mineral N and readily decomposable C (Harrison-Kirk et al., 2013) and soil pH 67 (Russenes et al., 2016), all of which are affected by management practices. Other important factors 68 are soil type (Davidson et al., 2000) and temperature (Schaufler et al., 2010). The N₂O yield of 69 nitrification and the production and reduction of N₂O during denitrification are further controlled 70 by soil pH (Bakken et al., 2012, Nadeem et al., 2019) and by the balance between oxidizable 71 carbon and available NO₃⁻ (Wu et al., 2018). Mulching and incorporation of crop residues leads to 72 increased N mineralization and respiratory O₂ consumption, thus potentially enhancing N₂O 73 74 emissions both from nitrification and denitrification (Drury et al., 1991), if soil moisture is sufficient to support microbial activity and restrict O₂ diffusion into the soil. Accordingly, N₂O 75 76 emissions are variable in time, often following rainfall events (Schwenke et al., 2016).

77 Crop diversification by combining legumes with cereals, both in rotation and intercropping, 78 enhances overall productivity and resource use efficiency, if managed properly (Ehrmann and Ritz, 2014). Intercropping of maize with grain legumes is common in the rift valley of Ethiopia and 79 central component in CSA (Arslan et al., 2015). In low input systems common to the Rift Valley, 80 integration of legumes with cereals diversifies the produce and improves farm income and 81 nutritional diversity for smallholder farmers (Sime and Aune, 2018). Moreover, by partially 82 replacing energy-intensive synthetic N, intercropping with legumes may increase the sustainability 83 of the agroecosystem as a whole (Carranca et al., 2015). However, to make best use of the resource 84 use complementarity of inter and main crop, the planting time of the intercrop has to be optimized 85 so that the maximum nutrient demand of the two components occurs at different times (Carruthers 86 87 et al., 2000). The timing of intercrops could also affect N₂O emissions if N mineralization from legume residues is poorly synchronized with the N requirement of the cereal crop. This can be 88 counteracted by reducing mineral N additions to intercropping systems, but the timing of the 89

90 intercrop (sowing date relative to the cereal crop) remains an issue that has, to the best of our
91 knowledge, not been studied with regard to N₂O emissions.

92 Intercropping and mulching may also affect the soil's capacity to oxidize atmospheric CH₄ as 93 abundant NH₄⁺ might inhibit methanotrophs (Laanbroek and Bodelier, 2004). However, field studies with incorporation of leguminous or non-leguminous catch crops have been inconclusive 94 (e.g. Sanz-Cobena et al., 2014). In a meta-study on CH₄ fluxes in non-wetland soils, Aronson and 95 Helliker (2010) concluded that N inhibition of CH₄ uptake is unlikely at fertilization rates below 96 100 kg N ha⁻¹ v⁻¹ and that much to the contrary, N addition may stimulate CH₄ uptake in N-limited 97 soils. Ho et al. (2015) found that incorporation of organic residues stimulated CH₄ uptake even in 98 fairly N-rich Dutch soils. Apart from providing reactive nitrogen to the soil, leguminous intercrops 99 may also affect CH₄ uptake by lowering soil moisture and thus increasing the diffusive flux of 100 101 atmospheric CH₄ into the soil. For instance, Wanyama et al. (2019) found that CH₄ uptake in soil 102 was negatively correlated with mean annual water-filled pore space in a study on different land 103 use intensities in Kenya.

104 In a review on N₂O fluxes in agricultural legume crops, Rochette and Janzen (2005) concluded 105 that the effect of legumes on N₂O emission is to be attributed to the release of extra N by rhizodeposition of soluble N compounds and decomposition of nodules rather than to the process 106 of nitrogen fixation itself. Intercropped legumes may thus affect N_2O emissions in two ways: by 107 directly providing organic N or by modulating the competition between plants and microbes for 108 109 soil N, for example by acting as an additional N sink prior to nodulation. Compared to mineral 110 fertilizers, N supply from biological fixation is considered environmentally friendly as it can potentially replace industrially fixed N (Jensen and Hauggaard-Nielsen, 2003), provided that crop 111 yields remain the same. However, combining easily degradable crop residues with synthetic N can 112 lead to elevated N₂O emissions (Baggs et al., 2000), potentially compromising the environmental 113 114 friendliness of intercropping in CSA. It is well known that the effect of crop residues on N₂O emission depends on a variety of factors such as residue amount and quality (C:N ratio, lignin and 115 cellulose content), soil properties (e.g. texture), placement mode (mulching, incorporation) and 116 117 soil moisture and temperature regimes (Sanz-Cobena et al., 2014, Li et al., 2016). So far, there is only a limited number of studies addressing the effect of legume intercropping on N₂O emissions 118 and CH₄ uptake in SSA crop production (Baggs et al., 2006; Millar et al., 2004; Dick et al., 2008). 119

120 The main objective of the present study was to evaluate the effects of forage legume intercropping 121 with maize on N_2O and CH_4 emissions during maize production in the Ethiopian Rift Valley. We 122 hypothesized that forage legumes increase N₂O emissions and decrease CH₄ uptake depending on above-ground biomass, legume species and sowing date; legumes intercropped three weeks after 123 sowing of maize would result in higher yields than those intercropped six weeks after maize and 124 lead to increased N₂O emissions if used with full-dose mineral fertilization. With late 125 126 intercropping, legume yields would be suppressed having no or little effect on N₂O emissions. 127 Hence, choosing legume species, sowing date and accounting for potential N inputs from legume intercrops could allow for better management of legume intercropping in SSA with reduced GHG 128 129 emissions.

130

131 **2. Materials and methods**

132 **2.1 Study area**

133 The field experiment was conducted during two years (2015-2016) at the Hawassa University Research Farm, 07°3'3.4"N and 38°30"20.4'E at an altitude of 1660 m a.s.l.. The mean annual 134 135 rainfall is 961 mm, with a bimodal pattern. The rainy season between June and October accounts for close to 80% of the annual rainfall. Average maximum and minimum monthly temperatures 136 137 are 27.4 and 12.9°C, respectively. The soil is clay-loam (46% sand, 26% silt, 28% clay) derived from weathered volcanic rock (Andosols), with a bulk density of 1.25 ± 0.05 g cm⁻³, a total N 138 content of 0.12%, an organic C content of 1.64%, an available Olsen P content of 175 mg kg⁻¹ and 139 a pH_{H2O} of 6.14. 140

141 **2.2 Experimental design and treatments**

Experimental plots (20 m²) were laid out in a complete randomized block design (RCBD) with four replicates and six treatments: unfertilized maize monocrop (M-F), fertilized maize monocrop (M+F), crotalaria intercropping three (M+Cr3w) and six (M+Cr6w) weeks after sowing maize and lablab intercropping three (M+Lb3w) and six (M+Lb6w) weeks after sowing maize (Table 2). Seed bed was prepared in both years by mold board plow to a depth of 0.25 m followed by harrowing by a tractor. A hybrid maize variety, BH-540 (released in 1995) was sown on May 30, 2015 and May 7, 2016. Maize was planted at a density of 53,333 plants ha⁻¹. Following national fertilization recommendations, diammonium phosphate (18 kg N, 20 kg P) was applied manually at planting and urea (46 kg N) four weeks after sowing maize, to all treatments except for the unfertilized control. The N fertilization rate was halved for the intercropping treatments in the 2016 season to account for carry-over of N from forage legumes grown in the previous year. The forage legumes crotalaria (*C. juncea*) and lablab (*L. purpureus*) were planted between maize rows at a density of 500,000 and 250,000 plants ha⁻¹, respectively.

155 The above-ground forage legume biomass was harvested at flowering and half of it was removed. 156 The remaining half was spread manually between the maize rows after cutting the fresh biomass 157 into ~10 cm pieces. Three- and 6-week intercrops were mulched on 27 July and 4 September in 2015 and 2 August and 8 September in 2016. As the mulching was done plot wise, plots within 158 159 the same treatment received different amounts of mulch depending on the legume yield of each 160 plot. In the 2016 growing season, all treatments were kept on the same plots as in 2015, capitalizing 161 on plot-specific N and C input from previous mulch. Aboveground dry matter yield was determined by drying a subsample at 72°C for 48 hours and C and N contents were measured by 162 163 an element analyser.

164 2.3 N₂O and CH₄ fluxes and ancillary data

GHG exchange was monitored weekly at different spots within the middle maize row by static, non-vented chambers (Rochette et al., 2008). We used custom-made aluminum chambers with an internal volume of 0.144 m³ and a cross-sectional area of 0.36 m² (Fig. S1). The chambers were pushed gently \sim 3 cm into the soil including 2 - 5 legume plants in the headspace. The septum was left open during deployment; once the chamber was inserted into the soil, the septum was closed and the base of the chamber was sealed around the circumference using moist clay.

171 Sampling was carried out weekly during the period June to September in 2015 and May to September in 2016 on 15 and 17 sampling dates, respectively. Gas samples were collected between 172 9:00 am and 2:00 pm. For each flux estimate, four gas samples were drawn from the chamber 173 headspace at 15 min intervals, starting immediately after deployment. Samples were taken with a 174 175 20 ml polypropylene syringe equipped with a 3-way valve. Before transferring the sample to a preevacuated 10 cc serum vial crimp-sealed with butyl septa, the sample was pumped 5 times in and 176 177 out of the chamber to obtain a representative sample. Overpressure in the septum vials was maintained to protect the sample from atmospheric contamination during storage and shipment to 178

the Norwegian University of Life Sciences, where the samples were analyzed by gas
chromatography. Helium-filled blank vials were included to evaluate contamination, which was
found to be less than 3% of ambient.

All samples were analyzed on a GC (Model 7890A, Agilent Santa Clara, CA, USA) connected to 182 an auto-sampler (GC-Pal, CTC, Switzerland). Upon piercing the septum with a hypodermic 183 needle, ca. 1 ml sample is transported via a peristaltic pump (Gilson minipuls 3, Middleton, W1, 184 USA) to the GC's injection system, before reverting the pump to backflush the injection system. 185 186 The GC is configured with a Poraplot U wide-bore capillary column connected to a thermal conductivity, a flame ionization and an electron capture detector to analyze CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O, 187 respectively. Helium 5.0 was used as carrier and Ar/CH₄ (90:10 vol/vol) as makeup gas for the 188 189 ECD. For calibration, two certified gas mixtures of CO₂, N₂O and CH₄ in Helium 5.0 (Linde-AGA, 190 Oslo, Norway), one at ambient concentrations and one ca. 3 times above ambient were used. A 191 running standard (every tenth sample) was used to evaluate drift of the ECD signal. Emission (CO₂, N₂O) and uptake (CH₄) rates were estimated by fitting linear or quadratic functions to the 192 193 observed concentration change in the chamber headspace and converting them to area flux 194 according to eq. 1

195
$$F_{GHG}(\mu g m^{-2} h^{-1}) = \frac{dc}{dt} * \frac{Vc}{A} * \frac{Mn}{Vn} * 60$$
 Eq. (1)

where, F_{GHG} is the flux (µg N₂O-N m⁻² h⁻¹ in case of N₂O; µg CH₄-C in the case of CH₄), $\frac{dc}{dt}$ the 196 rate of change in concentration over time (ppm min⁻¹), V_c the volume of the chamber (m³), A the 197 area covered by the chamber (m²), M_n the molar mass of the element in question (g mol⁻¹) and V_n 198 the molecular volume of gas at chamber temperature (m³ mol⁻¹). A quadratic fit was only used in 199 cases where N₂O accumulation in the chamber showed a convex downwards and CH₄ uptake a 200 201 convex upwards trend (i.e. decreasing emission or uptake rates with time) to estimate time-zero rates. R² values for fluxes > 3 µg N₂O-N or CH₄-C m⁻² h⁻¹ were generally \ge 0.85; fluxes < 3 µg 202 had lower R² values in some cases but were still included to capture periods with low flux activity. 203 Fluxes were cumulated plot-wise by linear interpolation for each growing season. 204

In 2016, soil moisture and temperature at 5 cm depth were monitored hourly using data loggers (Decagon EM50, Pullman, WA, USA) together with ECH₂O sensors (Decagon) for volumetric soil water content (VSWC) and temperature at five points across the experimental field. The sensors were placed in the experimental field at 5 random spots. No data are available for the 2015
season, due to equipment failure.

Soil bulk density was measured at 10 random spots in the experimental field using 100 cm³ steal cylinders and drying them at 105°C for 24 hours. To calculate daily water filled pore space values for the 2016 growing season, a particle density of 2.65 g cm⁻³ was assumed:

213

214
$$WFPS = VSWC/(1 - \frac{BD}{PD}) * 100$$
 Eq. (2)

215

where *WFPS* is the water filled pore space, *VSWC* the volumetric soil water content, *BD* the bulk
density and *PD* the particle density. Daily rainfall data were collected using an on-site rain gauge.

218 2.4 Estimating N inputs and N₂O emission factors

N input from forage legume crop residues was estimated from measured above-ground dry matter 219 yield, its N content and the amount of mulch applied. To account for belowground inputs a shoot 220 to root ratio of two was assumed for both crotalaria and lablab (Fageria et al., 2014). Dry matter 221 222 yields of forage legumes differed greatly depending on sowing time, with generally larger yields in 3-week than 6-week intercropping. Also, forage legumes sown three weeks after maize grew 223 faster and were harvested and mulched earlier than those sown six weeks after maize. We assumed 224 that 50% of the legume N (mulched and belowground) was released during the growing season 225 but reduced this amount to 30% for the aboveground component (mulch) of the 6-week treatments 226 227 to account for the later mulching date. The proportions becoming available during the growing seasons are conservative estimates based on Odhiambo (2010), who reported that about 50% of N 228 229 contained in crotalaria, lablab and mucuna was released during a 16-week incubation experiment 230 at optimal temperature and moisture conditions. Placing litter bags into dry surface soil, Abera et 231 al. (2014) found that legume residues decomposed rapidly under *in situ* conditions in the Ethiopian Rift Valley, releasing up to 89% of the added N within 6 months. 232

For the second year, 50% of the N left after the growing season (below and aboveground) was assumed to become available, on top of the N-input from the newly sown forage legumes. Dry

matter yields of forage legumes and estimated N input for the two years are presented in Table 1.

236 Treatment-specific, growing-season N₂O emission factors were calculated as:

237
$$N_2 O EF = \frac{(N_2 O_{treatment} - N_2 O_{control})}{N input} * 100$$
 Eq. (3)

where $N_2O EF$ is the N₂O emission factor (% of N input lost as N₂O-N), $N_2O_{treatment}$ the cumulative N₂O-N emission (from sowing to harvest) in the fertilized and intercropped treatments, $N_2O_{control}$ the emission from the M-F treatment (background emission) and N_{input} the estimated total input of N.

Non-CO₂ GHG emissions were calculated as CO₂ equivalents balancing cumulative seasonal N₂O-N emissions with CH₄ uptake on the plot level and averaging them for treatments (Table 2, Fig. 5).

245 **2.5 Grain yields and yield-scaled N₂O emissions**

Maize grain yield was determined by manually harvesting the three middle rows (to avoid border effects) of each plot, and was standardized to 12.5% moisture content using a digital grain moisture meter. All values were extrapolated from the plot to the hectare. To estimate yield-scaled N₂O emissions (g N₂O-N ton⁻¹ grain yield), cumulative emissions were divided by grain yield.

250 **2.6 Statistical analysis**

Differences in cumulative CH₄ and N₂O emissions between treatments in each cropping season were tested by analysis of variance (ANOVA) with LSD used for mean separation after testing the data for normality and homoscedasticity. Cumulative seasonal N₂O emissions for 2015 were logtransformed. Statistical significance was declared at $P \le 0.05$.

255

256 **3. Results**

257 **3.1 Weather conditions**

The year 2015 was one of the most severe drought years in decades and, as a result, sowing in 2015 was delayed by 3 weeks as compared to 2016. Rain fell late during the growing season and the cumulative rainfall for April to October was about 100 mm lower in 2015 than in 2016 (Fig. 1d, g).

262 **3.2** N₂O fluxes

263 N₂O emission rates in 2015 (treatment means, n=4) ranged from 1.1 to 13.7 μ g N m⁻² h⁻¹ for the 264 control treatment (Fig. 1a). Similarly, for fertilized maize, N₂O emissions ranged from 2 to 23.5

µg N m⁻² h⁻¹. Emission fluxes were generally larger for the 3-week intercropping treatments; the 265 3-week crotalaria treatment emitted N₂O at rates of 1.7 - 34.3 and the 3-week maize-lablab emitted 266 $1.9 - 62.7 \mu g N m^{-2} h^{-1}$, whereas the 6-week maize-crotalaria emitted $2.1 - 24.2 \mu g N m^{-2} h^{-1}$ and 267 the corresponding rate for the 6-week maize-lablab intercrop was $1.5 - 10.7 \ \mu g \ N \ m^{-2} \ h^{-1}$. The 268 269 generally low emission rates in the 6-weak lablab intercropping systems corresponded to poor growth of lablab due to shading by the maize plants. Irrespective of legume species, the highest 270 271 emission rates were found for intercrops planted three weeks after maize (Fig. 1b, c). A peak of N₂O emission occurred in the 3-week intercropping systems around mid-August, 2015, which was 272 significantly larger than in the unfertilized control (P=0.013), the fertilized maize monocrop 273 (P=0.001), and the 6 weeks crotalaria (P=0.021) and lablab (P=0.002) intercrops. 274

During the 2016 season, N₂O emission rates in the M-F treatment (unfertilized control) varied 275 between 2.5 and 22.8 μ g N m⁻² h⁻¹, peaking at the beginning of the season when WFPS was >50%. 276 There were no significant differences in WFPS values between treatments (data not shown). 277 Fertilized maize had similar rates (3.1 - 24.2 µg N m⁻² h⁻¹) peaking at around four weeks after 278 planting. Maize-forage legume treatments had larger emission rates, ranging from 1.8 to 40.2 for 279 3-week crotalaria and 3.2 to 58.6 μ g N m⁻² h⁻¹ for 6-week crotalaria, and 3.9 to 38.0 for 3-week 280 lablab and 1.9 to 45.2 µg N m⁻² h⁻¹ for 6-week lablab. In general, emission rates were higher in the 281 beginning than in the end of the cropping season (Fig. 1d-f). Despite higher fluxes for 282 283 intercropping treatments than in the unfertilized control in week 1 (P=0.162) and 4 (P=0.061), there were no statistically significant differences in flux rates between the treatments. 284

285 **3.3 Cumulative N₂O emissions**

During the 2015 growing season, all treatments had equal or higher cumulative N₂O emissions 286 than the unfertilized control, with the 3-week lablab intercropping system emitting significantly 287 more N_2O than the unfertilized control (p=0.006) and the 6-week lablab intercrop (Fig. 2a). 288 Comparing intercropping treatments with the fertilized control, lablab sown 3 weeks after maize 289 clearly increased N₂O emissions but not significantly (P=0.35), whereas all other intercropping 290 treatments had cumulative N₂O emissions comparable with fertilized maize control. Regarding 291 sowing date, 3-week lablab had significantly higher N_2O emissions (P<0.01) than its 6-week 292 293 counterpart, whereas no such effect was seen for crotalaria.

During the 2016 growing season, lablab intercropping 3-weeks after maize showed significantly higher (P<0.01) cumulative N₂O emissions than the unfertilized control, but there was no difference between fully fertilized maize monocrop and intercropped maize treatments fertilized with 50% of the mineral N applied in 2015, nor was there any effect of intercropping date (3 vs. 6 weeks; Fig. 2b).

299 **3.4 Legume and maize yields**

Aboveground yields of lablab were generally higher than those of crotalaria (Table 1). Intercropping three weeks after maize resulted in higher biomass yields compared to six weeks for both legume species. Both legumes grew poorly during the second growing season, particularly crotalaria. Maize grain yields differed greatly between the years and were roughly 20% higher in the wetter year of 2016 (Table 2). Better growth conditions for maize in the second year resulted in smaller yields of intercrop legumes.

306 3.5 N₂O emission factor and intensity

307 Growing-season emission factors (EF) varied from 0.02 to 0.25 in 2015 and 0.11 to 0.20% in 2016 308 (Table 2). Of the intercropped treatments, lablab intercropped 3 weeks after maize resulted in a 309 significantly larger emission factor than fertilized maize and other intercropping treatments, whereas there was no significant difference in 2016. Overall, growing-season N₂O emission 310 311 factors were ~ 40% higher in 2016 than in 2015, which is mainly due to the smaller N input in 2016 which was 25 to 45% lower than in 2015, except for the 3-week lablab system which had an 312 estimated 18% higher N input in 2016 than 2015 (Table 1). The latter was due to the extraordinary 313 high lablab yield in the previous year and its stipulated carryover (Table 1). 314

Mean yield-scaled N₂O emissions in 2015 varied between 25 to 55 g N₂O ton⁻¹ grain yields. In 2015, 3-week lablab had a higher N₂O intensity than 6-week lablab, whereas all other differences were insignificant. In 2016, with mineral N fertilization reduced to 50%, N₂O emission intensities varied from 26 to 37 g N₂O ton⁻¹ grain, with no significant effect of legume species, sowing date or N fertilization (Table 2).

- 320 To further explore the variability of N₂O emissions, we plotted cumulative N₂O emissions plot-
- 321 wise against legume N yield, but found no relationship (not shown). However, when plotting yield-
- scaled N_2O emission over legume N yield, a significant positive relationship (P=0.01) emerged for

2015, but not 2016 (Fig. 3a, b), suggesting that leguminous N input increased N₂O emissions more
than maize yields in the dry year of 2015.

325 **3.6 CH4 fluxes**

All treatments acted as net sink for CH₄, with uptake rates ranging from 31 to 93 µg C m⁻² h⁻¹ in 326 2015 (Fig. 4a-c). Uptake rates in 2015 were rather constant in time with somewhat elevated uptake 327 rates towards the end of the season. There were no obvious treatment effects. By contrast, in the 328 wetter vear of 2016, CH₄ uptake showed a pronounced maximum in the beginning of June with 329 uptake rates of up to 140 µg C m⁻¹ h⁻¹ irrespective of treatment (Fig. 4d-f), when WFPS values 330 declined to values below 25% (Fig. 4g). Methane uptake during this period tended to be greatest 331 in the unfertilized control, while intercropping treatments had smaller uptake rates, which, 332 333 however, were not significantly different from maize monocrop treatments. Differences between treatments at single sampling dates were insignificant throughout the season. Highest CH₄ uptake 334 335 in 2016 was recorded with lowest WFPS (~10%).

336 **3.7 Cumulative CH4 uptake**

Cropping season cumulative CH₄ uptake exceeded 1 kg C ha⁻¹ in both years with no significant effect of intercropping, legume species or time of intercropping (Fig. S2a, b). Maize intercropped with crotalaria tended to take up less CH₄ but this effect was not statistically significant in 2015 or 2016 (P=0.056). Plotting cumulative CH₄ uptake plot-wise over legume dry matter yield did not result in a significant relationship, but highest seasonal uptake rates occurred in plots with lowest legume dry matter yield (data not shown).

343 **3.8 Total non-CO₂ GHG emissions**

The relative contribution of CH₄ to the non-CO₂ GHG emission of the different cropping systems 344 varied between 22 and 69% and was highest in the non-fertilized maize monocrop. Three-week 345 lablab intercropping resulted in significantly higher total emissions compared with 6-week lablab 346 intercropping and maize mono-cropping (Table 2). By contrast, in 2016, legume species but not 347 intercropping time affected the non-CO₂ GHG emission balance (P<0.05). Lablab intercropped 3 348 weeks after maize resulted in significantly higher (P<0.05) total GHG emission than the 349 unfertilized control but was indistinctive from the fertilized maize monocrop, or other intercrop 350 treatments (Table 2, Fig. 5a, b). 351

353 **4. Discussion**

4.1 Maize-legume intercropping and N₂O emissions

Background N₂O emissions (in unfertilized maize monocrop) fluctuated between 1.1 and 23.0 µg 355 N₂O-N m⁻² h⁻¹, which is in the range of previously reported emission rates for soils in SSA with 356 low N fertilizer input (0 – 20 μ g N₂O-N m⁻² h⁻¹; Pelster et al., 2017). Baseline emissions were 357 358 somewhat higher in the wetter season of 2016, owing to ~100 mm more rainfall in the beginning of the season (Fig. 1d, g). Elevated emission rates >30 μ g N₂O-N m⁻² h⁻¹ occurred in 2015 on few 359 occasions in intercrop treatments, notably in mid-August when rain fell right after mulching of the 360 3-week intercrops. Mulching of the 6-week intercrops did not affect N₂O emissions, probably 361 because the mulched legume biomass was too small to affect the flux (Fig. 1b, c; Table 1). In 2016, 362 mulching of the 3-week legumes was followed by rainfall, increasing the WFPS to 50% (Fig. 1g), 363 364 however, without resulting in elevated N_2O emission rates (Fig. 1e, f). Together, this suggests that the direct effect of mulching on N₂O emission is highly dependent on soil moisture and the amount 365 of mulch and cannot be generalized, contrary to our hypothesis that legume intercrops would 366 367 invariably increase N₂O emissions.

Legume dry matter yields varied strongly (100 to 3000 kg ha⁻¹) throughout the two experimental 368 years (Table 1, Fig. 3), depending on species, intercropping time and weather. Lablab grew more 369 370 vigorously and realized larger dry matter yields than crotalaria (Table 1). Moreover, lablab is known to be a better N₂ fixer than crotalaria (Ojiem et al., 2007), presumably leading to higher N 371 input, which would explain larger N₂O emissions with this intercrop (Fig. 2). Three-week 372 intercrops performed generally better than 6-week intercrops. This was particularly apparent for 373 374 the low-growing lablab (Table 1). Weather in the beginning of the season played a major role for 375 the growth performance of the intercrops by controlling maize growth, which in turn controlled legume growth by shading. Together, this resulted in a wide range of potential leguminous N-376 377 inputs in our experiment, which could be used to examine their overall effect on N_2O emissions on a seasonal basis under the semi-arid conditions of the central Ethiopian rift valley. Surprisingly, 378 we did not find any significant relationship between estimated total N input or legume N yield and 379 380 cumulative N_2O emission. This may be due to the notoriously high spatial and temporal variability of N₂O emissions rates (Flessa et al., 1995), or reflect the fact that intercropping had no or opposing 381 effects on N₂O forming processes. Cumulative N₂O emissions and legume N yields integrate over 382

the entire season and do not capture seasonal dynamics of soil N cycling and N uptake, which could obscure or cancel out transient legume effects on N_2O emissions. Possibly, N released in intercropping treatments was efficiently absorbed by the main crop, even though intercropping did not lead to significantly higher maize grain yields in our experiment. Alternatively, changes in physicochemical conditions brought about by intercrops, such as potentially lower soil moisture due to more evapotranspiration, may have counteracted the commonly observed stimulating effect of legume N on N_2O emissions (Almaraz et al., 2009, Sant'Anna et al., 2018).

390 We found a significant positive relationship between N_2O intensity and legume N yields in 2015, 391 suggesting that intercropped legumes indeed increase N_2O emissions relative to maize yields (Fig. 3a). It is impossible to say, however, whether this relationship was driven by the extra N entering 392 the system through biological N fixation, or whether an increasing legume biomass affected 393 394 physicochemical conditions in the rhizosphere favoring N₂O formation. In 2016, legume dry 395 matter yields were much lower than in 2015, owing to early rains favoring maize growth, and no 396 significant relationship with N₂O intensity was found (Fig. 3b). This illustrates that the effect of 397 legume intercropping on N_2O emissions is highly dependent on sowing date and weather, both of which control the growth of legume and main crops and ultimately the amount and fate of 398 399 leguminous N in the intercropping system. Our data suggest that excessive accumulation of 400 leguminous biomass in SSA maize cropping enhances the risk for elevated N_2O emissions.

We expected N₂O emissions to respond more strongly to intercropping in the second year (2016), 401 402 as legume mulches were applied according to their plot-wise aboveground yields in the previous 403 year. Indeed, N₂O emission rates were clearly higher in intercropping treatments on the first sampling date in 2016 (Fig. 1e, f), indicating increased N cycling in mulched plots (Campiglia et 404 al., 2011). This difference vanished quickly, however, suggesting that the effect of intercrop 405 mulches, even at high amounts (Table 1), on N_2O emissions in the subsequent year was negligible. 406 407 It is noteworthy that our estimates of the fraction of N carried over between the years were based 408 on literature data (Table 1), and that a considerable part of the mulched N may have been lost during abundant rainfalls (300 mm) early in the 2016 season before crops were sown. 409

410 Cumulative N_2O emissions from intercrops, with mineral fertilization rate halved, were 411 comparable to those in the fully fertilized maize monocrop in 2016. This may be partly due to the 412 50% reduction in mineral N application to intercrop treatments, as found by others (Tang et al., 413 2017). Another reason may be that a considerable proportion of the cumulative emission in 2016 occurred before or shortly after 3-week intercrops were sown, and was thus unaffected by growing 414 legumes. Overall, cumulative N₂O emissions were equal or higher in 2016 than in 2015, despite 415 reduced mineral N addition to intercrops and lower legume biomass. Ultimately, the lack of a clear 416 emission response to legume intercropping in the second year calls for studies tracing cumulative 417 mulching effects over multiple years and exploring their driving factors in more detail. In our 418 419 study, amount and timing of rainfall appeared to be more important for N₂O emissions in the second year than amount and carryover of legume N. 420

421 Given our finding that N₂O intensity responded positively to legume biomass and its N content in a drought year with poor maize growth, intercrop species as well as sowing and harvest dates 422 (relative to the main crop) emerge as viable management factors for controlling the accumulation 423 424 of legume biomass between the maize rows and hence the risk for increased N₂O emission. 425 Legume species and cultivar in intercropping systems are known to be critical for N loss, both during the intercropping and the subsequent seasons (Pappa et al., 2011, Weiler et al., 2018). The 426 427 stimulating effect of crop residues on N_2O emission has been reported to depend on residue quality and soil moisture, with denitrification being the likely process (Li et al., 2016). Our study provides 428 429 evidence that vigorous growth of high yielding legume intercrops can enhance N₂O emissions in 430 years unfavorable for maize growth, whereas in years with sufficient water availability early in the 431 growing season, maize growth is favored preventing excessive growth of the intercrop. Our study 432 therefore points to optimizing the sowing date in response to expected emergence and growth of maize as a promising option to control growth of the intercrop and hence to deal with the risk of 433 increased N₂O emissions. 434

435 **4.2 Seasonal N₂O and CH₄ emission, EF_{N2O} and total GHG emission**

Growing season N₂O emissions in fertilized treatments varied from 0.17 to 0.33 (2015) and 0.23 to 0.3 (2016) kg N₂O-N ha⁻¹ covering a period of 107 (2015) and 123 (2016) days (Fig. 2), and a range of estimated total N inputs from 36.4 to 97.8 kg N ha⁻¹ (Table 1). There are no N₂O emissions studies for maize-legume intercropping in the Ethiopian Rift valley so far. Hickman et al. (2014a) reported N₂O emissions of 0.62 and 0.81 kg N ha⁻¹ over 99 days for 100 and 200 kg N input ha⁻¹, respectively, for a maize field without intercropping in humid western Kenya, which seems to be higher than seasonal emissions we found. Baggs et al. (2006), working in the same region with 443 maize intercropped with legumes in an agroforestry system reported N₂O emissions ranging from 0.2 to 0.6 kg N ha⁻¹ with higher emissions in tilled intercropping treatments; our values are in the 444 445 lower end of the range they reported. The largest seasonal N2O emission for intercropping reported so far from SSA is 4.1 kg N ha⁻¹ (84 days) after incorporating 7.4 t ha⁻¹ of a Sesbania macroptilium 446 447 mixture in humid western Kenya (Millar et al., 2004). Compared to the N₂O emissions reported for humid tropical maize production systems, our data suggest that maize-legume intercropping 448 449 based on mulching in the sub-humid to semi-arid rift valley appears to be a minor N₂O source, 450 mainly because of the relatively small amount of legume biomass mulched (Table 1). Growing season N₂O emission factors (EF) in our study ranged from 0.02 to 0.25 in 2015 and 0.11 to 0.20% 451 in 2016 of the estimated total N input, including assumed N inputs from legume mulch as well as 452 belowground additions and carryover between the years (Table 1). Even if the estimated EF is 453 doubled to account for off-season emissions, it is still lower than the annual IPCC default value of 454 1% N₂O-N per unit added N (IPCC, 2014). Our estimated EFs thus seem to be at the lower end of 455 those reported by Kim et al. (2016) for SSA smallholder agriculture estimated from literature data 456 (0.01 to 4.1%). The reasons for the low EFs in our study are probably the high background 457 458 emissions in the fertile soil of the Hawassa University research farm which supports high maize yields even in the unfertilized control (Table 1) and the low levels of N input. The soil has been 459 460 used over decades for agronomic trials with various fertilization rates with and without crop residue retention and legume intercropping (e.g. Raji et al., 2019). Thus, our field trial has to be 461 462 considered representative for intensive management as opposed to smallholder systems with minimal or no fertilization history. 463

Methane uptake by the soil in both seasons varied between 1.0 to 1.5 kg CH₄-C ha⁻¹ without 464 showing any significant treatment effect, even though maize-legume intercrops tended to take up 465 less CH₄ than maize monocrops (Fig. S1). The observed trend might relate to competitive 466 inhibition of CH₄ oxidation by higher NH₄⁺ availability (Le Mer and Roger, 2001, Dunfield and 467 Knowles, 1995) in the presence of legume intercrops, even though estimated total N inputs 468 remained below 100 kg N ha⁻¹, which is considered a threshold for NH₄⁺ inhibition (Aronson and 469 470 Helliker, 2010). Alternatively, densely growing legumes may have lowered CH₄ uptake through 471 impeding CH₄ and/or O₂ diffusion into the soil (Ball et al., 1997). We did not observe stimulation of CH₄ uptake by legume intercropping, which we attribute to the absence of N and P deficiency 472 in this fertile soil. Methane uptake rates varied from 20 to 140 µg CH₄-C m⁻² h⁻¹ which is in the 473

range of rates reported previously for SSA upland soils (Pelster et al., 2017). Seasonal CH₄ uptake
in our experiment offsets between 22 and 69% of the CO₂ equivalents associated with N₂O
emissions without revealing any significant treatment effect (Fig. S2a, b), but the offset was
relatively largest in the unfertilized maize monocrop and smallest in lablab intercropping. Hence,
CH₄ uptake is an important component of the non-CO₂ climate footprint of SSA crop production.

479 **4.3 Legume intercropping and climate smart agriculture**

480 Legumes are an important N source in smallholder farming systems, where mineral fertilizers are 481 unaffordable or unavailable. Legume intercrops maximize resource use efficiency as total productivity is often higher than in mono-cropping systems (Banik et al., 2006). Moreover, N fixed 482 483 biologically by legume intercrops can partly replace synthetic N fertilizers, if the release is 484 synchronized with the nutrient demand of the cereal crop. On the other hand, surplus N from legumes may result in N losses as NO₃⁻, NH₃ and NO, N₂O or N₂. Mulching and incorporation of 485 486 legume biomass has been found to increase N₂O emissions under temperate conditions (Baggs et 487 al., 2000, Baggs et al., 2003) and under humid tropical conditions (Millar et al., 2004). Also under semi-arid, Mediterranean conditions, vetch (V. villosa) used as a winter catch crop and mulched in 488 spring significantly increased N₂O emissions during the fallow period while rape did not (Sanz-489 Cobena et al., 2014). This was later confirmed by a ¹⁵N study, highlighting the role of N 490 491 mineralization from legumes as a source of N₂O (Guardia et al., 2016). None of the studies found 492 an overall N₂O saving effect of catch crops when scaling up to the entire crop cycle, even though the latter study used reduced mineral N fertilization rates in treatments with catch crops. By 493 494 contrast, reduced NO_3^{-} leaching and N_2O emission has been reported from maize intercropped with legumes in the semi-arid North China plain, which the authors attributed to enhanced N uptake by 495 both the inter and main crop and reduced soil moisture in treatments with intercrops during the 496 497 rainy season (Huang et al., 2017). This shows that legume intercrops have a potential to both increase or reduce N₂O emissions with consequences for the non-CO₂ footprint of cereal 498 499 production and hence for the viability of intercropping as a central component of CSA (Thierfelder 500 et al., 2017).

The legume intercrops used in our study had low C:N ratios (Table S1) and can be expected to release a significant part of their N through decomposition of roots and nodules or root exudation as well as during decomposition of mulches (Fustec et al., 2010). The effect of mulching on N₂O

504 emissions depends on the C:N ratio with increased emissions for low C:N ratio residues (Baggs et al., 2000, Shan and Yan, 2013). In line with this, N_2O emissions in intercrop treatments of our 505 506 study exceeded those in fertilized maize monocrop on several sampling dates, both during active growth of legumes and after mulching. Another important aspect is the amount of legume N carried 507 over between years which depends, among others, on amount and quality of the legume and the 508 weather between the growing seasons. Abera et al. (2014) showed that surface-placed residues of 509 510 haricot bean and pigeon pea decompose quickly despite relatively dry conditions during offseason. Vigorous rainfalls in the beginning of the growing season like in 2016 (Fig. 1) could lead to 511 dissolved N losses, which could lead to indirect N₂O emissions elsewhere, which should be taken 512 into account when evaluating intercropping as a CSA strategy. 513

514

515 **5. Conclusion**

516 While legume intercrops have the potential to improve cereal yields and diversify produces for 517 smallholders in central Ethiopian rift valley, a risk of enhanced N₂O emissions remains, which became apparent as increased "N₂O intensity" of the main crop in a drought year (2015). At the 518 519 same time, our study points at possibilities to counteract this trend by actively controlling legume biomass development and hence potential N input through "climate-smart" choices of legume 520 521 species, sowing date and mulch amounts in response to prevailing environmental conditions. This 522 approach, however, is complicated by the annual variability in growth conditions and requires 523 active planning of sowing and mulching time by the farmer. Our study was conducted on a relatively nutrient-rich soil (as compared to typical smallholder farms) which supports high yields 524 525 of both maize and leguminous intercrops. Under these conditions, intercropped legumes can potentially replace a considerable part of synthetic fertilizer, thus supporting common CSA goals. 526 527 However, more studies are needed to fully explore intercropping options in the framework of CSA in the rift valley, particularly in nutrient-poor smallholder fields. Future studies on CSA 528 529 approaches in the rift valley should address, in addition to greenhouse gas emissions, N-runoff and soil organic matter build up, ideally in long-term field trials with and without legume 530 intercropping. Future studies should also attempt to combine flux measurements with inorganic N 531 dynamics and BNF measurements. Given that seasonal N₂O emission factors and intensities in our 532

study were in the lower range of published values for SSA, intercropping appears as a promising
approach to sustainable intensification in the Ethiopian Rift Valley.

535

Acknowledgements. The study is part of the NORHED program "Research and capacity building
in climate smart agriculture in the Horn of Africa" funded by the Norwegian Agency for
Development Cooperation (Norad). We are grateful to Teshome Geletu, Teketel Chiro and Tigist
Yimer for assistance during setting up and managing the field experiment, sample collection and
preparation, and to Trygve Fredriksen for assistance during analysis of samples in the laboratory
at NMBU.

542

543 **References**

- Abera, G., Wolde-Meskel, E. & Bakken, L. R.: Unexpected high decomposition of legume
 residues in dry season soils from tropical coffee plantations and crop lands, Agronomy
 for Sustainable Development, 34, 667-676; 2014.
- ALmaraz, J. J., Zhou, X., Mabood, F., Madramootoo, C., Rochette, P., MA, B.-L. & Smith, D.
 L.: Greenhouse gas fluxes associated with soybean production under two tillage systems in southwestern Quebec, Soil and Tillage Research, 104, 134-139, 2009.
- Aronson, E. L. & Helliker, B. R.: Methane flux in non-wetland soils in response to nitrogen
 addition: a meta-analysis, Ecology, 91, 3242-3251, 2010.
- Arslan, A., Mccarthy, N., Lipper, L., Asfaw, S., Cattaneo, A. & Kokwe, M.: Climate Smart
 Agriculture? Assessing the Adaptation Implications in Zambia, Journal of Agricultural
 Economics, 66, 753-780, 2015.
- Baggs, E. M., Chebii, J. & Ndufa, J. K.: A short-term investigation of trace gas emissions
 following tillage and no-tillage of agroforestry residues in western Kenya, Soil and
 Tillage Research, 90, 69-76, 2006.
- Baggs, E. M., Rees, R. M., Smith, K. A. & Vinten, A. J. A.: Nitrous oxide emission from soils
 after incorporating crop residues, Soil Use and Management, 16, 82-87, 2000.
- Baggs, E. M., Stevenson, M., Pihlatie, M., Regar, A., Cook, H., Cadisch, G. J.: Nitrous oxide
 emissions following application of residues and fertiliser under zero and conventional
 tillage, Plant and Soil, 254, 361-370, 2003.
- Bakken, L. R., Bergaust, L., Liu, B. & Frostegård, Å.: Regulation of denitrification at the cellular
 level: a clue to the understanding of N₂O emissions from soils, Philos Trans R Soc Lond
 B Biol Sci., 367(1593):1226–1234. doi:10.1098/rstb.2011.0321, 2012.
- Ball, B. C., Smith, K. A., Klemedtsson, L., Brumme, R., Sitaula, B. K., Hansen, S., Prieme, A.,
 Macdonald, J. & Horgan, G. W.: The influence of soil gas transport properties on
 methane oxidation in a selection of northern European soils, Journal of Geophysical
 Research, 102, 23309-23317, 1997.

- Banik, P., Midya, A., Sarkar, B. K. & Ghose, S. S.: Wheat and chickpea intercropping systems in
 an additive series experiment: Advantages and weed smothering, European Journal of
 Agronomy, 24, 325-332, 2006.
- Bédard, C., Knowles, R.: Physiology, biochemistry, and specific inhibitors of CH₄, NH₄⁺, and
 CO oxidation by methanotrophs and nitrifiers, Microbiol. Rev., 53, 500 68–84, 1989.
- Bedoussac, L., Journet, E.-P., Hauggaard-Nielsen, H., Naudin, C., Corre-Hellou, G., Jensen, E.
 S., Prieur, L. & Justes, E. J. A. F. S. D.: Ecological principles underlying the increase of productivity achieved by cereal-grain legume intercrops in organic farming. A review, 35, 911-935, 2015.
- Blanc E. & Strobl, E.: The impact of climate change on cropland productivity: evidence from
 satellite based products at the river basin scale in Africa, Climatic Change, 117, 873–890,
 2013.
- Campiglia, E., Mancinelli, R., Radicetti, E., Marinari, S.: Legume cover crops and mulches:
 effects on nitrate leaching and nitrogen input in a pepper crop (*Capsicum annuum* L.),
 Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosyst. 89, 399-412, 2011.
- Carranca, C., Torres, M. O. & Madeira, M.: Underestimated role of legume roots for soil N
 fertility, Agronomy for Sustainable Development, 35, 1095-1102, 2015.
- Carruthers, K., Prithiviraj, B., FE, Q., Cloutier, D., Martin, R. C. & Smith, D. L.: Intercropping
 corn with soybean, lupin and forages: yield component responses, European Journal of
 Agronomy, 12, 103-115, 2000.
- Davidson, E. A., Keller, M., Erickson, H. E., Verchot, L. V. & Veldkamp, E.: Testing a
 Conceptual Model of Soil Emissions of Nitrous and Nitric Oxides: Using two functions
 based on soil nitrogen availability and soil water content, the hole-in-the-pipe model
 characterizes a large fraction of the observed variation of nitric oxide and nitrous oxide
 emissions from soils, BioScience, 50, 667-680, 2000.
- de Jager, I., Borgonjen-van den Berg, K.J., Giller, K.E., Brouwer, I.D.: Current and potential role
 of grain legumes on protein and micronutrient adequacy of the diet of rural Ghanaian
 infants and young children: using linear programming, Nutrition Journal 18, 12, 2019
- Dick, J., Kaya, B., Soutoura, M., Skiba, U., Smith, R., Niang, A. & Tabo, R.: The contribution
 of agricultural practices to nitrous oxide emissions in semi- arid Mali, Soil Use and
 Management, 24, 292-301, 2008.
- Drury, C. F., Mckenney, D. J. & Findlay, W. I.: Relationships between denitrification, microbial
 biomass and indigenous soil properties, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 23, 751-755,
 1991.
- Dunfield, P. & Knowles, R.: Kinetics of inhibition of methane oxidation by nitrate, nitrite, and
 ammonium in a humisol, Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 61, 3129, 1995.
- Ehrmann, J. & Ritz, K.: Plant soil interactions in temperate multi-cropping production systems,
 Plant and Soil, 376, 1-29, 2014.
- Fageria, N. K., Moreira, A., Moraes, L. A. C. & Moraes, M. F.: Root growth, nutrient uptake,
 and nutrient-use efficiency by roots of tropical legume cover crops as influenced by
 phosphorus fertilization, Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis, 45, 555569, 2014.
- Flessa, H., Dörsch, P., Besse, F.: Seasonal variation of N₂O and CH₄ fluxes in differently
 managed arable soils in Southern Germany, Journal of Geophysical Research, 100(D11),
 23115-23124, 1995.

- Fustec, J., Lesuffleur, F., Mahieu, S. & Cliquet, J.-B. J. A. F. S. D.: Nitrogen rhizodeposition of
 legumes. A review, Agronomy for Sustainable Development, 30, 57-66, 2010.
- Guardia, G., Abalos, D., Garcia-Marco, S., Quemada, M., Alonso-Ayuso, M., Cardenas, L. M.,
 Dixon, E. R. & Vallejo, A.: Effect of cover crops on greenhouse gas emissions in an
 irrigated field under integrated soil fertility management, Biogeosciences, 13, 5245-5257,
 2016.
- Harrison-Kirk, T., Beare, M. H., Meenken, E. D. & Condron, L. M.: Soil organic matter and
 texture affect responses to dry/wet cycles: Effects on carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide
 emissions, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 57, 43-55, 2013.
- Hickman, J. E., Palm, C. A., Mutuo, P., Melillo, J. M. & Tang, J.: Nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions
 in response to increasing fertilizer addition in maize (*Zea mays* L.) agriculture in western
 Kenya, Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems, 100, 177-187, 2014a.
- Hickman, J. E., Scholes, R. J., Rosenstock, T. S., Perez Garcia-Pando, C. & Nyamangara, J.:
 Assessing non-CO₂ climate-forcing emissions and mitigation in sub-Saharan Africa,
 Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 9-10, 65-72, 2014b.
- Ho, A., Reim, A., Kim, S. Y., Meima-Franke, M., Termorshuizen, A., De Boer, W., Van der
 Putten, W. H. & Bodelier, P. L. E.: Unexpected stimulation of soil methane uptake as
 emergent property of agricultural soils following bio-based residue application, Global
 Change Biology, 21, 3864-3879, 2015.
- Huang, J., Sui, P., Gao, W. & Chen, Y.: Effect of maize-soybean intercropping on soil nitrous
 oxide emissions in silt loam soil of the North China Plain, Pedosphere. *In Press.* 2017.
- IPCC: Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III
 to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change,
 [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A.
 Adler, I. Baum, S. Brunner, P. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J. Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C.
 von Stechow, T. Zwickel and J.C. Minx (eds.)], Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,
 United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2014.
- Jensen, E. S. & Hauggaard-Nielsen, H.: How can increased use of biological N₂ fixation in agriculture benefit the environment?, Plant and Soil, 252, 177-186, 2003.
- Khalil, K., Mary, B. & Renault, P.: Nitrous oxide production by nitrification and denitrification
 in soil aggregates as affected by O₂ concentration, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 36,
 687-699, 2004.
- Kim, D. G., Thomas, A. D., Pelster, D., Rosenstock, T. S. & Sanz-Cobena, A.: Greenhouse gas
 emissions from natural ecosystems and agricultural lands in sub-Saharan Africa:
 synthesis of available data and suggestions for further research, Biogeosciences, 13,
 4789-4809, 2016.
- Laanbroek, H. J. & Bodelier, P. L. E.: Nitrogen as a regulatory factor of methane oxidation in
 soils and sediments, FEMS Microbiology Ecology, 47, 265-277, 2004.
- Le Mer, J. & Roger, P.: Production, oxidation, emission and consumption of methane by soils: A
 review, European Journal of Soil Biology, 37, 25-50, 2001.
- Li, X., Sørensen, P., Olesen, J. E. & Petersen, S. O.: Evidence for denitrification as main source
 of N₂O emission from residue-amended soil, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 92, 153 160, 2016.
- Makate, C., Makate, M., Mutenje, M., Mango, N. & Siziba, S.: Synergistic impacts of
 agricultural credit and extension on adoption of climate-smart agricultural technologies in
 southern Africa, Environmental Development, 100458, 2019.

- Millar, N., Ndufa, J. K., Cadisch, G. & Baggs, E. M.: Nitrous oxide emissions following
 incorporation of improved-fallow residues in the humid tropics, Global Biogeochemical
 Cycles, 18. DOI: 10.1029/2003GB002114, 2004.
- Nadeem, S., Bakken, L. R., Frostegård, Å., Gaby, J. C. & Dörsch, P.: Liming enhances
 nitrification and increases its N₂O yield but reduces soil N₂O emissions from coupled
 nitrification-denitrification through increased N₂O reductase activity, Submitted to Soil
 Biology and Biochemistry, 2019.
- Neufeldt, H., Jahn, M., Campbell, B. M., Beddington, J. R., Declerck, F., De Pinto, A., Gulledge,
 J., Hellin, J., Herrero, M., Jarvis, A., Lezaks, D., Meinke, H., Rosenstock, T., Scholes,
 M., Scholes, R., Vermeulen, S., Wollenberg, E. & Zougmore, R.: Beyond climate-smart
 agriculture: toward safe operating spaces for global food systems, Agriculture & Food
 Security, 2, 12, 2013.
- Odhiambo, J. J. O.: Decomposition and nitrogen release by green manure legume residues in
 different soil types, African Journal of Agricultural Research, 5, 090-096, 2010.
- Ojiem, J. O., Vanlauwe, B., De Ridder, N. & Giller, K. E.: Niche-based assessment of
 contributions of legumes to the nitrogen economy of Western Kenya smallholder farms,
 Plant and Soil, 292, 119-135, 2007.
- Pappa, V. A., Rees, R. M., Walker, R. L., Baddeley, J. A. & Watson, C. A.: Nitrous oxide
 emissions and nitrate leaching in an arable rotation resulting from the presence of an
 intercrop, Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 141, 153-161, 2011.
- Pelster, D., Rufino, M., Rosenstock, T., Mango, J., Saiz, G., Diaz-Pines, E., Baldi, G. &
 Butterbach-Bahl, K.: Smallholder farms in eastern African tropical highlands have
 lowsoil greenhouse gas fluxes, Biogeosciences, 14, 187-202, 2017.
- Raji, S. G., Tzanakakis, V., Dörsch, P.: Bradyrhizobial inoculation and P application effects on
 haricot and mung beans in the Ethiopian Rift Valley, Plant and Soil, DOI:
 10.1007/s11104-019-04170-2, 2019.
- Rochette, P., Eriksen-Hamel, N.S.: Chamber measurements of soil nitrous oxide flux: Are
 absolute values reliable? Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J., 72, 331-342, 2008.
- Rochette, P. & Janzen, H. H.: Towards a revised coefficient for estimating N₂O emissions from
 legumes, Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems, 73, 171-179, 2005.
- Russenes A.L., Korsaeth A., Bakken L.R. & Dörsch P.: Spatial variation in soil pH controls off season N2O emission in an agricultural soil, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 99, 36-46,
 2016.
- Sant'anna, S. A. C., Martins, M. R., Goulart, J. M., Araujo, S. N., Araujo, E. S., Zaman, M.,
 Jantalia, C. P., Alves, B. J. R., Boddey, R. M. & Urquiaga, S.: Biological nitrogen
 fixation and soil N₂O emissions from legume residues in an Acrisol in SE Brazil,
 Geoderma Regional, 15, e00196, 2018.
- Sanz-Cobena, A., Garcia-Marco, S., Quemada, M., Gabriel, J. L., Almendros, P. & Vallejo, A.:
 Do cover crops enhance N₂O, CO₂ or CH₄ emissions from soil in Mediterranean arable
 systems?, Science of The Total Environment, 466-467, 164-174, 2014.
- Schaufler, G., Kitzler, B., Schindlbacher, A., Skiba, U., Sutton, M. A. & ZechmeisterBoltenstern, S.: Greenhouse gas emissions from European soils under different land use:
 effects of soil moisture and temperature, Eur. J. Soil Sci., 61, 683-696, 2010.
- Schlüter, S., Zawallich, J., Vogel, H. J. & Dörsch, P.: Physical constraints for respiration in
 microbial hotspots in soil and their importance for denitrification, Biogeosciences., 16,
 3665-3678, 2019.

- Schwenke, G. D., Herridge, D. F., Scheer, C., Rowlings, D. W., Haigh, B. M. & Mcmullen, K.
 G.: Greenhouse gas (N₂O and CH₄) fluxes under nitrogen-fertilised dryland wheat and
 barley on subtropical Vertosols: Risk, rainfall and alternatives, Soil Research, 54, 634650, 2016.
- Shan, J. & Yan, X.: Effects of crop residue returning on nitrous oxide emissions in agricultural
 soils, Atmospheric Environment, 71, 170-175, 2013.
- Sime, G., Aune, J.B.: Sustainability of Improved Crop Varieties and Agricultural Practices: A
 Case Study in the Central Rift Valley of Ethiopia. Agriculture, 8, 177, 2018.
- Tang, Y.L., Yu, L.L., Gaun, A.M., Zhou, X.Y., Wang, Z.G., Gou, Y.G. & Wang, J.W.: Soil
 mineral nitrogen and yield-scaled soil N₂O emissions lowered by reducing nitrogen
 application and intercropping with soybean for sweet maize production in southern
 China, Journal of Integrative Agriculture, 16, 2586-2596, 2017.
- Thierfelder, C., Chivenge, P., Mupangwa, W., Rosenstock, T. S., Lamanna, C. & Eyre, J. X. J. F.
 S.: How climate-smart is conservation agriculture (CA)? its potential to deliver on
 adaptation, mitigation and productivity on smallholder farms in southern Africa, Food
 Security, 9, 537-560, 2017.
- Wanyama, I., Pelster, D. E., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Verchot, L. V., Martius, C. & Rufino, M. C.:
 Soil carbon dioxide and methane fluxes from forests and other land use types in an
 African tropical montane region, Biogeochemistry, 143, 171-190, 2019.
- Weiler, D. A., Giacomini, S. J., Recous, S., Bastos, L. M., Pilecco, G. E., Dietrich, G. & Aita, C.:
 Trade-off between C and N recycling and N₂O emissions of soils with summer cover
 crops in subtropical agrosystems, Plant and Soil, 433, 213-225, 2018.
- Wrage-Mönnig, N., Horn, M. A., Well, R., Müller, C., Velthof, G. & Oenema, O.: The role of nitrifier denitrification in the production of nitrous oxide revisited, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 123, A3-A16, 2018.
- Wu, D., Wei, Z., Well, R., Shan, J., Yan, X., Bol, R. & Senbayram, M.: Straw amendment with
 nitrate-N decreased N2O/(N2O+N2) ratio but increased soil N2O emission: A case study
 of direct soil-born N2 measurements, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 127, 301-304,
 2018.

737

Table 1: N inputs from forage legumes and fertilization per treatment. Shown are mean values ($n=4 \pm standard error$)

Legume	DMY	Aboveground N yield ^a	Belowground N yield ^b	N from mulch ^c	Mineral N	Carryover ^d	Total N input						
	kg N ha ⁻¹												
	2015												
	Crotalaria												
3w	1516±183	53.3±6.4	17.7±2.1	26.6±3.2	64		75.8						
6w	345±65	12.1±2.3	4.0±0.8	6.1±1.1	64		66.4						
Lablab													
3w	2221±340	96.8±14.8	32.3±4.9	48.4 ± 7.4	64		82.9						
бw	467±137	20.3±6.0	6.8 ± 2.0	10.2±3.0	64		67.7						
2016													
Crotalaria													
3w	468±85	16.4 ± 3.0	5.47 ± 1.0	8.21±1.5	32	11.1±1.3	56.8						
бw	65±44	2.3±1.5	0.75 ± 0.5	1.13±0.8	32	2.5 ± 0.5	36.4						
Lablab													
3w	1256±221	54.7±9.6	18.25±3.2	27.4 ± 4.8	32	20.2±3.1	97.8						
бw	186±60	8.1±2.6	2.70±0.9	4.06±1.3	32	4.2±1.2	43.0						

740 ^a N content of crotalaria and lablab was 3.51 and 4.36%, respectively, measured in 2 representative samples,

741 DMY=Dry matter yield

^b assuming a shoot-to-root ratio of 2 and an average belowground N input from the standing legumes of 50% during
 the growing season

^c returning half of the aboveground yield as mulch; assuming an average N release of 50% and 30% for 3-week and
 6-week treatments, respectively, during the growing season

^d assuming that 50% of the remaining N becomes available in the following cropping season

Table 2: Grain yields, growing-season N₂O emission factors and non-CO₂ GHG emission associated with N₂O and CH₄ and N₂O emission intensities for fertilized treatments with and without legume intercropping during 107 days in 2015 and 123 days in 2016. N input was estimated as outlined in Table 1. Shown are mean values (n=4 \pm standard error). Different letters indicate statistical difference at p < 0.05.

			2015		2016				
Treatment	Maize Grain yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	N ₂ O emission factor (%)	Non-CO ₂ GHG emission (kg CO ₂ eq. ha ⁻¹)*	N ₂ O emission intensity (g N ₂ O- N ton ⁻¹ grain)	Maize Grain yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	N ₂ O Emission factor (%)	Non-CO ₂ GHG emission (kg CO ₂ eq. ha ⁻¹)*	N ₂ O emission intensity (g N ₂ O -N ton ⁻¹ grain)	
M-F	4313±235 ^a		17.4±12 ^a	29.7±4.2 ^{ab}	6558±217ª		29.7±18 ^a	26.3±4.0 ^a	
M+F	5022±133 ^{ab}	$0.07{\pm}0.07^{ab}$	38.4 ± 25^{a}	34.4 ± 8.8^{ab}	8403±342 ^b	0.20±0.03ª	91.4±16 ^{ab}	37.0 <u>±</u> 4.0 ^a	
M+Cr3w	5882±249 ^{ab}	$0.17{\pm}0.05^{\mathrm{ab}}$	78.0±12 ^{ab}	42.2±5.5 ^b	8276±236 ^b	0.16±0.08 ^a	78.3±19 ^{ab}	33.6±4.7ª	
M+Cr6w	5316±316 ^{ab}	$0.07{\pm}0.06^{\rm ab}$	$47.0{\pm}15^{ab}$	34.8 ± 5.4^{ab}	$8283{\pm}148^{\mathbf{b}}$	0.16±0.05 ^a	69.0±12 ^{ab}	27.8 ± 2.0^{a}	
M+Lb3w	5989±528 ^b	0.25 ± 0.06^{b}	120.5±27 ^b	54.3±6.1 ^{ab}	8557 ± 262^{b}	0.15 ± 0.03^{a}	111.7±9 ^b	36.8±2.1ª	
M+Lb6w	5541±492 ^{ab}	0.02±0.01ª	21.2±7ª	24.6±1.5ª	8306±501 ^b	0.11 ± 0.07^{a}	62.3±25 ^{ab}	26.8±3.9ª	

* N₂O: 300 CO₂ eq; CH₄: 25 CO₂ eq



Figure 1: Mean N₂O emission rates (n=4; error bars = SEM) in 2015 (left panel) and 2016 (right panel) and daily rain fall and water-filled pore space (in 2016 only). Figures a and d show emission rates in the absence of intercrops, b and e with crotalaria and c and f with lablab intercrops.



775

Figure 2: Cumulative seasonal N₂O-N (g N ha⁻¹ season⁻¹) in 2015 (a) and 2016 (b) throughout 107 and 123 days, respectively, in treatments with and without legume intercropping. Error bars denote SEM (n=4). Different letters indicate significant differences at p < 0.05. M+F: fertilized maize; M+Cr3w: fertilized maize with crotalaria sown 3 weeks after maize; M+Cr6w: fertilized maize with crotalaria sown 6 weeks after maize; M+Lb3w: fertilized maize with lablab sown 3 weeks after maize; M+Lb6w: fertilized maize with lablab sown 6 weeks after maize

- 782
- 783
- 784
- 785
- 786



Figure 3: Relationship between N₂O emission intensity and aboveground intercrop legume N yield in intercrop treatments in 2015 (a) and 2016 (b). Shown are single-plot values for each treatment (n=4).



Figure 4: Mean CH₄ flux in 2015 (left panel) and 2016 (right panel) and daily rainfall and waterfilled pore space (in 2016 only). Error bars show standard error of the mean (n=4). Figures a and d show emission rates in the absence of intercrops, b and e with crotalaria and c and f with lablab intercropping.



Figure 5: Relative contribution of CH_4 uptake and N_2O emission to seasonal total non- CO_2 GHG emissions in mono- and intercropping treatments in 2015 (a) and 2016 (b). Error bars indicate standard deviation (n=4).