

# EFFECT MINIMUM TILLAGE, CROP ROTATION AND CROP RESIDUES AS MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ON SOIL HEALTH

H. T. R. Al-Furaiji<sup>1,2</sup>N. S. Ali<sup>2</sup>

Researcher

Prof.

<sup>1</sup> Mesopotamia State Company for Seeds - Ministry of Agriculture, Baghdad, Iraq.<sup>2</sup> Dept. Soil Sci. and Water Reso., Coll. of Agric. Engin. Sci., University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq.[hussein.taha1107a@coagri.uobaghdad.edu.iq](mailto:hussein.taha1107a@coagri.uobaghdad.edu.iq)[nooruldeen.s@coagri.uobaghdad.edu.iq](mailto:nooruldeen.s@coagri.uobaghdad.edu.iq)[meso\\_nahrin@zeraa.gov.iq](mailto:meso_nahrin@zeraa.gov.iq)

## ABSTRACT

Two field experiments were conducted at the research station of College of Agricultural Engineering Sciences - University of Baghdad at Aljadriya, Baghdad -Iraq during two seasons 2021-2022, to evaluate effect of minimum tillage, crop rotation and crop residues on soil health. The 1<sup>st</sup> one was with split-plot arrangement with two factors: crop residues (0% Residues (0%R) and 100% Residues (100%R)) and tillage (minimum (MT) and conventional (CT)) with four replicates. The 2<sup>nd</sup> one was with split-split plot arrangement with three factors: the same tillage and residues in 1<sup>st</sup> trail coupled with crop rotation (clover – maize and clover – mung bean). Soil organic carbon (SOC), organic matter (SOM), active carbon (SAC), aggregate stability, EC, total bacteria and fungi count, available N, P, K, Fe, Zn were evaluated as a soil health indicators. Results of both trails indicated that the best results were (12.78 g SOC Kg<sup>-1</sup>, 22.03 g SOM Kg<sup>-1</sup>, 178.92 mg SAC Kg<sup>-1</sup>, 44.72%, 1.11 dS m<sup>-1</sup>, 425.0\*10<sup>8</sup> CFU g<sup>-1</sup> soil, 357.5\*10<sup>3</sup> CFU g<sup>-1</sup> soil, 50.75 mg N, 17.12 mg P, 279.9 mg K, 4.68 mg Fe Kg<sup>-1</sup>, 2.79 mg Zn Kg<sup>-1</sup> soil for the treatment (100%R+MT+ clover – mung bean crop rotation) compared with results of (8.96 g SOC Kg<sup>-1</sup>, 15.45 g SOM Kg<sup>-1</sup>, 109.3 mg SAC Kg<sup>-1</sup>, 31.42%, 1.66 dS m<sup>-1</sup>, 33.5\*10<sup>8</sup> CFU bacteria g<sup>-1</sup> soil, 16.5\*10<sup>3</sup> CFU fungi g<sup>-1</sup> soil, 30.62 mg N, 11.75 mg P, 133.5 mg K, 2.95 mg Fe Kg<sup>-1</sup>, 1.73 mg Zn Kg<sup>-1</sup> soil) for treatment (0%R+ CT+ without crop rotation) respectively.

Keywords: Soil quality, aggregate stability, saturated hydraulic conductivity, total carbonate, calcareous soil, alkaline phosphatase enzyme activity.

\* Part of Ph.D. Dissertation of the 1<sup>st</sup> Author

الفريجي وعلي

مجلة العلوم الزراعية العراقية- 2025 :56 (6):1939-1946

تأثير الحراثة الدنيا وتعاقب المحاصيل وبقايا المحصول كممارسات إدارية في صحة التربة

نور الدين شوقي علي<sup>2</sup>حسين طه راضي الفريجي<sup>1 و 2</sup>

أستاذ

باحث

<sup>1</sup> شركة ما بين النهرين العامة للبذور - وزارة الزراعة، بغداد، العراق.<sup>2</sup> قسم علوم التربة والموارد المائية - كلية علوم الهندسة الزراعية - جامعة بغداد، بغداد، العراق.

## المستخلص

تم إجراء تجربتين حقليتين في محطة أبحاث كلية علوم الهندسة الزراعية - جامعة بغداد في الجادرية، بغداد - العراق خلال موسمين 2021-2022، لتقييم تأثير ممارسات الحد الأدنى من الحراثة وتناوب المحاصيل وإدارة مخلفات المحاصيل في صحة التربة. كانت التجربة الأولى بترتيب الألواح المنشقة بعاملين: مخلفات المحاصيل (0% و 100% مخلفات) والحراثة (الحد الأدنى (MT) والتقليدية (CT)) بأربعة مكررات. التجربة الثانية كانت بترتيب الألواح المنشقة-المنشقة واشتملت على ثلاثة عوامل: عاملي المخلفات والحراثة نفسها مصحوبة بتعاقب المحاصيل (برسيم - ذرة صفراء) و(برسيم - ماش). تم تقدير الكربون العضوي (SOC) و المادة العضوية (SOM) والكربون النشط (SAC) وثباتية التجمعات و EC والعدد الكلي للبكتيريا والفطريات والجهاز بالتربة من N و P و K و Fe و Zn كمؤشرات لصحة التربة. أظهرت نتائج التجربتين أن أفضل النتائج كانت (12.78 غم SOC كغم<sup>-1</sup> و 22.03 غم SOM كغم<sup>-1</sup> و 178.92 ملغم SAC كغم<sup>-1</sup> و 44.72% و 1.11 دسي سيمنز م<sup>-1</sup> والبكتيريا 425.0\*10<sup>8</sup> CFU غم<sup>-1</sup> تربة والفطريات 357.5\*10<sup>3</sup> CFU غم<sup>-1</sup> تربة و 50.75 ملغم N و 17.12 ملغم P و 279.9 ملغم K و 4.68 ملغم Fe كغم<sup>-1</sup> و 2.79 ملغم Zn كغم<sup>-1</sup> تربة لمعاملة (حراثة الحد الأدنى + 100% مخلفات + دورة زراعية برسيم - ماش) مقارنة بالنتائج (8.96 غم SOC كغم<sup>-1</sup> و 15.45 غم SOM كغم<sup>-1</sup> و 109.3 ملغم SAC كغم<sup>-1</sup> و 31.42% و 1.66 دسي سيمنز م<sup>-1</sup> والبكتيريا 33.5\*10<sup>8</sup> CFU غم<sup>-1</sup> تربة والفطريات 16.5\*10<sup>3</sup> CFU غم<sup>-1</sup> تربة و 30.62 ملغم N و 11.75 ملغم P و 133.5 ملغم K و 2.95 ملغم Fe و 1.73 ملغم Zn كغم<sup>-1</sup> تربة لمعاملة (حراثة تقليدية + 0% مخلفات + بدون دورة زراعية) على الترتيب.

كلمات مفتاحية: جودة التربة، ثباتية التجمعات، الإيصالية المائية المشبعة، الكربونات الكلية، تربة كلسية، فعالية إنزيم الفوسفاتيز القاعدي.

\* جزء من أطروحة دكتوراه للباحث الأول.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.  
Copyright© 2025 [College of Agricultural Engineering Sciences - University of Baghdad](http://www.coagri.uobaghdad.edu.iq)

Received: 12/6/2023, Accepted: 11/10/2023, Published: December 2025

## INTRODUCTION

Soil health can be defined as the continued capacity of soil to function as a vital living ecosystem that sustains plants, animals, and humans. Soil organic matter (SOM) is very important in determining soil fertility and productivity and soil health. A lot of SOM can be lost due to soil and environmental effects, especially in arid and semi-arid regions. Identifying agricultural management practices that minimize loss or even enhance SOM stores, is very important for sustaining soils and food production systems, and improving the environment by minimizing global warming (8). Integrating good soil's physical, chemical, fertility and biological properties can improve soil health and increasingly become a common management practice. Several studies have reported greater SOC under minimum or no tillage compared to conventional tillage (7, 14 and 21). Numerous studies have indicated that crop rotation, minimum tillage, and crop residues improved physical, chemical, biological, and fertility properties and enhanced soil health and quality, (4, 5, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22 and 25). Furthermore, enriching the soil enhances life on our planet. The effects of tillage systems (minimum tillage, conventional tillage and deep tillage) and crop residues retention on soil properties. Minimum tillage and crop residues improved soil properties and increased yield. (23). Reducing Tillage and using crop rotation with legume and crop residues effected on soil carbon and soil physical properties. It increases organic carbon and improves bulk density, porosity and water content (19). This study was aimed to evaluate the effect of soil management practices (reducing tillage, using crops rotation with legume crop in the rotation system and using previous crop residues) on soil properties as affected on soil health and fertility.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two field experiments were conducted at the experimental research station of the College of

Agricultural Engineering Sciences-University of Baghdad in Aljadriya, Baghdad – Iraq (33° 16' 02" N . 44° 22' 33" E) during two seasons (fall and spring of 2021-2022). Results of soil analysis pre-planting test for the studied field soil show in Table 1. The trial was conducted in a randomized complete block design (RCBD) with four replicates, to investigate the effect of tillage, crop residues, and crop rotation management practices on clover, maize, and mung bean productivities. In the 1<sup>st</sup> experiment, two factors were used: the first was the residue of the previous crop (Alfalfa) (*Medicago sativa* L.), 100% residues (100% R) and 0% residues (0%R) the 2<sup>nd</sup> factor was tillage: minimum tillage (MT) and conventional tillage (CT) in split-plot arrangement planted with clover (*Trifolium repens* L.). (the 1<sup>st</sup> experiment started in 20<sup>th</sup> of November 2021 and finished in 1<sup>st</sup> of March 2022). The 2<sup>nd</sup> experiment followed the 1<sup>st</sup> one in the spring season using tillage, crop residues, and crop rotation clover-maize (*Zea mays* L.) and clover-mung bean (*Vigna radiata* L.), Productivities. Both crops were sown at the same plots of the previous clover crop, (the 2<sup>nd</sup> experiment started in 22<sup>th</sup> of March 2022 and finished in 1<sup>st</sup> of August 2022) in a split-split plot arrangement. Plants were fertilized in the two trails according to Ali (6). Soil samples were collected before and after each trial to test the soil's chemical, physical, fertility and biological properties. At the end, of every experiment samples of soils were collected for measuring SOC, SOM, AC, aggregate stability, soil saturated hydraulic conductivity, EC, pH, total carbonates, the total count of bacteria and fungi, alkaline phosphatase enzyme, soil available N, P, K, Fe, and Zn. It should be noted that although the two experiments are differ in design and had different statistical analyses they will be presented together for the sake of simple comparisons.

**Table 1. Chemical , Physical , Biological and Fertility properties of the Soil before planting\***

Property		Value	Unit
Hydrogen potential (pH) (1:1)		8.25	-
Electrical conductivity (EC) (1:1)		1.85	dS m <sup>-1</sup>
Available nitrogen		28.00	
Available phosphorus		13.25	
Available potassium		174.01	mg kg <sup>-1</sup> soil
Available iron		3.55	
Available zinc		2.10	
Carbonate minerals		345.0	
Soil organic carbon		9.35	g kg <sup>-1</sup> soil
Soil organic matter		16.13	
Active carbon		128.44	mg kg <sup>-1</sup> soil
Dissolved cations	Ca <sup>2+</sup>	8.95	
	Mg <sup>2+</sup>	4.55	
	K <sup>1+</sup>	2.35	
	Na <sup>1+</sup>	3.47	m mol L <sup>-1</sup>
Dissolved anions	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	5.10	
	Cl <sup>1-</sup>	19.5	
	HCO <sub>3</sub> <sup>1-</sup>	2.95	
	CO <sub>3</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	Nil	
CEC		19.45	C mol <sub>+</sub> kg <sup>-1</sup> soil
Soil aggregate stability		26.45	%
Saturated hydraulic conductivity		1.96	cm h <sup>-1</sup>
Sand		353.0	
Silt		519.0	g kg <sup>-1</sup>
Clay		128.0	
Soil texture class			Silty loam
water content			
at 33 kPa		23.4	
at 1500 kPa		12.0	%
Available water		11.4	
Biological properties			
Total bacteria count		4.5 * 10 <sup>9</sup>	CFU g <sup>-1</sup> soil
Total fungi count		3 * 10 <sup>3</sup>	
Alkaline phosphatase enzyme activity		108.49	Microgram p-nitro phenol g <sup>-1</sup> dry soil h <sup>-1</sup>

\*Measurements done according to methods mentioned by (9, 10 and 24)

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The effect of crop residues, tillage, and crop rotation on soil health and quality indicators were presented in (Tables 2 – 6). Results of SOC, SOM, and AC were presented in Table 2. The results indicated that all carbon parameters were improved by applying such practices. The treatment (100%R + MT + crop rotation clover – mung bean) gave the values of (12.78 g kg<sup>-1</sup>, 22.03g kg<sup>-1</sup>, 178.92 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> Soil) with an increasing percent (42.63, 42.59, 63.70,)% compared with treatment (0% R + CT) of the first season (without crop rotation) which were (8.96 g kg<sup>-1</sup>, 15.45 g kg<sup>-1</sup>, 109.3 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) respectively. The effect of treatments on some soil physical properties mostly related to soil quality and health were presented in table 3. Results indicated that aggregate stability and saturated hydraulic conductivity

were improved with such practices with an increment of 42.32 and 22.91% for 100%R+MT+crop rotation (especially where legumes follow each other). Table 4 shows the results of the effect of management practices on some soil chemical properties. Results indicated a decrease in EC and total carbonates. The Effect of management practices on some soil biological properties show in Table 5. Table (4) indicates a significant reduction in (EC, pH, and total carbonates) which were (1.11 dS m<sup>-1</sup>, 7.90, 322.5 g kg<sup>-1</sup>) with decreases of (33.13, 3.54, 11.93)% for treatment (100%R+ MT + crop rotation clover – mung bean) compared with values (1.66 dSm<sup>-1</sup>, 8.19, 366.2 g kg<sup>-1</sup>) for treatment (0%R + CT) for 1<sup>st</sup> season (without crop rotation), respectively

**Table 2. Effect of minimum tillage, crop rotation and crop residues management on some soil carbon parameters**

Treatments	Carbon parameters		
	1 <sup>st</sup> Season (without crop rotation) (clover)		
	SOC (g Kg <sup>-1</sup> soil)	SOM (g Kg <sup>-1</sup> soil)	SAC (mg Kg <sup>-1</sup> soil)
0%R+CT	8.96	15.45	109.3
0%R+MT	10.27	17.71	132.1
100%R+CT	11.29	19.47	154.2
100%R+MT	12.08	20.82	173.6
LSD 0.05	0.462	0.797	8.07
Second season (crop rotation)			
clover - maize			
0%R+CT	8.08	13.93	88.88
0%R+MT	9.29	16.01	111.45
100%R+CT	10.95	18.88	145.09
100%R+MT	11.74	20.24	161.39
LSD 0.05	0.382	0.661	4.926
Clover – mung bean			
0%R+CT	9.20	15.86	105.80
0%R+MT	10.43	17.97	130.32
100%R+CT	11.50	19.82	155.19
100%R+MT	12.78	22.03	178.92
LSD0.05	0.382	0.661	4.926

**Table 3. Effect of minimum tillage, crop rotation and crop residues management on some soil physical parameters**

Treatments	Physical properties	
	Aggregate stability (%)	Saturated hydraulic conductivity (cm h <sup>-1</sup> )
1 <sup>st</sup> season (without crop rotation) (clover)		
0%R+CT	31.42	2.27
0%R+MT	38.20	2.32
100%R+CT	37.73	2.56
100%R+MT	41.84	2.65
LSD 0.05	0.427	0.174
2 <sup>nd</sup> season (crop rotation)		
clover - maize		
0%R+CT	39.05	2.32
0%R+MT	40.41	2.34
100%R+CT	42.08	2.51
100%R+MT	43.81	2.72
LSD 0.05	0.974	0.098
clover –mung bean		
0%R+CT	39.82	2.37
0%R+MT	40.62	2.38
100%R+CT	42.54	2.67
100%R+MT	44.72	2.79
LSD0.05	0.974	0.098

**Table 4. Effect of minimum tillage, crop rotation and crop residues management practices on some chemical properties .**

Treatments	Chemical properties		
	EC (1:1) (dS m <sup>-1</sup> )	pH	Total carbonate (TC) (g Kg <sup>-1</sup> soil)
<b>First season (without crop rotation) (clover)</b>			
0% R + CT	1.66	8.19	366.2
0% R + MT	1.60	8.15	361.9
100% R + CT	1.50	7.93	342.6
100% R + MT	1.48	7.81	338.1
LSD 0.05	NS	0.208	14.4
<b>Second season (crop rotation) clover - maize</b>			
0% R + CT	1.69	8.41	362.5
0% R + MT	1.53	8.34	360.0
100% R + CT	1.49	8.02	346.9
100% R + MT	1.18	7.99	330.6
LSD 0.05	0.168	0.087	7.971
<b>clover – mung bean</b>			
0% R + CT	1.59	8.36	361.3
0% R + MT	1.42	8.28	351.9
100% R + CT	1.24	8.09	332.5
100% R + MT	1.11	7.90	322.5
LSD 0.05	0.168	0.087	7.971

Table 5 indicates the effect of crop residues, tillage and crop rotation on biological properties in the soil as indicators of soil health and quality. It shows a significant increase in (total bacteria count, total fungi count, alkaline phosphatase enzyme activity) with treatment (100% residues + minimum tillage + crop rotation clover – mung bean)

which values were (425.0\*10<sup>8</sup> CFU, 357.5 \* 10<sup>3</sup> CFU, 170.11 µg P-nitro phenol g<sup>-1</sup> dry soil h<sup>-1</sup>) comparing with treatment (0% residues + conventional tillage) in the first season (without crop rotation) which were (33.5\* 10<sup>8</sup> CFU, 16.5\* 10<sup>3</sup> CFU, 136.38 Microgram P-nitro phenol g<sup>-1</sup> dry soil h<sup>-1</sup>), respectively.

**Table 5. Effect of minimum tillage, crop rotation and crop residues management practices on some biological properties as an indicators of soil health and quality**

Treatments	Biological properties		
	Total bacteria count (*10 <sup>8</sup> CFU g <sup>-1</sup> soil)	Total fungi count (*10 <sup>3</sup> CFU g <sup>-1</sup> soil)	Phosphatase activity (µ g para nitro phenol g <sup>-1</sup> dry soil h <sup>-1</sup> )
<b>First season (without crop rotation)</b>			
0% R + CT	33.5	16.5	136.38
0% R + MT	93.2	35.2	141.24
100% R + CT	205.0	75.0	159.46
100% R + MT	237.5	122.5	167.22
LSD 0.05	29.95	25.76	6.558
<b>Second season (crop rotation) clover - maize</b>			
0% R + CT	17.0	10.0	105.99
0% R + MT	66.2	24.5	117.30
100% R + CT	162.5	85.0	139.25
100% R + MT	207.5	130.0	152.79
LSD 0.05	16.30	18.68	9.61
<b>clover – mung bean</b>			
0% R + CT	49.2	22.0	116.28
0% R + MT	81.5	37.8	127.49
100% R + CT	187.5	95.0	143.92
100% R + MT	425.0	357.5	170.11
LSD 0.05	16.30	18.68	9.61

Table 6 indicates the effect of crop residues, tillage and crop rotation on available nutrients in the soil as indicators of soil health and quality. It shows a significant increases of

(available nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, iron, and zinc)) with treatment (100% residues + minimum tillage + crop rotation clover – mung bean) which values were (50.75 mg N

kg<sup>-1</sup>, 17.12 mg P kg<sup>-1</sup>, 279.9 mg K kg<sup>-1</sup>, 4.68 mg Fe kg<sup>-1</sup>, 2.79 mg Zn kg<sup>-1</sup>) with increasing percent (65.74, 45.70, 109.66, 58.64, 61.27)% comparing with treatment (0%R + CT) in the first season (without crop rotation) which were (30.62 mg N kg<sup>-1</sup>, 11.75 mg P kg<sup>-1</sup>, 133.5 mg

K kg<sup>-1</sup>, 2.95 mg Fe kg<sup>-1</sup>, 1.73 mg Zn kg<sup>-1</sup>), respectively, It should mention that Zn in 1<sup>st</sup> trail (100%R+MT) (2.98 mg Zn kg<sup>-1</sup>soil) was higher than Zn in 2<sup>nd</sup> trail ( 100%R+MT+crop rotation clover-mung bean) ( 2.79 mg Zn kg<sup>-1</sup> soil).

**Table 6. Effect of minimum tillage, crop rotation and crop residues management practices on some fertility properties as an indicators of soil health and quality**

Treatments	Available nitrogen (mg N Kg <sup>-1</sup> soil)	Available phosphorus (mg P Kg <sup>-1</sup> soil)	Fertility index Available potassium (mg K Kg <sup>-1</sup> soil)	Available iron (mg Fe Kg <sup>-1</sup> soil)	Available zinc (mg Zn Kg <sup>-1</sup> soil)
First season (without crop rotation) (clover)					
0% R + CT	30.62	11.75	133.5	2.95	1.73
0% R + MT	32.38	13.12	150.4	3.20	2.03
100%R + CT	42.00	14.66	189.8	3.90	2.39
100%R+ MT	45.50	16.88	212.3	3.99	2.98
LSD 0.05	1.457	0.819	34.26	0.213	0.137
Second season (crop rotation)					
clover - maize					
0% R + CT	22.75	10.39	144.7	3.05	1.65
0% R + MT	28.00	12.42	168.9	3.38	1.98
100%R + CT	35.88	14.16	216.2	4.18	2.30
100%R+ MT	44.50	15.39	248.4	4.46	2.51
LSD 0.05	4.889	0.374	16.77	0.156	0.097
clover – mung bean					
0% R + CT	26.25	11.96	158.8	3.13	1.83
0% R + MT	29.75	13.73	195.4	3.54	2.08
100%R + CT	40.12	15.01	243.3	4.25	2.39
100%R+ MT	50.75	17.12	279.9	4.68	2.79
LSD 0.05	4.889	0.374	16.77	0.156	0.097

Tables 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 show the effect of tillage, crop rotation and crop residues management practices on some soil properties as an indicator of soil health and quality. These tables presented the differences in some chemical, physical, biological, and soil fertility properties as affected by such treatments. The increments in soil carbon, soil aggregate stability, soil saturated hydraulic conductivity, and biological and soil nutrient availability were very clear. on the contrary, the decrease in some soil chemical properties were clear as well (1, 2 and 18). These results reflect the role of crop residues (alfalfa and clover) in increasing soil organic carbon parameters (Table 2). Soil organic carbon and organic matter can be considered the best indicators for soil health and quality (11 and 14) due to the carbon role in biodiversity especially soil microorganisms and enzymes (Table 5). These microorganisms have a very important role in nutrient cycling (7) besides, soil organic matter has a very important role in nutrient availability. Crop residues at the same time enhance physical soil properties like soil aggregate stability and saturated hydraulic

conductivity (Table 3) through the activity of bacteria which secrete or provide soil polysaccharides that keep particles of soil together and that lead to creating new soil aggregates and keep another aggregate and resistance of soil degradation, so that leads to enhance physical soil properties like aggregate stability and saturated hydraulic conductivity and soil structure (1 and 2). Fungi have a very important function represented by gathering particles of soil by hyphae so it helps to form new aggregates of soil and increasing aggregates stability. Minimum tillage leads to the same result due to reducing oxidation of organic matter and conserves organic carbon from being lost especially in an arid-semi arid climate of Iraq. At the same time, minimum tillage can reduce broken colonies of bacteria and fungi and keep them healthy. Crop rotation especially one containing legumes in sequences is very important in providing nutrients, especially nitrogen (14). The results of these two experiments confirmed the results of (13) and the results of (16 and 17), and results of (15). Results of these two experiments showed the first experiment

indicated enhanced soil properties and soil health and quality. It can be concluded that adopting best management practices can improve soil properties and soil health. Healthy soil will produce better yield with good quality as have been seen from the results of (3, 4, 12, 18 and 26)

## CONCLUSION

Using integrated management practices: crop rotation, residues of previous crop and minimum tillage can have a very clear impact on soil health, so using such practices could be recommended.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

## DECLARATION OF FUND

The authors declare that they have not received a fund.

## REFERENCES

1. Abbasi, M. K., M. Azhar, and M. T. Majid. 2009. Cumulative effects of white clover residues on the changes in soil properties, nutrient uptake, growth and yield of maize crop in the sub-humid hilly region of Azad Jammu and Kashmir, Pakistan. *African Journal of Biotechnology* . 8 (10) : 2184 - 2194. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJB09.330>
2. Alam, K., M. Isalm, N. Salahin and M. Hasanuzzaman. 2014. Effect of tillage practices on soil properties and crop productivity in Wheat - Mung bean - Rice cropping system under subtropical climatic conditions. *The Scientific World Journal*. Article ID 437283, pp:15. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/437283>
3. Al-Furaiji, H. T. R. and N. S. Ali. 2024. Soil organic carbon and aggregate stability as affected by soil management practices. *Iraqi Journal of Market Research and Consumer protection*. 16(2):114-123. [http://dx.doi.org/10.28936/jmracpc16.2.2024.\(10\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.28936/jmracpc16.2.2024.(10))
4. Alhalfi, D. A. N. and S. S. J. Alazzawi. 2022a. Effect of organic fertilizer sources and chemical fertilization on soil chemical properties and yield of summer squash . *Neuro Quantology*, 20(5):1554-1565. Doi: 10.14704/nq.2022.20.5.NQ22543
5. Alhalfi, D. A. N. and S. S. J. Alazzawi. 2022b. Effect of organic fertilizer sources and chemical fertilization on soil physical traits and yield of summer squash. *Iraqi Journal of Market Research and Consumers Protection* .14 (2) : 74 – 81 . [http://dx.doi.org/10.28936/jmracpc14.2.2022.\(9\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.28936/jmracpc14.2.2022.(9)).
6. Ali, N. S. 2012. Fertilizer Technology and Uses. Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. College of Agricultural Engineering Sciences, University of Baghdad. University House for Printing, Publishing & Translation. pp:1-202.
7. Ali, N. S., M. M. Allawi and N. H. Majeed. 2022. Rhizosphere Management and Agricultural Sustainability. Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. College of Agricultural Engineering Sciences, University of Baghdad. Aloom Center for Printing, Baghdad, Iraq. pp: 1-320.
8. Amelung, W., D. Bossio, W. de Vries, I. Kogel-Knabner, J. Lehmann, R. Amundson, R. Bol, C. Collins, R. Lal, J. Leifeld, B. Minasny, G. Pan, K. Paustian, C. Rumpel, J. Sanderman, J. W. van Groenigen, S. Mooney, B. van Wesemael, M. Wander, and A. Chabbi, 2020. Towards a global-scale soil climate mitigation strategy. *Natural Community Journal*, 11, 5427. doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-18887-7
9. Aoda, M. I. and N. T. Mahdi. 2017. Methods of Soil Physical Properties Analyses. University House For Printing, Publishing & Translation. Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. pp:1- 215.
10. Black, C. A., D. D. Evans, L. E. Ensminger, J. L. White and F. E. Clark (Eds). 1965. Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2. Chemical and Microbiological Properties. Am. Soc. Agron., Inc. Madison. Wisconsin, USA. P:1569.
11. Higashi, T., M. Yunghui, M. Komatsuzaki., S. Miura, T. Hirata, H. Araki, N. Kaneko, and H. Ohta. 2014. Tillage and cover crop species affect soil organic carbon in Andosol, Kanto, Japan. *Soil and Tillage Research*. 138: 64 – 72. DOI: [10.1016/j.still.2013.12.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2013.12.010)
12. Intergovernmental Technical Panel on Soils (ITPS). 2016. Status of the World's Soil Resources Main report (FAO, Rome), pp:1-607. <https://doi.org/10.5194/soil-2-79-2016>
13. Jeghata, H. A. S., and N. M. Muhawish. 2021. Effect of three tillage systems, levels of



plant residues and type of crop on some physical properties and organic carbon fractions in a Gypsiferous soil. College of Basic Education Researchers Journal. 17 (1) , 929 – 954 .

<https://doi.org/10.33899/berj.2021.167750>

14. Magdoff, F., and H. V. Es. 2021. Building Soils For Better Crops (Ecological Management For Healthy Soils). 4<sup>th</sup> Handbook Series Book 10, Published by The Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE) Program, With Funding From The National Institute of Food and Agriculture, U. S. Department of Agriculture. PP:1-230.

15. Masood, T. K., and N. S. Ali. 2022. Effect of soil organic carbon content in different soils on water holding capacity and soil health. IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science. 1158 022035.PP:1315-1755.

DOI:10.1088/1755-1315/1158/2/022035

16. Mohammed, H. A., and K. U. Hasan. 2022. Effect of bacterial bio-fertilization on phosphorus budget, growth and yield of Faba bean when intercropped with wheat. International J. of Health Science, 6(55):9200-9212. DOI:[10.13140/RG.2.2.28479.18089](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.28479.18089)

17. Mohammed, H. A., and K. U. Hasan. 2023. Effect of bacteria and yeast bio fertilization on nitrogen budget, growth, and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) when intercropping with faba bean (*Vicia faba* L.) Bionatura Journal. Issue 1(8).1 . <http://dx.doi.org/10.21931/RB/CSS/2023.08.01.79>

18. Mooleki, S. P., Y. Gan, R. L. Lemke, R. P. Zentner, and C. Hamel. 2016. Effect of green manure crops, termination method, stubble crops and fallow on soil water, available N and exchangeable P. Canadian. J. of Plant Sci. 96(5): 867 – 886. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjps-2015-0336>

19. Mtyobile, M., L. Muzangwa and P. N. S. Mnkeni. 2019. Tillage and crop rotation effects on soil carbon and selected soil physical properties in a Haplic Cambisol in Eastern Cape , South Africa. Soil and water research, 15(1). Doi:10.17221/176/2018-SWR

20. Nath, C. P., N. Kumar, K. Das, K. K. Hazra, C. S. Paraharaj and N. P. Singh. 2021.

Impact of variable tillage based residue management and legume based cropping for seven years on enzymes activity, soil quality index and crop productivity in rice ecology. Elsevier Journal. V : 10. 100 – 107 .

DOI:[10.1016/j.indic.2021.100107](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indic.2021.100107)

21. Nyambo, P., B. Thengeni, C. Chiduzza and T. Araya. 2021. Tillage, crop rotation, residue management and biochar influence on soil chemical and biological properties. South African Journal of Plant and Soil. 38 (5). P 390 – 397 .

DOI:[10.1080/02571862.2021.1962421](https://doi.org/10.1080/02571862.2021.1962421)

22. Riahinia, F., and H. Emami. 2021. Effects of crop residues and tillage operations on soil quality indices. Polish Journal of Soil Sciences. 0079-2985 .

DOI:[10.17951/pjss/2021.54.1.167](https://doi.org/10.17951/pjss/2021.54.1.167)

23. Salahin, N., K. Alam, A-T. M. A. I. Mondol, M. S. Islam, Md. H. Rashid and M. A. Hoque. 2017. Effect of tillage and residue retention on soil properties and crop yields in wheat- mungbean- rice crop rotation under subtropical humid climate. Open journal of soil science. 7(1): 17.

Doi:10.4236/ojss.2017.71001.

24. Salim, Ch. Sh., and N. S. Ali. 2017. Guide for Chemical Analyses of Soil, Water, Plant and Fertilizers. University House For Printing, Publishing & Translation. Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. pp: 1-277.

25. Saurabh, K., K. K. Rao, J. S. Mishra, R. Kumar, S. P. Poonia, S. K. Samal, H. S. Roy, A. K. Dubey, A. K. Choubey, S. Mondal, B. P. Bhatt, M. Verma and R.K. Malik. 2021. Influence of tillage based crop establishment and residue management practices on soil quality indices and yield sustainability in rice-wheat cropping system of Eastern Indo-Gangetic Plains. Elsevier J. Soil & Tillage Research 206 (2021) 104841 .

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2020.104841>

26. Sommer, R.. C., D. Piggan, M. Feindel, L. V. Ansar, K. Delden, J. Shimonaka, O. Abdalla, G. Douba, A. Estefan, R. Haddad, A. Haj-Abdo, P. Hajdibo, Y. Hayek, A. K. Khoder, and J. Ryan. 2014. Effects of zero tillage and residue retention on soil quality in the Mediterranean Region of Northern Syria. Open Journal of Soil Science. 4.(3): 4438.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojss.2014.43015>