

Determination of Appropriate Planting Space and Vertical Numbers for Hybrid Arabica Coffee at Yeki District, Southwestern Ethiopia

Behailu Mekonnen^{1*}, Shiferaw Temeteme¹, Essubalew Getachew², Habtewold Kiflew³ and Tesfaye Shimber⁴

¹Tepi National Spices Research Center, Tepi, Ethiopia

²Jimma University College of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine, Jimma, Ethiopia

³Holetta Agricultural Research Center, Holetta, Ethiopia

⁴Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Abstract

An experiment was conducted at Tepi National Spices Research Center for five years, to determine the optimum planting space and vertical numbers that promote growth and yield of hybrid Arabica coffee variety. The treatments consisted of three levels of planting space (2.5 m x 2.5 m, 2.5 m x 2.0 m, 2.0 m x 2.0 m) and three vertical numbers (single stem, two stem, free growth). The experiment was laid out in Randomized Complete Block Design with three replications. The recorded data on yield and yield attributes like internode length of primary branches, number of bearing and non-bearing primary branches, number of nodes of primary branch and the main stem were significantly influenced by the interaction effects of planting space and vertical numbers. Similarly, the coffee yield was also significantly influenced by the interaction of planting space and vertical numbers. The highest plant height and internode length of primary branches were recorded at the same planting space of 2.0 m x 2.0 m with two stem and free growth habit, respectively. Whereas, the maximum node number on primary branches and main stem were recorded from treatments which had the same planting space (2.5 m x 2.0 m) with single stem and two stem, respectively. The maximum number of bearing primary branches were recorded from trees which treated with 2.0 m x 2.0 m with free growth habit. Likewise, the highest coffee yield was found in a planting space of 2.0 m x 2.0 m with free growth habit. Therefore, it could be concluded that using of an optimum planting space of 2 m x 2 m with free growth habit enhanced the growth, yield and yield components of hybrid coffee. However, it is important to repeat the study in different locations for further investigation on yield and quality attributes.

Keywords: Hybrid coffee; Pruning; Clean coffee; Planting space

Introduction

Coffee belongs to the genus *Coffea* sub-genus *Coffea*, family Rubiaceae and is mostly present in tropical and subtropical regions of the world [1]. The species which are economically important and cultivated world-wide are *Coffea arabica* (Arabica coffee) and *Coffea canephora* (Robusta coffee) [2]. Ethiopia is the primary center of origin and diversification for Arabica coffee [3-5]. In Ethiopia, Arabica coffee grows under very diverse agro-ecologies and wider ranges of altitudes, temperature, rainfall, humidity and soil types [6]. It grows wild in some forest areas, from semi Savannah climate of the Gambella plain (500 m.a.s.l.) to the continuously wet mountain forest zones of the southwest, in gardens and back yards of southeast and northern regions up to 2600 m.a.s.l. [6,7]. The soil varies from sandy loam to heavy clay while the dominant soil types are acidic (pH 4.2-6.8) red, reddish brown lateric loams or clay loams of volcanic origin and total annual rainfall varies from 750 to 2,400 mm [8].

The crop is mainly produced in the South Western, Southern and Eastern parts of the country. According to [9], the total area coverage of coffee in Ethiopia is estimated to be around 800,000 ha, and an estimated annual national production is about 419,980.20 tons. Coffee production is important to the Ethiopian economy; it contributes about 60% of the country's foreign currency earnings [9]. More than 15 million people directly or indirectly depend on coffee value chain for their income and employment [9-11]. Moreover, about 35% of the total production is consumed within the producing areas [12] and in general, over 50% of the coffee produced is consumed within Ethiopia [13]. Even though Ethiopia has high genetic diversity, diverse and suitable agro-ecologies and suitable land mass, the national coffee yield per unit area is generally low (748 kg ha⁻¹) [14]. Since, the majority of coffee farmers in the country practice the old traditional cropping

patterns. Besides, several production constraints were faced, among which the most important could be cultivation of unimproved coffee cultivars with poor agronomic practices, including low-density coffee planting patterns and inappropriate pruning practices.

Several studies have indicated that coffee may be more suited for a dense planting pattern. According to [15] report, the productivity of densely planted coffee is generally much greater than that of traditional plantings. It has been also reported that a closely planting space favors the individual coffee plant to utilize the environmental resources such as light, moisture and nutrients throughout the growing period [16]. In other study, closely planted coffee results almost a complete ground coverage and better uptake of available soil nutrients by denser rooting [17]. In dense plantings, coffee roots develop deeper so that they take up water and nutrients from lower soil horizons [18]. Although densely planting systems may increase production per unit area increases along with population density up to a certain level, but the yield per tree could be decreases with high planting density [19]. The reduction of yield per individual tree with close spacing may be attributed to the effect of shading on the number of fruit-bearing nodes and fruit number per node [19,20].

***Corresponding author:** Behailu Mekonnen, Tepi National Spices Research Center, Tepi, Ethiopia, Tel: +251-92-091-82-78; E-mail: behailumekonnenba@gmail.com

Received May 15, 2018; **Accepted** August 06, 2018; **Published** August 13, 2018

Citation: Mekonnen B, Temeteme S, Getachew E, Kiflew H, Shimber T (2018) Determination of Appropriate Planting Space and Vertical Numbers for Hybrid Arabica Coffee at Yeki District, Southwestern Ethiopia. J Hortic 5: 240. doi: 10.4172/2376-0354.1000240

Copyright: © 2018 Mekonnen B, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Pruning is an important cultural practice in management of modern coffee farms. It helps to create well-structured, healthy trees that give good yields over a long period of time without alternate bearing or biennial production [21]. Moreover, it also favor in balancing fruit to leaf ratio that enhance the nutrient translocation (source to sink), facilitate harvesting and other crop managements [22]. However, past research attempts have not focused on details of coffee planting space and pruning practices for this growing area particularly for hybrid varieties. Accordingly, information is also scarce about the use of optimum planting space and pruning practices for hybrid varieties to widely adopt by coffee growers in the study area. Therefore, this study was proposed to solve the above stated research gaps for low land area like Tepi and its surrounding with the objective of determining optimum planting space and vertical numbers that promote yield of hybrid Arabica coffee variety.

Materials and Methods

The experiment was conducted at Tepi National Spices Research Center (TNSRC) from the year 2012 - 2016. The center is located at 7°10' N latitude and 35°25' E longitude and situated at an altitude of 1200 m.a.s.l representing a lowland altitude according to Ethiopian traditional agro-ecological division, elevation is the basis for this classification [23]. It is characterized by hot humid with an average annual rainfall of 1559 mm and mean maximum and minimum temperature of 30.23°C and 16.09°C, respectively [24]. The soil type of the experimental site is classified as Nitisols and Fluvisols with minor occurrence of Leptosols, which is dominated by a loam texture with a pH range of 5.60 to 6.0 [25]. The soil depth is very deep (>150 cm) and have a color of dark brown (7.5 YR3/2) when moist. The organic matter content is medium to very high (2.47 to 7.02%) according to [26] classification. The total nitrogen content is low to very high (0.09 to 0.73%) according to [27] classification, while the available phosphorus is low to medium (0.97 to 7.36 ppm) based on the rating of Yacob E et al. (Figure 1) [28].

The treatments consisted of three levels of planting space; Sp₁ (2.5 m x 2.5 m), Sp₂ (2.5 m x 2.0 m), Sp₃ (2.0 m x 2.0 m) and three types of vertical numbers; P₁ (single stem), P₂ (two stem), P₃ (free growth). The plant population density for Sp₁, Sp₂ and Sp₃ were 1600, 2000 and 2500 tree ha⁻¹, respectively. The experiment was conducted in RCBD with factorial arrangement of 9 treatment combinations (3 planting space x 3 vertical numbers) in three replications. The experimental

area was divided in to three blocks, nine experimental plots were enclosed by each block and each experimental plot was held a total of 30 trees. Hybrid Arabica coffee variety (74165 x Dr1) was used for this experiment. Coffee seedlings were transplanted in June 2012, based on their respective spacing. Training and pruning of coffee tree were also practiced as per the treatment arrangement, except for the free growth one. For two vertical stems, pruning was done when the seedlings reached at the height of 45 cm above ground to allow two active stem per plant. All routine field management activities were uniformly and timely applied as per the recommendations.

Yield and yield component parameters were recorded from ten representative trees for each experimental plots, the representative trees were randomly selected only from the central rows. The data collected were; number of primary branches, number of nodes of primary branch, number of nodes of the main stem, stem girth (cm) and canopy diameter (cm), internode length of primary branch (cm), number of bearing and non-bearing primary branches and coffee yield (kg ha⁻¹) data were recorded from the representative sample trees.

The method of data collection for each parameter was as follows:

Number of primary branches: This parameter was recorded by counting the number of primary branches.

Number of nodes of primary branch: This parameter was recorded by counting the number of nodes.

Number of nodes on main stem: Measured as a total number of nodes count per tree

Stem girth (cm): This was measured above 5 centimeter at the ground level using caliper

Canopy diameter (cm): Average length of tree canopy measure twice, east-west and north- south, from the widest portion of the tree canopy

Internode length on longest primary branch (cm): This parameter calculated as LLPB/NNPB, where Length of longest primary branch (cm), NNPB = number of nodes on longest primary branch.

Number of bearing and non-bearing primary branches: This was measured by counting the number of bearing and non-bearing primary branches per tree

Coffee yield (Kg ha⁻¹): Fresh cherry weight that had already been recorded per tree bases was used and converted to clean coffee in quintals per hectare.

Data analyses

The collected data were subjected to statistical analysis. Analyses of variance were carried out using SAS version 9.2 English [29]. Significant differences between and or among treatments were delineated by Least Significant Differences (LSD) at 5% probability [30].

Results and Discussions

Effect of different planting space and vertical number on growth parameters of hybrid Arabica coffee

Number of bearing and non-bearing primary branches: From the result, number of bearing primary branch was significantly ($P < 0.05$) affected by the main effects of planting space and by the interaction effects of planting space and vertical numbers. However, number of bearing primary branch was not significantly affected by the main




Figure 1: Administrative map of the study area (Source: Regional statistic and population office of SNNPR).

effects of vertical numbers (Table 1). Number of bearing primary branch was linearly increased along with plant population number. Thus, the maximum number of bearing primary branches were recorded from coffee tree which was planted in 2.0 m x 2.0 m with free growth followed by the treatment which received a two stem with the same planting space. Whereas, the minimum number of bearing primary branches were recorded from coffee tree which was planted in 2.5 m x 2.5 m with two stem (Table 1).

Similarly, number of non-bearing primary branch was significantly ($P < 0.05$) affected by the main effects of planting space and by the interaction effects of planting space and vertical numbers. However, a main effect of vertical numbers does not influence the non-bearing primary branch number per plant. Thus, the maximum number of non-bearing primary branches was recorded from coffee tree which was planted in 2.0 m x 2.0 m with two stems. However, it was statistically non-significance difference with the treatments; two stem with 2.0 m x 2.0 m and free growth with 2.0 m x 2.0 m. While, minimum number of non-bearing primary branches were recorded from coffee tree which was planted in a narrow space (2.0 m x 2.0 m) with two stems (Table 1).

The increase in bearing primary branches per tree with increasing tree population number has been attributed to efficient utilization of environmental inputs, viz. light, moisture and nutrients, until the biological optimum is attained [16]. In the same way, the non-bearing primary branch number was linearly increased along with plant population number (Table 1). This result could be associated with high coffee tree population density with enhanced branching leading to insufficient utilization of nutrients for each individual tree. Moreover, it might be due to less light absorption by individual tree due to high mutual shading effects of closely planted coffee trees [31].

Stem girth and canopy diameter

The recorded data on stem girth of coffee tree was not significantly influenced by the interaction and main effects of planting space and vertical number. Which indicates that there is no variation in coffee stem girth due to the effect of different population density and vertical numbers. Thus, the maximum stem girth was recorded at a planting space of 2.5 m x 2.0 m, and from free grown coffee tree (Figure 2). Similarly, the canopy diameter was not significantly ($P < 0.05$) affected by the main effects of vertical number and interaction of factors being studied. A wide canopy was observed from both free grown tree and closely planted tree (Figure 3).

Internode length of primary branches

Internodes length of primary branch was significantly ($P < 0.05$) affected by the main effect of planting space and vertical numbers, as




Figure 2: Effect of (a) planting space and (b) vertical number on stem girth of coffee tree.




Figure 3: Effect of (a) planting space and (b) vertical number on canopy diameter of coffee tree.

well as by the interaction effect of the two factors. Thus, the highest internodes length was recorded from coffee tree which was planted in 2.5 m x 2.5 m with free growth followed by the treatment which consists of similar planting space with two stems. Whereas, the lowest internode length was recorded from coffee tree which was planted in 2.5 m x 2.0 m with free growth habit (Table 2). This result could be association with the wide planting space of coffee tree; thereby the primary and secondary branches might be grown faster and elongated.

Number of nodes of primary branch and main stem

Number of nodes of primary was significantly ($P < 0.05$) affected by the interaction of planting space and vertical numbers, as well as by the main effects of both factors. Thus, the highest node number in primary branch was recorded from treatment in which coffee planted in 2.5 m x 2.0 m with two stems, but statistically it is similar with two stems and free growth with a planting space of (2.5 m x 2.0 m). Whereas, the lowest node number on primary branch was recorded from coffee tree which was planted in 2.5 m x 2.5 m with free growth habit (Table 3). On the other hand, number of nodes of the main stem was significantly ($P < 0.05$) affected by the interaction effects of planting space and vertical numbers, as well as by the main effects of planting space. The highest node number on the main stem was recorded from coffee tree which was planted in 2.5 m x 2.0 m with two stems. While, the lowest node number on the main stem was recorded from coffee tree which was planted in 2.5 m x 2.5 m with two stems (Table 3).

As a result, two stems with optimum population density increase primary branches and node number, which is associated with enhanced branching and increasing of light interception by individual coffee tree [32]. On the other hand, the response of node number on the main stem could be associated with the enhanced growth of two verticals height.

Treatments	Number of Bearing Primary Branches Plant ⁻¹			Number of Non-bearing Primary Branches Plant ⁻¹		
	Sp ₁	Sp ₂	Sp ₃	Sp ₁	Sp ₂	Sp ₃
P ₁	21.80 ^e	39.73 ^{bc}	46.80 ^{ab}	11.80 ^e	16.33 ^{a-d}	19.47 ^a
P ₂	28.00 ^{de}	42.87 ^{bc}	42.87 ^{bc}	14.97 ^{b-e}	16.07 ^{a-d}	17.17 ^{abc}
P ₃	26.33 ^{de}	35.03 ^{cd}	53.03 ^a	13.50 ^{cde}	12.57 ^{de}	18.70 ^{ab}
CV%	23.80			26.19		
LSD _(0.05)	*			*		

Means followed by the same letter within a column are not significantly different at 5% level of significance; * = significance at 5% probability, CV = coefficient of variance; LSD = least significance difference; Sp₁ = 2.5m*2.5m, Sp₂ = 2.5 m*2.0m, Sp₃ = 2.0m *2.0m, P₁ = single stems, P₂ = two stems, P₃ = free growth.

Table 1: Number of bearing and non-bearing primary branches of hybrid coffee as influenced by the interaction of planting space and vertical numbers.

Effects of different planting space and vertical numbers on clean coffee yield

Clean coffee yield was significantly ($P < 0.05$) influenced by the interaction effects of planting space and vertical numbers, as well as by the main effects of vertical numbers. The yield showed an increment as the population density of coffee tree increased. Thus, the highest clean coffee yield was obtained from closely planted coffee (2.0 m x 2.0 m) with free growth habit followed by the treatment which is a planting space of 2.5 m x 2.0 m with free growth habit. Whereas, the lowest clean coffee yield was obtained from treatment which is a planting space of 2.5 m x 2.0 m with two stems (Table 4).

The coffee yield increases with population density of coffee tree, it could be attributed to efficient utilization of environmental inputs, viz. light, moisture, nutrients, until the biological optimum is attained Teye et al., [16]. Moreover, the free growth habit of coffee gave higher yield as compared to multiple stem uncapped and multiple stem capped growth habit.

Treatment	Internode Length of Primary Branches (cm)		
	Sp ₁	Sp ₂	Sp ₃
P ₁	4.70 ^{bc}	4.22 ^{de}	4.48 ^{cd}
P ₂	4.78 ^b	4.59 ^{bc}	4.59 ^{bc}
P ₃	5.20 ^a	4.11 ^e	4.53 ^{bc}
CV%	5.90		
LSD _(0.05)	*		

Means followed by the same letter within a column are not significantly different at 5% level of significance; * = significance at 5% probability, CV = coefficient of variance; LSD = least significance difference; Sp₁ = 2.5m*2.5m, Sp₂ = 2.5m*2.0m, Sp₃ = 2.0m*2.0m, P₁ = single stems, P₂ = two stems, P₃ = free growth.

Table 2: Internode length of primary branches of hybrid coffee as influenced by the interaction of planting space and vertical numbers.

Treatment	Number of Nodes of Primary Branches			Number of Nodes of the Main Stem		
	Sp ₁	Sp ₂	Sp ₃	Sp ₁	Sp ₂	Sp ₃
P ₁	19.53 ^{bc}	21.04 ^a	18.66 ^{cd}	34.43 ^c	48.07 ^{ab}	47.27 ^{ab}
P ₂	17.93 ^{de}	19.98 ^{ab}	19.41 ^{bc}	45.30 ^{ab}	50.33 ^a	39.63 ^{bc}
P ₃	17.31 ^e	20.57 ^{ab}	19.49 ^{bc}	46.17 ^{ab}	39.87 ^{bc}	39.57 ^{bc}
CV%	6.30			21.03		
LSD _(0.05)	*			*		

Means followed by the same letter within a column are not significantly different at 5% level of significance; * = significance at 5% probability, CV = coefficient of variance; LSD = least significance difference; Sp₁ = 2.5m*2.5m, Sp₂ = 2.5m*2.0m, Sp₃ = 2.0m*2.0m, P₁ = single stems, P₂ = two stems, P₃ = free growth.

Table 3: Number of nodes of primary branch and main stem as influenced by the interaction of planting space and vertical numbers.

Treatment	Clean Coffee Yield (kg ha ⁻¹)		
	Sp ₁	Sp ₂	Sp ₃
P ₁	727.50 ^{bcd}	509.33 ^d	650.17 ^{cd}
P ₂	581.00 ^d	846.33 ^{abc}	680.33 ^{cd}
P ₃	863.87 ^{abc}	953.47 ^{ab}	1028.93 ^a
CV%	33.59		
LSD _(0.05)	*		

Means followed by the same letter within a column are not significantly different at 5% level of significance; * = significance at 5% probability, CV = coefficient of variance; LSD = least significance difference; Sp₁ = 2.5m*2.5m, Sp₂ = 2.5m*2.0m, Sp₃ = 2.0m*2.0m, P₁ = single stems, P₂ = two stems, P₃ = free growth.

Table 4: Clean coffee yield as influenced by the interaction of planting space and vertical numbers.

Conclusion

Based on the outcome of the study, planting space and vertical numbers had a significant effect on yield and yield attributes, viz., number of bearing and non-bearing primary branches, length of internode, node number on primary branch and main stem, yield of coffee. The clean coffee yield was increased as the number of coffee tree increased or population density increased. The highest coffee yield was found from closely planted coffee tree (2.0 m x 2.0 m) with a free growth habit. Therefore, it could be concluded that using of optimum planting space of 2 m x 2 m with free growth habit enhanced the growth, yield and yield components of hybrid coffee in the study area and its surrounding as well. However, it is important to repeat the study in different locations for further investigation on yield and quality attributes.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thanks Tepi National Spice Research Center (TNSRC/ EIAR) for financial support during the research work and also Mr. Asirade Chane and Mr. Wondimu Gebre Silassie technical assistant of land and water resource research process under agronomy research division at TNSRC for their unreserved technical support on field works from land preparation up to data collection. Finally we would like to highly acknowledge the publisher.

References

- Davis A, Govaerts R, Bridson D, Stoffelen P (2006) An annotated taxonomic conspectus of the genus *Coffea* (Rubiaceae). Bot J Linear Soc 152: 465-512.
- Kathurima C, Kenji G, Muhoho S, Boulanger R, Gichimu B, et al. (2012) Genetic diversity among commercial coffee varieties, advanced selections and museum collections in Kenya using molecular markers. Int J Biodivers Conserv 4: 39-46.
- Vavilov N (1951) The origin, variation, immunity and breeding of cultivated plants. Soil Sci 72: 482.
- Workafes W, Kassu K (2000) Coffee production system in Ethiopia. Proceedings of the Workshop on Control of Coffee Berry Disease in Ethiopia. EARO, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, pp: 99-106.
- Mesfin K, Bayetta B (2008) Phenotypic diversity in the Hararge coffee (*Coffea arabica* L.) germplasm for quantitative traits. East Afr J Sci 2: 13-18.
- Mesfin A, Bayetta B (1987) Genotype x environment interaction in coffee (*Coffea arabica* L.) In: Fourteenth international scientific colloquium on coffee, Montreux, Paris.
- Bayetta B, Mesfin A (1986) Variation among national coffee collections for some agronomic characters. First Ethiopian Coffee Symposium. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Teweldebirhan G (1988) The importance of Ethiopian forests in the conservation of Arabica coffee gene pools. 12th plenary meeting of forestry, Hamburg, W Germany, pp: 65-72.
- Desalegn A (2017) Review on Genetic Diversity of Coffee (*Coffea arabica* L.) in Ethiopia. Int J forestry Hort 3: 10.
- Petit N (2007) Ethiopia's coffee sector: a bitter or better future? J Agrar Change 7: 225-263.
- Jean-Pierre L, Bayetta B, Surendra K, Benoit B (2008) Current status of coffee (*Coffea arabica* L) genetic resources in Ethiopia: implications for conservation. Genet Resour Crop Evol 55: 1079-1093.
- Chauhan R, Hooda M, Tanga A (2015) Coffee: The Backbone of Ethiopian Economy. Inter J Economic Plants 1: 082-086.
- Bart M, Seneshaw T, Tadesse K, Yaw N (2014) Structure and performance of Ethiopia's coffee export sector. Edited book Published by Ethiopian Development Research Institute and International Food Policy Research Institute in Ethiopia strategy support programme.
- Mawardi S, Hulupi R (1995) Genotype by environment interaction of bean characteristics in Arabica coffee. Proceedings of ASIC, 16 Colloque, Kyoto pp: 637-644.
- DaMatta F (2004) Eco-physiological constraints on the production of shaded and unshaded coffee: a review. Field Crops Res 86: 99-114.

16. Taye K, Tesfaye S, Alemseged Y, Anteneh N, Endale T, et al. (2001) The impact of close spacing on yield of Arabica coffee under contrasting agro-ecologies of Ethiopia. *African Crop Sci J* 9: 401-409.
17. Van der Vossen H (2005) A critical analysis of agronomic and economic sustainability of organic coffee production. *Experimental Agric* 41: 449-473.
18. Cassidy D, Kumar D (1984) Root distribution of *Coffea arabica* L. in Zimbabwe. I. The effect of plant density, mulch, cova planting and shade in Chipinge. Zimbabwe. *J Agric Res* 22: 119-132.
19. Kuguru F, Fisher N, Browning G, Mitchell H (1978) The effect of tree density on yield and some yield components of Arabica coffee in Kenya. *Acta Hort* 65: 101-113.
20. Avelino J, Barboza B, Araya J, Fonseca C, Davrieux F et al. (2005) Effect of slope exposure, altitude and yield on coffee quality in two altitude terroirs of Costa Rica, and Santa Maria de Dota. *J Sci Food Agric* 85: 1869-1876.
21. Weldemariam S, Sara B, Daniel M, Solomon G (2016) Factors affecting coffee (*Coffea arabica* L.) quality in Ethiopia: A Review. *J Multidisciplinary Scientific Res* 4: 22-28.
22. Yilma Y (1986) Coffee pruning: A review. Proceedings of the first Ethiopian coffee symposium of coffee pp: 20-23.
23. Dereje G, Eshetu A (2011) Agro-ecologies of Ethiopia and major crops grown; collaboration with EIAR. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
24. Girma H, Digafe T, Wondyfray T (2008) Yield and quality evaluation of ginger (*Zingiber officinale* Rosc) collections and introductions. In: Lemma, D., Girma, H., Zenebe, W., Terefe, B., Asfaw, Z., Lakew, B. (eds.) Ethiopian Horticultural Science Society (EHSS), Proceedings of the first inaugural conference, 27-30 March 2006, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, pp: 215-220.
25. Abayneh E, Ashenafi A (2005) Soils of Tepi and Haru Agricultural Research Sub centers, Soil Survey and Land Evaluation Section. National Soil Research Center, Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
26. Murphy H (1968) A Report on Fertility Status and Other Data on Some Soils of Ethiopia. Experimental Station Bulletin No. 44. Haile Silassie College of Agriculture, Oklahoma State University.
27. Tekalign T (1991) Soil, plant, water, fertilizer, animal manure and compost analysis. Working Document No. 13. International Livestock Research Center for Africa, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
28. Olsen S, Cole C, Watanabe F, Dean L (1954) Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. USDA Circular, Washington, USA 939: 1-19.
29. Cary, Statistical Analysis System (SAS) (2008) SAS Institute, North Carolina, USA.
30. Gomez K, Gomez A (1984) Statistical Procedure for Agricultural Research. International Rice Research Institute, Wiley-Inter science.
31. Endale T, Anteneh N, Tesfaye S, Taye K, Fantahun A (2006) Yield response of Arabica coffee to spacing and training methods in Southwestern Ethiopia. In: Proceedings of the 21st International Coffee Science (ASIC). 10-15 September, 2006, Montpellier, France. pp: 1173-1178.
32. Yacob E, Tesfaye S, Gibramu T, Alemseged Y (1993) Effects of canopies and bearing heads on density and yield of CBD resistant Arabica (*Coffea arabica* L.). In: Proceedings of the 15th International Scientific Colloquium on Coffee, 6-11 June, 1993. Paris, France. pp: 322-328.