

Agronomic Biofortification:

Uncovering the Evidence

A seminar organized by the Excellence in Agronomy Agronomic Initiative

Job Kihara Maguta, Gudeta W Sileshi, Peter Omondi Bolo, Dominic Mwanzia Mutambu, Andrew Musili Sila

The Global Issue of "Hidden Hunger"



~ 3 BILLION

People worldwide suffer from "hidden hunger" caused by micronutrient deficiencies, especially zinc (Zn) and iron (Fe).

- Insufficient dietary intake is one of the leading causes of Zn and Fe deficiencies
- Management of NPK has been main focus in fertility work, with decades of mining micronutrients
- Yield increases due to micronutrients fertilization are starting to shift fertilizer formulations.
- Evidence on improvements of produce quality, e.g. density of Zn and Fe lacking















Generating Evidences for Agronomic Biofortification

Specifying The Extent To Which And The Conditions Under Which This Is Achievable





UCIMMYT













Africa R*i*ce

GCIAT

CIMMYT.

Werld

ICRÍSAT

IFPRI

IITA

IRRI

Eia Strategic R&D on Agronomic Biofortification

- What are the appropriate **on-station and on-farm** trial designs for detecting changes in the KPIs of produce quality for different staple crops? [in order to identify and use robust on-station and on-farm trial designs]
- What measurements (including rapid IR techniques), modeling tools and methods are appropriate to monitor nutritional key performance indicators (KPIs) for different crops? [to identify and use suitable methods and models for produce quality assessment]
- How do combinations of GENE (including biofortified staple crops), ENVIRONMENT (soil, climate), and MANAGEMENT (crop and land management practices) influence crop produce quality? [to generate evidence and solutions to improve produce quality to secure nutritional security outcomes]
- Where are the **priority micro-nutrient deficient/responsive geographies** for spatial targeting of interventions to achieve large-scale agronomic gains? *[targeting impact to scale]*



AfricaRice

Bioversit

⊜CIAT

Ісіммут.

Werld Agrelotestry Centre

₽ICRÍSAT

IFPRI

IITA

IRRI

WMI

Building a Global Database for Generating Evidences



- Agronomic trials data
- Systematic literature reviews and data digitization

Agronomic Biofortifications

Global Meta-Analyses on Maize



Excellence in Agronomy







GCIAT ..

Vician Angentary ICARDA VICARDA

IITA

IRRI

WM

as influenced by agronomic management and biophysical factors



Maize Grain Zinc and Iron Concentrations



1a. Background and justification





⊜CIAT

Ісіммут





ICARDA
ICRÍSAT



IITA



Harristens Marristens



- Zinc (Zn) and iron (Fe) deficiencies affect ~3 billion people globally
- Insufficient dietary intake is one of the leading causes of Zn and Fe deficiencies
- Zn and Fe deficiencies are high in populations consuming staple cereals
- Regions with Zn-deficient soils are characterized by Zn deficiency in humans
- Agronomic practices, soil and climate often determine availability of Zn and Fe
- Information is lacking on the distributions of Zn and Fe in maize grain
- Information is also lacking on how effect sizes vary with agronomic and biophysical factors







CIAT

СІММҮТ





∉ICRÌSAT



IITA



1b. Objectives of The Meta-Analysis



To establish the distribution of Zn and Fe concentrations in maize grain at the global scale and the probability of attaining nutrient concentration targets



To assess the contribution of different agronomic practices in increasing the concentrations of Zn and Fe in maize grain



To identify key biophysical factors and **metrics** to guide agronomic biofortification



1a. Background and justification





GCIAT





€ICRÌSAT



IITA





- 1. Benchmark concentrations of Zn (38 mg kg⁻¹) and Fe (60 mg kg-1) in maize grain are attainable with agronomic innovations;
- There are significant differences in 2. grain concentrations of Zn and Fe due to different agronomic practices;
- 3. Concentrations of Zn and Fe are influenced by soil biophysical factors



2. Method













We followed recommended steps for the meta-analysis

We used the response ration (treatment/NPK) as our effect size















IRRI









GCIAT

CIMMYT.



ICRÍSAT



IITA



Number Of Studies and Total Number of Observations Available for Meta-analysis

	No. of			After removing outliers								
Variable	Studies	Countries	Observations	Mean	Median	Q1	Q3	CV (%)*	Outliers			
Zn (mg kg ⁻¹)	102	24	1332	29.9	27.0	21.0	37.4	43.3	86			
Fe (mg kg ⁻¹)	32	15	359	58.6	50.5	23.0	82.9	70.5	9			
Proteins (%)	90	21	1349	9.2	9.2	8.0	10.3	27.9	8			
Nitrogen (%)	38	14	443	1.7	1.6	1.4	1.8	32.9	32			
Grain P (%)	37	10	485	0.48	0.34	0.26	0.48	126.8	20			



3. Synthesis













Distributions of Zn and Fe in maize grain

CIP

CIMMYT

- The overall probability of grain Zn concentrations exceeding the benchmark of 38 mg kg⁻¹ was only 24%
- The probability of grain Fe concentrations exceeding the benchmark of 60 mg kg⁻¹ was 43%
- When Zn was applied ("With") to the soil, the probabilities were increased to 32% for Zn and 53% for Fe

AfricaRice

RCIAT



IITA

UCRÍSAT

IRRI







⊜CIAT

ПСІММҮТ.





∮ICRÌSAT



IITA



Karnational Voter Nengerent Indones



Overall effect of Zn application on grain Zn and Fe concentrations

- Overall, Zn application increased grain Zn concentrations by 28% over the NPK fertilizer
- It also increased grain Fe concentrations by 10%







GCIAT

Сіммут







Between-study variation in response to Zn application

<u>Grain yields</u> significantly increased with Zn application relative to the NPK control in 27 out of 56 studies

(a) Grain Zn concentrations			
Sharma at al (2021)	Mean		N
Paramacivan et al (2011)	1.00		12
Taria et al (2014)	1.04		- 33
Paramacivan et al (2010)	1.70		11
Palamatic (2010)	1.74		
Kandali et al (2010)	1.72		0
Pructy at al (2020)	1.00		6
Flusty et al (2020)	1.01		0
Etering et al (2017)	1.02	·	20
Manjulaula (2013)	1.02		10
Naveed et al (2018)	1.49		12
Saiker et al (2019)	1.43		0
Liu et al (2020)	1.41		5
Liu et al (2017)	1.30		15
Ranman et al (2017)	1.30		12
Adarsha et al (2018)	1.35		/
Fahad et al (2015)	1.35		40
Puga et al (2013)	1.33		8
Ladumor et al (2020)	1.32		12
Aref (2010)	1.30		16
Kanwal et al (2010)	1.30	11	6
Ewees et al (2008)	1.28		10
Singh et al (2019)	1.27		13
Ziaeyan & Rajaei (2009)	1.26		16
Gharibi et al (2016)	1.24		16
Abo-Marzoka et al (2018)	1.23	I →1	24
Mohsin et al (2014)	1.22	F 1	34
Subbaiah et al (2016)	1.22	••	10
Ahmad et al (2018)	1.21		8
Hussain et al (2019)	1.21		14
Manzeke et al (2014)	1.21		24
Pooniya et al (2017)	1.21		10
Khalid et al (2019)	1.20	II	8
Faujdar et al (2014)	1.20	I	6
Arabhanvi & Hulih. (2018)	1.19	F-1	23
VanEynde et al (2023)	1.19		18
Tuhy et al (2015)	1.17		4
Shivay & Prasad (2014)	1.15		8
Shivay et al (2014)	1.15	••	4
Mari et al (2015)	1.15	II	8
Wortman et al (2019)	1.15	••	15
Pooniya et al (2014)	1.13	II	10
Behera et al (2015)	1.11		14
Grujcic et al (2018)	1.10		4
Panda et al (2020)	1.07 ⊫		5
Umesh et al (2014)	1.07		15
Joshi et al (2020)	1.03 		8
Martínez-Cuesta et al (2021)	1.02		15
Durgude et al (2014)	1.01 -		6
lzydorczyk et al (2020)	1.01 —		7
0	.6 0.8 1	1.0 1.2 1.4 1.6 1.8	2.0 2.2
	Respo	nse ratio (RR)	







GCIAT

Ісіммүт





IRRI

IWMI

Between-study variation in response to Zn application

Grain Zn concentrations significantly increased with Zn application relative to the NPK control in 40 out of 49 studies.









CIAT

СІММҮТ





WM

Association between grain yield, Zn, Fe and protein concentrations

- Grain yield vs grain Zn concentrations:
 32 out of 61 studies had significantly positive slopes
- Grain yield vs grain Fe concentrations:
 6 out of 16 studies had significantly positive slopes
- Grain yield vs grain protein concentrations:
 6 out of 11 studies had significantly positive slopes
- Grain protein vs grain Zn concentrations:
 10 out of 18 studies had significantly positive slopes
- Grain Zn vs Fe concentrations:

14 out of 24 studies had significantly positive slopes

(c) In(Fe) vs In(Zn)			
	Slope		N
Tewolde et al (2019)	2.51	H	12
Verma et al (2021)	1.68	► – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –	7
Wortman et al (2019)	1.28		24
Adarsha et al (2018)	1.07	—	8
Saleem et al (2016)	0.94	н	8
Gandomkar & Rahmani	0.93	B	8
Abdel-Azeem (2020)	0.91	н	16
E wees et al (2008)	0.87	н	14
Pamar et al (2022)	0.71	н	8
Gharibi et al (2016)	0.66	н	40
EI-Kholy et al (2005)	0.50		10
Dragicevic et al (2015)	0.44	—	12
rabhanvi & Hulih. (2018)	0.41		24
Rahman et al (2017)	0.34		12
Wang et al (2012)	0.33	H	8
Omran et al (2018)	0.18	P <mark>→</mark> I	16
Raani et al (2022)	0.17	H	7
Javeed et al (2019)	0.09	⊢ ⊸1	6
Stewart et al (2019)	0.04	H-H	6
Wierzbowska et al (2021)	-0.13	H	24
Behera et al (2015)	-0.19	H	14
Kaleeswari (2019)	-0.21		7
Galani et al (2021)	-0.37		24
Puga et al (2013)	-0.44	H	8
_	4	2 0 2	4 6

Slope



Take-away message:

Increases in grain yield, grain Zn, Fe and protein concentrations can be achieved concurrently





Treatment effects on grain Zn and Fe concentrations

The combined application of NPK, micronutrient and organic inputs (NPK+Mn+OM) increased grain yield by 41%, grain Zn by 57% and Fe concentrations by 44% relative to the NPK control









CIMMYT.













Treatment effects on grain Zn and Fe concentrations

The combined application of NPK, micronutrient and organic inputs (NPK+Mn+OM) increased grain yield by 41%, grain Zn by 57% and Fe concentrations by 44% relative to the NPK control

Small sample sizes preclude definitive conclusions about inoculation and irrigation effects.

AfricaRice

	Grain Zn Mean Study(N)				Mean	Grain Fe Study(N)			
ation	With	1.27	<u> </u>	4(11)		1.35	—	2(6)	
Inocul	Without	1.32	H :	14(96)		1.27	н	14(96)	
e Irrigation	With	1.27	⊢––	2(9)		1.29	H	2(9)	
	Without	1.36		6(47)		1.28	m	6(47)	
906	Unknown	1.30	⊢ –	20(219)		1.12		9(78)	
Tilla	Tilled	1.33	H I	19(202)		1.92	F	1(3)	
OM applic	With	1.64		⊣ 8(51)		1.45		2(5)	
	Without	1.28	ы	59(584)		1.26	н	14(97)	
plic Zn applic	Soil	1.32	н	48(393)		1.03	-	9(63)	
	Foliar	1.28	П	28(185)		1.36	н	8(44)	
	Combined	1.55		+ 9(36)		1.60		2(5)	
	With	1.35		13(76)		1.53		9(40)	
Feag	Without	1.32	H	56(558)		1.22	щ	11(77)	
	-	00 1	.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	3.00
Response ratio (RR)					Response ratio (RR)				













Biophysical factors moderating responses

Effect of either foliar or soil application of Zn on grain Zn concentrations was higher on alkali soils and soils with lowmedium Olsen P.

Small sample sizes preclude definitive conclusions.

(a)	Fol	iar Zn apj	plicatio Mean	n						Stud	ly(
		Fine	1.48			-			1	3(41)
	Textur	Medium	1.32			-	_	I		11(8	8)
		Coarse	1.35			-		-		6(20)
	H	Acidic	1.29			-	_	I		10(5	2)
		Neutral	1.27			-	_	I		9(64)
		Alkali	1.59			F			_	¶6(4(6)
	SOC	Low	1.33			F	_	I		17(1	03
		Medium	1.36			<u> </u>		-		2(18))
		High	1.41			-				2(5)	
	IsenP	Low	1.35			F	-			23(1	66
		Med	1.30		F			-		2(8)	
	0	High	1.01	-			-			1(7)	
		0.	.0 0	.5 Resp	1	.0 nse r	1. ati	.5 0 (RR	2 ()	.0	2

















Biophysical factors moderating responses

Overall effect of Zn application on grain Zn concentrations were higher on calcareous soils, medium to coarsetextured soils and alkali soils.

Small sample sizes preclude definitive conclusions about grain Fe concentrations.

7

Bioversity

AR

AfricaRice



GCIAT

IRRI

- Through agronomic biofortification it is possible to increase Zn and Fe concentrations of maize grain by 32% and 31% relative to NPK fertilizer
- Zn concentrations of grain concomitantly increases with increases • in grain yield and Fe, protein and P concentrations in the grain

THANK YOU!

FICR

