Review Paper

Potential use of forage-legume intercropping technologies to adapt to climate-change impacts on mixed crop-livestock systems in Africa: A review

Abubeker Hassen[1#], Deribe Gemiyo Talore[1], Belete Shenkute Gemeda[1], Eyob Habte Tesfamariam[2], Michael Andrew Friend[3], Thamsanqa Doctor Empire Mpanza[1]

[1] Department of Animal and Wildlife Sciences, University of Pretoria 0002, Private Bag X 0083, Pretoria, South Africa,

[2] Department of Plant and Soil Science, University of Pretoria 0002, Private Bag X 0028, Pretoria, South Africa.

[3] Graham Centre for Agricultural Innovation, Charles Sturt University, PO Box 588, Wagga Wagga, Australia

[#] Corresponding author: Abubeker Hassen
Abubeker.Hassen@up.ac.za
Phone: +2712420 3273

Deribe Gemiyo Talore
Deribeg2000@yahoo.com

Belete Shenkute Gemeda
beletegemeda@gmail.com

Eyob Habte Tesfamariam
Eyob.Tesfamariam@up.ac.za

Michael Andrew Friend
mfriend@csu.edu.au

Thamsanqa Doctor Empire Mpanza
thamidempanza@webmail.co.za

Abstract

This paper summarizes effects of forage-legume intercropping on grain and fodder yield, land equivalent ratio, residual soil fertility, disease and insect pest reduction in mixed crop-livestock systems in Africa. In particular, it discusses the potential benefit of forage-legume intercropping in improving productivity, resource use efficiency and resilience of the system under climate change, which enhances adaptation to climate change and possibly provides the co-benefit of reducing greenhouse gases in sub-Saharan Africa. Research undertaken in Africa demonstrates that intercropping forage legumes with cereals improves overall yield and soil fertility, and reduces the risk of crop failure owing to rainfall variability, diseases, weeds and pests. When the forage from intercropped legumes is provided to animals it improves the digestibility of poor-quality feed, animal performance and efficiency of roughage feed utilization by ruminants. Additional role that legumes may play include lowering erosion and the loss of organic matter, reducing nitrogen leaching and carbon losses, and promoting carbon sequestration. Nitrogen fixed by legumes is safer than nitrogen from inorganic fertilizers. Despite the many benefits of forage legume intercropping the current adoption rate in sub-Saharan Africa is very low. Future research aimed at selection of compatible varieties, appropriate plant geometry and temporal arrangement of the various intercrops under different locations and management scenarios, as well as minimizing the confounding effects of water, soil, light, microclimate, and seeds could enhance adoption of the technology in Africa.

1. Introduction

Agriculture forms the backbone of the economic growth of sub-Saharan African (SSA) countries, accounting for 40% of gross domestic product (GDP) and employing more than half the labour force (Barrios et al. 2008). In a large fraction of SSA, where most livelihoods depend on rain-fed smallholder agriculture, agricultural production is sensitive to climate change (Barrios et al. 2008; FAO 2016). A general decline in rainfall pattern has been reported in Africa since the first half of the nineteenth century (Nicholson 1994; 2001). Rising temperatures, associated with this decline in rainfall, have a direct negative effect on vegetation cover, which in turn contributes to soil degradation because of the exposure of the soil surface to wind and water erosion. Consequently, Southern Africa is predicted to lose about 14% of cultivable land and about 20% of its pasture production potential by 2080 because of climate change (Shah et al. 2008). It is apparent that an increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO_2) might lead to dichotomous effects, namely stimulating plant growth (Luo et al. 2004) and contributing to the greenhouse gas effect (IPCC 2013). According to Luo et al. (2004) plant growth demands more nitrogen, water and other essential nutrients, leading to progressive nitrogen limitation (PNL) in the soil, subsequently destabilizing the C:N ratio of organic matter in the soil (Soussan and Lemaire 2014), which in turn suggest that the nitrogen cycle has the ability to regulate climate change through its influence on carbon sequestration (Liang et al. 2016).

In SSA, smallholder mixed crop-livestock systems are more important than any other system in terms of their contribution to total agricultural output (FAO 2010; Soussan and Lemaire 2014). Mixed crop-livestock farming

systems are held responsible for large greenhouse gas emissions. However, they could play significant role in the mitigation of these emissions (Thornton and Herrero 2014). One of the potential mitigation measures that could be adopted in crop-livestock systems is the introduction of forage legumes in areas under grass production as grass-legume mixtures. This is likely to reduce direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions (Soussan and Lemaire 2014) thereby mitigating and facilitating adaptation to climate change (Luscher et al. 2014) by replacing inorganic nitrogen-fertilizer inputs with symbiotic nitrogen fixation. Thus legumes may occupy a niche in such systems as intercrops (Sumberg 2002; Sprent et al. 2010), because they have the ability to symbiotically fix nitrogen in the soil (Zahran 1999). This would preclude the occurrence of NPL due to the increase of nitrogen input into ecosystem as a result of symbiotic nitrogen fixation into soil. Hence, this review analyses the potential role of forage-legume intercropping in the mixed crop-livestock system; and discusses the potential of these technologies to adapt to and mitigate climate-change impacts in the mixed crop-livestock systems in SSA.

2. Climate change and agriculture in Africa

Agricultural productivity in SSA is expected to decrease between 15 and 35% in future as a result of climate change (Cline 2007; IPCC 2007), which would affect crop and livestock production, hydrologic balances, input supplies and other components of the agricultural systems. The impact is expected to be aggravated by rapid human population growth in the region. Although many non-climate factors affect agriculture, climate change overlays and interacts with other factors to worsen conditions (IPCC 2007). Rain-fed agriculture is sensitive to climate variability and change, because of its direct dependence on the amount and distribution of rainfall. The vulnerability of the system varies from region to region, and countries in SSA region have limited capacity to adapt to and mitigate the impacts of climate change. This problem is aggravated by lack of awareness of climate-change adaptation and of mitigation measures by rural communities (Lobell et al. 2008).

3. Impacts of climate change on livestock production

Livestock production supports the livelihoods of more than 600 million poor smallholder farmers in the developing world and is an important source of food (meat and dairy products), animal products (leather), and income in the event of crop failure (Seo and Mendelsohn 2007). Climate change is expected to have several impacts on feed crops, grazing systems, animal physiology and health (Thornton et al. 2009), thereby negatively affecting livestock production in SSA (Serdeczny et al. 2016). The impact on crops and forages includes changes in herbage growth and quality, the species composition of pastures, concentrations of water-soluble carbohydrates and nitrogen (N), and N leaching in certain systems because of high rainfall events (Ngongoni et al. 2007). Higher temperatures (in the prevalence of moisture) may increase the rate of development of pathogens and parasites that spend some of their lifecycle outside their host animal (Harvell et al. 2002). In addition, heat stress may decrease cow fertility, fitness and longevity (King et al. 2006) while livestock death associated to recurrent drought is a common phenomenon in the arid and semi-arid rangelands of East Africa (Oba 2001). However, the vulnerability of livestock to climate change varies according to species, genetic potential, life stage and nutritional status of the animals (Thornton et al. 2009).

4. The role of forage-legume intercropping in adapting to climate change under different agro-ecological zones in Africa

In Africa forage legumes are commonly intercropped with cereals such as maize (Hassen et al. 2006; Carlson 2008; Birteeb et al. 2011; Kabirizi et al. 2012), sorghum (Mohammed et al. 2008; Lithourgidis et al. 2011), millet (Mohammed et al. 2008), and wheat (Astatke et al. 1995), as well as root crops (cassava) (Mba and Ezumah 1985)). The forage-legume species that have been successfully intercropped in each of the major agro-ecological zones of Africa (Figure 1) are discussed below.


Figure 1 **Major climate zones of Africa based on the length of the growing period (Source**: Adapted from FAO/IIASA, 2000)

4.1 Arid to moist semi-arid zones

The net effects of intercropping on grain yield, forage biomass yield of the companion crops and the land equivalent ratio (LER) of the intercropping system for major African climatic zones are summarized in Table 1. It was apparent that intercropping maize with legumes (*Vignia ungulata*, *Lablab purpurius*, *Stylosanthes guianensis* and *Macroptilium atropurpurium*) improved grain and forage yield of maize compared with maize alone planted in sandy loam to loamy sand soils in areas receiving at least 600 mm of mean annual rainfall (Alhaj 2008; Birteeb et al. 2011). The LER in these areas was also more than unity. In contrast, in areas receiving less than 500 mm of mean annual rainfall, maize yield under intercropping was less than when maize was planted alone, though the LER was more than unity (Vesterager et al. 2008), probably because of competition for resources, especially water.

Sorghum-cowpea intercropping studies in the semi-arid regions of Burkina Faso reduced runoff losses of soil by 20–30% compared with sorghum monoculture, and by 45–55% compared with cowpea monoculture (Zougmore et al. 2000). This area received mean annual rainfall of 800 mm during the study period, and is characterized by high rainfall intensity and therefore high runoff losses (about 40% of the annual rainfall), reducing the effective rainfall. The soil in this study site was reported to be low in N and no fertilizer application was reported for the study period. Reports from this study showed that the yields of both sorghum and cowpea doubled under intercropping compared with monoculture. In contrast, studies conducted by Oseni (2010) reported lower sorghum yield under sorghum-cowpea intercropping compared with sorghum monoculture in a higher rainfall (970 mm) environment. The observed higher yield for sorghum monoculture was attributed to the inorganic fertilizer that was applied at planting.

Table 1: Grain yield, forage biomass yield and land equivalent ratio of legumes intercropping in arid to moist semi-arid agro-ecological zones of Africa

Intercrops	Grain yield	Forage biomass yield	LER	AEZ	Reported benefits	Reference
Maize-cowpea	+	++	1.40-2.29	Arid (savannah)	Economic advantage is high	Alhaji 2008
Maize-lablab	+	++	1.12	Arid (savannah)	77.6% ground cover	Birteeb et al. 2011
Maize-*Stylosanthes G.*	+	++	1.4	Arid (savannah)	38% ground cover	Birteeb et al. 2011
Maize-*M. Macroptilium*	+	++	1.11	Arid (savannah)	42.9% ground cover	Birteeb et al. 2011
Maize-cowpea	-	++	1.44-1.63	Moist semi-arid	Weed reduced by 46.2%; *Striga* infestation reduced.	Katsaruware et al. 2009
Maize-cowpea	+	++	na	Sub-arid	35% additional monitory value	Carlson 2008
Maize-lablab	++	++	1.11	Semi-arid	CP of stover improved by 7.6%	Kabirizi et al. 2012
Sorghum-cowpea	+	++	na	Semi-arid	Reduced run-off by 20-30%	Lithourgidis et al. 2011
Sorghum-cowpea	-	+	1.08	Semi-arid	Monetary index advantage	Oseni 2010
Sorghum-cowpea	+++	+++	1.88	Arid	Grain and fodder yield increased	Mohammed et al. 2008
Sorghum-cowpea	+++	++	na	Semi-arid	9.4 % yield advantage	Samuel and Mesfin 2003
Millet-cowpea	+	++	1.92	Arid	Drought resistant	Hulet and Gosseye 1986
Maize-cowpea	+	++	1.35	Semi-arid	18% yield advantage	Vesterager et al. 2008
Sorghum-cowpea	-	+++	1.63	Savannah	Grain yield increased	Zougmore et al. 2000

LER: land equivalent ratio; AEZ: agro-ecological zone, na: not available, RF: rainfall, CP: crude protein

Grain and forage biomass yield: - (minus) means yield reduced; LER <1 + means yield reduced, but LER above unity (>1); ++ means yield is not affected, with LER above unity (1); +++ means yield improved with LER above 1.5

4.2 Sub-humid to humid zones

The forage legumes commonly used for intercropping with food crops in sub-humid to humid zones are shown in Table 2. Except for maize-lablab and cassava-cowpea intercropping systems, grain yield was not affected negatively by intercropping. The reduction in grain yield of maize and tuber yield of cassava when planted with lablab and cowpea in humid regions was attributed to the fast and vigorous growth of legumes (Mba and Ezumai 1985; Hassen et al. 2006). The higher LER of cassava-cowpea intercrops suggests there may still be an economic advantage of this combination, despite the reduction in tuber yields.

Table 2: Grain yield, forage biomass yield and land equivalent ratio obtained by legume intercropping in humid to sub-humid agro-ecological zones

Intercrops	Grain yield	Forage biomass yield	LER	AEZ	Descriptors /comments	Reference
Maize-cowpea	+	++	1-1.4	Sub-humid	Early maturing could be best compatible	Adeniyan et al. 2011; Surve et al. 2012
Maize-cowpea	+	++	na	Sub-humid	Did not suppress grain yield	Maasdorp and Titterton 1997
Cassava-cowpea	+	++	1.2	Humid	Improve total yield and starchiness, protect soil	Mustaers et al. 1993
Maize-lablab	-	++	na	Humid	14–69% forage biomass contribution from legumes	Ngongoni et al. 2007
Cassava-cowpea	-	++	1.48-2.02	Humid	Late harvesting of cassava	Mba and Ezumai 1985
Sorghum-*Vicia dasycarpa*	+++	++	na	Humid	Intercrops gave 3.4% more grain yield	Samuel and Mesfin 2003
Maize-*Lablab purpureus*	++	+++	1.46	Humid	Highest lablab yield at later stages of maize growth	Hassen et al. 2006
Wheat-lablab	++	++	1.35	Sub-humid	At no N level	Astatke et al. 1995
Wheat-clover	++	++	1.35	Sub-humid	At no N level	Astatke et al. 1995
Maize-vetch	++	++	1.1	Sub-humid	At no N level	Astatke et al. 1995

LER: land equivalent ratio; AEZ: agro-ecological zone, na: not available

Grain and forage biomass yield: - (minus) means yield reduced, LER <1, + (plus) means yield reduced, but LER above unity (>1); ++ means yield is not affected with LER above unity (1); +++ means yield improved with LER above 1.5

Maize grain yield was higher when intercropped with *Vicia dasycarpa,* but in other combinations, yields were not suppressed, especially where delayed planting of the legumes was practised (Hassen et al. 2006).

4.3 Tropical to warm temperate zones

The crops used mainly for intercropping in warm temperate and tropical zones are indicated in Table 3. Except for maize-velvet bean and wheat-alfalfa intercropping combinations, grain yield was higher or similar in these combinations compared with sole crop. The forage biomass, however, was higher in the intercropping systems than in sole crops for all combinations.

Table 3: Grain yield, forage biomass yield and land equivalent ratio of forage legume intercropping in warm-temperate and tropical agro-ecological zones

Intercrops	Grain yield	Forage biomass yield	LER	AEZ	Descriptors /comments	Reference
Maize-velvet bean	-	++	0.77-1.08	Warm temperate	N concentration is 4.9%	Murungu et al. 2011
Maize-sun hemp	+	++	0.98-1.13	Warm temperate	N concentration is 2.6%	Murungu et al. 2011
Wheat-alfalfa	-	+	na	Tropics	Reduced incidence of a soil-borne pathogen	Lithourgidis et al. 2011
Sorghum-*Desmodium*	+	+	na	Warm temperate	100% *Striga* control	Ejeta 2007
Cassava-pigeon pea	+	++	na	Tropics	planting date is important	Cenpukdee and Fukai 1992

LER: land equivalent ratio; AEZ: agro-ecological zone, na: not available

Grain and forage biomass yield: - (minus) means yield reduced; LER <1, + (plus) means yield reduced, but LER above unity (>1); ++ means yield is not affected with LER above unity (1); +++ means yield improved, with LER above 1.5

5 Does forage-legume intercropping have the potential to adapt to climate-change impacts in the mixed crop-livestock farming system in Africa?

Forage-legume intercropping could play a significant role in adaptation to climate change by reducing soil degradation (chemical and physical), improving soil fertility through nitrogen fixation, reducing the prevalence of weeds, pests and disease, and improving yield, feed quality and animal performance. In addition, it would provide a co-benefit in terms of reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Details of the roles of forage-legume intercropping in mitigating and adapting to climate change in the mixed crop-livestock farming system in Africa are presented below.

5.1 Reduction of soil degradation through land cover and soil erosion control

Intercropping forage legumes as cover crops has shown positive effects on soil structure by enhancing the formation and maintenance of soil aggregates (Lupwayi et al. 2011) through better ground cover (Brandt et al. 1989; Tomm and Foster, 2000). This leads to an increase in soil organic matter relative to sole crops, and increases water infiltration and air circulation (Lupwayi 2011), thus improving soil water-holding capacity (Dovel et al. 1995; Murphy and Cocucci 1999; Samuel and Mesfin 2003). For example, 62% ground cover has been achieved by clover species (Tomm and Foster 2001) and 53.2% by *Lablab purpureus* and *Centrosema pubescens* (Birteeb et al. 2011). Such cover crops play positive roles by reducing the impact of rainfall on soil erosion during heavy rain events, and of wind erosion (Birteeb et al. 2011). Similarly Murphy and Cocucci (1999) and Tomm and Foster (2000) observed similar benefit in studies in Oregon and Brazil, respectively where a reduction in soil loss of up to 50% (Dovel et al. 1999; Tomm and

Foster 2001) was reported under intercropping legumes with grain crops compared to grain crop alone. Similar findings have been reported by Birteeb et al. (2011) and Bryan et al. (2011).

5.2 Nitrogen fixation and improvement in soil nitrogen content

A large portion of SSA is situated in belts of uncertain rainfall, thus with uncertain response to nitrogen fertilizer (ILCA 1987). In such situations, maximizing biological nitrogen (N_2) fixation by utilizing suitable legumes is crucial. Estimates of the amount of nitrogen fixed by legumes under different agro-ecological zones of Africa under forage-legume intercropping with cereals and other crops are presented in Table 4. The amount of N_2 fixed varied in the range of 4 to 581 kg N_2/ha, depending on nodule formation of the intercropped forage-legume cultivars (Ayisi et al. 2004), the fertility status of the soil and competition between the intercrops.

Table 4: Estimates of N$_2$ fixation (kg/ha) by legumes commonly used for intercropping in Africa

Country	Legume	N-fixed (kg/ha)	Yield(t/ha)	AEZ*	Reference
Ghana	Cowpea	200	6.7	Arid-semi-arid	Dakora and Keya 1997
Zimbabwe	L. purpureus	45-60	na	Sub-humid	Mohamed-Saleem 1986
South Africa	S. sesban	28-63	na	Semi-arid	Snap et al. 1998
Nigeria	Cowpea	122	na	Sub-humid	Eaglesham et al. 1981
Zimbabwe	Cowpea	68-138	1.4	Sub-humid	Rusinamhodzi et al. 2006
Zimbabwe	Cowpea	4-29	0.1-0.6	Sub-humid	Ncube et al. 2007
Namibia	Cowpea	13 (30-60%)	0.8	Semi-arid	McDonagh and Hillyer 2003
SSA	Cowpea	9-125	1.5-2.7	Arid/semi-arid	Giller et al. 1997
Ghana	Cowpea	29-179	na	Savannah	Belane and Dakora 2009
South Africa	Cowpea	25-217	0.04-1.5	Semi-arid	Ayisi et al. 2004
South Africa	Cowpea	46-87	1.6-2.7	Semi-arid	Makoi et al. 2009
Tanzania	Cowpea	70	1.2	Semi-arid	Vesterager et al. 2008
Senegal	Sesbania sesban	8-18	2-3.8	Semi-arid	Ndoye and Dreyfus 1988
Senegal	Sesbania rostrata	85-102	4-5.2	Semi-arid	Ndoye and Dreyfus 1988
Tanzania	L. luecocephala	110	0.9	Sub-humid	Hogberg and Kvarnstrom 1982
Nigeria	G. sepium	108	na	Sub-humid	Liya et al. 1990
Kenya	Cajanus cajan	161	8.5	Semi-arid	Onim et al. 1990
Kenya	L. leucocephala	643	9.3	Semi-arid	Onim et al. 1990
Togo	Calliandra	26.5	na	Sub-humid	Schroth and Lehmann 1995

*Agro-ecological zone

According to Giller et al. (1997), the amount of N$_2$ fixed by grain and forage legumes in SSA ranged between 11 and 201 kg N$_2$/ha for sole-cropped cowpea and intercropped cowpea. Assuming an average N$_2$ fixation of 45 kg N$_2$/ha for cowpea, and multiplying these amounts by the land coverage of about 11.1 million hectares, it is estimated that about 500 million kg N$_2$ could be fixed by cowpea in SSA (Lupwayi et al. 2011). The level of N$_2$ fixation by forage legumes, however, is influenced by soil fertility status. For instance, Ojiem et al. (2007) observed a 44% decrease in N$_2$ fixed by legumes under less fertile soil relative to high fertility soils. In such low fertility soils, a starter dose (about 30 kg/ha) of N fertilization could improve N$_2$ fixation with the legume component (Hassen et al. 2006) as long as other nutrients, especially phosphorus and pH, are not limiting. These natural fertilizers enable smallholder farmers to improve the soil fertility without increasing debt (Murphy and Cocucci 1999) due to rising prices of inorganic fertilizers, while reducing the environmental footprint of the agro-ecosystem.

5.3 Weed, pest, and disease control

Intercropping provides the forage legume and the companion crop with greater competitive advantage against weeds. Increased barley grain yield was reported by Dovel et al. (1995) because of suppression of weeds by inter-seeded legumes. Other studies by Jeranyama et al. (2000) reported the suppression of weeds in a lablab-cereal intercropping. Similarly, in a sorghum-Desmodium intercropping, 100% control of *Striga* was achieved (Reinhardt and Tesfamicahel 2011). Ejeta (2007) reported consistent reduction in *Striga* infestation in maize-cowpea intercropping relative to continuously cropped sole maize.

Intercropping improves crop resistance to pests. Based on a review of more than 150 published field and desktop studies on more than 200 herbaceous species, Lithourgidis et al. (2011) reported that 53% of the pest species were less abundant in the intercrop, 18% were more abundant, 9% showed no difference, and 20% showed a variable response. A separate study conducted by Khan et al. (2001) showed that intercropping Desmodium species with sorghum and maize enhanced soil fertility and increased the effectiveness of applied N in suppressing parasites. Similarly, studies by Skovgard and Päts (1997) reported a reduction in stem borer infestation when *Striga*-tolerant maize variety Acr. 97TZL Comp. 1-W was intercropped with cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L.).

Intercropping of forage legumes enhances the disease resistance of companion crops. A general disease reduction of 20–40% because of intercropping has been reported elsewhere (Hauggard-Nielson et al. 2001). Similarly, a review by Lithourgidis et al. (2011) showed that the incidence of pathogens of soil-borne take-all disease was reduced by maize-alfalfa intercropping. Monoculture fields require more chemicals to control weeds, pests and diseases compared with intercropping (Singh and Adjeigbe 2002). Intercropping could therefore be useful in reducing the risk of crop failure because of the predicted increases in diseases and pests incidence related to climate change (Jeranyama et al. 2000, Lithourgidis et al. 2011).

5.4 Overall yield improvement (grain and biomass) and land equivalent ratio

Forage legume intercropping improves yield, LER or both, thus improving land-use efficiency. A yield advantage of 20–60% was observed under legume-grain crop intercropping, mainly because of improved soil water-holding capacity in Oregon USA (Murphy and Cocucci 1999), reduced pest incidence and more efficient use of nutrients, water and solar radiation (Lithourgidis et al. 2011). Stylosanthes species intercropping improved the grain yield of maize under low fertility soils (Vesterager et al. 2008; Birteeb et al. 2011). Sorghum-*Vicia* species intercropping also showed a higher grain and biomass yield of sorghum (Samuel and Mesfin 2003). Although farmers are not targeting increased stover yield, they could practise legume-cereal intercropping to produce livestock feed without compromising grain yield (Birteeb et al. 2011), while ensuring the stability of both grain and forage yields (Mohammed et al. 2008).

Other studies demonstrated that the grain and stover yields of cereal crops in cereal-legume intercropping systems were lower than yields of sole crops. Nonetheless, the total productivity per unit of land (LER) remained greater for

intercropping than for sole crops (ILCA 1987; Mpairwe et al. 2002). For instance, high LERs of 1.88 and 1.51 were reported in a sorghum-cowpea intercropping (Mohammed et al. 2008; Surve et al. 2012), indicating the overall yield advantage of intercrops over sole crops in terms of land-use efficiency. Similarly Lemlem (2013) reported higher net return in monetary values from maize-lablab (44.5%) and maize-cowpea (58.9%) intercropping compared to maize alone due to the observed higher LER of 1.65 and 1.71 for maize-lablab and maize-cowpea intercropping, respectively. Cenpukidee and Fukai (1992) also reported that intercropping of cassava-pigeon pea decreased tuber yield slightly, but the overall economic return was higher than the sole crops because of improved soil fertility. In those intercropping systems, pigeon pea was able to fix up to 161 kg N/ha (Onim et al. 1990).

5.5 Improvement of feed quality and animal performance

Protein is the most important and expensive supplement for livestock under smallholder conditions in Africa. A protein content of 8–16% in a given feed is usually required to meet the maintenance, growth, production and normal functioning of rumen micro flora (Van Soest 1982; Eskandari et al. 2009). Forage legumes provide generally high-quality feed that can be used to supplement crop residues, which are the main source of animal feed in many smallholder farming systems (Nnadi and Haque 1986). In particular, protein yield of legume intercrops is reported to be higher than that of sole crops (ILCA 1987). Increases in CP content of 11–51% have been reported for various intercropping systems compared with sole crops (Tomm and Foster 2001; Lithourgidis et al 2011). The CP contents of maize + lablab, sorghum + lablab and wheat + lablab were reported to be 4.2, 3.9 and 2.4 times higher than their sole stands (Mpairwe et al. 2002), respectively. Intercropping stylo with sorghum resulted in higher-crude protein content of Stylo-sorghum mix compared to sorghum alone (ILCA 1987) and showed considerable potential for increasing CP yields per hectare (Birteeb et al. 2011), which improved dry season feed availability and quality (Ngongoni et al. 2007). Most of the legumes used for intercropping had CP content above the minimum threshold (7%) for optimum rumen function and feed intake (Van Soest 1982). An improvement in digestibility and nutritive values of forage has been reported by intercropping clover spp. and cowpea with wheat and cassava, respectively, (ILCA 1987).

The reported higher CP content, digestibility and lower crude fibre content of forage from forage-legume intercropping systems (Massdorp and Titterton 1997; Murphy and Cocucci 1999) are likely to result in improved fermentation of roughages in the rumen, and release of volatile fatty acids that support better animal performance (Birteeb et al. 2011). For example, lablab may possess on average 17% CP (Murphy and Cocucci 1999) and could be suitable as a supplementary feed to complement poor-quality roughages such as crop residues often deficient in rumen degradable nitrogen. Ensuring the supply of rumen-degradable nitrogen in the diet of ruminant through supplementation of lablab forage (Sumberg 2002) will improves rumen microbial fermentation of poor-quality roughages and overall digestibility of the total diet, leading to improvements in ruminant production. Access to higher protein forages will enable better use of low-protein, high-fibre crop residues (Murphy and Cocucci 1999). Similarly barley straw was used more efficiently by growing steers when it was supplemented with legume silage (Zhuoga et al. 2016).

6. Mitigation co-benefits associated with forage-legume intercropping

There are many synergies and trade-offs in food production and climate adaptation and mitigation (FAO 2010). The majority of the studies on intercropping have shown that the impact of climate change could be partly mitigated through integrating forage-legume intercropping into the farming system to improve the quality of forage supplied to the animal, because legume supplementation improves the digestibility of fibrous feedstuffs (FAO 2010). The subsequent increase in digestibility is likely to increase intake and animal performance, but reduce methane emissions per unit of animal product due to more efficient feed utilisation. Increasing the digestibility in the diet is the best mitigation measure because most CH_4 emissions are generated from enteric fermentation (Verge et al. 2007). Previous studies by Gurian-Sherman (2011) reported a 15-30% CH_4 emission reduction with the improvement of digestibility.

Because legumes fix nitrogen in the soil (Zahran 1999), the need for industrial nitrogen fertilizer is reduced. The reduced use of fertilizer N in legume-based cropping systems means lower use of fossil fuel (CO_2 emissions) in manufacturing, transporting and applying fertilizer N (Bryan et al. 2011). According to IPCC (2007), soil carbon sequestration has a technical potential to mitigate 89% of greenhouse gas emission. Cong et al. (2014) reported soil organic carbon in the top 20 cm was 4% greater in an intercropped system compared to a sole crop system over a seven year experiment, demonstrating the potential of intercropping to mitigate against climate change. By reviewing legume-based systems as compared to fertilized annual crops in eastern Canada and north-eastern USA, Gregorich et al. (2005) found that legume crops are grown successfully with little or no nitrogen fertilizer. Subsequently the emissions of nitrous oxide (N_2O) are expected to be lower in a legume crop than in a fertilized cereal crop (Bryan et al. 2011; Birteeb et al. 2011), thus demonstrating the high mitigation potential of intercropping with legumes. The introduction of legumes into grass based forage production systems is expected to further reduce N_2O emission due to the reduction in soil nitrate levels through uptake by the intercropped grass. According to a review study by Jensen et al. (2012) a grass-clover intercropping was reported to have lower mean annual N_2O emission (0.54 kg N_2O-N ha^{-1}) compared to a N-fertilised pasture grass (4.49 kg N_2O-N ha^{-1}) and pure legume stands of white clover (0.79 kg N_2O-N ha^{-1}). However, there is little or no information on the level of N_2O emissions from forage-legume intercropping as opposed to sole main crops fertilized with inorganic nitrogen fertilizer in SSA countries (Lupwayi et al. 2011). Recently, Senbayram et al. (2016) reported seasonal N_2O fluxes were 35% lower in a wheat-faba bean mix compared to N-fertilised wheat in Germany, demonstrating the potential for intercropping to mitigate fertiliser derived N_2O emissions, although work is required to quantify the benefits in SSA rainfall conditions.

The amount of carbon that can be sequestered in the soil depends on the balance between the carbon inputs and losses (Jensen et al. 2012). Studies from various regions of the world show that forage legume intercropping enhances carbon sequestration. For instance, studies by Tarre et al. (2001) in Brazil showed that the introduction of *Desmodium Ovalifolium* into a Brachiaria sward increased the rate of soil carbon sequestration from 0.66 to 1.17 Mg C ha^{-1} per year in the top 100cm soil layer over a 9 year period. Other studies in Columbia by Fisher et al. (1974) also reported an increase in carbon sequestration by 7.8 Mg ha^{-1} per year with the introduction of a legume (*Arachis pintoi*) into a sword compared to sole grass. Studies in the sub-Saharan African country of Malawi, however, showed that the role

of legume intercropping with cereal crops on carbon sequestration is dependent on the rainfall and temperature of the study site (Simwake et al. unpublished). Reduced use of insecticides and herbicides as a result of the decreased weed and pest invasion under legume intercropping compared with a sole plot (Singh and Adjeigbe 2002) implies less energy utilization (CO_2 emission) in manufacturing, transporting and applying insecticides and herbicides (Bryan et al. 2011).

7. Adoption of forage legume intercropping technologies in Africa

Although this review identified the many benefits of including forage legumes as intercrop in crop-livestock systems in SSA the level of adoption of the technologies by smallholder farmers is very low. This is due to a number of constraints, which includes mainly limited access to inputs (e.g. seed, fertilizer, etc.), yield depression of cereals, low yields and lack of persistence of legumes, and lack of fencing material and access to credit were identified as core factors limiting adoption of forage legume technologies in Zimbabwe (Nnadi and Haque 1986; Mapiye 2006; Ogutu and Obare 2015, Unpublished report). In addition, gender, literacy level, size of household, land area per household and number of animals per household indirectly affected adoption of forage technologies in Africa (Mapiye 2006, Chijikwa 2016, unpublished report).

8. Summary

Intercropping forage legumes with cereals and root crop production is well recognized in mixed crop-livestock farming systems of Africa for land intensification, improved grain and forage nutritive value, reduced impacts of diseases and pests, and as cover crops to reduce soil erosion and degradation. Within an intercrop system, however, there is a competition for key resources such as water, nutrients and light, depending on the crop species, climatic conditions and management practices. In moisture-stressed zones of arid and semi-arid areas, the influential factors that determine the benefits of intercrops are water and, to a lesser extent, nutrients. In contrast, in humid zones nutrient deficiency and light because of the shading effect are more profound than other factors. Ensuring optimum spatial and temporal arrangements, nutrient availability, population density and cropping pattern of the companion crops for each environment are pre-conditions to enhancing the overall productivity, resource use efficiency and profitability of the intercrops, as well as improving the resilience of the system to adapt to and mitigate climate changes. Future research needs to focus on testing intercrop technologies for each agro-ecological zone across soil types to determine optimum spatial arrangements and geometry of companion crops for efficient utilization of resources (light, water and capital) and improve adoption of forage legume intercropping technology by smallholder farmers in Africa.

References

Adeniyan ON, Ayoola OT, Ogunleti DO (2011) Evaluation of cowpea cultivars under maize and maize-cassava based intercropping systems. Afr. J. Plant Sci 5(10):570-574.

Alhaji HI (2008) Yield Performance of Some Cowpea Varieties under Sole and Intercropping with Maize at Bauchi, Nigeria. ISSN 1994-9057. Afr. Rev. 2(3):278-291.doi.org/10.4314/afrrev.v2i3.41073.

Astatke A, Mohamed-Saleem MA, El Wakeel A (1995) Soil water dynamics under cereal and forage legume mixtures on drained vertisols in the Ethiopian Highlands. Agric. Water Manag. 27:17-24. doi.10.1016/0378(95)01131-2

Ayisi KK, Mpangane PNZ, Anthony W (2004) Grain yield and symbiotic activity of cowpea cultivars grown in sole and intercropping systems with maize in the Limpopo Province of South Africa. Proceedings of Fourth International Crop Science Congress, 26 September–1 October, Brisbane, Australia.

Barrios S, Ouattara B, Strobl E (2008) The impact of climatic change on agricultural production: Is it different for Africa? Food Policy 33(4):287-298.doi.10.1016/j.foodpol.2008.01.003

Belane AK, Dakora FD (2009) Measurement of N_2 fixation in 30 cowpea *(Vigna unguiculata L. walp.)* genotypes under field conditions in Ghana, using the 15 N natural abundance technique. Symbiosis 48:47-56. Doi:10.1007/BF03179984

Birteeb PT, Addah W, Japer N. Addo-Kwafo A (2011) Effects of intercropping cereal- legume on biomass and grain yield in the savanna zone tamale, Ghana. LRRD 23, Article #198. Retrieved 7 June 2012 from http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd23/9.birt23198.htm.

Bryan E, Ringer C, Okaba B, Koo J, Herrero M, Silvestri S (2011) Agricultural land management: Capturing synergies between climate change adaptation, greenhouse gas mitigation and agricultural productivity: Insights from Kenya. Report to the World Bank Report 3b, Kenya, pp 116.

Carlson JD (2008) Intercropping with maize in sub-arid regions. Community Planning & Analysis Technical Brief 16 April 2008.

Cenpukdee U, Fukai S (1992) Cassava/legume intercropping with contrasting cassava cultivars. 1. Competition between component crops under three intercropping conditions. Field Crops Res. 29(2):113-133.doi:10.1016/0378-4290 (90) 90082-k

Cline WR (2007) Global warming and agriculture: Impact estimates by country. Center for Global Development and Peterson Institute for International Economics: Washington, D.C.

Dakora FD, Keya SO (1997) Contribution of legume nitrogen fixation to sustainable agriculture in sub-Saharan Africa. Soil Biol and Biochem 29(5-6):809-817.doi:10.1016/S0038-0717(96)00225-8

Dovel RL, Chilcote G, Rainey J (1995) Intercropping barely and annual legumes for grain and forage. Klamath Experiment Station, Klamath, Falls. Annual Report.1995

Eaglesham ARJ, Ayanaba A, Ranga Rao V, Eskew DL (1981) Improving the nitrogen nutrition of maize by intercropping cowpea. Soil Biol Biochem 13, 169-171.doi:10.1016/0038-0717(81)90014-6

Ejeta G (2007) Breeding for striga resistance in sorghum: Explorations intricate host-parasite biology. Crop Sci 47(3):216-227. doi:10.2135/cropsci2007.04.011IPBS

Eskandari H, Ghanbari-Bonjara A, Galari M, Salari M (2009) Forage quality of cowpea intercropped with corn as affected by nutrient uptake and light interception. Notulae Botanicae Horti Agrobotanici Cluj-Napoca 37 (1):171-174.

FAO (UN Food and Agriculture Organization /IIA SA (Institute of Internal Auditors, South Africa) (2000) Global agro-ecological zones CD-ROM FAO/IIASA, 2000; online: http://www.iiasa.ac.at/Research/LUC/GAEZ /index.htm (accessed 25 October 2012).

FAO (2010) Food and agriculture organization of the United Nations statistical databases. See http://faostat.fao.org/.

FAO (2016) Smallholder productivity under climatic variability: Adoption and impact of widely promoted agricultural practices in Tanzania, by Aslihan Arslan, Ferderico Belotti Leslie Lipper. ESA working paper No. 16-03 Rome, FAO.

Fisher MJ, Rao IM, Ayarza MA, Lascono CE, Sanz JI, Thomas RJ, Vera RR (1994) Carbon storage by introduced deep-rooted grasses in South American savannas. Nature 371:236-238.

Giller KE, Cadisch G, Ehaliotis C, Adams E, Sakala WD, Mafongonya PL (1997) Building soil nitrogen capital in Africa. In Buresh RJ, Sanchez PA, Calhoun F (eds) Replenishing soil fertility in Africa. Madison, WI: SSSA Special Publication Number 51. SSSA and ASA, pp. 151-192.

Gregorich EG, Rochette P, Van den Bygaart AJ, Angers DA (2005) Greenhouse gas contributions of agricultural soils and potential mitigation practices in Eastern Canada. Soil Tillage Res. 83:53–72. doi:10.1016/j.still.2005.02.009

Gurian-Sherman D (2011) Raising the steaks: global warming and pasture-raised beef production in the United States. Union of Concerned Scientists, Cambridge, MA, USA, pp45

Harvell CD, Mitchell CE, Ward JR, Altizer S, Dobson AP, Ostfeld RS, Samuel MD (2002) Ecology – climate warming and disease risks for terrestrial and marine biota. Science 296:2158–2162. doi:10.1126/science.1063699

Hassen A, Lemma G, Rethman NFG (2006) Effect of *Lablab purpureus* and *Vicia atropupuria* as an intercrop, or in a crop rotation, on grain and forage yields of maize of Ethiopia. Trop Grasslands 40:111-118.

Hauggard-Nielson H, Ambus P, Jensen ES (2001) Evaluating pea and barley cultivars for complementary in intercropping at different levels of soil N availability. Field Crops Res 72:185-196. doi:10.1016/S0378-4290(01)00176-9

Hogberg P, Kvarnstrom M (1982) Nitrogen fixation by the woody legume *Leucaena leucocephala* in Tanzania. Plant and Soil. 66:21-28. doi:10.1007/BF02203398

Hulet H, Gosseye P (1986) Effect of intercropping cowpea on dry-matter and grain yield of millet in the semi-arid zone of Mali. In: Haque I, Jutzi S, and Neate P J H (eds), Potentials of forage legumes in farming systems of sub-Saharan Africa. Proceedings of a workshop held at ILCA, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 16–19 September 1985. ILCA (International Livestock Centre for Africa), Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, pp. 379-396.

ILCA (International Livestock Centre for Africa) (1987) Intercropping Trifolium spp. in wheat and its suitability for smallholder farmer conditions of the Ethiopian Highlands, ILCA, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) Climate change (2007) Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Working group 11 contributions to the fourth assessment report of the intergovernmental Panel on climate Change, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Jensen ES, Peoples MB, Boddey RM, Gresshoff PM, Hauggaard-Nielsen H, Alves JR and Morrison MJ (2012) Legumes for mitigation of climate change and the provision of feedstock for biofuels and biorefineries. A review, 32:329-364.

Jeranyama P, Hesterman OB, Waddington SR, Harwood RR (2000) Relay-intercropping of sunhemp and cowpea into a smallholder maize system in Zimbabwe, Agro. J 92:239-244.doi:10.2134/agonj2000.922239x

Kabirizi J, Mugrwa S, Ziwa E, Nanyennya W, Matovu M, Kigongo J, Komutunga E, Agona A, and Mubiru, D (2012) The role of forages in mitigating the effects of climate change in smallholder crop-livestock systems (http://www.slidshare.net/cenafrica/ downloaded on October, 2012).

Katsaruware RD, Manyanhaire IO (2009) Maize-cowpea intercropping and weed suppression in leaf stripped and detasselled maize in Zimbabwe. EJEAFChe, 8 (11), 2009. [1218-1226], Zimbabwe Open University, Zimbabwe.

Khan ZR, Hassanali A, Khamis TM, Pickett JA, Wadhams LJ (2001) Mechanism of *Striga hermonthica* suppression by *Desmodium unicenatum* in maize-based farming systems. In: A Fer, P Thalouran, D.M, Joel, L.J Musselman, C. Parker and J.A.C Verkeleij (eds). Proceedings of the Seventh International Parasite Weed Symposium, pp 307, Nantes, France.

King JM, Parsons DJ, Turnpenny JR, Nyangaga J, Bakari P, Wathes CM (2006) Modelling energy metabolism of Friesians in Kenya smallholdings shows how heat stress and energy deficit constrain milk yield and cow replacement rate. Anim Sci J 82:705–716. doi:10.1079/ASC200689

Lemlem A (2013) The effect of intercropping maize with cowpea and lablab on crop yield. Herald J. Agric. Food Sci. Res. 2: 156 - 170

Liang J, Qi X, Souza L, Luo Y (2016) Processes regulation progressive nitrogen limitation under elevated carbon dioxide: a meta-analysis. Biogeosciences, 13:2689-2699.doi:10.5194/bg-13-2689-2016

Lithourgidis AS, Dordas CA, Damalas CA, Vlachostergios DN (2011) Annual intercrops: an alternative pathway for sustainable agriculture. Aust J Crop Sci 5(4):396-410.

Liya SM, Odu CTI, Agboola AA, Mulongo K (1990) Estimation of N_2 fixation by nitrogen fixing trees in the sub humid tropics using ^{15}N dilution and difference method. Paper presented at Fourth African Association for Biological Nitrogen Fixation, IITA, Ibadan, 24-28.

Lobell DB, Burke MB, Tebaldi C, Mastrandrea MD, Falcon WP, Naylor RL (2008) Prioritizing climate change adaptation needs for food security in 2030. Science, 319(5863):607-610.doi:10.1126/science.1152339

Luo Y, Su B, Currie WS, Dukes JS, Finzi AC, Hartwig U, Hungate B, McMurtrie RE, Oren R, Parton WJ, Pataki DE, Shaw MR, Zak, DR, Field CB (2004) Progressive nitrogen limitation of ecosystem responses to rising atmospheric carbon dioxide. Bioscience, 54:731-739.doi:10.1641/0006-3568(2004)054

Lupwayi NZ, Kennedy AC, Chirwa R M (2011) Grain legume impacts on soil biological processes in sub-Saharan Africa. Afr. J. Plant Sci. 5(1):1-7.

Luscher A, Mueller-Harvey I, Soussana JF, Rees RM, Peyraud JL (2014) Potential of legume-based grassland-livestock systems in Europe: A review. Grass Forage Sci. 69:201-228.doi:10.1111/gfs.12124

Maasdorp BV, Titterton M (1997) Nutritional improvement of maize silage dairying: mixed-crop silages from sole and intercropped legumes and a long-season variety of maize, biomass yield and nutritive value. Anim Feed Sci Tech 69:241-261.doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8401(97)81639-2

McDonagh JF, Hillyer AEM (2003) Grain legumes in pearl millet systems in northern Namibia: An assessment of potential nitrogen contributions. Expl Agric. 39:349–362.doi:10.1017/S00014479703001364

Mba A, Ezumah HC (1985) Cassava/cowpea intercropping. International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Annual Report for 1984. Ibadan, Nigeria, 175-176.

Makoi JHJR, Chimphango SBM, Dakora FD (2009) Effect of legume plant density and mixed culture on symbiotic N2 fixation in five cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L.Walp) genotypes in South Africa. Symbiosis 48:57-67.doi:org/10.1007/BF03179985

Mapiye C, Foti R, Chikumba N, Poshiwa X, Mwale M, Chivuraise C and Mupangwa J F (2006) Constraints to adoption of forage and browse legumes by smallholder dairy farmers in Zimbabwe. *LRRD. Volume 18, Article #175.* Retrieved August 11, 2016, from http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd18/12/mapi18175.htm

Mohammed-Saleem MA (1986) The ecology, vegetation and land-use of sub-humid Nigeria. In: Von Kaufamann R, Chater S, Blench R (eds) Livestock systems research in Nigeria sub-humid zone, ILCA, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Mohammed IB, Olufajo OO, Singh BB, Miko S, Mohammed SG (2008) Evaluation of yield of components of sorghum/cowpea intercrops in the Sudan savannah ecological zone, ARPN J Ag. & Bio. Sci. 3(3)(May 2008).

Mpairwe DR, Sabiiti EN, Ummuna NN, Tegegne A, Osuji P (2002) Effect of intercropping cereal crops with forage legumes and source of nutrients on cereal grain yield and fodder dry matter yields. Afri Crop Sci J 10:81-97.doi.org/10.4314/acsj.v10i1.27559

Murphy AM, Cocucci P E (1999) A tropical forage solution to poor quality ruminant diets: A review of Lablab purpureus. LRRD (11)(2)(1999), Canada.

Murungu FS, Chiduza C, Muchaonyerwa P (2011) Productivity of maize after strip intercropping with leguminous crops under warm-temperate climate. Afri. J. Agric. Res. 6 (24):5405-5413.doi:10.5897/AJAR11.507

Mustaers HJW, Ezumah HC, Osiru DSO (1993) Cassava-based intercropping: A review. Field Crops Res, 34:431-457.doi:10.1016/0378-4290(93)90125-7

Ncube B, Twomlow SJ, van Wilk MT, Dimes JP, Giller KE (2007) Productivity and residual benefits of grain legumes to sorghum under semi-arid conditions in southwestern Zimbabwe. Plant and Soil 299(1):1-15.doi:10.1007/s11104-007-9330-5

Ndoye I, Dreyfus B (1988) N_2 fixation by *Sesbania rostrata* and *Sesbania sesban* estimated using [15] N and total N difference methods. Soil Biol. Biochem. 20:209-213.doi:1016/0038-0717(88)90038-7

Ngongoni NT, Mwale M, Mapiye C, Moyo MT, Hamudikuwanda H , M Totterton (2007) Evaluation of cereal-legume intercropped forages for small holder dairy production in Zimbabwe, LRRD. Volume 19, Article #129. Retrieved August 16, 2016, from http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd19/9/ngon19129.htm. Nicholson SE (1994) Recent rainfall fluctuations in Africa and their relationships to past conditions over the continent. The Holocene 4:121–131.doi:10.1177/095968369400400202Nicholson SE (2001) Climatic and environmental change in Africa during the last two centuries. Climate Research 17:123–144.doi:10.3354/cr017123

Nnadi L.A. and Haque I. (1986) Forage legume-cereal systems: improvement of soil fertility and agricultural production with special reference to sub-Saharan Africa. In: Haque I, Jutzi S and Neate P J H. (Eds.) (1986) *Potentials of forage legumes in farming systems of sub-Saharan Africa.* Proceedings of a workshop held at ILCA, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 16-19 September 1985. ILCA, Addis Ababa. http://www.fao.org/wairdocs/ilri/x5488e/x5488e0p.htm

Oba G (2001) The effect of multiple droughts on cattle in Obbu, Northern Kenya. J. Arid Environ. 41:375-386.doi:10.1006/jare.2000.0785

Ojiem JO, Vanlauwe B, De Ridder N, Giller KE (2007) Niche-based assessment of contributions of legumes to the nitrogen economy of Western Kenya smallholder farms. Plant Soil, 292:119-135.doi:10.1007/s11104-007-9207-7

Onim JFM, Mathuva M, Oteno K, Fitzhugh HA (1990). Soil fertility changes and response of maize and beans to green manures of leucaena, sesbania and pigeon pea. Agrofor. Syst, 12:197-215. doi:10.1007/BF00123474

Oseni TO (2010) Evaluation of sorghum-cowpea intercrop productivity in savannah agro-ecology using competition indices. J. Agri. Sci. 2(3);229-239.doi.org/10.5539/jas.v2n3p229

Reinhardt CF, Tesfamichael N (2011) Nitrogen in combination with *Desmodium intortum* effectively suppresses *Striga asiatica* in a sorghum-Desmodium intercropping system. Journal of Agriculture in the Tropics and Sub-Tropics112:98-128.

Rusinamhodzi L, Murwira HK, Nyamangra J (2006) Cotton-cowpea intercropping and its N_2 fixation capacity improves yield of a subsequent maize crop under Zimbabwean rain-fed conditions. Plant and Soil 287:327-336.doi:10.1007/s11104-006-9080-9

Samuel M, Mesfin D (2003) Effect of under sowing annual forage legumes on grain and dry matter stalk yield of sorghum *(Sorghum bicolor l.)* and dry matter forage yield in the eastern Amhara region. In: Asfaw Yemegnuhal and Tamrat Degefa (eds). Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Conference of the Ethiopian Society of Animal Production (ESAP), Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 28-30 August 2003. ESAP, Addis Ababa. 405 pp.

Schroth G, Lehmann J (1995) Contrasting effects of roots and mulch from three agro forestry species on yields of alley cropped maize. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 54:890-101. doi:10.1016/0167(95)00585-G

Seo SN, Mendelsohn R (2007) Climate change impacts on animal husbandry in Africa: A Ricardian analysis. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 4261. doi:10.1596/1813-9450-4261

Serdeczny O, Adams S, Baarsch F, Coumou D, Robinson A, Hare W, Schaeffer M, Perrette M, Reinhardt J (2016) Climate change impacts in sub-Saharan Africa from physical changes to their social repercussions. Reg Environ Change. doi:10.1007/S10113-015-0910-2.

Shah MM, Fischer G, van Velthuizen H (2008) Food security and sustainable agriculture: The challenges of climate change in sub-Saharan Africa. Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), CSD-16 Review session (5-16 May 2008). United Nations, New York.

Singh BB, Adjeighe HA (2002) Improving cowpea cereal-based cropping systems in the dry savannas of West Africa. In: Fatokun, A, SA Tarawali, BB Singh, PM Kormawa, M Tamo (eds). Challenges and opportunities for enhancing sustainable cowpea production. IITA, Ibadan, Nigeria, pp 276-284.

Skovgard H, Päts P (1997) Reduction of stem borer damage by intercropping maize with cowpea. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 62:13-19. doi:10.1016/S0167-8809(96)01114-0

Snap SS, Mafongoya PL, Waddington S (1998) Organic matter technologies for integrated nutrient management in smallholder cropping systems of southern Africa. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 71(1-3): 185-200.doi:10.1016S0167-8809*(98)00140-6

Soussan J, Lemaire G (2014) Coupling carbon and nitrogen cycles for environmentally sustainable intensification of grasslands and crop-livestock systems. Agric. Ecosyst Environ. 190:9-17. Doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2013.10.012

Sprent JI, David WO, Felix D (2010) African legumes: a vital but under-utilized resource. Journal of Experimental Botany 61:1257-1265.doi:10.1093/jxb/erp342 Stern N (2006). Stern Review: Economics of climate change. 2006, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 712.

Sumberg J (2002) The logic of fodder legumes in Africa. Food Policy 27:285-300.doi:10.1016/S0306-9192(02)000169-2

Surve VH, Arvadia MK, Tandel BB (2012) Effect of row ratio in cereal-legume fodder under intercropping systems on biomass production and economics. IJARR 2 (1):32-34, 2012.

Tarre R, Macedo R, Cantarutti RB, de Rezende PC, Pereira JM, Ferreira E, Alves BJR, Urquiaga S, Boddey RM (2001) The effect of the presence of a forage legume on nitrogen and carbon levels in soils under Brachiaria pastures in the Atlantic forest region of the South of Bahia, Brzil. Plant Soil 234:15-26.

Thornton PK, Herrero M (2014) Climate change adaptation in mixed crop-livestock systems in developing countries. Global Food Security. 3(2):99-107.doi:10.1016/j.gfs.2014.02.002

Thornton P K, Van de Steeg J, Notenbaert A, Herrero M (2009) The impacts of climate change on livestock and livestock systems in developing countries: A review of what we know and what we need to know. Agric. Syst. 101:113–127.doi:10.1016/j.agsy.2009.05.002

Tomm GO, Foster RK (2001) Effect of intercropping wheat with forage legumes on wheat production and ground cover. Pesq. agropec. bras. Brasilia 36(3):465-471.doi.org/10.1590/S0100-204X2001000300010

Van Soest PJ (1982) Nutritional ecology of the ruminants. O& B books, Corvallis, Oregon, USA.

Verge XPC, De Kimpe C, Desjardins RL (2007) Agricultural production, greenhouse gas emissions and mitigation potential. Agric. Forest. Meteorol 142:255-269. Doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2006.06.011

Vesterager JM, Nielsen NE, Høng-Jensen H (2008) Effects of cropping history and phosphorus source on yield and nitrogen fixation in sole and intercropped cowpea-maize systems. Nutr Cycl Agroecosys 80:61-73.doi:10.1007/s10705-007-9121-7

Zahran HH (1999) Rhizobium-legume symbiosis and nitrogen fixation under severe conditions and in an arid climate. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev 63**:**968–989.

Zhuoga X, Wilkins JF, Friend MA, Piltz JW (2016) Effect of supplementing barley straw with lucerne silage or cottonseed meal on diet digestibility and growth rate of steers. Anim. Feed Sci.Tech. 218**:** 84-92.doi:10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2016.05.010

Zougmore R, Kambou FN, Ouattara K, Guillobez S (2000) Sorghum-cowpea intercropping: An effective technique against runoff and soil erosion in the Sahel (Saria, Burkina Faso). Arid Soil Res. Rehabil. 14:329-342.doi:10.1080/08903060050136441