Original Research Article

Agronomic efficiency of bone meal under acidification in *Brachiaria ruziziensis* dry matter production in Western Amazon

---

ABSTRACT

Aims: The objective of this work was to evaluate the agronomic efficiency of the bone meal under acidification in the production of dry matter of *Brachiaria ruziziensis* in relation to a soluble source.

Study ~~D~~design: The experiment was conducted in a completely randomized design with seven treatments and three replications. Treatments included ~~: ~~a control~~Witness;~~, ~~S~~single ~~S~~superphosphate (SS),~~;~~ ~~B~~bone ~~M~~meal (BM),~~;~~ BM treated with 10% ~~O~~oxalic ~~A~~acid~~s~~,~~;~~ BM treated with 10% ~~A~~acetic ~~A~~acid, and BM treated with 1% to 0.5% ~~H~~hydrochloric ~~A~~acid.

Place and ~~D~~duration of ~~S~~study: The experiment was carried out from October 2014 to February 2015, at the Experimental Farm of the Federal University of Rondônia (UNIR), located 15 km from the city of Rolim de Moura, Rondônia, Brazil.

Methodology: The bone meal used in the experiment was produced manually, where bovine bones were collected and burned for carbon removal and particle reduction. The oxalic acid, acetic acid and hydrochloric acid~~s~~ were used to ~~to~~ increase the solubility of the bone meal ~~and~~ for application~~ed~~ to the soil for growth of *B. ruziziensis*. Parameters ~~It was~~ evaluated were the ~~A~~agronomic ~~E~~efficiency ~~I~~index (AEI), ~~P~~phosphorus ~~C~~conversion ~~E~~efficiency (PCE), ~~S~~shoot ~~D~~dry ~~M~~matter (SDM), and ~~R~~root ~~D~~dry ~~M~~matter (RDM).

Results: AEI ~~was~~ obtained for acid treatments was above 60% and PCE satisfactory when compared to the soluble source, except for 0.5% hydrochloric acid and significantly above the BM without acid treatments. There was higher production of SDM and RDM with the soluble source (SS), however the acid treatments promoted dry matter production above the BM without acid treatments.

Conclusions: The application of acids in bone meal promoted satisfactory agronomic efficiency gains for ~~plants of~~ *Brachiaria ruziziensis*.

Comment [O1]: What is the difference between **SS** for super superphosphate and **SS** for soluble source

Keywords: Phosphorus~~;~~, Forage~~;~~, Exploitation

1. INTRODUCTION

~~The~~ Brazil is the second largest producer of beef in the world, behind only the United States, and according to the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics [1], the herd surpasses 218 million heads. Approximately, 80% of the Brazilian herd is extensively raised under planted / natural pastures, since it is the most economical method of cattle feeding to cattle ranchers [2]. Of the fodder used for this purpose, those of the genus *Brachiaria* correspond to 70~~% and~~ - 80% of the area planted in Brazil. The *Brachiaria ruziziensis* is one of the most planted because of its high palatability, grazing support, and high dry matter production (6 to 15 t ha^{-1}) [3].

It is estimated, however, that about 70 to 80% of the pastures used for this purpose are degraded or in the process of degradation [4]. According to Dias-Filho [2], the main causes of this degradation are focused on the adopted management, such as fire use, low quality seeds, high stocking rates, and absence of fertilization. Among these, the absence and inefficiency of fertilization has been noted as a more aggravating factor of pasture degradation in Brazil [5,6]. As soil fertility decreases, there is a marked productive loss of fodder and, consequently, decrease in animal production [3].

When considering the Amazon region, the problem tends to be more pronounced, considering the prevailing~~the~~ most acidic soil characteristics, low cation exchange capacity, high aluminum saturation, and low nutrient reserves, mainly in phosphorus (P) (between 1 and 3 g dm^{-3}) [2]. Therefore, ~~I~~it is suggested~~,~~ ~~therefore,~~ that fertilization with this nutrient ~~is~~ should be carried out~~,~~ in order to guarantee its adequate supply.

Phosphorus maintenance for pasture production has been performed with the use of liming and the use of soluble phosphorus sources, such as single superphosphate and triple superphosphate [7]. Although widely used, they come from the exploration of phosphate rocks, whose reserves are estimated to deplete in up to 100 years [8, 9]. In this sense, it is necessary the study of new sources of phosphorus in order to guarantee the supply of this element [10,6].

Recently, studies by several authors have shown that the use of solid animal waste processed, bone meal (BM), have been pointed as potential source of phosphorus and calcium for plants [11,~~11~~12?]. Under heat action, bones can also supply magnesium, potassium and iron from the blood [13]. However, due to the chemical nature of the bones (hydroxyapatite), BM has low solubility of phosphorus in water (0.26% of P_2O_5) despite its high concentration, between 30.6~~, 6~~ and 38.8% P_2O_5 [14]. However, it is necessary to study acidifying agents capable of readily ~~providing~~ releasing the available phosphorus in the bones, as tested for 2% citric acid, which provided 23% solubility to bone meal [15].

Thus, the objective of this study was to evaluate the agronomic efficiency of the bone meal under acidification in the production of dry matter of *Brachiaria ruziziensis* in relation to a soluble source.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted at the Experimental Sector of Agronomy of the Federal University of Rondônia - UNIR, Campus Rolim de Moura, RO - Brazil, located ~~at coordinates~~ 11º 34'58.60" S and 61º46'22.30" W ~~with~~ at an altitude of 277 m. The climate of the region, according to the classification of Koppen, is Aw type, with defined dry season, mean temperature of 28 ° C, mean annual precipitation of 2,250 mm, and relative humidity of 85% [16].

The study was conducted in open-air pots of 3.9 kg in a completely randomized design, with seven treatments and three replicates~~, totaling 21 experimental units~~ (Table 1).

Table 1. Treatments used in the experimentation~~.~~

Treatments	Description	Symbol
1	Unmanaged control	Wit.
2	P (Simple ~~S~~superphosphate)	SS
3	P (Bone ~~M~~meal)	BM

Formatted: Justified
Formatted Table
Formatted: Justified
Formatted: Justified
Formatted: Justified

4	(Bone ~~M~~meal + 10% ~~O~~oxalic ~~A~~acid)	Oxa $^{10\%}$
5	(Bone ~~M~~meal + 10% ~~A~~acetic ~~A~~acid)	Ace $^{10\%}$
6	(Bone ~~M~~meal + 1% hydrochloric acid)	HCl $^{1\%}$
7	(Bone ~~M~~meal + 0.5 % hydrochloric acid)	HCl $^{0,5\%}$

The conduction of the open-~~-~~air experiment aimed to study the effect of various treatments on plants under natural conditions (different from greenhouse conditions). As a source of phosphate fertilization, bone meal (37.5% P_2O_5) and simple superphosphate (18% P_2O_5) were used. For each source, the equivalent of 100 kg ha^{-1} of P_2O_5 was used, depending on the concentration of each source. For the evaluations under equal conditions, both P sources were subjected to grinding and sieving ~~of~~with 2.00 mm-mesh.

As substrate for the plants, the arable layer (0-20 cm) of the experimental area classified as Eutrophic Yellow Red Oxisol [17] was used, with the following chemical and physical characteristics: pH in water = 5.4 ; Organic matter = 3 dag kg^{-1}; P = 3.7 mg dm^{-3}; K = 102 mg dm^{-3}; S-SO^{-2} = 3.6 mg dm^{-3}, Ca = 4.1 cmol$_c$ dm^{-3}; Mg: 1.4 cmol$_c$ dm^{-3}; Fe = 88 mg dm^{-3}; Cu = 1.8 mg dm^{-3}; Zn = 1.5 mg dm^{-3}; Mn = 25 mg dm^{-3}; B = 0.14 mg dm^{-3}, Potential ~~A~~acidity = 4.8 cmol$_c$ dm^{-3}; Al = 0.12 cmol$_c$ dm^{-3}; Sum of ~~B~~bases = 5.7 cmol$_c$ dm^{-3}; Potential cation exchange capacity = 10.5 cmol$_c$ dm^{-3}; Bas~~i~~es ~~S~~saturation= 54%; Saturation by aluminum = 2%; Sand = 530 g kg^{-1}; Silt = 83 g kg^{-1} and Clay = 381 g kg^{-1}.

The bone meal was produced ~~under~~ through burning for elimination of organic compounds and for maceration in smaller particles. For this, the bovine bones were arranged inside a masonry barbecue and accommodated in coin-~~-~~type screens, using charcoal for the burning for approximately eight hours. After cooling ~~the material,~~for about 24 hours~~ later~~, the bones were ground with the use of gral and pistil and sieved in a 2.00 mm-~~-~~mesh. The material was characterized in laboratory ~~for~~ by the analysis of the contents of P and Ca, ~~presenting~~ which were 37.5% P_2O_5 and 43.76% CaO.

As acid extractors of phosphorus, the oxalic acid, acetic acid and hydrochloric acids (PAs) were used. For ~~O~~oxalic and ~~A~~acetic acids, 10 ml of acid were dilut~~ion~~ed in 100 ml of distilled water.~~ was used.~~ For hydrochloric acid~~,~~'s dilution~~, of~~ 1 and 0.5 ml were used ~~in~~ for 100 ml of distilled water~~ was used~~. The solutions were applied to 100 g of bone meal. Subsequently, the material was forced to air drying at 65 °~~-~~C for approximately 72 hours. The bone meal was homogenized to the soil and arranged in the experimental units (open-air pots of 3.9 kg).

The Brachiaria ruziziensis sprouts collected in the experimental area and standardized (12 cm in height and mean mass of 4.52 g) were used as indicator of the treatments. Three shoots of *B. ruziziensis* were arranged in each experimental unit. In addition to the treatments, complementary fertilization with macro and micronutrients was applied as recommended for the forage ~~described~~ by Costa et al. [3]. The water supply was performed by daily manual ~~irrigation~~watering, applying 300 ml / pot / day. Cultural treatments were carried out regarding the manual removal of invasive plants from the soil seed bank.

The plants were ~~cultivated~~ grown for 120 days, with ~~S~~shoot ~~D~~dry ~~M~~matter (SDM) at 60, 90 and 120 days. The forage was cut at 20 cm from the soil level and the SDM determined from drying in a forced circulation oven at 65 ºC for approximately 72 hours. At the end of the periods the sum of the SDM produced in the three periods was calculated for the ~~calculation~~ determination of the ~~A~~agronomic ~~E~~efficiency ~~I~~index (AEI) and ~~P~~phosphorus ~~C~~conversion ~~E~~efficiency (PCE).

Formatted: Justified

Formatted: Justified

Formatted: Justified

Formatted: Justified

Comment [O2]: Do you mean that they were "planted"? If yes, please use the term "**planted**" rather than "arranged"

The AEI was calculated from equation 1:

$$AEI\ (\%) = [(Y2-Y1) / (Y3-Y1)] \times 100\ (Equation1)$$

~~W~~where~~:~~ AEI = Agronomic ~~E~~efficiency ~~I~~index, ~~in%;~~ Y1 = SDM obtained in the control, ~~in g;~~ Y2 = SDM obtained with the treatments, ~~in g;~~ Y3 = SDM obtained from the reference source (SS). ~~, in g.~~

The PCE was calculated from equation 2:

$$PCE\ \cancel{(mg\ mg^{-1})} = (SDM\ Treatments - SDM\ Witness) / APA\ (Equation\ 2)$$

~~W~~where~~:~~ PCE = Phosphorus ~~C~~conversion ~~E~~efficiency, ~~mg mg-1;~~ SDM ~~T~~treatments = Dry ~~M~~matter of the Aerial Part Total obtained in each treatment, in mg; SDM ~~Witness~~ control = Dry matter of the ~~T~~total ~~A~~aerial ~~P~~part obtained ~~in~~ from the control; APA = Amount of ~~P~~phosphorus ~~A~~added. ~~, in mg / pot.~~

The root dry matter ~~of the roots~~ (RDM) was obtained ~~after~~ 120 days ~~of~~ after treatments. For this, the roots were removed from the experimental units, washed and subjected to drying in forced circulation oven at 65 ºC for approximately 72 hours. SDM and RDM were determined using a precision digital scale. ~~The~~ Data obtained ~~data~~ were ~~submitted~~ subjected to ~~the~~ an analysis of variance and the contrast of the means was realized by the test of Tukey ~~to 5% of probability. For the analyzes,~~ using the statistical program ASSISTAT 7.7 was used.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

~~Significant results were observed in all studied variables (P <0.01). When analyzing table 1, it is noticed that the~~ Total ~~S~~shoot ~~D~~dry ~~M~~matter (SDM) was significantly higher in the commercial soluble source (SS) ~~application~~of phosphorus (Table 1). However, acidification of bone meal (BM) with 10% acetic acid, 10% ~~O~~oxalic acid and 1% ~~C~~chloride promoted an increase of 224%, 231% and 249% in relation to treatment that did not receive acidification (BM). In relation to the control, the application of BM without acidification promoted increments of only 56.1%.

With the exception of the treatment with 0.5% hydrochloric acid, the other acid treatments promoted a significantly similar effect on the ~~A~~agronomic ~~E~~efficiency ~~I~~index (AEI), with the lowest AEI observed, confirming its natural phosphate characteristics. $Oxa_{10\%}$, $Ace_{10\%}$ and $HCl_{1\%}$ acidifying treatments promoted ~~I~~ AEI on average 31% lower, taxing much lower by observing the AEI without acidification of FO. Owing to the efficiency scale, it can be noted that the AEI decreased in the following order: SS> $HCl_{1\%}$ > $Ace_{10\%}$ > $Oxa_{10\%}$ > $HCl_{0.5\%}$ > BM (Table 2).

Phosphorus ~~C~~conversion ~~E~~efficiency (PCE) was significantly higher in the standard treatment (SS), however high PCE values were obtained with acid treatments, when compared to those that did not receive acidification (BM). Among the acid treatments, $HCl_{0.5\%}$ was the one with the lowest efficiency. The PCE ~~obeyed~~ showed the following order: SS > $HCl_{1\%}$ > $Ace_{10\%}$ > $Oxa_{10\%}$ > $HCl_{0.5\%}$ > BM (Table 2).

Table 2. Values of ~~S~~shoot ~~D~~dry ~~M~~matter (SDM) of *Brachiaria ruziziensis*, ~~A~~agronomic ~~E~~efficiency ~~I~~index (AEI) and ~~P~~phosphorus ~~C~~conversion ~~E~~efficiency (PCE) of bone meal (BM) under acidification.

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Comment [O3]: FO stands for what?

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Treatments	SDM (g)	AEI (%)	PCE (mg mg^{-1})
Witness	4,1 d	----	----
SS	23,1 a	100 a	223,13 a
BM	7,3 cd	16,84 d	37,58 c
BM+ Oxa $^{10\%}$	16,4 abc	64,73 b	144,45 abc
BM+ Ace $^{10\%}$	16,9 ab	67,36 b	150,32 abc
BM+ HCl $^{1\%}$	18,1 ab	73,68 b	164,41 ab
BM+ HCl $^{0,5\%}$	10,3 bcd	32,63 c	72,81 bc
C.V	8,28	7,03	23,09
F	182,7	166, 8	7,50
p	0,001	0,001	0,002

C.V: Coefficient of ~~V~~variation; BM: Bone ~~M~~meal; SS: Simple ~~S~~superphosphate; Oxa10%: Bone ~~M~~meal + 10% ~~O~~oxalic ~~A~~acid; Ace10%: Bone ~~M~~meal + 10% ~~A~~acetic ~~A~~acid; HCl1%: Bone ~~M~~meal + 1% hydrochloric acid; HCl 0,5%: Bone ~~M~~meal + 0.5 % hydrochloric acid

Due to the high solubility of simple superphosphate (SS) in water [18], shoot dry matter production (SDM) was substantially higher, given the high availability of phosphorus (P) in solution. The same behavior was observed by Simões et al. [19] when using SS compared to bone meal (BM) in Tifton grass. However, these same authors observed satisfactory results with BM.

In a study using bone meal and meat, Oliveira et al. [20] observed ~~results of~~ SDM of Tifton grass varying between 65 and 93% in relation to fertilization with SS, a fact not observed in this work, where the application of the alternative source of P resulted in about 30% and the extraction of the acids between 70.9 and 78%. In general terms, the production of dry matter with natural phosphate sources depends on the forage species and the BM production method.

The low natural solubility of BM may compromise the short-term response of annual crops, such as *B. ruziziensis*, and is not fully indicated for efficient production of SDM, especially in soils with pH above 5.0, where the reactions with phosphate naturally occur slowly and progressively [15].

Agronomic ~~E~~efficiency ~~I~~index ~~(AEI)~~ data differ from ~~results~~ those obtained in ~~other~~ the studies by Balbino et al. [15] and Farias et al. [21], which ~~verified~~ showed high BM efficiencies when compared to the control (soluble phosphate) treatment. Compared with Arad phosphate and triple superphosphate, Balbino et al. [15] ~~verified~~ obtained an increase in the availability of P in the soil and in the production of sugarcane ~~in~~ with the use of BM. However, in the present study low AEI was observed using this source of P.

The low efficiency index can be related to the pH considered high in the application of bone meal on the substrate, preventing the transformation of the bound Ca + P compounds from BM to available soil phosphorus [14]. Also, according to Damaceno et al. [6], raising the pH can reduce BM efficiency and increase SS efficiency.

Like the soluble sources that undergo acidic attacks in reaction with water, like 2% citric acid on triple superphosphate, the action of the acidic extractors ~~is~~ was pronounced in this work. With the exception of 0.5% ~~H~~hydrochloric ~~A~~acid, the other extractors showed AEI above 60%, considered high by Silva et al. [22] when compared to the standard source, evidencing its potential use in increasing the solubility of natural phosphate. These same authors, when studying the dry matter production of pigeon pea (*Cajanus cajan*), obtained similar responses between the use of natural phosphate and triple superphosphate.

Due to the high availability of phosphorus from the soluble source (SS), high phosphorus conversion efficiency (PCE) was obtained, a result also observed by Zambrosi et al. [23], which obtained a superiority of 31% of the same source in relation to the use of a natural phosphate (thermophosphate) in millet. However, the application of the acids resulted in satisfactory phosphorus efficiencies in dry matter, when ~~observed~~ observing the behavior without its presence. The PCE is directly correlated with the capacity of the phosphate source to release the nutrient in the soil solution [23, 6]. Therefore, the low capacity observed by the bone meal ~~compromises~~ compromised the use of the nutrient by the forage.

Another fact intrinsic to PCE is the extent and efficiency of root system absorption, which responds to the available P in the soil. The distinction in the morphology and root physiology modifies the uptake of P and other nutrients, compromising PCE [23]. The difference mentioned can be observed in the distribution of roots of *B. ruziziensis* according to the phosphate source and the acid treatment used (Figure 1).

Formatted: Font: Italic

Figure 1. Root system of *B. ruziziensis* according to the treatments applied~~.~~

Formatted: Font: Italic

According to Singh et al. [24], the increase in P availability in the soil allows root growth in depth and the emergence of lateral roots in grasses, such as *B. ruziziensis*. Therefore, when the opposite scenario is found, the result responds in the same way, as ~~verified~~ shown for ~~D~~root dry ~~M~~matter ~~of Roots~~ (RDM). The observed similarity between the control and the BM evidenced~~s~~ the low supply of available phosphorus, resulting in poor root architecture (Figure 1). All acidic treatments provided an increase in weight and volume and in the presence of *B. ruziziensis* root hairs, both related to the increased availability of phosphorus ~~in~~ for plants.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Observing the behavior of the root,~~:~~ aerial part, the acidification of BM provided a balance between what was produced in the aerial part and in the roots. This fact ~~is~~ was reported by Taiz and Zeiger [25], arguing that values close to one represent balance between the photosynthetic rate benefited by adequate nutrition and root expansion promoted by the presence of nutrients in the soil.

4. CONCLUSION

The ~~S~~shoot ~~D~~dry ~~M~~matter and ~~R~~root ~~D~~dry ~~M~~matter from *B. ruziziensis* were positively influenced by bone meal ~~treatment~~ treated with acids. Other than acidification with $HCl_{0.5\%}$, the other treatments provided AEI~~'~~s above 60%. Acid treatments provided higher PCE~~'~~s in the absence of acidification. It is recommended to use acid extractors to increase the availability of phosphorus from bone meal, which is an alternative to the shortage of fortified mineral sources. ~~in the world~~

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Subscript

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

Formatted: French (France)

1. IBGE. Pesquisa da pecuária municipal; 2018. (Accessed 17 June 2018). Available: https://sidra.ibge.gov.br/pesquisa/ppm/quadros/brasil/2016.

2. Dias-Filho MB. Degradação de Pastagens: o que é e como evitar. Belém: Embrapa; 2017.

3. Costa NL, Moraes A, Carvalho PCF, Monteiro ALG, Motta ACV, Oliveira RA. Dinâmica de crescimento e produtividade de forragem de *Trachypogon plumosus* sob níveis de correção da fertilidade do solo e idades de rebrota. Ciência Animal Brasileira. 2016;17(2):175-184. Portuguese

4. Ferraz JBS, Felício PED. Production systems - an example from Brazil. Meat Science. 2010;84(2):238-242.

5. Ferreira AVL, Ferreira E, Cavali J, Porto MO, Stachiw R. Farinha de Ossos. Revista Brasileira de Ciência da Amazônia. 2014;3(1):29-36. Portuguese

6. Damaceno JBD, Ferreira E, Oliveira DM, Guimarães RS, Gama RT, Padilha FJ. Produção de biomassa de Brachiaria ruziziensis adubada com farinha de ossos sob tratamentos ácidos. Revista Agrogeoambiental. 2018;10(1):83-93. Portuguese

7. Magalhães AF, Pires AJV, Carvalho GGP, Silva FF, Sousa CMV. Influência do nitrogênio e do fósforo na produção do capim-braquiária. Revista Brasileira de Zootecnia. 2007;36(5):1240-1246. Portuguese

8. Oelkers EH, Valsami JE. Phosphate mineral reactivity and global sustainability. Elements. 2008;4(2):83-87.

9. Lapido-Loureiro FE, Melamed R, Figueiredo Neto J. Fertilizantes: Agroindústria e Sustentabilidade. Rio de Janeiro: Centro de Tecnologia Mineral; 2009.

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: French (France)

10. Porto EMV, Alves DD, Vitor CMT, Gomes VM, Silva MF, David AMSS. Rendimento Forrageiro da *Brachiaria brizantha* cv. Marandu submetida a doses crescentes de fósforo. Scientia Agrária Paranaensis. 2012;11(3):25-34. Portuguese

11. Avelar AC, Ferreira WM, Brito W, Menezes MABC. Composição mineral de fosfatos, calcário e farinha de ossos usados na Agropecuária Brasileira. Archivos de Zootecna. 2009;58(224):737-740. Portuguese

12. Mattar EPL, Júnior EFF, Oliveira E. Caracterização físico-química de cinza de osso bovino para avaliação do seu potencial uso agrícola. Pesquisa Agropecuária Tropical. 2014;1(1):65-70. Portuguese

13. Miyahara RY, Gouvêa D, Toffoli SM. Obtenção e caracterização de cinza de ossos bovinos visando à fabricação de porcelanas de ossos - bone china. Cerâmica. 2007;53(327):234-239. Portuguese

14. Caione G, Fernandes FM, Lange, A. Efeito residual de fontes de fósforo nos atributos químicos do solo, nutrição e produtividade de biomassa da cana-de-açúcar. Revista Brasileira de Ciências Agrárias. 2013;8(2):189-196. Portuguese

15. Balbino TGM, Reinicke F, Modes K, Bezerra IL, Dias JRM, Ferreira E. Farinha de ossos na produção capim Tifton. Revista Brasileira de Ciência da Amazônia. 2012;1(1):182-186. Portuguese

16. Peel MC, Finlayson BL, Mcmahon TA. Koppen-Geiger, uptade world map of the Köppen-geiger climate classification. Hydrology and Earth System Science. 2007;1(11):1633-1644

17. Embrapa. Sistema brasileiro de classificação de solo. 2th ed. Brasília: Embrapa; 2013.

18. Prado GR, Silva LS, Prochnow LI, Griebeler G, PocojeskI E, Moro VJ. Comportamento de superfosfato simples contendo fosfato de ferro de baixa solubilidade em água em solos de várzea do Rio Grande do Sul. Revista Brasileira de Ciência do Solo. 2011;35(3):907-914. Portuguese

19. Simões AC, Cruz IV, Cruz CV, Souza KG, Souza EFM, Dias JRM, Ferreira E. Meat and bone meals in agronomy perfonance of tifton grass. International Journal of Agriculture and Forestry. 2012;2(2):78-83.

20. Oliveira SB, Caione G, Camargo MF, Oliveira ANB, Santana L. Fontes de fósforo no estabelecimento e produtividade de forrageiras na região de alta floresta – MT. Global Science and Technology. 2012;5(1):1-10. Portuguese

21. Farias LN, Silva EMB, Guimarães SL, Souza ACP, Silva TJA, Schlichting AF. Concentration of nutrients and chlorophyll index in pigeon pea fertilized with rock phosphate and liming in cerrado oxisol. African Journal of Agricultural Research. 2015;10(14):1743-1750.

22. Silva AG, França AFS, Miyagi ES, Dambros CE, Lopes FB. Eficiência da fertilização fosfatada e nitrogenada em cultivares de milheto. Ciência Animal Brasileira. 2014;15(2):119-127. Portuguese

Formatted: French (France)

23. Zambrosi FCB, Mattos Júnior D, Furlani PR, Quaggio JA Boaretto RM. Eficiência de absorção e utilização de fósforo em porta enxertos cítricos. Revista Brasileira de Ciência do Solo. 2012;36(2):435-496. Portuguese

24. Singh SK, Badgujar G, Reddy VR, Fleisher DH, Bunce JA. Carbon dioxide diffusion across stomata and mesophyll and photobiochemical processes as affected by growth CO_2 and phosphorus nutrition in cotton. Journal of Plant Physiology. 2013;170(9):801-813.

25. Taiz L, Zeiger E. Fisiologia Vegetal. 5th ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed; 2013.