Opinion Article

Moisture Harvesting Structures Enhance Survival and Growth Performance of Multi-Purpose Tree Seedlings in Semi-Arid Hillsides of Tigray,Ethiopia

ABSTRACT

Vegetation cover degradation is aserious problems in low rainfall areas ofEthiopia.Reversing forest degradation in moisture stressed areas has been a great challenge. Moisture harvesting structures could help to alleviate deforestation through enhancing seedling survival and growth. A field experiment was carried outfor three years at two degraded hillsidesof KilteAwlaelo district, Tigray, Ethiopia.It was conducted with the objective of evaluating the effect of moisture harvesting structures on survival and growth of tree seedlings. The treatments were micro basin, micro trench, eyebrow basin and conventional pit as moisture harvesting structures combined with three multi-purpose tree seedlings namely; *Schinusmolle*, *Grevillea robusta*, and *Olea europaea*.The set up was asplit plot design with three replications. The moisture harvesting structures were assigned to the main plots and the tree seedlings as the sub-plots.Data on seedling survival, plant height, and collar diameter were collected. The collected data were analyzed using GenStat16 edition software by general liner model.Statistical significant difference between and among treatment means were assessed using least significant difference (LSD) at 5% level of significance. The results in main effect showed eyebrow basin >micro basin >micro trench > conventional pit in the upper site; and micro basin > eyebrow basin > micro trench > conventional pit in the lower site in their order of level of significance in enhancing theseedlings survival and growth performance.The interaction effects alsoshowed *Schinusmolle*backed with eyebrow and micro basinon above structure pit position had highest survival rate and growth performances.Hence, eyebrow basin and micro basin as moisture harvesting structure planted with *Schinusmolle*tree species at the above pit position should be demonstrated and scaled up in moisture stressed areas of KilteAwlaelo district and other areas with similar climatic conditions.

***Keywords**: Moisture harvesting structure, tree species, seedling survival, growth performance*

UNDER PEER REVIEW

1. INTRODUCTION

Arid environment constitutes a large part of the globe and suffers from various degrees of land degradation with dry hydro-climate; where water is a limiting factor for biomass production, combined together with fragile and inherently lessfertile soils [1, 2]. The main source of livelihood in arid environments, is generally linked to poor management of water resources and exploitation of vegetation cover which is one of the major constraints of eastern and central African [3]. In the Sahelian zone, more than 90% of the population depends on land resources for their livelihood [4]. The combined effects of physical, chemical, and biological processesand human activities result in land degradation [5].According to Yirdaw et al. [6] land degradation is a serious problem affecting 1.5 billion people globally.

Ethiopia as part of the globe, land degradation has been widespread and affecting people's livelihoods through limiting agricultural production, wood biomass and various ecosystem goods and services[7-8].The major ecological problems in Ethiopia are forest degradation and soil erosion [9-11].To alleviateforest degradation and deforestation,seedling plantation-based landscape restoration were practiced using appropriate tree and shrub species, as an important solution in the tropical ecosystem rehabilitation options[12, 13].In-situ rainwater harvestingsupported seedling plantation is recommended to enhance water infiltration and reduce runoff so as to increase seedling survival and growth performances [14, 15]. Vegetation establishment on degraded lands are constrained by insufficient moisture availability as the main constraint [16-18]; as a result survival and growth of seedlings are influenced byseason [19]since the principal limiting factor controlling the growth and survival of tree seedlings is moisture.

To redress the low survival and growth performances of planted seedlings, integration of moisture harvesting structures have been practiced in dryland areas [20, 21]. Physical soil and water conservation structuressuch as micro basin, eyebrow basin, micro trench, herring bones etc.are classified as conservation structures for collecting, storing and spreading various forms of runoff from different sources used to enhance agro-forestry, forage development and forestry[22].The function of physical soil and water conservation is to protect erosion and to harvest moisture[23]. Moisture harvesting soil and water conservation structureshelp to reduce velocity of runoff and collect water behind the structures and the stored water facilitates plant growth and improves vegetation cover in dryland areas [24, 25]. However, the choice of moisture harvesting structures for best seedling survival and growth performances has not been identified through research and remain a key challenge in implementing suitable moisture harvesting structures in degraded land rehabilitation efforts [26]. Evaluating different moisture harvesting structures to enhance planted tree seedlings survival and growth performances are crucial in degraded hillsides. Therefore, an experiment was conducted aimed at evaluating different moisture harvesting structures and their pit positions on survival and growth of different multi-purpose tree seedlings in KilteAwlaelo district of Tigray region Ethiopia.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Description of the Study Area

The study area KilteAwlaelo is found in Tigray, Ethiopia (Figure 1).KilteAwlaelo is geographically located at about 45 km north of Mekelle the capital of the Tigray region at a distance of 898 km from Addis Ababa to the northern Ethiopia and found in 13^{o} 30'to 13^{o} 59' N latitude and 39^{o} 20' to 39^{o} 40' Elongitude. The experimental site is found at an elevation of 2081 ma.s.l in the Upper slope and 2021 ma.s.l in the lower slope.



Figure 1. Study area

The Agro-climate classifications of KilteAwlaelo district is characterizedas highland with an average annual temperature of 20^{o}c and the annual rain fall ranges from 350-400 mm(Figure 2).The rain fall pattern of the study area is characterized as mono-modal and start rainfall on the middle of June and lasts at early September [27].Concerning the hydrological aspects there are many seasonal rivers in the district, which flow to Tekeze River basin and Afar basin and have moderatelyhot temperature from the end of February to the end of May [28].

UNDER PEER REVIEW



Figure 2. Monthly average rainfall (mm) and temperature (^{o}c) of 27 years

2.2 Experimental Design

The experiment was conducted for three years from 2017 to 2019, in a split plotdesign with three replicationsmoisture harvesting soil and water conservationstructures was assigned as main plot and tree seedlings as subplots. Four plots of each 13 x 14 m (182 m^2area) was laid in two sites as uppersite andlowersiteat 17% slope gradient.Three moisture harvesting structures andone conventional plantation pit as control and three tree seedlings in each site were included. The seedling plantation pit positions in case of micro basin and eyebrow basin are above the structure and below the moisture harvesting structure; whereas the pits positions in the micro trench are inside the moisture harvesting structure, below the moisture harvesting structure and between the two moisture harvesting structures. The control pit is the conventional pit with no moisture harvesting structures around. The soil type of the study area is classified as Leptosols[29].

Treatment description

The treatments and treatment set up are presented in Table 1. Micro basins, micro trenches, eyebrow basins and conventional pit were used as moisture harvesting structures.The tree seedlings were*S. molle*, *Grevillea robusta*(*G.robusta*) and *Olea europaea*(*O. europaea*)planted in each plotat the starting of the rainy season in June 2017. Seedlings of 45 cm average height and 0.40 cm mean collar diameter was used. Spacing between seedlings and was dependent on the type of structure and tree seedlings.

Table 1. Description of the Treatments

Moisture harvesting SWC structures	Pit position	Tree species	Treatments
Micro basin (Mb)	**A**bove structure (As)	*G. robusta* (Gr)	MbAsGr
		S. molle(Sm)	MbAsSm
		O. europaea (Oe)	MbAsOe
	Below Structure (Bs)	*G. robusta*	MbBsGr
		S. molle	MbBsSm
		O. europaea	MbBsOe
Micro trench (Mt)	Inside structure (Is)	*G. robusta*	MtIsGr
		S. molle	MtIsSm
		O. europaea	MtIsOe
	Between structure (Bts)	*G. robusta*	MtBtsGr
		S. molle	MtBtsSm
		O. europaea	MtBtsOe
	Below structure (Bs)	*G. robusta*	MtBsGr
		S. molle	MtBsSm
		O. europaea	MtBsOe
Eyebrow basin (Eb)	Above structure (As)	*G. robusta*	EbAsGr
		S. molle	EbAsSm
		O. europaea	EbAsOe
	Below structure (Bs)	*G. robusta*	EbBsGr
		S. molle	EbBsSm
		O. europaea	EbBsOe
Conventional pit (Cp)	Inside the pit (Ip)	*G. robusta*	CpIpGr
		S. molle	CpIpSm
		O. europaea	CpIpOe

2.3 Moisture harvesting Structures

Threemoisture harvesting structures were carefully selected based on the community based participatory watershed development guideline ministry of agriculture of Ethiopia [22]. The specification and design of the structures used for evaluation in the study areaare described below:

Micro basins: Are small circular and stone-faced structures for tree seedling planting. Its dimension was 2.50 m diameter, 40 cm height, 20 cm depth at the base of the structure with 40 cm diameter and 50 cm depth of plantation pit. This is suitable for medium and slightly low rain fall areas, stony areas and shallow soils. Also applicable in steep and degraded hillsides.

Micro trenches: These were rectangular structures with 40 cm depth, 300 cm length, 40 cm width constructed along the contours. The length of the tie within the structures was 50 cm with 40 cm diameter and 50 cm depth plantation pit. This can support the growth of tree seedlings and applicable in a broad range of soils and slopes.

Eyebrow basins: Eyebrow basins are recommended on hillsides where stone is available.The height of the structure was 40 cm, diameter 250 cm and the depth or base of the structure was 30 cm with water collection area of 100 cm length x 100 cm width x 25 cm depth. The plantation pit was 40 cm diameter and 50 cm depth (Figure 3).

UNDER PEER REVIEW



Figure3.Design and constructed eyebrow basin structure

Conventional Pit: Following the contour line the normal plantation pits was constructed with a dimension of 40cm diameter and 50 cm deep. The pits were spaced at 300 cm between plants and lateral differences**.**

2.4 Tree Seedling Selection

Three tree seedling types were selected based on the local community preference and considering the indicators of ecological suitability, protection functions and socio-economic functions of the species. Based on Orwa et al., [30] the selected species have the following characteristics:

Grevillea robusta

G. robusta R. Br.is a Proteaceae family which reaches up to 30 m tall.It is a very successful Australian tree planted and widely used in dry, moist and wet mid highland and highlandagro climatic zones.

Olea europaea

*O. europaea*is from Oleaceae family with 10-15 m height. It is widely distributed in dry forest in east Africa and Ethiopia. It is best in good forest soil, but hardy and drought resistant once established, even in poor soils. The species is found in moist and wet mid highland and highlandagro climatic zones in all regions 1,400-3,100 ma.s.l.

Schinusmolle

According to Orwa et al. [30]*S. molle*is an evergreen tree with 3-15 m height and tolerates high temperatures and once established is extremely drought resistant. It is shallow rooted and can be brittle and broken by strong wind. It grows in altitude zero to 2400 ma.s.l with mean annual temperature 15-20 ^{0}C., mean annual rainfall 300-600 mm and it prefers well-drained sandy soils.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

2.5 Data Collection

Data on planted seedling survival, plant height and collar diameter were collected at the end of the rainy season for three consecutive years. However, only the third year data are used for this article.

2.6 Statistical Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using GenStat16 edition[31] software by general liner model.Statistically significant difference between and among treatment means were assessed using least significant difference (LSD) at 5% level of significance [32].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Contribution of Moisture Harvesting Structures on Seedling Survival

The planted seedling survival rate in percentdue to the moisture harvesting structures both in the upper and lower sitesare presented in Figure 4. The lower site performed higher seedling survival rate as compared to the upper site. The result showed that all moisture harvesting structures at the lower site have higher seedling survival than the upper site, but in the upper site there was even a complete loss of the seedling at the conventional pit (control).This result supports to the findings of Daws et al. [33] who reported that bottom site area showed better seedling survival on similar moisture harvesting structures of plantation than upper site. The reason they forwarded wasthat nutrient and moisture could be translocated to the bottom site, so that water and nutrient was very important for tree seedling survival.As discussed by Yu et al. [34]seedling survival was significantly increased from upper to lower along slopes. Therefore, the collected water helped the seedlings to get more moisture compared to the upper site.

Generally, the moisture harvesting structures showed highest seedling survival than the conventional pit in both the upper and lower sites. This result was in line with the findings of Eyasu et al. [21] who found seedlings planted in moisture harvesting structures survived better compared to the conventional pit. Other authors also reported almost allmoisture harvesting structures play a crucial role in conserving and storing moisture[35] and have a significant impact on seedling survival [36] on degraded lands.

UNDER PEER REVIEW



Figure 4. Average seedling survival (%) comparison in moisture harvestingstructures

3.2 Tree Survival (%) in the Area

Figure 5 shows the survival of tree seedlings both in the upper and lower sites. TheANOVA results of the seedling survivalshowed significant ($p < 0.05$) difference in both the upper and the lower sites.*S. molle*showed the highest survival rate both in the upper and the lower sites.The lower site performed higher seedling survival rate as compared to the upper site.Therefore, the best tree survived for the area was*S. molle*compared to *G.robusta*and*O. europaea*. According to the authors like Orwa et al. [30]*S.molle*survived better than*G. robusta and O. europaea* in moisture stressed areas.



Figure 5. Average seedling survival (%) comparison of tree species

3.3 Interaction Effect of Moisture Harvesting Structures and Tree Species on Seedling Survival

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Table 2 shows the survival rate of different tree species in percent due to the moisture harvesting structures both in the upper and lower sites. The tree seedling survival was highly significantly ($p < 0.01$) affected by the main effect moisture harvesting structures and tree species both in the lower and the upper sites. Survival rate was also significantly ($p<0.05$) affected by the treatments as a result of the interaction effects of small moisture harvesting structures and tree species. The interaction effect of moisture harvesting structures and tree specieswere also highly significantly ($p < 0.01$) affected in the lower site; whereas in the upper site, it wasonly significant at ($p < 0.05$). Even though,moisture harvesting structures generally helpful for seedling survival and enhance tree growth [37]; there was a specific structure for a specific tree species.The highest survival rate was recorded in*S. molle*tree species at eyebrow basin and micro basin moisture harvesting structures.This result strengthens to the findings of Derib et al. [26] who found eyebrow basin and micro basin moisture harvesting structures the best solution for dry spell mitigation and enhance the overall seedling performance. Singh, [38] also proved efficiency of moisture harvesting structures varied for the survival, growth, and productivity of seedlings.

O. europaea was totally dried in the upper site in the moisture harvesting structures and the control except in the micro trench. The reason why *O. europaea* survived in micro trenchwasdue the volume of water harvested in the micro trench ($0.48m^3$) which was wider than the other structures. However, this trench has also a side effect for seedling survival due to water logging effect for seedlings such as *S. molle*and *G. robusta*. This shows *O. europaea*wasless tolerant to moisture stress but tolerant for water logging(personal observation) compared with *S. molle*and *G. robusta*with no moisture harvesting structures.To the worst, all the three types of seedlings planted in the conventional pit total dried out in the upper site. This result strengthens to the findings by Siraj et al. [39] who found planted seedlings in moisture harvesting structures survived well; whereas seedlings planted in a conventional pit dried out after four years. Similarly, *G. robusta* and*O. europaea* dried out totally but *S. molle*survived only 8.3% in the lower site. As Abdella and Cheneke, [40] proved *G. robusta* showed the leastsurvival rate and performance as compared to *Moringaoliefera,* and*Susbaniasesban*after three years of establishment in Ethiopia.

Table 2. Moisture harvesting Structures with tree species on seedling survival (%)

MH Structures	Tree species	Treatment	Upper	Lower
Micro basin	*G. robusta*	MbGr	25.00^{c}	37.5^{c}
	S. molle	MbSm	66.67^{ab}	91.7^{a}
	O. europaea	MbOe	0.00^{d}	20.8^{de}
Micro trench	*G. robusta*	MtGr	13.89^{cd}	16.7^{de}
	S. molle	MtSm	52.78^{b}	69.4^{b}
	O. europaea	MtOe	5.56^{d}	22.2^{d}
Eyebrow basin	*G. robusta*	EbGr	25.00^{c}	37.5^{c}
	S. molle	EbSm	79.17^{a}	83.3^{ab}
	O. europaea	EbOe	0.00^{d}	20.8^{de}
Conventional pit	*G. robusta*	CpGr	0.00^{d}	0.0^{f}

UNDER PEER REVIEW

	S. molle	CpSm	0.00^{d}	8.3^{ef}
	O. europaea	CpOe	0.00^{d}	0.0^{f}
Significance (p=0.05)	MH structure (MHS)		**	**
	Tree species (Tree sps)		**	**
	MHS X Tree sps		*	**

Note: Means with the same letter across column of the treatments are not significantly different at P < 0.05, * = significant (p < 0.05), ** = highly significant (p < 0.01), MH= moisture harvesting

3.4 Effect of Pit Position of Moisture harvesting Structures on Seedling Survival (%)

The results of the survival of different tree species due to the pit position on the moisture harvesting structures both in the upper and lower sites are presented in Table 3. The interaction effect of tree species and pit position was highly significantly ($p < 0.01$) affected in seedling survival among the tree species in the different moisture harvesting structures' pit position both in the lower and the upper sites except the eyebrow basin in the lower site. Both in the micro basin and eyebrow basin moisture harvesting structures the above structure pit position of the upper site significantly ($p < 0.05$) affected in *S. molle*. Hence, *S. molle*survived better in the above and below micro basin and eyebrow basin structure's pit position.The lowest seedling survival was recorded in the convectional pit and micro trench.From this result it can be concluded that *S. molle*seedling has either the ability to absorb by its roots the moisture harvested all around the moisture harvesting structures stored by micro trench, eyebrow and micro basin structures without preferring the pit position, or it was moisture stress tolerant tree. However, in case of *G. robusta* tree seedlings, it is better to plant on the pit above the eyebrow and micro basin moisture harvesting structures both in the upper and lower sites.Tadele et al. [35] reported weak and short rooting system do not able to absorb conserved moisture far from seedling roots, they then recommended to plant long rooted seedlings to absorb the stored water.

Table 3.Average seedling survival (%) on moisture harvesting structure's pit position

Tree species	Pit position	Micro basin		Eyebrow basin	
		Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
G. robusta	Above	33.3^{b}	50.0^{b}	41.7^{c}	50.0^{bc}
	Below	16.7^{c}	25.0^{c}	8.3^{d}	25.0^{cde}
	Control	0.0^{d}	0.0^{e}	0.0^{d}	0.0^{e}
S. molle	Above	91.7^{a}	91.7^{a}	91.7^{a}	91.7^{a}
	Below	41.7^{b}	91.7^{a}	66.7^{b}	75.0^{ab}
	Control	0.0^{d}	8.3^{de}	0.0^{d}	8.3d^{e}
O. europaea	Above	0.0^{d}	25.0^{c}	0.0^{d}	33.3^{cd}
	Below	0.0^{d}	16.7^{cd}	0.0^{d}	8.3^{de}
	Control	0.0^{d}	0.0^{e}	0.0^{d}	0.0^{e}
Significanc	Pit position	**	**	**	**

Tree species	Pit position	Micro Trench	
		Upper	Lower
G. robusta	Inside	25.0^{c}	25.0^{cd}
	Between	0.0^{e}	8.3^{de}
	Below	13.3^{de}	16.7^{cde}
	Control	0.0^{e}	0.0^{e}
S. molle	Inside	66.7^{a}	83.3^{a}
	Between	50.0^{ab}	50.0^{a}
	Below	41.7^{bc}	75.0^{a}
	control	0.0^{e}	8.3^{de}
O.	Inside	0.0^{e}	25.0^{cd}

UNDER PEER REVIEW

e (p=0.05)	(Pit p)				
	Tree species (T sps)	**	**	**	**
	Pit p X T sps	**	**	**	*

europaea	Between	8.3^{de}	33.3^{bc}
	Below	8.3^{de}	8.3^{de}
	Control	0.0^{e}	0.0^{e}
Significance (p=0.05)	Pit position	**	**
	Tree sps	**	**
	Pit p X T sps	**	**

3.5 Contribution of Moisture harvesting Structures on Seedling Growth

The growth of tree seedling due to the moisture harvesting structures both in the upper and lower sites of the third year are presented in Table 4. The height and diameter increment of the seedlingsin different moisture harvesting structures in the third year were highly significantly ($p < 0.01$) affected in the upper site. Similarly, height showed significant ($p < 0.05$) difference in the lower site. However, there was no significant ($p > 0.05$) difference in diameter in the lower site. The significant differences were observed mainly between the moisture harvesting structures and the conventional pit, but there were no as such significant difference among the moisture harvesting structures in seedlings growth.

The better growth performance on the moisture harvesting structures was due to the moisture advantage collected by the water collection ditch of the moisture harvesting structure (see section 2.3). Therefore, the water collection ditch helped the seedlings to get more moisture advantage to grow better.So many authors [21, 36, and 41] proved the advantage of moisture harvesting structures on tree seedling growth. Generally, the lower site showed better height and diameter increment of seedlings compared to the upper site. It was expected that if there was no moisture stress in the area, there could have not been significant difference on the tree seedling growth. That is why the none significance differencein the lower site in case of diameter due to the presence of better moisture compared to the upper site,because of the wider catchment area to harvest the overtopped runoff from the upper site's structure.

Table 4. Height and diameter of seedlings onmoisture harvesting structures third year

Moisture harvesting structures	**Upper**		**Lower**	
	Height (cm)	Diameter (mm)	Height (cm)	Diameter (mm)
Micro Trench	28.2^{ab}	4.7^{a}	41.3^{a}	8.6
Eyebrow Basin	38.5^{a}	6.3^{a}	44.2^{a}	8.3
Micro Basin	23.0^{b}	3.9^{a}	35.2^{ab}	7.6
Conventional Pit	0.0^{c}	0.0^{b}	18.9^{b}	3.3
P_value (0.05)	**	**	*	ns
CV (%)	14.5	13.1	8.9	7.1

3.6 Interaction Effect of Moisture harvesting Structures and Tree Species on Seedling Growth

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Table 5 shows interaction effect of the differentmoisture harvesting structures and tree species on height and diameter of the different seedlings both in the upper and lower sites. The plant growth parameters such as plant height and plant diameter were significantly ($p < 0.05$) affected by the treatments as a result of the interaction effects of moisture harvesting structures and tree species (MHS X Tree sps) in the upper site. However, the interaction effect in the lower site was highlysignificantly ($p < 0.01$) affected by the treatments as a result of the interaction (MHS X Tree sps) effects of moisture harvesting structures and tree species.

In the upper site highest plant height and diameter was recorded in *S. molle*tree species at eyebrow basin moisture harvesting structure. Similarly, in the lower site*S. molle*has the highest plant height on eyebrow basin and micro trench but the highest diameter was recorded on the micro trench by *S. molle*.This is in line with the findings of Cheneke et al. [36]diameter of seedlings at breast height grown in microtrenches were significantly higher than those grown in moisture conservation structures conventional pit.Poor growth performance was observed in the conventional pit for all types of the species. The interaction of tree seedling species and moisture harvesting structures showed that those seedlings grown on moisture harvesting structures were significantly thicker and taller than those grown on the conventional pit.; especially O. europaea was totally dried in the upper site in the moisture harvesting structures and the conventional pit but *O. europaea*existed in the micro trench in the lower site. Alem et al. [42] found significant increment on diameter and height of *A. saligna*and *C. equisetifolia* on trench supported plantations.

Table 5. Interaction effect of moisture harvesting structures and tree species on plant height and diameter

WH structures X Tree species		**Upper**		**Lower**	
		height (cm)	diameter (mm)	height (cm)	diameter (mm)
Eyebrow basin	*G. robusta*	31.2^{bcd}	4.8^{bd}	27.2^{cd}	4.5^{fg}
	S. molle	65.3^{a}	11.7^{a}	66.8^{a}	11.1^{b}
	O. europaea	19.0^{def}	2.5^{de}	38.5^{bc}	9.5^{bcd}
Micro basin	*G. robusta*	26.2^{cde}	3.3^{de}	25.3^{cd}	4.2^{fg}
	S. molle	35.3^{be}	7.7^{b}	47.0^{b}	9.7^{bcd}
	O. europaea	7.5^{fg}	0.7^{e}	33.2^{bcd}	9.2^{bcde}
Micro Trench	*G. robusta*	27.7^{cd}	4.1^{d}	38.2^{bc}	5.9^{cef}
	S. molle	41.7^{b}	7.7^{bc}	64.7^{a}	15.3^{a}
	O. europaea	15.1^{efg}	2.3^{de}	20.9^{def}	4.8^{f}
Conventional pit	*G. robusta*	0.0^{g}	0.0^{e}	34.0^{bcd}	0.0^{g}
	S. molle	0.0^{g}	0.0^{e}	22.7^{cde}	10.0^{bc}
	O. europaea	0.0^{g}	0.0^{e}	0.0^{e}	0.0^{g}
Significance	WH structure	**	**	**	**

UNDER PEER REVIEW

(p=0.05)	Tree species	**	**	**	**
	WHS X Tree sps	*	*	**	**

4. CONCLUSIONS

The studyrevealed that the potential advantages of selectedmoisture harvesting (micro basin, eyebrow basin and micro trench) types of soil and water conservation structuresfor the survival and growth of different tree species (*S. molle,G. robusta andO. europaea*)in the Leptosols soil type of degraded hillslopes inKilteAwlaelodistrict in eastern Tigray hills. Based on the results of this study the following conclusions can be forwarded. The first part provided the effect of the moisture harvesting structures on survival rate and growth of tree seedlings. The second part focused on identification of the best tree species survived for the area without supporting with any moisture harvesting structures. The third point also identified the bestmoisture harvesting structure that fits with which tree species for survival and growth rate. The final result discussed on identification of the effective pit position from the water collection ditch by the structure so that the moisture will be easily accessedby the root hairs of the planted seedlings.

Accordingly, almost all the three moisture harvesting structures have a significant positive effect on survival and growth of tree seedlings compared to the conventional pit but withsome efficiency differences among the structures. The results in the upper site showed eyebrow basin > micro basin > micro trench > conventional pit; but micro basin > eyebrow basin > micro trench > conventional pit in the lower site in their order of level of efficiency in enhancing the seedlings survival and growth performance.In some cases construction materials formoisture harvesting structures and supporting seedlings with moisture may be difficult; therefore, in this case the best tree species survived for degraded areas like KilteAwlaelois*S. molle*.The results of the combined effect of moisture harvesting structures and tree seedlings showed eyebrow basin and micro basin moisture harvesting structure gave best performance on survival and growth of *S. molle* in this study.On the other hand*O. europaea* survived best in micro trench; So that it can be used as an alternative moisture harvesting structure in areas with no stones for construction of micro basin and eyebrow basin moisture harvesting structures with enough soil depth.The effective pit passion for *G. robusta* on eyebrow and micro basinwas above the moisture harvesting structure. Whereas, species like *S. molle*were selective no pit position.

Therefore, moisture stressed plantation areas like KilteAwlaelo are better to plant *S. molle,* backed either by eyebrow or micro basin. Further researches related with root length and root biomass especially in the seedling stage of *G. robusta*, *S. molle* and *O. europaea* seedlings should be done to better understand about the tree seedlings.

REFERENCES

UNDER PEER REVIEW

1. Falkenmark, M., J. Lundqvist and C. Widstrand, 1990. Coping with water scarcity–implications of biomass strategy for communities and policies. *Int. J. Water Resource. Develop*, 6: 29-43
2. Tolesa, A., Mammo, S., Bohnett, E., 2021. Effects of Soil and Water Conservation Structures on Selected Soil Physicochemical Properties: The Case of Ejersa Lafo District, Central Highlands of Ethiopia. *Applied and Environmental Soil Science.* Vol. 2021, Article ID 9910237, pp: 11https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/9910237.
3. Wani, S., Ramakrishna, T., Sreedevi, T., Long, T., Wangkahart, B., Shiferaw, P., Pathak, P. &. Sreedevi, A. V., 2005. Integrated Management of Watershed for Agricultural Diversification and Sustainable Livelihoods in Eastern and Central Africa: Lessons and Experiences from Semi - Arid South Asia,
4. Sop T., Oldeland J, Schmiedel U, Ouedraogo I, Thiombiano A., 2010. Population structure of three woody species in four ethnic domains of the Sub-Sahel of Burkina Faso. Land Degrade Dev 22(6):519–529
5. Acharya, A., Kafle, N., 2009. Land degradation issues in Nepal and its management through agroforestry. *J. Agric. Environ.*(10):115-123.
6. Yirdaw E, Tigabu M, Monge A., 2017. Rehabilitation of degraded dryland ecosystems-a review. Silva Fennica 51(1): 1-32 https://doi.org/10.14214/sf.1673
7. Mebrat, W., 2015. Natural regeneration practice in degraded high lands of Ethiopia through area enclosure. *Int. J. Environ. Prot. Policy3*:120–123.
8. Bisaro, A., Kirk, M., Zdruli, P., Zimmermann, W., 2014. Global drivers setting desertification research priorities: Insights from a stakeholder consultation forum. *Land Degrad. Dev.25*: 5–16.
9. Aronson, j., Shivcharn D., & Edouard L., 1999. Dryland Restoration and Rehabilitation, Arid Soil Research and Rehabilitation, 13(4):315-317, https://doi.org/10.1080/089030699263203
10. Darghouth S, Ward C, Gambarelli G,Styger E, Roux J., 2008. Watershed managementapproaches, policies, and operations:Lessons for Scaling Up.
11. Ephraim, C., 2011. Integrated Watershed Management for Minimizing Land Degradation and Enhancing Livelihoods of Resource Poor Farmers a Case of Pungwe River Watershed, Zimbabwe, 13 (8): *ISSN: 1520-5509*
12. Founoune H., Duponnois, R., Ba, A., Bouami F., 2002. Influence of the dual arbuscular endomycorrhizal/ectomycorrhizal symbiosis on the growth of *Acacia holosericea (A. Cunn. Ex G. Don)* in glasshouse conditions. Annals of Forest Sciences 59: 93-98.
13. Gebirehiwot, H., 2023. Review on factors affecting early survival of tree / shrub seedlings and its remedy in restoration sites of Ethiopia. Issue 1. DOI: 10.2478/jlecol-2023-0007
14. Piemontese, L., Castelli, G., Fetzer, I., Barron, J., Liniger, H., Harari, N., Bresci, E., & Jaramillo, F., 2020. Estimating the global potential of water harvesting from successful
UNDER PEER REVIEW

case studies. *Global Environmental Change*, *63* (August 2019), 102121. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.gloenvcha.2020.102121.

15. Sinore, T., Doboch, D., 2021. Effects of Soil and Water Conservation at Different Landscape Positions on Soil Properties and Farmers' Perception in Hobicheka Sub-Watershed, Southern Ethiopia. *Applied and Environmental Soil Science.* Vol. 2021, Article ID 9295650, pp: 12 https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/9295650
16. Tognetti R, Johnson JD, Michelozzi M., 1995. The response of European beech (Fagus sylvatica L.) seedlings from two Italian populations to drought and recovery. Trees 9: 348-354.
17. Evans, J., 1996. Plantation forestry in the tropics (2nd Ed.). Oxford science publications. Clarendan press, Oxford.
18. Li WQ, Liu XJ, Khan MA, Gul B., 2008. Relationship between soil characteristics and halophytic vegetation in coastal region of North China. Pak. J. Bot. 40(3):1081 -1090.
19. Bharali, S., Paul, A., Latif Khan, M., & Bihari Singha, L., 2012. Survival and Growth of Seedlings of Two Rhododendron Tree Species along an Altitudinal Gradient in a Temperate Broad Leaved Forest of Arunachal Pradesh, India. *International Journal of Plant Research*, 2(1):39–46. https://doi.org/10.5923/j.plant.20120201.06
20. Suleman S, Wood M., Shah B., Murray L., 1995. Rainwater harvesting for increasing livestock forage on arid rangelands of Pakistan. *J. Range Manag*. pp. 523-527.
21. Eyasu, G., Tassew T., & Gidey, A., 2019. Effect of Different Moisture Harvesting Techniques on Seedling Survivals and Growth of Trees in Degraded Lands of Southern Tigray. *Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry, 4(1):1-10,*
22. Lakew D, Carucci V, Asrat W, Yitayew A., 2005. Community based participatory watershed development: A guideline. Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, (Eds). Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
23. Daniel, B., Diribu. J., Berhanu. F., 2001. Soil and water conservation manual/guideline for Ethiopia, Addis Ababa Ethiopia.
24. Singh G, Rani A, Bala N, Shukla S, Baloch S, Limba N., 2010. Resource availability through rainwater harvesting influenced vegetation diversity and herbage yield in hillslope of Aravalli in India. Front. Agric. China 4(2):145-158.
25. IFAD, 2022. Water harvesting systems for smallholder producers Tips for selection and design. Working paper. ISBN 978-92-9266-185-4
26. Derib, S., Assefa, T., Berhanu, B Zeleke, G., 2009. Impacts of micro-basin water harvesting structures in improving vegetative cover in degraded hillslope areas of north-east Ethiopia. *The Rangeland Journal,* (31):259–265. DOI: 10.1071/RJ09012
27. MoARD, 2000. Traditional agro- climatic zones and their physical characteristics.
28. WOoARD, 2017. Wereda Office of Agriculture and Rural Development annual report (unpublished documents).

UNDER PEER REVIEW

29. IUSS Working Group WRB. 2015. World Reference Base for Soil Resources 2014, update 2015 International soil classification system for naming soils and creating legends for soil maps. World Soil Resources Reports No. 106. FAO, Rome.
30. Orwa, C., Mutua, A., Kindt, R., Jamnadass, R. and Anthony, S., 2009. Agroforestry Database: A Tree Reference and Selection Guide Version 4.0. World Agroforestry Centre, Kenya.
31. VSN International, 2013. Installation database window installer package, GenStat16 edition
32. Gomez, and Gomez, H., 1984. Statistical analysis for agricultural research..John Willy and Sons Inc, 120-155
33. Daws, M., Mullins, C., Burslem, D., Paton, S., Dalling, J., 2002. Topographic position affects the water regime in a semi-deciduous tropical forest in Panama. Plant soil *238*(1):79-89.
34. Yu F, Wang D., Shi X., Yi X., Huang Q., Hu Y., 2013. Effects of environmental factors on tree seedling regeneration in a pine-oak mixed forest in the Qinling Mountains, China. *J. Mountain Sci.* 10(5): 845-853
35. Tadele, D., Moges, A., Dananto, M., 2018. Impact evaluation on survival of tree seedling using selected in situ rainwater harvesting methods in Gerduba Watershed, Borana Zone, Ethiopia. April (10): 43-51
36. Cheneke, B., Abdella, M., Elema, R., 2021. Performance Evaluation of Multipurpose Tree Species Integrated with Moisture Conservation Structures on Degraded Area Closure at Babille District, Ethiopia. *Journal of Water Resources and Ocean Science*. 10(1): 1-8. doi: 10.11648/j.wros.20211001.11
37. Ludwig, J., Wilcox, B., Breshears, D., Tongway, D., Imeson, A., 2005. Vegetation patches and runofferosion as interacting ecohydrological processes in semiarid landscapes. *Ecology* 86:288–297.
38. Singh, S., 2012. Enhancing growth and biomass production of plantation and associated vegetation through rainwater harvesting in degraded hills in southern Rajasthan, India. *New forests* 43: 349–364, doi: 10.1007/s11056-011-9285-5
39. Siraj, K., Sisay, T., Desta, N., Feyisa, S., Hayleyesus, A., Tadessa, N., &Bultu, K., 2021. Evaluation of selected multipurpose tree species and moisture conservation structures for degraded dryland rehabilitation in Dugda Dawa District, Southern Ethiopia. *Journal of Horticulture and Forestry*, *13*(2): 58–68. https://doi.org/10.5897/jhf2021.0670
40. Abdella, M., Cheneke, B., 2020. Adaptation and Growth Performance of Multipurpose Tree Species under Erer Dodota condition, Harari Region, Ethiopia. *Int J Environ Sci Nat Res* 24(1): DOI:10.19080/IJESNR.2020.23.556130
41. Mohammed, S., and Mohamed, A., 2016. Impact of Water Harvesting Techniques on Growth of Some Indigenous Tree Species in Jebel Awlia Locality, Sudan. 16(3):2249-4626.
UNDER PEER REVIEW

42. Alem, S., Nemec, P., Habrov, H., 2020. Effects of a Trench as a Moisture Harvesting Structure on the Biomass Production and Growth of Trees Planted to Restore Degraded Land , Southern Ethiopia. *Appl. Sci. 10*, 8560; doi: 10.3390/app10238560

UNDER PEER REVIEW