

1 **Effects of Biogas Slurry on Fruit Economic Traits and Soil Nutrients**
2
 of *Camellia oleifera* Abel

3 **Short title: Effects of Biogas Slurry on *C. oleifera* Abel**

4 Lu You, Shuqin Yu, Huiyun Liu, Chutian Wang, Zengliang Zhou, Ling Zhang, Dongnan Hu*

5 College of Forestry, Jiangxi Agricultural University, Nanchang, Jiangxi 330045, China

6 Author's Emails:

7 Lu You:1131463207@qq.com

8 Shuqin Yu:717135517@qq.com

9 HuiyunLiu:853971245@qq.com

10 Chutian Wang:344601541@qq.com

11 Zengliang Zhou:850933252@qq.com

12 Ling Zhang: lingzhang09@126.com

13 Dongnan Hu:dnhu98@163.com

14 *Corresponding author, E-mail: dnhu98@163.com

15

16 **Abstract**

17 Soil nutrients play a principal role in *Camellia oleifera* Abel (oil-seed camellia) production. *Camellia*
18 *oleifera* absorbs nutrients from surrounding soils and its production is highly influenced by nutrients or
19 fertilization. In this study, we investigated the effects of biogas slurry applications on soil nutrients and
20 economic traits of *C. oleifera* fruits. Five different amounts of fertilizing biogas slurry (0, 10, 20, 30, or
21 40 kg/plant/year from three applications per year) were applied to *C. oleifera* plants in 2015 and 2016.
22 Rhizosphere soil nutrients and *C. oleifera* fruit economic traits (yield, seed rate, and oil yield) were
23 measured. Fertilization with biogas slurry increased soil organic matter, available nitrogen (N),
24 phosphorus (P), and potassium (K) in both 2015 and 2016. Increases in soil available N, P, and K were
25 largest at the highest slurry application rate and second largest at the second highest application rate.
26 Fruit economic traits were maximized at the two highest application rates. Oil yield was correlated
27 with soil available P in 2015 and 2016, and soil organic matter in 2015. Fertilization with biogas slurry
28 decreased saturated fatty acid content in fruit but had no effect on unsaturated fatty acid content. In
29 conclusion, fertilization with biogas slurry increases rhizosphere soil nutrients and fruit economic traits
30 of *C. oleifera* with the rates of at least 30 kg/plant/year having the most positive effects.

31 **Keywords:** *Camellia oleifera* Abel, biogas slurry, soil nutrients, fruit economic traits, fertilization

32

33 **Introduction**

34 Biogas slurry is the secondary product of the anaerobic digestion process, and is also a widely used
35 fertilizer in agricultural production. Biogas slurry is not only an environmentally friendly organic
36 fertilizer, but it is also an efficient utilization of waste materials. In recent years in China, livestock
37 wastes, such as feces and urine, have become a serious problem and create extensive environmental
38 pollution [1], while anaerobic digestion is one of the effective solutions. The main product of anaerobic
39 digestion is biogas which is an important and clean energy source. Meanwhile, the by-product, biogas
40 slurry is also an environmentally friendly organic fertilizer that can be used in agricultural production
41 [2-3]. Nowadays, the use of biogas slurry in agricultural production has drastically increased in China
42 and many other Asian countries, not only because of the high cost of chemical fertilizers, but also for
43 the high nutrients in biogas slurry [4-5]. It was reported that more than 450 million tons of biogas
44 slurry have been used in China each year [6]. Biogas slurry has dual effects in plant production. One is
45 as a bio fertilizer with plentiful nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), potassium (K), and other trace
46 elements, and the other is as a biological pesticide due to high levels of amino acids, growth hormones,
47 and antibiotics that promote plant growth [7-8]. Dry slurry was reported to contain <0.5% nitrogen,
48 while the wet slurry contained 1.6% nitrogen as readily available nutrients. Because of the fermentation,
49 ammonium ion (NH_4^+) content and pH of the biogas slurry increased, while the concentration of carbon
50 (C) from the dry matter reduced, and the C/N ratio also decreased [9-10]. Furthermore, biogas slurry
51 supplies more plant-readily available N than other fertilizers [11]. The available forms of nitrogen are
52 inorganic, including nitrate (NO_3) and ammonium (NH_4) and simple structured organic partly from the
53 degradation of organic matter. The available nitrogen can directly be absorbed by plants.

54 *Camellia oleifera* C. Abel is an unusual oil shrub native to China that is distributed in 18
55 provinces/cities and more than 1,000 districts in China. It is reported that the planting area in China is
56 over 5,000 acres, yielding about 200,000 tons of oil per year [12]. Camellia oil is a high quality edible
57 oil, also named tea-oil, characterized by abundant unsaturated fatty acids, e.g., oleic acid and linoleic
58 acid [13-14]. There is a long tradition of consuming tea-oil in China, especially in South China. In
59 recent years, the planted area of *C. oleifera* is enlarging as demand for tea-oil is increasing [15]. The
60 key factor that determines the yield of *C. oleifera* is fertilizer application [16]. Traditional cultivation
61 methods depend on chemical fertilizers, farm insecticides and chemical growth hormones which could
62 lead to soil acidification, hardening, nutrient imbalances, and regression that results in reduction of

63 production [17-19].

64 The effects of slurry and other organic manures on plants and crops have been shown[20]. Liquid
65 fermented biogas slurry, from the outlet of the biogas digester can be readily used and applied directly
66 to crops, vegetables, fodder grass and many other plants [21-23].However, knowledge about the effects
67 of biogas slurry on *C. oleifera* is limited. The potential benefits of biogas slurry to *C. oleifera* and its
68 application at different amounts need to be tested. In this study, we investigated the effects of biogas
69 slurry applications on the soil nutrients and the fruit yield of *C. oleifera* to assess whether the usage of
70 biogas slurry could substitute partly or wholly for chemical fertilizers.

71

72 **Materials and methods**

73 **Materials.** This study was conducted in a *C. oleifera* plantation in Wannian, Jiangxi province in China
74 from 2015 to 2016. The area has a typical warm and humid subtropical monsoon climate with an
75 annual mean temperature of 17.4°C, an annual rainfall of 1808 mm, and an annual relative humidity of
76 82%. The annual mean frost-free days are 259 d in the experimental area. The *C. oleifera* trees were
77 planted in the red clay soil on the sunny hilly land with gradient less than 20%. The plantation in this
78 study was seven years old, the row spacing was 3 by 3 m, and trees were 2-3 m high. The biogas slurry
79 was prepared from pig farmyard manure using a farm biogas digester with a 200 m³ capacity. The
80 biogas slurry was moderately alkaline, low in dry matter and ammonium.

81 **Experiment design.** The experiment was carried out using a randomized block design with five
82 treatments: (1) no biogas slurry [group B₀]; (2) 10 kg of biogas slurry/plant/year [group B₁]; (3) 20 kg
83 of biogas slurry/plant/year [group B₂]; (4) 30 kg of biogas slurry/plant/year [group B₃]; (5) 40 kg of
84 biogas slurry/plant/year [group B₄]. All of the five treatments were not fertilized by any chemical
85 fertilizers. The biogas slurry was fertilized by the furrow method into the drip line of trees, divided into
86 three times a year in March, June and September. Each treatment was carried out with three plots with
87 5 replicate plants in each plot.

88 **Detection methods.** Mixed soil samples were collected from 0-20 cm and 20-40 cm rhizosphere soil
89 immediately after fruit harvest. The concentrations of available N, P, K and organic matter were
90 detected by using the methods of diffusion and absorption titration, NH₄F-HCl extraction and
91 molybdenum blue colorimetric, neutral NH₄OAC extraction and flame photometric, and K₂Cr₂O₇-
92 H₂SO₄ and FeSO₄ titration. Fruits of each experimental *C. oleifera* were harvested in October 2015 and

93 2016 and the weight of fresh fruit was measured. Because *C. oliefera* yield goes up and down each year
94 [24-25], we calculated the production trait indices by using the average statistics of 2015 and 2016.
95 Moisture rate of fresh seed= (fresh seed weight-dry seed weight)/fresh seed weight×100%, fresh seed
96 rate = (fresh seed weight/fresh fruit weight) × 100%, dry seed rate = (dry seed weight/fresh fruit weight)
97 × 100%, oil rate of kernel = (fat weight/kernel weight) ×100%, oil rate of fresh fruit = oil rate of
98 kernel×dry seed rate×100%. Fatty acids in fresh fruit weremeasured according to the GB-5009,168-
99 2016 method, by ShimadzuGC-2010 Plusgas chromatograph [26-27].

100 **Statistical analyses.** The concentrations of organic matter, available N, P, and K between 2015 and
101 2016 were statisticallyanalyzed for significance by ANOVA by SPSS 19.0and means were compared
102 by LSD (least significant difference) tests at $p<0.05$. The effects of biogas slurry on soil nutrients
103 (organic matter, available N, P, and K) and yield were tested by correlation analysis.

104

105 **Results**

106 **Effects of biogas slurry on organic matter in rhizosphere soil.** Application of biogas slurry
107 significantly increased the organic matter concentration of soils (Fig. 1A). In the first experimental year
108 (2015), concentrations of soil organic matter raised as the dose of biogas slurry increased. Compared to
109 the control group B₀, the organic matter concentration of B₁, B₂, B₃, and B₄ groups increased by 32.2%
110 ($p<0.05$), 55.8% ($p<0.01$), 70.9% ($p<0.01$), and 72.6% ($p<0.01$), respectively. Multiple comparison
111 revealed no significant differences among treatments B₂, B₃ and B₄. In the second experimental year
112 (2016), the pattern was similar to that in 2015. All biogas slurry application rates increased organic
113 matter compared the control group with the treatments B₃ and B₄having higher enhancement rates than
114 those in 2015, with increments of 142.28% and 137.56%, respectively.

115 **Effects of biogas slurry on available nitrogen in rhizosphere soil.** Fertilizing with biogas slurry
116 increased soil available nitrogen both in the first ($P_{2015}=0.009<0.01$) and second ($P_{2016}\approx 0.00<0.01$)
117 experimental years (Fig. 1B). Treatment B₄, the highest biogas slurry dose used, caused the highest
118 increment of available nitrogen in both 2015 (249.07%) and 2016 (499.2%), when compared to that in
119 the control groups. Soil available nitrogen decreased from 2015 to 2016 in the no slurry addition control
120 group. The lower application rates of slurry (B₁, B₂) had similar levels of soil available N in the two
121 experimental years but at the second highest slurry addition rate (B₃), soil available nitrogen continued

122 to increase in the second year.

123 **Effects of biogas slurry on available phosphorus in rhizosphere soil.** All four biogas slurry
124 fertilized groups had higher concentrations of available phosphorus in 2016 than in 2015 (Fig. 1C). But,
125 the control group had lower available phosphorus concentrations in 2016 than in 2015. In 2015, the four
126 fertilized groups (B₁, B₂, B₃, B₄) had increments of 151.81%, 139.97%, 119.96%, and 135.82% of
127 available P, respectively, compared to the control group. Multiple comparisons revealed no significant
128 difference among the four fertilized groups in 2015. In 2016, compared to the control group, the
129 enhancement of available phosphorus was larger with greater slurry addition rates (B₁, B₂, B₃, B₄) with
130 increments of 161.95%, 188.88%, 210.10%, and 255.05%, respectively.

131 **Effects of biogas slurry on available potassium in rhizosphere soil.** Available potassium decreased
132 from the first to the second year in the control and lowest slurry addition (B₁) treatments (Fig. 1D). In
133 2015, available K in soils increased as the amount of biogas slurry application increased especially for
134 treatments B₃ and B₄ (43.46% and 49.68%, respectively). In 2016, treatments B₃ and B₄ still showed
135 significant enhancements of 117.07% (p<0.01) and 132.52% (p<0.01), respectively.

136 **Effects of biogas slurry on fruit yield and main economic traits of *C. oleifera*.** The average oil yield
137 of *C. oleifera* in 2015 and 2016 showed a highest enhancement when fertilized with at least 30 kg
138 biogas slurry per plant each year (Table 2). There was a trend of increasing yield as the amount of
139 biogas slurry increased. Regarding to the main economic traits of *C. oleifera*, the fresh seeds from
140 treatments B₀ and B₁ contained highest moisture ratios, while the lowest oil yield. Compared to the
141 control treatment B₀, the oil yield of treatments B₃ and B₄ increased in 105% and 95%, respectively.

142 **Effects of biogas slurry on fatty acids of *C. oleifera* oil.** Saturated fatty acids were mainly palmitic
143 acid and stearic acid, accounting for about 10% of the fatty acid content (Table 3). The content of
144 palmitic acid in the control B₀ was the highest with all slurry application rates lowering the amounts.
145 The effect of biogas slurry treatment on stearic acid was close to the significant level (P=0.07).
146 Fertilizing with biogas slurry did not affect the unsaturated fatty acid content in fruit (Table
147 3). Correlations among saturated and unsaturated fatty acids showed that oleic acid was negatively
148 correlated with palmitic and linoleic acids, and linoleic acid was positively correlated with α -
149 linolenic acid (Table 4).

150 **Correlations among soil nutrients and fruit economic traits.** The oil rates of fresh fruit were
151 positively correlated with soil nutrients in 2015 (N, P, K) and 2016 (organic matter; Table 5). Oil

152 ratesof kernels were positively correlated with N, P, K, and organic matter in both years (Table 5). Oil
153 yield was positively correlated with the concentration of available P in both 2015 and 2016, and
154 positively correlated with organic matter in 2015.

155

156 **Discussion**

157 *Camellia oleifera* is a woody tree species endemic in China, and one of the important economic tree
158 species. Oil from seeds is known to benefit health and is commonly eaten in China. Becauseflowers
159 and fruits of *C. oleifera* grow throughout the year, and mature at the same time, fertilizers must be
160 added to achieve high yields, especially of fruit and oil [28]. It is reported that P, N, K, Ca and Mg are
161 the primary soil nutrientslimiting *C. oleifera* yield [29].In conventional planting, chemical fertilizers
162 are mainly used. But thelong-term useof chemical fertilizers hascaused land retirement, nutrient deficits
163 and sealing of soil, which reduces yield [30]. To address this, new culture techniques and fertilizers
164 should be developed and used in *C. oleifera* production. In this study, we used a new fertilizer, biogas
165 slurry, in *C. oleifera* plantations, and investigated the response of nutrients in rhizosphere soil and the
166 yields of*C. oleifera*.

167 Biogas slurry is a by-product of anaerobic fermentation, which plays a central role in the efforts to
168 improve the utilization of animal manure and reduce the influence of animal excretion on surrounding
169 environments [31-32]. During manuredigestion, about half of the carbon is released as methane and
170 carbon dioxide (biogas), and part of the organic nitrogen is released as ammonium [33]. Ammonium is
171 directly available to crops when it is appliedto fields. Furthermore, biogas slurry contains abundant
172 available nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium, which are important nutrients for plants. It is reported
173 that the supply of nitrogen from the digested slurry had a direct influence on the yield in the growing
174 season, while the supply of phosphorus and potassium can be seen in the next year or several years [34].
175 So, we set a two-year experimental period to investigate the effects of biogas slurry on available N, P,
176 and K of soils and the yield of *C. oleifera* in this study. During the two-year observation, we found the
177 fertilization of biogas slurry has positive effects on the increment of available N, P, K of soils, and also
178 improves the fruit and oil yield of *C. oleifera*. From the results in this study, we consider biogas slurry
179 an effective substitute for chemical fertilizer in *C. oleifera* production.

180 Biogas slurry has abundant mineral elements and organic matter that can be released slowly. These
181 characters of biogas slurry may positively affect soil fertility indices, e.g., organic matter, available N,

182 P, and K over years [35]. A previous study evaluated the utilization ratio of NH₄-N in biogas slurry,
183 and found that more than 90% of the applied NH₄-N could be used, which indicated an immediate
184 increase in amount of the soil NH₄-N [9]. Friedel *et al.* measured a 37% increase in inorganic N during
185 the incubation of farmyard manure-derived biogas slurry in soil for 60 days [36]. Similarly, we
186 observed a sharp enhancement of available N in soils fertilized with as little as 10 kg of biogas slurry
187 per plant in 2015. The amounts of N supplied from some levels of biogas slurry application in this
188 study were more than *C. oleifera* demand, so available N accumulation was observed in 2016 (Fig. 1B).
189 Positive effects on available P and K after biogas slurry application were in accordance with that on
190 available N, but with different increasing degrees. Available P is one of the main ecological factors
191 limiting the increase of *C. oleifera* yield. Jun Yuan *et al.* studied responses to low P and found that *C.*
192 *oleifera* roots secreted organic acids when the soil P is low and led to a utilization of soluble
193 phosphates [37]. So, we just observed a slight but not sharp decrease of soil available P in the control
194 group in 2016. Studies from Kashem *et al.* [38] demonstrated that alkaline pH could promote the
195 availability of phosphorus in soils. It is likely that alkaline biogas slurry increased pH and, in turn, the
196 availability of P in soils. The slow-release of nutrients in biogas slurry could contribute to the
197 accumulation of organic matter, available N, P, and K in the second experimental year. We predict a
198 larger promotion of nutrients in rhizosphere soil and yield of *C. oleifera* with long-term biogas slurry
199 application.

200

201 **Conclusions**

202 We studied the effects of biogas slurry on nutrients in rhizosphere soil and fruit economic traits of *C.*
203 *oleifera*. We found that the use of biogas slurry could significantly enhance the concentration of
204 available N, P, and K in soils, and significantly improve the yield of *C. oleifera*. In the first year, soils
205 had higher concentrations of N, P, and K after treatment with biogas slurry and these enhancements
206 were larger in the second year. Fertilized yield of *C. oleifera* oil also increased in the two experimental
207 years, especially with higher application rates. Yield of oil also showed association to the increasing
208 discipline of soil available N, P, and K in rhizosphere soils. Addition rates of at least 30 kg/plant/year
209 (treatments B₃ and B₄) had the highest yield of fresh fruit, fresh seed rate, and dry seed rate, and
210 resulted in a higher oil yield per plant. Because amounts beyond 30 kg biogas slurry per plant had no
211 additional benefit to yield, so 30 kg biogas slurry per plant is likely the optimal rate of addition. We

212 concludethatbiogas slurry has plays an important role in the production increasing of *C. oleifera*, and
213 might be an effective substitution of chemical fertilizer in *C. oleifera* production.

214

215 **Acknowledgements** This study was financially supported by National Natural ScienceFoundation
216 of China (grant number: 31560218, 41501317). The authors have no conflicts on this study and
217 manuscript, and also appreciate Dr. Deping Song's and Dr. Evan Siemann's help inrevising the
218 manuscript.

219

220 **Author Contributions**

221 **Conceptualization:** Dongnan Hu

222 **Data curation:** Lu You, Huiyun Liu, Shuqin Yu

223 **Investigation:** Lu You, Chutian Wang, Zengliang Zhou

224 **Writing-original draft:** Lu You, Huiyun Liu, Ling Zhang

225 **Writing-review & editing:** Dongnan Hu, Lu You

226

227 **References**

- 228 1. Zhang C, Su H, Baeyens J, Tan T (2014) Reviewing the anaerobic digestion of food waste for
229 biogas production. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*. 38: 383-392.
- 230 2. D'Imporzano G, Pilu R, Corno L, Adani F (2018) *Arundodonax* L. can substitute traditional energy
231 crops for more efficient, environmentally-friendly production of biogas: A Life Cycle Assessment
232 approach. *Bioresource Technology* 267: 249-256.
- 233 3. Holm-Nielsen JB, Al Seadi T, Oleskowicz-Popiel P (2009) The future of anaerobic digestion and
234 biogas utilization. *Bioresource Technology* 100(22): 5478-5484.
- 235 4. Surendra KC, Takara D, Hashimoto AG, Khanal SK (2014) Biogas as a sustainable energy source
236 for developing countries: Opportunities and challenges. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy
237 Reviews* 31: 846-859.
- 238 5. Li JS, Duan N, Guo S, Shao L, Lin C, Wang JH, Hou J, Hou Y, Meng J, Han MY (2012)
239 Renewable resource for agricultural ecosystem in China: Ecological benefit for biogas by-product
240 for planting. *Ecological Informatics* 12: 101-110.
- 241 6. Mao C, Feng Y, Wang X, Ren G (2015) Review on research achievements of biogas from anaerobic
242 digestion. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 45: 540-555.
- 243 7. Banik S, Nandi R (2004) Effect of supplementation of rice straw with biogas residual slurry manure
244 on the yield, protein and mineral contents of oyster mushroom. *Industrial Crops and Products*
245 20(3): 311-319.

- 246 8. Insam H, Gómez-Brandón M, Ascher J (2015) Manure-based biogas fermentation residues –
247 Friend or foe of soil fertility? *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 84: 1-14.
- 248 9. Terhoeven-Urselmans T, Scheller E, Raubuch M, Ludwig B, Joergensen RG (2009) CO₂ evolution
249 and N mineralization after biogas slurry application in the field and its yield effects on spring
250 barley. *Applied Soil Ecology* 42(3): 297-302.
- 251 10. Hansen MN, Henriksen K, Sommer SG (2006) Observations of production and emission of
252 greenhouse gases and ammonia during storage of solids separated from pig slurry: Effects of
253 covering. *Atmospheric Environment* 40(22): 4172-4181.
- 254 11. Möller K, Müller T (2012) Effects of anaerobic digestion on digestate nutrient availability and crop
255 growth: A review. *Engineering in Life Sciences* 12(3): 242-257.
- 256 12. Liang HY, Hao BQ, Chen GC, Ye H, Ma J (2017) *Camellia* as an Oilseed Crop. *HortScience* 52(4):
257 488-497.
- 258 13. Ma J L, Ye H, RuiY K, Chen GC, Zhang N (2011) Fatty acid composition of *Camellia oleifera* oil.
259 *Journal für Verbraucherschutz und Lebensmittelsicherheit* 6(1): 9-12.
- 260 14. Zhu XY, Lin HM, Chen X, Xie J, Wang P (2011) Mechanochemical-Assisted Extraction and
261 Antioxidant Activities of Kaempferol Glycosides from *Camellia oleifera* Abel. *Meal*. *Journal of*
262 *Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 59(8): 3986-3993.
- 263 15. Wang XN, Chen YZ, WU LQ, LIU RK, Yang XH, Wang R, Yang KW (2008) Oil Content and
264 Fatty Acid Composition of *Camellia oleifera* Seed. *Journal of Central South University of*
265 *Forestry & Technology* 28(3): 11-17.
- 266 16. Chen YZ, PengSF, Wang XN (2007) Study of high yield cultivation technologies of oil-Tea
267 *Camellia(Camellia oleifera)*——Formulate Fertilization. *Forest research* 20(5): 650-655.
- 268 17. Carvalho FP (2006) Agriculture, pesticides, food security and food safety. *Environmental Science*
269 *& Policy* 9(7-8): 685-692.
- 270 18. Watts DB, Torbert HA, Prior SA, Huluka G (2010) Long-term tillage and poultry litter impacts soil
271 carbon and nitrogen mineralization and fertility. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 74(4):
272 1239-1247.
- 273 19. Matson PA, Parton WJ, Power AG, Swift MJ (1997) Agricultural intensification and ecosystem
274 properties. *Science* 277(5325): 504-509.
- 275 20. Edmeades DC (2003) The long-term effects of manures and fertilisers on soil productivity and
276 quality: a review. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* 66(2): 165-180.
- 277 21. Hernández T, Chocano C, Moreno J, García C (2016) Use of compost as an alternative to
278 conventional inorganic fertilizers in intensive lettuce (*Lactuca sativa* L.) crops—Effects on soil
279 and plant. *Soil and Tillage Research* 160: 14-22.
- 280 22. Al Seadi T, Drosch B, Fuchs W, Rutz D, Janssen R (2013) 12 - Biogas digestate quality and
281 utilization. *The Biogas Handbook: Woodhead Publishing*. pp. 267-301.
- 282 23. Bond T, Templeton MR (2011) History and future of domestic biogas plants in the developing
283 world. *Energy for Sustainable Development* 15(4): 347-354.
- 284 24. Chen Y (2007) Physiochemical properties and bioactivities of tea seed (*Camellia oleifera*) oil.
285 *Dissertations & Theses*

- 286 25. Liao T, Yuan DY, Zou F, Gao C, Yang Y, Zhang L, Tan XF (2014) Self-Sterility in *Camellia*
287 *oleiferamay* Be Due to the Prezygotic Late-Acting Self-Incompatibility. Plos One 9(6): e99639.
288 26. Su MH, Shih MC, Lin KH (2014) Chemical composition of seed oils in native Taiwanese *Camellia*
289 species. Food Chemistry 156: 369-373.
290 27. Tan C, Ghazali HM, Kuntom A, Tan C, Ariffin AA (2009) Extraction and physicochemical
291 properties of low free fatty acid crude palm oil. Food Chemistry 113(2): 645-650.
292 28. Vela P, Salinero C, Sainz MJ (2013) Phenological growth stages of *Camellia japonica*. Annals of
293 Applied Biology 162(2): 182-190.
294 29. He G, Zhang J, Hu X, Wu J (2011) Effect of aluminum toxicity and phosphorus deficiency on the
295 growth and photosynthesis of oil tea (*Camellia oleifera* Abel.) seedlings in acidic red soils.
296 ActaPhysiologiaePlantarum 33(4): 1285-1292.
297 30. Fan T, Stewart BA, Yong W, Junjie L, Guangye Z (2005) Long-term fertilization effects on grain
298 yield, water-use efficiency and soil fertility in the dryland of Loess Plateau in China. Agriculture,
299 Ecosystems & Environment 106(4): 313-329.
300 31. Rehl T, Lansche J, Müller J (2012) Life cycle assessment of energy generation from biogas—
301 Attributional vs. consequential approach. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 16(6):
302 3766-3775.
303 32. Hu Y, Cheng H, Tao S (2017) Environmental and human health challenges of industrial livestock
304 and poultry farming in China and their mitigation. Environment International 107: 111-130.
305 33. Maqbool S, Ul Hassan A, JavedAkhtar M, Tahir M (2014) Integrated use of biogas slurry and
306 chemical fertilizer to improve growth and yield of okra. Science Letters 2(1):56-59 .
307 34. Liu E, Yan C, Mei X, He W, Bing SH, Ding L, Liu Q, Liu S, Fan T (2010) Long-term effect of
308 chemical fertilizer, straw, and manure on soil chemical and biological properties in northwest
309 China. Geoderma 158(3): 173-180.
310 35. Zheng X, Fan J, Xu L, Zhou J (2017) Effects of Combined Application of Biogas Slurry and
311 Chemical Fertilizer on Soil Aggregation and C/N Distribution in an Ultisol. Plos One 12(1):
312 e170491.
313 36. Friedel JK (2000) The effect of farming system on labile fractions of organic matter in Calcari -
314 Epileptic Regosols. Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science 163(1): 41-45.
315 37. YuanJ, TanX F, YuanD Y, ZhangX J, YeSC, ZhouJQ(2013) Effect of phosphates on the Growth,
316 Photosynthesis, and P Content of Oil Tea in Acidic Red Soils. Journal of Sustainable Forestry
317 32(6): 594-604.
318 38. Kashem MA, Akinremi OO, Racz GJ (2004) Extractable phosphorus in alkaline soils amended with
319 high rates of organic and inorganic phosphorus. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 84(4): 459-467.
320

321 **Figure Captions**

322 Fig.1 Effects of biogas slurry on contents of (A) organic matter, (B) available nitrogen, (C)
323 phosphorus and (D) potassium in rhizosphere soil during 2015 and 2016.

324

325 **Table 1 Experimental design (Unit: kg/plant)**

Treatments	March	June	September	Annual total
B ₁	0	0	0	0
B ₂	4	3	3	10
B ₃	8	6	6	20
B ₄	10	10	10	30
B ₅	14	13	13	40

326

327

Table 2 Effects of biogas slurry on yield and the main properties of *C. oleifera*

Treatments	Yield kg/plant	Moisture rate of fresh seed(%)	Fresh seed rate (%)	Dry seed rate (%)	Oil rate of Kernel(%)	Oil rate of fresh fruit(%)	Oil yieldkg/plant
B ₀	1.97±0.60 ^a	44.68±2.03 ^a	54.39±8.17 ^b	33.84±7.98 ^a	45.24±3.50 ^b	10.52±3.14 ^b	0.20±0.02 ^b
B ₁	2.20±1.15 ^a	44.36±2.66 ^a	59.23±14.07 ^{ab}	33.17±9.13 ^a	49.28±3.16 ^b	10.31±3.92 ^b	0.23±0.12 ^b
B ₂	2.24±0.91 ^a	40.49±0.11 ^b	66.82±15.98 ^{ab}	39.77±9.54 ^a	50.17±1.35 ^{ab}	13.35±2.84 ^{ab}	0.28±0.09 ^{ab}
B ₃	2.76±0.76 ^a	42.30±1.33 ^{ab}	85.23±24.35 ^a	45.59±9.02 ^a	48.77±2.89 ^b	14.40±1.74 ^{ab}	0.41±0.18 ^a
B ₄	2.29±0.39 ^a	42.83±2.63 ^{ab}	69.78±14.96 ^{ab}	43.44±7.18 ^a	54.83±2.08 ^a	16.72±2.88 ^a	0.39±0.17 ^a

328

329

330 **Table 3 Saturated and unsaturated fatty acids in the fruit of *C. oleifera* fertilized by different amounts of biogas slurry**

Treatments	Saturated fatty acid %		Unsaturated fatty acid %			
	Palmitic acid (C16:0)	Stearic acid (C18:0)	Oleic acid (C18:1)	Linoleic acid (C18:2)	γ -linolenic acid(C18:3)	α -linolenic acid(C18:3)
B ₀	8.713±0.235 ^a	2.127±0.170 ^a	79.743±1.25 ^a	7.416±1.170 ^a	0.005±0.001 ^a	0.277±0.007 ^{ab}
B ₁	7.925±0.337 ^b	1.927±0.152 ^{ab}	78.695±0.574 ^a	7.804±0.485 ^a	0.007±0.001 ^a	0.252±0.017 ^b
B ₂	7.927±0.427 ^b	2.034±0.057 ^{ab}	79.620±0.984 ^a	7.286±0.284 ^a	0.005±0.002 ^a	0.260±0.013 ^{ab}
B ₃	8.009±0.436 ^b	1.820±0.059 ^b	79.674±1.629 ^a	7.695±1.308 ^a	0.004±0.002 ^a	0.301±0.033 ^a
B ₄	7.982±0.138 ^b	2.032±0.277 ^{ab}	80.616±0.485 ^a	6.533±0.511 ^a	0.005±0.000 ^a	0.241±0.031 ^b

331
332

333

Table 4 Correlations among saturated and unsaturated fatty acids

Fattyacid	Correlation (significance: p-value)					
	Palmiticacid(C16:0)	Stearic acid(C18:0)	Oleic acid(C18:1)	Linoleic acid(C18:2)	γ - linolenic acid(C18:3)	α -linolenic acid(C18:3)
Palmiticacid(c16:0)	1					
Stearic acid(C18:0)	-0.359(0.189)	1				
Oleic acid(C18:1)	-0.628*(0.012)	0.273(0.325)	1			
Linoleic acid(C18:2)	0.441(0.099)	-0.271(0.328)	-.0924**(0.000)	1		
γ - linolenic acid(C18:3)	0.192(0.493)	-0.261(0.347)	-0.211(0.451)	0.083(0.769)	1	
α -linolenic acid(C18:3)	-0.174(0.535)	-0.132(0.639)	-0.375(0.168)	0.567*(0.027)	0.036(0.898)	1

334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345

346 **Table 5 Correlation of oil yield components and soil nutrients**

Nutrients of soil	Year	Correlation (significance: p-value)		
		Oil rate of fresh fruit	Oil rate of kernel	Oil yield
Available nitrogen	2015	0.241(0.387)	0.549*(0.034)	0.407(0.132)
	2016	0.514*(0.050)	0.720**(0.002)	0.418(0.121)
Available phosphorus	2015	0.472(0.076)	0.628*(0.012)	0.636*(0.011)
	2016	0.623*(0.013)	0.681**(0.005)	0.719**(0.003)
Available potassium	2015	0.454(0.089)	0.648**(0.009)	0.252(0.364)
	2016	0.591*(0.020)	0.647**(0.009)	0.392(0.148)
Organic matter	2015	0.681**(0.005)	0.619*(0.014)	0.644*(0.010)
	2016	0.372(0.172)	0.565*(0.028)	0.385(0.157)

347 Note: *indicates $p < 0.05$, ≥ 0.01 ; **indicates $p < 0.01$.

