



**HAL**  
open science

## Increased mineral fertilizer use on maize can improve both household food security and regional food production in East Africa

Gatien N. Falconnier, Louise Leroux, Damien Beillouin, Marc Corbeels, Robert J. Hijmans, Camila Bonilla-Cedrez, Mark van Wijk, Katrien Descheemaeker, Shamie Zingore, François Affholder, et al.

### ► To cite this version:

Gatien N. Falconnier, Louise Leroux, Damien Beillouin, Marc Corbeels, Robert J. Hijmans, et al.. Increased mineral fertilizer use on maize can improve both household food security and regional food production in East Africa. *Agricultural Systems*, 2023, 205, pp.103588. 10.1016/j.agsy.2022.103588 . hal-03903523

**HAL Id: hal-03903523**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03903523>**

Submitted on 19 Dec 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

1 **Increased mineral fertilizer use on maize can improve both household food security and**  
2 **regional food production in East Africa**

3 Gatien N. Falconnier<sup>\*1,2,3</sup>, Louise Leroux<sup>1,2,14</sup>, Damien Beillouin<sup>4,5</sup>, Marc Corbeels<sup>1,2,14</sup>, Robert  
4 J. Hijmans<sup>6</sup>, Camila Bonilla-Cedrez<sup>7</sup>, Mark van Wijk<sup>8</sup>, Katrien Descheemaeker<sup>9</sup>, Shamie  
5 Zingore<sup>10</sup>, François Affholder<sup>1,2</sup>, Santiago Lopez-Ridaura<sup>11</sup>, Eric Malézieux<sup>4,5</sup>, David  
6 Makowski<sup>12</sup>, Jairos Rurinda<sup>13</sup>, Martin K. van Ittersum<sup>9</sup>, Bernard Vanlauwe<sup>14</sup>, Ken E. Giller<sup>9</sup>,  
7 Sabine-Karen Lammoglia<sup>15,16</sup>, Katharina Waha<sup>17</sup>

8 \*corresponding author

9 <sup>1</sup>AIDA, Univ Montpellier, CIRAD, Montpellier, France

10 <sup>2</sup>CIRAD, UPR AIDA, F-34398 Montpellier, France

11 <sup>3</sup>International Maize and Wheat Improvement Centre (CIMMYT)-Zimbabwe, 12.5 km Peg Mazowe Road, Harare,  
12 Zimbabwe

13 <sup>4</sup>CIRAD, UPR HortSys, F-34398 Montpellier, France

14 <sup>5</sup>HortSys, Univ Montpellier, CIRAD, Montpellier, France

15 <sup>6</sup>Department of Environmental Science and Policy, University of California, Davis, CA, USA.

16 <sup>7</sup>Animal Production Systems Group, Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

17 <sup>8</sup>International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), Nairobi, 00100, Kenya

18 <sup>9</sup>Plant Production Systems Group, Wageningen University, Wageningen, Netherlands

19 <sup>10</sup>African Plant Nutrition Institute, UM6P Experimental Farm, Benguéir 41350, Morocco

20 <sup>11</sup>International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT), Apdo, 6-641 06600, México, D.F., Mexico

21 <sup>12</sup>University Paris-Saclay, INRAE, AgroParisTech, UMR MIA 518, 91120 Palaiseau, France

22 <sup>13</sup>Department of Soil Science and Environment, University of Zimbabwe, PO Box MP 167, Mount Pleasant,  
23 Harare, Zimbabwe

24 <sup>14</sup>International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, PO Box 30709, 00100 Nairobi, Kenya

25 <sup>15</sup>ABSys, Univ Montpellier, CIHEAM-IAMM, CIRAD, INRAE, Institut Agro, 34060 Montpellier, France

26 <sup>16</sup>CIRAD, UMR ABSys, F-34398, Montpellier, France

27 <sup>17</sup>CSIRO, Agriculture & Food, 306 Carmody Rd, St Lucia, QLD, Australia

28 **Abstract:**

29 *Context*

30 Despite recent improvements in living standards, a substantial proportion of farm households  
31 in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) is food insecure, and increasing crop productivity could help  
32 address this problem.

33 *Objective*

34 We estimated the effect of increasing maize yields with mineral fertilizer on household food  
35 security and on regional and national maize supply in two East African countries - Uganda and  
36 Tanzania.

37 *Methods*

38 We estimated maize yield response to nitrogen (N) fertilization with a machine learning model  
39 trained on 15 952 observations of maize responses to fertilizer across SSA. Together with  
40 spatial price data, we used this model to quantify the profit-maximizing N fertilizer input for a  
41 nationally-representative sample of 4188 agricultural households in the two countries. We  
42 computed a food availability indicator for all households.

43 *Results and conclusions*

44 The mean profit-maximizing N input was 82 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in Tanzania, but it was much lower in  
45 Uganda (24 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) mostly because of less favorable prices. The profit-maximizing N input  
46 was above the reported N input for 95% of the households in Tanzania and for 43% of the  
47 households in Uganda. It was predicted to increase the food availability ratio of food insecure  
48 maize growers by 95% in Tanzania, and by 25% in Uganda. The administrative regions where  
49 maize supply could increase most were not the same as the regions where the increase in  
50 household-level food security was largest. With increased fertilization, food insecure maize

51 growing households (35% in Tanzania and 42% in Uganda) could only contribute about 20%  
52 of the overall increase in maize supply, whereas the 20 to 30% food secure households that  
53 have a larger area planted with maize could contribute more than 60%.

#### 54 *Significance*

55 Our study makes two key contributions: i) a substantial increase in national maize supply is  
56 more likely to come from already food secure households with relatively large farms, while  
57 food insecure households with small farms may nevertheless increase their household-level  
58 food security through maize intensification, and ii) high potential areas to increase maize  
59 domestic production do not necessarily match with areas where there is immediate scope to  
60 improve household-level food security

61 *Keywords: random forest, LSMS-ISA household surveys, sub-Saharan Africa*

## 62 **1. Introduction**

63 Over the past decade, living standards have improved substantially in some countries of sub-  
64 Saharan Africa (SSA). This has been associated with high growth in agricultural gross domestic  
65 product (GDP) (Jayne et al., 2018a), improved health (Masters et al., 2018) and better nutrition  
66 (Beal et al., 2017). Despite these positive trends, food security remains a critical issue, and more  
67 than a third of rural households across 17 countries in SSA was found to be food insecure (Frelat  
68 et al., 2016). Food production has not kept pace with population growth (FAO et al., 2022; Luan  
69 et al., 2013) and the majority of countries in SSA are net food importers (Mendez del Villar and  
70 Lançon, 2015; Rakotoarisoa et al., 2011; van Ittersum et al., 2016),

71 Increasing staple food production on current agricultural land is necessary to improve  
72 household and national food security, while limiting biodiversity loss and carbon dioxide  
73 emissions associated with agricultural land expansion (van Loon et al., 2019; van Ittersum et  
74 al., 2016). Yet, crop yields in SSA are much lower than yields that are attainable with good  
75 agronomic management practices. A major reason for the low crop yields in SSA is that the  
76 average fertilizer use in SSA is low, that is 12, 2 and 3 kg/ha for nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P)  
77 and potassium (K), respectively (FAOSTAT, 2018). It has, however, rapidly increased in some  
78 countries over the past decades (for example, N fertilizer use was 39 kg/ha in Zambia and 23  
79 kg/ha in Ethiopia in 2018). The limited use of mineral fertilizer leads to widespread nutrient  
80 mining (Cobo et al., 2010). Therefore, a significant increase in nutrient inputs in the form of  
81 mineral fertilizer is required to sustainably increase crop productivity (ten Berge et al., 2019,  
82 Jayne et al., 2019). In combination with mineral fertilizer, the integration of legumes in crop  
83 rotations (Franke et al., 2018), the implementation of agroforestry practices (Kuyah et al.,  
84 2019), and the better use of organic resources such as manure (Vanlauwe et al., 2014) are key  
85 to improve nutrient use efficiency and avoid detrimental nutrient losses to the environment.

86 The biophysical environment can constrain the effectiveness of mineral fertilizer inputs. For  
87 example, fields that are already fertile, or, in contrast, lack secondary nutrients and  
88 micronutrients, can be unresponsive to NPK fertilizers (Nziguheba et al., 2021; Vanlauwe et  
89 al., 2010). Drought stress or excessive rainfall events can also lead to low fertilizer use  
90 efficiency (Affholder, 1997; Mapanda et al., 2012), which may discourage farmers to invest in  
91 fertilizer. These biophysical constraints vary spatially, owing to a combination of natural  
92 environmental variability and soil fertility heterogeneity associated with previous field  
93 management by farmers (Njoroge et al., 2017). Economic constraints also act as a barrier for  
94 investment in fertilizer to increase crop productivity. High prices of fertilizer and low prices of  
95 agricultural products can lead to unfavourable cost:benefit ratios (see Jayne et al., 2018 and  
96 Bonilla Cedrez et al., 2021 for recent estimates of cost:benefit ratios across SSA). These  
97 economic constraints vary spatially, as fertilizer price is usually higher in remote – poorly  
98 accessible – areas (Bonilla Cedrez et al., 2020a). In addition, farm household characteristics  
99 can constrain intensification of crop production to improve household-level food availability  
100 (Tittonell et al., 2010). For example, rural households with limited crop land do not directly  
101 benefit from an increase in crop productivity (Giller et al., 2021; Ritzema et al., 2017), and poor  
102 households may not have the cash to buy fertilizer, even if it would be profitable to do so.  
103 Farmers resource endowment also varies spatially, with local variations as important as  
104 country-wide variations (Wichern et al., 2018). The current literature falls short in determining  
105 the spatial interaction between biophysical, economic and household-level factors that drive the  
106 contribution of maize intensification to food security in the diverse contexts of SSA. In their  
107 most optimistic scenario, Ritzema et al. (2017) investigated how a 100% increase in cereal yield  
108 would impact household food security of 1700 households in seven countries of East and West  
109 Africa. But the increase in cereal yield could be much stronger, e.g. maize yield can be  
110 quadrupled in some areas with favorable soil and climate in SSA

111 (<https://www.yieldgap.org/gygaviewer/index.html>). Moreover, the authors relied on site-  
112 specific household surveys that possibly did not cover the full span of existing biophysical  
113 conditions and farmers' context. Palmas and Chamberlin (2020) investigated the biophysical  
114 and economic constraints to the use of mineral fertilizer on maize in Tanzania. Their study  
115 brought crucial insights into the spatial determinants of fertilizer profitability, but did not  
116 consider the household dimension. Yet, household characteristics (e.g. land per capita) can  
117 strongly influence the contribution of intensification of cereal production to improved food  
118 security.

119 Maize is the most important staple food crop in SSA, especially in Eastern Africa (OCDE and  
120 FAO, 2016). Tanzania and Uganda are ideal case study countries for several reasons. Firstly,  
121 Tanzania and Uganda are in the top-ten maize producing countries in SSA, with 6.2 and 2.7 Mt  
122 yr<sup>-1</sup> (2017-2018 average), respectively (FAOSTAT, 2018). Secondly, both countries have  
123 diverse agro-ecological conditions allowing the analysis of a wide range of maize growing  
124 conditions that also prevail elsewhere across SSA: there are six "maize mega-environments"  
125 (Hartkamp et al., 2000) in Tanzania: dry lowland, dry mid-altitude, highland, wet lower mid-  
126 altitude, wet upper mid-altitude and wet lowland, and five of these also prevail in Uganda (no  
127 wet lowlands). Thirdly, maize yield and fertilizer use in the two countries is low, as it is the case  
128 in most countries in SSA: the average maize yield in 2018 was 2.6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> in Uganda, and 1.7 t  
129 ha<sup>-1</sup> in Tanzania (FAOSTAT, 2018); Nitrogen fertilizer use on cropland was 1.2 kg (N) ha<sup>-1</sup>  
130 year<sup>-1</sup> in Uganda and 9.1 (N) kg ha<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup> in Tanzania in 2018 (FAOSTAT, 2018). Fourthly,  
131 arable land per capita, a crucial indicator of how agricultural intensification can contribute to  
132 improve food security (Giller et al., 2021), is more constrained in Uganda than in Tanzania:  
133 land per capita is 0.16 ha in Uganda, close to the first quartile of 0.15 ha for SSA countries, and  
134 0.24 ha in Tanzania, close to the third quartile of 0.25 ha per capita for SSA countries (World

135 Bank, 2021a). Lastly, the two countries allow to explore the impact of variable mineral N  
136 fertilizer costs, as these are greater in Uganda than in Tanzania (Bonilla Cedrez et al., 2020a).

137 In this study we estimate the potential contribution of maize intensification with mineral  
138 fertilizer to increase maize production and household food security in Uganda and Tanzania.  
139 Using existing datasets across SSA on maize fertilizer trials (Bonilla Cedrez et al., 2021; Kihara  
140 et al., 2017, 2016), fertilizer and maize price (Bonilla Cedrez et al., 2020a, 2020b), and  
141 nationally representative household surveys in Uganda and Tanzania (Kilic et al., 2015), we  
142 explore the spatial variation in maize response to nutrient inputs, maize prices and fertilizer  
143 costs, and household characteristics. We estimate the contribution to national food security, that  
144 is, the amount of surplus production that farm households can produce, to be sold and consumed  
145 by others. We explore the three following research questions: i) What is the potential increase  
146 in household-level food security by intensification of maize production? ii) What is the relative  
147 importance of increasing maize production in already food secure and currently food insecure  
148 maize growers for national maize production? and iii) Are the regions where household-level  
149 food security would benefit most, also the regions where national-level production would  
150 increase most? In line with the recent finding that small farms contribute only marginally to  
151 global food production (Lowder et al., 2021; Ricciardi et al., 2018), our leading hypothesis was  
152 that an increase in national maize production will be achieved mostly by large farms that are  
153 already food secure, while food insecure small farms will contribute less to this increase. We  
154 also hypothesized that despite their low contribution to national food security, food insecure  
155 small farms benefit from maize intensification to improve their food security.

## 156 **2. Material and methods**

### 157 **2.1. Overall approach**

158 Our study assessed the contribution of the intensification of maize production to food security  
159 in three main steps. First, we trained a statistical model with fertilizer trial data to predict maize



160 grain yield responses to N, P and K fertilizer application for the soil and climate conditions  
161 prevailing across SSA, and predicted the spatial variation in maize grain yield response to N, P  
162 and K fertilizer in Uganda and Tanzania. Then, we computed a simple food security indicator  
163 at household level (the food availability ratio, FA, see below) for a nationally representative set  
164 of farm households in Uganda and Tanzania. In a last step, we used the predicted maize yield  
165 responses to N, and spatial data on fertilizer and maize prices, to estimate i) the profit-  
166 maximizing N fertilizer input for each household, ii) the additional maize production from using  
167 this amount of fertilizer, and its effect on the household food availability ratio, and iii) the  
168 increase in the overall regional and national maize grain supply. We also performed a sensitivity  
169 analysis to evaluate the impact of changes in maize prices, N fertilizer costs, and maize yield  
170 responses to N on our estimates.

## 171 **2.2. Maize yield response to mineral fertilizer**

### 172 **2.2.1. Experimental data from maize fertilizer trials**

173 We combined data from 15,952 maize fertilizer trials conducted at 1352 locations in SSA from  
174 1969 to 2017 (see Appendix 1 in Supplementary materials for details on the composition of the  
175 dataset). The dataset included information on trial location (longitude, latitude), maize grain  
176 yield, N, P and K fertilizer application rates, topsoil (0-30 cm) characteristics such as soil  
177 organic carbon, sand, available P, exchangeable K, Ca and Mg contents and pH, and climate  
178 variables such as growing-season rainfall, rainfall intensity and temperature, and number of  
179 consecutive dry days over the maize growing season. The trials were rainfed, implying that  
180 there may have been water stress in some growing seasons and/or in some locations.  
181 Environmental variables that were not reported with the trial data were estimated from spatial  
182 data bases (see Appendix 1 in Supplementary materials for details). Soil characteristics varied  
183 greatly, allowing the analysis of a wide range of maize growth conditions (Figure S1). The trial

184 locations spanned all maize-mega-environments (Figure S2A), and covered a large range of  
185 seasonal rainfalls and temperatures (Figure S2B).

### 186 **2.2.2. Spatial prediction of maize response to N, P and K fertilizer**

187 We used a Random Forest (RF) algorithm to predict maize grain yield as a function of nutrient  
188 inputs (N, P, K), soil properties (soil organic carbon, sand, available P, exchangeable K, Ca and  
189 Mg content and pH), and climatic factors (seasonal rainfall, average growing season  
190 temperature, number of consecutive dry spell during the season and daily rainfall intensity  
191 during the season). We tuned three hyperparameters (parameters that are calibrated during the  
192 learning process of the RF algorithm, i.e. the number of trees, the number of candidate predictor  
193 variables at each node and the minimum number of samples necessary to split a nonterminal  
194 node) based on 70% of the dataset (randomly selected) and an 8-fold cross validation with two  
195 replicates. We explored 30 combinations of the hyperparameters obtained by maximizing the  
196 coverage of the parameter space. The criterion maximized during the training procedure was  
197 the cross-validated proportion of the explained maize yield variance ( $R^2$ ) averaged over the two  
198 replicates. The performance of the best RF model (with optimal combination of hyper-  
199 parameters) was then evaluated on the 30% hold-out test dataset. Feature analysis (i.e. partial  
200 dependence plot and variable importance) was performed on the model fit with the full dataset.  
201 Variable importance values were calculated based on a metric that captures the increase in mean  
202 squared error (MSE), calculated from out-of-sample predictions, after randomly permuting the  
203 values of the respective predictors (Breiman, 2001), using the R package *vip* (Greenwell et al.,  
204 2020). Functional relationships between predictors and maize yield were analyzed through  
205 partial dependence plots using the *pdp* R package (Greenwell, 2017). A partial dependence plot  
206 shows the marginal effect of one input on the model prediction, averaged across the values  
207 taken by the other inputs. In order to test the contribution of climate factors, we built one model

208 that included climate variables, and another model that did not include these, and compared the  
209 predictive capacity of the two models.

210 The RF model was then used to predict maize control yield (0 N, 0 P, 0 K) in Uganda and  
211 Tanzania at a spatial resolution of 250m using soil data (topsoil organic carbon, sand, available  
212 P, exchangeable K, Ca and Mg content and pH) from Africa SoilGrid (Hengl et al., 2015; Hengl  
213 et al., 2017). Effects on yield of incremental additions of N (i.e. 20, 40, 60, 80, 100, 120, 160,  
214 180 and 200 kg/ha) were then investigated. Though the model was built to deal with the  
215 interactions between N, P and K inputs, for this spatial exploration we focused on the impact  
216 of N and assumed for all N additions an input of 20kg/ha of both P and K, i.e. the P and K  
217 amounts that a compound basal fertilizer application would bring.

## 218 **2.3. Food security analysis**

### 219 **2.3.1. Farm household survey data**

220 We used the Living Standard Measurement Study – Integrated Surveys on Agriculture (LSMS-  
221 ISA) of 2010-2011 for Uganda and Tanzania (Kilic et al., 2015). These household surveys are  
222 nationally representative and cover the main regions of Uganda (World Bank, 2021b) and  
223 Tanzania (World Bank, 2021a). These surveys included 2716 households in Uganda and 3440  
224 in Tanzania. Households reporting no crop production and households with missing location  
225 coordinates were excluded from the analysis, leading to a reduced sample of 1753 farm  
226 households in Uganda and 2435 in Tanzania. We used the following variables: household  
227 location (with a 10-km offset), household composition, farmer-reported total cropped land and  
228 area for the different crops, farmer-reported total crop production and sales of crop production,  
229 mineral fertilizer use on crops, total livestock production (meat and milk), sales of livestock  
230 products, and off-farm income.

### 231 **2.3.2. Food security indicator: the household-level food availability ratio**

232 We adopted the food security indicator described in Frelat et al. (2016), also used in Ritzema  
233 et al. (2017), Wichern et al. (2017) and Wichern et al. (2019): the ratio of household-level food  
234 availability (expressed in potential food equivalent energy, kcal per day) to household energy  
235 need (in kcal per day). Household-level food availability was computed as the sum of (i) the  
236 energy from crop and livestock products consumed by the household and (ii) the energy that  
237 could be obtained from food purchases with the income earned with the sales of on-farm  
238 products (crop and livestock) and off-farm activities. Consumption of on-farm grown crop and  
239 livestock products was computed by subtracting the reported sold quantities from the reported  
240 produced quantities. Energy in consumed crop and livestock products was then computed using  
241 product-specific energy content. In order to compute (potential) household-level food  
242 availability, the income from the sales of on-farm products and from off-farm activities was  
243 converted into energy (assuming that all of it was used to purchase maize) and added to calories  
244 in consumed crop and livestock products produced on-farm. Household energy need was  
245 obtained by multiplying household size (expressed in adult male equivalent) with the assumed  
246 2500 kcal d<sup>-1</sup> energy need of a male adult (FAO, 2001). The food availability ratio was  
247 computed as the ratio of household-level food availability to household energy need. A food  
248 availability ratio of one indicates that potential calorie availability at household level (on-farm  
249 production plus the calories that could be obtained with the income from off-farm activities and  
250 sales of farm products) matches household needs. The food availability ratio corresponds to  
251 potential food availability, i.e. in reality households do not entirely use their on- and off-farm  
252 income to purchase the staple food (maize in our case), because of other consumptive needs  
253 and also dysfunctional markets (Dillon and Barrett, 2017). It therefore quantifies the *potential*  
254 of a household to be food secure. Under land, market and/or production constraints, the food  
255 availability ratio has been shown to be well correlated to other food security indicators  
256 (Hammond et al., 2017), namely the Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS), the

257 Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) (Coates et al., 2007) and the number of  
258 months in which households experience food insecurity (Van Wijk et al., 2020). The food  
259 availability ratio increased with HFIAS and HDDS, up to a food availability ratio of two  
260 (Hammond et al., 2017). A food availability ratio of two indicates that potential calorie  
261 availability at household level is twice household needs. We considered households with a food  
262 availability ratio below two as “food insecure”, and those with a food availability ratio above  
263 two as “food secure”. We further classified households with a food availability ratio below one  
264 as “food deficient households”, and those with a food availability ratio between one and two as  
265 “food fragile households”. Depending on whether households cultivated maize (i.e. maize area  
266 on the farm above zero) or not, they were subsequently classified into “food insecure maize  
267 growers” and “food insecure non-maize growers”.

268 In previous studies, farmer-reported maize yield was used to quantify the food availability  
269 indicator in Uganda and Tanzania (e.g. Wichern et al., 2017; Fraval et al. 2019). For our analysis  
270 we used the maize yields predicted by the model for the N, P, K application reported by the  
271 farmer in the survey. Fields with missing information on N, P and K inputs, that is, for 99 fields  
272 in Uganda (out of 3603 surveyed fields) and 844 fields in Tanzania (out of 2125 surveyed  
273 fields), were assumed to have received median mineral fertilizer application (of all informed  
274 fields per country), which was zero in Tanzania and Uganda. Wichern et al. (2017) and Fraval  
275 et al. (2019) used the median of the reported maize prices per region to calculate the income  
276 from sold maize. In this study, we used the spatially interpolated maize price as in Bonilla  
277 Cedrez et al. (2020b). Similar to the farmer-reported prices in the LSMS surveys, they were  
278 higher in Tanzania than in Uganda (Figure S3A, Figure S4).

### 279 **2.3.3. Computing profit-maximizing N input**

280 Using the N response predicted by the RF model at the household locations, we computed the  
281 partial gross margin (i.e. not including the cost of other inputs that are left unchanged) for  
282 incremental additions of fertilizer N: 20, 40, 60, 80, 100, 120, 160, 180 and 200 kg/ha:

$$283 \quad gm_i = (Y_{0N} + NAE_i \times i) \times maize\ price - i \times N\ cost \quad (1)$$

284 where  $gm_i$  is the gross margin for N input rate  $i$ ,  $Y_{0N}$  is maize grain yield with no N fertilizer  
285 input predicted by the model at a given household location,  $N-AE_i$  is the agronomic efficiency  
286 of N predicted by the model at a given household location,  $i$  is the N input rate, *maize price* is  
287 the predicted maize price at a given household location, and *N cost* is N fertilizer cost at a given  
288 household location. Profit-maximizing N input was the N input rate with the highest gross  
289 margin at a given household location. Additional labor cost for increased fertilizer application  
290 was not considered because of lack of reliable data.

291 N-AE was computed as follows (Vanlauwe et al., 2011):

$$292 \quad N-AE_i = \frac{(Y_i - Y_{0N})}{i} \quad (2)$$

293 where  $Y_i$  is the maize grain yield with N input rate  $i$  and  $Y_{0N}$  is the maize grain yield with no  
294 N fertilizer input.

295 The market maize price and N fertilizer cost at a given household location was extracted from  
296 the spatial dataset of Bonilla Cedrez et al. (2020a, 2020b) (Appendix 2 in Supplementary  
297 materials describes the model development procedure of these two studies).

#### 298 **2.3.4. Change in food availability ratio and increase in regional and national** 299 **maize supply**

300 When profit-maximizing N fertilizer input was above the currently reported N fertilizer input  
301 by farmers, we computed the corresponding potential additional maize production  $\Delta P$ :

$$\Delta P = (Y_{new1} - Y_{current1}) \times \text{area}_{s1} + (Y_{new2} - Y_{current2}) \times \text{area}_{s2} \quad (3)$$

where  $Y_{new1}$  and  $Y_{new2}$  are the predicted maize yields with profit-maximizing N input for the short and long growing seasons, respectively,  $Y_{current1}$  and  $Y_{current2}$  are the corresponding predicted maize yields with the N input as reported by the farmer in the survey, and  $\text{area}_{s1}$  and  $\text{area}_{s2}$  are the maize areas in, respectively, short and long season, as reported by the household head in the survey (depending on household location, there may be only one growing season and  $\text{area}_{s2}$  was therefore equal to 0). We assumed equal maize responses to N for the two seasons at a given household location. When profit-maximizing N fertilizer input was equal or below the currently reported N fertilizer input,  $\Delta P$  was set to 0.  $\Delta P$  was converted to energy and used to compute the household food availability ratio adjusted for the use of profit-maximizing N input (FAprofmax). A relative change in the household food availability ratio ( $\Delta FA$ ) was then computed as follows:

$$\Delta FA = \text{FAprofmax} / \text{FAbaseline} \quad (4)$$

Where FAprofmax is the food availability ratio with profit-maximizing N input and FAbaseline is the food availability ratio with current reported N input on maize.

The impact of N-AE and farm characteristics (per-capita maize area, total cropland, livestock and off-farm income) on  $\Delta FA$  was explored by classifying farms in three classes with regard to these variables: class one below the 33th percentile of all farms for the considered variable, class two between the 33th and 66<sup>th</sup> percentile, and class three above the 66<sup>th</sup> percentile.

Then  $\Delta P$  was aggregated for all surveyed household at the level of the administrative region and country, to compute the relative increase in maize grain supply, assumed to be a proxy for the relative increase in regional/national maize production. The contribution of food insecure and food secure households (further disaggregated by classes of per-capita maize area) to this potential increase in maize grain supply was also calculated.

### 326           **2.3.5. Sensitivity analysis**

327   The impact of variations in N-AE, maize price and N cost on i) the profit-maximizing N input,  
328   ii) the share of food insecure maize growers who would increase their food availability ratio  
329   with the use of profit-maximizing N input, iii) the median  $\Delta$ FA of food insecure maize growers,  
330   and iv) the relative potential increase in national maize grain supply, was explored through  
331   sensitivity analysis. N-AE, maize price and N fertilizer cost varied between 0.25 to 2 times their  
332   baseline value.

## 333   **3. Results**

### 334           **3.1. Maize grain yield predictions**

335   The inclusion of climate-related predictors (seasonal rainfall and mean temperature over the  
336   maize growing season, number of consecutive dry days over the season, and daily rainfall  
337   intensity over the season) only marginally improved the predictive capacity of the model;  $R^2$   
338   increased from 0.82 to 0.87. For this reason, we used the RF model without climate variables.  
339   The model predicted maize grain yield (for hold-out data) with a Root Mean Square Error  
340   (RMSE) of 919 kg grain yield  $\text{ha}^{-1}$  (corresponding to a relative RMSE of 27%), and a Mean  
341   Absolute Error (MAE) of 657 kg grain yield  $\text{ha}^{-1}$  (Figure 1). Uncertainty in model predictions  
342   increased with higher values of observed maize yield (Figure 1). N and P fertilizer inputs  
343   contributed most to predict maize yield, followed by the soil sand content (Figure S5). In  
344   contrast, the contribution of K fertilizer and that of the other soil properties (available P,  
345   exchangeable K, Mg, Ca, organic carbon and pH) was marginal (Figure S5). Predicted maize  
346   yield increased with N applied in the range 0-150 kg N  $\text{ha}^{-1}$  and with P up to 50 kg P  $\text{ha}^{-1}$ , but  
347   decreased with coarser soil texture (higher soil sand content, Figure S6).

### 348           **3.2. Predicted maize yield in response to fertilizer in Uganda and Tanzania**



349 Predicted maize grain yields with no fertilizer input (“control yield”) ranged from 500 to more  
350 than 2500 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Figure 2A). Predicted control yield was generally smaller in sandy areas  
351 such as the coastal areas in Tanzania and somewhat higher in areas with high soil available P  
352 such as the volcanic soils in Eastern Uganda near Mount Elgon and in the northern highlands  
353 of Tanzania near Kilimanjaro (Figures S7, S8). With the maximum fertilizer use considered  
354 (200 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>, 20 kg P ha<sup>-1</sup>, 20 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>), predicted yield increased by up to five times the  
355 control yield (Figure 2B). The largest predicted yield increase was in areas with the smallest  
356 control yields (for example, in the southwest Tanzanian highlands, south-eastern Tanzania, and  
357 the area around Lake Victoria in Uganda). Median N-AE (across locations) was 20 kg (grain)  
358 kg (N)<sup>-1</sup> with N inputs of 40 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, and decreased gradually with higher N fertilizer inputs  
359 (Figure S9B). N-AE also significantly (P-value <0.001) decreased with higher control yields,  
360 lower sand content, and higher soil organic carbon (Figure S10). As a consequence, the areas  
361 with the lowest control yields were generally areas of highest N-AE (Figure 2A and Figure  
362 S11).

### 363 **3.3. Food security analysis with current fertilizer use**

364 Fertilizer use reported by farmers in the 2011 survey was very low. In Tanzania, only 12% of  
365 the 3212 surveyed maize plots had received N, 3% had received P and 0.3% had received K,  
366 with a median application (for fields receiving mineral fertilizer) of 38 (N), 12 (P) and 7 (K)  
367 kg/ha. In Uganda, less than 1% of the 3553 surveyed maize plots had received mineral fertilizer,  
368 with median application of 1.0 (N), 1.4 (P) and 2.5 (K) kg/ha. Overall, predicted maize grain  
369 yield (with N use reported by farmers) was greater (median=1207 kg/ha) than farmer-reported  
370 maize yield (median=482 kg/ha), possibly because of weed/disease/pest stresses not accounted  
371 for by the RF model. Yet, in some cases, especially in Uganda, farmer-reported yield was  
372 greater than the predicted yield with the reported N use – possibly because of the uncertainty  
373 related to farmers’ estimates of their maize production and area.

374 We found that a large share of the surveyed farm households was food insecure when using the  
375 maize yield predicted with their reported N use: 44% of the households in Tanzania and 46%  
376 in Uganda had a food availability ratio of less than two, and 25% of household in Tanzania and  
377 Uganda had a food availability ratio of less than one (Figure 3). When using farmer-reported  
378 maize yield, these percentages were greater in Tanzania, and similar in Uganda: 74% of the  
379 households in Tanzania and 45% in Uganda had a food availability ratio of less than two. In  
380 what follows we report results that used predicted maize yields. Crops produced and consumed  
381 on-farm were the largest contributors to household food availability for food insecure (FA<2)  
382 households in Tanzania (Figure 3a). Off-farm income and sales of livestock and crop products  
383 contributed more to the food security status of farm households in Uganda than in Tanzania  
384 (Figure 3b). The majority of food insecure (FA<2) households produced maize: 64% in  
385 Tanzania and 51% in Uganda. The majority of food secure (FA>2) households also grew maize,  
386 87% in Tanzania and 58% in Uganda. There were no obvious spatial patterns in the locations  
387 of food insecure maize growers; Households were sampled and surveyed in the eastern,  
388 western, northern and southern parts of Uganda and Tanzania (Figure S12A), and food insecure  
389 maize households could be found in almost all regions where the survey was conducted (Figure  
390 S12B). The scope for intensifying maize production (that is, the maximum relative increase in  
391 maize yield, Figure 2B) varied greatly across the locations where food insecure households  
392 were found, in both countries (Figure S12B).

### 393 **3.4. Impact of additional N input on household food security**

394 Based on model prediction and spatial price data, the mean profit-maximizing N input was 82  
395 kg (N) ha<sup>-1</sup> in Tanzania, and only 24 kg (N) ha<sup>-1</sup> in Uganda (Figure S13). The difference between  
396 countries was mostly attributed to lower maize price and higher N cost in Uganda (Figure S4).  
397 For 90% of maize growers in Tanzania (95% of the food insecure maize growers), profit-  
398 maximizing N input was above the current reported N use, and their food availability ratio was

399 predicted to increase when using the profit-maximizing N input. In Uganda, this was the case  
400 for only 41% of the maize growers (43% of the food insecure maize growers). Households for  
401 which profit-maximising N input was above current reported use were spread all over Tanzania,  
402 and in Uganda around Lake Victoria (Figure S13B), i.e. in areas with higher maize prices, lower  
403 fertiliser costs, and thus with a maize price : N fertilizer cost ratio compatible with profitable  
404 use of more fertiliser (Figure S3).

405 The relative increase in the food availability ratio (with additional N input) decreased with the  
406 baseline food availability ratio: food insecure ( $FA > 2$ ) households benefited much more in  
407 relative terms, than food secure ( $FA > 2$ ) households (Figure 4A). In addition, household with  
408 greater N-AE, larger per-capita maize area, and larger cropped land benefited most from the  
409 use of profit-maximizing N inputs (Figure 4B, 4C and 4D). Off-farm and livestock income had  
410 only a marginal impact on the relative increase in food availability ratio (Figure 4E and 5F).

411 With the additional - profit-maximizing - N input, the share of food insecure maize growers  
412 was predicted to drop from 28% to 13% of the total household population in Tanzania (Figure  
413 5A). In Uganda, the change was marginal, i.e. from 23% to 21% (Figure 5A). The farm  
414 households who could reach food security had medium to large per-capita maize area (above  
415 0.17 ha in Tanzania, and 0.03 ha in Uganda) (Figure 5B). None of the households with small  
416 per-capita maize area could achieve food security with the additional profit-maximizing N input  
417 (data not shown).

### 418 **3.5. Regional-level vs household-level food security**

419 Though food insecure ( $FA < 2$ ) households benefited more from profit-maximising N input for  
420 their food security than food secure ( $FA > 2$ ) households, they contributed only marginally to  
421 the overall increase in national maize supply. Food insecure households contributed less than  
422 20% to the overall increase in maize supply in Tanzania and Uganda, though they represented

423 around 40% of the total farm population in both countries (Figure 6). In contrast, food secure  
424 households with large per-capita maize area, , contributed more than 60% to the overall increase  
425 in maize supply in both countries, though they represented only 20 to 30% of total household  
426 population (Figure 6).

427 The relative increase in regional maize supply with N fertilizer use was predicted to vary  
428 between one (i.e. no increase) and three, across administrative regions in Tanzania and Uganda  
429 (Figure 7A). In some regions, this increase in total maize production concurred with an increase  
430 in the household-level food availability ratio for food insecure maize growers. For example, in  
431 the Mtwara Region in southern Tanzania (#23 in Figure 7), regional maize supply was predicted  
432 to increase three times, and the food availability ratio for food insecure households by almost  
433 2.5 times. However, there were regions where despite a small predicted increase in total maize  
434 supply, the predicted increase in household-level food availability for food insecure maize  
435 growers was substantial. For example, in the Iringa Region in central Tanzania (#8 in Figure  
436 7), total maize supply was predicted to increase 1.8 times, while the household-level food  
437 availability ratio for food insecure maize growers was predicted to increase 2.3 times. Regions  
438 where the potential for increasing total maize supply was highest did not necessarily match with  
439 regions with the largest potential for improving household-level food security.

### 440 **3.1. Impact of changes in N-AE, maize price and N fertilizer cost**

441 The profit-maximizing N input, the share of beneficiaries (i.e. food insecure maize growers who  
442 increased their food availability ratio with additional N fertilizer use on maize), and the relative  
443 national increase in maize supply were all sensitive to changes in maize prices, N-AE and N  
444 fertilizer costs (Figure 8). Changes in N-AE had the same effect as changes in maize prices on  
445 the output variables of Figure 7, which is not surprising as both variables play a similar role in  
446 the equation that determines profitability of N fertilizer use (see Section 2.3.3). On the other  
447 hand, the median relative change in food availability ratio for food insecure maize growers was

448 not sensitive to changes in maize prices, N-AE and N fertilizer costs, because it was also  
449 influenced by the share of beneficiaries (i.e. this share fluctuated in the different scenarios on  
450 maize prices and N fertilizer costs) (Figure 8C).

## 451 **4. Discussion**

### 452 *4.1 Potential and obstacles of maize intensification to improve household food security*

453 Our analysis showed that a substantial share of food insecure maize growers in Tanzania and  
454 Uganda could increase their household food availability in the short term with additional N  
455 fertilizer use on maize. This finding matches the results of an analysis in East, West and  
456 Southern Africa (comprising 1024 households in total) of Giller et al. (2021), who estimated  
457 that closing the yield gap of major crops would allow more than 50% of farm households to  
458 become food secure.

459 Soil properties influence the opportunity for farm households to improve their food security.  
460 Largest benefits were obtained in areas with large N-AE values, that is, on sandy soils with low  
461 soil organic matter and therefore low maize yields when no fertilizer was used. On the other  
462 hand, smaller N-AE values were achieved on clayey soils on which maize yields in the absence  
463 of fertilizer were relatively high because these soils tend to have more organic matter that can  
464 mineralize and provide substantial amounts of N to the crop in the absence of fertilizer. Some  
465 characteristics of the farm households were also important in enhancing food security at  
466 household level. We found that the opportunity to achieve food security through intensified  
467 fertilizer use increased with farm size and maize area per capita, similar to the findings of Giller  
468 et al. (2021) for small farms sizes in Ethiopia, Ghana and Malawi. However, in addition to  
469 intensification of crop production, off-farm income is key for enhanced food security at  
470 household level. Agricultural intensification may, however, help spur a thriving rural non-farm  
471 economy that can generate alternative income sources for households (Haggblade et al., 2010).

472 In this context, rural to urban migration, the so-called “natural Malthusian population control”  
473 (Demont et al., 2007) can restrain further farm fragmentation in rural areas and provide at the  
474 same time key remittances for the development of the rural economy.

475 Although additional N fertilizer use could substantially contribute to improved household food  
476 security, this strategy was not profitable for farm households in locations where the maize price  
477 and N fertilizer cost were unfavorable; the estimated profit-maximizing N input was null in  
478 Western, Northern and Eastern Uganda in particular, corroborating the low current use of  
479 mineral fertilizer by farmers. An increase in the price:cost ratio could be achieved with input  
480 subsidy programs for maize growers for whom fertilizer is currently not profitable. Input  
481 subsidy programs through which farmers can access fertilizer at below-market prices have been  
482 on the rise again since 2010 in several countries of SSA (Jayne et al., 2018b). Despite failing  
483 to target the poorer farmers in a number of instances (Pan and Christiaensen., 2012, Jayne et  
484 al., 2013), these programs have had a measurable impact on maize productivity. For example,  
485 the Farm Input Subsidy Program (FISP) in Malawi brought a 17% increase in farmers’ gross  
486 margin (Karamba and Winters, 2015). Reducing transport costs (with e.g. improvements in road  
487 conditions) could also contribute to lower fertilizer cost and improve the profitability of  
488 fertilizer use (Guo et al., 2009). For example, the average N fertilizer price of 0.39 USD kg<sup>-1</sup> in  
489 Illinois (USA) during 2001-2013 (Beckman and Riche, 2015) is about 17% of the estimated  
490 price across Tanzania and Uganda in this study (2.34 USD kg<sup>-1</sup>). The much lower N cost  
491 reported by Beckman and Riche (2015) corresponds to the lower limit of N cost explored in the  
492 sensitivity analysis of this study; this boundary is therefore not unrealistic for prices elsewhere  
493 in the world. On the other hand, with a 75% increase in N fertilizer price, profit-maximising N  
494 input in Tanzania was predicted to drop to zero, highlighting the drastic impact that the current  
495 rise in fossil fuel prices, and thus N fertilizer prices, is likely to have on food security in SSA.  
496 Seasonal variations in maize grain prices (Bonilla Cedrez et al., 2020b) can also impact fertilizer

497 profitability. Poor households usually sell their production soon after harvest when prices are  
498 usually low, because they have no storage facilities and/or need cash. In our study, we  
499 considered annualized maize grain prices, while farmers who are equipped with adequate  
500 storage facilities and well connected to markets, may want to sell their extra produce during the  
501 lean season when maize prices are higher (Burke et al., 2020).

502 Profit-maximizing N input rates increase with improved N use efficiency by maize (higher N-  
503 AE values), which can enlarge the share of beneficiaries from intensification of maize  
504 production, especially in Uganda. The average predicted N-AE for maize in our study was 20  
505 kg grain yield kg<sup>-1</sup> N added (for a N input of 40 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>), which is well below the 32 kg kg  
506 N<sup>-1</sup> or more that can be achieved in well-managed maize fields (ten Berge et al., 2019;  
507 Vanlauwe et al., 2011). Our model was trained with mostly on-farm data, with possibly sub-  
508 optimal weed, pest and disease management affecting N-AE. More generally, improving the  
509 synchrony between crop demand and N supply following the “4R” nutrient management  
510 framework (“using the right N source at the right rate, right time and in the right place”,  
511 Udvardi et al., 2021) is also key to achieve greater N-AE.

512 Our analysis showed that for most farm households in Tanzania, the use of additional N  
513 fertilizer was profitable. Yet, the question remains why these farmers do not actually use (more)  
514 fertilizer. One reason could be that farmers lack capital to buy fertilizer, possibly also because  
515 credit options to finance its purchase at the start of the season are scarce or do not exist. Another  
516 explanation could be the usual risk averse nature of farmers, associated with e.g. exposure to  
517 drought (Assefa et al., 2021; Jourdain et al., 2020). While fertilizer use might be profitable on  
518 average, in years with, for example, drought stress leading to poor yields, farmers would not  
519 break even (e.g. Biielders and Gérard, 2015). In addition, in our study we assumed that farmers  
520 would apply the profit-maximizing N fertilizer input. However, in reality farmers might only  
521 go for more N fertilizer if the increment in gross margin exceeds the extra N cost by a safety

522 margin. A value:cost ratio of two is typically used as a basis for adoption of a technology (e.g.  
523 Jayne et al., 2018b). Lastly, the extra cost of labour for fertilizer application was not considered  
524 in our study; including it would also lower the estimated profitability of fertilizer use.

#### 525 *4.2 National food security vs household-level food security*

526 The use of additional N fertilizer was predicted to substantially increase overall regional and  
527 national maize production. The food riots of 2008, the COVID-19 outbreak, and the recent war  
528 in Ukraine have emphasized the vulnerability of relying heavily on food imports to national  
529 governments and revived the idea of national and regional food self-sufficiency (d'Amour et  
530 al., 2016; Fontan Sers and Mughal, 2020). Building resilience in SSA's states to the  
531 consequences of such events, while meeting a growing food demand with population growth  
532 and avoiding further cropland expansion, requires drastic increases in cereal yields. Van  
533 Ittersum et al. (2016) calculated that cereal yields have to increase to close to 80% of their  
534 water-limited yield potential to feed the population in SSA by 2050, and this will require a 15-  
535 fold increase in nutrient inputs (ten Berge et al., 2019). Our study helps identify regions where  
536 the scope to increase maize production is greatest (see Figure 7C). However, these priority  
537 regions in terms of national food security do not necessarily match with the regions where the  
538 scope to improve household-level food security is the strongest (see Figure 7B). Policy  
539 interventions that prioritize national food security will require specific attention to this, ensuring  
540 that "no one is left behind" (United Nations, 2015).

#### 541 *4.3 Long-term sustainability of cropping systems*

542 Although relatively small profit-maximizing N fertilizer inputs (80 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> in Tanzania, and  
543 20 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> in Uganda) may yield immediate benefits for household food security, these inputs  
544 are unlikely to be sufficient to avoid soil mining and to guarantee long-term sustainability of  
545 maize-based systems. Ten Berge et al. (2019) calculated that on average a minimum of 140-



546 150 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> must be available to maize crop to sustain yields compatible with SSA food self-  
547 sufficiency by 2050, i.e. far more than the profit-maximizing N fertilizer inputs computed in  
548 our study. Recycling of biomass, use of farmyard manure, rotating with grain legumes and use  
549 of leguminous trees in agroforestry systems can complement mineral fertilizer to provide the N  
550 required to sustain high maize yields in future. The increased N fertilizer input required to  
551 achieve household and national food security, while preserving long-term soil fertility, comes,  
552 however, at a cost for the environment in the form of N leaching losses and gaseous emissions.  
553 Narrowing the maize yield gap in SSA will undoubtedly increase N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (Leitner et al.,  
554 2020). Yet, van Loon et al. (2019) estimated that meeting the food demand in SSA by 2050  
555 through intensification of cereal production with mineral fertilizer, assuming good agronomy  
556 and using the '4R' principles of nutrient management, would emit less greenhouse gases than  
557 through cropland expansion from deforestation. Large fertilizer inputs, if not retained in soils,  
558 can also contribute to eutrophication in lakes, inland and coastal waters, with direct threats to  
559 biodiversity and human health. The '4R' approach to nutrient management that is crucial for  
560 increasing nutrient use efficiency and profitability, will at the same time reduce leaching and  
561 run-off of nutrients causing eutrophication.

#### 562 *4.4 Opportunities to use and improve the proposed framework*

563 Extending our analysis to other countries or regions with larger land holdings and possibly  
564 larger maize area per capita would be necessary to fully grasp the potential of maize  
565 intensification to contribute to improved food security throughout SSA, e.g. in the cotton basin  
566 in Mali the median cultivated land area per capita is 0.84 ha compared with 0.13 ha in central  
567 Malawi and 0.14 ha in the Ethiopian highlands (Giller et al., 2021). Besides, other crops than  
568 maize, e.g. traditional grains like sorghum and millet, rice, legumes (e.g. groundnut and  
569 cowpea), highland banana, root and tuber crops and vegetables, have to be considered to  
570 quantify the full potential of intensification and diversification of crop production to reduce

571 food insecurity. It will however, be challenging to do this with an empirical model as there is  
572 less data available for these types of crops than for maize.

573 The accuracy of the RF model of our study ( $R^2 = 0.82$ ) was better than that of a model trained  
574 on yields measured in 601 field trials in Tanzania [ $R^2=0.24$ , Palmas and Chamberlin, (2020)],  
575 highlighting the importance of training the model on a large dataset. The main features of our  
576 model were in line with the findings of a meta-analysis of 71 studies across SSA that showed  
577 that soil texture, pH and exchangeable K were the main factors explaining variability in N-AE  
578 (Ichami et al., 2019). Soils can vary substantially in macro and micro-nutrient content at short  
579 distances – owing to past crop management by farmers (Falconnier et al., 2016). The variations  
580 of crop responses to nutrient inputs depending on rainfall season (short vs long in area with two  
581 growing seasons per year) would also deserve further analysis. With the current data, total  
582 rainfall, and other indicators related to its distribution, only marginally improved the ability of  
583 the RF model to explain maize yield variability. Process-based crop models could be used to  
584 simulate crop responses to fertilizer inputs. This type of models can be calibrated with data  
585 from a limited set of trials spread across representative locations and then used to make  
586 predictions at any location (see Deng et al., 2019 for an example). More specifically, process-  
587 based crop models can account for the impact of drought or excessive rainfall on fertilizer use  
588 efficiency, and are useful to determine the probability of yield failure and the risk of not  
589 breaking-even when using fertilizer (e.g. Ricome et al., 2017). Risk assessment will help to  
590 further distinguish areas where fertilizer use is a low-risk opportunity for farmers and those  
591 where its use is too risky and must be complemented with specific interventions [e.g. index-  
592 based insurance (Benami et al., 2021)].

593 Lastly, local variations in prices of maize and costs of fertilizer, due to e.g. transportation costs  
594 that are not included in the spatial price predictions, and uncertainty of farmer-reported crop  
595 areas are substantial sources of uncertainty in our analysis, as pointed out in our sensitivity

596 analysis. Our study and the proposed framework could therefore guide national and regional  
597 priority settings of interventions around intensification of maize production with fertilizer, but  
598 should be complemented with place-based assessments of the local relevance of proposed  
599 interventions.

600

## 601 **Conclusions**

602 Intensification of maize production with mineral fertilizer can substantially improve the food  
603 security of food insecure households in Uganda and Tanzania. Households with relatively large  
604 per-capita maize area benefit most, as well as those located in areas where maize yields are low  
605 in the absence of fertilizer use and where yield responses to nutrients are high. In some areas,  
606 particularly in Uganda, profit-maximizing N fertilizer input is low, and the potential of maize  
607 intensification through fertilizers to reduce food insecurity is thus limited. Institutional  
608 commitment to smart input subsidies and investments in road networks could lower fertilizer  
609 price, and broader investments in agricultural research, development and extension to  
610 operationalize best-practices (better seed quality, timely planting, optimal plant density, and  
611 proper weed, pest and disease management) could help to improve nutrient use efficiency by  
612 crops. Our study brings important insights for priority setting as high potential areas for  
613 increased maize domestic production do not necessarily match with areas where there is  
614 immediate scope for improving household-level food security. These two impact levels should  
615 be coherently considered when articulating policy and research priorities that aim at improving  
616 food security at household level and regionally.

617

618

619

620 **Acknowledgements:**

621 The lead author is grateful to the CIRAD-Persyst department that provided funds for the  
622 workshop that allowed to initiate this study. M.K.v.I and K.E.G. acknowledge grants from the  
623 NWO-WOTRO Strategic Partnership NL-CGIAR.

624

625 **References:**

- 626 Affholder, F., 1997. Empirically modelling the interaction between intensification and climatic risk in  
627 semiarid regions. *Field Crops Research* 52, 79–93. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4290(96)03453-3)  
628 [4290\(96\)03453-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4290(96)03453-3)
- 629 Assefa, B.T., Reidsma, P., Chamberlin, J., van Ittersum, M.K., 2021. Farm- and community-level  
630 factors underlying the profitability of fertiliser usage for Ethiopian smallholder farmers.  
631 *Agrekon* 60, 460–479. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03031853.2021.1984958>
- 632 Beal, T., Massiot, E., Arsenault, J.E., Smith, M.R., Hijmans, R.J., 2017. Global trends in dietary  
633 micronutrient supplies and estimated prevalence of inadequate intakes. *PLOS ONE* 12,  
634 e0175554. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0175554>
- 635 Beckman, J., Riche, S., 2015. CHANGES TO THE NATURAL GAS, CORN, AND FERTILIZER PRICE  
636 RELATIONSHIPS FROM THE BIOFUELS ERA. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics* 47,  
637 494–509. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aae.2015.22>
- 638 Benami, E., Jin, Z., Carter, M.R., Ghosh, A., Hijmans, R.J., Hobbs, A., Kenduiwo, B., Lobell, D.B., 2021.  
639 Uniting remote sensing, crop modelling and economics for agricultural risk management. *Nat*  
640 *Rev Earth Environ* 2, 140–159. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-020-00122-y>
- 641 Bielders, C.L., Gérard, B., 2015. Millet response to microdose fertilization in south–western Niger:  
642 Effect of antecedent fertility management and environmental factors. *Field Crops Research*  
643 171, 165–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2014.10.008>
- 644 Bonilla Cedrez, C., Chamberlin, J., Guo, Z., Hijmans, R.J., 2020a. Spatial variation in fertilizer prices in  
645 Sub-Saharan Africa. *PLOS ONE* 15, e0227764. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0227764>
- 646 Bonilla Cedrez, C., Chamberlin, J., Hijmans, R.J., 2021. Fertilizer and grain prices constrain food  
647 production in sub-Saharan Africa. *Nat Food* 2, 766–772. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-00370-1)  
648 [00370-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-00370-1)
- 649 Bonilla Cedrez, C., Chamberlin, J., Hijmans, R.J., 2020b. Seasonal, annual, and spatial variation in  
650 cereal prices in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Glob Food Sec* 26, 100438.  
651 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2020.100438>
- 652 Breiman, L., 2001. Random Forests. *Machine Learning* 45, 5–32.  
653 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324>
- 654 Burke, W.J., Snapp, S.S., Jayne, T.S., 2020. An in-depth examination of maize yield response to  
655 fertilizer in Central Malawi reveals low profits and too many weeds. *Agricultural Economics*  
656 51, 923–940. <https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12601>
- 657 Coates, J., Swindale, A., Bilinsky, P., 2007. Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) for  
658 Measurement of Food Access: Indicator Guide: Version 3: (576842013-001).  
659 <https://doi.org/10.1037/e576842013-001>
- 660 Cobo, J.G., Dercon, G., Cadisch, G., 2010. Nutrient balances in African land use systems across  
661 different spatial scales: A review of approaches, challenges and progress. *Agriculture,*  
662 *Ecosystems & Environment* 136, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2009.11.006>

663 d'Amour, C.B., Wenz, L., Kalkuhl, M., Steckel, J.C., Creutzig, F., 2016. Teleconnected food supply  
664 shocks. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 11, 035007. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/11/3/035007>

665 Demont, M., Jouve, P., Stessens, J., Tollens, E., 2007. Boserup versus Malthus revisited: Evolution of  
666 farming systems in northern Côte d'Ivoire. *Agricultural Systems* 93, 215–228.  
667 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2006.05.006>

668 Dillon, B., Barrett, C.B., 2017. Agricultural factor markets in Sub-Saharan Africa: An updated view with  
669 formal tests for market failure. *Food Policy, Agriculture in Africa – Telling Myths from Facts*  
670 67, 64–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2016.09.015>

671 Falconnier, G.N., Descheemaeker, K., Van Mourik, T.A., Giller, K.E., 2016. Unravelling the causes of  
672 variability in crop yields and treatment responses for better tailoring of options for  
673 sustainable intensification in southern Mali. *Field Crops Research* 187, 113–126.  
674 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2015.12.015>

675 FAO, 2001. Human energy requirements. *Food and Nutrition Technical Report* (pp. 103). Rome: Food  
676 and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

677 FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP, WHO, 2022. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2022:  
678 Repurposing food and agricultural policies to make healthy diets more affordable, The State  
679 of Food Security and Nutrition in the World (SOFI). FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP, WHO, Rome,  
680 Italy. <https://doi.org/10.4060/cc0639en>

681 FAOSTAT, 2018. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Rome, Italy.  
682 <http://faostat.fao.org>.

683 Fontan Sers, C., Mughal, M., 2020. Covid-19 outbreak and the need for rice self-sufficiency in West  
684 Africa. *World Development* 135, 105071. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105071>

685 Fraval, S., Hammond, J., Wichern, J., Oosting, S.J., Boer, I.J.M.D., Teufel, N., Lannerstad, M., Waha, K.,  
686 Pagella, T., Rosenstock, T.S., Giller, K.E., Herrero, M., Harris, D., Wijk, M.T.V., 2019. MAKING  
687 THE MOST OF IMPERFECT DATA: A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF STANDARD INFORMATION  
688 COLLECTED IN FARM HOUSEHOLD SURVEYS. *Experimental Agriculture* 55, 230–250.  
689 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0014479718000388>

690 Frelat, R., Lopez-Ridaura, S., Giller, K.E., Herrero, M., Douchamps, S., Djurfeldt, A.A., Erenstein, O.,  
691 Henderson, B., Kassie, M., Paul, B.K., Rigolot, C., Ritzema, R.S., Rodriguez, D., van Asten,  
692 P.J.A., van Wijk, M.T., 2016. Drivers of household food availability in sub-Saharan Africa  
693 based on big data from small farms. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*  
694 *United States of America* 113, 458–463. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1518384112>

695 Giller, K.E., Delaune, T., Silva, J.V., van Wijk, M., Hammond, J., Descheemaeker, K., van de Ven, G.,  
696 Schut, A.G.T., Taulya, G., Chikowo, R., Andersson, J.A., 2021. Small farms and development in  
697 sub-Saharan Africa: Farming for food, for income or for lack of better options? *Food Sec.*  
698 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-021-01209-0>

699 Greenwell, B., 2017. pdp: An R Package for Constructing Partial Dependence Plots. *The R Journal*  
700 421–436.

701 Greenwell, B., Boehmke, B., Gray, B., 2020. vip: Variable Importance Plots.

702 Guo, Z., Koo, J., Wood, S., 2009. Fertilizer profitability in East Africa: A Spatially Explicit Policy Analysis  
703 (No. 51710), 2009 Conference, August 16-22, 2009, Beijing, China, 2009 Conference, August  
704 16-22, 2009, Beijing, China. *International Association of Agricultural Economists*.

705 Haggblade, S., Hazell, P., Reardon, T., 2010. The Rural Non-farm Economy: Prospects for Growth and  
706 Poverty Reduction. *World Development, The Future of Small Farms* 38, 1429–1441.  
707 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2009.06.008>

708 Hammond, J., Fraval, S., van Etten, J., Suchini, J.G., Mercado, L., Pagella, T., Frelat, R., Lannerstad, M.,  
709 Douchamps, S., Teufel, N., Valbuena, D., van Wijk, M.T., 2017. The Rural Household Multi-  
710 Indicator Survey (RHoMIS) for rapid characterisation of households to inform climate smart  
711 agriculture interventions: Description and applications in East Africa and Central America.  
712 *Agricultural Systems* 151, 225–233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2016.05.003>

713 Hartkamp, A.D., White, J.W., Rodriguez Aguilar, A., Bänziger, M., Srinivasan, G., Granados, G., 2000.  
714 Maize production environments revisited. *CIMMYT Mexico*.

715 Ichami, S.M., Shepherd, K.D., Sila, A.M., Stoorvogel, J.J., Hoffland, E., 2019. Fertilizer response and  
716 nitrogen use efficiency in African smallholder maize farms. *Nutr Cycl Agroecosyst* 113, 1–19.  
717 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-018-9958-y>

718 Jayne, T. s., Mather, D., Mason, N., Ricker-Gilbert, J., 2013. How do fertilizer subsidy programs affect  
719 total fertilizer use in sub-Saharan Africa? Crowding out, diversion, and benefit/cost  
720 assessments. *Agricultural Economics* 44, 687–703. <https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12082>

721 Jayne, T.S., Chamberlin, J., Benfica, R., 2018a. Africa’s Unfolding Economic Transformation. *The*  
722 *Journal of Development Studies* 54, 777–787.  
723 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2018.1430774>

724 Jayne, T.S., Mason, N.M., Burke, W.J., Ariga, J., 2018b. Review: Taking stock of Africa’s second-  
725 generation agricultural input subsidy programs. *Food Policy* 75, 1–14.  
726 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2018.01.003>

727 Jourdain, D., Lairez, J., Striffler, B., Affholder, F., 2020. Farmers’ preference for cropping systems and  
728 the development of sustainable intensification: a choice experiment approach. *Rev Agric*  
729 *Food Environ Stud* 101, 417–437. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41130-020-00100-4>

730 Karamba, R.W., Winters, P.C., 2015. Gender and agricultural productivity: implications of the Farm  
731 Input Subsidy Program in Malawi. *Agricultural Economics* 46, 357–374.  
732 <https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12169>

733 Kihara, J., Nziguheba, G., Zingore, S., Coulibaly, A., Esilaba, A., Kabambe, V., Njoroge, S., Palm, C.,  
734 Huising, J., 2016. Understanding variability in crop response to fertilizer and amendments in  
735 sub-Saharan Africa. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 229, 1–12.  
736 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.05.012>

737 Kihara, J., Sileshi, G.W., Nziguheba, G., Kinyua, M., Zingore, S., Sommer, R., 2017. Application of  
738 secondary nutrients and micronutrients increases crop yields in sub-Saharan Africa. *Agron.*  
739 *Sustain. Dev.* 37, 25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-017-0431-0>

740 Kilic, T., Winters, P., Carletto, C., 2015. Gender and agriculture in sub-Saharan Africa: introduction to  
741 the special issue. *Agricultural Economics* 46, 281–284. <https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12165>

742 Kuyah, S., Whitney, C.W., Jonsson, M., Sileshi, G.W., Öborn, I., Muthuri, C.W., Luedeling, E., 2019.  
743 Agroforestry delivers a win-win solution for ecosystem services in sub-Saharan Africa. A  
744 meta-analysis. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 39, 47. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-019-0589-8>

745 Leitner, S., Pelster, D.E., Werner, C., Merbold, L., Baggs, E.M., Mapanda, F., Butterbach-Bahl, K., 2020.  
746 Closing maize yield gaps in sub-Saharan Africa will boost soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. *Current Opinion*  
747 *in Environmental Sustainability, Climate Change, Reactive Nitrogen, Food Security and*  
748 *Sustainable Agriculture* 47, 95–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2020.08.018>

749 Loon, M.P. van, Hijbeek, R., Berge, H.F.M. ten, Sy, V.D., Broeke, G.A. ten, Solomon, D., Ittersum, M.K.  
750 van, 2019. Impacts of intensifying or expanding cereal cropping in sub-Saharan Africa on  
751 greenhouse gas emissions and food security. *Global Change Biology* 25, 3720–3730.  
752 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14783>

753 Lowder, S.K., Sánchez, M.V., Bertini, R., 2021. Which farms feed the world and has farmland become  
754 more concentrated? *World Development* 142, 105455.  
755 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105455>

756 Luan, Y., Cui, X., Ferrat, M., 2013. Historical trends of food self-sufficiency in Africa. *Food Security* 5,  
757 393–405. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-013-0260-1>

758 Mapanda, F., Wuta, M., Nyamangara, J., Rees, R.M., 2012. Nitrogen leaching and indirect nitrous  
759 oxide emissions from fertilized croplands in Zimbabwe. *Nutr Cycl Agroecosyst* 94, 85–96.  
760 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-012-9528-7>

761 Masters, W.A., Rosenblum, N.Z., Alemu, R.G., 2018. Agricultural Transformation, Nutrition Transition  
762 and Food Policy in Africa: Preston Curves Reveal New Stylised Facts. *The Journal of*  
763 *Development Studies* 54, 788–802. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2018.1430768>

764 Mendez del Villar, P., Lançon, F., 2015. West African rice development: Beyond protectionism versus  
765 liberalization? *Global Food Security, Special Section on "Selected papers from the 3rd Africa*  
766 *Rice Congress "* 5, 56–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2014.11.001>

767 Njoroge, S., Schut, A.G.T., Giller, K.E., Zingore, S., 2017. Strong spatial-temporal patterns in maize  
768 yield response to nutrient additions in African smallholder farms. *Field Crops Research* 214,  
769 321–330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2017.09.026>

770 Nziguheba, G., van Heerwaarden, J., Vanlauwe, B., 2021. Quantifying the prevalence of (non)-  
771 response to fertilizers in sub-Saharan Africa using on-farm trial data. *Nutr Cycl Agroecosyst*  
772 121, 257–269. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-021-10174-1>

773 OCDE, FAO, 2016. Agriculture in Sub-Saharan Africa: Prospects and challenges for the next decade,  
774 in: *OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2016-2025*. Paris.

775 Palmas, S., Chamberlin, J., 2020. Fertilizer profitability for smallholder maize farmers in Tanzania: A  
776 spatially-explicit ex ante analysis. *PLOS ONE* 15, e0239149.  
777 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0239149>

778 Pan, L., Christiaensen, L., 2012. Who is Vouching for the Input Voucher? Decentralized Targeting and  
779 Elite Capture in Tanzania. *World Development* 40, 1619–1633.  
780 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2012.04.012>

781 Rakotoarisoa, M.A., lafrate, M., Paschali, M., 2011. Why has Africa become a net food importer? -  
782 Explaining Africa agricultural and food trade deficits. *Rural Infrastructure and Agro-Industries*  
783 Division, FAO, Rome, Italy.

784 Ricciardi, V., Ramankutty, N., Mehrabi, Z., Jarvis, L., Chookolingo, B., 2018. How much of the world's  
785 food do smallholders produce? *Global Food Security* 17, 64–72.  
786 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2018.05.002>

787 Ritzema, R.S., Frelat, R., Douchamps, S., Silvestri, S., Rufino, M.C., Herrero, M., Giller, K.E., López-  
788 Ridaura, S., Teufel, N., Paul, B.K., Wijk, M.T. van, 2017. Is production intensification likely to  
789 make farm households food-adequate? A simple food availability analysis across smallholder  
790 farming systems from East and West Africa. *Food Sec.* 9, 115–131.  
791 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-016-0638-y>

792 ten Berge, H.F.M., Hijbeek, R., van Loon, M.P., Rurinda, J., Tesfaye, K., Zingore, S., Craufurd, P., van  
793 Heerwaarden, J., Brentrup, F., Schröder, J.J., Boogaard, H.L., de Groot, H.L.E., van Ittersum,  
794 M.K., 2019. Maize crop nutrient input requirements for food security in sub-Saharan Africa.  
795 *Global Food Security* 23, 9–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2019.02.001>

796 Tittonell, P., Muriuki, A., Shepherd, K.D., Mugendi, D., Kaizzi, K.C., Okeyo, J., Verchot, L., Coe, R.,  
797 Vanlauwe, B., 2010. The diversity of rural livelihoods and their influence on soil fertility in  
798 agricultural systems of East Africa – A typology of smallholder farms. *Agricultural Systems*  
799 103, 83–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2009.10.001>

800 Udvardi, M., Below, F.E., Castellano, M.J., Eagle, A.J., Giller, K.E., Ladha, J.K., Liu, X., Maaz, T.M., Nova-  
801 Franco, B., Raghuram, N., Robertson, G.P., Roy, S., Saha, M., Schmidt, S., Tegeder, M., York,  
802 L.M., Peters, J.W., 2021. A Research Road Map for Responsible Use of Agricultural Nitrogen.  
803 *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems* 5.

804 United Nations, 2015. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development |  
805 Department of Economic and Social Affairs [WWW Document]. URL  
806 <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda> (accessed 7.1.22).

807 van Ittersum, M.K., van Bussel, L.G.J., Wolf, J., Grassini, P., van Wart, J., Guilpart, N., Claessens, L., de  
808 Groot, H., Wiebe, K., Mason-D'Croz, D., Yang, H., Boogaard, H., van Oort, P.A.J., van Loon,  
809 M.P., Saito, K., Adimo, O., Adjei-Nsiah, S., Agali, A., Bala, A., Chikowo, R., Kaizzi, K., Kouressy,  
810 M., Makoi, J.H.J.R., Ouattara, K., Tesfaye, K., Cassman, K.G., 2016. Can sub-Saharan Africa  
811 feed itself? *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 113, 14964–14969.  
812 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1610359113>

813 Vanlauwe, B., Bationo, A., Chianu, J., Giller, K.E., Merckx, R., Mokwunye, U., Ohiokpehai, O., Pypers,  
814 P., Tabo, R., Shepherd, K.D., Smaling, E.M.A., Woomer, P.L., Sanginga, N., 2010. Integrated  
815 Soil Fertility Management, Operational definition and consequences for implementation and  
816 dissemination. *Outlook on Agriculture* 39, 8.

817 Vanlauwe, B., Kihara, J., Chivenge, P., Pypers, P., Coe, R., Six, J., 2011. Agronomic use efficiency of N  
818 fertilizer in maize-based systems in sub-Saharan Africa within the context of integrated soil  
819 fertility management. *Plant Soil* 339, 35–50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-010-0462-7>  
820 Wichern, J., Descheemaeker, K., Giller, K.E., Ebanyat, P., Taulya, G., van Wijk, M.T., 2019.  
821 Vulnerability and adaptation options to climate change for rural livelihoods – A country-wide  
822 analysis for Uganda. *Agricultural Systems* 176, 102663.  
823 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2019.102663>  
824 Wichern, J., Heerwaarden, J. van, Bruin, S. de, Descheemaeker, K., Asten, P.J.A. van, Giller, K.E., Wijk,  
825 M.T. van, 2018. Using household survey data to identify large-scale food security patterns  
826 across Uganda. *PLOS ONE* 13, e0208714. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0208714>  
827 Wichern, J., van Wijk, M.T., Descheemaeker, K., Frelat, R., van Asten, P.J.A., Giller, K.E., 2017. Food  
828 availability and livelihood strategies among rural households across Uganda. *Food Sec.* 9,  
829 1385–1403. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-017-0732-9>  
830 World Bank, 2021a. Arable land (hectares per person) - Sub-Saharan Africa.  
831 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/AG.LND.ARBL.HA.PC?locations=ZG>, last accessed  
832 09/12/2021.  
833 World Bank, 2021b. Living Standards Measurement Study - LSMS-ISA. Uganda.  
834 <https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/lsmis/initiatives/lsmis-ISA#43>, last accessed  
835 07/12/2021.  
836 World Bank, 2021c. Living Standards Measurement Study - LSMS-ISA. Tanzania.  
837 <https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/lsmis/initiatives/lsmis-ISA#7>, last accessed  
838 07/12/2021.  
839






Figure 1: Observed and Random Forest predictions of maize yield for the maize trials across sub-Saharan Africa used for model validation. The solid line is the 1:1 line, the dotted line is the regression line of predicted vs observed values.




Figure 2: A) Control maize yield (no fertilizer input) predicted by the Random Forest model and B) maximum relative increase in yield (i.e. yield with maximum (200N/20P/20K) fertilizer application divided by control yield). Areas in Uganda and Tanzania where maize is not grown (according to IFPRI, 2020) appear in white. In areas with two (short and long) cropping seasons per year, the model predicted the same yield because weather-related variables were not used as input to the Random Forest model.

#### References:

IFPRI, 2020. Spatially-Disaggregated Crop Production Statistics Data in Africa South of the Sahara for 2017. <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/FSSKBW>, Harvard Dataverse, V3.




Figure 3: Household (hh) food availability ratio (FA) for 2435 households in Tanzania (A) and 1753 households in Uganda (B). The y-axis was log-transformed so that  $y = \log(FA + 1)$ . Households were ordered by increasing food availability ratio (i.e. the ratio of available food to the required food) along the x-axis. A bar is one household. The red dashed line is the 5000 kcal cap<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup> food security threshold (i.e. food availability ratio =2), and the blue dashed line is the 2500 kcal cap<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup> food security threshold (i.e. food availability ratio =1). A rolling average was applied with subsets of 30 households to smooth the curves for easier interpretation. Different colours indicate the source of the food, be it produced on-farm or purchased. Crops were considered as cash crops when more than 90% of the annual production was sold. Large values of sold and consumed crop on the right side of the plots correspond to potential bias in survey data rather than to real consumption values.




Figure 4: Boxplots of relative change in Food availability ratio (FA) per FA class in baseline (i.e. with current reported N input on maize) in Tanzania and Uganda (A), and for three classes of nitrogen agronomic efficiency (N-AE) (B), per-capita maize area (C), total cropland (D), off-farm income (E) and livestock income (F). Red boxplot are households below the 33<sup>th</sup> percentile of the considered N-AE or farm characteristic, green boxplots are households between the 33<sup>th</sup> and 66<sup>th</sup> percentile, and blue boxplots are households above the 66<sup>th</sup> percentile. The y-axis was log-transformed so that  $y = \log(\text{relative change in FA} + 1)$ .




Figure 5: (A) Share of food insecure maize growers in total agricultural household population in baseline situation (current maize yield) and with profit-maximizing N input on maize in Uganda and Tanzania and (B) share of these food insecure maize growers who have small per-capita maize area (<0.17 ha in Tanzania and <0.03 in Uganda), medium per-capita maize area (0.17-0.38 ha in Tanzania and 0.03-0.07 in Uganda) and large per-capita maize area (>0.38 in Tanzania and >0.07 in Uganda)




Figure 6: Comparison between the i) relative contribution to national increase in maize supply and ii) share in total household population, for household of contrasting food availability ratio (FA) and maize area per capita classes in Tanzania and Uganda. Class 1 for per-capita maize area is <0.17 ha in Tanzania and <0.03 in Uganda, class 2 for per-capita maize area is 0.17-0.38 ha in Tanzania and 0.03-0.07 in Uganda, and class 3 for per-capita maize area is >0.38 in Tanzania and >0.07 in Uganda.




Figure 7: A) Relative change in regional maize supply (dots) and median relative change in household-level food availability (FA) ratio for food insecure maize-growers (with the use of additional, profit-maximizing N input), in regions of Uganda and Tanzania (bars), B) map of regional median relative change in food availability ratio for food insecure maize-growers, and C) map of relative increase in regional maize supply. Numbers in the map are number of regions that correspond with the Region identifier along the x-axis of figure A.






Figure 8: Sensitivity analysis of the impact of a change in maize price, nitrogen agronomic efficiency (N-AE) and N cost on A) profit-maximizing N input, B) share of food insecure maize growers who increase their food availability ratio with the use of additional profit-maximizing N input on maize, C) median relative change in food availability ratio (FA) for food insecure maize growers, and D) relative increase in national maize supply due to the use of additional N input on maize, in Tanzania and Uganda.



