Magnesium Supplementation ConcerningVariation in soil chemical properties and yield of cowpea Yieldunder graded doses of magnesium application in Ultisol of Kerala

ABSTRACT

Aim: We conducted aA pot culture study was conducted to determine the effectinfluence of varying magnesium levels on soil chemical propertiesand yield of cowpea in Ultisols of Kerala.
We used a

Study design: Ccompletely randomized design. The study was carried out in **the**

Place and duration of study: Radiotracer Laboratory, College of Agriculture, Vellanikkara, Kerala Agricultural University,from inJanuary-April 2019.

Methodology: Varyingmagnesium Magnesium carbonate at levelsranging from 5 mg kg^{-1}to 80 mg.kg^{-1}werewasprovided as magnesium carbonatealong with recommended doses of fertilizers for cowpea maintained in pots. Rhizosphere samples were analyzed during flowering and at harvest of the crop following standard procedures. Yield and yield attributes are recorded at the time of harvest.

Results: Graded doses of magnesium could introduced significant (P< 0.05) variations in the soil available nutrientsstatus and yield of cowpea. Soil pH and available magnesium in rhizospheresoil during flowering and after croppost-harvest increased with the increasing levels of magnesium carbonate, and the treatment supplied withusing80 mg kg^{-1} of magnesium recorded the highest pH, available phosphorus, potassium, and magnesium. In contrast, the gradation of magnesium could not produce significant variation in yield. The highest yieldwas recorded in treatment supplied with 10 mg kg^{-1}of magnesium and was on par with those of higher levels of magnesium supplement.

Conclusion: Graded doses of magnesium could introduced variation in available nutrientsstatusbut a better yield response in cowpea was obtained from magnesium at 10 mg.kg^{-1} of soil.

Keywords: available nutrients, magnesium, Ultisol, available nutrients, yield

INTRODUCTION

Lateritic soils occupy more than fifty per cent 50% of the total geographical area of Kerala. The soils are characterized by low pH, and low cation exchange capacity leading to low nutrient retention due to the dominance of kaolinite, and oxides, and hydrous oxides of iron and aluminium(Chandran*et al.*, 2005). Magnesium saturation constitutes 4-20% of the cation exchange capacity of the soil (Fageria, 2010). Even though magnesium is one of the major exchangeable cations on the exchange complex of soil, magnesium deficiency is a major constraint to crop productivity. About 90–98%~~per cent~~ of the soil Mg is incorporated in the crystal lattice structure of minerals, thus not directly available for plant uptake. Crop loss due to magnesium deficiency can be alleviated with appropriate fertilization practices. Wilkinson (2000) reported a positive correlation ~~and interactions~~ between phosphorus and magnesium in the soil. Generally, Mg has an effect on potassium translocation in soil. The low magnesium status in soil decreases potassium availability (Hanaway, etal 1982). Barber (1995) reported the existence of negative interaction between calcium and magnesium in the soil. Kene et al. (1990) observed a reduced calcium uptake by plants in high magnesium-containing soil, and the plants grown under such conditions showed calcium deficiency. Studies on interactions between calcium, magnesium, and potassium showed a suppressive effect of calcium and potassium on magnesium uptake, which also depends on ionic concentration and soil properties (Camberato and Pan, 2000). Studying nutrient interaction atroot–soil interface is an important aspect ~~in~~ ofmineral nutrition. Hence,~~present investigation was undertaken~~We aimed to study the influence of applied magnesium on soil chemical properties and corresponding variation in cowpea yield.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The pot culture experiment was laid out as a completely randomized design with ~~twelve~~ 12treatments and four replication in January-~~april~~ April 2019.Topsoil (0-15cm) representingUltisolwas collected from Water Management Research Unit ($13^0$32N and $76^0$26E), Kerala Agricultural University. The soil sample was air dried, ground, sieved through a 2 mm sieve, and characterized for physicochemical properties. ~~The soil samplewas air dried, ground, sieved through a 2 mm sieve and characterized for physico-chemical properties.The soil was sandy clay in texture with an initial pH of 4.7. Organic carbon (1.32%), available nitrogen (476.67 kgha^{-1}) and potassium (240.18 kgha^{-1}) were medium in status, while phosphorus (98.04 kgha^{-1}) was high. The secondary and micronutrients except magnesium (64.53 mg kg^{-1}) and boron (0.22 mg kg^{-1}) were sufficient (Table 1).~~

Five kilogramsof soil ~~was~~ werefilled in earthen pots. Treatmentsincluded were ~~absolute~~ control (T_1), recommended dose of fertilizers (RDF; ~~)~~ ~~(~~T_2), RDF + magnesium ~~@~~ ~~(~~5 mg.kg^{-1};~~ of soil (~~T_3), RDF+ magnesium ~~@ (~~10 mg.kg^{-1}; ~~of soil (~~T_4), RDF+ magnesium ~~@ (~~15 mg.kg^{-1}; ~~of soil (~~T_5), RDF+ magnesium ~~@ (~~20 mg.kg^{-1}; ~~of soil (~~T_6), RDF + magnesium ~~@ (~~30 mg.kg^{-1}; ~~of soil (~~T_7), RDF+ magnesium ~~@ (~~40 mg.kg^{-1}; ~~of soil (~~T_8), RDF+ magnesium ~~@ (~~50 mg.kg^{-1}; ~~of~~

Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript soil (T9), RDF + magnesium @ (60 mg.kg^{-1}; of soil (T10) and RDF + magnesium @ (80 mg.kg^{-1} of soil ; (T11).

The recommended dose of fertilizers for cowpea includes the application of 20 t.ha^{-1} of vermicompost (VC), 250 kg.ha^{-1} calcium carbonate, and 20:30:10 kg.ha^{-1} of N, P_2O_5, and K_2O and was modified based on initial soil test result (KAU, 2016). After applying calcium carbonate, a one-week interval was given for applying organic manure. Two weeks after thepost-application of organic manure, varying levels of magnesium carbonate were added in accordance withfollowing the treatments. Three seeds of bhagyalakshmi, a bush cowpea variety, were sown in each pot, and one healthy seedling was maintained after one week of emergence. Half a dose of nitrogen and complete doses of phosphorus and potassium were applied after thinning the population. The remaining dose of nitrogen was supplied two weeks after the first application.Foliar application of boron (0.05%) was done twice to combat boron deficiency. The nutrients were supplied through water-soluble sources. Organic manure used for the study was characterized and was found havingto havea pH of 7.10. The nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, calcium, and magnesium in the vermi compostVC were 1.71, 0.30, 0.61, 1.27, and 0.28% respectively (table Table 2). Irrigation with de-ionized water, weed control, and plant protection measures were adopted uniformly in each pot.

Soil analysis was carried out during flowering and at the harvest of the crop. At flowering, soil samples were collected by destructive sampling of two replications. A composite sample from five pots maintained under each replication was used for analyzing various chemical properties. Soil pH, EC, K, Ca, and Mg were determined by following the procedure of Jackson (1958). The organic carbon was analyzed by the wet oxidation method of Walkley and Black (1934), available N by Subbiah and Asija (1956) method, P by Bray and Kurtz (1945) method and Fe, Mn, Zn, and Cu was determined by following the procedure of Sims and Johnson (1991). The data were analyzed statistically using the OPSTAT software package (Sheoran*et al*., 1998) and Duncan's multiple range test was employed to test the significance of the difference between means of treatments.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The soil was sandy clay in texture with an initial pH of 4.7. Organic carbon, available nitrogen, and potassium were medium in status, while phosphorus was high. The secondary and micronutrients except magnesium and boron were sufficient (Table 1).

~~Soil analysis was carried out during flowering and at harvest of the crop. At flowering, soil samples were collected by a destructive sampling of two replications. A composite sample from five pots maintained under each replication was used for analyzing various chemical properties. Soil pH, EC, K, Ca and Mgwere determined by following the procedure of Jackson (1958). The organic carbon was analysed by the wet oxidation method ofWalkley and Black (1934),available N by Subbiah and Asija (1956) method, P byBray and Kurtz (1945) method and Fe, Mn, Zn and Cuwas determined by following the procedure of Sims and Johnson (1991). The data was analysed statistically using OPSTAT software package (Sheoran *et al*., 1998) and Duncan's multiple range test was employed to test the significance of the difference between means of treatments.~~

Soil pH measured during flowering and after harvest differed significantly (P<0.05) between treatments with the highest increment obtained in soil treated with 80 mg.kg^{-1}~~of magnesium~~ (Table 3). Applyingmagnesium carbonate with a neutralizing value of 118.61% resulted in an increased soil pH.The increased soil pH observed after crop harvest compared to the flowering stage in all treatments except absolute control might be due to the slow solubility of magnesium carbonate. The solubility of dolomite/ magnesite was 87% less than kieserite three weeks after application (Senbayram*et al.,* 2015).

The organic carbon content in the soil increased ~~from the initial value of 1.32 %~~ in all treatments except absolute control during flowering and harvest, which can be attributed to the addition of~~ vermicompost~~VC~~at 20 t ha^{-1}~~(Table 3). ~~Available nitrogen status in soil varied between 347.72 – 534.46 mg kg^{-1} during flowering and 286.12 – 501.72 mg^{-} kg $^{-1}$at harvest.~~ Available nitrogen in the soil was significantly (P<0.05) higher in treatment supplied with a recommended dose of fertilizers during flowering and ~~after~~ post-harvest~~ of crop~~, which can be attributed to the higher organic carbon status of soil in this treatment (Table 1).~~Organic~~ The organic carbon content of the soil is taken as the index of nitrogen supplying power as the C:N ratio is usually stabilized at 10:1 to 12:1 ~~under~~ intropical humid climates (Sureshkumar*et al*., 2018; John, 2014).

Soil analysis for available phosphorus during flowering and harvest showed a significantly (P<0.05) higher status in treatment supplied with 80 mg.kg^{-1} magnesium, which might be due to the increase in soil pH (~~table~~ Table 3). ~~The pH of soil recorded during flowering and harvest was 5.20.~~ Hence result was ~~in accordance with~~following the finding of Fageria*et al.* (2008), who reported an increase in available phosphorus as pH increased to above 5.0, due to the release of P ions from Al and Fe oxides. Adams (1980) also reported the occurrence of positive correlation and interactions between phosphorus and magnesium in soil and that Mg helps in greater solubilisation solubilizationof phosphorus in soil.

Available potassium was significantly (P<0.05) higher in soil received 80 mg.kg^{-1}magnesium both flowering and after harvest (Table 4). This might be due to the release of potassium from the exchange sites to maintain the equilibrium between the soil solid phase and solution phase. According to Schofield's ratio law, the ratio of cations held by the soil and the ratio in an equilibrium solution is constant (Sanyal*et al*., 2009). Hannaway*et al*. (1982) studied the effect of Mg on K translocation in soil and reported that low magnesium status in soil decreases the available K.

Available calcium levels ranged between 390.67- 538.25 mg kg^{-1} during flowering and 467.35 - 627.25 mg kg^{-1} during harvest. Available calcium level increased from the initial level in all treatments except absolute control due to the calcium release from calcium carbonate/ organic manure (Table 4). A further increase in available calcium in the soil was observed after the croppost-harvest, which might indicate the release of calcium from calcium carbonate and/or organic manure (1.27% calcium). Though there isconflicting information concerning the reaction time of limestone in acid soils, Jones and Mallarino (2018) reported a significant influence of reagent-grade calcium carbonate in the soil after 200 days of incubation though a significant increase in pH was realized within 10 days.

The variations in available Mg content in soil at both stages of analysis corresponded to the gradation in magnesium through added sources with the highest content in treatment supplied with 80mg.$kg^{-1}$of magnesium (Table 4). An increase in available magnesium status at crop harvest when compared to the flowering stage indicates the release of magnesium from magnesium carbonate. Further, an increase in the available pool of nutrients in maintaining sufficient soil humidity and temperature was reported by Fageria(2010).

Yield and related biometric attributes were significantly (P<0.05) influenced by the varying levels of magnesium added (Table 5). Significantly (P<0.05) higher plant height was obtained in treatment supplied with 10 mg.$kg^{-1}$of magnesiumwith a mean value of 61.65cm and followed by plants treated withby 30 and 15 mg.$kg^{-1}$of magnesium. The treatments differed significantly (P<0.05) with respect toconcerningthe number of pods per plant. A significantly(P<0.05) higher number of pods per plant was obtained in plants that received 50 mg.$kg^{-1}$of magnesium and was wereon par with that of 5, 10, 15, 20, and 80 mg.$kg^{-1}$of magnesium.A sSignificantly (P<0.05) long pods were observed in plants supplied with 5, 30, and 60 mg.kg^{-1}of magnesium. The treatments differed significantly with respect to the yield per plant. Plants treated with 10 mg.kg^{-1}of magnesium recorded significantly (P<0.05) higher yields but were on par with that of 50, 20, 30, 60, and 80 mg.kg^{-1} magnesium received plants. The absolute control treatment recorded the lowest yield. The lack of growth response to the higher dose of magnesium addition indicated that a moderate level of magnesium *ie*10 mg.kg^{-1}would be sufficient to meet the magnesium requirements of cowpea.

CONCLUSION

On a final note, concurrent increases in soil pH and available magnesium were recorded during the flowering and harvest stage of cowpea with a graded dose of magnesium added.A better amelioration of soil pH and the highest available magnesium, potassium, and phosphorus were recorded in soil that received 80 mg.kg^{-1} of magnesium. But the response of cowpea yield was not ~~in accordancewith~~followingthe varying levels of magnesium~~ supplied~~. A better yield ~~response~~ in cowpea was obtained from magnesium at 10 mg.kg^{-1}~~ of soil~~, suggesting to be the optimum dose for yield maximization.

REFERENCE

Comment [es1]: MUST BE UPDATED as 8.7% (2 out of 23) of the listed references were published in the past five years. The percentage has to increase to at least 30-40%. The lack of updated references indicated a study of lower interest

Adams F. Interactions of phosphorus with other elements in soils and in plants. In: Khasawneh FE,editors, The Role of Phosphorus in Agriculture. Soil Science Society of America, Madison, 1980.

Barber SA. Soil Nutrient Bioavailability: A Mechanistic Approach. John Wiley & Sons.1995: 263p.

Berger KC. and Troug E. Boron determination in soil and plant. Indian Eng. Chem. Anal. Ed.1939: 11: 540-542.

Bray RH, and Kurtz LT. Determination of total nitrogen, organic and available form of phosphorus in soils. Soil Sci. 1945: 59: 39-45.

Camberato JJ. and Pan WL. Bioavailability of calcium, magnesium, and sulfur. In: Sumner, M. E (ed.), Handbook of soil science. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press. 2000.

Chandran P, Ray SK, Bhattacharyya T, Srivastava P, Krishnan P, and Pal DK. Lateritic soils of Kerala, India: their mineralogy, genesis, and taxonomy. Aust. J. Soil Res. 2009: 43:839–852.

Fageria NK. Optimum soil acidity indices for dry bean production on an Oxisol in no-tillage system. Commun. Soil Sci. Plant Anal. 2008: 39:845-857.

Fageria NK. The use of nutrients in crop plants. CRC Press, Boca Raton. 2010.

Hannaway DB, Bush LP, and Leggett JE. Mineral composition of Kenhytall fescue as affected by nutrient solution concentrations of Mg and K. J. Plant Nutr.1982: 5:137-151.

Jackson ML. Soil Chemical Analysis. Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi. 1958.

John I. 2014. Wet soil analysis nutrient prescription in paddy soils. M. Sc. (Ag) thesis, Kerala Agricultural University, Thrissur, 130p.

Jones, J. D. and Mallarino, A. P. 2018. Influence of source and particle size on agricultural limestone efficiency at increasing soil pH. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 82(1):271-282.

KAU [Kerala Agricultural University].Package of Practices Recommendations: Crops (15th Ed.). Kerala Agricultural University, Thrissur. 2016.

Kene HK, Wankhade ST, and Sagare BN. Influence of nutrient spray on yield and oil content of sunflower. Annu. Plant Physiol. 1990:4(2): 249-251.

Sanyal S, Ghosh D, and Gosh D. Kinetics of potassium adsorption and desorption in some soils of west Bengal. J. Indian Chemical Soc. 2009: 86(4): 367-376.

Senbayram M, Gransee A, Wahle V, and Thiel H. Role of magnesium fertilizers in agriculture: plant–soil continuum. Crop Pasture Sci. 2015: 66(12):1219-1229.

Sheoran OP, Tonk DS, Kaushik LS, Hasija RC, and Pannu RS. Statistical Software Package for Agricultural Research Workers. In: Hooda DS, and Hasija RC, editors. Recent Advances in information theory, Statistics & Computer Applications by Department of Mathematics Statistics, CCS HAU, Hisar. 1998.

Sims JR, and Johnson GV. Micronutrient soil test. In: Mortvedt JJ,Cox FR, Shuman LM, and Welch RM, editors. Micronutrient in Agriculture (2nd Ed.), Madison, U. S. A. 1991.

Subbiah BV and Asija CL. A rapid procedure for estimation of available nitrogen in soils. Current Sci.1956: 25: 259-260.

Sureshkumar P, Geetha P and Bhindhu PS. Chemistry and Fertility - Management of Humid Tropical Soilsof Kerala as Influenced by Topography and Climate. Indian J. Fertil.2018: 14 (3): 30-44.

Tabatabai MA.Sulfer. In: Page AL, Keeney DR, Baker DE, Miller RH, Roscoe Ellis Jr, and Rhoades JD, editors. Method of Soil Analysis part 2 Chemical and Microbial Properties (2nd Ed.). American Society of Agronomy, Mdison, Wisconsin, USA. 1982.

Walkley AJ. and Black IA. 1934. Estimation of soil organic carbon by chromic acid titration method. Soil Sci. 31: 29-38.

Wilkinson SR., Grunes DL, and Sumner ME. Nutrient interactions in soil and plant nutrition. In: Sumner ME, editors.Handbook of soil science. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press. 2000.

Table 1. Initial soil properties of the experimental site

Soil parameters	**Value**
Sand (%)	46.90
Silt (%)	11.60
Clay (%)	40.30
Texture	Sandy clay

pH	4.70
Electrical Conductivity (EC) ($dS.m^{-1}$)	0.07
Organic carbon (OC) (%)	1.32
Available nitrogen (Av. N) ($kg.ha^{-1}$)	476.67
Available phosphorus (Av. P) ($kg.ha^{-1}$)	98.04
Available potassium(Av. K) ($kg.ha^{-1}$)	240.18
Available calcium (Av. Ca) ($mg.kg^{-1}$)	429.30
Available magnesium (Av. Mg) ($mg.kg^{-1}$)	64.53
Available sulphur (Av. S) ($mg.kg^{-1}$)	5.00
Available iron (Av. Fe) ($mg.kg^{-1}$)	12.41
Available manganese(Av. Mn) ($mg.kg^{-1}$)	16.26
Available zinc (Av. Zn) ($mg.kg^{-1}$)	3.81
Available copper (Av. Cu) ($mg.kg^{-1}$)	8.08
Available boron (Av. B) ($mg.kg^{-1}$)	0.24
Effective cation exchange capacity ($cmol(+)kg^{-1}$)	5.63

Table 2 Characteristics of organic manure

Parameters	Content
pH	7.10
EC (dS m^{-1})	0.81
Nitrogen (%)	1.79
Phosphorus (%)	0.30
Potassium (%)	0.61
Calcium (%)	1.97
Magnesium (%)	0.28
~~Sulphur~~ Sulfur(%)	0.25
Iron (mg.kg^{-1})	1000.00
Manganese (mg.kg^{-1})	290.60
Zinc (mg.kg^{-1})	80.50
Copper (mg.kg^{-1})	24.00
Boron (mg.kg^{-1})	64.40

Table 3. Effect of treatments on soil pH, organic carbon, available N, and available P content of the soil

Treatments		pH		Organic carbon (%)		Available Nitrogen(kg ha^{-1})		Available P (kg ha^{-1})	
		Flowering	Harvest	Flowering	Harvest	Flowering	Harvest	Flowering	Harvest
T_1	Absolute control	4.75^{g}	4.72^{g}	1.27^{g}	1.08^{f}	347.72^{g}	286.12^{c}	82.89^{g}	72.23^{h}
T_2	~~Recommended~~ The recommended dose of fertilizers (RDF)	4.88^{f}	4.92^{e}	2.54^{a}	2.12^{a}	534.55^{a}	501.72^{a}	122.55^{bc}	137.24^{a}
T_3	RDF + magnesium ~~@~~ (5 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	4.94^{d}	4.96^{de}	2.02^{c}	1.90^{abc}	502.46^{bc}	489.21^{a}	116.89^{d}	98.28^{e}
T_4	RDF + magnesium ~~@~~(10 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	4.96^{d}	4.97^{de}	1.43^{f}	1.72^{bcd}	512.37^{b}	345.18^{b}	107.14^{f}	98.79^{e}
T_5	RDF + magnesium ~~@~~ (15 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	4.88^{ef}	4.91^{e}	2.54^{a}	1.70^{cde}	503.52^{bc}	332.41^{bc}	121.50^{c}	125.1^{c}
T_6	RDF + magnesium ~~@~~ (20 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	4.94^{d}	4.98^{cd}	1.51^{f}	1.67^{cde}	371.02^{f}	482.94^{a}	113.3^{e}	88.1^{g}
T_7	RDF + magnesium ~~@~~ (30 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	5.01^{c}	5.02^{c}	1.48^{f}	1.525^{de}	506.38^{b}	502.94^{a}	108.35^{f}	94.48^{f}

T_8	RDF + magnesium ~~@~~ (40 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	5.04^{c}	5.14^{b}	1.87^{d}	1.50^{de}	509.52^{b}	348.45^{b}	107.69^{f}	98.29^{e}
T_9	RDF + magnesium ~~@~~ (50 mg kg^{-1} ~~of soil~~)	4.92^{de}	4.95^{de}	2.23^{b}	1.47^{e}	429.98^{e}	495.48^{a}	123.83^{b}	125.20^{c}
T_{10}	RDF + magnesium ~~@~~ (60 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	5.10^{b}	5.14^{b}	1.77^{de}	1.95^{ab}	512.09^{b}	470.39^{a}	106.7^{f}	109.73^{d}
T_{11}	RDF + magnesium ~~@~~ (80 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	5.20^{a}	5.20^{a}	1.74^{e}	1.99^{a}	491.40^{c}	472.39^{a}	131.76^{a}	129.88^{b}

Treatment means with common superscripts do not differ significantly

Treatments		Potassium (kg ha^{-1})		Calcium (mg kg^{-1})		Magnesium (mg kg^{-1})	
		Flowering	Harvest	Flowering	Harvest	Flowering	Harvest
T_1	Absolute control	139.38^{f}	191.99^{h}	390.67^{c}	467.35^{f}	55.57^{i}	63.10^{g}
T_2	~~Recommended~~ The recommended dose of fertilizers (RDF)	183.29^{b}	268.24^{bc}	511.75^{b}	575.02^{d}	73.77^{g}	80.90^{e}
T_3	RDF + magnesium ~~@~~ (5 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	149.01^{e}	234.24^{fg}	502.00^{b}	580.50^{d}	67.72^{h}	70.52^{f}
T_4	RDF + magnesium ~~@~~(10 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	150.02^{e}	244.49^{e}	510.75^{b}	624.00^{a}	75.90^{f}	79.49^{b}

Table 4. Effect of treatments onavailable potassium, calcium, and magnesium

T_5	RDF + magnesium @ (15 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	148.06^{e}	259.56^{cd}	502.40^{b}	627.25^{a}	76.90^{fg}	93.10^{d}
T_6	RDF + magnesium @ (20 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	156.96^{d}	229.60^{g}	504.75^{b}	598.25^{c}	77.85^{f}	82.55^{e}
T_7	RDF + magnesium @ (30 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	157.86^{d}	242.42^{ef}	502.07^{b}	616.50^{ab}	81.77^{e}	89.42^{d}
T_8	RDF + magnesium @ (40 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	165.20^{c}	256.92^{d}	538.25^{a}	605.30^{bc}	93.05^{d}	100.80^{c}
T_9	RDF + magnesium @ (50 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	179.42^{b}	250.82^{de}	520.00^{ab}	597.50^{c}	105.25^{b}	110.40^{b}
T_{10}	RDF + magnesium @ (60 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	166.65^{c}	276.92^{b}	499.92^{b}	614.00^{abc}	101.10^{c}	126.82^{a}
T_{11}	RDF + magnesium (@ 80 mg kg^{-1}) ~~of soil~~	198.74^{a}	290.64^{a}	507.25^{b}	557.25^{e}	123.47^{a}	130.95^{a}
Treatment means with common superscripts do not differ significantly							

Table 5. Effect of ~~treatments~~ Treatments on biometric parameters of ~~cowpea~~Cowpea

Treatments	Plant height	Pods per plant	Length of pods	Yield

T_1	Absolute control	37.90^{f}	8.25^{f}	9.60^{g}	33.04^{e}
T_2	RDF + magnesium (5 mg kg^{-1})~~RDF + magnesium @ 5 mg kg^{-1} of soil~~	52.80^{c}	19.5^{abc}	17.70^{a}	70.39^{c}
T_3	RDF + magnesium (10 mg kg^{-1})~~RDF + magnesium @10 mg kg^{-1} of soil~~	61.65^{a}	19.50^{abc}	15.80^{bc}	79.33^{a}
T_4	RDF + magnesium (15 mg kg^{-1})~~RDF + magnesium @ 15 mg kg^{-1} of soil~~	56.95^{b}	18.75^{abc}	15.95^{bc}	73.33^{bc}
T_5	RDF + magnesium (20 mg kg^{-1})~~RDF + magnesium @ 20 mg kg^{-1} of soil~~	49.65^{d}	20.25^{ab}	15.05^{cd}	76.57^{ab}
T_6	RDF + magnesium (30 mg kg^{-1})~~RDF + magnesium @ 30 mg kg^{-1} of soil~~	58.95^{b}	17.25^{bc}	17.00^{ab}	75.28^{abc}
T_7	RDF + magnesium (40 mg kg^{-1})~~RDF + magnesium @ 40 mg kg^{-1} of soil~~	48.40^{d}	18.00^{bc}	15.50^{c}	73.30^{bc}
T_8	RDF + magnesium (50 mg kg^{-1})~~RDF + magnesium @ 50 mg kg^{-1} of soil~~	49.80^{d}	21.75^{a}	16.35^{abc}	76.12^{abc}
T_9	RDF + magnesium (60 mg kg^{-1})~~RDF + magnesium @ 60 mg kg^{-1} of soil~~	48.25^{d}	16.50^{cd}	17.70^{a}	74.64^{abc}
T_{10}	RDF + magnesium (80 mg kg^{-1})~~RDF + magnesium @ 80 mg kg^{-1} of soil~~	49.55^{d}	18.75^{abc}	13.95^{de}	74.19^{abc}
Treatment means with common superscripts do not differ significantly					