

Original Research Article

Analyzing the role of different molybdenum doses and *Rhizobium* inoculation in optimizing nutrient absorption and yield in vegetable cowpea [*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp.] cv. AVCP 1

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to evaluate the effects of different rates of ammonium molybdate and *Rhizobium* inoculation on the yield and nutrient uptake of vegetable cowpea. Results indicated that the application of ammonium molybdate and *Rhizobium* inoculation significantly improved total cowpea yield. The highest yield was observed with the treatment combination of 300 g ha⁻¹ ammonium molybdate (M₂) and *Rhizobium* inoculation (R₁). Nutrient analysis revealed that phosphorus, potassium and iron content in cowpea pods significantly increased with ammonium molybdate and *Rhizobium* treatments. The highest phosphorus and potassium contents (0.26% and 1.78%, respectively) were recorded with M₂ treatment, while the maximum iron content was found in M₃ treatment. *Rhizobium* treated seeds (R₁) also enhanced phosphorus, potassium and iron content in the pods (0.25%, 1.76% and 195.43 mg kg⁻¹, respectively). In terms of nutrient uptake, the highest nitrogen and phosphorus uptake (250.57 and 37.74 kg ha⁻¹, respectively) was observed with the combined M₂ R₁ treatment. Similarly, the highest potassium uptake in pods (112.08 kg ha⁻¹) and total potassium uptake (181.62 kg ha⁻¹) were recorded with M₂ R₁ treatment, respectively. The interaction between ammonium molybdate and *Rhizobium* inoculation showed significant effects on nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium uptake, highlighting the importance of these treatments in enhancing cowpea nutrient absorption and yield. This study underscores the potential of combined ammonium molybdate application and *Rhizobium* inoculation to optimize nutrient uptake and improve the yield of cowpea in sustainable

Comment [ID1]: Difficult to find the treatment M2. Rather write the treatment summary

Comment [ID2]: Complete the sentence

INTRODUCTION

Vegetables make up a major portion of the human diet in many parts of the world and play a significant role in human nutrition, especially as sources of phyto nutrients: vitamins (C, A, B₁, B₆, B₉, E), minerals, dietary fiber and phytochemicals. Legumes form an integral group among vegetable crops. They are not only nutritious but also have a low glycemic index (GI). Regular consumption of legumes helps control type 2 diabetes, cholesterol levels, hypertension and obesity. Among these leguminous vegetables, cowpea is an important crop grown for its immature pods and seeds.

Comment [ID3]: Add reference

Comment [ID4]: What is the purpose of seeds of cowpea?

Cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp.) is one of the most important legume vegetable grown in India. The choice of cowpea as a vegetable is due to its palatability, nutritional factors and absence of metabolites or other toxins. The use of cowpea as a vegetable acts as a cheap source of protein (22-24%) in vegetarian dominated diets. Being rich in protein and containing many other nutrients, it is also known as vegetable meat. In India, cowpea is cultivated as one of the leading legume vegetable crop, covering an area of 23,012 ha, with an annual production of 1,33,587 tonnes and having productivity of 5800 kg ha⁻¹.

Comment [ID5]: Have you tested? How can you say?

Molybdenum is an essential element, it is a constituent of the nitrogenase enzyme and bacteria fixes nitrogen needs molybdenum during the fixation processes. Molybdenum has a positive effect on yield, quality and nodules forming in legume crops. The functions of molybdenum in leguminous plants include nitrate reduction, nodulation, nitrogen fixation and general metabolism. Molybdenum was required for normal plant growth, reduction supply with molybdenum to the growth medium decreased activities of nitrate reductase and glutamine synthetase involved at initial steps of nitrate assimilation. Generally, Indian soils under natural condition are lacking in effective and specific strain of *Rhizobium*, which is responsible for symbiotic nitrogen fixation, growth stimulation of plant and enhances yield of pulses. *Rhizobium* inoculation also serves as a cheaper and usually more effective agronomic practice for ensuring adequate nitrogen nutrition of legumes than the application of nitrogen fertilizer.

Comment [ID6]: What type of bacteria?

Comment [ID7]: Why?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment conducted at vegetable research farm, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari during summer season on cv. AVCP 1. There were 12 treatment combinations including six concentrations of molybdenum viz., soil application of M₁ 200 g ha⁻¹ and M₂ 300 g ha⁻¹, seed treatment M₃ 25, M₄ 50 g ha⁻¹ seeds and Ammonium molybdate solution M₅ (12.5 % Mo) before sowing with *Rhizobium* i.e., R₀: without, R₁: with *Rhizobium* 10 ml kg⁻¹ seeds inoculation. Cowpea was planted with row to row distance of 45 cm and plant to plant distance of 30 cm in Factorial Randomized Block Design (FRBD) with three replication (Panse and Sukhatme 1985). All the recommended cultural practices and plant protection measures were followed. Observations were recorded from each plant of for yield and various qualitative characters and the data were subjected to statistical analyses. Methods followed for plant analysis: The pods and plants of cowpea were analyzed for N, P, K and Fe content following standard methods given in Table 1. The concentration of the nutrients was expressed in terms of percentage or mg kg⁻¹ as the case may be. Subsequently, the uptake of these nutrients by pod and *haulm* portion of cowpea was also calculated by using the following formula:

Comment [ID8]: How do the authors fix this dose for treatments?

Comment [ID9]: Same as Comment ID8

Comment [ID10]: Same as Comment ID8

Table 1. Methods employed for plant analysis

Nutrients	Method employed	Reference
N	Wet digestion (Chromic acid)	Trivedi <i>et al.</i> , 1999
P and K	Wet digestion (diacid) followed by P: Spectrophotometric (Vanadomolybdophosphoric yellow colour method) K: Flame photometric	Jackson, 1973
Fe	Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer (AAS)	Elwell and Gridley, 1967

Nutrient uptake by plant:

$$N, P, K \text{ uptake (kg/ha)} = \frac{\text{Nutrient content (\%)} \times \text{Yield (kg/ha)}}{100}$$

$$\text{Fe uptake (g/ha)} = \frac{\text{Nutrient content (mg/kg)} \times \text{Yield (kg/ha)}}{1000}$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Yield attributes: The study revealed the effect of Ammonium molybdenum and *Rhizobium* was found significant in total yield (q) of cowpea. Maximum yield was observed in M₂ was 41.83 and *Rhizobium* (R₁) treated seed also help to enhance the cowpea yield was 48.28 and treatment combination M₂R₁ was found maximum in 59.67. This may be because to the presence of molybdenum and biofertilizers, such as *Rhizobium* and PSB, which increase root morphology through the production of cytokinins by *Rhizobium* and growth hormones like IAA. As a result, the plant would have been able to better absorb nutrients, producing more pods per plant and seeds per pod (Chatterjee and Bandyopadhyay, 2017) These findings are in collaboration with those reported by Kumar *et al.* 2018 and Pragi *et al.* 2018.

Comment [ID11]: No mention in the materials Method section!

Comment [ID12]: check

Nutrient Content and uptake by plant the Table 2 revealed that the phosphorus, potassium and iron content in pod increased significantly over control. The maximum phosphorus and potassium (0.26 and 1.78 %, respectively) contain was reported in 300 g ha⁻¹ ammonium molybdate in soil application (M₂) while the iron contain was superior found in M₃ (197.57 mg kg⁻¹) whereas, the *Rhizobium* (R₁) treated seeds also helps to improve phosphorus, potassium and iron content in cowpea pod was (0.25%, 1.76% and 195.43 mg kg⁻¹, respectively).

Comment [ID13]: replace with content

Comment [ID14]: replace with content

The Table 3 showed the significant effect of nitrogen and phosphorus uptake in pod and haulm and total uptake of nitrogen and phosphorus in cowpea and the maximum result was reported in M₂ was 229.15, 200.91, 428.87, 17.57 and 21.01 kg ha⁻¹, respectively and while the total phosphorus uptake was found in M₄ (34.76) and the *Rhizobium* (R₁) treated seeds also helps to improve the uptake of nitrogen and phosphorus in pod and haulm and total nitrogen and

Comment [ID15]: What is the necessity of determining pod and haulm uptake to total uptake, since all are showing similar trends?

phosphorus was 220.42, 190.58, 427.73, 16.68, 20.19 and 32.69 kg ha⁻¹, respectively. The interaction effect of ammonium molybdate and *Rhizobium* was found to be significant in nitrogen uptake in pod and total uptake of nitrogen and phosphorus in cowpea and the result reported the maximum in M₂R₁ was 250.57, 482.20 and 37.74 kg ha⁻¹, respectively. Table 4 shows the significant effect of potassium uptake in pod and haulm and total uptake of potassium. The maximum potassium uptake in pod was reported in M₄ (112.08 kg ha⁻¹) whereas the maximum potassium uptake in haulm and total uptake of potassium was found in M₂ was 72.80 and 181.62 kg ha⁻¹ and the *Rhizobium* (R₁) treated seeds also helps to improve the potassium uptake in pod and haulm and total uptake of potassium was 106.16, 68.03 and 167.07 kg ha⁻¹. The interaction effect of ammonium molybdate and *Rhizobium* was found to be significant in potassium uptake in pod and haulm and total uptake of potassium in cowpea and the result reported maximum in M₂R₁ was 116.63, 74.96 and 182.80 kg ha⁻¹, respectively. It might be because molybdenum increased the activity of the enzymes nitrogenase and nitrate reductase, which improved the soil's ability to fix nitrogen. This can be the result of elevated enzymatic activity in *Rhizobium* and plants. Similar findings were published by Amit *et al.* (2007), who discovered that *Rhizobium* and molybdenum greatly enhanced the plant's uptake of nitrogen, phosphate and potassium in mung beans compared to the control. Additionally, Hossain *et al.* (2005) found that *Bradyrhizobium*, phosphorus and molybdenum applied together increased nitrogen uptake (132.2 kg ha⁻¹) in cv. G-2 (120.6 kg ha⁻¹). The use of micronutrients has been found to be beneficial in enhancing the uptake of nitrogen and phosphorus, while *Rhizobium* inoculation is known to enhance nodulation and nitrogen fixation in plants. This is because molybdenum replaces nitrogen fertilizers in legumes, enhances rhizobial infection, aids in the transport of sugars and there is a close relationship between the supply of micronutrients and nitrogen content (Jyung and Krishna, 1975). The outcome supported the findings of Singh *et al.* (1992) in cowpea and Jethra and Kothari (1995) in fenugreek.

Comment [ID16]: Explain why?

Comment [ID17]: Explain Why?

Comment [ID18]: Discuss

Comment [ID19]: How?

Comment [ID20]: Is it justified to say considering the criteria of essential nutrient elements for plants?

Comment [ID21]: Add conclusion of your findings

Comment [ID22]: Not checked

REFERENCES

- Amit, K. J., Sudhir, K. and Pawar, J. D. S. (2007). Response of mung bean (*Vigna radiata*) to phosphorus and micronutrients on N and P uptake and seed quality. *Legume Research*, 30: 201–4.
- Chatterjee, R. and Bandyopadhyay, S. (2017). Effect of boron, molybdenum and biofertilizers on growth and yield of cowpea in acid soil of eastern Himalayan region. *Journal of the Saudi Society of Agriculture Science*, 16(4): 332-336.
- Elwell, W. T. and Gridley, J. A. F. (1967). In: Atomic absorption spectrophotometry, Pergamon Press Ltd., London, pp. 221

- Jackson, M. L. (1973). In: Soil Chemical Analysis, Prentice Hall of India, Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
- Hossain, M. M., Mian, M. H. and Islam, M. R. 2005. Effect of phosphorus, molybdenum and *BradyRhizobium* inoculants on growth, yield and N uptake of soybean. *International Journal of Subtropical Agricultural Research and Development*. 3: 29-34.
- Jethra, J. K. and Kothari, M. L. (1995). Response of fenugreek to molybdenum and cobalt fertilization management. *Arid Ecosystem*, pp: 199-200.
- Jyung, W. H. and Krishna, A. 1975. Effect of micronutrients in legumes. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 55: 414-20.
- Kumar, R., Tomar, G. S., Kumawat, N. and Singh, S. P. (2018). Effect of varieties, plant density and molybdenum on yield and economics of Black gram (*Vigna mungo* L.) under rainfed condition of Chhattisgarh. *International Journal of Chemical Studies*, 6(1): 1867-1870.
- Panse, V. G. and Sukhatme, P. V. (1985). "Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers", Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi, India, pp: 152-161.
- Pragi, K. L., Leva, R. L., Vaghasiya, H. Y. and Patel, H. A. (2018). Integrated nutrient management in summer cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L.) under South Gujarat condition. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*, 7(9): 1513-1522.
- Singh, B. R., Khadelwal, B. and Singh, B. (1992). Effect of manganese and molybdenum fertilization with *Rhizobium* inoculation on the yield and protein content of cowpea. *Journal of Indian Society of Soil Science*, 40 (4): 738-741.
- Trivedi, B. S. Patel, G. G. Desai, R. M. and Padhiyar G. M. (1999). Comparison of Kjeldahl's and chromic acid methods of nitrogen determination. Gujarat Agricultural University, *Research Journal*, 25(91): 9-14.

Table 2: Effect of different molybdenum doses and *Rhizobium* on total pod yield (t ha⁻¹), phosphorus in pod (%), potassium in pod (%) and Fe content in pod (mg kg⁻¹) of cowpea cv. AVCP 1

	Total yield quintal per ha ⁻¹			Phosphorus in pod (%)			Potassium in pod (%)			Fe content in pod (mg kg ⁻¹)		
	R ₀	R ₁	Mean	R ₀	R ₁	Mean	R ₀	R ₁	Mean	R ₀	R ₁	Mean
M₀	38.33	40.00	39.17	0.21	0.22	0.22	1.63	1.70	1.67	168.06	177.18	172.62
M₁	47.00	48.33	47.67	0.23	0.24	0.24	1.71	1.72	1.72	178.74	181.71	180.22
M₂	38.67	59.67	49.17	0.25	0.28	0.26	1.75	1.81	1.78	182.62	206.68	194.65
M₃	39.00	44.67	41.83	0.24	0.26	0.25	1.73	1.74	1.74	195.41	199.61	197.51
M₄	38.33	48.67	43.50	0.24	0.26	0.25	1.73	1.79	1.76	200.66	204.64	202.65
M₅	39.67	48.33	44.00	0.24	0.26	0.25	1.73	1.78	1.76	201.53	202.78	202.15
Mean	40.17	48.28		0.24	0.25		1.71	1.76		187.83	195.43	
	M	R	M × R	M	R	M × R	M	R	M × R	M	R	M × R
S.Em. ±	1.18	0.68	1.67	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.03	2.84	1.64	4.02
C.D. 5 %	3.45	1.99	4.88	0.03	0.01	NS	0.07	0.04	NS	8.34	4.81	NS
C.V. (%)	6.52			8.37			3.41			3.63		

Table 3: Effect of different molybdenum doses and *Rhizobium* on nitrogen uptake kg ha⁻¹ in pod, nitrogen uptake kg ha⁻¹ in haulm, total nitrogen kg ha⁻¹, phosphorus uptake kg ha⁻¹ in pod, phosphorus uptake kg ha⁻¹ in haulm and total phosphorus kg ha⁻¹ of cowpea cv. AVCP 1

	Nitrogen uptake kg ha ⁻¹ in pod.			Nitrogen uptake kg ha ⁻¹ in haulm.			Total Nitrogen kg ha ⁻¹			Phosphorus uptake kg ha ⁻¹ in pod			Phosphorus uptake kg ha ⁻¹ in haulm			Phosphorus uptake kg ha ⁻¹ in total		
	R ₀	R ₁	Mean	R ₀	R ₁	Mean	R ₀	R ₁	Mean	R ₀	R ₁	Mean	R ₀	R ₁	Mean	R ₀	R ₁	Mean
M₀	160.01	179.35	169.68	167.48	176.35	171.92	273.53	345.33	309.43	13.60	13.98	13.79	17.54	18.26	17.90	24.38	26.18	25.28
M₁	185.77	192.17	188.97	178.82	184.13	181.47	370.97	407.97	389.47	14.97	16.21	15.59	18.72	20.23	19.48	26.92	31.53	29.23
M₂	207.72	250.57	229.15	190.77	211.05	200.91	375.54	482.20	428.87	16.59	18.55	17.57	20.69	21.33	21.01	28.23	37.74	32.99
M₃	218.31	227.27	222.79	187.62	191.68	189.65	404.16	452.27	428.22	15.19	17.60	16.39	19.78	20.03	19.91	30.84	33.38	32.11
M₄	222.58	234.88	228.73	188.63	193.76	191.20	413.64	458.38	436.01	15.09	17.74	16.42	19.05	20.94	20.00	33.42	36.10	34.76
M₅	204.01	238.25	221.13	191.38	186.54	188.96	392.90	420.27	406.58	15.35	15.99	15.67	19.43	20.33	19.88	30.71	31.18	30.95
Mean	199.73	220.42		184.12	190.58		371.79	427.73		15.13	16.68		19.20	20.19		29.08	32.69	
	M	R	M × R	M	R	M × R	M	R	M × R	M	R	M × R	M	R	M × R	M	R	M × R
S.Em. ±	3.40	1.96	4.80	3.35	1.93	4.73	6.62	3.82	9.36	0.48	0.28	0.68	0.42	0.24	0.59	0.97	0.56	1.37
C.D. 5 %	9.96	5.75	14.09	9.82	5.67	NS	19.42	11.21	27.46	1.40	0.81	NS	1.23	0.71	NS	2.84	1.64	4.01
C.V. (%)	3.96			4.37			4.06			7.38			5.22			7.67		

Table 4: Effect of different molybdenum doses and <i>Rhizobium</i> on potassium uptake kg ha ⁻¹ in pod, potassium uptake kg ha ⁻¹ in Haulm and total potassium kg ha ⁻¹ of cowpea cv. AVCP 1									
	Potassium uptake kg ha ⁻¹ in pod			Potassium uptake kg ha ⁻¹ in haulm			Total potassium uptake kg ha ⁻¹		
	R ₀	R ₁	Mean	R ₀	R ₁	Mean	R ₀	R ₁	Mean
M₀	83.95	90.10	87.03	50.66	56.56	53.61	127.37	145.31	136.34
M₁	91.12	97.16	94.14	67.83	68.50	68.17	168.25	151.47	159.86
M₂	98.03	116.63	107.33	70.63	74.96	72.80	180.44	182.80	181.62
M₃	93.07	109.39	101.23	60.87	68.27	64.57	151.65	165.85	158.75
M₄	110.17	113.98	112.08	59.19	70.31	64.75	174.50	180.85	177.67
M₅	108.62	109.72	109.17	68.81	69.58	69.20	175.86	176.11	175.99
Mean	97.49	106.16		63.00	68.03		163.01	167.07	
	M	R	M × R	M	R	M × R	M	R	M × R
S.Em. ±	1.87	1.08	2.65	1.18	0.68	1.66	2.03	1.18	2.88
C.D. 5 %	5.49	3.167	7.76	3.45	1.99	4.88	5.97	3.45	8.44
C.V. (%)	4.5			4.4			3.02		