ORGANIC MATTER EFFECT ON Glomus intrarradices IN BEANS (Phaseolus vulgaris L.) GROWTH CULTIVATED IN SOILS WITH TWO SOURCES OF WATER UNDER GREENHOUSE CONDITIONS

Abdul Khalil Gardezi Instituto de Recursos Naturales, Programa de Hidrociencias. Colegio de Postgraduados. Montecillo, Texcoco, Estado de México. 56230 México.

> Sergio R. Márquez-Berber Departamento de Fitotecnia. Universidad Autónoma Chapingo. Chapingo, Estado de México. 56230 México.

Bemjamín Figueroa-Sandoval Instituto de Recursos Naturales, Programa de Hidrociencias. Colegio de Postgraduados. Montecillo, Texcoco, Estado de México. 56230 México.

> Gustavo Almaguer Vargas Departamento de Fitotecnia. Universidad Autónoma Chapingo. Chapingo, Estado de México. 56230 México.

Mario Ulises Larqué-Saavedra Área de Estadística e Investigación de Operaciones. Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Azcapotzalco. México, D.F. México.

> Miguel J. Escalona-Maurice Programa de Desarrollo Rural Montecillo, Texcoco, Estado de México. 56230 México.

SUMMARY

The objective of this research was to evaluate the effect of organic matter on the association with Glomus intrarradices and soil contamination on beans (Phaseolus vulgaris L.). The study was done under greenhouse conditions at the Montecillo Campus of the Postgraduate College, Mexico. Two soils were used, one irrigated with sewage water and the other one with clean water from a well. Half of the plants were inoculated with Glomus intrarradices. Vermicompost was used as a source of organic matter. There were highly significant increases $(p \le 0.05)$ in all the variables recorded due to the application of organic matter, and to the inoculation with Glomus intarradices. The irrigation source of the soils used for this experiment only had a significant effect (p≤0.05) on pod number and nitrogen fixation. The best growth and grain yield occurred with inoculated plants and supplementary organic matter.

Key words: Soil contamination, vermicompost, sewage water, arbuscular endomycorrhiza, edible legumes.

INTRODUCTION

Common bean is the most important legume in Mexico. More than 1.5 million hectares were planted in 2011 in this country. This surface was reduced in 2012 due to severe drought conditions [24]. It is cultivated mainly in areas where water is scarce under rainfall conditions. Sewage water it is used for its irrigation in some regions. Studies on its effect on plant growth and yield are needed.

Farmers usually apply chemical fertilizer. Its cost has been increasing dramatically in the last years [18]. Organic matter sometimes is applied as fertilizer as a sole source or in combination with chemical products. However, its consequences on beneficial microorganisms as endomycorrhiza need to be understood in order to improve their usage.

Glomus intrarradices has been used to improve plant growth under different conditions, included contaminated soils. Several researchers consider that this kind of fungi as the most important organisms on earth interacting in agro environments. More than 80% of all terrestrial plants, among them most of the horticultural and crop plants have a symbiotic relationship with these fungi. The stimulation of plant growth can be attributed mainly to the improvement of phosphorus nutrition [1, 9, 12, 17, 23].

Glomus intrarradices has increased bean yield 36% [19]. Novella *et al.* [21] had reported augmented corn and bean yield when they were cultivated together and were inoculated with a combination of *Rhizobium* and mycorrhiza.

Glomus mosseae amplified shoot growth four times [27]. Mycorhizal development was better under no tillage conditions than using conventional one in an oat-wheat rotation [6]. Mineral nitrogen improves biomass and root growth when mycorrhiza is present [26].

The objective of this study was to investigate the effect of organic matter associated with *Glomus intrarradices*, on the growth and yield of beans, in two soils with different water source under greenhouse conditions.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was done under greenhouse conditions at the Postgraduate College, Montecillo Campus, State of Mexico, in the spring and summer of 2012. Two soils, from Tocuila, Texcoco, Mexico, were used. One was irrigated with sewage water, and the other one with clean water from a well. Their characteristics are shown in Table 1.

Table 1	Soil	anal	ysis	for	the	two	type	es, one	irriga	ted	with	
sewage water and the other with clean one.												

	рн	EC	OM	TN	NO ₃	P	CEC	
Soil sample	1:2	dm sec $^{-1}$	%	%	mg kg ⁻¹	mg kg ⁻¹	C mol (+) kg ⁻¹	
Soil depth 0-5	7.44	349	2.5	0.098	18	15	19	
Residual water								
Soil depth 5-10	7.37	454	2.48	0.096	17	14	18	
Residual water								
Soil depth 10-40	7.44	475	2.45	0.094	15	11	15	
Residual water								
Soil depth 0-5	7.52	314	2.49	0.097	17	14	18	
Clean water								
Soil depth 5-10	7.75	332	2.47	0.095	16	13	17	
Clean water								
Soil depth 10-40	7.85	384	2.43	0.092	13	10	13	
Clean water								
Soil comple	Ca	Mg	K	Na	Fe	Zn	Cu	
Soil sample	Ca mg kg ⁻¹	Mg mg kg ⁻¹	K mg kg ⁻¹	Na mg kg ⁻¹	Fe mg kg ⁻¹	Zn mg kg ⁻¹	Cu mg kg⁻¹	
Soil sample	Ca mg kg ⁻¹ 1250	Mg mg kg⁻¹ 59	Κ mg kg ⁻¹ 1180	Na mg kg ⁻¹ 400	Fe mg kg ⁻¹ 5	Zn mg kg ⁻¹ 3	Cu mg kg ⁻¹ 0.5	
Soil sample Soil depth 0-5 Residual water	Ca mg kg ⁻¹ 1250	Mg mg kg⁻¹ 59	К mg kg ⁻¹ 1180	Na mg kg ⁻¹ 400	Fe mg kg ⁻¹ 5	Zn mg kg ⁻¹ 3	Cu mg kg ⁻¹ 0.5	
Soil sample Soil depth 0-5 Residual water Soil depth 5-10	Ca mg kg ⁻¹ 1250 1210	Mg mg kg ⁻¹ 59 56	K mg kg ⁻¹ 1180 1220	Na mg kg ⁻¹ 400 640	Fe mg kg ⁻¹ 5	Zn mg kg ⁻¹ 3	Cu mg kg ⁻¹ 0.5 0.5	
Soil sample Soil depth 0-5 Residual water Soil depth 5-10 Residual water	Ca mg kg ⁻¹ 1250 1210	Mg mg kg ⁻¹ 59 56	K mg kg ⁻¹ 1180 1220	Na mg kg ⁻¹ 400 640	Fe mg kg ⁻¹ 5	Zn mg kg ⁻¹ 3 3	Cu mg kg ⁻¹ 0.5 0.5	
Soil sample Soil depth 0-5 Residual water Soil depth 5-10 Residual water Soil depth 10-40	Ca mg kg ⁻¹ 1250 1210 1245	Mg mg kg ⁻¹ 59 56 59	K mg kg ⁻¹ 1180 1220 1400	Na mg kg ⁻¹ 400 640 800	Fe mg kg ⁻¹ 5 5 4	Zn mg kg ⁻¹ 3 3 3	Cu mg kg ⁻¹ 0.5 0.5 0.4	
Soil sample Soil depth 0-5 Residual water Soil depth 5-10 Residual water Soil depth 10-40 Residual water	Ca mg kg ⁻¹ 1250 1210 1245	Mg mg kg ⁻¹ 59 56 56 59	K mg kg ⁻¹ 1180 1220 1400	Na mg kg ⁻¹ 400 640 800	Fe mg kg ⁻¹ 5 5 4	Zn mg kg ⁻¹ 3 3 3	Cu mg kg ⁻¹ 0.5 0.5 0.4	
Soil sample Soil depth 0-5 Residual water Soil depth 5-10 Residual water Soil depth 10-40 Residual water Soil depth 0-5	Ca mg kg ⁻¹ 1250 1210 1245 1245	Mg mg kg ⁻¹ 59 56 59 59 58	K mg kg ⁻¹ 1180 1220 1220 1400 1120	Na mg kg ⁻¹ 400 640 800 360	Fe mg kg ⁻¹ 5 5 4 5	Zn mg kg ⁻¹ 3 3 3 3	Cu mg kg ⁻¹ 0.5 0.5 0.4 0.5	
Soil sample Soil depth 0-5 Residual water Soil depth 5-10 Residual water Soil depth 10-40 Residual water Soil depth 0-5 Clean water	Ca mg kg ⁻¹ 1250 1210 1245 1240	Mg mg kg ⁻¹ 59 56 59 59 58	K mg kg ⁻¹ 1180 1220 1400 1120	Na mg kg ⁻¹ 400 640 800 360	Fe mg kg ⁻¹ 5 5 4 5	Zn mg kg ⁻¹ 3 3 3 3 3	Cu mg kg ⁻¹ 0.5 0.5 0.4 0.4	
Soil sample Soil depth 0-5 Residual water Soil depth 5-10 Residual water Soil depth 10-40 Residual water Soil depth 0-5 Clean water Soil depth 5-10	Ca mg kg ⁻¹ 1250 1210 1245 1245 1240 1243	Mg mg kg ⁻¹ 59 56 59 59 58 58 60	K mg kg ⁻¹ 1180 1220 1400 1120 11120	Na mg kg ⁻¹ 400 640 800 360 360	Fe mg kg ⁻¹ 5 5 4 5 5 3	Zn mg kg ⁻¹ 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	Cu mg kg ⁻¹ 0.5 0.5 0.4 0.5 0.4	
Soil sample Soil depth 0-5 Residual water Soil depth 5-10 Residual water Soil depth 10-40 Residual water Soil depth 0-5 Clean water Soil depth 5-10 Clean water	Ca mg kg ⁻¹ 1250 1210 1245 1240 1240 1243	Mg mg kg ⁻¹ 59 56 59 59 58 58 60	K mg kg ⁻¹ 1180 1220 1400 1120 1110	Na mg kg ⁻¹ 400 640 800 360 360	Fe mg kg ⁻¹ 5 5 4 5 3	Zn mg kg ⁻¹ 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	Cu mg kg ⁻¹ 0.5 0.5 0.4 0.4 0.5	
Soil sample Soil depth 0-5 Residual water Soil depth 5-10 Residual water Soil depth 10-40 Residual water Soil depth 0-5 Clean water Soil depth 5-10 Clean water Soil depth 10-40	Ca mg kg ⁻¹ 1250 1210 1245 1245 1240 1243 1243	Mg mg kg ⁻¹ 59 56 56 59 59 58 60 53	K mg kg ⁻¹ 1180 1220 1400 1120 1110 1110 11140	Na mg kg ⁻¹ 400 640 800 360 640 640	Fe mg kg ⁻¹ 5 5 4 5 5 3 3 4	Zn mg kg ⁻¹ 3 3 3 3 3 3 2	Cu mg kg ⁻¹ 0.5 0.5 0.4 0.4 0.5 0.4 0.4	

Key: pH= Hydrogen potential, EC=Electrical conductivity, OM= Organic matter, TN= Total nitrogen, NO₃= Nitric nitrogen, CEC= Cation Exchange Capacity.

The seeds were sterilized with 1% sodium hypochlorite during 4 minutes, and hydrated on filter paper in petri dishes for 48 hours. The seeds were sown in polyethylene bags that had been filled with three kg of two soil types. The treatments were: planting in soil irrigated with sewage water and the other one with clean water. Both soils were collected at three depths 0-5, 5-10, and 10-40 cm from plots of one hectare [5].

The soil organic matter was determined using the Walkey and Black method. For phosphorus, Olsen's method was utilized. Interchangeable bases were measured with ammonium acetate 1 Normal (CH₃COONH₄) pH 7, and micronutrients with DTPA (diethylene-triamine-pentaacetic acid).

Bayomex bean genotype was planted. The seed was provided by the National Institute for Agriculture, Livestock and Forestry Research (INIFAP). The inoculation was done during the planting, mixing 5 g of sand with sorghum roots with 78 % colonization of *Glomus intrarradices* and 1050 spores per 100 g of inert material. Two levels of *Glomus* were applied, with and without *Glomus*.

Organic matter was applied as a vermicompost. It was prepared using 60 kg of bovine manure, 25 kg of melon waste, and 15 kg of wheat straw. The mixture was subjected four months to the action of earth worms. Four doses were applied. In every bag of three kg, 0, 28.86 g, 57.7 g, and 86.46 g of vermicompost were mixed. They are equivalent to 0, 25, 50, and 75 t ha⁻¹ of organic matter.

The variables evaluated were: plant height (PH, cm), leaf area (LA, cm²), pod number (PN), grain dry weight (GDW, g), root length (RL, cm), root volume (RV cm³), root dry weight (RDW, g), pod dry weight (PDW, g), grain number (GN) biomass dry weight (BDW, g), white nodule number (WNN), red nodule number (RNN), and total nodule number (TNN).

A factorial arrangement with 16 treatments (4x2x2) was used with a completely randomized block design with three replications. An analysis of variance for all variables registered was done and a Tukey mean comparison test for the significant variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The soil texture was sandy loam. The pH was alkaline. It was higher in the soils irrigated with clean water. The difference was greater in the 10-40 cm depth. The soil with clean water had a pH of 7.85, and that with sewage water, only 7.44 (Table 1). The electrical conductivity (EC), organic matter (OM), total nitrogen (TN), nitric nitrogen (NO₃), phosphorous (P), Cation Exchange Capacity (CEC), calcium (Ca), potassium (K), sodium (Na), iron (Fe), zinc (Zn), and copper (Cu) quantities are higher in the soils that were irrigated with sewage water.

In both soils, total nitrogen (TN), and the nitric nitrogen (NO₃) quantities were low. The distribution were higher in the 5-10 cm layer. No ammoniacal nitrogen (NH₄) was found in the two soils. It explains why total nitrogen is only slightly higher on the soils that were irrigated with sewage water that had a higher organic matter [20].

The levels of Cu were below the threshold for considering them as contaminants [5]. No Cr and Ni traces were found.

There were highly significant differences ($p \le 0.01$) in all the variables recorded due to the application of organic matter, and to the inoculation with *Glomus intrarradices*.

The pod number, and the white, red, and total nodule number were significantly affected ($p \le 0.05$) for the contamination from the soil with sewage water. Their higher content of nitric and total nitrogen could reduce the nodule number. It is well known the antagonistic effect between nitrogen content is soils and nitrogen fixation [7]. The lack of effect on growth and yield could be explained by the low N fixation [8, 22].

A positive effect of inoculation with *Glomus intrarradices* was found. The highly significant differences ($p \le 0.01$) among treatments for all the variables recorded generated a beneficial effect on plant growth due to an improvement in the absorption of mineral nutrients required by the plants [2, 3]. This behavior was similar to that found by Gardezi *et al.* [8, 9, 12, 13 and 14].

Yield, root and shoot growth from plants with mycorrhiza were superior to those without inoculation (Table 2). The treatments with

mycorrhiza were 54% taller, had 25% more leaf area (Figure 2), 48% heavier shoot dry weight, 47% longer roots, 56% greater root volume, and 48% more root dry weight¹ (Figure 3). This is an indication of a positive effect of mycorrhiza on plant growth originated by better mineral nutrient absorption required by the plant [1, 2]. Gardezi *et al.* [10, 11, 12] also found this beneficial effect in *Leucaena lecocephala* associated with endomycorrhiza and with *Rhizobium.* Positive responses to the inoculation with mycorrhiza were also found in a number of species [24], including beans [2].

The inoculation with *Glomus intrarradices* improved root and shoot growth. It also had a beneficial effect on the biological nitrogen fixation, and a superior absorption of nutrients [12]. Thus, it contributed to higher yield in beans, coinciding with other studies [2]. Inoculated plants had 38% heavier pods and yielded 116% more grain (Table 2, and Figure 1).

 Table 2. Honest significant difference of the effect of Glomus intrarradices on common bean (Phaseolus vulgaris L.).

Glomus intraradices	Plant height (cm)	Dry weigth aerial part (g)		Leaf area (cm2)		Grain number (In)		Grain dry weight (g)		Pod dry weight (g)		Pod number (In)
Inoculated	124.542a		24.292a	448.79a		2.9806a		10.9	58a	3.0000a		2.1849a
No inoculated	100.667b		16.375b	3	57.92b	2.38	345b	5.083b		2.1667b		1.8475b
Glomus intraradices	Root leng (cm)	ht	Root volum (cm3	: ne)	D wei root	ry igth t (g)	W nc nu	/hite odule mber (In)	ท ทเ	Red odule umber (ln)	ı r	Total nodule number (In)
Inoculated	28.70)8a	9.79)17a	3.()833a 1		.9818a		2.6397a		3.0620a
No inoculate	d 19.50)0b	6.2500		2.0833b		1	.2320b		1.9258b		2.2557b

In=transformated to natural log. Means with the same letter in each column are not significantly different (Tukey α = 0.05)



Figure 1. Effect of inoculation with *Glomus intrarradices* and different doses of organic matter (vermicompost) on soils with two types of irrigation in grain dry weight of common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.).

Key: Glumus=0: Noninoculated, Glumus=1: Inoculated with *Glomus intrarradices*. The vertical lines indicate standard error.

Plant growth was affected by the organic matter application (Table 3). It provided significantly higher ($p \le 0.01$) plant height in all the treatments compared with the control. Aryal *et al* [3] found similar results. Only the higher quantities gave heavier dry weight of the aerial part (Figure 4). A similar situation was found in the leaf area (Figure 2).

Table 3. Honest significant difference of the effect of organic matter (vermicompost) on common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.).

Organic matter t*ha ⁻¹	Plant height (cm)	Dr ae	y weigth rial part (g)	Lea (d	of area cm2)	Gra num (Ir	in ber 1)	Grain dr weight (g)	y Poo : we (d dry ight g)	Pod number (In)	
0	90.167b		15.333b		361.67b	2.	289b	4.833	lb 2	2.083b	1.824b	
25	115.000a		19.833ab	4	02.50ab	2.5	511ab	7.917a	ıb :	2.667a	1.949ab	
50	123.417a		22.917a		415.00a	2	.963a 6.0		lb :	2.750a	2.131a	
75	121.833a		23.250a		434.25a	2	.968a	13.250)a :	2.833a	2.161a	
Organic matter t*ha ⁻¹	Root leng (cm)	ht	Root volum (cm3	: ie)	Dry w root	eigth (g)	W no nu (/hite odule mber (In)	Red nodu numl (In	d ule ber)	Total nodule number (In)	
0	19.58	3b	5.9	17b	2	.000b		1.125b	1.7	'44b	2.070b	
25	24.833	ab	7.66	7.667ab		.750a	1	.637ab	2.5	64a	2.919a	
50	25.91	.7a	9.0)83a	3	.000a	1	.682ab	2.33	7ab	2.692a	
75	26.08	3a	9.4	17a	2	.583a		1.983a	2.4	87a	2.954a	

In=transformated to natural log. Means with the same letter in each column are not significantly different (Tukey α = 0.05)



Figure 2. Effect of inoculation with *Glomus intrarradices* on soils with two types of irrigation on leaf area of three cultivars common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.).

Key: Glumus=0: Noninoculated, Glumus=1: Inoculated with *Glomus intrarradices*. The vertical lines indicate standard error.

Root length and root volume (Figure 5) were also significantly greater ($p \le 0.05$) only with the two higher applications of vermicompost. However, all the doses of organic matter gave heavier roots.

Organic matter also promoted nitrogen fixation. All the vermicompost applications had a significantly higher total nodule number. However, only the elevated dose was related with a greater white and red nodule number.

¹ Increase percentages are referred to the values found in bean plants inoculated with mycorrhiza compared to those without inoculation.



Figure 3. Effect of inoculation with *Glomus intrarradices* and organic matter application (vermicompost) in soils with two types of irrigation on pod number of common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.).

Key: Glumus=0: Noninoculated, Glumus=1: Inoculated with *Glomus intrarradices*. The vertical lines indicate standard error.



Figure 4. Effect of inoculation with *Glomus intrarradices* and organic matter application (vermicompost) in soils with two types of irrigation on plant height of common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.).

Key: Glumus=0: Noninoculated, Glumus=1: Inoculated with *Glomus intrarradices*. The vertical lines indicate standard error.

In an analogous way with mycorrhizal inoculation, the organic matter promoted better root and shoot growth. Therefore, as a result, photosynthetic production increased. Pod number was higher with organic matter (Figure 3). Grain yield was 174% enhanced with the highest dose of organic matter compared with the control (Figure 1, Table 3).

Thus, the poorest growth and grain yield occurred with uninoculated plants that lacked supplementary organic matter.

The irrigation source of the soils used for this experiment only had a significant effect ($p \le 0.05$) on pod number and nitrogen fixation. The higher content of organic matter and nitrogen found in the soils watered with sewage water generated a greater pod number. However, this effect was not present in grain yield (Table 4).

Table 4. Honest significant difference of the effect of the irrigation source on common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.).

Irrigation Source	Plant height (cm)	w a pa	Dry reigth rerial art (g)	Leaf (ci	area m2)	Grai numl (In	in ber)	Grain dry weight (g)		Pod dry weight (g)		Pod number (In)
Clean water	109.17a	19.38a		40)0.88a	2.	64a	8.4	16a	2.58a		1.93b
Sewage water	115.29a	a 21.29a		40)5.83a	2.	74a	7.58a		2.58		2.10a
Irrigation Source	Root lenght (cm)		Root volum (cm3)		t Dr ne wei 3) root		W nc nu	/hite odule mber (In)	n nı	Red odule umber (ln)	r n	Total nodule iumber (In)
Clean water	23.4	6a	7.	50a		2.46a	2.31a			2.71a		3.23a
Sewage wate	r 24.7	'5a	8.	54a 2		2.71a		0.91b		1.85b		2.09b

In=transformated to natural log.Means with the same letter in each column are not significantly different (Tukey α = 0.05)



Figure 5. Effect of inoculation with *Glomus intrarradices* and organic matter application (vermicompost) in soils with two types of irrigation on root volume of common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.). Key: Glumus=0: Noninoculated, Glumus=1: Inoculated with *Glomus intrarradices*. The vertical lines indicate standard error.

The nitrogen fixation, measured as the nodule number (white, red, and total) was higher in the soils irrigated with clean water (Table 4). A plausible explanation for this finding is the antagonistic effect between nitrogen content is soils and nitrogen fixation [7]. The soils watered with sewage water had higher total and nitric nitrogen (Table 1). Gardezi *et al.* [15, 16] found similar results in previous experiments.

CONCLUSIONS

Mycorrhizal inoculation and nitrogen fixation provided higher bean root and shoot growth and therefore, better yields. Previous evidence with legumes showed that they have benefited with this symbiosis because the treatments with this fungus produce the highest values for all evaluated variables. The application of organic matter, as vermicompost, improved plant growth, and grain yield. The contamination from the soil by sewage water did not affect plant growth or yield. It only affected nitrogen fixation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors want to thank Dr. Juan Antonio Villanueva, Head of Research, Montecillo Campus, Colegio de Postgraduados, for his valuable help for the development of this project.

LITERATURE CITED

- Alarcón, A. 2008. Los hongos micorrízicos arbusculares como biotecnología en la propagación y manejo de plantas en viveros. Agroproductividad 1(1): 19-23
- [2] Aryal, U. K., H. L. Xu, and M. Fujita. 2003. Rhizobia and AM fungal inoculation improve growth and nutrient uptake of bean plants under organic fertilization. J Sustainable Agric. 21(3): 27-39.
- [3] Aryal, U. K., S. K. Shah, H. L. Xu, M. Fujita. 2006. Growth, nodulation and mycorrhizal colonization in bean plants improved by rhizobial inoculation with organic and chemical fertilization. J Sustainable Agric. 29(2): 71-83.
- [4] Bermúdez, M., L.Castro, y R. Araya V. 1995. Efecto de la aplicación de micorrizas y roca fosfórica sobre el crecimiento y la adquisición de nutrimentos de plantas de frijol en un ultisol de Costa Rica. Mejoramiento y manejo agronómico del frijol común (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) para adaptación en suelos de bajo fósforo. *En* Beck, D.; comp. y ed. Memoria del *Taller Internacional sobre Bajo Fósforo en el Cultivo de Frijol.* San José (Costa Rica). 13-15 Nov 1995. p. 95-103.
- [5] Castellanos, J. Z., J. X. Uvalle B. y A. Aguilar S. 2000. Manual de interpretación de suelos y aguas. Colección INCAPA. México. 226 p.
- [6] Castillo, C. G.; Rubio, R.; Rouanet, J. L.; Borie, F. 2006. Early effects of tillage and crop rotation on arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal propagules in an Ultisol. Biology and Fertility of Soils 43(1): 83-92.
- [7] Dong ShouKun, Liu LiJun, Sun CongShu, Zhang Bing, Ma XiuFeng, Jiao GuangChun, Ma ChunMei, Gong ZhenPing. 2011. A study of the effects of nitrogen levels on nodule growth of soybean using ¹⁵N tracing.
 Plant Nutrition and Fertilizer Science 17 (4): 985-988.
- [8] Gardezi, A.K., R. Ferrera-Cerrato, J. Kohashi, E.M. Engleman y M. Larqué-Saavedra. 1990. Potencial diferentes variedades de *Phaseolus vulgaris* de alta eficiencia en la fijación de nitrógeno en asociación con *Rhizobium leguminosarum* Biovar *Phaseoli*. Agrociencia 1(4): 25-39.
- [9] Gardezi, A. K., I. D. Barceló-Quintal, V.M. Cetina-Alcalá, A. L. Bussy, M. U. Larqué-Saavedra, E. M. Saenz, A. Exebio-García, J. Pérez-Nieto, and M. A. Borja-Salin. 2005. Phytoremediation by *Leucaena leucocephala* in association with arbuscular endomycorrhiza and Rhizobium in soil polluted by Cr. *In* Callaos *et al.* **Proceedings of the 9th World Multiconference on Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics.** Orlando, Florida. U.S.A. VII: 289-298.
- [10] Gardezi, A. K., E. Ojeda-Trejo, E. Mejia-Saenz, A. Exebio-García, U. Larque-Saavedra, S. Márquez-Berber, y V.M. Cetina–Alcalá. 2007. Effect of arbuscular endomycorrhizas associated with cow manure in *Leucaena leucocephala_In* Callaos *et al.* Proceedings of the 11th World Multiconference on Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics. Orlando, Florida. U.S.A. IV: 113-118.

- [11] Gardezi, A. K., A. Exebio-García, E. Ojeda-Trejo, E. Mejia-Saenz, L. Tijerina-Chavez, M. Delgadillo-Piñon, U. Larqué-Saavedra, C. Villanueva-Verduzco, and H. Gardezi. 2008a. Growth response of *Leucaena leucocephala* associated with arbuscular endomycorrhizae to applications of organic matter in an irrigated soil with sewage water. *In* Callaos *et al.* Proceedings of the 12th World Multiconference on Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics. Orlando, Florida. U.S.A. IV: 153-158.
- [12] Gardezi, A. K., E. Ojeda-Trejo, and S. R. Márquez-Berber. 2008b. Respuesta a la inoculación de Glomus intraradix, materia orgánica y dosis de fertilización fosfatada en el crecimiento de mezquite (*Prosopis* sp.). Agroproductividad 1(1): 24-28.
- [13] Gardezi, A. K., I. D. Barceló, A. Exebio-García, E. Mejía-Saenz, U. Larqué-Saavedra, S. R. Márquez-Berber, C. Villanueva-Verduzco, H. Gardezi, and D. Talavera-Magaña. 2009. Cu²⁺ bioaccumulation by *Leucaena leucocephala* in symbiosis with *Glomus* spp. and *Rhizobium* in copper-containing soil. *In* Callaos *et al.* Proceedings of the 13th World Multiconference on Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics. Orlando, Florida. U.S.A. II: 17-22.
- [14] Gardezi, A. K., B. Figueroa-Sandoval, A Exebio-García, S. R. Márquez-Berber, M. U. Larqué-Saavedra, E. Mejía-Saanz, D. Talavera-Magaña, M. E. Delgadillo-Piñon, C. Villanueva-Verduzco, and H. Gardezi. 2010. Effect of *Glomus intrarradices* associated with different genotypes of *Phaseolus vulgaris* (common bean) in two soil types. *In* Callaos *et al.* Proceedings of the 14th World Multiconference on Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics. Orlando, Florida. U.S.A. II:5-10.
- [15] Gardezi, A. K., S. R. Marquez-Berber, B. Figueroa-Sandoval, U. Larqué-Saavedra, M. Escalona-Maurice. 2012. Endomycorrhizal inoculation effect on beans (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.), oat (*Avena sativa* L.), and wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) growth cultivated in two soil types under greenhouse conditions. Journal of Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics 10(5): 68-72.
- [16]Gardezi, A. K., Márquez-Berber S. R., Figueroa-Sandoval, B., Iourii Nikolskii Gavrilov, Larqué-Saavedra U., Escalona-Maurice M. J. 2013. Fungicide effect on *Glomus intrarradices* in different genotypes of beans (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.), oat (*Avena sativa* L.), and wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) growth cultivated in two soil types under greenhouse conditions. Journal of Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics. 11(8):46-51.
- [17] George, E.; V. Romheld y H. Marschner. 1994. Contribution of mycorrhizal fungi to micronutrient uptake by plants. *In* J.A. Manthey, D.E. Crowley y D.G. Lewis (eds.). Biochemistry of metal micronutrients in the rhizosphere. London. pp. 93-109.
- [18] Huang, W. 2009. Factors Contributing to the Recent Increase in U.S. Fertilizer Prices, 2002-08. Outlook AR-33. A Report from the Economic Research Service. USDA. http://www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/AR33/AR33.pdf
- [19] Irizar Garza, M. B.; Vargas Vázquez, P.; Garza García, D.; Tut y Couoh, C.; Rojas Martínez, I.; Trujillo Campos, A.; García Silva, R.; Aguirre Montoya, D.; Martínez González, J. C.; Alvarado Mendoza, S.; Grageda Cabrera, O.; Valero Garza, J.; Aguirre Medina, J. F. 2003. Respuesta de cultivos agrícolas a los biofertilizantes en la Región Central de México. Agricultura Técnica en México, 29(2):. 213-225.
- [20] Lavelle P, and A. Spain. 2005. **Soil Ecology**. Springer Publisher, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.
- [21] Novella L., R., A. M. Machado A., M. C. Ladrón de Guevara, y A. Vega B. 2003. Participación de los biofertilizantes en la producción del policultivo. Alimentaria 349: 133-135.

- [22] Lindemann, W. C., and C. R. Glover. 2003. Nitrogen Fixation by Legumes. Guide A-129. Cooperative Extension Service. College of Agriculture and Home Economics. New Mexico State University.
- [23] Plenchette, C., C. Clermont-Dauphin, J. M. Meynard, and J. A. Fortin. 2005. Managing arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in cropping systems. Can J Plant Sci. 85:31-40.
- [24] SIAP-SIACON. 2013. Information System for Agrifood Consultation. Database. Ministry of Agriculture. Mexico. www.siap.gob.mx
- [25] Tawaraya, K. 2003. Arbuscular mycorrhizal dependency of different plant species and cultivars. Soil Science and Plant Nutrition 49 (5): 655-668.
- [26] Tu, C.; Booker, F. L.; Watson, D. M.; Chen, X.; Rufty, T. W.; Shi, W.; Hu, S. J. 2006. Mycorrhizal mediation of plant N acquisition and residue decomposition: impact of mineral N inputs. Global Change Biology. 12(5): 793-803.
- [27] Yücel, C.; Özkan, H.; Ortas, I.; Yagbasanlar, T. 2009. Screening of wild emmer wheat accessions (*Triticum turgidum* subsp. *dicoccoides*) for mycorrhizal dependency. **Turkish Journal of Agriculture and Forestry** 33 (5): 513-523.