

Biological Forum – An International Journal

14(1): 455-459(2022)

ISSN No. (Print): 0975-1130 ISSN No. (Online): 2249-3239

# Effect of different Land-use Systems on Microbial Population and Urease Enzyme activity in a Mollisol

Basta Ram<sup>1\*</sup>, Ajeet Pratap Singh<sup>1</sup>, Vijay Kant Singh<sup>2</sup>, Shubham Anil Durgude<sup>1</sup> and Anil Nath<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Soil Science, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, (Uttarakhand), India. <sup>2</sup>Depatment of Soil Science, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, (Punjab), India.

> (Corresponding author: Basta Ram\*) (Received 20 October 2021, Accepted 20 December, 2021) (Published by Research Trend, Website: www.researchtrend.net)

ABSTRACT: The soil microbial properties and urease activity significantly influenced by different different treatments. Different land uses effect micrbial and urease enzyme activity, the present study was conducted at Norman E. Borlaug Crop Research Centre, G. B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar. The different treatment selected for study were  $T_1$  (rice–potato–okra),  $T_2$  (rice–pea (vegetable)–maize),  $T_3$  (sorghum multi-cut (fodder)–yellow sarson–black gram),  $T_4$  (rice-wheat–green gram),  $T_5$  (rice–berseem + oat + mustard (fodder)–maize + cowpea (fodder)),  $T_6$  (guava + lemon),  $S_7$  (poplar + turmeric),  $T_8$  (eucalyptus + turmeric),  $T_9$  (fallow). The highest value of soil bacteria (4.29 × 10<sup>8</sup> cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), fungi (3.99 × 10<sup>5</sup> cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), actinomycetes (3.46 × 10<sup>6</sup> cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), total microbial count (4.78 × 10<sup>8</sup> cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil). More over, urease enzyme activity (9.23mg urea g<sup>1</sup> soil 24h<sup>-1</sup>) observed under the  $T_8$  treatment, which was significantly differ from  $T_9$ . Value of  $T_7$  treatment was obtained significantly at par with  $T_8$  treatment with respect to bacterial count. According to this finding, the soil under crop and crop + forest based treatments was found better with respect to soil microbial population popuand urease enzyme activity followed by crops, and uncultivated land.

The high amount chemical fertilize application in crop adversely are influence of soil health, production potential, water pollution, increase environmental challenge, land degradation, the areas increase of problematic soil and loss of soil biodiversity. This all are the challenge related to monocroping in particular area. Resultant most fertile soil become unproductive, Therefore, solution of this problems is that we should bring different land uses systems into practice, which will develop in the soil health and the quality of the soil. On the basis of result of this experiment, we can say that more soil health was found in the crop and forestry base treatments, as well as it was found that with this type of system, we can also generate additional income like different products from different systems. which is sold in different markets It has been concluded from this experiment that the number of fungi, bacteria, actinomycetes, total mircobial count and uraceae enzyme activity has been observed more in the crop and forestry based land uses systems because the forestry system increases the amount of organic carbon in the soil as well as in the amount of food for microbes. The forestry system improves other properties of the soil such as physical, chemical and biological properties, resultant increase the productivity and health of the soil.

Keywords: Land-use Systems, Microbial count, urease enzyme activity.

# INTRODUCTION

Soil is a complex mixer of minerals consisting of different form of minerals, OM, soil separates, water retention and void in soil. Nutrients are contribute in soil from mineral by decomposition, mineralisation, immobilisation, absorption, and desorption (IFOAM, 2002). Soil is highly diverse in nature because it is composed of physical, chemical and biological properties (Goovaerts, 1998). Any process in soil affect soil properties; therefore, knowledge of soil properties is essential with different land-use systems (Amusan *et al.*, 2006). Biological properties influence soil fertility by different processes like solubilization, absorption.

desorption. and mineral and organic matter transformation. In addition, soil biological properties provide information regarding nutrient dynamics, nutrient availability, soil quality and health, root growth, soil erosion and seed germination. Since many soil biological processes became the founder of other soil processes, which may be variations induced by the different treatments. The present study was conduct for study of soil microbial population and urease under treatment. different different The Bacteria, actinomycetes, fungi and algae are part of soil microbial biomass, active carbon fraction of soil organic matter and nutrient cycling (Henrot and Robertson 1994). Soil nutrient content and its

availability are highly correlated with microbial biomass present in the soil. Therefore it is consider as indicator of soil quality under agricultural land (Rice et al., 1986) and directly effect on soil health (Marschner et al., 2001). Biochemical dynamics of carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus(P) mineralization of nutrient are associated with microbial population (Schoenholtz et al., 2000). Micro and essential nutrient in present in complex forms in soil and that are not easily available to the plants as water soluble form. Microbes helping in making complex form to water soluble forms (Grayston et al., 1998). Micro and essential nutrient in present in complex forms in soil and that are not easily available to the plants as water soluble form. Microbes helping in making complex form to water soluble forms (Grayston et al., 1998). Conventional tillage, irrigation, fertilizer application and human related activity influenced on microbial populations well activity of microbes in soil (Arunachalam 2003; Liebig et al., 2004). The alteration of microbial population is due to different land use, continue cultivation and loss of soil organic matter in cultivated soil (Srivastava and Singh 1989). Agroforestry and management practice influenced on biological properties degraded land due to addition of high quality crop and organic residue in soil (Mendonça et al., 2001). Fisher (1995) reported that trees based land use influenced soil biological properties by different ways such as many trees species fix nitrogen from atmosphere therefore increase nitrogen content in soil. Trees may also enhance the above and below ground microclimate around plant roots and may alter the soil biological properties. In Kenya, Belsky et al. (1989) reported 35% to 60% more soil microbial biomass under Adansonia digitata and Acacia tortilis crowns than in the grassland areas because of trees provide good bioclimate. Trees influenced above and below microclimate near root zone area ultimately that alter soil biological properties. kenya Belsky et al. (1989) reported 35 - 60% more microbial biomass with Acacia tortilis and Adansonia digitata cownns thanin the graasland area because of trees provide favourable bioclimate Kaur et al. (2000) reported soil microbial biomass under mono cropping of rice, forestry, and agro forestry in India. microbial biomass data was increased by 42% (microbial-C) and 13% (microbial-N) in agro forestry compared to cropping system. The agro-forestry based land use obtained more microbial biomass and population in soil.

From the results of this experiment, it has been concluded that adopting agroforestry in future, instead of any one cropping system, which we will be able to conserve soil, soil productivity, and crop production will also increase.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

# A. Physiographic description of the study area

The that study was conducted at Norman E. Borlaug Crop Research Centre of Govind Ballabh Pant University, Pantnagar, and District U.S. Nagar of Uttarakhand. Soil order was Mollisol. Pantnagar falls under sub-humid and sub-tropical climate (Puri & Mahajan 1960). Soil samples were collected from the 0-20 cm depth.

#### B. Treatment details

Nive land-use system have been taken as a treatment with three replication. The treatment selected for study were  $T_1$  (rice–potato–okra),  $T_2$  (rice–pea (vegetable)–maize),  $T_3$  (sorghum multi-cut (fodder)–yellow sarson–black gram),  $T_4$  (rice-wheat–green gram),  $T_5$  (rice–berseem + oat + mustard (fodder)–maize + cowpea (fodder)),  $T_6$  (guava + lemon),  $S_7$  (poplar + turmeric),  $T_8$  (eucalyptus + turmeric),  $T_9$  (fallow (uncultivated land).

#### C. Microbial population

Serial dilution pour plate method use for measurment of microbial count (Wollum, 1983). Serial dilutions were performedin the Laminar's flow chamber in the laboratory. 90 mL sterile water blank mix with 10 g of soil. For dilution 10<sup>-2</sup> dilution, 10 mL of soil suspension was put to a 90 mL sterile water blank. It was shake uniformly for 10<sup>-3</sup> dilutions 1mL was transferred to 9 mL water. The procedure was repeated to get dilution upto  $10^{-8}$ .;  $10^{-4}$ ,  $10^{-5}$  and  $10^{-6}$  for actinomycetes and  $10^{-6}$ ,  $10^{-7}$  and  $10^{-8}$  for bacteria. Then 1 mL of required dilution 10<sup>-3</sup>, 10<sup>-4</sup> and 10<sup>-5</sup> for fungi was transferred into sterile well-labelled Petri plates. Then 20-25 mL of selective media for specific organisms (Nutrient Agar medium, Martin's Rose-Bengal medium and Kenknight's for bacteria, fungy and actinomycetes repectively cooled to 45°C was poured uniformly into Petri plates. The medium was allowed to solidify and, after solidification, incubated at  $28 \pm 2^{\circ}$ C temperature. The colonies formed were counted for bacteria after 48 hours, for fungi after 92-96 hours and for actinomycetes after a week's incubation. cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil unit use for repersent of microbial population.

#### D. Urease activity

Urease enzyme activity was determined colourimetrically (Bremner and Douglas, 1971); in this process, urea react with diacetylmonoxime(DAM) in the thiosemicarbazide phosphoric acid (TSC) with sulphuric acid. 5g soil sample was use in 125 mL polypropylene (PP) bottle and treated with 5 mL urea solution (10 ppm urea). Then it was incubated at 37-40°C for 5-6 hours. After that 50 mL of 2MKCl-PMA (Phenyl mercuric acetate) solution was add up. The bottle was appropriately capped then after for one hour keep for shaking. After one hour, it was filtered. Then 2 mL extract was pipette out in 50 mL volumetric flask, and volume was made upto 10 mL with 2MKCl-PMA solution, after that 30 mL of colouring reagent diacetylmonoxime and thiosemicarbazide solution was added in it. The flask was swirled and kept in a hot waterbath for half an hour. After that flask was cooled immediately by keeping it in cold water (using ice) for 15-30 minutes, and volume was made up to 50 mL with water. The intensity red colour was measured at 527 nm wavelength by spectrophotometer (Chhonkar & Tarafdar 1984). Standard curve reading use for calculaton of extracted. Urease activity was calculate in mg urea  $g^{-1}$  soil 24 hr<sup>-1</sup>.

# E. Statistical analysis

Experiment was conducted according to the complete randomized block design (CRBD). The data of this

Ram et al.,

experimental data were statistically analyzed using of variance analysis technique that know as ANOVA (Panse and Suchatme, 1978). The difference in between treatments was measured by applying "F"test of significance at 5 per cent level of significance (0.05 LSD).

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### A. Bacteria population

The data of the bacterial population under different tratment is given in Table 1. It is found from the data that the bacterial population in soil significantly varied under different treatments. The bacterial population in soil ranged between 1.56 to  $4.29 \times 10^8$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil at 0-20 cm depth. The highest bacterial population was 4.29  $\times 10^8$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup>obtained under the treatment T<sub>8</sub>eucalyptus + turmeric treatment, that was significantly superior than all other treatments of experiment. It was significantly higher than that under  $T_1 (2.60 \times 10^8 \text{ cfu g}^{-1})$ soil),  $T_2 (1.83 \times 10^8 \text{ cfu g}^{-1} \text{ soil})$ ,  $T_3 (1.93 \times 10^8 \text{ cfu g}^{-1} \text{ soil})$ ,  $T_4 (2.10 \times 10^8 \text{ cfu g}^{-1} \text{ soil})$ ,  $T_5 (2.34 \times 10^8 \text{ cfu g}^{-1} \text{ soil})$ ,  $T_6 (1.61 \times 10^8 \text{ cfu g}^{-1} \text{ soil})$ ,  $T_7 (4.16 \times$ soil) and T<sub>9</sub> ( $1.56 \times 10^8$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil) treatment. In case of agro-forestry systems, the highest bacterial population was reported under the eucalyptus + turmeric treatment, followed by the poplar + turmeric tratment. Several research have reported that microbial diversity in soil is greater under agro + forestry systems due to the effects of tree with crop and organic matter inputs and also difference in litter fall, and root exudates of plants. (Ferreira et al., 2012). The bacterial population significantly influenced under different land use systems and highest bacterial population obtained under forest land use than cultivated soil recorded by Bello et al., (2013); Nwafor et al. (2015); Kumar et al. (2017); Pandey et al. (2019). Soil microbial count more obtain under agro forestry based land use systems as compare to field crops and horticultural crops.

The fungal count under different treatments is illustrated in Table 1. On the basis on data, different treatment was significantly differed with fungal population in soil. The fungal count in soil ranged between 1.54 to  $3.99 \times 10^5$  cfug<sup>-1</sup> soil at 0-20 cm depth. The highest fungal population was obtained under  $T_8$  $(3.99 \times 10^5 \text{ cfug}^{-1} \text{ soil})$  treatment and it was significantly higher than that under  $T_1$  (2.58 × 10<sup>5</sup> cfug<sup>-1</sup> soil),  $T_2$  $(1.79 \times 10^5 \text{ cfug}^{-1} \text{ soil}), \text{ T}_3 (1.88 \times 10^5 \text{ cfug}^{-1} \text{ soil}), \text{ T}_4 (2.07 \times 10^5 \text{ cfug}^{-1} \text{ soil}), \text{ T}_5 (2.30 \times 10^5 \text{ cfug}^{-1} \text{ soil}), \text{ T}_6$  $(1.58 \times 10^5 \text{ cfug}^{-1} \text{ soil}), \text{ T}_7 (3.66 \times 10^5 \text{ cfug}^{-1} \text{ soil}) \text{ and } \text{ T}_9$  $(1.54 \times 10^5 \text{ cfug}^{-1} \text{ soil})$  treatment. Bharadwal and Omanwar, (1992) found that maximum value of fungal population were obtained with (eucalyptus + turmeric) + (poplar + turmeric) based treatments that increase the macronutrients content in the soil, the resultant increase in the fungal population with eucalyptus + turmeric and poplar + turmeric land uses systems. The fungi are easily influenced by change in land use systems and environmental condition (Sui et al., 2012). Pandey et al. (2019) Soil microbial count more obtain under agro forestry based land use systems as compare to field crops and horticultural crops. Under forest area fungi count reported maximum because of less disturbance and low tillage practice Asadu & Chibuike (2015).

#### C. Actinomycetes population

The actinomycetes population in the soil with different treatment is classified in table 1.**A**ctinomycetes population in soil significantly varied under different different. The actinomycetes population in soil ranged between 1.36 to  $3.46 \times 10^6$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil at 0-20 cm depth. The actinomycetes population in soil was recorded maximum with T<sub>8</sub> ( $3.46 \times 10^6$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil) treatment was significantly higher than that under T<sub>1</sub> (3.07 cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), T<sub>2</sub> ( $2.70 \times 10^6$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), T<sub>3</sub> ( $2.75 \times 10^6$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), T<sub>4</sub> ( $2.81 \times 10^6$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), T<sub>5</sub> ( $2.88 \times 10^6$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), T<sub>6</sub> ( $2.54 \times 10^6$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), T<sub>7</sub> ( $3.18 \times 10^6$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), and T<sub>9</sub> ( $1.36 \times 10^6$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil) treatment.

## B. Fungi population

Symbol	Treatment	Bacteria (×10 <sup>8</sup> cfu g <sup>-1</sup> soil)	Fungus (×10 <sup>5</sup> cfu g <sup>-1</sup> soil)	Actinomycetes (×10 <sup>6</sup> cfu g <sup>-1</sup> soil)
T <sub>1</sub>	Rice – potato – okra	2.60	2.58	3.07
T <sub>2</sub>	Rice – pea vegetable – maize	1.83	1.79	2.70
T <sub>3</sub>	Sorghum multi-cutfodder– yellow sarson – black gram	1.93	1.88	2.75
$T_4$	Rice – wheat – green gram	2.10	2.07	2.81
T <sub>5</sub>	Rice– berseem + oat + mustard – maize+cowpea fodder	2.34	2.30	2.88
T <sub>6</sub>	Guava + lemon	1.61	1.58	2.54
T <sub>7</sub>	Poplar + turmeric	4.16	3.66	3.18
T <sub>8</sub>	Eucalyptus + turmeric	4.29	3.99	3.46
T <sub>9</sub>	Fallow uncultivated land	1.56	1.54	1.36
SEm±		0.046	0.042	0.083
CD at 5%		0.140	0.127	0.251

Table 1: Effect of different land-use systems on the microbial population at 20 cm soil depth.

Among the agroforestry systems, actinomycetes population was reported maximum with eucalyptus + turmeric treatment due to higher OM and more litter fall by the tree that increase microbial population content in the soil. This study supported by Joshi and Yadav (2005). The actinomycetes population value was obtained highest in surface and subsurface soil under agro forestry based land use systems Kumar *et al.* (2017) that result also supported by Okonkwo (2010). Pandey *et al.* (2019) Soil microbial count more obtain under agro forestry based land use systems as compare to field crops and horticultural crops.

## D. Total microbial population

The total microbial population of the surface soil under different treatment is presented in Table 2. According to data the total microbial population in soil was significantly varied under different treatments. The total microbial count in soil was ranged between 1.68 to 4.78  $\times 10^8$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil at 0-20 cm depth. The highest microbial population was measured under T<sub>8</sub> (4.78  $\times 10^8$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil) treatment was significantly higher than T<sub>1</sub> (4.10  $\times 10^8$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), T<sub>2</sub> (2.06  $\times 10^8$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), T<sub>3</sub> (2.30  $\times 10^8$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), T<sub>4</sub> (3.10  $\times 10^8$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), T<sub>5</sub> (3.39  $\times 10^8$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), T<sub>6</sub> (1.71  $\times 10^8$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), T<sub>7</sub> (4.28  $\times 10^8$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil), and T<sub>9</sub> (1.68  $\times 10^8$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> soil) treatment. Bacteria were the most dominant group

among different group of microbial populations. Same supported by Radhakrishnan and result also Varadharajan (2016); Nayak, (2017). Pandey et al., (2019) reported soil microbial count more obtain under agro forestry based land use systems as compare to field crops and horticultural crops. Similar research finding supported by microbial population are influenced by soil type, moisture and plants species Wieland, et al. (2001); Girvan et al. (2003) reported that soil type is main determinative of soil microbial properties in soil. The population of bacteria higher in September and lower in July this was due to rain, temperature and land use and Chander et al. (1998) reported that under continue 12 year old agro forestry based land use system significantly influence on soil microbial population.

Table 2: Effect of different land-use sy	stems on total microbial count and urease enz	vme activity in the soil.

Symbol	Treatment	Total count (×10 <sup>8</sup> cfu g <sup>-1</sup> soil)	Urease (mg urea g <sup>1</sup> soil 24h <sup>-1)</sup>
T <sub>1</sub>	Rice – potato – okra	4.10	7.43
T <sub>2</sub>	Rice – pea vegetable – maize	2.06	5.05
T <sub>3</sub>	Sorghum multi-cutfodder– yellow sarson – black gram	2.30	5.26
$T_4$	Rice-wheat-green gram	3.10	5.46
T <sub>5</sub>	Rice-berseem + oat + mustard-maize+cowpea fodder	3.39	6.14
$T_6$	Guava + lemon	1.71	4.95
T <sub>7</sub>	Poplar + turmeric	4.28	8.20
T <sub>8</sub>	Eucalyptus + turmeric	4.78	9.23
T9	Fallow uncultivated land	1.68	4.16
SEm±		0.038	0.078
CD at 5%		0.115	0.235

# E. Urease activity in soil

The data on urease enzyme activity in soil under different treatment is given in Table 2. Urease activity in surface soil significantly varied under different treatment. It varied from 4.16 to 9.23 mg urea g<sup>-1</sup> soil 24h<sup>-1</sup> at 0-20 cm depth. The highest urease activity was recorded under  $T_8$  (9.23 mg urea g<sup>-1</sup> soil), that was significantly more than all other trearments. On the other hand, urease activity recorded under T7 (8.20 mg urea g<sup>-1</sup> soil) treatment was significantly higher than that under  $T_1$  (7.43 mg urea g<sup>-1</sup> soil),  $T_2$  (5.05 mg urea g<sup>-1</sup> soil),  $T_3$  (5.26 mg urea g<sup>-1</sup> soil),  $T_4$  (5.46 mg urea g<sup>-1</sup> soil),  $T_5$  (6.14 mg urea g<sup>-1</sup> soil),  $T_6$  (4.95 mg urea g soil), and  $T_9(4.16 \text{ mg urea g}^{-1} \text{ soil})$  treatment. Agroforestry based treatments were obtained higher urease activity in the soil, i.e. eucalyptus + turmeric and poplar + turmeric treatments. This was due to high soil organic carbon and OM content. A similar finding was also observed by under forest soils compared to agricultural soils Blonska et al., (2017); Pandey et al. (2019). Soil microbial count and urease enzyme activity more were obtain under agro forestry based land use systems as compare to field crops and horticultural crops and The urease enzyme more obtained under agro-forest based land use systems because of more litter fall on soil and living dead root (Zahir et al., 2001).

#### CONCLUSION

The bacterial, fungal, actinomycetes, total microbial population and urease activity differed significantly under different treatments.

Ram et al., Biological Forum – An International Journal

The highest bacterial population, fungal population, actinomycetes, total microbial population and urease activity was reported under  $T_8$  (eucalyptus + turmeric) land-use system while the lowest were obtained under  $T_9$  (fallow uncultivated) treatment. The basis on of these result, concluded that among different treatment better microbial population and urease activity of soil were found under agro and forestry based treatment ( $T_8$  and  $T_7$  treatments). So, soil researchers should have been promoted the agroforestry land-use system in combination with agricultural systems.

Acknowledgment. Authors are grateful to the Head, Department of Soil Science, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture & Technlogy, Pantnagar, for providing the necessary facilities and the researchers associated with the ICAR–AICRP on Integrated Farming System. Conflict of Interest. None.

#### REFERENCES

- Amusan, A. A., Shitu, A. K., Makinde, W. O., & Orewole, O. (2006). Assessment of changes in selected soil properties under different land use in Obafemi Awolowo University Community, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. *Electron J. Environ Agric Food Chem*, 5, 1178-1184.
- Arunachalam, A. (2003). Role of microbial biomass in soil nutrient dynamics along a jhum cycle gradient. *Journal of Tropical Forest Science*, 279-288.
- Asadu, C. L. A., & Chibuike, G. U. (2015). Contributions of organic matter, clay and silt to the effective CEC of soils of different land use history. *Adv. Nat. Appl. Sci*, 9, 110-115.
- Bello, H. S., Isa, T., Isa, M. A., & Akinmuisere, K. (2013). Effects of land use on the nature and population of microorganisms in the semi-arid region of north-eastern 14(1): 455-459(2022)

Nigeria. International journal of environment, 2(1): 224-230.

- Belsky, A. J., Amundson, R. G., Duxbury, J. M., Riha, S. J., Ali, A. R., & Mwonga, S. M. (1989). The effects of trees on their physical, chemical and biological environments in a semi-arid savanna in Kenya. *Journal of applied ecology*, 1005-1024.
- Bharadwal, V., & Omanwar, P. K. (1992). Impact of long term fertility treatments on bulk density, water contents and microbial population of soil. *Journal of the Indian Society* of Soil Science, 40(3): 553-555.
- Blonska, E., Lasota, J., & Zwydak, M. (2017). The relationship between soil properties, enzyme activity and land use.
- Bremner, J. M., & Douglas, L. A. (1971). Inhibition of urease activity in soils. Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 3(4): 297-307.
- Chander, K., Goyal, S., Nandal, D. P., & Kapoor, K. K. (1998). Soil organic matter, microbial biomass and enzyme activities in a tropical agroforestry system. *Biology and fertility of soils*, 27(2): 168-172.
- Chhonkar, P. K., & Tarafdar, J. C. (1984). Accumulation of phosphatases in soils. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*, 32(2), 266-272.
- Fisher, R. F. (1995). Amelioration of degraded rain forest soils by plantations of native trees. Soil Science Society of America Journal, 59(2): 544-549.
- Girvan, M. S., Bullimore, J., Pretty, J. N., Osborn, A. M., & Ball, A. S. (2003). Soil type is the primary determinant of the composition of the total and active bacterial communities in arable soils. *Applied and environmental microbiology*, 69(3): 1800-1809.
- Goovaerts, P. (1998). Geostatistical tools for characterizing the spatial variability of microbiological and physicochemical soil properties. *Biology and Fertility of* soils, 27(4): 315-334.
- Grayston, S. J., Wang, S., Campbell, C. D., & Edwards, A. C. (1998). Selective influence of plant species on microbial diversity in the rhizosphere. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 30(3): 369-378.
- Henrot, J., & Robertson, G. P. (1994). Vegetation removal in two soils of the humid tropics: effect on microbial biomass. Soil biology and Biochemistry, 26(1): 111-116.
- IFOAM. (2002). Soil Fertility. The Soil. A living organism Training manual of Organic Agriculture in the Tropics.
- Joshi, P. K., & Yadav, R. K. (2005). Effect of sewage on microbiological and chemical properties and crop growth in reclaimed alkali soil. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Soil, water and Environment Quality, Issues and Stratigies.
- Kaur, R., Mittal, N., Kakkar, M., Aggarwal, A. K., & Mathur, M. D. (2000). Otomycosis: a clinicomycologic study. *Ear*, nose & throat journal, 79(8), 606-609.
- Kumar, U., Shahid, M., Tripathi, R., Mohanty, S., Kumar, A., Bhattacharyya, P., & Nayak, A. K. (2017). Variation of functional diversity of soil microbial community in subhumid tropical rice-rice cropping system under long-term organic and inorganic fertilization. *Ecological indicators*, 73: 536-543.

- Liebig, M. A., Tanaka, D. L., & Wienhold, B. J. (2004). Tillage and cropping effects on soil quality indicators in the northern Great Plains. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 78(2), 131-141.
- Marschner, P., Yang, C. H., Lieberei, R., & Crowley, D. E. (2001). Soil and plant specific effects on bacterial community composition in the rhizosphere. *Soil biology* and biochemistry, 33(11): 1437-1445.
- Mendonça, E. S., Leite, L. F. C., & Ferreira Neto, P. S. (2001). Cultivo do café em sistema agroflorestal: uma opção para recuperação de solos degradados. *Revista Árvore*, 25(3): 375-383.
- Nayak, D. R., Babu, Y. J., & Adhya, T. K. (2007). Long-term application of compost influences microbial biomass and enzyme activities in a tropical Aeric Endoaquept planted to rice under flooded condition. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 39(8), 1897-1906.
- Nwafor, I. A., & Chibuike, G. U. (2015). Contributions of microorganisms to soil fertility in adjacent forest, fallow and cultivated land use types in Nsukka, Nigeria.
- Okonkwo, C. I. (2010). Effect of burning and cultivation on soil properties and microbial population of four different land use systems in Abakaliki. *Res. J. Agric. Biol. Sci.*, 6(6): 1007-1014.
- Pandey, V., Gautam, P., & Singh, A. P. (2019). Study of microbial count in soil under different land use systems in a mollisol. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci.*, 8(1): 16-21.
- Panse, V. C., & Sukhatme, P. V. (1978). Statistical methods for Agricultural workers. III Rev. Ed. ICAR, New Delhi.
- Puri, G. S., & Mahajan, S. D. (1960). The study of the evergreen vegetation of Mahabaleshwar area. *Nelumbo-The Bulletin* of the Botanical Survey of India, 2(1-2), 109-137.
- Radhakrishnan, S., & Varadharajan, M. (2016). Status of microbial diversity in agroforestry systems in Tamil Nadu, India. *Journal of basic microbiology*, 56(6): 662-669.
- Rice, C. W., Smith, M. S., & Blevins, R. L. (1986). Soil nitrogen availability after long-term continuous no-tillage and conventional tillage corn production. *Soil Science Society* of America Journal, 50(5): 1206-1210.
- Schoenholtz, S. H., Van Miegroet, H., & Burger, J. A. (2000). A review of chemical and physical properties as indicators of forest soil quality: challenges and opportunities. *Forest* ecology and management, 138(1-3): 335-356.
- Srivastava, S. C., & Singh, J. S. (1989). Effect of cultivation on microbial carbon and nitrogen in dry tropical forest soil. *Biology and Fertility of Soils*, 8(4): 343-348.
- Wieland, G., Neumann, R., & Backhaus, H. (2001). Variation of microbial communities in soil, rhizosphere, and rhizoplane in response to crop species, soil type, and crop development. *Applied and environmental microbiology*, 67(12): 5849-5854.
- Wollum, A. G. (1983). Cultural methods for soil microorganisms. *Methods of Soil Analysis: Part 2 Chemical and Microbiological Properties*, 9: 781-802.
- Zahir, Z. A., Asghar, H. N., & Arshad, M. (2001). Cytokinin and its precursors for improving growth and yield of rice. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 33(3), 405-408.

**How to cite this article:** Basta Ram, Ajeet Pratap Singh, Vijay Kant Singh, Shubham Anil Durgude and Anil Nath (2022). Effect of different Land-use Systems on Microbial Population and Urease Enzyme Activity in a Mollisol. *Biological Forum – An International Journal*, *14*(1): 455-459.