

**PROXIMATE AND NUTRIENT COMPOSITION OF SOME COMMON BEAN
(*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) AND COWPEA (*Vigna unguiculata* L. WALP.) ACCESSIONS OF
JOS- PLATEAU, NIGERIA.**

ABSTRACT

The compositional analysis of some common bean and cowpea landraces of Jos plateau were carried out to determine their proximate and mineral constituents. The results revealed a wide variability and significant differences ($P < 0.05$) in proximate compositions with the exception of crude fibre. The percentage moisture content ranged from 9.10% - 10.27%, Protein content 21.23% - 23.83%, ether extract 1.60% - 2.03%, Ash 3.10% - 3.87%, Carbohydrate 57.10% - 69.23%, Crude fibre 3.60% - 4.30%. The macro and trace mineral compositions varied and were statistically significant ($P < 0.05$), Ca 208.33-653.33 mg/100g, K 25.0-54.0 mg/100g, Mg 30.0-56.0mg/100g, P 266.67-850.00 mg/100g, Fe ranged between 7.07-9.80 $\mu\text{g}/100\text{g}$, Mn 0.02 -0.03 $\mu\text{g}/100\text{g}$, Zn 0.20-0.70 $\mu\text{g}/100\text{g}$ and B from 0.00-0.01 $\mu\text{g}/100\text{g}$. The presences of appreciable quantities of proximate and mineral constituents in the accessions has contributed in physical, mental growth and development of the local population were they provide cheap access to nutrients sources. This high variability in mineral compositions indicates that the accessions could serve as source germplasm for developing improved varieties.

Keywords: Common Bean, Cowpea, Heritability, Proximate, Variability, Nutrient composition

1. INTRODUCTION

Generally, peas, beans and pulses are legumes and referred to the seeds of leguminosae. Ikezu *et al.* (1), reported that legumes are considered as poor man meat, due to their high protein content and low cost compared to meat and meat products. The common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) and Cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L. Walp.) are traditional food for many people in Africa, Asia and Latin America (2) where intake per capita ranges from 1 to 40 kg/year (3, 4). Legumes and especially, the common bean are the most important grain legume for direct human consumption (5). The dry bean is a low fat food, good source of protein, essential vitamins and minerals, soluble-fiber starch and phytochemicals (2, 6). Leguminous plants are found throughout the world, but the greatest diversity has been known to occur in the tropic and sub tropics ecology. Norman *et al.*, (7) reported that of all edible legumes, *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. have the widest geographical distribution and is the most cultivated amongst members of the species and morphologically diverse with genetic variability for protein concentration and for its specific seed protein components (7, 8, 9).

Common bean research in terms of crop improvement is still at its lowest level in Nigeria compared to other grain legumes such as cowpea, soybeans, groundnut (10, 11). In spite of the nutritional significance of legumes in various farming communities and the wide range of crop specie adaptability to diverse ecology, only a small fraction of its rich natural and promising plant resource existing in their natural habitat as cultivar/ecotypes/landrace have been documented and profitably exploited for improvement to increase food and raw material production in the country (10, 12, 13).

In Nigeria, beans are grown and widely eaten (1). Legumes are highly sought after because they tend to have a unique subtle sweetness and flavour. They are also more tender and smooth in texture after cooking and reported to be of high nutritional content (14). The protein content in dry beans ranges between 20% and 30% (15). Some health benefits associated with the consumption of common beans include reduction of cholesterol level (16), and coronary heart diseases (17, 18, 19), favorable effects against cancer (20), decrease of diabetes and obesity (21), high antioxidant capacity (22), anti-mutagenic (23), and anti-proliferative effects (24). This class of plant are crucial to the balance of nature by producing a great mass of biologically nitrogen fixing organism into the soil, hence, could enable vast land to be brought into arable cultivation.

However, as a protein source, common beans have a disadvantages of requiring long cooking periods (25) and some anti- nutritional properties (25). The determination of the degree of genetic variability is the first step in identifying promising genotype for improvement for traits of economic importance.

In spite of the fact that the chemical composition of some common bean has been investigated (1), information seems to be lacking on existing compositional variability for proximate and mineral composition among common bean and cowpea landraces. This paper therefore aims at investigating the genetic variability among common bean landraces for proximate and mineral composition of their dry seeds.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Sampling and Sample Preparation: The seed of *Phaseolus vulgaris* and *Vigna unguiculata* landraces were sourced from Mangu, Bokos and Jos–South local government areas of plateau state, Nigeria. Picture Plate 1 shows the seed features of the various genotypes used in this study. The seeds were ground to fine powder and kept in air tight containers for Proximate and mineral compositional investigations

2.2 Proximate Composition

Seed bean Nitrogen (N) was determined by the thermal conductivity procedure that included the combustion of the sample to 1040 °C (26). The N content of the seed was multiplied by 6.25 to obtain the protein content (27). The percentage carbohydrate content of seeds was determined by summing up the percentages of moisture, ash, crude protein, fat (ether extract) and subtracting from 100% CHO = 100 - (Sum of the percentages of moisture, ash, fat, protein and crude fibre). The difference in value was taken as the percentage total carbohydrate content of seed (28, 29).

2.3 Mineral Composition Analysis

Ten (10) accessions of common bean and two accessions of cowpea were analysed for Ca, Fe, B, Zn, K, Mg, Mn and P by flame atomic absorption spectrometry (Perkin-Elmer spectrophotometer, model 1100B, Phoenix, Arizona, USA), (26). Bean seed samples were ground to a fine powder to ensure homogeneity before analysis of macro and micronutrients. The samples were concentrated by evaporating 100ml of sample to about 20ml. They were thereafter aspirated through the nebulizer into the air-acetylene flame where atomization took place. Using a source lamp for each element, the amount of energy absorbed in the flame is proportional to the concentration of the element in the sample over a limited concentration range.

2.4 Statistical Analysis

All data were subjected to an ANOVA. The least significant difference (LSD) was used to compare the means of the genotypes using the SPSS (2007) version 16.0 statistical software.

3. RESULTS

Proximate and Nutrient Composition of Some Common Bean (*Phaseolus Vulgaris* L.) and Cowpea (*Vigna Unguiculata* L. Walpers) accessions is presented in Table 1.

The moisture content of the seed was highest in accession 1 (10.27%), followed by accession 2, 6 and 7 (10.13%, 10.07% and 10.07%), while the lowest percentage moisture content was shown in accession 12 (9.10%). However, there were a highly significant differences ($P < 0.05$) between the percentage moisture content in the twelve accessions of legume dry seeds evaluated.

The crude protein fraction of the seed was highest in accessions 6, 4 and 8 (23.83%, 23.63% and 23.57%). While, the lowest crude protein component of the seed was recorded in accession 5 (21.23%). There were significant differences ($P < 0.05$) between the crude protein fractions of the twelve accessions of bean seeds.

The ether extract component of the seed ranged between (2.03% - 1.60%). Accession with highest values were 12, 7 and 10 (2.03%, 1.90% and 1.83%). While accession 4 recorded the lowest ether extract fraction (1.60%). The various fractions of ether extract values were statistically significant ($P > 0.05$).

The ash fraction of the seed was more in accession 3, 12 and 2 (3.87%, 3.83% and 3.70). While, accession 4 showed the lowest ash fraction (3.10%). The percentage ash fractions showed highly significant differences ($P < 0.05$) amongst the bean seeds accessions evaluated.

The crude fibre fraction of the legumes seeds was highest in accession 1 (4.30%), followed by accession 7 (4.27%). Least crude fibre fraction were recorded in accession 10 (3.60%). There were not significantly different ($P < 0.05$) between the crude fibre components in the twelve accessions evaluated.

The results in Table 1 indicate that the seeds of accession 10, 9 and 5 had the highest carbohydrate content (69.23%, 60.37% and 59.70%). While accession 2 recorded the lowest (57.10%) carbohydrate content. There were highly significant differences ($P < 0.05$) between the carbohydrate contents in the legumes accessions of common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) and cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L.)

Mineral composition analysis revealed variation in the concentration of macro nutrient in the dry bean seeds. Calcium (Ca) ranged between 653.33-208.33 (mg/100g) accession 3 and 7 have highest values (65.33 and 620.00 mg/100g). While accession 4 had least value of

120 208.33mg/100g. The values were statistically different ($P < 0.05$) among the accessions
121 evaluated.

122 Magnesium (Mg), values ranged between 56.00-30.00mg/100g. Accession 1, 10 and 3 have high
123 magnesium values (56.00, 47.00 and 48.00 mg/100g respectively. Accession 3 have lowest value
124 of 30.00mg/100g. The values were statistically different ($P < 0.05$), among the accessions
125 evaluated.

126
127 The Phosphorus (P) content among the accession ranged between 850.00-266.67mg/100g.
128 Accession 3, 1, 9 and 6 have high values (850.00, 753.33, 650.00 and 626.67). Lowest value
129 were recorded by accession 5 (266.67). The values were statistically different ($P < 0.05$), among
130 the accessions evaluated.

131
132 The content of Potassium (K) in the accessions ranged between 54.00-25.00 mg/100g.
133 Accessions 2, 8 and 10 have high potassium content (54.00, 45.00 and 45.00 mg/100g). Lowest
134 value was recorded in accession 4 (25.00 mg/100g). However, the values were statistically
135 different ($P < 0.05$), among the accessions evaluated.

136
137 Among the micronutrients, iron (Fe) composition in the accessions ranged between 9.80-7.07
138 $\mu\text{g}/100\text{g}$. High values were recorded for accessions 3, 12 and 5 (9.80, 9.43 and 9.23 $\mu\text{g}/100\text{g}$).
139 The lowest iron value were found in accession 4 (7.07 $\mu\text{g}/100\text{g}$).The values were statistically
140 different ($P < 0.05$), among all the accessions evaluated.

141
142 Boron (B), compositional value for the accession investigated ranged between 0.01-
143 0.00 $\mu\text{m}/100\text{g}$. Accessions with very low Boron traces were 2, 3, 6, 10 and 12 (0.00 $\mu\text{g}/100\text{g}$ for
144 all), while the other accession have 0.01 $\mu\text{g}/100\text{g}$ respectively. The results were statistically
145 different ($P < 0.05$).

146
147 The Zinc (Zn) content of the accessions ranged between 0.70-0.20 $\mu\text{g}/100\text{g}$. The highest values
148 were found in accession 11 (0.70 $\mu\text{g}/100\text{g}$), while the least was recorded for accession 3
149 (0.20 $\mu\text{g}/100\text{g}$). The results were statistically different ($P < 0.05$).

150 Manganese (Mn) content of the accessions ranged between 0.04-0.02 μ g/100g. Accession 5, 8
151 and 9 have high values of 0.04 μ g/100g respectively, while the accession with the lowest content
152 was accession 2 (0.02 μ g/100g). The results were statistically different ($P < 0.05$).


153

154 Table1. Proximate and mineral compositions of common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) and Cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L)

Accessions	Proximate composition (%)						Minerals composition							
	Moisture content	Protein	Ether extract	Ash	Crude fibre	Carbohydrate	Ca (mg/100g)	Fe (mg/100g)	B (µg/100g)	Zn (µg/100g)	K (mg/100g)	Mg (mg/100g)	Mn (µg/100g)	P (mg/100g)
1	10.27	22.57	1.70	3.53	4.30	57.63	451.67	8.53	0.01	0.30	36.0	56.00	0.03	753.33
2	10.13	22.73	1.63	3.70	4.13	57.10	420.00	7.43	0.00	0.40	54.00	37.00	0.02	541.67
3	9.77	22.30	1.80	3.20	3.80	59.13	653.33	9.80	0.00	0.20	42.00	48.00	0.02	850.00
4	9.40	23.63	1.60	3.10	3.73	58.53	208.33	7.07	0.01	0.50	25.00	30.00	0.03	266.67
5	9.90	21.23	1.87	3.87	4.10	59.70	275.00	9.23	0.01	0.40	32.00	35.00	0.04	356.67
6	10.07	23.83	1.70	3.27	4.07	57.03	403.33	7.93	0.00	0.40	40.00	42.00	0.03	626.67
7	9.13	22.23	1.90	3.27	4.27	59.10	620.00	9.00	0.01	0.60	35.00	38.00	0.03	550.00
8	9.57	23.57	1.73	3.53	3.90	57.70	510.00	8.57	0.01	0.50	45.00	35.00	0.04	421.67
9	9.13	21.77	1.73	3.67	3.67	60.37	495.00	7.83	0.01	0.60	42.00	45.00	0.04	650.00
10	10.07	21.77	1.83	3.50	3.60	69.23	475.00	8.47	0.00	0.40	45.00	47.0	0.03	523.33
11	9.70	22.20	1.70	3.43	3.70	59.27	351.67	7.37	0.01	0.70	37.33	52.00	0.02	393.33
12	9.10	23.03	2.03	3.83	3.73	58.27	421.67	9.43	0.00	0.50	40.00	42.00	0.03	455.00
Sig.	***	***	***	***	ns	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
F-LSD _(0.05)	0.21	0.27	0.13	0.14	ns	0.62	4.53	0.11	0.00	0.11	0.30	1.38	0.00	8.94

155 ***: Statistically Significant at ($P \leq 0.001$)

156 **ns**: not Statistically Significant at ($P > 0.05$)



157 Plate 1: Picture showing seed variability of common bean and cowpea landraces on the Plateau

4. DISCUSSIONS

The results of the Proximate and Nutrient Composition of some common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) and Cowpea (*Vigna Unguiculata* L. Walpers) accessions presented in Table 1. Revealed that the proximate composition is comparable to those of other legumes such as soybean, groundnut, Winged bean and Jack beans and other less emphasized legumes such as Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.), pigeon pea (*Cajanus cajan*), Sword bean (*Canavalia ensiformis*) Bambara bean (*Kerstingiella* spp) (11).

The Carbohydrate and protein in the plant indicated the high nutritional value of the seed. Presence of Carbohydrate revealed that the plant is a good source of energy while Protein indicated that it can help in physical and mental growth and development as earlier indicated by (2, 14).

The ash content showed that they contained some quality of mineral element which are essential in our diet (24). The high moisture content suggested that they should be dried properly before storage so as to avoid the invasion of micro-organisms which can lead to their spoilage (1). The percentage of the crude fiber suggested that diet prepared with these accessions could help to ensure good gut movement of food through the gut to provide energy and ensure break down of the food.

The ether extract fractions (crude fat or lipid) provides very good source of energy and aids in transport of fat soluble vitamins, insulates and protects internal tissues and contributes to important cells processes (30, 31). The protein content of the sample showed that the seed is highly proteinous and could be incorporated in the diet of both old and young including pregnant and nursing mothers and the high carbohydrate value indicated that the seed contained reasonable amount of energy and will give high amount of energy when consumed.

Mineral composition analysis revealed variation in the concentration of both macro and trace mineral elements in the accessions of dry bean seeds. Most of these macro (N, P, K and Mg) and trace element (Fe, Mn, Zn, and B) found in appreciable quantities in the results are currently of growing concern to human nutrition (32). Their presence provides cheap access to the local community and an affordable means to a good health.

186 **REFERENCES**

- 187 1. Ikezu UJM, I.P. Udeozo IP, Egbe DE. Phytochemical and Proximate Analysis of Black
188 Turtle Beans (*Phaseolus vulgaris*) *African Journal of Basic & Applied Sciences*.2015;
189 7(2): 88 - 90.
- 190 2. Messina ML. Legumes and Soybeans: Overview of Their Nutritional Profiles and Health
191 Effects. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.*1999; 70(suppl.):439S-450S.
- 192 3. Câmara CRS, Urrea CA, Schlegel V. Pinto Beans (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) as a
193 Functional Food: Implications on Human Health. *Agriculture*, 2013; 3:90-111.
194
- 195 4. FAO Web site. Available online: <http://faostat.fao.org/site/339/default.aspx> (accessed on
196 6, December 2015).
197
- 198 5. Beebe S, Rengifo J, Gaitan E, Duque MC, Tohme J. Diversity and origin of Andean
199 Landraces of common bean. *Crop Science*,2001; 41, 854-862.
200
- 201 6. Meiners CR, Derise NL, Lau HC, Crews MG, Ritchey SJ, Murphy EW. Proximate
202 composition and yield of raw and cooked mature dry legume. *J. Agric. Food.*
203 *Chem.*1976; 24:1122-1126.
- 204 7. Norman MJC, Pearson CJ, Searle PGE. Tropical Food Crops: in their environment,
205 2Ed. Cambridge University Press.1995; Pp. 208-224.
206
- 207 8. Pursglove JW. *Tropical Crops: Dicotyledons*. Longman Singapore Publishers. 1988; Pp.
208 304-311.
- 209 9. Adesoye AI, Ojobo OA. Genetic diversity assessment of *Phaseolus vulgaris* L.
210 landraces in Nigeria's mid-altitude agroecological zone. *International Journal of*
211 *Biodiversity and Conservation*. 2012; 4(13): 453-460.
- 212 10. NACGRAB/FDA. A Country Report: State of plant genetic resources for food and
213 agriculture in Nigeria (1996-2008). National Centre for Genetic Resources and
214 Biotechnology, Ibadan /Federal Department of Agriculture, Abuja. 2008.
- 215 11. Nwadike C. Genetic Characterization of Some Local Accessions of Common Beans
216 (*Phaseolus Vulgaris* L.) at Jos and Makurdi, Nigeria. An M.Sc. thesis submitted to the
217 Department of Plant Breeding and Seed Science College of Agronomy University of
218 Agriculture Makurdi-Benue State, Nigeria. 2014.
- 219 12. FMEnv. *National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan*, Federal Ministry of
220 Environment, Abuja.2006.

- 221 13. Adelaja BA, Fasidi IO. Survey and collection of indigenous spice germplasm for
222 conservation and genetic improvement in Nigeria. *PGR News Letter*, 2011; 53:67-71.
- 223 14. Aremu M, Olayioye YE, Ikokoh PP. Effect of processing on the nutritional quality of
224 variety of seed flours *J. Chem., Soc. Nig.*2009; 34(2): 140-149.
- 225 15. Shellie-Dessert K, Bliss F. Genetic improvement of food quality factors. Common
226 beans. p. 649-677. In van Schoonhoven, A., and O. Voyset (Eds.) *Research for crop*
227 *improvement*. CAB International, CIAT, Redwood Press, Melksham, Wiltshire, UK.
228 1991.
- 229 16. Rosa COB, Costa NMB, Numes RM, Leal PFG. The cholesterol-lowering effect of black
230 beans (*P. vulgaris* L.) in hypo cholesterolemic rats. *Arch. Latinoam. Nutr.* 1998; 48:306-
231 310.
- 232 17. Anderson JW, Smith BM, Washno CS. Cardiovascular and renal benefits of Dry beans
233 and soybean intake. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.*1998; 70(suppl.):464s-474s.
- 234 18. Bazzano LA, He J, Ogden LG, Loria C, Vapputuri S, Myers I, Whelton PK. Legume
235 consumption and risk of coronary disease in U.S men and women. *Arch. Int. Med.* 2001;
236 161:2528.
- 237 20. Hangen L, Bennick MR. Consumption of black beans and navy beans (*P. vulgaris*)
238 reduced azoxymethane-induced colon cancer in rats. *Nutr. Canc*2002; 44:60-65.
- 239 21. Geil PB, Anderson JW. Nutrition and health implications of dry beans: a review. *J. Am.*
240 *Coll. Nutr.*1994; 13:549-558.
- 241 22. Heimler D P, Vignolini MG, Dini, Romani A. Rapid tests to assess the antioxidant
242 activity of *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. dry beans. *J. Agric. Chem.* 2005; 53:3053-3056.
- 243 23. Azevedo L, Gomes JC, Stringheta PC, Gontijo AM, Padovani CR, Ribeiro LR, Salvatori
244 DM. Black bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) as protective agent against DNA damage in
245 mice. *Food Chem. Toxicol.* 2003; 41:1671-1676.
- 246 24. Aparicio-Fernández X, García-Gasca T, Yousef GG, Lila MA, González de Mejía E,
247 and G. Loarca-Piña G. Chemopreventive activity of polyphenolics from black Jamapa
248 bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) on HeLa and HaCaT cells. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*2006;
249 54:2116-2122.
- 250 25. Muzquiz M, Burbano C, Ayet G, Pedrosa MM, nd Cuadrado C. The investigation
251 of antinutritional factors in *Phaseolus vulgaris*. *Environmental and varietal differences.*
252 *Biotechnol. Agron. Soc. Environ.*1999; 3(4): 210–216.

- 253 26. Sadzawka A, Carrasco MA, Demanet R, Flores H, Grez R, Mora ML, Neaman
254 YA.(2007). Métodos de análisis de tejidos vegetales. 2ª ed. Serie Actas INIA N° 40. 140
255 p. Instituto de Investigaciones Agropecuarias, Santiago, Chile.2007; 53 – 59.
- 256 27. Guzmán-Maldonado SH, Acosta-Gallegos J, Paredes-López O. Protein and mineral
257 content of a novel collection of wild and weedy common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.). *J.*
258 *Sci. Food Agric* 2000;. 80:1874-1881
- 259 28. A.O.A.C. Association of Analytical Chemist Official Method of analysis. Washington
260 DC, 2006.
- 261 29. Ameh GI. Proximate and Mineral Composition of Seed and Tuber of African Yam Bean
262 (*Sphenostylis Stenocarpa* (Hoechst. Ex. A. Rich.) Harms. *Asset an International Journal*
263 *Asset Series B.* 2007; 6(1): 1-10.
- 264 30. Jones MM, Johnson DO, and J.T. Nethville JT. Chemistry and society. 5th ed., Saunder
265 College Publishers U.S.A. 1985; pp: 521-577.
- 266 31. Pamela CC, Richard AH, Denise RF. Lippincotts illustrated Reviews Biochemistry
267 3rd ed., Lippincott Wiliam and Wikins, Philadelphia. 2005; Pp: 335-388.
- 268 32. Graham RD, Welch RM, Bouis HE. Addressing micronutrient malnutrition
269 through enhancing the nutritional quantity of staple foods: principles, perspectives and
270 knowledge gaps. *Adv. Agron.*2001; 70:77-142.