

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT • [OPEN ACCESS](#)

Root Colonization by Microorganisms and The Effects of PGPR On Plant Growth: A Mini-Review

Uyi, G.O. et al. (2023). Root Colonization by Microorganisms and The Effects of PGPR On Plant Growth: A Mini-Review. Jurnal Biota. In press
<http://jurnal.radenfatah.ac.id/index.php/biota/article/view/18948>

Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Accepted Manuscripts is 'the version of the article accepted for publication including all changes made as a result of the peer review process, and which may also include the addition to the article by Jurnal Biota of a header, an article ID, a cover sheet and/or an 'Accepted Manuscript' watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by Jurnal Biota and/or its licensors'.

This Accepted Manuscript is © 2022 The Author(s). Published by Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang

As the Version of Record of this article is going to be / has been published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY SA 4.0 International License, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY SA 4.0 International License immediately.

Everyone is permitted to use all or part of the original content in this article, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the license <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

Although reasonable endeavors have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on Pandawa Institute once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions may be required. All third-party content is fully copyright protected and is not published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY SA license, unless that is specifically stated in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

1 **Root Colonization by Microorganisms and The Effects of PGPR**

2 **On Plant Growth: A Mini-Review**

3
4 **Gerard Osuyi Uyi, Salamatu Musa Idris, Bashir Eya Sani*, Peter Uteh Upla, Aleruchi**
5 **Chuku, Oluwatosin Adeyemi Okunade**

6
7 Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Science, Federal University of Science, Lafia, Nigeria

8
9 Email: bashmodulus@gmail.com

10 11 **ABSTRACT**

12 This brief review provides a concise overview of the impact of microorganisms that colonize
13 roots on plant growth, with a particular focus on plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR).
14 At the root-soil interface, microorganisms such as bacteria and fungi interact with plants,
15 providing various advantages, including nutrient acquisition, pathogen protection, and stress
16 tolerance. PGPR, which are bacteria that promote plant growth through mechanisms such as
17 nitrogen fixation, potassium solubilization, induction of plant stress resistance and siderophore
18 production, are among the most beneficial of these microorganisms. The colonization process
19 entails chemotaxis, adhesion, and colonization of both the rhizosphere and endosphere, which
20 are facilitated by exopolysaccharides, biofilm formation, and signaling molecules. PGPR has
21 been shown to boost root and shoot growth, enhance nutrient and water use efficiency, and
22 enhance plant resistance to biotic and abiotic stressors. These effects are mediated by direct
23 and indirect interactions between PGPR and plants, which involve modulation of plant immune
24 responses and systemic resistance. Understanding these mechanisms is critical to the
25 exploitation of PGPR in sustainable agriculture. PGPR can reduce reliance on chemical
26 fertilizers and pesticides, but further research is required to unravel the complex interactions
27 between microorganisms and plants, identify key signaling molecules in root colonization, and
28 optimize the use of PGPR in various crops. This brief review underlines the importance of root
29 colonization by microorganisms, particularly PGPR, in promoting plant growth and sustainable
30 agriculture.

31
32 **Keywords:** *Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR); Plant-microbe Interactions;*
33 *Root Colonization; Rhizosphere; Mycorrhiza.*

34

35 **Introduction**

36 As plants are the major terrestrial primary producer, it should come as no surprise that
37 many microorganisms in the soil have evolved close relationships with them as a vast number
38 of these soil microbes are heterotrophs that depend on other organisms for their food (Willey
39 et al., 2008). It is believed that terrestrial plants evolved from aquatic ones and this was possible
40 through cooperation with soil microbes, many of which still remain today. These interactions
41 could be commensalism where only the microbes benefit, mutualistic where both the plants
42 and microbes benefit, or parasitic where the microbes induce harm to the plants (Willey et al.,
43 2008). The balance between saprophytic and pathogenic microorganisms in soil and plant
44 rhizospheres is a major factor affecting root diseases. In this case, the soil is referred to as
45 disease suppressive when the nonpathogenic microbes supersede the pathogenic ones (Schroth
46 & Weinhold, 1986).

47 According to Lareen *et al.* (Lareen et al., 2016), these plant-microbe relationships could
48 impact a plant's health and development in one of such ways: change in the quantity and quality
49 of crop yield, enhancing plant development and tolerance to biotic and abiotic stressors.

50 The root is an organ of the plant responsible for anchorage, uptake of nutrients and water from
51 the surrounding soil, and release of nutrients in the form of exudates with growth regulatory
52 properties (Ahmad et al., 2011). The root-soil interface or rhizosphere is the layer of soil
53 surrounding the plant roots where exudates migrate and are characterized by an exceptionally
54 high microbiological activity (Podile et al., 2014). Various groups of microorganisms including
55 bacteria, actinomycetes, fungi, algae, and protozoans inhabit the rhizospheric soil among which
56 bacteria are the most abundant (Mehmood et al., 2018; Podile et al., 2014). This could,
57 according to Saharan and Nehra (Saharan & Nehra, 2011), be probably because they have the
58 greatest influence on plant physiology, especially considering their competitiveness in root
59 colonization.

60 The number of microorganisms in the rhizosphere has been said to be more than those in
61 the rhizosphere-free soil, this could be attributed to the physical and chemical changes in the
62 rhizosphere brought about by the root's secretion of important compounds into the rhizosphere,
63 such compounds include fatty acids, organic acids, sugars, vitamins, amino acids, nucleotides,
64 polyphenols, flavonoids, hormones, and nutrients, which attracts microorganisms, serve as a
65 food source for the microorganisms within the rhizosphere and serve to keep the soil moist
66 which is essential for the development of soil microbes (Compant et al., 2019; Mendes et al.,
67 2013). This impact of the plant root on the growth of soil microorganisms is known as the
68 Rhizosphere effect.

69 Microbial interaction in the rhizosphere is a complex one, the different groups of
70 microbes do not interact only with the plant, but also with themselves. It has been observed
71 that the formation of nodules by nitrogen-fixing bacteria in leguminous plants and the
72 establishment of Arbuscular Mycorrhizae often occur simultaneously and synergistically. The
73 presence of genes responsible for the fixation of nitrogen in an endosymbiotic bacterium,
74 *Burkholderia* was demonstrated in Arbuscular Mycorrhizal hyphae by Minerdi *et al.* (Minerdi
75 *et al.*, 2001).

76

77 **Materials and Methods**

78 To assess the current state of the research on importance of Microorganisms and The
79 Effects of PGPR, a review of the existing journal literature, books, report, blogs, and newspaper
80 were carried out. Keywords (Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR); Plant-microbe
81 interactions; Root Colonization; Rhizosphere; Mycorrhiza) search in the google, google scholar,
82 web of science database (www.thomsonreuters.com/web-of-science), and a full – text search
83 of the Science Direct (www.sciencedirect.com) database were carried out. The reviews or
84 literature reviews will be examined to identify further studies for inclusion, and the results of
85 meta-analyses will not be included in the analysis.

86 **Conflict of Interests and Data Sharing**

87 The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interests. No new data was analyzed or
88 created; hence, data sharing is not applicable to this article.

89

90 **Results and Discussion**

91 **1. Plant-Microbe Interactions**

92 It is well documented that just as the growth of plants is positively influenced by biotic
93 and abiotic factors, they can as well be hindered by these plant stressors. Stressors such as
94 phytopathogens, and draught hinders plant growth (Saharan & Nehra, 2011).

95 There is a high demand of plant-microbe interactions all around the world, this is due to the
96 fact that they are seen as potential alternatives to the use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides,
97 and the ability of the microbes to relieve plants of the various biotic and abiotic stresses are
98 plaguing the agricultural industry (Romano *et al.*, 2020; Turan *et al.*, 2021). Turan *et al.* (Turan
99 *et al.*, 2021) describe agriculture as a vital part of every country's economic well-being, hence
100 improving the yield and quality of crops has gained more focus as it is considered a global
101 agricultural problem (Zhang *et al.*, 2023).

102 Plant-microbe interactions are complex and multifaceted relationships between plants
103 and microorganisms that live in and around them. These microorganisms are mainly bacteria
104 and fungi and the invasion could be beneficial or detrimental to the plants (Dolatabadian, 2020).
105 Fungal mycorrhizae, rhizobial bacteria, and endophytes are groups of microorganisms that
106 establish a beneficial relationship with plant roots (Narula et al., 2012; Slonczewski et al.,
107 2015).

108 a. Fungal Mycorrhizae

109 Mycorrhizae is a mutualistic interaction established between plant roots and soil
110 fungi. It is observed in the rhizosphere of most – about 80% – terrestrial plants (Narula et
111 al., 2012). Unlike most fungi, mycorrhizal fungi obtain photosynthetically derived
112 carbohydrates from their host plant (hence most mycorrhizal fungi are not saprophytic),
113 on the other hand, the plant host benefits from this interaction through a number of ways,
114 including enhanced nutrient uptake as fungi provide access to immobile nutrients, such as
115 phosphorous being the most valuable service provided by mycorrhizae to the plant
116 (Slonczewski et al., 2015; Willey et al., 2008).

117 Mycorrhizae can either remain extracellular forming interconnected sheaths of
118 hyphae around the root as in the case of ectomycorrhizae, or penetrate the root cells as in
119 the case of endomycorrhizae.

120 b. Nitrogen-Fixation Symbiosis

121 This is another essential plant-microbe interaction (Narula et al., 2012). Gram-
122 negative nitrogen-fixing bacteria and legumes are the parties involved in this interaction.
123 The most extensively studied groups of nitrogen fixers are *Rhizobium* and *Frankia*
124 (Mehmood et al., 2018; Saharan & Nehra, 2011). Bacteria such as the nitrogen fixers are
125 attracted to the root by exudates released by plants, this is accompanied by the formation
126 of nodules for nitrogen fixation upon entry of the bacteria into the root cells (Mehmood et
127 al., 2018). It has been documented that 80% of nitrogen available for plant assimilation is
128 derived from biological nitrogen fixation by these bacteria and the remaining 20% is
129 attributed to non-symbiotic processes (Mehmood et al., 2018). Nitrogen fixers are not only
130 beneficial to their symbiont but also to other plants not involved in the relationship as
131 some nitrogen can be leaked and taken up by them (Slonczewski et al., 2015).

132 c. Growth Promoters (PGPR)

133 A group of soil bacteria, capable of enhancing plant growth and increasing the yield
134 and quality of crops were recognized several years back and are successfully used today
135 in field experiments (Saharan & Nehra, 2011). PGPR are widely distributed among the

136 following bacterial taxa; *Actinobacteria*, *Bacteroidetes*, *Cyanobacteria*, *Firmicutes*, and
137 *Proteobacteria* (Martínez-Viveros et al., 2010).

138 This group of bacteria and the mechanisms through which they promote plant
139 growth is discussed in detail in a subsequent section of this review.

140

141 **2. Root Colonization by Microbes**

142 Root colonization by microorganisms can be initiated through a number of ways, the first
143 of which includes, recognition of specific chemical molecules released by the plants through
144 the roots. The next step involves the adherence of microorganisms to the surface of the root or
145 penetration into the roots for endophytes. The last step involves the colonization of plant roots
146 by increasing microbial density and cell-cell communication. Research has shown that plants
147 and microbes have developed the potential to communicate among themselves. These
148 microorganisms identify/sense signaling molecules produced by plants. Microbes respond to
149 these signals by releasing compounds that are in turn recognized by plants thus initiating a
150 plant-microbe conversation. Once the relationship is initiated, the plants and microbes continue
151 to monitor the physiology of their partner and adjust accordingly (Lareen et al., 2016; Lyu &
152 Smith, 2022).

153 The communication however depends on the specific group of microorganisms in
154 question. In legumes, the symbiotic association starts with mutual recognition of signal
155 molecules, Rhizobia produce a lipo-chitooligosaccharide signal in response to a plant-derived
156 flavonoid (Nod factor). Perception of Nod factor by legume plant result in the activation of
157 subsequent symbiotic reactions that lead to rhizobial infection and nodule organogenesis
158 (Dolatabadian, 2020; Lareen et al., 2016).

159 In an arbuscular mycorrhizal association, recognition initiates when plants release
160 strigolactone that stimulates spore germination and promotes hyphae growth, on the other hand,
161 fungi produce mycorrhizal factors, such as lipo-chitooligosaccharides and
162 chitooligosaccharides, to activate the signaling pathway of the symbiosis in the root
163 (Dolatabadian, 2020; Lyu & Smith, 2022).

164 Interaction between plants and pathogenic microbes initiates when Pattern Recognition
165 Receptors (PRRs) on the cell membrane of plant cells bind microbe/pathogen-associated
166 molecular patterns (MAMPs/PAMPs) and control plant immune responses. The binding
167 triggers PAMP-Triggered Immunity (PTI)/basal resistance, which is a defense response in
168 plants called the first line of defense. This mechanism is effective in restricting infection in
169 most plant species (Chen et al., 2022; Dolatabadian, 2020; Nishad et al., 2020).

170

171 **3. Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR)**

172 The terminology “plant growth promoting rhizobacteria” was used to describe the
 173 enhanced growth of plant and crop yield by specific bacteria that colonizes the root of plants.
 174 PGPR describe root-colonizing bacteria that cause this effect, to differentiate them from other
 175 rhizospheric microorganisms that did not enhance plant growth (Schroth & Weinhold, 1986).
 176 The term plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria was coined by Kloepper and Schroth (Kloepper
 177 & Schroth, 1978) to illustrate the group of beneficial microbes that promote plant growth by
 178 effective colonization of the roots of plants (Mehmood et al., 2018). Some plant growth-
 179 promoting rhizobacteria and their mechanism of action are listed in Table 1.

180
 181
 182

Table 1: Mechanism of PGPRs (Singh & Sachdev, 2018)

PGPR	Mechanism	Plant/Crop Affected
<i>Azoarcus</i> sp.	Nitrogen fixation	Rice
<i>Azotobacter vinelandii</i>	Cytokinin production	Cucumber (tomato)
<i>Azorhizobium</i>	Nitrogen fixation	Wheat
	Cytokinin and gibberellin production	Potato, cucumber, pepper
	Siderophore production	
<i>Bacillus licheniformis</i>	Induction of plant stress resistance	Maize, pepper
	Potassium solubilization	Cucumber, pepper
<i>Burkholderia vietnamiensis</i>	Nitrogen fixation	Rice
<i>Chryseobacterium</i>	Siderophore production	Tomato
<i>Frankia</i>	Nitrogen fixation	Alnus
<i>Mycobacterium</i>	Induction of plant stress resistance	Maize
	Induction of plant stress resistance	Peanut
<i>Rhizobium</i>	Hydrogen cyanide production	Legumes
	Nitrogen fixation	Legumes, rice
<i>Pseudomonas</i>	ACC deaminase synthesis	Mung beans, wheat
<i>Streptomyces</i>	Indole acetic acid synthesis	Indian lilac

183

184 Plant growth-promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR) can influence plant growth directly and
185 indirectly in several ways but majorly grouped into four which include: nutrient transfer,
186 growth enhancement through phyto regulators, biocontrol, and induction of stress tolerance
187 (Dolatabadian, 2020; Tsukanova et al., 2017; Turan et al., 2021). The direct effect includes:
188 producing phyto regulators (such as cytokinins, auxin, and gibberellins), lowering ethylene
189 concentrations in plants, solubilizing inorganic and mineralizing organic phosphates, symbiotic
190 nitrogen fixation, organic matter (amino acids and enzymes) synthesis, and activating disease-
191 resistance pathways. Indirect benefits of PGPR to plants include biocontrol by antagonizing
192 and outcompeting pathogens and pests, and induction of plant-stress tolerance to harsh
193 environmental conditions and pathogens of plants (Dolatabadian, 2020; Tsukanova et al., 2017;
194 Turan et al., 2021).

195 a. Nutrient availability

196 The impact of PGPR on plant growth is observed in its ability to enhance nutrient
197 availability for plant uptake. It does this by either converting some otherwise inaccessible
198 minerals in the soil to plant-accessible forms or by sequestering them thereby preventing
199 them from leaching out (Vejan et al., 2016).

200 Although nitrogen gas constitutes 80% of the atmospheric nitrogen, it is the most
201 limiting nutrient for plants. The provision of fixed nitrogen enables the growth of plants in
202 soils that would otherwise be nitrogen-limiting. This can be achieved through nitrogen
203 fixation which is a uniquely prokaryotic process. *Azobacter* is an example of a bacterium
204 that can fix nitrogen (Vejan et al., 2016; Willey et al., 2008).

205 Some PGPR solubilizes phosphate that is otherwise inaccessible to plants resulting in
206 increased availability of accessible phosphate ions in the soil, which can be easily taken up
207 by the plants. *Kocuria turfanensis* strain 2M4 isolated from rhizospheric soil was discovered
208 to be a phosphate solubilizer (Vejan et al., 2016).

209 Lavakush *et al.* (Lavakush et al., 2014) conducted research using *Pseudomonas*
210 *fluorescens*, *Pseudomonas putida*, and *Pseudomonas fluorescens* PGPR strains to study their
211 effect on nutrient uptake by rice.

212 b. Growth hormones/regulators

213 Plant hormones also called phytohormones are organic molecules that act as chemical
214 signals influencing the plant's capability to respond to its environment (Vejan et al., 2016).
215 Plant Growth Regulators on the other hand are Phytohormones that are synthesized
216 exogenously that is, not by the plants by natural and synthetic means. These substances,

217 required in low concentrations are synthesized in various parts of the plants and are
218 transported along a concentration gradient (higher concentration towards lower
219 concentration within the plant) (Mehmood et al., 2018; Vejan et al., 2016). Plants'
220 physiological processes such as growth, differentiation and development, stomatal
221 movement, flowering, and fruit ripening are influenced by phytohormones. Phytohormones
222 are classified into five and these are ethylene, abscisic acid, auxins, cytokinins, and
223 gibberellins (Mehmood et al., 2018). It is noteworthy that two or more plant hormones act
224 together to produce an effect that could either stimulate or inhibit plant growth depending
225 on the concentration of the hormones (Vejan et al., 2016). A prominent way through which
226 PGPRs enhance plant growth is observed in their ability to produce or alter the concentration
227 of phytohormones (Mehmood et al., 2018; Vejan et al., 2016).

228 IAA (indole-3-acetic acid) is considered the most important native Auxin. It functions
229 as a signal molecule regulating various plant developmental stages such as organogenesis,
230 cellular responses such as cell expansion, cell division, and differentiation, and gene
231 regulation. Many bacterial species have been reported to possess the ability to produce the
232 auxin phytohormone IAA (Saharan & Nehra, 2011). Tsukanova *et al.* (Tsukanova et al., 2017)
233 reported that plants inoculated with *Aeromonas punctata* PNS-1, *Serratia marcescens* 90–
234 166 and *Azospirillum brasilense* Sp245, PGPR that produces auxin showed an increased
235 level of endogenous auxin.

236 Gibberellin, another phytohormone is involved in seed germination, development of
237 fruit and flower, and stem and leaf growth. A study by Khan *et al.* (Khan et al., 2014) showed
238 the effect of gibberellin-producing *Sphingomonas sp.* LK11 strain in growth characteristics
239 of tomato.

240 Cytokinins are another class of plant hormones that are a prerequisite for the
241 progression of the cell cycle in plant cells, an essential aspect of every living cell. It has been
242 confirmed that PGPR can influence plant cytokinin concentration. *Platyclusus orientalis*
243 plants inoculated with a cytokinin-producing PGPR strain of *Bacillus subtilis* (AE016877)
244 have an increased level of cytokinin in the shoots (Tsukanova et al., 2017).

245 Ethylene at high concentrations, are known to be detrimental to plants, it generally
246 causes diminished crop performance by inducing defoliation, inhibiting stem and root
247 growth, and causing premature senescence. 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylate (ACC), a
248 precursor for ethylene is synthesized as a response to various environmental stressors, and
249 secreted to the rhizosphere where it is taken up again by the roots, and converted into
250 ethylene. This leads to the accumulation of ethylene with a downward spiral effect, thus,
251 PGPR that can degrade ACC in the rhizosphere aids the plant in re-establishing a healthy

252 root system that can cope with environmental stress (Martínez-Viveros et al., 2010;
253 Tsukanova et al., 2017).

254 **c. Anti-stressors**

255 Biotic stressors of plants include pathogenic fungi, bacteria, nematodes, and viruses
256 whereas abiotic stressors include drought, air pollution, low or high temperature, moisture,
257 and salinity (Mehmood et al., 2018). Abiotic stresses can account for about 50% to 82% loss
258 in crop yield though this value can vary depending on the type of crop (Saharan & Nehra,
259 2011). Inoculation of such plants with PGPR can increase their tolerance to stress and hence
260 prevent yield loss (Mehmood et al., 2018).

261 The plant hormone ethylene endogenously maintains plant homeostasis under stressed
262 conditions such as drought and inhibits root and shoot development. However, PGPR ACC
263 deaminase's breakdown of the ethylene precursor ACC reduces plant stress and restores
264 regular plant development (Yang et al., 2009). Under conditions of water scarcity, seed
265 treatment with PGPR had great results in a variety of agricultural plants, including chickpeas,
266 maize, and asparagus (Mehmood et al., 2018).

267 For plants in metal-stressed soil, the metal-resistant PGPR can act as an efficient bio-
268 inoculant that sequesters metal thereby promoting plant growth. *Pseudomonas putida* is a
269 great choice for field application in polluted soil since it is resilient to a variety of heavy
270 metals at greater levels (Saharan & Nehra, 2011).

271 **d. Biocontrol**

272 Another function of PGPR is to control plant diseases and pests, hence decreasing the
273 need for pesticides that may otherwise endanger human health and non-target organisms in
274 crop systems. Biocontrol is achieved through antagonistic interactions which involve
275 competition for colonization sites or nutrients and the production of antimicrobial
276 compounds by the PGPR (Singh & Sachdev, 2018). These will in turn inhibit the
277 pathogen/pest thereby promoting plant growth (Johansson et al., 2004). The bacterial isolate
278 *P. chlororaphis* PCL1391 was reported in a study to inhibit the growth of root pathogen
279 *Fusarium oxysporum* by effectively colonizing tomato roots and releasing a wide range of
280 antifungal compounds, including phenazine-1-carboxamide (PCN), hydrogen cyanide,
281 chitinases, and proteases (Johansson et al., 2004). Hence efficient colonization of the root
282 can confer on a bacterium biocontrol property. Another biocontrol strain *Pseudomonas*
283 *fluorescens* 2P24 uses quorum sensing (QS) and antibiosis for inhibiting plant pathogens
284 (Singh & Sachdev, 2018).

285

286 **Conclusion**

287 The present paper provides an extensive summary on the phenomenon of root
288 colonization by microorganisms, particularly plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR),
289 and its consequential influence on plant growth. It elaborates on the mechanisms of root
290 colonization, such as chemotaxis, adhesion, biofilm formation, and signalling molecules,
291 which facilitate a symbiotic relationship between plants and microbes. The review highlights
292 diverse ways in which PGPR can boost plant growth, including nutrient transfer, growth
293 hormone production, biocontrol, and stress tolerance. Comprehending these interactions has
294 significant implications for sustainable agriculture and plant protection, as the utilization of
295 PGPR and other beneficial microbes can effectively reduce the dependence on chemical
296 fertilizers and pesticides while simultaneously enhancing plant resistance to environmental
297 stressors. Nevertheless, the paper acknowledges the prevailing challenges, such as the variable
298 effectiveness and compatibility of PGPR, which requires further scientific research on
299 molecular mechanisms, signalling molecules, and long-term effects on soil health and plant
300 fitness to advance agricultural applications.

301

302 **References**

- 303 Ahmad, F., Husain, F. M., & Ahmad, I. (2011). Rhizosphere and Root Colonization by Bacterial
304 Inoculants and Their Monitoring Methods: A Critical Area in PGPR Research. In I.
305 Ahmad, F. Ahmad, & J. Pichtel (Eds.), *Microbes and Microbial Technology:
306 Agricultural and Environmental Applications* (pp. 363–391). Springer.
307 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-7931-5_14
- 308 Chen, J., Zhang, X., Rathjen, J. P., & Dodds, P. N. (2022). Direct recognition of pathogen
309 effectors by plant NLR immune receptors and downstream signalling. *Essays in
310 Biochemistry*, 66(5), 471–483. <https://doi.org/10.1042/EBC20210072>
- 311 Compant, S., Samad, A., Faist, H., & Sessitsch, A. (2019). A review on the plant microbiome:
312 Ecology, functions, and emerging trends in microbial application. *Journal of Advanced
313 Research*, 19, 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jare.2019.03.004>
- 314 Dolatabadian, A. (2020). Plant-Microbe Interaction. *Biology*, 10(1), 15.
315 <https://doi.org/10.3390/biology10010015>
- 316 Johansson, J. F., Paul, L. R., & Finlay, R. D. (2004). Microbial interactions in the
317 mycorrhizosphere and their significance for sustainable agriculture. *FEMS
318 Microbiology Ecology*, 48(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.femsec.2003.11.012>
- 319 Khan, A. L., Waqas, M., Kang, S.-M., Al-Harrasi, A., Hussain, J., Al-Rawahi, A., Al-Khiziri,
320 S., Ullah, I., Ali, L., Jung, H.-Y., & Lee, I.-J. (2014). Bacterial endophyte
321 *Sphingomonas* sp. LK11 produces gibberellins and IAA and promotes tomato plant

322 growth. *Journal of Microbiology (Seoul, Korea)*, 52(8), 689–695.
323 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12275-014-4002-7>

324 Kloepper, J. W., & Schroth, M. N. (1978). *Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria on radishes*.
325 2, 879–882.

326 Lareen, A., Burton, F., & Schäfer, P. (2016). Plant root-microbe communication in shaping root
327 microbiomes. *Plant Molecular Biology*, 90(6), 575–587.
328 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11103-015-0417-8>

329 Lavakush, Yadav, J., Verma, J. P., Jaiswal, D. K., & Kumar, A. (2014). Evaluation of PGPR
330 and different concentration of phosphorus level on plant growth, yield and nutrient
331 content of rice (*Oryza sativa*). *Ecological Engineering*, 62, 123–128.
332 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2013.10.013>

333 Lyu, D., & Smith, D. L. (2022). The root signals in rhizospheric inter-organismal
334 communications. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 13, 1064058.
335 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2022.1064058>

336 Martínez-Viveros, O., Jorquera, M. A., Crowley, D. E., Gajardo, G., & Mora, M. L. (2010).
337 Mechanisms and Practical Considerations Involved in Plant Growth Promotion by
338 Rhizobacteria. *Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition*, 10(3), 293–319.
339 <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-95162010000100006>

340 Mehmood, U., Inam-ul-Haq, M., Saeed, M., Altaf, A., Azam, F., & Hayat, S. (2018). A Brief
341 Review on Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR): A Key Role in Plant
342 Growth Promotion. *Plant Protection*, 2(2), Article 2.

343 Mendes, R., Garbeva, P., & Raaijmakers, J. M. (2013). The rhizosphere microbiome:
344 Significance of plant beneficial, plant pathogenic, and human pathogenic
345 microorganisms. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews*, 37(5), 634–663.
346 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1574-6976.12028>

347 Minerdi, D., Fani, R., Gallo, R., Boarino, A., & Bonfante, P. (2001). Nitrogen Fixation Genes
348 in an Endosymbiotic Burkholderia Strain. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*,
349 67(2), 725–732. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.67.2.725-732.2001>

350 Narula, N., Kothe, E., & Behl, R. K. (2012). Role of root exudates in plant-microbe interactions.
351 *Journal of Applied Botany and Food Quality*.
352 [https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Role-of-root-exudates-in-plant-microbe-
353 interactions-Narula-Kothe/d8dc210b7b2de4ddd35870e66ed2c39a3378b2d8](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Role-of-root-exudates-in-plant-microbe-interactions-Narula-Kothe/d8dc210b7b2de4ddd35870e66ed2c39a3378b2d8)

354 Nishad, R., Ahmed, T., Rahman, V. J., & Kareem, A. (2020). Modulation of Plant Defense
355 System in Response to Microbial Interactions. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 11.
356 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2020.01298>

- 357 Podile, A. R., Vukanti, R. V. N. R., Sravani, A., Kalam, S., Dutta, S., Durgeshwar, P., & Papa
358 Rao, V. (2014). Root Colonization and Quorum Sensing are the Driving forces of Plant
359 Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria (pgpr) for Growth Promotion. *Proceedings of the*
360 *Indian National Science Academy*, 80(2), 407.
361 <https://doi.org/10.16943/ptinsa/2014/v80i2/55117>
- 362 Romano, I., Ventorino, V., Ambrosino, P., Testa, A., Chouyia, F. E., & Pepe, O. (2020).
363 Development and Application of Low-Cost and Eco-Sustainable Bio-Stimulant
364 Containing a New Plant Growth-Promoting Strain *Kosakonia pseudosacchari* TL13.
365 *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 11, 2044. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2020.02044>
- 366 Saharan, B., & Nehra, V. (2011). Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria: A critical review. *Life*
367 *Sci Med Res*, 21, 1–30.
- 368 Schroth, M. N., & Weinhold, A. R. (1986). Root-colonizing Bacteria and Plant Health.
369 *HortScience*, 21(6), 1295–1298. <https://doi.org/10.21273/HORTSCI.21.6.1295>
- 370 Singh, R. P., & Sachdev, S. (2018). Root colonization: Imperative mechanism for efficient plant
371 protection and growth. *MOJ Ecology & Environmental Sciences*, 3(4).
372 <https://doi.org/10.15406/mojes.2018.03.00094>
- 373 Slonczewski, J. L., Foster, J. W., & Zinser, E. R. (2015). Rhizosphere Interactions. In
374 *Microbiology an Evolving Science* (6th ed.). W.W. Norton & Company.
- 375 Tsukanova, K. A., Chebotar, V. K., Meyer, J. J. M., & Bibikova, T. N. (2017). Effect of plant
376 growth-promoting Rhizobacteria on plant hormone homeostasis. *South African Journal*
377 *of Botany*, 113, 91–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sajb.2017.07.007>
- 378 Turan, M., Arjumend, T., Argin, S., Yildirim, E., Katircioğlu, H., Gürkan, B., Ekinci, M., Gunes,
379 A., Kocaman, A., & Bolouri, P. (2021). *Plant Root Enhancement by Plant Growth*
380 *Promoting Rhizobacteria*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.99890>
- 381 Vejan, P., Abdullah, R., Khadiran, T., Ismail, S., & Nasrulhaq Boyce, A. (2016). Role of Plant
382 Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria in Agricultural Sustainability—A Review. *Molecules*,
383 21(5), 573. <https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules21050573>
- 384 Willey, J. M., Sherwood, L. M., & Woolverton, C. J. (2008). *Prescott Harley Klein's*
385 *Microbiology* (7th ed.). McGraw Hill.
- 386 Yang, J., Kloepper, J. W., & Ryu, C.-M. (2009). Rhizosphere bacteria help plants tolerate
387 abiotic stress. *Trends in Plant Science*, 14(1), 1–4.
388 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2008.10.004>
- 389 Zhang, B., Shi, F., Zheng, X., Pan, H., Wen, Y., & Song, F. (2023). Effects of AMF Compound
390 Inoculants on Growth, Ion Homeostasis, and Salt Tolerance-Related Gene Expression

391 in *Oryza sativa* L. Under Salt Treatments. *Rice (New York, N.Y.)*, 16(1), 18.
392 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12284-023-00635-2>

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT