

## Original Research Article

### A consortium of soil bacteria mediates the partial replacement of mineral fertilizer for sustainable grapevine cultivation in sandy soil.

4

5

6

#### Abstract

8

The demand for chemical fertilizers in agriculture has increased to deal with the present global population increase. However, the excessive use of chemical fertilizers can be reduced by applying biofertilizers as an eco-friendly tool. Plant growth-promoting bacteria (PGPR) has an essential need in terms of fertilizer savings and promoting plant yield. Here, we study the effect of using three (PGPR) bacterial strains “*Bacillus nakamurai* MSRH1, *Bacillus pacificus* MSRH3, *Paenibacillus polymyxa* MSRH5”, integrated with chemical fertilizers (40, 60, 80, 100% need based NPK) on vegetative growth, yield production, and quality of table grapes ‘Flam Seedless’ grown in sand soil during two successive seasons of 2020 and 2021, with a preliminary trial season in 2019. Our results show that amending grapes with NPK in combination with the consortium of three strains led to significant improvement in colonized vines compared to a single application of 100% NPK. Results showed that bacterial consortium combined with 80% and 60% NPK mineral fertilizer had more positive effects than un-inoculated vines in growth parameters, cluster characteristics, yield/vine and berry quality in the two growing seasons. Besides, N, P and K concentrations of leaf petiole, total leaf chlorophyll content, and carbohydrates in canes were significantly enhanced by bacteria consortium with 80% and 60% PK chemical fertilizers. PGPR significantly increased total bacterial count, N<sub>2</sub>-fixing, P- solubilizing and K-solubilizing bacteria in soil treated with the three strains of bacteria plus mineral fertilizer. In addition, dehydrogenase and phosphatase activity in the rhizosphere soil were also increased in treatments inoculated with strains plus mineral fertilizer. In conclusion, the as a sustainable technique for NPK saving and as an alternative to conventional methods of supplying nutrients to plants. The field study results showed that PGPR approach has potential and can be considered as a crop management strategy to increase the yield and quality of grapes, reduce chemical fertilization and subsequent environmental pollution, and could be useful in terms of sustainable production.

Your abstract has 318 words, 18 :[1r]Comment over the maximum allowable number. Negotiate with the publisher.

**Keywords:** Grapevines, chemical fertilizer, PGPR, growth, yield.

## 1. Introduction

Grape (*Vitis vinifera*, L.), family *Vitaceae*, is one of the top ranked crops worldwide because of its nutritional value, multilabel use and profitable income [1]. In Egypt, Flameless grape has been classified as the second cultivated fruit trees, with 810.3 million m<sup>2</sup> extension in the last few years [2]. However, the green revolution aims to increase plant production per unit area, which consequently depends on chemical fertilizers to provide crops with major essential nutrients [3]. In this respect, synthetic fertilizers have been reported to enhance soil fertility with nutrients which its deficiencies [4,5]. Furthermore, plants require three essential nutrients, nitrogen, phosphorous and potassium to maintain good growth performance, balance plant physiological function and quality parameters [6]. The most essential crop nutrients in agricultural systems are nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), and potassium (K) [7].-Nitrogen is the main factor of the plant cell and vital to the metabolic processes, such as photosynthesis, and core element for amino acids in plant structures [8]. Nitrogen is also a factor in the development of DNA, which contains the genetic blueprint of the plant – it's a component of nucleic acid [9]. Like nitrogen, phosphorus plays an essential role in biosynthesis, respiration, energy storage, cell division, translocation of carbohydrates, and a crucial element for both DNA and RNA [10]. Besides, phosphorus improves the overall crop quality and supports plants throughout their life cycle, stimulating root development, increasing the strength of stems and stalk, supporting flowering and the production of seeds as well as contributing to an earlier and more uniform crop maturity [11,12,13]. Potassium, an important element, increases the production of carbohydrates and proteins, catalyzes the activity of some enzymes, stimulates the synthesis and accumulation of thiamin and riboflavin and is critical for the activity of guard cells [14]. In addition, potassium helps to regulate the level of water in the plant, affecting both the uptake of water by the roots and its loss through evaporations; it can therefore improve a plants tolerance to drought [15,16]. On the other hand, excessive application of NPK fertilizers beyond crops' demand not only can cause harmful environmental and ecosystem impacts, but also affect crop quality and human health [17,18]. To achieve maximum benefits in terms of fertilizer savings and better development, plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) inoculation technology can be considered as an effective sustainable nutritional crop supplementation for alleviating the use of chemical fertilizers [19,20], improving crop yield and to sustain soil health

[21,22]. PGPRs are an important component of the rhizosphere of many plants that affect plant growth either by different direct or indirect mechanisms [23]. It promotes plant growth by creating phytohormones [24] and vitamins [25], improving root branching and root diameter [26], altering systematic resistance against various phytopathogens [27] are some of PGPR impacts in agriculture system. In addition, PGPR, as microbial inoculants, have a positive impact on soil biology and it can be recognized as a good strategy for recovering semiarid areas and degraded ecosystems [28]. PGPR and their attributes with plants are well known and starting to be exploited commercially in many crops [29,30].

77

To overcome excessive NPK application, we investigate the impact of using a well characterized soil bacteria isolated from Egyptian soil as biological biofertilizer on growth of Grapes. A PGPRs consortium (*Bacillus nakamurai* MSR11, *Bacillus pacificus* MSR13, and *Paenibacillus polymyxa* MSR15), on growth, production, and quality of colored Table Grapes 'Flam Seedless' supplied with four levels of NPK fertilizers in sand soil.

84

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Plant materials and NPK application

The present work was conducted during the two successive seasons of 2020 and 2021, with a preliminary trial season 2019, at a ten-years-old Flam Seedless vineyard (*V. vinifera*, L), grown in sand soil with drip irrigation system, at El-Khatatba region, Minya Governorate "30° 31' 12" N, 30° 59' 24" E", Egypt. The physical and chemical properties of the soil (Table 1) were determined according to [31]. Forty free disease and uniform size vines, cultivated at 2 x 3 m apart and trellised by the Spanish Parron shape system, were selected. Vines were pruned, in the last week of December of 2020 and 2021 seasons, respectively, with a load of 68 buds per vine. All vines received the mineral fertilizers as recommended by ministry agriculture as follow: Thirty units (P) of calcium superphosphate and 50 kg of Sulphur fertilizers (S) were added once at the beginning of vegetative growth stage. One hundred units of potassium sulfate (K) and 60 units of ammonium nitrate (N) were divided to three doses (25% at the beginning of vegetative growth, 50% after fruit set, and 25% after harvest stages). Fifty kilograms of magnesium sulfate (Mg) were added at 10 kg/ month. Fifty kilograms of calcium nitrate (Ca) were divided to two doses (before bloom and after fruit set stage). Mineral NPK

**: [2r] Comment**

It is recommended to introduce a map into the manuscript to mark the location of the experiments.

**: [3r] Comment**

You must introduce photos in the manuscript with the location of the experiment. The photos must show the surfaces treated with each treatment option, as they are separated so as not to influence them. Without this evidence of conducting experiments, it is difficult to convince the correct procedural conditions, if not even by carrying out the experiments.

fertilizers were applied as single treatment (100% NPK, control) or as 40, 60, and 80% of NPK combination with bacterial consortium.

104

105

UNDER PEER REVIEW

**Table 1.** Physical and chemical properties of the soil.

Depth of Sample	Soil	PH	EC dS/m	Ca <sup>++</sup> (mg/L)	Mg <sup>++</sup> (mg/L)	Cl <sup>-</sup> (mg/L)	CO <sup>3-</sup> (mg/L)	HCO <sup>3-</sup> (mg/L)	So <sup>4</sup> (mg/L)	K(mg/L)	Na(mg/L)	SAR*
Superficial		8.32	5.15	37	12	15.2	0	5	76	1.7	45.5	9.2
30 cm	Sand	8.32	5.85	42	10	21.9	0	7	44	3.9	16.9	3.3
60 cm		8.32	4.88	40	6	20	0	5	38	2	14.8	3.1
<b>Available nutrients (p.p.m)</b>				<b>P</b>	<b>K</b>	<b>Fe</b>	<b>Zn</b>	<b>Mg</b>	<b>Cu</b>	<b>Caco3 %</b>	<b>O. M. (%)</b>	
	Superficial			24	127	3.3	2.3	2.3	35	3.7	1.2	
	30 cm			22	121	1.89	1.32	1.2	22	2.3	0.87	
	60 cm			18	117	2.6	1.2	1.64	0.1	2.1	0.54	

(\*) SAR= sodium adsorption ratio.

## 2.2 Bacterial growth and inoculum preparation

*Bacillus nakamurai* MSRH1, *Bacillus pacificus* MSRH3 and *Paenibacillus polymyxa* MSRH5 were provided by Professor Abo-Koura's Microbiology Department, Soil, Water and Environmental Institute (SWERI), Agriculture Research Center (ARC), Giza, Egypt. Briefly, the pre-inoculum for each strain was prepared in agar plates then incubated at  $30 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$  for 48h. Later, numerous identical developing colonies were conveyed into a liquid broth medium for 12h at  $30 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$  in a rotary shaker at 120 rpm. For inoculum harvesting, each medium was centrifuged (7,000 g for 10 min) then washed twice in potassium phosphate buffer (pH 7.0, 60 mmol). The optical density was measured by spectrophotometer ( $\text{OD } 10^8 \text{ cells/ mL at } \lambda 600 \text{ nm}$ ) [32]. To prepare the inoculums, MSRH1, MSRH3 and MSRH5 were grown individually in nutrient broth medium for 48 h at  $28^\circ\text{C}$ , in a rotary shaker incubator at 150 rpm to exponential phase ( $6 \times 10^7$ ,  $5 \times 10^6$  and  $5 \times 10^6 \text{ cfu. mL}^{-1}$ , respectively). Ten ml suspension of each strain was mixed to colonize vine plants at the second week of January.

120

## 2.3 Characterization of PGPR traits

The three bacterial strains were grown on nutrient broth medium then incubated at  $28 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$  for 24 h. Exopolysaccharides (EPS) was determined by [33] while IAA was determined as described by [34]. Biofilm creation was examined according to [35].

125

## 2.4 Growth parameters, leaves N, P, K and Chlorophyll content

At the harvest time, shoot length and number of leaves per plant were measured manually. Leaf area meter (Model CI 203, USA) was used to determine leaf area of the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> apical leaves. During the flowering stage, ten samples were taken from leaves opposite to cluster to determine N, P and K content in leaf petioles [36] and total chlorophyll content [37].

132

## 2.5 Bud burst and fertility percentage

Number of buds were counted one month after bud burst and the percentage of buds burst were calculated [38] as follows:

Bud burst % = (Number of bursted buds per vine / Total buds per vine) x 100.

While number of clusters per vine were counted and divided by the total number of buds and then the fertility was calculated as follows:

Bud fertility % = (No. of clusters per vine / Total buds per vine) x 100

We suggest photos. :[4r]Comment

Explain the abbreviation. :[5r]Comment

No symbolizes the number of :[6r]Comment objects? If so, write it the same as two rows before. Be consistent in the text, write "number". No is usually interpreted as an ordinal number.

## 2.6 Yield

Grape bunches were taken from all possible locations on grapevines so that the samples represent correct yield and quality attributes. In this respect, average cluster weight (g) was measured, while the average yield per vine was calculated as follow:

Yield per vine = number of clusters per vine × average cluster weight

145

## 2.7 Berries quality

A sample of 50 berries were selected from each replica and the juice was extracted to measure the total soluble solids (TSS, Brix<sup>0</sup>) at room temperature by hand refractometer, while titratable acidity (TA, gram tartaric acid/100 ml juice) was determined by titration with NaOH [39]. Total anthocyanin for the berries skin (mg/100g fw) was calculated according to [40]. Total carbohydrates in fruiting canes were determined calorimetrically

[41]

153

## 2.8 Wood ripening and pruning weight

At dormant seasons, twelve shoots for each replicated were select to assess the coefficient of wood ripening, which calculated by dividing length of the ripened part by the total length of the shoot [42]. In addition, one year old pruning wood weight per vine (g) was calculated [43].

159

## 2.9 Total bacterial count, N-Fixer bacteria, Phosphate and Potassium solubilizing bacteria

Total bacterial count in rhizosphere soil was done as described by [44], then Nitrogen fixing bacteria were counted on glucose mineral media (NFGMM) [45]. P-solubilizing and phosphate releasing bacteria were calculated on agar medium for 3-5 days at 28°C [46].

165

## 2.10. Enzyme activity

Dehydrogenase activity (DHA) ( $\mu\text{gTPF g}^{-1}$  dry soil day<sup>-1</sup>) in rhizosphere soil for each treatment was determined as described by [47]. Alkaline and acidic phosphatases (mg/g dry soil) were determined according to [48].

## 2.11. Costs and net profit /feddan

Yield / feddan ton (average two seasons) = Yield (kg fruit/vine) x Number of vines/700.

Total costs / feddan (L.E.) = Treatments (amino acids) costs/ feddan (L.E.) + Costs of cultural practices/ feddan (L.E.).

Total production/ feddan (L.E.) = Yield/ feddan ton X price of one ton.

Subchapter 2.10 appears twice. :[7r]Comment

Explain the abbreviation :[8r]Comment  
(Egyptian Pound?).

If Feddan is an Egyptian surface :[9r]Comment  
unit, what is Feddan ton?

Net profit / feddan (L.E.) = Total production/feddan (L.E.) - Total costs / feddan (L.E.).

176

### 2.1.1. Statistical Analyses

The experiment was conducted in three replicates, as a completely randomized block design (CRBD). All data were analyzed by ANOVA, least significant difference (LSD) test was used to compare means using the statistical analysis software; CoStat (CoHort Software, USA) version 6.4. The values of probability  $p \leq 0.05$  were considered statistically significant based on the least significant difference test.

183

## 2. Results

### 2.1 Growth, bud behavior and yield traits

Data in Table (2) reveal significant increases in number of leaves, leaf area, bud burst, bud fertility, yield per vine and cluster weight with 80 and 60% NPK + PGPRs consortium than 100% NPK. Yield and cluster weight recorded 16 and 17% increase, with 80% NPK + PGPRs consortium when compared to control in the two seasons, respectively. Obviously, 40% NPK + PGPRs consortium recorded lower yield component than other treatments. Regarding to growth traits, shoot length revealed no significant difference between treatments. Meanwhile, significant increase in number of leaves was obtained with vines supplied with 80% NPK + PGPRs consortium than other treatments. Similar trend was observed in terms of yield per vines and cluster weight.

195

### 2.2 Nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, and leaf chlorophyll

According to data presented in Table (3), content of N, P, K in leaf petiole and total leaf chlorophyll were positively affected by inoculation vine with PGPRs consortium combined with different mineral NPK, than single NPK application. In addition, the three nutrients concentrations were higher in vine treated with 80% NPK + PGPRs consortium followed by vine treated with 60% NPK + PGPRs consortium than control in the two successive growing seasons. In terms of leaf chlorophyll content, better values were observed in leaves of vines treated with PGPRs consortium than control. However, no significant differences between 40, 60, 80% NPK + PGPRs consortium were obtained in two seasons.

Chapter 2 is "Materials and Methods", So Results should be Chapter 3.?

**Table 2.** Effect of the combination between PGPR<sub>s</sub> and 100, 80, 60, 40 % NPK levels on growth bud behavior and yield of Flam Seedless grapevines.

Treatments	Number of leaves		Shoot length (cm)		Leaf area (cm) <sup>2</sup>		Bud burst %		Bud fertility %		Yield (kg)		Cluster weight (g)	
	2020	2021	2020	2021	2020	2021	2020	2021	2020	2021	2020	2021	2020	2021
100% NPK (Control)	30	31	248	250	171	166	89	89	74	75	15.5	16.5	483	517
80% NPK+ PGPR	35	36	253	252	179	175	94	94	79	80	18.1	19.3	567	603
60% NPK+ PGPR	32	35	251	248	170	168	92	93	77	78	16.7	17.9	523	540
40% NPK+ PGPR	30	32	252	251	172	169	79	75	64	68	12.0	11.3	300	327
L.S.D. (0.05)	1.0	1.3	NS	NS	2.3	1.7	1.4	1.0	1.6	1.7	0.92	1.1	28.7	26.7

**Table 3.** Effect of the combination between PGPRs and 100, 80, 60, 40 % NPK levels on N, P, K contents in leaf petiole and total chlorophyll of Flam Seedless grapevines

Treatments	N (%)		P (%)		K (%)		Chlorophyll (mg/g FW)	
	2020	2021	2020	2021	2020	2021	2020	2021
100% NPK (Control)	2.11	2.25	0.34	0.37	1.43	1.52	36.50	34.40
80% NPK+ PGPR	2.43	2.44	0.54	0.47	1.62	1.64	37.63	35.30
60% NPK+ PGPR	2.40	2.38	0.42	0.45	1.50	1.58	37.13	35.07
40% NPK+ PGPR	2.16	2.37	0.38	0.43	1.44	1.53	37.10	34.97
L.S.D. (0.05)	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.08	0.32	1.28

207  
208  
209  
210  
211

### 2.3 Quality of berries

213 significant differences observed between berries in terms of TSS under PGPR<sub>s</sub> inoculation than control (Table 4). On the other hand, vines treated with 80% NPK + PGPR<sub>s</sub> consortium followed by vine treated with 60% NPK + PGPR<sub>s</sub> consortium revealed significant increases in values of titratable acidity and anthocyanin concentration, respectively.

218

### 2.4 Growth promoting activities of the consortium

220 The three strains were tested for their plant growth promoting characteristics including Exopolysaccharides (EPS), IAA and biofilm formations (Table 5). MSRH1 showed highest production for EPS and biofilm followed by MSRH3 and MSRH5, respectively, while higher IAA was produced with MSRH5 than other strains.

224

Table 25 Effect of the combination between PGPRs and 100, 80, 60, 40 % NPK levels on quality of Flam Seedless berries.

Treatments	T.S.S (Brix)		Titratable acidity (%)		Anthocyanin (mg /100g FW)	
	2020	2021	2020	2021	2020	2021
100% NPK (Control)	16.67	17.00	1.00	0.90	34.27	33.50
80% NPK+ PGPR	17.00	17.67	0.90	0.90	38.37	37.47
60% NPK+ PGPR	16.67	17.33	0.90	0.90	36.57	35.57
40% NPK+ PGPR	16.67	17.33	0.80	0.80	35.83	34.37
L.S.D. (0.05)	NS	NS	0.07	0.05	1.8	2.5

227

Table 26 Exopolysaccharides (EPS), IAA and biofilm formations by three bacterial strains.

229

Strain	Exopolysaccharide (EPS)	IAA production	Biofilm formation
<i>Bacillus nakamurai</i>	+++	+	+++
<i>Bacillus pacificus</i> MSRH3	++	+	++
<i>Paenibacillus polymyxa</i> MSRH5	+	++	+

230

231

### 2.5 Population of soil bacteria upon consortium inoculation

Three strains were used as potential plant growth promoting bacteria, and consortium to produce a complex inoculant and effect of the mix were monitored. Forty-five days post-burst of Flam Seedless grapevines, the population of N<sub>2</sub>-fixing, P-solubilizing, and K-solubilizing bacterial growth in soil were powerfully enhanced with 80% NPK + bacteria in the two seasons (Table 6). Moreover, the N<sub>2</sub>-fixing, P- and K-solubilizing bacteria were higher in vine treated with consortium in combination with NPK fertilizer than control.

240

241

UNDER PEER REVIEW

**Table 6.** Effect of PGPRs consortium inoculation on population of soil bacteria of Flam Seedless grapevines

Treatments	Total count of bacteria		N <sub>2</sub> -fixing bacteria	P-solubilizing bacteria	K-solubilizing bacteria	N <sub>2</sub> -fixing bacteria	P-solubilizing bacteria	K-solubilizing bacteria		
	(x 10 <sup>6</sup> cfu g <sup>-1</sup> soil)								(x10 <sup>4</sup> cfu g <sup>-1</sup> soil)	
	2020	2021							2020	2021
100% NPK (Control)	66.2 ± 0.61	73.8 ± 0.53	25.9±0.67	28.8 ± 1.7	15.4± 0.53	33.1± 0.66	29.77± 9.77	17.5± 0.52		
80% NPK+ PGPR	90.3 ± 1.91	94.9± 4.1	43.4 ± 1.2	56.5± 0.6	52.6±2.8	49.2 ± 1.0	58.53± 0.85	53.3± 0.59		
60% NPK+ PGPR	80.0 ± 1.86	82.5 ± 1.30	33.6 ± 1.05	42.5 ± 5.5	26.4±3.09	39.6± 1.0	43.80±43.80	28.53± 0.61		
40% NPK+ PGPR	76.8± 0.53	78.4± 0.50	33.1± 0.7	29.27± 1.15	33.1± 0.7	35.1±0.40	32.6±0.90	34.7± 0.50		

242

### 243 Enzymatic activities in soil

244 Dehydrogenase activity (DHA), acidic phosphatase and alkaline phosphatase  
 245 activity in the soil treated with bacterial consortium was significantly increased with 80%  
 246 NPK+ PGPRs consortium followed by 60%, respectively, in comparison to control  
 247 (Table 7). No significant differences were found between controls and 40% NPK  
 248 inoculated with bacterial consortium in the two growing seasons (Table 7).

249

250 **Table 7** Effect of PGPRs consortium inoculation on enzymatic activities in soil of Flam Seedless  
 251 grapevines

Treatments	Dehydrogenase activity ( $\mu\text{g TPF g}^{-1}$ dry soil $^{-1}$ day $^{-1}$ )		Acidic Phosphatase activity ( $\mu\text{g pnp g}^{-1}$ soil h $^{-1}$ )		Alkaline phosphatase activity ( $\mu\text{g pnp g}^{-1}$ soil h $^{-1}$ )	
	2020	2021	2020	2021	2020	2021
100% NPK (Control)	50.6	68.3	75.7	84.9	52.3	55.2
80% NPK+ PGPR	76.8	91.1	90.9	91.6	65.8	68.5
60% NPK+ PGPR	72.7	87.8	86.9	89.2	59.4	62.5
40% NPK+ PGPR	51.7	70.3	81.5	71.1	64.0	64.5
L.S.D. (0.05)	4.4	2.1	1.5	1.2	1.6	1.3

252

253

### 254 2.6. Wood ripening, pruning weight and carbohydrates in canes

255 Application of bacterial consortium plus NPK mineral fertilizer increased  
 256 significantly ripening wood, pruning wood weight and carbohydrates in canes in two  
 257 growing seasons (Table 8). It is obvious that application 80% NPK mineral fertilizer +  
 258 PGPRs showed the highest value for pruning wood weight, coefficient of wood ripening  
 259 and carbohydrates in canes compared to other treatments.

260

261 **Table 8** Effect of PGPRs consortium inoculation on pruning wood weight, coefficient of wood ripening  
 262 and carbohydrates in canes of Flam Seedless grapevines.

263

Treatments	Weight of pruning/vine (g)		Wood ripening coefficient		Carbohydrates in canes (%)	
	2020	2021	2020	2021	2020	2021

100% NPK (Control)	3067	325	0.74	0.75	23.00	24.20
80% NPK+ PGPR	3367	3467	0.84	0.86	28.10	29.20
60% NPK+ PGPR	3333	3433	0.84	0.85	25.70	28.10
40% NPK+ PGPR	3300	3400	0.81	0.84	25.80	27.00
L.S.D. (0.05)	121	577	0.02	0.01	1.05	0.71

264

### Costs and net profit /feddan

It is clear from the obtained data in (Table 9) that Application three strains (PGPRS) for partial replacement of Mineral NPK fertilizer of Flame seedless grapevines with mineral NPK fertilizer gave the best net profit/ feddan as compared with (100 % mineral NPK control). In addition, Application of 80% mineral NPK fertilizer mixed with NPK bacteria gave the highest values of net profit / feddan which recorded 10603 (L.E.) over control as average two seasons.

272

**Table 9** Costs and net profit /feddan of three strains (PGPR<sub>s</sub>) for partial replacement of Mineral NPK fertilizer applications of Flame seedless as average two seasons 2020 and 2021 seasons

275

Treatments		Costs of *cultural practice without mineral NPK / fed. (L.E.)	Costs of mineral NPK/ fed. (L.E.)	Costs of treatments NPK bacteria costs/fed. (L.E.)	Total costs / fed. (L.E.)	/Yield /fed Ton	Total production /fed. (L.E.)	Net profit / fed. (L.E.)	Net profit / fed. over control (L.E.)
T1	100 % mineral NPK	25000	10000	2800	35000	11.200	67200	32200	0
T2	80% mineral NPK+ NPK bacteria	25000	8000	2800	35800	13.100	78603	42803	10603
T3	60% mineral NPK+ NPK bacteria	25000	6000	2800	33800	12.103	72618	38818	6618
T4	40% mineral NPK+ NPK bacteria	25000	4000	2800	31800	11.648	69888	38088	5888

Cultural practices such as (Fertilizers, Pesticides, fungicides, Irrigation and Labour)

- Pesticide/1 liter from NPK bacteria = 20 (L.E.)

- NPK bacteria 70 x 2doses = 140 liter = 2800 (L.E.) / feddan
- One feddan = 700 vines
- One ton from yield = 6000 (L.E.)

### 3. Discussion

Flam Seedless is a popular grape grown in Egypt for local consumption and export markets. Meanwhile, excessive, and continuous application of chemical fertilizers increases the production costs, decrease fruit quality, and harm soil chemical and biological properties causing an environmental pollution [49]. In this respect, biofertilizers including the PGPR have reported to improve nutritional rank, yield, physical and chemical properties of colonized soil [50,51,52].

Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) are bacterial strains that reside in the root rhizosphere, interact with plants roots, and affect their growth and productivity by diverse mechanisms [53]. In this study, three strains "*Bacillus nakamurai* MSRH1, *Bacillus pacificus* MSRH3, *Paenibacillus polymyxa* MSRH5" were selected based on their effectiveness in colonizing plant root and production of Exopolysaccharides (EPS), IAA and biofilm, as shown in Table (5). Clearly, the combination between 80% NPK and PGPR consortium caused an improvement in vegetative growth characters and bud behavior of inoculated vines in comparison to control, 60 and 40% NPK levels, respectively, in the two growing seasons. Application of PGPR consortium significantly increased number of leaves, branch length and leaf area, which agrees with [54] on Flam Seedless. These positive effects of PGPR inoculation on growth traits of colonized vines are the result of stimulating plant systemic resistance, root branching, production of IAA, and enhancing soil fertility [55,56,57]. Several reports indicated the capability of PGPR in complete or partial replacement of chemical fertilizers to increase growth and yield of profitable crops [58]. For instance, supplying grapevines with NPK fertilizers at 50% in combination with PGPR improved growth and fruiting over the application of mineral N alone [59]. In addition, application of PGPR consortium plus 80, 60 and 40% of NPK fertilizer significantly increased maturity parameters and cluster characteristics of colonized Flam Seedless than un-colonized vines (Table 2). The increased fertility in the grapevine may be caused by apical dominance and vegetative vigor found in Flam Seedless [60]. In connection, [61] reported that complex bacteria significantly increased yield and clusters weight of Flam Seedless grapevines as compared with mineral fertilization. At leaf level, concentrations of N, P and K were positively enhanced by inoculation vine with PGPR (Table 3).

Chapter 4.?? :[11r]Comment

???:[12r]Comment

Please reformulate, probably :[13r]Comment  
and after K is not necessary?

Our results are in line with [62] on Pomegranate, [63] on mango, [64] on citrus, [65] on olive, [66] on strawberry. The authors reported that bio-fertilizer containing N-fixing bacteria combined with mineral NPK were more active in enhancing accumulation of N, P and K in leaves of colonized plant than un-colonized. In addition, the beneficial effect of the bacterial strains might be related to its effect on increasing nitrogen fixation, creation of growth promoting substances or organic acids and improving nutrient uptake [67]. In conclusion, the previous beneficial effect of PGPR on growth and vine nutritional status surely reflected on improving berry setting and cluster weight consequently the yield [68].

These positive effects of PGPR inoculation on growth and nutritional status of Flame Seedless grapes led to an increase in pruning wood weight, coefficient of wood ripening and carbohydrates in canes, as shown in table (8). This may be explained based on that soil microorganisms excrete a range of hormones, growth substances and antibiotics that promote plant growth [69]. Overall studies of the present study proposed that among the most studied PGPR, have several reported properties, as well as nitrogen fixation [70] phosphorus solubilization [71] antibiotic synthesis [72] and phytohormone production [73].

According to the effect of PGPR application on quality of grape berries, our results show the highest values of total soluble solids, total acidity and anthocyanin were found in berries of plants colonized with PGPR combined with mineral NPK, mainly at 80% NPK, if compared with single NPK application (Table 4). These results are in harmony with [74] who found that bio-fertilizer significantly increased TSS and decreased juice acidity of Flame Seedless grapevines. In addition, inoculation with *G. versiforme* improved the percentage of titratable acidity content compared to non-inoculated [75].

This increase may be explained because of the healthy superior of treated vine, as shown in Table 2, which increases nutrient content and chlorophyll activity of colonized plants [76]. In this respect, it is important to mention that bacterial strains in the present study had especially positive effect on the stimulus of grape leaf chlorophyll content as compared with un-inoculated plants (Table 3). Likewise, [77] revealed that the maximum chlorophyll index was obtained in sugarcane leaves by application of *Pseudomonas sp.* The increments in chlorophyll could be related to the enhancement in element uptakes induced by bacteria [78].

346 Furthermore, supplying superior grapevines with *Azospirillum brasilense* proved  
to be 347 very effective in stimulating carbohydrates percentage [68], while application of  
bio-348 fertilizers for five-year-old seedless grapevine increased carbohydrate content than  
control 349 [54]. It is also worth mentioning that interaction between PGPR and the plant  
dep-350 on plants genotype, soil types, and harvest targets [79]. As shown in Table (7), the  
total 351 bacterial count, N<sub>2</sub>-fixing, P-solubilizing, and K-solubilizing bacteria in soil of  
grape 352 were powerfully enhanced due to the applied complex inoculant NPK bacteria.  
The 353 results are harmony with [80] who found that the populations of N<sub>2</sub>-fixing bacteria,  
as well 354 as P- and K-solubilizing bacteria were significantly higher than inoculated kiwi  
fruit 355 plants. In connection, mineral fertilizer combined with PGPR application recorded  
high 356 bacteria counts as compared to the control treatment [81,82]. These PGPR in turn  
lead 357 to the speed of more exudates and plant products for usage by the plant root plus  
incre-358 ase rhizosphere bacterial biomass [83]. This trend is supported by obtained increase  
in en-359 zymatic activities as illustrated in Table (9).

360 However, evaluation of the enzymatic activity can provide early evidence of the  
chan-361 ges in the soil environment, long before the changes of the chemical composition and  
phys-362 ical properties of soils. One of the most important groups of soil enzymes is  
dehy-363 drogenases (DHA) that present in all the live cells of microorganisms [84], and  
hence 364 are often considered to be the indicators of the general microbial activity of the  
rhizo-365 sphere [85]. DHA plays an essential role for organic matter decomposition and  
nutri-366 tional remobilization of rhizosphere soil [86,87], while soil acidic phosphatase enzyme  
show 367 an essential role in the mineralization of organic P [88]. The present study showed  
that 368 Acid or Alkaline phosphatase, and dehydrogenase enzymes in grapes tree rhizosphere  
were 369 significantly increased by complex application of PGPR consortium with mineral  
ferti-370 lizer (Table 9). This might be because of the mechanisms of bacteria in civilizing the  
phys-371 ical and chemical soil properties, particularly the soil structure, which improve the  
micro-372 bial activity in the soil [89]. In this study, a high number of bacteria were creating to  
have 373 positive effect on dehydrogenase activity in soil, as high dehydrogenase activity  
was 374 observed compared to un-inoculated treatments [90]. Previous studies also stated that  
the 375 N-fixing and P-solubilizing bacterial strains had the capability to be responsible for  
nutri-376 tional and encourage each other by their physical and biochemical activities thus  
enh-377 ancing the physical properties of plants [91]. Therefore, this study suggests that the  
app-378 lication of bio fertilizers plus mineral NPK fertilizer could encourage soil microbes to  
syn-379 thesize dehydrogenase and phosphatase and promoting microbial metabolic activity.

#### 4. Conclusion

PGPR might contribute to improve plants growth by modulating the physiological and biochemical activities of plants, especially those underlying the acquisition of mineral nutrients. In addition, the three strains, namely *Paenibacillus polymyxa* MSR5, *Bacillus nakavirai* MSR1 and *Bacillus pacificus* MSR3, had biological adaptation of the tested soil, and there were increasing in the population of bacteria. In this respect, tested PGPR consortium could be recommended as a partial substitute of mineral NPK fertilizer in vineyard of Flam Seedless grapevine. However, application of 80% NPK mineral fertilizer mixed with PGPR was the best practice might help to shrink the use of agrochemicals, as also foreseen by the green deal concept for an increasingly sustainable agriculture.

392

393

#### References

- Imran M, Rauf A, Imran A, Nadeem M, Ahmad Z, Atif M. Health Benefits of Grapes Polyphenols. *J. Environ. Agric. Sci.* 2017; 10: 40-51.
- Egyptian Ministry of Agriculture. *Agri. Econom.* 2021; 2.
- Chandini RK, Kumar R, Om, P. The Impact of Chemical Fertilizers on our Environment and Ecosystem. *In: Res. Trends Envir. Sci.* 2019; 71-86.
- Souza RD, Ambrosini A, Passaglia LM. Plant growth-promoting bacteria as inoculants in agricultural soils. *Genet. Mol. Biol.* 2015; 38: 401-19.
- Tsafaras I, Campen JB, de Zwart HF, Voogt W, Al Harbi A, Al Assaf K, Abdelaziz ME, Qaryouti M, Stanghellini C. Quantifying the trade-off between water and electricity for tomato production in arid environments. *Agric. Water Manag.* 2022; 271: 107819.
- Sharma A, Chetani R. A review on the effect of organic and chemical fertilizers on plants. *Int. J. Res. Appl. Sci. Eng. Technol.* 2017; 5: 677- 686.
- Chude VO, Malgwi WB, Amapu IV, Ano OA. Manual on Soil Fertility Assessment (Ed). Federal Fertilizer Department (FFD) in collaboration with FAO/National Special Programme for Food Security, Abuja, Nigeria. 2004.
- Martínez-Dalmau J, Berbel J, Ordóñez-Fernández R. Nitrogen Fertilization. A Review of the Risks Associated with the Inefficiency of Its Use and Policy Responses. *Sustainability* 2021; 13:5625.
- Van den Ackerveken GF, Dunn JM, Cozijnsen AJ, RM, Vossen JPM, Van den Broek HW J, Wit PJG, M De. Nitrogen limitation induces expression of the avirulence gene *avr9* in the tomato pathogen *Cladosporium fulvum*. *Molec. Gen. Genet.* 1994; 243: 277-285.
- Raven, J.A. RNA function and phosphorus use by photosynthetic organisms. *Front. Plant Sci.* 2013; 4:536.
- Farooq M, Wahid A, Kobayashi N, Fujita D, Basra S M A. Plant drought stress: effects, mechanisms and management. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 2009; 29: 185-212.

422 Sharma S, Kumar V, Tripathi RB. Isolation of phosphate solubilizing  
423 microorganism (PSMs) from soil. *J. Microbiol. Biotechnol. Res.* 2011; 1: 90-95.

424 Khan M, A Latif M, Arsalan M, Aziz M, Ulla R, Bilal M, Ashgar W, Latif R,  
425 Ehsan M, Mehmood MT. Enhancing phosphorus bioavailability in maize through  
426 phosphorus solubilizing fungi. *Intl. J. Agric. Biol.* 2022; 2: 2843-288

427 Xinxiang Xu, Xin Du, Wang Fen, Jianchuan Sha, Chen Qian, Tian Ge, Zhanling  
428 Zhu, Shunfeng Ge, Yuanmao Jiang. Effects of Potassium Levels on Plant Growth,  
429 Accumulation and Distribution of Carbon, and Nitrate Metabolism in Apple  
430 Dwarf Rootstock Seedlings. *Front. Plant Sci.* 2020; 11: 904.

431 Cakmak I. The role of potassium in alleviating detrimental effects of abiotic  
432 stresses in plants. *J. Plant Nutr. Soil Sci.* 2005; 168: 521-530.

433 Hu Wei, Nan Jiang, Jiashuo Yang, Yali Meng, Youhua Wang, Binglin Chen,  
434 Wenqing Zhao, Derrick MO, Zhiguo Zhou. Potassium (K) supply affects K  
435 accumulation and photosynthetic physiology in two cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*  
436 L.) cultivars with different K sensitivities. *Field Crops Res.* 2016; 196: 51-63.

437 Adesemoye AO, Torbert HA, Kloepper JW. Increased plant uptake of nitrogen  
438 from 15N-depleted fertilizer using plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria. *Appl.*  
439 *Soil Ecolo.* 2010; 46: 54-58.

440 Sainju UM, Ghimire R, Pradhan GP. Nitrogen fertilization I: Impact on crop, soil,  
441 and environment. *Nitrogen Fix.* 2019; 9: 1-9.

442 Shahrajabian MH, Chaski C, Polyzos N, Petropoulos SA. Biostimulants  
443 Application: A Low Input Cropping Management Tool for Sustainable Farming of  
444 Vegetables. *Biomolecules* 2021; 11: 698.

445 Ye H, Wen Y, Chen Z, Zhang T, Li S, Guan M, Zhang Y, Su S. Relationship of  
446 Soil Microbiota to Seed Kernel Metabolism in *Camellia oleifera* Under Mulched.  
447 2022, *Front. Plant Sci.* 13: 920604.

448 Sood G, Rajesh K, Girish P, Meenakshi D. Effect of Indigenous Plant Growth-  
449 Promoting Rhizobacteria on Wheat (*Triticum Aestivum* L.) Productivity and Soil  
450 Nutrients. *Comm. Soil Sci. Plant Analysis.* 2019; 2:141-152.

451 Saad MM, Eida AA, Hirt H. Tailoring plant-associated microbial inoculants in  
452 agriculture: a roadmap for successful application. *J. Exp. Bot.* 2020; 13:3878-  
453 3901.

454 Saber Z, Esmaeili MA, Abbasian A, Heidarzadeh A. Response of Wheat Growth  
455 Parameters to Co-Inoculation of Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR)  
456 and Different Levels of Inorganic Nitrogen and Phosphorus. *World Appl. Sci. J.*  
457 2012; 16: 213-219.

458 Synek L, Rawat A, L'Haridon F, Weisskopf L, Saad MM, Hirt H. Multiple  
459 strategies of plant colonization by beneficial endophytic *Enterobacter* sp. SA187.  
460 *Environ Microbio.* 2021; 10: 6223-6240.

461 Barnawal D, Bharti N, Maji D, Chanotiya CS. ACC deaminase containing  
462 *Arthrobacter protophormiae* induces NaCl stress tolerance through reduced ACC  
463 oxidase activity and ethylene production resulting in improved nodulation and  
464 mycorrhization in *Pisum sativum*. *J. Plant Physio.* 2014; 171: 884-894.

465 Russo RO, Berlyn GP. The Use of Organic Biostimulants to Help Low Input  
466 Sustainable Agriculture. *J. Sustain. Agric.* 1991; 1: 19-42.

467 Daler S, Çetin EM. Determination of the effects of plant growth-promoting  
468 rhizobacteria applications on Kober 5 BB American grapevine rootstock in lead  
469 stress. *J. Biol. Agri. Health.* 2017; 12: 50-55.

470 Yakhin OI, Lubyantsev AA, Yakhin IA, Brown PH. Biostimulants in Plant Science:  
471 A Global Perspective. *Front. Plant Sci.* 2017; 7: 2049.

292 Gray EJ, Smith DL. Intracellular and extracellular PGPR: commonalities and  
 473 distinctions in the plant–bacterium signaling processes. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 2005;  
 474 37: 395-412.

305 Syed Nabi RB, Shahzad R, Tayade R, Shahid M, Hussain A, Ali MW, Yun BW.  
 476 Evaluation potential of PGPR to protect tomato against *Fusarium* wilt and  
 477 promote plant growth. *PeerJ.* 2021; 16: 9.

318 Richards LA. Diagnosis and Improvement of Saline and Alkali Soils. United  
 479 States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. USA. 1954.

320 Bashan Y. Significance of timing and level of inoculation with rhizosphere  
 481 bacteria on wheat plants. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 1986; 18: 297-301.

322 Gilickmann E, Dessaux YA. Critical examination of the specificity of the  
 483 Salkowski reagent for indolic compounds produced by phytopathogenic bacteria.  
 484 *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 1995; 61: 793-796.

335 Damery JT, Alexander M. Physiological differences between effective and  
 486 ineffective strains of rhizobium. *Soil. Sci.* 1969; 103: 209-215.  
 487

338 Christensen GD, Simpson WA, Younger JJ, Baddour L, Barrett FF, Melton DM,  
 489 Beachey EH. Adherence of coagulase negative Staphylococci to plastic tissue  
 490 culture plates: a quantitative model for the adherence of Staphylococci to medical  
 491 devices. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 1985; 22: 996-1006.

362 Cottenie A, Verloo M, Kiekens L, Relgho G, Camerlynck W. Chemical analysis  
 493 of plant and soil. Lab. Analytical Agrochemist. State Univ. Gent, Belgium. 1982.

374 Mackinny, G. Absorption of light by chlorophyll solution. *J. Bio. Chem.* 1941;  
 495 140: 315- 322.

386 Bessis R. Sur Different Models Expression Quantitative De la fertilité chez la  
 497 vigne. *Aca.* 1960: 828-882.

398 Tourky MN, El-Shahat SS, Rizk MH. Effect of Dormex on fruit set, quality and  
 499 storage life of Thompson seedless grapes (*Banati grapes*). *J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura*  
 500 *Univ.* 1995; 12: 5139-5151.

401 Husia CL, Luh BS, Chichester, C. D. Anthocyanin in free stone peach. *J. Food*  
 502 *Sci.* 1965; 30: 5-12.

403 Du Bois M, Gilles KA, Hamilton JK, Rebers PT, Smith F. Colorimetric Method  
 504 for Determination of Sugars and Related Substances. *Analytical Chemist.* 1965;  
 505 28: 350-356.

406 Rizk MH, Rizk NA. Effect of Dormex on bud behavior, yield and rate of wood  
 507 maturity of Thompson seedless grapevine. *Egypt. J. Appl. Sci.* 1994; 9: 525-542.

408 Selim HH, Fayek MA, Sweidan AM. Reproduction of Bircher Apple Cultivar by  
 509 Layering. *Ann. Agri. Sci. Moshtohor.* 1978; 9: 156-166

440 Difco Manual. Dehydrated Culture Media and Reagents for Microbiological and  
 511 Clinical Laboratory Procedure. 10<sup>th</sup> Eds, Michigan. USA. 1984.

452 Zaw KL, San Y, Ei PK, Tin ML, Ma TN, Wai WM. Isolation, Evaluation and  
 513 Characterization of Free-Living Nitrogen Fixing Bacteria from Agricultural Soils  
 514 in Myanmar for Biofertilizer Formulation. *Int. J. Plant Biol. Res.* 2018; 6: 1092.

465 Zhang J, Liu J, Y, Meng LY, Ma ZY, Tang XY, Cao YY, Leni S. Isolation and  
 516 characterization of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria from wheat roots by  
 517 wheat germ agglutinin labeled with fluoresce in isothiocyanate. *J. Microbiol.* 2012;  
 518 50: 191-198.

479 Skujins, J. Enzymes in soil, In: McLaren AD, Peterson GH. (Eds.), *Soil Biochem.*  
 520 Marcel Dekker, Inc. New York, USA. 1976; 371-414.

521 Tabatabai MA. Soil enzymes, In: Page AL, Miller RH, Keeney DR. (Eds.),  
522 Methods of Soil Analysis. *Ameri. Soc. Agron.* 1982:903-947.

523 Kobua CK, Jou YT, Wang YM. Advantages of Amending Chemical Fertilizer  
524 with Plant-Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria under Alternate Wetting Drying Rice  
525 Cultivation. *Agriculture.* 2021; 11: 605.

506 El-Naggar AMA. Effect of Organic Farming on Drip Irrigation Grapevine and  
527 Soil Chemical Properties, *In Proceed. 2<sup>nd</sup> Intl Conf. Agri.* 2004: 117-128.

528 Zhang L, Chengxi Yan, Qing Guo, Junbiao Zhang, Jorge Ruiz-Menjivar. The  
529 impact of agricultural chemical inputs on environment: global evidence from  
530 informetrics analysis and visualization. *Intl. J. Low-Carbon Techn.* 2018; 13: 338-  
531 352.

532 Abdelaziz ME, Atia MAM, Abdelsattar M, Abdelaziz SM, Ibrahim TAA,  
533 Abdeldaym EA. Unravelling the Role of Piriformospora indica in Combating  
534 Water Deficiency by Modulating Physiological Performance and Chlorophyll  
535 Metabolism-Related Genes in Cucumis sativus. *Horticulturae.* 2021; 7:399.

536 Sedri MH, Niedbała G, Roohi E, Niazi M, Szulc P, Rahmani HA, Fiezi V.  
537 Comparative Analysis of Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR) and  
538 Chemical Fertilizers on Quantitative and Qualitative Characteristics of Rainfed  
539 Wheat. *Agronomy,* 2022; 12: 1524.

540 Ahmed MF, Mohamed MN. Improved Productivity of Superior Seedless  
541 Grapevines Using Irradiated Compost and Bio-Fertilization in the Desert Land  
542 Arab. *J. Nucl. Sci. Appl.* 2018; 51: 94-103.

533 Biswas JC, Ladha JK, Dazzo FB. Rhizobia inoculation improves nutrient up take  
544 and growth of low land rice. *Soil Sci. Soc. Amr. J.* 2000; 64:1644-1650.

565 Lucy M, Reed E, Glick BR. Applications of free-living plant growth-promoting  
546 rhizobacteria. Review Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek. 2004; 86:1-25

577 Crecchio C, Mimmo T, Bulgarelli D, Pertot I, Pii Y, Perazzolli M, Scagliola M,  
548 Cesco S. Beneficial soil microbiome for sustainable agriculture  
549 production. *Sustain. Agric. Rev.* 2018; 31: 443-481.

580 Scagliola M, Valentinuzzi F, Mimmo T. Cesco S. Crecchio C, Pii Y.  
551 Bioinoculants as Promising Complement of Chemical Fertilizers for a More  
552 Sustainable Agricultural Practice. *Front. Sustain. Food Sys.* 2021; 4.

593 Shaaban ASA. Effect of organic fertilization on growth and quality of Superior  
554 grapevines. *Ph.D. thesis Fac. Agric. Cairo Univ., Egypt.* 2014.

605 Cássia R, Erasmo J, Marco A, Ilda M, Maria C, Alberto K, Otília B Fertilidade de  
556 gemas de videiras „Niagara Rosada” de acordo com o sistema de condução. *Rev.*  
557 *Bras. Fruti. Jaboticabal.* 2006; 28: 136-138.

638 Khalil HA. The Potential of Biofertilizers to Improve Vegetative Growth,  
559 Nutritional Status, Yield and Fruit Quality of Flame Seedless Grapevines,  
560 American-Eurasian. *J. Agric. Environ. Sci.* 2012; 12: 1122-1127.

621 Aseri GK, Jain N, Panwar J, Rao AV, Meghwal PR. Biofertilizers improve plant  
562 growth, fruit yield, nutrition, metabolism and rhizosphere enzyme activities of  
563 Pomegranate (*Punica granatum* L.) in Indian Thar Desert. *Scient. Hort.* 2008;  
564 117:130-135.

685 Ghazi NA. The effect of Arbuscular Mycorrhiza fungi on the establishment of  
566 Sour orange (*C. aurantium*) under different levels of phosphorus. *Acta Hort.* 2013;  
567 984: 103-10.

648 Haggag LF, Merwad MM, Awad NM, Shahin MFM, Khalil KH, Mahdy HA.  
569 Studies on the effect of bacterial mixture and NPK mineral fertilizer on vegetative

570and chemical properties of "Toffahi" olive seedlings under greenhouse condition.  
571*J. Agric. Technol.* 2015; 11: 1535-15468.

572Kundu S, Datta P, Mishra J, Rashmi K, Ghosh B. Influence of biofertilizer and  
573inorganic fertilizer in pruned mango orchard cv. Amrapali. *J. Crop Weed.* 2011; 7:  
574100-103.

575Rueda D, Valencia G, Soria N, Rueda BB, Manjunatha B, Kundapur RR,  
576Selvanayagam M. Effect of *Azospirillum spp.* and *Azotobacter spp.* on the growth  
577and yield of strawberry (*Fragaria vesca*) in hydroponic system under different  
578nitrogen levels. *J. Appl. Pharm. Sci.* 2016; 6: 48-54.

579Samah YAE. Effect of Biofertilizer on Yield and Berry Qualities of Grapevines.

580*Ph.D thesis Fac. Agric. Mansoura Univ. Egypt.* 2002.

582Ahmed FF, Dakhly OF, Abada MAM, Uwakiem M Kh. Effect of some  
583azospirillum strains as a partial replacement of inorganic N fertilizers, on yield  
584and quality of Superior grapevines. *Menoufia J. Plant Prod.* 2017; 2: 495-514.

585Abobatta WFR. Influence of magnetic iron and K-humate on productivity of  
586Valencia orange trees (*Citrus sinensis* L.) under salinity conditions. *Int. J. Sci.*  
587*Res. Agric. Sci.* 2015; 2:108-119.

588Cakmakci R, Donmez F, Aydın A, Sahin, F. Growth promotion of plants by plant  
589growth-promoting rhizobacteria under greenhouse and two different field soil  
590conditions. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 2006; 38:1482-148.

591De Freitas JR, Banerjee MR, Germida JJ. Phosphate solubilizing rhizobacteria  
592enhance the growth and yield but not phosphorus uptake of canola (*Brassica*  
593*napus* L.). *Biol. Fertil. Soils.* 1997; 24:358-364.

594Rosado AS, Seldin L. Production of potentially novel anti-microbial substance by  
595*Bacillus polymyxa*. *World J Microbiol. Biotech.* 1993;9: 521-52.

596Timmusk S, Nicander B, Granhall U, Tillberg E. Cytokinin production by  
597*Paenobacillus polymyxa*. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 1999; 31:1847-185.

598Khalil HA. The Potential of Biofertilizers to Improve Vegetative Growth,  
599Nutritional Status, Yield and Fruit Quality of Flame Seedless Grapevines,  
600*American-Eurasian J. Agric. Environ. Sci.* 2012; 12: 1122-1127.

601Salah E, Kamal A, Mourad S, Khadija H, Hassan G. Effects of inoculation with  
602mycorrhizae and the benefits of bacteria on physicochemical and microbiological  
603properties of soil, growth, productivity and quality of table grapes grown under  
604Mediterranean climate conditions. *J. Plant Protect. Res.* 2021; 1427-4345.

605Fawzi MIF, Shahin MFM Kandil EA. Effect of bud load on bud behavior, yield,  
606bunch characteristics and some biochemical contents of the cane of crimson  
607seedless grapevines. *J. Amer. Sci.* 2010; 6: 187-194.

608Pirhadi M, Enayatizamir N, Motamedi H, Sorkheh K. Impact of soil salinity on  
609diversity and community of sugarcane endophytic plant growth promoting  
610bacteria (*Saccharum officinarum* L. var. CP48). *Appl. Ecology Environ. Res.*  
6112017; 16: 725-739.

612Ali S, Matilla Y, Zeki K, Fikrettin S. Growth and mineral acquisition response  
613of grapevine rootstocks (*Vitis* spp.) to inoculation with different strains of plant  
614growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR). *J. Sci. Food Agric.* 2012; 92: 2148-2153.

615Bhardwaj D, Ansari MW, Sahoo RK, Tuteja N. Biofertilizers function as key  
616player in sustainable agriculture by improving soil fertility, plant tolerance and  
617crop productivity. *Microbiol. Cell Factories.* 2014; 13:66.

808 Hong Shen, Xinhua He, Yiqing Liu, Yi Chen, Jianming Tang, Tao Guo. A  
619 Complex Inoculant of N<sub>2</sub>-Fixing, P- and K-Solubilizing Bacteria from a Purple  
620 Soil Improves the Growth of Kiwifruit (*Actinidia chinensis*) Plantlets. *Front.*  
621 *Microbiol.* 2016; 7: 84.

822 Zhao J, Ni T, Li Y, Xiong W, Ran W, Shen B, Shen Q, Zhang R. Responses of  
623 Bacterial Communities in Arable Soils in a Rice-Wheat Cropping System to  
624 Different Fertilizer Regimes and Sampling Times. *PLoS ONE.* 2014; 9.

825 Das BB, Dkhar MS. Rhizosphere Microbial Populations and Physico Chemical  
626 Properties as Affected by Organic and Inorganic Farming Practices. *Am. Eurasian*  
627 *J. Agric. Environ. Sci.* 2011; 10:140-150.

628

829 Curyło K, Telesiński A. Use of Phosphatase and Dehydrogenase Activities in  
630 the Assessment of Calcium Peroxide and Citric Acid Effects in Soil Contaminated  
631 with Petrol. *Open Life Sci.* 2020; 28:15,12-20.

832 Moeskops B, Sukristiyonubowo Buchan D, Sleutel S, Herawaty L, Husen E,  
633 Saraswati R, Setyorini D, De Neve S. Soil microbial communities and activities  
634 under intensive organic and conventional vegetable farming in West Java,  
635 Indonesia. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 2010; 45: 112-120.

636

837 Kaczyńska G, Borowik A, Wyzkowska J. Soil Dehydrogenases as an  
638 Indicator of Contamination of the Environment with Petroleum Products. *Water*  
639 *Air Soil Pollut.* 2015; 226: 372.

860 Lioussanne L, Perreault F, Jolicœur M, St-Arnauda M. The bacterial  
641 community of tomato rhizosphere is modified by inoculation with arbuscular  
642 mycorrhizal fungi but unaffected by soil enrichment with mycorrhizal root  
643 exudates or inoculation with *Phytophthora nicotianae*. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 2010;  
644 42: 473-483.

875 Liang Q, Chen H, Gong Y, Yang H, Fan M, Kuzyakov Y. Effects of 15 years of  
646 manure and mineral fertilizers on enzyme activities in particle-size fractions in a  
647 North China Plain soil. *Euro. J. Soil Biol.* 2014; 60: 112-119.

888 Wang Y, Shi J, Wang H, Lin Q, Chen X, Chen Y. The influence of soil heavy  
649 metals pollution on soil microbial biomass, enzyme activity, and community  
650 composition near a copper smelter. *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Safe.* 2007; 67: 75-81.

891 Maqshoof A, Zahir AZ, Jamil M, Latif FNM, Akhtar MF. Integrated use of  
652 plant growth promoting rhizobacteria, biogas slurry and chemical nitrogen for  
653 sustainable production of maize under salt-affected conditions. *Pak. J. Bot.* 2014;  
654 46:375-382.

905 Qaiser Jamal, Yong Seong Lee, Hyeon Deok Jeon, and Kil Young Kim. Effect  
656 of Plant Growth-Promoting Bacteria *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* Y1 on Soil  
657 properties, Pepper Seedling Growth, Rhizosphere Bacterial Flora and Soil  
658 Enzymes. *Plant Protect. Sci.* 2018; 54:129-137.

939 Jha CK, Saraf M. Evaluation of multispecies plant-growth promoting consortia  
660 for the growth promotion of *Jatropha curcas* L. *J. Plant Growth Regul.* 2012; 31:  
661 588-598.

662