*Original Research Article*

# MicrobialFiltrates Improved Growth Parameters of Invitro PVX Infected Potato Plantlets


## ABSTRACT

This study focuses on utilizing the phenomenon of systemic acquired resistance (SAR) to control plant viruses and increased growth in vitro. The study demonstrated the induction of SAR in potato plantlets against Potato Virus X by using bacterial culture filtrates invitro. These biotic inducers included *Pseudomonas spp.*and *Bacillus spp.* The study observed the occurrence of induced resistance and enhanced growth in potato plantlets treated with culture filtrates containing these microorganisms. This was evident through a reduction in PVXinfection,disease severity and associated biochemical changes (such as elevated levels of endogenous salicylic acid, protein content, chlorophyll content, peroxidase and polyphenol oxidase activities), as well as improvements in growth parameters.



*Key words: PVX, Bacterial filtrate, micropropagation,growth parameters, proteincontent*


.

## INTRODUCTION

Microorganisms can contaminate plant tissue cultures,and affect their growth and development. Microbial contamination can occur from various sources, including the environment,contaminated equipment and infected plant material. Once contamination occurs, it can spread rapidly throughout the culture, leading to a loss of genetically uniform plants and production objectives. To prevent microbial contamination, strict aseptic techniques must be followed during all steps of plant tissue culture, including sterilization of tools, media, and plant material. Contaminated cultures should be discarded immediately to prevent further spread of the microbes. In addition to aseptic techniques, the use of antibiotics and antifungal agents in the culture media can help control microbial growth. However, their use should be minimized to avoid potential negative effects on the plants. Regular monitoring of cultures for contamination is crucial to detect early any microbial growth. This can be done through visual inspection, microscopic examination or microbial culture tests. Contaminated cultures should be isolated and treated accordingly to prevent further contamination [1].

Overall, implementing strict aseptic techniques, routine monitoring, and appropriate use of antimicrobial agents are essential for successful plant tissue culture and preventing microbial contamination [2].
Microbial contamination is a majorproblem in plant cell and tissue culture. Various microorganisms such as fungi, yeasts, bacteria, viruses, viroids, and micro-arthropods like mites and thrips can contaminate plant tissue cultures [1]. In order to combat this contamination, numerous agents have been identified that can induce resistance in plants against pathogens. One effective method involves treating plants with the Bacterial filtrate of non-pathogenic isolates, either individually or in combination. This treatment has been found to be highly effective in inhibiting virus infections through induced systemic resistance [3,4].
The objective of the current study is to identify various microorganisms that can potentially contaminate potato tissue cultures and to determine the most effective bacterial filtrate that can induce growth parameters and systemic resistance in potato cultures against potato virus X in micro propagated potato plantlets.

## MATERIALS and METHODS

**Plant materials:**Potato virus X-infected tuber cv. Spounta cultivated at the Virology Greenhouse Fac. of Agriculture at Ain Shams University served as the starting sprouts for in vitro potato cultures. Polyclonal antibodies were used by DAS-ELISA to test potato tuber for PVX infection [5].
Infected potato sprouts were washed with tap water and immersed in 3% sodium hypochlorite for 20 minutes. Explants were rinsed three times with sterilized distilled water following surface sterilization. Aseptically transferring the explants to MS basal culture media free of hormones [6]. All cultures were raised for three weeks at a temperature of 26°C under 16 hours of light and 8 hours of darkness. As replicates, five sprouts were used. On multiplication MS medium, potato plantlets were in vitro subcultured [7].
**Isolation and purification of microbial contaminants:**Bacteria that contaminated invitro potato cultures, were inoculated onto nutrient agar medium [8]and cultured at 30°C for three days. For further induced resistance investigations, a single colony was selected on slant tube media and kept at 4°C in a refrigerator.
**Characterization and identification of microbiological isolates:**Bacterial isolates were identified in accordance with [9] and Bergey's Manual [10].
**Induced resistance using bacterial filtrate:**According to [11]a loop full of bacterial growth from an agar slope was transferred to 10 ml of tryptic soy broth to prepare the culture filtrate. The bacteria cell was removed from the culture by spinning for 10 minutes at 10,000 rpm. **Bacterial filtrate** (cell-free supernatants)was combined with MS medium in the following ratios: MS medium (as control), 100 ml culture filtrate /1000 mL MS medium and 200 ml culture filtrate/ 1000mL MS medium. Whereas, MS medium were used (as control). All potato plantlets treated with culture filtrates were incubated under culture conditions in jars with five plantlets per jar and five jars for each treatment.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

**Evaluation of induced resistance**: Induced resistance in potato plantlets against PVX was evaluated based on:

**PVX concentration:** Percentage of PVX concentration was measured in potato plantlets by DAS-ELISA, to evaluate the degree of induced resistance in potato plantlets against PVX[5].

**Plantlets growth parameters:**shoot number,shoot length, and growth values of the regenerated cultures plantlets were calculated for each treatment after eight weeks [12].

**Protein content:**The total soluble protein content of the leaves was determined Folin phenol reagent using according to [13].

## Biochemical analysis:

**Enzyme activity**: Plantlet tissue weighing one gram was mashed in 3 ml of 50 mμ potassium phosphate (pH 7.0). The homogenates were centrifuged for 10 minutes at 12000 rpm at $4^{o}$C. The crude enzyme protein (supernatant) was gathered and separated into 1.5 ml. The supernatant wasused to estimate the activity of the following enzymes [14].

**Peroxidase activity:** 200 μl of the crude enzyme dissolved in, 0.1 M phosphate buffer:3.5ml (pH 7.0) were mixed with 100 μl of guaicacol (0.251) to measure the peroxidase activity. For five minutes, the optical density at 470 nm was measured once every minute [15].

**Polyphenoloxidaseactivity**: was determined in 200 μl of the crude enzyme dissolved in, 0.1 M phosphate **Buffer**:3.5ml (pH 7.0) and mixed with 2.95 ml of 20 mM catechol. The optical density was recorded every one min for 5 min at 420 nm [16].

**Photopigments:**Chlorophyll a, b, and carotenoids were extracted and their concentrations were calculated in accordance with [17, 18].

**Salicylic acid:** Total salicylic acid was extracted and quantified from potato plantlets by fluorescence HPLC [19].

# RESULTS

The current study was carried out to inducegrowth parameters and resistance phenomena via bacterial filtrate through different stages of potato micropropagation. Homologous sprouted tubers were obtained from PVX infected potato plants cv. Spunta.

**Infestation of micro propagated potato shoots:**Gramnegative bacteria (*Pseudomonas spp. and Bacillus spp.*)were among the major genera of bacteria that were tested and were frequently identified in association with micro propagatedplantlets. *P. florescence*were identified as more common bacterial contaminant followed by*P. aeruginosa* with the lowest frequency (Table 1).

**Table 1. Characteristics and frequency of potato culture-contaminating bacterium isolates.**



UNDER PEER REVIEW

| Bacterial contaminants | Characteristics | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Cell morphology | Motility | Gram stain | Endospors formation | Pigment production | Frequency (%) |
| P. florescence | Short rod | + | G- | No | greenish yellow | 30.88 |
| Bacillus sp. | Long rod | + | G+ | Intermediate spore | Creamy | 25.46 |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa | Short rod | + | G- | No | Pale yellow | 15.67 |

G-: Gram stain negative G+: Gram stain positive)

### Induced resistance in micropropagated potato plantlets:

Based on the decrease in PVX infectivity and the development rates of potato plantlets, microbial contaminants were screened for biotic inducers. Therefore,the three bacterial contaminants were used to investigate how their culture filtrate affected plantlet growth invitro.

Virus Infectivity: Using specific polyclonal antibodies Potato virus X (PVX) was detected in potato sprouts by DAS-ELISA. Microbialfiltrates provided variable reduction in PVX infection.Whereas,individual contaminant filtrate gave high reduction in PVX infection and increasing by increase microbial filtrates concentrations(Table 2).

**Table 2. Effect of individual microbial filtrate on PVX infectivity in potato plantlets.**

| Parameters **Microbial** filtrate | **100 MF $^{-1}$L MS medium** | | | **200 MF $^{-1}$L MS medium** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Optical density** | **% of PVX infectivity** | **Reduction infection (%)** | **Optical density** | **% of PVX infectivity** | **Reduction infection (%)** |
| *P. florescence* | 0.215 | 49.5 | 48.5 | 0.286 | 52.45 | 43.5 |
| *Bacillus* spp. | 0.221 | 57.0 | 42.0 | 0.235 | 61.45 | 39.5 |
| *P.aeruginosa* | 0.246 | 87.0 | 38.5 | 0.262 | 73.40 | 28.0 |
| Mixed microbial isolates filtrates | 0.158 | 30.25 | 50.32 | 0.198 | 55.42 | 59.68 |

Plantlet PVX infected (+ve)= 0.375

Plantlet health (-ve)= 0.125

$$\text{Reduction infectivity (R1)} = \frac{\text{Total plantlets} - \text{treatment}}{\text{Total plantlets}} \times 100$$

An average of five jars containing 15-20 plantlets $^{-1}$jar. The microbial filtrate due to reduction of PVX infectivity whereas *P. florescence., Bacillus spp and, P.aeruginosa*revealed the reduction of PVXinfectivity

UNDER PEER REVIEW

(43.5, 39.5 and28.0 ) at 100 $^{-1}$L MS medium, respectively and (48.5, 42.0 and 38.5 ) at 200 $^{-1}$L MS medium, respectively, (Table 2).

## Growth rates of potato plantlets:

The results of the study indicate that the application of microbial filtrates to potato cultures MS medium resulted in increased growth parameters compared to the control group (healthy and/or PVX-infected potato plantlets). Specifically, the application of bacterial culture filtrates at a concentration of 100 ml/l MS medium led to the highest increase in shoot and root length, as well as the number of (shoots, roots, and leaves). In the case of *pseudomonas florescence* (100MF$^{-1}$L) the(shoot length,shoot number, leaves number, root length, root numbers and growth value) was(8.75,3.22,5.70,9.20,9.75 and 3.25) respectively**.** *P. florescence* gave highest growth parameters compared with other bacterial filtrates (Table 3).

**Table 3. Effect of microbial culture filtrates on growth parameters of PVX infected potato plantlets.**

| Treatments | | Shoot length (cm) | Shoot number | Leaves number | Root length (cm) | Root number | Growth value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Healthy control (disinfectants) | | 6.35 | 1.50 | 5.12 | 6.75 | 7.25 | 1.75 |
| Infected control (disinfectants) | | 5.86 | 1.25 | 3.88 | 5.25 | 6.14 | 1.43 |
| *P. florescence* MF $^{-1}$L | 100 | 8.75 | 3.22 | 5.70 | 9.20 | 9.75 | 3.25 |
| | 200 | 7.95 | 2.02 | 5.11 | 7.98 | 7.64 | 2.05 |
| *Bacillus spp.* MF $^{-1}$L | 100 | 7.89 | 2.96 | 5.20 | 7.95 | 8.89 | 2.95 |
| | 200 | 6.25 | 2.26 | 4.65 | 6.56 | 7.21 | 1.26 |
| *P.aeruginosa* MF $^{-1}$L | 100 | 6.89 | 2.70 | 4.95 | 7.85 | 7.05 | 2.78 |
| | 200 | 5.69 | 1.98 | 3.69 | 6.02 | 6.23 | 1.55 |
| Mixed microbial isolates filtrates 100 MF $^{-1}$L | | 7.75 | 2.40 | 5.15 | 7.20 | 8.21 | 2.50 |

Calculated as average from 100 potato plantlets (10 jars)

## Phytochemical contents:

Protein content and enzyme activities were determined in treated potato plantlets with individual and mixed microbial filtrate*in vitro*. Data in **Table (3)** revealed that, all microbial filtrates inducers increased in protein content and enzyme activities of potato plantlets *in vitro*. The highest protein content

UNDER PEER REVIEW

was produced by individual microbial filtrate, such as *Bacillus spp.* (1.85); followed by *P. florescence*(175.9),while the lowest content was produced by *P.aeruginosa*(1.41); microbial and mixed microbial Filtrate (1.49µg/g fresh weight) compared with control (healthy and PVY-infected plantlets, 1.15 and 1.25) respectively.

The highest peroxidase activity was induced by *Bacillus spp*(182.5)., while the lowest was induced by mixed microbial Filtrate (52.3). *Bacillus spp and P. florescence*were also found to induce the highest polyphenoloxidaseactivity (215.7 and 185.7) respectively. PVX-infected plantlets showed the highest polyphenoloxidase activity (265.3). PVX infection caused a reduction in chlorophyll a, chlorophyll b, and carotenoid contents, but treatment with microbial filtrates increased these contents compared to infected plantlets. Microbial filtrates and PVX infection also increased the salicylic acid content in potato plantlets (Table 4).

**Table 4. Effect of microbial filtrates (100 MF $^{-1}$L) on some phytochemical contents of PVX-infected potato plantlets *in vitro*.**

| Treatments | Protein content (µg/g fresh weight) | Peroxidase specific activity (µg/g fresh weight) | Polyphenoloxidase specific activity (µg/g fresh weight) | Total SA (µg/g fresh weight) | Photopigments (µg/g fresh weight) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Chl a | Chl b | carotenoids |
| Health control | 1.15 | 64.5 | 115.2 | 75.25 | 2.15 | 1.49 | 1.75 |
| PVX-infected control | 1.25 | 168.2 | 265.3 | 200.25 | 1.45 | 1.21 | 1.25 |
| *P. florescence* | 1.59 | 175.9 | 185.7 | 150.75 | 2.27 | 1.71 | 1.92 |
| *Bacillus spp* | 1.85 | 182.5 | 215.7 | 239.15 | 2.75 | 2.05 | 2.12 |
| *.P.aeruginosa* | 1.41 | 154.5 | 136.2 | 114.20 | 2.51 | 1.91 | 2.15 |
| Mixed microbial Filtrate | 1.49 | 152.3 | 170.2 | 185.50 | 1.50 | 1.45 | 1.75 |

## DISCUSSION

As surface sterilizing agents per culture, sodium hypochlorite and ethanol were used to obtain the least amount of contamination in potato sprouts, This findings in agreements with [2].

Using appropriate specialized media, contaminants from potato shoots that had been micro-propagated were separated. Gram-negative bacteria were typically discovered in soil and plant-related environments. Based on the features, the bacterial contaminants were grouped into major genera (*Pseudomonas spp. and Bacillus spp.*). These findings are consistent with those of [1, 21].

UNDER PEER REVIEW

It is important to note that the Pseudomonas and Bacillus genera had the highest frequency of bacterial isolates, whereas Enterobacter, Klebsiella, and Corynebacterium genera had the lowest frequency. A number of bacteria were recovered from various plant cultures during tissue culture processes, according to earlier researchers' reports. such as gram positive and gram-negative bacteria were *Staphylococcusxylosus*, *S.aureus*, *S. cohnii*, *Bacillus* sp., *Corynebacterium* sp., *Micrococcus* sp., *Pseudomonas vesicularis*, *Serratia* sp., *Cellulomonas* sp., *Clavibacter* sp., *Curtobacterium*, *Microbacterium* sp., *Acinetobacter* sp., *Wautersia* (*Ralstonia*) and *Stenotrophomonas* sp. [22, 23, 24, 20]. On the other hand, many bacterial contaminants from various plant cultures were isolated during tissue culture methods. These contaminants were identified as *Bacillus spp. and Pseudomonas spp.* [ 25, 26, 27, 20].

According to research on how bacterial cultures filtrate affected shoots and roots as well as growth value, applications of bacterial filtrate resulted in the longest shoots and roots as well as the highest growth value. It is also important to note that, when compared to the addition of Bacillus culture filtrate, the filtrate of Pseudomonas culture demonstrated a better promotion effect on strawberry growth value. Several studies have shown that *Bacillus and Pseudomonas* created IAA in their cultures in this regard [28, 29, 30]. Additionally, Acinetobacter, Bacillus, Pseudomonas, Wautersia (Ralstonia), and Stenotrophomonas all produced IAA in [24].

These results revealed that, in tissue culture circumstances, microbial auxins may be encouraging the growth parameters.

In comparison to the control treatment (bacterial filtrate-free), the application of bacterial culture filtrate to the potato culture medium improved all growth metrics for the potato plantlets. It is also important to note that, the filtrate from the (100 MF $^{-1}$L) demonstrated a higher promotion effect on potato plantlet lengths and growth value.

## REFERENCES


[1] Leifert C and Cassells AC. Microbial Hazards in Plant Tissue and Cell Cultures. In Vitro Cellular Developmental Biology Plant,2001; 37:133-138. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11627-001-0025-y

[2] Isenegger D A, Taylor PWJ, Mullins K et al. Molecular detection of a bacterial contaminant Bacillus pumilus in symptomless potato plant tissue cultures. Plant Cell Rep, 2003; 21:814–820. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00299-003-0583-z

[3] Kolase SV and Sawant DM. Management of bean common mosaic virus by the use of botanicals. In, Abstracts of national symposium on Plant Protection Strategies for Sustainable Agri-Horticulture held at SKU & AST, Jammu, 2001; 12-13 October: 104

[4] Nasr-Eldin M, Messiha N, Othman B, Megahed A and Elhalag K. Induction of potato systemic resistance against the potato virus Y (PVYNTN), using crude filtrates of Streptomyces spp. under

greenhouse conditions. Egypt J Biol Pest Control, 2019; 29:62. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41938-019-0165-1

[5] Clark MF and Adams SAN. Characteristics of the microplate method of enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay for the detection of Plant Viruses. Journal of General Virology, 1971; 34:475-483.

[6] MurashigeT and Skoog F. A revised medium for rapid growth and bioassays with tobacco tissue cultures. Physiol. Plant., 1962; 15: 473-497.

[7] Xhulaj D B and Gixhari B. In vitro micropropagation of potato (Solanum tuberosum L.) cultivars. Agriculture and Forestry, 2018; 64 (4):105-112. DOI:10.17707/AgricultForest.64.4.12.

[8] Jay J M. Modern food microbiology (4th Edition), AVI Book, Van Nosrand Reinhold, New York, USA, 1992.

[9] Klement Z, Rudolph K and Sands DC. Methods in phytobacteriology. Budapest: AkadémiaiKiadó, Budapest, 1990.

[10] Bergey D H, Holt J G, Krieg N R and Sneath P H A. Bergey's manual of determinative bacteriology. Publ. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 9th Edition, 1994:787pp.

[11] Ouda S M, Debevere J and Enan G. Purification and biochemical characterization of plantaricin UG1 produced by Lactobacillus plantarum UG1 isolated from dry sausage. Life Sci. J., 2014; 114: 271-279.

[12] Ziv M. The use of growth retardants for the regulation and acclimatization of *in vitro* plants. Hort. Abst., 1992; 64: 537.

[13] Lowry O H, Rosebrough N J, Farr A L, Randall R J. Protein measurement with the Folin phenol reagent, J. Biol. Chem, 1951;193:265–275.

[14] Mukherjee S P and Choudhuri M A. Implications of water stress-induced changes in the levels of endogenous ascorbic acid and hydrogen peroxide in Vigna seedlings, Physiol. Plant, 1983; 58:166–170.

[15] Malik C P and Singh M B. Plant Enzymology and Histoenzymology: A text manual. Kalyani Publications, New Delhi., 1980; P: 50.

[16] Coseteng M Y and LEE C Y. Changes in apple polyphenoloxidase and polyphenol concentrations in relation to degree of browning. J. Food Sci., 1987; 52(4):985-989.

[17] Vernon L and Seely G. The Chlorophylls; Academic Press: New York, NY, USA, 1966.

[18] Lichtenthaler H K. Chlorophylls and carotenoids: Pigments of photosynthetic biomembranes. In Methods in Enzymology; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1987; Volume 148, pp. 350–382.

[19] Loake G and Grant M. Salicylic acid in plant defense-the players and protagonists. Curr. Opin. Plant Biol., 2007;10:466-472.

[20] Mona H A Hussein. Microbiological studies on the bacterial and fungal contamination under strawberry tissue culture conditions. MSc. Fac. Agric. MoshtohorBenha Univ. 2007; 107 pp.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

[21] Megahed A A, El-Dougdoug K A, Othman B A, Lashin S M, Ibrahim M A, Sofy A R Induction of resistance in tomato plants against Tomato mosaic tobamoviral using beneficial microbial isolates. Pak. J. Biol. Sci. 2013; 16:385–390, doi:10.3923/pjbs.2013.385.390.

[22] Van Den Houwe I and Swennen R. Characterization and control of bacterial contaminants in *in vitro* cultures of banana (*Musa* spp.) Acta Hort. 2000; 530: 69–79.

[23] Bhattacharya Y. Tissue culture and transformation studies in indian cultivars of papaya (*Carica papaya* L.). Ph.D. thesis, Plant Tissue Culture Division National Chemical Laboratory, Pune University, India 2002; 249pp.

[24] Lata H, Li XC, Silva B, Moraes R M and Halda-Alija L. Identification of IAA producing endophytic bacteria from micropropagated echinacea plants using 16S rRNA sequencing. Plant Cell Tissue Organ Cult, 2006; 85:353-359.

[25] Murugesh S, Subathra Devi C, Mohana Srinivasan V, Mahesh N and Vijayalakshmi S. Bacterial and fungal contamination in plant tissue culture laboratory: A guide to recognition and management School of Chemical and Biotechnology. SASTRA Deemed Univ. Thanjavur, 1999; 613-402, Tamilnadu, India.

[26] Odutaya O I, Oso RT, Akinyemi B O and Amusd N A. Microbial contaminants of cultured *Hibiscus cannabinus* and *Telfaria occidentalis* tissues. African Journal of Biotechnology, 2004; 3(9):473-476.

[27] Wu L S. Study on the contaminantion and prevention in plant tissue culture of *Rosa chinensis*. Journal of Jiangsu Foresty Science and Technology, 2005; 32(1): 28-31.

[28] William F, Stanley F O and Mishale G D. Auxin production by plant pathogenic *Pseudomonas* and *Xanthomonas*. Applied and Environmental Microbiology, Aug., 1987: 839-1845.

[29] Sofy A R, Hmed AA, Alnaggar A E A M, Dawoud R A, El shaarawy R M and Sofy M R. Mitigating effects of Bean yellow mosaic virus infection in faba bean using new carboxymethyl chitosan-titania nanobiocomposites. International Journal of Biological Macromolecules, 2020; 163:1261-1275.

[30] Sofy A R, Sofy M R, Hmed A A, Dawoud R A, Alnaggar A E A M, Soliman A M, El-Dougdoug N K. Ameliorating the Adverse Effects of Tomato mosaic tobamovirus Infecting Tomato Plants in Egypt by Boosting Immunity in Tomato Plants Using Zinc Oxide Vanoparticles. 2021; 26:1337. https:// doi.org/10.3390/molecules26051337.

UNDER PEER REVIEW