




- Yusran (Autor)

Use of Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR) to Improve Mycorrhization, Nutrient acquisition and Growth of Vegetable Plants Affected by Soilborne Pathogens



<https://cuvillier.de/de/shop/publications/984>

Copyright:

Cuvillier Verlag, Inhaberin Annette Jentsch-Cuvillier, Nonnenstieg 8, 37075 Göttingen, Germany

Telefon: +49 (0)551 54724-0, E-Mail: info@cuvillier.de, Website: <https://cuvillier.de>

Table of Contents

Table of contents	i
List of figures	vii
List of tables	xv
Abbreviations	xviii
1. General Introduction	1
1.1. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria	2
1.2. Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF)	5
1.3. Interactions between PGPR and AMF	7
1.4. Soilborne plant pathogens	9
1.5. Biological control of soilborne pathogens	11
1.6. Working hypothesis and objectives	15
References	19
2. Improving mycorrhization, nutrient acquisition and growth of tomato by soil inoculation with <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. “Proradix [®] ” (DSMZ 13134)	36
Abstract	37
2.1. Introduction	38
2.2. Material and methods	40
2.2.1. Microbial inoculums, treatments and plant growth conditions	40
2.2.2. Plant harvest and nutrient content analysis	40
2.2.3. Root colonization by arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF)	41
2.2.4. Statistical analysis	41
2.3. Results	42
2.3.1. Mycorrhizal root colonization	42
2.3.2. Root and shoot biomass production	43
2.3.3. Shoot nutrient concentrations	44
2.4. Discussion	46
2.4. Acknowledgements	50
References	50
3. The effects of selected rhizobacteria on the establishment of seed germination, seedling growth and protection against <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> Schlecht f.sp. <i>radicis-lycopersici</i> Jarvis and Shoemaker at different tomato varieties (<i>In vitro</i> and growth chamber experiment)	57
Abstract	58
3.1. Introduction	59
3.2. Material and methods	61
3.2.1. <i>In vitro</i> antagonisms of Bacteria against <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> Schlecht f.sp. <i>radicis-lycopersici</i> Jarvis and Shoemaker	61
3.2.1.1. Inhibition of mycelia growth of FORL on two solid agar medium	61
3.2.1.2. Fungal mycelia biomass production	62

3.2.1.3. Inhibition of conidial germination	62
3.2.2. Growth chamber experiment	63
3.2.2.1. Plant, substrate, microbial inoculums and growth conditions	63
3.2.2.2. Plant response measurements	63
3.2.2.3. Seedling infection by <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> f.sp. <i>radicis-lycopersici</i> Jarvis and Shoemaker, root lesion and disease index assessment	63
3.2.3. Statistical analysis	64
3.3. Results	64
3.3.1. <i>In vitro</i> test for mycelia growth, biomass production and conidial germination of FORL growth	64
3.3.2. Seed germination rate of four tomato varieties	67
3.3.3. Seedling biomass production	68
3.3.4. FORL seedling infection, root lesion and disease index	70
3.4. Discussion	72
3.5. Conclusion	75
3.7. Acknowledgements	75
References	76
4. Use of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) to improve mycorrhization, nutrient acquisition and growth of tomato affected by <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> Schlecht f. sp. <i>radicis-lycopersici</i> Jarvis and Shoemaker	81
Abstract	82
4.1. Introduction	83
4.2. Materials and methods	84
4.2.1. Plant, soil, microbial inocula and growth conditions	83
4.2.2. Plant harvest and nutrient concentration analysis	85
4.2.3. Root colonization by AMF	86
4.2.4. Disease index and root lesion assessment	86
4.2.5. Population of fluorescent <i>Pseudomonas</i> spp. and <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> Schlecht f.sp. <i>radicis-lycopersici</i> (FORL) Jarvis and Shoemaker in the rhizosphere of tomato	87
4.3. Statistical analysis	88
4.4. Results	
4.4.1. Mycorrhizal root colonization and biomass production of three-weeks-old seedlings	88
4.4.2. Mycorrhizal root colonization of nine-weeks-old seedlings	90
4.4.3. Nutrient concentration in the shoot of nine-weeks-old tomato seedlings	90
4.4.4. Biomass production of nine-weeks-old seedlings	91
4.4.5. Disease index and root colonization by FORL	93
4.4.6. Population of FORL in the rhizosphere of nine-weeks-old seedlings	94
4.4.7. Population of fluorescent <i>Pseudomonas</i> spp. in the rhizosphere of nine-weeks-old tomato seedlings	94
4.5. Discussion	95
4.5. Conclusion	99

4.5. Acknowledgements	99
References	99
5. Contribution of <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. “Proradix®” and <i>Bacillus amyloliquefaciens</i> FZB42 on establishment of AMF infection, nutrient acquisition and healthy growth of tomato affected by <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> Schlecht f. sp. <i>radicis-lycopersici</i> Jarvis and Shoemaker	
Abstract	108
5.1. Introduction	109
5.2. Material and methods	110
5.2.1. Microbial inoculums, treatments and plant growth conditions	110
5.2.2. Plant harvest and nutrient concentration analysis	111
5.2.3. Root colonization by AMF	112
5.2.4. Disease severity and root lesion assessment	113
5.2.5. Population of fluorescent <i>Pseudomonas</i> spp. and <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> f.sp. <i>radicis-lycopersici</i> Jarvis and Shoemaker (FORL) in the rhizosphere of tomato	114
5.3. Statistical analysis	115
5.4. Results	115
5.4.1. Mycorrhizal root colonization	115
5.4.2. Nutrient concentration in the shoot of tomato	116
5.4.3. Biomass production	117
5.4.4. Population of FORL in the rhizosphere, root colonization by FORL and disease index	118
5.4.5. Population of fluorescent <i>Pseudomonads</i> spp. in the rhizosphere	120
5.5. Discussion	124
5.6. Conclusions	125
5.7. Acknowledgements	125
References	125
6. Contribution of <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. “Proradix®” and <i>Bacillus amyloliquefaciens</i> FZB42 on healthy plant growth of tomato affected by soil sickness	
Abstract	131
6.1. Introduction	132
6.2. Materials and methods	133
6.2.1. Microbial inoculums, treatments and plant growth conditions	133
6.2.2. Plant harvest and nutrient concentration analysis	135
6.2.3. Root colonization by AMF	135
6.2.4. Root lesion assessment	136
6.2.5. Population of fluorescent <i>Pseudomonas</i> spp., <i>Fusarium</i> spp. and <i>Phytophthora</i> spp. in the rhizosphere of tomato	136
6.3. Statistical analysis	137
6.4. Results	137
6.4.1. Mycorrhizal root colonization of six-weeks-old seedlings	137
6.4.2. Biomass production of six-weeks-old seedlings	138
6.4.3. Shoot Macro- and micronutrients concentration	139

6.4.4. Population of fluorescent <i>Pseudomonas</i> spp. in the rhizosphere	140
6.4.5. Population of <i>Phytophthora</i> spp. and <i>Fusarium</i> spp. in the rhizosphere	141
6.5. Discussion	143
6.6. Conclusion	145
6.7. Acknowledgement	145
References	146
7. Suppression of soilborne pathogens in onion (<i>Allium ascalonicum</i> L.) by selected rhizobacteria; related mechanisms	151
Abstract	152
7.1. Introduction	153
7.2. Materials and methods	154
7.2.1. Plant and microbial inoculums	152
7.2.2. Experimental harvest and analysis of nutrient concentrations in the plant tissue	155
7.2.3. Root colonization by AMF	156
7.2.4. Root lesion assessment	156
7.2.5. Population of fluorescent <i>Pseudomonas</i> spp., Mn-reducers and Mn- oxidizers bacteria in the rhizosphere of onion	156
7.3. Statistical analysis	156
7.4. Results	158
7.4.1. Number of bulb production and soilborne pathogen suppression	158
7.4.2. Biomass production	159
7.4.3. Macro- and micronutrient concentration in the shoots	160
7.4.4. Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) infection	161
7.4.4. Rhizosphere rhizobacteria population	162
7.5. Discussion	163
7.6. Conclusion	167
7.7. Acknowledgements	168
References	168
8. The systemic effects of <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. “Proradix®” and AMF on defense response to FORL infection in tomato plants	175
Abstract	176
8.1. Introduction	177
8.2. Materials and methods	179
8.2.1. Biological material and growth conditions	179
8.2.2. Plant harvest and nutrient content analysis	180
8.2.3. Root colonization by AMF	181
8.2.4. Disease rating and colonization by FORL	182
8.2.5. Protein extraction and quantification	182
8.3. Statistical analysis	183

Table of contents

8.4. Results	183
8.4.1. Disease rating and root lesion caused by FORL	183
8.4.2. Protein concentration in the roots	185
8.4.3. Growth promotion assay	185
8.4.4. Root colonization by AMF	188
8.4.5. Phosphorus concentration in the shoot of tomato	188
8.5. Discussion	189
8.6. Acknowledgements	193
References	193
9. General discussion	202
9.1. Effects of Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria on mycorrhization in the roots of the plants	202
9.2. Effect of Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria on the population of other rhizobacterias	204
9.3. Effect of Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria on nutrient acquisition	206
9.4. Effect of Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria on plant growth	208
9.5. Effect of Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria on suppression of soilborne pathogens	209
9.6. Conclusion	214
9.7. Outlooks	214
References	215
10. Summary	227
11. Zusammenfassung	232
12. Acknowledgements	237
13. Curriculum Vitae	240
Declaration	251

List of figures :

- Figure 1.1. Interactions between biocontrol plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR), plants, pathogens and soil. These elements interact with one another through biotic and abiotic signals. (Source : Haas and D efago., 2005; modified). ISR = Induced systemic resistance 5
- Figure 1.2. Scheme of the multifunctional bio-control actions of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) 16
- Figure 2.1. Percentage of roots infected by Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) *Glomus intraradices* 6 weeks after tomato planting at different levels of AMF inoculation, without and with additional *Pseudomonas* sp. "Proradix " (DSMZ 13134) (PR) inoculation. Capital letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the levels of AMF inoculation (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$). Small letters in the bars indicate significant differences between treatments without *P. sp. "Proradix "* and with *P. sp. "Proradix "* (t-test, $p > 0,01$) within one level of AMF-inoculate 42
- Figure 2.1. Percentage of roots infected by Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) *Glomus intraradices* 6 weeks after tomato planting at different levels of AMF inoculation, without and with additional *Pseudomonas* sp. "Proradix " (DSMZ 13134) (PR) inoculation. Capital letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the levels of AMF inoculation (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$). Small letters in the bars indicate significant differences between treatments without *P. sp. "Proradix "* and with *P. sp. "Proradix "* (t-test, $p > 0,01$) within one level of AMF-inoculate 42
- Figure 2.2. Root dry weight of tomato plants 6 weeks after planting with different levels of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) inoculation, without and with additional *Pseudomonas* sp. "Proradix " (DSMZ 13134) (PR) inoculation. Capital letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the levels of AMF inoculation (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$). Small letters in the bars indicate significant differences between treatments without *P. sp. "Proradix "* and with *P. sp. "Proradix "* (t-test, $p > 0,01$) within one level of AMF inoculate 43
- Figure 2.3. Shoot dry weight of tomato plants 6 weeks after planting with different levels of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) inoculation, without and with additional *Pseudomonas* sp. "Proradix " (DSMZ 13134) (PR) inoculation. Capital letter above the bars indicate significant differences between the levels of AMF inoculation (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$). Small letters in the bars indicate significant differences between treatments without *P. sp. "Proradix "* and with *P. sp. "Proradix "* (t-test, $p > 0,01$) within one level of AMF-inoculate 44

-
- Figure 2.4. Shoot P concentration of tomato plants 6 weeks after planting at different levels of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) inoculation, without and with additional *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (DSMZ 13134) (PR) inoculation. Capital letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the levels of AMF inoculation (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$). Small letters in the bars indicate significant differences between treatments without *P. sp.* “Proradix[®]” and with *P. sp.* “Proradix[®]” (t-test, $p > 0,01$) within one level of AMF-inoculate 45
- Figure 2.5. Shoot Zn concentration of tomato plants 6 weeks after planting at different levels of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) inoculation, without and with additional *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (DSMZ 13134) (PR) inoculation. Capital letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the levels of AMF inoculation (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$). Small letters in the bars indicate significant differences between treatments without *P. sp.* “Proradix[®]” and with *P. sp.* “Proradix[®]” (t-test, $p > 0,01$) within one level of AMF-inoculate 45
- Figure 2.6. Shoot Mn concentration of tomato plants 6 weeks after planting at different levels of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) inoculation, without and with additional *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (DSMZ 13134) (PR) inoculation. Capital letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the levels of AMF inoculation (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$). Small letters in the bars indicate significant differences between treatments without *P. sp.* “Proradix[®]” and with *P. sp.* “Proradix[®]” (t-test, $p > 0,01$) within one level of AMF-inoculate 46
- Figure 3.1. Percentage of mycelia growth inhibition of *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shomaker (FORL) at two types of agar medium (King’s B and PDB) without and with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (DSMZ 13134) (PR) and *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) inoculation. PR and BA where either applied spot wise to the agar plate or mixed to the fluid agar before filling into the plates. Error bars indicate standard errors of the mean ($n=5$). Very small standart error bars are hidden. All bars differ significantly from 0% (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$). Letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments within one agar medium type (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$). Arterisk indicate significant differences between type of medium (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$) 65
- Figure 3.2. Inhibition mycelium growth of *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlect f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shomaker (FORL) at two types of agar medium (King’s B and PDB) without and with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (DSMZ 13134) (PR) inoculation. *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” where either applied spot wise to the agar plate or mixed to the fluid agar before filling into the plates (a = spot, b = mixed, and c = control) 66

- Figure 3.3. Mycelia dry weight of *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shomaker (FORL) after seven days of incubation at Potato Dextrose Broth (PDB) liquid medium treated without and with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (DSMZ 13134) (PR) and *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) inoculation. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). Letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 66
- Figure 3.4. Conidial germination of *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shomaker (FORL) in sterilized distilled water or in Potato Dextrose Broth (PDB) liquid medium treated without and with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (DSMZ 13134) (PR) and *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) inoculation after 12 h incubation. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). Letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 67
- Figure 3.5. Seeds germination of four tomato varieties seven days after sowing treated without and with *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shomaker (FORL), *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (DSMZ 13134) (PR) and *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) inoculation. The control was treated neither with FORL nor with any of the bacteria. Vertical bars indicating standard errors of the mean (n=4) are extremely small and mostly not visible. Small letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments within in the same tomato variety (Tukey test, p<0,05). Capital letters indicate significant differences between tomato varieties (Tukey test, p<0,05) 68
- Figure 3.6. Shoot dry weight of seedlings of four tomato varieties four weeks after sowing treated without and with *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shomaker (FORL), *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (DSMZ 13134) (PR) and *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 inoculation. The control was treated neither with FORL nor with any of the bacteria. Vertical error bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Very small standard errors are hidden. Small letters above the bar groups indicate significant differences between the treatments within the same variety (Tukey test, p<0,05). Capital letters above the bar indicate significant differences between variety of tomato treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 69

Figure 3.7. Root dry weight of seedling of four tomato varieties four weeks after sowing treated without and with *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shomaker (FORL), *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (DSMZ 13134) (PR) and *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 inoculation. The control was treated neither with FORL nor with any of the bacteria. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Small letters above the bar groups indicate significant differences between the treatments within the same variety (Tukey test, p<0,05). Capital letters above the bar indicate significant differences between varieties of tomato treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 69

Figure 3.8. Percentage of seedling infection of four tomato varieties caused by *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shomaker (FORL) in the treatment without and with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (DSMZ 13134) (PR) and *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) inoculation, four weeks after sowing. The control was treated neither with FORL nor with any of the bacteria. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Small letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments within the same variety (Tukey test, p<0,05). Capital letters above the bar groups indicate significant differences between varieties of tomato treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 70

Figure 3.9. Percentage of root lesion of four tomato varieties caused by *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shomaker (FORL) in the treatment without and with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (DSMZ 13134) (PR) and *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) inoculation, four weeks after sowing. The control was treated neither with FORL nor with any of the bacteria. Vertical bars indicating standard errors of the mean (n=4) are extremely small and not visible. Small letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments in the same variety (Tukey test, p<0,05). Capital letters above the bar groups indicate significant differences between variety of tomato treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 71

Figure 3.10. Performance of tomato roots infected by *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shomaker (FORL) in; (A and B) the treatment with bacteria strain inoculation, and (C) the treatment without bacteria strains inoculation, four weeks after sowing 71

Figure 3.11. Disease index (%) in four tomato varieties four weeks after sowing caused by *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shomaker (FORL) combined in without and with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (DSMZ 13134) (PR) and *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) inoculation. The control was treated neither with FORL nor with any of the bacteria. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4) are extremely small and mostly not visible. Small letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments within the same

- variety (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$). Capital letters above the bar groups indicate significant differences between variety of tomato treatments (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$) 72
- Figure 4.1. Percentage of roots infected by AMF *Glomus intraradices* 3 weeks after planting with *Glomus intraradices* and *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) inoculation. Error bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=10). Letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$) 89
- Figure 4.2. Shoot and root fresh weight of tomato plants 3 weeks after planting with AMF *Glomus intraradices* and *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) inoculation. Error bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=10). Letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$) 89
- Figure 4.3. Percentage of roots infected by AMF *Glomus intraradices* 9 weeks after planting with AMF *Glomus intraradices*, *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) and *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shomaker (FORL) inoculation. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). Letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$) 90
- Figure 4.4. Root dry weight of tomato plants 9 weeks after planting with AMF *Glomus intraradices*, *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) and *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shomaker (FORL) inoculation. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). Letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$) 92
- Figure 4.5. Shoot dry weight of tomato plants 9 weeks after planting with AMF *Glomus intraradices*, *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) and *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shomaker (FORL). Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). Letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$) 92
- Figure 4.6. Disease index of tomato plants 9 weeks after planting with AMF *Glomus intraradices*, *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) and *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shomaker (FORL). Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). Letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, $p < 0,05$) 93

- Figure 4.7. Percentage of the root infected by *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f. sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shoemaker (FORL) (root lesions) of tomato plants 9 weeks after planting with AMF *Glomus intraradices*, *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) and FORL. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). Letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 93
- Figure 4.8. Colony forming units (CFU) of *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f. sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shoemaker (FORL) in the rhizosphere soil of tomato plants 9 weeks after planting with AMF *Glomus intraradices*, *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) and FORL. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 94
- Figure 4.9. Colony forming units (CFU) of fluorescent *Pseudomonas* spp. in the rhizosphere of tomato plants 9 weeks after planting with AMF *Glomus intraradices*, *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) and *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f.sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shoemaker (FORL). Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 95
- Figure 5.1. Percentage of roots infected by AMF 9 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR), *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) on replant disease soil infected by FORL. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 116
- Figure 5.2. Root dry weight of tomato plants 9 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR), *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) inoculation on replant disease soil infected by FORL. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Different letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 117
- Figure 5.3. Shoot dry weight of tomato plants 9 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR), *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) inoculation on replant disease soil infected by FORL. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Different letter above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 118

- Figure 5.4. Colony forming units (CFU) of FORL in the rhizosphere of tomato plants 9 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (PR), *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) on replant disease soil infected by FORL. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Different letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 119
- Figure 5.5. Disease index of tomato plants 9 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (PR), *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) inoculation on replant disease soil infected by FORL. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). Different letter above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 119
- Figure 5.6. Percentage of root lesions of tomato plants 9 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (PR), *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) inoculation on replant disease soil infected by FORL. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). Different letters above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 120
- Figure 5.7. Colony forming units (CFU) of fluorescent *Pseudomonas* spp. in the rhizosphere of tomato plants 9 weeks after tomato planting inoculated with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (PR), *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) on replant disease soil infected by FORL. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). The letter above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05) 121
- Figure 6.1. The replant disease soils were collected from the rooting zone of a tomato plantation with known replant disease problems (control row) (Horticultural experimental station, Gartenbau), University of Hohenheim, Stuttgart, Germany 134
- Figure 6.2. Percentage of roots infected by indigenous AMF 6 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (PR) or *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) on replant disease soil. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Different small letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (within one tomato variety) and different capital letters indicate significant differences between the two tomato varieties (Tukey test, p<0,05) 138

- Figure 6.3. Root dry weight of two tomato varieties 6 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (PR), *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) on replant disease soil. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). The letter above the bars and following tomato variety indicate significant differences between all treatments and the letter following tomato variety indicate significant differences between varieties (Tukey test, p<0,05) 138
- Figure 6.4. Shoot dry weight of two tomato varieties 6 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (PR) or *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) on replant disease soil. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Different small letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (within one tomato variety) and different capital letters indicate significant differences between the two tomato varieties (Tukey test, p<0,05) 139
- Figure 6.5. Roots of two tomato varieties 6 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (PR), *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) on a replant disease soil 139
- Figure 6.6. Population of fluorescent *Pseudomonas* spp. in the rhizosphere of two tomato varieties 6 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (PR) or *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) on replant disease soil. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Different small letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (within one tomato variety) and different capital letters indicate significant differences between the two tomato varieties (Tukey test, p<0,05) 140
- Figure 6.7. Root lesions caused by soilborne pathogens of two tomato varieties 6 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (PR) or *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) on replant disease soil. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Different small letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (within one tomato variety) and different capital letters indicate significant differences between the two tomato varieties (Tukey test, p<0,05) 141
- Figure 6.8. Population of *Phytophthora* spp. in the rhizosphere of two tomato varieties 6 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (PR) or *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) on replant disease soil. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Different small letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (within one tomato variety) and different capital letters indicate significant differences between the two tomato varieties (Tukey test, p<0,05) 142

-
- Figure 6.9. Population of *Fusarium* spp. in the rhizosphere of two tomato varieties 6 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) or *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) on replant disease soil. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Different small letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (within one tomato variety) and different capital letters indicate significant differences between the two tomato varieties (Tukey test, p<0,05) 142
- Figure 7.1. Numbers of bulbs formed per pot 13 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) or *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) and soilborne pathogen inoculation (PATH). Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). The letter above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, p<0.05) 158
- Figure 7.2. Growth of onion plants 13 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) or *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) on a pathogen infected soil (A) and non-pathogen infected soil (B) 160
- Figure 7.3. Percentage of roots infected by indigenous arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) 13 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) or *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) and soilborne pathogen inoculation (PATH). Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). The letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, p<0.05) 162
- Figure 7.4. Population of *Pseudomonas* spp. (cfu g⁻¹ dry root), Mn-reducing and Mn-oxidizing bacteria (cfu g⁻¹ rhizosphere soil) in the rhizosphere of onion plants 13 weeks after planting with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) or *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* FZB42 (BA) and soilborne pathogen inoculation (PATH). Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). The letters above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments within one group of microorganisms (Tukey test, p<0.05) 163
- Figure 8.1. Tomato plant disease rating after inoculation without or with *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f. sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shoemaker (FORL) in one compartment and inoculation without or with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) and/or arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) in the other compartment of a split root compartment system. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). The letter above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05). NM = No microbial inoculants 184
- Figure 8.2. Root lesions (% root length) of tomato plants in a compartment without or with *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f. sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shoemaker (FORL) inoculation as affected by the inoculation without or with *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix®” (PR) and/or arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) in the other compartment of a split root compartment system.

Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). The letter above the bars indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05). NM = No microbial inoculants	184
Figure 8.3. Biomass of tomato shoots after inoculation without or with <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> Schlecht f. sp. <i>radicis-lycopersici</i> Jarvis and Shoemaker (FORL) in one compartment and inoculation without or with <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. “Proradix®” (PR) and/or arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) in the other compartment of a split root compartment system. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). The letter above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05). NM = No microbial inoculants	187
Figure 8.4. Growth of tomato shoots after inoculation without or with <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> Schlecht f. sp. <i>radicis-lycopersici</i> Jarvis and Shoemaker (FORL) in one compartment and inoculation without or with <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. “Proradix®” (PR) and/or arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) in the other compartment of a split root compartment system. NM = No microbial inoculants	187
Figure 8.5. Percentage of mycorrhizal infection of tomato roots after inoculation without or with <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> Schlecht f. sp. <i>radicis-lycopersici</i> Jarvis and Shoemaker (FORL) in one compartment and inoculation without or with <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. “Proradix®” (PR) and/or arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) in the other compartment of a split root compartment system. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). The letter above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05)	188
Figure 8.6. Phosphorus concentration of tomato shoot after inoculation without or with <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> Schlecht f. sp. <i>radicis-lycopersici</i> Jarvis and Shoemaker (FORL) in one compartment and inoculation without or with <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. “Proradix®” (PR) and/or arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) in the other compartment of a split root compartment system. Vertical bars indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). The letter above the bars indicate significant differences between the treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05)	189

List of tables :

Tabel 4.1. Macro and micronutrient concentration in the shoots of tomato plants after planting with AMF <i>Glomus intraradices</i> , <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. “Proradix®” (PR) and <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> Schlecht. sp. <i>radicis-lycopersici</i> Jarvis and Shoemaker (FORL) inoculation. Value in the same column indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). Letters in the same column indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05)	91
---	----

Tabel 5.1. Total macro- and micronutrient concentration in the shoot of tomato plants 9 weeks after planting and inoculation with <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. “Proradix [®] ” (PR), <i>Bacillus amyloliquefaciens</i> FZB42 (BA) and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF). Different letters indicate significant differences between the treatments within the same column (Tukey test, p<0,05)	117
Tabel 6.1. Macro- and micronutrient concentration in the shoot dry matter of two tomato varieties six weeks after planting with <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. “Proradix [®] ” (PR) or <i>Bacillus amyloliquefaciens</i> FZB42 (BA) in replant disease soil. Different letters in the same row indicate significant differences between all treatments within each variety and asterisk following nutrient symbol indicate significant differences between two variety(Tukey test, p<0,05). NS = No significant difference)	140
Tabel 7.1. Effect of <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. “Proradix [®] ” (PR) or <i>Bacillus amyloliquefaciens</i> FZB42 (BA) on the percentage of damaged bulbs infected by soilborne pathogens and root lesions of onion plants 13 weeks after planting with grow in a substrate with and without pathogen inoculation. Value in the same column indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). Different letters in the same column indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, p<0.05)	159
Tabel 7.2. Effect of <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. “Proradix [®] ” (PR) or <i>Bacillus amyloliquefaciens</i> FZB42 (BA) on Biomass production of onion plants 13 weeks after planting with grow in a substrate with and without pathogen inoculation. Value in the same column indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). The letters in the same column indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, p<0.05)	159
Tabel 7.3. Macro- and micronutrient concentration in the shoot of onion plants 13 weeks after planting with <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp “Proradix [®] ” (PR) or <i>Bacillus amyloliquefaciens</i> FZB42 (BA) and soilborne pathogen inoculation. Value in the same column indicate standard errors of the mean (n=5). The letter in the same column indicate significant differences between all treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05)	161
Tabel 8.1. The split root compartment system. One compartment (Split 1) was inoculated without or with <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> Schlecht f. sp. <i>radicis-lycopersici</i> Jarvis and Shoemaker (FORL) and other compartment (Split 2) was inoculated without and with <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. “Proradix [®] ” (PR) and/or Arbuscular mycorrhizal (AMF). NM = No microbial inoculants)	180

Tabel 8.2. Protein concentration of tomato roots as affected by the inoculation with *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f. sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shoemaker (FORL), *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (PR) and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) in different compartments (Split 1 and Split 2) a split root system. Value in the same column indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Different letters within the same column indicate significant differences between the treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05). NM = No microbial inoculants 185

Tabel 8.3. Biomass of tomato roots as affected by the inoculation with *Fusarium oxysporum* Schlecht f. sp. *radicis-lycopersici* Jarvis and Shoemaker (FORL), *Pseudomonas* sp. “Proradix[®]” (PR) and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) in different compartments (Split 1 and Split 2) a split root system. Value in the same column indicate standard errors of the mean (n=4). Different letters within the same column indicate significant differences between the treatments (Tukey test, p<0,05). NM = No microbial inoculants 186