# Effect of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Symbiosis and plant growth promoting microbes in tea plantation of North East India

R. PHUKAN, S. R. SARMAH, P. DUTTA, I. PHUKAN, R. BEGUM, A. J. TANTI, S. DEBNATH AND B. K. BARTHAKUR\*

Tocklai experimental station, Tea Research Association, Jorhat 785008, Assam, India

Per cent root colonization of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal (AM) fungi in tea ( $Camellia\ sinensis\ (L)\ O$ . Kuntze) is well documented. Recently a survey was conducted in tea growing areas of North-East India to assess the occurrence of AM fungi in tea plantation. Being an obligate symbiont, infection of AM fungi in dominant weed flora was also considered. Per cent association of AM infection in feeder roots of tea and dominant weed species of tea plantation ranged within 25-60 % and 40-90 % respectively. The experiments conducted showed encouraging response of AM fungi in young tea in terms of leaf harvest irrespective of addition of  $P_2O_5$ . Application of phosphate can be reduced or minimized by inoculating AM fungi in tea plantation. Nutrient parameters analysed showed suitability of the samples for microbial as well as AM population. Moreover, the analysis of rhizosphere soil revealed dominant presence of fungi and bacteria than other groups of specific organisms i.e. *Azospirillum, Azotobacter, Rhizobium,* Actinomycetes, PSB etc.

The experiment conducted in the green house with the native PGPR microbes both in case of tea and other test plants had proved the benefits in terms of biomass increase.

Key words: Arbuscular Mycorrhiza, symbiosis, tea, plant growth promoting microbes

### INTRODUCTION

The Arbuscular Mycorrhizal (AM) fungi are known to enhance plant growth and phosphate uptake by the plant, particularly in P-deficient soil (Smith et al, 1988). Rhizosphere microbes and AM fungi are the most important constituents of tea ecosystem. Now a day it is well known that most of these microbes are beneficial in nature. One group of microorganisms, which are beneficial to crops, is bacteria that colonize roots or rhizosphere soil. These bacteria are referred to a group of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) (Kloepper, 1993). Tunstall (1925, 1930) has first reported the association of AM fungi in tea. In the recent years various workers (Barthakur et al., 1992, 1994; Hazarika et al., 2001 ; Dutta et al., 2004; Chakraborty et al., 2004; Phukan et al., 2005) have studied the possible beneficial aspects of AM fungi and rhizosphere microflora in tea plantations in respect to nutrient uptake, disease protection, PGP activity etc. AM

fungi are specially known for their phosphate uptake by the roots (Gerdeman, 1968; Schultz et al., 1981; Papilane and Bandrs, 1985). Trials are conducted both *in vitro* and *in vivo* to assess the beneficial effect of AM fungi and PGP microbes. AM and rhizosphere microorganisms can mutually influence each other and this can result in synergistic interaction.

In the present investigation an attempt has been made to observe the occurrence of AM fungi in North East India (Barthakur *et al.*, 2005) and to evaluate the effect of certain beneficial PGP microbes in tea plantation as an integrated plant nutrient management. Tea rhizosphere harbours beneficial microbes, which in turn influence the growth and vigour of the plant. However, the establishment of inoculated plant growth promoting rhizosphere microbes (PGP) in the developing root system is a pre-condition for beneficial plant growth promoting effects (Wolfgang and Hoflich, 1995).

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

# Screening of AM association

To cover the entire North Eastern India survey was conducted in four different geographical regions i.e. Cachar, North Bank and South Bank of Brahmaputra river and Upper Assam. Different commercial tea gardens were selected from each belt. Three different age group of tea plants were considered i.e. 0-5 years, 6-15 years and above 15 years from where three to five replicates of tea feeder roots and rhizosphere soil samples were collected randomly.

Subsequently feeder roots of dominant weed flora of each representative gardens (5 gardens in each belt) were also collected for screening of their AM association. The per cent mycorrhizal colonization of the root samples was determined according to the techniques of Philips and Haymanns (1970) and Nicholson's (1960).

# Field experiment on AM symbiosis

A randomized field trial was laid out where previously (AM fungi) inoculated tea cuttings with *Glomus fasciculatum* in the nursery were transplanted to the field with different doses of single super phosphate (SSP) and rock phosphate combinations to see the effect of AM fungi in relation to phosphate uptake. The per cent colonization of the AM fungi and the effect on the crop yield was recorded simultaneously as per standard methodology.

From each treatment the succulant leaf samples were collected for determination of phosphate content by Tri-acid digestion method (Jackson, 1958).

### Analysis and estimation of rhizosphere microbes

Isolation and estimation of tea rhizosphere microbes, viz., diazotrophs and phosphate solubilizers from soil samples were done by Serial Dilution plate method, (Waksman, 1922). Triplicate plates were maintained for each treatment and numbers of cfu per g of soil were recorded after 48h and 15 days for bacteria and others respectively. Recommended media namely Nutrient agar/soil extract, Rose Bengal/Czapek-dox, Yeast extract mannitol agar, Kenknight, Okon's, Winogrdsky's/ Ashby's and Pikovskaya's were used for isolation of different groups of microbes.

# Effect of PGPR microbes on vegetative growth of test plants

To see the effect of the isolated PGPR microbes, on test plant maize was taken into consideration. Isolated microbes as described above were subjected to study their effect of growth promoting factors. Each isolate was cultured in the potato dextrose broth for 10 days at 25±2°C in Erlenmeyer flasks. The seeds of the test plants were surface sterilized by 0.01% HgCl, followed by several changes by sterilized distilled water to remove the trace of HgCl<sub>2</sub>. The treated seeds were soaked with the specific culture filtrates for overnight. Healthy seeds were then allowed to germinate in the Petriplates providing culture filtrates to maintain moisture content for 48 hr. Germinated seeds were planted in earthen pots by inoculating 1 ml of the PGPR stock filtrates/pot. Second round of treatments were imposed at 30 days interval having 5 replicates in each treatments including one control. The soil taken for the trials were air-dried, ground, sieved and sterilized twice at 121°C for 1 hr. Then the earthen pots were filled with 100 g of soil and sand at 1:1 proportion and germinated seeds are planted out. Plants were harvested at the time to flowering and total dry biomass was recorded.

### Effect of PGPR microbes on tea cuttings

After screening the effect of PGPR microbes on test plants, these strains were subjected for trial on TV 18 cuttings in the green house. The plants were allowed to grow freely for one year in the earthen pots. Isolates of PGPR microbes mainly *Azospirillum, Azotobacter, Rhizobium,* Phosphate solubilizers and *Trichoderma viride* were inoculated to the potted plants @ 10 ml/pot. A second dose was also applied after 45 days of first application. The number of leaves, height and girth of stem were recorded.

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

# Screening of AM association

The analysis of the association of AM fungi in tea feeder roots are presented in Tables 1-4. The data showed the presence of moderate to high mycelial association irrespective of age group in all the four belts. However, the presence of arbuscule "the functional unit" of AM fungi was found to decrease in respect of to the increase of age of the plants. From this analysis, the tea root system showed the viable presence of AM fungi, which helped in better nutrient uptake of the plant.

Table 1: Per cent association of AM fungi in different tea plants under different age group (Site: Cachar)

|              | Age group of tea roots (Year) |    |    |    |      |    |          |    |   |  |  |  |  |
|--------------|-------------------------------|----|----|----|------|----|----------|----|---|--|--|--|--|
|              | 0-5                           |    |    | -  | 6-15 | 75 | Above 15 |    |   |  |  |  |  |
| Tea Estates  | M                             | V  | Α  | M  | ٧    | Α  | M        | V  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Rosekandy    | 36                            | 4  | 0  | 32 | 6    | 0  | 44       | 0  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Narsingpore  | 48                            | 8  | 0  | 40 | 2    | 0  | 36       | 8  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Bundookmara  | 48                            | 16 | 4  | 46 | 12   | 2  | 40       | 0  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| South Cachar | 60                            | 20 | 12 | 36 | 6    | 0  | 32       | 0  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Chandighat   | 52                            | 4  | 12 | 28 | 2    | 2  | 40       | 12 | 0 |  |  |  |  |

M = Mycelia; V = Vesicles; A = Arbuscules.

Table 2: Per cent association of AM fungi in different tea plants under different age group (Site: North bank)

|             | Age group of tea roots (Year) |     |   |    |      |   |          |    |   |  |  |  |  |
|-------------|-------------------------------|-----|---|----|------|---|----------|----|---|--|--|--|--|
|             | -                             | 0-5 |   | 6  | 3-15 |   | Above 15 |    |   |  |  |  |  |
| Tea Estates | M                             | ٧   | Α | M  | ٧    | Α | M        | ٧  | Α |  |  |  |  |
| Durrung     | 24                            | 0   | 4 | 40 | 8    | 0 | 36       | 12 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Kolony      | 28                            | 8   | 8 | 36 | 8    | 0 | 48       | 8  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Harchurah   | 28                            | 0   | 0 | 40 | 4    | 8 | 40       | 8  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Addabarie   | 16                            | 0   | 0 | 28 | 0    | 0 | 36       | 12 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Phulbari    | 28                            | 4   | 8 | 24 | 8    | 4 | 44       | 8  | 4 |  |  |  |  |

M = Mycelia; V = Vesicles; A = Arbuscules.

Table 3: Per cent association of AM fungi in different tea plants under different age group (Site: South Bank)

|             |   |    | Ag  | e gro | oup o | f tea | root | s (Ye | ar) |    |
|-------------|---|----|-----|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|-----|----|
|             |   |    | 0-5 |       | 6     | 3-15  |      | Ab    | ove | 15 |
| Tea Estates |   | M  | ٧   | Α     | M     | ٧     | Α    | M     | V   | Α  |
| Kotalgoorie | 1 | 24 | 8   | 16    | 16    | 4     | 0    | 20    | 0   | 0  |
| Hunwal      |   | 48 | 8   | 12    | 60    | 0     | 0    | 52    | 4   | 0  |
| Teok        |   | 12 | 4   | 4     | 20    | 0     | 0    | 12    | 0   | 0  |
| Dolaguri    |   | 32 | 12  | 0     | 44    | 4     | 0    | 28    | 8   | 0  |
| Kakodonga   |   | 36 | 4   | 4     | 20    | 4     | 0    | 20    | 0   | 0  |

M = Mycelia; V = Vesicles; A = Arbuscules.

Table 4: Per cent association of AM fungi in different tea plants under different age group (Site: Upper Assam)

|             | Age group of tea roots (Year) |     |    |    |      |          |    |    |    |  |  |  |  |
|-------------|-------------------------------|-----|----|----|------|----------|----|----|----|--|--|--|--|
|             |                               | 0-5 |    | 6  | 6-15 | Above 15 |    |    |    |  |  |  |  |
| Tea Estates | M                             | ٧   | Α  | М  | ٧    | Α        | M  | ٧  | Α  |  |  |  |  |
| Khowang     | 28                            | 8   | 16 | 32 | 4    | 16       | 36 | 4  | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Margherita  | 32                            | 8   | 8  | 36 | 8    | 8        | 16 | 12 | C  |  |  |  |  |
| Nahorhabi   | 24                            | 0   | 8  | 32 | 4    | 12       | 28 | 16 | 4  |  |  |  |  |
| Dikom       | 56                            | 44  | 24 | 16 | 0    | 0        | 20 | 0  | 4  |  |  |  |  |
| Pengaree    | 32                            | 4   | 0  | 28 | 4    | 0        | 28 | 0  | C  |  |  |  |  |

M = Mycelia; V = Vesicles; A = Arbuscules.

Table 5: Per cent association of VAM fungi in different weeds species of tea plantation (Site: Cachar)

| Weed species                   |    |        |    |            |     | 7    | Tea Es  | tates            |             |    |    |    |       |    |       |
|--------------------------------|----|--------|----|------------|-----|------|---------|------------------|-------------|----|----|----|-------|----|-------|
| Edward Control Control Control | Ro | sekano | dy | Chandighat |     | Na   | rsingpo | re               | Bundookmara |    |    | S  | .Cach | ar |       |
|                                | M  | V      | Α  | M          | ٧   | Α    | M       | V                | Α           | M  | V  | Α  | М     | V  | Α     |
| Ageratum conyzoides            | 84 | 40     | 20 | 84         | 44  | 20   | 80      | 52               | 12          | 96 | 44 | 52 | 96    | 56 | 60    |
| Borreria hispida               | 72 | 8      | 44 | 68         | 32  | 40   | 80      | 0                | 48          | 88 | 24 | 48 | 76    | 0  | 52    |
| Mimosa pudica                  | 84 | 24     | 0  | 48         | 8   | 4    | 96      | 44               | 32          | +  | -  | -  | -     |    | S     |
| Mimosa invisa                  | 48 | 12     | 0  | _          | ~   | -    | -       | ( <del>-</del> ) | -           | 92 | 32 | 4  | 80    | 56 | 28    |
| Mikania micrantha              | -  | -      | -  | -          | 9.5 | 17.0 | 96      | 68               | 0           | 76 | 24 | 8  | -     |    | . uni |
| Spermacoea ocymoides           | -  | -      | -  | 2          |     | -    | _       | -                | -           | -  | -  | -  |       | -  | 37.   |
| Jussiaea suffruticosa          | -  | 1-1    | -  | 76         | 36  | 36   | -       | -                | -           | -  | -  | -  | 80    | 0  | 73    |
| Peperomia pellucida            | -  | -      | -  | 2          | 120 | -    | -       | -                | -           |    | -  | -  | -     |    | 3 2 3 |
| Scoparia dulcis                | 64 | 40     | 28 | 85         | 50  | 42   | 88      | 0                | 50          | 80 | 36 | 16 | 72    | 0  | 54    |
| Solanum nigrum                 | 76 | 28     | 8  | -          | -   | -    | _       | _                | 0-0         | 40 | 0  | 16 | -     | -  | -     |
| Leucas linifolia               | -  | -      | -  | -          | -   | - "  | -       |                  | -           |    | -  | •  | -     | -  | 7.0   |

M = Mycelia; V = Vesicles; A = Arbuscules.

Table 6: Per cent association of VAM fungi in different weeds species of tea plantation (Site: North Bank)

| Weed species          |    |        |    |        |    | 19        | Tea Esta | ates      |    |           |           |               |    |      |   |
|-----------------------|----|--------|----|--------|----|-----------|----------|-----------|----|-----------|-----------|---------------|----|------|---|
|                       |    | Durrur | ig | Kolony |    | Harchurah |          | Addabarie |    |           | Phulbarie |               | е  |      |   |
|                       | M  | V      | A  | M      | ٧  | Α         | M        | V         | Α  | M         | V         | Α             | М  | ٧    | Α |
| Ageratum conyzoides   | 72 | 20     | 36 | 80     | 16 | 48        | 12/      | -         | -  | -         | -         | -             | 34 | 16   | 4 |
| Borreria hispida      | 72 | 24     | 40 | 72     | 16 | 40        | -        | -         | -  | 68        | 8         | 36            | 22 | 12   | 4 |
| Mimosa pudica         | 76 | 40     | 16 | -      | 2  | -         | -        | 2         | -  | 2 2       | _         | 2             | -  | V 1= | - |
| Mimosa invisa         | 64 | 24     | 12 | -      | -  | -         | - *      | -         | 4  | 1 to 10 " | 1.50      | - "           | -  | -    | • |
| Mikania micrantha     | -  | -      | -  | -      | -  | -         | -        | -         | -  | 5.7       | -         | -             | -  | -    | - |
| Spermacoea ocymoides  | 64 | 4      | 52 | 60     | 0  | 48        | 52       | 12        | 24 | 60        | 16        | 24            | 30 | 12   | 6 |
| Jussiaea suffruticosa | 60 | 0      | 16 | -      | -  |           | -        | -         | -  | -         | -         | -             | -  | -    | - |
| Peperomia pellucida   | 84 | 16     | 8  | -      | -  |           | -        | -         | -  | 7.9-      | 1.7       |               | 2  | -    | - |
| Scoparia dulcis       | -  | -      |    |        | -  | -         | -        | -         | Ξ  | -         | -         | ¥ .           |    | -    |   |
| Solanum nigrum        | 2  | 10     |    | -      | -  | 40        | -        | -         | -  | 1 6 200   | -         | *) <b>-</b> : |    | -    |   |
| Leucas linifolia      | -  | -      | -  |        | -  | -         | -        | -         | -  | -         | v - 7     | 1             | •  | -    | - |

M = Mycelia; V = Vesicles; A = Arbuscules.

Table 7: Per cent association of VAM fungi in different weeds species of tea plantation (Site: Upper Assam)

| Weed species          |      |       |    |            |       |           | Tea Es | tates |     |    |     |        |       |      |    |
|-----------------------|------|-------|----|------------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|-----|----|-----|--------|-------|------|----|
| 6.00                  | K    | howan | g  | Margherita |       | Naharhabi |        | Dikom |     |    | P   | engare | е     |      |    |
|                       | M    | V     | Α  | M          | V     | Α         | M      | V     | Α   | М  | V   | Α      | М     | V    | Α  |
| Ageratum conyzoides   | 76   | 40    | 28 | -          |       |           | 36     | 0     | 12  | 56 | 8   | 4      | 68    | 28   | 24 |
| Borreria hispida      | 68   | 48    | 36 | 68         | 12    | 44        | -      |       | -   | 52 | 12  | 28     | 1 - 1 |      | -  |
| Mimosa pudica         | 1,70 |       | -  |            | -     | -         | -      | -     | -   | -  | -   | -      | -     | -    | -  |
| Mimosa invisa         | -    | -     | _  | -          | -     | -         | -      | -     | -   |    | -   | -      | -     | -    | -  |
| Mikania micrantha     |      | -     | -  | 46         | 26    | 13        | -      | -     | -   | -  | _ 5 | -      |       | -    | -  |
| Spermacoea ocymoides  | 32   | 0     | 4  |            | -     | -         | 72     | 48    | 40  | 56 | 20  | 20     | -     | -    | -  |
| Jussiaea suffruticosa |      | -     | -  | -          |       | -         |        | 1.5   | 170 | -  | -   | 7.     |       | 0.70 |    |
| Peperomia pellucida   | 88   | 16    | 4  | -          | -     | -         | 68     | 24    | 4   | -  | _   | -      | 194   | -    | -  |
| Scoparia dulcis       | - 7  |       | -  | -          | 100   |           | -      |       | 1-1 | -  | -   | -      | 100   |      | -  |
| Solanum nigrum        | -    | -     | -  | -          | -     | -         | -      | -     | -   | -  | *   | -      | -     | -    | -  |
| Leucas linifolia      | -    |       | -  | -          | (300) | -         |        | •     | 100 | -  |     | -      |       | 3-2  |    |

M = Mycelia; V = Vesicles; A = Arbuscules.

Table 8: Per cent association of VAM fungi in different weeds species of tea plantation (Site: South Bank)

| Weed species          |             |     |        |    |      |    | Tea Es   | tates |    |           |    |     |    |    |    |
|-----------------------|-------------|-----|--------|----|------|----|----------|-------|----|-----------|----|-----|----|----|----|
|                       | Kotalgoorie |     | Hunwal |    | Teok |    | Dolaguri |       |    | Kakodonga |    |     |    |    |    |
|                       | M           | ٧   | Α      | M  | V    | Α  | M        | V     | Α  | M         | V  | Α   | M  | V  | Α  |
| Ageratum conyzoides   | 60          | 8   | 8      | 72 | 32   | 24 | 68       | 56    | 36 | 68        | 20 | 24  | 52 | 44 | 16 |
| Borreria hispida      | 60          | - 8 | 32     | 64 | 36   | 28 | 60       | 16    | 36 | -         | -  | -   | 56 | 4  | 40 |
| Mimosa pudica         | -           | -   | -      | 9  | -    | -  | -        | -     | -  | -         | -  | - 3 | -  | -  | -  |
| Mimosa invisa         | -           | -   | -      | -  |      | -  |          | -     |    | -         | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  |
| Mikania micrantha     | -           | -   | - 1    | -  |      | -  | -        |       | -  | -         | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  |
| Spermacoea ocymoides  | -           | -   | -      | 53 | 0    | 40 | -        | -     | -  | -         | -  | -   |    | -  |    |
| Jussiaea suffruticosa | -           | -   | -      | -  | -    | -  | -        | -     | -  | -         | -  | 8   | -  | -  | -  |
| Peperomia pellucida   | -           | -   | -      | -  |      |    | -        | -     | -  | -         | -  | -   | -  | -  |    |
| Scoparia dulcis       |             | -   | -      | 2  |      | -  | 44       | 28    | 8  | -         | -  | -   | -  | -  |    |
| Solanum nigrum        | (a)         | 141 | _      |    |      |    | -        | _     |    | -         | -  | -   | 56 | 12 | 31 |
| Leucas linifolia      | -           | (-) | -      | -  | -    | -  | -        | -     | -  |           | -  | 2   | -  | -  | -  |

M = Mycelia; V = Vesicles; A = Arbuscules.

The results presented in Tables 5-8 showed moderate to high AM association in most of the weed species. The association of mycelium ranged upto 96 % whereas the presence of arbuscules and vesicles are less in all the analysed weed species. The association of AM fungi was comparatively more in Cachar gardens than others.

# Field experiment of AM symbiosis

The results presented in Table 9 showed the per cent colonization of AM fungi in different doses of SSP and rock phosphate treatments which was more in case of AM fungi inoculated ones. The association was maximum in the inoculated series in presence of rock phosphate; where release of  $P_2O_5$  was naturally slow. However, the presence of arbuscules the functional unit of AM fungi was very low in all the treatments during the assessment period. Natural association of AM fungi was also observed in case of non-inoculated plants, which indicated the host perference of the AM fungi in the

roots of tea plants.

Table 9: Per colonization of AM fungi

| Treatments                         |    | olonization<br>(months) |    | lonization<br>months) | % A colonization after (months) |    |  |
|------------------------------------|----|-------------------------|----|-----------------------|---------------------------------|----|--|
|                                    | 12 | 24                      | 12 | 24                    | 12                              | 24 |  |
| SSP 30g + RP30g/<br>pit & M plant  | 44 | -52                     | 6  | 12                    | 0                               | 0  |  |
| SSP 30g + RP30g/<br>pit & NM plant | 28 | 20                      | 2  | 5                     | 0                               | 0  |  |
| SSP 71g/pit<br>& NM plant          | 68 | 76                      | 2  | 4                     | 2                               | 0  |  |
| SSP71g/pit<br>& NM plant           | 36 | 40                      | 4  | 4                     | 0                               | 0  |  |
| RP 52 g/pit<br>& NM plant          | 80 | 78                      | 16 | 12                    | 6                               | 2  |  |
| RP52g/pit<br>& NM plant            | 38 | 35                      | 2  | 4                     | 4                               | 0  |  |
| No phosphate<br>& M plant          | 48 | 53                      | 10 | 8                     | 0                               | 0  |  |
| No phosphate<br>& NM plant         | 22 | 27                      | 2  | 2                     | 0                               | 0  |  |

M = Mycelium; V = Vesicles; A = Arbuscules; SSP = Single Super phosphate; RP = Rock phosphate; M plant = Mycorrhizal plant; NM plant = Non Mycorrhizal plant

It was evident from the Table 10 that the beneficial effect of AM fungi in terms of the green leaf harvest in tea plants which reflected in better productivity upto  $4^{th}$  year even in absence of  $P_2O_5$ . AM fungi can be utilized in the tea plantation as a tool for increasing productivity.

Table 10: Effect of Mycorrhizal association on yield

| Treatments                     | G        | reen leaf y | rield * in h | <g< th=""></g<> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
|                                | 1st year | 2nd year    | 3rd year     | 4th year        |
| SSP30g+RP30g/pit & M plant     | 21.540   | 38.910      | 41.775       | 43.440          |
| SSP30g+RP30g/pit<br>& NM plant | 17.697   | 34.015      | 38.345       | 40.880          |
| SSP 71g/pit & M plant          | 22.245   | 40.290      | 32.775       | 41.070          |
| SSP71g/pit & NM plant          | 15.328   | 32.190      | 37.025       | 40.860          |
| RP52g/pit & M plant            | 21.750   | 40.210      | 45.155       | 45.200          |
| RP52g/pit & NM plant           | 19.477   | 38.250      | 42.810       | 41.890          |
| No phosphate & M plant         | 23.977   | 41.155      | 39.805       | 43.700          |
| No phosphate & NM plant        | 19.845   | 33.860      | 38.770       | 40.455          |

M = Mycelium; V = Vesicles; A = Arbuscules; SSP = Single Super phosphate; RP = Rock phosphate; M plant = Mycorrhizal plant; NM plant = Non Mycorrhizal plant

Uptake of  $P_2O_5$  by the tender shoots was also found to be more in case of AM inoculated plants as shown in the Table 11.

Table 11: Uptake of P,O, by tender tea shoots

| Treatments                  | % P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> |                    |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|--|
|                             | after 12<br>months              | after 24<br>months |  |  |  |  |
| SSP30g+RP30g/pit & M plant  | 0.92                            | 0.62               |  |  |  |  |
| SSP30g+RP30g/pit & NM plant | 0.82                            | 0.57               |  |  |  |  |
| SSP 71g/pit & M plant       | 0.93                            | 0.71               |  |  |  |  |
| SSP71g/pit & NM plant       | 0.94                            | 0.48               |  |  |  |  |
| RP52g/pit & M plant         | 0.97                            | 0.47               |  |  |  |  |
| RP52g/pit & NM plant        | 0.95                            | 0.46               |  |  |  |  |
| No phosphate & M plant      | 0.95                            | 0.63               |  |  |  |  |
| No phosphate & NM plant     | 0.92                            | 0.43               |  |  |  |  |

$$\label{eq:mass_special} \begin{split} & M = \text{Mycelium; V} = \text{Vesicles; A} = \text{Arbuscules; SSP} = \text{Single Super} \\ & \text{phosphate; RP} = \text{Rock phosphate; M plant} = \text{Mycorrhizal plant;} \\ & \text{NM plant} = \text{Non Mycorrhizal plant} \end{split}$$

# Analysis and estimation of rhizosphere microbes

The results presented in Table 12-15 showed the microbial load of the soil samples in their specific growth medium. In all the gardens of Cachar, North Bank, South Bank and Upper Assam total count of fungal and bacterial population are recorded more than other specific groups of microbes i.e. Actinomycetes, *Azospirillum, Azotobacter,* PSB, etc.

Table 12: Microbial analysis of rhizosphere microflora of different tea Estate of Cachar

| Tea Estate  | Bacteria<br>cfu/g<br>soil | Fungi<br>cfu/g<br>soil | Actino-<br>mycetes<br>cfu/g<br>soil | Azospi-<br>rillum<br>cfu/g<br>soil | PSB<br>cfu/g<br>soil | Azoto-<br>bacter<br>cfu/g<br>soil |
|-------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Rosekandy   | 23×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 6×10 <sup>4</sup>      | 4×10 <sup>5</sup>                   | 3×10 <sup>5</sup>                  | ND                   | ND                                |
| Narsingpore | 26×105                    | 12×10 <sup>4</sup>     | 6×10 <sup>5</sup>                   | 3×105                              | 2×105                | ND                                |
| Bundookmara | 75×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 10×10 <sup>4</sup>     | 4×10 <sup>5</sup>                   | 4×10 <sup>5</sup>                  | 5×105                | ND                                |
| S. Cachar   | 29×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 14×104                 | 4×10 <sup>5</sup>                   | 1×10 <sup>5</sup>                  | 6×10 <sup>5</sup>    | ND                                |
| Chandighat  | 29×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 11×10 <sup>4</sup>     | 2×10 <sup>5</sup>                   | 3×105                              | ND                   | ND                                |

ND = Not detected.

Table 13: Microbial Analysis of rhizosphere microflora of different Tea Estates of North Bank

|               |                           |                        | W 0 0 0 0 0 0 0                     |                                 |                                    |                      | 1 1 4 1 1 1 1                     |
|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Tea<br>Estate | Bacteria<br>cfu/g<br>soil | Fungi<br>cfu/g<br>soil | Actino-<br>mycetes<br>cfu/g<br>soil | Rhizo-<br>bium<br>cfu/g<br>soil | Azospi-<br>rillum<br>cfu/g<br>soil | PSB<br>cfu/g<br>soil | Azoto-<br>bacter<br>cfu/g<br>soil |
| Durrung       | 27×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 7×10 <sup>4</sup>      | 5×10 <sup>5</sup>                   | ND                              | ND                                 | ND                   | ND                                |
| Kolony        | 20×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 25×104                 | 4×105                               | 5×105                           | 1×105                              | ND                   | 4×105                             |
| Harchurah     | 17×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 4×104                  | 3×105                               | 7×10 <sup>5</sup>               | 2×105                              | ND                   | ND                                |
| Addabarie     | 24×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 4×104                  | 1×10 <sup>5</sup>                   | 1×10 <sup>5</sup>               | 3×105                              | 1×105                | ND                                |
| Phulbari      | 6×10 <sup>5</sup>         | 10×10⁴                 | ND                                  | ND                              | 2×10 <sup>5</sup>                  | 1×10 <sup>5</sup>    | ND                                |
|               |                           |                        |                                     |                                 |                                    |                      |                                   |

Table 14: Microbial Analysis of rhizosphere microflora of different Tea Estates of South Bank

| Tea         |                           |                        | Actino-                  | Rhizo-                | Azospi-                 |                      | Azoto-                  |
|-------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Estate      | Bacteria<br>cfu/g<br>soil | Fungi<br>cfu/g<br>soil | mycetes<br>cfu/g<br>soil | bium<br>cfu/g<br>soil | rillum<br>cfu/g<br>soil | PSB<br>cfu/g<br>soil | bacter<br>cfu/g<br>soil |
| Kotalgoorie | 29×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 8×10 <sup>4</sup>      | 8×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 2×10 <sup>5</sup>     | ND                      | ND                   | ND                      |
| Hunwal      | 18×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 11×104                 | 9×105                    | 2×105                 | 1×105                   | 1×105                | 1×10 <sup>5</sup>       |
| Teok        | 12×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 2×104                  | 3×105                    | 1×10 <sup>5</sup>     | 1×105                   | 2×105                | ND                      |
| Kakodonga   | 19×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 11×104                 | 1×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 1×10 <sup>5</sup>     | 1×10 <sup>5</sup>       | 1×105                | ND                      |
| Dolaguri    | 24×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 5×104                  | 3×105                    | 95×10 <sup>5</sup>    | 3×105                   | ND                   | ND                      |

Table 15: Microbial Analysis of rhizosphere microflora of different Tea Estates of Upper Assam

| Tea<br>Estate | Bacteria<br>cfu/g<br>soil | Fungi<br>cfu/g<br>soil | Actino-<br>mycetes<br>cfu/g<br>soil | Rhizo-<br>bium<br>cfu/g<br>soil | Azospi-<br>rillum<br>cfu/g<br>soil | PSB<br>cfu/g | Azoto-<br>bacter<br>cfu/g<br>soil |
|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| Dikom         | 24×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 7×10 <sup>4</sup>      | 4×10 <sup>5</sup>                   | 1×10 <sup>5</sup>               | ND                                 | ND           | ND                                |
| Nahorhabi     | 66×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 11×10 <sup>4</sup>     | 2×105                               | 2×105                           | 2×105                              | 1×105        | ND                                |
| Khowang       | 41×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 6×104                  | 2×105                               | 2×105                           | 2×105                              | 1×105        | 1×105                             |
| Margherita    | 39×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 9×104                  | 3×105                               | 2×105                           | 3×105                              | 1×105        | ND                                |
| Pengaree      | 30×10 <sup>5</sup>        | 10×10 <sup>4</sup>     | ND                                  | 3×105                           | ND                                 | 3×105        | 1×10 <sup>5</sup>                 |

ND = Not detected.

The rhizosphere soil samples collected from the gardens showed its suitability in terms physicochemical properties for the growth of the tea plant and rhizosphere microbes (Table 16).

Table 16: P<sup>H</sup> and nutrient status of soil samples collected from different regions

| Tea regions | P <sup>H</sup> (water extract) | % OC dry wt. soil. | Average nutrients (PPM) |       |       |  |
|-------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|-------|--|
|             |                                |                    | N                       | Р     | K     |  |
| Cachar      | 4.59                           | 1.60               | 122.8                   | 78.29 | 203.8 |  |
| North Bank  | 4.79                           | 1.08               | 177.46                  | 42.10 | 182.6 |  |
| South Bank  | 4.41                           | 1.11               | 98.81                   | 41.22 | 136.6 |  |
| Upper Assam | 4.51                           | 1.51               | 110.00                  | 77.42 | 188.5 |  |

# Effect of PGPR microbes on the vegetative growth of test plants

The results presented in the Table 17 below showed the beneficial effects of the PGPR microbe in terms of biomass. It was seen that the % weight gain was maximum upto 97.20 and 94.04 when plants were treated with MMPDS/01 and MMBC/04 respectively. Next to these were the MMFUN/02, MMFUN/01. MMAZM/10 and MMRZM/04 where more than 80 % increase of biomass was achieved.

Table 17: Effect of certain PGP microbes on growth and biomass of Maize plants

| Isolates of PGP | Mean dry weight in g (5 replicates) | Wt. % gain ove control |  |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| MMPDS/O1        | 3.67                                | 97.20                  |  |
| MMBC/O1         | 2.84                                | 52.68                  |  |
| MMBC/O3         | 3.28                                | 76.34                  |  |
| MMBC/O4         | 3.61                                | 94.08                  |  |
| MMFUN/O1        | 3.50                                | 8.17                   |  |
| MMFUN/O2        | 3.53                                | 89.78                  |  |
| MMFUN/O3        | 3.29                                | 76.88                  |  |
| MMAZM/10        | 3.38                                | 81.72                  |  |
| MMAZM/O4        | 3.38                                | 81.72                  |  |
| MMAZR/O8        | 3.28                                | 76.34                  |  |
| MMPSB/O7        | 2.15                                | 15.59                  |  |
| MMPSB/10        | 3.17                                | 70.32                  |  |
| CONTROL         | 1.86                                | -                      |  |

Table 18: Effect of certain PGP microbes on growth of young tea plants

| Treatments | % In          | % Increase over control |        |  |  |  |  |
|------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| -01        | No. of leaves | Girth                   | Height |  |  |  |  |
| MMPDS/O1   | 21.2          | 25.0                    | 39.9   |  |  |  |  |
| MMBC/O1    | 60.6          | 37.5                    | 96.4   |  |  |  |  |
| MMBC/O3    | 51.4          | 50.0                    | 29.2   |  |  |  |  |
| MMBC/O4    | 54.5          | 37.5                    | 69.0   |  |  |  |  |
| MMFUN/O1   | 87.9          | 75.0                    | 42.9   |  |  |  |  |
| MMFUN/O2   | 63.9          | 37.5                    | 25.6   |  |  |  |  |
| MMFUN/O3   | 69.7          | 25.0                    | 89.3   |  |  |  |  |
| MMAZM/10   | 97.0          | 87.5                    | 49.4   |  |  |  |  |
| MMAZM/O4   | 97.0          | 25.0                    | 45.8   |  |  |  |  |
| MMAZR/O8   | 36.4          | 50.0                    | 66.7   |  |  |  |  |
| MMPSB/O7   | 18.2          | 37.5                    | 51.2   |  |  |  |  |
| MMPSB/10   | 87.9          | 75.0                    | 97.6   |  |  |  |  |

# Effect of PGPR microbes on tea cuttings

The experiments conducted to assess the effect of certain PGPR microbes proved their beneficial effect in terms of vegetative growth of young tea plants as shown in Table 18. The data showed a distinct gain in number of leaves, girth of stem and height of the plant over control. This was found to be maximum when the soil of the pot was inoculated with MM-PSB/10 and MM-Azm/10.

#### REFERENCES

Barthakur, B. K.; Dutta, P.; and Begum, R. 1992: Studies on Vesicular Arbuscular Mycorrhiza (VAM) in tea plantation. Proceedings of the 31st Tocklai Conference 1992, TRA: 259-263.

Barthakur, B. K.; Dutta, P.; begum, R.; Sarmah, S. R.; and Gohain, K. K. 1994: More about Vesicular Arbuscular Mycorrhiza in tea: Proceedings of the 32<sup>nd</sup> Tocklai Conference: 242-246.

Barthakur, B. K.; Dutta, P.; Sarmah, S. R.; Begum, R. Kalita, J.N.; Singh, K. and Hazarika, M. 2005. Effect of VAM association in tea plantation of North East India. *Crop Res.* **29** (3): 441-445.

Chakraborty, U.; Basnet Merab; Bhutia, Lhanjey; and Chakraborty, B. 2004. Plant growth pomoting activity of *Bacillus pumilus* and *B. megaterium* from tea rhizosphere. Paper presented in the International conference on O-CHAT culture and Science. November, 4-6, 2004 Shizuoka Japan.

Dutta, P; Sarmah, S. R.; Phukan, Ivy; Tanti, A; Begum, R; Phukan, R; Debnath. S; and Barthakur B. K. 2004. Potentials of Vesicular Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Rhizosphere microflora in Tea plantation of North East India. Paper presented in National Symposium of Rhizosphere Biotechnology at Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur, held on 29-30th, Nov 2004.

Gerdemann, J. W 1968: Vesicular Arbuscular Mycorrhiza and Plant Growth. *Ann. Rev. Phytopath.*, **6**: 397-

Hazarika, D. K; Phookan A. K; Talukdar, N. C; Saikia, G. K; and Barthakur, B. K 2001: Response of tea [Camellia sinensis (L) O. Kuntze] seedlings to inoculation of VAM fungi, Phosphate solubilizing bacteria (PSB) and plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR). Presented in National level seminar on Resource Management for Self Reliant Agriculture Economy of North East Region, Held on 9-10 Feb. 01.

Jackson, M. L; 1958. In Chemical analysis: 326-335.

Kloepper, J. W. 1993. Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria as biological control agents. Pages 255-274. In: In: Soil Micobial Ecology: Applications in Agricultural and Environmental Management (ed. Metting R.B.) Marcel Dekker, New York.

- Nicolson, T. H. 1960: Mycorrhizain Gramineae. *Trans Brit. Mycol. Soc.***43** (1): 132-145.
- Phillips, J. M. and Hayman, D. S. 1970: Improved procedure for clearing root parasitic and vesicular arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi for rapid assessment of infection. *Trans. Brit. Mycol. Soc.* **51**: 687-694.
- Papilane, J. B. and Bandrs, J. M. R. S 1985: Influence of Vesicular Arbuscular Mycorrhizal fungi on the growth of Coffee and Cocoa seedling. *Sri lanka J. Agric. Sci.*, **22** (1): 73-9.
- Phukan, I; Phukan, R; Dutta. P; Tanti. A. J; Sarmah, S. R; Begum, and; Barthakur, B.K 2005: Distribution of VAM fungi and application of PGP microbes in tea plantation. Presented at 34th Tocklai conference.

  28-30 Nov. 2005.
- Schultz, R. C; Kormanik, P. P; and Bryan, W. C; 1981: Effects of fertilization and Vesicular Arbuscular

- Mycorrhizal inoculation on growth of hard wood seedlings Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J., 45: 961-5.
- Smith, S. and Gianinazzi-Pearson, V, 1988 Physiological interactions between symbionts in vesicular-arbuscular mycirrhizal plants. *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol.*, **39**: 221-224.
- Tunstall, A. C; 1925: Mycorrhiza on tea plants. *Quart. J. Indian tea Assoc. Sci. Dep.* pp. 159.
- Tunstall, A. C; 1930; Some observation on tea roots. Quart. J. Indian tea Assoc. Sci. Dep. pp.75-78.
- Waksman, S.A; 1922: The growth of fungi in the soil. *Soil Sci.* 14: 153-157.
- Wolfgang, Wiehe and Hoflich, Gisela 1995: Survival of plant growth promoting rhizosphere bacteria in the rhizosphere of different crops and migration to non-inoculated plants under field condition in North East Germany. *Microbial Res.* **150**: 201-206.

(Accepted for publication December 10, 2007)