



## Functional activity of biofertilizers for improving yield and its components of common bean plants under water stress.

Baka, Z.A.<sup>1</sup>, Abdel-Fattah, G. M.,<sup>2</sup> Soliman, T.M.<sup>1</sup>, Shokr, M. B.<sup>3</sup>, Ahmed, M.A.\*<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Botany, Faculty of Science, Damietta University, Egypt

<sup>2</sup>Department of Botany, Faculty of Science, Mansoura University, Egypt

<sup>3</sup> Horticultural Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center, Cairo, Egypt

Received: 6/4/2020  
Accepted: 21/4/2020

**Abstract:** Water stress is a world-wide problem that affects the functional and biochemical processes of plants resulting in varying growth, income and water associations of economic plants. The present work was evaluated to improve the yield of common bean plants (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) under different water stress levels by using microorganisms. The interaction effect between water stress (WW as recommended irrigation, WS<sub>1</sub> after 13 days and WS<sub>2</sub> after 18 days) holding water and inoculation with different microorganisms (AMF, EM, endophytic bacteria) used alone or in combination with each other were evaluated for their effect on yield production. Application of AMF and EM considerably increased the average values of all quality parameters and realized the highest mean values until WS<sub>1</sub>. The inoculation with AMF and EM with WS<sub>1</sub> are the greater than other levels which common bean plants had a significantly higher number of pods, length of pod, pods weight, 100 seeds weight, yield (ton /Fed) and water-use efficiency (WUE, ton/ m<sup>3</sup>). Concentrations of nutrients (N, K, P, Mg and Ca). In addition, vitamin B<sub>1</sub>, folic acid, total carbohydrates, crude protein and crude fibers significantly increased at AMF+EM under second water stress (WS<sub>1</sub>).

**keywords:** Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi, (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.)Yield components Water levels

### Introduction

Ingestion of legumes, mostly dry beans, has favorable in some countries due to an improved understanding of consumers about the nutritional features [1]. Beans considered an important source of nutritional protein. Furthermore, the fiber content proscribes blood sugar levels from raising rapidly after a meal, creating these beans an especially good high-quality for individuals with diabetes [2]. Water is one of the most valued resources on earth, therefore, thirst for water will turn into one of the most insistent resource problems of the current century [3]. The main challenge fronting Egypt now is the robust need for better management and development of the available restricted resources of water, energy and land to bump into the needs of population progress [3]. Recently, there are exhausting new technologies to raise the production of this legume, such as mechanized harvesting and

irrigation, to face to consume beans everyday [4]. Plants are wide-open to a diversity of biotic or abiotic stresses, such as salt loading, freezing and drought affect their growth, development and productivity. One of the major abiotic stresses that upset plant productivity is water stress resulting from salinity and drought [5]. Water stress affects the biochemical and biological processes of plants [6, 7], resulting in altering yield, growth, water relations [8 9, 10] and metabolic trails [11]. Reduction in plant growth under water stress is by reason of osmotic stress resulted from reducing the uptake of nutrients and soil water potential [12, 13]. AMF are pervasive soil microbes from the phylum Glomeromycota that ripen a mutualistic symbiosis with the excessive majority of land plants [14, 15]. Mycorrhizae are mutualistic symbiotic associations based on bidirectional nutrients between the roots and soil fungi of

vascular plants, where AMF transfers water and inorganic nutrients to the plant and obtain carbohydrates un exchange [16, 17]. One of the microbiological preparations used to improve quantitative and qualitative yielding of plants is Effective Microorganisms (EM) [18]. EM can significantly improve soil fertility and flowering, promotes growth, fruit development and maturing in crops. It can raise crop yields and enhance crop quality other than rushing the breakdown of organic matter from crop remains [19]. Endophytes are microorganisms counting bacteria and fungi that expend the full of their life cycle colonizing in living tissue of different plants archetypally without causing any noticeable symptoms of disease [20, 21]. Therefore, application of endophytic bacteria resulting in the construction of phytohormones, biocontrol of phytopathogens in the root region (through creation of antibacterial agents or antifungal, nutrient competition, siderophore production and induction of systematically developed immunity, or host resistance [22, 23].

The purpose of the present work was to study the alleviation of the water stress by using microorganisms and improving the yield production of *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. plants under diverse water stress levels.

## 2. Materials and methods

### Design of the experiment

This study was carried out from March to June of 2018 at the Station of Experimental Research, Science's Faculty, Mansoura University. The experimental layout was split - plot design in a randomized complete blocks design with three replicates, the main plots were the three water levels (WW, WS<sub>1</sub> and WS<sub>2</sub>), whereas the sub plots were the microorganisms treatments. The plot was 1.68 m<sup>2</sup> (2 lines× 120cm long×70 cm width).

### 2. Inoculum preparation of AMF

The inoculum of AMF species counting: *G. mosseae*, *G. clarum*, *G. monosporium* and *Gigaspora margarita* were initially insulated from rhizosphere soil of *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. plants using the wet sieving and decanting technique [24], and then identified by Dr. Abdel-Fattah G. M. The identified AMF spores were left to burgeon for 6 months on sudangrass plants (*Sorghum halepense* L.)

under normal conditions. Plants were irrigated by tap water as required in addition to the nutrient solutions (Long- Ashton without phosphorus) were provided. A mixture of soil and infected sudangrass root, that confined spores were used as AMF inoculum. The AMF inoculums containing 5 g of rhizosphere soil (approx. 725 spores) and 0.5 g infected sudangrass root bits with an infection level of 88.6% was inoculated to each plot.

### 3. Growth conditions and planting

Seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. (Nebraska), gaining from the Horti. Res. Center, Egypt and used during this study. Seeds were surface disinfected in 0.01% mercuric chloride for 3 min, afterward washed with purified water. The disinfected seeds were permitted to germinate on wet disinfected cotton for 3 days. For AMF treatments, each block was infected with 5g of rhizosphere soil (approx.275 spores/g soil) and 0.5 g of cut AMF fresh sudangrass roots (M = 88.6%). Below the soil surface of common bean plants, the inoculum was placed 3-5 cm to produce mycorrhizal plants. While, the effective of microorganisms (EM) and endophytic bacteria were added in a presoaking way for the seeds at planting time, and the second time in a foliar way after 37 days from sowing.

### Measurements

#### 1.Estimation of mycorrhizal root colonization

The stained parts were placed on slides and were detected with a microscope (Carl Zeiss, Italy) at 40× magnification. They were visually allocated to 6 classes of AM colonization (from 0: 5 depending on the existence of AMF erection in the root section) and to 4 levels of AMF richness (from A0: A3). AMF colonization levels of the stained roots were appraised by the method of Trouvelot *et al.* [25] using the *Mycocalcsoftware* (<http://www.dijon.inra.fr/mychintec/mycocalcprg/download.html>). This method calculates three parameters of mycorrhizal colonization as follows:-

**F:** Rate of root colonization.

**M:** Strength of cortical colonization.

**A:** Arbuscules rate in roots.

## 2. Yield components

No. of pods, length of one pod, pods weight/ plant, weight of 100 seeds, yield ton/Fed and WUE were determined proximately after harvest Grain premeditated from {yield / water applied at a sdifferent level of requirements }according to Stanhill [26]. [27]. Phosphorus was determined subsequent ammonium molybdate blue method [28]. K and Na were evaluated by a flame spectrophotometer (Corning 400, UK), while Ca and Mg were determined by atomic absorption (PerkinElmer, Model 2308, USA) according to Allen [29].

## 3. Mineral and element contents

After cessation by acid, investigated of N, P, K, Mg and Ca contents. Total nitrogen (N) was dignified by using Kjeldahl method

**4 Total Soluble Sugars (TSS)** assessed by anthrone method [30]. Protein was determined by AOAC [31]. In addition, folic acid was estimated according to the method of Ruengsitagoon and Hattanat

## 3. Results and Discussion

### 1. Yield parameters

Results presented in Tables (1) demonstrate the effect of water stress and different microorganisms plus their interaction on dry yield and yield components of common bean seeds in the expression of no. of pods plant-1, pod length, weight of 100 seed, weight of pods, weight of seed plant-1, yield ton/fed, and WUE ton/m<sup>3</sup>. It is clear from the results presented in Table (1) that inoculation of common bean seeds with the different types of studied microorganisms combined under different water stress investigated gave a high value for yield characters and its component of common bean plant than those obtained for the uninoculated ones (at all treatments). The highest mean values were obtained with the treatment of AMF+EM under WS<sub>1</sub>. These observations in good agreement with Utkhede [33] indicated that inoculation of tomato plants by AMF and EM produced

significantly higher fruit number and fruit yield compared to other plants.

## 2. Quality parameters of common bean seeds

### Quality parameters of common bean seeds.

Table (2) show that the mean values of crude protein, crude fiber, total soluble sugar, and folic acid in seeds of common bean as influenced by water stress and different microorganisms alone or in acombination are presented in **Table (2)**. The co-inoculation of common bean seeds with the mixture of microorganisms under all water stress levels significantly increased the average values of crude protein, total carbohydrates, crude fiber, folic acid and Vitamin B1 in seeds of common bean than those in control plants under the same water stress. The most suitable treatment which realized the highest values were connected with the treatment of AMF+EM under second water stress (WS<sub>1</sub>). Biofertilizers can exert positive effect on plant growth including synthesis of phyto-hormones, N<sub>2</sub>-fixation, and nitrate reductase activity and enhancing minerals uptake [34]. Our results also were in covenant with Abdelmoneim et al. [35] who stated that protein content enhancement is related to relative increase in nitrogen fixation due to biofertilizer application.

The use of mycorrhizal fungi and EM application play a significant role with water stress these results in accordance with [36, 37] who reported that the using of EM encourage plant growth production of hormones and rise nitrogen fixation

and phosphorous intake that cause cumulative of protein content in the seeds. Moreover, it can raise crop yield, develop soil fertility and crop quality, help to accurate nutritional and functional crop complaints, increase nutrient availability and plant nutrient uptake [38]. Furthermore, many authors recommend that changes in sugar content are related to greater production of assimilates in plants inoculated with AMF and EM. This is caused by better mineral nutrition of plants and the creation of phytohormones by symbiotic microorganisms, it is expected that the improvement in mineral intake by plants results in yield quality enhancement [39, 40].

### 3. Mycorrhizal colonization levels

Mycorrhizal colonization parameters were articulated as rate of root colonization (F),

intensity of cortical colonization (M) and arbuscules rate in roots (A) **Table (3)**. The data revealed that the level of AMF root colonization continued to increase with the growth in plant age in all treatments. At the similar time, the AMF colonization was significantly reduced by increasing the water stress level at WS<sub>2</sub> while significantly increased at WS<sub>1</sub> particularly at the interaction between AMF and EM. Thus, it can be concluded that under water stress (WS<sub>1</sub>) the AM fungi were able to increase the root infection significantly. In this present study, mycorrhizal levels of root infection were significantly reduced in common bean root tissues with WS<sub>1</sub> than with WW plants, and this result was more caused by the topmost water stress level (WS<sub>2</sub>). While, the WS<sub>1</sub> recorded highly significant. Our data are in covenant with Asrar *et al.* [41] who stated that, both strengths of AMF colonization (M) and arbuscular occurrence (A) were innocent with WS<sub>1</sub> than with WW plants, and this result was more caused with the highest water stress

level decreased in snapdragon root tissues. The result is in harmony with the verdict of Kaya *et al.* [42] who described that water stress significantly reduced the AM colonization by *G. clarum* in watermolen plants. In dissimilarity, preceding studies have revealed that the % of root colonized by AMF wasn't affected by water stress [43, 12].

## 2. Nutrient contents

Contents of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, calcium and magnesium of common bean plants are affected by either inoculation by different microorganisms and different levels of water stress are presented in **Table (4)**. A positive effect was observed on the mean contents of all Nutritional elements under study due to using the combination. In this respect, the highest values; (3.13, 0.400, 2.99, 2.87 and 2.29%) for N, P, Ca, K and Mg%, respectively in common bean seeds AMF plants [45]. Thus, it is marked that the AMF fungal association propositions a number of benefits to the plants.

**Table (1):** Interaction between water stress and different microorganisms on yield parameters of common bean seeds

Treatments		No. of pods/plant	Pod length cm	Weight of 100 seed g	Weight of pods g	Yield ton/Fed	WUE ton/m <sup>3</sup>
WW	Control	16.67 <sup>rs</sup>	10.55 <sup>s</sup>	36.64 <sup>s</sup>	111.54 <sup>s</sup>	22.98 <sup>s</sup>	2.836 <sup>f</sup>
	AMF	27.00 <sup>kl</sup>	13.32 <sup>k</sup>	55.41 <sup>k</sup>	155.51 <sup>k</sup>	30.36 <sup>k</sup>	4.413 <sup>l</sup>
	EM	23.00 <sup>nm</sup>	12.15 <sup>n</sup>	48.45 <sup>n</sup>	138.92 <sup>n</sup>	27.60 <sup>n</sup>	3.814 <sup>m</sup>
	Endophy	21.67 <sup>no</sup>	11.83 <sup>o</sup>	45.80 <sup>o</sup>	133.69 <sup>o</sup>	26.66 <sup>o</sup>	3.622 <sup>n</sup>
	EM+Endo	25.67 <sup>kl</sup>	13.11 <sup>l</sup>	52.79 <sup>l</sup>	149.81 <sup>l</sup>	29.42 <sup>l</sup>	4.214 <sup>k</sup>
	AMF+EM	31.00 <sup>gh</sup>	14.26 <sup>h</sup>	62.54 <sup>h</sup>	171.63 <sup>h</sup>	33.13 <sup>h</sup>	4.825 <sup>h</sup>
	AMF+Endo	29.67 <sup>hi</sup>	13.95 <sup>i</sup>	59.55 <sup>i</sup>	166.70 <sup>i</sup>	32.19 <sup>i</sup>	4.791 <sup>h</sup>
	Mixture	28.33 <sup>ij</sup>	13.65 <sup>j</sup>	57.64 <sup>j</sup>	160.71 <sup>j</sup>	31.27 <sup>j</sup>	4.605 <sup>i</sup>
WS <sub>1</sub>	Control	11.33 <sup>vw</sup>	9.27 <sup>w</sup>	27.55 <sup>w</sup>	89.45 <sup>w</sup>	19.30 <sup>w</sup>	2.043 <sup>v</sup>
	AMF	36.00 <sup>cd</sup>	15.54 <sup>d</sup>	71.58 <sup>d</sup>	193.68 <sup>d</sup>	36.83 <sup>d</sup>	5.777 <sup>d</sup>
	EM	33.67 <sup>ef</sup>	14.92 <sup>f</sup>	66.63 <sup>f</sup>	182.41 <sup>f</sup>	34.96 <sup>f</sup>	5.384 <sup>f</sup>
	Endophy	32.00 <sup>fg</sup>	14.55 <sup>g</sup>	64.50 <sup>g</sup>	177.41 <sup>g</sup>	34.04 <sup>g</sup>	5.189 <sup>g</sup>
	EM+Endo	34.67 <sup>de</sup>	15.23 <sup>e</sup>	69.37 <sup>e</sup>	188.56 <sup>e</sup>	35.90 <sup>e</sup>	5.573 <sup>e</sup>
	AMF+EM	40.00 <sup>a</sup>	16.53 <sup>a</sup>	78.56 <sup>a</sup>	210.89 <sup>a</sup>	39.62 <sup>a</sup>	6.354 <sup>a</sup>
	AMF+Endo	38.67 <sup>ab</sup>	16.18 <sup>b</sup>	76.64 <sup>b</sup>	204.33 <sup>b</sup>	38.68 <sup>b</sup>	6.161 <sup>b</sup>
	Mixture	37.67 <sup>bc</sup>	15.86 <sup>c</sup>	73.48 <sup>c</sup>	199.51 <sup>c</sup>	37.75 <sup>c</sup>	5.957 <sup>c</sup>
WS <sub>2</sub>	Control	10.00 <sup>w</sup>	8.96 <sup>x</sup>	25.57 <sup>x</sup>	84.19 <sup>x</sup>	18.41 <sup>x</sup>	1.847 <sup>w</sup>
	AMF	17.67 <sup>qr</sup>	10.86 <sup>r</sup>	39.31 <sup>r</sup>	117.93 <sup>r</sup>	23.90 <sup>r</sup>	3.043 <sup>q</sup>
	EM	14.00 <sup>tu</sup>	9.92 <sup>u</sup>	32.32 <sup>u</sup>	100.88 <sup>u</sup>	21.14 <sup>u</sup>	2.434 <sup>t</sup>
	Endophy	12.67 <sup>uv</sup>	9.56 <sup>v</sup>	29.49 <sup>v</sup>	95.22 <sup>v</sup>	20.23 <sup>v</sup>	2.238 <sup>u</sup>
	EM+Endo	15.33 <sup>st</sup>	10.25 <sup>t</sup>	34.35 <sup>t</sup>	106.25 <sup>t</sup>	22.07 <sup>t</sup>	2.644 <sup>s</sup>
	AMF+EM	24.33 <sup>lm</sup>	12.46 <sup>m</sup>	50.61 <sup>m</sup>	144.31 <sup>m</sup>	28.49 <sup>m</sup>	4.016 <sup>l</sup>
	AMF+Endo	20.33 <sup>op</sup>	11.53 <sup>p</sup>	43.40 <sup>p</sup>	127.73 <sup>p</sup>	25.75 <sup>p</sup>	3.426 <sup>o</sup>
	Mixture	19.00 <sup>pq</sup>	11.19 <sup>q</sup>	41.23 <sup>q</sup>	122.21 <sup>q</sup>	24.84 <sup>q</sup>	3.224 <sup>p</sup>
LSD at 5%		1.71	0.12	1.61	2.18	0.12	0.10

**Table (2):** Effect of water stress levels and different microorganisms on quality parameters of common bean seeds.

Treatments		Curdeprotien%	TSS %	Folic acid (mg/100g)
WW	Control	13.31 <sup>p</sup>	4.83 <sup>p</sup>	184.50 <sup>o</sup>
	AMF	16.85 <sup>h</sup>	5.46 <sup>i</sup>	194.47 <sup>k</sup>
	EM	16.29 <sup>i</sup>	5.13 <sup>l</sup>	191.27 <sup>m</sup>
	Endophy	15.92 <sup>j</sup>	4.98 <sup>n</sup>	189.73 <sup>n</sup>
	EM+Endo	16.54 <sup>i</sup>	5.28 <sup>k</sup>	192.87 <sup>l</sup>
	AMF+EM	17.52 <sup>ig</sup>	5.97 <sup>f</sup>	198.73 <sup>h</sup>
	AMF+Endo	17.35 <sup>g</sup>	5.79 <sup>g</sup>	197.33 <sup>i</sup>
	Mixture	17.23 <sup>g</sup>	5.60 <sup>h</sup>	195.70 <sup>j</sup>
WS1	Control	12.79 <sup>q</sup>	4.74 <sup>q</sup>	171.47 <sup>v</sup>
	AMF	18.54 <sup>c</sup>	6.28 <sup>d</sup>	225.27 <sup>d</sup>
	EM	17.98 <sup>de</sup>	5.97 <sup>f</sup>	222.43 <sup>f</sup>
	Endophy	17.79 <sup>ef</sup>	5.80 <sup>g</sup>	220.90 <sup>g</sup>
	EM+Endo	18.21 <sup>d</sup>	6.12 <sup>e</sup>	223.53 <sup>e</sup>
	AMF+EM	<b>19.54<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>6.82<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>229.93<sup>a</sup></b>
	AMF+Endo	19.33 <sup>ab</sup>	6.61 <sup>b</sup>	228.37 <sup>b</sup>
	Mixture	19.13 <sup>b</sup>	6.46 <sup>c</sup>	226.53 <sup>c</sup>
WS2	Control	12.27 <sup>r</sup>	4.26 <sup>t</sup>	169.60 <sup>w</sup>
	AMF	14.75 <sup>l</sup>	4.91 <sup>o</sup>	175.43 <sup>s</sup>
	EM	14.02 <sup>n</sup>	4.57 <sup>r</sup>	172.50 <sup>u</sup>
	Endophy	13.69 <sup>o</sup>	4.43 <sup>s</sup>	171.17 <sup>v</sup>
	EM+Endo	14.35 <sup>m</sup>	4.74 <sup>q</sup>	174.27 <sup>t</sup>
	AMF+EM	15.73 <sup>jk</sup>	5.37 <sup>j</sup>	180.30 <sup>p</sup>
	AMF+Endo	15.44 <sup>k</sup>	5.26 <sup>k</sup>	178.67 <sup>q</sup>
	Mixture	15.00 <sup>l</sup>	5.06 <sup>m</sup>	177.13 <sup>r</sup>
<b>LSD at 5%</b>		<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.07</b>

**Table (3):** Mcorrhizal levels of common bean plants under different water stress levels

Treatments		Mycorrhizal levels		
		F%	M%	A%
WW	AMF	70.00 <sup>g</sup>	43.00 <sup>g</sup>	27.00 <sup>i</sup>
	AMF+EM	95.00 <sup>b</sup>	56.00 <sup>b</sup>	39.00 <sup>c</sup>
	EM+Endo	85.00 <sup>d</sup>	50.00 <sup>d</sup>	35.00 <sup>e</sup>
	Mixture	75.00 <sup>f</sup>	45.00 <sup>f</sup>	30.00 <sup>g</sup>
WS1	AMF	85.00 <sup>d</sup>	48.00 <sup>e</sup>	43.00 <sup>b</sup>
	AMF+EM	100.00 <sup>a</sup>	64.33 <sup>a</sup>	49.27 <sup>a</sup>
	EM+Endo	91.00 <sup>c</sup>	54.00 <sup>c</sup>	43.33 <sup>b</sup>
	Mixture	85.00 <sup>d</sup>	50.00 <sup>d</sup>	37.00 <sup>d</sup>
WS2	AMF	65.00 <sup>h</sup>	39.00 <sup>h</sup>	23.13 <sup>k</sup>
	AMF+EM	80.67 <sup>e</sup>	49.67 <sup>d</sup>	30.67 <sup>f</sup>
	EM+Endo	75.00 <sup>f</sup>	45.00 <sup>f</sup>	28.00 <sup>h</sup>
	Mixture	70.00 <sup>g</sup>	40.00 <sup>h</sup>	26.00 <sup>j</sup>
<b>LSD at 5%</b>		<b>1.34</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>0.50</b>

**Table (4):** Interaction between water stress levels and different microorganisms on N, P, K, Mg and Ca % of common bean seeds.

reatments		N%	P%	K%	Ca%	Mg%
WW	Control	2.13 <sup>p</sup>	0.275 <sup>p</sup>	1.78 <sup>r</sup>	1.65 <sup>r</sup>	1.16 <sup>q</sup>
	AMF	2.70 <sup>h</sup>	0.344 <sup>h</sup>	2.36 <sup>j</sup>	2.32 <sup>i</sup>	1.79 <sup>h</sup>
	EM	2.61 <sup>i</sup>	0.334 <sup>i</sup>	2.23 <sup>k</sup>	2.24 <sup>jk</sup>	1.73 <sup>i</sup>
	Endophy	2.55 <sup>j</sup>	0.329 <sup>j</sup>	2.18 <sup>k</sup>	2.20 <sup>k</sup>	1.68 <sup>j</sup>
	EM+Endo	2.65 <sup>i</sup>	0.336 <sup>i</sup>	2.27 <sup>k</sup>	2.28 <sup>ij</sup>	1.77 <sup>hi</sup>
	AMF+EM	2.80 <sup>fg</sup>	0.356 <sup>f</sup>	2.52 <sup>h</sup>	2.49 <sup>f</sup>	1.97 <sup>e</sup>
	AMF+Endo	2.78 <sup>g</sup>	0.351 <sup>g</sup>	2.47 <sup>i</sup>	2.44 <sup>g</sup>	1.90 <sup>f</sup>
	Mixture	2.76 <sup>g</sup>	0.348 <sup>gh</sup>	2.40 <sup>j</sup>	2.37 <sup>h</sup>	1.85 <sup>g</sup>
WS1	Control	2.05 <sup>q</sup>	0.261 <sup>q</sup>	1.67 <sup>s</sup>	1.54 <sup>s</sup>	1.08 <sup>r</sup>
	AMF	2.97 <sup>c</sup>	0.379 <sup>c</sup>	2.77 <sup>d</sup>	2.72 <sup>c</sup>	2.11 <sup>d</sup>
	EM	2.88 <sup>de</sup>	0.366 <sup>e</sup>	2.61 <sup>f</sup>	2.60 <sup>e</sup>	2.02 <sup>e</sup>
	Endophy	2.85 <sup>ef</sup>	0.362 <sup>e</sup>	2.57 <sup>g</sup>	2.57 <sup>e</sup>	2.00 <sup>e</sup>
	EM+Endo	2.91 <sup>d</sup>	0.372 <sup>d</sup>	2.68 <sup>e</sup>	2.66 <sup>d</sup>	2.07 <sup>d</sup>
	AMF+EM	3.13 <sup>a</sup>	0.400 <sup>a</sup>	2.99 <sup>a</sup>	2.87 <sup>a</sup>	2.29 <sup>a</sup>
	AMF+Endo	3.09 <sup>ab</sup>	0.390 <sup>b</sup>	2.94 <sup>b</sup>	2.82 <sup>b</sup>	2.22 <sup>b</sup>
	Mixture	3.06 <sup>b</sup>	0.383 <sup>c</sup>	2.83 <sup>c</sup>	2.77 <sup>b</sup>	2.17 <sup>c</sup>
WS2	Control	1.96 <sup>r</sup>	0.199 <sup>r</sup>	1.49 <sup>t</sup>	1.43 <sup>t</sup>	0.97 <sup>s</sup>
	AMF	2.36 <sup>l</sup>	0.306 <sup>m</sup>	2.01 <sup>o</sup>	1.88 <sup>n</sup>	1.38 <sup>n</sup>
	EM	2.24 <sup>n</sup>	0.297 <sup>n</sup>	1.93 <sup>pq</sup>	1.77 <sup>p</sup>	1.26 <sup>p</sup>
	Endophy	2.19 <sup>o</sup>	0.290 <sup>o</sup>	1.90 <sup>q</sup>	1.70 <sup>q</sup>	1.23 <sup>p</sup>
	EM+Endo	2.30 <sup>m</sup>	0.301 <sup>n</sup>	1.95 <sup>p</sup>	1.82 <sup>o</sup>	1.32 <sup>o</sup>
	AMF+EM	2.52 <sup>jk</sup>	0.324 <sup>jk</sup>	2.17 <sup>l</sup>	2.09 <sup>l</sup>	1.59 <sup>k</sup>
	AMF+Endo	2.47 <sup>k</sup>	0.320 <sup>k</sup>	2.11 <sup>m</sup>	2.01 <sup>m</sup>	1.51 <sup>l</sup>
	Mixture	2.40 <sup>l</sup>	0.312 <sup>l</sup>	2.07 <sup>n</sup>	1.97 <sup>m</sup>	1.44 <sup>m</sup>
LSD at 5%		0.05	0.005	0.04	0.05	0.04

## References

1. Peksen, E. and Artik, C. (2005). Antibesinsel Maddeler Ve Yemeklik Tane Baklagillerin Besleyici Değerleri. *OMU Zir Fak Der.* 20:110-120(in Turkish).
2. Celleno, L., Tolaini, M.V., D'Amore, A., Perricone, N.V. and Preuss, H.G.A. (2007). A dietary supplement containing standardized Phaseolus vulgaris extract influences body composition of overweight men and women. *International Journal of Medical Sciences.* 4: 45-52.
3. Ashour M. A.; El Attar S. T.; Rafaat Y. M. and Mohamed M. N. (2009). Water resources management in Egypt. *Journal of Engineering Sciences.* 37(2): 269-279.
4. De Almeida A. J. B.; Silvia R. M. C.; Vanderleia S. and Divair C. (2017). Chemical changes in bean grains during storage in controlled conditions. *Brazilian Association of Agricultural Engineering.* 37(3): 529-540.
5. Khalil S. E. and El-Noemani A.A. (2012). Effect of irrigation intervals and exogenous proline application in improving tolerance of garden cress plant (*Lepidium sativum* L.) to water stress. *Journal of Applied Sciences Research.* 8(1): 157-167.
6. Maggio, A., Reddy, M.P., Joly, R.J. (2000). Leaf gas exchange and soluble accumulation in the halophyte *Salvadora persica* grown at moderate salinity. *Environmental and Experimental Botany.* 44: 31-38.
7. Asrar, A.A. and Elhindi, K.M. (2011). Alleviation of drought stress of marigold (*Tagetes erecta*) plants by using arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *Saudi Journal of Biological Science.* 18:93-98.
8. Abdel-Fattah, G.M., Migahed, F.F., Ibrahim, A.H. (2002). Interactive effects of endomycorrhizal fungus *Glomus etunicatum* and phosphorus fertilization on growth and metabolic activities of broad bean plants under drought stress conditions. *Pakistan Journal Biological Science.* 5: 835-841.
9. Wu, Q., Xia, R.X. (2006). Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi influence growth, osmotic adjustment and photosynthesis of citrus under well-watered and water stress



- conditions. *Journal of Plant physiology*. **163**: 417-425.
10. Ibrahim, H.A., Abdel-Fattah, G.M., Eman, F.M., Abd El\_Aziz. M.H., Shohr, A.E. (2011). Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and spermine alleviate the adverse effects of salinity stress on electrolyte leakage and productivity of wheat plants. *Phyton-Annales Rei Botanicae*. **51**: 261-276.
  11. Subramanian, K.S., Charest, C. (1995). Influence of arbuscular mycorrhizae on the metabolism of maize under drought stress. *Mycorrhiza* **5**: 273-278.
  12. Auge, R.M. (2001). Water relations, drought and vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis. *Mycorrhiza* **11**: 3-42.
  13. Lee, B.R., Kim, K.Y., Jung, W.J., Avise, J.C., Ourry, A., Kim, T.H. (2007). Peroxidases and lignification in relation to the intensity of water-deficit stress in white clover (*Trifolium repens* L.). *Journal of Experimental and Botany*. **6**: 1271-1279.
  14. Smith, S.E., Read, D.J. (2008). *Mycorrhizal Symbiosis*. Academic Press, San Diego, USA, P. 800.
  15. Montero Sammerfeld, H., Diaz, L.M., Alvarez, M., Anazco Villanueva, C., Matus, E., Boon, N., Boeckx, P. and Hyugens, D. (2013). High winter diversity of mycorrhizal fungal communities in shallow and deep grassland soils. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*, **65**: 236-244.
  16. Abdel-Fattah, G.; Rabie, G.H.; Shaaban, L.D. and Metwally, R. A. (2016). The impact of the arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi on growth and physiological parameters of cowpea plants grown under salt stress conditions. *International Journal of Applied Sciences and Biotech*. **4**: 372-379.
  17. Aseel, D.G., Rashad, Y.M. and Hammad, S.M. (2019). Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi trigger transcriptional expression of flavonoid and chlorogenic acid biosynthetic pathways genes in tomato against tomato mosaic virus. *Scientific Reports*. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-019-46281-x.
  18. Górski, R. and Kleiber, T. (2010). Effect of effective microorganisms (Em) on nutrient contents in substrate and development and yielding of rose (*Rosa x hybrida*) and gerbera (*Gerbera jamesonii*). *Ecological chemistry and engineering s*. **4**(17):506-513.
  19. El-Shafei, A.; Yehia, M. and El-Naqib, F. (2008). Impact of effective microorganisms compost on soil fertility and rice productivity and quality. *Misr Journal of Agricultural Engineering*. **25**(3): 1067-1093.
  20. Arnold, A.E. (2007). Understanding the diversity of foliar fungal endophytes: progress, challenges, and frontiers. *Fungal Biology Reviews*. **21**: 51-66.
  21. Sandhu S.S., Kumar S., Aharwal R.P., Shukla H., Rajak R.C. (2014). Endophytic Fungi: As A Source of Antimicrobials Bioactive Compounds. *World Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*. **3**: 1179-1797.
  22. Sessitsch, A.; Reiter, B.; Pfeifer, U. and Wilhelm, E. (2002). Cultivation-independent population analysis of bacterial endophytes in three potato varieties based on eubacterial and Actinomycetes specific PCR of 16S rRNA genes. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology*. **39**: 23-32.
  23. Sturz, A.V.; Christie, B.R. and Nowak, J. (2000). Bacterial endophytes: potential role in developing sustainable system of crop production. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences*. **19**: 1-30.
  24. Gerdemann, J.W. and Nicolson, T.H. (1963): Spores of mycorrhizal *Endogone* species extracted from soil by wet sieving and decanting. *Transaction of the British Mycological Society*, **46**: 235-244.
  25. Trouvelot, A., Kough, J.L., and Gianinazzi-Pearson, V. (1986). Mesure du taux de mycorrhization VA d'un systeme eradiculaire recherche de methods d'estimation ayant une signification fonctionnelle. In: Gianinazzi-Pearson, V., and Gianinazzi, S. (eds): *Physiological and Genetical Aspects of mycorrhizae*. INRA Publications, Paris, pp. 217-221.
  26. Stanhill, G. (1986). Water use efficiency. *Advances in Agronomy*. **39**: 53-85.
  27. Nelson, D.W. and Sommers, L.E. (1973). Determination of total nitrogen in plant material. *Agron*. (**65**):109-112.

28. Chapman, H.D. and Pratt, P.F. (1961). Ammonium vandate-molybdate method for determenation of phosphorus. – In: Methods of Analysis for Soils, Plants and Water. 1st Ed. California Univ., California pp: 184-203.
29. Allen, S. E. (1989). Chemical Analysis of Ecological Materials. 2nd edn. Blackwell Sci. Pub. Osney, Oxford, London. pp: 50-84.
30. Hedge J., Hofreiter B., Whistler R. and Be Miller J. (1962). Carbohydrate chemistry. Academic Press, New York. Pp17.
31. AOAC. (2000). Association of Official Analytical Chemists, 17th ED. of A.O.A.C. International Maryland, U.S.A, Pp1250.
32. Ruengsitagoon, W. and Hattanat, N. (2012). Simple Spectrophotometric Method for Determination of Folic Acid. The 4th Annual Northeast Pharmacy Research Conference, Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Khon Kaen University, Thailand.
33. Yang, Z.Q.; Zuo, Y.X.; Yao, Y.G.; Chen, X.W.; Yang, G.C. and Zhang, Y.P. (2001). Analysis of the 18S rRNA genes of Sarcocystis species suggests that the morphologically similar organisms from cattle and water buffalo should be considered the same species. Molecular and Biochemical Parasitology. 115: 283-288.
34. El-Komy, H.M.; Abdel-Samad, H.M.; Hetta, A.M. and Barakat, N.A. (2004). Possible roles of nitrogen fixation and mineral uptake induced by rhizobacterial inoculation on salt tolerance of maize. *Polish Journal of Microbiology*. 53(1):53-60.
35. Abdelmoneim, T.S.; Moussa, T.A.A.; Almaghrabi, O.A.; Alzahrani1, H.S. and Abdelbagi, I. (2014). Increasing plant tolerance to drought stress by inoculation with arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *Life Science Journal*. 11(1): 10-17.
36. El Zembranya, H.; Cortetc, J.; Lutzd, M.P.; Chaberte, A.; Baudonia, E.; Haurata, J.; Maughance, N.; Felixf, D.; Defagod, G.; Ballya R. and Moenne-Loccoz, Y. (2006). Field survival of the phytostimulator of Azospirillum lipoferum CRT1 and functional impact on maize crop, biodegradation of crop residues, and soil faunal indicators in a context of decreasing nitrogen fertilization. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*. 38: 1712-1726.
37. Kaur, R.; Macloed, J.; Foley, W. and Nayudu, M. (2006). Gluconic acid: an antifungal agent produced by Pseudomonas species in biological control of take-all. *Photochemistry*. 67: 595-604.
38. Hu, C. and Qi, Y. (2013). Long-term effective micro-organisms application promote growth and increase yields and nutrition of wheat in China. *The European Journal of Agronomy*. 46:63-67.
39. He, L.; Li, C.Y. and Liu, R.J. (2017). Indirect interactions between arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and Spodoptera exigua alter photosynthesis and plant endogenous hormones. *Mycorrhiza*. 27:525-535.
40. Shi, Y.; Lou, K. and Li, C. 2010. Growth and photosynthetic efficiency promotion of sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris* L.) by endophytic bacteria. *Photosynthesis Research*. 105: 5-13.
41. Asrar, A.A.; Abdel-fattah, G.M. and Elhindi K.M. (2012). Improving growth, flower yield, and water relations of snapdragon (*Antirrhinum majus* L.) plants grown under well-watered and water-stress conditions using arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *Photosynthetica*. 50 (2): 305-316.
42. Kaya, C.; Higgs, D.; Kirnak, H. and Tas, I. (2003). Mycorrhizal colonization improves fruit yield and water use efficiency in water-melon (*CitrullusLanatus* Thunb.) grown under well-watered and water-stressed conditions. *Plant Soil*. 253:287-292.
43. Morte, A.; Lovisolo, C. and Schubert, A. (2000). Effect of drought stress on growth and water relations of the mycorrhizal association *Helianthemum almeriense* - *Terfezia claveryi*. *Mycorrhiza*. 10: 115-119.
44. Colla, G.; Roupheal, Y.; Cardarelli, M.; Tullio, M.; Rivera, C.M. and Rea, E. (2008). Alleviation of salt stress by arbuscular mycorrhizal in zucchini plants grown at low and high phosphorus



- concentration. *Biology and Fertility of Soils*. **44**: 501-509.
- 45 Yang, Z.Q.; Zuo, Y.X.; Yao, Y.G.; Chen, X.W.; Yang, G.C. and Zhang, Y.P. (2001). Analysis of the 18S rRNA genes of *Sarcocystis* species suggests that the morphologically similar organisms from cattle and water buffalo should be considered the same species. *Molecular and Biochemical Parasitology*. **115**: 283-288.