



3

30

# *Proceedings* 1 **Formulation and Evaluation of Sugarcane Bagasse-based Bio-** <sup>2</sup> **control Agents for Sustainable Phytopathogen Management †**

**Chioma Bertha Ehis-Eriakha\* 1 , Stephen Eromosele Akemu <sup>1</sup>and Azeeza Tiamiyu 1,** 4

- <sup>1</sup> Department of Microbiology, Edo State University Uzairue; e-mail@e-mail.com 5
	- **\*** Correspondence: ekwuabu.bertha@edouniversity.edu.ng; Tel.: +2347038892250 6
- † Presented at the 3rd International Electronic Conference on Agronomy, Online, 15 30 October, 2023 7

**Abstract:** Biocontrol agents are microbiological-based alternatives to agrochemicals due to their ef- 8 fective and sustainable attributes in controlling phytopathogens. This research highlights the for- 9 mulation of bio-control agents using sugarcane bagasse as a carrier matrix and evaluation of the 10 formulants in phytopathogen management. The isolated rhizospheric bacteria were screened for 11 antibiosis trait responsible for biocontrol activity using the agar streak method. Bacterial isolates 12 with antibiosis potential were further identified phenotypically. The carrier was prepared by oven 13 drying the sugarcane bagasse at  $90^{\circ}$ C for three days, ground and sieved using a mesh sieve of 1.16 14 mm. For the bio-control formulation, 200 ml of biocontrol inoculum was added to 20 g of sugar cane 15 bagasse for each organism to form the final products. Water and adhesion capacities were con- 16 ducted on the three formulations and afterwards the antagonistic potential of the formulants were 17 evaluated using maize growth profile after 21 days. A total of 9 isolates were obtained, only three 18 (3) showed antibiosis antagonistic activity and were further used for the formulation branded as 19 ZEEMYC (*Mycobacterium* spp), ZEEPAS (*Pseudomonas* spp), and ZEEBAC (*Bacillus* spp), respec- 20 tively. The water capacity of the three formulations were between 6.9 g - 9.9 g, respectively while 21 adhesion capacity was also displayed. At day five(5), maize seeds in all pots sprouted except dis- 22 eased seeds without bio-control agent (DS). At day 11, plant height, shoot length and root length 23 ranged between (36.5cm-39cm), (31 cm - 34 cm), and (5 cm - 7 cm) for plants with biocontrol agent, 24 control was 42 cm, 34.5 cm, 7.5 cm while barely visible growth was observed in DS. This study 25 displays the potential of natural-based biocontrol agents in controlling the phytopathogen *Aspergil-* 26 *lus niger*. 27

**Keywords:** Biocontrol; Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria; Bioformulation; Microbial inoculants; 28 Sugarcane bagasse; Antibiosis 29

**Citation:** To be added by editorial staff during production.

Academic Editor: Firstname Lastname

Published: date

**Publisher's Note:** MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



**Copyright:** © 2022 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

# **1. Introduction** 31

Phytopathogens pose a significant threat to global agricultural productivity, leading 32 to substantial crop losses and economic damage. In response to growing concerns about 33 the environmental and health risks associated with chemical pesticides, researchers have 34 been exploring sustainable and eco-friendly alternatives for phytopathogen management 35 [1]. One of such environmentally friendly pathogen control approaches is the use of bio- 36 logical control (biocontrol) agents. Biocontrol agents are natural or modified organisms 37 or microbes that effectively control phytopathogens to enhance the yield of plants [2]. 38 They can serve as alternatives to agrochemicals due to their sustainable attributes in con- 39 trolling phytopathogens and their application in crop cultivation can significantly impact 40 sustainable farming. The plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) which are consid- 41 ered a broad range of microorganisms that use multiple mechanisms or sometimes a com- 42 bination of processes to stimulate plant development and control a range of phytopatho- 43 gens have been used effectively in biocontrol of phytopathogens. Inoculants from *Bacillus* 44

spp, *Rhizobia* spp., *Azosprilium lipoferum*, *A. brasilense*, *Azotobacter* spp, *Pseudomonas* spp 1 and *Bradyrhizobium* spp. are among the most commonly used PGPR-based biofertilizers 2 and biocontrol agents commercially available in Africa [3].  $\qquad \qquad$  3

In biocontrol of plant based diseases, rhizospheric microbes possess several mecha- 4 nisms that allow for antagonistic potential against different diseases. These mechanisms 5 include the following but not limited to: siderophore and hydrogen cyanide production, 6 antibiosis activity, induced systemic response, hyperparasitism and others. Antibiosis is 7 a process of biocontrol mechanism which is achieved by the production of secondary me- 8 tabolites like volatile compounds and antibiotics by the beneficial microbes which help to 9 antagonise pathogens in the host plants [4]. 10

Presently, beneficial bacteria are currently used in the formulation of inoculants in 11 two forms: solid and liquid carriers. These inoculant formulations are used in a variety of 12 commercially important agricultural crops [5]. Carrier-based bioinoculants demonstrate 13 efficiency by their capacity to influence the shelf life of the inoculant. Thus, the judicious 14 choice of a suitable carrier is paramount not only in ensuring the preservation of the inoc- 15 ulant's shelf life during storage but also enhancing its efficacy in agricultural fields [6]. 16 Sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum*) is renowned for its extensive cultivation and the signif- 17 icant byproduct it generates in the form of bagasse, which is the dry, fibrous residue that 18 remains after the extraction of sugarcane juice [7]. This agro-waste has been used and re- 19 ported as a suitable and inert carrier matrix for bioformulation of products involving mi- 20 crobial inoculations. Therefore, the objective of this research is to assess the effectiveness 21 of the biocontrol agents formulated using sugar-cane bagasse as a carrier matrix in com- 22 bating phytopathogens and promoting plant growth. 23

## **2. Materials and Methods** 24

## *2.1. Collection and Isolation of PGPR Strains* 25

Rhizospheric soil sample was collected from the rhizosphere of selected plants using 26 standard methods according to Verma and Yadav. [8]. The PGPR strain was isolated from 27 the sample using serial dilution and spread plate methods according to Sivasakthi et al. 28 [9] to obtain pure isolates. 29

#### *2.2. Evaluation of antagonistic activity using antibiosis method* 30

The agar streak method was employed to evaluate the antagonistic activity of iso- 31 lated rhizospheric bacteria against phytopathogens to determine their antibiosis potential. 32 The isolated rhizospheric bacteria and a fungal pathogen (collected from a culture collec- 33 tion center) identified as *Aspergillus niger* were used for the assay according to Sellem et 34 al. [10]. Isolates with inhibition zones (haloes without mycelial development or deformed 35 hyphae) larger than 2 mm were selected and identified phenotypically according to Ehis- 36 Eriakha et al. [11]. 37

# *2.3. Inoculum Preparation and formulation of sugarcane bagasse-based biocontrol agent* 38

Rhizobacterial strains with antibiosis properties were used for the preparation of the 39 inoculum according to Riaz et al. [12]. For the formulation, 60 g of the prepared and ster- 40 ilized sugarcane bagasse was introduced into bacterial pellets in approximately 1:10 ratio 41 (weight/volume). The mixture of sugarcane bagasse and liquid culture was vortexed for 42 45 minutes in support of homogenous mixing of the bacterial cell within the bagasse ma- 43 trix and dried at room temperature ( $28 \pm 10^{\circ}$ C). The experiment was performed in tripli- 44 cate. The containers were sealed in airtight sterilized packs to prevent any potential con- 45 tamination according to Ansari and Jaikishun [13] with slight modifications. 46



**Figure 1.** Bioformulation of sugar cane bagasse-based biocontrol agent**.** 2

## *2.4. Determination of Water absorption and adhesion capacity of the formulant* 3

Water absorption capacity was determined by the method described by Norhasnan 4 et al. [14] and calculated using the equation:  $\% \mathbf{M} = \frac{\mathbf{W_t} - \mathbf{W_0}}{\mathbf{W_0}}$  $\frac{1-\mathbf{w}_0}{\mathbf{w}_0} \times \mathbf{100}$  5

Where, *Wt* is the sample's weight at a recorded immersion time, and *W0* is the 6 weight of the dried sample. Adhesion capacity was also determined according to the 7 method of Baliyan et al. [15]. 8

# *2.5. Physicochemical analysis of soil sample prior to cultivation* 9

The pH of the soil sample was measured using a pH meter. Soil Electrical Conduc- 10 tivity and Soil organic matter were also conducted according to the method of Salihu and 11 Iyya. [16]. Temperature, total organic carbon, and heavy metal constituents of the soil 12 were also determined based on standard methods. The standard methods of the standard methods of the standard me

## *2.6. Evaluation of formulated biocontrol agents on maize cultivation under greenhouse condition* 14

The formulated biocontrol inoculants were evaluated for their biocontrol potential 15 against phytopathogens in controlled laboratory conditions. The ability of the biocontrol 16 bacteria to induce plant defense responses and suppress disease development was inves- 17 tigated. The performance of seeds and soil treated with the sugarcane bagasse-based for- 18 mulant was compared to control groups to assess their effectiveness. Five (5) different 19 groups were prepared: ZEEMYC (*Mycobacterium* spp + phytopathogen + healthy maize 20 seeds), ZEEPAS (*Pseudomonas* spp + phytopathogen + healthy maize seeds), ZEEBAC (*Ba-* 21 *cillus* spp + phytopathogen + healthy maize seeds), Control A (healthy maize seeds) and 22 Control B (diseased maize seeds). The planting of seeds was done following the method 23 of Ju et al. [17] using a block randomized design in triplicates and the experimental design 24 is presented in Table 1. 25

1

27



**Table 1.** Experimental design. 1

KEY: ZEEMYC- Formulated *Mycobacterium* spp with bagasse, ZEEPAS- Formulated *Pseudo-* 3 *monas* spp with bagasse, ZEEBAC- Formulated *Bacillus* spp with bagasse, Phytopthogen: *Asper-* 4 *gillus fumigatus.* 5

#### *2.7. Data Analysis* 6

Data generated from the monitoring indices were subjected to different statistical 7 tools and models such as one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) SPSS version 22 and 8 standard deviation. 9

## **3. Results** 10

Out of 20 bacterial isolates obtained, three isolates showed the highest antibiosis ac- 11 tivity against Aspergillus niger as shown in Table 1. The zones of inhibition were higher 12 than 2 mm and hence scored positive for antibiosis activity. The three isolates were Gram 13 positive and Gram negative while other phenotypic properties displayed by the individ- 14 ual isolates revealed a close relatedness to Mycobacterium spp (MS1), Pseudomonas spp 15 (MS3), and Bacillus spp (CS2) respectively, and assigned tentative identities (Table 2) 16

The bioformulation was successfully performed using the three biocontrol agents ab- 17 sorbed in the sugarcane-bagasse carrier matrix and the final products were branded as 18 ZEEMYC, ZEEPAS, and ZEEBAC for Mycobacterium spp, Pseudomonas spp, and Bacil- 19 lus spp, respectively. The water capacities of the formulants ranged between 6.9 g and 9.9 20 g (Table 3), while adhesion activity was also evidenced establishing the successful formu- 21 lation of the biocontrol agent. 22

Prior to maize cultivation, a comprehensive analysis of the soil physicochemical 23 properties indicated that the soil sample was well-suited for agricultural purposes. The 24 levels of phosphate, nitrate, electrical conductivity (E. conductivity), and other critical pa- 25 rameters were found to be well within the typical ranges when compared to undisturbed 26 arable soil conditions. Furthermore, an assessment of heavy metal concentrations and or- 27 ganic content revealed that the sample was uncontaminated (as shown in Table 4). Upon 28 concluding the cultivation phase on day 28, it became evident that the ZEEPAS treatment 29 had produced the highest plant height (43.7 cm), closely trailed by the ZEEBAC treatment 30 (39.97 cm). In contrast, ZEEMYC treatment and control group A which received healthy 31 seeds, resulted in slightly shorter plant heights, with ZEEMYC exhibiting the lowest 32 height at 36.77 cm. Notably, no growth was observed in control group B throughout the 33 entire sampling period (as detailed in Table 5). 34

*Table 1.* Antibiosis Antagonistic Activity of the Isolates*.* 35



 $\overline{2}$ 

$\overline{\text{1}}$ ate	ber ies		៖ មិន និះ	$\Sigma$ .			$\vec{G}$ in $\vec{E}$ is $\vec{G}$ if $\vec{G}$ if			$\overline{\text{Na}}$ Lac Su-			
MS 1	Round, Cream,						$+$					$+$	Mycobacte- <i>rium</i> spp.
	Raised.		- $Rod + +$										
	Smooth. Entire,												
	Opaque												
	Dry, Small												
	Round, Yellowish-		$Rod + + + - -$								$+ + + - - - +$		Pseudomonas spp.
MS <sub>3</sub>	green, Flat, Smooth,												
	Entire, opaque, Dry,												
	Small												
	Round, Cream,												
	Raised												
CS <sub>2</sub>	Smooth, Entire,		$+$ Rod		$^{+}$	$+$		$+$ $-$	$^{+}$	$+$		$^{+}$	$+$ Bacillus spp
	Opaque												
	Dry, Large												
	Key: + positive; - negative; r rod; c: cocci.												

Table 2. Morphological and biochemical characteristics of biocontrol organisms 1

*Table 3.* Water capacity of sugarcane bagasse-based inoculant*.* 3



*Table 4.* Mean values of the soil physicochemical properties prior to cultivation *.* 5



6

4

7

8

- 10
- 11



**Table 5.** Plant parameters of Maize plant at different growing stages. 1

Data presented as: Mean ± SD; superscripts for means for groups in homogeneous subsets 2 indicates diverse significant differences at  $P \le 0.05$ . 3



Key: ZEEPAS: Pseudomonas spp inoculant, ZEEMYC: Mycobacterium spp inoculant, ZEEBAC: Ba- 6 cillus spp inoculant, CONTROL A: healthy seeds without biocontrol agent; CONTROL B: diseased 7 seeds without biocontrol agent. 8

*Figure 2.* Plant growth and development of maize (Zea mays) plant at days 7, 14, and 28. 9

#### *4.* **Discussion** 10

Multiple rhizobacteria with the ability to inhibit the growth of plant pathogens using 11 diverse mechanisms are usually present in the rhizosphere of plants [18]. These mecha- 12 nisms often entail the production of chemical compounds referred to as antibiotics, which 13 are expressed by various microorganisms contingent upon their genetic makeup and 14 serve as agents that antagonize phytopathogens.. The chemicals are diverse, some of 15 which have broad spectrum potentials targeting a wide range of phytopathogens. In this 16 study, three selected rhizobacterial isolates with antibiosis potential were successfully uti- 17 lized for the production of a sugarcane bagasse-based biocontrol agent. Antibiosis is one 18 of the most studied biocontrol mechanisms in plant disease control and the synthesis of 19 different antibiotics by microorganisms associated with plants participating in the biolog- 20 ical control of plant pathogens has been widely acknowledged as a significant mechanism 21

contributing to the mitigation of disease symptoms, especially within the context of soil 1 conditions [4]. In this study, the rhizospheric bacteria displayed biocontrol of phytopath- 2 ogen potential through antibiosis mechanism in mitgating *Aspergillus niger* which is a 3 known phytopathogen associated with different plants. The biocontrol formulation with 4 sugarcane bagasse and rhizobacteria with biocontrol attribute successfully promoted the 5 growth of diseased *Zea mays* with no evidence of stunted growth or diseased parts. The 6 formulant effectively enhanced growth of the plant as evidenced in the plant parameters 7 in comparison with the growth of healthy plant under same conditions. 8

The rhizobacteria utilised in this research were carefully selected from a pool of iso- 9 lated rhizobacteria based on their ability to demonstrate antibiosis and *in vitro* antagonis- 10 tic traits. The antibiosis activity of the selected bacteria were assessed and scored based 11 on the formation of zones of inhibition measuring up to 2 mm as seen in Table 1 and 12 notably, the result corresponds with the findings of Liu et al. [19]. The antibiosis attribute 13 underscores the ability of microbes to produce secondary metabolites which improves the 14 bacterium's ability to either compete with pathogens by inhibiting the activity of the path- 15 ogens or by triggering host defenses. Plant responses to bioinoculants are influenced by 16 soil physicochemical parameters and edaphic variables [20]. As a result, several soil phys- 17 iochemical parameters were determined prior to the cultivation experiment on the soil. 18 The soil parameters revealed an optimum quantity of nitrates, phosphorus, and organic 19 matter which are rate-limiting factors for plant growth while the heavy metals present are 20 essential for optimum plant growth and the concentrations were within permissible limits 21 [21]. 22

Understanding how different treatments impact the growth of plants is essential for 23 optimizing cultivation practices and achieving desired plant outcomes. This study as- 24 sessed the growth parameters of maize using the different sugarcane bagasse inoculant 25 treatments. In this study, the different biocontrol agents harboring the three selected bac- 26 terial strains showed varied plant growth patterns. Although based on statistical analysis, 27 no significant difference (P≤0.05) was observed among treatments and between treat- 28 ments and control A except at day 7 for plant height between ZEEBAC and other treat- 29 ments and for shoot length between ZEEMYC and other treamtments including control 30 A.. This demonstrates the effectiveness of the formulated biocontrol agents in suppressing 31 the phytopathogen Aspergillus niger and promoting plant growth comparatively meas- 32 urable with plants grown with healthy seeds. Again, control B showed no visible growth 33 just a sprout within the soil layer which is another remarkable evidence displaying the 34 biocontrol potential of ZEEMYC, ZEEPAS, and ZEEBAC. Plant pathogens have deleteri- 35 ous effects on plants such as reduced yield, poor growth, or no growth which conse- 36 quently promote food insecurity [22]. The rapid and healthy plant growth observed in the 37 three treated pots could also be attributed to the nutritional constituents of the sugar cane 38 bagasse carrier matrix which has served as biofertilizers in previous studies. Hassan et al. 39 [23] accessed the effects of carrier-based biofertilizer (using maize straw and sugarcane 40 husk as carriers) containing Bacillus and Pseudomonas species on wheat growth, the bio- 41 fertilizer increased plant growth and also decreased heavy metal concentrations in soils. 42 Detraska [24] also conducted a similar experiment to evaluate the effects of Streptomyces 43 spp immobilized with sugar cane bagasse on plant growth promotion. 44

#### *5.* **Conclusion** 45

The assessment of maize growth parameters under the various bioformulations 46 demonstrated that these bioinoculants had a positive impact on plant growth and sup- 47 pressed the phytopathogen Aspergillus niger. This research conclusively demonstrates 48 the biocontrol potential of the sugar-cane bagasse based bioformulant in effectively man- 49 aging and controlling the phytopathogen *Aspergillus niger,* contributing to sustainable ag- 50 ricultural practices. This study also reveals that the bioformulant could serve as an effec- 51 tive, sustainable, and eco-friendly alternative to agrochemicals in combating plant dis- 52

eases, enhancing plant growth, and securing food production for the growing global pop- 1 ulation. More significantly, this research aligns with the second sustainable development 2 goal (SDG 2). 3

4

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization: Ehis-Eriakha C.B.; methodology: Ehis-Eriakha C. B.; and 5 Akemu S. E.; and Tiamiyu A.; software, Ehis-Eriakha C. B.; Akemu S. E.; validation: Ehis-Eriakha C. 6 B.; formal analysis: Tiamiyu A investigation: Tiamiyu A data curation, Tiamiyu A.; writing—origi- 7 nal draft preparation, Ehis-Eriakha C. B.; Akemu S. E.; writing—review and editing, Ehis-Eriakha 8 C. B.; Akemu S. E.; supervision, Ehis-Eriakha C.B. All authors have read and agreed to the published 9 version of the manuscript." 10

**Funding:** Please: This research received no external funding 11

**Informed Consent Statement:** Not applicable 12

**Acknowledgments:** We would like to extend our heartfelt appreciation to the Microbiology Labor- 13 atory at Edo State University Uzairue for their invaluable support and resources that contributed 14 significantly to the completion of this project.  $15$ 

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest 16

# **References** 17

- 1. Ali, S.; Tyagi, A.; Bae, H. Plant Microbiome: An Ocean of Possibilities for Improving Disease Resistance in Plants. *Microor-* 18 *ganisms* **2023**, 11(2), 392. 19
- 2. Singh, S.; Kumar, V.; Dhanjal, D. S.; Singh, J. Biological control agents: diversity, ecological significances, and biotechno- 20 logical applications. *Natural bioactive products in sustainable agriculture* **2020**, 31-44. 21
- 3. Khan, N.; Bano, A., Ali, S.; Babar, M. A. Crosstalk amongst phytohormones from planta and PGPR under biotic and abiotic 22 stresses. *Plant Growth Regulation* **2020**, 90, 189-203. 23
- 4. Arseneault T.; Filion, M. Biocontrol through antibiosis: exploring the role played by subinhibitory concentrations of antibi- 24 otics in soil and their impact on plant pathogens. *Canadian Journal of Plant Pathology* **2017**, 39:3, 267-274. 25
- 5. Dutta, J.; Thakur, D. Evaluation of multifarious plant growth promoting traits, antagonistic potential and phylogenetic 26 affiliation of rhizobacteria associated with commercial tea plants grown in Darjeeling, India. *PloS one* **2017**, 12(8), e0182302. 27
- 6. Aloo, B. N.; Mbega, E. R.; Makumba, B. A.; Tumuhairwe, J. B. Effects of carrier materials and storage temperatures on the 28 viability and stability of three biofertilizer inoculants obtained from potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) rhizosphere. *Agriculture* 29 **2022**, 12(2), 140. 30
- 7. Raza, Q. U. A.; Bashir, M. A.; Rehim, A.; Sial, M. U.; Ali Raza, H. M.; Atif, H. M.; Geng, Y. Sugarcane industrial byproducts 31 as challenges to environmental safety and their remedies: A review. *Water* **2021**, 13(24), 3495. 32
- 8. Verma, P.; Yadav, A. N.; Khannam, K. S.; Kumar, S.; Saxena, A. K.; Suman, A. Molecular diversity and multifarious plant 33 growth promoting attributes of Bacilli associated with wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) rhizosphere from six diverse agro-eco- 34 logical zones of India. *Journal of Basic Microbiology* **2016,** 56(1), 44-58. 35
- 9. Sivasakthi, S.; Usharani, G.; Saranraj, P. Biocontrol potentiality of plant growth promoting bacteria (PGPR)-*Pseudomonas* 36 *fluorescens* and *Bacillus subtilis*: A review. *African journal of agricultural research* **2014**, 9(16), 1265-1277. 37
- 10. Sellem, I.; Triki, M. A.; Elleuch, L.; Cheffi, M.; Chakchouk, A.; Smaoui, S., Mellouli, L. The use of newly isolated Strepto- 38 myces strain TN258 as a potential biocontrol agent of potato tubers leak caused by *Pythium ultimum*. *Journal of basic micro-* 39 *biology* **2017**, 57(5), 393-401. 40
- 11. Ehis-Eriakha, C. B.; Willy-Vidona, C.; Akemu, S. E.; Isolation and Molecular Characterization of Diazotrophic Bacteria in 41 Arable Soils. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology* **2022**, 7, 1436-1443. 42
- 12. Riaz, U.; Murtaza, G.; Anum, W.; Samreen, T.; Sarfraz, M.; Nazir, M. Z. Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR) as 43 biofertilizers and biopesticides. Microbiota and biofertilizers: a sustainable continuum for plant and soil health **2021**, pp 44 181-196. **45**
- 13. Ansari, A. A.; Jaikishun, S. Vermicomposting of sugarcane bagasse and rice straw and its impact on the cultivation of 46 Phaseolus vulgaris L. in Guyana, South America*. Journal of Agricultural Technology* **2011**, 7(2), 225-234. 47
- Norhasnan, N. H. A.; Hassan, M. Z.; Nor, A. F. M.; Zaki, S. A.; Dolah, R.; Jamaludin, K. R.; Aziz, S. A. Physicomechanical 48 Properties of Rice Husk/Coco Peat Reinforced Acrylonitrile Butadiene Styrene Blend Composites. *Polymers* **2021**, 13(7), 49 1171. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/polym13071171 50
- 15. Baliyan, N.; Qureshi, K. A.; Jaremko, M.; Rajput, M.; Singh, M.; Dhiman, S.; Kumar, A. Bioformulation Containing Cohorts 51 of *Ensifer adhaerens* MSN12 and *Bacillus cereus* MEN8 for the Nutrient Enhancement of *Cicer arietinum* L*. Plants* **2022**, 11(22), 52  $3123.$  53
- 16. Salihu, S. O.; Iyya, Z. Assessment of physicochemical parameters and organochlorine pesticide residues in selected vege- 1 table farmlands soil in Zamfara state, Nigeria. *Science Progress and Research* (SPR), **2022,** 2(2), 559-566. https://doi. 2 org/10.52152/spr/2022.171. 3
- 17. Ju, W.; Jin, X.; Lei L.; Guoting, S.; Wei, Z.; Chengjiao, D. Rhizobacteria inoculation benefits nutrient availability for phyto- 4 stabilization in copper contaminated soil: Drivers from bacterial community structures in rhizosphere. *Applied Soil Ecology* 5 **2020,** 150: 103450. 6
- 18. Mehmood, U.; Inam-ul-Haq, M.; Saeed, M.; Altaf, A.; Azam, F.; Hayat, S. A brief review on plant growth promoting rhizo- 7 bacteria (PGPR): a key role in plant growth promotion. *Plant Protection* **2018**, 2(2), 77-82. 8
- 19. Liu, K.; Garrett, C.; Fadamiro, H.; Kloepper, J. W., Antagonism of black rot in cabbage by mixtures of plant growth-pro- 9 moting rhizobacteria (PGPR). *BioControl* **2016**, 61, 605-613. 10
- 20. Ghnaya, T.; Mnassri, M.; Ghabriche, R.; Wali, M.; Poschenrieder, C.; Lutts, S.; Abdelly, C. Nodulation by Sinorhizobium 11 meliloti originated from a mining soil alleviates Cd toxicity and increases Cd-phytoextraction in *Medicago sativa* L. *Frontiers* 12 *in Plant Science 2015, 6, 863.* 13
- 21. Rana, A.; Saharan, B.; Nain, L.; Prasanna, R.; Shivay, Y. S. Enhancing micronutrient uptake and yield of wheat through 14 bacterial PGPR consortia. *Soil Science and Plant Nutrition*, 58(5) **2012**, 573-582. 15
- 22. El-Baky, N. A.; Amara, A. A. A. F. Recent approaches towards control of fungal diseases in plants: An updated review. 16 *Journal of Fungi* **2021**, 7(11), 900. 17
- 23. Hassan, T. U.; Bano, A.; Naz, I. Alleviation of heavy metals toxicity by the application of plant growth promoting rhizobac- 18 teria and effects on wheat grown in saline sodic field. *International journal of phytoremediation* **2017**, 19(6), 522-529. 19
- 24. Detraksa, J. Evaluation of plant growth− promoting streptomyces sp. SR13− 2 immobilized with sugarcane bagasse and 20 filter cake for promoting rice growth. *Food and Applied Bioscience Journal* **2020**, 8(2), 1-13. 21