YIELD RESPONSE OF FIVE MAIZE HYBRIDS TO INOCULATION WITH RHIZOBACTERIA

N. Mrkovački 1*, D. Bjelić 1, D. Jošić 2, I. Đalović 1

¹Institute of Field and Vegetable Crops, Novi Sad, Serbia ²Institute of Soil Science, Belgrade, Serbia

*corresponding author: nastasija.mrkovacki@nsseme.com

Abstract

The biofertilizers are found positive contribution to soil fertility, resulting in an increase in crop yield without causing any environmental, water or soil pollution hazards. Nitrogen fixing and phosphorus solubilizing bacteria play an important role in nitrogen mobilization and phosphorus solubilization for the benefit of plant growth. A field experiment to study yield response of maize to inoculation with rhizobacteria, was conducted during 2013 at experimental field of Institute of Field and Vegetable Crops in Novi Sad. The maize hybrids (NS 3014, NS 4015, NS 5043, NS 6010 and NS 6030) were used in the study. The field experiment was laid out in randomized complete block design with four treatments (control and 3 inoculations) and four replications. Inoculation was done with *Pseudomonas* PS2, *Bacillus* Q7 and their mixture with *Azotobacter chroococcum* (Q7 + PS2 + AC). Application method was incorporation immidiately before planting with liquid culture of strains (1 1 + 300 1 H2O ha-1). The results showed significant increase in maize yield with inoculation treatments. The best effect on maize yield was achieved with mixture of strains (19.7%). Significantly higher yield was obtained for hybrids NS6010 and NS 6030. The highest increase in yield of maize was achieved with hybrid NS 6030 (32.2%). Statistically significant differences in comparison to the control were obtained on treatments with Q7 and PS2 + Q7 + AC.

Key words: Azotobacter, Bacillus, Pseudomonas, yield.

Introduction

Maize is one of the most important cereal crops in the world. In 2010, this crop was grown in an area of nearly 162 million ha and occupied second place in overall production (http://faostat.fao.org). In Serbia, maize is grown on about 1 200 000 ha and the total grain production is between 4 and 7 million tons per year. The grain yield of maize dependson the genetic potential of a hybrid, soil characteristics, agrotechnical measures and climatic factors (Jocković *et al.*, 2010; Dalović, 2014).

Microbial inoculants are highly ranked among promising alternatives for reducing global fertilizer inputs into agroecosystems. Their use has been steadily growing through the last decade. some microbial inoculants are able to improve nutrient availability and plant uptake capability, thereby reducing nutrient inputs and increasing the use efficiency of applied chemical fertilizers. Single or mixed inoculant formulations containing plant growth promoting bacteria (PGPB) stimulate plant growth by diverse mechanisms, which include biological nitrogen fixation, synthesis of hormones and a variety of other molecules, phosphate solubilization and biological control of pathogens.

Maize (Zea mays L.) is widely used for human and animal food and is a staple in many developing world communities where small increases in productivity without increasing production costs represent significant gains in food security. Thus, new technologies promoting the effectiveness of bioinoculants based on endophythyc diazotrophic microbes (such as plant growth promoting bacteria (PGPB) are of compelling social environmental reelvance).

Significant increases in growth and yield of agronomical important crops in response to inoculation with PGPR have been reported by Asghar et al. (2002), Bashan et al. (2004) and Biswas et al. (2000).Azospirillum, Pseudomonas and Azotobacter strains could affect seed germination and seedling growth (Shaukat et al. 2006). Kloepper et al. (1992) has been shown that wheat yield increased up to 30% with Azotobacter inoculation and up to 43% with Bacillus inoculation. Strains of Pseudomonas Pseudomonas putida and fluorescens could increase root and shoot elongation in canola (Glick et al. 1997) as well as wheat and potato (De Freitas and Germida, 1992; Frommel et al., 1993). Thus it has been shown that Azospirillum and Pseudomonas had the potential for agricultural exploatation and could use as natural fertilizers (Bashan et al., 1989; Cakmakci et al., 2006).

The main objective of this research was to determine the effect og PGPR strains on yield of five maize hybrids.

Material and methods

The trial was conducted at Rimski Sancevi experimental field of Institute of Field and Vegetable Crops in Novi Sad. The experimental objects were five hybrids of maize (NS 3014, NS 4015, NS 5043, NS 6010 and NS 6030) developed at Institute and three treatments with microorganisms. Non inoculated treatment was control. Inoculation was done with Pseudomonas PS2, Bacillus O7 and their mixture with Azotobacter chroococcum (Q7 + PS2 + AC). Application method was incorporation immediately before planting with liquid culture of strains (1 1 + $300 \ 1 \ H_2O \ ha^{-1}$). The experimental design was a randomized, complete block with four replications. Data were analyzed by the analysis of variance; LSD test were used to separate treatment means when there was a significant difference at the P<0.05 level. All analyses were conducted using the statistical software package STATISTICA 10.0 (StatSoft Inc. USA) (Mead et al., 1996).

Results and discussion

The results showed significant increase in maize yield with inoculation treatments (Table 1). The best effect of inoculation was achived with mixture of strains (PS2 + Q7 + AC). The highest yield was obtained with hybrids NS 6010 and NS 6030 on all examined treatments in comparison with control. The highest increase in yield of maize was achieved with hybrid NS 6030 (32.2%). Statistically significant differences in comparison to the control were obtained on treatments with Q7 and PS2 + Q7 + AC.

Treatment	Hybrid	Yield (t ha ⁻¹)
Control	NS 3014	6.23 ^f
	NS 4015	6.77 ^{ef}
	NS 5043	6.82 ^{ef}
	NS 6010	7.38 ^{cde}
	NS 6030	6.89 ^{def}
Treatment 1: Pseudomonas PS ₂	NS 3014	6.32 ^f
	NS 4015	6.83 ^{ef}
	NS 5043	6.95 ^{def}
	NS 6010	7.56 ^{bcde}
	NS 6030	7.64 ^{bcde}
Treatment 2: <i>Bacillus</i> Q ₇	NS 3014	6.98 ^{def}
	NS 4015	7.48 ^{cde}
	NS 5043	7.85 ^{bcd}
	NS 6010	8.19 ^{abc}
	NS 6030	8.29 ^{abc}
Treatment 3: $PS_2 + Q_7 + AC$ Pseudomonas + Bacillus + Azotobacter	NS 3014	7.42 ^{cde}
	NS 4015	7.65 ^{bcde}
	NS 5043	8.13 ^{abc}
	NS 6010	8.49 ^{ab}
	NS 6030	9.11ª

Table 1. Effect of inoculation with PGPR on maize yield

Means with the same letter are not significantly different at the P = 0.05 level of significance

Co-inoculation (Azotobacter, Bacillus, Pseudomonas) had an advantage compared to single inoculation, which is similar in our results, while in case of single strains, better effects were achieved in Pseudomonas and Azotobacter treatments (Jarak et al., 2012). Hajnal-Jafari (2010) investigated the effect of co-inoculation of NS 640 maize hybrid on the grain yield and microbiological activity in the rhizosphere. The results obtained over the period of three years showed that the average grain yield amounted to when microbial inoculants were used, and that microbiological variants had a significant effect on the total number of microorganisms, number of aminoheterotrophs, free nitrogen-fixing bacteria and phosphorus-mobilizing bacteria. Mixture of biofertilizers, biostimulants and biopesticides (A. chroococcum, A. vinelandi, A. lipoferum, B. megaterium and B. subtilis) caused an increase in the yield of all three investigated maize hybrids (Govedarica et al., 2002). Results of Hamidi et al. (2009) revealed that co-inoculation with PGPR (A. chroococcum, A. lipoferum, A. brasilense and P. fluorescens) had the highest promoting

effect on phenology and grain yield of maize hybrids. The best results on dry matter accumulation and yield of maize hybrids were obtained by the plots which seeds were inoculated with Azotobacter bacteria compared with Azosprillium and *Azotobacter* Azosprillium priming (Sharifi et al., 2011). Findings of Umesha et al. (2014) have clearly combined showed that application of **Bacillus** Azotobacter chroococcum, megaterium and Pseudomonas fluorescens along with recommended dose of NPK and enriched compost has resulted in obtaining highest plant growth, crop yield and dry matter production of maize.

References

Asghar, H.N., Zahir, Z.A., Arshad, M., Khaliq, A. (2002). Releationship between *in vitro* production of auxins by rhizobacteria and their growth promoting activities in *Brassica juncea* L. Biol. Fert. Soils No. 35, pp. 231-237.

Bashan, Y., Holguin, G., de-Bashan, L.E. (2004). *Azospirillum*-plant relationships: physiological, molecular, agricultural, and

environmental advances (1997-2003). Can. J. Microbiol. No. 50, pp. 521-577.

Bashan, Y., Ream, Y., Levanony, H.L., Sade, A. (1989). Non-specific response in plant growth yields and root colonization of noncereal crop plants to inoculation with *Azospirillum brasilense* cd. Can. J. Bot. No. 67, pp. 1317-1324.

Biswas, J.C., Ladha J.K., Dazzo F.B. (2000). Rhizobia inoculation improves nutrient uptake and growth of lowland rice. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. No. 64, pp.1644–1650.

Cakmakci, R., Donmez, F., Aydin, A., Sahin F. (2006). Growth promotion of plants by plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria under greenhouse and two different field soil conditions. Soil Biol. Biochem. No. 38, pp. 1482-1487.

De Freitas, J.R., Germida, J.J. (1992). Growth promotion of winter wheat by fluorescent pseudomonads under growth chamber conditions. Soil Biol. Biochem. No. 24, pp. 1127-1135.

Đalović, I. (2014). More important morphological traits and the content of mineral elements in maize at the different levels of fertilization. Ph.D. Thesis. Faculty of Agriculture, University of Novi Sad.

Frommel, M.I., Nowak J., Lazarovits, G. (1993). Treatment of potato tubers with a growth promoting *Pseudomonas* sp.: Plant growth responses and bacterium distribution in the rhizosphere. Plant Soil No. 150, pp. 51-60.

Glick, B.R., Changping, L., Sibdas, G., Dumbroff, E.B. (1997). Early development of canola seedlings in the presence of the plant growth-promoting

rhizobacterium *Pseudomonas putida* GR12-2. Soil Biol. Biochem. No. 29, pp.1233-1239.

Govedarica, M., Milosević, N., Jarak, M., Đuric, S., Jeličić, Z., Kuzevski, J., Đorđević, S. 2002. Use of biofertilizers, biostimulators and biopesticides in agriculture production. Field Veg. Crop Res. No. 37, pp. 85-95.

Hajnal-Jafari, T. (2010). Effect of inoculation on the yield and microbial activity in soil under maize. PhD thesis. Faculty of Agriculture, University of Novi Sad.

Hamidi, A., Chaokan, R., Asgharzadeh, A., Dehghaoshoar, M., Ghalavand A., Malakouti, M.J. (2009). Effect of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) on phenology of late maturity maize (*Zea mays* L.) hybrids. Iranian J. Crop Sci. No. 11, pp. 249–270.

Jarak, M., Mrkovački, N., Bjelić, D., Jošić, D., Hajnal-Jafari, T., Stamenov, D. (2012). Effects of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria on maize in greenhouse and field trial. Afr. J. Microbiol. Res. No.6, pp. 5683–5690.

Jocković, Đ., Stojaković, M., Ivanović, M., Bekavac, G., Popov, R., Đalović, I. (2010). NS maize hybrids – today and tomorrow. Field Veg. Crop Res. No. 47, pp. 325–333.

Kloepper, J.W., Beauchamp, C.J. (1992). A review of issues related to measuring colonization of plant roots by bacteria. Can. J. Microbiol. No. 38, pp. 1219-1232.

Mead, R., Curnow, N.R., Hasted, M.A. (1996). Statistical methods in agriculturae and experimental biology, Chapman and Hall, London, pp. 415.

Sharifi, R.S., Khavazi, K., Gholipouri, A. (2011). Effect of seed priming with plant growth promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR) on dry matter accumulation and yield of maize (*Zea mays* L.) hybrids. J. Food Agr. Environ. No. 9, pp. 393–397.

Shaukat, K., Affrasayab, S., Hasnain, S. (2006). Growth responses of *Triticum aestivum* to plant growth promoting rhizobacteria used as a biofertilizer. Res. J. Microbiol. No. 1, pp. 330-338.

Umesha, S., Srikantaiah, M., Prasanna, K.S., Sreeramulu, K.R., Divya, M., Lakshmipathi, R.N. (2014). Comparative effect of organics and biofertilizers on growth and yield of maize (*Zea mays* L.). Curr. Agr. Res. J. No. 2, pp. 55-62.

http://faostat.fao.org