This is the accepted manuscript version of the contribution published as:

Aallam, Y., Dhiba, D., El Rasafi, T., Abbas, Y., Haddioui, A., Tarkka, M., Hamdali, H. (2023):
Assessment of two endemic rock phosphate solubilizing *Streptomyces* spp. on sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris* L.) growth under field conditions *Sci. Hortic.* **316**, art. 112033

The publisher's version is available at:

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2023.112033

- 1 Assessment of two endemic rock phosphate solubilizing Streptomyces spp. on sugar beet (Beta vulgaris L.)
- 2 growth under field conditions
- Yassine Aallam ^{a,b}. Driss Dhiba ^c. Taoufik El Rasafi ^a. Younes Abbas ^d. Abdelmajid Haddioui ^a. Mika Tarkka
 ^{e,f}. Hanane Hamdali ^{a,*}
- 5 ^a Laboratory of Agro-Industrial and Medical Biotechnologies, Faculty of Sciences and Technology University of
- 6 Sultan Moulay Slimane, B.P: 523 Beni-Mellal, Morocco. <u>yassine.aallam@gmail.com</u>; <u>elrasafi_taoufik@hotmail.com</u>;
- 7 <u>ahaddioui@yahoo.fr</u>; <u>hanane.hamdali@usms.ac.ma</u>
- 8 ^b Mohammed VI Polytechnic University, Department of Agrobiosciences, Laboratory of Plant-Microbe Interactions,
- 9 43150 Ben Guerir, Morocco
- ^c International Water Research Institute (IWRI), University Mohammed 6 Polytechnic (UM6P), Ben Guerir 43150,
- 11 Morocco. <u>driss.dhiba@um6p.ma;</u>
- 12 ^d Polydisciplinary Faculty of Beni Mellal, University of Sultan Moulay Slimane, Mghila B.P: 523, Beni-Mellal 23000,
- 13 Morocco. a.younes@usms.ma
- 14 e UFZ-Helmholtz-Centre for Environmental Research, Soil Ecology Department, Theodor-Lieser-Straße 4,
- 15 06120 Halle, Germany. <u>mika.tarkka@ufz.de</u>
- ¹⁶ ^f German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Deutscher Platz 5e, 04103 Leipzig,
- 17 Germany.
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- _**_**
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30 * Corresponding author
- 31 Prof. Hanane HAMDALI
- 32 University of Sultan Moulay Slimane, Faculty of Sciences and Technology, Laboratory of Agro-Industrial and
- 33 Medical Biotechnologies, P.O. 523, Beni-Mellal 23000, Morocco. Office phone: +212 5 23 48 52 12; Fax: + 212 5 23
- 34 48 52 01; Email: <u>hanane.hamdali@usms.ac.ma</u>

35 Abstract

- 36 Biocontrol agents and plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria represent promising tools to improve plant growth and
- 37 health as environmentally friendly biopesticides and fertilizers. *Streptomyces* bacteria are commonly used for
- 38 biocontrol, but have been poorly investigated for biofertilizer activity. In this study, we evaluated at field scale the
- 39 performance of rock phosphate (RP) solubilizing Streptomyces spp. (S. bellus (SB) and S. saprophyticus (SS) in
- 40 promoting the growth of sugar beet under RP fertilization. Inoculation of seeds with SB stimulated root elongation
- 41 and inoculation with SS enhanced shoot elongation. At the end of the trial, chlorophyll levels in the leaves were higher
- 42 with SS. The highest root yield was recorded with SS, and root diameter increased with both bacteria. The levels of
- 43 soil available phosphorus (P) and potassium (K) increased particularly with SB, but also with SS inoculation. In sum,
- 44 potassium and phosphate solubilizing and sugar beet growth promoting activities of SB and SS were lower in the field
- 45 than previously observed in the greenhouse. That the activities were present in the field speaks for improving the
- 46 formulation and optimizing the application strategy.
- 47
- 48 Keywords: Actinobacteria, Biofertilizer, Phosphate solubilizing microorganisms, PGPR.

49 1. Introduction

50 Most agricultural soils are a reservoir of P, but the phosphorus is not available to plants. It can be trapped by e.g. 51 calcium and magnesium in calcareous soils, immobilized by iron and aluminum in acidic soils, or present in organic 52 forms (C. Xiao et al., 2013). To support the P uptake of plants, readily available chemical fertilizers are mostly applied 53 to agricultural fields, but excessive application of fertilizers can lead to environmental problems such as negative 54 impacts on food chain (Anwar et al., 2016), eutrophication, or soil nutrient imbalance (Naik et al., 2019). Further 55 problems regarding P fertilization are that the global reserves of the raw product of phosphate mines, rock phosphate 56 (RP), are limited and may even be depleted by 2060 (Cordell et al., 2009), but also that a high extent of the applied 57 chemical P fertilizers is converted to insoluble forms that are then not available to plants (Alori et al., 2017; Ben Farhat 58 et al., 2015). Soil fertilization with RP can be considered as an alternative for chemical phosphate fertilizers. RP is 59 namely less expensive than chemical fertilizers and causes less problems to the environment (Xiao et al., 2011). Direct 60 application of RP is unfortunately only effective in acidic soils (Maharana et al., 2020) and its use in alkaline soils is 61 not effective without the assistance of phosphate solubilizing microorganisms (PSM) (Azaroual et al., 2020; Manzoor 62 et al., 2016; Moharana et al., 2018; C. Q. Xiao et al., 2013). Members of Actinobacteria do colonize rhizospheres and 63 plant roots, but they are not traditional PSMs. They are rather known for their abilities to produce antibiotics and serve 64 as biocontrol agents, and their resistance to extreme conditions such as prolonged drought (Ghorbani-Nasrabadi et al., 65 2013; Olanrewaju and Babalola, 2019; Trujillo et al., 2015). Some members of Actinobacteria do produce siderophores and fix nitrogen (Bousselham et al., 2022; Kakoi et al., 2014; Nafis et al., 2019). Other members of the 66 67 Phylum stimulate plant growth by synthetizing phytohormones, including cytokinins, gibberellins, and indole-acetic 68 acid (IAA) (Hamdali et al., 2008a; Lehr et al., 2008; Nafis et al., 2019) or by producing 1 aminocyclopropane-1-69 carboxylic acid deaminase (Gebauer et al., 2021). Some information exists on the performance of PSM Actinobacteria 70 (Hamdali et al., 2021, 2008b, 2008c, 2008a), but only few reports of their performance in the field. Wang et al. (2018) 71 showed that application of Streptomyces griseoplanus in combination with a P fertilizer increased soil available P 72 concentration and enhanced plant growth and enhanced grain yield of maize. Also by using maize, Dicko et al. (2018) 73 showed that inoculation with unclassified Actinobacteria led to higher shoot biomass and increased seed yield when 74 compared to the uninoculated control. Furthermore, a field trial using talcum powder formulation of led to higher 75 shoot length and shoot and root weights, total grain yield and weight of grains in rice plants (Tamreihao et al., 2016). 76 But, the potential of Actinobacteria in P solubilization from RP in a field setting, or their performance as a plant 77 growth promoting bacterium with other crops than maize or rice, have not yet been investigated.

78 To fill this knowledge gap, we investigated the performance of two endemic PSB Streptomycetes strains 79 (Aallam et al., 2021a) in a sugar beet field. Streptomyces bellus and S. saprophyticus strains were previously isolated 80 from sugar beet rhizosphere. They were selected for this field study, since they enhanced sugar beet growth and P 81 acquisition from RP in greenhouse experiments and protected sugar beet from *Fusarium* root rot (Aallam et al., 2021b). 82 To the best of our knowledge, only few studies with biofertilization of sugar beet by bacteria in field scale exist. These 83 include the reports on Bacillus (Cakmakçi et al., 2001, 1999; Sahin et al., 2004); Paenibacillus, Pseudomonas and 84 Rhodobacter (Çakmakçi et al., 2006), but no reports on biofertilization of sugar beet using Actinobacteria exist. This 85 study was carried out in order to evaluate the impact of soil amendment with natural rock phosphate and inoculation

- 86 of sugar beet seeds with either of the two *Streptomyces* spp. as phosphate biofertilizer and their effect on sugar beets
- growth and yield. Based on the performance of the bacteria in the greenhouse studies, their natural phosphate and
- 88 potassium solubilizing capacity, and the stronger stimulation of sugar beet growth by S. bellus than S. saprophyticus
- 89 (Aallam et al., 2022, 2021b, 2021a), this work was based on three hypotheses: i) both isolates stimulate sugar beet
- 90 shoot and root growth and ii) P and K availability in soil, but iii) S. bellus has a stronger impact than S. saprophyticus.
- 91 **2. Materials and Methods**

92 2.1. Description of study and sampling area

The field experiment was carried out in a non-fertilized private farm (32°28'54.9"N, 6°10'50.5"W) located at 25 km south of Beni Mellal region of Morocco in March 2020. The climate in this area is warm Mediterranean with a temperature ranging between 1.1 and 40°C and a mean annual rainfall generally between 350 and 650 mm/year (Barakat et al., 2019).

97 2.2. Physicochemical analysis of the studied site

98 The physicochemical properties of the soil are listed in Table S1. According to the FAO-UNESCO (1990) 99 classification, the soil is a calcareous calcisol with a low available P and K concentrations. Various characteristics 100 were measured using standards procedures; particle size distribution (NFX 31-107), pH and electrical conductivity (NF ISO 10390 and NF ISO 11265), CaCO₃ (NF EN ISO 10693), organic matter (OM) (NF ISO 14235), exchangeable 101 102 elements (NFX 31-108 and NF ISO 11263), oligo-elements (Cu, Fe, Mn, Zn) (NFX 31-121) and total N, P and K 103 (Kjeldahl and ICP-OES (Agilent 5110 150 ICP-OES, USA)). In general, the soil was silt sandy with 4.81% OM, 86.00 104 mg kg⁻¹ exchangeable P and 4933.00 mg kg⁻¹ total P. The molted rock phosphate used as a supplement is a calcium 105 hydroxyapatite constituted by O: 56.53%; F: 2.42%; Na: 1.81%; Mg: 1.94%; Al: 2.03%; P: 9.37%; S: 0.77%; Sn: 0.12%; Ca: 16.35%; Fe: 0.60% (Hamdali et al., 2008a). 106

107 **2.3. Inoculum preparation and seeds treatment**

108 Streptomyces bellus MW797036 (SB) and Streptomyces saprophyticus MW797316 (SS) isolated from Moroccan 109 sugar beet fields were previously selected for their multiple Potential Plant Growth (PGP) abilities (Aallam et al., 110 2021a, 2021b). The strains are available at the culture collection "Collections Coordonnées Marocaines de 111 Microorganismes (CCMM)" under the identification numbers CCMM B1328 (SB) and CCMM B1327 (SS). Spores 112 of each strain, stored in 20% sterile glycerol at 20 °C, were used to inoculate (at 10⁶ spores mL⁻¹) 50 ml cultures of 113 liquid Bennett medium (Jones, 1949) incubated in 250 ml Erlenmeyer flasks (x 4) for 3 days at 28 °C under constant agitation on a rotary shaker (180 g min⁻¹). The Streptomyces mycelium was centrifuged at $10,000 \times g$ for 10 min, 114 115 washed twice with phosphate buffer saline (PBS; pH 7.2, 10 mM K₂HPO₄-KH₂PO₄, 0.14 M NaCl), fragmented 116 through the needle of a sterile syringe and re-suspended in 40 mL of sterile deionised water. Twenty ml of the mycelial 117 suspension was added to 10 g of wet carboxymethylcellulose (CMC, Merck). This paste was mixed with seeds as 118 indicated later in this section. Four repetitions were conducted for each treatment and for each plot of the experiments. 119 Sugar beet (Beta vulgaris L.) seeds were harvested in October 2019, and obtained from COSUMAR, the

major Moroccan sugar manufacturer (www.cosumar.co.ma). Surface sterilization of the seeds was achieved by soaking the seeds in a solution of 0.4% sodium hypochlorite and 0.1% Tween 80 for 5 min. Subsequently, the seeds

- 122 were rinsed extensively with sterile deionized water and inoculated as described before. Each seed was coated by a
- thin layer of wet CMC, containing 10^6 colony forming units bacteria, as determined by plating on Bennett agar.

124 2.4. Sugar beet field trial

- The sugar beet field trial was conducted in a well-irrigated area during six consecutive months. Mineral and biofertilizer were applied in different treatments in a randomized complete block design (RCBD) on a plot size of 2
- 127 m x 10 m with four sub-plots with 6 m² (3m x 2m) in each area and spacing with 0.5 m x 2 m with four replicates (Fig.
- 128 S1). The distance between plants and rows were maintained at 20 cm and 40 cm, respectively. This measured area
- 129 contains 180 plants in each plot indicated in the supplementary material (Fig. S1). After sowing the plots were irrigated
- 130 immediately. Furthermore, all others practice such as irrigation, fertilization and herb control were made in the same
- 131 way of farmers in the region. Flood irrigation was applied twice a week and weed was controlled mechanically by
- 132 workers. After 30 days from sowing, plants were thinned to only one plant/hill.
- 133 The five treatments used in this study were:
- Treatment 1: Uninoculated Seeds in soil amended with NPK (nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium) as positive control (NPK)
- Treatment 2: Uninoculated Seeds in soil without NPK as negative control (N₀P₀K₀)
- Treatment 3: Coated sugar beet seeds with *S. saprophyticus* strain in soil amended with natural RP as sources
 of phosphorus, urea as source of nitrogen and potassium sulphate as source of potassium (SS)
- Treatment 4: Coated sugar beet seeds with *S. bellus* strain in soil amended with natural RP as sources of phosphorus, urea as source of nitrogen and potassium sulphate as source of potassium (SB)
- Treatment 5: Uninoculated seeds in soil amended with natural RP as sources of phosphorus, urea as source
 of nitrogen and potassium sulphate as source of potassium (RP)
- For NPK fertilization, Nitrogen was used in the form of urea (33% N) at rate of 300 kg ha⁻¹, two times at 6 leaf stage (2 months) and after 4 months of sowing. Phosphorus and potassium were applied in the form of phosphoric anhydride (23% P_2O_5) at rate 250 kg ha⁻¹ and in the form of potassium sulphate (50% K₂O) at rate of 250 kg ha⁻¹ respectively, the rock phosphate was applied at rat of 30kg/ha. One time at planting time.
- 147 2.5. Plant sampling and parameters analysis
- Agronomic parameters such as shoot length (from the plant base to the top of the first fully developed leaf), root length,
- dry matter and chlorophyll concentration as a measure of photosynthetic potential were measured at 30, 60, 90, 120,
- 150 and 180 days after sowing by sampling four plants per plot. After harvesting, the parts of the sugar beet plants
- 151 were dried in the oven at 70 °C to obtain a constant weight. The samples were dried, ground and sieved.
- At maturity (180 days from planting), 1 m x 1 m in area was harvested from each sub-plot to measure the following parameters: root yield (t ha⁻¹), shoot yield (t ha⁻¹), sucrose concentration (%) by handheld refractometer (Atago Co, Japan), and root diameter. Then, plant material (one plant/sub-plot) was dried to determine the accumulation of total nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium in roots and shoots. Soil samples from each sub-plot were collected and analyzed for N, P and K determination. Total nitrogen was analyzed using Kjeldahl method, available P according to NF ISO 11263 and available K according to NFX 31-108.
- 158 2.6. Statistical analysis

- 159 Root and shoot length and dry weight of roots and shoots were subjected to two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA)
- to determine the effect of both treatments and time. First, the data were transformed to obtain normal distribution.
- 161 Then, a one-way analysis was performed to compare the effect of different treatments on sucrose, shoot and root yield
- 162 and element concentrations in soil, root and shoot at end point. Significant differences between
- 163 means were compared using Duncan's tests at a 5%. All data were treated using SPSS software 20.0 package for
- 164 Windows.

165 **3. Results**

166 3.1. Effect of inoculation with Streptomyces bellus (SB) or S. saprophyticus (SS) on sugar beet growth

Sugar beet growth was followed for 6 months (M1-M6) with no nutrient addition ($N_0P_0K_0$), recommended nutrients 167 168 (NPK), rock phosphate (RP), and RP with seed inoculation with SB or SS (Fig. S1). The analysis of results by the 169 two-way ANOVA indicated significant effect on sugar beet shoot and root lengths by treatment and time (p < 0.05). 170 Shoot length was increased by SS in M5 and root length by M4 and M5 by SB. As expected, the plant growth 171 parameters were at their lowest levels in the non-supplemented soil $N_0P_0K_0$, and compared to that, higher and 172 comparable between RP and NPK fertilization (Fig. 1). Shoot and root biomass was largely unaffected from the 173 treatments. During M4, SB had a negative influence on shoot biomass, and root biomass was at its highest with N₀P₀K₀ 174 (Fig. 2).

175 3.2. Effects of Streptomyces spp. on plant physiological parameters

176 The influence of *Streptomyces* spp. on chlorophyll a, chlorophyll b and carotenoid concentrations are presented in Fig.

177 3. Higher chlorophyll a levels were recorded with SS during M3, and chlorophyll b levels again with SS during M6.

By contrast, carotenoid levels were not affected by the bacteria. The effects of fertilizer applications were context

dependent. For instance, higher chlorophyll a and carotenoid levels were recorded for NPK than RP during M5, but

180 not during other months.

181 3.3. Effects of the Streptomyces spp. on N, P and K concentrations of sugar beet plants at harvest

182 Shoot N concentration (Fig. 4) was highest in SS. Surprisingly, the levels of N in shoots were at their lowest with SB.

183 Root N concentrations were lower with SB or SS, close to the values in $N_0P_0K_0$. The two bacteria did not affect shoot

184 or root P concentrations (Fig. 4). In shoots, lowest P concentrations were recorded in N₀P₀K₀ and NPK, and in roots,

185 the only significant difference was between SB (higher) and $N_0P_0K_0$ (lower). The bacteria had contrasting effects on

- 186 shoot and root K concentrations (Fig. 4). For shoots, K concentrations were lower with SB or SS than in RP. Apart
- from that, very low values were detected for $N_0P_0K_0$ and NPK. For roots, K concentration increased with SS.

188 3.4. Effect of Streptomyces spp. inoculation on sugar beet yield at harvest

- 189 Shoot yield at harvest was not affected by the streptomycetes, and it was comparable between RP and NPK (Fig. 5).
- 190 Root yield increased with SS and reached a comparable value with SS to that in NPK (Fig. 5). Root diameter increased
- 191 by the inoculation with SB and with SS, and the values were comparable to that in NPK. The growth parameters at
- harvest were consistently lower in $N_0P_0K_0$ than in other treatments.

193 **3.5.** Effect of Streptomyces spp. on sugar beet sucrose concentration

- 194 The only significant differences between the sugar beet sucrose concentrations were the higher value with SB than
- with $N_0P_0K_0$ or NPK (Fig. 6). Treatment with SB showed the highest sucrose concentration of 16.6 % of fresh
- 196 weight, and the values for SS and RP were similar, 15.7 % and 15.6 %, respectively.

197 **3.6.** Effect of Streptomyces spp. on N, P and K concentrations of the soil

198 At harvest, we also investigated how the bacterial inoculation affected soil total N, and available P and K levels (Table

- 199 1). Both S. bellus and S. saprophyticus increased the total concentration of available P and K in soil, and the effect of
- 200 SB was higher than that of SS. The concentrations of available P and K were at their lowest in N₀P₀K₀, available P
- 201 was lower in RP than in NPK, and available K vice versa.

202 4. Discussion

- 203 Based on the performance of two endemic Streptomyces isolates in vitro and by greenhouse studies, showing mineral 204 phosphate solubilizing, sugar beet growth promoting and disease suppressing activities (Aallam et al. 2021a, b), we 205 conducted a field experiment to see if this benefit is maintained outside the laboratory. Results showed, that root yield 206 increased with S. saprophyticus (SS), reaching a comparable value with SS to that in NPK fertilization. Furthermore, 207 both SS and SB treatments led to an increased sugar beet root diameter. This is to our knowledge the first field scale 208 report on a PGPR Streptomyces strain promoting sugar beet yield, and it supports the findings with other plant species 209 suggesting that plant associated Actinobacteria provide plant beneficial traits (Goudjal et al., 2013; Nafis et al., 2019; 210 Olanrewaju and Babalola, 2019; Worsley et al., 2020). The concentrations of available P and K in soil were increased 211 by the treatment with SB and SS, supporting the view that searching for rhizosphere microorganisms that solubilize 212 minerals in vitro and in vivo is a promising screening strategy to obtain PGPR (Gondal et al. 2021; Miransari 2011; 213 Wang et al. 2021). Our earlier in vitro and greenhouse experiments indicated that a treatment with SB has a stronger 214 positive influence on P and K availability in soil and uptake by plants than with SS, and that SB has a higher capacity 215 to produce indole acetic acid (IAA) and stimulate sugar beet growth than SS (Aallam et al., 2021a, 2021b). Whereas 216 the positive influence on available P and K in the soil was confirmed in the field, only SS significantly improved sugar 217 beet production. These observations provide further evidence that although results from in vitro assays and greenhouse 218 experiments can be promising, they have to be further elaborated in the field scale (Aallam et al., 2022).
- The inoculation of sugar beet seeds had only a minor impact on sugar beet seedlings: increased shoot length by SS during the fifth month and increased root length by SB during the fourth and fifth month (Fig. 1). This observation supports only in part our first hypothesis, that stated a higher growth rate of plants with bacterial inoculation. The positive influence on roots and shoot elongation is in agreement with the earlier results of Mohamed and El Sebai (2019) using *Burkholderia* sp., *Bacillus* sp. and *Acinetobacter* sp. isolates with sugar beet. Apart from

224 the positive influence of SS on sugar beet yield, shoot or root biomass were not affected by SB or SS. In contrast, 225 numerous works have reported that microorganisms stimulate plant growth when RP is added to the soil. Examples 226 include wheat inoculated with Enterobacter aerogenes, Bacillus megaterium and B. safensis (Mukhtar et al., 2017), 227 maize and wheat with Pantoea cypripedii and Pseudomonas plecoglossicida (Kaur and Reddy, 2015), tomato with 228 Paenibacillus polymyxa and B. megaterium (Elyazied and Abou-aly, 2011), but also sunchoke with Klebsiella 229 variicola strain also increased its dry matter after application of RP as insoluble P source under field conditions 230 (Nacoon et al., 2021): in the presence of RP, a seed inoculation with these bacteria promoted root and shoot growth 231 under field conditions. What was not evaluated in this study, was the contribution of P release from organic sources. 232 Streptomycetes are also known for their role in mineral acquisition through phytase activity (Puppala et al., 2019) and 233 phytase production by PSMs is considered to be an important factor in the biofertilization process (Rasul et al., 2021). 234 The chlorophyll concentration of sugar beet leaves, indicative of improved nitrogen acquisition, was enhanced only 235 by SS and at a certain stage of growth. Higher chlorophyll level was recorded during the third month and chlorophyll 236 b levels at harvest. These results are consistent in part with those observed in sugarcane by Chauhan et al. (2013), who 237 showed that the inoculation by Gluconacetobacter and Azospirillum spp. under field conditions increased chlorophyll 238 concentrations of sugarcane leaves.

239 Availability of P and K in soil was increased by both bacteria, especially by SB (Fig. 7). This result is in line 240 with the second hypothesis, which suggested better soil availability of P and K in the presence of the bacteria, as well 241 as the third hypothesis, stating that SB has a stronger effect than SS. One would expect that the mobilization of P and 242 K by these strains leads, in the absence of increased plant biomass, to higher P and K concentrations in the plants, but 243 this was not observed. Instead, treatment by the two bacteria had no effect on P concentrations, induced lower shoot 244 K concentrations, and only in the roots with SS inoculation an increased K concentration. The negligible effect on P 245 uptake may be due to the calcareous nature of the field soil, alike what was reported by Shaheen et al. (2021) where 246 P is strongly associated to the mineral under a higher pH: surface adsorption and precipitation lower the P availability 247 and mobility in calcareous soils (Pizzeghello et al., 2011), and even by stimulating soil P and K availability, the 248 influence of the bacteria may not have been sufficient for stimulating plant mineral nutrient uptake. In support to our 249 results, Pseudomonas fluorescens and P. chlororaphis treatments of sugar beet grown on calcareous soil did not 250 increase plant K levels (Sacristán-Pérez-Minayo et al., 2020). Our earlier greenhouse study indicated that SB and SS 251 stimulate plant P and K levels especially when both RP and K mineral are applied (Aallam et al., 2022, 2021a). This 252 raises the question whether RP amendment should be coupled with the application of orthoclase or another K mineral, 253 to support the functionality of SB and SS.

Sugar beet yield was enhanced by SS and sugar beet diameter by both bacteria (Fig. 3) but sugar beet sucrose content did not change significantly (Fig. 4). By contrast, treatments by N-fixing and/or P-solubilizing *Paenibacillus polymyxa*, *Pseudomonas putida* and *Rhodobacter capsulatus* (Çakmakçi et al., 2006, 2001) in field conditions stimulated sugar beet sucrose concentrations, as well as the inoculation of sugarcane with the PSB *B. megatherium* (Sundara et al., 2002). In addition, it was found that 50% of the costly super phosphate could be replaced by RP when applied in conjunction with the PSB *B. megatherium*. The effects of SB and SS on sugar beet N concentration were mostly negative (Fig. 7). This is unfortunate, since the elevation in N levels stimulates the growth of plants and the uptake and utilization of P and K (Leilah and Khan, 2021). For instance, the inoculation of *Pseudomonas* spp. with RP increased not only P but also N concentrations of shoots and roots of wheat plants, suggesting a synergistic link between improved N and P nutrition (Elhaissoufi et al., 2020). That suggests that a combination of N fixing or N uptake facilitating bacteria with SB and SS should be tested in the field.

265 In greenhouse studies, we observed biocontrol activity of S. bellus and S. saprophyticus against Fusarium 266 spp., causal agents of rot root disease in sugar beet plants (Aallam et al., 2022). Since the control plants of this field 267 experiment were not affected by root pathogens, we could not estimate the biocontrol potential in the field. This would 268 be important, as successful field trials with biocontrol Actinobacteria have been rare (Ebrahimi-Zarandi et al., 2022). 269 Applications of phosphate solubilizing bacteria can influence the bacterial community of inoculated soil, which may 270 affect the response of the plants to the inoculant. For instance, Chouyia et al. (2020) showed that inoculation with S. 271 roseocinereus TOR3209 stimulated the density of total prokaryotes and total Actinobacteria in the rhizosphere. 272 TOR3209 inoculation led to higher tomato biomass and fruit yield but also increased the relative abundances of 273 families Flavobacteriaceae, Sphingobacteriaceae, Polyangiaceae and Enterobacteriaceae in tomato rhizosphere. In 274 a pot experiment with TOR3209 and a Bacillus velezensis isolate from tomato rhizosphere the strains jointly promoted 275 tomato production, but during this process, the abundance of inoculated TOR3209 strongly decreased in the 276 rhizosphere (Hu et al., 2020).

277

278 **5. Conclusions**

In conclusion, *Streptomyces bellus* and *S. saprophyticus* strains promoted P and K availability in the soil and *S. saprophyticus* sugar beet yield. Based on our field results, we anticipate that *S. saprophyticus* could be used as an ecological and sustainable bio-fertilizer for sugar beet agriculture. According to literature Gram positive bacteria are adequate for coating the seeds due to their thick peptidoglycan cell wall. Another field site and at least two seasons need to be investigated to test how robust the isolates are in the field. Finally, quantitation of the PSMs during the field experiment and evaluating the changes in rhizosphere community composition and suppression of soil borne pathogens would give valuable details on the mechanisms behind sugar beet growth promotion.

- 287 **Disclosure statement.**
- 288 The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

289 Funding details: This work was supported by the University of Sultan Moulay Slimane fees granted for

290 laboratories.

291 Acknowledgments.

292 We acknowledge University Mohammed VI Polytechnic (UM6P), Ben Guerir, Morocco, for all nutrients analysis.

293 References

Aallam, Y., Dhiba, D., El Rasafi, T., Lemriss, S., Haddioui, A., Tarkka, M., Hamdali, H., 2022. Growth promotion

- and protection against root rot of sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris* L.) by two rock phosphate and potassium solubilizing
 Streptomyces spp. under greenhouse conditions. Plant Soil. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-021-05252-w
- 297 Aallam, Y., Dhiba, D., Lemriss, S., Souiri, A., Karray, F., Rasafi, T. El, Saïdi, N., Haddioui, A., El Kabbaj, S., Virolle,
- 298M.J., Hamdali, H., 2021a. Isolation and characterization of phosphate solubilizing streptomyces sp. Endemic299from sugar beet fields of the beni-mellal region in morocco. Microorganisms 9, 1–15.
- 300 https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms9050914
- 301 Aallam, Y., El Maliki, B., Dhiba, D., Lemriss, S., Souiri, A., Haddioui, A., Tarkka, M., Hamdali, H., 2021b. Multiple 302 potential plant growth promotion activities of endemic Streptomyces spp. From Moroccan sugar beet fields with 303 inhibitory Microorganisms 9. their activities against Fusarium spp. 1 - 15.304 https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms9071429
- Alori, E.T., Glick, B.R., Babalola, O.O., 2017. Microbial Phosphorus Solubilization and Its Potential for Use in
 Sustainable Agriculture. Front. Microbiol. 8, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2017.00971
- Anwar, S., Ali, B., Sajid, I., 2016. Screening of Rhizospheric Actinomycetes for Various In-vitro and In-vivo Plant
 Growth Promoting (PGP) Traits and for Agroactive Compounds. Front. Microbiol. 7, 1–11.
 https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.01334
- Azaroual, S.E., Hazzoumi, Z., El Mernissi, N., Aasfar, A., Kadmiri, M.I., Bouizgarne, B., 2020. Role of Inorganic
 Phosphate Solubilizing Bacilli Isolated from Moroccan Phosphate Rock Mine and Rhizosphere Soils in Wheat
 (*Triticum aestivum* L) Phosphorus Uptake. Curr. Microbiol. 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00284-020-02046-8
- Barakat, A., Ennaji, W., Krimissa, S., Bouzaid, M., 2019. Heavy metal contamination and ecological-health risk
 evaluation in peri-urban wastewater-irrigated soils of Beni-Mellal city (Morocco). Int. J. Environ. Health Res.
- 315 00, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/09603123.2019.1595540
- Ben Farhat, M., Boukhris, I., Chouayekh, H., 2015. Mineral phosphate solubilization by Streptomyces sp. CTM396
 involves the excretion of gluconic acid and is stimulated by humic acids. FEMS Microbiol. Lett. 362, 1–8.
 https://doi.org/10.1093/femsle/fnv008
- Bousselham, M., Lemriss, S., Dhiba, D., Aallam, Y., Souiri, A., Abbas, Y., 2022. Streptomycetaceae and
 Promicromonosporaceae : Two Actinomycetes Families from Moroccan Oat Soils Enhancing Solubilization of
 Net and Physical Microscopic and the Micr
- 321 Natural Phosphate. Microorganisms 10, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms10061116
- Çakmakçi, R., Donmez, F., Aydın, A., Sahin, F., 2006. Growth promotion of plants by plant growth-promoting
 rhizobacteria under greenhouse and two different field soil conditions. Soil Biol. Biochem. 38, 1482–1487.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2005.09.019
- Çakmakçi, R., Kantar, F., Algur, O.F., 1999. Sugar beet and Barley Yields in Relation to Bacillus polymyxa and
 Bacillus megaterium var . phosphaticum Inoculation. J. Plant Nutr. Soil Sci. 162, 437–442.
- 327 Çakmakçi, R., Kantar, F., Sahin, F., 2001. Effect of N 2 -fixing bacterial inoculations on yield of sugar beet and barley.
 328 J. Plant Nutr. 164, 527–531.
- Chauhan, H., Bagyara, D.J., Sharma, A., 2013. Plants Growth-promoting bacterial endophytes from sugarcabe and
 Thier ptential in promoting growth of the host under field conditions. Exp. Agric. 49, 43–52.
 https://doi.org/10.1017/S0014479712001019

- Chouyia, F.E., Romano, I., Fechtali, T., Fagnano, M., Fiorentino, N., Visconti, D., Idbella, M., Ventorino, V., Pepe,
 O., 2020. P-solubilizing streptomyces roseocinereus ms1b15 with multiple plant growth-promoting traits
 enhance barley development and regulate rhizosphere microbial population. Front. Plant Sci. 11, 1–10.
 https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.01137
- Cordell, D., Drangert, J., White, S., 2009. The story of phosphorus : Global food security and food for thought. Glob.
 Environ. Chang. 19, 292–305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2008.10.009
- Dicko, A.H., Babana, A.H., Kassogué, A., Fané, R., Nantoumé, D., Ouattara, D., Maiga, K., Dao, S., 2018. A Malian
 native plant growth promoting Actinomycetes based biofertilizer improves maize growth and yield. Symbiosis
 75, 267–275. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13199-018-0555-2
- Ebrahimi-Zarandi, M., Saberi Riseh, R., Tarkka, M.T., 2022. Actinobacteria as Effective Biocontrol Agents against
 Plant Pathogens, an Overview on Their Role in Eliciting Plant Defense. Microorganisms 10, 1–15.
 https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms10091739
- 344 Elhaissoufi, W., Khourchi, S., Ibnyasser, A., Ghoulam, C., Rchiad, Z., Zeroual, Y., Lyamlouli, K., Bargaz, A., 2020. Phosphate Solubilizing Rhizobacteria Could Have a Stronger Influence on Wheat Root Traits and Aboveground 345 346 Physiology Than Rhizosphere Ρ Solubilization. Front. Plant Sci. 11, 1 - 15.347 https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.00979
- Elyazied, A.A., Abou-aly, H., 2011. Enhancing Growth, Productivity and Quality of Tomato Plants Using Phosphate
 Solubilizing Microorganisms. Aust. J. Basic Appl. Sci. 5, 371–379.
- 350 Gebauer, L., Bouffaud, M., Ganther, M., Yim, B., Vetterlein, D., Smalla, K., Buscot, F., Heintz-buschart, A., Tarkka, 351 M.T., 2021. Soil Texture, Sampling Depth and Root Hairs Shape the Structure of ACC Deaminase Bacterial 352 Community Composition in Maize Rhizosphere. Front. Microbiol. 12, 1 - 12.353 https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2021.616828
- Ghorbani-Nasrabadi, R., Greiner, R., Alikhani, H.A., Hamedi, J., Yakhchali, B., 2013. Distribution of actinomycetes
 in different soil ecosystems and effect of media composition on extracellular phosphatase activity. J. Soil Sci.
 Plant Nutr. 13, 223–236.
- Gondal, A.H., Hussain, I., Ijaz, A.B., Zafar, A., Ch, B.I., Zafar, H., Sohail, M.D., Niazi, H., Touseef, M., Khan, A.A.,
 Tariq, M., Yousuf, H., Usama, M., 2021. Influence of Soil Ph and Microbes on Mineral Solubility and Plant
 Nutrition : A Review. Int. J. Agric. Biol. Sci. 71–81.
- Goudjal, Y., Toumatia, O., Yekkour, A., Sabaou, N., Mathieu, F., Zitouni, A., 2013. Biocontrol of *Rhizoctonia solani* damping-off and promotion of tomato plant growth by endophytic actinomycetes isolated from native plants of
 Algerian Sahara. Microbiol. Res. 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2013.06.014
- Hamdali, H., Bouizgarne, B., Hafidi, M., Lebrihi, A., Virolle, M.J., Ouhdouch, Y., 2008a. Screening for rock
 phosphate solubilizing Actinomycetes from Moroccan phosphate mines. Appl. soil Ecol. 38, 12–19.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2007.08.007
- Hamdali, H., Hafidi, M., Virolle, M.J., Ouhdouch, Y., 2008b. Growth promotion and protection against damping-off
 of wheat by two rock phosphate solubilizing actinomycetes in a P-deficient soil under greenhouse conditions.
 Appl. Soil Ecol. 40, 510–517. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2008.08.001

- Hamdali, H., Hafidi, M., Virolle, M.J., Ouhdouch, Y., 2008c. Rock phosphate-solubilizing Actinomycetes : screening
 for plant growth-promoting activities. World J Microbiol Biotechnol 24, 2565–2575.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11274-008-9817-0
- 372 Hamdali, H., Lebrihi, A., Monje, M.C., Benharref, A., Hafidi, M., Ouhdouch, Y., Virolle, M.J., 2021. A Molecule of 373 the Viridomycin Family Originating from a Streptomyces griseus -Related Strain Has the Ability to Solubilize 374 1–9. Rock Phosphate and to Inhibit Microbial Growth. antibiotics 10. 375 https://doi.org/10.3390/antibiotics10010072
- Hu, D., Li, S., Li, Y., Peng, J., Wei, X., Ma, J., Zhang, C., Jia, N., Wang, E., Wang, Z., 2020. *Streptomyces* sp. strain
 TOR3209: a rhizosphere bacterium promoting growth of tomato by affecting the rhizosphere microbial
 community. Sci. Rep. 10, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-76887-5
- Jones, K.L., 1949. Fresh Isolates Of Actinomycets in Which the Presence of Sporogenous Aerial Mycelia Is a
 Fluctuation Characteristic. J. Bacteriol. 57, 141–145.
- Kakoi, K., Yamaura, M., Kamiharai, T., Tamari, D., Abe, M., Uchiumi, T., Kucho, K.-I., 2014. Isolation of Mutants
 of the Nitrogen-Fixing Actinomycete Frankia. Microbes Environ. 29, 31–37.
 https://doi.org/10.1264/jsme2.ME13126
- Kaur, G., Reddy, M.S., 2015. Effects of phosphate-solubilizing bacteria, rock phosphate and chemical fertilizers on
 maize-wheat cropping cycle and economics. Pedosphere 25, 428–437. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1002 0160(15)30010-2
- Lehr, N., Schrey, S.D., Hampp, R., Tarkka, M.T., 2008. Root inoculation with a forest soil streptomycete leads to
 locally and systemically increased resistance against phytopathogens in Norway spruce. New Phytol. 177, 965–
 976. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2007.02322.x
- Leilah, A.A.A., Khan, N., 2021. Interactive Effects of Gibberellic Acid and Nitrogen Fertilization on the Growth ,
 Yield , and Quality of Sugar Beet. agronomy 11, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy 11010137
- Maharana, R., Basu, A., Dhal, N.K., Adak, T., 2020. Biosolubilization of rock phosphate by Pleurotus ostreatus with
 brewery sludge and its effect on the growth of maize (*Zea mays* L .). J. Plant Nutr. 1–16.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/01904167.2020.1822397
- 395 Manzoor, M., Abbasi, M.K., Sultan, T., 2016. Isolation of Phosphate Solubilizing Bacteria from Maize Rhizosphere 396 and Their Potential for Rock Growth Promotion. Geomicrobiol. J. ISSN 0451. 397 https://doi.org/10.1080/01490451.2016.1146373
- Miransari, M., 2011. Soil microbes and plant fertilization. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 92, 875–885.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-011-3521-y
- Mohamed, H., El Sebai, T.N., 2019. Effect of Bio-stimilant (Phosphate Solubilizing Microorganims) on Yield and
 Quality of Some Sugar Beet Varieties. Egypt. J. Appl. Sci 34, 114–129.
- Moharana, P.C., Meena, M.D., Biswas, D.R., 2018. Role of Phosphate-Solubilizing Microbes in the Enhancement of
 Fertilizer Value of Rock Phosphate Through Composting Technology, in: Meena, S. V (Ed.), Role of
 Rhizospheric Microbes in Soil. Springer, pp. 167–202. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-0044-8
- 405 Mukhtar, S., Shahid, I., Mehnaz, S., Malik, K.A., 2017. Assessment of two carrier materials for phosphate solubilizing

- 406 biofertilizers and their effect on growth of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Microbiol. Res. 205, 107–117.
 407 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2017.08.011
- Nacoon, S., Jogloy, S., Riddech, N., Mongkolthanaruk, W., Ekprasert, J., Cooper, J., Boonlue, S., 2021. Combination
 of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and phosphate solubilizing bacteria on growth and production of Helianthus
 tuberosus under field condition. Sci. Rep. 11, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-86042-3
- 411 Nafis, A., Raklami, A., Bechtaoui, N., Khalloufi, F. El, El Alaoui, A., Glick, B. r, Hafidi, M., Kouisni, L., Ouhdouch,
- Y., Hassani, L., 2019. Actinobacteria from Extreme Niches in Morocco and Their Plant Growth-Promoting
 Potentials. diversity 11, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.3390/d11080139
- Naik, K., Mishra, S., Srichandan, H., Singh, K.P., Sarangi, P.K., 2019. Biocatalysis and Agricultural Biotechnology
 Plant growth promoting microbes : Potential link to sustainable agriculture and environment. Biocatal. Agric.
 Biotechnol. 21, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bcab.2019.101326
- Olanrewaju, O.S., Babalola, O.O., 2019. *Streptomyces* : implications and interactions in plant growth promotion. Appl.
 Microbiol. Biotechnol. 103, 1179–1188. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-018-09577-y
- Pizzeghello, D., Berti, A., Nardi, S., Morari, F., 2011. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment Phosphorus forms
 and P-sorption properties in three alkaline soils after long-term mineral and manure applications in north-eastern
 Italy. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 141, 58–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2011.02.011
- Puppala, R.K., Bhavsar, K., Sonalkar, V., Khire, J.M., 2019. Characterization of Novel Acidic and Thermostable
 Phytase Secreting *Streptomyces* sp. (NCIM 5533) for Plant Growth Promoting Characteristics. Biocatal. Agric.
 Biotechnol. 18, 101020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bcab.2019.101020
- Rasul, M., Yasmin, S., Yahya, M., Breitkreuz, C., Tarkka, M., Reitz, T., 2021. The Wheat Growth-promoting Traits
 of *Ochrobactrum* and *Pantoea* Species, Responsible for Solubilization of Different P Sources, are Ensured by
 Genes Encoding Enzymes of Multiple P-releasing Pathways. Microbiol. Res. 246, 126703.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2021.126703
- Sacristán-pérez-minayo, G., López-robles, D.J., Rad, C., Miranda-barroso, L., Sacristán-pérez-minayo, G., 2020.
 Microbial Inoculation for Productivity Improvements and Potential Biological Control in Sugar Beet Crops.
 Front. Plant Sci. 11, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.604898
- Sahin, F., Çakmakçi, R., Kantar, F., 2004. Sugar beet and barley yields in relation to inoculation with N2-fixing and
 phosphate solubilizing bacteria. Plant Soil 265, 123–129.
- Shaheen, S.M., Wang, J., Baumann, K., Wang, S.L., Leinweber, P., Rinklebe, J., 2021. Redox-induced mobilization
 of phosphorus in groundwater affected arable soil profiles. Chemosphere 275.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2021.129928
- 437 Sundara, B., Natarajan, V., Hari, K., 2002. Influence of phosphorus solubilizing bacteria on the changes in soil
 438 available phosphorus and sugarcane and sugar yields. F. Crop. Res. J. 77, 43–49.
- Tamreihao, K., Ningthoujam, D.S., Nimaichand, S., Singh, E.S., Reena, P., Singh, S.H., Nongthomba, U., 2016.
 Biocontrol and plant growth promoting activities of a *Streptomyces corchorusii* strain UCR3-16 and preparation
- of powder formulation for application as biofertilizer agents for rice plant. Microbiol. Res. 192, 260–270.
- 442 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2016.08.005

- Trujillo, M.E., Riesco, R., Benito, P., Carro, L., 2015. Endophytic Actinobacteria and the Interaction of
 Micromonospora and Nitrogen Fixing Plants. Front. Microbiol. 6, 1–15.
 https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2015.01341
- Wang, C., Cui, J., Yang, L., Zhao, C., Wang, T., Yan, L., Liu, S., 2018. Phosphorus-release dynamics by phosphate
 solubilizing actinomycetes and its enhancement of growth and yields in maize. Int. J. Agric. Biol. 20, 437–444.
 https://doi.org/10.17957/IJAB/15.0554
- Wang, C., Wang, H., Li, Y., Li, Q., Yan, W., Zhang, Y., 2021. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria isolation from
 rhizosphere of submerged macrophytes and their growth-promoting effect on *Vallisneria natans* under high
 sediment organic matter load. Microb. Biotechnol. https://doi.org/10.1111/1751-7915.13756
- Worsley, S.F., Newitt, J., Rassbach, J., Batey, S.F.D., Holmes, N.A., Murrell, J.C., Wilkinson, B., Hutchings, M.I.,
 2020. *Streptomyces* Endophytes Promote Host Health and Enhance Growth across Plant Species. Appl. Environ.
 Microbiol. 86, 1–17.
- Xiao, C., Chi, R., Li, X., Xia, M., Xia, Z., 2011. Biosolubilization of Rock Phosphate by Three Stress-Tolerant Fungal
 Strains. Appl. Biochem. Biotechnol. 165, 719–727. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12010-011-9290-3
- Xiao, C., Chi, R., Pan, X., Liu, F., He, J., 2013. Rock phosphate solubilization by four yeast strains. Ann. microbiol
 63, 173–178. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13213-012-0458-z
- Xiao, C.Q., Chi, R.A., Fang, Y.J., 2013. Effects of *Acidiphilium cryptum* on biosolubilization of rock phosphate in the
 presence of *Acidithiobacillus ferrooxidans*. Trans. Nonferrous Met. Soc. China 23, 2153–2159.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/S1003-6326(13)62711-9
- 462
- 463

465	Table 1 . Soil N, P and K concentrations after 6 months sugar beet growth in field conditions. RP: sugar beet with rock
466	phosphate; SB: sugar beet seeds inoculated by S. bellus (SB) with RP; SS: sugar beet seeds inoculated with S.
467	saprophyticus (SS) with RP, $N_0P_0K_0$: negative control; NPK: positive control. Values are mean of three samples \pm
468	SD.

			469
	Total	Available 470	
	Ν	Р	K
	%	L	mg kg ⁻¹ 471
SB	$0.15\pm0.02a$	$89.33 \pm 3.05a$	$586.33 \pm 2.08a$
SS	$0.11 \pm 0.02 b$	$79.17 \pm 0.76 b$	$391.00 \pm 2.65b$
RP	$0.15\pm0.01a$	$61.33 \pm 1.16 d$	$384.67 \pm 1.53c$
$N_0P_0K_0$	$0.06\pm0.01c$	$55.00\pm2.65e$	$295.67 \pm 1.53e$
NPK	$0.15\pm0.02a$	$74.67\pm2.08c$	476 358.33 ± 2.52d 477



479 480

Fig. 1 Shoot and root lengths (cm) of sugar sugar beet during 6 months. SB: Soil inoculated with *Streptomyces bellus* in the presence of RP; SS: Soil inoculated with *S. saprophyticus* (SS) in the presence of RP; N₀P₀K₀: negative control; NPK: positive control and RP: Rock phosphate without inoculation. Values are means of four replicates and errors bars represent standard deviation. Different lowercase letters above bars shows significant differences between treatments according to ANOVA ($p \le 0.05$). M1-M6, the month of measurement. Note that in each month, 4 sugar beet plants were harvested and used for the analyses.



Fig. 2 Sugar beet shoot and root biomass (dry weight) during 6 months. SB: Soil inoculated with *Streptomyces bellus* in the presence of RP; SS: Soil inoculated with *S. saprophyticus* (SS) in the presence of RP; N₀P₀K₀: negative control; NPK: positive control and RP: Rock phosphate without inoculation. Values are means of four replicates and errors bars represent standard deviation. Different lowercase letters above bars shows significant differences between treatments according to ANOVA ($p \le 0.05$). M1-M6, the month of measurement. Note that in each month, 4 sugar beet plants were harvested and used for the analyses.

495

496



Fig. 3 Effects of *Streptomyces* inoculation on plant chlorophyll a, chlorophyll b and relative carotenoid content. SB: Soil inoculated with *Streptomyces bellus* in the presence of RP; SS: Soil inoculated with *S. saprophyticus* (SS) in the presence of RP; N₀P₀K₀: negative control; NPK: positive control and RP: Rock phosphate without inoculation. Values are mean of four replicates and error bars represent standard deviation. Different letters above the bars show significant differences between treatments within $p \le 0.05$. M1-M6, the month of measurement. Note that in each month, 4 sugar beet plants were harvested and used for the analyses.



Fig. 4 Effects of *Streptomyces* inoculation on leaf relative water content (RWC). SB: Soil inoculated with
 Streptomyces bellus in the presence of RP; SS: Soil inoculated with *S. saprophyticus* (SS) in the presence of RP;
 N₀P₀K₀: negative control; NPK: positive control and RP: Rock phosphate without inoculation. Values are mean of
 four replicates and error bars represent standard deviation. M1-M6, the month of measurement. Note that in each

511 month, 4 sugar beet plants were harvested and used for the analyses.



Fig. 5 Estimation of N, P and K in sugar beet shoots and roots. Inoculations with *S. bellus* (SB) or *S. saprophyticus* (SS) in presence of rock phosphate (RP). $N_0P_0K_0$: negative control; NPK: positive control and RP: Rock phosphate without inoculation. Boxplots represent four replicates after 6 months of cultivation (equils to M6 of earlier figures). Different lowercase letters above bars shows significant differences between treatments within $p \le 0.05$

518



Fig. 6 Growth parameters of sugar beet plants. Shoots yield, Roots yield and root diameter of sugar beet plants without bacterial inoculation or with *S. bellus* (SB) or *S. saprophyticus* (SS), and in the presence of rock phosphate (RP) as P source. N₀P₀K₀: negative control; NPK: positive control and RP: Rock phosphate without inoculation. Boxplots represent four replicates after 6 months of cultivation. Different lowercase letters above bars shows significant differences between treatments within $p \le 0.05$.



Fig. 7 Sucrose concentration in sugar beet plants. Inoculations with *s. bellus* (SB) or *S. saprophyticus* (SS) in the presence of rock phosphate (RP). $N_0P_0K_0$: negative control; NPK: positive control; RP: Rock phosphate without inoculation. Boxplots represent four replicates after 6 months of cultivation. Different lowercase letters above bars shows significant differences between treatments within $p \le 0.05$

533

534