Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

جامعة الملك سعون King Saud University

Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences

journal homepage: www.sciencedirect.com

Original article

A comparative study of bacterial diversity based on culturable and culture-independent techniques in the rhizosphere of maize (*Zea mays* L.)



لجمعية السعودية لعلوم الحياة AUDI BIOLOGICAL SOCIET

Muther Mansoor Qaisrani^{a,*,1}, Ahmad Zaheer^{b,1}, Muhammad Sajjad Mirza^c, Tahir Naqqash^d, Tahira Batool Qaisrani^e, Muhammad Kashif Hanif^f, Ghulam Rasool^e, Kauser Abdulla Malik^g, Saleem Ullah^a, Mohammad Sarwar Jamal^{h,j}, Zeenat Mirza^{h,j}, Sajjad Karim^{i,j}, Mahmood Rasool^{i,j}

^c National Institute for Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering (NIBGE), Faisalabad, Pakistan

^fDepartment of Biotechnology, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

^g Department of Biological Sciences, Forman Christian College (A Chartered University), Lahore, Pakistan

^h King Fahd Medical Research Center (KFMRC), King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

ⁱ Center of Excellence in Genomic Medicine Research (CEGMR), King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

^j Department of Medical Laboratory Technology, Faculty of Applied Medical Sciences, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 20 February 2019 Revised 22 March 2019 Accepted 31 March 2019 Available online 1 April 2019

Keywords: Azospirillum Diazotrophs 16S rRNA nifH Metagenomics

ABSTRACT

Objective: Maize is an important crop for fodder, food and feed industry. The present study explores the plant-microbe interactions as alternative eco-friendly sustainable strategies to enhance the crop yield. *Methodology:* Bacterial diversity was studied in the rhizosphere of maize by culture-dependent and culture-independent techniques by soil sampling, extraction of DNA, amplification of gene of interest, cloning of desired fragment and library construction.

Results: Culturable bacteria were identified as *Achromobacter, Agrobacterium, Azospirillum, Bacillus, Brevibacillus, Bosea, Enterobacter, Microbacterium, Pseudomonas, Rhodococcus, Stenotrophomonas* and *Xanthomonas* genera. For culture-independent approach, clone library of 16S ribosomal RNA gene was assembled and 100 randomly selected clones were sequenced. Majority of the sequences were related to Firmicutes (17%), Acidobacteria (16%), Actinobacteria (17%), Alpha-Proteobacteria (7%), Delta-proteobacteria (4.2%) and Gemmatimonadetes (4.2%) However, some of the sequences (30%) were novel that showed no homologies to phyla of cultured bacteria in the database. Diversity of diazotrophic bacteria in the rhizosphere investigated by analysis of PCR-amplified *nif*H gene sequence that revealed abundance of sequences belonging to genera *Azoarcus* (25%), *Aeromonas* (10%), *Pseudomonas* (10%). The diazotrophic genera *Azotobacter, Agrobacterium* and *Zoogloea* related *nif*H sequences were also detected but no sequence related to *Azospirillum* was found showing biasness of the growth medium rather than relative abundance of diazotrophs in the rhizosphere.

Conclusion: The study provides a foundation for future research on focussed isolation of the *Azoarcus* and other diazotrophs found in higher abundance in the rhizosphere.

© 2019 Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of King Saud University. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

* Corresponding author at: Department of Bioinformatics, Khwaja Fareed University of Engineering & IT, Rahim Yar Khan, Pakistan.

E-mail address: mutherqais@gmail.com (M.M. Qaisrani).

¹ Muther Mansoor Qaisrani and Ahmad Zaheer contributed equally.

Peer review under responsibility of King Saud University.

ELSEVIER



1. Introduction

Maize (*Zea mays* L.) is one of the most widely grown crop for fodder, food and feed industry. Maize used as raw material for energy generation in world (Byrt et al., 2011). Recent introduction of high yielding hybrid varieties coupled with adoption of cropping system with two crops per year instead of a single maize crop have contributed to popularity of this crop among the farming

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sjbs.2019.03.010

1319-562X/© 2019 Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of King Saud University.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

^a Department of Bioinformatics, Khwaja Fareed University of Engineering & IT, Rahim Yar Khan, Pakistan

^b Institute of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, The University of Lahore, Lahore, Pakistan

^d Institute of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan

f Facultu of Amigultural Sciences, Chari University, Dana Chari Khan, Debietan

^e Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, Ghazi University, Dera Ghazi Khan, Pakistan

community in Pakistan. Securing sustainable yields requires a detailed knowledge of genetic and environmental factors that influence crop. Developed nations have used extensive breeding and management strategies for maximizing yields with higher inputs of fertilizers and insecticides. As the environmental and economic concerns of using these chemical increased. Alternative strategies are being employed to enhance the cropping system sustainability using eco-friendly approaches while retaining the competitive crop yields. The interaction between rhizosphere microbiota colonizing the plant root plays an important role in crop yield. The plant-microbe interactions taking place between "plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) and plant root" mediate plant's nutrient acquisition and disease tolerance. These rhizobacteria are a diverse group of microbes like Azospirillum. Azotobacter. Bacillus. Burkholderia. Herbaspirillum and Pseudomonas (Bhattacharvva and Iha, 2012: Oaisrani et al., 2014: Avvaz et al., 2016) and involved in plant stimulation by atmospheric N_2 fixation, phytohormone production, antagonism against pathogens, phosphate solubilization, siderophore production and biofilm formation. The beneficial effects of PGPR inoculation have been studied on various crops including maize (Bhattacharyya and Jha, 2012; Sheng et al., 2012; Zaheer et al., 2016).

Traditionally, analysis of bacterial communities and diversity has been dependent upon the cultivation of the microbes from the environment. However, culture-based studies provide limited information of community structure because majority of bacteria cannot be cultured in laboratory due to lack of information on specific growth requirements. As a result a large proportion of microbial population remained un-explored. Advancement in culture-independent techniques like sequence analysis of amplicons of 16S rRNA and *nif*H genes from soil DNA, has facilitated microbial diversity studies by comparing composition, richness, and structure of the prokaryotic communities in soil and other environments (Mirza et al., 2014; Hakim et al., 2018). These studies have even facilitated soil microbiologists to make more focused attempts to isolate useful microbes.

Previously, analysis of bacterial taxa associated with maize was based on culturable fraction or culture-independent fraction (Sanguin et al., 2006) separately. No data is available on the comparative analysis or the *nif*H based analysis of culture-dependent and culture-independent fractions of rhizosphere communities from the rhizosphere of maize. In present study maize rhizosphere's soil samples were collected and investigated the culturable fraction of bacterial community from maize by isolations on growth media, followed by *16S rRNA* based identification of isolates. Bacterial diversity studies were extended to non-culturable fraction by extracting DNA directly from that soil for PCR amplification of 16S rRNA and *nif*H genes, followed by sequence and phylogenetic analysis.

2. Methodology

2.1. Analysis of bacterial diversity through culture-dependent technique

Rhizospheric soil and roots samples of maize plants (variety FSH 810) were collected from experimental fields of NIBGE (National Institute for Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering). The field soil was a sandy loam and bacteria were isolated on LB (Luria-Bertani) agar and NFM (Nitrogen-Free Medium) medium (Okon et al., 1977) using serial dilution plating technique. Colonies with different shape, size and color purified separately through subculturing on the same medium. Nitrogen fixers were obtained by enrichment technique, root pieces (5–10 mm length) were inoculated along with rhizospheric soil to NFM medium and after 5–6 enrichments, single colonies were purified on LB plates. Colony morphology was studied after 24 h of incubation at 28 ± 2 °C.

2.2. PCR amplification and cloning

CTAB (Cetyl Trimethyl Ammonium Bromide) method was used to extract total genomic DNA from pure bacterial strains. 16S ribosomal RNA gene was amplified by primers PH: 5'-AAGGAGGTGATC CAGCCGCA-3' and PA: 5'-AGAGTTTGATCCTGGCTCAG-3' using conditions reported by Qaisrani et al. (Qaisrani et al., 2014). The PCR products were cloned in pTZ57/R vector (Fermentas, Germany), confirmed by restriction analysis and sequenced commercially from Macrogen, Korea. Molecular phylogenetic analysis of strains were done as per Zaheer et al. (2016) study.

2.3. Analysis of bacterial diversity by culture-independent technique

2.3.1. Soil sampling and DNA extraction

Rhizospheric soil samples were collected from three maize plants and pooled to prepare a composite sample. From this composite sample two sub-samples (0.5 g each) were used for extraction of soil DNA. Soil DNA was extracted using Fast DNA Spin Kit (MP Biomedicals Inc, France).

2.3.2. PCR amplification, cloning and library construction

To amplify 16S rRNA gene from soil DNA, primers and reaction conditions were same as reported earlier by Qaisrani et al. (2014). For amplification of *nifH*; PolF and PolR primers was used. PCR conditions were the same as Qaisrani et al. (2014); except annealing temperature of 48 °C. The PCR products were cloned in pTZ57/R vector (Fermentas, Germany), confirmed by restriction analysis. 100 clones were randomly selected and sequenced commercially from Macrogen, Korea. For *nifH*, PCR products of *nifH* from six independent reactions were combined and cloned. Forty clones were selected randomly and sequenced.

3. Results

3.1. Bacterial diversity using culture-dependent method

Ten isolates were identified as *Bacillus*, four as *Azospirillum brasilense*, two *Pseudomonas stutzeri*, three *Stenotrophomonas* spp., two *Enterobacter* spp. and one each of *Brevibacillus*, *Agrobacterium*, *Bosea* and *Microbacterium* sp., based on 16S rRNA gene analysis (Table 1). *Bacillus* genera came as dominant genera in culturable population followed by *Azospirillum* sp. and *Stenotrophomonas* sp. (Fig. 1).

3.2. Bacterial diversity revealed by 16S rRNA gene sequence analysis

Out of 100 clones sequenced randomly from *16S rRNA* clone library, 70 clones provided the good read-length and sequence information (Table 2). Most of the clones (30%) were related to the uncultured bacterial sequences, which did not show any similarity with the known phyla or taxa (Fig. 2). Firmicutes, acidobacteria, actinobacteria, alpha-proteobacteria, delta-proteobacteria, and gemmatimonadetes were the major phyla found.

3.3. Diversity of diazotrophs revealed by nifH sequence analysis

Twenty clones provided the sequence information out of 40 clones sequenced from *nif*H gene clone library. Among the *nif*H sequences obtained in the present study, 65% sequences showed similarity with those of culturable diazotrophs and the remaining 35% showed sequence similarity with non-culturable bacteria

Table 1

identification of pure strains on the dasis of 165 rking ge	ina gene
---	----------

Isolate ID	Accession # of the isolates	Description	Maximum similarity (%) in the databank and accession number
M1	HE646771	Azospirillum brasilense	FR745918 (98)
M7	HE646772	Azospirillum brasilense	FR745918 (99)
M9	HE646773	Pseudomonas stutzeri	GQ402828 (97)
M14	HE646774	Pseudomonas stutzeri	GQ402828 (99)
M18	HE984300	Enterobacter sp.	AB641897 (96)
M25	HE646775	Achromobacter sp.	EU220009 (99)
M27	HE646776	Stenotrophomonassp.	GQ360071 (99)
M28	HE646777	Rhodococcussp.	FJ752527 (99)
M32	HE646779	Bacillus niabensis	JQ946067 (98)
M34	HE646785	Bacillus sp.	KF596683 (99)
M35	HE984301	Azospirillum	HE977616 (97)
Mac	115646792	Agrobactorium on	EI710240 (86)
M27	HE040785	Stanotronhomonas	UM461140 (80)
10157	HE040782	sp.	HM401149 (89)
M38	HE646793	Bosea sp.	JQ689184 (77)
M39	HE646781	Stenotrophomonas	AB508855 (85)
MΔ	HE646786	sp. R magatarium	KC692200 (99)
MB	HE646787	B. tequilensis	KC172005 (99)
MC	HE646788	B. licheniformis	IN852814 (99)
ME	HE646789	B. thuringensis	KF317874 (99)
ME	HE646790	B. nanhaiensis	KC992295 (99)
MG	HE646791	B. niahensis	10946066 (98)
MH	HE646792	Brevibacillusbervis	JE772474 (98)
MP4	HE984302	Microhacterium sp	10660077 (98)
MP5	HE646780	Bacillus sp.	FI784129 (98)
MP7	HE984303	Enterobacter sp.	FI868807 (98)
MP8	HE984304	Bacillus lichneformis	HO266667 (99)
ZN1	HE646778	Azospirillum	DQ288686 (99)
		brasilense	

(Table 3). The *nifH* sequences similar to culturable diazotrophs belonged to genera *Aeromonas*, *Agrobacterium*, *Azoarcus*, *Azotobacter*, *Bacillus*, *Pseudomonas* and *Zoogloea*, which showed culturing with their respective member in phylogenetic analysis (Fig. 3).

4. Discussion

Investigation of bacterial communities and diversity in the plant's rhizosphere is very important as these microbes exert direct beneficial or pathogenic effect on plants. Despite the abundance of bacterial species in the rhizosphere, more than 99% of these species cannot be cultured that include 31 bacterial phyla. Metagenomic analysis provided detailed information of microbial diversity, composition, richness, structure and function (Mirza et al., 2014). Comparison of culturable and non-culturable community will help to determine the structurally abundant, functionally viable and potentially valuable bacteria that can ultimately be used as inoculum to influence the plant health in a positive manner.

Limited studies are available regarding the bacterial diversity in maize rhizosphere. In the present study, bacterial diversity was compared by using culture-dependent technique and culture-independent technique. Among the culturable population obtained dominant (37%) were members from *Bacillus* spp. which have been widely stated in the rhizosphere of different plants (Hakim et al., 2018). Bacterial isolates showing plump rods with vibroid motility in N-free semi solid NFM medium, showed high sequence similarity with *Azospirillum brasilense* strains. Azospirilla have been isolated from many crops including cereals, legumes and grasses (Qaisrani et al., 2014; Ayyaz et al., 2016).

Among others, following genera *Pseudomonas stutzeri, Stenotrophomonas maltiphilia Enterobacter, Agrobacterium, Microbacterium, Bosea,* and *Brevibacillus* spp. were obtained. From maize rhizosphere, the isolation of *Pseudomonas, Enterobacter, Microbacterium*



Fig. 1. On the base of 16S rRNA, detection of culturable bacteria from the rhizoshperic soil of maize.

Table 2	
Clone identification on the basis of	16S rRNA gene rhizospheric DNA of maize.

MRS1HE585109Uncultured (U) bacteriumEU160410 (98)MRS2HE585110Bacillus sp.AJ315064 (95)MRS3HE585111U. Myxococcales bacteriumEU445232 (95)MRS4HE585112U. bacteriumEU676444 (94)MRS5HE585113U. Activibrio sp.JX505257 (98)MRS6HE585114Actinomadura sp.AF131317 (95)MRS8HE585115U. bacteriumFJ893527 (84)MRS9HE585116Paenibacillus validusGU191921 (95)MRS11HE585117U. ActidobacteriumDQ514045 (99)MRS12HE585118U. Actidilus sp.HE646746 (99)S1HE599541U. Bacillus sp.HE646746 (99)S2HE599542U. Bacillus sp.JQ793577 (97)S4HE599543U. bacteriumJN177890 (98)S5HE599545U. GemmatimonaderesAY921704 (100)S6HE599546U. GemmatimonodetesAY921704 (100)	
MRS2 HE585110 Bacillus sp. AJ315064 (95) MRS3 HE585111 U. Myxococcales bacterium EU445232 (95) MRS4 HE585112 U. bacterium EU676444 (94) MRS5 HE585113 U. Acitivibrio sp. JX505257 (98) MRS6 HE585114 Actinomadura sp. AF131317 (95) MRS8 HE585115 U. bacterium FJ893527 (84) MRS9 HE585116 Paenibacillus validus GU191921 (95) MRS11 HE585117 U. Acidobacterium DQ514045 (99) MRS12 HE585118 U. Acidimicrobium FJ551475 (94) S1 HE599540 U. Bacillus sp. HE646746 (99) S2 HE599541 U. Gemmatimonas sp. HM447783 (96) S3 HE599542 U. Bacillus sp. JQ793577 (97) S4 HE599543 U. bacterium JN177890 (98) S5 HE599544 U. acetobacteraceae EU193084 (98) S6 HE599545 U. Gemmatimonodetes AY921704 (100) S7 UF609646 <	
MRS3 HE585111 U. Myxococcales bacterium EU445232 (95) MRS4 HE585112 U. bacterium EU676444 (94) MRS5 HE585113 U. Acitivibrio sp. JX505257 (98) MRS6 HE585114 Actinomadura sp. AF131317 (95) MRS8 HE585115 U. bacterium FJ893527 (84) MRS9 HE585116 Paenibacillus validus GU191921 (95) MRS11 HE585117 U. Acidobacterium DQ514045 (99) MRS12 HE585118 U. Acidimicrobium FJ551475 (94) S1 HE599540 U. Bacillus sp. HE646746 (99) S2 HE599541 U. Gemmatimonas sp. HM447783 (96) S3 HE599542 U. Bacillus sp. JQ793577 (97) S4 HE599543 U. bacterium JN177890 (98) S5 HE599544 U. acetobacteraceae EU193084 (98) S6 HE599545 U. Gemmatimonodetes AY921704 (100) S7 UE500546 U. Acidobacteriaceae EV193084 (98)	
MRS4 HE585112 U. bacterium EU676444 (94) MRS5 HE585113 U. Acitivibrio sp. JX505257 (98) MRS6 HE585114 Actinomadura sp. AF131317 (95) MRS8 HE585115 U. bacterium FJ893527 (84) MRS9 HE585116 Paenibacillus validus GU191921 (95) MRS11 HE585117 U. Acidobacterium DQ514045 (99) MRS12 HE585118 U. Acidbacterium FJ551475 (94) S1 HE599540 U. Bacillus sp. HE646746 (99) S2 HE599541 U. Gemmatimonas sp. HM447783 (96) S3 HE599543 U. bacterium JN177890 (98) S5 HE599544 U. acetobacteraceae EU193084 (98) S6 HE599545 U. Gemmatimonodetes AY921704 (100) S7 UH500546 U. Acidobacteraceae EU193084 (98)	
MRS5 HE585113 U. Acitivibrio sp. JX505257 (98) MRS6 HE585114 Actinomadura sp. AF131317 (95) MRS8 HE585115 U. bacterium FJ893527 (84) MRS9 HE585116 Paenibacillus validus GU191921 (95) MRS11 HE585117 U. Acidobacterium DQ514045 (99) MRS12 HE585118 U. Acidobacterium DQ514045 (99) S1 HE599540 U. Bacillus sp. HE646746 (99) S2 HE599541 U. Gemmatimonas sp. HM447783 (96) S3 HE599543 U. bacterium JN177890 (98) S5 HE599544 U. acetobacteraceae EU193084 (98) S6 HE599545 U. Gemmatimonodetes AY921704 (100)	
MRS6 HE585114 Actinomadura sp. AF131317 (95) MRS8 HE585115 U. bacterium FJ893527 (84) MRS9 HE585116 Paenibacillus validus GU191921 (95) MRS11 HE585117 U. Acidobacterium DQ514045 (99) MRS12 HE585118 U. Acidobacterium DQ514045 (99) S1 HE599540 U. Bacillus sp. HE646746 (99) S2 HE599541 U. Gernmatimonas sp. HM447783 (96) S3 HE599542 U. Bacillus sp. JQ793577 (97) S4 HE599543 U. bacterium JN177890 (98) S5 HE599544 U. acetobacteraceae EU193084 (98) S6 HE599545 U. Gemmatimonodetes AY921704 (100)	
MRS8 HE585115 U. bacterium FJ893527 (84) MRS9 HE585116 Paenibacillus validus GU191921 (95) MRS11 HE585117 U. Acidobacterium DQ514045 (99) MRS12 HE585118 U. Acidibacterium DQ514045 (99) S1 HE599540 U. Bacillus sp. HE646746 (99) S2 HE599541 U. Gemmatimonas sp. HM447783 (96) S3 HE599542 U. Bacillus sp. JQ793577 (97) S4 HE599543 U. bacterium JN177890 (98) S5 HE599544 U. acetobacteraceae EU193084 (98) S6 HE599545 U. Gemmatimonodetes AY921704 (100)	
MRS9 HE585116 Paenibacillus validus GU191921 (95) MRS11 HE585117 U. Acidobacterium DQ514045 (99) MRS12 HE585118 U. Acidimicrobium FJ551475 (94) S1 HE599540 U. Bacillus sp. HE646746 (99) S2 HE599541 U. Gemmatimonas sp. HM447783 (96) S3 HE599542 U. Bacillus sp. JQ793577 (97) S4 HE599543 U. bacterium JN177890 (98) S5 HE599544 U. acetobacteraceae EU193084 (98) S6 HE599545 U. Gemmatimonodetes AY921704 (100) S7 UF509546 U. Acidobacteraica HV1447801 (08)	
MRS11 HE585117 U. Acidobacterium DQ514045 (99) MRS12 HE585118 U. Acidimicrobium FJ551475 (94) S1 HE599540 U. Bacillus sp. HE646746 (99) S2 HE599541 U. Gemmatimonas sp. HM447783 (96) S3 HE599542 U. Bacillus sp. JQ793577 (97) S4 HE599543 U. bacterium JN177890 (98) S5 HE599544 U. acetobacteraceae EU193084 (98) S6 HE599545 U. Gemmatimonodetes AY921704 (100) S7 UE500546 U. Acidobacteria UM447801 (09)	
MRS12 HE585118 U. Acidimicrobium FJ551475 (94) S1 HE599540 U. Bacillus sp. HE646746 (99) S2 HE599541 U. Gemmatimonas sp. HM447783 (96) S3 HE599542 U. Bacillus sp. JQ793577 (97) S4 HE599543 U. bacterium JN177890 (98) S5 HE599544 U. acetobacteraceae EU193084 (98) S6 HE599545 U. Gemmatimonodetes AY921704 (100) S7 UH500546 L4 Acidobacteraica HM447001 (08)	
S1 HE599540 U. Bacillus sp. HE646746 (99) S2 HE599541 U. Cemmatimonas sp. HM447783 (96) S3 HE599542 U. Bacillus sp. JQ793577 (97) S4 HE599543 U. bacterium JN177890 (98) S5 HE599544 U. acetobacteraceae EU193084 (98) S6 HE599545 U. Germatimonodetes AY921704 (100) S7 UF509546 U. Acidobacteria HM447001 (08)	
S2 HE599541 U. Gemmatimonas sp. HM447783 (96) S3 HE599542 U. Bacillus sp. JQ793577 (97) S4 HE599543 U. bacterium JN177890 (98) S5 HE599544 U. acetobacteraceae EU193084 (98) S6 HE599545 U. Gemmatimonodetes AY921704 (100) S7 UF509646 U. Acidobactoria UM447801 (08)	
S3 HE599542 U. Bacillus sp. JQ793577 (97) S4 HE599543 U. bacterium JN177890 (98) S5 HE599544 U. acetobacteraceae EU193084 (98) S6 HE599545 U. Germatimonodetes AY921704 (100) S7 UI500646 Li Acidobactoria LW1402801 (08)	
S4 HE599543 U. bacterium JN177890 (98) S5 HE599544 U. acetobacteraceae EU193084 (98) S6 HE599545 U. Gemmatimonodetes AY921704 (100) S7 UI500546 U. Acidobactoria UM447801 (08)	
S5 HE599544 U. acetobacteraceae EU193084 (98) S6 HE599545 U. Gemmatimonodetes AY921704 (100) S7 UIE500546 U. Acidotectoria UM447801 (08)	
S6 HE599545 U. Germatimonodetes AY921704 (100)	
C7 LIEEOOEAC LI Acidobactoria LIMAA7001 (00)	
57 nE599546 0. Actuobucteria nivi447691 (98)	
S8 HE599547 U. Nocardiodes HE662540 (98)	
S9 HE599548 U. Acidobacteria HE646770 (76)	
S10 HE599549 U. Acidobacteriaceae FJ550882 (92)	
S11 HE599550 U. Acadoacteria EU9/9108 (93)	
S12 HE599551 Syntropholacter Jumaroxidans EU266858 (92)	
513 HE599552 U. ačidopatřenum JN409041 (93)	
514 HE599555 U. ACIODOICTETACEAE HM438249 (99)	
515 HE599554 U. Conexistancer sp. FJ551841 (97)	
510 HE595555 U. Kaistokatersp. Fj86320 (98)	
S17 HE595556 U. ACHODACHIAGede HM435240 (99)	
516 HE50558 I Subigroupped las EI80327 (98)	
515 11555555 0.5pinipininalates 1905522 (56)	
S20 HE646745 Duchasse provinces IX102604 (90)	
S22 HE646746 Braillus subtermeus NR104749 (99)	
S23 HE646747 II bacterium IF910325 (95)	
524 HE646748 Terrihacillus sp. EU(435359 (98)	
525 HE646749 U. bacterium G0306031 (93)	
S26 HE646750 U. bacterium [N417563 (99)	
S27 HE646751 U. Bacillussp. JN082282 (99)	
S28 HE646752 U. bacterium HM437987 (98)	
S29 HE646753 <i>Catenulis poraacidiphila</i> CP001700 (97)	
S30 HE646754 U. bacterium HM37969 (99)	
S31 HE646755 Agrobacterium tumefaciens JF513176 (97)	
S32 HE646756 U. Rubrobacteraceae FJ552011 (98)	
S33 HE646757 U. Bacillus sp. AY082367 (99)	
S34 HE646758 U. Actinobacterium JN037890 (97)	
S35 HE646759 U. Chlorotlexi HQ397103 (96)	
S36 HE646760 U. Bacillaceae bacterium JQ/93415 (99)	
S37 HE646761 U. delta-ProteoDacterium RF247583 (95)	
538 HE646/62 U. bacterium JU(428/56 (96)	
5.55 11:0407/05 U. dattelluiti JNU36819 (95) 540 UE646764 Nonemuraar cp V/2417240 (00)	
STO ILOGUION MONOMINICUS. RC417545 (33)	
S42 HE646766 Acidobacteriaceae HM438224 (90)	
S42 HE646767 II Bacterialetes bacterium KC440976 (98)	
S44 HE645768 U. Germatimonas sp HM438475 (96)	
S45 HE646769 U. bacterium IN178474 (98)	
S46 HE646770 U. Acidobacteria bacterium [0957800 (97)	
58 HE798162 U. bacterium F[152787 (98)	
59 HE798163 U. bacterium [Q769654 (98)	
60 HE798164 U. bacterium KF037819 (98)	
61 HE798165 U. bacterium JN037990 (84)	
62 HE798166 U. bacterium JN869202 (94)	
63 HE798167 U. Sphingomonas sp. JN628042 (99)	
64 HE798168 U. bacterium KC554081 (97)	
65 HE798169 U. alpha-Proteobacterium KF437571 (97)	
66 HE798170 U. Actinobacterium HQ183925 (98)	
67 HE798171 Bacillus sp. AB062678 (99)	
69HE798173Alpha-Proteobacterium bacteriumKF43757 (96)	
/U HE798174 Nocardioides sp. NR_044185 (99) U HE7090 FF HE7090 FF HE7090 FF	
/1 HE/981/5 U. Dacterium FJ/55/54 (9/)	
12 HE/981/b Janibacter sp. JN644568 (90)	

neimengense and *Agrobacterium* spp. have been described. Isolation of *Stenotrophomonas* from the rhizospheric soil of *Astragalus bisulcatus* and similarly from the rhizospheric soil of sugarcane *Bre*-

vibacillus has been reported. The genus *Bosea* has been isolated from the agriculture soil (Qaisrani et al., 2014; Hakim et al., 2018). The low sequence homologies (<90%) obtained for *Agrobac*-



Fig. 2. On the base of 16S rRNA, detection of non-culturable bacteria from the rhizoshperic soil of maize.

Table 3

Clone sequences of partial nifH gene detected in the rhizosphere of maize.

Clone ID	Accession No. of the clones	Description	Maximum similarity (%) in the databank and Accession number
C-1	LN624092	Uncultured Azoarcus sp. partial sequence of nifH gene	EF158389 (96)
C-2	LN612752	Uncultured bacterium partial sequence of nifH gene	HQ335683 (94)
C-3	LN624093	Uncultured Azotobacter chroococcum partial sequence of nifH	M73020 (97)
		gene	
C-4	LN624094	Uncultured Agrobacterium tumefaciens partial sequence of nifH	FJ822995 (98)
		gene	
C-5	LN624095	Uncultured Aeromonas sp. partial sequence of nifH gene	FJ687522 (1 0 0)
C- 6	LN624096	Uncultured bacterium partial sequence of nifH gene	EF494089 (98)
C-7	LN624097	Uncultured Azoarcus sp. partial sequence of nifH gene	AF200742 (96)
C-8	LN624098	Uncultured Aeromonas sp. partial sequence of nifH gene	FJ687522 (98)
C-9	LN624099	Uncultured Pseudomonas stutzeri partial sequence of nifH gene	FR669139 (93)
C-10	LN624100	Uncultured bacterium partial sequence of nifH gene	AY196413 (97)
C-11	LN624101	Uncultured Azoarcus sp. partial sequence of nifH gene	EF158389 (95)
C-12	LN624102	Uncultured Zoogloea oryzae partial sequence of nifH gene	AB201046 (96)
C-13.	LN624103	Uncultured Azoarcus sp. partial sequence of nifH gene	Y12545 (94)
C-14	LN624104	Uncultured Bacillus sp. partial sequence of nifH gene	EU693342 (94)
C-15	LN624105	Uncultured Pseudomonas stutzeri partial sequence of nifH gene	DQ776415 (91)
C-16	LN624106	Uncultured bacterium partial sequence of nifH gene	HM210352 (87)
C-17.	LN624107	Uncultured bacterium partial sequence of nifH gene	GU121497 (96)
C-18	LN612756	Uncultured Azoarcus sp. partial sequence of nifH gene	EF158389 (95)
C-19	LN612757	Uncultured bacterium partial sequence of nifH gene	AY196413 (96)
C-20	LN612755	Uncultured bacterium partial sequence of nifH gene	GU193145 (84)

terium, Bosea and *Stenotrophomonas* spp. might be due to the partial 16S ribosomal RNA gene sequences gained in the present study for sequence comparison.

The cultivation-independent analysis demonstrated that majority of the sequences (78.6%) obtained from the soil DNA derived *16S rRNA* clone library were related to the uncultured bacteria. About 30% of the total cloned sequences showed no similarity with the known phyla or taxa and were considered as novel sequences. Other genera detected were firmicutes (17%), acidobacteria (16%), actinobacteria (17%), alpha-proteobacteria (7%), deltaproteobacteria (4.2%) and gemmatamonedales (4.2%). Abundance of proteobacteria was earlier reported in canola (Kaiser et al., 2001) and two pasture soils followed by actinomycetes (McCaig et al., 1999). Moreover, abundance of α -proteobacteria was reported in rice clone libraries along with acidobacteria, firmicutes, bacteriodetes groups (Arjun and Harikrishnan, 2011).

Similarities of clone sequences showing relatedness to culturable bacteria were further computed to find the PGPRs among



Fig. 3. nifH clone library of maize variety FSH-810 rhizosphere soil showing sequences related to culturable and non-culturable bacteria.

them. In the 16S rRNA clone library, sequences related to Bacillus sp., Syntrophaceae, Kaistobacter sp. Sphingomonadales, Streptomyces sp. Janibacter sp., Nocardioides sp., Azospirillum sp., Sphingomonas sp., Rubrobacteraceae and Nonomuraea were detected. Members of these genera have been earlier known as PGPR, exhibiting one or more plant-beneficial traits including enzyme production like ACC-deaminase, bio-control potential against *Fussarium* and improve the phytoremediation ability of *Brassica juncea* grown-up in contaminated soil with glyphosate (Qaisrani et al., 2014; Ermakova et al., 2010). *Bacillus* strains produce antifungal compounds, siderophores and HCN that help plant for optimum growth and exhibit bioremediation potential for Chromium (Cr)

contaminated soils (Kathiravan et al., 2011). The Burkholderia strains have been described as to produce ACC-deaminase, siderophores and anti-fungal compounds for maize growth promotion (Byrt et al., 2011). Herbicide resistant characters in Kaistobacter and Nocardioides strains have also been described. Sphingomonas and Streptomyces have been reported as biocontrol agents and produce siderophores and enzymes. Bioremediation potential of Streptomyces for Cr has been reported (Sheng et al., 2012). The sequences associated to Terribacillus sp. Acidobacteria; Gemmata sp., Gemmatimonas sp. Chloroflexi and Actinobacterium were also detected during this study but no PGPR activity has been reported for the members of these groups so far.

When the culture-dependent data was compared with the culture-independent data, Azospirillum, Achromobacter, Rhodococcus and Bacillus genera were detected in the clone library but sequences related to *Pseudomonas* were not detected using culture-independent technique. Although, the number of clones sequenced were not in large quantity and were randomly selected but Pseudomonas were lacking among the 70 clones. From the rhizosphere of maize, using ITS the presence of acidobacteria, actinobacteria, bacteroidetes, chloroflexi. firmicutes. gemmatimonadetes and proteobacteria have been reported (Chauhan et al., 2011). Moreover, Enterobacter, Erwinia, Klebsiella, Pseudomonas, Stenotrophomonas and Bacillus were reported as predominant while Achromobacter, Lysinibacillus and Paenibacillus as rare genera in maize rhizosphere (Paola et al., 2011). Comparing the data of present study with those of published on this subject it is clear that proteobacteria, actinobacteria, bacteroidetes acidobacteria, firmicutes, chloroflexi, planctomycetes, gemmatimonadetes are the most dominant bacteria in the rhizosphere of maize.

Regarding the diversity of functional gene *nif*H, the sequences related to nifH of Azoarcus sp. (25%). Pseudomonas stutzeri (10%), Aeromonas (10%), Azotobacter (5%), Agrobacterium (5%), Zoogloea oryzae (5%) and Bacillus (5%) were detected. Moreover 35% sequences showed no similarity with the *nif*H of cultured bacteria. These results suggest that maize rhizosphere favors the growth and presence of diverse diazotrophs that can have the potential to enhance the crop productivity. The *nif*H sequences in soil DNA related to those of Pseudomonas were detected but nifH gene could not be amplified from the pure cultures of Pseudomonas retrieved from rhizosphere of maize. The incidence of nitrogen-fixation in Pseudomonas genus has been long discussed. P. stutzeri strain are rare nitrogen-fixer (Mirza et al., 2006) and in most cases positive identification of these strains based on DNA-techniques were not engaged at the time of their isolation. *nifH* sequences related to Zoogloea genus from maize rhizosphere were found. The presence of nitrogen fixing Zoogloea has been reported from the soils of Pakistan and was used as PGPR for sugarcane (Mirza et al., 2001).

Among the clones of *nif*H gene obtained in the present study, 25% were related to *Azoarcus*. Isolation of *Azoarcus* strains from kallar grass of Pakistani saline soils was initially reported by Reinhold-Hurek et al. (1993) and was extensive studied there within host plant. Since then, no *Azoarcus* could be isolated from rhizosphere although extensive work was carried out on the isolation of diazotrophs and other PGPR. As a result, *Azoarcus* was considered as of rare occurrence and uncommon among the diazotrophic population in Pakistani soils. However presence of *nifH* sequences related to *Azoarcus* in maize rhizosphere necessitate intensification of isolation attempts to obtain pure cultures of this important bacterium for inoculum production for maize or other crops grown in the country.

Contrary to the *Azoarcus*, four *Azospirillum* strains were identified from the rhizosphere of maize using culture-dependent technique but no *16S rRNA* or *nifH* sequence related to this diazotrophic genus was detected among both the libraries (*nifH*, *16S rRNA*) constructed from soil DNA. This reflects the biasness of the growth medium used in this study rather than the relative abundance of *Azospirillum* in the rhizosphere. Future studies based on next-generation sequencing technology may enable detection of these and other important PGPR in the maize rhizosphere of maize.

5. Conclusion

This study has provided a basis for the future research on "nonculturable" PGPRs and the diazotrophic population present in the rhizosphere of maize especially a rarely cultivated but frequent colonizer *Azoarcus*. More focused approach should be used for targeted cultivation of this diazotroph and exploit its potential to enhance nitrogen acquisition of plant. The information will help to identify potential PGPR for maize inoculation as many of the strains identified might have direct or indirect part in plant stimulation. Moreover, several other bacteria were detected that might have potential for bio-remediation of contaminated-soils or the production of useful enzymes for industrial purposes.

Declaration conflicts of interest

None.

References

- Arjun, J.K., Harikrishnan, K., 2011. Metagenomic analysis of bacterial diversity in the rice rhizosphere soil microbiome. Biotechnol. Bioinf. Bioeng. 1, 361–367.
- Ayyaz, K., Zaheer, A., Rasul, G., Mirza, M.S., 2016. Isolation and identification by 16S rRNA sequence analysis of plant growth-promoting azospirilla from the rhizosphere of wheat. Braz. J. Microbiol. 47, 542–550.
- Bhattacharyya, P., Jha, D., 2012. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR): emergence in agriculture. World J. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 28, 1327–1350.
- Byrt, C.S., Grof, C.P., Furbank, R.T., 2011. C4 Plants as biofuel feedstocks: optimising biomass production and feedstock quality from a lignocellulosic perspective free access. J. Integr. Plant Biol. 53, 120–135.
- Chauhan, P.S., Chaudhry, V., Mishra, S., Nautiyal, C.S., 2011. Uncultured bacterial diversity in tropical maize (*Zea mays L.*) rhizosphere. J. Basic Microbiol. 51, 15– 32.
- Ermakova, I.T., Kiseleva, N.I., Shushkova, T., Zharikov, M., Zharikov, G.A., Leontievsky, A.A., 2010. Bioremediation of glyphosate-contaminated soils. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 88, 585–594.
- Hakim, S., Mirza, B.S., Zaheer, A., Mclean, J.E., Imran, A., Yasmin, S., Mirza, M.S., 2018. Retrieved 16S rRNA and nifH sequences reveal co-dominance of Bradyrhizobium and Ensifer (Sinorhizobium) strains in field-collected root nodules of the promiscuous host Vigna radiata (L.) R Wilczek. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 102, 485–497.
- Kaiser, O., Pühler, A., Selbitschka, W., 2001. Phylogenetic analysis of microbial diversity in the rhizoplane of oilseed rape (*Brassica napus* cv. Westar) employing cultivation-dependent and cultivation-independent approaches. Microb. Ecol. 42, 136–149.
- Kathiravan, M.N., Karthick, R., Muthukumar, K., 2011. Ex situ bioremediation of Cr (VI) contaminated soil by Bacillus sp.: batch and continuous studies. Chem. Eng. J. 169, 107–115.
- McCaig, A.E., Glover, L.A., Prosser, J.I., 1999. Molecular analysis of bacterial community structure and diversity in unimproved and improved upland grass pastures. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 65, 1721–1730.
- Mirza, M.S., Ahmad, W., Latif, F., Haurat, J., Bally, R., Normand, P., Malik, K.A., 2001. Isolation, partial characterization, and the effect of plant growth-promoting bacteria (PGPB) on micro-propagated sugarcane in vitro. Plant Soil 237, 47–54.
- Mirza, M.S., Mehnaz, S., Normand, P., Prigent-Combaret, C., Moënne-Loccoz, Y., Bally, R., Malik, K.A., 2006. Molecular characterization and PCR detection of a nitrogen-fixing Pseudomonas strain promoting rice growth. Biol. Fert. Soils 43, 163–170.
- Mirza, B.S., Potisap, C., Nüsslein, K., Bohannan, B.J., Rodrigues, J.L., 2014. Response of free-living nitrogen-fixing microorganisms to land use change in the Amazon rainforest. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 80, 281–288.
- Okon, Y., Albrecht, S.L., Burris, R., 1977. Methods for growing *Spirillum lipoferum* and for counting it in pure culture and in association with plants. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 33, 85–88.
- Paola, P., Fernando, I., Mónica, R., Miriam, E., Esperanza, M.-R., 2011. Analysis of the bacterial diversity associated with the roots of maize (*Zea mays L.*) through culture-dependent and culture-independent methods. ISRN Ecol.
- Qaisrani, M.M., Mirza, M.S., Zaheer, A., Malik, K.A., 2014. Isolation and identification by 16S rRNA sequence analysis of Achromobacter, Azospirillum and Rhodococcus strains from the rhizosphere of maize and screening for the beneficial effect on plant growth. Pak. J. Agr. Sci. 51, 91–99.
- Reinhold-Hurek, B., Hurek, T., Gillis, M., Hoste, B., Vancanneyt, M., Kersters, K., De Ley, J., 1993. Azoarcus gen. nov., nitrogen-fixing proteobacteria associated with

roots of Kallar grass (*Leptochloa fusca* (L.) Kunth), and description of two species, *Azoarcus indigens* sp. nov. and *Azoarcus communis* sp. nov. Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol. 43, 574–584.

- Sanguin, H., Remenant, B., Dechesne, A., Thioulouse, J., Vogel, T.M., Nesme, X., Moënne-Loccoz, Y., Grundmann, G.L., 2006. Potential of a 16S *rRNA*-based taxonomic microarray for analyzing the rhizosphere effects of maize on *Agrobacterium* spp. and bacterial communities. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 72, 4302–4312.
- Sheng, X., Sun, L., Huang, Z., He, L., Zhang, W., Chen, Z., 2012. Promotion of growth and Cu accumulation of bio-energy crop (*Zea mays*) by bacteria: implications for energy plant biomass production and phytoremediation. J Environ. Manage. 103, 58–64.
- Zaheer, A., Mirza, B.S., McLean, J.E., Yasmin, S., Shah, T.M., Malik, K.A., Mirza, M.S., 2016. Association of plant growth-promoting *Serratia* spp. with the root nodules of chickpea. Res. Microbiol. 167, 510–520.