# Journal of Agricultural Chemistry and Biotechnology

Journal homepage: www.jacb.mans.edu.eg Available online at: www.jacb.journals.ekb.eg

## The Impact of Inoculation with Arbuscular mycorrhizal Fungi on Tomato **Tolerance to Salt Stress and Nutrients Uptake in Sandy Soil**

## Noha M. Abdelhameid<sup>\*</sup> and Mona M. El-Shazly

Soil Fertility and microbiology Dept., Desert Research Center (DRC), Cairo , Egypt



ABSTRACT



To evaluate the effect of mycorrhiza (Glomus macrocarpium) with two phosphorus and nitrogen levels (50 and 75 % Optimal dose) and two water salinity levels (2800 ppm (S1) and 3800ppm (S2)) on yield, nutrients uptake and growth parameters of tomato plant. A field experiment was conducted at El Sheikh Zowaied Research Station, North Sinai, Egypt during two successive seasons. The obtained results showed that inoculation with mycorrhizal fungi reduces the negative impact of salinity in growth parameters, nutrient contents and yield of tomato by increasing significantly the shoot and root weights by 38.6, 48.65% and 38.7, 47.86%; leaf area and chlorophyll content by 12.36, 29.90% and 12.93, 30.87%; root/shoot ratio by 19.17 and 11.43% and marketable yield by 29.99 and 33.63%. While significantly reduce the loss of unmarketable yield from 11.05 to 8.86% for the two seasons, respectively. Also, mycorrhizal inoculation increases significantly the plant N by 6.34 and 5.31%; P by 23.66 and 22.03% ad K by 3.64 and 3.15% for both seasons respectively. Similarly, mycorrhizal inoculation significantly improved microbial activities in the soil rhizosphere area of tomato plants. The total microbial counts, phosphatase enzyme, root colonization and soil mycorrhizal spores increases by 33.60 and 35.00%; 45.92 and 52.88%; 257.14 and 257.89% and 34.18 and 34.47% for two seasons, respectively. Mineral fertilizers at 75% of optimal dose increase all traits parameters compared with 50%. In general, these results showed that mycorrhizal fungi represent a promising resource for improving both sustainable food production under salt conditions and human nutritional needs.

Keywords: Tomato ; Mycorrhizae; Phosphorous ; Nitrogen ; Salinity Stress ; Sandy Soil

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Tomato (Lycopersicon esculentum Mill.) is one of the most popular and widely grown vegetable crops in mycorrhizal fungi are soil Egypt. Arbuscular microorganisms that launch mutual symbiosis with majority of plants, providing a direct physical linkage between soil and plant roots (Dudhane et al., 2013). The bio-fertilizers including mycorrhiza fungi provide nutrients to the grown plants, increase soil fertility and maintain soil structure. The Vesicular - Arbuscular Mycorrhiza (VAM) improves the properties of soil in rhizosphere, enlarges root areas of host plants, and improves the efficiency of water absorption, enhances the absorption of phosphorus and other nutritional elements, and then improves nutritional status of host plant; activates defense system of host plant quickly; protects against oxidative damage generated by drought, able to alter water relations and played a great role in the growth of host plants(Augé, 2001). Phosphatase produced by VAM fungi play an important role in transform fixed or insoluble phosphate into soluble form, which can be used by plant freely. Other elements such as zinc and copper can also not flow freely in soil (Wu and Xia, 2004). The absorption of Ca, Si, Ni, Co etc. were also increased by mycorrhizal symbiosis (Li et al., 1991).

Salinization arising from sodium chloride highly concentrations in irrigation water and unnecessary use of chemical fertilizers causes serious problems in agriculture and has increased progressively in many parts of the world, particularly in arid and semi-arid areas (Oztekin et al.,

DOI: 10.21608/jacb.2020.86998

2013). In addition, climate change is causing agricultural damage worldwide as a result of more frequent flooding and drought cycles and increased soil salinity. Saline soils exist in more than 7% of the Earth's surface and signify a major limiting factor that decreases 20% of crop production worldwide under irrigated land (Feng et al., 2002; Porcel et al., 2012). Therefore, the utilization and development of saline land has been important challenge for researchers throughout the world (Singh et al., 2011).

Tomatoes are one of the most globally important crops that are known to benefit from a mycorrhizal symbiotic relationship (Nzanza et al., 2012). An electrical conductivity (EC) of greater than 2.5 dSm-1 reduces tomato yields, as reported by (Sonneveld and Welles, 1988). Therefore, the حذف salt-tolerant soil microbes could be a good alternative for plant development under conditions of extreme salinity (Giri et al., 2003). The arbuscular - mycorrhizal fungi have been studied for their ability to reduce the effects of salt on tomatoes (Daei et al., 2009; Feng et al., 2002). The mycorrhizal fungi symbiosis with lettuce (Lactuca sativa L.) and maize (Zea mays L) plants have been reported to alleviate salt stress and improving the dry weights of the hosts (Aroca et al., 2013; Estrada et al., 2013). (Liu et al., 2016) reported that mycorrhizal fungal community endorsed leaf proline accumulation in cotton and a higher K+/Na+ ratio. Also improved P uptake derived from mycorrhizal fungi were related to alleviating salt stress and promoted the growth of cotton and maize in saline soils. (Vuksani et al., 2015) found that the production of open field tomato can be improved by

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author. E-mail address: nmousa5@gmail.com

the pre inoculation of mycorrhizal fungi to tomato transplants at the nursery stage. The tomato seedlings can then benefit a faster stand formation rate and higher vigor which is additional reflected to a prolonged harvesting stage and higher yield.

In salt-stressed soil, mycorrhizal fungi enhance the supply of mineral nutrients to plants, particularly the supply of P, as it tends to be precipitated in phosphate salts (Al-Karaki and Hammad, 2001). (Hart *et al.*, 2015) found that AM fungal inoculation increased the nutrient quality of tomato fruits for most nutrients particularly N, P, and Cu. Mycorrhizal fungi counterbalance the contrary effects of salinity stress, and then, increase plant growth (Giri *et al.*, 2003). VAM fungi also protect the host plants against the detrimental effects of stresses (Rabie, 2005) by enhancing the antioxidant responses (García-Sánchez et al., 2014) and/or via the induction of acquired systemic tolerance (Hashem *et al.*, 2016).

The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of Mycorrhizae, nitrogen and phosphate levels on the productivity of tomato plants under two salinity levels at El-Sheikh Zowaied research station, North Sinai, Egypt.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was carried out for two successive seasons of 2017 and 2018 at El-Sheikh Zowaid research station, North Sinai. During program work at Desert Research Center (DRC), Cairo , Egypt to investigate the effect of Mycorrhizae, some nutrient of elements (nitrogen and phosphorus) levels and irrigation water salinity levels on the productivity of tomato (Solanum lycopersicum L. super hybrid cultivar). Seeds were sown in polystyrene trays on 10th and 5th of February, 2017 and 2018, respectively. Seedlings and germination stages were conducted in the greenhouse. Seedlings were transplanted by hand at the third true leaf stage on 10<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> of March 2017 and 2018, respectively in oriented rows, 1.3 m apart, with 0.4 m between plants in the row, giving a plant density of 2 plants m<sup>-2</sup>. Some physical and chemical properties of the experimental soil and irrigation water were determined according to (Klute, 1986; Page et al., 1982) as shown in (Tables 1 and 2).

| Table 1. Some physical and chemical | l properties of the experimental soi |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|

|      | Physical analysis (%) |       |         |            |                  |                  |        |                 |                   |                   |           |                   |
|------|-----------------------|-------|---------|------------|------------------|------------------|--------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Sand |                       |       |         |            |                  | Silt             |        | C               | lay               | Soi               | l Texture | e                 |
|      |                       | 97.2  |         |            | 1.3              |                  |        | 1.5             |                   | Sand              |           |                   |
|      | Chemical analysis     |       |         |            |                  |                  |        |                 |                   |                   |           |                   |
| II   |                       |       | T N0/ C | C/N        |                  | Cations          | (me/L) |                 |                   | Anions (1         | ne/L)     |                   |
| рп   | EC USIII              | 0.C % | 1.11%   | C/IN Tatio | Ca <sup>+2</sup> | Mg <sup>+2</sup> | $K^+$  | Na <sup>+</sup> | CO3 <sup>-2</sup> | HCO3 <sup>-</sup> | Cl        | SO4 <sup>-2</sup> |
| 7.69 | 1.71                  | 0.53  | 0.020   | 26.5       | 7.94             | 2.68             | 3.71   | 1.62            | 0.00              | 4.99              | 5.52      | 5.66              |
|      |                       |       |         |            |                  |                  |        |                 |                   |                   |           |                   |

Table 2. Chemical analysis of irrigation water of the field experiment

| Walla  | 11   | EC EC | Cations (me/L)   |           |                  |                 | Anions (me/L)     |                   |      |                   | TDS   |
|--------|------|-------|------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------|
| wens   | рн   | (ppm) | Ca <sup>+2</sup> | $Mg^{+2}$ | $\mathbf{K}^{+}$ | Na <sup>+</sup> | CO3 <sup>-2</sup> | HCO3 <sup>-</sup> | Cl.  | SO4 <sup>-2</sup> | (ppm) |
| Well 1 | 8.13 | 4.38  | 12.4             | 5.2       | 0.1              | 27.1            | 0                 | 3.7               | 27.9 | 14.2              | 2800  |
| Well 2 | 8.50 | 5.94  | 16.0             | 7.8       | 0.1              | 37.5            | 0                 | 4.9               | 37.2 | 19.3              | 3800  |

Phosphatic fertilizer as calcium super-phosphate (15.5%  $P_2O_5$ ) was added at two levels in the rate of 50 and 75% of 30 kg  $P_2O_5$  ha<sup>-1</sup> during seed bed preparation, Also, nitrogen fertilizer was applied as ammonium sulfate (20.5% N) at two levels in the rate of 50 and 75 % of 120 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> through three equal doses during plant growth. 50 Kg of potassium sulphate (50.0% K<sub>2</sub>O) was added at flowering stage. The following data were recorded; root and shoot weight, leaf area, chlorophyll content, fruit wt., and yield. **Biofertilization** 

Vesicular Arbuscular Mycorrhiza (VAM) spores were isolated from soil pre-inoculated with mycorrhiza (*Glomus macrocarpium*) by the wet-sieving and decantation method described by (Gerdemann and Nicolson, 1963) from the upper layer of the experimental area. The VAM inocula was mixed with pure sand and kept in the refrigerator to be used in the inoculation.

#### Assessment of VAM infection

The staining method of (Phillips and Hayman, 1970) was used for preparing soil (number of spores per gram) and root (colonization percentage) samples for microscopic observation. The gridlines intersect method of (Giovannetti and Mosse, 1980) was used to estimate the VAM infection percentage, using the equation:

 $Root \ colonization \ \% = \frac{No. \ of \ positive \ intersect \ points}{Total \ number \ of \ observed \ intersect \ points}$ 

Rhizosphere soil sample were collected at harvest and analyzed for: total microbial counts on Bunt and Rovira medium (Nautiyal, 1999). Soil samples were analyzed for determination of phosphatase activity using disodium phenyl phosphate served as enzyme substrate (Öhlinger, 1996). Chlorophyll content was measured by using Minolta chlorophyll meter (SPAD-502) to determine the total chlorophyll in fresh leaves.

Plant samples were taken at harvesting time from each treatment, dried at 70°, and ground using stainless steel equipment for the determination of N, P, and K. Plant nutrients were determined as follows: Total nitrogen using the micro kjeldahl method (A. O. A. C., 2005). Phosphorus and potassium, using dry ashing technique according to (Cottenie *et al.*, 1982). The phosphorus measured colorimetric using Vanado-molybdate method and potassium using Flame photometer apparatus.

Statistical analysis

The collected data in both seasons of study were exposed to analysis of variance as a factorial experiment in split-split plot design and significant difference among means were determined according to (Snedecor and Cochran, 1969) with the aid of Costat software. In addition, significant difference among mean were distinguished and least significant differences LSD between means were compared at 5%.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### Growth parameters of tomato plants

Data presented in Table (3 a & b) showed a significant difference among all studied parameters (shoot weight, root weight, leaf area and chlorophyll content) under mycorrhizal inoculation, two mineral fertilizers doses (50 and 75 %) and two salinity levels, 2800 ppm (S1) and 3800 ppm (S2). Maximum increase of shoot and root weight were obtained with mycorrhizal inoculation at mineral fertilizer 75% compared with mineral fertilizer without inoculation at salinity level S1. Also , increasing salinity with S2 significantly shoot and root weight. However, mycorrhizal inoculation reduces the negative impact of salinity in shoot and root weight by increasing shoot and root weights by 38.6, 48.65% and 38.7, 47.86% for both seasons, respectively compared to without inoculation.

Mycorrhizal inoculation at two levels of salinity, significantly improve tomato plant growth under the terms of leaf area and chlorophyll content of tomato plant. The mycorrhizal inoculation increases leaf area and chlorophyll content by 12.36, 29.90% and 12.93, 30.87% for first and second seasons, respectively compared to without inoculation. Also, mycorrhizal inoculation led to increase root/shoot ratio by 19.17 and 11.43% for first and second seasons, respectively when compared to without inoculation treatment. Increasing mineral fertilizers (N and P) from 50 to 75% increase root and shoot weight, leaf area and root/shoot ratio by 21.45 & 18.94%; 18.91 & 18.94%; 23.17 & 23.66%; 23.77 & 23.43%; and 3.88 & 4.14% for the both seasons, respectively. These results in accordance with that reported by many researchers, that VA mycorrhizal fungi could enhance the ability of plants to cope with salt stress (Asghari et al., 2005; Enteshari and Hajbagheri, 2011; Rabie, 2005; Yano-Melo et al., 2003) by improving plant nutrient uptake, protecting enzyme activity and empowering water uptake. Mycorrhizal inoculation to Capsicum annuum showed enhanced chlorophyll contents, and Mg and N uptake and reduced Na transport under saline conditions (Çekiç et al., 2012).

Table 3a. Effect of Mycorrhizal inoculation, two salinity levels and mineral fertilizer levels on growth parameters of tomato plants at first season.

| Salinity                                 | Myco          | $MF^{\pm}$ | Root wt./plant (g) | Shoot wt./plant (g) | Leaf area (cm <sup>2</sup> ) | Chlorophyll | Root/Shoot ratio (DW <sup>§</sup> basis) |
|--|---------------|------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------|--|
|  | Without       | 50         | 87.1               | 654.3               | 14.22                        | 24.53       | 0.124                                    |
| C 1                                      | without       | 75         | 95.2               | 730.7               | 17.25                        | 24.5        | 0.119                                    |
| 51                                       | With          | 50         | 109.1              | 817.3               | 15.64                        | 28.3        | 0.133                                    |
| S1 —<br>S2 —<br>LSD at 5%<br>Mycorrhizae | vv lul        | 75         | 138.3              | 1051.3              | 19.2                         | 33.1        | 0.131                                    |
| S1 -<br>S2 -<br>LSD at 5%                | Without       | 50         | 26.4               | 203                 | 12.5                         | 21.6        | 0.128                                    |
|  |               | 75         | 37.7               | 236.7               | 15.9                         | 30.26       | 0.110                                    |
|  | With          | 50         | 53.3               | 314.2               | 14.6                         | 29.2        | 0.150                                    |
|  | with          | 75         | 64.5               | 346.1               | 17.82                        | 40.43       | 0.157                                    |
| LSD at 5%                                | 6 Salinity    |            | 1.546              | 13.375              | 0.034                        | 0.0687      | 0.0002                                   |
| Mycorrhiz                                | zae           |            | 0.339              | 2.130               | 0.021                        | 0.0868      | 0.0003                                   |
| Mineral Fo                               | ertilizers (M | F)         | 0.113              | 0.834               | 0.022                        | 0.0498      | 0.00006                                  |
| Interaction                              | 1             |            | 0.226              | 1.667               | 0.044                        | 0.100       | 0.0001                                   |
| ( )                                      | 1.0 (11) (    | (e) 1      | • • •              |                     |                              |             |  |

(±) mineral fertilizers, (§) dry weight

Table 3b. Effect of Mycorrhizal inoculation, two salinity levels and mineral fertilizer levels on growth parameters of tomato plants at second season.

| Salinity   | Myco           | MF± | Root wt./plant (g) | Shoot wt./plant (g) | Leaf area (cm2) | Chlorophyll | Root/Shoot ratio (DW§ basis) |
|--|----------------|-----|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------------------|
|  | Without        | 50  | 89.4               | 665.3               | 14.5            | 25          | 0.134                        |
| C 1  | without        | 75  | 95.8               | 745.2               | 17.6            | 24.9        | 0.129                        |
| Salinity 1<br>W<br>S1 W<br>S2 W<br>S2 M<br>U.S.D. at 5%<br>Mycorrhizae<br>Mineral Ferti<br>Interaction | With           | 50  | 112.4              | 834.8               | 16              | 29.2        | 0.135                        |
|  | vv iui         | 75  | 138.7              | 1066.2              | 19.6            | 33.7        | 0.130                        |
|  | Without        | 50  | 28.3               | 206.8               | 12.7            | 21.9        | 0.137                        |
| <b>GQ</b>  | without        | 75  | 38.9               | 246.5               | 16.1            | 30.1        | 0.158                        |
| 52   | With           | 50  | 55.7               | 322.8               | 14.8            | 29.2        | 0.154                        |
|  | vv iui         | 75  | 66.5               | 356.2               | 18.4            | 41.3        | 0.160                        |
| L.S.D. at  | 5% Salinit     | y   | 1.533              | 13.534              | 0.035           | 0.060       | 0.0008                       |
| Mycorrhi   | zae            |     | 0.344              | 2.164               | 0.023           | 0.091       | 0.0003                       |
| Mineral F  | Fertilizers (I | MF) | 0.103              | 0.833               | 0.023           | 0.051       | 0.0001                       |
| Interactio   | n              |     | 0.206              | 1.666               | 0.043           | 0.099       | 0.0001                       |

#### **Yield components:**

Salinity significantly reduced marketable yield and increased the unmarketable yield, while, inoculation with mycorrhiza had enhanced the marketable yield under two salinity levels and both mineral fertilizers. Data presented in Table (4) and Figure (1) clearly showed that, increasing salinity from S1 to S2 led to decrease significantly marketable yield of tomato by 42.71 and 42.31% in two seasons. While, marketable yield was increased by inoculation with mycorrhizal fungi, with an overall mean value of 29.99 and 33.63% in both seasons, respectively. Also, application of 75% of mineral fertilizers increase significantly the marketable yield by 18.067 and 18.85% compared with 50% of mineral fertilizer. Mycorrhizal inoculation proved to be effective in improving fruit weight and yield of tomato plant under two salinity levels. Maximum marketable yield was recorded with mycorrhizal inoculation and mineral fertilizer 75% at first salinity level being 5104.3 and 4951.2 kg/ha for two seasons, respectively.

|            | tomat         | o pian | 15                        |                      |                           |                           |  |
|------------|---------------|--------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Galiaite   | M             | ME     | market<br>(to             | table yield<br>m/ha) | unmarketable<br>yield (%) |                           |  |
| Sanniy     | y Miyco.      | MF     | 1 <sup>st</sup><br>Season | 2nd Season           | 1 <sup>st</sup><br>Season | 2 <sup>nd</sup><br>Season |  |
|            | <b>W</b> 7.41 | 50     | 48.78                     | 47.59                | 9.39                      | 9.12                      |  |
| <b>S</b> 1 | Without       | 75     | 62.93                     | 62.14                | 8.18                      | 7.97                      |  |
|            | With          | 50     | 56.93                     | 57.53                | 8.57                      | 8.08                      |  |
|            |               | 75     | 76.14                     | 76.60                | 6.69                      | 6.41                      |  |
|            | W/:414        | 50     | 28.69                     | 28.10                | 13.63                     | 12.92                     |  |
| 60         | without       | 75     | 27.27                     | 26.77                | 13.02                     | 12.10                     |  |
| 52         | W/:41-        | 50     | 41.94                     | 42.49                | 11.42                     | 10.29                     |  |
|            | with          | 75     | 42.93                     | 43.34                | 8.78                      | 8.35                      |  |
| L.S.D.     | at 5% Sali    | nity   | 0.65                      | 0.64                 | 0.05                      | 0.05                      |  |
| Mycori     | hizae         |        | 0.14                      | 0.16                 | 0.01                      | 0.01                      |  |
| Minera     | l Fertilizer  | s (MF) | 0.08                      | 0.08                 | 0.01                      | 0.01                      |  |
| Interact   | tion          |        | 0.16                      | 0.16                 | 0.01                      | 0.01                      |  |

Table 4. Effect of Mycorrhizal inoculation, two salinity levels and mineral fertilizers levels on yield of tomato plants



Fig. 1. Effect of bio and mineral fertilizers application on marketable and unmarketable yield of tomato (ton ha<sup>-1</sup>)

On contrast, significantly increasing salinity with S1 & S2 without inoculation the unmarketable yield increased from 8.21 to 11.71% and from 7.89 to 10.92% for two seasons, respectively. At the same time, inoculation with mycorrhiza and high level of mineral fertilizer (75%) were significantly decrease the unmarketable yield from 11.05 to 8.86% and 10.75 to 9.17% for the first season and from 10.53 to 8.258% and from 10.10 to 8.75% for the second season (Table 4 and Fig. 1). Obtained results are in agreement with those found by with (Al-Karaki *et al.*, 2001) they found that, AMF improved shoot growth and fruit yield and nutrient acquisition in fruits of inoculated tomato. AMF colonization also demonstrated the potential for protection of plants from salt stress in arid and semiarid regions. **Soil macro-nutrients:** 

Results in Table (5) showed that soil nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium concentrations were higher in the soil of inoculated plants than uninoculated ones. Inoculation with mycorrhiza increases significantly the soil N, P and K by 13.29 & 14.56%; 21.01 & 21.77% and 7.42 & 7.65% for first and second seasons, respectively. At the same time, high dose of mineral fertilizer (75%) is significantly increase the soil N, P and K by 7.95 & 7.40%; 14.38 & 14.42% and 1.87 & 1.91% for both seasons, respectively. While, increase salinity from S1 to S2 decrease the soil N, P and K by 4.64 & 5.02%; 28.07 & 27.92% and 1.86 & 1.48% at two seasons, respectively. The mycorrhizal inoculation with mineral fertilizer at 75% treatments recorded significantly the highest soil N, P and K concentrations (197.4, 59.2 and 248.3 ppm; 200.1, 60.7 and 253.6 ppm) for two seasons, respectively. Tawaraya et al., (2006) reported that mycorrhiza associated with plants rises the availability of phosphate by solubilizing the insoluble fraction of inorganic phosphate, which significantly increase phosphate uptake and phosphate concentration in the plant tissue.

 Table 5. Effect of Mycorrhizal inoculation, two salinity levels and mineral fertilizer levels on macronutrient concentration (ppm) in rhizosphere of tomato plants.

| T                  | reatments | ,  | •     | 1 <sup>st</sup> season |       | 2 <sup>nd</sup> season |      |       |  |  |
|--------------------|-----------|----|-------|------------------------|-------|------------------------|------|-------|--|--|
| Water Salinity     | Мусо      | MF | Ν     | P                      | K     | Ν                      | P    | K     |  |  |
| <b>`</b>           | 117.4     | 50 | 161.6 | 42.3                   | 224.3 | 163.1                  | 43.5 | 227.5 |  |  |
| 01                 | without   | 75 | 176.4 | 54.2                   | 229.1 | 178.2                  | 55.4 | 231.4 |  |  |
| S1<br>S2           | With      | 50 | 188.3 | 57.3                   | 242.2 | 191.3                  | 59.2 | 246.5 |  |  |
|                    |           | 75 | 197.4 | 59.2                   | 248.3 | 200.1                  | 60.7 | 253.6 |  |  |
|                    | Without   | 50 | 156.4 | 35.4                   | 221.4 | 157.5                  | 35.8 | 226.3 |  |  |
| 50                 |           | 75 | 169.1 | 40.4                   | 226.4 | 168.4                  | 41.1 | 231.2 |  |  |
| 52                 | XX 7° -1  | 50 | 174.3 | 42.5                   | 238.2 | 178.6                  | 43.1 | 242.2 |  |  |
|                    | with      | 75 | 191.4 | 49.6                   | 239.8 | 194.5                  | 50.2 | 244.4 |  |  |
| L.S.D. at 5% Sali  | inity     |    | 0.20  | 0.29                   | 0.11  | 0.22                   | 0.30 | 0.09  |  |  |
| Mycorrhizae        | -         |    | 0.25  | 0.10                   | 0.19  | 0.28                   | 0.11 | 0.20  |  |  |
| Mineral Fertilizer | rs ( MF)  |    | 0.01  | 0.05                   | 0.03  | 0.09 0.05 0.03         |      |       |  |  |
| Interaction        |           |    | 0.18  | 0.10                   | 0.06  | 0.17                   | 0.10 | 0.06  |  |  |

#### Plant macro-nutrient content:

Regarding to the mycorrhizal inoculation, mineral fertilizers and salinity effects on NPK level in tomato leaves. The obtained data in Table (6) illustrated that plant nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium concentrations were higher in the inoculated plants than uninoculated ones. Mycorrhizal inoculation showed stimulating effect in increasing NPK content in tomato leaves at first and second salinity levels. Mycorrhizal inoculation significantly increases the plant N, P

and K by 6.34 & 5.31%; 23.66 & 22.03% and 3.64 & 3.15% for first and second seasons, respectively. At the same time, mineral fertilizers at 75% significantly increase the plant N, P and K by 7.12 & 7.12%; 19.72 & 19.34% and 5.07 & 4.99% for first and second seasons, respectively. While, increase salinity from S1 to S2 decrease the plant N, P and K by 6.60 & 5.82%; 5.26 & 5.17% and 5.96 & 4.55% at two seasons, respectively. The influence of mycorrhizal fungi to plant nitrogen nutrition differs widely in diverse symbiotic systems,

but mycorrhizal fungi can transfer significant amounts of nitrogen to their host plants (Chen *et al.*, 2018). The mycorrhiza inoculation with mineral fertilizers at 75% treatments recorded significantly the highest soil N, P and K concentration (22.23, 7.86 and 12.81 mg/g dry matter and 22.15, 7.81 and 12.91 mg/g dry matter) for two seasons, respectively. The results of current study indicated that mycorrhizal inoculated plants had greater tolerance to salt stress than uninoculated plants, this results in agreement with those found by (Al-Karaki *et al.*, 2001). Earlier studies indicated that the VAM fungi increase the root surface area that increases plant nutrient uptake (Zhang *et al.*, 2016). Also, Abdelhameid (2019) found that the application of effective microorganisms reduces the bad effect of salinity and drought on NPK concentration in barley. Regardless of the mycorrhizal treatment, salinity caused a significant decrease in N, P and K, whereas the reverse was true for the N/P ratio in tomato plants. In either moderate (S1) or severe (S2) salinity levels, the mycorrhizal inoculation encouraged a significant increase in leaf N, P and K. Contrastingly, the N/P ratio decreased with mycorrhizal inoculation, indicating that the mycorrhizae increased P rather than N. Data in Table (6) indicating that, inoculation with mycorrhizal fungi decreased the N/P ratio by 16.99 and 16.83% in two seasons, respectively. The interaction of salinity stress and VAM significantly affects the concentrations of P and N and the N/P ratio in plant shoots (Mitra *et al.*, 2019; Wang *et al.*, 2018).

 Table 6. Effect of Mycorrhizal inoculation, two salinity levels and mineral fertilizer levels on macronutrient concentration (mg/g DM <sup>£</sup>) in leaves of tomato plants.

| Treatme                  | 1 <sup>st</sup> season |    |       |      | 2 <sup>nd</sup> season |           |       |      |       |           |
|--------------------------|------------------------|----|-------|------|------------------------|-----------|-------|------|-------|-----------|
| Water Salinity           | Myco                   | MF | Ν     | Р    | K                      | N/P ratio | Ν     | Р    | K     | N/P ratio |
|                          | Without                | 50 | 19.41 | 5.43 | 11.51                  | 3.59      | 19.61 | 5.62 | 11.61 | 3.50      |
| C 1                      | winnout                | 75 | 21.33 | 6.33 | 12.02                  | 3.38      | 21.52 | 6.53 | 12.13 | 3.31      |
| 51                       | With                   | 50 | 21.14 | 6.15 | 12.04                  | 3.46      | 21.14 | 6.13 | 12.12 | 3.44      |
|                          | vv iui                 | 75 | 22.23 | 7.86 | 12.81                  | 2.85      | 22.15 | 7.81 | 12.91 | 2.84      |
|                          | Without                | 50 | 18.71 | 4.57 | 11.05                  | 4.16      | 19.04 | 4.63 | 11.33 | 4.10      |
| \$2                      |                        | 75 | 19.54 | 6.18 | 11.63                  | 3.20      | 19.82 | 6.13 | 11.92 | 3.23      |
| 32                       | W7:41-                 | 50 | 19.42 | 6.74 | 11.34                  | 2.90      | 19.55 | 6.81 | 11.55 | 2.87      |
|                          | vv iui                 | 75 | 21.26 | 7.03 | 11.72                  | 3.03      | 21.41 | 7.22 | 11.94 | 2.97      |
| L.S.D. at 5% Salinity    |                        |    | 0.03  | 0.01 | 0.02                   | 0.01      | 0.03  | 0.01 | 0.01  | 0.01      |
| Mycorrhizae              |                        |    | 0.01  | 0.02 | 0.01                   | 0.01      | 0.01  | 0.02 | 0.01  | 0.01      |
| Mineral Fertilizers (MF) |                        |    | 0.01  | 0.01 | 0.01                   | 0.01      | 0.01  | 0.01 | 0.01  | 0.01      |
| Interaction              |                        |    | 0.02  | 0.02 | 0.01                   | 0.01      | 0.02  | 0.02 | 0.01  | 0.01      |
| (£) dry matter           |                        |    |       |      |                        |           |       |      |       |           |

#### **Total microbial counts**

Data presented in Table (7) clearly showed that there are high variations of total microbial counts between all treatments in tomato plant rhizosphere at two salinity levels, two mineral fertilizers doses and mycorrhizal inoculation. Highest total microbial counts recorded with mycorrhizal inoculation at first salinity level and 75% mineral fertilizer being  $180 \times 10^5$  cfu / g dry soil, increasing salinity level causes significant decrease in total microbial counts. Mycorrhizal inoculation treatments increase significantly the total microbial count by 33.60 and 35.00% compared with uninoculated treatments. While increasing salinity level from S1 to S2 decreases the total microbial counts by 11.18 and 11.33%, in two seasons, respectively. Whereas the mineral fertilizers have slightly affected the total microbial counts. When mineral fertilizers increase from 50 to 75% of recommended dose, increases the total microbial counts by 0.34 and 1.51% in two seasons, respectively. This finding is in accordance with Abd El-Gawad (2014) who reported that, microbial inoculants increase number and biological activities of desired microorganisms and improve the fertility in the root zone.

#### Phosphatase enzyme

Presented data in Table (7) clearly showed that, phosphatase activity recorded significant increase with mycorrhizae treatments. Mycorrhizae inoculation treatment with 50% mineral fertilizer level at S1 recorded the highest phosphatase activity being (0.46 and 0.52 mg phenol/g soil/24h) at first and second seasons, respectively. Mycorrhizal inoculation treatments increase the phosphatase activity at S1 by 45.92 and 52.88% in two seasons compared to uninoculated treatments. While increasing salinity level from S1 to S2 decreases the phosphatase activity by 23.15 and 22.88%, in two seasons, respectively. When mineral fertilizers increase from 50 to 75% of recommended dose, increases the phosphatase activity by 7.76 and 8.73% in two seasons, respectively. George *et al.*, (2002) found that Phosphatase enzyme is able to mineralize organic phosphates into inorganic form of phosphates that available high phosphate for plant.

# Root colonization and number of spores in soil rhizosphere

The root colonization of tomato plants and number of spores/ g soil in the soil rhizosphere were affected by microbial inoculation. The percent of root colonization was higher in the tomato inoculated with mycorrhiza, where inoculation increases the root mycorrhizal infection by 257.14 and 257.89% compared to uninoculated plants. On the other side, the mycorrhizal infection was found to decrease significantly with increasing salinity (Table 7), although it remained relatively high even at high salinity. Increasing salinity level from S1 to S2 decrease the root mycorrhizal infection by 9.15 and 8.38% for the two seasons, respectively. In contrast, increase the mineral fertilizers from 50 to 75% of recommended dose increase the root mycorrhizal infection by 9.15% in first season while decrease the infection by 4.71% in the second season.

Number of mycorrhizal spores in soil increases with inoculation of mycorrhizal as described in Table (7).

#### Noha M. Abdelhameid and Mona M. El-Shazly

Number of spores increase by 53.65 and 54.48% in inoculated treatments compared to uninoculated treatments. Also, increase mineral fertilizers from 50 to 75% of recommended dose increases the number of spores in soil by 34.18 and 34.47% in two seasons, respectively. On the other hand, increase salinity levels from S1 to S2 decrease the soil number of spores by 18.81 and 18.65% in two seasons, respectively. Kobae *et al.*, (2016) recognized that high phosphorus supply has a strong inhibitory effect on

mycorrhizal colonization. Nitrogen decrease may be able to generate a signal that responds the inhibition of high phosphorus availabilities on mycorrhiza colonization (Breuillin-Sessoms *et al.*, 2015; Nouri *et al.*, 2014). This result is in agreement with ARM (2014) root colonization (percent) was enhanced significantly by the influence of VAM compared to in absence. Solaiman *et al.* (2005) also recorded enhanced root colonization in chickpea due to the influence of VAM.

Table 7. Effect of Mycorrhizal inoculation, two salinity levels and mineral fertilizer levels on microbial determinations in rhizosphere of tomato plants grown at El-Shiekh zowaied, Egypt

| Salinity S1 S2 L.S.D. at          | Мусо           | MF  | Total microbial count<br>cfu/ml |                        | Phosp<br>(mg pheno     | hatase<br>l/g soil/24h) | Myco<br>Infect         | rrhizal<br>tion %      | Mycorrhizal No.<br>of spores/g soil |                        |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|-----|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
|                                   | •              |     | 1st season                      | 2 <sup>nd</sup> season | 1 <sup>st</sup> season | 2 <sup>nd</sup> season  | 1 <sup>st</sup> season | 2 <sup>nd</sup> season | 1st season                          | 2 <sup>nd</sup> season |
|                                   | Without        | 50  | 129                             | 131                    | 0.23                   | 0.25                    | 17.1                   | 19.3                   | 7.6                                 | 8.4                    |
| S1                                | without        | 75  | 133                             | 130                    | 0.3                    | 0.31                    | 19.2                   | 20.5                   | 14.1                                | 15.5                   |
|                                   | With           | 50  | 180                             | 182                    | 0.46                   | 0.52                    | 62.5                   | 74.4                   | 15.2                                | 16.7                   |
|                                   |                | 75  | 173                             | 176                    | 0.34                   | 0.37                    | 69.4                   | 68.6                   | 17.4                                | 19.2                   |
|                                   | Without        | 50  | 115                             | 117                    | 0.21                   | 0.23                    | 16.1                   | 18.2                   | 7.6                                 | 8.3                    |
| 62                                |                | 75  | 123                             | 122                    | 0.24                   | 0.25                    | 18.3                   | 19.4                   | 10.13                               | 11.1                   |
| 52                                | With           | 50  | 161                             | 162                    | 0.35                   | 0.37                    | 58.6                   | 67.5                   | 12.3                                | 13.6                   |
| S1<br>S2<br>L.S.D. at<br>Mycorrhi | vv iui         | 75  | 154                             | 155                    | 0.28                   | 0.33                    | 61.4                   | 63.7                   | 15.7                                | 17.4                   |
| L.S.D. at                         | 5%Salinity     |     | 0.39                            | 0.39                   | 0.002                  | 0.001                   | 0.09                   | 0.09                   | 0.05                                | 0.06                   |
| Mycorrhi                          | zae            |     | 0.48                            | 0.50                   | 0.001                  | 0.001                   | 0.51                   | 0.56                   | 0.06                                | 0.07                   |
| Mineral F                         | Fertilizers (N | MF) | 0.04                            | 0.04                   | 0.001                  | 0.001                   | 0.03                   | 0.02                   | 0.03                                | 0.03                   |
| Interactio                        | n              |     | 0.09                            | 0.09                   | 0.001                  | 0.001                   | 0.05                   | 0.05                   | 0.05                                | 0.05                   |

## CONCLUSION

Impact of salinity on growth parameters of tomato plant, mineral contents of shoots, fruit yields and microbial determinations. Mycorrhizal inoculation and mineral fertilizer levels (50 and 75 %) showed positive results at two salinity levels on all studied parameters. Tomato plants treated with mycorrhizal fungi showed mitigative and protective role in counteraction negative salinity effects. Mycorrhiza increased root system activity, and plant access ability to nutrients in addition to producing hormones simulating growth. Finally investigating results of this study indicated that positive effects of mycorrhizal inoculation on growth hold true to tomato. Therefore, the study results indicated that the application of suitable mycorrhizae could be efficient to increasing yield, improving growth traits of tomato.

## REFERENCES

- A. O. A. C. (2005). "Association Official Analytical Chemists, Official methods of analysis," Washington. D C. USA.
- Abd El-Gawad, A. M. (2014). Evaluation the activity of Rhodotourla glutinis and molybdenum on growth and productivity of Faba bean under north Sinai conditions. Egypt.J. of Appl. Sci. 29(3), 155-173.
- Abdelhameid, N. M. (2019). Effect of mycorrhizal inoculation and potassium fertilization on grain yield and nutrient uptake of sweet sorghum cultivated under water stress in calcareous soil. Egyptian Journal of Soil Science. Vol. 60, No. 1, pp. 17 - 29.
- Al-Karaki, G. N., and Hammad, R. (2001). Mycorrhizal influence on fruit yield and mineral content of tomato grown under salt stress. J. of plant nutr.24(8), 1311-1323.

- Al-Karaki, G. N., Hammad, R., and Rusan, M. (2001). Response of two tomato cultivars differing in salt tolerance to inoculation with mycorrhizal fungi under salt stress. Mycorrhiza 11(1), 43-47.
- ARM, S. (2014). Influence of arbusclar mycorrhiza in presence of Rhizobium, nitrogen and phosphorus on growth and yield of mungbean. Bulletin of the Institute of Tropical Agric., Kyushu Univ. 37, 1-26.
- Aroca, R., Ruiz-Lozano, J. M., Zamarreño, Á. M., Paz, J. A., García-Mina, J. M., Pozo, M. J., and López-Ráez, J. A. (2013). Arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis influences strigolactone production under salinity and alleviates salt stress in lettuce plants. J. of plant physiol. 170(1), 47-55.
- Asghari, H., Marschner, P., Smith, S., and Smith, F. (2005). Growth response of Atriplex nummularia to inoculation with arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi at different salinity levels. Plant and Soil 273, 245-256.
- Augé, R. M. (2001). Water relations, drought and vesiculararbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis. Mycorrhiza 11(1), 3-42.
- Breuillin-Sessoms, F., Floss, D. S., Gomez, S. K., Pumplin, N., Ding, Y., Levesque-Tremblay, V., Noar, R. D., Daniels, D. A., Bravo, A., and Eaglesham, J. B. (2015). Suppression of arbuscule degeneration in Medicago truncatula phosphate transporter4 mutants is dependent on the ammonium transporter 2 family protein AMT2; 3. The Plant Cell, tpc. 114.131144.
- Çekiç, F. Ö., Ünyayar, S., and Ortaş, İ. (2012). Effects of arbuscular mycorrhizal inoculation on biochemical parameters in Capsicum annuum grown under long term salt stress. Turkish J. of Botany 36(1), 63-72.
- Chen, A., Gu, M., Wang, S., Chen, J., and Xu, G. (2018). Transport properties and regulatory roles of nitrogen in arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis. Seminars in Cell & Developmental Biol. 74, 80-88.

- Cottenie, A., Verloo, M., Kiekens, L., Velghe, G., and Camerlynck, R. (1982). Chemical analysis of plants and soils. State Univ. Ghent Belgium, pp: 44-45.
- Daei, G., Ardekani, M., Rejali, F., Teimuri, S., and Miransari, M. (2009). Alleviation of salinity stress on wheat yield, yield components, and nutrient uptake using arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi under field conditions. J.of plant physiol. 166(6), 617-625.
- Dudhane, M., Borde, M., Jite, P. K., and Kulkarni, M. V. (2013). Effect of salinity stress on growth and antioxidant enzyme activities in tomato plants inoculated with Glomus intraradices. Mycorrhiza News 25(2), 14-19.
- Enteshari, S., and Hajbagheri, S. (2011). Effects of mycorrhizal fungi on some physiological characteristics of salt stressed Ocimum basilicum L. J. of Plant Physiol. 1 (4), 215–222.
- Estrada, B., Aroca, R., Barea, J. M., and Ruiz-Lozano, J. M. (2013). Native arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi isolated from a saline habitat improved maize antioxidant systems and plant tolerance to salinity. Plant sci. 201, 42-51.
- Feng, G., Zhang, F., Li, X., Tian, C., Tang, C., and Rengel, Z. (2002). Improved tolerance of maize plants to salt stress by arbuscular mycorrhiza is related to higher accumulation of soluble sugars in roots. Mycorrhiza 12(4), 185-190.
- García-Sánchez, M., Palma, J. M., Ocampo, J. A., García-Romera, I., and Aranda, E. (2014). Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi alleviate oxidative stress induced by ADOR and enhance antioxidant responses of tomato plants. J. of plant physiol. 171(6), 421-428.
- George, T., Gregory, P., Wood, M., Read, D., and Buresh, R. (2002). Phosphatase activity and organic acids in the rhizosphere of potential agroforestry species and maize. *Soil Biology Biochemistry* 34, 1487-1494.
- Gerdemann, J., and Nicolson, T. H. (1963). Spores of mycorrhizal Endogone species extracted from soil by wet sieving and decanting. Transactions of the British Mycological society 46(2), 235-244.
- Giovannetti, M., and Mosse, B. (1980). An evaluation of techniques for measuring vesicular arbuscular mycorrhizal infection in roots. New phytologist 84, 489-500.
- Giri, B., Kapoor, R., and Mukerji, K. (2003). Influence of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and salinity on growth, biomass, and mineral nutrition of Acacia auriculiformis. Biol. and Fertility of Soils 38(3), 170-175.
- Hart, M., Ehret, D., Krumbein, A., Leung, C., Murch, S., Turi, C., and Franken, P. (2015). Inoculation with arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi improves the nutritional value of tomatoes. Mycorrhiza 25, 359-376.
- Hashem, A., Abd\_Allah, E., Alqarawi, A., Al Huqail, A. A., Egamberdieva, D., and Wirth, S. J. S. j. o. b. s. (2016). Alleviation of cadmium stress in Solanum lycopersicum L. by arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi via induction of acquired systemic tolerance. 23, 272-281.

- Klute, A. (1986). Methods of soil analysis, part 1 physical and mineralogical methods, Arnold Klute ed. Agronomy Monographs 9 (1), Madison, Wisconsin, 1188 pp., 87-89.
- Kobae, Y., Ohmori, Y., Saito, C., Yano, K., Ohtomo, R., & Fujiwara, T. (2016). Phosphate treatment strongly inhibits new arbuscule development but not the maintenance of arbuscule in mycorrhizal rice roots. Plant Physiology, 171(1), 566-579.
- Li, X.-L., Marschner, H., and George, E. (1991). Acquisition of phosphorus and copper by VAmycorrhizal hyphae and root-to-shoot transport in white clover. Plant and Soil 136(1), 49-57.
- Liu, S., Guo, X., Feng, G., Maimaitiaili, B., Fan, J., and He, X. (2016). Indigenous arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi can alleviate salt stress and promote growth of cotton and maize in saline fields. Plant & Soil 398, 195-206.
- Mitra, D., Uniyal, N., Panneerselvam, P., Senapati, A., and Ganeshamurthy, A. (2019). Role of mycorrhiza and its associated bacteria on plant growth promotion and nutrient management in sustainable agriculture. Internat. J. Of Life Sci. and Appl.Sci.1(1), 1-10.
- Nautiyal, C. S. (1999). An efficient microbiological growth medium for screening phosphate solubilizing microorganisms. FEMS microbiol. Letters 170(1), 265-270.
- Nouri, E., Breuillin-Sessoms, F., Feller, U., and Reinhardt, D. (2014). Phosphorus and nitrogen regulate arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis in Petunia hybrida. PLoS One 9, e90841.
- Nzanza, B., Marais, D., and Soundy, P. (2012). Response of tomato (Solanum lycopersicum L.) to nursery inoculation with Trichoderma harzianum and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi under field conditions. Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica, Section B-Soil & Plant Science 62(3), 209-215.
- Öhlinger, R. (1996). Phosphomonoesterase activity with the substrate phenylphosphate. Methods in soil biol., 210-213.
- Oztekin, G. B., Tuzel, Y., and Tuzel, I. H. (2013). Does mycorrhiza improve salinity tolerance in grafted plants? Scientia Horticulturae 149, 55-60.
- Page, A., Miller, R., and Keeney, D. (1982). "Methods of soil analysis. Part 2. Chemical and microbiological properties. Agronomy, No. 9," Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI. USA.
- Phillips, J., and Hayman, D. (1970). Improved procedures for clearing roots and staining parasitic and vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi for rapid assessment of infection. Transactions of the British Mycological Society 55(1), 158-IN18.
- Porcel, R., Aroca, R., and Ruiz-Lozano, J. M. (2012). Salinity stress alleviation using arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. A review. Agron. for Sustainable Develop. 32(1), 181-200.
- Rabie, G. (2005). Influence of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and kinetin on the response of mungbean plants to irrigation with seawater. Mycorrhiza 15(3), 225-230.

#### Noha M. Abdelhameid and Mona M. El-Shazly

- Singh, S., Rekha, P., Arun, A., Huang, Y.-M., Shen, F.-T., and Young, C.-C. (2011). Wastewater from monosodium glutamate industry as a low cost fertilizer source for corn (Zea mays L.). Biomass and Bioenergy 35(9), 4001-4007.
- Snedecor, G., and Cochran, W. (1969). "Statistical methods 6th ed The Iowa State University Press Ames Iowa USA."
- Solaiman, A., Rabbani, M., and Molla, M. (2005). Effects of inoculation of Rhizobium and Arbuscular Mycorrhiza, Poultry litter, Nitrogen, and Phosphorus on growth and yield in chickpea. Korean J. of Crop Sci. 50, 256-261.
- Sonneveld, C., and Welles, G. (1988). Yield and quality of rockwool-grown tomatoes as affected by variations in EC-value and climatic conditions. Plant and soil 111(1), 37-42.
- Tawaraya, K., Naito, M., and Wagatsuma, T. (2006). Solubilization of insoluble inorganic phosphate by hyphal exudates of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. J. of Plant Nutr. 29, 657-665.

- Vuksani, A., Sallaku, G., and Balliu, A. (2015). The Effects of Endogenous Mycorrhiza (Glomus spp.) on Stand Establishment Rate and Yield of Open Field Tomato Crop. Albanian J. of Agricultural Sci. 14, 25-30.
- Wang, Y., Wang, M., Li, Y., Wu, A., and Huang, J. (2018). Effects of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi on growth and nitrogen uptake of Chrysanthemum morifolium under salt stress. PLoS One 13.
- Wu, Q., and Xia, R. (2004). The relation between vesiculararbuscular mycorrhizae and water metabolism in plants. Chinese Agricultural Science Bulletin 20(1), 188-192.
- Yano-Melo, A. M., Saggin Jr, O. J., and Maia, L. C. (2003). Tolerance of mycorrhized banana (Musa sp. cv. Pacovan) plantlets to saline stress. Agric.,Ecosystems & Environ. 95(1), 343-348.
- Zhang, W., Wang, H. W., Wang, X. X., Xie, X. G., Siddikee, M. A., Xu, R. S., and Dai, C. C. (2016). Enhanced nodulation of peanut when co-inoculated with fungal endophyte Phomopsis liquidambari and bradyrhizobium. Plant Physiol. Biochem . 98, 1-11.

## تأثير التلقيح بفطر الميكوريزا على تحمل الطماطم للإجهاد الملحي وامتصاص العناصر في أرض رملية نهى موسى عبد الحميد ومنى مرسى الشاذلى قسم خصوبة وميكروبيولوجيا الأراضى، مركز بحوث الصحراء، مصر

لتقييم تأثير فطريات الميكوريزا (Glomus macrocarpium) مع مستوبين من التسميد المعدني الفوسفورى والنيتر وجيني (٥٠ و ٧٠٪ من الجرعة الموصى بها) بالإضافة إلى مستوبين من ملوحة الماء (2000 جزء في المليون (SI) و ٣٠٠٠ جزء في المليون (S2) )على إمتصاص العناصر الغذائية ومؤشرات النمو وكذلك كمية المحصول لنبات الطماطم. أجريت تجربة حقلية بمحطة أبحاث الشيخ زويد - شمال سيناء – مركز بحوث الصحراء- مصر خلال موسمين منتاليين. أظهرت النتائج التي تم الحصول عليها أن التلقيح بفطريات الميكوريزا يقلل من التأثير السلبي للملوحة في مؤشرات النمو وحتوى النبات من المعاطم. أجريت تجربة حقلية بمحطة أبحاث الشيخ زويد - شمال سيناء – مركز بحوث الصحراء- مصر خلال موسمين منتاليين. أظهرت النتائج التي تم الحصول عليها أن التلقيح بفطريات الميكوريزا يقلل من التأثير السلبي للملوحة في مؤشرات النمو ومحتوى النبات من المغذيات وكذا محصول الطماطم وذلك عن طريق زيادة وزن المجموع الخضرى والجذرى معنوياً بنسبة ٢٨,٦ و ٢٨,٣ و ٢٨,٣ و ٢٨,٣ و كذلك مساحة الأور اق وكذا محصول الطماطم وذلك عن طريق زيادة وزن المجموع الخضرى والجزى معنوياً بنسبة ٢٨,٦ و ٢٥,٣ و ٢٨,٣ و و ٢٨,٣ و وكذلك مساحة الأور اق ومحتوى النبات من المتويق من ١١,٩ لى ٢٨,٣ و ٢٨,٣ و ٤٢,٣ و ١٢,٣ و و ٢٢,٣ و وعدا أنسبة الجزر المجموع الخضرى والجزي دالتلويق في الموري وينا بنسبة ٢٩,٩ و ٢٢,٣ و ٢٢,٣ و ٢٢,٣ و ٢٢,٣ و ٢٢,٣ و ٢٢,٣ و ٢٢,٣ و للموريق الموسمين الول والثريت من معوى النبات من العناصر الغذائية الكبرى مثل ال و ٩ و ٢٢,٣ في المور وق المعرون المور و ٢٦,٣ و ٢٢,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٢ و٢٢ و ٢٢,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٦,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٢ و٢٢,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٦,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٦,٣ و٢٢,٣ و٢٦,٣ و٢٢,٣ 