

**UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF SOIL MICROBIOTA
IN DISEASE SUPPRESSION UNDER DIFFERENT
FARMING PRACTICES**

SHIVANI KHATRI



**DEPARTMENT OF BIOCHEMICAL ENGINEERING AND
BIOTECHNOLOGY**

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

JANUARY 2024

**UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF SOIL MICROBIOTA
IN DISEASE SUPPRESSION UNDER DIFFERENT
FARMING PRACTICES**

by

SHIVANI KHATRI

**DEPARTMENT OF BIOCHEMICAL ENGINEERING AND
BIOTECHNOLOGY**

Submitted

*In fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy*

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

JANUARY 2024

*DEDICATED
TO THE
ALMIGHTY
AND MY
PARENTS*

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “**Understanding the role of soil microbiota in disease suppression under different farming practices**” submitted by **Ms. Shivani Khatri** has been prepared under my guidance with the rules and regulations of Indian Institute of Technology Delhi India. The results presented in this thesis have not been submitted for any degree or diploma in any other institute or university.

(Dr. Shilpi Sharma)

Professor

Department of Biochemical Engineering and Biotechnology

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

Hauz Khas, New Delhi – 110016, India

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Getting a doctorate degree had been a long-time dream of mine. Toiling and persevering of over five years, finally culminated into this beautiful moment. But as I started writing my doctoral thesis, I could not help but think of so many wonderful people whose unwavering support led me to this stage. It would be unfair of me to go on without acknowledging each and every one of them for all that they have done for me in the past six years.

*First and foremost, I would like to thank my Ph.D. supervisor, **Prof. Shilpi Sharma**, for making this possible. Her expertise in environmental microbiology has not only expanded my knowledge but also shaped my research instincts in profound ways. Her insightful feedbacks and constructive criticism have made me think critically and helped me refine my ideas. I am immensely grateful for the countless hours she has spent guiding me, sharing her wisdom, and prodding me to reach my full potential. She has helped me tremendously on both personal and professional levels. I have always been impressed by her ideas and will admit that she is one of the strongest people I know. I always strive to imbibe some of her qualities. I am very thankful to her for the constant guidance, support and motivation.*

*I wish to express my gratitude to **Dr. Yashbir S. Shivay** and **Dr. Madan Pal** from the **Indian Agricultural Research Institute**, Delhi for dedicating their time and expertise for the field experiments. I was also fortunate to be able to work in **Prof. Lars Jelsbak's** lab at the **Technical University of Denmark (DTU)** during my stay as a visiting Ph.D. student for 6 months (September 2019 to February 2020). The work I did there was crucial in achieving my research goals. It also helped me understand how different institutes and labs work and learnt the nuances of different work cultures, which made me much more adaptable in diverse situations. I would like to thank my labmates at DTU, **Mikkel Anbo**, **Morten Lindqvist Hansen**, **Zhiming He**, **Mario Wibowo**, **Jonas Greve Lauritsen**, and **Pavelas Sazinas** (colleague and best friend) during the research visit in Prof. Jelsbak's lab, for their unconditional support in making my experiments successful. I would also like to acknowledge the efforts of **Prof. Ling Ding** in making my research story on the analysis of metabolic potential of biocontrol isolates, a great success. I thank my SRC members, **Prof. Saroj Mishra**, **Prof. Prashant Mishra**, **Prof. Preeti Srivastava**, and **Prof. Hariprasad P.** for their insightful suggestions, criticism, and appreciation, all of which helped me better my work.*

*To my dear friends (**Shubham Dubey**, **Arti Tyagi** and **Priyanka Dubey**) and lab mates (**Gautam Sir**, **Richa Ma'am**, **Sonal Ma'am**, **Swati Ma'am**, **Upma Ma'am**, **Vijal Ma'am**, **Salila**, **Rashi**, **Priya**, **Priyanka Ma'am**, **Kanika** and **Soumya**), words cannot fully convey my appreciation for their cheerful support and understanding throughout my research tenure. Their friendship has been a pillar of strength, providing the much-needed encouragement, laughter, and a shoulder to lean on when the weight of this endeavour felt overwhelming. I would like to thank **Shubham**, who always stood by me*

*both personally and professionally. Not only has he been a laboratory colleague, but I consider him a true friend whom I met during my Ph.D. tenure. I would also like to thank **Swati ma'am**, **Vijal ma'am** and **Upma ma'am** for their affection for me, with whom I never felt homesick. I will always be grateful to **Annapurna Ma'am** for her help and support. She was the only lab member with whom I had very long scientific discussions. I want to thank her for nurturing my molecular biology skills.*

*I also sincerely thank the **Department of Biochemical Engineering and Biotechnology** at **Indian Institute of Technology Delhi** for providing me with well-equipped means and great opportunity to carry out my Ph.D. work. I heartily acknowledge the different funding agencies, **University of Grant Commission**, **MFIRP scheme of IITD**, **Department of Biotechnology**, and **Novozymes-Nordisk (Copenhagen, Denmark) Research Grant** for providing me with financial support during my Ph.D. tenure and international visit.*

Each one of you, whom I have thanked, has inspired me to persist in the face of challenges, to push beyond my comfort zone, and to embrace the pursuit of knowledge with unwavering determination. Your belief in me has been a constant reminder of the potential I possess, even when self-doubts threatened to cloud my vision. As I embark on the next chapter of my professional journey, I carry with me the invaluable lessons and memories we have shared. The knowledge I have gained and the connections I have formed with each of you will forever shape my future endeavours. I am honoured and humbled to have had the privilege of learning from such exceptional individuals.

*And finally, my heart goes out to my lovely Parents, Siblings (**Vansh** and **Neha**), Parents-in-laws and Husband (**Pravesh Dabas**), without all of them by my side, this journey would have been impossible. Their patience, kindness, and willingness to lend an ear, even in the busiest moments, have been invaluable to me. I am inspired by the presence of my darling little princess **Kaarvi**, whose innocence has constantly motivated me to work hard towards my objectives in order to march ahead in life and do well always, so that we can have a secure and beautiful future together.*

Thanks to everyone once again, from the depths of my heart, for constant support, guidance, and friendship. I am truly blessed to have each one of you by my side throughout this transforming experience of Ph.D.

*Finally, I thank **God** for helping me out through all challenges and ensuring all my endeavours are fruitful.*

Shivani Khatri

ABSTRACT

Controlling soil-borne plant diseases by harnessing the natural potential of soil microbial communities has several benefits, including environmental sustainability and economic advantages for farmers. Disease-suppressive soils can naturally inhibit the development of phytopathogens, reducing the incidence of plant diseases. Organic agriculture relies on natural products and helps maintain ecosystem functionality by enriching soil biodiversity and chemical composition. It is well known that the higher soil microbiome activity and diversity in organic agriculture gives the soil a disease-suppressing potential against soil-borne phytopathogens. Therefore, adopting organic farming to protect crops from soil-borne diseases can curb the increasing use of pesticides and fungicides since the green revolution to improve crop quality. However, the mechanisms underlying disease suppression in organic agriculture are poorly understood. Few studies have attempted to determine the effects of organic and conventional agriculture on the structural and functional potential of the soil microbiome in relation to “general disease suppression”.

In the present study, **a comparative analysis of the effects of long-term conventional and organic farming practices (field experiment ongoing since 2004) was done in terms of identifying characteristic disease-suppressive microbial, molecular, and metabolic markers.** The soil samples from fields under conventional and organic agriculture were screened for their associated physicochemical properties and disease-suppressive potential towards a wide range of fungal and bacterial plant pathogens using dual-culture assays. The plant biometric parameters were also recorded at the harvest stage of wheat and rice grown in conventional and organic farming fields over three cropping seasons, i.e., 2018, 2019, and 2020. Once the higher disease-suppressive ability of organic farming was confirmed, its microbial basis was investigated by understanding the changes in the structural diversity of soil microbiome in conventional and organic agriculture. The bacterial and fungal diversity was

analyzed using 16S rRNA and ITS-based amplicon sequencing. Higher bacterial and lower fungal diversity was observed in soil from the field under organic farming than in conventional farming. The organic field soil harboured a higher abundance of known antagonistic bacterial and fungal genera such as *Bacillus*, *Pseudomonas*, *Burkholderia*, *Mortierella*, *Acremonium*, and *Chaetomium*. Due to the known association of *Pseudomonas* with disease-suppressive soils, its diversity was then determined in conventional and organic farming. A higher *Pseudomonas* diversity, along with increased abundance of antagonistic *Pseudomonas* species, were detected in organic farming.

The alterations in the structural diversity of the soil microbiome were then correlated with the changes in the functional potential of the soil microbiome in the context of disease suppressiveness in organic and conventional farming. Direct estimation of hydrolytic enzymes activities and quantification of disease-suppressive markers in soil, including for pyrrolnitrin, fengycin, bacillibactin, and chitinase, revealed their higher abundance in soil treated with organic fertilizers than inorganic fertilizers. A robust culture bank of biocontrol strains was generated from organic field soil, and functional characterization was done using whole-genome sequencing and untargeted metabolomics. Several antimicrobial metabolic gene clusters related to non-ribosomal peptide synthetases were found in the genomes of biocontrol isolates. The common metabolites produced by biocontrol strains in the presence of pathogenic stress were pyrrolnitrin, phenazine, obafluorin, resorcinol, etc. The bacterial isolates with good root colonization ability showed disease-suppressive ability towards *Fusarium oxysporum* and *Verticillium dahliae* with *in planta* wheat growth experiment under controlled conditions. *In planta* disease-suppressive assays were also conducted to test and compare the suppressive effects of conventional and organic field soil against *Fusarium oxysporum* and *Rhizoctonia solani* in a plant growth chamber with wheat and rice plant systems. The higher disease-suppressive ability of organic field soil was observed against both pathogens and increased

expression of biotic stress markers in plants grown in soil from conventional farming field. Based on the knowledge gained by identifying the structural and functional markers of disease-suppressiveness in organic farming, an attempt to transform a conducive soil into suppressive soil was made by a soil transplantation experiment conducted under field conditions. The transferability of disease-suppressive potential of organic field soil to the conventional field soil was confirmed by determining the changes in the structural and functional abundances of disease-suppressive markers.

Conclusively, soil under organic farming showed higher general disease-suppressive potential than that under conventional farming. The higher disease suppressiveness in organic farming could be correlated with significant changes in the structural and functional composition of soil microbiome. The microbial taxa identified in this study can be used to generate synthetic biocontrol microbial communities that mimic natural communities in organic farming to induce overall disease suppression in conducive soils. Detection of molecular and metabolic markers that are more abundant in organic agriculture can be used to characterize any agricultural soil for its disease-suppressive potential. Developing a soil transplantation assay to convert conducive soils into disease-suppressive soils offers an approach to environment-friendly plant disease control.

सार

मृदा सूक्ष्मजीव समुदायों की प्राकृतिक क्षमता का दोहन करके मृदा जनित पौधों की बीमारियों को नियंत्रित करने के कई लाभ हैं, जिनमें पर्यावरणीय स्थिरता और किसानों के लिए आर्थिक लाभ शामिल हैं। रोग-दमनकारी मिट्टी स्वाभाविक रूप से संयंत्र रोगजनकों के विकास को रोक सकती है, जिससे पौधों की बीमारियों की घटनाओं में कमी आती है। जैविक कृषि प्राकृतिक उत्पादों पर निर्भर करती है और मिट्टी की जैव विविधता और रासायनिक संरचना को समृद्ध करके पारिस्थितिकी तंत्र की कार्यक्षमता को बनाए रखने में मदद करती है। यह सर्वविदित है कि उच्च मृदा सूक्ष्मकाय गतिविधि और जैविक कृषि में विविधता मिट्टी को मृदा जनित संयंत्र रोगजनकों के खिलाफ रोग-दबाने की क्षमता प्रदान करती है। इसलिए, फसलों को मिट्टी से होने वाली बीमारियों से बचाने के लिए जैविक खेती को अपनाने से फसल की गुणवत्ता में सुधार के लिए हरित क्रांति के बाद से कीटनाशकों और फफूंदनाशकों के बढ़ते उपयोग पर अंकुश लगाया जा सकता है। हालांकि, जैविक कृषि में रोग दमन के तंत्र को कम समझा जाता है। कुछ अध्ययनों ने "सामान्य रोग दमन" (general disease suppressiveness) के संबंध में मिट्टी के सूक्ष्मकाय की संरचनात्मक और कार्यात्मक क्षमता पर जैविक और पारंपरिक कृषि के प्रभावों को निर्धारित करने का प्रयास किया है।

वर्तमान अध्ययन में, विशिष्ट रोग-दमनकारी सूक्ष्मजैविक, आणविक और चयापचय अंकनों की पहचान करने के संदर्भ में दीर्घकालिक पारंपरिक और जैविक खेती प्रथाओं (2004 से चल रहे खेती प्रयोग) के प्रभावों का तुलनात्मक विश्लेषण किया गया था। पारंपरिक और जैविक कृषि के तहत खेतों से मिट्टी के नमूनों को उनके संबंधित भौतिक-रासायनिक गुणों और रोग-दमनकारी क्षमता के लिए dual-culture assays का उपयोग करके फफूंद और जीवाणु पादप रोगजनकों की एक विस्तृत श्रृंखला के लिए जांचा गया। तीन फसली मौसमों, यानी 2018, 2019 और 2020 में पारंपरिक और जैविक खेती के खेतों में उगाए गए गेहूं और चावल की कटाई के चरण में फसल उत्पादकता में वृद्धि मानक भी दर्ज किए गए थे। जैविक खेती की उच्च रोग-दमनकारी क्षमता की पुष्टि हो जाने के बाद, इसकी पारंपरिक और जैविक कृषि में मृदा

सूक्ष्मकाय की संरचनात्मक विविधता में परिवर्तन को समझकर सूक्ष्मजैविक आधार की जांच की गई। 16S rRNA- और ITS- आधारित amplicon अनुक्रमण का उपयोग करके जीवाणु और कवक विविधता का विश्लेषण किया गया था। पारंपरिक खेती की तुलना में जैविक खेती के तहत खेत की मिट्टी में उच्च जीवाणु और कम कवक विविधता देखी गई। जैविक खेती की मिट्टी में *Bacillus*, *Pseudomonas*, *Burkholderia*, *Mortierella*, *Acremonium*, और *Chaetomium* जैसे ज्ञात प्रतिपक्षी जीवाणु और कवक जनन की अधिकता पाई जाती है। रोग-दमनकारी मिट्टी के साथ *Pseudomonas* के ज्ञात जुड़ाव के कारण, इसकी विविधता तब पारंपरिक और जैविक खेती में निर्धारित की गई थी। जैविक खेती में प्रतिपक्षी *Pseudomonas* प्रजातियों की बहुतायत में वृद्धि के साथ एक उच्च *Pseudomonas* विविधता का पता चला।

मृदा सूक्ष्मकाय की संरचनात्मक विविधता में परिवर्तन तब जैविक और पारंपरिक खेती में रोग दमन के संदर्भ में मृदा सूक्ष्मकाय की कार्यात्मक क्षमता में परिवर्तन के साथ सहसंबद्ध थे। Hydrolytic enzymes की गतिविधियों का प्रत्यक्ष अनुमान और मिट्टी में रोग दमनकारी अंकों की मात्रा का ठहराव, जिसमें pyrrolnitrin, fengycin, bacillibactin और chitinase शामिल हैं, ये अकार्बनिक उर्वरकों की तुलना में जैविक उर्वरकों के साथ उपचारित मिट्टी में उनकी उच्च बहुतायत का खुलासा किया। जैविक खेती की मिट्टी से जैविक नियंत्रक जीवाणुओं का एक मजबूत culture बैंक तैयार किया गया था, और पूरे-जीनोम अनुक्रमण और अलक्षित metabolomics का उपयोग करके कार्यात्मक लक्षण वर्णन किया गया था। जैविक नियंत्रक जीवाणुओं के genome में non-ribosomal peptide synthetase से संबंधित कई रोगाणुरोधी चयापचय जीन क्लस्टर पाए गए। रोगजनक तनाव की उपस्थिति में जैविक नियंत्रक जीवाणु द्वारा उत्पादित सामान्य metabolites pyrrolnitrin, fengycin, obafluorin, resorcinol आदि थे। अच्छी जड़ उपनिवेशन क्षमता वाले जीवाण ने फसल गेहूं विकास प्रयोग में नियंत्रित गेहूं के विकास प्रयोग के साथ *Fusarium oxysporum* और *Verticillium dahliae* के प्रति रोग दमनकारी क्षमता दिखाई। स्थितियाँ। फसल रोग में गेहूं और चावल के पौधे प्रणालियों के साथ एक पौधे के विकास कक्ष में *Fusarium oxysporum* और *Rhizoctonia solani* के खिलाफ पारंपरिक और जैविक खेती की मिट्टी के दमनकारी

प्रभावों का परीक्षण और तुलना करने के लिए दमनकारी परीक्षण भी किए गए थे। पारंपरिक कृषि खेती से मिट्टी में उगाए गए पौधों में रोगजनकों और जैविक तनाव अंकनों की अभिव्यक्ति दोनों के खिलाफ जैविक खेती की मिट्टी की उच्च रोग-दमनकारी क्षमता देखी गई। जैविक खेती में रोग दमनकारीता के संरचनात्मक और कार्यात्मक अंकनों की पहचान करके प्राप्त ज्ञान के आधार पर, एक अनुकूल मिट्टी को दमनकारी मिट्टी में बदलने का प्रयास खेती की परिस्थितियों में किए गए मिट्टी के प्रत्यारोपण प्रयोग द्वारा किया गया था। रोग-दमनकारी मार्करों के संरचनात्मक और कार्यात्मक बहुतायत में परिवर्तन का निर्धारण करके पारंपरिक खेती की मिट्टी में जैविक खेती की मिट्टी की रोग दमनकारी क्षमता की हस्तांतरणीयता की पुष्टि की गई थी।

निष्कर्ष रूप से, जैविक खेती के तहत मिट्टी ने पारंपरिक खेती की तुलना में अधिक सामान्य रोग-दमनकारी क्षमता दिखाई। जैविक खेती में उच्च रोग दमनात्मकता को मृदा सूक्ष्मकाय की संरचनात्मक और कार्यात्मक संरचना में महत्वपूर्ण परिवर्तनों के साथ सहसंबद्ध किया जा सकता है। इस अध्ययन में पहचाने गए सूक्ष्मजैविक taxa का उपयोग कृत्रिम जैविक नियंत्रक जीवाणुओं के समुदायों को उत्पन्न करने के लिए किया जा सकता है जो अनुकूल मिट्टी में समग्र रोग दमन को प्रेरित करने के लिए जैविक खेती में प्राकृतिक समुदायों की नकल करते हैं। कार्बनिक कृषि में अधिक प्रचुर मात्रा में आणविक और चयापचय अंकनों का पता लगाने का उपयोग किसी भी कृषि मिट्टी को रोग-दमनकारी क्षमता के लिए चिह्नित करने के लिए किया जा सकता है। अनुकूल मिट्टी को रोग-दमनकारी मिट्टी में बदलने के लिए मिट्टी के प्रत्यारोपण परख का विकास करना पर्यावरण के अनुकूल पौधों के रोग नियंत्रण के लिए एक दृष्टिकोण प्रदान करता है।

LIST OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
CERTIFICATE	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii-iii
ABSTRACT	iv-ix
LIST OF FIGURES	xvi-xix
LIST OF TABLES	xx-xxi
ABBREVIATIONS	xxii-xxiv
1. INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES	32-41
1.1 Introduction	33
1.1.1 Sustainable agriculture and organic farming	34
1.1.2 Disease-suppressive soils	35
1.1.3 Mechanisms of suppression of plant pathogens	37
1.1.4 Organic farming and disease-suppressiveness	38
1.1.5 Model crops used in this study	40
1.2 Objectives	40
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	43-65
2.1 Soil health	43
2.2 Soil-borne plant diseases	43
2.3 Disease-suppressive soils	45
2.4 Mechanistic understanding of disease-suppressive soils	48
2.5 Omics approaches to study disease-suppressive soils	50
2.6 Organic farming and disease suppressiveness	53
2.7. Transformation of conducive soil to suppressive one	64
3. MATERIALS AND METHODS	66-101
3.1. Study site under conventional and organic farming	70
3.1.1. Model crops	70
3.1.2. Experimental location	71
3.1.3. Treatments	71

3.1.4. Cropping seasons	71
3.1.5. Plant and soil sampling and analysis	72
3.1.5.1. <i>Plant growth parameters</i>	72
3.1.5.2. <i>Yield parameters of crop</i>	72
3.1.5.3. <i>Soil physiochemical properties</i>	73
3.2 <i>In vitro</i> screening of soil for disease-suppressive potential	73
3.2.1. Phytopathogens selected for the study	73
3.2.2. Dual-culture assay to check the suppressive potential of bacterial and fungal components of soil	74
3.3. Analysis of soil microbial communities with a culture-independent approach	75
3.3.1. DNA extraction and polymerase chain reaction (PCR)	75
3.3.2. Prokaryotic community structure of soil under different farming practices	76
3.3.2.1. <i>Total bacterial diversity using amplicon sequencing</i>	76
3.3.2.1.1. <u>16S rRNA-based library preparation and Illumina sequencing</u>	76
3.3.2.1.2. <u>Processing of raw reads and taxonomic assignment</u>	79
3.3.2.2. <i>Pseudomonas diversity using amplicon sequencing</i>	79
3.3.2.2.1. <u>rpoD-based library preparation and Illumina sequencing</u>	79
3.3.2.2.2. <u>Processing of raw reads and taxonomic assignment</u>	80
3.3.3. Total fungal diversity using ITS-based amplicon sequencing	80
3.3.3.1. <i>ITS-based library preparation and Illumina sequencing</i>	80
3.3.3.2. <i>Raw sequencing reads processing and taxonomic annotation</i>	81
3.4. Quantification of structural and functional disease-suppressive markers in soil under different farming practices	82
3.4.1. Quantification of biocontrol activities in soil	82
3.4.2. Quantification of disease-suppressive and group specific genes using quantitative PCR (qPCR)	83
3.5. Culture-dependent analysis of soil microbial communities	87
3.5.1. Selective isolation of biocontrol genera from soil under organic farming	87
3.5.2. Biocontrol properties of selected potent antagonistic strains	88
3.5.2.1. <i>Chitinase activity</i>	88
3.5.2.2. <i>Siderophore production</i>	88
3.5.2.3. <i>HCN production</i>	89
3.5.2.4. <i>IAA production</i>	89

3.5.3. Bacterial genomic DNA extraction	90
3.5.4. Phylogenetic affiliation of bacterial isolates	90
3.5.5. Whole-genome sequencing and metabolic cluster analysis of <i>Pseudomonas</i> isolates	91
3.5.6. Detection of metabolites having biocontrol activity by <i>Pseudomonas</i> strains	92
3.6. <i>In planta</i> assays under controlled condition	93
3.6.1. Suppressive potential of individual bacterial isolates against fungal phytopathogens	93
3.6.1.1. Root colonization assay and scanning electron microscopy (SEM)	93
3.6.1.2. Plant growth experiment to determine biocontrol activity of <i>Pseudomonas</i> strains	95
3.6.1.2.1. Scoring of disease severity in plantlets	96
3.6.1.2.2. Plant growth parameters	96
3.6.2. Plant growth experiment to determine the suppressive potential of soil	96
3.6.2.1. Calculation of disease severity index	97
3.6.2.2. Plant growth parameters	98
3.6.2.3. Quantification of stress-specific biomarkers in plants	98
3.7. Soil transformation assay using PVC pipe setup under field condition	99
3.7.1. Measurement of disease severity index of plants	101
3.7.2. Recording plant biometric parameters	101
3.7.3. Quantification of abundance of structural and functional disease-suppressive biomarkers in soil	101
3.8. Statistical analysis	101
4. RESULTS	103-209
4.1. Impact of conventional and organic farming practice on soil characteristics and plant growth parameters	104
4.1.1. Plant growth and yield attributes	104
4.1.2. Soil physiochemical parameters	106
4.1.3. Cumulative effect of agricultural practices on soil and plant parameters	111
4.2. Potential of disease suppression in soil against phytopathogens for fields under conventional and organic regimes of farming	113
4.3. Structural diversity of microbiome in conventional and organic agriculture	118
4.3.1. Total bacterial and fungal abundance in conventional and organic field soil	118

4.3.2. Estimation of various bacterial phyla abundance in soil from conventional and organic field	119
4.3.3. Impact of individual variables on the abundance of structural members of soil microbiome in conventional and organic agriculture	129
4.3.3.1. <i>Soil management practices</i>	129
4.3.3.2. <i>Seasonal variability</i>	130
4.3.3.3. <i>Cropping systems</i>	133
4.3.4. Fungal community structure in conventional and organic agriculture	134
4.3.4.1. <i>Taxonomic annotation of fungal diversity</i>	134
4.3.4.2. <i>α-diversity of fungal communities</i>	138
4.3.4.3. <i>β-diversity of fungal communities</i>	141
4.3.5. Prokaryotic communities in conventional and organic agriculture	142
4.3.5.1. <i>Structural diversity of prokaryotic communities at different taxonomic levels</i>	142
4.3.5.2. <i>α-diversity of prokaryotic communities</i>	147
4.3.5.3. <i>β-diversity of prokaryotic communities</i>	149
4.3.6. <i>Pseudomonas</i> diversity in conventional and organic agriculture	151
4.3.6.1. <i>Pseudomonas diversity at different taxonomic levels under conventional and organic farming</i>	151
4.3.6.2. <i>α-diversity of <i>Pseudomonas</i> communities</i>	153
4.3.6.3. <i>β-diversity of <i>Pseudomonas</i> communities</i>	154
4.4. Functional diversity of rhizospheric soil microbiome from conventional and organic farming in context to disease suppression	155
4.4.1. Comparison of activity of hydrolytic enzymes and production of siderophores in conventional and organic field soil	155
4.4.2. Abundance of disease-suppressive genetic biomarkers in conventional and organic field soil	156
4.4.3. Impact of individual variables on the abundance of markers (genes) for disease-suppressiveness in conventional and organic field soil	163
4.4.3.1 <i>Soil management practices</i>	163
4.4.3.2. <i>Seasonal variability</i>	164
4.4.3.3. <i>Cropping systems</i>	166
4.5. Generation of culture bank of biocontrol strains isolated from organic field	168

4.6. Disease-suppressive potential of bacterial soil isolates from organic field	170
4.6.1. Biocontrol properties and disease suppression ability of bacterial isolates against phytopathogens	170
4.6.2. Phylogenetic affiliation of bacterial isolates	173
4.7. Analysis of whole-genome sequences and metabolic gene clusters of <i>Pseudomonas</i> isolates	175
4.8. Antimicrobial metabolites produced by <i>Pseudomonas</i> isolates	181
4.9. Plant growth experiment for assessing disease-suppression trait of <i>Pseudomonas</i> isolates identified from plots of organic field	185
4.9.1. Root colonization ability of <i>Pseudomonas</i> isolates	185
4.9.2. <i>In planta</i> assay to check the disease suppression activity of <i>Pseudomonas</i> strains identified from organic field, against fungal phytopathogens	190
4.10. <i>In planta</i> disease-suppression capacity of soil against fungal phytopathogens	193
4.10.1. Disease severity index	193
4.10.2. Plant growth parameters	195
4.10.3. Biotic stress markers	197
4.11. Transforming conducive soil into disease-suppressive soil	199
4.11.1. Assessing severity of disease in plants	199
4.11.2. Plant growth parameters	200
4.11.3. Abundance of microbial members in soil	203
4.11.3.1. <i>Abundance of bacteria and fungi in rhizospheric microbiome</i>	203
4.11.3.2. <i>Abundance of dominant bacterial phyla in rhizospheric microbiome</i>	204
4.11.4. Activity of hydrolytic enzymes in the rhizosphere	205
4.11.5. Estimation of disease-suppressive gene abundances in transformed soil and in conventional and organic field soil	206
5. DISCUSSION	210-237
5.1. Crop-specific changes in physiochemical properties of plant and soil	215
5.1.1. Higher plant growth parameters recorded under organic farming	215
5.1.2. Improved soil physiochemical parameters observed under organic farming	216
5.2. Response of the microbiome towards different farming practices	217
5.2.1. Changes in the structural diversity of microbiome in soil under conventional and organic farming	217

5.2.1.1. <i>Opposite trends recorded for the abundance of bacterial and fungal populations</i>	217
5.2.1.2. <i>Basidiomycota and Zygomycota identified as dominant members in disease-suppressive soil</i>	219
5.2.1.3. <i>Higher bacterial diversity under organic farming contributed to disease-suppressive ability of the soil</i>	222
5.2.1.4. <i>Pseudomonas emerged as a key player in conferring disease-suppressiveness</i>	224
5.2.2. Higher biocontrol activities and abundance of disease-suppressive genes in the soil contributed to disease-suppressiveness in organic agriculture	225
5.3. Inhibition of disease development by phytopathogens in soil fertilized with organic amendments	230
5.4. <i>Pseudomonas</i> isolates from organic field showed biocontrol activities against phytopathogens	231
5.5. Soil from organic field induced disease-suppressiveness in soil from conventional field	233
5.5.1. Lower disease severity and better plant growth noticed in transformed soil	233
5.5.2. Changes detected in the abundance of structural and functional genes in rhizosphere	235
6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	238-243
 6.1. Summary	 239
6.2. Conclusions	242
<i>Bibliography</i>	244
<i>Appendix</i>	268
CURRICULUM VITAE	274

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Figure legend	Page No.
2.1	Possible underlying mechanisms of disease-suppressive soils	48
2.2	Target and non-target effects of organic farming on attributes of plants and soil	54
3.1	Experimental layout to understand the effect of different agri-management practices on the structural and functional diversity of microbiome in the context of disease suppressiveness (Objective 1)	67
3.2	Schematic representation of the approach adopted to transform conducive soil into soil suppressive against soil-borne phytopathogens (Objective 2)	68
3.3	Experimental field at ICAR-IARI, New Delhi	70
3.4	Representative image of dual culture assay with bacterial soil suspension, against <i>Fusarium solani</i> after 10 days of incubation at 28°C	74
3.5	Biocontrol activities of potent bacterial isolates from soil: chitinase activity (a), siderophore production (b), and HCN production (c)	89
3.6	Different zones of growth of root systems	94
3.7	Tubes with 0.6% growth medium to conduct plant growth experiment	95
3.8	PVC-pipe setup of the experiment conducted to transform conducive soil into a suppressive one by soil transplantation	100
4.1	The box plots illustrate the impact of different agricultural management practices on the height of plants (a, b), and their grain yield (c, d) during three consecutive cropping seasons (2018, 2019, and 2020) for wheat and rice crops	105
4.2	Box plot showing the effect of conventional and organic farming on straw yield (a, b), and biological yield (c, d) of wheat and rice crops, respectively (n=3)	105
4.3	Box plots representing the effect of different farming practice on pH (a, b), electrical conductivity (c, d) and bulk density of soil (e, f) during cropping seasons of wheat and rice, respectively	107
4.4	Box plots representing the impact of different farming practices on available N (a, b), available P (c, d), available K (e, f), and organic C (g, h) of wheat and rice crops, respectively (n=3)	110
4.5	Principal component analysis to study effect of different regimes of farming on soil and yield parameters of wheat and rice for three cropping seasons i.e., 2018, 2019 and 2020	112
4.6	Disease-suppressive potential of bacterial component of soil from different farming practices and control estimated with dual culture assays against <i>Fusarium solani</i> (FS) and <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> (FO)	114
4.7	The potential of disease suppression by bacterial members in soil from different agricultural regimes and control against fungal and bacterial pathogens using a dual culture assay	115
4.8	The potential of disease suppression by fungal members of soil under different practices of farming and control estimated using dual culture assays	116

4.9	The potential of disease suppression by fungal component of soil in different agricultural regimes and control against fungal and bacterial pathogens using a dual culture assay	117
4.10	Total abundance of bacteria and fungi in control soil and in conventional and organic field soil	119
4.11	The abundance of <i>Actinobacteria</i> , <i>Acidobacteria</i> and <i>Gemmatimonadetes</i> in control soil, and in conventional and organic field soil	123
4.12	The abundance of <i>Firmicutes</i> , α - and β - <i>Proteobacteria</i> in soil in control soil, and in conventional and organic field soil	124
4.13	NMDS plots demonstrating the differences in the abundance of structural members of rhizospheric microbiome under different farming practices and in control soil in accordance to Bray-Curtis distances at wheat (a), and rice (b) harvest	130
4.14	Box-Whisker plots showing the effect of different cropping seasons (2018, 2019, and 2020) on the abundance of markers for total bacteria, total fungi, and dominant bacterial phyla from rhizosphere of the wheat cropping system	131
4.15	Box-Whisker plots showing the effect of different cropping seasons (2018, 2019, and 2020) on the abundances of gene copies serving as marker for total bacteria, total fungi, and dominant bacterial groups in the rhizosphere of the rice cropping system	132
4.16	PCA plots showing the effect on wheat (a), and rice (b) cropping systems on the abundance of structural members of rhizospheric soil microbiome	134
4.17.	The Venn diagram representing the total number of OTUs in control soil and in organic and conventional field soil (a), stacked bar-plot depicts relative abundance of different fungal phyla in each soil sample under specific treatments with a relative frequency >0.5 (b)	136
4.18	The relative abundance plot representing different fungal species abundance having relative frequency >0.5	137
4.19	Heat map illustrating the top 30 OTUs commonly present in control soil, and in conventional and organic field soil	138
4.20	Box plots displaying the α -diversity indices of the fungal community in soil samples taken from various farming practices and the control soil	139
4.21	Total number of observed fungal OTUs depicted as rarefaction curve in the control soil, and in conventional and organic field soil	140
4.22	Principal component analysis (PCA) representing β -diversity in the fungal community of soil analyzed from different agri-management practices and control soil	141
4.23	Venn diagram representing the total number of OTUs in control soil, and in conventional and organic field soil (a). Stacked bar plot depicting the relative abundance of different phyla present in each soil sample under different treatments, with a relative frequency greater than 0.5 ($n=3$) (b)	143
4.24	The relative abundance plot depicting the abundance of various genera with a relative frequency >0.5 ($n=3$)	145
4.25	The top 50 most abundant OTUs present at genera level shown as heatmap in control soil, and in conventional and organic field soil	146
4.26	Rarefaction curve showing total number of prokaryotic OTUs observed under conventional and organic farming	148
4.27	α -diversity indices of prokaryotic community in control soil, and in conventional and organic field soil	148

4.28	β -diversity of prokaryotic communities was compared between soil samples taken from different farming systems and a control plot	150
4.29	The diversity of <i>Pseudomonas</i> species in control soil, and in conventional and organic field soil, has been shown for three replicates belonging to each treatment	152
4.30	Representation of α -diversity of <i>Pseudomonas</i> community in control soil, and in conventional and organic field soil ($p < 0.05$)	154
4.31	Representation of β -diversity of <i>Pseudomonas</i> communities in control soil, and in conventional and organic field soil ($p < 0.05$)	155
4.32	Quantitative estimation of chitinase (a), cellulase (b), and siderophore (c) from soil under different farming practices ($n=3$)	156
4.33	The abundance of chitinase (<i>GA1</i>) and pyrrolnitrin (<i>prnD</i>) gene copies in conventional and organic agriculture	159
4.34	The abundance of fengycin (<i>fenA</i>) and bacillibactin (<i>dhb</i>) gene copies in conventional and organic agriculture	160
4.35	NMDS plots demonstrating the differences in abundance of disease-suppressive genes in soil under different farming practices and from control based on Bray-Curtis distances, at wheat (a), and rice (b) harvest	164
4.36	Box-Whisker plots showing the effect of different cropping seasons (2018, 2019, and 2020) on the abundance of genes encoding pyrrolnitrin, fengycin, bacillibactin and chitinase in the rhizosphere of wheat	165
4.37	Box-Whisker plots showing the effect of different cropping seasons (2018, 2019, and 2020) on the abundance of genes encoding pyrrolnitrin, fengycin, bacillibactin and chitinase in the rhizosphere of rice	166
4.38	PCA plots showing the effect on wheat (a), and rice (b) cropping systems on the abundance of genes encoding pyrrolnitrin, fengycin, bacillibactin and chitinase in the rhizospheric soil	167
4.39	The abundance of total bacterial, fungi and biocontrol genera in control soil, and in conventional and organic field soil	169
4.40	Disease-suppressive ability of <i>Pseudomonas</i> isolates from soil from organic field tested against <i>Verticillium dahliae</i> , <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> , and <i>Erwinia carotovora</i>	173
4.41	Phylogenetic tree constructed based on neighbour-joining approach with bootstrap of 500 replicates for three strains SK (a), SK2 (b), and SK3 (c) based on <i>rpoD</i> gene sequences showing the relation of these strains with their closely related <i>Pseudomonas</i> subgroups	177
4.42	Genomic gaps of three strains of <i>Pseudomonas</i> , SK (a), SK2 (b), and SK3 (c)	179
4.43	Gene clusters with maximum similarity in the genome sequence of strain SK, SK2 and SK3 as identified by AntiSMASH analysis	181
4.44	Ion chromatograms of extracted metabolites produced by strains namely, SK, SK2 and SK3 with LC/MS: obafluorin peak extracted at m/z 359 from SK (a), dihydroaceterin peak extracted at m/z 225 from SK2 (b), phenazine-1-carboxylic acid peak extracted between m/z 225 to 245 from SK3 (c)	183
4.45	Mass spectra at respective retention time (tR): obafluorin peak extracted at tR (12.061 min) from SK (a), dihydroaceterin peak extracted at tR (8.444 min) from SK2 (b) and phenazine-1-carboxylic acid peak extracted at tR (8.462 min) from SK3 (c)	184
4.46	Colonies of different strains of <i>Pseudomonas</i> on Luria agar plate 7 days after sowing (DAS) (a). The colony count of three <i>Pseudomonas</i> strains (SK, SK2	186

	and SK3) adhered to wheat root system surface at different time points i.e., 7, 14 and 21 DAS (b)	
4.47	SEM images showing colonization of wheat roots at 7 DAS	187
4.48	SEM images showing colonization of wheat roots at 14 DAS	188
4.49	SEM images showing colonization of wheat roots at 21 DAS	189
4.50	The growth inhibitory activity of the three <i>Pseudomonas</i> isolates, viz., SK, SK2 and SK3 against fungal phytopathogens	190
4.51	The impact of <i>Pseudomonas</i> isolates on plant growth attributes upon pathogens' infestation	192
4.52	The disease-suppression capability of soil obtained from organic and conventional fields	194
4.53	Plant growth attributes of wheat and rice affected by pathogen infestation under different farming practices	196
4.54	Heatmap depicting the impact of pathogens infestation on stress-specific biomarkers of wheat (a), and rice (b) plants	198
4.55	The impact of fungal phytopathogens on wheat plant's growth under various treatments	200
4.56	Plant growth parameters under different treatments in soil transformation assay	202
4.57	Total bacterial and fungal abundance in soil from different treatments of soil transformation assay	203
4.58	Abundance of dominant bacterial phyla in different treatments in soil transformation assay	205
4.59	Chitinase (a) and cellulase (b) activities in different treatments in soil transformation assay	206
4.60	Abundance of disease-suppressive biomarkers in soil from different treatments of soil transformation assay	208
6.1	Summary of results obtained for objectives 1 and 2 of the study	241

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Legend	Page No.
2.1	Role of organic farming in disease suppressiveness	61
3.1	List of PCR primer sets and the cycling conditions to assess the diversity of bacteria, fungi, and <i>Pseudomonas</i> under different agri-management practices	78
3.2	Details of the primers and cycling conditions used in the study for quantification of disease suppressive, bacterial, and fungal markers under different farming practices	84
3.3	Treatments for soil transformation experiment	100
4.1	Pearson correlation matrix between different structural microbial markers in wheat and rice rhizosphere under conventional and organic agriculture	121
4.2	The average number of gene copies of dominant bacterial phyla under different farming practices at the flowering and harvest stages of wheat and rice over three cropping seasons.	122
4.3	The abundance of total bacteria, fungi, and dominant bacterial phyla during wheat cropping seasons (2018, 2019, 2020) under different farming practices.	125
4.4	The abundance of total bacteria, fungi, and dominant bacterial phyla during rice cropping seasons (2018, 2019, 2020) under different farming practices.	127
4.5	PERMANOVA analysis of prokaryotic diversity under different farming systems	149
4.6	Relative abundance (%) of different <i>Pseudomonas</i> species in control soil and in conventional and organic field soil	152
4.7	Pearson correlation matrix between the copies of disease-suppressive genes during wheat and rice cropping seasons	157
4.8	The average number of gene copies of functional disease-suppressive markers under different farming practices at the flowering and harvest stages of wheat and rice over three cropping seasons	158
4.9	Impact of different farming practices on abundance of various disease specific biomarkers during wheat and rice cropping seasons (2018, 2019, 2020)	161
4.10	Attributes conferring biocontrol activity to <i>Pseudomonas</i> and <i>Bacillus</i> strains isolated from organic field soil	170
4.11	Disease suppressiveness of bacterial strains against fungal and bacterial pathogens	171
4.12	Phylogenetic affiliation of <i>Pseudomonas</i> and <i>Bacillus</i> isolates using <i>rpoD</i> and 16S rRNA markers, and whole genome sequencing of three isolates	174
4.13	Genomic features and functional annotations of different <i>Pseudomonas</i> isolates (SK, SK2, and SK3) based on NCBI Prokaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline	178
4.14	Identification of biosynthetic gene clusters in the genome sequences of strains SK, SK2 and SK3	180

4.15	Metabolites produced by strains SK, SK2 and SK3 as detected with LC/MS	182
4.16	Impact of mixing soil of conventional and organic field soil, on abundance of total bacteria, fungi, dominant bacterial phyla, and disease-suppressive genetic markers. Org. and O: organic; Con. and C: conventional, S: sterile, RS: <i>Rhizoctonia solani</i> , FO: <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i>	209

ABBREVIATIONS

Molecules and Chemicals

(NH₄)₂SO₄
CAS
CTAB
DAPG
DNS
EDTA
FeCl₃
FeSO₄
H₂O₂
HClO₃
HCN
IAA
KH₂PO₄
MeCN
MgSO₄·7H₂O
NaCl
NAG
SDS

Ammonium sulfate
Chrome azurol S
Cetyl trimethyl ammonium Bromide
2,4-diacetylphloroglucinol
3,5-dinitro-salicylic acid
Ethylene diamine tetra acetic Acid
Ferric chloride
Ferrous sulphate
Hydrogen peroxide
Chloric acid
Hydrogen cyanide
Indole acetic acid
Dihydrogen potassium phosphate
Acetonitrile
Magnesium sulfate heptahydrate
Sodium chloride
N-acetyl-glucosamine
Sodium dodecyl sulfate

Units

%
bp
cm
dS m⁻¹
g
g cc⁻¹
kg
°C
Ng
L
m
M
mL
mm
min
rpm
S
v/v
t_R
μL
μM
μg mL⁻¹
tonnes h⁻¹

Percent
Base pairs
Centimetre
Deci Siemens per metre
Gram
Gram per cubic metre
Kilogram
Degrees Celsius
Nanogram
Litre
Metre
Molar
Millilitre
Millimetre
Minutes
Revolutions per minute
Seconds
Volume by volume
Retention time
Microliter
Micromolar
Microgram per milliliter
Tonnes per Hectare

Elements

N	Nitrogen
P	Phosphorus
K	Potassium
C	Carbon

Important terminology used in the study

AMF	Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungus
BGA	Blue Green Algae
BGCs	Biosynthetic Gene Clusters
CFU	Colony Forming Unit
CLPP	Community Level Physiological Profiling
DAS	Days After Sowing
<i>dhbA</i>	Bacillibactin
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic Acid
EC	Electrical Conductivity
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
<i>FenA</i>	Fengycin
FYM	Farmyard Manure
<i>GA1</i>	Chitinase
ISR	Induced Systemic Resistance
ITCC	Indian Type Culture Collection
ITS	Internal Transcribed Spacer
LC/MS	Liquid Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry
LGLM	<i>Leucaena</i> Green Manure
MCT	Microcentrifuge Tube
MLSA	Multilocus Sequence Analysis
MTCC	Microbial Type Culture Collection
NCBI	National Center for Biotechnology Information
NMDS	Nonmetric Multidimensional Scaling
NMSA	National Mission for Sustainable Agriculture
ODW	Oven Dry Weight
OTU	Operational Taxonomic Unit
PCA	Principal Component Analysis
PCR	Polymerase Chain Reaction
PDA	Potato Dextrose Agar
PDB	Potato Dextrose Broth
PERMANOVA	Permutational Multivariate Analysis of Variance
PGPB	Plant Growth Promoting Bacteria
PO	Peroxidase
PPO	Polyphenol Oxidase
PPO	Phenol peroxidase
<i>prnD</i>	Pyrrolnitrin
PVC	Polyvinyl Chloride
QIIME	Quantitative Insights into Microbial Ecology

qPCR	quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction
<i>rpoD</i>	RNA polymerase sigma factor D
rRNA	Ribosomal Ribonucleic Acid
SEM	Scanning Electron Microscopy
SGM	<i>Sesbania</i> Green Manure
SOC	Soil Organic Carbon
SRA	Sequence Read Archive
SSP	Single Superphosphate
T-RFLP	Terminal-Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism
TAD	Take All Decline
tRNA	Transfer Ribonucleic Acid
UHPLC-MS	Ultra-High-Performance Liquid Chromatography-High Resolution Mass Spectrometry
UN	United Nations
USD	United States Dollars