

**Assessing the impact of organic amendments on  
the structural and functional diversity of  
rhizospheric bacteria and soil health**

**VIJAY LAXMI SHRIVAS**



**CENTRE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY**

**INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI**

**December 2023**

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2023

**Assessing the impact of organic amendments on the  
structural and functional diversity of rhizospheric  
bacteria and soil health**

by

**VIJAY LAXMI SHRIVAS**

**CENTRE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND  
TECHNOLOGY**

*Submitted*

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

to the



**INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI**

**December 2023**

*DEDICATED  
TO THE  
ALMIGHTY  
AND MY  
PARENTS*

# CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “**Assessing the impact of organic amendments on the structural and functional diversity of rhizospheric bacteria and soil health**” submitted by **Vijay Laxmi Shrivastava** to the Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi, for the award of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy**, is a record of original bona-fide research work carried out by her under my supervision.

In my opinion, the thesis has reached the requisite standard. The contents of this thesis, in full or in parts, have not been submitted to any other Institute or University for the award of any degree or diploma.

**Prof. Hariprasad. P.**

Associate Professor  
Centre for Rural Development and  
Technology,  
Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi  
New Delhi- 110016  
INDIA

**Prof. Shilpi Sharma**

Professor  
Department of Biomedical Engineering and  
Biotechnology,  
Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi  
New Delhi- 110016  
INDIA

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

*Above all, I humbly bow down in reverence to the **Almighty**, for orchestrating the culmination of this journey. I attribute this moment in life to the blessings of “**Lord Shiva**”, who has bestowed upon me the courage, fortitude, and health required to reach this remarkable milestone. Despite the ups and downs of this journey, Shiv ji has always fortified my faith during times of adversity, sustaining me through the lows.*

*I extend sincere and profound gratitude to my esteemed Ph.D. supervisors, Prof. Hariprasad P. and Prof. Shilpi Sharma. Their unwavering support and invaluable guidance throughout this transformative journey have been immeasurable and deeply appreciated.*

***Prof. Hariprasad’s** profound expertise in environmental biotechnology has not only enriched my knowledge but has also left an indelible mark on my research instincts. His astute feedback helped me to engage in critical analysis, leading to the refinement of my ideas. Completing my Ph.D. under his adept guidance is a humbling privilege.*

***Prof. Shilpi Sharma’s** role as my primary supervisor has been truly exceptional, spanning a journey of nearly 7 years. Our association began by a stroke of divine luck during a research project, which later evolved into a continuous collaboration under her guidance. The realization of achieving a doctorate degree had been a cherished aspiration nurtured over an extended period. Throughout my project tenure, she consistently encouraged me to pursue a Ph.D. program. Guided by her expertise and with the blessing of divine providence, I was bestowed the golden opportunity to work under her guidance for my doctoral journey. I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Prof. Shilpi Sharma for her constant support, invaluable guidance, and harmonious cooperation. Under her tutelage, I have gained an immeasurable amount of knowledge. Her commitment to precision, pursuit of perfection, diligent work ethic, and adept time management, are truly remarkable attributes. Throughout this journey, she has demonstrated enduring patience, unwavering determination, invaluable insights, and unceasing efforts to aid in my personal and professional growth. Words cannot express the depth of my indebtedness to her.*

*I am deeply thankful to the esteemed members of my research committee - **Prof. Satyawati Sharma** (CRDT), **Prof. Anushree Malik** (CRDT), and **Dr. K. Swarnalakshmi** (Division of Microbiology, IARI, New Delhi) for their invaluable contributions. Their insightful suggestions, dedicated time, and rigorous scientific discussions during my research journey have significantly enriched my thesis work.*

*I would like to thank **Department of Biotechnology (DBT)**, Govt. of India, and **IIT Delhi** for providing financial support during my Ph.D.*

*I extend profound gratitude to **Dr. Anil Kumar Choudhary** (formerly affiliated with ICAR-IARI) for their invaluable contributions, support, and assistance with the field experiments and manure sample collection. I would also like to thank **Dr. Anchal Dass** (Division of Agronomy, IARI) for his assistance and support with the field experiments at IARI. Additionally, I would like to acknowledge the indispensable role of **Mr. Rajinder ji** and his workers for their support in maintaining the fields even during the challenging times posed by the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond. I would also like to extend my gratitude to **Dr. Avinash Sharma** (NCCS, Pune) for his help with amplicon sequencing.*

*Having the privilege of working under the guidance of two supervisors allowed me to connect with wonderful individuals from both the DBEB and CRDT labs. While I predominantly dedicated my time to the Environmental Genomics Lab (EGL), DBEB, this journey provided me the chance to collaborate and engage with a myriad of remarkable personalities. **Richa, Sakshi Ma'am, Jeny, Upma, Gautam, Abhineet, and Monika** were already present in the lab when I joined, offering a welcoming and supportive beginning. The EGL family expanded as **Vasu**, who has now become a lifelong friend and brother, joined along with Nidhi, Priyanka, and Swati. Another group of exceptional individuals that became gems in my journey were **Shubham, Shivani, and Annapurna Ma'am**. It was an absolute delight to share lab space and forge strong friendships with these generous and kind-hearted souls. A special acknowledgment goes to **Richa, Vasu, and Sakshi Ma'am** for being constant pillars of support during the initial stages of my Ph.D. and thereafter, offering invaluable assistance, and the mental fortitude needed to navigate the journey.*

*My time during Ph.D. was significantly enriched by the camaraderie of Shubham, Upma, Annapurna Ma'am, Shivani, Priyanka, and Swati. Working with them was an enjoyable experience. Among them, **Shubham's** presence in the lab was particularly remarkable. His willingness to assist and offer support whenever needed, coupled with his anecdotes and humor, consistently created a harmonious lab environment. The memories I shared with Shubham from coursework to the culmination of the Ph.D., are deeply cherished.*

***Annapurna Ma'am** stands out as another extraordinary individual. Her gentle demeanor, boundless generosity, and support served as pillar of strength. She consistently made herself available to provide guidance whenever and wherever it was needed. I am sincerely grateful for her presence in my journey.*

*I extend my gratitude to my lovely juniors - **Salila, Rashi, Soumya, Priya, Kanika and Rituraj**, for their support and affection. Additionally, I would like to express my thanks to our postdocs, **Dr. Sonal and Dr. Shweta**, for their support in the lab. I am also grateful for the help and support by lab technical staff **Late Shiv bhaiya**.*

*As I move forward, the memories of my time in EGL will forever hold a special place in my heart.*

*In the Environmental Biotechnology Lab, I want to express my gratitude to all my batchmates and juniors for their help, support, and kindness during this journey. A big thank you to **Dr. Durai, Gaurav, Kapil, Bhani, Priyanka, Shazia, and Leena** for always being there when I needed them. I also want to thank **Pratibha** for her support.*

*Certainly, heartfelt gratitude is owed to my family and friends for their unwavering and constant support. First and foremost, I would like to express my deep thanks to my parents, my parents-in-law, my brothers **Praveen** and **Sumit**, my brother-in-law **Deepak**, my sisters-in-law, and my adorable niece **Saumya** for their unshakeable belief in me. It was my parents' enduring dream that consistently motivated me to persist through all adversities and attain this significant milestone.*

*I also extend my gratitude to my dear friend **Vandana** for her mental support throughout this entire period.*

*Lastly, but by no means least, my heartfelt gratitude extends to my beloved partner, **Ravi**. It is without a doubt that this journey would not have been feasible without his ceaseless support, unwavering belief, and profound understanding. As I sit here, reflecting on the extensive and demanding odyssey of my Ph.D., I am overcome with emotions and flooded with an indescribable sense of thankfulness for his steadfast encouragement, affection, and empathy throughout this taxing pursuit. Words inevitably fall short in capturing the magnitude of my appreciation for him and the profound influence he has had on my life during this extraordinary chapter.*

*Vijay Laxmi Shrivastava*

## **Abstract**

Agriculture, a key contributor to the growing Indian economy, is facing significant challenges in meeting the needs of a rapidly expanding population. Synthetic fertilizers have been extensively used in modern agriculture to overcome this issue. While conventional agriculture has increased agricultural productivity, it has been at a high cost to the environment due to the indiscriminate use of agrochemicals, and intense practices. The detrimental effects of conventional agriculture have encouraged a shift towards more sustainable options, such as organic farming. Organic farming practices prioritize reduced agrochemical dependency, biodiversity enhancement, and climate resilience. Organic amendments have been found to promote microbial activity, improve soil quality, and boost plant development by nourishing microorganisms and boosting nutrient release. With a focus on ecological equilibrium, disease resilience, and incorporating organic inputs, organic farming embodies a more sustainable agricultural system, aligning with the principles of UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), effectively addressing diverse challenges.

Microorganisms, particularly bacteria, present in the soil are crucial in nutrient recycling and soil fertility. The rhizosphere, and its associated microorganisms, are extremely important for plant health and ecological function. To ensure sustainable agriculture, it is vital to comprehend how organic and conventional farming impact crop yield and soil health, including the diversity and composition of rhizospheric bacterial communities, which are excellent indicators of soil health and plant fitness. However, concerns persist in the safe use of organic amendments due to the presence of antibiotic resistance in manure. India's large livestock population and insufficient antimicrobial resistance (AMR) data raise serious concerns.

The current study evaluated three cycles of the pigeonpea-wheat cropping system (PWCS) under conventional and organic farming systems in field experiments (over a period of four years). The study aimed to determine the impact of agricultural management practices on plant

growth and soil health. The rhizospheric bacterial community was thoroughly investigated by employing a range of molecular markers targeting the structural diversity and functional potential of bacterial communities and antibiotic resistant markers. This was attained by employing a polyphasic approach, including assessment of the physicochemical parameters of plants and soil, adoption of traditional microbiological techniques and advanced molecular tools. The polyphasic analysis of a range of attributes of plants and soil provided a multifaceted understanding of the effects of several factors (agri-management practices, amendments, crops, cropping cycle) on the PWCS system.

Initially, manure samples were screened across seven states in India, to comprehend the patterns of antibiotic resistance in animal manure and their possible correlation, if any, with other environmental factors. This step aimed to identify suitable manure samples (exhibiting antibiotic resistance, and devoid of it) for subsequent field experiments. Soil samples from conventional and organic fields were investigated for their physicochemical parameters, and microbiological attributes using culture-dependent and culture-independent techniques. Plant growth attributes were recorded at the harvest stage of pigeonpea and wheat during three successive cropping seasons. Quantitative insight into the responses of total bacteria and specific bacterial groups (*α-Proteobacteria*, *β-Proteobacteria*, *Acidobacteria*, *Firmicutes*, and *Actinobacteria*) in the rhizosphere was gained through qPCR. Additionally, the functional potential of these bacterial communities was assessed by targeting bacterial guilds involved in nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) cycles. This entailed quantifying the genetic markers associated with pivotal steps in the nitrogen cycle (nitrogen fixation-*nifH*, nitrification-*amoA*, denitrification-*narG*) and the phosphorus cycle (solubilization-*pqqC*, mineralization-*phoD*) through qPCR. To comprehend the influence of farming practices on the spread of antibiotic resistance, different markers for antibiotic resistance (aminoglycoside-*aacA*,  $\beta$ -lactam-*blaTEM*, chloramphenicol-*chlI*, macrolide-*ermB*, sulfonamides-*sulI*, *sul2* and tetracycline-

*tetO*) and integrons-*int1* and *int2* were targeted in the rhizosphere soil using qPCR. The bacterial diversity at the harvest stage of the pigeonpea crop after the completion of the three year-field experiment, was characterized using 16S rRNA gene-based amplicon sequencing. The current study deciphered a correlation between bacterial abundance, nutrient concentrations, and antibiotic resistance in the manure samples suggesting a potential link between intensive farming practices, antibiotic usage, and the prevalence of antibiotic resistance in manure. Two manure samples were shortlisted for the setting up of field experiments, one with a higher abundance of antibiotic resistant bacteria (ARB) and another with a lower abundance of ARB. Results from the three-year (2018-19, 2019-20, and 2020-21) field experiments with PWCS exhibited a distinct impact of the agriculture practices. Conventional treatments showed the best response in terms of plant growth attributes, yield parameters, and NPK acquisition. However, organic farming practices boosted total bacterial abundance and improved both the structural diversity and functional potential of rhizospheric bacterial communities for both crops. By the end of the third cropping season, the bacterial diversity in the organic treatments had significantly diverged from the initial bacterial community composition of the applied amendments. It was also noticed that manure amendments exhibited a higher abundance of copies of antibiotic resistant genes (ARGs) than the rhizospheric soil under organic and conventional treatments. Three-year field experiment with the pigeonpea-wheat cropping system revealed a complex interaction between agricultural practices, bacterial community dynamics, and crop productivity. The notable prevalence of ARGs linked to manure amendments serves as a cautionary note, demanding responsible management practices. The complex interplay between agricultural practices, plant and soil health, rhizospheric bacterial communities, and antibiotic resistance, suggest the need for a comprehensive approach to sustainable and effective crop management.

## सारांश

कृषि, जो भारत की बढ़ती अर्थव्यवस्था में एक प्रमुख योगदानकर्ता है, तेजी से बढ़ती आबादी की जरूरतों को पूरा करने में महत्वपूर्ण चुनौतियों का सामना कर रही है। इस समस्या को दूर करने के लिए आधुनिक कृषि में कृत्रिम उर्वरकों का बड़े पैमाने पर उपयोग किया गया है। जबकि पारंपरिक कृषि ने उत्पादकता में वृद्धि की है, कृषि रसायनों के अंधाधुंध उपयोग और गहन प्रथाओं के कारण पर्यावरण को इसकी भारी कीमत चुकानी पड़ी है। पारंपरिक कृषि के हानिकारक प्रभावों ने जैविक खेती जैसे अधिक संपोषणीय विकल्पों की ओर बदलाव को प्रोत्साहित किया है। जैविक खेती पद्धतियाँ कम कृषि रसायन निर्भरता, जैव विविधता वृद्धि, और जलवायु प्रतिरोध को प्राथमिकता देती हैं। सूक्ष्मजीव गतिविधि को बढ़ावा देने, मिट्टी की गुणवत्ता में सुधार करने, और सूक्ष्मजीवों को पोषण देकर और पोषक तत्वों निर्गमन को बढ़ावा देकर पौधों के विकास को बढ़ावा देने के लिए जैविक संशोधन पाए गए हैं। जलवायु संतुलन, रोग प्रतिरोधक क्षमता और जैविक आदानों को शामिल करने पर ध्यान देने के साथ, जैविक खेती एक अधिक संपोषणीय कृषि प्रणाली का प्रतीक है, जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र के सतत विकास लक्ष्यों (एसडीजी / SDGs) के सिद्धांतों के साथ संरेखित होती है, और विभिन्न चुनौतियों का प्रभावी ढंग से समाधान करती है।

मिट्टी में मौजूद सूक्ष्मजीव, विशेष रूप से बैक्टीरिया (bacteria), पोषक तत्वों के पुनर्चक्रण और मिट्टी की उर्वरता में महत्वपूर्ण हैं। राइजोस्फीयर (rhizosphere), और उससे जुड़े सूक्ष्मजीव, पौधों के स्वास्थ्य और समुचित कार्य के लिए बेहद महत्वपूर्ण हैं। संपोषणीय कृषि सुनिश्चित करने के लिए, यह समझना महत्वपूर्ण है कि जैविक और पारंपरिक खेती फसल की उपज और मिट्टी के स्वास्थ्य को कैसे प्रभावित करती है, जिसमें राइजोस्फेरिक (rhizospheric) जीवाणु समुदायों की विविधता और संरचना भी शामिल है, जो मिट्टी के स्वास्थ्य और पौधों की फिटनेस (fitness) के उत्कृष्ट संकेतक हैं। हालाँकि, जीवांश खाद में एंटीबायोटिक (antibiotic) प्रतिरोध की उपस्थिति के कारण जैविक संशोधनों के सुरक्षित उपयोग को लेकर चिंताएँ बनी हुई हैं। भारत की बड़ी पशुधन आबादी और अपर्याप्त रोगाणुरोधी प्रतिरोध (antimicrobial resistance, AMR) डेटा गंभीर चिंताएं पैदा करते हैं। वर्तमान अध्ययन में क्षेत्रीय प्रयोगों में पारंपरिक और जैविक खेती प्रणालियों के तहत अरहर-गेहूं फसल प्रणाली (पीडब्ल्यूसीएस / PWCS) के तीन चक्रों का मूल्यांकन किया गया। अध्ययन का उद्देश्य पौधों की वृद्धि और मिट्टी के स्वास्थ्य पर कृषि प्रबंधन प्रथाओं के प्रभाव को निर्धारित करना था। जीवाणु समुदायों और एंटीबायोटिक

(antibiotic)-प्रतिरोधी मार्करों की संरचनात्मक विविधता और कार्यात्मक क्षमता को लक्षित करने वाले आणविक मार्करों की एक श्रृंखला को नियोजित करके राइजोस्फेरिक (rhizospheric) जीवाणु समुदाय की पूरी तरह से जांच की गई थी। यह पौधों और मिट्टी के भौतिक-रासायनिक मापदंडों के मूल्यांकन, पारंपरिक सूक्ष्मजीवविज्ञानी तकनीकों और उन्नत आणविक उपकरणों को अपनाने सहित, एक पॉलीफेज़िक (polyphasic) दृष्टिकोण को नियोजित करके प्राप्त किया गया। पौधों और मिट्टी के विभिन्न पहलुओं के विश्लेषण ने पीडब्ल्यूसीएस (PWCS) प्रणाली पर कई कारकों (कृषि-प्रबंधन प्रथाओं, संशोधनों, फसलों) के प्रभावों की बहुमुखी समझ प्रदान की गई।

प्रारंभ में, भारत के सात राज्यों में जीवांश खाद के नमूनों की जांच की गई, ताकि पशु जीवांश खाद में एंटीबायोटिक प्रतिरोध के स्वरूप और अन्य पर्यावरणीय कारकों के साथ उनके संभावित सहसंबंध को समझा जा सके। इस कदम का उद्देश्य बाद के क्षेत्र प्रयोगों के लिए उपयुक्त जीवांश खाद के नमूनों (एंटीबायोटिक प्रतिरोध प्रदर्शित करने वाले, और इससे रहित) की पहचान करना था। पारंपरिक और जैविक क्षेत्रों से मिट्टी के नमूनों की जांच उनके भौतिक-रासायनिक मापदंडों और जीवाणु अवलम्बित (culture-dependent) और जीवाणु निरालम्ब (culture-independent) तकनीकों का उपयोग करके सूक्ष्मजीवविज्ञानी विशेषताओं के लिए की गई। लगातार तीन फसल मौसमों के दौरान अरहर और गेहूं की कटाई के चरण में पौधों की वृद्धि विशेषताओं को दर्ज किया गया। मात्रात्मक पोलीमरेज़ श्रृंखला प्रतिक्रिया (qPCR) के माध्यम से राइजोस्फीयर (rhizosphere) में कुल बैक्टीरिया (bacteria) बहुतायत और विशिष्ट बैक्टीरिया (bacteria) समूहों जैसे  $\alpha$ -प्रोटियोबैक्टीरिया ( $\alpha$ -Proteobacteria),  $\beta$ -प्रोटियोबैक्टीरिया ( $\beta$ -Proteobacteria), एसिडोबैक्टीरिया (Acidobacteria), फर्मिक्यूट्स (Firmicutes), और एक्टिनोबैक्टीरिया (Actinobacteria) की प्रतिक्रियाओं में मात्रात्मक अंतर्दृष्टि प्राप्त की गई थी। इसके अतिरिक्त, नाइट्रोजन (nitrogen) और फास्फोरस (phosphorus) चक्रों में शामिल जीवाणु संघों को लक्षित करके इन जीवाणु समुदायों की कार्यात्मक क्षमता का आकलन किया गया था। इसमें qPCR के माध्यम से नाइट्रोजन (Nitrogen) चक्र जैसे नाइट्रोजन स्थिरीकरण (nitrogen fixation)-*nifH*, नाइट्रिफिकेशन (nitrification)-*amoA*, डेनाइट्रिफिकेशन (denitrification)-*narG* और फॉस्फोरस (Phosphorus) चक्र [सॉल्वलाइजेशन (solubilization) -*pqqC*, खनिजकरण (mineralization)-*phoD*] में महत्वपूर्ण चरणों से जुड़े आनुवंशिक मार्करों की मात्रा निर्धारित करना शामिल था। एंटीबायोटिक (antibiotic) प्रतिरोध के प्रसार पर कृषि पद्धतियों के प्रभाव को समझने के लिए, एंटीबायोटिक (antibiotic) प्रतिरोध के लिए अलग-अलग मार्कर [एमिनोग्लाइकोसाइड

(aminoglycoside)-*aacA*,  $\beta$ -लैक्टम ( $\beta$ -lactam)-*blaTEM*, क्लोरैम्फेनिकॉल (chloramphenicol)-*chl1*, मैक्रोलाइड (macrolides)-*ermB*, सल्फोनामाइड्स (sulphonamides)-*sul1*, *sul2* और टेट्रासाइक्लिन (tetracycline)-*tetO* और इंटीग्रोन्स (integrons)- *int1* और *int2*] को qPCR का उपयोग करके राइजोस्फीयर (rhizosphere) में लक्षित किया गया था। तीन साल के क्षेत्र प्रयोग के पूरा होने के बाद अरहर की फसल की कटाई के चरण में बैक्टीरिया (bacteria) की विविधता को 16S rRNA जीन (gene) आधारित एम्प्लिकॉन (amplicon) अनुक्रमण का उपयोग करके चित्रित किया गया था।

वर्तमान अध्ययन ने जीवांश खाद के नमूनों में बैक्टीरिया (bacteria) की प्रचुरता, पोषक तत्वों की सांद्रता और एंटीबायोटिक (antibiotic) प्रतिरोध के बीच संबंध को समझा, जो कि गहन कृषि पद्धतियों, एंटीबायोटिक (antibiotic) के उपयोग और जीवांश खाद में एंटीबायोटिक (antibiotic) प्रतिरोध की व्यापकता के बीच एक संभावित संबंध का सुझाव देता है। खेत प्रयोगों की स्थापना के लिए दो जीवांश खाद नमूनों को शॉर्टलिस्ट (shortlist) किया गया था, एक में एंटीबायोटिक (antibiotic)-प्रतिरोधी बैक्टीरिया (bacteria) की अधिक मात्रा थी और दूसरे में एआरबी (ARB) की कम बहुतायत थी। पीडब्ल्यूसीएस (PWCS) के साथ तीन-वर्षीय (2018-19, 2019-20 और 2020-21) क्षेत्र प्रयोगों के परिणामों ने कृषि प्रथाओं का एक विशिष्ट प्रभाव प्रदर्शित किया। पारंपरिक उपचारों ने पौधों की वृद्धि विशेषताओं, उपज मापदंडों और NPK अधिग्रहण के मामले में सबसे अच्छी प्रतिक्रिया दिखाई। हालाँकि, जैविक खेती प्रथाओं ने कुल बैक्टीरिया (bacteria) बहुतायत को बढ़ावा दिया और दोनों फसलों के लिए राइजोस्फेरिक बैक्टीरिया (rhizospheric bacteria) समुदायों की संरचना विविधता और कार्य क्षमता दोनों में सुधार किया। तीसरे फसल के अंत तक, जैविक उपचारों में जीवाणु विविधता लागू संशोधनों की प्रारंभिक जीवाणु समुदाय संरचना से काफी भिन्न हो गई थी। यह भी देखा गया कि जीवांश खाद संशोधनों ने जैविक और पारंपरिक उपचारों की तुलना में एंटीबायोटिक (antibiotic) प्रतिरोधी जीनस (genes) की प्रतियों की अधिक प्रचुरता प्रदर्शित की। अरहर गेहूं फसल प्रणाली के साथ तीन साल के क्षेत्र प्रयोग से कृषि प्रथाओं, जीवाणु समुदाय की गतिशीलता और फसल उत्पादकता के बीच एक जटिल बातचीत का पता चला। जीवांश खाद संशोधनों से जुड़े एंटीबायोटिक (antibiotic) प्रतिरोधी जीनों का उल्लेखनीय प्रसार एक चेतावनी के रूप में कार्य करता है, जो जिम्मेदार प्रबंधन प्रथाओं की मांग करता है। कृषि पद्धतियों, पौधों और मिट्टी के स्वास्थ्य, राइजोस्फेरिक (rhizospheric) जीवाणु

समुदायों और एंटीबायोटिक (antibiotic) प्रतिरोध के बीच जटिल परस्पर क्रिया, संपोषणीय और प्रभावी फसल प्रबंधन के लिए एक व्यापक दृष्टिकोण की आवश्यकता का सुझाव देती है।

## LIST OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i-iii
ABSTRACT	iv-vi
सारांश	vii-x
LIST OF FIGURES	xv-xix
LIST OF TABLES	xx
ABBREVIATIONS	xxi-xxiii
<b>1. INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES</b>	<b>1-11</b>
1.1. Introduction	01
1.1.1. Sustainable agriculture	02
1.1.2. Organic agriculture	03
1.1.3. Microbial community under different agricultural management practices	04
1.1.4. Spread of antibiotic resistance in organic farming	05
1.1.5. Cropping systems	07
1.2. Objectives	08
<b>2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE</b>	<b>12-41</b>
2.1. Modern agriculture and current challenges	12
2.2. Role of organic practices in agricultural sustainability	12
2.2.1. Role of organic farming on soil health	13
2.2.2. Impact of organic farming on soil microbial communities	14
2.2.3. Impact of organic farming on plant attributes	15
2.3. Impact of organic amendments on agricultural sustainability and productivity	17
2.4. Rhizospheric microbiome and its role in plant and soil health	19
2.5. Impact of different farming practices on the bacterial community dynamics	20
2.6. Impact of agricultural practices on microbe-mediated soil functions	28
2.7. Impact of organic farming on the spread of antibiotic resistance in agriculture	30
2.8. Model crops used in the study	38
<b>3. MATERIALS AND METHODS</b>	<b>42-65</b>
3.1. Workflow	42
3.2. Survey of manure samples for the presence of antibiotic resistant bacteria (ARB)	44
3.3. Pot and field experiments under different farming practices	47
3.3.1. Model crops	47

3.3.2. <i>Experimental set up</i>	48
3.3.3. <i>Treatments</i>	51
3.3.4. <i>Sampling</i>	53
3.3.4.1. <i>Plant height</i>	54
3.3.4.2. <i>Dry matter</i>	54
3.3.4.3. <i>Grain yield and biological yield</i>	54
3.3.5. <i>Soil analysis</i>	55
3.3.5.1 <i>Nutrient analysis</i>	55
3.3.5.2 <i>Culture dependent analysis</i>	55
3.4. <b>DNA extraction from soil and manure</b>	57
3.5. <b>Quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR)</b>	58
3.5.1 <i>Preparation of standards</i>	58
3.5.2 <i>Inhibition assay</i>	58
3.5.3 <i>qPCR assays</i>	59
3.6. <b>16S rRNA gene-based library preparation and amplicon sequencing</b>	63
3.7. <b>Statistical analysis</b>	63
<b>4. RESULTS</b>	<b>66-149</b>
4.1. <b>Status of antibiotic resistance in manure samples across Indian states</b>	67
4.1.1. <i>Antibiotic resistance in manure</i>	67
4.1.2. <i>Physiochemical analysis of manure</i>	69
4.1.3. <i>Culture independent analysis of manure for quantification of total bacterial abundance and antibiotic resistance genes in manure</i>	71
4.1.4. <i>Correlation among physiological parameters and antibiotic resistance</i>	72
4.1.5. <i>Cumulative impact of physiological parameters on bacterial abundance and antibiotic resistance of manure</i>	73
4.2. <b>Selection of manure for plant growth experiments</b>	74
4.3. <b>Physicochemical characterization of soil used for plant growth experiments</b>	75
4.4. <b>Characterization of amendments used in plant growth experiments</b>	78
4.4.1. <i>Enumeration of selected amendments for the presence of antibiotic resistant bacteria</i>	79
4.5. <b>Effect of farming practices on pigeonpea-wheat crop rotation</b>	80
4.5.1. <i>Influence of farming practices on pigeonpea-wheat crop rotation in pot experiment</i>	80
4.5.1.1 <i>Plant growth attributes</i>	80
4.5.1.2 <i>Presence of ARB in rhizospheric soil</i>	83
4.5.1.3 <i>Total rhizospheric bacterial abundance</i>	84
4.5.2. <i>Effect of farming practices on pigeonpea-wheat crop rotation under field conditions</i>	85
4.5.2.1 <i>Plant growth and yield parameters</i>	85
4.5.2.2 <i>Plant nutrient uptake</i>	90
4.5.2.3 <i>Soil nutrient uptake</i>	94
4.5.2.4 <i>Impact of agricultural practices on total bacterial abundance and dominant bacterial groups in rhizospheric soil</i>	97
4.5.2.4.1 <i>Total bacterial abundance</i>	97

4.5.2.4.2	<i>α-Proteobacteria</i>	98
4.5.2.4.3	<i>β-Proteobacteria</i>	99
4.5.2.4.4	<i>Actinobacteria</i>	101
4.5.2.4.5	<i>Firmicutes</i>	102
4.5.2.4.6	<i>Acidobacteria</i>	102
4.5.2.5	<i>Effects of agri-management practices on rhizospheric bacterial community diversity</i>	107
4.5.2.5.1	Effect of individual parameters on the abundance of rhizospheric bacterial community	114
4.5.2.6	<i>Effect of agricultural practices on the abundance of functional markers in rhizospheric soil</i>	117
4.5.2.6.1	Impact on guilds of bacteria engaged in the nitrogen cycle	117
4.5.2.6.2	Impact on bacterial guilds engaged in the phosphorus cycle	121
4.5.2.6.3	Impact of individual variables on the abundance of functional potential of rhizospheric bacteria	127
4.5.2.7	<i>Impact of agricultural practices on the abundance of antibiotic resistant bacteria and genes in rhizospheric soil</i>	130
4.5.2.7.1	Enumeration of ARB in rhizospheric soil	130
4.5.2.7.2	Impact on the abundance of antibiotic resistance genes in rhizospheric soil	134
4.5.2.7.3	Impact of individual variables on antibiotic resistant bacterial communities present in the rhizosphere	147
4.5.3	<i>Cumulative impact of farming practices on plant growth, soil health, and on the abundance of structural, functional, and antibiotic resistant markers</i>	149
<b>5. DISCUSSION</b>		<b>150-175</b>
5.1	<b>Status of antibiotic resistance in manure samples across Indian states</b>	155
5.2	<b>The effects of agricultural practices on plant attributes</b>	158
5.3	<b>The effects of agricultural practices on status of soil nutrients</b>	160
5.4	<b>Impact of different farming practices on rhizospheric microbiome</b>	162
5.4.1	<i>Effect on the abundance of total and dominant bacterial groups</i>	162
5.4.2	<i>Effect on the composition of rhizospheric bacterial communities</i>	164
5.4.3	<i>Effect on the abundance of markers for functional potential of bacterial population in the rhizosphere</i>	166
5.4.4	<i>Effect on abundance of antibiotic resistant bacterial population</i>	170
5.5	<b>Impact of individual variables on the markers targeting structural diversity, functional potential, antibiotic resistant genes and mobile genetic elements</b>	172
<b>6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</b>		<b>176-182</b>
6.1	<b>Summary</b>	176

<b>6.2 Conclusions</b>	182
<b>7. Bibliography</b>	<b>183-211</b>
<i>Appendix</i>	<b>212-218</b>
<i>Curriculum Vitae</i>	<b>219-222</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Figure legend	Page No.
2.1	Source, fate and impact of antibiotics in an agriculture system (Source: Shrivastava et al., 2022)	32
2.2	Field setup at ICAR-IARI with pigeonpea crop	38
2.3	Experimental field at ICAR-IARI with wheat crop.	40
3.1	Experimental layout for assessing the impact of different farming practices on structural and functional diversity of rhizospheric bacterial community, plant attributes, and soil health.	42
3.2	Map of India indicating the locations of sample collection of manure	45
3.3	Manure collection from one of the locations (ICAR-IARI-Biomass Unit, New Delhi).	47
3.4	Pot experiments with (a) pigeonpea, and (b) wheat crops at IIT Delhi nursery	49
3.5	Experimental field in ICAR-IARI	50
3.6	Field experiments with (a) pigeonpea, and (b) wheat crops at ICAR-IARI, New Delhi	51
3.7	Microbial enumeration from field soil on specific media	57
4.1	Presence of antibiotic resistance in cultivable bacterial communities present in manure, based on disc diffusion assay.	66
4.2	Pie-chart representing the percentage distribution of antibiotic resistance detected in manure samples, by antibiotic disc diffusion assay.	67
4.3	Stacked cluster analysis of manure samples for various physiological parameters, (a) total nitrogen (N), total phosphorus (P), and total potassium (K) (b) EC and pH.	69
4.4	Polar heatmap representing the log abundance of total bacteria (16S rRNA) and antibiotic resistant genes ( <i>aacA</i> , <i>blaTEM</i> , <i>chl1</i> , <i>ermB</i> , <i>sul1</i> , <i>sul2</i> , <i>int1</i> , <i>int2</i> , and <i>tetO</i> ) belonging to different groups of antibiotics, in the manure samples.	71
4.5	Pearson correlation matrix among physiological parameters (TN: total nitrogen, TP: total phosphorus, TK: total potassium, pH, EC: Electrical conductivity), total bacterial abundance (16S rRNA) and antibiotic resistance genes ( <i>aacA</i> , <i>blaTEM</i> , <i>chl1</i> , <i>ermB</i> , <i>sul1</i> , <i>sul2</i> , <i>int1</i> , <i>int2</i> , and <i>tetO</i> ) in the manure samples.	72

4.6	NMDS illustrating differences in the clustering of manure samples based on the geographical locations of the manure collection based on Bray-Curtis distance.	73
4.7	Screening of manure samples from Delhi-NCR region, on media amended with eight antibiotics (chloramphenicol, nalidixic acid, oxytetracycline, penicillin, amoxicillin, streptomycin, sulfadiazine, and tetracycline).	74
4.8	Microbial enumeration of bulk soil targeting different groups of microorganisms.	76
4.9	Enumeration of bulk soil on various antibiotic amended media using different antibiotics.	77
4.10	Enumeration of manure and biocompost amendments on eight different antibiotics (chloramphenicol, nalidixic acid, oxytetracycline, penicillin, amoxicillin, streptomycin, sulfadiazine, and tetracycline) amended media for the prevalence of ARB at the beginning of three cropping seasons (a) pigeonpea for the years 2018-2020, and (b) wheat for the years 2019-2021.	79
4.11	The effect of agricultural practices on (a) plant height, (b) dry weight, and (c) grain yield over three cropping seasons, (2018, 2019, and 2020) for pigeonpea.	81
4.12	The effect of agricultural practices on (a) plant height, (b) dry weight, and (c) grain yield over three cropping seasons (2019, 2020, and 2021) for wheat.	82
4.13	The effect of agriculture management practices on the dynamics of ARB in the rhizospheres of (a) pigeonpea for the years 2018-2020, and (b) wheat for the years 2019-2021 at the harvest stage.	83
4.14	Effect of farming practices on total bacterial abundance (16S rRNA gene copies / g of dry soil) in the rhizospheres of (a) pigeonpea (2018, 2019, and 2020), and (b) wheat (2019, 2020, and 2021) at harvest stages.	84
4.15	The effect of agricultural practices on (a) plant height, and (b) dry matter accumulation over three cropping seasons (2018, 2019, and 2020) for pigeonpea.	86
4.16	The effect of agricultural practices on (a) plant height, and (b) dry matter accumulation over three cropping seasons (2019, 2020, and 2021) for wheat.	87
4.17.	The effect of agricultural practices on grain yield, stover yield, and harvest index over three cropping seasons (2018, 2019, and 2020) for (a) pigeonpea, and (2019, 2020, and 2021) for (b) wheat.	88

4.18	PCA showing the impact of different agriculture practices on plant growth and yield parameters on (a) pigeonpea, and (b) wheat over three seasons.	89
4.19	The effect of agricultural practices on (a) available N, (b) available P, and (c) available K over three cropping seasons (2018, 2019, and 2020) for pigeonpea crop.	91
4.20	The effect of agricultural practices on (a) available N, (b) available P, and (c) available K over three cropping seasons (2019, 2020, and 2021) for wheat crop.	92
4.21	Impact of different agriculture practices on plant nutrient uptake on (a) pigeonpea and (b) wheat crops.	93
4.22	The effect of agricultural management practices on the (a) available N, (b) available P, (c) available K and (d) soil organic carbon (%) content of the soil (2018-2021).	96
4.23	PCA plots showing the impact of different agriculture practices on soil nutrient availability over three years (2018-2021).	97
4.24	Effect of farming practices on total bacterial abundance of (a) 16S rRNA gene copies/g of dry rhizospheric soil of pigeonpea over three years (2018, 2019, and 2020), and (b) 16S rRNA gene copies/g of dry rhizospheric soil of wheat crop over three years (2019, 2020, and 2021) at harvest stages.	98
4.25	Effect of farming practices on the abundance of <i>α-Proteobacteria</i> in (a) pigeonpea (2018, 2019, and 2020), and (b) wheat (2019-21) at harvest stage over three years.	99
4.26	Effect of farming practices on the abundance of <i>β-Proteobacteria</i> in (a) pigeonpea (2018, 2019, and 2020), and (b) wheat (2019-21) at harvest stage over three years.	100
4.27	Effect of farming practices on the abundance of <i>Actinobacteria</i> in (a) pigeonpea (2018, 2019, and 2020), and (b) wheat (2019-21) at harvest stage over three years.	101
4.28	Effect of farming practices on the abundance of <i>Firmicutes</i> in the rhizospheric soil of (a) pigeonpea (2018, 2019, and 2020), and (b) wheat (2019-21) at harvest stage over three years.	102
4.29	Effect of farming practices on the abundance of <i>Acidobacteria</i> in (a) pigeonpea (2018, 2019, and 2020), and (b) wheat (2019-21) at harvest stage over three years.	103
4.30	Chord diagrams illustrating the overall impact of agriculture farming practices on total bacterial abundance and dominant bacterial groups in (a, b, c) pigeonpea for the years 2018, 2019, and 2020 at the harvest stage	105

4.31	Chord diagrams illustrating the overall impact of agriculture farming practices on total bacterial abundance and dominant bacterial groups in (a, b, c) wheat for the years 2019, 2020, and 2021 at the harvest stage.	106
4.32	Rarefaction curves generated against number of species sequenced per sample ( $n=3$ ).	107
4.33	Biclustering heatmap of various treatments and amendments at bacterial taxonomic level (phylum level).	108
4.34	Diversity of bacterial genera under different agri management practices and amendments on the relative abundance of bacterial genera on 100% stacked plot.	109
4.35	Venn diagram representing the number of common and unique genera found in different treatments and amendments.	110
4.36	Impact of different farming practices on $\alpha$ diversity indices of resident bacterial community, (a) Shannon, (b) Simpson, and (c) Chao1.	112
4.37.	Impact of different farming practices on $\beta$ diversity of resident bacterial community, heatmap generated using Bray-Curtis dissimilarity matrix.	113
4.38.	Principal component analysis (PCA) illustrating the effect of different farming practices on the resident bacterial community under different treatments and amendments (FYM and BIOC) based on OTU abundance.	114
4.39	PCA plots showing the impact of cropping system on the structural diversity of rhizospheric bacteria in (a) pigeonpea, and (b) wheat over three cropping seasons.	115
4.40	NMDS plots showing the combined effect of different farming practices on the abundance of total bacteria and dominant bacterial groups.	117
4.41	Radial diagrams illustrating the impact of farming practices on rhizospheric bacterial population involved in nitrogen cycling by plotting the log transformed values of <i>nifH</i> , <i>amoA</i> , and <i>narG</i> gene abundance in (a, b, c) pigeonpea and (d, e, f) wheat cropping system for years 2018-2020 and 2019-2021.	120
4.42	Radial diagrams illustrating the impact of farming practices on rhizospheric bacterial population involved in phosphorus cycling by plotting the log transformed values of <i>phoD</i> and <i>pqqC</i> gene abundance in (a, b) pigeonpea and (c, d) wheat cropping system for years 2018-2020 and 2019-2021, respectively.	123

4.43	Chord diagram illustrating the overall impact of agriculture farming practices on the abundance of functional bacterial groups in (a, b, c) pigeonpea for the years 2018, 2019 and 2020, and (d, e, f) wheat for the years 2019, 2020, and 2021 at the harvest stage.	126
4.44	PCA plots showing the impact of cropping system on the abundance of functional markers present in the rhizosphere of (a) pigeonpea, and (b) wheat over three cropping seasons.	128
4.45	NMDS plots showing the combine effect of different farming practices on the abundance of functional bacteria groups.	129
4.46	Trends of antibiotic resistant bacteria (ARB) at different plant stages (a) pigeonpea, and (b) wheat.	131
4.47	The effect of agriculture management practices on the dynamics of ARB in the rhizosphere of (a) pigeonpea (2018-2020), and (b) wheat (2019-2021) at the harvest stage.	132
4.48	Radial diagrams illustrating the impact of farming practices on (a) <i>aacA</i> , (b) <i>blaTEM</i> , (c) <i>chlI</i> , (d) <i>ermB</i> , (e) <i>int1</i> , (f) <i>int2</i> , (g) <i>sul1</i> , (h) <i>sul2</i> , and (i) <i>tetO</i> gene abundance in pigeonpea cropping systems for the years 2018-2020.	137
4.49	Radial diagram illustrating the impact of farming practices on (a) <i>aacA</i> , (b) <i>blaTEM</i> , (c) <i>chlI</i> , (d) <i>ermB</i> , (e) <i>int1</i> , (f) <i>int2</i> , (g) <i>sul1</i> , (h) <i>sul2</i> , and (i) <i>tetO</i> gene abundance in wheat cropping system for the years 2019-2021.	141
4.50	Chord diagrams illustrating the impact of agricultural practices on antibiotic resistance genes in (a, b, c) pigeonpea for years 2018, 2019 and 2020, and (d, e, f) wheat for the years 2019, 2020, and 2021 at the harvest stage.	144
4.51	PCA plots showing the impact of cropping system on the abundance of antibiotic resistant genes in the rhizospheres of (a) pigeonpea, and (b) wheat.	145
4.52	NMDS plots showing the combined effect of different farming practices on the abundance of antibiotic resistance genes.	147
4.53	PCA plot showing the cumulative impact of agri-management practices on the abundance of structural and functional markers, and antibiotic resistance genes in the rhizosphere.	148
4.54	The Pearson correlation matrix among plant growth parameters, soil nutrient, total bacterial abundance, dominant bacterial groups, and antibiotic resistance genes.	149
6.1	Summary of work done to assess the impact of farming practices on rhizospheric bacterial community dynamics, plant attributes, and soil health	181

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table No.</b>	<b>Table Legend</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
2.1	Effect of different agricultural management systems on microbial community diversity in soil ecosystem	24
2.2	Impact of manure amendments on the spread of antibiotic resistance in agriculture soil	36
3.1	Treatments for field experiments	53
3.2	Specific media used for enumeration of culturable microbial community	56
3.3	Molecular markers used for the quantification of total bacterial abundance, structural, functional and antibiotic resistant traits under different farming practices	60
4.1	Physicochemical properties of bulk soil	75
4.2	Physicochemical properties of amendments	78

## ABBREVIATIONS

### Elements

Al	Aluminium
C	Carbon
Ca	Calcium
Fe	Carbon
K	Potassium
Mg	Magnesium
N	Nitrogen
Na	Sodium
P	Phosphorus
Pb	Lead
Se	Selenium
Zn	Zinc

### Molecules and compounds

NH <sub>3</sub>	Ammonia
CTAB	Cetyl Trimethyl Ammonium Bromide
K <sub>2</sub> O	Potassium oxide
NO <sub>2</sub>	Nitrite
NO <sub>3</sub>	Nitrate
PVP	Polyvinylpyrrolidone
P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub>	Phosphorus pentoxide
PO <sub>4</sub> <sup>3-</sup>	Phosphate

### Units

%	Percent
bp	Base Pairs
cm	Centimetre
g	Gram
mL	Millilitre
μL	Microliter
°C	Degrees Celsius
μg	Microgram
μS	Micro Seimens
l	Litre
kg	Kilogram
m	Metre
mg	Microgram
min	Minutes
rpm	Revolutions Per Minute
mm	Millimetre
ng	Nanogram
ha	Hectare
s	Seconds
h	Hour

## Important abbreviations and terminologies used in the study

$\alpha$	Alpha
$\beta$	Beta
AMF	Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungus
AMP	Ampicillin
AMR	Antimicrobial Resistance
ANOVA	Analysis Of Variance
AP	Arunachal Pradesh
ARB	Antibiotic Resistant Bacteria
ARGs	Antibiotic Resistant Genes
AS	Assam
AZM	Azithromycin
BIOC	Biocompost
BUU	Biomass Utilization Unit
CDDEP	Center For Disease Dynamics, Economics & Policy
CHL	Chloramphenicol
CLI	Clindamycin
CLPP	Community-Level Physiological Profiling
CON	Conventional
DA&FW	Department Of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare
DAS	Days After Sowing
DGGE	Denaturing Gradient Gel Electrophoresis
DL	Delhi
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic Acid
DOX	Doxycycline
EC	Electrical Conductivity
FAME	Fatty Acid Methyl Ester
FAO	Food And Agriculture Organization
FiBL	Forschungs Institut Für Biologischen Landbau
FYM 1	Farmyard Manure with ARB
FYM 2	Farmyard Manure with minimal /less ARB
GY	Grain Yield
H	Plant Height
HGT	Horizontal Gene Transfer
HI	Harvest Index
HSD	Honestly Significant Difference
HT-qPCR	High Throughput qPCR
IARI	Indian Agricultural Research Institute
ICAR	Indian Council of Agricultural Research
IITD	Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
INM	Integrated Nutrient Management
MGEs	Mobile Genetic Elements
MIC	Minimal Inhibitory Concentration
MLSB	Macrolide-Lincosamide-Streptogramin B
NAL	Nalidixic Acid

NBRIP	National Botanical Research Institute's Phosphate Growth Medium
NCR	National Capital Region
NMDS	Nonmetric Multidimensional Scaling
NOR	Norfloxacin
NSC	National Seed Corporation
ORG	Organic
OTU	Operational Taxonomic Unit
OXY	Oxytetracycline
PC	Principal Component
PCA	Principal Component Analysis
PCR	Polymerase Chain Reaction
PDA	Potato Dextrose Agar
PEN	Penicillin
PLFA	Phospholipid Fatty Acid Analysis
PGPR	Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria
PQQC	Pyrroloquinoline Quinone
PQQGDH	Pyrroloquinoline Protein Glucose Dehydrogenase
PWCS	Pigeonpea-Wheat Cropping System
QIIME	Quantitative Insights Into Microbial Ecology
qPCR	Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction
r	Pearson Correlation Coefficient
RDF	Recommended Dose of Fertilizer
RIF	Rifampicin
RNA	Ribonucleic Acid
rRNA	Ribosomal Ribonucleic Acid
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SOC	Soil Organic Carbon
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
SSP	Single Superphosphate
STP	Streptomycin
SUL	Sulphadiazine
TET	Tetracycline
TOC	Total Organic Carbon
TPF	Triphenyl Formazan
TSS	Total Soluble Solids
UN	United Nations
USD	United States Dollars
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
VFGs	Virulence Factor Genes