

1 **Diversity of Culturable Endophytic bacteria from Wild and Cultivated Rice showed**
2 **potential Plant Growth Promoting activities**

3 Madhusmita Borah, Saurav Das, Himangshu Baruah, Robin C. Boro, Madhumita Barooah*
4 Department of Agricultural Biotechnology, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat, Assam
5

6 **Authors Affiliations:**

7
8 **Madhusmita Borah:** Department of Agricultural Biotechnology, Assam Agricultural
9 University, Jorhat, Assam. Email Id: madhusmita.maina@gmail.com

10
11 **Saurav Das:** Department of Agricultural Biotechnology, Assam Agricultural University,
12 Jorhat, Assam. Email Id: saurav12das@gmail.com

13
14 **Himangshu Baruah:** Department of Agricultural Biotechnology, Assam Agricultural
15 University, Jorhat, Assam. Email Id: bhimangshu14@gmail.com

16
17 **Robin Ch. Boro:** Department of Agricultural Biotechnology, Assam Agricultural University,
18 Jorhat, Assam. Email Id: robinboro@gmail.com

19
20 ***Corresponding Author:**

21 **Madhumita Barooah:** Professor, Department of Agricultural Biotechnology, Assam
22 Agricultural University, Jorhat, Assam. Email Id: m.barooah@aau.ac.in
23

24 **Present Address:**

- 25 1. **Saurav Das:** DBT- Advanced Institutional Biotech Hub, Bholanath College, Dhubri,
26 Assam.
27 2. **Himangshu Baruah:** Department of Environmental Science, Cotton College State
28 University, Guwahati, Assam.
29

30 **Abstract**

31 In this paper, we report the endophytic microbial diversity of cultivated and wild *Oryza*
32 *sativa* plants including their functional traits related to multiple traits that promote plant
33 growth and development. Around 255 bacteria were isolated out of which 70 isolates were
34 selected for further studies based on their morphological differences. The isolates were
35 characterized both at biochemical and at the molecular level by 16s rRNA gene sequencing.
36 Based on 16S rRNA gene sequencing the isolates were categorized into three major phyla, viz,
37 Firmicutes (57.1 %), Actinobacteria (20.0 %) and Proteobacteria (22.8 %). Firmicutes was
38 the dominant group of bacteria of which the most abundant genus was *Bacillus*. The isolates
39 were further screened *in vitro* for plant growth promoting activities which revealed a hitherto

40 unreported endophytic bacterial isolate, *Microbacteriaceae bacterium* RS01 11 as the highest
41 secretor of a phytohormone, IAA ($28.39 \pm 1.39 \mu\text{g/ml}$) and GA ($67.23 \pm 1.83 \mu\text{g/ml}$).
42 *Bacillus subtilis* RHS 01 displayed highest phosphate solubilizing activity (81.70 ± 1.98
43 $\mu\text{g/ml}$) while, *Microbacterium testaceum* MK LS01, and *Microbacterium*
44 *trichothecenolyticum* MI03 L05 exhibited highest potassium solubilizing activity
45 ($53.42 \pm 0.75 \mu\text{g/ml}$) and zinc solubilizing efficiency (157.50%) respectively. *Bacillus*
46 *barbaricus* LP20 05 produced highest siderophore units (64.8 %). Potential plant growth
47 promoting isolated were tested *in vivo* in pot culture under greenhouse conditions. A
48 consortium consisting of *Microbacteriaceae bacterium* RS01 11, *Bacillus testaceum* MK
49 LS01 and *Bacillus subtilis* RHS promoted plant growth and increased the yield 3.4 fold in
50 rice when compared to control T0 when tested in pot culture and reduce application rates of
51 chemical fertilizer to half the recommended dose. Our study confirms the potentiality of the
52 rice endophytes isolated as good plant growth promoter and effective biofertilizer.

53

54 **Keywords:** Endophytes, phytohormone production, mineral solubilization, siderophore,
55 biocontrol, pot culture.

56

57 INTRODUCTION

58 In a natural ecosystem, all the healthy and asymptomatic plants host a diverse group
59 of the microbial community including bacteria, fungi, viruses and protista collectively,
60 known as plant microbiota (Hiruma et al., 2016). Among the plant-associated
61 microorganisms, endophytes are the bacterial and fungal population colonizing within a plant
62 tissue for a part of its life cycle without showing any apparent pathogenesis (Tan and Zou,
63 2001). Culture-dependent and independent community profiling revealed their active
64 association virtually with all the tissues of a host plant, including the intercellular spaces of
65 the cell walls, vascular bundles, and in reproductive organs of plants, e.g. flowers, fruits, and
66 seeds. Their association was even logged from aseptically regenerated tissues of micro-
67 propagated plants (Dias et al., 2009). Environmental parameter including soil nutrients and
68 different abiotic stresses influence the diversification of the endophytic entity in a plant may
69 play a significant role in the natural fitness in particular environment (Bulgarelli et al., 2013;
70 Kogel et al., 2006). In this mutualistic relationship, the plant provides primary nutritive
71 components and a protective niche for the endophytic organisms whereas, the endophytes
72 produce useful metabolites and systemic signals (Rosenblueth and Martínez-Romero, 2006;

73 Strobel, 2003). Endophytic bacteria like *Bacillus*, *Enterobacter*, *Klebsiella*, *Pseudomonas*,
74 *Burkholderia*, *Pantoea*, *Agrobacterium*, etc. have been isolated from diverse plant species
75 including maize, potato, tomato, sugarcane, and cucumber (Bacon and Hinton, 2007).

76 Although the endophytic relationship was documented long ago by Perotti, (1926),
77 many aspects of this mutualistic relationship are poorly understood including the molecular
78 mechanisms underlying such association and the selective association of a particular group of
79 endophytes(Xia et al., 2015). Most of the reports on endophytic colonization in plants have
80 focused on plant and root endophytic association (Lundberg et al., 2013; Romero et al.,
81 2014). Plant-microbe association has been studied for many decades for sustainable
82 agricultural practices. Endophytes are known for their ability to promote plant growth either
83 directly or indirectly through several metabolic activities including facilitating the acquisition
84 of mineral resources like phosphorus, potassium, zinc, and iron or by regulating the
85 phytohormone production including auxin, gibberellin, and cytokinin (Glick, 2014;
86 Rosenblueth and Martínez-Romero, 2006). Indirectly, they can stimulate host growth by
87 antagonistic activity or by inducing systemic resistance against different phytopathogens
88 (Arnold, 2007; Pillay and Nowak, 1997). A particular endophyte can affect the plant growth
89 and development using one or more of these mechanisms.

90 Of the nearly 3,00,000 plant species that exist on the earth, each individual plant is
91 host to one or more endophytes but only a few of these plants have ever been completely
92 studied relative to their endophytic biology (Strobel et al., 2004). Thus, the probability of
93 isolation of novel and beneficial endophytic microorganisms from the diverse flora is
94 considerably high. Plants growing in areas of biodiversity hotspot may be host to endophytes
95 hitherto unreported. Assam is located within the Indo-Burma biodiversity hotspot and a
96 secondary center of *Oryza sativa* with more than 4000 accessions of germplasm. Along with
97 the cultivated rice varieties, Assam harbors a significantly high number of wild accessions
98 mainly belonging to *Oryza rufipogon*. Thus, the wild rice together with cultivated ones can be
99 a potential host to the different endophytic community with eco-physiological characteristics
100 for adaption to different biotic and abiotic stresses. Exploration of endophyte-plant
101 interaction can help to devise a low-input sustainable agricultural application for different
102 crops in various farming conditions. Thus, in this paper, we report the diverse endophytic
103 community of rice through culture-dependent profiling and characterization of the potent
104 endophytes for their plant growth promoting activity and further present results of their
105 influence to promote crop growth and yield.

106 **Materials and Methods**

107 **Isolation and Characterization:**

108 Locally cultivated rice varieties *viz.*, Kola Joha, Miatong, Barjahi, and Gitesh were
109 collected at booting stage from Jorhat (26°43'03.8"N 94°11'40.2"E), Tinsukia (27°20'34.5"N
110 95°42'33.2"E) and Lakhimpur (26°57'38.5"N 93°51'53.5"E) districts of Assam. In addition to
111 cultivated plants (*Oryza sativa*) different morphotypes of wild rice *O. rufipogon*, locally
112 known as “*Uri-Dhol*” were collected to assess the endophytic diversity of prokaryotic
113 microorganisms by the culture-dependent approach. Healthy and disease free paddy samples
114 were selected, uprooted from rice fields and immediately transported to the laboratory in ice
115 boxes. The plant samples were thoroughly cleaned with running water to remove the attached
116 debris. After that, leaves, stems, and roots were separated and cut into thin sections of 2-3 cm
117 long and washed thoroughly with double distilled water. The samples were rinsed in 70%
118 ethanol, sterilized with 0.1% HgCl₂ and further washed with sterile distilled water for several
119 times to remove the surface sterilizing agents (Gagné et al., 1987). One gram of the samples
120 were homogenized in 10 ml of distilled water to prepare a stock solution of tissue
121 homogenate. The appropriate diluted sample was inoculated in Tryptic Soya Agar (TSA)
122 plates and incubated at 30° C for 48 hrs and pure cultures were isolated by streak plate
123 method. The bacterial isolates were characterized both morphologically and biochemically
124 through various tests (gram staining, starch hydrolysis, casein hydrolysis, catalase reaction,
125 citrate and malate utilization, nitrate reduction, H₂S production and gelatin liquefaction)
126 according to the Bergey's Manual of Determinative Bacteriology (Krieg, 2015).

127 **Molecular Characterization**

128 Genomic DNA was extracted from bacteria as per standard phenol-chloroform
129 method. The 1500 bp region of the 16S rRNA gene was amplified from the extracted
130 genomic DNA using the universal forward primer 5'-AGAGTTTGATCCTGGCTC -3' and
131 reverse primer 5'-AAGGAGGTGATCCAGCCG-3'. The PCR products thus obtained were
132 sequenced. The forward and reverse sequences obtained were assembled using the Codon
133 Code Aligner software. Nucleotide sequence identities were determined using the BLAST
134 tool from the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI). Partial sequence data
135 for the 16S rRNA genes have been deposited in the Gen Bank nucleotide sequence data
136 libraries and Gene Bank accession numbers have been provided to these sequences. After
137 aligning the sequence of the 16S rRNA region, a phylogenetic tree was constructed using
138 MEGA 6.0 based on neighbor-joining method for the analysis of evolutionary relatedness and

139 the evolutionary distances were computed using the Kimura 2-parameter method (Kimura,
140 1980).

141 **Determination of Species Diversity**

142 Diversity and the relative species abundance of the endophytic isolates identified in
143 this study were calculated using the Shannon diversity index and Simpson diversity index.
144 The PAST software program was adopted to measure the ecological diversity indices and
145 generate the rarefaction curves to evaluate the overall richness (Ryan et al., 2001).

146 **In vitro Plant Growth Promoting Traits**

147 **Phytohormone Production**

148 The endophytic bacterial isolates were screened for *in-vitro* phytohormone production
149 mainly Indole Acetic Acid (IAA) and Gibberellic Acid (GA) Quantitative estimation of IAA
150 and GA was determined by following the method described earlier (Patten and Glick, 2002;
151 Vikram et al., 2007).

152

153 **Mineral Solubilization**

154 The isolates were checked for their different mineral solubilizing activities including
155 phosphate, potassium and zinc solubilization by following the method described earlier (Hu
156 et al., 2006; Ramesh et al., 2014).

157 **Siderophore Production**

158 Bacterial isolates were assayed for siderophore production as described by Schwyn
159 and Neilands (1987) (Schwyn and Neilands, 1987). Quantitative estimation of siderophores
160 was done by CAS shuttle assay (Payne, 1994).

161 **Efficacy of bio-inoculum on plant growth promotion under greenhouse conditions**

162 **Plant material**

163 The rice cultivar used for the pot culture study was Dichang, which is a short duration
164 variety. Dichang can be grown in Sali (June/ July to November/ December) and Boro
165 (November/ December to May/June) season; however, we opted for the Boro season to carry
166 out our experiment.

167 **Inoculum Preparation**

168 Identified bacterial strains showing high phytostimulent activity viz.
169 *Microbacteriaceae* bacterium RS01 11, *Bacillus subtilis* RHS01 and *Microbacterium*
170 *testaceum* MK LS01 were analyzed for evaluating the efficacy of the strains in an *in-vivo* pot
171 culture experiment under greenhouse condition. Culture inoculum was prepared by mixing

172 equal quantities of each culture just before application. Prior to preparation of consortia,
173 compatibility of isolates was checked according to Fukui (1994).

174 **Experimental design**

175 The experiment was arranged in a complete randomized design (CRD) with five
176 replications per treatment. The test was performed with six different treatments with
177 compositional differences in bio inoculum, organic compost (vermicompost) and inorganic
178 fertilizers. A control set of pot was maintained without any treatment to replicate the
179 controlled environment. Treatments designed were T0: Soil (Untreated); T1: Soil + Chemical
180 fertilizer (NPK); T2: Soil + Vermicompost; T3: Soil + Bioinoculum; T4: Soil +
181 Vermicompost + Bioinoculum; T5: Soil + ½ NPK + ½ Vermicompost; T6: Soil + ½ NPK +
182 ½ Vermicompost + ½ Bioinoculum.

183 **Pot preparation**

184 Soil from rice farming fields was collected, air-dried and sieved. Chemical fertilizer
185 Nitrogen, Phosphorus, and Potassium (NPK) were used in a ratio of 40:20:20 kg/hectare.
186 Vermicompost was used in a ration of 300gm/10kg of soil. In bioinoculum treatment, each
187 pot received 20 ml of bacterial inoculum.

188 **Seed sowing and harvesting of the plants**

189 Rice seeds were soaked in sterilized water in a Petri dish for 24 hours. The water was
190 drained off and the seeds were kept in a closed Petri dish in warm conditions for 2 days. Four
191 pre-germinated seeds were allowed to grow in each pot in the greenhouse. The plants were
192 watered twice a day to maintain optimum soil moisture regime and kept under greenhouse
193 condition with ambient temperature and air humidity. The plant was regularly monitored till
194 harvest (150 days) for gradual growth promotion. Parameters selected for assessing the
195 growth of the plant were plant height, number of tillers, number of leaves per tiller, length of
196 the flag leaf, number of panicles per tiller, the total number of seeds per plant, weight of 100
197 grains, weight of dry biomass and yield per plant. Plant growth parameters were measured
198 from 30 days till harvest in an interval of every 15 days

199 **Statistical analysis**

200 Data from the quantitative analysis of plant growth promoting traits and pot culture
201 experiment were analyzed by one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Statistical analysis
202 was performed by using SPSS software (version 18). Significant differences between means
203 were compared using least significant differences test (LSD) at 5% ($p \leq 0.05$) probability
204 level.

205 **Result**

206 **Isolation and Characterization:**

207 A total of 255 bacterial endophytes were isolated from leaf, stem and root section of
208 both cultivated and wild rice plant. About 70 different isolates were selected on the basis of
209 their varying morphological characteristics. Bacterial endophytes were characterized
210 biochemically, 53 isolates were found to be gram-positive and 17 gram-negative. Thirty-three
211 isolates were positive for starch hydrolysis (amylase producers), 15 isolates were found
212 positive for casein hydrolysis (protease producers), 41 isolates were catalase producers, 14
213 citrate utilizers, 35 malate utilizers, 22 nitrate reducers, 33 H₂S producers and 46 gelatinase
214 producers (**Table 1**).

215 Isolates were further characterized at the molecular level using 16S rRNA
216 gene sequence data, 70 different bacterial endophytic strains were identified and submitted to
217 GenBank Database and GenBank accession numbers obtained (**Table 2**). A phylogenetic tree
218 was constructed using the 16S rRNA sequences (**Fig 1**) and the evolutionary history was
219 inferred using the Neighbor-Joining method in MEGA6. The bacteria isolated in this study
220 belonged to 3 major phyla, viz., Firmicutes (57.1 %), Actinobacteria (20.0 %) and
221 Proteobacteria (22.8 %). Isolates from cultivated rice and wild rice were grouped together as
222 they share the same phylogenetic origin. Gram-positive bacteria and gram-negative formed
223 two major independent clusters, Cluster I and Cluster II respectively. The Cluster I included
224 2 phyla viz. Firmicutes and Actinobacteria while Cluster 2 comprised of phylum,
225 Proteobacteria. Within the Firmicutes the major clade belonged to the class Bacilli mainly
226 encompassing the genus *Bacillus* (92.5%). Actinobacteria, the second clade of gram-positive
227 bacteria encompassed members of the class Actinobacteria under which genus
228 Microbacterium, Microbacteriaceae and Cellulosimicrobium were observed. Analysis of the
229 Proteobacteria revealed the presence of Alphaproteobacteria, Betaproteobacteria and
230 Gammaproteobacteria. Majority of the clades were affiliated with Gammaproteobacteria,
231 mostly by Pseudomonaceae (43.75%). Other clades of some minor groups such as
232 Enterobacteriaceae, Moraxellaceae, Xanthomonadaceae, Burkholderiaceae etc were also
233 observed under this major group.

234 A gradation of diversity in tissues of both cultivated and wild rice was observed in the
235 Shannon diversity index. Diversity indices of bacterial endophytes varied within plant parts
236 as well as between cultivated and wild rice. High Shannon diversity index was recorded in
237 roots ($H = 2.718$ and 1.946) of cultivated and wild rice, followed by in stem ($H = 2.659$ and

238 1.609). Diversity was least in leaf ($H = 2.393$ and 1.386) of both cultivated and wild rice.
239 Simpson index (1-D) was highest in roots (0.930 and 0.857) with a richness of 16 different
240 species occurring in cultivated rice and 7 species occurring in wild rice. The overall richness
241 of endophytic bacteria as revealed in the Refraction curve indicated species richness in
242 cultivated rice with maximum species richness in roots (**Fig. 2 & Table. 3**).

243 Out of 54 endophytic bacteria isolated from different parts of cultivated rice, the
244 isolates belonged to 11 different genera viz. *Bacillus*, *Brevibacillus*, *Lysenibacillus*
245 *Microbacterium*, *Microbacteriaceae*, *Staphylococcus*, *Pantoea*, *Burkholderia*, *Acinetobacter*,
246 *Pseudomonas*, and *Ralstonia*. While, *Bacillus*, *Stenotrophomonas*, *Microbacterium*,
247 *Cellulosimicrobium*, *Proteus*, *Staphylococcus*, *Erwinia*, *Ochrobactrum*, and *Enterobacter*
248 were the genera isolated from plant parts of wild rice (**Fig. 3(a)**). *Bacillus* sp., *B. pumilus*, *B.*
249 *cereus*, *B. safensis*, *B. megaterium*, *Microbacterium* sp. were the most frequently occurring
250 species found in stem, leaf, and root of *Oryza sativa*. *Bacillus megaterium* was found to be
251 dominant species in the leaf while *Bacillus cereus* in the stem. *Bacillus cereus*,
252 *Cellulosimicrobium cellulans*, and *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia* were found to be dominant
253 species occurring in most plant parts of wild rice (**Fig. 3(b)**).

254 **Screening of isolates for plant growth promoting properties (PGP)**

255 **Phytohormone Production**

256 **Indole Acetic Acid (IAA)**

257 The production of IAA is an important property of endophytic bacteria which aid in
258 promoting plant growth. *In vitro* screening for IAA production revealed a substantial
259 variation in the range of IAA (2.33 - 28.39 $\mu\text{g/ml}$) production among the 35 isolates that
260 produced the phytohormone (**Fig. 4(a)**). The isolate, *Microbacteriaceae bacterium* RS01 11
261 produced significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) higher amount of IAA ($28.39 \pm 1.33 \mu\text{g/ml}$) when compared
262 to other isolates.

263 **Gibberellic Acid (GA) Production**

264 Twenty four isolates showed the ability to produce gibberellic acid (GA) that ranged
265 between 7.94 – 67.23 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ (**Fig. 4(b)**). The isolate *Microbacteriaceae bacterium* RS01 11
266 also produced significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) higher amount of gibberellic acid ($67.23 \pm 1.67 \mu\text{g/ml}$)
267 when compared to the isolate *Microbacterium testaceum* LP21 R02 that produced the least
268 ($7.94 \pm 0.56 \mu\text{g/ml}$).

269

270

271 **Mineral Solubilisation**

272 **Phosphate Solubilization**

273 Bacterial endophytes were screened for their ability to solubilize phosphate which
274 revealed 35 isolates as potential phosphate solubilizer. Quantitative analysis of phosphate
275 solubilizing abilities of these bacteria varied between 6.8 and 81.70 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ (**Fig. 5(a)**).
276 Phosphate solubilization activity was shown significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) higher in *Bacillus*
277 *subtilis* RHS 01 ($81.70 \pm 1.3 \mu\text{g/ml}$) followed by *Brevibacillus agri* RS01 05 (60.75 ± 0.24
278 $\mu\text{g/ml}$).

279 **Potassium Solubilization**

280 Of the seventy isolates, ten isolates were found to be potential potassium solubilizers
281 (**Fig. 5(b)**). The solubilizing efficiencies of the isolates ranged between 17.67 – 81.33 $\mu\text{g/ml}$.
282 *Microbacterium testaceum* MK LS01 ($81.33 \pm 0.58 \mu\text{g/ml}$) and *Bacillus cereus* RHC 13
283 ($79.66 \pm 1.67 \mu\text{g/ml}$) had significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) higher ability to solubilize potassium while
284 *Bacillus pumilus* RHS 06 showed the least ability to solubilize potassium (17.67 ± 0.45
285 $\mu\text{g/ml}$).

287 **Zinc Solubilization**

288 The bacterial isolates were inoculated in the Tris minimal agar medium containing two
289 different insoluble sources ZnO and ZnS of Zn at 0.1%. However, the endophytic isolates
290 could solubilize only ZnO. The solubilization efficiency of the isolates was calculated by
291 measuring the diameter of the colony growth and the solubilization zone. Zinc solubilizing
292 efficiency of the isolates ranged between 110 % and 157.50 % (**Fig. 5(c)**). Zinc solubilization
293 efficiency was found significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) higher in *Microbacterium trichothecenolyticum*
294 MI03 L05 (157.50 %) when compared to *Bacillus altitudinis* RR01 3D (148.72 %) and
295 *Staphylococcus* sp. LP01S02 (109.89) with least solubilizing efficiency (**Fig 5(c)**).

296 **Siderophore production**

297 For the initial detection of siderophore, bacterial endophytes were grown in modified
298 Fiss minimal medium under low iron conditions. Fourteen bacterial endophytic isolates
299 produced siderophore (Carson et al., 2000). This was further confirmed by CAS shuttle assay
300 in which siderophore production was calculated in terms of percentage of siderophore units
301 (**Fig. 6**). Siderophore units ranged between 7.06 - 64.80 %. *Bacillus barbaricus* LP20 05
302 produced significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) higher siderophore units (64.8 %) when compared to
303 *Bacillus megaterium* RLS 12 (7.06 %).

304 **Efficacy of bio-inoculum on plant growth promotion under greenhouse conditions**

305 Three endophytic strains namely, *Microbacteriaceae bacterium* RS01 11, *Bacillus*
306 *subtilis* RHS 01 and *Microbacterium testaceum* MK LS01 were selected based on maximum
307 PGP activity for their ability to promote plant growth in rice variety Dichang in pot culture
308 experiment. The performance of the treatments in all combination was analyzed till harvest.

309 All the six treatments showed varying degree of growth as compared to the control
310 (T0) treatment. The treatment T6 resulted in significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) higher shoot height,
311 number of panicles per plant, the total number of seeds per plant, the weight of 100 seeds and
312 yield per plant and with an average value of 26.48 cm, 16.80, 463.8, 2.19 gm and 10.16 gm
313 respectively when compared to all other treatments. Length of flag leaf and dry biomass of
314 the plant were highest in T2 and T6 treatment (**Table 4**). The pairwise comparison of
315 treatments did not reveal any significance among the treatments for a number of tillers and
316 number of leaves, although all treatments resulted significantly different from control T0 (**Fig.**
317 **7**).

318 **Discussion:**

319 Endophytes are the diverse group of endosymbiotic microorganisms which can
320 directly or indirectly influence the growth and development of plants without causing any
321 pathogenic effect on the host. Identification and characterization of diverse endophytic
322 microorganism from different niches with potential phytostimulant activity can aid in
323 improving sustainable agricultural practices. Morphological and biochemical characterization
324 of the isolates revealed the dominance of gram-positive bacteria over the gram-negative
325 bacterial endophytes. Molecular characterization of the isolates using 16S rRNA gene
326 showed Firmicutes (57.1%) as the major colonizer of rice tissue particularly the *Bacillus* sp.
327 Earlier reports suggested *Bacillus* as an efficient tissue colonizers in different plants including
328 *Coffea arabica* L., sunflower, cotton, potato, strawberry, *Panaxnoto ginseng* and citrus plants
329 (Araújo et al., 2001; Dias et al., 2009; Forchetti et al., 2007; Ma et al., 2013; Misaghi and
330 Donndelinger, n.d.; Sessitsch et al., 2004; Vega et al., 2005). Production of a multilayered
331 cell wall structure, formation of stress-resistant endospores and secretion of peptide
332 antibiotics, peptide signal molecules, and extracellular enzymes are some of the physiological
333 traits of *Bacillus* that enable them to survive in several different ecological niches (Lyngwi
334 and Joshi, 2014). Other important phylum identified were and Actinobacteria (20%) and
335 Proteobacteria (22.8%). Phylum Actinobacteria was represented by the family
336 Microbacteriaceae under which *Microbacterium*, *Microbacteriaceae*, and *Cellulosimicrobium*

337 were observed. Several species of *Microbacterium* was previously isolated from plants such
338 as maize, rice and wheat (Conn and Franco, 2004; Elbeltagy et al., 2001; Rijavec et al., 2007).
339 Proteobacterial sub-classification showed the dominance of Alphaproteobacteria,
340 Betaproteobacteria, and Gammaproteobacteria. Pseudomonadaceae family with
341 *Pseudomonas* as a major member of endophytes from proteobacteria accounted for 10 % of
342 the total isolates. Genus *Pseudomonas* is a widely distributed plant-associated bacterium with
343 reported activity of growth promotion in plants such as alfalfa (Gagné et al., 1987), clover
344 (Sturz et al., 1997), potato (Reiter et al., 2002), and pea (Elvira-Recuenco and van Vuurde,
345 2000). Some minor groups such as Enterobacteriaceae, Moraxellaceae, Xanthomonadaceae,
346 Burkholderiaceae were also observed from proteobacterial phylum.

347 Endophytic bacterial diversity was measured in terms of Shannon (H) and Simpson
348 (1-D) diversity indices which indicated differences in cultivated and wild rice and species
349 richness. Higher values of Shannon and Simpson indices are representative of more diverse
350 communities. High indices were noted for roots of cultivated ($H = 2.718$, 1-D=0.930) and
351 wild ($H = 1.946$, 1-D=0.857) rice. This could be explained on the basis that most endophytic
352 bacteria are derived from the soil. The rhizosphere is the region for bacteria to reside and
353 obtain nutrients (Raaijmakers et al., 2002). Bacteria residing in the rhizosphere might also
354 have the potential to enter and colonize the plant roots. In fact, microbial population and their
355 diversity in the rhizosphere is a major contributor for number and diversity of endophytes in a
356 host plant (Hallmann and Berg, 2006). Some rhizoplane-colonizing bacteria can penetrate
357 plant roots, and some strains may move to stem and leaves, with a lower bacterial density in
358 comparison to root-colonizing populations (Compant et al., 2010). In the present study
359 decrease of endophytic population was recorded from root onwards to the leaf through the
360 stem. The reason maybe that most of the endophytes enter into the plant tissue through root
361 and only a few can penetrate the xylem vessels through the casparian strip. The few microbes
362 enter in to the xylem vessels slowly move towards the apical parts of the plant and hence the
363 concentration of microbes decreases from root to stem and leaf (Gasser et al., 2011). In a
364 study by Prakamhang *et al.* (2009) endophytic bacteria in rice were found in highest density
365 in roots than other parts of the plant (Prakamhang et al., 2009).

366 All plants from cultivated to wild possess diverse endophytic microbiome. Such
367 endophytes are of particular interest because they have high potential to produce different
368 phytohormones and phytoestimulatory compounds for promoting growth and yield. However,
369 often these microorganisms are studied as a collective group and endophytes colonizing in

370 different parts of a plant are rarely being analyzed. The study of microbial community in leaf,
371 stem, and roots showed a difference in the microbiome of cultivated and wild rice. The
372 microbial load in the wild rice was significantly less than the cultivated rice indicating the
373 difference in their habitat throughout influence endophyte diversity. Wild rice is mainly
374 found in the waterlogged marshy soils where abiotic stress is common, while cultivated
375 varieties are traditionally grown with all the required nutrient supplements. Moreover, the
376 cultivated rice seeds come from different locations which also influence upon the endophytic
377 bacterial diversity.

378 The genus wise classification showed wild rice was mainly dominated by *Bacillus*,
379 *Microbacterium*, *Cellulosimicrobium*, *Ochrobactrum*, *Pantoea*, *Enterobacteriaceae*, and
380 *Erwinia*. However, cultivated varieties showed a varied diversity of *Bacillus* along with
381 *Microbacterium*, *Microbacteriaceae*, *Pantoea*, *Burkholderia*, *Acinetobacter*, *Pseudomonas*,
382 *Acidovorax*, *Ralstonia*, *Staphylococcus*, *Lysenibacillus*, and *Brevibacillus*. Further annotation
383 showed the variation is not only in the microbiome of cultivated and wild rice but there is a
384 visible differentiation in the colonizing pattern of microorganism across the different parts of
385 plants. Bacteria like *B. altitudinus*, *B. aryabhatai*, *B. mycoides*, *L. fusiformis*, and *A.*
386 *guillouiae* are root-associated bacteria in cultivated rice while *O. tritici*, *P. penneri*, *Erwinia*
387 *sp.*, *Microbacterium sp.* were from wild rice. Interestingly *M. arborescens* is strictly root-
388 associated bacteria in both the cultivated and wild rice. In significance, the colonization in the
389 root is not random, like *M. arborescens* is beneficial to the root as they can produce high
390 exopolysaccharide which helps in the soil aggregation and reports also suggest their
391 involvement in iron-translocation in the rhizosphere. Microorganism mainly *B. mycoides*
392 helps in nitrogen fixation, *B. altitudinis* can produce glucanase which helps the plant to inhibit
393 the soil-borne pathogenic fungi, *B. aryabhatai* shows tolerance against nitrosative stress
394 which protects the root cells from cellular damage. Stem specific diversity showed the
395 dominance of *B. amyloliquefaciens*, *B. agri*, *Staphylococcus sp.*, *M. bacterium*, *M.*
396 *laevaniformans*, *Burkholderia sp.*, *P. putida* and *Acinetobacter sp.*, in cultivated rice while *B.*
397 *barbaricus*, *M. trichothecenolyticum*, and *E. asburiae* were dominant in the stem of wild rice.
398 Leaf associated bacteria was not as diverse as other parts, *P. ananatis*, *R. mannitolilytica*, *M.*
399 *trichothecenolyticum* was found in cultivated rice while *B. pumilus*, and *B. niabensis*, was
400 found in wild rice. Bacteria found on the leaf of cultivated varieties were a mostly
401 opportunistic human pathogen, which suggests the human intervention in the farmland,
402 whereas *B. pumilus* and *B. niabensis* are native plant associate encouraging the less

403 anthropogenic activities. Other identified bacteria from cultivated and wild rice like *Bacillus*
404 *sp.*, *B. subtilis*, *B. cereus*, *B. safensis*, *B. megaterium*, *Pseudomonas sp.*, *B. cereus*, *C.*
405 *cellulans*, *M. testaceum* and *S. maltophilia* showed abundance in all the parts with exceptions.
406 *Bacillus pumilus*, which is dominant in all three parts of the plant in cultivated rice but only
407 leaf specific in wild rice.

408 Endophytes can directly or indirectly influence on growth and development of plants
409 without causing any pathogenic effect on the host. The mutual interaction is habitually
410 facilitated by a number of metabolites linked with impelling mechanisms *viz.* mobilizations
411 and uptake of nutrients and production or co-regulation of phytohormones. Phytohormone
412 production by endophytes is perhaps the best-studied mechanism of plant growth promotion
413 (Long et al., 2008). Indole-3-acetic acid (IAA), the most common auxin found in the plant
414 (Barazani and Friedman, 1999) regulates various aspects of plant growth and development
415 (Bulgarelli et al., 2013). It acts as a regulator of numerous biological processes such as cell
416 division and elongation, tissue differentiation, apical dominance, and responses to light,
417 gravity, and pathogens (Aloni et al., 2006). Our study revealed that *Microbacteriaceae*
418 *bacterium* RS011 produced a significant amount of Indole-Acetic-Acid (28.39 ± 1.33 $\mu\text{g/ml}$)
419 followed by *Microbacterium testaceum* MK LS01 (24.25 ± 0.90 $\mu\text{g/ml}$). *Bacillus sp.* isolated
420 from rice had been reported earlier for their IAA producing activity by Phetcharat and
421 Duangpaeng (2012) (Phetcharat and Duangpaeng, 2012). Gibberellic acid (GA), a class of
422 major phytohormone responsible for seed germination and mobilization of food-substances
423 for the growth of a new cell, was found to be maximum in *Microbacteriaceae bacterium*
424 RS01 11 (67.23 ± 1.67 $\mu\text{g/ml}$) followed by *Bacillus subtilis* RHS 01 (57.63 ± 1.57).
425 Gibberellic acid has also been reported to be synthesized by several bacterial species
426 including *Acinetobacter*, *Azospirillum brasilense*, *Agrobacterium*, *Arthrobacter*, *A. lipoferum*,
427 *Azotobacter*, *Bacillus*, *Bradyrhizobium japonicum*, *Flavobacterium*, *Micrococcus*,
428 *Clostridium*, *Pseudomonas*, *Rhizobium* and *Xanthomonas* (Gutierrez-Manero et al., 2001).
429 Endophytic *Pseudomonas* and *Bacillus* isolates of tropical legume crops were also reported to
430 secrete GA (Maheswari and Komalavalli, 2013). To the best of our knowledge, this is the
431 first report on rice endophytic *Microbacteriaceae bacterium* with the ability to secrete
432 substantial amount of IAA and GA.

433 Plant growth and yield are essentially dependent on the availability of minerals which
434 they directly or indirectly acquire from the soil. Soil constitutes 0.5% phosphorus, mostly in
435 the form of insoluble mineral complexes which plants cannot directly absorb (Rengel and

436 Marschner, 2005), only 0.1 % of the total P exists in a soluble form available for plant uptake
437 (Sharma et al., 2013). Phosphate-solubilising bacteria (PSB) are able to solubilise bound
438 phosphorous from organic or inorganic molecules, by secretion of organic acids such as
439 phytic acid, formic acid, acetic acid, lactic acid and by producing enzymes such as
440 phosphatases or C-P lyases (Chung et al., 2005; Kim et al., 1998). Characterization of PSB
441 showed *Bacillus subtilis* RHS 01 as a potent phosphate solubilizer ($81.70 \pm 1.3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}$)
442 followed by *Brevibacillus agri* RS01 05 ($60.75 \pm 0.24 \mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$). These endophytic bacterial
443 isolates were able to solubilize organic or inorganic form of phosphate suggesting that they
444 could play a role in resource mobilization in nutrient-poor habitat. The previous study by
445 Dias et al., (2009) confirmed the efficiency of endophytic bacteria such as *Bacillus subtilis*
446 and *B. megaterium* isolated from strawberry in solubilization of tricalcium phosphate (Dias et
447 al., 2009).

448 Potassium is a major nutrient for plant growth and development, which provides an
449 ionic environment for metabolic process in the cytosol and as such function as a growth
450 regulator. *Microbacteriaceae testaceum* MK LS01 ($81.33 \pm 0.58 \mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$) and *Bacillus cereus*
451 RHC 13 ($79.66 \pm 1.67 \mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$) solubilized the highest amount of potassium in the study.
452 *Bacillus cereus* isolated from soil is reported to solubilize potassium (Diep and Hieu, 2013).
453 Yuan et al., 2015 isolated 14 species from 10 genera of potassium-solubilizing endophytic
454 bacteria from moso bamboo which mainly consist of *Alcaligenes* sp., *Enterobacter* sp. and
455 *Bacillus* sp. Other genera such as *Burkholderia* sp., *Paenibacillus* sp., and *Acidothiobacillus*
456 sp. were reported to be potassium solubilizing biofertilizer (Nair and Padmavathy, 2014).
457 *Microbacterium foliorum*, isolated from tobacco rhizosphere has the ability to solubilize
458 potassium (Zhang and Kong, 2014). However, this is the first report of potassium
459 solubilization property of endophyte *Microbacteriaceae testaceum*, isolated from rice.

460 Zinc, though a micronutrient is one of the essential minerals for chlorophyll synthesis.
461 Zinc solubilizing microorganisms have the ability to dissolve the immobilized zinc viz. zinc
462 phosphate, zinc oxide and zinc carbonate in considerable quantity (Saravanan et al., 2007). In
463 the present study, *Microbacterium trichothecenolyticum* MI03L05 and *Bacillus altitudinis*
464 RR03D showed a significant amount of zinc solubilization with an efficiency of 157.50 %
465 and 148.64 % respectively. The formation of halo zones by the microorganisms is due to the
466 movement of acidity corresponded with the solubilization of the metal compound (Fasim et
467 al., 2002). Other bacterial genera viz. *Acinetobacter*, *Bacillus*, *Gluconacetobacter*,
468 *Pseudomonas*, *Thiobacillus thiooxidans*, *Thiobacillus ferrooxidans*, and facultative

469 thermophilic iron oxidizers have also been reported as zinc solubilizers (Saravanan et al.,
470 2007). Endophytic *Bacillus* sp. and *Pseudomonas* sp. isolated from soybean were also
471 reported to solubilize zinc (Ramesh et al., 2014). But there are no previous reports on zinc
472 solubilization by *Microbacterium trichothecenolyticum* which is supposed to be the first of its
473 kind.

474 Production of siderophore for iron chelation is an important trait in endophytic
475 bacteria. Despite being the most available element in the earth crust, the bioavailability of
476 iron is very limited due to the low solubility of Fe^{+3} ion and siderophores, perhaps, are the
477 strongest binding agent of Fe^{+3} . A number of plant species can directly absorb the bacterial
478 Fe^{3+} siderophores complexes (Beneduzi et al., 2012). *Bacillus barbaricus* LP20 05 (64.8 %)
479 was found to exhibit highest siderophore production activity, followed by *Lysenibacillus*
480 *fusiformis* LP01R08 (55.05%). Endophytic bacteria *Bacillus barbaricus* isolated from
481 *Zingiber officinale* was reported to produce siderophore (GINTING et al., 2013).
482 Siderophore production is also shown by rhizospheric bacteria *Bacillus barbaricus* (21%) and
483 *Pseudomonas fluorescens* (76%) (Gupta and Gopal, 2008).

484 Increase application of PGPB can be seen in sustainable agricultural practices for
485 growth enhancement and increased crop yield (Kloepper et al., 1991). In the present study,
486 the pot culture evaluation revealed the T6 treatment (Soil + ½ NPK + ½ Vermicompost + ½
487 Bioinoculum) as effective in promoting plant growth in terms of shoot heights, number of
488 tillers, number of panicles, the total number of seeds per plant, weight of 100 grains and yield
489 per plant. The T6 treatment resulted in significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) higher increase on growth and
490 yield parameters when compared to control T0 and T1 (NPK). The delay in acclimatization
491 and colonization of the microorganisms in soil and rhizosphere may initially take time to
492 show the benefit, however once established the PGPB enhanced plant growth and yield.
493 Endophytic PGPB are good candidates to be used as inoculant as they can colonize roots and
494 create a favourable environment for development and yield (Bacon and Hinton, 2007). The
495 mechanisms by which bacteria can influence plant growth differ among species and isolates,
496 usually there is no single mechanism for promoting plant growth (Souza et al., 2015) hence
497 mechanisms that stimulated plant growth could be explained by combined effects of all the
498 PGPR properties like phytohormone (IAA and GA) production and mineral (phosphate,
499 potassium, and zinc) solubilisation of each isolate present in the bio-inoculum (Bashan et al.,
500 2004; Glick, 1995). *Microbacteriaceae* bacterium RS01 11 had phytohormone biosynthesis
501 capacity which might have stimulated the process of plant growth. The secretion of IAA

502 might have aided in improving root development while GA in promoting shoot growth.
503 *Bacillus subtilis* RHS 01 and *Microbacterium testaceum* MK LS01 were able efficient
504 phosphate and potassium solubilizers respectively. *Bacillus subtilis* RHS 01 and
505 *Microbacterium testaceum* MK LS01 had good zinc solubilising activity as well that might
506 have helped the process of growth enhancement. Earlier greenhouse and pot culture studies
507 with the endophytic rhizobial inoculum indicated the significant increase in N, P and K
508 uptake in rice plants and led to increased biomass and yield of rice plants (Biswas et al.,
509 2000). Similar kind of experiment was conducted by Ashrafuzzaman et al., (2009) to
510 determine the efficiency of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) for the
511 enhancement of rice growth and found that the use of PGPR isolates PGB4, PGG2, and
512 PGT3 as inoculant biofertilizers were beneficial for rice cultivation as they enhanced the
513 growth of rice.

514 **Conclusion**

515 The study generated a baseline data on the endophytic bacterial diversity of cultivated
516 and wild rice in Assam through a culture dependent method. The endophytes
517 *Microbacteriaceae bacterium*, *Microbacterium testaceum* and *Bacillus subtilis* exhibiting
518 multiple plant growth promoting activity with high efficiency can form a prospective
519 consortium which can further be employed as a source of bio-fertilizer for enhancement of
520 plant growth and development. Current research also suggests that the inoculation of crops
521 with bioinoculum of endophytic bacteria has the potential to reduce application rates of
522 chemical fertilizer to half the recommended dose.

523 **Acknowledgment**

524 Authors are grateful to the funding organization Department of Biotechnology (DBT),
525 Ministry of Science and Technology, Govt. of India and Department of Agricultural
526 Biotechnology, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat, Assam for carrying out the research.

527 **Reference**

- 528 Aloni, R., Aloni, E., Langhans, M., Ullrich, C.I., 2006. Role of auxin in regulating
529 *Arabidopsis* flower development. *Planta* 223, 315–328. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00425-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00425-005-0088-9)
530 005-0088-9
- 531 Araújo, W.L., Maccheroni, W., Aguilar-Vildoso, C.I., Barroso, P.A., Saridakis, H.O.,
532 Azevedo, J.L., 2001. Variability and interactions between endophytic bacteria and fungi
533 isolated from leaf tissues of citrus rootstocks. *Can. J. Microbiol.* 47, 229–36.
- 534 Arnold, A.E., 2007. Understanding the diversity of foliar endophytic fungi: progress,

- 535 challenges, and frontiers. *Fungal Biol. Rev.* 21, 51–66.
536 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FBR.2007.05.003>
- 537 Ashrafuzzaman, M., Hossen, F., Ismail, M., Hoque, A., Islam, M., Shahidullah, S., Meon, S.,
538 2009. Efficiency of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) for the enhancement
539 of rice growth. *African J. Biotechnol.* 8.
- 540 Bacon, C.W., Hinton, D.M., 2007. Bacterial endophytes: The endophytic niche, its occupants,
541 and its utility, in: *Plant-Associated Bacteria*. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 155–
542 194. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-4538-7_5
- 543 Barazani, O., Friedman, J., 1999. Is IAA the Major Root Growth Factor Secreted from Plant-
544 Growth-Mediating Bacteria? *J. Chem. Ecol.* 25, 2397–2406.
545 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020890311499>
- 546 Bashan, Y., Holguin, G., de-Bashan, L.E., 2004. *Azospirillum* -plant relationships:
547 physiological, molecular, agricultural, and environmental advances (1997-2003). *Can. J.*
548 *Microbiol.* 50, 521–577. <https://doi.org/10.1139/w04-035>
- 549 Beneduzi, A., Ambrosini, A., Passaglia, L.M.P., 2012. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria
550 (PGPR): Their potential as antagonists and biocontrol agents. *Genet. Mol. Biol.* 35,
551 1044–51.
- 552 Biswas, J.C., Ladha, J.K., Dazzo, F.B., 2000. Rhizobia Inoculation Improves Nutrient Uptake
553 and Growth of Lowland Rice. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 64, 1644.
554 <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2000.6451644x>
- 555 Bulgarelli, D., Schlaeppi, K., Spaepen, S., van Themaat, E.V.L., Schulze-Lefert, P., 2013.
556 Structure and Functions of the Bacterial Microbiota of Plants. *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.* 64,
557 807–838. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-050312-120106>
- 558 Carson, K.C., Meyer, J.-M., Dilworth, M.J., 2000. Hydroxamate siderophores of root nodule
559 bacteria. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 32, 11–21. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717\(99\)00107-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717(99)00107-8)
560 8
- 561 Chung, H., Park, M., Madhaiyan, M., Seshadri, S., Song, J., Cho, H., Sa, T., 2005. Isolation
562 and characterization of phosphate solubilizing bacteria from the rhizosphere of crop
563 plants of Korea. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 37, 1970–1974.
564 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SOILBIO.2005.02.025>
- 565 Compant, S., Clément, C., Sessitsch, A., 2010. Plant growth-promoting bacteria in the rhizo-
566 and endosphere of plants: Their role, colonization, mechanisms involved and prospects
567 for utilization. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 42, 669–678.

- 568 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SOILBIO.2009.11.024>
- 569 Conn, V.M., Franco, C.M.M., 2004. Analysis of the endophytic actinobacterial population in
570 the roots of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) by terminal restriction fragment length
571 polymorphism and sequencing of 16S rRNA clones. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 70,
572 1787–94. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.70.3.1787-1794.2004>
- 573 Dias, A.C.F., Costa, F.E.C., Andreote, F.D., Lacava, P.T., Teixeira, M.A., Assumpção, L.C.,
574 Araújo, W.L., Azevedo, J.L., Melo, I.S., 2009. Isolation of micropropagated strawberry
575 endophytic bacteria and assessment of their potential for plant growth promotion. *World*
576 *J. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 25, 189–195. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11274-008-9878-0>
- 577 Diep, C.N., Hieu, T.N., 2013. Phosphate and Potassium Solubilizing Bacteria from
578 Weathered Materials of denatured Rock Mountain, Ha Tien, Kien Giang Province,
579 Vietnam. *Am. J. Life Sci.* 1, 88. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajls.20130103.12>
- 580 Elbeltagy, A., Nishioka, K., Sato, T., Suzuki, H., Ye, B., Hamada, T., Isawa, T., Mitsui, H.,
581 Minamisawa, K., 2001. Endophytic colonization and in planta nitrogen fixation by a
582 *Herbaspirillum* sp. isolated from wild rice species. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 67, 5285–
583 93. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.67.11.5285-5293.2001>
- 584 Elvira-Recuenco, M., van Vuurde, J.W., 2000. Natural incidence of endophytic bacteria in
585 pea cultivars under field conditions. *Can. J. Microbiol.* 46, 1036–41.
- 586 Fasim, F., Ahmed, N., Parsons, R., Gadd, G.M., 2002. Solubilization of zinc salts by a
587 bacterium isolated from the air environment of a tannery. *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* 213,
588 1–6.
- 589 Forchetti, G., Masciarelli, O., Alemano, S., Alvarez, D., Abdala, G., 2007. Endophytic
590 bacteria in sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.): isolation, characterization, and production
591 of jasmonates and abscisic acid in culture medium. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 76,
592 1145–1152. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-007-1077-7>
- 593 Fukui, R., 1994. Interaction Between Strains of Pseudomonads in Sugar Beet Spermophores
594 and Their Relationship to Pericarp Colonization by *Pythium ultimum* in Soil.
595 *Phytopathology* 84, 1322. <https://doi.org/10.1094/Phyto-84-1322>
- 596 Gagné, S., Richard, C., Rousseau, H., Antoun, H., 1987. Xylem-residing bacteria in alfalfa
597 roots. *Can. J. Microbiol.* 33, 996–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1139/m87-175>
- 598 Gasser, I., Cardinale, M., Müller, H., Heller, S., Eberl, L., Lindenkamp, N., Kaddor, C.,
599 Steinbüchel, A., Berg, G., 2011. Analysis of the endophytic lifestyle and plant growth
600 promotion of *Burkholderia terricola* ZR2-12. *Plant Soil* 347, 125–136.

- 601 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-011-0833-8>
- 602 GINTING, R.C.B., SUKARNO, N., WIDYASTUTI, U., DARUSMAN, L.K., KANAYA, S.,
603 2013. Diversity of Endophytic Fungi from Red Ginger (*Zingiber officinale* Rosc.) Plant
604 and Their Inhibitory Effect to *Fusarium oxysporum* Plant Pathogenic Fungi. HAYATI J.
605 Biosci. 20, 127–137. <https://doi.org/10.4308/HJB.20.3.127>
- 606 Glick, B.R., 2014. Bacteria with ACC deaminase can promote plant growth and help to feed
607 the world. Microbiol. Res. 169, 30–39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2013.09.009>
- 608 Glick, B.R., 1995. The enhancement of plant growth by free-living bacteria. Can. J.
609 Microbiol. 41, 109–117. <https://doi.org/10.1139/m95-015>
- 610 Gupta, A., Gopal, M., 2008. SIDEROPHORE PRODUCTION BY PLANT GROWTH
611 PROMOTING RHIZOBACTERIA, Indian Journal Of Agricultural Research.
- 612 Gutierrez-Manero, F.J., Ramos-Solano, B., Probanza, A. n, Mehouchi, J., R. Tadeo, F.,
613 Talon, M., 2001. The plant-growth-promoting rhizobacteria *Bacillus pumilus* and
614 *Bacillus licheniformis* produce high amounts of physiologically active gibberellins.
615 Physiol. Plant. 111, 206–211. <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1399-3054.2001.1110211.x>
- 616 Hallmann, J., Berg, G., 2006. Spectrum and Population Dynamics of Bacterial Root
617 Endophytes, in: Microbial Root Endophytes. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin,
618 Heidelberg, pp. 15–31. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-33526-9_2
- 619 Hiruma, K., Gerlach, N., Sacristán, S., Nakano, R.T., Hacquard, S., Kracher, B., Neumann,
620 U., Ramírez, D., Bucher, M., O'Connell, R.J., Schulze-Lefert, P., 2016. Root Endophyte
621 *Colletotrichum tofieldiae* Confers Plant Fitness Benefits that Are Phosphate Status
622 Dependent. Cell 165, 464–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2016.02.028>
- 623 Hu, X., Chen, J., Guo, J., 2006. Two Phosphate- and Potassium-solubilizing Bacteria Isolated
624 from Tianmu Mountain, Zhejiang, China. World J. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 22, 983–990.
625 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11274-006-9144-2>
- 626 Kim, K.Y., Jordan, D., McDonald, G., 1998. Enterobacter agglomerans, phosphate
627 solubilizing bacteria, and microbial activity in soil: Effect of carbon sources. Soil Biol.
628 Biochem. 30, 995–1003. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717\(98\)00007-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717(98)00007-8)
- 629 Kimura, M., 1980. A simple method for estimating evolutionary rates of base substitutions
630 through comparative studies of nucleotide sequences. J. Mol. Evol. 16, 111–20.
- 631 Kloepper, J.W., Rodríguez-Kábana, R., McInroy, J.A., Collins, D.J., 1991. Analysis of
632 populations and physiological characterization of microorganisms in rhizospheres of
633 plants with antagonistic properties to phytopathogenic nematodes. Plant Soil 136, 95–

- 634 102. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02465224>
- 635 Kogel, K.-H., Franken, P., Hückelhoven, R., 2006. Endophyte or parasite – what decides?
636 *Curr. Opin. Plant Biol.* 9, 358–363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2006.05.001>
- 637 Krieg, N.R., 2015. *vogesella*, in: *Bergey’s Manual of Systematics of Archaea and Bacteria*.
638 Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, Department of Biology, Blacksburg,
639 VA 24061-0406, USA, pp. 25–27. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118960608.gbm00985>.
- 640 Long, H.H., Schmidt, D.D., Baldwin, I.T., 2008. Native bacterial endophytes promote host
641 growth in a species-specific manner; phytohormone manipulations do not result in
642 common growth responses. *PLoS One* 3, e2702.
643 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0002702>
- 644 Lundberg, D.S., Yourstone, S., Mieczkowski, P., Jones, C.D., Dangl, J.L., 2013. Practical
645 innovations for high-throughput amplicon sequencing. *Nat. Methods* 10, 999–1002.
646 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2634>
- 647 Lyngwi, N.A., Joshi, S., 2014. Economically important *Bacillus* and related genera: a mini
648 review, in: Arnab Sen (Ed.), *Biology of Useful Plants and Microbes*. Narosa Publishing
649 House, New Delhi, pp. 1–11.
- 650 Ma, L., Cao, Y.H., Cheng, M.H., Huang, Y., Mo, M.H., Wang, Y., Yang, J.Z., Yang, F.X.,
651 2013. Phylogenetic diversity of bacterial endophytes of *Panax notoginseng* with
652 antagonistic characteristics towards pathogens of root-rot disease complex. *Antonie Van*
653 *Leeuwenhoek* 103, 299–312. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10482-012-9810-3>
- 654 Maheswari, N.U., Komalavalli, R., 2013. Diversity of Soil Fungi from Thiruvarur District,
655 Tamil Nadu, India. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci* 2, 135–141.
- 656 Misaghi, I.J., Donndelinger, C.R., n.d. Endophytic Bacteria in Symptom-Free Cotton Plants.
657 Nair, D.N., Padmavathy, S., 2014. Impact of endophytic microorganisms on plants,
658 environment and humans. *ScientificWorldJournal*. 2014, 250693.
659 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/250693>
- 660 Patten, C.L., Glick, B.R., 2002. Role of *Pseudomonas putida* indoleacetic acid in
661 development of the host plant root system. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 68, 3795–801.
- 662 Payne, S.M., 1994. Detection, isolation, and characterization of siderophores. *Methods*
663 *Enzymol.* 235, 329–44.
- 664 Phetcharat, P., Duangpaeng, A., 2012. Screening of Endophytic Bacteria from Organic Rice
665 Tissue for Indole Acetic Acid Production. *Procedia Eng.* 32, 177–183.
666 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PROENG.2012.01.1254>

- 667 Pillay, V.K., Nowak, J., 1997. Inoculum density, temperature, and genotype effects on in
668 vitro growth promotion and epiphytic and endophytic colonization of tomato
669 (*Lycopersicon esculentum* L.) seedlings inoculated with a pseudomonad bacterium. Can.
670 J. Microbiol. 43, 354–361. <https://doi.org/10.1139/m97-049>
- 671 Prakamhang, J., Minamisawa, K., Teamtaisong, K., Boonkerd, N., Teaumroong, N., 2009.
672 The communities of endophytic diazotrophic bacteria in cultivated rice (*Oryza sativa* L.).
673 Appl. Soil Ecol. 42, 141–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.APSSOIL.2009.02.008>
- 674 Raaijmakers, J.M., Vlami, M., de Souza, J.T., 2002. Antibiotic production by bacterial
675 biocontrol agents. Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek 81, 537–547.
676 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020501420831>
- 677 Ramesh, A., Sharma, S.K., Sharma, M.P., Yadav, N., Joshi, O.P., 2014. Inoculation of zinc
678 solubilizing *Bacillus aryabhattai* strains for improved growth, mobilization and
679 biofortification of zinc in soybean and wheat cultivated in Vertisols of central India.
680 Appl. Soil Ecol. 73, 87–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2013.08.009>
- 681 Reiter, B., Pfeifer, U., Schwab, H., Sessitsch, A., 2002. Response of endophytic bacterial
682 communities in potato plants to infection with *Erwinia carotovora* subsp. *atroseptica*.
683 Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 68, 2261–8. [https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.68.5.2261-](https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.68.5.2261-2268.2002)
684 [2268.2002](https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.68.5.2261-2268.2002)
- 685 Rengel, Z., Marschner, P., 2005. Nutrient availability and management in the rhizosphere:
686 exploiting genotypic differences. New Phytol. 168, 305–312.
687 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2005.01558.x>
- 688 Rijavec, T., Lapanje, A., Dermastia, M., Rupnik, M., 2007. Isolation of bacterial endophytes
689 from germinated maize kernels. Can. J. Microbiol. 53, 802–808.
690 <https://doi.org/10.1139/W07-048>
- 691 Romero, F.M., Marina, M., Pieckenstain, F.L., 2014. The communities of tomato (*Solanum*
692 *lycopersicum* L.) leaf endophytic bacteria, analyzed by 16S-ribosomal RNA gene
693 pyrosequencing. FEMS Microbiol. Lett. 351, 187–194. [https://doi.org/10.1111/1574-](https://doi.org/10.1111/1574-6968.12377)
694 [6968.12377](https://doi.org/10.1111/1574-6968.12377)
- 695 Rosenblueth, M., Martínez-Romero, E., 2006. Bacterial Endophytes and Their Interactions
696 with Hosts. Mol. Plant-Microbe Interact. 19, 827–837. [https://doi.org/10.1094/MPMI-](https://doi.org/10.1094/MPMI-19-0827)
697 [19-0827](https://doi.org/10.1094/MPMI-19-0827)
- 698 Ryan, P.D., Hammer, Ø., Harper, D.A., Paul Ryan, D.D., 2001. PAST:
699 PALEONTOLOGICAL STATISTICS SOFTWARE PACKAGE FOR EDUCATION

- 700 AND DATA ANALYSIS. *Palaeontol. Electron.* 178kb. T. Harper. Geol. Museum 4, 5–7.
- 701 Saravanan, V.S., Kalaiarasan, P., Madhaiyan, M., Thangaraju, M., 2007. Solubilization of
702 insoluble zinc compounds by *Gluconacetobacter diazotrophicus* and the detrimental
703 action of zinc ion (Zn^{2+}) and zinc chelates on root knot nematode *Meloidogyne*
704 *incognita*. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* 44, 235–241. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-765X.2006.02079.x)
705 [765X.2006.02079.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-765X.2006.02079.x)
- 706 Schwyn, B., Neilands, J.B., 1987. Universal chemical assay for the detection and
707 determination of siderophores. *Anal. Biochem.* 160, 47–56.
- 708 Sessitsch, A., Reiter, B., Berg, G., 2004. Endophytic bacterial communities of field-grown
709 potato plants and their plant-growth-promoting and antagonistic abilities. *Can. J.*
710 *Microbiol.* 50, 239–249. <https://doi.org/10.1139/w03-118>
- 711 Sharma, S.B., Sayyed, R.Z., Trivedi, M.H., Gobi, T.A., 2013. Phosphate solubilizing
712 microbes: sustainable approach for managing phosphorus deficiency in agricultural soils.
713 *Springerplus* 2, 587. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2193-1801-2-587>
- 714 Souza, R. de, Ambrosini, A., Passaglia, L.M.P., Souza, R. de, Ambrosini, A., Passaglia,
715 L.M.P., 2015. Plant growth-promoting bacteria as inoculants in agricultural soils. *Genet.*
716 *Mol. Biol.* 38, 401–419. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1415-475738420150053>
- 717 Strobel, G.A., 2003. Endophytes as sources of bioactive products. *Microbes Infect.* 5, 535–44.
- 718 Strobel, G., Daisy, B., Castillo, U., Harper, J., 2004. Natural Products from Endophytic
719 Microorganisms \pm . *J. Nat. Prod.* 67, 257–268. <https://doi.org/10.1021/np030397v>
- 720 Sturz, A. V., Christie, B.R., Matheson, B.G., Nowak, J., 1997. Biodiversity of endophytic
721 bacteria which colonize red clover nodules, roots, stems and foliage and their influence
722 on host growth. *Biol. Fertil. Soils* 25, 13–19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s003740050273>
- 723 Tan, R.X., Zou, W.X., 2001. Endophytes: a rich source of functional metabolites. *Nat. Prod.*
724 *Rep.* 18, 448–59.
- 725 Vega, F.E., Pava-Ripoll, M., Posada, F., Buyer, J.S., 2005. Endophytic bacteria in *Coffea*
726 *arabica* L. *J. Basic Microbiol.* 45, 371–380. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jobm.200410551>
- 727 Vikram, A., Hamzehzarghani, H., Alagawadi, A.R., Krishnaraj, P.U., Chandrashekar, B.S.,
728 2007. Production of Plant Growth Promoting Substances by Phosphate Solubilizing
729 Bacteria Isolated from Vertisols. *J. Plant Sci.* 2, 326–333.
730 <https://doi.org/10.3923/jps.2007.326.333>
- 731 Xia, Y., DeBolt, S., Dreyer, J., Scott, D., Williams, M.A., 2015. Characterization of
732 culturable bacterial endophytes and their capacity to promote plant growth from plants

733 grown using organic or conventional practices. *Front. Plant Sci.* 6, 490.

734 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2015.00490>

735 Zhang, C., Kong, F., 2014. Isolation and identification of potassium-solubilizing bacteria
736 from tobacco rhizospheric soil and their effect on tobacco plants. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 82,
737 18–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.APSOIL.2014.05.002>

738

739 **Figure Captions**

740 Fig. 1: Phylogenetic analysis of 16S rRNA gene sequences of the bacterial isolates along with
741 the reference sequences from NCBI. The analysis was conducted using neighbor-joining
742 method.

743 Fig. 2: Rarefaction curve of bacterial endophytes: (i) cultivated and (ii) wild rice (A: root, B:
744 stem and C: leaf).

745

746 Fig. 3: Diversity of bacterial endophytes isolated from different parts of (A) Wild rice and (B)
747 Cultivar rice variety.

748

749 Fig. 4: Phytohormone production by the isolated bacteria (a) Indole acetic acid (IAA) (b)
750 Gibberellic acid (Ga).

751

752 Fig. 5: Mineral solubilization efficiency of the isolate endophytes (a) Phosphate (b)
753 Potassium and (c) Zinc.

754

755 Fig. 6: Siderophore production efficiency of the isolated endophytes.

756

757 Fig. 7: Pot culture experiment – evaluation of plant growth promoting efficiency of the
758 isolates using rice as an test plant under controlled greenhouse environment. Parameters
759 evaluated for the experiment, (a) Shoot Height of Rice; (b) Number of Tillers developed in
760 Rice; (c) Number of Leaves; (d)No. of grains; (e) Wieght of 100 grains; (f) Dry biomass of
761 the plant (gm); (g) Yield per plant.

762

763

764

764 **Table legends**

765

766 Table 1: Morphological and biochemical characterization of the isolates.

767

768 Table 2: Endophytic bacteria with their isolation source and NCBI accession number.

769

770 Table 3: Diversity indices of endophytes isolated from cultivated and rice.

771

772 Table 4: Growth characteristics of pot culture till harvest.

773

774

775

776

777

778

Table 1: Morphological and biochemical characterization of the isolates

Sl No.	Sample Code	Cell Shape	Gram reaction	Starch Hydrolysis	Caesin Hydrolysis	Catalase Reaction	Citrate Utilization	Malate Utilization	Nitrate Reduction	H ₂ S Production	Gelatin liquefaction	Cellulase Production	Pectinase Production
1.	MI3 L05	rod	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
2.	RR01 3D	rod	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	+
3.	RR01 04	rod	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-
4.	RS01 05	rod	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-
5.	RS01 11	rod	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-
6.	RLS 04	rod	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+
7.	RHS 06	rod	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-
8.	RHS 01	rod	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
9.	RHS 11	rod	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
10.	RLS 12	rod	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
11.	LP10 S10	rod	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
12.	LP10 S01	rod	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-
13.	LP21 S03	rod	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-
14.	LP31 R13	round	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-
15.	LP10 L02	<i>rod</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-
16.	RHS 02	<i>rod</i>	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-
17.	LP21 R02	rod	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-

18.	LP10 S06	rod	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-
19.	M12 LS01	rod	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
20.	LP01 R08	rod	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21.	MK2L02	rod	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
22.	LP21S02	rod	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
23.	LP01L06	rod	+	+		+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
24.	LP35L05	rod	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-
25.	LP31L19	<i>rod</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
26.	LP01S02	round	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
27.	LP10L02	<i>rod</i>	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
28.	RHS07	round	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
29.	LP31 R11	rod	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-
30.	LP31 L04	rod	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-
31.	LP35 L05	rod	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-
32.	RHD 11	<i>rod</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
33.	RR01 3C	rod	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
34.	RS01 04	rod	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
35.	RHM 104	rod	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+
36.	RHM 105	rod	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-

37.	RHM 109	rod	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-
38.	RHM 111	rod	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-
39.	RHM 113	rod	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+
40.	RHM 120	rod	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-
41.	RHM 122	rod	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+		+	-
42.	RHM 123	rod	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-
43.	RSC 04	rod	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+
44.	RSC 05	rod	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-
45.	RLC 11	rod	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
46.	RHC 13	rod	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+
47.	RRC 23	rod	+	-	-		-		-	-	-	-	-
48.	RRC 24	rod	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-
49.	RRC 26	rod	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50.	MK LS01	<i>rod</i>	+		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-
51.	RNS 01	<i>rod</i>	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-
52.	RNS 02	<i>rod</i>	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-
53.	RNS 03	<i>rod</i>	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-
54.	LP02 01	<i>rod</i>	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-
55.	LP05 05	rod	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
56.	LP05 06	rod	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-

57.	LP05 07	round	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
58.	LP05 08	round	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
59.	LP12 05	rod	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
60.	LP12 09	rod	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
61.	LP12 10	rod	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
62.	LP12 11	rod	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	-
63.	LP20 01	rod	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-
64.	LP20 03	rod	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
65.	LP20 04	<i>rod</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
66.	LP20 05	<i>rod</i>	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-
67.	LP20 06	<i>rod</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
68.	RNS 04	rod	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-
69.	RNS 05	rod	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
70.	LP31 L03	rod	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-

Table 2: Endophytic bacteria with their isolation source and NCBI accession number

Sl. No.	Isolate Code	Isolation Source		Organism Match	Family	Phylum	Accession number
		Type	Plant Part				
1.	MI03 L05	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Microbacterium trichothecenolyticum</i>	<i>Microbacteriaceae</i>	Actinobacteria	KF953537
2.	RR01 3D	Cultivated	Root	<i>Bacillus altitudinis</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KF953538
3.	RR01 04	Cultivated	Root	<i>Bacillus aryabhatai</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KF953539
4.	RS01 05	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Brevibacillus agri</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	MF503998
5.	RS01 11	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Microbacteriaceae bacterium</i>	<i>Microbacteriaceae</i>	Actinobacteria	KF957732
6.	RLS 04	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Bacillus</i> sp.	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KF957733
7.	RHS 06	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Bacillus pumilus</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KF957734
8.	RHS 01	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KF957735
9.	RHS 11	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Bacillus amyloliquefaciens</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KF957736
10.	RLS 12	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Bacillus megaterium</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KF957737
11.	LP10 S10	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KM977832
12.	LP10 S01	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Burkholderia</i> sp.	Burkholderiaceae	Proteobacteria	KM977833
13.	LP21 S03	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Microbacterium laevaniformans</i>	<i>Microbacteriaceae</i>	Actinobacteria	KM977830
14.	LP31 R13	Cultivated	Root	<i>Acinetobacter guillourie</i>	Moraxellaceae	Proteobacteria	KM977837
15.	LP10 L02	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Pseudomonas</i> sp.	Pseudomonadaceae	Proteobacteria	KM977829
16.	RHS 02	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Pseudomonas putida</i>	Pseudomonadaceae	Proteobacteria	KM977835
17.	LP21 R02	Cultivated	Root	<i>Microbacterium testaceum</i>	<i>Microbacteriaceae</i>	Actinobacteria	KM977831
18.	LP10 S06	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KM350268
19.	M12 LS01	Cultivated	Root	<i>Brevibacillus brevis</i>	Paenibacillaceae	Firmicutes	KM350266
20.	LP01 R08	Cultivated	Root	<i>Lysenibacillus fusiformis</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KP419697
21.	MK2 L02	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Microbacterium</i> sp.	<i>Microbacteriaceae</i>	Actinobacteria	KM350264

22.	LP21 S02	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Microbacterium</i> sp.	<i>Microbacteriaceae</i>	Actinobacteria	KM977824
23.	LP01 L06	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Bacillus pumilus</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KM977825
24.	LP35 L05	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Bacillus</i> sp.	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KM977826
25.	LP31 L19	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Ralstonia mannitolilytica</i>	Pseudomonadaceae	Proteobacteria	KM977827
26.	LP01 S02	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Staphylococcus</i> sp.	Staphylococcaceae	Firmicutes	KM977828
27.	LP10 L02	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Pseudomonas</i> sp.	Pseudomonadaceae	Proteobacteria	KM977834
28.	RHS 07	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Acinetobacter</i> sp.	Pseudomonadaceae	Proteobacteria	MF503997
29.	LP31 R11	Cultivated	Root	<i>Bacillus pumilus</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KM350265
30.	LP31 L04	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Bacillus megaterium</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KM350267
31.	LP35 L05	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Bacillus megaterium</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KM350269
32.	RHD 11	Cultivated	Root	<i>Pseudomonas</i> sp.	Pseudomonadaceae	Proteobacteria	KP419696
33.	RHM 104	Cultivated	Root	<i>Bacillus safensis</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT380665
34.	RHM 105	Cultivated	Root	<i>Bacillus mycoides</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT380666
35.	RHM 109	Cultivated	Root	<i>Bacillus safensis</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT380667
36.	RHM 111	Cultivated	Root	<i>Bacillus megaterium</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT380668
37.	RHM 113	Cultivated	Root	<i>Bacillus pumilus</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT380669
38.	RHM 120	Cultivated	Root	<i>Bacillus humi</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT380670
39.	RHM 122	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Bacillus megaterium</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT380671
40.	RHM 123	Cultivated	Root	<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT380672
41.	RSC 04	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Bacillus</i> sp.	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT380674
42.	RSC 05	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Bacillus safensis</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT380675
43.	RLC 11	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Bacillus safensis</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT380676
44.	RHC 13	Cultivated	Root	<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT380677
45.	RRC 23	Cultivated	Root	<i>Microbacterium arborescens</i>	<i>Microbacteriaceae</i>	Actinobacteria	KT380678

46.	RRC 24	Cultivated	Root	<i>Bacillus megaterium</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT380679
47.	RRC 26	Cultivated	Root	<i>Microbacterium</i> sp.	<i>Microbacteriaceae</i>	Actinobacteria	KT380680
48.	MK LS01	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Microbacterium testaceum</i>	<i>Microbacteriaceae</i>	Actinobacteria	KT380682
49.	RNS 01	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT380683
50.	RNS 02	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Pantoea ananatis</i>	Enterobacteriaceae	Proteobacteria	KT380684
51.	RNS 03	Cultivated	Root	<i>Bacillus</i> sp.	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT380685
52.	LP02 01	Wild	Leaf	<i>Bacillus pumilus</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT427902
53.	LP05 05	Wild	Leaf	<i>Stenotrophomonas maltophilia</i>	Xanthomonadaceae	Proteobacteria	KT427903
54.	LP05 06	Wild	Stem	<i>Stenotrophomonas maltophilia</i>	Xanthomonadaceae	Proteobacteria	KT427904
55.	LP05 07	Wild	Root	<i>Microbacterium</i> sp.	<i>Microbacteriaceae</i>	Actinobacteria	KT427905
56.	LP05 08	Wild	Root	<i>Microbacterium arborescens</i>	<i>Microbacteriaceae</i>	Actinobacteria	KT427906
57.	LP12 05	Wild	Leaf	<i>Cellulosimicrobium cellulans</i>	<i>Microbacteriaceae</i>	Actinobacteria	KT427907
58.	LP12 09	Wild	Root	<i>Cellulosimicrobium cellulans</i>	<i>Microbacteriaceae</i>	Actinobacteria	KT427908
59.	LP12 10	Wild	Stem	<i>Microbacterium trichothecenolyticum</i>	<i>Microbacteriaceae</i>	Actinobacteria	KT427909
60.	LP12 11	Wild	Root	<i>Proteus penneri</i>	Enterobacteriaceae	Proteobacteria	KT427910
61.	LP20 01	Wild	Leaf	<i>Bacillus niabensis</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT427913
62.	LP20 03	Wild	Root	<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT427914
63.	LP20 04	Wild	Stem	<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT427915
64.	LP20 05	Wild	Stem	<i>Bacillus barbaricus</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KT427916
65.	LP20 06	Wild	Root	<i>Erwinia</i> sp.	Enterobacteriaceae	Proteobacteria	KT427917
66.	RR01 3C	Wild	Root	<i>Ochrobactrum tritici</i>	Brucellaceae	Proteobacteria	KT380663
67.	RS01 04	Wild	Stem	<i>Enterobacter asburiae</i>	Enterobacteriaceae	Proteobacteria	KT380664
68.	RNS 04	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Pseudomonas putida</i>	Pseudomonadaceae	Proteobacteria	KX375413
69.	RNS 05	Cultivated	Stem	<i>Brevibacillus agri</i>	Paenibacillaceae	Firmicutes	KX375412

70.	LP31 L03	Cultivated	Leaf	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	Bacillaceae	Firmicutes	KX375411
-----	----------	------------	------	--------------------------	-------------	------------	----------

Table 3: Diversity indices of endophytes isolated from cultivated and rice


	Cultivated				Wild			
	Taxa S	Individual s	Shannon H	Simpson 1-D	Taxa S	Individual s	Shannon H	Simpson 1-D
Root	16	20	2.718	0.930	7	7	1.946	0.857
Stem	15	18	2.659	0.925	5	5	1.609	0.800
Leaf	12	16	2.393	0.898	4	4	1.386	0.750



Table 4: Growth characteristics of pot culture till harvest

Treatment	Shoot Height (cm)	No. of Tillers	No. of Leaves	Length of flag leaf (cm)	No. of panicles per plant	Total no. of seeds per plant	Weight / 100 seeds (gm)	Dry Biomass of the plant (gm)	Yield/plant
T0	18.00 c	4.60 d	3.40 d	21.74 e	6.60 e	178.00 g	1.69 e	16.79 f	3.00 g
T1	22.12 b	8.20 a	6.40 a	39.18 a	12.20 c	372.20 c	1.87 c	42.78 a	6.97 c
T2	21.06 b	6.40 b c	5.40 b	35.70 b	10.20 cd	273.20 e	1.89 c	31.18 c	5.18 e
T3	22.24 b	5.60 c	4.40 c	31.84 c	9.20 cd	226.40 f	1.78 d	27.66 d	4.03 f
T4	22.50 b	8.00 ab	5.00 c	39.08 a	11.60 c	331.00 d	1.87 c	22.86 e	6.19 d
T5	21.84 b	8.00 ab	5.00 bc	29.26 d	14.60 b	423.80 b	2.04 b	33.97 b	8.64 b
T6	26.48 a	9.20 a	5.40 b	35.34 b	16.80 a	463.80 a	2.19 a	31.36 c	10.16 a

Mean with same letters in each column are not significantly different at $p \leq 0.05$ according to LSD test




bioRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/310797>; this version posted April 30, 2018. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under aCC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.










WILD RICE (A)




bioRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/310797>; this version posted April 30, 2018. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under aCC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.



CULTIVAR RICE (B)







Siderophore production

