Phosphate bacterial solubilization: A key rhizosphere driving force enabling higher P use efficiency and crop productivity

Wissal Elhaissoufi, Cherki Ghoulam, Abdellatif Barakat, Youssef Zeroual, Adnane Bargaz

Journal of Advanced Research xxx (xxxx) xxx

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Advanced Research

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jare

Review

Phosphate bacterial solubilization: A key rhizosphere driving force enabling higher P use efficiency and crop productivity

Wissal Elhaissoufi [a,b], Cherki Ghoulam [a,b], Abdellatif Barakat [a,c], Youssef Zeroual [d], Adnane Bargaz [a,*]

[a] Laboratory of Plant-Microbe Interactions, Plant & Soil Microbiome Subprogram, AgroBioSciences, Mohammed VI Polytechnic University, Ben Guerir 43150, Morocco
[b] Laboratory of Biotechnology and Agrophysiology of Symbiosis, Faculty of Sciences and Techniques, Cadi Ayyad University, Marrakech 40000, Morocco
[c] IATE, Univ Montpellier, INRAE, Agro Institut. 2, Place Pierre Viala, 34060 Montpellier, France
[d] Situation Innovation – OCP Group, Jorf Lasfar 24025, Morocco

GRAPHICAL ABSTRACT



ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 30 June 2021
Revised 7 August 2021
Accepted 19 August 2021
Available online xxxx

Keywords:
Bio-formulation
Crop production
Nutrient use efficiency
Phosphate solubilizing bacteria
Phosphorus
Rock phosphate

ABSTRACT

Background: Increasing crop production to feed a growing population has driven the use of mineral fertilizers to ensure nutrients availability and fertility of agricultural soils. After nitrogen, phosphorus (P) is the second most important nutrient for plant growth and productivity. However, P availability in most agricultural soils is often limited because P strongly binds to soil particles and divalent cations forming insoluble P-complexes. Therefore, there is a constant need to sustainably improve soil P availability. This may include, among other strategies, the application of microbial resources specialized in P cycling, such as phosphate solubilizing bacteria (PSB). This P-mediating bacterial component can improve soil biological fertility and crop production, and should be integrated in well-established formulations to enhance availability and efficiency in use of P. This is of importance to P fertilization, including both organic and mineral P such as rock phosphate (RP) aiming to improve its agronomic efficiency within an integrated crop nutrition system where agronomic profitability of P and PSB can synergistically occur.

Aim of Review: The purpose of this review is to discuss critically the important contribution of PSB to crop P nutrition in concert with P fertilizers, with a specific focus on RP. We also highlight the need for PSB bioformulations being a sustainable approach to enhance P fertilizer use efficiency and crop production.

Key Scientific Concepts of Review: We first recognize the important contribution of PSB to sustain crop

Peer review under responsibility of Cairo University.
* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: adnane.bargaz@um6p.ma (A. Bargaz).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jare.2021.08.014
2090-1232/

production, which requires a rational approach for both screening and evaluation of PSB enabling an accurate assessment of the bacterial effects both alone and in intertwined interaction with plant roots. Furthermore, we propose new research ideas about the development of microbial bioformulations based on PSB with a particular focus on strains exhibiting synergetic effects with RP.

Introduction

Human population is expected to reach 9 billion by 2050, an increase of 0.7% per year, accompanied by a 70% increase in food demand [1]. For many years, the aim for applying fertilizers is to supply nutrients to plants to sustainably secure adequate crop yield. Besides nitrogen (N) and potash (K), phosphorus (P) has been crucial to sustain crops yield for the production of both food and feed [2-4].

Phosphorus is an essential macronutrient directly involved in nucleic acids, cells division and growth of new tissues, which all regulate protein synthesis and energy transfer [5]. This nutrient is needed for diverse cellular processes like photosynthesis, carbohydrate metabolism, energy production, redox-homeostasis, and signaling [6]. Phosphorus plays a key role in root development, root traits anatomy modifications and root hair density with a significant contribution in increasing yield of crops [7]. Phosphorus can limit normal plant growth if not provided by the soil or by appropriate quantities of fertilizers. Consequently, P deficiency can cause significant reductions (up to 15%) of crop yield [8]. For this reason, P application remains one of the main agricultural practices to meet plant needs.

Obviously, application of water-soluble P fertilizers improves soil mineral fertility and increase P availability in soils, thereby plant P uptake will be enhanced leading to a higher plant productivity and yield [9]. Although P fertilizers are agriculturally vital to secure crop growth and productivity, their use efficiency by crops significantly may be very low due to P fixation to soil cations. For example, P fertilizers can rapidly react with soil divalent cations such as calcium (Ca), iron (Fe) and aluminum (Al) to form insoluble soil P mineral forms [10,11]. Therefore, improving use efficiency of P fertilizers in terms of nutrient uptake and crop yield remains highly important. Unlike water-soluble P fertilizers, RP directly applied in agricultural soils could be an efficient P form for crop production in high P retention soils [12]. The agronomic efficiency of RP has been extensively studied and reported over the past 50 years [13], and the positive effects of its direct application on soil properties and plants growth have been well reported to rely mainly on RP solubility [14-16]. However, the rate of RP dissolution needs to be improved in most agricultural soils, which is ultimately needed to meet plant P demand. To increase RP agronomic efficiency, use of agriculturally beneficial microorganisms involved in P-cycling is a promising biotechnological strategy that has gained worldwide interest in recent decades.

These microbes are commonly known as P solubilizers (PSM) belonging to the group of plant growth promoting microbes (PGPM) due to their phyto-stimulation capacities [17,18]. Among PGPM, plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR), exhibiting higher P solubilizing abilities, have been categorized as PSB exhibiting substantial benefits for plant growth and yield [19-21]. For example, *Pseudomonas* [22], *Azotobacter* [23], *Xanthomonas* [24], *Rhodococcus*, *Arthrobacter*, *Serratia*, *Chryseobacterium*, *Gordonia*, *Phyllobacterium*, and *Delftia* sp. [25,26] are known to exhibit higher P solubilization capacities along with multiple plant growth promoting activities.

In addition to their native P solubilizing capacity in soils, PSB can be combined to RP, as both are natural resources and their co-application has been demonstrated to improve RP agronomic efficiency [27-30]. Indeed, exploitation of microbial functional traits related to P solubilization, mainly in high P-retention agricultural soils, is paramount in order to propose microbial-based strategies enabling RP use efficiency, [31]. Many experimental studies provided evidence that synergies can occur when combining both PSB and RP likely leading to cost-effective P-based biofertilizers directly applicable in acidic or alkaline soils. For instance, dual application of RP and PSB (e.g., *Azotobacter*, *Azosporillum*, *Rhizobium* and *Klebsiella*) significantly improved plant P nutrition of both cereal and legume crops [32-37].

Indeed, various formulations containing PSB have been established to increase RP dissolution as well as achieving high yield of crops. The use of PSB becomes effective as it could continuously offer biological solutions in concert with mineral P fertilization as both are highly beneficial for plant growth. In this review, we focus on the importance of both RP and PSB in terms of agronomic profitability within an integrated P biofertilization approach. We also detail agronomic profitability of P (mineral and organic) and PSB co-application in amended soils and inoculated crops, establishing the connection between the influence of PSB co-application on agroecosystem production. Moreover, we discuss the importance of both a rational and functional screening approach of PSB, which is based on different screening levels to help construct efficient consortia. Additionally, we highlight PSB formulation to be a crucial step for bacterial survival and P solubilization activities within the root/rhizosphere interface. Specifically, our review discusses a real need to exploit PSB based on their ability to solubilize RP to advance research on a possible development of controlled-release P fertilizers as part of an environmentally sustainable approach alleviating low P availability issue while enhancing P use efficiency (PUE).

Phosphorus is an essential nutrient for food production

Phosphorus is considered as a macronutrient majorly involved in central and important molecules for living organisms including DNA, RNA, sugar, lipids, proteins, ATP, ADP and NADPH [38]. It is therefore an essential nutrient for plants development and growth given that P concentration reaches up to 0.5% of plant dry weight [5]. Adequate levels of P availability in soils, among other factors, significantly contributes to crop productivity assuming that P fertilizers are vital to meet plant P nutritional requirements that is partly responsible for sustaining crop production.

Phosphorus in the soil–plant continuum

Phosphorus in soil exists in different chemical forms, either organic or inorganic (Pi). Besides the readily available P fraction that P fertilizers can significantly provide, activities of both roots and associated microorganisms also contribute to improve P availability in the rhizosphere soil. Inorganic P forms include precipitated P containing minerals (Fig. 1) defined as minerals that contain P as a structural element [39] such as apatites, strengite and variscite that are very stable, and their solubility depends on soil pH [40]. Meanwhile the secondary forms are adsorbed or bound P (Fig. 1) such as P-sorbing minerals, mainly Al-, Ca- and



Fig. 1. Schematic representation of P cycling processes in soil–plant- microorganisms systems. "Insoluble P" represents P fixed with soil particles (ions, humus and primary P minerals) and "organic P" represents the organically bound component of P in microbial biomass and plant residues. Extracellular enzymatic hydrolysis and organic acid production are the biochemical process involved by roots and microorganisms to increase P availability.

Fe- P whose dissolution depends on soil particles and soil pH [41,42]. Organic P forms consists of compounds varying in terms of bioavailability and solubility. For instance, most organic P forms usually exist as inositol P, anhydrides of phosphoric acid and phosphonates forms [43,44] originated from plant residues and animal manure [45-47]. Meanwhile, an important organic P proportion, between 3 and 14%, is bound in microbial biomass [48], which competes with plants for available P [49]. In the long term, this microbial biomass could represent a temporary immobilized pool of P, which can be mineralized and released in the soil solution as available P.

Despite the high capacity of P to bind strongly to soil particles [10], P availability for plant uptake is generally a balanced process of both adsorption and desorption phenomena. Indeed, rhizosphere biological processes play key roles in P dynamic and availability in agricultural soils. Both plants, via roots, and rhizosphere microbes significantly contribute to soil biological activities, thus driving P dynamic in the root-soil interface where P bioavailability highly dependent on organic and inorganic compounds such as mucilage, organic acids, phosphatases, and some specific signaling substances (proton release, chelation and ligand exchange) (Fig. 1). All considered to be key drivers of various rhizosphere processes [10] including P-cycling microorganisms that improve P availability in agricultural soils.

To facilitate P acquisition from soils, different modifications in root architectural traits are employed such as increasing root length and root hair density [50]. Root hairs are the most specialized for nutrient uptake [51]. In addition, formation of cluster roots is also considered among the major adaptations for a better P acquisition [52]. Crops may respond differently to soil P levels such as wheat, maize and rice exhibiting longer root hairs that improve PUE [53-55]. On the other hand, leguminous crops (such as *Cicer arietinum* and *Vicia Faba*) significantly change root physiology (such as exudates) than root morphology [56]. For example, exudation of organic acids such as oxalate and malate are involved in increasing P availability [57]. Another study on two contrasting soybean genotypes reported significant induction of oxalate, malate and citrate under P deficiency and/or aluminum toxicity [57]. Moreover, extracellular exudation of enzymes into the rhizosphere, either by roots or associated microorganisms, are additional mechanisms significantly contributing to improve P availability [58] with acid phosphatases being the most abundant P-hydrolyzing enzymes produced under low P conditions [59].

In connection with this research review, PSM can solubilize/ mineralize unavailable P forms in soils through different mechanisms such as rhizosphere acidification and/or phosphatases excretion, resulting in enhanced plant P uptake [37]. For instance, PSB inoculation can modify root morphology and architecture through phytohormones production such as abscisic acid, cytokinin, indole-3-acetic acid and gibberellic acid [60,61]. Moreover, PSB could modulate the expression of auxin-responsive genes, hence playing a key role in the regulation of endogenous auxin level with positive consequences on P acquisition and plant physiological status [62-65]. In addition, positive effects on spatial rhizosphere/root heterogeneity can occur due to increased soil exploration leading to a more solubilization and root absorption of P, which can be achieved by inoculating roots with auxin-producing PSB isolates [66].

Phosphorus is a key nutrient fertilizer for a sustainable crop production and food security

Enhancing agricultural productivity to ensure food security is a matter of concern, which undoubtedly will require adequate amount of essential nutrients, including P. Commercial fertilizers are multiple and could be found as straight fertilizer when only a single nutrient is presented like single super P (SSP) or triple super P (TSP) or like urea or ammonium sulphate for nitrogenous straight fertilizer, whereas di-ammonium P (DAP), monoammonium P (MAP), nitrophosphate (NP) and NPK, among other fertilizers, are considered mixed or complex fertilizers containing more than one essential nutrient [67]. For instance, application of urea P and monopotassium P increased soil P availability and leaf P content of *Solanum tuberosum* [68]. This is in line with recent findings by Otinga et al. [69] reporting that soil available P enhanced with the application of P fertilizers (TSP) with positive impacts on soil fertility. In addition, application of P fertilizers including monocalcium P (MCP) and DAP improved nutrients (P and N) uptake of rice [70]. This fertilization could affect positively shoot and root P content generating higher plant biomass (80%) compared to unfertilized plants [71]. Similarly, under both greenhouse and the field conditions, growth, nutrient uptake, and grain yield of soybean increased under different P fertilization supplies including TSP and RP [72]. Furthermore, yield of sugarcane and *Solanum tuberosum* increased in response to different P fertilizers (e.g., DAP, SSP, TSP and RP) [68,73,74]. It is noted that application of P fertilizers improves soil fertility and increase P availability in soils, thereby plant P uptake will simultaneously increase leading to a better plant growth and yield.

Although P is an essential nutrient, however only a small fraction of it, estimated up to 25%, is taken up by plants [75]. Hence, application of P fertilizers must consider soil physicochemical properties (e.g., pH, redox potential) plausibly responsible for such a reduced utilization such as in acidic soils where P is mostly fixed by Al or Fe and in alkaline soils predominately by Ca [8]. Fertilizers such as TSP, DAP and MCP are water soluble P concentrated fertilizers, but their rapid reactivity with soil nutrients and clay particles significantly impact the fate of P in the soil as well as plant P uptake presumably will not synchronize with application of P fertilizers over time. Alternatively, RP may strongly be recommended to use as a low-reactive P fertilizer against fixation and adsorption phenomena, particularly in high-P retention soils. It was also demonstrated that RP remains a slowly dissolving P form enabling a gradual P release likely through acidification due to rhizosphere activities [15,76,77]. However, RP dissolution rate seems to be low given the higher plant P requirements throughout growth stages. To overcome RP low solubility, utilization of high P-dissolving crops (exhibiting robust and active rooting system) and PSM capable of solubilizing RP is highly recommended. Indeed, application of RP combined with PSM remains a highly interesting approach, which can offer opportunities to improve PUE.

Fertilizer best management practices improve PUE and meet sustainable agriculture goals

Agronomic practices, in terms of plant nutrition and soil fertility, through application of the right mineral fertilizers, while considering the right amount and composition, the right time, and the right place, ultimately improve use efficiency of nutrients [77] with positive consequences on yield in particular and on the demand for food and feed in general. A wiser "in field and in time" agricultural application of P-based fertilizers is of importance to make P nutrient use agronomically more efficient, environmentally beneficial, and economically vital. For this purpose, the 4Rs Nutrient Stewardship guidelines have been developed by the fertilizer industry as a process to guide fertilizer best management practices (FBMP) all around the world [78].

Bringing a single nutrient are usually used such as P containing fertilizers whose application is needed to raise P availability in soils [79]. For the right rate principle, it clearly links to soil nutrients status and plant requirements. An effective soil analysis (such as Olsen test [80], Bray test [81] and Kelowna and modified Kelowna tests [82]) should be available to determine the need for P fertilizer application and to estimate P rate needed. Application of P should be synchronized with the crop's nutrient requirements "Right Time", especially at early growth stage of plant development, given that crops are often sensitive to P deficiency at the earliest growth stage [83]. Moreover, later P supply may be important for plant, which depends on the initial P status [84]. Optimization of P availability for crops can also be achieved with the right placement of P fertilizers "Right place" [85]. Indeed, application of P fertilizers nearby the root zone can help plants take up P efficiently and positively influence overall plant growth performance and yields. In this regards, banding of P fertilizer near to the root zone or it application with seeds have been reported among the best placement option more than P broadcast on the soil surface [86]. Placement of P fertilizers within the soil even at smaller placed P doses was reported to enhance rice development, P uptake, and yield under P deficiency [85]. Overall, fertilizers 4Rs practices have proven efficient to ensure a better agronomic efficiency of P fertilizers while considering the physical and chemical properties of soils and crop needs (Fig. 2).

In addition, ecological consideration should be taking as a starting point to create innovative fertilization strategies where both ecological and biological processes (e.g., nutrient-specific interactions in the rhizosphere and plants, soil, and plant microbiomes, etc.) and technologies can be co-exploited via concerted research and development efforts to achieve sustainable crop production goal. An example of integrated approach adopted to increase P fertilizers agronomic efficiency was proposed by Jayakumar et al. [87] suggesting a combination of both P mineral fertilizers (RP and TSP) and biological resources (PSB, egg shell and animal bone waste). This combination showed an increased (14%) efficiency of TSP when combined with bacterial inoculation. This exemplifies positive synergies between both mineral and microbial resources leading a better plant growth. Opportunities, therefore, exist to systematically deploy microbial resources as part of integrated crop fertilization systems [30].

Moreover, improvement of P use efficiency in agricultural ecosystem could be achieved through minimizing nutrient loss by developing smart fertilizers, which become a priority research among many agricultural research institutions. One of the most promising strategies is to develop controlled-release fertilizers (CRFs) (Fig. 2) deliberately made to release the active nutrient in a controlled manner while extending the duration of release and manipulating the rate of release to meet plants needs [88]. There are several CRFs marketed; for instance, application of coted polymer (MAP, DAP and SSP) increased PUE in rice as well as P availability in soil [89]. In a recent study, Pizzeghello et al. [90] reported an induced yields and P uptake of *Hypericum moserianum* in response to polymer-coated MAP compared to MAP application. Nevertheless, there is still a limited number of studies on the development of controlled release P-fertilizers using low-grade RP. In this regard, Sarkar et al. [3] used different coating agents (polyvinyl alcohol and liquid paraffin) to produce a controlled release RP formulation and suggested this as a strategy to enhance P use efficiency. In other hands, being an integral component of soil biogeochemical processes, exploitation of free or encapsulated PSM in an environment friendly strategy can increase P availability in soil–plant systems using several mechanisms [91,92]. Thus, the development of fertilizers based on the combination of RP nanocomposites and PSB along with best management practices could improve PUE and meet sustainable agriculture goals.

Phosphate bio-solubilization boosts rock phosphate agronomic efficiency

Increased agronomic efficiency of rock phosphate for a better PUE

Evidently, RP even in its natural form contributes to crop production mainly in specific soil conditions, but adequate technolo-



Fig. 2. Simplified illustration of a bio-formulation process involving RP and PSM aiming to increase efficiency along with nutrient best management Practices (BMP) to control P release and to increase fertilizer agronomic efficiency.

gies are needed to generate additional agronomic efficiency of RP. Across plant growth stages, it is essential to develop new strategies applied to the rhizosphere interface to dissolve maximum amount of available P from RP. One of the successful practices is the combination of RP with organic amendments such as manure [93-95]. Co-application of RP and vermicompost (cow dung, grasses, aquatic weeds and municipal solid wastes) was found to increase soil P availability more than single application of RP [96]. A study by Narayanan [97] demonstrated an increased RP use efficiency when combined with vermicompost or anaerobic digestate sludge considered to be excellent biofertilizers compared to mineral P fertilizers. Following the same approach, incorporation of different RP rates with organic manure, including cow dung and waste paper, increased soil soluble P by 39, 50 and 65% as compared to 2, 4 and 8% under a single RP application, respectively [98].

Another strategy consists of mixing RP with water soluble P fertilizers assumed to be both agronomically and economically effective. In this context, mixing RP with TSP was successful with the relative RP agronomic effectiveness (calculated relatively to a P conventional fertilizer) increased from 12.5 to 45% [99]. This improvement could be explained by the ability of TSP to provide a readily available P fraction for plants even at the earliest stages of their development with the assumption that RP use efficiency increases while plant roots develop and spatially exploit the rhizosphere soil [13]. Ndakidemi [99] also demonstrated the positive impacts of the combined use of RP and TSP on common bean whose seed yield significantly increased two fold (219%) compared to single RP fertilization. Similarly, co-application of RP and TSP (50/50%) was reported as effective as TSP (100%) in both field- and pot experiments-grown sorghum [100]. Besides, partial acidulation of RP can contribute to improve RP agronomic efficiency. The reaction of RP with acid waste (metallurgical acid residue and whether an acidic mine waste) was effective to produce more soluble P, thus improving plant P uptake and yield [101-103]. From the promising findings of these studies, it appears that practical formulations of mixed P fertilizers combining RP and other mineral P sources could be considered as a possible pathway enabling a higher RP agronomic efficiency, however more applied research are required to prove compatibility with both soil types and crops.

Furthermore, exploitation of PSM is among promising microbial technological applications used to increase RP agronomic efficiency. In this context, P-mediating microorganisms are integral components of the soil P dynamic as they strongly participate in the rhizosphere nutrient dynamic processes [104]. Many microorganisms, including fungi, bacteria, and yeast can solubilize different insoluble forms of P [92,105,106]. Xu et al. [107] showed that *Pantoea ananatis* and *Bacillus thuringiensis* could increase RP efficiency by producing organic acids such as gluconic, citric, and α-Ketoglutaric. Additionally, RP combined with PSB (*Pantoea cypripedii* and *Pseudomonas plecoglossicida*) increased soil P availability resulting in a higher crop yield of both maize and wheat [37]. Moreover, RP agronomic efficiency can be enhanced by adopting a mechanical–biological approach consisting of producing soluble P by growing *Aspergillus niger* using RP with particle sizes in the nanometric range. The mechanical treatment of RP (even for short periods of milling), combined with the biological cultivation process could be highly effective in increasing RP solubilization with gains ranged from 60 to 115% [108].

Phosphate solubilizing bacteria contribute to improve P use from rock phosphate

Evidently, PSB efficiency for PUE and crop production has been demonstrated through controlled and field studies, however RP that stands as a natural P source primarily used in the production of P fertilizers for the agriculture is still lacking technologies enabling a higher P solubilization as compared to well-developed technologies and processes that chemically transform RP into P mineral fertilizers. Over the last ten years, the effects of PSB on RP solubilization have been reported in more than 4640 research publications (Fig. 3) related to specific research fields, mainly sciences of the environment (494), soil (423), agronomy (308), plant (301), and microbial biotechnology (157). In these studies that have been trending up since 2000, attention has been paid



Fig. 3. Number of publications per year related to PSB (phosphate solubilizing bacteria) and their effect on rock phosphate solubilization in the las twenty years (2000–2020) according to Web of science database. The gray histogram represents the annual number of publications while the blue line illustrates the accumulate number of publications. Database are collected from Web of science using the following key words: ("phosphate solubilizing bacteria "OR"phosphorus solubilizing bacteria"OR"phosphate solubilizing rhizobacteria" AND" rock phosphate" or "phosphate rock").

to the important role of microorganisms to enhance RP solubilization for a direct P application, and to develop appropriate technologies that enhance both RP solubilization and its agronomic efficiency. This also included identification of obstacles associated with the direct use of RP.

Phosphate solubilizing bacteria are capable to solubilize unavailable P form to soluble forms, thereby improving subsequent availability of P to plants [109-112]. Bacterial species belonging to several genera such *Pseudomonas spp*., *Agrobacterium spp*., and *Bacillus* spp., [113,114] are used as soil inoculants to increase P availability. In addition to P solubilization ability, other studies have reported *Rhizobium tropici* [115], *Azotobacter chroococcum* [116], *Enterobacter cloacae* [117] to be both solubilizing and mineralizing P bacteria. Park et al. [118] demonstrated that *Enterobacter* sp. can increase RP solubilization up to 17.5%, and this trait presumably increased soil P availability, showing that inoculation with PSB and amendment with RP could be a promising alternative option to use this potent source as P fertilizer and maintain higher nutrient availability in soils [118]. Similarly, Rezakhani et al. [119] reported a significant effect on RP solubilization indicated by increased soil P availability through inoculation with *Pseudomonas* sp. FA1. This PSB strain significantly promoted root and shoot biomass and uptake of P under RP fertilization. Moreover, PSB (MRS23) combined with RP resulted in a higher soil P availability (27%) compared to that solubilized (4%) from RP alone [37]. These results indicated that PSB increased the efficiency of RP by increasing its solubilization and providing more P into mineral P pool. In addition, inoculation of maize and wheat plants with PSB "*Pantoea cypripedii* and *P. plecoglossicida*" under RP fertilization notably improved P content of shoots (37 and 186%), roots (76 and 91%) and yield (20 and 16%) of maize and wheat, respectively [33]. Similar effects were observed in wheat fertilized with RP and inoculated individually with five PSB *Pseudomonas plecoglossicida*, *P. reinekei*, *P. koreensis*, *P. japonica* and *P. frederiksbergensis* showing positive impacts on rhizosphere available P, shoot P content and root acid phosphatase activities [7].

In this regard, the efficiency of "RP-PSB" can also be improved by introducing a nutrient-rich organic component such as organic amendments including poultry manure and composts. Such a mixture have been reported to positively impact maize responses under RP and proposed to be a promising approach to enhance soil P availability and plant growth in intensive cropping systems [120]. Similarly, Alzoubi et al. [121] demonstrated that RP agronomic efficiency significantly increased in response to inoculation with PSB (*Bacillus megaterium*) and amendment with organic fertilizers (based on organic manure and olive residues). Moreover, growth and yield of legume plants (chickpea and lentil) significantly enhanced under application of RP enriched with organic amendments and PSB (*Bacillus thuringiensis* and *Bacillus* sp. Cp-h60). This improvement is attributed to the positive effect of PSB on P availability and particularly on nodulation that improved N nutrition of chickpea and lentil [36]. Likewise, combined use of RP, poultry manure and PSB (*Pseudomonas spp*, *Azospirillum spp*, and *Agrobacterium spp* strains) increased growth, P uptake and yield of chili equivalently to DAP application [28]. In this direction, it was demonstrated that PSB-RP utilization associated with application of biochar, in order to optimize microbial growth and reproduction, can be considered as a sustainable strategy to enhance RP solubilization and soil P availability [122,123].

A fine-tuned bacterial screening approach is needed for accurate selection of PSB

Generally, the adopted methodology for PSB screening (in vitro assays) is based mainly on soluble P quantification tests from either RP or other sparingly available P forms. Most likely, only PSB exhibiting high P solubilization rate are selected for additional traits, while the isolates with a low P solubilizing are excluded although they might be of importance in promoting plant growth rather than P solubilization and uptake of P. In a recent comparative study by Elhaissoufi et al. [7] using five contrasting PSB isolates, demonstrated that *Pseudomonas plecoglossicida* exhibiting the lowest P solubilization rate increased considerably shoot P content more than *Pseudomonas koreensis* and *Pseudomonas japonica* characterized for the high P solubilizing ability. Therefore, it is advisable to perform a thorough characterization that values the lowest PSB instead of making an exclusion decision, particularly both lowest and highest P solubilizing isolates might be of interest in constructing consortia exhibiting complementary traits. Indeed, an additional test in liquid and soil medium to assess P solubilization should simultaneously be performed. Liu et al. [124] showed that PSB (*Bacillus megaterium*, *Bacillus. Subtilis*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Pseudomonas oryzihabitans*) strains with the highest P solubilization values in liquid medium or agar plates exhibited a lowest P solubilization capacities once the PSB are inoculated in soil. In addition, empirical reports show that tricalcium P is inappropriate, as a universal selection, for most PSB isolated because P bio-solubilization is a very complex phenomenon affected by many factors, each of which cannot be evaluated and tested separately [125]

In this review, a rational screening approach is proposed based on both in vitro and in vivo characterization of PSB (Fig. 4). Several screening levels can be suggested with a starting level consisting of a fundamental characterization of main P solubilization traits in vitro conditions, particularly the qualitative (solubilization index) and quantitative traits (P available). Direct and indirect PGP traits (auxin production, N fixation, siderophore production etc.) are also needed in the first level of PSB characterization. At this first screening level, PSB either with or without halo of solubilization are selected, regardless of P solubilization capacities they exhibited. Halo production on solid agar medium should not be considered the sole test method for PSB screening, as it has been shown that bacterial strains exhibiting P solubilization in liquid medium did not produce solubilization halos when tested on agar plates [124]. The second level involves in-depth characterization of PSB, which involves in-soil inoculation experiments. In this approach, it is necessary to timely monitor the effect of PSB on P solubilization in unplanted soils. Due to the complex factors of soils, bacterial strains could solubilize insoluble P and release a soluble P form in liquid medium and into the soil without developing halo zones when tested on agar plates [124]. Thus, to avoid underestimating P solubilization bacterial capacity, P solubilization traits should be estimated in various media, concurrently. In addition to soil inoculation, the effect of PSB on plant growth at different stages of development (seedlings, vegetative and flowering) is proposed. The third level allows an efficient screening of PSB that could efficiently solubilize P along with increasing plant growth. The improvement of plant growth could be associated with multiple plant growth-promoting traits that PSB could exhibit rather than PSB solubilization traits[126,127]. In addition, it was demonstrated that PSB with low and medium P solubilization capacity induced a positive effect on root traits, wheat biomass and nutrient acquisition compared to PSB exhibiting high P solubilizing capacities[7]. The 4th level leads to a precise selection of PSB not only based on P solubilization under laboratory conditions, but also on the basis of monitoring P availability in unplanted soil experiments as well as the effect of PSB on plant development at different growth stages. Thus, the lowest and highest PSB isolates could be important candidates to select for consortia construction featuring multiple and different traits responsible for enhancing P availability and improving plant growth.

Physiological mechanisms implemented by PSB for P solubilization / mineralization

Phosphate solubilizing bacteria can be efficient in making P more available to plants from both organic and inorganic sources by solubilizing and mineralizing insoluble P compounds [128]. As mentioned in different studies in Table 1, the principal mechanism of P solubilization is the secretion of P-mineral dissolving compounds such as organic acids, protons, and siderophores [128-135]. Organic acids produced increased plant-available P into the rhizosphere by forming complexes with cations (Al- or Fr-P) or by block P absorption sites on soil particles [136]. These organic acids are the products of the microbial metabolism, mostly by oxidative respiration or fermentation of organic sources such as glucose [137]. For example, organic acids such as lactic, malic, acetic, oxalic, and gluconic are produced by different bacterial species such as *Serratia* sp., *Bacillus* sp., *Enterobacter* sp. and *Azospirillum* sp. [135,138,139]. In this regard, gluconic acid has been reported to be the most involved in P solubilization by chelating the cations bound to insoluble P [129]. In addition, many Gram-negative bacteria employ periplasmic glucose oxidation through pyrroloquinoline quinone-dependent glucose dehydrogenase



Fig. 4. Illustration of bacterial screening steps proposed as an integrative approach for a qualitative and quantitative assessment and selection of phosphate-solubilizing bacteria based on four screening levels.

Table 1
Examples of organic acids produced by PSB and involved in P solubilization.

References	PSB strains	Organic acids	Concentration	pH
[128]	*Pseudomonas fluorescens*	gluconic acid-format acid - propanedioic acids	11.1 mM	4
[129]	*Pseudomonas prosekii*	2,3-dimethylfumaric acid	45 mg/l	5–9
[130]	*Erwinia rhapontici, Bacillus subtilis, Pseudomonas chlororaphis*	acetic acid-propionic acid- 2-keto-gluconic acid- gluconic acid.	10 mM–4.7 mM–35 mM	2.7–4.10;
[131]	*Firmicutes SP, Proteobacteria sp,*	oxalic, lactic, citric, succinic, acetic and formic acids	45.7 mg/g to 82.7 mg/g	0.5
[132]	*Citrobacter, Pseudomonas, Staphylococcus, Bacillus*	– –	1.4 2.6 2	3.81–5.31
[133]	*Bacillus strain* *Enterobacter*	acetic acid, citric acid – Oxalic acid	(56.7 μg/ml) (36.2 μg/ml) (5.93 μg/ml	– –
[134]	*A. defluvii, S. prasinopilosus B. megaterium*	Malic and lactic anions	80.48 ± 10.28 μg mL–64.03 ± 5.94 μg mL–	6.5–6.96
[135]	*Serratia* sp.	malic acid- lactic acid- acetic acid	(237 mg/l) (599.5 mg/l) (5.0 mg/l)	7.0 to 3.15

enzyme to produce gluconic acids that is encoded by *gcd* gene [140]. Pyrroloquinoline quinone acts as a redox cofactor in glucose dehydrogenase enzyme resulting in P solubilization [140]. Other mechanisms of P solubilizing bacteria include the release of protons with less or even no production of organic acids [141]. Moreover, an alternative mechanism to organic acid production is the production of inorganic acids (e.g., sulphuric, carbonic, and nitric acids) and chelating substances such as siderophores [22]. However, the efficiency of inorganic acids to solubilize P remains less important than organic acids [142].

In addition to P solubilization, PSB can be able to mineralize organic P. Different groups of P hydrolyzing enzymes are involved in the organic P mineralization processes. The first group produced by PSB has been characterized as phosphomonoesterases also referred to as phosphatases (encoded by *olpA*) [143-145]. These enzymes can either be acid or alkaline phosphomonoesterases [146,147]. Alkaline phosphatase catalyzes the hydrolysis of P esters, namely Glucose-6 phosphate and ATP, releasing Pi [148]. Alkaline phosphatase optimal pH is above 7, most often between 9 and 10 while acid phosphatase has a pH optimum between 4 and 6 [149]. Another type of P hydrolyzing enzymes produced by PSB is phytase (encoded by *appA*) [150,151]. This enzyme is responsible for the mineralization of P from soil organic matter where P is stored in phytate, which hydrolyses bioavailable P. Previous findings have revealed that microbial phytases are the most suitable for application in commercial biotechnology enzyme production due to their catalytic properties [152].Furthermore, phosphonatase (encoded by *phnX*) and C-P lyase (encoded by *phnJ*), are able to release free P from recalcitrant organic P forms [153].

Bioformulation of P-solubilizing bacteria to improve P use efficiency

Design and market of PGPR bioformulations

Formulation of microorganisms as biofertilizers is one of the environmentally friendly practices employed to improve performance of microorganisms used in crop production. According to a definition proposed by Malusà et al. [154], formulation contains one or more beneficial microbial strains prepared with an easy-to-use and economical carrier material. The bioformulation, as a process, is a crucial multistep consisting of providing a safe environment that protects microbial cells once they are introduced through a suitable carrier into the soil. The selection of an adequate carrier, and a design of correct delivery methods are paramount components to consider. Different microbial formulations have been developed, either liquid or solid, using various carrier materials. The carrier materials play a key role in the efficiency of the bacterial formulation. The main properties of a good carrier are: (i) non-toxicity to microbes, (ii) good exchange surface, (iii) ease of both sterilization and processing, (iv) available in high quantity, renewable and inexpensive, and (v) non-toxic to plant, human health and environment (Fig. 5). Data in Fig. 5 represents an innovative approach of bacterial formulation. A liquid formulation of microbial cells is prepared with water, oil or water-soluble polymer that improves stability and dispersion of microorganism [155,156]. Both liquid and solid state-fermentation have also been developed for microbial formulation using various biomasses riche in nitrogen and carbon [157,158]. Solid bioformulations are often based on either inorganic or organic carriers, prepared in solid include granules, microgranules, wettable powders and dusts [159-162] and classified according to application mode and carrier design.

Solid and liquid formulations (Table 2), including encapsulations, are available in the market [163,164]. Granule formulations contain active ingredients, binder, and carrier materials. Most commonly carrier materials used are wheat meal [165], gluten [166], gelatin or acacia gum [167], semolina (durum), cottonseed flour and sugars [168] and sodium alginate [161]. For instance, commercial biofertilizers containing *M. anisopliae var anisopliae* strain F52 (MET52) [169] and *Serratia entomophila* [170] are considered to be effective granular biofertilizers. Moreover, wettable powders are of much interest because they are applied as a suspension in water and can be easily added to a liquid carrier just before its application. Commercial biofertilizers containing *Trichoderma harzianum*, *Pseudozyma flocculosa* and *Pseudomonas fluorescens* A506 are examples of wettable powders bioformulation[171,172]. Starch has been well studied with a dried beads or liquid core capsules [173,174]. It has successfully been used as a carrier in PGPR formulations [175]. The addition of mineral clay to alginate-based formulations was found to increase the physical properties of alginate polymer used as a carrier of *Raoultella planticola* [176], improve cell survival, and serve as a protective micro-habitat accessible to bacteria due to its layer structure [177,178]. Dusts are also one of the oldest formulation types and contain a finely ground mixture of the active ingredients with particle size ranging from 50 to 100 μm [179]. For example, bioformulation of *Beauveria. bassiana conidia* based on skimmed milk powder and glucose was reported to achieve 100% of conidial germination and retained 78% conidial viability even after 12 months of storage at 30 °C [180]. Protein hydrolysates from animal and plant biomass were also used as a carrier for rhizospheric microbial formulations [181]. In this regard, Vejan et al. [182] reported that the bioformulation of *Bacillus salmalaya* with chitosan-alginate-protein capsules, achieving an encapsulation index of 99.7.



Fig. 5. Proposed design approach of liquid and solid microbial formulations using various carrier materials with several properties ((i) non-toxic to bacterial strain, (ii) good exchange surface, easy to sterilize and easy to process (iii), (iv) available in high quantity, renewable and inexpensive, and (iv) non-toxic to plant, human health and environment) in order to ensure cells viability.

Establishment of liquid bioformulations has shown multiple advantages compared to solid bioformulations, including longer shelf life, high microbial viability, no contamination and high performance in field [183]. Liquid bioformulations consist in general of specific broth 10–40%, of dispersant 1–5%, ingredient for suspension 1–3%, surfactant at 3–8% and carrier liquid either oil or water, or a combination of both at 35–65% by weight [184]. Suspension concentrates, oil-miscible flowable concentrate, ultralow volume suspensions and oil dispersion are all types of liquid bioformulations [180]. Companies around the world are getting more and more interested in this new generation of biofertilizers. For instance, Japan and the United States companies produce and use different types of biofertilizers that contain *Rhizobium* sp. as inoculant on various crops including lentils, soybeans, corn, sorghum, sugar beets, wheat and canola [179,185].

Efficient "PGPR-RP" bioformulations are needed for direct application in agriculture

Biofertilizers have been widely applied in agriculture to help improve crop productivity and soil fertility. Biofertilizers are an essential component of sustainable agriculture and play a key role in supporting soil productivity while increasing the availability of various nutrients and inducing PGP traits (auxin, P solubilization,

Table 2
Examples of studies reporting benefical effects of solid and liquid bio-formulations on various crops.

Formulation types	***References***	***Strains used***	***plants***	**Effects of formulation on plants**
SOLIDE		**FORMULATION**	[203]	*Bacillus subtilis*
	Lentil	Biocontrol activity against Fusarium promoting their growth and increased the dry weight of lentil plants.		
	[204]	*Trichoderma parareesei, Pseudomonas fluorescens, Bacillus subtilis Azotobacter chroococcum*	*Tomato*	Biocontrol activity against Solanum esculentum Mill increase yield of tomato
	[205]	*Bacillus Subtilis Pseudomonas corrugata*		Increase maize growth parameters
	[206]	*Enterobacter cloacae (PSB)*	–	Increase growth and yield crop in sodic/saline soil.sodic/saline soil.
	[207]	*Bacillus megatherium*	*Vicia faba*	Enhanced plant biomass, increased the yield and accelerate the rhizosphere colonization
	[208]	*Pseudomonas fluorescens Bacillus subtilis Trichoderma viride tomato brinjal chill*		Biocontrol activity against *Ralstonia solanacearum*
[209]	*Bacillus*	*endophyticus Bacillus sphaericus Enterobacter aerogenes Bacillus safensis Bacillus megaterium(PSB)*	*Wheat*	Increased root and shoot dry weights and lengths of wheat in field conditions
LIQUIDE		**FORMULATION**	[210]	*Pseudomonas fluorescens*
	–	Increase crop protection and enhance production		
	[211]	*Bacillus subtilis*	*Wheat*	Biocontrol activity against Fusarium
	[212]	*Trichoderma* spp.	variety of horticultural fruits trees ornamental crops	Protect plants, enhance vegetative growth and contain pathogen populations
[213]		*Burkholderia* sp.	*Pigeonpea*	Increase in plant biomass, nodule number and weight, and number of pods

N fixation, etc.). For instance, bioformulated PSB strains (*Pantoea* sp. and *Pseudomonas* sp.) proved a great potential to enhance *Pisum sativum* growth [186]. Bioformulations, either individually or in consortium, containing *Bacillus licheniformis* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* significantly increased growth parameters and yield of *Brassica campestri* [187]. Indeed, bioformulated *Pseudomonas* sp. is a patented biofertilizer that increase plant growth with high market competitiveness [188]. This increase could be explained by directly providing plant with essential nutrients or indirectly by protecting plant against pathogens. Moreover, the application of biofertilizer based on PSB formulations showed an increase of 12.45, 78.11, and 34.4% in plant height, green fodder yield and grain yield of sorghum, respectively [189]. Furthermore, application of bioformulated *Rhizobium* enhanced nodulation by 42% along with increased germination and seed yield of *Lens culinaris* [190].

It is obvious that bacterial formulation is a green approach used to boost soil fertility and improve crop productivity. Over the past ten years numerous patents are invented for this purpose (Table 3). Reddy and Janarthanam [191] invented microbial formulations that includes bacterial strains belonging to N fixing bacteria, PSB, other rhizobacteria, and biocontrol microbe isolates, and fungal strains (*Trichoderma viride*, T. *vixens*, *T. harzianum*, *T. harzianum LK*, *T. harzianum G*, and *T. longibrachiatum*). These polymicrobial formulations conferred for pea plant resistance against pathogens and increased nutrients (N, P, K) availability under reduced agrochemical applications [191]. Indeed, the invention of liquid bioformulation of the PSB "*Pseuodomonas fluorescens*" improved P, potash, boron and iron content of corn plants [192]. In addition, various capsule bioformulations have been invented to meet a specific plant need. For example, "Nitroset" is a consortium of symbiotic or non-symbiotic N_2 fixing bacteria with a capacity to affect positively N fixation, "Phossol" is defined as a combination of PSB that increase P availability, "Potmob" include potash mobilizing microbe that effect potash mobilization, "Encounter", "Encounter- 100", "Rottucider" and "Nemuccider" are capsulated consortia of microbes acting as biopesticides and bionematicides [193]. In addition, to increase P availability and crop yield, bioformulation of PSB such as *Bacillus megathrium* and *Pseudomonas putida improve* plant P uptake as well as fertilizers efficiency [194]. Indeed, Nadeem et al. [195] invented an efficient bioformulation with no synthetic process that allows P solubilization and mobilization from RP using either PSM (alone), or the combination of PSM and PGPM. Moreover, one or numerous PSM (such as *Penicillium spp*) with one or more plant growth promoting traits (N fixation, P solubilization, seed germination, plant growth etc.) were used to formulate efficient biofertilizers containing RP, MAP, DAP, MCP, TSP and ammonium polyphosphate to increase soil P availability, plant P uptake and fertilizers use efficiency [196].

However, formulation of an effective biofertilizer requires a particular supporting carrier to protect the bacterial cells during storage and transport [197]. As mentioned earlier, there are different types of bioformulations used in agriculture, yet the application of this biofertilizers could be unprofitable because of a lack of adequate formulations and the low inoculant quality [198]. For the reason to achieve a successful bioformulation, numerous challenges should be tackled, among which, selection of a microbial strain exhibiting a better survival and colonization capacity, which in turn will ensure efficiency of bioformulations [199]. Under both natural and agricultural systems conditions, it is necessary to understand the bacterial community structure and functions in relation to environmental factors in order to avoid the multitrophic competition phenomena in the plant-soil-microbe continuum [200]. The second concern is to maintain the viability and functional properties of inoculant that could be enhanced using some additives such as of phytohormones (gibberellin acid and cytokinin), glycerol, a trihydroxyalcohol, poly-lactic acid and strigolactones [201].

Free or encapsulate PSB are applied in soil to increase RP solubilization. However, up to date encapsulation techniques were not used to simultaneously formulate RP and PSM [92,202] as opposed to regular solid formulations. To our knowledge, only a few studies have developed materials integrating both RP particles dispersion and encapsulation of microorganisms in the same structure [106]. The production of a biofertilizer containing RP and PSM (individual or consortium) could be a potential approach to increase RP solubilization whose agronomic efficiency could be enhanced by PSM organic acids production. Formulation of PSB also requires integration of carrier materials, human health and environment risk, storage and transport. Selection of carrier materials suitable for liquid or solid formulations, while considering risks, costs and efficiency at each development step, is crucial for the development of eco-friendly biofertilizers (Fig. 5). Research efforts should also be oriented towards development of micro-environmental (using specific carrier martials) conditions to facilitate the growth and to harness functions of microbial bioformulations.

Conclusions

Thanks to the high potential of beneficial PGPM in crop productivity and resource use efficiency, multiple PSB inoculants or bioformulations have been used in agriculture. On another hand, many bacterial inoculants show insufficient performance due to many constraints, which could directly link to the bacterial

Table 3
Description of bio-formulation technology patents related to PSM application from 1991 to 2017.

References	Patent title	Description of the invention	Date
[214]	Methods and compositions for increasing the amounts of phosphorus and/or micronutrients available for plant uptake from soil	The invention relates to a method and composition for increasing the amounts of phosphorus and micronutrients available for uptake by plants from the soil by introducing an inoculum of the fungus *Penicillium bilaji*.	25/06/1991
[215]	Microbial solubilization of phosphate	Formulation of liquide biofertilizer comprise phosphate source and PSM,	27/01/1992
[191]	Polymicrobial Formulations For Enhancing Plant Productivity	Polymicrobial formulations comprise numerous bacterial and fungal strains to increase nutrients availability and plant growth	17/12/2009
[216]	Synergistic bacterial consortia for mobilizing soil phosphorus	Combinaition of synergitic bacteria strains (consortia) to transform organic phosphate to enhance soil P availability and other macronutrients and/or micronutrients to plants, and thereby enhancing their growth and yield.	06/11/2010
[217]	A kind of preparation of new biological organic fertilizer fermentation maturity agent	Biological organic fertilizers comprise *Bacillus spp* to improves soil moisture content, and drought-relief and protection of the harvest promote plant growth, and improving the yield and quality	25/07/2017

formulation itself or indirectly to the environment, notably the low adaptive capacity in field. In general, most of knowledge reported in this review shows that bacterial solubilization could be unreproducible due to many experimental constraints, which reduce chances to provide efficacious bacterial formulations even though knowledge in this field has reached significant achievements in applied agricultural microbiology. In addition, recent findings pointed out inconsistencies in using bioformulations as a replacement to nutrient fertilizers such as P fertilizers, rather than exploring opportunities to a joint use of both resources. In this context, we outline three key research priorities for harnessing P bacterial solubilization in sustainable crop production:

- Implement new bacterial culture-dependent screening approaches that simulate both controlled and field conditions, which should offer an accurate evaluation of crop response to PSB in vitro and vivo conditions. This should consider variations, not only at the bacterial species level for P solubilization, but also to overall plant-PSB responses at both temporal and spatial levels likely enabling tight relationships between potentially efficient PSB and the surrounding rhizosphere environment.
- Construct microbial consortia uniting all desired characteristics, but mainly PUE, is an emerging research area that requires more attention on identifying synergistic microbial combinations that enhance both above- and below-ground crop performance. Although a microbial consortium is likely hard to engineer due to a dynamic state of species within the microbial mixture consisting of at least two different microorganisms, identification of the best isolates is inextricably dependent on a consortium-oriented isolation/construction approach enabling the use of compatible microbial strains with different modes of action. This should consider how much diversity is needed while ensuring complementarity in functions to generate major impacts on both P uptake and plant growth performance.
- Adopt multi-disciplinary approaches to design innovative microbial formulations in concert with rationalized use of agrochemicals, including P fertilizers with positive impacts on both crops and environment. This will require understanding the impact of fertilization on soil PSB abundance and function, which also reflects the need for fine-tuning fertilization levels, notably P and N.

Compliance with ethics requirements

This article does not contain any studies with human or animal subjects.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements

This review is part of a research project (AS17 2019-2022) financially supported by OCP Group at Mohammed VI Polytechnic University Morocco (UM6P). We thank Dr. Saloua Fertahi for kindly providing additional information related to bioformulation.

References

[1] Roser M. Future Population Growth - Our World in Data 2014. https://ourworldindata.org/future-population-growth (accessed December 29, 2020).
[2] Scholz RW, Geissler B. Feebates for dealing with trade-offs on fertilizer subsidies: a conceptual framework for environmental management. J Clean Prod 2018;189:898–909. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.03.319.
[3] Sarkar A, Biswas DR, Datta SC, Roy T, Moharana PC, Biswas SS, et al. Polymer coated novel controlled release rock phosphate formulations for improving phosphorus use efficiency by wheat in an Inceptisol. Soil Tillage Res 2018;180:48–62. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2018.02.009.
[4] Xiong L, Wang P, Kopittke PM. Tailoring hydroxyapatite nanoparticles to increase their efficiency as phosphorus fertilisers in soils. Geoderma 2018;323:116–25. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2018.03.002.
[5] Vance CP, Uhde-Stone C, Allan DL. Phosphorus acquisition and use: critical adaptations by plants for securing a nonrenewable resource. New Phytol 2003;157:423–47. doi: https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1469-8137.2003.00695.x.
[6] Siedliska A, Baranowski P, Pastuszka-Woźniak J, Zubik M, Krzyszczak J. Identification of plant leaf phosphorus content at different growth stages based on hyperspectral reflectance. BMC Plant Biol 2021;21:1–17. doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/S12870-020-02807-4.
[7] Elhaissoufi W, Khourchi S, Ibnyasser A, Ghoulam C, Rchiad Z, Zeroual Y, et al. Phosphate solubilizing rhizobacteria could have a stronger influence on wheat root traits and aboveground physiology than rhizosphere P solubilization. Front Plant Sci 2020;11:979. doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.00979.
[8] Shenoy VV, Kalagudi GM. Enhancing plant phosphorus use efficiency for sustainable cropping. Biotechnol Adv 2005;23:501–13. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2005.01.004.
[9] Meyer G, Frossard E, Mäder P, Nanzer S, Randall DG, Udert KM, et al. Water soluble phosphate fertilizers for crops grown in calcareous soils – an outdated paradigm for recycled phosphorus fertilizers? Plant Soil 2018;424:367–88. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-017-3545-x.
[10] Shen J, Yuan L, Zhang J, Li H, Bai Z, Chen X, et al. Phosphorus dynamics: from soil to plant. Plant Physiol 2011;156:997–1005. doi: https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.111.175232.
[11] Barrow NJ. The effects of pH on phosphate uptake from the soil. Plant Soil 2017;410:401–10. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-016-3008-9.
[12] Rafael RBA, Fernández-Marcos ML, Cocco S, Ruello ML, Weindorf DC, Cardelli V, et al. Assessment of potential nutrient release from phosphate rock and dolostone for application in acid soils. Pedosphere 2018;28:44–58. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S1002-0160(17)60437-5.
[13] Chien SH, Prochnow LI, Cantarella H. Recent developments of fertilizer production and use to improve nutrient efficiency and minimize environmental impacts. Adv Agron 2009;102:267–322. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113(09)01008-6.
[14] Khasawneh FE, Doll EC. The use of phosphate rock for direct application to soils. Adv Agron 1979;30:159–206. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113(08)60706-3.
[15] Rajan SSS, Watkinson JH, Sinclair AG. Phosphate rocks for direct application to soils. Adv Agron 1996;57:77–159. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113(08)60923-2.
[16] Msolla MM, Semoka JMR, Szilas C, Borggaard OK. Crop (Maize) response to direct application of local phosphate rock on selected acid soils of Tanzania. Commun Soil Sci Plant Anal 2007;38:93–106. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/00103620601093710.
[17] Compant S, Samad A, Faist H, Sessitsch A. A review on the plant microbiome: ecology, functions, and emerging trends in microbial application. J Adv Res 2019;19:29–37. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jare.2019.03.004.
[18] Hassan SED. Plant growth-promoting activities for bacterial and fungal endophytes isolated from medicinal plant of Teucrium polium L. J Adv Res 2017;8:687–95. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jare.2017.09.001.
[19] Fahad S, Hussain S, Bano A, Saud S, Hassan S, Shan D, et al. Potential role of phytohormones and plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria in abiotic stresses: consequences for changing environment. Environ Sci Pollut Res 2015;22:4907–21. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-014-3754-2.
[20] Jambhulkar PP, Sharma P, Yadav R. Delivery systems for introduction of microbial inoculants in the field. Microb. Inoculants Sustain. Agric. Product., New Delhi: Springer India; 2016, p. 199–218. 10.1007/978-81-322-2644-4_13.
[21] Tang A, Haruna AO, Muhamad N, Majid A. Potential PGPR properties of cellulolytic, nitrogen- fixing, and phosphate-solubilizing bacteria of a rehabilitated tropical forest soil. Microorganisms 2018;8:442.
[22] Sharma SB, Sayyed RZ, Trivedi MH, Gobi TA. Phosphate solubilizing microbes: sustainable approach for managing phosphorus deficiency in agricultural soils. Springerplus 2013;2:587. doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/2193-1801-2-587.
[23] Kumar V, Singh KP. Enriching vermicompost by nitrogen fixing and phosphate solubilizing bacteria. Bioresour Technol 2001;76:173–5. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524(00)00061-4.
[24] De Freitas JR, Banerjee MR, Germida JJ. Phosphate-solubilizing rhizobacteria enhance the growth and yield but not phosphorus uptake of canola (Brassica napus L.). Biol Fertil Soils 1997;24:358–64. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s003740050258.
[25] Wani P, Zaidi A, Khan A, Khan MS. Effect of phorate on phosphate solubilization and indole acetic acid releasing potentials of rhizospheric microorganisms. Ann. Plant Prot. 2005;13:139–44.
[26] Chen YP, Rekha PD, Arun AB, Shen FT, Lai W, Young CC. Phosphate solubilizing bacteria from subtropical soil and their tricalcium phosphate solubilizing abilities 2006;34:33–41. 10.1016/j.apsoil.2005.12.002.

[27] Gomes EA, Silva UC, Marriel IE, Oliveira CA, Lana UGP. Rock phosphate solubilizing microorganisms isolated from maize rhizosphere soil. Rev Bras Milho e Sorgo 2014;13:69–81. doi: https://doi.org/10.18512/1980-6477/rbms.v13n1p69-81.

[28] Abbasi MK, Musa N, Manzoor M. Mineralization of soluble P fertilizers and insoluble rock phosphate in response to phosphate-solubilizing bacteria and poultry manure and their effect on the growth and P utilization efficiency of chilli (Capsicum annuum L.). Biogeosciences 2015;12:4607–19. doi: https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-12-4607-2015.

[29] Giro VB, Jindo K, Vittorazzi C, De Oliveira RSS, Conceição GP, Canellas LP, et al. Rock phosphate combined with phosphatesolubilizing microorganisms and humic substance for reduction of plant phosphorus demands from single superphosphate. Acta Hortic 2016;1146:63–8. 10.17660/ActaHortic.2016.1146.8.

[30] Bargaz A, Lyamlouli K, Chtouki M, Zeroual Y, Dhiba D. Soil microbial resources for improving fertilizers efficiency in an integrated plant nutrient management system. Front Microbiol 2018;9:1606. doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2018.01606.

[31] Arvind Kumar. Phosphate solubilizing bacteria in agriculture biotechnology: diversity, mechanism and their role in plant growth and crop yield. Int J Adv Res 2016;4:116–24. doi: https://doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/111.

[32] López-Ortega DPM, Criollo-Campos PJ, Gómez-Vargas RM, Camelo-Rusinque M, Estrada-Bonilla G, Garrido-Rubiano MF, et al. Caracterización de bacterias diazotróficas Characterization of diazotrophic phosphate solubilizing bacteria as growth promoters of maize plants Caracterización de bacterias diazotróficas solublizadoras de fosfato como promotoras de crecimiento en plantas. Rev Colomb Biotecnol Diciembre 2013;XV XV:115–23. 10.15446/rev.colomb.biote.v15n2.36303.

[33] Kaur G, Reddy MS. Effects of phosphate-solubilizing bacteria, rock phosphate and chemical fertilizers on maize-wheat cropping cycle and economics. Pedosphere 2015;25:428–37. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S1002-0160(15)30010-2.

[34] Mideksa MJ, Löscher CR, Schmitz RA, Assefa F. Phosphate solubilization and multiple plant growth promoting properties of rhizobacteria isolated from chickpea (Cicer aeritinum L.) producing areas of Ethiopia. African J Biotechnol 2016;15:1899–912. doi: https://doi.org/10.5897/AJB2015.15172.

[35] Adnan M, Shah Z, Fahad S, Arif M, Alam M, Saud S, et al. Phosphate-solubilizing bacteria nullify the antagonistic effect of soil calcification on bioavailability of phosphorus in alkaline soils. Sci Rep 2017:1–13. doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-16537-5.

[36] Ditta A, Imtiaz M, Mehmood S, Rizwan MS, Mubeen F, Aziz O, et al. Rock phosphate-enriched organic fertilizer with phosphate-solubilizing microorganisms improves nodulation, growth, and yield of legumes. Soil Sci. Plant Anal., vol. 00, Taylor & Francis; 2018, p. 1–11. 10.1080/00103624.2018.1538374.

[37] Manzoor M, Abbasi MK, Sultan T. Isolation of phosphate solubilizing bacteria from maize rhizosphere and their potential for rock phosphate solubilization-mineralization and plant growth promotion. Geomicrobiol J 2017;34:81–95. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/01490451.2016.1146373.

[38] Zhang Z, Liao H, Lucas WJ. Molecular mechanisms underlying phosphate sensing, signaling, and adaptation in plants. J Integr Plant Biol 2014;56:192–220. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/jipb.12163.

[39] Blume H-P, Brümmer GW, Fleige H, Horn R, Kandeler E, Kögel-Knabner I, et al. Scheffer/ schachtschabel soil science. Scheffer/SchachtschabelSoil Sci., Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2016, p. 1–6. 10.1007/978-3-642-30942-7_1.

[40] Filippelli GM. The global phosphorus cycle. Phosphates Geochemical, Geobiol. Mater. Importance, vol. 48, De Gruyter Mouton; 2002, p. 425. 10.2138/rmg.2002.48.10.

[41] Pierzynski J, Hettiarachchi GM. Reactions of phosphorus fertilizers with and without a fertilizer enhancer in three acidic soils with high phosphorus-fixing capacity. Soil Sci Soc Am J 2018;82:1124–39. doi: https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2018.01.0064.

[42] Oelkers EH, Valsami-Jones E. Phosphate mineral reactivity and global sustainability. Elements 2008;4:83–7. doi: https://doi.org/10.2113/GSELEMENTS.4.2.83.

[43] Condron LM, Turner BL, Cade-Menun BJ. Chemistry and dynamics of soil organic phosphorus. Phosphorus Agric Environ 2005;46:87–121. doi: https://doi.org/10.2134/agronmonogr46.c4.

[44] Turner BL, Cade-Menun BJ, Condron LM, Newman S. Extraction of soil organic phosphorus. Talanta 2005;66:294–306. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2004.11.012.

[45] Turner BL, Papházy MJ, Haygarth PM, Mckelvie ID. Inositol phosphates in the environment. Philos Trans R Soc London Ser B Biol Sci 2002;357:449–69. doi: https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2001.0837.

[46] Koopmans GF, Chardon WJ, Dolfing J, Oenema O, van der Meer P, van Riemsdijk WH. Wet chemical and phosphorus-31 nuclear magnetic resonance analysis of phosphorus speciation in a sandy soil receiving long-term fertilizer or animal manure applications. J Environ Qual 2003;32:287–95. doi: https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2003.2870.

[47] Gerke J. Phytate (Inositol hexakisphosphate) in soil and phosphate acquisition from inositol phosphates by higher plants. A review. Plants 2015;4:253–66. doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/plants4020253.

[48] Reddy KR, Wetzel RG, Kadlec RH. Biogeochemistry of phosphorus in wetlands. Phosphorus Agric. Environ. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2005, p. 263–316. 10.2134/agronmonogr46.c9.

[49] Margenot A, Singh BR, Rao IM, Sommer R. Phosphorus fertilization and management in soils of Sub-Saharan Africa. Soil Phosphorus. CRC Press 2017:151–208. doi: https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315372327-9.

[50] Haling RE, Brown LK, Stefanski A, Kidd DR, Ryan MH, Sandral GA, et al. Differences in nutrient foraging among Trifolium subterraneum cultivars deliver improved P-acquisition efficiency. Plant Soil 2018;424:539–54. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-017-3511-7.

[51] Gilroy S, Jones DL. Through form to function: Root hair development and nutrient uptake. Trends Plant Sci 2000;5:56–60. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S1360-1385(99)01551-4.

[52] Pate J, Watt M. Roots of Banksia spp. (Proteaceae) with special reference to functioning of their specialized proteoid root clusters. Plant roots hidden half. Marcel Dek, Marcel Dekker; 2002, p. 989–1006.

[53] Nguyen VL, Stangoulis J. Variation in root system architecture and morphology of two wheat genotypes is a predictor of their tolerance to phosphorus deficiency. Acta Physiol Plant 2019;41:1–13. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/S11738-019-2891-0.

[54] Hu Y, Ye X, Shi L, Duan H, Xu F. Genotypic differences in root morphology and phosphorus uptake kinetics in brassica napus under low phosphorus supply. 2010;33:889–901. 10.1080/01904161003658239.

[55] Vejchasarn P, Lynch JP, Brown KM. Genetic variability in phosphorus responses of rice root phenotypes. Rice 2016;2016(9):1–16. doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/S12284-016-0102-9.

[56] Lyu Y, Tang H, Li H, Zhang F, Rengel Z, Whalley WR, et al. Major crop species show differential balance between root morphological and physiological responses to variable phosphorus supply. Front Plant Sci 2016;7. doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2016.01939.

[57] Dong D, Peng X, Yan X. Organic acid exudation induced by phosphorus deficiency and/or aluminium toxicity in two contrasting soybean genotypes. Physiol Plant 2004;122:190–9. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1399-3054.2004.00373.X.

[58] Machado CT de T, Furlani ÂMC. Root phosphatase activity, plant growth and phosphorus accumulation of maize genotypes. Sci Agric 2004;61:216–23. 10.1590/S0103-90162004000200015.

[59] Li M, Osaki M, Rao IM, Tadano T. Secretion of phytase from the roots of several plant species under phosphorus-deficient conditions. Plant Soil 1997;195:161–9. doi: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1004264002524.

[60] Jiang Z, Jiang D, Zhou Q, Zheng Z, Cao B, Meng Q, et al. Enhancing the atrazine tolerance of Pennisetum americanum (L.) K. Schum by inoculating with indole-3-acetic acid producing strain Pseudomonas chlororaphis PAS18. Ecotoxicol Environ Saf 2020;202:110854. 10.1016/j.ecoenv.2020.110854.

[61] Khajeeyan R, Salehi A, Movahhedi Dehnavi M, Farajee H, Kohanmoo MA. Growth parameters, water productivity and aloin content of Aloe vera affected by mycorrhiza and PGPR application under different irrigation regimes. South African J Bot 2021. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sajb.2021.02.026.

[62] Wang Q, Ye J, Wu Y, Luo S, Chen B, Ma L, et al. Promotion of the root development and Zn uptake of Sedum alfredii was achieved by an endophytic bacterium Sasm05. Ecotoxicol Environ Saf 2019;172:97–104. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2019.01.009.

[63] Kotasthane AS, Pradhan A, Shinde U. Host specific plant growth promoting activity of IAA producing and phosphate solubilizing fluorescent pseudomonas. Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci 2018;7(3511–32). doi: https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2018.702.418.

[64] Suleman M, Id SY, Rasul M, Yahya M, Atta M, Mirza MS. Phosphate solubilizing bacteria with glucose dehydrogenase gene for phosphorus uptake and beneficial effects on wheat. PLoS ONE 2018;13:1–28. doi: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0204408.

[65] Liu X, Wang G, Ran Y, Qi D, Han G, Guan B, et al. Overall supply level, not the relative supply of nitrogen and phosphorus, affects the plant community composition of a supratidal wetland in the Yellow River Delta. Sci Total Environ 2019;695:. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.133866133866.

[66] Raya-Gonzalez J, Ortiz-Castro R, Ruiz-Herrera LF, Kazan K, Lopez-Bucio J. Phytochrome and flowering time1/mediator25 regulates lateral root formation via auxin signaling in arabidopsis. Plant Physiol 2014;165:880–94. doi: https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.114.239806.

[67] Cheremisinoff PN. Industry Profile—Fertilizers. Waste Minimization Cost Reduct. Process Ind., Elsevier; 1995, p. 222–84. 10.1016/b978-081551388-9.50009-9.

[68] Eissa MA. Efficiency of P fertigation for drip-irrigated potato grown on calcareous sandy soils. Potato Res 2019;62:97–108. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11540-018-9399-7.

[69] Otinga AN, Pypers P, Okalebo JR, Njoroge R, Emong'ole M, Six L, et al. Partial substitution of phosphorus fertiliser by farmyard manure and its localised application increases agronomic efficiency and profitability of maize production. F Crop Res 2013;140:32–43. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2012.10.003.

[70] Lu D, Song H, Jiang S, Chen X, Wang H, Zhou J. Managing fertiliser placement locations and source types to improve rice yield and the use efficiency of nitrogen and phosphorus. F Crop Res 2019;231:10–7. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2018.11.004.

[71] Shabnam R, Tarek MH, Iqbal MT. Understanding phosphorus dynamics in wheat plant and growth response in a split-root system in acidic soil. Agric Nat Resour 2018;52:259–65. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anres.2018.09.006.

[72] Adjei-Nsiah S, Kumah JF, Owusu-Bennoah E, Kanampiu F. Influence of P sources and rhizobium inoculation on growth and yield of soybean genotypes on ferric lixisols of Northern Guinea Savanna Zone of Ghana. Commun Soil Sci Plant Anal 2019;50:853–68. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/00103624.2019.1589489.
[73] Chitkala Devi T, Bharathalakshmi M, Kumari MBGS, Naidu NV. Effect of sources and levels of phosphorus with zinc on yield and quality of sugarcane. Sugar Tech 2012;14:195–8. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12355-012-0144-2.
[74] Rosendo dos Santos V, Soltangheisi A, Junqueira Franco H, Kolln O, Vitti A, Santos Dias C, et al. Phosphate sources and their placement affecting soil phosphorus pools in sugarcane. Agronomy 2018;8:283. doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy8120283.
[75] Syers JK, Johnston AE, Curtin D. Efficiency of soil and fertilizer phosphorus use. Reconciling changing concepts of soil phosphorus behaviour with agronomic information. In: n The 18th World Congress of Soil Science., editor. Fao Fertil. Plant Nutr. Bull., FAO; 2008, p. 219.
[76] Kaleeswari R, Subramanian S. Chemical reactivity of phosphate rocks - a review. Agric Rev 2001;22:121–6.
[77] Bindraban PS, Dimkpa C, Nagarajan L, Roy A, Rabbinge R. Revisiting fertilisers and fertilisation strategies for improved nutrient uptake by plants. Biol Fertil Soils 2015;51:897–911. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00374-015-1039-7.
[78] Ryan J, Sommer R, Ibrikci H. Fertilizer best management practices: a perspective from the dryland west Asia-North Africa Region. J Agron Crop Sci 2012;198:57–67. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-037X.2011.00488.x.
[79] Chien SH, Prochnow LI, Tu S, Snyder CS. Agronomic and environmental aspects of phosphate fertilizers varying in source and solubility: an update review. Nutr Cycl Agroecosyst 2011;89:229–55. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-010-9390-4.
[80] Olsen S. Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. US Dep Agric 1954.
[81] Bary R, Kurtz L. Determination of total, organic, and available forms of phosphorus in soils. Soil Sci 1945;59:39–45.
[82] Ashworth J, Mrazek K. "modified kelowna" test for available phosphorus and potassium in soil. Commun Soil Sci Plant Anal 1995;26:731–9. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/00103629509369331.
[83] Göransson H, Welc M, Bünemann EK, Christl I, Venterink HO. Nitrogen and phosphorus availability at early stages of soil development in the Damma glacier forefield, Switzerland; implications for establishment of N2-fixing plants. Plant Soil 2016;404:251–61. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-016-2821-5.
[84] Sutton PJ, Peterseon GA, Sander DH. Dry matter production in tops and roots of winter wheat as affected by phosphorus availability during various growth stages [1]. Agron J 1983;75:657–63. doi: https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj1983.00021962007500040019x.
[85] Saleem MF, Randhawa MS, Hussain S, Wahid MA, Anjum SA. Nitrogen management studies in autumn planted maize (Zea Mays L.) Hybrids. J Anim Plant Sci 2009;19:140–3. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2019.03.021.
[86] McLaughlin MJ, McBeath TM, Smernik R, Stacey SP, Ajiboye B, Guppy C. The chemical nature of P accumulation in agricultural soils-implications for fertiliser management and design: An Australian perspective. Plant Soil 2011;349:69–87. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-011-0907-7.
[87] Jayakumar N, Paulraj P, Sajeesh P, Sajna K, Zinneera A. Application of native phosphate solubilizing bacteria for the use of cheap organic and inorganic phosphate source in agricultural practise of Capsicum annum (Chili) - A pilot scale field study. Mater Today Proc 2019;16:1630–9. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2019.06.028.
[88] Irfan SA, Razali R, KuShaari KZ, Mansor N, Azeem B, Ford Versypt AN. A review of mathematical modeling and simulation of controlled-release fertilizers. J Control Release 2018;271:45–54. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2017.12.017.
[89] Fageria NK, Santos AB, Reis RA. Agronomic evaluation of phosphorus sources in lowland rice production. Commun Soil Sci Plant Anal 2014;45:2067–91. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/00103624.2014.911302.
[90] Pizzeghello D, Schiavon M, Maretto L, Stevanato P, Ertani A, Altissimo A, et al. Short-term application of polymer-coated mono-ammonium phosphate in a calcareous soil affects the pools of available phosphorus and the growth of hypericum × moserianum (L.). Front Sustain Food Syst 2019;3:4. doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2019.00004.
[91] Vassilev N, Vassileva M, Fenice M, Federici F. Immobilized cell technology applied in solubilization of insoluble inorganic (rock) phosphates and P plant acquisition. Bioresour Technol 2001;79:263–71. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524(01)00017-7.
[92] Jain R, Saxena J, Sharma V. The evaluation of free and encapsulated Aspergillus awamori for phosphate solubilization in fermentation and soil-plant system. Appl Soil Ecol 2010;46:90–4. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2010.06.008.
[93] Alloush GA. Dissolution and effectiveness of phosphate rock in acidic soil amended with cattle manure. Plant Soil 2003;251:37–46. doi: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022987915057.
[94] Biswas SS, Ghosh A, Singhal SK, Biswas DR, Roy T, Sarkar A, et al. Phosphorus enriched organic amendments can increase nitrogen use efficiency in wheat. Commun Soil Sci Plant Anal 2019;50:1178–91. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/00103624.2019.1604736.
[95] Ali A, Sharif M, Wahid F, Zhang Z, Shah SNM, Rafiullah, et al. Effect of composted rock phosphate with organic materials on yield and phosphorus uptake of berseem and maize. Am J Plant Sci 2014;05:975–84. doi: https://doi.org/10.4236/ajps.2014.57110.
[96] Pramanik P, Bhattacharya S, Bhattacharyya P, Banik P. Phosphorous solubilization from rock phosphate in presence of vermicomposts in Aqualfs. Geoderma 2009;152:16–22. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2009.05.013.
[97] Narayanan CM. Production of phosphate-rich biofertiliser using vermicompost and anaerobic digestor sludge. Adv Chem Eng Sci 2012;02:187–91. doi: https://doi.org/10.4236/aces.2012.22022.
[98] Tapiwa L, Nyari P, Mnkeni S. Vermicomposting manure- paper mixture with igneous rock phosphate enhances biodegradation, phosphorus bioavailability and reduces heavy metal concentrations. Heliyon 2018:e00749. 10.1016/j.heliyon.2018.e00749.
[99] Ndakidemi PA. Agronomic and economic potential of tughutu and minjingu phosphate rock as alternative phosphorus sources for bean growers. Pedosphere 2007;17:732–8. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S1002-0160(07)60088-5.
[100] Soma DM, Kiba DI, Gnankambary Z, Ewusi-Mensah N, Sanou M, Nacro HB, et al. Effectiveness of combined application of Kodjari phosphate rock, water soluble phosphorus fertilizer and manure in a Ferric Lixisol in the centre west of Burkina Faso. Arch Agron Soil Sci 2018;64:384–97. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/03650340.2017.1353216.
[101] Mattiello EM, Resende Filho IDP, Barreto MS, Soares AR, Silva IR d., Vergütz L, et al. Soluble phosphate fertilizer production using acid effluent from metallurgical industry. J Environ Manage 2016;166:140–6. 10.1016/j.jenvman.2015.10.012.
[102] Santos WO, Hesterberg D, Mattiello EM, Vergütz L, Barreto MSC, Silva IR, et al. Increasing soluble phosphate species by treatment of phosphate rocks with acidic waste. J Environ Qual 2016;45:1988–97. doi: https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2016.03.0079.
[103] Barreto MSC, Mattiello EM, Santos WO, Melo LCA, Vergütz L, Novais RF. Agronomic efficiency of phosphate fertilizers produced by the re-use of a metallurgical acid residue. J Environ Manage 2018;208:1–7. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.11.075.
[104] Jha SK, Ahmad Z, Crowley DE. Fuzzy-genetic approaches for estimation of microbial rock phosphate solubilization in sandy clay loam textured soil. Comput Electron Agric 2018;150:125–33. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2018.04.014.
[105] De Oliveira Mendes G, Moreira De Freitas AL, Liparini Pereira O, Ribeiro Da Silva I, Bojkov Vassilev N, Dutra Costa M. Mechanisms of phosphate solubilization by fungal isolates when exposed to different P sources. Ann Microbiol 2014;64:239–49. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s13213-013-0656-3.
[106] Klaic R, Giroto AS, Guimarães GGF, Plotegher F, Ribeiro C, Zangirolami TC, et al. Nanocomposite of starch-phosphate rock bioactivated for environmentally-friendly fertilization. Miner Eng 2018;128:230–7. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mineng.2018.09.002.
[107] Xu JC, Huang LM, Chen C, Wang J, Long XX. Effective lead immobilization by phosphate rock solubilization mediated by phosphate rock amendment and phosphate solubilizing bacteria. Chemosphere 2019;237:124540. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.124540.
[108] Klaic R, Plotegher F, Ribeiro C, Zangirolami TC, Farinas CS. A novel combined mechanical-biological approach to improve rock phosphate solubilization. Int J Miner Process 2017;161:50–8. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.minpro.2017.02.009.
[109] Srinivasan R, Yandigeri MS, Kashyap S, Alagawadi AR. Effect of salt on survival and P-solubilization potential of phosphate solubilizing microorganisms from salt affected soils. Saudi J Biol Sci 2012;19:427–34. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sjbs.2012.05.004.
[110] Khan MS, Zaidi A, Musarrat J. Phosphate solubilizing microorganisms: Principles and application of microphos technology. 2014. 10.1007/978-3-319-08216-5.
[111] Acevedo E, Galindo-Castañeda T, Prada F, Navia M, Romero HM. Phosphate-solubilizing microorganisms associated with the rhizosphere of oil palm (Elaeis guineensis Jacq.) in Colombia. Appl Soil Ecol 2014;80:26–33. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2014.03.011.
[112] Behera BC, Singdevsachan SK, Mishra RR, Dutta SK, Thatoi HN. Diversity, mechanism and biotechnology of phosphate solubilising microorganism in mangrove-A review. Biocatal Agric Biotechnol 2014;3:97–110. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bcab.2013.09.008.
[113] Babalola OO, Glick BR. The use of microbial inoculants in African agriculture: current practice and future prospects. Agric Environ 2012;10:540–9.
[114] Glick BR. Plant growth-promoting bacteria: mechanisms and applications. Scientifica (Cairo) 2012;2012:1–15. doi: https://doi.org/10.6064/2012/963401.
[115] Tajini F, Trabelsi M, Drevon JJ. Combined inoculation with Glomus intraradices and Rhizobium tropici CIAT899 increases phosphorus use efficiency for symbiotic nitrogen fixation in common bean (Phaseolus vulgaris L.). Saudi J Biol Sci 2012;19:157–63. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sjbs.2011.11.003.
[116] Kumar S, Bauddh K, Barman SC, Singh RP. Amendments of microbial biofertilizers and organic substances reduces requirement of urea and DAP with enhanced nutrient availability and productivity of wheat (Triticum aestivum L.). Ecol Eng 2014;71:432–7. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2014.07.007.

[117] Safirzadeh S, Chorom M, Enayatizamir N. Effect of phosphate solubilising bacteria (Enterobacter cloacae) on phosphorus uptake efficiency in sugarcane (Saccharum officinarum L.). Soil Res 2019;57:333–41.
[118] Park JH, Bolan N, Megharaj M, Naidu R. Concomitant rock phosphate dissolution and lead immobilization by phosphate solubilizing bacteria (Enterobacter sp.). J Environ Manage 2011;92:1115–20. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2010.11.031.
[119] Rezakhani L, Motesharezadeh B, Tehrani MM, Etesami H, Mirseyed Hosseini H. Phosphate–solubilizing bacteria and silicon synergistically augment phosphorus (P) uptake by wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) plant fertilized with soluble or insoluble P source. Ecotoxicol Environ Saf 2019;173:504–13. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2019.02.060.
[120] Manzoor M, Kallem Abbasi M, Sultan Tariq. Isolation of Phosphate Solubilizing Bacteria from Maize Rhizosphere and Their Potential for Rock Growth Promotion. Geomicrobiol J ISSN 2016;0451. 10.1080/01490451.2016.1146373.
[121] Alzoubi MM, Gaibore M. The effect of phosphate solubilizing bacteria and organic fertilization on availability of Syrian rock phosphate and increase of triple superphosphate efficiency. World J Agric Sci 2012;8:473–8. doi: https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wjas.2012.8.5.1668.
[122] de Amaral Leite A, de Souza Cardoso AA, de Almeida Leite R, de Oliveira-Longatti SM, Lustosa Filho JF, de Souza Moreira FM, et al. Selected bacterial strains enhance phosphorus availability from biochar-based rock phosphate fertilizer. Ann Microbiol 2020;70:1–13. doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/s13213-020-01550-3.
[123] Wei Y, Zhao Y, Wang H, Lu Q, Cao Z, Cui H, et al. An optimized regulating method for composting phosphorus fractions transformation based on biochar addition and phosphate-solubilizing bacteria inoculation. Bioresour Technol 2016;221:139–46. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIORTECH.2016.09.038.
[124] Liu Z, Li YC, Zhang S, Fu Y, Fan X, Patel JS, et al. Characterization of phosphate-solubilizing bacteria isolated from calcareous soils. Appl Soil Ecol 2015;96:217–24. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2015.08.003.
[125] Bashan Y, Kamnev AA, de-Bashan LE. Tricalcium phosphate is inappropriate as a universal selection factor for isolating and testing phosphate-solubilizing bacteria that enhance plant growth: a proposal for an alternative procedure. Biol Fertil Soils 2012;49:465–79. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/S00374-012-0737-7.
[126] Taurian T, Anzuay MS, Angelini JG, Tonelli ML, Ludueña L, Pena D, et al. Phosphate-solubilizing peanut associated bacteria: screening for plant growth-promoting activities. Plant Soil 2010;329:421–31. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/S11104-009-0168-X.
[127] El-Tarabily KA, Youssef T. Enhancement of morphological, anatomical and physiological characteristics of seedlings of the mangrove Avicennia marina inoculated with a native phosphate-solubilizing isolate of Oceanobacillus picturae under greenhouse conditions. Plant Soil 2010;332:147–62. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/S11104-010-0280-Y.
[128] Chen W, Yang F, Zhang L, Wang J. Organic acid secretion and phosphate solubilizing efficiency of Pseudomonas sp. PSB12: effects of phosphorus forms and carbon sources. Geomicrobiol J 2016;33:870–7. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/01490451.2015.1123329.
[129] Yu LY, Huang HB, Wang XH, Li S, Feng NX, Zhao HM, et al. Novel phosphate-solubilising bacteria isolated from sewage sludge and the mechanism of phosphate solubilisation. Sci Total Environ 2019;658:474–84. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.12.166.
[130] Muleta D, Granhall U, Assefa F, Bo E. Phosphate-solubilising rhizobacteria associated with Coffea arabica L. in natural coffee forests of southwestern. J Saudi Soc Agric Sci 2013;12:73–84. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssas.2012.07.002.
[131] Wei Y, Wei Z. Effect of organic acids production and bacterial community on the possible mechanism of phosphorus solubilization during composting with enriched phosphate-solubilizing bacteria inoculation. Bioresour Technol 2018;247:190–9. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2017.09.092.
[132] Saikia J, Sarma RK, Dhandia R, Yadav A, Bharali R, Gupta VK, et al. Alleviation of drought stress in pulse crops with ACC deaminase producing rhizobacteria isolated from acidic soil of Northeast India. Sci Rep 2018;8:1–16. doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-21921-w.
[133] Tahir M, Khalid U, Ijaz M, Shah GM, Naeem MA, Shahid M, et al. Combined application of bio-organic phosphate and phosphorus solubilizing bacteria (Bacillus strain MWT 14) improve the performance of bread wheat with low fertilizer input under an arid climate. Brazilian J Microbiol 2018;49:15–24. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjm.2017.11.005.
[134] Zheng BX, Ding K, Yang XR, Wadaan MAM, Hozzein WN, Peñuelas J, et al. Straw biochar increases the abundance of inorganic phosphate solubilizing bacterial community for better rape (Brassica napus) growth and phosphate uptake. Sci Total Environ 2019;647:1113–20. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.07.454.
[135] Behera BC, Yadav H, Singh SK, Mishra RR, Sethi BK, Dutta SK, et al. Phosphate solubilization and acid phosphatase activity of Serratia sp. isolated from mangrove soil of Mahanadi river delta, Odisha, India. J Genet Eng Biotechnol 2017;15:169–78. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jgeb.2017.01.003.
[136] Demissie S, Muleta D, Berecha G. Effect of phosphate solubilizing bacteria on seed germination and seedling growth of Faba bean (Vicia faba L.). Int J Agric Res 2013;8:123–36. doi: https://doi.org/10.3923/ijar.2013.123.136.
[137] Zaidi A, Khan MS, Ahemad M, Oves M. Plant growth promotion by phosphate solubilizing bacteria. Acta Microbiol Immunol Hungarica 2009;56:263–84. doi: https://doi.org/10.1556/AMicr.56.2009.3.6.
[138] Tahir M, Mirza MS, Zaheer A, Dimitrov MR, Smidt H, Hameed S. Isolation and identification of phosphate solubilizer Azospirillum, Bacillus and Enterobacter strains by 16SrRNA sequence analysis and their effect on growth of wheat (Triticum aestivum L.). Aust J Crop Sci 2013;7:1284–92.
[139] Liang JL, Liu J, Jia P, Yang TT, Zeng QW, Zhang SC, et al. Novel phosphate-solubilizing bacteria enhance soil phosphorus cycling following ecological restoration of land degraded by mining. ISME J 2020;14:1600–13. doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-020-0632-4.
[140] Bharwad K, Rajkumar S. Modulation of PQQ-dependent glucose dehydrogenase (mGDH and sGDH) activity by succinate in phosphate solubilizing plant growth promoting Acinetobacter sp. SK2. 3 Biotech 2020;10:1–11. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s13205-019-1991-2.
[141] Jilani G, Akhtar MS, Naqvi SM, Rasheed M, Ali Khan A, Jilani G, et al. A Phosphorus solubilizing bacteria: occurrence, mechanisms and their role in crop production. J Agric Biol Sci 2009;1:48–58.
[142] Alori ET, Glick BR, Babalola OO. Microbial phosphorus solubilization and its potential for use in sustainable agriculture. Front Microbiol 2017;8:971. doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2017.00971.
[143] Chen Q, Liu S. Identification and characterization of the phosphate-solubilizing bacterium pantoea sp. S32 in reclamation soil in Shanxi, China. Front Microbiol 2019;10:2171. doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2019.02171.
[144] Trujillo-Narcía A, Rivera-Cruz MC, Magaña-Aquino M, Trujillo-Rivera EA. The burning of sugarcane plantation in the tropics modifies the microbial and enzymatic processes in soil and rhizosphere. J Soil Sci Plant Nutr 2019;19:906–19. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s42729-019-00089-w.
[145] Chawngthu L, Hnamte R, Lalfakzuala R. Isolation and characterization of rhizospheric phosphate solubilizing bacteria from wetland paddy field of Mizoram, India. Geomicrobiol J 2020;37:366–75. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/01490451.2019.1709108.
[146] Behera BC, Yadav H, Singh SK, Sethi BK, Mishra RR, Kumari S, et al. Alkaline phosphatase activity of a phosphate solubilizing Alcaligenes faecalis, isolated from Mangrove soil. Biotechnol Res Innov 2017;1:101–11. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biori.2017.01.003.
[147] Wan W, Wang Y, Tan J, Qin Y, Zuo W, Wu H, et al. Alkaline phosphatase-harboring bacterial community and multiple enzyme activity contribute to phosphorus transformation during vegetable waste and chicken manure composting. Bioresour Technol 2020;297:. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2019.122406122406.
[148] Suzumura M, Ishikawa K, Ogawa H. Characterization of dissolved organic phosphorus in coastal seawater using ultrafiltration and phosphohydrolytic enzymes. Limnol Oceanogr 1998;43:1553–64. doi: https://doi.org/10.4319/LO.1998.43.7.1553.
[149] Journal BP, Lubián LM, Blasco J, Establier R. A comparative study of acid and alkaline phosphatase activities in several strains of Nannochloris (Chlorophyceae) and Nannochloropsis (Eustigmatophyceae). Br Phycol J 2007;27:119–30. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/00071619200650131.
[150] Kaur G, Reddy MS. Phosphate solubilizing rhizobacteria from an organic farm and their influence on the growth and yield of maize (Zea mays L.). J Gen Appl Microbiol 2013;59:295–303. doi: https://doi.org/10.2323/jgam.9.415.
[151] Paul R, Singh RD, Patra AK, Biswas DR, Bhattacharyya R, Arunkumar K. Phosphorus dynamics and solubilizing microorganisms in acid soils under different land uses of Lesser Himalayas of India. Agrofor Syst 2018;92:449–61. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-017-0168-4.
[152] S H, A K, E S, J B, M L, O Z. Biotechnological production and applications of phytases. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 2005;68:588–97. 10.1007/S00253-005-0005-Y.
[153] Richardson AE, Simpson RJ. Soil microorganisms mediating phosphorus availability ypdate on microbial phosphorus. Plant Physiol 2011;156:989–96. doi: https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.111.175448.
[154] Malusá E, Sas-Paszt L, Ciesielska J. Technologies for beneficial microorganisms inocula used as biofertilizers. Sci World J 2012;2012. doi: https://doi.org/10.1100/2012/491206.
[155] Catroux G, Hartmann A, Revellin C. Trends in rhizobial inoculant production and use. Plant Soil 2001;230:21–30. doi: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1004777115628.
[156] Bashan Y, Kloepper JW, de-Bashan LE, Nannipieri P. A need for disclosure of the identity of microorganisms, constituents, and application methods when reporting tests with microbe-based or pesticide-based products. Biol Fertil Soils 2016;52:283–4. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00374-016-1091-y.
[157] Kumar A, Kanwar S. Lipase production in solid-state fermentation (SSF): recent developments and biotechnological applications. Dyn Biochem Process Biotechnol Mol Biol 2012;6:13–27. doi: https://doi.org/10.1590/S1516-89132005000400010.
[158] Vassilev N, Eichler-Löbermann B, Flor-Peregrin E, Martos V, Reyes A, Vassileva M. Production of a potential liquid plant bio-stimulant by immobilized Piriformospora indica in repeated-batch fermentation process. AMB Express 2017;7:106. doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/s13568-017-0408-z.
[159] Larena I, Melgarejo P, De Cal A. Drying of conidia of Penicillium oxalicum, a biological control agent against Fusarium wilt of tomato. J Phytopathol 2003;151:600–6. doi: https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0931-1785.2003.00772.x.
[160] Abadias M, Teixidó N, Usall J, Solsona C, Viñas I. Survival of the postharvest biocontrol yeast Candida sake CPA-1 after dehydration by spray-drying. Biocontrol Sci Technol 2005;15:835–46. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/09583150500187041.
[161] Guijarro B, Melgarejo P, De Cal A. Effect of stabilizers on the shelf-life of Penicillium frequentans conidia and their efficacy as a biological agent

against peach brown rot. Int J Food Microbiol 2007;113:117–24. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2006.06.024.
[162] Mastan A, Rane D, Dastager SG, Vivek Babu CS. Development of low-cost plant probiotic formulations of functional endophytes for sustainable cultivation of Coleus forskohlii. Microbiol Res 2019;227:. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2019.126310126310.
[163] Brar SK, Verma M, Tyagi RD, Valéro JR. Recent advances in downstream processing and formulations of Bacillus thuringiensis based biopesticides. Process Biochem 2006;41:323–42. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procbio.2005.07.015.
[164] Knowles A. Recent developments of safer formulations of agrochemicals. Environmentalist 2008;28:35–44. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10669-007-9045-4.
[165] Navon A. Bacillus thuringiensis application in agriculture. Entomopathog. Bact. from Lab. to F. Appl., Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands; 2000, p. 355–69. 10.1007/978-94-017-1429-7_19.
[166] Behle RW, McGulRe MR, Gillespie RL, Shasha BS. Effects of alkaline gluten on the insecticidal activity of Bacillus thuringiensis. J Econ Entomol 1997;90:354–60. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/jee/90.2.354.
[167] Maldonado BM, Galán WL, Rodríguez PC, Quiroz MH. Evaluation of polymer-based granular formulations of Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis against larval Aedes aegypti in the laboratory. J Am Mosq Control Assoc 2002;18:352–8.
[168] Ridgway RL, Illum VL, Farrar RR, Calvin DD, Fleischer SJ, Inscoe MN. Granular matrix formulation of bacillus thuringiensis for control of the European corn borer (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae). J Econ Entomol 1996;89:1088–94. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/jee/89.5.1088.
[169] Monte E. Understanding Trichoderma: between biotechnology and microbial ecology. Int Microbiol 2001;4:1–4. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s101230100001.
[170] Young SD, Townsend RJ, Swaminathan J, O'Callaghan M. Serratia entomophila-coated seed to improve ryegrass establishment in the presence of grass grubs. New Zeal Plant Prot 2010;63:229–34. doi: https://doi.org/10.30843/nzpp.2010.63.6573.
[171] Stockwell VO, Stack JP. Using Pseudomonas spp. for integrated biological control. Phytopathology 2007;97:244–9. doi: https://doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO-97-2-0244.
[172] Punja ZK, Utkhede RS. Using fungi and yeasts to manage vegetable crop diseases. Trends Biotechnol 2003;21:400–7. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-7799(03)00193-8.
[173] Jankowski T, Zielinska M, Wysakowska A. Encapsulation of lactic acid bacteria with alginate/starch capsules. Biotechnol Tech 1997;11:31–4. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02764447.
[174] Kim D-H, Na S-K, Park J-S. Preparation and characterization of modified starch-based plastic film reinforced with short pulp fiber. I. Structural properties. J Appl Polym Sci 2003;88:2100–7. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/app.11630.
[175] De-Bashan LE, Bashan Y, Moreno M, Lebsky VK, Bustillos JJ. Increased pigment and lipid content, lipid variety, and cell and population size of the microalgae Chlorella spp. when co-immobilized in alginate beads with the microalgae-growth-promoting bacterium Azospirillum brasilense. Can J Microbiol 2002;48:514–21. doi: https://doi.org/10.1139/w02-051.
[176] He Y, Wu Z, Tu L, Han Y, Zhang G, Li C. Encapsulation and characterization of slow-release microbial fertilizer from the composites of bentonite and alginate. Appl Clay Sci 2015;109–110:68–75. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clay.2015.02.001.
[177] Heijnen CE, Hok-A-Hin CH, Van Veen JA. Improvements to the use of bentonite clay as a protective agent, increasing survival levels of bacteria introduced into soil. Soil Biol Biochem 1992;24:533–8. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/0038-0717(92)90077-B.
[178] Schoebitz M, López MD, Roldán A. Bioencapsulation of microbial inoculants for better soil–plant fertilization. A review. Agron Sustain Dev 2013;33:751–65. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/S13593-013-0142-0.
[179] Mishra J, Arora NK. Bioformulations for plant growth promotion and combating phytopathogens: A sustainable approach. Bioformulations Sustain. Agric. Springer International Publishing; 2016, p. 3–33. 10.1007/978-81-322-2779-3_1.
[180] Mishra S, Kumar P, Malik A. Preparation, characterization, and insecticidal activity evaluation of three different formulations of Beauveria bassiana against Musca domestica. Parasitol Res 2013;112:3485–95. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-013-3529-6.
[181] Colla G, Hoagland L, Ruzzi M, Cardarelli M, Bonini P, Canaguier R, et al. Biostimulant action of protein hydrolysates: unraveling their effects on plant physiology and microbiome. Front Plant Sci 2017;8:2202. doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.02202.
[182] Vejan P, Abdullah R, Khadiran T, Ismail S. Encapsulation of Bacillus salmalaya 139SI using double coating biopolymer technique. Lett Appl Microbiol 2018;68:56–63. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/lam.13088.
[183] Vendan RT, Muthusamy T. Development and standardization of cyst based liquid formulation of azospirillum. Acta Microbiol Immunol Hung 2007;54:167–77. doi: https://doi.org/10.1556/AMicr.54.2007.2.7.
[184] Kumar P, Sharma N, Sharma S, Gupta R. Rhizosphere stochiometry, fruit yield, quality attributes and growth response to PGPR transplant amendments in strawberry (Fragaria × ananassa Duch.) growing on solarized soils. Sci Hortic (Amsterdam) 2020;265:10. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2020.109215.
[185] García-Fraile P, Menéndez E, Rivas R. Role of bacterial biofertilizers in agriculture and forestry. AIMS Bioeng 2015;2:183–205. doi: https://doi.org/10.3934/bioeng.2015.3.183.
[186] Anwar MS, Paliwal A, Firdous N, Verma A, Kumar A, Pande V. Co-culture development and bioformulation efficacy of psychrotrophic PGPRs to promote growth and development of pea (Pisum sativum) plant. J Gen Appl Microbiol 2018;65:88–95. doi: https://doi.org/10.2323/jgam.2018.05.007.
[187] Maheshwari DK, Dubey RC, Agarwal M, Dheeman S, Aeron A, Bajpai VK. Carrier based formulations of biocoenotic consortia of disease suppressive Pseudomonas aeruginosa KRP1 and Bacillus licheniformis KRB1. Ecol Eng 2015;81:272–7. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2015.04.066.
[188] Kun Y, Guishui X, Xianquan B, Zhenhui W, Liang S, Yiyu H. Phosphate-solubilizing bacterium, and separation and culture method and application thereof, 2015.
[189] Akhtar S, Bashir S, Khan S, Iqbal J, Gulshan AB, Irshad S, et al. Integrated usage of synthetic and bio-fertilizers: an environment friendly approach to improve the productivity of sorghum. Cereal Res Commun 2020;48:247–53. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s42976-020-00029-w.
[190] Paliya S, Mandpe A, Kumar S, Kumar MS. Enhanced nodulation and higher germination using sludge ash as a carrier for biofertilizer production. J Environ Manage 2019;250:. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109523109523.
[191] Reddy CA, Janarthanam L. Polymicrobial formulations for enhancing plant productivity; 2009.
[192] Errakhi R, Lebrihi A. Liquid formulation comprising two phosphorus-solubilizing pseudomonas fluorescens lr1 for use in agricultural fertilization; 2013.
[193] Sharad NC. Capsulated formulation with beneficial microbes for healthy plant growth; 2012.
[194] Patel CS. Advance material and method of preparation of bacterial formulation using phosphorus solubilizing bacteria that makes phosphorous available to plant which are unavailable due to higher soil pH; 2010.
[195] Nadeem T, Arshad M, Hamad RJ, Nasim A. Process of producing bio-organo-phosphate (BOP) fertilizer through continuous solubilization of rock phosphate by a composting bioprocess and bioaugmentation with phosphorus solubilizing microorganisms; 2013.
[196] Greenshields D, Steckler S, Priest kari, Caldwell C, Frodyma M. Microbial strains, compositions, and methods for increasing available phosphate for plants; 2013.
[197] Xavier IJ, Holloway G, Leggett M. Development of rhizobial inoculant formulations. Cm 2004;3:0. 10.1094/cm-2004-0301-06-rv.
[198] Stephens JHG, Rask HM. Inoculant production and formulation. F Crop Res 2000;65:249–58. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4290(99)00090-8.
[199] Arora N kumar, Khare E, Maheshwari DK. Plant growth and health promoting bacteria 2011;18. 10.1007/978-3-642-13612-2.
[200] Berninger T, González López Ó, Bejarano A, Preininger C, Sessitsch A. Maintenance and assessment of cell viability in formulation of non-sporulating bacterial inoculants. Microb Biotechnol 2018;11:277–301. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/1751-7915.12880.
[201] Vassilev N, Vassileva M, Martos V, Garcia del Moral LF, Kowalska J, Tylkowski B, et al. Formulation of microbial inoculants by encapsulation in natural polysaccharides: focus on beneficial properties of carrier additives and derivatives. Front Plant Sci 2020;11:270. 10.3389/fpls.2020.00270.
[202] Giroto AS, Guimarães GGF, Foschini M, Ribeiro C. Role of slow-release nanocomposite fertilizers on nitrogen and phosphate availability in soil. Sci Rep 2017;7:1–11. doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/srep46032.
[203] Rezaei-Chiyaneh E, Amirnia R, Machiani MA, Javanmard A, Maggi F, Morshedloo MR. Intercropping fennel (Foeniculum vulgare L.) with common bean (Phaseolus vulgaris L.) as affected by PGPR inoculation: A strategy for improving yield, essential oil and fatty acid composition. Sci Hortic (Amsterdam) 2020;261:108951. 10.1016/j.scienta.2019.108951.
[204] Bharat A, Bhorade SM, Morales-Nebreda L, McQuattie-Pimentel AC, Soberanes S, Ridge K, et al. Flow cytometry reveals similarities between lung macrophages in humans and mice. Am J Respir Cell Mol Biol 2016;54:147–9. doi: https://doi.org/10.1165/rcmb.2015-0147LE.
[205] Trivedi P, Pandey A, Palni LMS. Carrier-based preparations of plant growth-promoting bacterial inoculants suitable for use in cooler regions. World J Microbiol Biotechnol 2005;21:941–5. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11274-004-6820-y.
[206] Hafeez M, Ramteke PW, Lawrence R, Harose R, Suresh BG, Kumari S, et al. Bio-formulation of halotolerant phosphate solubilizing enterobacter cloacae HFZ-H4 strain to screen different carrier materials and their shelf life study. Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci 2018;7:2373–80. doi: https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2018.701.285.
[207] Nacoon S, Jogloy S, Riddech N, Mongkolthanaruk W, Kuyper TW, Boonlue S. Interaction between phosphate solubilizing bacteria and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi on growth promotion and tuber inulin content of helianthus tuberosus L. Sci Rep 2020;10:1–10. doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-61846-x.
[208] Bora P, Bora LC, Deka PC. Efficacy of substrate based bioformulation of microbial antagonists in the management of bacterial disease of some solanaceous vegetables in Assam. J Biol Control 2016;30:49–54. doi: https://doi.org/10.18311/JBC/2016/6459.

[209] Mukhtar S, Shahid I, Mehnaz S, Malik KA. Assessment of two carrier materials for phosphate solubilizing biofertilizers and their effect on growth of wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) Microbiological Research Assessment of two carrier materials for phosphate solubilizing biofertilizers and their e f. Microbiol Res 2017;205:107–17. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2017.08.011.

[210] Pushpa A, Subhash C, Reddy M. Development of liquid formulation for the dual purpose of crop protection and production. J Environ Res Dev 2014;8:378.

[211] Schisler DA, Slininger PJ, Behle RW, Jackson MA. Formulation of Bacillus spp. for biological control of plant diseases. Phytopathology 2004;94:1267–71. doi: https://doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO.2004.94.11.1267.

[212] Woo SL, Ruocco M, Vinale F, Nigro M, Marra R, Lombardi N, et al. Trichoderma-based products and their widespread use in agriculture. Open Mycol J 2014;8:71–126. doi: https://doi.org/10.2174/1874437001408010071.

[213] Pandey P, Maheshwari DK. Bioformulation of Burkholderia sp. MSSP with a multispecies consortium for growth promotion of Cajanus cajan. Can J Microbiol 2007;53:213–22. doi: https://doi.org/10.1139/W06-118.

[214] Reginald MNK. Methods and compositions for increasing the amounts of phosphorus and/or micronutrients available for plant uptake from soils - Google Patents 1991. https://patents.google.com/patent/US5026417A/en?oq=5026417 (accessed December 25, 2020).

[215] Rogers RD, Wolfram JH. Microbial solubilization of phosphate; 1992.

[216] Wallenstein MD, Bell CW. Synergistic bacterial consortia for mobilizing soil phosphorus; 2010.

[217] Hanming L. A kind of preparation of new biological organic fertilizer fermentation maturity agent; 2017.