

Genetic modification strategies in Rhizobia to combat abiotic stress in legumes

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CEPI	Central Environmental Pollution Index
CPCB	Central Pollution Control Board
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
ICAR	The Indian Council of Agriculture Research
EIA	Environmental Impact Association
PM	Particulate Matter
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
PGPR	Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobium
ACC	Acetyl-CoA carboxylase
IAA	Indole-3 acetic Acid
ROS	Reactive Oxygen Species
GSH	Reduced Glutathione
GSSG	Oxidized Glutathione
GGT	Gamma glutamyl Transpeptidase
GCS	Gamma glutamylcysteine synthetase
GS	Glutathione synthase
ATP	Adenosine triphosphate
PGPB	Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobium
LB	Luria Bertani
YEM	Yeast extract Mannitol
NAIMCC	National Agriculturally Important Microbial Culture Collection
pPAT	Plasmid Pushpa Akash Tanvi
C1	Consortium 1
C2	Consortium 2
SOD	Superoxide dismutase
GR	Glutathione reductase

Genetic modification strategies in Rhizobia to combat abiotic stress in legumes

CAT	Catalase
APX	Ascorbate peroxidase
NBT	Nitro blue tetrazolium
GMO	Genetically modified
H ₂ O ₂	Hydrogen peroxide
MDA	Malondialdehyde
WT	Wild type
SEM	Scanning electron microscope
VP	Variable Pressure
XRD	X-ray diffraction
FTIR	Fourier-transform Infrared spectroscopy
CdS	Cadmium Sulphide
NP	Nanoparticles
Cr	Chromium
Hg	Mercury
Ni	Nickle
V	Vanadium
Se	Selenium
As	Arsenic
Cd	Cadmium
Cu	Copper
Zn	Zinc
Pb	Lead
ug	Microgram
mg	Milligram
kg	Kilogram
L	Litres
ml	Millilitres

Genetic modification strategies in Rhizobia to combat abiotic stress in legumes

List of Figures

Figure	Page no.
Figure 1.1 Intertwining interactions of Agriculture, Industries and humans with Nature	5
Figure 1.2 Arsenic contamination in India	11
Figure 1.3 Various methods of heavy metal remediation from soil	12
Figure 1.4 Schematic diagram for uptake, translocation and sequestration of heavy metals by plants	13
Figure 1.5 Schematic representation of the PGPR activities	14
Figure 1.6 Mechanisms employed by bacteria to neutralize heavy metal stress	15
Figure 1.7 Schematic representation of formation of metal sulphide by bacterial cells exposed to heavy metal stress	16
Figure 1.8 Schematic representation of symbiosis mechanism by rhizobium	16
Figure 3.1 FASTA sequence of <i>E. coli</i> DH10B <i>ybdK</i> gene	39
Figure 3.2 Agarose gel electrophoresis profile of <i>ybdK</i> gene amplicons generated by gradient PCR.	43
Figure 3.3 Schematic representation of <i>ybdK</i> gene amplicon	43
Figure 3.4 Schematic representation of an empty vector pBBR1MCS2	44
Figure 3.5 Agarose gel electrophoresis profile of the digested vector (pBBR1MCS2) and amplicon (<i>ybdK</i> gene)	45
Figure 3.6.a Schematic representation of digested vector pBBR1MCS2	45
Figure 3.6.b Schematic representation of digested <i>ybdK</i> gene amplicon	45
Figure 3.7 Agarose gel electrophoresis profile of a recombinant plasmid pPAT	45
Figure 3.8 Agarose gel electrophoresis profile of the validation of recombinant plasmid by digestion.	46
Figure 3.9 Schematic representation of pPAT plasmid	47
Figure 3.10 Transformation by electroporation	48
Figure 3.11 pPAT isolated from Rhizobial transformants	49

Genetic modification strategies in Rhizobia to combat abiotic stress in legumes

Figure 3.12 Validation of pPAT by PCR method	50
Figure 3.13 Growth curve of PGPR in YEM and M9 minimal medium	51-52
Figure 3.14.a Estimation of Total glutathione (intracellular) from different PGPR	53
Figure 3.14.b Estimation of Reduced glutathione (intracellular) estimation from different PGPR.	53
Figure 4.1.a Bacterial colony morphology under the influence of Arsenic stress	70
Figure 4.1.b Bacterial colony morphology under the influence of Cadmium stress	70
Figure 4.2.a Effect of Arsenic on radicle emergence in fenugreek seed	71
Figure 4.2.b Effect of Cadmium on radicle emergence in fenugreek seed	71
Figure 4.3.a Spot assay to determine bacterial sensitivity towards arsenic induced stress	72
Figure 4.3.b Spot assay to determine bacterial sensitivity towards Cadmium induced stress	73
Figure 4.4.a Growth of fenugreek seedlings treated with PGPR in Arsenic stress (Top view)	75
Figure 4.4.b Growth of fenugreek seedlings treated with PGPR in Arsenic stress (Side view)	75
Figure 4.4.c Seedlings morphology at 0 ppm arsenic stress	75
Figure 4.4.d Seedlings morphology at 30 ppm arsenic stress	75
Figure 4.4.e Shoot length of fenugreek seedlings treated with PGPR growing in arsenic stress	76
Figure 4.4.f Root length of fenugreek seedlings treated with PGPR growing in arsenic stress	76
Figure 4.4.g total length of fenugreek seedlings treated with PGPR growing in arsenic stress.	76
Figure 4.5.a Germination % of the seeds coated with PGPR in Arsenic stress	77

Genetic modification strategies in Rhizobia to combat abiotic stress in legumes

Figure 4.5.b SVI of seedlings treated with PGPR growing in Arsenic contaminated soil	77
Figure 4.6.a Fresh weight of seedlings treated with PGPR grown in Arsenic contaminated soil	78
Figure 4.6.b Dry weight of seedlings treated with PGPR grown in Arsenic contaminated soil	78
Figure 4.7.a Chlorophyll A content in the leaves of seedlings treated with PGPR growing in arsenic contaminated soil	79
Figure 4.7.b Chlorophyll B content in the leaves of seedlings treated with PGPR growing in arsenic contaminated soil	79
Figure 4.7.c Total Chlorophyll in the leaves of seedlings treated with PGPR growing in arsenic contaminated soil	79
Figure 4.7.d Carotenoids content in the leaves of seedlings treated with PGPR growing in arsenic contaminated soil.	79
Figure 4.8.a H ₂ O ₂ estimation from the shoots of seedlings growing in Arsenic contaminated soil.	80
Figure 4.8.b H ₂ O ₂ estimation from the roots of seedlings growing in Arsenic contaminated soil.	80
Figure 4.9.a MDA estimation from the shoots of seedlings growing in Arsenic contaminated soil.	81
Figure 4.9.b MDA estimation from the roots of seedlings growing in Arsenic contaminated soil.	81
Figure 4.10.a SOD activity in the shoots of seedlings growing in Arsenic contaminated soil	82
Figure 4.10.b SOD activity in the roots of seedlings growing in Arsenic contaminated soil	82
Figure 4.10.c CAT activity in the shoots of seedlings growing in Arsenic contaminated soil	82
Figure 4.10.d CAT activity in the roots of seedlings growing in Arsenic contaminated soil	82
Figure 4.10.e APX activity in the shoots of seedlings growing in Arsenic contaminated soil	82

Genetic modification strategies in Rhizobia to combat abiotic stress in legumes

Figure 4.10.f APX activity in the roots of seedlings growing in Arsenic contaminated soil	82
Figure 4.10.g GR activity in the shoots of seedlings growing in Arsenic contaminated soil.	83
Figure 4.10.h GR activity in the roots of seedlings growing in Arsenic contaminated soil.	83
Figure 4.11.a Growth of fenugreek seedlings treated with PGPR in Cadmium stress (Top view)	86
Figure 4.11.b Seedlings morphology at 0 ppm Cadmium stress	86
Figure 4.11.c Seedlings morphology at 50 ppm Cadmium stress	86
Figure 4.12.a Shoot length of fenugreek seedlings treated with PGPR growing in Cadmium stress	87
Figure 4.12.b Root length of fenugreek seedlings treated with PGPR growing in Cadmium stress	87
Figure 4.12.c Total length of fenugreek seedlings treated with PGPR growing in Cadmium stress	87
Figure 4.13.a Germination % of the seeds coated with PGPR in Cadmium stress	88
Figure 4.13.b SVI of seedlings treated with PGPR growing in Cadmium contaminated soil	88
Figure 4.14.a Fresh weight of the seedlings treated with different PGPR grown in cadmium contaminated soil	89
Figure 4.14.b Dry weight of the seedlings treated with different PGPR grown in cadmium contaminated soil.	89
Figure 4.15.a Chlorophyll a content in the leaves of seedlings treated with PGPR growing in cadmium contaminated soil	90
Figure 4.15.b Chlorophyll b content in the leaves of seedlings treated with PGPR growing in cadmium contaminated soil	90
Figure 4.15.c Total Chlorophyll content in the leaves of seedlings treated with PGPR growing in cadmium contaminated soil	90

Genetic modification strategies in Rhizobia to combat abiotic stress in legumes

Figure 4.15.d Carotenoids content in the leaves of seedlings treated with PGPR growing in cadmium contaminated soil.	90
Figure 4.16.a H ₂ O ₂ estimation from the shoots of seedlings growing in Cadmium contaminated soil.	91
Figure 4.16.b H ₂ O ₂ estimation from the roots of seedlings growing in Cadmium contaminated soil.	91
Figure 4.16.a MDA estimation from the shoots of seedlings growing in Cadmium contaminated soil.	91
Figure 4.16.b MDA estimation from the roots of seedlings growing in Cadmium contaminated soil.	91
Figure 4.17.a SOD activity in the shoots of seedlings growing in Cadmium contaminated soil	93
Figure 4.17.b SOD activity in the roots of seedlings growing in Cadmium contaminated soil	93
Figure 4.17.c CAT activity in the shoots of seedlings growing in Cadmium contaminated soil	93
Figure 4.17.d CAT activity in the roots of seedlings growing in Cadmium contaminated soil	93
Figure 4.17.e APX activity in the shoots of seedlings growing in Cadmium contaminated soil	93
Figure 4.17.f APX activity in the roots of seedlings growing in Cadmium contaminated soil	93
Figure 4.17.g GR activity in the shoots of seedlings growing in Cadmium contaminated soil.	94
Figure 4.17.h GR activity in the roots of seedlings growing in Cadmium contaminated soil.	94
Figure 4.18.a Growth of fenugreek seedlings treated with PGPR consortia in As and Cd contaminated soil (5 days)	96
Figure 4.18.b Growth of fenugreek seedlings treated with PGPR consortia in As and Cd contaminated soil (25 days)	96
Figure 4.18.c Morphology of the seedlings treated with PGPR consortia growing in Arsenic stress	97

Genetic modification strategies in Rhizobia to combat abiotic stress in legumes

Figure 4.18.d Morphology of the seedlings treated with PGPR consortia growing in Cadmium stress	97
Figure 4.19 a) Shoot length b) Root length c) Total length d) SVI of the seedlings treated with PGPR consortium growing in Arsenic & Cadmium stress	98
Figure 4.20 a) Fresh weight b) Dry weight of the seedlings treated with PGPR consortium growing in Arsenic & Cadmium stress	100
Figure 4.21 a) Chlorophyll a b) Chlorophyll b c) Total chlorophyll d) Carotenoids levels in the seedlings treated with PGPR consortium growing in Arsenic& Cadmium stress	102
Figure 4.22 H ₂ O ₂ content in a) Shoot and b) Root, MDA content in c) Shoot and d) Root of the seedlings treated with PGPR consortium growing in Arsenic & Cadmium stress	103
Figure 4.23 SOD levels in a) Shoot and b) Root, GR levels in c) Shoot and d) Root of the seedlings treated with PGPR consortium growing in Arsenic & Cadmium stress	104
Figure 5.1 Biosynthesized nanoparticles deposited at the bottom of the beaker.	121
Figure 5.2 Nanoparticles collected after airdrying process	122
Figure 5.3 FTIR of CdS nanoparticles produced by a) M1 b) M2 c) M3 d) M4 e) M5 bacteria to analyse the molecules attached to its surface.	123
Figure 5.4 SEM analysis of the CdS nanoparticles produced by a) M1 b) M2 c) M3 d) M4 e) M5	125
Figure 5.5) XRD analysis of the CdS nanoparticles produced by a) M1 b) M2 c) M3 d) M4 e) M5	127

Genetic modification strategies in Rhizobia to combat abiotic stress in legumes

List of Tables

Tables	Page no.
Table 1.1 Causes of soil degradation in India	7
Table 1.2 Source of heavy metal pollution	8
Table 3.1 Bacteria used in this study	35-36
Table 3.2 Plasmids and Primers used in the study	36-37
Table 3.3 PCR protocol for amplification of <i>E. coli</i> DH10B <i>ybdK</i> gene	39
Table 3.4 Protocol for Sequential digestion of a Vector and the gene of interest	40
Table 3.5 BLASTN of <i>ybdK</i> gene insert from pPAT plasmid with <i>E. coli</i> genome	48
Table 3.6.a Estimation of extracellular glutathione from nutrient media	54
Table 3.6.b Estimation of extracellular glutathione from M9 media	54
Table 4.1 Soil Analysis	65
Table 4.2 Individual PGPG study groups	66
Table 4.3 PGPR consortium study groups	66
Table 5.1 Estimation of extracellular glutathione from nutrient media after 48 hours.	120
Table 5.2 Mass of cadmium sulphide crystals formed from 50 ml supernatant.	121

Genetic modification strategies in Rhizobia to combat abiotic stress in legumes

Abstract

PGPR is one of the most important tools used in the modern agriculture practice. PGPR can be used as biofertilizers as well as biocontrol agents. Rhizobium is an important PGPR, which is has been used as biofertilizer for legumes since last two decades. Besides biofertilizers it has been also employed as bioremediation agent, for remediation of heavy metal polluted soil. Rhizobium is an important PGPR which is capable of symbiosis with legumes for nitrogen fixation, so it can work in soil as well as plant. Any genetic modification in rhizobium bacteria would have an amplified effect due to its ability to form nodules in the legume roots. A single nodule could contain about 10^9 bacteria which is 100 times more than the entire rhizosphere of a single crop like fenugreek. Also, while living in non-symbiotic state, it can perform all the duties of any other PGPR. Because of this rhizobium especially is used in biofertilizer formulations for legumes.

Aim of our study was to check the effects of genetically modified rhizobium on the growth of fenugreek seedlings in Arsenic and Cadmium contaminated soil. *E. coli* DH10B *ybdK* gene, which encodes a carboxylate- amine ligase was cloned in a low copy number plasmid pBBR1MCS2 plasmid under a constitutive lac promoter, which yielded a 6.2 kb recombinant plasmid, pPAT. Since it is a carboxylate- amine ligase, it possesses the gamma glutamyl cysteine ligase activity. The *gshA* gene in bacteria encodes this enzyme which catalyses the first step in glutathione biosynthesis. Many studies have stated that the rhizobium devoid of *gshA* synthesizes very less glutathione, as well as loses the ability to form symbiotic nodules with legumes, but when complemented with *gshA* containing plasmid, it regains its ability to produce sufficient glutathione and symbiosis. Many studies have also reported the enhanced synthesis of glutathione by cloning *gshA* gene using plasmid. Similarly, our study also reported enhanced glutathione synthesis by GMO rhizobium compared to the wild type rhizobium. It was observed that M3 and M5 accumulated significantly higher levels of glutathione compared to M2 and M4 respectively. M2 and M4 are the wild type counterparts of M3 and M5 respectively. This was observed in rich as well as minimal media.

To determine their effect on fenugreek seedlings, seeds of fenugreek were coated with M1-M5 bacteria and sown in Arsenic and Cadmium spiked soil. M1 was used as a control for all experiments. Seedlings were allowed to grow for 16 days and its morphology, growth

Genetic modification strategies in Rhizobia to combat abiotic stress in legumes

parameters, oxidative stress parameters and antioxidant enzyme profile was measured in order to check the effect of glutathione overproducing rhizobium on the growth of fenugreek. It was observed that M3 and M5 treated seedlings showed enhanced growth parameters, reduced oxidative stress and reduced antioxidant enzyme levels in shoots as well as roots compared to M2 and M4 treated seedlings respectively. Glutathione reductase GR showed increase in GMO bacteria treated seedlings which justifies that more glutathione is present in the tissue, despite of low antioxidant enzyme levels, which means that the source of glutathione is external. This concludes that the GMO rhizobium exhibits protective effect towards fenugreek growing in Arsenic and Cadmium polluted soil.

Similar experiments were performed with the bacterial consortia. Fenugreek seeds coated with C2 (M1+M3+M5) and C1 (M1+M2+M4) consortium were grown in Arsenic and Cadmium contaminated soil for 25 days. C2 bearing M3 and M5 is a GMO consortium. It was observed that C2 treated seedlings showed increased growth parameters, reduced oxidative stress and reduced antioxidant enzyme levels. Rather the interplay was more complex as the crosstalk between different bacterial species and plants differ in consortia compared to single bacteria. In our conclusion this GMO consortium also exhibits protective effect towards fenugreek growing in Arsenic and Cadmium polluted soil compared to wild type consortium.

PGPR employs varieties of methods to capture/detoxify heavy metals. They are known to form intracellular as well as extracellular nanoparticles. It is also established that glutathione has the capability to synthesize and stabilize the cadmium sulphide nanoparticles. In our study the ability of GMO rhizobium was checked for the *invitro* formation of extracellular cadmium sulphide nanoparticles. We observed that M3 and M5 produced significantly higher amount of CdS NPs compared to M2 and M4 respectively, due to higher secretion of glutathione in the growth media. Also, the NPs synthesized by GMO rhizobium showed smaller aggregation compared to wildtype rhizobium, which was confirmed by SEM. FTIR was performed to get an idea about the functional groups of the molecules attached to the surface of nanoparticles, to confirm the presence of glutathione on them. Amide I band in the FTIR spectra of CdS NPs produced by M3 and M5 showed reduced transmittance of the concerned peak compared to M2 and M4 respectively. Finally, XRD analysis was done to confirm that the material synthesized by bacteria were nanoparticles. Biosynthesized CdS nanoparticles were in cubic

Genetic modification strategies in Rhizobia to combat abiotic stress in legumes

phase which was confirmed by analysis of the prominent 2 theta peaks of diffractogram. Thus, GMO rhizobium are capable of biosynthesis of more extracellular CdS nanoparticles.

Therefore, clubbing the above observations, we can conclude that rhizobium has the ability to reduce the bioavailability of cadmium metal by converting it into nanoparticle aggregate. Both GMO as well as wild type of forming aggregates. But the only difference is that the GMO rhizobium are capable of formation of smaller aggregates, which was confirmed by SEM. Smaller aggregates have large surface to volume ratio which gives it better chance of detoxification by further modification by other PGPR present in the rhizosphere/vicinity. Thus, we conclude that GMO PGPR producing enhanced levels of glutathione could be used as a PGPR for fenugreek growing in Arsenic and Cadmium polluted soil.