

1 **Evaluating *Bacillus* spp. As Biocontrol Agents against *Meloidogyne***  
2 ***incognita* infesting Tomato**

3  
4 **Bommenahalli Sathish Kavya<sup>1\*</sup>, Tiptur Roopla-Nayak Kavitha<sup>2</sup>, Arati<sup>3</sup>, and Nagavath**  
5 **Lohith Kumar<sup>3</sup>**

6  
7 **ABSTRACT**

8 Tomato is attributed as a global host for root-knot nematode (*Meloidogyne incognita*)  
9 soliciting ponderous damage. Using biocontrol agents to control plant parasitic nematodes is a  
10 well-established, green approach in advance of synthetic nematicides. The role of *Bacillus* spp.  
11 in inciting physiological and biochemical alterations in nematode infestation is discussed in the  
12 present study. The susceptible (PKM-1) and resistant (Hisar Lalit) tomato cultivars treated with  
13 *Bacillus pumilus* augmented the shoot length, root length and biomass of plants compared to  
14 the standard check, *Pseudomonas fluorescens*, followed by *B. megaterium*. Accordingly, all the  
15 biocontrol agent-treated susceptible plants showed reduced galling and exhibited a root gall  
16 index of 3 (moderately resistant) and reduced nematode population in soil and roots. Contrarily,  
17 all the resistant plants showed highly resistant reactions. *B. pumilus* showed the topmost  
18 expression of all the biochemical enzymes like peroxidase (PO), polyphenol oxidase (PPO),  
19 catalase (CAT), phenylalanine ammonia-lyase (PAL) and total phenols. Conclusively, *B.*  
20 *pumilus* was found to be the most potential in reducing nematode infestation by embellishing  
21 the plant growth and enhancing defense-related enzymes in tomatoes.

22 **KEYWORDS:** Root-knot nematode, Tomato, *Bacillus* spp., Biochemical enzymes.

23  
24 **INTRODUCTION**

25 Plant parasitic nematodes (PPNs) are one of the egregious biotic stresses that are a well-  
26 recognized threat to crop production and food security. PPNS are omnipresent, enabling them  
27 to attack all different kinds of crop plants, field crops, and vegetable and flower crops that cause  
28 annual economic losses of USD 173 billion globally (Elling *et al.*, 2013). They are also  
29 responsible for multiple pathogen infection that predisposes the susceptible crops to other  
30 pathogens like fungi, bacteria and thus indirectly contributing to reduced yield and crop  
31 productivity (Back *et al.*, 2002).

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Plant Pathology, University of Agricultural Sciences, GKVK, Bengaluru-65, Karnataka, India.

<sup>2</sup> AICRP (Nematodes) Laboratory, Department of Plant Pathology, University of Agricultural Sciences, GKVK, Bengaluru-65, Karnataka, India.

<sup>3</sup> Department of Agricultural Microbiology, University of Agricultural Sciences, GKVK, Bengaluru-65, Karnataka, India.

Corresponding author; e-mail: kavyavishu2210@gmail.com

32 There exist more than 4000 PPNs attacking crops. Of these, the most important and prominent  
33 one is the root-knot nematode (*Meloidogyne* spp.), which voraciously feeds all crops, especially  
34 vegetables (Koenning *et al.*, 1999). Global vegetable production is under threat due to the  
35 damage from four different species of *Meloidogyne* viz., *M. arenaria*, *M. javanica*, *M. incognita*  
36 and *M. hapla*. However, *M. incognita* is one of the important pests of solanaceous crops majorly  
37 in tomatoes.

38 Tomato is the second most paramount remunerable exigent solanaceous vegetable grown  
39 worldwide after potato. Infestation of *M. incognita* in tomatoes impedes production and lowers  
40 yield, making them vulnerable to other wilt and/or rot causing pathogens (Ogwulumba *et al.*,  
41 2011). The habitual monitoring tactic employed by growers is the use of synthetic nematicides  
42 which create economic and environmental constraints. Under these circumstances, substitutive  
43 strategies are gaining preponderance. The current study explains one such alternative strategy  
44 to combat root-knot nematode infesting tomatoes.

45 Biocontrol or biological control is an economically and environmentally well-fit tactic against  
46 plant pathogens. Precisely, biocontrol of nematodes can be defined as the management of  
47 nematode populations and the damage caused by them through the action of antagonists either  
48 directly or indirectly by manipulating the environment favorable for nematodes (Poveda *et al.*,  
49 2020) that includes many of fungi and bacterial species. The organism that shows antagonism  
50 against pathogens are called biocontrol agents (BCA) where, these organisms interact with  
51 pathogens through various mechanisms like competition, antibiosis and/or through inducing the  
52 plant resistance against pathogens.

53 Plant resistance is one of the defensive strategies used by most of the hosts against pest and  
54 pathogen attacks. Once the plant encounters the attack, the pathogen-associated molecular  
55 patterns (PAMPs) will be recognized by the pattern recognition receptors (PRRs) on the cell  
56 surface. Thereby it triggers a complex signaling network leading to defense responses (PAMP-  
57 triggered immunity) (Ramirez-Prado *et al.*, 2018; Hou *et al.*, 2019). When it fails, these  
58 biocontrol agents help the plant to trigger its innate immunity by producing microbial-  
59 associated molecular patterns (MAMPs) that act as elicitors for triggering the complex defense  
60 responses by the host against pathogens (Poveda *et al.*, 2020). It includes the production of  
61 reactive oxygen species, hypersensitive response, production of defensive enzymes  
62 (peroxidase, polyphenol oxidase, phenylalanine ammonia-lyase, catalase, etc.), phytohormones  
63 (salicylic acid, jasmonic acid and/or ethylene) and many signaling cascades.

64 In the current study, we investigated the nematicidal potential of a bacterial bioagent, *Bacillus*  
65 spp. against *M. incognita* in tomato and the level of defensive enzymes across different *Bacillus*  
66 spp. treated plants.

67

## 68 MATERIALS AND METHODS

69 The experiments were laid out in a glasshouse at AICRP (Nematodes), Zonal Agricultural  
70 Research Station, GKVK, Bengaluru. Precedently, the species of *Meloidogyne* was validated as  
71 *M. incognita* by using the “Perineal pattern technique” (Chitwood, 1949).

72

### 73 Collection of Bacterial Culture

74 Three distinct species of *Bacillus* viz., *B. subtilis* IIHR Bs-2, *B. megaterium* Bm-IIHR, *B.*  
75 *pumilus* IIHR Bp-2 cultures were obtained from ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural  
76 Research, Bengaluru whereas *Pseudomonas fluorescence* (standard check) was obtained from  
77 Pathogenomics Laboratory, Department of Plant Pathology, University of Agricultural  
78 Sciences, GKVK, Bengaluru.

79

### 80 Collection of Tomato Seeds

81 Tomato seeds of nematode susceptible variety, PKM-1 were collected from IIHR, Bengaluru  
82 and tomato seeds of nematode resistant variety, Hisar Lalit (NRT 8) were collected from  
83 Chaudhary Charan Singh Agricultural University, Hisar, Haryana. Tomato plants were raised  
84 in portrays and transplanted into pots (2 kg) filled with sterilized soil after 21 days.

85

### 86 Preparation of Bacterial and Nematode Suspension

87 The bacterial suspensions of respective bio-agents were prepared by growing a bacteria in 250  
88 mL nutrient broth and incubating for 24 hours. The turbid broth was centrifuged at 5000 rpm  
89 for 5 min and cells were resuspended with phosphate buffer (pH=7). The concentration was  
90 maintained at the rate of  $2.5 \times 10^7$  CFU/mL and the bacterial suspension was inoculated through  
91 the seedling dip method to 25-day-old seedlings before translation for 3 hours. Here,  
92 *Pseudomonas fluorescens* was used as a standard check.

93 Nematode inoculum was obtained from infected tomato roots. We extracted the nematode by  
94 following Combined Cobb’s sieving and Baermann’s funnel technique (Ayoub, 1977). 50 mL  
95 of nematode suspension was prepared at the rate of 20 juveniles per mL of water. After a week  
96 of transplanting, the nematode suspension of 50 mL per plant with 1000 juveniles was  
97 inoculated by making 4-5 holes around the seedling.

98 Nematicide-treated (carbofuran @ 1g/kg pot) plants were considered as a positive control.  
99 Complete random design (CRD) was maintained in a glass house (temperature: 20°C) with  
100 three replications of seven treatments. The experiment was conducted twice.

101

### 102 **Studies on Physiological Alterations in Tomato**

103 The efficacy of *Bacillus* spp. on the incidence and establishment of root-knot nematode in  
104 tomatoes was studied through various parameters of plant growth and nematode infection under  
105 pot experiments. After 45 days of inoculation, observations viz., shoot growth (cm), root  
106 growth (g) and root-knot index (1-5 scale), nematode population in roots and soil were taken  
107 (Narasimhamurthy *et al.*, 2017).

### 108 **Status of Defense-related Biochemicals in Tomato**

109 The biochemical levels in tomato-treated and untreated plants were assessed. One gram of  
110 fresh root was collected from susceptible and resistant plants after 28 days of nematode  
111 inoculation from each treatment for biochemical analysis. Fresh roots were washed gently in  
112 running tap water and homogenized in 1 mL of 0.1 M phosphate buffer (pH 7.0) at 4 °C in a  
113 pre-chilled pestle and mortar. The homogenate was centrifuged at 20,000 rpm at 4 °C for 15  
114 min and the supernatant served as an enzyme source for further analysis (Anita *et al.*, 2004).

115 Here tomato plants were tested for biochemical levels of several defense-related enzymes  
116 like peroxidase (PO), polyphenol oxidase (PPO), phenylalanine ammonia-lyase (PAL),  
117 catalase (CAT) and total phenols using spectrophotometer by following standard procedures  
118 (Prabhu *et al.*, 2019).

119

### 120 **Estimation of peroxidase (PO) activity**

121 Peroxidase activity was assayed spectrophotometrically (Chander, 1990). The reaction  
122 mixture consisted of 2.5 mL of 0.05 M potassium phosphate buffer, 0.2 mL of o- phenyl diamine  
123 (OPD), 0.2 mL of 0.3 per cent H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and 0.03 mL of enzyme extract. The reaction mixture was  
124 incubated at room temperature (28±1°C). The change in absorbance was recorded at 60 sec  
125 intervals for 5 min. The enzyme preparation without H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> served as blank. The enzyme activity  
126 was expressed as change in the absorbance at 450 nm min<sup>-1</sup> g<sup>-1</sup> on fresh weight basis.

127

### 128 **Estimation of polyphenol oxidase (PPO)**

129 PPO activity was determined as per the procedure given by Selvaraj and Kumar (1995). The  
130 reaction mixture consisted of 2.9 mL of 0.05 M potassium phosphate buffer (pH 6.8), 0.1 mL  
131 of 1.25 per cent pyrogallol and enzyme extract of 0.5 mL. The increase in absorbance was

132 measured at 450 nm up to 5 min for 1 min interval. Polyphenol oxidase activity was expressed  
133 as absorbance/min/gm FW.

134

#### 135 **Estimation of phenylalanine ammonia lyase (PAL)**

136 The PAL assay was conducted as per the method described by Whetten and Senderoff (1992).  
137 0.4 mL of enzyme extract was incubated with 0.5 mL of 0.1 M borate buffer (pH 8.8) and 0.5  
138 mL of 12 mM L-phenylalanine in the same buffer for 30 min at 30 °C. The reaction was arrested  
139 by adding 0.5 mL of 1 M TCA and incubated at 37 °C for 5 min. The blank was prepared, that  
140 contains 0.4 mL of crude enzyme extract and 2.7 mL of 0.1 M borate buffer (pH 8.8) and  
141 absorbance was measured at 290 nm in spectrophotometer. Standard curve was drawn with  
142 graded amounts of cinnamic acid dissolved in acetone. The enzyme activity was expressed as  
143  $\mu\text{M}$  of trans-cinnamic acid  $\text{min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$  fresh weight.

144

#### 145 **Estimation of Catalase**

146 The catalase activity was estimated as per the procedure given by Masia (1998). The reaction  
147 mixture contains 2.6 mL of 0.067 M sodium phosphate buffer (pH 7.0), 0.3 mL of 3 per cent  
148  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  and 0.1 mL of enzyme extract. The decrease in absorbance was measured at 240 nm up  
149 to 5 min for 1 min time interval. Catalase activity was expressed as  $\mu\text{g H}_2\text{O}_2/\text{gm FW}$ .

150

#### 151 **Estimation of Total phenol (Singleton and Rossi, 1965)**

152 Total phenol content was estimated by spectrophotometric method using Folin Ciocalteu  
153 Reagent (FCR) at an absorbance of 700 nm by following procedure. Five grams of sample was  
154 homogenized with 20 mL of methanol (80%) in a pestle and mortar 2-3 times and volume was  
155 made to 50 mL. 0.5 mL of the extract was taken in test tubes, 0.2 mL of Folin-Ciocalteu's  
156 Phenol Reagent was added followed by 3.3 mL of distilled water and mixed well. After 2 min,  
157 1 mL of sodium carbonate solution was added and mixed. Allowed to stand at room temperature  
158 for 30 min and blue colour was read in a spectrophotometer at 700 nm. Standard curve for  
159 phenols was prepared using gallic acid (GA) as standard. The content of the total soluble phenol  
160 was calculated according to a standard curve obtained from a Folin Ciocalteu reagent with a  
161 phenol solution ( $\text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{OH}$ ) and expressed as mg gallic acid equivalent/100 g fresh weight.

162

#### 163 **Data Analysis**

164 The data so generated were analyzed using WASP – Web Agri Stat Software Package 2.0  
165 developed by ICAR. Completely Randomized Design (CRD) was used in the present study.

166 The difference between treatment means was compared with the critical difference values to  
167 know a significant difference.

168

## 169 RESULTS

### 170 Physiological Transfiguration Incited by *Bacillus* spp. in Tomato

171 *Bacillus* spp. had shown its potential to embellish the shoot and root growth in relevance with  
172 control treated with only nematode (Table 1). The effectuation of *Bacillus pumilus* was premier  
173 among different *Bacillus* spp. and a standard check, *Pseudomonas fluorescense*.

174

### 175 Effects on tomato growth

176 In the case of susceptible variety, despite the fact that carbofuran-treated plants showed  
177 overhead expression of shoot growth, *Bacillus pumilus*-treated plants showed the highest  
178 shoot length (57.27 cm) and shoot weight (Fresh weight: 179.18 g and Dry weight: 81.72 g)  
179 among different bioagents followed by *B. megaterium* (shoot length: 55.34 cm; Fresh weight:  
180 175.90g and Dry weight: 77.67g). Conversely, in the case of resistant variety, regardless of  
181 the bioagents, the nematode-challenged plants exhibited the highest shoot growth which was  
182 comparable with healthy plants but then carbofuran-treated plants showed the least shoot  
183 growth.

184 A similar trend was noticed with respect to root growth as that of shoot growth in both root-  
185 knot nematode susceptible and resistant tomato varieties, respectively. In the case of susceptible  
186 variety, the root growth of the bacterial bio-agents treated-*Meloidogyne incognita*-infested  
187 plants showed higher values than only nematode-challenged plants, among which *B. pumilus*  
188 showed maximal root length (30.73 cm) and root weight (Fresh weight: 7.67 g and Dry weight:  
189 4.89 g). Even when the healthy resistant variety showed the topmost expression of root growth  
190 witnessing the fact that the bioagent treatment was non-significant.

191

### 192 Effects on nematode infestation

193 The root-knot index was calculated by considering the number of galls produced per root  
194 system (Table 2). Except for the fact that the resistant variety showed highly resistant to  
195 resistant reactions with a root-knot index of 1-2, the bioagents-treated plants revealed a lesser  
196 number of galls (23.33-28.33) in susceptible variety and a root-knot index of 3 imposing a  
197 moderately resistant reaction. Of these, *B. pumilus* eliminated at most the production of galls  
198 on the roots (Fig. 1a & 1b). Further number egg masses per root system (Table 2) and nematode  
199 population was evaluated both in soil and roots. The nematode population was significantly



200 reduced in the *Bacillus* spp. treated plants compared to control showing the significance of  
201 biocontrol treatment (Table 3).

202

### 203 **Biochemical levels after *Bacillus* spp. treatment in Tomato**

204 In this study, biochemicals like peroxidase (PO), polyphenol oxidase (PPO), catalase (CAT),  
205 phenylalanine ammonia-lyase (PAL) and total phenols were analyzed in both susceptible and  
206 resistant varieties. The inoculation of bio-agents to *M. incognita* infested plants showed  
207 increased activity of all tested enzymes (peroxidase, polyphenol oxidase, phenylalanine lyase,  
208 catalase and total phenols) over control in both susceptible and resistant varieties (Fig. 2a &  
209 2b). Among bioagents, *B. pumilus* showed the topmost expression of all the enzymes. However,  
210 the resistant variety showed higher enzymatic activity than the susceptible variety except for  
211 the catalase enzyme.

212

### 213 **Studies on peroxidase (PO) activity**

214 The activity of peroxidase was assayed spectrophotometrically at 450 nm as per procedure  
215 given by Chander (1990). The increased activity of peroxidase was recorded in *Meloidogyne*  
216 *incognita* inoculated samples of susceptible variety along with resistant tomato variety (0.487  
217 and 1.461  $\text{abs min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$ , respectively) compared to respective healthy plants (0.187 and 0.561  
218  $\text{abs min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$ ), but enzymatic activity was higher in resistant variety (Fig. 2aA).

219 The bacterial bio-agents treated-*Meloidogyne incognita* infested plants showed the highest  
220 enzymatic activity (susceptible: 0.697-0.793 and resistant: 2.537-2.056  $\text{abs min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$ ) compared  
221 to all other treatments in susceptible as well as in resistant varieties. Among them, *Bacillus*  
222 *pumilus* treated plants (susceptible: 0.793 and resistant: 2.537  $\text{abs min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$ ) showed  
223 significantly supreme activity of peroxidase, followed by *Pseudomonas fluorescens*  
224 (susceptible: 0.733 and resistant: 2.482  $\text{abs min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$ ) and *B. subtilis* (susceptible: 0.730 and  
225 resistant: 2.125  $\text{abs min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$ ).

226

### 227 **Studies on polyphenol oxidase estimation (PPO) activity**

228 The polyphenol oxidase activity was assayed spectrophotometrically at 450 nm by following  
229 the procedure given by Selvaraj and Kumar (1995). The activity of polyphenol oxidase was  
230 increased upon bacterial bio-agents treatment to *Meloidogyne incognita* inoculated susceptible  
231 and resistant tomato varieties (0.076 to 0.094 and 0.171 to 0.216  $\text{abs min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$ , respectively)  
232 compared to respective *M. incognita* infested plants (0.060 and 0.108  $\text{abs min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$ ) however,  
233 enzymatic activity was higher in resistant variety compared to susceptible variety (Fig. 2aB).

234 Among bacterial bio-agents treated-*Meloidogyne incognita* infested plants, *Bacillus pumilus*  
235 treated plants showed highest activity (susceptible: 0.094 and resistant: 0.216 changes in  
236 absorbance  $\text{min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$ ) and it was on par with *Pseudomonas fluorescens* (susceptible: 0.090 and  
237 resistant: 0.207 changes in absorbance  $\text{min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$ ).

238

#### 239 **Studies on phenylalanine ammonia lyase (PAL) activity**

240 The polyphenol oxidase activity was assayed according to the procedure given by Ross and  
241 Senderoff (1992) spectrophotometrically at 290 nm. There was an increased enzymatic activity  
242 in *Meloidogyne incognita* infested plants (susceptible: 0.337 and resistant: 0.741  $\mu\text{M}$  trans-  
243 cinnamic acid  $\text{min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$ ) compared to healthy plants (0.147 and 0.323  $\mu\text{M}$  trans-cinnamic acid  
244  $\text{min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$ , respectively). However, the activity was significantly higher in bacterized-*M.*  
245 *incognita* infested plants.

246 The susceptible plants treated with *Bacillus pumilus* along with *Meloidogyne incognita*  
247 (0.510  $\mu\text{M}$  trans-cinnamic acid  $\text{min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$ ) showed higher activity of phenylalanine ammonia  
248 lyase, followed by *Pseudomonas fluorescens* treated- *M. incognita* infested susceptible plants  
249 (0.503  $\mu\text{M}$  trans-cinnamic acid  $\text{min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$ ). Resistance plants followed a similar course (*B.*  
250 *pumilus*: 1.275 and *P. fluorescens*: 1.156  $\mu\text{M}$  trans-cinnamic acid  $\text{min}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1}$ ), but they were on  
251 par with each other (Fig. 2aC).

252

#### 253 **Studies on catalase (CAT) activity**

254 The activity of catalase was assayed spectrophotometrically at 240 nm by following the  
255 procedure given by Masia (1998). The increased activity of catalase was recorded in  
256 *Meloidogyne incognita* inoculated samples of susceptible and resistant tomato varieties (32.01  
257 and 21.340  $\mu\text{g H}_2\text{O}_2 \text{g}^{-1}$ , respectively) compared to respective healthy plants (24.964 and 16.643  
258  $\mu\text{g H}_2\text{O}_2 \text{g}^{-1}$ ), but enzymatic activity was higher in susceptible variety (Fig. 2bA). The activity  
259 of catalase got significantly decreased in bacterized nematode challenged tomato varieties  
260 (susceptible: 15.251- 18.614 and resistant: 9.500-11.740  $\mu\text{g H}_2\text{O}_2 \text{g}^{-1}$ ).

261 Among bacterial bio-agents, *Bacillus pumilus* treated plants showed least catalase activity  
262 (susceptible: 15.251 and resistant: 9.500  $\mu\text{g H}_2\text{O}_2 \text{g}^{-1}$ ), followed by *Pseudomonas fluorescens*  
263 (susceptible: 16.754 and resistant: 10.503  $\mu\text{g H}_2\text{O}_2 \text{g}^{-1}$ ) and both were on par and no significant  
264 difference was found.

265

266

267

268



269 **Studies on total phenols**

270 Total phenols were estimated by spectrophotometric method using Folin Ciocalteu Reagent  
271 (FCR) at an absorbance of 700 nm. Higher accumulation of phenol was observed in bacterial-  
272 bio-agents treated plants than untreated plants. In general, the inoculation of *Meloidogyne*  
273 *incognita* and bacterial-bio-agents simultaneously recorded significantly higher phenol  
274 (susceptible: 65.987-68.593 and resistant: 79.184-82.311 mg gallic acid equivalent/100g fresh  
275 weight) content than control with *M. incognita* inoculation (susceptible: 48.747 and resistant:  
276 58.496 mg gallic acid equivalent/100g fresh weight).

277 Among the bacterial bio-agents treated-*Meloidogyne incognita* infested tomato plants, the  
278 plants treated with *Bacillus pumilus* showed the highest phenol content (susceptible: 68.593  
279 and resistant: 82.311 mg gallic acid equivalent/100g fresh weight) and it was on par with  
280 *Pseudomonas fluorescens* (susceptible: 67.413 and resistant: 80.895 mg gallic acid  
281 equivalent/100g fresh weight) (Fig. 2bB).

282

283 **DISCUSSION**

284 The influence of different *Bacillus* spp. on the physiology and biochemical status of  
285 *Meloidogyne incognita*-infested tomato plants was investigated. The significant increment in  
286 the shoot and root growth of tomato plants proves that the biocontrol agents do act as plant  
287 growth-promoting agents. From the above observations, it is evident that bacterial bio-agents  
288 have a positive effect on root and shoot growth. This may be attributed to one or more of the  
289 following factors; production of phosphatases by *Bacillus* spp. facilitates the conversion of  
290 insoluble phosphorus to available one for the use of plants (Abdelmoteleb and Gonzalez-  
291 Mendoza, 2020), production of growth-promoting phytohormones *viz.*, indole acetic acid  
292 (IAA), gibberellic acid (GA), cytokine (Calvo *et al.*, 2010), improvement of water and nutrients  
293 uptake, production of antibiotic metabolites effective against soil-borne pathogens and  
294 production of B-group vitamins that promote rooting capacity and affect the population of the  
295 microbial community (Wu *et al.*, 2005; Rai, 2006).

296 Furthermore, the reduced galling in bacterial bio-agents treated plants might be owing to the  
297 ability of the bio-agents to modify root exudates, thus hindering the feeding site recognition by  
298 the nematodes in the soil (Siddiqui and Mahmood, 1999; Zhou *et al.*, 2019). Thus, affected the  
299 gall formation. In addition, the bacterial bioagents produce nematicidal acids that decrease the  
300 nematode population in the soil and reduce the level of infection and hence the galling of roots  
301 (Iatsenko *et al.*, 2014; Lee and Kim, 2016).

302 However, when nematode-susceptible and resistant varieties are compared, the average  
303 number of galls formed per root system and root-knot index were less in the case of the resistant  
304 variety. These results were adjacent to the results obtained by Kumari *et al.* (2016), who made  
305 a comparative study on *M. graminicola* susceptible (Pusa 1121) and resistant (Vandana)  
306 cultivars of rice. It was found that after 15 dpi, all the growth parameters of nematode were  
307 recorded low in the resistant variety and were significantly different from the susceptible  
308 variety. However, while comparing the response of susceptible versus resistant varieties upon  
309 infection with *M. incognita*, many contradictions arose may be due to nematode effects  
310 (nematode biology varies with resistant and susceptible hosts), systemic hormone signaling  
311 effects or tissue-specific differential expression of selected genes (Cabasan *et al.*, 2012).

312 The bio-agent activity was clearly noticed in susceptible plants infested with *M. incognita*.  
313 The genetic background of the resistant variety (Hisar Lalit) contains *Mi 1.2* gene which shows  
314 resistance to *M. incognita* (Reddy *et al.*, 2016) and this might be the reason for variations  
315 observed in nematode infection in the resistant genotypes and it might attract nematodes  
316 meagerly less than susceptible ones (Peacock, 1959). Because of the ability of a resistant variety  
317 to overcome nematode infection on its own, the treatments were established to be non-  
318 significant in many of the nematode growth parameters.

319 Studies on biochemical levels suggest that defense-related enzymes (peroxidase,  
320 phenylalanine ammonia-lyase, polyphenol oxidase and catalase) and biomolecules (phenols)  
321 get enhanced when the plants were subjected to biotic stress and abiotic stress. The above  
322 observations on **biochemical studies** revealed that there was a significant accumulation of all  
323 tested enzymes in bacterized tomato plants (susceptible and resistant) challenged with  
324 *Meloidogyne incognita*. Among different *Bacillus* spp., *B. pumilus* treated-*M. incognita* infested  
325 plants showed supreme activity of biochemicals, followed by *B. subtilis* in susceptible as well  
326 as in resistant varieties compared to *Pseudomonas fluorescence* (standard check).

327 When compared to susceptible and resistant varieties, the activities of enzymes were superior  
328 in the resistant variety (except catalase) probably due to avoidance of nematode invasion (Rao  
329 *et al.*, 2017) which was because of its early and enhanced accumulation of enzymes in response  
330 to invading pathogens. Enhanced levels of defense enzymes and phenolic content in plants  
331 treated with bio-agents may contributed to resistance development, safeguarding the plants  
332 without causing harm.

333 The present investigation revealed the potentiality of *Bacillus* as a bio-agent that could reduce  
334 gall formation, root-knot index and nematode population, thus improving the shoot and root

335 growth under pot experiments. *Bacillus* spp. could be included in integrated disease  
336 management strategies to reduce the damage caused by *M. incognita* in tomatoes. These  
337 findings revealed that *B. pumilus* was the most potential *Bacillus* bio-agent in reducing *M.*  
338 *incognita* infection by embellishing the plant growth and strengthening the plants by enhancing  
339 defense-related enzymes, followed by *B. subtilis* and *B. megaterium*.

340

#### 341 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

342 The authors are thankful to the ICAR-Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Bengaluru  
343 for assisting to carry out the research. They also acknowledge the support from the Head,  
344 AICRP (Nematodes), Department of Plant Pathology, University of Agricultural Sciences,  
345 GKVK, Bengaluru for the necessary facilities to carry out this work smoothly.

346

#### 347 REFERENCES

- 348 1. Abdelmoteleb, A. and Gonzalez-Mendoza, D. 2020. Isolation and identification of  
349 phosphate solubilizing *Bacillus* spp. from *Tamarix ramosissima* rhizosphere and their effect on  
350 growth of *Phaseolus vulgaris* under salinity stress. *Geomicrobiol. J.*, **37(10)**: 901-908.
- 351 2. Anita, B., Rajendran, G. and Samiyappan, R. 2004. Induction of systemic resistance in  
352 tomato against root-knot nematode, *Meloidogyne incognita* by *Pseudomonas*  
353 *fluorescens*. *Nematol. Mediterr.*, **32**: 47-51.
- 354 3. Ayoub, S. M., 1977. Plant nematology-an agricultural training aid. State and California,  
355 Dept. Food and Agric. Sacramento (USA), Sacramento, 156pp.
- 356 4. Back, M. A., Haydock, P. P. J. and Jenkinson, P. 2002. Disease complexes involving  
357 plant parasitic nematodes and soilborne pathogens. *Plant Pathol.*, **51(6)**: 683-697.
- 358 5. Cabasan, M. T. N., Kumar, A. and De-Waele, D. 2012. Comparison of migration,  
359 penetration, development and reproduction of *Meloidogyne graminicola* on susceptible and  
360 resistant rice genotypes. *Nematology*, **14(4)**: 405-415.
- 361 6. Calvo, P., Ormeno-Orrillo, E., Martinez-Romero, E. and Zuniga, D. 2010.  
362 Characterization of *Bacillus* isolates of potato rhizosphere from andean soils of Peru and their  
363 potential PGPR characteristics. *Braz. J. Microbiol.*, **41**: 899-906.
- 364 7. Chander, M. S. 1990. Enzymic associations with resistance to rust and powdery mildew  
365 in peas. *Indian J. Hortic.*, **47(3)**: 341-345
- 366 8. Chitwood, B. G. 1949. 'Root-knot nematodes'. Part 1. A revision of the genus  
367 *Meloidogyne* Goeldi, 1887. *Proc. Helminthol. Soc. Wash.*, **16(2)**: 90-114.

- 368 9. Collange, B., Navarrete, M., Peyre, G., Mateille, T. and Tchamitchian, M. 2011. Root-  
369 knot nematode (*Meloidogyne*) management in vegetable crop production: the challenge of an  
370 agronomic system analysis. *Crop. Prot.*, **30(10)**: 1251-1262.
- 371 10. Elling, A. A. 2013. Major emerging problems with minor *Meloidogyne*  
372 species. *Phytopathol.*, **103(11)**: 1092-1102.
- 373 11. Hallmann, J., Davies, K. G. and Sikora, R. 2009. Biological control using microbial  
374 pathogens, endophytes and antagonists. In: Root-knot nematodes. Wallingford UK: CABI, pp  
375 380-411.
- 376 12. Hou, S., Liu, Z., hen, H. and Wu, D., 2019. Damage-associated molecular pattern-  
377 triggered immunity in plants. *Front. Plant Sci.*, **10**: 646.
- 378 13. Iatsenko, I., Boichenko, I. and Sommer, R. J. 2014. *Bacillus thuringiensis* DB27  
379 produces two novel protoxins, Cry21Fa1 and Cry21Ha1, which act synergistically against  
380 nematodes. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, **80(10)**: 3266-3275.
- 381 14. Koenning, S. R., Overstreet, C., Noling, J. W., Donald, P. A., Becker, J. O. and Fortnum,  
382 B. A. 1999. Survey of crop losses in response to phytoparasitic nematodes in the United States  
383 for 1994. *J. Nematol.*, **31(4S)**: 587.
- 384 15. Kumari, C., Dutta, T. K., Banakar, P. and Rao, U. 2016. Comparing the defense-related  
385 gene expression changes upon root-knot nematode attack in susceptible versus resistant  
386 cultivars of rice. *Sci. Rep.*, **6(1)**: 1-13.
- 387 16. Lee, Y. S. and Kim, K. Y. 2016. Antagonistic potential of *Bacillus pumilus* L1 against  
388 root- knot nematode, *Meloidogyne arenaria*. *J. Phytopathol.*, **164(1)**: 29-39.
- 389 17. Masia, A., 1998. Superoxide dismutase and catalase activities in apple fruit during  
390 ripening and post- harvest and with special reference to ethylene. *Physiol. Plant.*, **104(4)**: 668-  
391 672.
- 392 18. Narasimhamurthy, H. B., Ravindra, H. and Mukesh Sehgal, R. N., 2017. GIS/GPS based  
393 survey on incidence and distribution of rice root-knot nematode (*Meloidogyne graminicola*) in  
394 Southern transition zone of Karnataka. *J. Entomol. Zool. Stud.*, **5(2)**: 410-413.
- 395 19. Ogwulumba, S. I., Ugwuoke, K. I. and Ogbuji, R. O. 2011. Reaction of tomato cv. roma  
396 vf (*Solanum lycopersicum*) to *Meloidogyne javanica* treub infestation in an ultisol treated with  
397 aqueous leaf extracts of bitter leaf (*Vernonia Amygdalina* L.) and mango (*Mangifera Indica*  
398 L.). *J. Plant Prot. Res.*, **51(1)**: 1-4.

- 399 20. Peacock, F. C. 1959. The development of a technique for studying the host/parasite  
400 relationship of the root-knot nematode *Meloidogyne incognita* under controlled  
401 conditions. *Nematologica*, **4(1)**: 43-55.
- 402 21. Poveda, J., Abril-Urias, P. and Escobar, C., 2020. Biological control of plant-parasitic  
403 nematodes by filamentous fungi inducers of resistance: Trichoderma, mycorrhizal and  
404 endophytic fungi. *Front. Microbiol.*, **11**:530260.
- 405 22. Prabu, P., Umamaheswari, R. and Rao, M. S. 2019. Deciphering the biocontrol  
406 mechanism of *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* IIHR BA2: detection of nematicidal, fungicidal and  
407 bactericidal lipopeptides. *Asian J. Microbiol. Biotechnol. Environ. Sci.*, **21(3)**: 731-739.
- 408 23. Radwan, M. A., Farrag, S. A. A., Abu-Elamayem, M. M. and Ahmed, N. S. 2012.  
409 Biological control of the root-knot nematode, *Meloidogyne incognita* on tomato using  
410 bioproducts of microbial origin. *Appl. Soil Ecol.*, **56**: 58-62.
- 411 24. Ramirez-Prado, J. S., Abulfaraj, A. A., Rayapuram, N., Benhamed, M. and Hirt, H.,  
412 2018. Plant immunity: from signaling to epigenetic control of defense. *Trends Plant Sci.*, **23(9)**:  
413 833-844.
- 414 25. Rao, M. S., Umamaheswari, R., Prabu, P., Kamalnath, M., Grace, G. N. and Chaya, M.  
415 K. 2017. Induction of systemic resistance in bell pepper (*Capsicum annum* L.) mediated through  
416 *Bacillus subtilis* IIHR BS-2 against root-knot nematode, *Meloidogyne incognita*. *Pest Manage.*  
417 *Horti. Ecosyst.*, **23(1)**: 64-71.
- 418 26. Reddy, Y. S., Sellaperumal, C., Prasanna, H. C., Yadav, A., Kashyap, S. P., Singh, S.,  
419 Rai, N., Singh, M. and Singh, B. 2018. Screening of tomato genotypes against root-knot  
420 nematode and validation of *Mi 1* gene-linked markers. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. India Sect. B Biol.*  
421 *Sci.*, **88**: 65-72.
- 422 27. Selvaraj, Y. and Kumar, R. 1995. Enzymatic regulation in ripening mango fruit. *Indian*  
423 *J. Hortic.*, **51(4)**: 316-323.
- 424 28. Siddiqui, Z. A. and Mahmood, I. 1999. Role of bacteria in the management of plant  
425 parasitic nematodes: a review. *Bioresou. Technol.*, **69(2)**: 167-179.
- 426 29. Singleton, V. L. and Rossi, J. A. 1965. Colorimetry of total phenolics with  
427 phosphomolybdic-phosphotungstic acid reagents. *Am. J. Enol. Vitic.*, **16(3)**: 144-158.
- 428 30. Whetten, R.W. and Sederoff, R. R. 1992. Phenylalanine ammonia-lyase from loblolly  
429 pine: purification of the enzyme and isolation of complementary DNA clones. *Plant*  
430 *Physiol.*, **98(1)**: 380-386.

431 31. Wu, S. C., Cao, Z. H., Li, Z. G., Cheung, K. C. and Wong, M. H. 2005. Effects of  
432 biofertilizer containing N-fixer, P and K solubilizers and AM fungi on maize growth: a  
433 greenhouse trial. *Geoderma*, **125(1-2)**: 155-166.

434 32. Zhou, D., Feng, H., Schuelke, T., De-Santiago, A., Zhang, Q., Zhang, J., Luo, C. and  
435 Wei, L. 2019. Rhizosphere microbiomes from root-knot nematode non-infested plants suppress  
436 nematode infection. *Microb. Ecol.*, **78**: 470-481.

437

438



439

Table 1. Physiological alterations incited by Bacillus spp. in *M. incognita*-infested tomato plants.

Treatments	Susceptible variety			Resistant variety			Susceptible variety			Resistant variety		
	Shoot length (cm)	Shoot weight (g)		Shoot length (cm)	Shoot weight (g)		Root length (cm)	Root weight (g)		Root length (cm)	Root weight (g)	
		Fresh	Dry		Fresh	Dry		Fresh	Dry		Fresh	Dry
<i>M. incognita</i> + Carbofuran	60.75 (±0.08) <sup>b</sup>	185.25 (±0.69) <sup>b</sup>	86.28 (±0.29) <sup>b</sup>	59.71 (±0.35) <sup>e</sup>	163.24 (±0.28) <sup>f</sup>	71.86 (±0.37) <sup>e</sup>	33.82 (±0.36) <sup>b</sup>	8.90 (±0.22) <sup>b</sup>	5.08 (±0.08) <sup>ab</sup>	33.68 (±0.28) <sup>e</sup>	9.03 (±0.27) <sup>e</sup>	4.56 (±0.14) <sup>d</sup>
<i>M. incognita</i> + <i>B. pumilus</i>	57.27 (±0.51) <sup>c</sup>	179.18 (±0.33) <sup>c</sup>	81.72 (±0.33) <sup>c</sup>	67.65 (±0.43) <sup>bc</sup>	208.09 (±0.34) <sup>b</sup>	97.54 (±0.28) <sup>ab</sup>	30.73 (±0.24) <sup>c</sup>	7.67 (±0.27) <sup>c</sup>	4.89 (±0.20) <sup>ab</sup>	39.30 (±0.41) <sup>b</sup>	11.74 (±0.20) <sup>b</sup>	5.89 (±0.12) <sup>abc</sup>
<i>M. incognita</i> + <i>B. megaterium</i>	55.34 (±0.29) <sup>d</sup>	175.90 (±1.36) <sup>d</sup>	77.67 (±2.68) <sup>d</sup>	67.38 (±0.33) <sup>cd</sup>	206.78 (±0.31) <sup>c</sup>	96.37 (±0.65) <sup>b</sup>	29.30 (±0.33) <sup>d</sup>	7.29 (±0.22) <sup>cd</sup>	4.53 (±0.25) <sup>b</sup>	37.86 (±0.2) <sup>c</sup>	11.28 (±0.35) <sup>bc</sup>	5.51 (±0.33) <sup>bc</sup>
<i>M. incognita</i> + <i>B. subtilis</i>	53.63 (±0.69) <sup>e</sup>	171.01 (±0.89) <sup>f</sup>	70.89 (±0.28) <sup>e</sup>	66.54 (±0.3) <sup>d</sup>	203.19 (±0.30) <sup>e</sup>	92.63 (±0.53) <sup>d</sup>	27.39 (±0.38) <sup>e</sup>	6.30 (±0.24) <sup>ef</sup>	4.29 (±0.53) <sup>b</sup>	36.51 (±0.72) <sup>d</sup>	10.34 (±0.18) <sup>d</sup>	5.11 (±0.08) <sup>cd</sup>
<i>M. incognita</i> + <i>P. flourescens</i>	54.08 (±0.37) <sup>de</sup>	173.30 (±9.74) <sup>e</sup>	71.09 (±5.16) <sup>e</sup>	66.87 (±0.18) <sup>cd</sup>	204.51 (±0.31) <sup>d</sup>	94.34 (±0.70) <sup>c</sup>	27.82 (±0.37) <sup>e</sup>	6.81 (±0.26) <sup>de</sup>	4.53 (±0.32) <sup>b</sup>	36.03 (±0.19) <sup>d</sup>	10.93 (±0.32) <sup>cd</sup>	5.19 (±0.47) <sup>cd</sup>
<i>M. incognita</i> only	43.21 (±0.46) <sup>f</sup>	144.52 (±0.59) <sup>g</sup>	56.06 (±0.36) <sup>f</sup>	68.61 (±0.32) <sup>b</sup>	210.03 (±0.46) <sup>a</sup>	97.71 (±0.2) <sup>ab</sup>	21.57 (±0.61) <sup>f</sup>	5.75 (±0.02) <sup>f</sup>	3.36 (±0.16) <sup>c</sup>	40.04 (±0.22) <sup>ab</sup>	11.92 (±0.19) <sup>b</sup>	6.25 (±0.27) <sup>ab</sup>
Healthy control	66.48 (±0.33) <sup>a</sup>	200.70 (±0.52) <sup>a</sup>	93.75 (±0.33) <sup>a</sup>	69.84 (±0.22) <sup>a</sup>	210.34 (±0.59) <sup>a</sup>	98.70 (±0.32) <sup>a</sup>	37.36 (±0.32) <sup>a</sup>	10.50 (±0.31) <sup>a</sup>	5.50 (±0.27) <sup>a</sup>	40.96 (±0.199) <sup>a</sup>	12.83 (±0.14) <sup>a</sup>	6.47 (±0.29) <sup>a</sup>
<b>SEm ±</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.43</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.23</b>
<b>CD @ 1 %</b>	<b>1.81</b>	<b>2.02</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>1.39</b>	<b>1.62</b>	<b>2.03</b>	<b>1.65</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>1.59</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>1.16</b>

440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453

454

Table 2. Effect of *Bacillus* spp. on egg masses and number of galls.

Treatments	Susceptible variety				Resistant variety			
	No. of galls per root system	Root-knot Index	No. of egg masses per root system	Per cent reduction over control	No. of galls per root system	Root-knot index	No. of egg masses per root system	Per cent reduction over control
<i>M. incognita</i> + Carbofuran	14.00 ( $\pm 0.57$ ) <sup>e</sup>	3	20.67 <sup>e</sup>	78.16	1.67( $\pm 0.33$ ) <sup>ab</sup>	2	1	50
<i>M. incognita</i> + <i>B. pumilus</i>	23.33( $\pm 0.33$ ) <sup>d</sup>	3	24.33 <sup>d</sup>	74.30	1( $\pm 0.57$ ) <sup>b</sup>	1	1	50
<i>M. incognita</i> + <i>B. megaterium</i>	25.33( $\pm 0.33$ ) <sup>c</sup>	3	27.33 <sup>c</sup>	71.13	1.33( $\pm 0.33$ ) <sup>ab</sup>	2	1.33	33.50
<i>M. incognita</i> + <i>B. subtilis</i>	28.33( $\pm 0.33$ ) <sup>b</sup>	3	31.33 <sup>b</sup>	66.90	1( $\pm 0$ ) <sup>b</sup>	1	0.67	66.50
<i>M. incognita</i> + <i>P. fluorescens</i>	27.33( $\pm 0.33$ ) <sup>b</sup>	3	30.00 <sup>b</sup>	68.31	1( $\pm 0$ ) <sup>b</sup>	1	0.67	66.50
<i>M. incognita</i> only	103.00( $\pm 0.57$ ) <sup>a</sup>	5	94.66 <sup>a</sup>	-	2( $\pm 0$ ) <sup>a</sup>	2	2	-
Healthy control	0.00( $\pm 0$ ) <sup>f</sup>	1	0.00 <sup>f</sup>	-	0.00( $\pm 0$ ) <sup>c</sup>	1	0	-
<b>SEm <math>\pm</math></b>	<b>0.47</b>		<b>0.66</b>		<b>0.23</b>		<b>NS</b>	
<b>CD @ 1 %</b>	<b>1.67</b>		<b>1.98</b>		<b>1.18</b>			

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

**Table 3.** Effect of bacterial bio-agents on final nematode population.

Treatments	Susceptible variety				Resistant variety			
	Soil (200 cc)	Per cent reduction over control	Root (5g)	Per cent reduction over control	Soil (200 cc)	Per cent reduction over control	Root (5g)	Per cent reduction over control
T <sub>1</sub> : <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> + carbofuran 3G (Positive control)	253.33 <sup>f</sup>	35.86	50.00 <sup>e</sup>	64.36	15.00 <sup>c</sup>	16.67	5.33 <sup>c</sup>	33.37
T <sub>2</sub> : <i>M. incognita</i> + <i>Bacillus pumilus</i>	268.33 <sup>e</sup>	32.06	54.33 <sup>d</sup>	61.28	15.67 <sup>a</sup>	12.94	6.67 <sup>ab</sup>	16.62
T <sub>3</sub> : <i>M. incognita</i> + <i>B. megaterium</i>	269.67 <sup>d</sup>	31.72	57.33 <sup>c</sup>	59.14	16.33 <sup>b</sup>	9.27	7.00 <sup>ab</sup>	12.50
T <sub>4</sub> : <i>M. incognita</i> + <i>B. subtilis</i>	273.33 <sup>b</sup>	30.80	61.33 <sup>b</sup>	56.29	17.67 <sup>bc</sup>	1.83	7.67 <sup>b</sup>	4.12
T <sub>5</sub> : <i>M. incognita</i> + <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i>	271.67 <sup>c</sup>	31.22	61.67 <sup>b</sup>	56.05	16.00 <sup>bc</sup>	11.11	7.33 <sup>ab</sup>	8.37
T <sub>6</sub> : Control with <i>M. incognita</i> inoculation	395 <sup>a</sup>	-	140.33 <sup>a</sup>	-	18.00 <sup>a</sup>	-	8.00 <sup>a</sup>	-
T <sub>7</sub> : Absolute control without <i>M. incognita</i> inoculation	0 <sup>g</sup>	-	0 <sup>f</sup>	-	0 <sup>d</sup>	-	0 <sup>d</sup>	-
<b>SEm ±</b>	<b>0.52</b>		<b>0.38</b>		<b>0.57</b>		<b>0.47</b>	
<b>CD @ 1 %</b>	<b>1.75</b>		<b>1.50</b>		<b>1.83</b>		<b>1.67</b>	

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476



*M. incognita* + *Bacillus pumilus*

Control (only *M. incognita*)

(a)

477  
478  
479  
480



*M. incognita* + *Bacillus pumilus*

Control (only *M. incognita*)

(b)

481  
482  
483  
484  
485

**Figure 1.** Effect of *Bacillus pumilus* galling of susceptible (a) and resistant (b) tomato plants infested with *Meloidogyne incognita*.

Treatments	PO (absorbance min <sup>-1</sup> g <sup>-1</sup> of fresh tissue)		PPO (absorbance min <sup>-1</sup> g <sup>-1</sup> of fresh tissue)		PAL (μM trans-cinnamic acid min <sup>-1</sup> g <sup>-1</sup> of fresh tissue)		CAT (μg H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> g <sup>-1</sup> )		Total phenols (mg gallic acid equivalent/100g fresh weight)	
	Susceptible	Resistant	Susceptible	Resistant	Susceptible	Resistant	Susceptible	Resistant	Susceptible	Resistant
T <sub>1</sub> : <i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> + carbofuran 3G (Positive control)	0.377 <sup>d</sup>	1.074 <sup>d</sup>	0.05 <sup>c</sup>	0.092 <sup>cd</sup>	0.28 <sup>e</sup>	0.507 <sup>f</sup>	26.149 <sup>b</sup>	17.433 <sup>b</sup>	43.403 <sup>c</sup>	52.083 <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>2</sub> : <i>M. incognita</i> + <i>Bacillus pumilus</i>	0.793 <sup>a</sup>	2.537 <sup>a</sup>	0.094 <sup>a</sup>	0.216 <sup>a</sup>	0.51 <sup>a</sup>	1.275 <sup>a</sup>	15.251 <sup>e</sup>	9.5 <sup>e</sup>	68.593 <sup>a</sup>	82.311 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>3</sub> : <i>M. incognita</i> + <i>B. megaterium</i>	0.697 <sup>b</sup>	2.056 <sup>b</sup>	0.076 <sup>ab</sup>	0.171 <sup>b</sup>	0.443 <sup>c</sup>	0.941 <sup>d</sup>	18.614 <sup>c</sup>	11.74 <sup>c</sup>	65.987 <sup>a</sup>	79.184 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>4</sub> : <i>M. incognita</i> + <i>B. subtilis</i>	0.73 <sup>b</sup>	2.125 <sup>b</sup>	0.084 <sup>a</sup>	0.181 <sup>b</sup>	0.473 <sup>b</sup>	1.045 <sup>c</sup>	17.825 <sup>cd</sup>	11.217 <sup>cd</sup>	66.71 <sup>a</sup>	80.052 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>5</sub> : <i>M. incognita</i> + <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i>	0.733 <sup>b</sup>	2.482 <sup>a</sup>	0.09 <sup>a</sup>	0.207 <sup>a</sup>	0.503 <sup>a</sup>	1.156 <sup>b</sup>	16.754 <sup>de</sup>	10.503 <sup>de</sup>	67.413 <sup>a</sup>	80.895 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>6</sub> : Control with <i>M. incognita</i> inoculation	0.487 <sup>c</sup>	1.461 <sup>c</sup>	0.06 <sup>bc</sup>	0.108 <sup>c</sup>	0.337 <sup>d</sup>	0.741 <sup>e</sup>	32.01 <sup>a</sup>	21.34 <sup>a</sup>	48.747 <sup>b</sup>	58.496 <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>7</sub> : Absolute control without <i>M. incognita</i> inoculation	0.187 <sup>e</sup>	0.561 <sup>e</sup>	0.048 <sup>c</sup>	0.083 <sup>d</sup>	0.147 <sup>f</sup>	0.323 <sup>g</sup>	24.964 <sup>b</sup>	16.643 <sup>b</sup>	29.637 <sup>d</sup>	35.564 <sup>d</sup>

486 **Table 4:** Biochemical levels in bacterial bio-agents treated *Meloidogyne incognita*-infested tomato plants.

487

488

489

490


491

492

493

494

495



496

497

498


499

500


501

**Figure 2a. Status of biochemicals** incited by bacterial bio-agents on *Meloidogyne incognita*-infested tomato plants (A) peroxidase (PO) activity, (B) polyphenol oxidase (PPO) activity and (C) phenylalanine ammonia-lyase (PAL) activity. **Note:** T<sub>1</sub> = *M. incognita* + carbofuran 3G, T<sub>2</sub> = *M. incognita* + *B. pumilus*, T<sub>3</sub> = *M. incognita* + *B. megaterium*, T<sub>4</sub> = *M. incognita* + *B. subtilis*, T<sub>5</sub> = *M. incognita* + *P. fluorescens*, T<sub>6</sub> = *M. incognita* only and T<sub>7</sub> = Healthy control.





502



503

504 **Figure 2b.** Status of biochemicals incited by bacterial bio-agents on *Meloidogyne incognita*-infested tomato  
 505 plants (A) catalase (CAT) activity and (B) total phenols content. **Note:** T<sub>1</sub> = *M. incognita* + carbofuran 3G, T<sub>2</sub> =  
 506 *M. incognita* + *B. pumilus*, T<sub>3</sub> = *M. incognita* + *B. megaterium*, T<sub>4</sub> = *M. incognita* + *B. subtilis*, T<sub>5</sub> = *M. incognita*  
 507 + *P. fluorescens*, T<sub>6</sub> = *M. incognita* only and T<sub>7</sub> = Healthy control.

508

509

510