Influence of Biofertilizers on the Biomass Production of *Casuarina equisetifolia* in Farm Forestry

K. Rajendran*, V. Sugavanam and P. Devaraj Institute of Forest Genetics and Tree Breeding P. O. Box No. 1061, Coimbatore-641 002 Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract

Casuarina equisetifolia seedlings inoculated with different biofertilizers such as *Azospirillum*, Phosphobacterium, VAM fungi and *Frankia* and their combinations were planted in farmland. Growth parameters were collected at bimonthly intervals up to 30 months. Biomass was estimated 24 months after planting. Maximum height, girth at breast height (gbh) and total biomass were obtained in the combined application of *Azospirillum*, Phosphobacterium, VAM and *Frankia*. The combination of VAM + *Frankia* among double inoculation, and the combination of *Azospirillum*, VAM and *Frankia* in triple inoculation also proved to be the best treatment in promoting the significant total height, gbh and total biomass production.

সারসংক্ষেপ

বিভিন্ন জীব-সার, যথা Azospirillum, Phosphobacterium, VAM ছত্রাক ও Frankia এবং তাদের মিলিত যৌগ Casuarina equisetifolia চারাতে ইনোকুলেশন করা হয় এবং পরে চারাগুলো মাঠে লাগানো হয়। দু মাস পর পর ৩০ মাস পর্যন্ত ঐসব চারার বৃদ্ধি পরিমাপ করা হয়। চারা লাগানোর ২৪ মাস পর তাদের বায়োমাস নির্ণয় করা হয়। Azospirillum, Phosphobacterium, VAM ছত্রাক এবং Frankia -এর মিলিত যৌগ প্রয়োগকৃত চারাগুলোতে উচ্চতা, বুক উচ্চতায় বেড় এবং মোট বায়োমাস বেশি পাওয়া যায়। উল্লেখযোগ্য সর্বাধিক উচ্চতা, বুক উচ্চতায় বেড় এবং মোট বায়োমাস বেশি পাওয়া যায়। উল্লেখযোগ্য সর্বাধিক উচ্চতা, বুক উচ্চতায় বেড় এবং মোট বায়োমাস বেশি পাওয়া যায়। + Frankia -এর মিশ্রণের বৈত ইনোকুলেশন এবং Azospirillum, VAM এবং Frankia -এর তৈরী মিশ্রণের ত্রয়ী ইনোকুলেশন সবচেয়ে ভাল হিসেবে প্রমাণিত হয়েছে।

Key words : Biofertilizers, biomass production, Casuarina equisetifolia, farm forestry

Introduction

The huge demand-supply gap and rising prices of industrial wood are making farm forestry and agroforestry plantations viable and attractive alternative land use option. Farm forestry will play a very important role in meeting the country's future wood requirement (Lal 1993). With increased pressure on available land resource, maximum harvestable quality biomass production per unit area is the prime concern.

*Corresponding author: Lecturer in Botany, Thiagarajar College, Post Box No. 107, 139-140 Kamarajar Salai, Madurai-625 009, Tamil Nadu, India. Email: kuppurajendran@usa.net In the context of increasing importance of intensive silviculture and multiple land use approach, a large number of fast growing exotics are grown in India. Among them *Casuarina equisetifolia* is commonly used for wasteland development due to its ability to form symbiotic nitrogen fixing microorganism of *Frankia*. Fertilizers play an important role in increasing biomass production of plantations and forestry crops.

In modern days, intensive crop cultivation requires chemical fertilizers, but chemical fertilizer is not only in short supplies but also very expensive in developing countries like India. Alternatively, biofertilizers are ecofriendly and economically viable to increase the biomass production. VAM fungi help in protecting the plants from harmful pests, especially soil borne microorganisms (Myers 1993).

Evidences are available on the beneficial effect of biofertilizers in increasing the growth and biomas of Casuarina equisetifolia in laboratory and nursery conditions. The effect of Casuarina equisetifolia seedlings inoculated with Frankia (Reddell 1990), Azospirillum (Rodriguez-Barrueco et al. 1991) and VAM (Vasanthakrishna et al. 1995) have been well documented. The dual inoculation of Azospirillum and Frankia (Rajendran 1993) and VAM and Frankia (Ramirez et al. 1992) was also reported in the seedlings of C. equisetifolia. However, the effect of combined inoculation of Azospirillum, Phosphobacteria, VAM fungi and Frankia in field conditions needs to be studied. Hence, the present investigation was carried out to assess the compatibility of microorganisms and their influence on the growth and biomass production of C. equisetifolia in farm forestry.

Materials and methods

Biofertilizer inoculum

The VAM fungi, *Gloms fasciculatum*, was isolated and recorded as dominant species in the rhizosphere soil of four years old *C. equisetifolia* plantation at Pudukkottai, Tamil Nadu, India. It was multiplied in pot culture in the sterilised mixture of said : vermiculite (1 : 1 v/v) and maintained in the roots of *Sorghum vulgare* as the host plant. The inoculum contained extramatrical hyphae, chlamydospores and infected root segments. Inoculum potentials were determined by the most probable number (Porter 1979) and approximately 12,500 infective propagules. Ten grams of the VAM fungi was added in the root zones of each seedlings of respective treatments.

Peat based culture of *Azospirillum* and Phosphobacterium with a population load of 10⁻⁹ and 10⁻⁸ colony forming unit/gram of peat soil respectively were obtained from the Department of Agricultural Microbiology, Tamil Nadu AgriculturalUniversity, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.

Frankia nodules were collected from the plus tree of *C. equisetifolia.* Nodules were washed and surface sterilised with 30% hydrogen peroxide for 20 minutes followed by 70% alcohol for 1 minute and then rinsed three times in distilled water, ground with a pestle and mortar and diluted with 2% sucrose solution (Reddell *et al.* 1988).

Seeds

Seeds were collected from the plus tree of five years old *C. equisetifolia* located at Vaithikovil of Pudukkottai district, Tamil Nadu, India. Matured cones were collected and the seeds were separated, graded and only bigger seeds were used for raising seedlings.

Potting media, transplanting of seedling and application of biofertilizers

Seeds were germinated in sand medium. Healthy and uniform size (about 5 cm height) seedlings were transplanted to 13×26 cm size polythene bags with a potting mixture of unsterilised sand : red soil : farm yard manure (2 : 3 : 1). Ten days after transplanting, peat based culture of 10 grams of *Azospirillum*, Phosphobacterium, vermiculite based VAM fungi and 10 ml of *Frankia* nodule suspension were applied to polythene bag at 5 cm depth near the root zone by making holes. There were 16 treatment combinations :

T1 - Azospirillum

- T2 Phosphobacterium
- T3 Vesicular arbuscular mycorrhizae (VAM)
- T4 Frankia
- T5 Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium
- T6 Azospirillum + VAM
- T7 Azospirillum + Frankia
- T8 Phosphobacterium + VAM

T9 - Phosphobacterium + Frankia

T10 - VAM + Frankia

T11-Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium + VAM

- T12 Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium + Frankia
- T13 Azospirillum + VAM + Frankia
- T14 Phosphobacterium + VAM + Frankia
- T15 Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium + VAM + Frankia
- T16 Control (uninoculated)

Biofertilizer inoculated seedlings were maintained in the nursery for six months, then the seedlings were planted in farmland.

Experimental design and planting

Six months old *C. equisetifolia* seedlings inoculated with biofertilizers were planted in 30 cm³ of pits at a spacing of 1 m x 1.5 m. The experiment was set up in a Randomised Block Design (RBD) with three replications. Each treatment blocks contained 36 plants. Totally 1728 seedlings were planted.

Study area

The study was conducted in a farm land at the Bank of Noiyal river in Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, Inda at latitude 11°02'N and longitude 76° 58'E, at an elevation of 409 m above mean sea level with an annual precipitation averages of 450-650 mm. Soil type is sandy clay loam (sand 63.6% : silt 26.8% : clay 9.6%) with a pH of 7.1. Organic content of the soil is 1.75%. The nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, calcium and magnesium contents are 0.55%, 0.11%, 0.47%, 0.71% and 0.36% respectively.

Soil pH was determined in 1:2.5 ratio of soil water suspension using a pH meter (Jackson 1973). Nitrogen was determined by Kjeldahl method using Kjeltech Auto analyser 1030 (Piper 1966). Phosphorus was estimated by Olsens method using Venado Molybdate yellow colour (Jackson 1973). Potassium was estimated by using Flame photometer with neutral normal ammonium acetate solution (Standford and English 1949). Calcium and magnesium were determined by Versenate method (Jackson 1973). Organic carbon was estimated by Walkley and Black wet digestion method (Piper 1966).

Biometric observations

Total tree height and girth at breast height (gbh) were measured 6, 12, 18, 24 and 30 months after planting. Biomass (oven dry) components such as foliage, twig and stem were estimated 24 months after planting.

Estimation of VAM root infection and microbial population

Soil and plant root samples were collected 24 months after planting for the estimation of VAM infection, VAM spore density, *Azospirillum* and Phosphobacterium population in the rhizosphere soil. VAM spore density in each soil sample was estimated by a modified wet sieving and decanting technique as described by Gerdemann and Nicolson (1963). Mycorrhizalroot infection was assessed following the procedure of Phillips and Hayman (1970). Dilution plate counting method was employed for the enumeration of microbial population in the soil samples. N-free semi-solid malate medium was used for *Azospirillum* (Dobereiner *et al.* 1976), Pikovskaya's medium was used for Phosphobacteria (Sundara Rao and Sinha 1963).

Frankia nodultion

Percentage of *Frankia* nodulated trees was assessed through excavating the soil portion of root system at depth of 0-30 cm. The number of nodule bearing trees were counted and percentage of *Frankia* nodulated trees were calculated using the following formula :

Percentage of nodulated trees = $\frac{\text{Number of nodulated trees}}{\text{Total number of trees examined}} \times 100$

Statistical analysis

The data were statistically analysed using analysis of variance (ANOVA), and treatment means were separated using Duncan's Multiple Range Test (P<0.05) (Duncan 1955).

Results

Height

The result shows that combined inoculation of Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium + VAM + Frankia (T15) recorded maximum height in all the stages, that was registered 90.4%, 23.6%, 28.1%, 20.56% and 30.2% increased over control at 6, 12, 18, 24 and 30 months respectively. Statistically there is no height difference between the triple except inoculations Azospirillum Phosphobacterium + VAM (T11) in 6 months after planting. Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium + Frankia (T12) in 12 months, Azospirillum + VAM + Frankia (T13) in 18, 24 and 30 months after planting registered better height over control (Table 1). Among double inoculations Azospirillum + VAM (T6) in six months, VAM + Frankia (T10) in 12, 18, 24 and 30 months after planting showed better height over control.

GBH

In general, combined inoculation of *Azospirillum* + Phosphobacterium + VAM + *Frankia* (T15) recorded maximum gbh at 6, 12, 18, 24 and 30 months after planting when compared with all other treatments. Among the triple inoculations, Phosphobacterium + VAM + *Frankia* (T14) and *Azospirillum* + VAM + *Frankia* (T13) in 6 months, *Azospirillum* + VAM + *Frankia* (T13) inoculated trees in 12, 18, 24 and 30 months after planting had better gbh (Table 1).

Among double inoculation, there was no significant variation between the treatments except *Azospirillum* + Phosphobacterium (T5) at 6 months after planting. But VAM + *Frankia* (T10) had better gbh among the double inoculations at 12, 18, 24 and 30 months after planting compared to control. In single inoculations, *Frankia* (T4) and VAM fungi (T3) recorded better gbh than other single inoculation in all the stages of growth.

Total above ground biomass

The results revealed that biofertilizers inoculated trees had significantly enhanced above ground biomass at 24 months after planting compared with uninoculated control trees (Table 2). Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium + VAM + Frankia (T15) inoculated trees were found to have higher above ground biomas than other treatments. Among triple inoculations, Azospirillum + VAM + Frankia (T13) registered next highest biomass than that of the control. Among double inoculations, VAM + Frankia (T10) registered more biomass than other treatments, but it was at par with Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium + VAM (T11) and Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium + Frankia (T12). In single inoculations, VAM fungi (T3) inoculated trees registered higher biomass when compared to other single inoculations.

Total below ground biomass

Combined inoculation with *Azospirillum* + Phosphobacterium + VAM + *Frankia* (T15) showed the highest root biomass (Table 2). However, it Table 1. Growth of Casuarina equisetifolia inoculated with biofertilizers in the farmland.

12.17bcd 13.04cde 13.04cde 12.30bc 13.22de 12.35cd 11.25ab 12.72cd 12.73cd 12.48cd 12.37cd 12.79cd 12.86cd 12.86cd Height 13.96e 10.72a (m) 30 months 24.47bcd 24.30bcd 24.20bcd 24 27bcd 24.33bcd 24 47bcd 23.70bc 23.07ab 25.57be 23.67bc 24.80cd 23.63bc 26.43e 26.70e 21.70a GBH (cm) 28.73f 10.87cde 10.87cde 10.90de Height 10.77cd 10.50b 10.37b 11.00e 11.60g 9.87a 9.93a 10.97e 11.03f 11.90g(m) 10.73c 11.53f 11.47f 24 months 18.70bcd 21.83ghi 19.13de 18.77cd 21.33gh 18.23bc 18.80cd 22.03hi 19.67ef 21.27g 17.97b 16.80a 17.07a 20.30f 22.13i GBH 23.20j (cm) 6.55efg 6.57efg 6.43cde 6.50def 6.57efg 6.30bcd 6.37b-e Height 6.18ab 6.28bc 6.67fg 7.00h 7.12h 6.738 6.03a (m) 7.45i 7.73j 18 months 15.43efg 15.67fg 15.63fg 15.23de 14.77bc 15.33ef 15.77g 15.738 13.43a 14.87c 15.0cd 14.47b 16.63h 16.93h 13.67a GBH 17.40i (cm) 5.66de 5.84de 5.36bc 5.39bc 5.60cd 5.61cd Height 4.58a 5.29b 5.91e 4.80a 5.13b 5.15b 5.24b 4.64a 4.82a (m) 5.4 12 months 10.1cde 9.7bcd 9.7bcd 10.2de 10.2de 10.2de 9.5bc 10.9fg 10.6ef 10.5ef 11.28 11.9h 8.5a GBH (cm) 9.4b 9.4b 9.2b 1.80abc 1.87abc Height 2.48de 1.75ab 1.73ab 1.79ab 2.18cd 2.05bc 2.62ef 2.87ef 2.61ef 2.68ef 1.57a 1.56a (m) 2.92f 2.99f 6 months 2.2cde 2.0bcd 2.3def 2.3def 3.0gh 2.2c-f 1.8ab 2.6fg GBH (cm) 2.9fg 2.4ef 2.4ef 2.5ef 2.6ef 3.2h 1.5a 3.3h Treatment T13 T14 T15 T16 T10 T12 TI1 T6 18 5 2 13 T4 TS 11 I

Treatments : T1 Azospirillum; T2 Phosphobacterium; T3 Vesicular arbuscular mycorrhizae (VAM); T4 Frankin; T5 Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium; T6 Azospirillum + VAM; T7 Azospirillum + Frankia; T8 Phosphobcteriurn + VAM; T9 Phosphobacterium + Frankia; T10 VAM + Frankia; T11 Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium + VAM; T12 Azospirillum Means followed by a common letter are not significantly different at the 5% level by DMRT

+ Phosphobacterium + Frankia; T13 Azospirillum + VAM + Frankia; T14 Phosphobacterium + VAM + Frankia; T15

Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium + VAM + Frankia and T16 Control.

Bangladesh Journal of Forest Science

30

Table 2. Biomass (kg/tree) of two years old Casuarina equisetifolia inoculated with biofertilizers in the farmland.

Total biomass	16.89c	14.096b	18.137d	16.533c	17.093cd	17.293cd	16.904cd	19.191e	21.461f	26.454h	25.204g	25.204g	28.5881	27.490i	30.362j	12.561a	
Total bgd	2.527cd	1.569a	2.555cd	1.840ab	1.780ab	2.256bc	2.367cd	2.615cd	2.618cd	3.404ef	3.347e	3.045de	4.015fg	3.499ef	4.417g	1.303a	
Root nodule	0.041a	0.016a	0.038a	0.108b	0.018a	0.030a	0.117a	0.023a	• 0.098b	0.129b	0.035a	0.119b	0.140b	0.111b	0.135b	0.012a	
Root weight	2.486cd	1.553a	2.517cd	1.742ab	1.761ab	2.226bc	2.520cd	2.592cd	2.520cd	3.275ef	3.312ef	2.926de	3.876fg	3.388ef	4.282g	1.219a	
Total agb weight	14.363c	12.527b	15.582d	14.683c	15.313cd	15.037cd	14.537c	16.576e	18.834f	23.050g	21.985g	22.159g	24.573h	24.441h	25.955i	11.258a	
Needle weight	3.749bcd	2.639a	3.567bc	2.962a	3.962cde	4.097def	4.215efg	3.525b	4.338e-h	4.759hi	4.534ghi	4.461fgh	4.524ghi	4.699 hi	4.895i	2.734a	
Branch & twig weight	1.797bc	1.625b	1.740bc	1.824bc	1.877c	1.808bc	1.162 a	3.348h	2.364d	2.571def	2.653ef	2.554de	2.719fg	2.593ef	2.879g	1.076a	
Bark weight	1.142bcd	0.660a	1.442def	0.764ab	1.347cde	0.965abc	0.627a	1.452def	0.999abc	1.290cde	1.345cde	1.477def	1.50def	1.776f	1.571ef	0.988abc	
Stem weight	· 7.675b	7.603c	8.833cd	9.133d	· 8.127bc	8.167bc	8.533cd	8.250bc	11.142e	14.43g	13.450f	13.667g	15.750h	15.373h	16.600i	6.460a	
Treatment	II	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15	T16	
	StemBarkBranch & twigNeedleTotal agbRootRootTotalweightweightweightweightweightweightpgd	StemBarkBranch & twig weightNeedle weightTotal agb weightRootRootTotalv 7.675b1.142bcd1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd1	StemBark weightBranch & twig weightNeedle weightTotal agb weightRoot weightRoot hoduleTotal bgd7.675b1.142bcd1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a1	StemBark weight weight weightBranch & weight weightNeedle weight weight meightRoot weight weight moduleRoot bgd bgdTotal bgd7.675b1.142bcd1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a18.833cd1.442def1.740bc3.567bc15.582d2.517cd0.038a2.555cd1	Stem Bark weight weight Branch & weight weight Needle weight Total agb weight Root weight Root hodule Fotal bgd Total 7.675b 1.142bcd 1.797bc 3.749bcd 14.363c 2.486cd 0.041a 2.527cd 1 7.603c 0.660a 1.625b 2.639a 12.527b 1.553a 0.016a 1.569a 1 8.833cd 1.442def 1.740bc 3.567bc 15.582d 2.517cd 0.038a 2.555cd 1 9.133d 0.764ab 1.824bc 2.962a 14.683c 1.742ab 0.108b 1.840ab 1	Stem Bark weight weight Needle weight weight Total agb weight Root weight Root bgd Fotal bgd 7.675b 1.142bcd 1.797bc 3.749bcd 14.363c 2.486cd 0.041a 2.527cd 1 7.603c 0.660a 1.625b 2.639a 12.527b 1.553a 0.016a 1.569a 1 8.833cd 1.442def 1.740bc 3.567bc 15.582d 2.517cd 0.038a 2.555cd 1 9.133d 0.764ab 1.824bc 2.962a 14.683c 1.742ab 0.108b 1.840ab 1 9.133d 0.764ab 1.827bc 2.962ad 14.683c 1.742ab 0.108b 1.840ab 1 8.8127bd 1.347cde 1.877c 3.962cde 15.313cd 1.761ab 0.018a 1.780ab 1	StemBark tweight weightBark twig weightBark twig weightNeedle weightTotal agb weightRootRootTotal bgd $7.675b$ $1.142bcd$ $1.797bc$ $3.749bcd$ $14.363c$ $2.486cd$ $0.041a$ $2.527cd$ 1 $7.603c$ $0.660a$ $1.797bc$ $3.749bcd$ $14.363c$ $2.486cd$ $0.041a$ $2.527cd$ 1 $7.603c$ $0.660a$ $1.625b$ $2.639a$ $12.527b$ $1.553a$ $0.016a$ $1.569a$ 1 $8.833cd$ $1.442def$ $1.740bc$ $3.567bc$ $15.582d$ $2.517cd$ $0.038a$ $2.555cd$ 1 $9.133d$ $0.764ab$ $1.824bc$ $2.962a$ $14.683c$ $1.742ab$ $0.108b$ $1.840ab$ 1 $9.133d$ $0.764ab$ $1.824bc$ $2.962a$ $14.683c$ $1.742ab$ $0.108b$ $1.840ab$ 1 $8.167bd$ $0.965abc$ $1.808bc$ $4.097def$ $15.037cd$ $2.226bc$ $0.030a$ $2.256bc$ $2.256bc$	Stem Bark twig weight Indedle weight Needle weight Total agb weight Root Root Total bgd 7.675b 1.142bcd 1.797bc 3.749bcd 14.363c 2.486cd 0.041a 2.527cd 1 7.603c 0.660a 1.625b 2.639a 12.527b 1.553a 0.016a 1.569a 1 8.833cd 1.442def 1.740bc 3.567bc 15.582d 2.517cd 0.038a 2.555cd 1 9.133d 0.764ab 1.824bc 2.567bc 15.582d 1.742ab 0.108b 1.840ab 1 9.133d 0.764ab 1.824bc 2.962ac 14.683c 1.742ab 0.108b 1.840ab 1 8.127bd 1.347cde 1.827bc 2.962cde 15.313cd 1.742ab 0.018a 1.840ab 1 8.167bc 0.965abc 1.807bc 3.962cde 15.313cd 2.756bc 0.030a 2.256bc 1 8.167bc 0.965abc 1.807bc 4.097def 15.037cd	Stem Bark twig weight Bark twig weight Needle weight Total agb weight Root weight Root bgd Total 7.675b 1.142bcd 1.797bc 3.749bcd 14.363c 2.486cd 0.041a 2.527cd 1 7.675b 1.142bcd 1.625b 3.749bcd 14.363c 2.486cd 0.041a 2.557cd 1 8.833cd 1.442def 1.740bc 3.567bc 15.582d 2.517cd 0.016a 1.569a 1 9.133d 0.764ab 1.824bc 2.652ad 14.553a 0.016a 1.840ab 1 9.133d 0.764ab 1.824bc 2.962a 14.683c 1.742ab 0.108b 1.840ab 1 9.133d 0.764ab 1.824bc 3.962cde 15.313cd 1.761ab 0.018a 1.840ab 1 8.127bc 1.347cde 1.824bc 2.962cd 15.313cd 1.761ab 0.018a 1.780ab 1 8.167bc 0.965abc 1.808bc 4.097def 15.037cd 2.526bc<	Stem Bark weight weight Needle weight weight Total agb weight Root Root Total bgd 7.675b 1.142bcd 1.797bc 3.749bcd 14.363c 2.486cd 0.041a 2.527cd 1 7.603c 0.660a 1.625b 2.639a 12.577b 1.553a 0.016a 1.569a 1 8.833cd 1.442def 1.740bc 3.567bc 15.582d 2.517cd 0.038a 2.555cd 1 9.133d 0.764ab 1.824bc 2.962a 14.683c 1.742ab 0.108b 1.840ab 1 9.133d 0.764ab 1.824bc 2.962a 15.313cd 1.742ab 0.108b 1.840ab 1 8.127bc 1.347cde 1.824bc 2.962cd 15.313cd 1.742ab 0.108b 1.840ab 1 8.127bc 1.877cd 3.962cde 15.037cd 1.761ab 0.018a 1.780ab 1 8.127bc 0.965abc 1.877c 2.975db 2.550cd 0.177a 2.367cd <t< td=""><td>Stem Barktive Branch & weight twig Needle twight weight twight Root twight weight by weight twight weight Root twight by twight twight twight twight weight twight twight weight twight weight Total by twight by twight twight twight twight twight twight twight twight Root twight by twight twight twight twight twight twight Total by twight twight twight twight Total by twight twight Total by twight twight Total by twight</td><td>StemBark twigt weight weight weightNeedle weight weightTotal agb weight weightRootRoot bod bddTotal bgd7.675b1.142bcd1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a19.133d0.764ab1.87bc2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a18.833cd1.442def1.740bc3.567bc3.567bc15.532d1.572db1.840ab19.133d0.764ab1.824bc2.962a14.683c1.742ab0.108b1.840ab18.8167b0.764ab1.877c2.962ad14.683c1.742ab0.108b1.840ab18.167b0.965abc1.877c3.962cde15.037cd2.226bc0.018a1.780ab18.167b0.965abc1.877c3.962cde15.037cd2.226bc0.018a2.367cd18.167b0.965abc1.877c3.962cde15.037cd2.520cd0.018a2.567cd18.167b0.965abc1.877c2.962cd1.4.537c2.520cd0.018b2.615cd18.157b1.452def3.348h3.525b16.576e2.520cd0.017a2.615cd18.157b0.999abc2.364d4.338eh18.834f</td><td>StemBark weight weight weightNeedle weight weightTotal agb weight weightRoot weightTotal bgd7.675b1.142bcd1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.797bc3.567bc15.582d1.553a0.016a1.569a19.133d0.764ab1.824bc2.962a14.683c1.742ab0.018a1.840ab19.133d0.764ab1.824bc2.962a14.683c1.761ab0.018a1.840ab19.133d0.764ab1.874bc2.962ab14.683c1.761ab0.018a1.840ab18.157bc0.347cde1.824bc2.962ab14.683c2.250cd0.030a2.256bc18.167bc0.965abc1.808bc4.097def15.037cd2.250cd0.030a2.256bc18.535cd1.452def3.348h3.525b16.576e2.520cd0.023a2.615cd18.550bc1.452def3.348h3.525b16.576e2.550cd0.023a2.615cd18.550bc1.452def3.348h3.525b16.576e2.550cd0.023a2.615cd18.250bc1.443g1.290cde2.367df2.367dg2.615cd2.615cd11.443g1.243eh18.834f2.520cd0.023a2.615cd2<</td><td>StemBark weight weight weightBranch & weight weightNeedle weight weightTotal agb weight weightRootRootTotal bgd7.675b1.142bcd1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.5582d1.5582d0.016a1.569a17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a15.582d1.5582d0.016a1.569a18.833cd1.442def1.740bc3.567bc15.582d1.576d0.038a2.555cd19.133d0.764ab1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.761ab0.018a1.780ab19.133d0.764ab1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.761ab0.018a1.780ab18.127bd0.347cde1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.761ab0.018a1.780ab18.127bd0.347cde1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.761ab0.018a1.780ab18.127bd0.747cde1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.761ab0.018a1.780ab18.127bd0.965abc1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.761ab0.018a1.780ab18.533cd0.627a1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.761ab2.367cd28.533cd1.452def3.348h3.525b16.576c0.030a2.615cd28.533cd1.453c2.535cd16.576b2.5756c<td< td=""><td>StemBark weight weight weight weightNeedle weight weight weightNotal agb weight weight weightRoot weightRoot hoduleTotal bgd7.675b1.142bcd1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a18.833cc1.442def1.740bc3.567bc15.582d2.517cd0.038a2.555cd19.133d0.764ab1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.742ab0.108b1.840ab18.833cc0.764ab1.877c3.962cde15.037cd2.250cd0.018a1.780ab18.167bc0.965abc1.808bc4.097def15.037cd2.250cd0.013a2.367cd28.533cc0.627a1.162a4.215efg14.537c2.520cd0.017a2.367cd28.533cd0.627a1.162a4.738e-h18.834f2.520cd0.003ba2.618cd28.533cd0.627a1.162a4.338e-h18.834f2.520cd0.005bb2.618cd28.5350c1.4426f3.348h3.525b18.834f2.520cd0.005bb2.618cd211.142e0.999abc2.571def4.338e-h18.834f2.520cd0.005bb2.618cd211.142e0.999abc</td><td>StemBark weight weight weight weightNoedle weight weightRootTotal bgd7.675b1.142bcd1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a17.603c0.660a1.625b2.699a12.577b1.553a0.016a1.569a19.133d0.764ab1.877c3.957cd15.532d1.761ab0.108b1.840ab19.133d0.764ab1.877c2.962a14.683c1.741ab0.108b1.840ab19.133d0.764ab1.877c2.962a14.683c1.761ab0.108b1.840ab18.137d0.764ab1.877c2.962ab15.313cd1.761ab0.108b1.840ab18.533cd0.955abc1.877c2.962ab1.877c2.520cd0.117a2.367cd28.533cd0.627a1.162a4.2156fg14.537c2.520cd0.017ab2.367cd28.533cd1.452def3.348eh18.334f2.520cd0.023a2.615cd211.142e0.999abc2.364d4.759hi2.3050g3.247e211.142e0.999abc2.574d1.873c2.592cd0.013b3.404ef13.450f1.447def2.574d2.367df2.3576f3.347e213.450f1.345cd2.576df2.3756f0.023a2.618cd2<</td><td>StemBark tweight weightNeedle weight weightNeedle weightNeedle weightTotal agb weightRootRootTotal bgd$7.675b$$1.142bcd$$1.797bc$$3.749bcd$$14.363c$$2.486cd$$0.041a$$2.557cd$$1$$7.603c$$0.660a$$1.625b$$3.749bcd$$14.363c$$2.486cd$$0.041a$$2.557cd$$1$$7.603c$$0.660a$$1.625b$$2.639a$$12.527b$$1.553a$$0.016a$$1.569a$$1$$9.133d$$0.764ab$$1.877c$$3.967bc$$15.532d$$1.742ab$$0.018a$$1.840ab$$1$$9.133d$$0.764ab$$1.877c$$3.962cde$$15.313cd$$1.742ab$$0.018a$$1.780ab$$1$$9.133d$$0.764ab$$1.877c$$3.962cde$$15.313cd$$1.742ab$$0.018a$$1.780ab$$1$$8.167bc$$0.965abc$$1.877c$$3.962cde$$15.313cd$$1.742ab$$0.018a$$1.780ab$$1$$8.167bc$$0.965abc$$1.877c$$2.952cd$$0.013a$$2.567cd$$2.367cd$$2$$8.167bc$$0.965abc$$1.877c$$2.334b$$1.537cd$$2.250cd$$0.013a$$2.615cd$$2.367cd$$8.157bc$$0.965abc$$1.877cd$$4.3384f$$2.570cd$$0.023a$$2.615cd$$2.367cd$$2.367cd$$8.250bc$$1.443d$$3.525bd$$1.573cd$$2.535cd$$0.012a$$2.615cd$$2.615cd$$2.615cd$$2.615cd$</td></td<></td></t<>	Stem Barktive Branch & weight twig Needle twight weight twight Root twight weight by weight twight weight Root twight by twight twight twight twight weight twight twight weight twight weight Total by twight by twight twight twight twight twight twight twight twight Root twight by twight twight twight twight twight twight Total by twight twight twight twight Total by twight twight Total by twight twight Total by twight	StemBark twigt weight weight weightNeedle weight weightTotal agb weight weightRootRoot bod bddTotal bgd7.675b1.142bcd1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a19.133d0.764ab1.87bc2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a18.833cd1.442def1.740bc3.567bc3.567bc15.532d1.572db1.840ab19.133d0.764ab1.824bc2.962a14.683c1.742ab0.108b1.840ab18.8167b0.764ab1.877c2.962ad14.683c1.742ab0.108b1.840ab18.167b0.965abc1.877c3.962cde15.037cd2.226bc0.018a1.780ab18.167b0.965abc1.877c3.962cde15.037cd2.226bc0.018a2.367cd18.167b0.965abc1.877c3.962cde15.037cd2.520cd0.018a2.567cd18.167b0.965abc1.877c2.962cd1.4.537c2.520cd0.018b2.615cd18.157b1.452def3.348h3.525b16.576e2.520cd0.017a2.615cd18.157b0.999abc2.364d4.338eh18.834f	StemBark weight weight weightNeedle weight weightTotal agb weight weightRoot weightTotal bgd7.675b1.142bcd1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.797bc3.567bc15.582d1.553a0.016a1.569a19.133d0.764ab1.824bc2.962a14.683c1.742ab0.018a1.840ab19.133d0.764ab1.824bc2.962a14.683c1.761ab0.018a1.840ab19.133d0.764ab1.874bc2.962ab14.683c1.761ab0.018a1.840ab18.157bc0.347cde1.824bc2.962ab14.683c2.250cd0.030a2.256bc18.167bc0.965abc1.808bc4.097def15.037cd2.250cd0.030a2.256bc18.535cd1.452def3.348h3.525b16.576e2.520cd0.023a2.615cd18.550bc1.452def3.348h3.525b16.576e2.550cd0.023a2.615cd18.550bc1.452def3.348h3.525b16.576e2.550cd0.023a2.615cd18.250bc1.443g1.290cde2.367df2.367dg2.615cd2.615cd11.443g1.243eh18.834f2.520cd0.023a2.615cd2<	StemBark weight weight weightBranch & weight weightNeedle weight weightTotal agb weight weightRootRootTotal bgd7.675b1.142bcd1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.5582d1.5582d0.016a1.569a17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a15.582d1.5582d0.016a1.569a18.833cd1.442def1.740bc3.567bc15.582d1.576d0.038a2.555cd19.133d0.764ab1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.761ab0.018a1.780ab19.133d0.764ab1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.761ab0.018a1.780ab18.127bd0.347cde1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.761ab0.018a1.780ab18.127bd0.347cde1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.761ab0.018a1.780ab18.127bd0.747cde1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.761ab0.018a1.780ab18.127bd0.965abc1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.761ab0.018a1.780ab18.533cd0.627a1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.761ab2.367cd28.533cd1.452def3.348h3.525b16.576c0.030a2.615cd28.533cd1.453c2.535cd16.576b2.5756c <td< td=""><td>StemBark weight weight weight weightNeedle weight weight weightNotal agb weight weight weightRoot weightRoot hoduleTotal bgd7.675b1.142bcd1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a18.833cc1.442def1.740bc3.567bc15.582d2.517cd0.038a2.555cd19.133d0.764ab1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.742ab0.108b1.840ab18.833cc0.764ab1.877c3.962cde15.037cd2.250cd0.018a1.780ab18.167bc0.965abc1.808bc4.097def15.037cd2.250cd0.013a2.367cd28.533cc0.627a1.162a4.215efg14.537c2.520cd0.017a2.367cd28.533cd0.627a1.162a4.738e-h18.834f2.520cd0.003ba2.618cd28.533cd0.627a1.162a4.338e-h18.834f2.520cd0.005bb2.618cd28.5350c1.4426f3.348h3.525b18.834f2.520cd0.005bb2.618cd211.142e0.999abc2.571def4.338e-h18.834f2.520cd0.005bb2.618cd211.142e0.999abc</td><td>StemBark weight weight weight weightNoedle weight weightRootTotal bgd7.675b1.142bcd1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a17.603c0.660a1.625b2.699a12.577b1.553a0.016a1.569a19.133d0.764ab1.877c3.957cd15.532d1.761ab0.108b1.840ab19.133d0.764ab1.877c2.962a14.683c1.741ab0.108b1.840ab19.133d0.764ab1.877c2.962a14.683c1.761ab0.108b1.840ab18.137d0.764ab1.877c2.962ab15.313cd1.761ab0.108b1.840ab18.533cd0.955abc1.877c2.962ab1.877c2.520cd0.117a2.367cd28.533cd0.627a1.162a4.2156fg14.537c2.520cd0.017ab2.367cd28.533cd1.452def3.348eh18.334f2.520cd0.023a2.615cd211.142e0.999abc2.364d4.759hi2.3050g3.247e211.142e0.999abc2.574d1.873c2.592cd0.013b3.404ef13.450f1.447def2.574d2.367df2.3576f3.347e213.450f1.345cd2.576df2.3756f0.023a2.618cd2<</td><td>StemBark tweight weightNeedle weight weightNeedle weightNeedle weightTotal agb weightRootRootTotal bgd$7.675b$$1.142bcd$$1.797bc$$3.749bcd$$14.363c$$2.486cd$$0.041a$$2.557cd$$1$$7.603c$$0.660a$$1.625b$$3.749bcd$$14.363c$$2.486cd$$0.041a$$2.557cd$$1$$7.603c$$0.660a$$1.625b$$2.639a$$12.527b$$1.553a$$0.016a$$1.569a$$1$$9.133d$$0.764ab$$1.877c$$3.967bc$$15.532d$$1.742ab$$0.018a$$1.840ab$$1$$9.133d$$0.764ab$$1.877c$$3.962cde$$15.313cd$$1.742ab$$0.018a$$1.780ab$$1$$9.133d$$0.764ab$$1.877c$$3.962cde$$15.313cd$$1.742ab$$0.018a$$1.780ab$$1$$8.167bc$$0.965abc$$1.877c$$3.962cde$$15.313cd$$1.742ab$$0.018a$$1.780ab$$1$$8.167bc$$0.965abc$$1.877c$$2.952cd$$0.013a$$2.567cd$$2.367cd$$2$$8.167bc$$0.965abc$$1.877c$$2.334b$$1.537cd$$2.250cd$$0.013a$$2.615cd$$2.367cd$$8.157bc$$0.965abc$$1.877cd$$4.3384f$$2.570cd$$0.023a$$2.615cd$$2.367cd$$2.367cd$$8.250bc$$1.443d$$3.525bd$$1.573cd$$2.535cd$$0.012a$$2.615cd$$2.615cd$$2.615cd$$2.615cd$</td></td<>	StemBark weight weight weight weightNeedle weight weight weightNotal agb weight weight weightRoot weightRoot hoduleTotal bgd7.675b1.142bcd1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a18.833cc1.442def1.740bc3.567bc15.582d2.517cd0.038a2.555cd19.133d0.764ab1.877c3.962cde15.313cd1.742ab0.108b1.840ab18.833cc0.764ab1.877c3.962cde15.037cd2.250cd0.018a1.780ab18.167bc0.965abc1.808bc4.097def15.037cd2.250cd0.013a2.367cd28.533cc0.627a1.162a4.215efg14.537c2.520cd0.017a2.367cd28.533cd0.627a1.162a4.738e-h18.834f2.520cd0.003ba2.618cd28.533cd0.627a1.162a4.338e-h18.834f2.520cd0.005bb2.618cd28.5350c1.4426f3.348h3.525b18.834f2.520cd0.005bb2.618cd211.142e0.999abc2.571def4.338e-h18.834f2.520cd0.005bb2.618cd211.142e0.999abc	StemBark weight weight weight weightNoedle weight weightRootTotal bgd7.675b1.142bcd1.797bc3.749bcd14.363c2.486cd0.041a2.527cd17.603c0.660a1.625b2.639a12.527b1.553a0.016a1.569a17.603c0.660a1.625b2.699a12.577b1.553a0.016a1.569a19.133d0.764ab1.877c3.957cd15.532d1.761ab0.108b1.840ab19.133d0.764ab1.877c2.962a14.683c1.741ab0.108b1.840ab19.133d0.764ab1.877c2.962a14.683c1.761ab0.108b1.840ab18.137d0.764ab1.877c2.962ab15.313cd1.761ab0.108b1.840ab18.533cd0.955abc1.877c2.962ab1.877c2.520cd0.117a2.367cd28.533cd0.627a1.162a4.2156fg14.537c2.520cd0.017ab2.367cd28.533cd1.452def3.348eh18.334f2.520cd0.023a2.615cd211.142e0.999abc2.364d4.759hi2.3050g3.247e211.142e0.999abc2.574d1.873c2.592cd0.013b3.404ef13.450f1.447def2.574d2.367df2.3576f3.347e213.450f1.345cd2.576df2.3756f0.023a2.618cd2<	StemBark tweight weightNeedle weight weightNeedle weightNeedle weightTotal agb weightRootRootTotal bgd $7.675b$ $1.142bcd$ $1.797bc$ $3.749bcd$ $14.363c$ $2.486cd$ $0.041a$ $2.557cd$ 1 $7.603c$ $0.660a$ $1.625b$ $3.749bcd$ $14.363c$ $2.486cd$ $0.041a$ $2.557cd$ 1 $7.603c$ $0.660a$ $1.625b$ $2.639a$ $12.527b$ $1.553a$ $0.016a$ $1.569a$ 1 $9.133d$ $0.764ab$ $1.877c$ $3.967bc$ $15.532d$ $1.742ab$ $0.018a$ $1.840ab$ 1 $9.133d$ $0.764ab$ $1.877c$ $3.962cde$ $15.313cd$ $1.742ab$ $0.018a$ $1.780ab$ 1 $9.133d$ $0.764ab$ $1.877c$ $3.962cde$ $15.313cd$ $1.742ab$ $0.018a$ $1.780ab$ 1 $8.167bc$ $0.965abc$ $1.877c$ $3.962cde$ $15.313cd$ $1.742ab$ $0.018a$ $1.780ab$ 1 $8.167bc$ $0.965abc$ $1.877c$ $2.952cd$ $0.013a$ $2.567cd$ $2.367cd$ 2 $8.167bc$ $0.965abc$ $1.877c$ $2.334b$ $1.537cd$ $2.250cd$ $0.013a$ $2.615cd$ $2.367cd$ $8.157bc$ $0.965abc$ $1.877cd$ $4.3384f$ $2.570cd$ $0.023a$ $2.615cd$ $2.367cd$ $2.367cd$ $8.250bc$ $1.443d$ $3.525bd$ $1.573cd$ $2.535cd$ $0.012a$ $2.615cd$ $2.615cd$ $2.615cd$ $2.615cd$

Means followed by a common letter are not significantly different at the 5% level by DMRT; agb = Above ground biomass; bgd = Below ground biomass.

Treatments : T1 Azospirillum; T2 Phosphobacterium; T3 Vesicular arbuscular mycorrhizae (VAM); T4 Frankia; T5 Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium; T6 Azospirillum + VAM; T7 Azospirillum + Frankia; T8 Phosphobcterium + VAM; T9 Phosphobacterium + Frankia; T10 VAM + Frankia; T11 Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium + VAM; T12 Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium + Frankia; T13 Azospirillum + VAM + Frankia; T14 Phosphobacterium + VAM + Frankia; T15 Azospirillum + Plosphobacterium + VAM + Frankia and T16 Control.

Vol. 29 (1), 2000

31

Table 3. Microbial population, VAM and Frankia infection in the rhizosphere of Casuarina equisetifolia inoculated with biofertilizer in the farmland (two years after planting).

Frankia nodulation %	24.77ab	27.57bc	35.33de	82.60g	32.33cd	24.67ab	76.00f	32.43cd	79.90fg	92.23 hi	41.13e	86.17gh	93.90 hi	85.00 gh	98.63i	20.53a
VAM colonization %	34.63a	42.33c	93.63fg	44.97c	36.90ab	73.60e	41.40bc	69.00e	44.33c	92.67fg	73.00e	56.83d	90.53f	96.63g	93.83fg	30.00a
Phosphobacterium	1.3×10^{4} b	4.2.x 10 ⁴ def	$1.5 \times 10^{4} b$	1.3 × 10 ⁴ b	2.6 x 10 ⁴ c	0.5 × 104a	1.6 x 10 ⁴ b	2.6 × 10 ⁴ c	4.5 x 10 ⁴ ef	2.2 x 10 ⁴ c	3.8 × 10 ⁴ d	4.6 x 10 ⁴ f	1.6 × 10 ⁴ b	4.0 x 10 ⁴ de	3.9 x 10 ⁴ de	1.35 x 10 ⁴ b
Azospirillum	3.8 × 10⁰f	0.1 × 10 ⁶ ab	0.8 x 10°b	0.4 x 10°ab	2.2 x 10 ⁶ cd	3.2 x 10 ⁶ e	2.8 x 10 ⁶ ce	0.5 x 10 ⁶ ab	0.4 × 10°ab	0.4 x 106ab	0.1 x 10 ⁶ a	2.6 x 10 ⁶ cde	2.7 x 10 ⁶ be	2.0 × 10 ⁶ c	2.8 x 10 ⁶ de	1.0 × 10⁵a
Treatment	TT	72	T3	T4	T5	T6	77	T8	6L	T10	III	T12	T13	T14	T15	T16

Means followed by a common letter are not significantly different at the 5% level by DMRT

Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium; T6 Azospirillum + VAM; T7 Azospirillum + Frankia; T8 Phosphobcterium + VAM; + Phosphobacterium + Frankia; T13 Azospirillum + VAM + Frankia; T14 Phosphobacterium + VAM + Frankia; T15 Treatments : T1 Azospirillum; T2 Phosphobacterium; T3 Vesicular arbuscular mycorrhizae (VAM); T4 Frankia; T5 T9 Phosphobacterium + Frankia; T10 VAM + Frankia; T11 Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium + VAM; T12 Azospirillum Azospirillum + Phosphobacterium + VAM + Frankia and T16 Control.

Bangladesh Journal of Forest Science

32

was statistically at par with *Azospirillum* + VAM + *Frankia* (T13) and Phosphobacterium + VAM + *Frankia* (T14) treated trees. Among single inoculations, VAM (T3) inoculated trees showed higher root biomass when compared with other single treatments. In double inoculations, VAM + *Frankia* (T10) showed better root biomass but it was at par with Phosphobacterium + VAM (T9), *Azospirillum* + Phosphobacterium + VAM (T11) and Phosphobacterium + VAM + *Frankia* (T14).

Total biomass

The highest total biomass was obtained in the combined application of *Azospirillum* + Phospobacterium + VAM + *Frankia* (T15) followed by *Azospirillum* + VAM + *Frankia* (T13) and Phosphobacterium + VAM + *Frankia* (T14). Among the double and single inoculations, VAM + *Frankia* (T10) and VAM (T3) treated trees registered better biomass compared to control trees (Table 2).

Microbial population

Maximum Azospirillum population was enumerated in rhizosphere soil of Azospirillum (T1) treated trees followed by the Azospirillum combined application with other microorganisms. Similarly, maxmium Phosphobacterium population was enumerated in rhizosphere soil of Phosphobacterium (T2) treated trees, and it was statistically at par with Phospobacterium coinoculated with other beneficial microorganisms (Table 3).

Percentage of VAM infection

VAM infection percentage was heighest in (T14) followed by (T15), and it was statistically at par with *Azospirillum* + VAM + *Frankia* (T13), VAM + *Frankia* (T10) and VAM (T3). Lowest VAM infection was calculated in control plants, and it was statistically at par with (T1) and (T5).

Percentage of Frankia nodulation

Seedlings inoculated with *Frankia* and in combination with VAM had maximum nodulated

trees. Percentage of nodulated trees was highest in Azospirillum + VAM + Frankia (T13), and it was statistically at par with Phosphobacterium + VAM + Frankia (T14) and VAM + Frankia (T10). Among individual inoculation Frankia (T4) inoculated trees had better nodulation than other individual inoculation. Lowest percentage of nodulated trees was control (T16), and it was statistically at par with Azospirillum inoculated (T1) trees (Table 3).

Discussions

In India intensive management of land has brought in to the prominence the need for a comprehensive knowledge of mineral requirements of forest tree species for suggesting suitable nutrient amendments in the nurseries and in the field. Application of suitable biofertilizers to tree crops is the most convenient method to satisfy the nutritional requirement of plants. *Casuarina equisetifolia* is one of the most important tree species grown widely in nutrient deficient, high alkaline and sandy soils. It has the ability to fix the atmospheric nitrogen and mobilize phosphorus due to the tripartite association of actinomycetes and mycorrhizal fungi.

C. equisetifolia attained 204.8 cm height and 3.6 cm diameter at the age of two years under arid conditions in Egypt (El - Lakany 1983). Halos (1983) reported that the height and diameter growth of *Casuarina* 1, 2 and 3 years old shows 1.6, 2.2 and 2.5 m respectively. In the present study the excellent growth of *C. equisetifolia* were observed in height ranging from 9.87-11.90 m and GBH ranging from 16.8-23.2 cm. The growth might be due to application of biofertilizers, regular irrigation, and intensive care.

In the present study, *C. equisetifolia* plants inoculated with biofertilizers had better growth. Combined inoculation of *Azospirillum* + Phospobacterium + VAM + *Frankia* (T15) recorded excellent growth, biomass and nodulation. The increase in growth and biomass due to co-inoculation of all the four biofertilizers might be strongly correlated with improved accumulation of both nitrogen due to *Azospirillum* and *Frankia* (Wong and Stenberg 1979, Reddell *et al.* 1988) and phosphorus due to VAM, and Phosphobacteria inoculation (Habte and Manjunath 1987).

The percentage of VA mycorrhizal colonization in the present study was high due to conjoint inoculation of *Azospirillum* + Phosphobacterium + VAM + *Frankia* in *C. equisetifolia* trees. VAM fungi application either individually or in combination with other microorganism had also increased the colonization in *C. equisetifolia* (Gunjal and Patil 1992). The increase in the VAM mycorrhizal infection in the root may be enhanced in the presence of Phosphate solubilizing bacteria (Azcon *et al.* 1976) or due to higher uptake of N and P (Manjunath *et al.* 1984, Dela Cruz *et al.* 1988).

In the uninoculated control, the colonization was 30%. This indicates the presence of native mycorrhizal fungi in the soils. Inspite of the presence of the native VAM fungi in untreated control trees, their growth response was much less than in specific VAM treated trees. It is concluded that the natural VAM fungi in the soil may be insufficient as expressed by Powell and Daniel (1978) and there is need to apply most suitable VAM fungi to increase the growth and biomass production. In the present study also artificial inoculation improved the plant growth more than the indigenous VAM fungi.

Plants inoculated with *Frankia* had more nodulation and higher nodular biomass than uninoculated control trees. Combined inoculation of *Frankia* + Phosphobacteria + VAM had excellent nodule development than single inoculation of *Frankia*. Growth of all plants inoculated with *Frankia* alone was poor and comparable to that of uninoculated trees. Nodulation was significantly low even after inoculation with effective *Frankia*. Poor nodulation may be attributed to the P stress in this P deficient soil brought about by the absence of VAM fungi which otherwise could provide the Prequired for nodulation and N₂ fixation. Nodulation was maximum in trees inoculated with *Frankia* + VAM fungi + Phosphobacteria. This implies that effective VAM fungi such as the species used played a major role in nodulation as reported also by Manjunath *et al.* (1984).

Dual inoculation with effective *Frankia* and mycorrhizal fungi has potential to significantly increase *Casuarina* productivity whilst minimizing the need for fertilizer application in P deficient soils (Diem and Gautheir 1982). The present study clearly demonstrates the importance of VAM and Phosphobacteria for good nodulation in association with *Frankia*. This is also the first report to show that in unsterilized soils in the field inoculation with combined inoculation of *Azospirillum*, VAM, *Frankia* and Phosphobacteria had enhanced growth and biomass of *C. equisetifolia*.

It is suggested that under appropriate management, the use of efficient biofertilizrs lead to increased growth and biomass of *C. equisetifolia* in field conditions. The present study had clearly shown that the combined application of *Azospirillum* + Phosphobacterium + VAM + *Frankia* plays a signification role in improving the growth and biomass of *C. equisetifolia*.

References

- Azcon, R.; Barea, J. M. and Hayman, D. S. 1976. Utilisation of rock phosphate in alkaline soils by plants inoculated with mycorrhizal fungi and phosphate solubilizing bacteria. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 8: 135-138.
- Dela Cruz, R. Z.; Manalo, M. Q.; Aggannan, N. S. and Tambalo, J. D. 1988. Growth of three legume trees inoculated with VAM fungi and *Rhizobium*. *Plant and Soil* 108 : 111-115.

- Diem, H. G. and Gauthier, D. 1982. Effect de lingection endomycorhizienne (*Glomus mosseae*) sur la nadulation *et al.* crossance de *Casuarina equisetifolia C. R. Academy of Science, Paris* 294 : 215-218.
- Dobereiner, J.; Marriel, J. E. and Nery, J. 1976. Ecological distribution of *Spirillum lipoferum* Beijerinick. *Canadian Journal of Microbiology* 22 : 1461-1473.
- Duncan, D. B. 1955. Multiple Range and Multiple f-tests. Biometrics 11: 1-42.
- El-Lakany, M. H. 1983. A review of breeding drought resistant *Casuarina* for shelterbelt establishment in arid regions with special reference to Egypt. *Forest Ecology and Management* 6 : 129-137.
- Gerdemann, J. M. and Nicolson, T. H. 1963. Spores of mycorrihzal Endgone species extracted from soil by wet sieving and decanting. *Transaction of the British Mycological Society* 46 : 235-244.
- Gunjal, S. S. and Patil, P. L. 1992. Mycorrhizal control of wilt in *Casuarina*. Agroforestry Today 4: 14-15.
- Habte, M. and Manjunath, A. 1987. Soil solution phosphorus status and mycorrhizal dependency in Leucaena leucocephala. Applied Environmental Microbiology 53: 797-801.
- Halos, S. C. 1983. Casuarina in Philippine forest development. In : Midgley, S. J.; Turnbull, J. W. and Johnston, R. D. (eds.). Casuarina Ecology, Management and Utilization. Proceedings of the First International Casuarina Workshop, CSIRO, Melbourne, Australia. pp. 89-98.
- Jackson, M. K. 1973. Soil Chemical Analysis. Printice Hall of India (Pvt.) Ltd., New Delhi.
- Lal, P. 1993. Farm forestry in India-problems and potential. National Workshop on "Farm Forestry Management" organized by Indian Institute of Foresty Management, Bhopal, June 23-26.
- Manujunath, A.; Bagyaraj, D. J. and Gopala Gowda, H. S. 1984. Dual inoculation with VAM and *Rhizobium* is beneficial to *Leucaena*. *Plant and Soil* 78 : 445-448.
- Myers, M. 1993. Mycorrhizae : their use as biofertilizers. *Horticulturist* 2 : 8-12.
- Phillips, J. M. and Hayman, D. S. 1970. Improved procedures for clearing roots and staining parasite and vesicular arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi for rapid assessment of infection. *Transaction of British Mycological Society* 55 : 158-161.
- Piper, C. S. 1966. Soil and Plant Analysis. Hans Publications, Bombay.
- Porter, W. M. 1979. The most probale number method for enumerating infective propagules of vesiculararbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in soil. *Australian Journal of Soil Research* 17: 515-518.
- Powell, C. L. and Daniel, J. 1978. Growth of white clover in undisturbed soils after inoculation with efficient mycorrhizal fungi. *New Zealand Journal of Agricultural Research* 21: 675-681.
- Rajendran, K. 1993. Effect of *Frankia* and *Azospirillum* on the growth and biomass production of *Casuarina* equisetifolia Forst. Proceedings of the National Seminar on Biodiversity Strategies for Conservation and Future Challenges. Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, India. pp. 187-190.
- Ramirez, S. H.; Valdes Ramires, M. and Cruz-Cisneros, R. 1992. Inoculation and irrigation with waste water of *Casuarina* in nurseries. *Turrialba* 42: 476-481.

- Reddell, P. 1990. Increasing productivity in plantations of *Casuarina* by inoculation with *Frankia*. *In* : El-Lakany, M.; Turnbull, J.-W. and Brewbaker, J. L. (eds.). *Advances in* Casuarina *Research*. Desert Development Centre, AUC, Cairo. pp. 133-140.
- Reddell, P.; Rosbrook, P.A.; Bowen, G.D. and Gwale, D. 1988. Growth response in *Casuarina cunninghamiana* plantings inoculation with *Frankia*. *Plant and Soil* 108 : 76-86.
- Rodriguez-Barrueco, C.; Cervantes, E.; Subba Rao, N. S. and Rodriguez-Caceres, E. 1991. Growth promoting effect of *Azospirillum brasilense* on *Casuarina cunninghamiana* Mig. *Plant and Soil* 135 : 121-124.
- Stanford, S. and English, L. 1949. Use of flame photometer in rapid soil tests of K and Ca. Agronomy Journal 41: 446-447.
- Sundara Rao, W. V. B. and Sinha, M. K. 1963. Phosphate dissolving organisms in the soil and rhizosphere. Indian Journal of Agricultural Science 33 : 272-278.
- Vasanthakrishna, M.; Bagyaraj, D. J. and Nirmalnath, P. J. 1995. Selection of efficient VAM fungi for *Casuarina equisetifolia* second screening. *New Forests* 121 : 157-162.
- Wong, P. P. and Sternberg, N. E. 1979. Characterization of *Azospirillum* isolates from nitrogen fixing roots of harvested sorghum plants. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 38: 1189-1191.