

## Original Research Article

# Spore density and arbuscularmycorrhizal colonization in sunflower

### ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to evaluate the number of spores and mycorrhizal root colonization in Cerrado soil, under sunflower cultivation. Sampling of rhizospheric soil occurred in three periods: sowing, flowering and sunflower harvest. The experimental design was a randomized complete block design with four replications. The evaluated parameters were number of total spores in 50 g of soil and arbuscularmycorrhizal colonization. The mean number of spores was 247 and 232 in 2009 and 2010, respectively. For root colonization there was a difference between years. The maximum spore production occurred during the flowering period and mycorrhizal colonization was not influenced by the genotype. To accomplish, mycorrhiza favors the development of sunflower in lower levels of phosphorus in the soil.

**Keywords:** *Helianthus annuus* L.; soil; arbuscularmycorrhizal fungi.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Soil quality and the viability of improvements through chemical, physical and biological management are essential factors for success in agricultural production. In this context, the study and the use of soil microbial population has shown the way to link sustainability to efficiency.

The symbiotic association between plant and arbuscularmycorrhizal fungi (AMF) is called mycorrhiza. Root colonization by arbuscularmycorrhizal fungi generates several improvements; the plant provides photosynthates to the fungus, and this, through the branching and extension of the mycelium, increases the area of nutrient absorption for the plant [1]. Thus, AMs can be used as an alternative to reduce the use of agricultural inputs, mainly fertilizers of chemical synthesis.

The influence of arbuscularmycorrhizal fungi acts not only on soil particles aggregation but also on plant growth, providing essential nutrients [2] and improving their ability to withstand adverse conditions.

The sunflower cultivation (*Helianthus annuus* L.) has aroused interest, especially in Brazilian Midwest, due to the broad adaptability to edaphoclimatic conditions, suitability for crop rotation and uses in the production of edible oil, biodiesel, ornamentation, animal food, among others [3,4].

**Comment [V1]:** What type of soil is it?

**Comment [V2]:** separate words

**Comment [V3]:** t would be more convenient to put the number of spores either per gram of soil or per kilogram of soil. This gives more idea of the density of AMF present in the rhizosphere of the studied plant

**Comment [V4]:** But was it similar in the 3 stages of plant growth sampled?

**Comment [V5]:** I suggest to put percentages in which the colonization oscillated every year

**Comment [V6]:** t is important to mention from the objective of the work that the variations in the number of spores and radical colonization in different genotypes and under different level of phosphorus fertilization were evaluated.

**Comment [V7]:** separate word

**Comment [V8]:** separate word

**Comment [V9]:** separate word

**Comment [V10]:** AMF? It is important to use the same way of naming fungi throughout the text

**Comment [V11]:** separate words

35 Considering that in the soils of the Cerrado Biome, for the optimization of the agricultural  
 36 production, is necessary the use of a high amount of inputs, and that the agronomic  
 37 efficiency is tied to the good indexes of soil quality, the present work aimed to evaluate the  
 38 number of spores in different times and mycorrhizal colonization in Cerrado Biome soil,  
 39 under cultivation of three sunflower genotypes.  
 40

## 41 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

42  
 43 The experiment was carried out at Santa Luzia Farm, in Campo Verde (MT-Brazil), latitude  
 44 15°45'12"S and longitude 55°22'44"W. The farm soil has clayed texture, with acid pH,  
 45 average bases saturation of 50%, absence of aluminum and high content of organic matter  
 46 (Table 1).  
 47

48 **Table 1. Chemical and physical properties of soil under sunflower cultivation in the**  
 49 **2009 and 2010 harvests at Farm Santa Luzia, Campo Verde – MT, Brazil**

Year	pH CaCl <sub>2</sub>	P	K	Ca	Mg	Al	H	MO	CTC
		mg dm <sup>-3</sup>			cmol <sub>c</sub> dm <sup>-3</sup>			gdm <sup>-3</sup>	cmol <sub>c</sub> dm <sup>-3</sup>
2009	5,1	21,8	76	3,2	0,9	0	4,4	37,8	8,7
2010	4,9	8,0	80	3,3	0,7	0	5,5	39,9	9,7

  

Bases saturation (V%)	Sand	Silt	Clay	Saturation (%)				
	g kg <sup>-1</sup>			Ca	Mg	K	H	
2009	49,3	196	133	671	36,7	10,5	2,3	50,7
2010	43,3	172	200	628	33,9	6,8	2,1	56,7

50  
 51 The experimental design applied in the field was randomized blocks, with four replications.  
 52 The plots were formed by four rows of 6.0 meters, spaced in 0.8 meters, between rows, and  
 53 0.3 meters, between plants, considering as useful area the two central rows. Fertilization  
 54 was carried out with 60-80-80 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of N-P-K and 2.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of boron.

55 The genotypes were M 734, Agrobela 960 and Helio 358, sown in 2009, and M 734, Embrapa  
 56 122 and HLA 860 H.O. in 2010. Rhizospheric soil sampling was obtained at 0-20 cm depth,  
 57 in three periods: sowing (first half of March), flowering (60 days after sowing) and harvesting  
 58 (after maturation). The rainfall distribution in the region, during the experiment, is shown in  
 59 Table 2.  
 60

61 **Table 2. Rainfall (mm month<sup>-1</sup>) in Campo Verde - MT, from February to July, in 2009**  
 62 **and 2010**

Year	February	March (S)	April	May (F)	June	July (H)	Total
2009	262	132	16	10	22	0,2	442,4
2010	385	206	325	55	3	2	974,0

63 S: sowing; F: flowering; H: harvest.

64  
 65 The evaluated parameters were total number of spores in soil, and arbuscular mycorrhizal  
 66 colonization, whose root sampling occurred during crop harvest. The spore extraction was  
 67 carried out by the wet sift methodology [5], in which the soil was processed in a sieving  
 68 systems (0.42 and 0.053 mm mesh) and centrifuged with water at 2800 rpm for 4 minutes.  
 69 Subsequently, the samples were resuspended in 50% sucrose solution, centrifuged and  
 70 washed. The spores were counted in a stereomicroscope in a petri dishes with vessels.

**Comment [V12]:** Is this a low dose of phosphorus? What is the dose that is used in a conventional way for the fertilization of this plant?

**Comment [V13]:** What was the reason why the genotypes used were selected? Why compare different genotypes in each year?

**Comment [V14]:** delete

**Comment [V15]:** separate word

**Comment [V16]:** use min instead of minute

71 For mycorrhizal colonization, the roots were washed, clarified with KOH (10%), acidified with  
 72 diluted HCl and stained with trypan blue [7]. Ten segments of 1-2 cm in length were selected  
 73 for slide assembly and quantification of colonization percentage under optical microscope.

Comment [V17]: 40X?

74 Analysis of variance were preceded and the significant means were compared by Tukey test  
 75 with 5% of significance.

### 76 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

77  
 78 For the factor year, there was no difference in the number of spores of AMF (Table 3). This  
 79 may occurred since the studied area adopted the minimum cropping system for more than  
 80 10 years. According to the authors [8], the association and mycorrhizal propagules  
 81 dissemination is more affected in the initial phases of the occupation and use of the soil, with  
 82 later stabilization.  
 83

84 **Table 3. Quantification of spores of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in Cerrado Biome**  
 85 **soil, under sunflower cultivation, in two years and three periods, in Campo**  
 86 **Verde – MT, Brazil**

Year	Genotype	Sowing			Flowering			Harvest			Average
		n° spores 50 g soil <sup>-1</sup>									
2009	M 734	153	b	B	296	a	A	267	a	A	247 a
	Agrobel 960	185	ab	B	342	a	A	233	ab	B	
	Helio 358	262	ab	AB	311	a	A	174	a	B	
	Média	200	a	B	317	a	A	225	a	B	
2010	M 734	234	ab	AB	270	a	A	147	b	B	232 a
	Embrapa 122	191	ab	A	254	a	A	216	ab	A	
	HLA 860 H.O.	271	a	AB	320	a	A	184	ab	B	
	Average	232	AB		281	A		182	B		
	CV (%)	11,60									

Comment [V18]: separate word

Comment [V19]: separate word

Comment [V20]: Why are there two columns where the results of the average comparison analysis are presented? there seems to be one more column in each sampled period in each evaluated variety

Comment [V21]: Why not perform the statistical analysis comparing between periods of culture in the same genotype and also among the 3? Interestingly, M734 presents for this year a number of spores opposite to that observed in 2009, to what do you attribute it?

Comment [V22]: Average?

87 Means followed by different letters in the column differ from each other, by the Tukey test ( $P = .05$ ).  
 88 CV:coefficient of variation.

Comment [V23]: Why use the coefficient of variation instead of the standard deviation to make the statistical analysis? Is there a difference of more than 100 spores between the first genotype and the last one in the sowing and harvest periods in 2009 and even then no statistically significant differences were found?

89 For the periods, spore density in flowering was higher in the two years of study, with a  
 90 general average of 317 in 2009 and 281 in 2010 (Table 3). The authors cited in the  
 91 reference [9] confirm that maximum spore production can occur in the flowering period and  
 92 in the final growth stage of the host.

Comment [V24]: To what is attributed that the highest density of spores can be obtained at the time of flowering and crop harvest?

93 According to the authors cited in the reference [2], the spore density of AMFs is generally  
 94 higher in agricultural systems, and variations may occur due to edaphoclimatic factors,  
 95 growing time, agricultural practices as well as the implanted crop.

96 The authors cited in the reference [10] studying Cerrado biome verified that the  
 97 arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi contribute to the growth of cultivated plants in annual cropping  
 98 and pasture systems and the number of spores of the native fungi varies, being the crop and  
 99 the cultivation system determinant for the enrichment of mycorrhizal fauna.

Comment [V25]: separate words

Comment [V26]: separate word

Comment [V27]: and?

100 The interaction between the genetic factors and the period was significant, demonstrating  
 101 that the genetic material influence the sporulation process. However, the variations were low  
 102 indicating the stabilization of the mycorrhizal fungi sporulation.

Comment [V28]: What is the average number of spores that can be found in a soil similar to the one in your study area? and in a native area?

Comment [V29]: separate words

103 In a carried study was verified that spore densities varies from 301 to 608 for maize crop,  
 104 whereas in soybean cultivated soil the values were between 239 and 287 [11], similar to  
 105 those obtained in the present work with sunflower. Mycorrhizal dynamics involving root  
 106 colonization and sporulation occur in different ways in different crops due to the compatibility  
 107 between AMF and the genetic characteristics of plants [12]. In addition, environmental,  
 108 climatic and edaphic factors generate changes in the symbiotic process [13].

Comment [V30]: separate words

109 In sugarcane the occurrence of AMF increase when the crop was preceded by sunflower  
 110 [14]. Likewise, sunflower favored the inoculum potential of AMF in the soil, and subsequent  
 111 corn growth [15].

112 Annual crops, green manures and forage species have a high degree of mycorrhizal  
 113 dependency, acting as a soil conditioning, multiplying the native mycorrhizal community  
 114 [16,13]. In this sense, sunflower is an option to benefit the soil mycorrhizal population in crop  
 115 rotation / succession systems.

Comment [V31]: This paragraph should be put once it has been demonstrated that the capacity of colonization of the plants by the AMF was high, otherwise it would not have sustenance, because the fact of finding a good number of propagules does not necessarily guarantee that these will be able to interact with the cultivation of interest in the first instance and in the second to promote the benefits reported in the literature

116 For the mycorrhizal colonization rate, it was observed a variation from 21 to 28% in 2009  
 117 and 28 to 48% in 2010 (Table 4), with no difference between genotypes. According to the  
 118 authors cited in the reference [17], mycorrhizal dependence can be defined as the plant's  
 119 responsiveness to mycorrhization through increased growth, which may be related to the  
 120 fertility and amount of phosphorus, present in the soil.

Comment [V32]: The percentages of colonization observed in all genotypes in the 2 years of sampling are low. In the literature, good colonization arises when the colonization oscillates around 40 and 60%. It would be convenient to include percentages of radical colonization reported for sunflower in other works.

121 About the factor year, in 2010 there was a higher mycorrhizal colonization, which can be  
 122 explained by the lower phosphorus content in the soil (Table 1). The correlation between the  
 123 phosphorus content and mycorrhizal colonization is negative [18] so, the reduction in the P  
 124 content may lead to an increase in plant colonization. Studing sunflower hybrids, it was  
 125 verified that higher doses of P decreased sporulation and AMF colonization [19].

Comment [V33]: This explanation has no support because although the soil could have a low initial content, it was compensated by the fertilization that was applied to the crop. On the other hand, how does it explain the substantive decrease of P presented in the soil from 2009 to 2010? This could be the result of a high demand for the crop or a leaching due to the amount of rainfall that occurred before sowing?

126  
 127 **Table 4. Average percentage of AMF colonization in soil under sunflower cultivation,**  
 128 **in Campo Verde - MT, Brazil, in 2009 and 2010**

Year	Genotype	Mycorrhizal colonization (%)	Average
2009	M 734	28 a	24 b
	Agrobel 960	21 a	
	Helio 358	22 a	
2010	M 734	38 a	38 a
	Embrapa 122	48 a	
	HLA 860 H.O.	28 a	
CV (%)		16,24	

Comment [V34]: it is necessary to specify if the doses of phosphorus that you applied in the fertilization of the plants are lower than those that are applied in a conventional manner

129 Means followed by different letters in the column differ from each other, by the Tukey test (P =.05).  
 130 CV:coefficient of variation.

Comment [V35]:

131 In general, the relationship AMF-plant can be mediated by nutrient levels, present in the soil,  
 132 since these fungi increase root exploration area, contributing to a greater absorption of  
 133 nutrients for the plant. As the increase in soil phosphorus decreases the root mycorrhizal  
 134 colonization and the plant dependence to mycorrhization [20], in soils with low levels of  
 135 phosphorus, typical of the Cerrado biome, the AMF favors sunflower cultivation [21].

136  
 137 Studying, AMF inoculation in sunflower, it was observed an increase in chapter diameter,  
 138 thousand achenes weight and achenes yield, parameters that were related to the better  
 139 development of the plants through the association with AMFs, due the higher absorption of  
 140 nutrients as P, K and Fe.  
 141

Comment [V36]: Where are the results that allow verification of this information?

142 In addition, there is evidences that mycorrhizal-sunflower ratio enables greater plant  
143 resistance to heat, showing an interesting impact in Cerrado production systems, which is  
144 characterized by high temperatures [23].

Comment [V37]: How does this information relate to the results obtained in this study?

146 Moreover, the potential of AMFs as biofertilizer for oleaginous crops is reforced, especially  
147 for soils with low fertility, since the practice allows to reach adequate levels of production,  
148 with less use of synthetic fertilizers making the productive system more sustainable [19].

149  
150 Therefore, colonization and mycorrhizal sporulation vary according to the sunflower  
151 genotype and the evaluation period. On flowering period there were intense AMFs activity,  
152 moment that is required to the plant a high nutritional supply for grain production.

#### 154 4. CONCLUSION

155  
156 The number of spores has low variation, demonstrating that the system is stable. The  
157 maximum production occurs in flowering period.

158 Mycorrhizal colonization in sunflower is not influenced by the genotype.

Comment [V38]: The conclusions are contradictory and only partial, it is necessary to abound more in the analysis of the results observed in number of propagules reported by genotype and year of sampling

159 Lower soil phosphorus levels favorsarbuscularmycorrhizal colonization.

Comment [V39]: separate words

#### 160 COMPETING INTERESTS

161  
162 We declare that no competing interests exist.

#### 164 REFERENCES

165  
166 1. Silva TFB, Santos ABS, Rozas CEO, Santos AC, Paiva LM. Influence of the density of  
167 mycorrhizal fungi on the production of passion fruit (*Passiflora alata* CURTIS). *The* 2009; 22  
168 (4): 1-6. English.

Comment [V40]: cursive

169

170 2. Rosseto P, Urcoviche RC, Oliviera JR, Alberton O. Spore density of mycorrhizal and  
171 fungal fungi of the UNIPAR glomale germplasm bank. *Archives of Veterinary Sciences and*  
172 *Zoology of UNIPAR*. 2012; 15 (1): 43-47. English. DOI: 10.25110 / arqvet.v15i1.2012.4166

173

174 3. Grunvald AK, Carvalho CGP, Oliveira ACB, Andrade CAB. Adaptability and stability of  
175 sunflower genotypes in Central Brazil. *Pesquisa Agropecuária Brasileira*. 2008; 43 (11):  
176 1483-1493. English. DOI: 10.1590 / S0100-204X2008001100006

177

178 4. Souza FR, Silva IM, Pellin DMP, Bergamin AC, Silva RP. Agronomic characteristics of the  
179 sunflower crop intercropped with *Brachiariaruziziensis*. *Agronomic Science Journal*. 2015; 46  
180 (1): 110-116. English. DOI: 10.1590 / S1806-66902015000100013

Comment [V41]: cursive and separate words

181

182 5. Gerdemann JW, Nicolson TH. Spores of mycorrhizal *Endogone* species extracted from soil  
183 by wet sieving and decanting. *Transaction of the British Mycological Society*. 1963; 46 (2):  
184 235-244. English. DOI: 10.1016 / S0007-1536 (63) 80079-0

Comment [V42]: separate words

186 6. Giovanetti M, Mosse B. An evaluation of techniques for measuring vesicular  
187 arbuscular mycorrhizal infection in roots. *New Phytologist*. 1980;84(3):489-500. DOI:  
188 10.1111/j.1469-8137.1980.tb04556.x

Comment [V43]: separate

190 7. Phillips JM, Hayman DS. Improved procedures for clearing roots and staining parasitic  
191 and vesicular arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi for rapid assessment of infection. *Transaction of*  
192 *the British Mycological Society*. 1970;55(1):158-161. DOI: 10.1016/S0007-1536(70)80110-3

Comment [V44]: separate

194 8. Carrenho R et al. Mycorrhizal fungi in Brazilian agrosystems. In: Siqueira JO et al.  
195 *Mycorrhizae: 30 years of research in Brazil*. Lavras: UFLA; 2008.

196

197 9. Smith SE, Read DJ. *Mycorrhizal symbiosis*. San Diego: Academic Press; 1997.

198

199 10. Miranda JCC, Vilela L, Miranda LN. Dynamics and contribution of mycorrhizal fungi in  
200 crop rotation systems. *Pesquisa Agropecuária Brasileira*. 2005; 40 (10): 1005-1014. DOI:  
201 10.1590 / S0100-204X2005001000009

202

203 11. Angelini GAR, Loss A, Pereira MG, Torres JLR, Saggin Júnior OJ. Mycorrhizal  
204 colonization, spore density and diversity of mycorrhizal and fungal fungi in Cerrado soil  
205 under no - tillage and conventional tillage. *Agrarian Sciences*. 2012; 33 (1): 115-130.  
206 English. DOI: 10.5433 / 1679-0359.2012v33n1p115.

207

208 12. Smith SE, Gianinazzi-Pearson V. Physiological interactions between symbionts in  
209 vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizal plants. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant*  
210 *Molecular Biology*. 1988; 39 (1): 221-244. DOI: 10.1146 / annurev.pp.39.060188.001253

Comment [V45]: separate

211

212 13. Miranda JCC. *Closed: mycorrhizae: occurrence and management*. Planaltina: Embrapa  
213 *Closed*; 2008.

214

215 14. Ambrosano EJ et al. Crop rotation biomass and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi effects on  
216 sugarcane yield. *Scientia Agricola*. 2010; 67 (6): 692-701. DOI: 10.1590 / S0103-  
217 90162010000600011

Comment [V46]: separate

218

219 15. Karasawa T, Kasahara Y, Takebe M. Differences in growth responses of maize to  
220 preceding cropping caused by fluctuation in the population of indigenous

221 arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*. 2002; 34 (6): 851-857. DOI:  
222 10.1016 / S0038-0717 (02) 00017-2

Comment [V47]: separate

223

224 16. Miranda JCC, Miranda LN, Vilela L, Vargas MA, Carvalho AM. Management of  
225 mycorrhizal fungi through crop rotation in the agricultural systems of the Cerrado. *Technical*  
226 *Comunicat e* 42, Embrapa Cerrados. Planaltina. 2001; 42: 1-3. English. Accessed 16 Feb  
227 2019.

228 Available: <https://www.infoteca.cnptia.embrapa.br/bitstream/doc/564225/1/comtec42.pdf>

229

230 17. Janos DP. Plant responsiveness to mycorrhizas differs from dependence upon  
231 mycorrhizas. *Mycorrhiza*. 2007; 17 (2): 75-91. DOI: 10.1007 / s00572-006-0094-1

232

233 18. Ferreira DA, Carneiro MAC, Saggin J nior OJ. Mycorrhizal fungi in a red latosol under  
234 management and uses in the Cerrado. *Soil Science Journal*. 2012; 36 (1): 51-61. English.  
235 DOI: 10.1590 / S0100-06832012000100006

236  
237 19. Sarah S, Ibrar M. Effects of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi on Spores Density and Root  
238 Colonization of Four Hybrids of Sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) at Different Rock  
239 Phosphate Levels. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture*. 2016;32(4):258-266. DOI:  
240 10.17582/journal.sja/2016.32.4.258.266

Comment [V48]: separate

241

242 20. Balota EL et al. Effect of mycorrhizal fungi on different doses of phosphorus in sunflower  
243 and peanut. *Encyclopedia Biosphere*. 2010; 6 (11): 1-8. English.

244

245 21. Balota et al. Effect of mycorrhizal fungi on oleaginous crops. In: Brazilian Congress of  
246 Castor Oil & International Symposium on Oilseeds, 1., 2010, Jo o Pessoa. *Anais ...*  
247 *Campina grande: Embrapa Algod o*, 2010. p. 680-684.

Comment [V49]: separate

248 22. Silva AJN. Soil chemical properties and growth of sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) as  
249 affected by the application of organic fertilizers and inoculation with arbuscular mycorrhizal  
250 fungi. *Revista Brasileira de Ci ncia do Solo*. 2015;39:151-161. DOI:  
251 10.1590/01000683rbc20150194

Comment [V50]: separate

Comment [V51]: separate

252

253 23. Mayer Z, Duc NH, Sasv ri Z, Posta K. How arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi influence the  
254 defense system of sunflower during different abiotic stresses. *Acta Biologica Hungarica*.  
255 2017;68(4):376-387. DOI: 10.1556/018.68.2017.4.4

Comment [V52]: separate

Comment [V53]: separate

Comment [V54]: separate