

3 **Effects of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal inoculation on growth and yield of two sweet**
4 **potato varieties**

6 **ABSTRACT**

7 Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) represent a functionally important component of soil
8 microbial community, being of particular significance for plant mineral nutrition in tropical agro
9 ecosystems. The effects of AMF inoculation on growth and yield of two sweet potato varieties
10 was studied during the short rains season of 2017/2018 in the Teaching and Research Farm of
11 Agricultural Science and Technology Department, Kenyatta University. The experiment was laid
12 down as 2x2 factorial design in a randomized complete block design (RCBD) with three
13 replications. The experimental factors were two sweet potato varieties (Kemb-10 and Bungoma)
14 and AMF inoculum (With and without inoculation). Data on growth was collected on vine length
15 and number of branches, while data on yield was collected on marketable storage roots and shoot
16 biomass. Data was analyzed using Genstat 15th edition and the results showed that there was
17 significantly difference at $P \leq 0.05$ among the treatments. AMF inoculation increased growth and
18 yield of sweet potatoes by vine length 29.74%, Number of branches 22.36%, marketable storage
19 roots 18.32%, and shoot biomass 28.68% in week 20. Also, variety interacting with AMF
20 inoculation enhanced growth and yield parameters. In conclusion, the study demonstrated that
21 the application of commercial AMF inoculum solely or when interacting with varieties enhanced
22 the growth and yield of sweet potatoes, though there was no significant difference between the
23 two varieties.

24 *Keywords: Arbuscular mycorrhiza fungi; inoculation; interactions; growth; yields.*

28 1. INTRODUCTION

29 Sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas* (L) Lam) is a dicotyledonous plant belonging to the family
30 Convolvulaceae. It is one of such important starchy tuber crops in tropical and subtropical
31 countries because of its yield potential and high calorific value. It is an important food security
32 crop in many developing countries [1]. The roots are mainly consumed though the leaves also
33 provide essential minerals, vitamins and protein [2]. It is ranked as the sixth most important food
34 crop worldwide, following rice, wheat, potatoes, maize, and cassava [3]. One reason for this is
35 that sweet potato is a hardy crop and can thrive on marginal soils [4]. Notwithstanding its hardy
36 nature, just like other crops it still requires some important nutrients to realize its full production
37 potential. For this reason, over the years, there has been a decline in sweet potato yield due to the
38 inherent poor soils in low- income countries [5].

39 On the other hand, inorganic fertilizers may enhance good yields [6], but farmers in low- income
40 countries cannot afford the costly inorganic fertilizer. Therefore, the search for cheaper soil
41 amendments such as organic fertilizers to improve the soil fertility has become more important.
42 Organic fertilizers improve the physical, chemical, and biological characteristics of the soil
43 thereby increasing productivity for food, improved income, and nutrition security [7]. As
44 research efforts are directed toward improving soil fertility for increased yields, it is important to
45 consider the effect of microorganisms such arbuscular mycorrhiza on the growth and yield of
46 sweet potatoes.

47 Arbuscular mycorrhiza fungi (AMF) which belong to phylum Glomeromycota [8]. Amongst the
48 mycorrhizal associations, the AMF association is the most common one [9]. They are ubiquitous
49 obligate mycobionts forming symbiosis with the terrestrial plant communities [10]. The role of
50 mycorrhizae in plant development pertains to mineral nutrition especially the uptake of
51 phosphate [11]. This effect has been attributed to the external hyphae of AMF being able to
52 extend from the root surface to the soil beyond the P depletion zone and so access a greater
53 volume of undepleted soil than the root alone. Therefore AMF is reported to increase the
54 absorptive area [12], because the fine and thinner structure of the fungal hyphae have better

55 access to soil pores and can explore larger soil volumes, which results in more efficient mining
56 for Pi sources [13]. This is because they have a small diameter of hyphae (20–50 μm) which
57 allows access to soil pores that cannot be explored by roots. Mycorrhizal hyphae have a higher
58 affinity (lower K_m) for P than roots [14]. AMF also have biochemical and physiological
59 characteristics which differ from those of roots which can enhance P availability. They do
60 acidify the rhizosphere through increased proton efflux or pCO_2 enhancement [15], which can
61 mobilize P [16]. Also, according to [17], mycorrhizal plants show enhanced photosynthetic
62 capacity. With these benefits, the AMF are known to be of great importance due to their high
63 capability to increase growth, yield, and quality of crops through the acquisition of nutrients in
64 less fertile soils and consequently lessening the prerequisite for Phosphate-based fertilizers [18].
65 The present study investigated the effects of AMF inoculation on growth and yield of two sweet
66 potato varieties. The specific objective of this work was to assess the effects of mycorrhizal
67 mixed commercial inoculum on growth and yield of both improved and landrace sweet potato
68 varieties in Kiambu County Kenya.

69 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

70 2.1 Description of the Study Site

71 An experiment was conducted in the Teaching and Research Farm of Agricultural Science and
72 Technology Department, Kenyatta University at Thika Road, Kiambu, (7.27oN 3.54oE). The
73 farm is within the coordinates 1°10'50.0"S, 36°55'41.0"E (Latitude:-1.180568; Longitude:
74 36.928042). The area temperature ranges between 12.8°C during the cold month and 24.6°C
75 during the hot seasons. The soils are loamy, acidic, well drained and moderately deep with low
76 level of phosphorus (9.0 mg/kg). The average amount of rainfall received is 989 mm per year

77 [19] where 1200 mm rains is recorded during the long rains whereas 780 mm is recorded during
78 the short rains.

79 **2.2 Crop Husbandry and Experimental Design**

80 The experiment was carried out for five months during the short rains of 2017/2018 cropping
81 season which occurred between November and March. The experimental factors were two sweet
82 potato varieties (Kemb-10 and Bungoma), and mycorrhizal mixed commercial inoculum. The
83 inoculum consisted of *Rhizophagus irregularis*, *Funneliformis mosseae*, *Claroideoglossum*
84 *claroideum* and *Claroideoglossum etunicatum* AMF species.

85
86 The experiment was then laid out as 2x2 factorial experiments in a randomized complete block
87 design (RCBD). The experiment had a total of 8 treatments. Each treatment was replicated three
88 times. Well matured healthy and disease-free cuttings of the two varieties were procured from
89 KARLO Embu. The vines were later covered with a moist cloth under a shade for two days to
90 initiate roots before planting. As per recommendation, 25g of mixed mycorrhizal inoculant was
91 added to the root absorption zone during planting. Sweet potato cuttings measuring 30cm were
92 planted in each replication with 3m × 3m plot size at 60cm × 30 cm spacing. All other
93 recommended cultural practices were applied as needed. Plots were kept free from weeds by
94 regular hand weeding.

95 **2.3 Data Collection**

96 Data on growth (vine length and number of branches) was collected monthly and at the end of
97 the fifth month, final harvesting was done on plants from 1.5 by 1.5 m plots area and the yield
98 parameters (Marketable storage root yield and shoots biomass) were determined. Marketable
99 storage roots were judged by tuber size, length, shape, cleanness, free from pests and diseases,
100 and those having the weight of more than 100g. Shoot biomass was judged as those sweet potato
101 vines growing above ground.



a) Bungoma variety



b) Kemb-10 variety

102

103 **2.4 Data Analysis**

104 Data collected on sweet potato growth and yield components were subjected to analysis of
105 variance using GenStat statistical software version 15.1 edition. The mean separation for
106 treatments was done using Fischer's Protected Least Significance Difference (L.S.D) test at 5%
107 level of significance.

108 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

109 **3.1 Influence of sweet potato varieties and mycorrhizal inoculation on vine length**

110 The vine lengths differed significantly ($P \leq 0.05$) due to variety and mycorrhiza inoculation as
111 shown in (Table 1). At harvesting week 20, the highest 86.8 cm vine length was recorded in
112 Bungoma variety. Data on mycorrhiza inoculation showed that inoculum influenced higher vine
113 length in studied weeks with the highest 92.9 cm being observed at the end of the fifth month.

114

115 **Table 1. Effects of sweet potato varieties and mycorrhizal inoculation on vine length**

VINE LENGTH (cm)			
Variety	WEEK 4 (WAP)	WEEK 12 (WAP)	WEEK 20 (WAP)
Bungoma	20.96b	32.33b	86.8a
Kemb-10	23.56a	35.51a	77.7a
LSD _{0.05}	1.95	2.33	11.68
Mycorrhiza			
MN	20.69b	31.28b	71.6b
MP	23.83a	36.56a	92.9a
LSD _{0.05}	2.15	2.34	10.88
VXMY			
BN	19.26b	29.59c	74.70b
KN	22.13ab	32.97bc	68.44b
BP	22.67ab	35.08ab	98.81a
KP	25.00a	38.04a	87.00ab
LSD _{0.05}	3.04	3.31	16.52

116 **Means followed by the same letter within the same column are not significantly different**
 117 **(P≤0.05).**

118 **WAP=Weeks after planting, MN=Mycorrhiza negative, MP=Mycorrhiza positive,**
 119 **VXMY=Variety interaction with mycorrhiza, BN= Bungoma without mycorrhiza,**
 120 **KN=Kembo-10 without mycorrhiza, BP= Bungoma interaction with mycorrhiza, KP =**
 121 **Kemb-10 interaction with mycorrhiza**

122
 123 Data on interactions between varieties and mycorrhizal revealed that there was significance
 124 different at P≤0.05. In week five the highest 98.81 cm vine length was recorded in Bungoma
 125 interacting with mycorrhiza though the positive interactions were not significantly different in all
 126 the weeks. Bungoma variety performed better than Kemb-10 variety in terms of vine length even
 127 where there was no inoculation. This could have been so because Bungoma variety is land race
 128 variety while Kemb 10 variety is an improved variety [20]. This corroborates with [21] who
 129 stated that petiole and vine lengths vary widely with genotypes. It is evident from our data that

130 AMF inoculation improved plant growth expressed as vine length compared with the un-
131 inoculated plants. This results correlates with [22] who studied the effect of AMF inoculation on
132 Temulawak plant and observed that mycorrhizal inoculation improved yield of studied plant.
133 Also the results were in-line with the findings by [23] who stated that treatments had higher
134 values of growth parameters including plant height, and number of seeds per plant. Previous
135 studies show the positive effects of mycorrhiza on plant growth [24].

136 **3.2 Influence of sweet potato varieties and mycorrhizal inoculation on Number of branches**

137 Analysis of variance showed that there was significant difference ($P \leq 0.05$) among the number of
138 branches due to variety **in week four only**. Inoculated sweet potato produced significantly higher
139 number of branches in all the weeks compared with the un-inoculated plants. The highest
140 number of branches 18.56 was recorded in week 20 (Table 2). Data on interaction showed that
141 there was significance difference ($P \leq 0.05$) in week four. Data revealed that maximum number of
142 branches 19.11 was recorded in week 20 as a result of Bungoma variety interacting with AMF.
143 Meanwhile the lowest number of branches 15.00 was recorded in Kemb-10 without AMF
144 inoculation.

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152 **Table 2. Effects of sweet potato varieties and mycorrhizal inoculation on number of**
 153 **branches**

Number of Branches			
Variety	WEEK 4 (WAP)	WEEK 12 (WAP)	WEEK 20 (WAP)
Bungoma	7.5b	10.61a	17.22a
Kemb-10	8.44a	11.23a	16.5a
LSD	0.85	1.09	2.09
Mycorrhiza			
MN	7.72a	10.06b	15.17b
MP	8.22a	11.83a	18.56a
LSD	0.95	1.08	2.07
VXMY			
BN	7.22a	9.78b	15.33ab
BP	7.77a	11.44ab	19.11a
KN	8.22a	10.33ab	15.00b
KP	8.66a	12.22a	18.00ab
LSD	1.2	1.54	2.95

154 **Means followed by the same letter within the same column are not significantly different**
 155 **(P≤0.05).**

156 **WAP=Weeks after planting, MN=Mycorrhiza negative, MP=Mycorrhiza positive,**
 157 **VXMY=Variety interaction with mycorrhiza, BN= Bungoma without mycorrhiza,**
 158 **KN=Kembo-10 without mycorrhiza, BP= Bungoma interaction with mycorrhiza, KP =**
 159 **Kemb-10 interaction with mycorrhiza**
 160

161 Sweet potato varieties performed differently in terms of number of branches due to their
 162 genotypic differences. Results on mycorrhiza inoculation indicated that inoculation resulted in
 163 the highest number of weeks in all the weeks. These increases may be due to the beneficial effect
 164 of AMF in enhancement of phosphorus element uptake. Phosphorus is known for the activation
 165 of photosynthesis and metabolic processes of organic compounds in plants and hence increasing
 166 plant growth [25].

167 Results on interaction revealed that the highest number of branches were observed where the
 168 variety were inoculated this could have been so because one of the most dramatic effects of
 169 infection by AM fungi on the host plant is the increase in phosphorus (P) uptake [26] mainly due

170 to the capacity of the AM fungi to absorb phosphate from soil and transfer it to the host roots
171 [27]. This is achieved through the increase in the absorbing surface and the exploitation of a
172 larger soil volume by the extra radical mycelium of the fungi.

173 **3.3 Influence of sweet potato varieties and mycorrhizal inoculation on yield**

174 The results of mean sweet potato marketable storage roots and shoot biomass yield recorded at
175 20 WAP are as shown in (Table 3). There was significant difference ($P>0.05$) between the means
176 in all the parameters. Kemb-10 recorded the highest 41.2 tha^{-1} marketable storage root yield.
177 Data on shoot biomass yield revealed that Bungoma variety had the highest 67.86 tha^{-1} shoot
178 biomass yield.

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193 **Table 3. Effects of sweet potato varieties and mycorrhizal inoculation on marketable**
 194 **storage root and shoot biomass yield**

Variety	Marketable storage root yield (t/ha)	Shoot biomass (t/ha)
Bungoma	35.03b	67.79a
Kemb-10	41.20a	57.85b
LSD _{0.05}	5.32	8.48
Mycorrhiza		
MN	34.89b	54.96b
MP	41.33a	70.72a
LSD _{0.05}	4.88	12.87
VXMY		
BN	31.39b	61.31ab
KN	38.36ab	48.57b
BP	38.62ab	74.28a
KP	43.95a	67.13a
LSD _{0.05}	7.54	11.98

195
 196 **Means followed by the same letter within the same column are not significantly different**
 197 **(P≤0.05).**

198 **WAP=Weeks after planting, MN=Mycorrhiza negative, MP=Mycorrhiza positive,**
 199 **VXMY=Variety interaction with mycorrhiza, BN= Bungoma without mycorrhiza,**
 200 **KN=Kembo-10 without mycorrhiza, BP= Bungoma interaction with mycorrhiza, KP =**
 201 **Kemb-10 interaction with mycorrhiza**

202 Data on mycorrhiza inoculation showed that there was significance difference in all the
 203 variables. Inoculation resulted in the highest marketable storage root and shoot biomass yield
 204 41.33tha⁻¹ and 70.8tha⁻¹ respectively. Interactions between variety and mycorrhiza inoculation
 205 were revealed. The highest 43.95tha⁻¹ storage root yield was observed in Kemb-10 interacting
 206 with mycorrhiza while the lowest 31.39tha⁻¹ was recorded in Bungoma without mycorrhiza
 207 inoculation. Results on shoot biomass indicated that Bungoma variety interacting with
 208 mycorrhiza had the maximum 74.28t/ha biomass.

209 The yield variation may be due to genetic potential of different varieties [28]. Also [29] reported
210 enormous existent variation among varieties. Among mycorrhiza inoculation, inoculation had
211 positive effects on the marketable and above biomass yields. This pronounced positive effect
212 agrees with most previous studies [30][31]. Inoculation of microplants of potato cv. Golden
213 Wonder with a commercially available AM fungus inoculum containing three species increased
214 the tuber yield when grown in the greenhouse in sand containing slow release fertilizer [32]. This
215 results are also in agreement with Fitriatin et al. [33] reported that applications of phosphorus
216 solubilizing microbe significantly improved yield of maize on Ultisol. The results are also in
217 comparison with those of Mukhongo at al. [34] who observed that combined application of
218 biofertilizers and inorganic nutrients improves sweet potato yield.

219 **4. CONCLUSION**

220 The study demonstrated that the application of AMF solely increased the growth and yield of
221 sweet potatoes, though there was no significant difference between the two varieties. This is an
222 indicator that AMF had no preference between the two varieties. Furthermore, it is conclusive
223 that appropriate interactions between sweet potato varieties and mycorrhiza can significantly
224 enhance plant growth and yield.

225 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

226 Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

227

228

229

230

231 **REFERENCES**

- 232 1. Crissman C., Anderson P., Fuglie K., Kapinga R., Lemaga B., Devaux A., Bussink C. Trends
233 in the potato and sweet potato sectors in sub-Saharan Africa and their contribution to the
234 Millennium Development Goals In Kapinga R. E., editor; , Kingamkono R., editor; , Msabaha
235 M., editor; , Ndunguru J., editor; , Lemaga B., editor; and Tusiime G., editor. (Eds.), Tropical
236 root and tuber crops: Opportunities for poverty alleviation and sustainable livelihoods in
237 developing countries: Proceedings of the thirteenth triennial symposium of the international
238 society for tropical root crops (iSTRC). 2007; (pp. 9–19). Arusha, Tanzania: International
239 Society for Tropical Root Crops.
- 240 2. Bovell-Benjamin, A.C. Sweet potato utilization in human health, industry and animal feed
241 systems In: Ray, R.C. and Tomlins, K.L. (eds) Sweet potato: Post Harvest Aspects in Food,
242 Feed, and Industry. Nova Science Publishers, New York, 2010; pp. 193–224
- 243 3. International Potato Center. Sweet potato Facts and Figures. Available at:
244 <https://cipotato.org/crops/sweetpotato/sweetpotato-facts-and-figures/> [accessed March 27, 2018].
- 245 4. Nedunchezhiyan, M., and Ray, R. C. Sweet potato growth, development, production and
246 utilization: Overview. In R. C. Ray, and K. I. Tomlins (Eds.), Sweet potato: Post harvest aspects
247 in food (pp. 2–26). New York: Nova Science Publishers Inc.2010;
- 248 5. Sowley, E., Neindow, M., and Abubakari, A. Effect of poultry manure and NPK on yield and
249 storability of orange-and white- fleshed sweet potato [*Ipomoea batatas* (L.) Lam]. ISABB
250 Journal of Food and Agricultural Sciences, 2015; 5(1), 1–6
- 251 6. Ali, M., Costa, D., Abedin, M., Sayed, M., and Basak, N. Effect of fertilizer and variety on the
252 yield of sweet potato. Bangladesh Journal of Agricultural Research, 2009; 34(3), 473–480

- 253 7. Gibberson, D. I., Joshua, O.-S., Ato, B.-P., Justice, O., and Paul, A. A. The effect of deficit
254 irrigation and manure on soil properties, growth and yield of orange fleshed sweet potato
255 [Ipomea batatas Lam]. *Scholars Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences*, 2016; 3(7),
256 463–473. <https://doi.org/10.21276/sjavs.2016.3.7.4>
- 257 8. Schuëbler A, Schwarzott D, Walker C. A new fungal phylum, the Glomeromycota: phylogeny
258 and evolution. *Mycol Res* 2001; (105):1413–1421.
- 259 9. Tahat, M.M. and K. Sijam. 2012. Mycorrhizal fungi and abiotic environmental conditions
260 relationship. *Res. J. Environ. Sci.*, 2012; 6: 125-133.
- 261 10. Barea JM, Jeffries P. Arbuscular mycorrhizas in sustainable soil plant systems. In: B. Hock
262 and A. Varma (eds) *Mycorrhiza, structure, Function, Molecular Biology and biotechnology*.
263 Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg. 1995; 521-559.
- 264 11. Moose B. The influence of soil type and endogone strain on the growth of mycorrhizal plants
265 in phosphate deficient soil. *Rev. Ecol. Sol.*1972; (9):529.
- 266 12. Smith, S. E., and Read, D. J. *Mycorrhizal Symbiosis*, 2nd Edn. London: Academic Press.
267 2007
- 268 13 Schnepf, A., Leitner, D., Klepsch, S., Pellerin, S., and Mollier, A. “Modelling phosphorus
269 dynamics in the soil-plant system,” in *Phosphorus in Action: Biological Processes in Soil*
270 *Phosphorus Cycling*, eds E. K. Bünemann, A. Obserson, and E. Frossard (Heidelberg: Springer),
271 2011; 113–133.
- 272 14. Howlever, R. H., Asher, C. J. and Edwards, D. G. Establishment of an effective mycorrhizal
273 association on cassava in flowing solution culture and its effects on phosphorus nutrition. *New*
274 *Phytol.* 1981; 90: 279–283.

- 275 15. Rigou, L. and Mignard, E. Factors of acidification of the rhizosphere of mycorrhizal plants.
276 Measurement of pCO₂ in the rhizosphere. *Acta Bot. Gall.* 1994; 141: 533–539.
- 277 16. Bago, B. and Azcon-Aguilar, C. Changes in the rhizospheric pH induced by arbuscular
278 mycorrhiza formation in onion (*Allium cepa* L). *Z. Pflanz. Bodenkunde.* 1997; 160: 333–339.
- 279 17. Boldt, K., Pors, Y., Haupt, B., Bitterlich, M., Kuhn, C., Grimm, B., et al. Photochemical
280 processes, carbon assimilation and RNA accumulation of sucrose transporter genes in tomato
281 arbuscular mycorrhiza. *J. Plant Physiol.* 2011; (168), 1256–1263. doi:
282 10.1016/j.jplph.2011.01.026
- 283 18. Roy-Bolduc, A., and M. Hijri. The use of mycorrhizae to enhance phosphorus uptake: A way
284 out the phosphorus crisis. *J. Biofertil. Biopestici.* 2011(2):104.
- 285 19. FAO/UNESCO. FAO-UNESCO Soil map of the world. Vol. IV. Africa, UNESCO, Paris.
286 1974;4: 307-308
- 287 20. Mwololo J.K., Mburu M. W. K., and Muturi P.W. Performance of sweet potato varieties
288 across environments in Kenya. *International Journal of Agronomy and Agricultural Research.*
289 2012; Vol. 2, No. 10, p. 1-11,
- 290 21. Yen, D.E. The sweet potato and Oceania; An essay in Ethno botany. Honolulu, Hawaii;
291 Bishop Museum press.1974
- 292 22. Samanhudi, A., Yunus, B. Pujiasmanto and M. Rahayu. Application of organic manure and
293 mycorrhizal for improving plant growth and yield of Temulawak (*Curcuma xanthorrhiza* Roxb.).
294 *Sci. Res. J.* 2014; 2(5): 2201-2796.
- 295 23. Jarande, N.N., P.S. Mankar, V.S. Khawale, A.A. Kanase and J.T. Mendhe. Response of
296 chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) to different levels of phosphorus through inorganic and organic
297 sources. *J. Soils and Crops.* 2006; 16(1): 240-243.

- 298 24. Cekic, F.O., Unyayar, S., Ortas, I. Effects of arbuscular mycorrhizal inoculation on
299 biochemical parameters in *Capsicum annuum* grown under long term salt stress. *Turk J*
300 *.Bot.*2012 (36), 63-72
- 301 25. Purekar PN, Singh RR, Deshmukh RD. *Plant Physiology and Ecology*. 2 nd Ed. Chand, S.
302 and Company, New Delhi, India.1992;
- 303 26. Kothari, S.K., H. Marschner, and V. Rornheld. 1991. Contribution of the VA mycorrhizal
304 hyphae in acquisition of phosphorus and zinc by maize grown in a calcareous soil. *Plant Soil*.
305 1991; (131): 177-185.
- 306 27. Asimi, S. Gianinazzi-Pearson, V. and Gianinazzi, S. Influence of increasing soil phosphorus
307 levels on interactions between vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizae and *Rhizobium* in soybeans.
308 *Canadian Journal of Botany*. 1980; (58):2200-2205.
- 309 28. Mcharo M, Carey EE, Gichuki ST. Performance of selected sweet potato varieties in Kenya.
310 *Afr. Crop Sci*. 2001; (9): 4 9-59
- 311 29. Vorasoot, N., P. Songsri, C. Akkasaeng, S. Jogloy and A. Patanothais. Effect of water stress
312 on yield and agronomic characters of peanut. *Journal of Science Technology*, 2003; (25): 283-
313 288.
- 314 30. Novak, Bruno, Ivanka Žutić, Nina Toth, and Nadica Dobričević. "Sweet potato [*Ipomoea*
315 *batatas* (L.) Lam] yield influenced by seedlings and mulching." *Agriculturae Conspectus*
316 *Scientificus* 72, no. 4 (2007): 357-359
- 317 31. Douds Jr, D. D., Joseph Lee, J. E. Shenk, and S. Ganser. "Inoculation of sweet potatoes with
318 AM fungi produced on-farm increases yield in high P soil." *Journal of Applied Horticulture* 17,
319 no. 3 (2015): 171-175.

320 32. Ryan, NA., Deliopoulos, T., Jones, P. and Haydock, P.P.J. Effects of mixed-isolate
321 illycoiThizal inoculum on potato-potato cyst nematode interaction. *Annals of Applied Botwti*,
322 2003; (143). 111-119.

323 33. Fitriatin, B.N., Yuniarti, A., Turmuktini, T., Ruswandi, T.K. The effect of phosphate
324 solubilizing microbe producing growth regulators on soil phosphate, growth and yield of maize
325 and fertilizer efficiency on Ultisol. *Eurasian Journal of Soil Science*.2014; 3(2): 101–107.

326 34. Mukhongo, Ruth W., John B. Tumuhairwe, Peter Ebanyat, AbdelAziz H. AbdelGadir, Moses
327 Thuita, and Cargele Masso. "Combined application of biofertilizers and inorganic nutrients
328 improves sweet potato yields." *Frontiers in plant science* 8 (2017): 219.

329

330

331

332

UNDER PEER REVIEW