

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 15<sup>th</sup> 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  $\mu\text{m}$ ) 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  $\text{pCO}_2$  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**

<b>VINE LENGTH (cm)</b>			
<b>Variety</b>	<b>WEEK 4 (WAP)</b>	<b>WEEK 12 (WAP)</b>	<b>WEEK 20 (WAP)</b>
Bungoma	20.96b	32.33b	86.8a
Kemb-10	23.56a	35.51a	77.7a
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>	1.95	2.33	11.68
<b>Mycorrhiza</b>			
MN	20.69b	31.28b	71.6b
MP	23.83a	36.56a	92.9a
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>	2.15	2.34	10.88
<b>VXMY</b>			
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 <sub>0.05</sub>	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**

<b>Number of Branches</b>			
<b>Variety</b>	<b>WEEK 4 (WAP)</b>	<b>WEEK 12 (WAP)</b>	<b>WEEK 20 (WAP)</b>
Bungoma	7.5b	10.61a	17.22a
Kemb-10	8.44a	11.23a	16.5a
LSD	0.85	1.09	2.09
<b>Mycorrhiza</b>			
MN	7.72a	10.06b	15.17b
MP	8.22a	11.83a	18.56a
LSD	0.95	1.08	2.07
<b>VXMY</b>			
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. Also, varieties interacting with mycorrhiza  
 164 revealed that the highest number of branches was observed where the varieties were inoculated.  
 165 These increases may be due to the beneficial effect of AMF in enhancement of phosphorus  
 166 element uptake, which is achieved through the increase in the absorbing surface and the  
 167 exploitation of a larger soil volume by the extra radical mycelium of the AMF. On the other hand  
 168 P is known for the activation of photosynthesis and metabolic processes of organic compounds in  
 169 plants and hence increasing plant growth [25].



### 171 **3.3 Influence of sweet potato varieties and mycorrhizal inoculation on yield**

172 The results of mean sweet potato marketable storage roots and shoot biomass yield recorded at  
173 20 WAP are as shown in (Table 3). There was significant difference ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) between the means  
174 in all the parameters. Kemb-10 recorded the highest  $41.2 \text{ tha}^{-1}$  marketable storage root yield.  
175 Data on shoot biomass yield revealed that Bungoma variety had the highest  $67.86 \text{ tha}^{-1}$  shoot  
176 biomass yield.

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194 **Table 3. Effects of sweet potato varieties and mycorrhizal inoculation on marketable**  
 195 **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 <sub>0.05</sub>	5.32	8.48
<b>Mycorrhiza</b>		
MN	34.89b	54.96b
MP	41.33a	70.72a
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>	4.88	12.87
<b>VXMY</b>		
BN	31.39b	61.31ab
KN	38.36ab	48.57b
BP	38.62ab	74.28a
KP	43.95a	67.13a
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>	7.54	11.98

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

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

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

210 The yield variation may be due to genetic potential of different varieties [26]. Also [27] reported  
211 enormous existent variation among varieties. Among mycorrhiza inoculation, inoculation had  
212 positive effects on the marketable and above biomass yields. This pronounced positive effect  
213 agrees with most previous studies [28][29]. Inoculation of microplants of potato cv. Golden  
214 Wonder with a commercially available AM fungus inoculum containing three species increased  
215 the tuber yield when grown in the greenhouse in sand containing slow release fertilizer [30].  
216 These results are also in agreement with Fitriatin et al. [31] reported that applications of  
217 phosphorus solubilizing microbe significantly improved yield of maize on Ultisol. The results  
218 are also in comparison with those of Mukhongo et al. [32] who observed that combined  
219 application of biofertilizers and inorganic nutrients improves sweet potato yield.

#### 220 **4. CONCLUSION**

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

#### 226 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

227 Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

228

229

230

231

232 **REFERENCES**

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

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

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

- 299 24. Cekic, F.O., Unyayar, S., Ortas, I. Effects of arbuscular mycorrhizal inoculation on  
300 biochemical parameters in *Capsicum annuum* grown under long term salt stress. *Turk J*  
301 *.Bot.*2012 (36), 63-72
- 302 25. Purekar PN, Singh RR, Deshmukh RD. *Plant Physiology and Ecology*. 2 nd Ed. Chand, S.  
303 and Company, New Delhi, India.1992;
- 304 26. Mcharo M, Carey EE, Gichuki ST. Performance of selected sweet potato varieties in Kenya.  
305 *Afr. Crop Sci.* 2001; (9): 4 9-59
- 306 27. Vorasoot, N., P. Songsri, C. Akkasaeng, S. Jogloy and A. Patanothais. Effect of water stress  
307 on yield and agronomic characters of peanut. *Journal of Science Technology*, 2003; (25): 283-  
308 288.
- 309 28. Novak, Bruno, Ivanka Žutić, Nina Toth, and Nadica Dobričević. "Sweet potato [*Ipomoea*  
310 *batatas* (L.) Lam] yield influenced by seedlings and mulching." *Agriculturae Conspectus*  
311 *Scientificus* 72, no. 4 (2007): 357-359
- 312 29. Douds Jr, D. D., Joseph Lee, J. E. Shenk, and S. Ganser. "Inoculation of sweet potatoes with  
313 AM fungi produced on-farm increases yield in high P soil." *Journal of Applied Horticulture* 17,  
314 no. 3 (2015): 171-175.
- 315 30. Ryan, NA., Deliopoulos, T., Jones, P. and Haydock, P.P.J. Effects of mixed-isolate  
316 illycoiThizal inoculum on potato-potato cyst nematode interaction. *Annals of Applied Botwti*,  
317 2003; (143). 111-119.
- 318 31. Fitriatin, B.N., Yuniarti, A., Turmuktini, T., Ruswandi, T.K. The effect of phosphate  
319 solubilizing microbe producing growth regulators on soil phosphate, growth and yield of maize  
320 and fertilizer efficiency on Ultisol. *Eurasian Journal of Soil Science*.2014; 3(2): 101–107.

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

324

325

326

327

UNDER PEER REVIEW