Plant-associated microbiomes in arid lands: Diversity, ecology and biotechnological potential

Asma Soussi¹, Raoudha Ferjani², Ramona Marasco¹, Amel Guesmi², Hanene Cherif², Eleonora Rolli³, Francesca Mapelli³, Hadda Imene Ouzari², Daniele Daffonchio^{1, 3} and Ameer Cherif^{4*}

¹ Biological and Environmental Sciences and Engineering Division, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, Thuwal 23955-6900, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

² Laboratory of Microorganisms and Active Biomolecules, Faculty of Sciences of Tunis, University of Tunis El Manar, Campus Universitaire, 2092, Tunis, Tunisia

³ Department of Food Environmental and Nutritional Sciences, Università degli Studi di Milano, 20133, Milano, Italy.

⁴ University of Manouba, Higher Institute of Biotechnology, LR11-ES31 Biotechnology and Bio-Geo Resources Valorization, Biotechpole Sidi Thabet, 2020, Ariana, Tunisia.

* Correspondence to: cherif.ameur@gmail.com

Abstract

Background Aridification is a worldwide serious threat directly affecting agriculture and crop production. In arid and desert areas, it has been found that microbial diversity is huge, built of microorganisms able to cope with the environmental harsh conditions by developing adaptation strategies. Plants growing in arid lands or regions facing prolonged abiotic stresses such as water limitation and salt accumulation have also developed specific physiological and molecular stress responses allowing them to thrive under normally unfavorable conditions.

Scope Under such extreme selection pressures, special root-associated bacterial assemblages, endowed with capabilities of plant growth promotion (PGP) and extremophile traits, are selected by the plants. In this review, we provide a general overview on the microbial diversity in arid lands and deserts versus specific microbial assemblages associated with plants. The ecological drivers that shape this diversity, how plant-associated microbiomes are selected, and their biotechnological potential are discussed.

Conclusions Selection and recruitment of the plant associated bacterial assemblages is mediated by the combination of the bio-pedo-agroclimatic conditions and the plant species or varieties. Diversity and functional redundancy of these associated PGPR makes them very active in supporting plant improvement, health and resistance to drought, salt and related stresses. Implementing proper biotechnological applications of the arid and desert-adapted PGPR constitute the challenge to be raised.

Keywords: Plant associated microbiome, Arid land, Extreme environments, Drought, Salinity, Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria, Sustainable agriculture, Biotechnology

Introduction

Arid areas cover nearly 47% of Earth's land surface. Such extended regions are characterized by various harsh environmental conditions mainly soil deficiency in water and nutrients, high salinity and acidity, low precipitation, high temperatures and UV irradiation (Whitford 2002). All the organisms thriving in these extreme environmental conditions, including plants and bacteria, adopt complex survival strategies to alleviate abiotic stresses. In desert environments, microorganisms are the first colonizers (Mapelli et al. 2012; Borin et al. 2010). They possess special adaptation mechanisms, partly related to their ability of expressing and regulating only those genes required to survive and respond appropriately to the physical and chemical composition of these particular habitats (Bohnert et al. 1995; Begley et al. 2002; Boor 2006; Colica et al. 2014). They are able to create stable associations with higher organisms like fungi, lichens and mosses to form the so-called biological soil crusts (BSC) which have a crucial performance in stabilizing soil against erosion and in the restoration of deserts soils (de-Bashan et al. 2010; Bashan et al. 2012; Xu et al. 2013). BSCs can also be favourable niches for the germination of plant seeds.

Microorganism colonization and services in extreme environments are essential for the plant establishment. While microorganisms favour the availability of water and nutrients for the plant, in return plant root system supply carbon sources for growth, representing a stable survival niche (Neilands 1995; Graham and Vance 2000; Richardson et al. 2009). In the plant root system, the rhizosphere, the first millimetres of soil surrounding plant root surface, is a thin dynamic layer of high activity and metabolism. Plant rhizosphere represents a suitable survival niche to microorganisms where nutrients are more available. In this compartment, bacteria are the most abundant microorganisms and since they are mostly providing useful services to support root and plant growth they are commonly defined as Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR). PGPR exert beneficial effects on the growth of the host plant via direct and indirect mechanisms. They directly promote the plant growth by increasing the availability of nutrients, for instance by fixing atmospheric nitrogen (Graham and Vance 2000; Richardson et al. 2009), solubilizing inorganic phosphate and producing siderophores that increase the availability of mineral nutrients such as iron (Neilands 1995; Richardson 2001). PGPR contribute to the modulation of plant hormone balance through the synthesis of hormone-like molecules, mainly auxins, cytokinins and gibberellins (Costacurta and Vanderleyden 1995; Spaepen et al. 2007). Indirect mechanisms include the prevention of attacks of plant pathogens through the synthesis of antibiotics or antifungal compounds and through competition for nutrients (Van Loon et al.

1997; McCully 2005; Couillerot et al. 2009; Saharan and Nehra 2011). On their side, plants noticeably contribute to the selection of PGPR by releasing root exudates, which generate a positive selection pressure and increase competitiveness among bacteria in root colonization (Shukla et al. 2013). A fraction of PGPR can also enter in root interior tissues, the so called endosphere, establishing the endophytic populations' community (Hallmann et al. 1997; Zinniel et al. 2002; Compant et al. 2005; Cankar et al. 2005; Danhorn and Fuqua 2007; Dias et al. 2009; Rhoden et al. 2015). Plants harbor endophytic bacteria that colonize a variety of internal plant tissues namely shoot, seeds and root tissues (Rosenblueth and Martínez-Romero 2006). In this context, Ulrich et al. (2008) identified *Paenibacillus*, *Methylobacterium* and *Stenotrophomonas* endophytes in the shoot tips and zygotic embryos of Norway spruce (*Picea abies*). In other studies, the endophytic bacteria *Methylobacterium extorquens*, *Pseudomonas synxantha*, *mycobacterium sp.* and *Rhodotorula minuta* were isolated from shoot tips of callus cultures of Scots pines (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) (Laukkanen et al. 2000, Pirttila et al. 2000). Beside, different bacterial genera have been identified within the endophytic community of potato (*Solanum tuberosum*) root tissues, for instance *Rheinheimera*, *Dyadobacter*, *Devosia*, *Pedobacter* and *Pseudoxanthomonas* (Manter et al. 2010). In *Mammillaria fraileana* seeds, endophytic bacteria distributed underneath the membrane covering the embryo and in the vascular tissue have been detected in addition to a large population of endophytic bacteria that have been isolated from stems and roots (Lopez et al. 2011). For instance, *Bacillus megaterium*, *Pseudomonas putida* and *Enterobacter sakazakii* have been isolated from the vascular cylinder, while *Azotobacter vinelandii* has been isolated from the root cortex.

This symbiotic association can be established without harming the plant (Lopez et al. 2011). Hence, several endophytes are of great importance given the beneficial effects that they offer to their host plants. Some endophytes are endowed with promoting growth potential (Dias et al. 2009; Bae et al. 2009; Lopez et al. 2011; Etesami et al. 2014) and biocontrol activities against phytopathogens (Melnick et al. 2013; Falcão et al. 2014). These particular characteristics lead them to be employed in several biotechnological applications. Thanks to their secondary metabolites, endophytes are employed as medicinal remedies (Strobel 2007; Qin et al. 2011) and as a tool for phytoremediation of organic contaminants giving their ability to degrade xenobiotics (Lodewyckx et al. 2002; Kuiper et al. 2004; Germaine et al. 2006; Doty 2008). They also play an important role in soil fertility and improvement of sustainable production of non-food crops for biomass and biofuel production (Ryan et al. 2008).

In stressful conditions mimicking arid and desert environments, it has been shown that biotic resistance of *Quercus pubescens* to insect pest infestation is not affected by warming and drought stresses. Leaf palatability is rather

influenced by the variability of trichome density implicated in such induced adaptation (Backhaus et al. 2014). Similarly, in salt stressed plants, adaptation implies a complex regulation machinery involving Ethylene Responsive Factor (ERF) (Klay et al. 2014). There is an increasing body of literature showing that arid soils may favour the selection of bacteria capable of providing suitable services to alleviate plant drought stress (Marasco et al. 2012; Marasco et al. 2013a; Shelef et al. 2013) suggesting that this adaptation may be manifesting in the bacterial assemblages.

Another important factor affecting the functioning of the root systems in arid soils is the multiple symbiotic interactions such as those that may occur between different life domains. An interesting case is the mutualistic tripartite symbiotic interaction established between the desert plant *Salsola inermis* with the beetle *Conorhynchus pistor* and its symbiotic bacterium *Klebsiella pneumonia* (Shelef et al. 2013). The bacterial symbiont inhabiting the gut of the plant-hosted beetle larvae, provide nitrogen to the beetle and the plant hosts. On its side, the host plant protects the beetle from predators and parasites with its roots and provides organic matter to the animal and to its symbiont. This example shows that symbiotic cooperation is capable to improve the growth sustainability of the partners under the harsh conditions of the desert. In addition, plant genotype was shown to have a direct effect in shaping the rhizosphere associated microbial communities (Haney et al. 2015).

Plants surviving in arid ecosystems can sustain specific root associated PGPR communities that are selected by the environmental factors peculiar of the different locations (Marasco et al. 2013a; Ferjani et al. 2015; Mapelli et al. 2013). Plant and cultivar type as well as nutriment richness of the soil, are pivotal factors for PGPR recruitment (Zhang et al. 2014; Latour et al. 1996). This selection gives rise to diverse PGPR communities with common capabilities for improving plant functionalities under the harsh conditions determined by drought and saline stresses in arid environments.

Within this context, several studies have explored this unique root-soil interface and assessed its biodiversity in arid lands, with particular interest for i) understanding PGPR activities involved in plant growth promotion and protection, ii) assessing the importance of the PGPR ecological-niche and diversity, and iii) exploiting PGPR to improve agricultural sustainability. In the following sections we discuss these aspects in the light of the recent literature.

Microbial diversity associated to plants growing in arid lands and deserts

Arid regions are characterized by low rainfall and substantial unvegetated areas, which offer a typical ecosystem with patchwork-shaped microbial assemblages (Pointing and Belnap 2012; Nagy et al. 2005). In the recent years, several surveys have been focused on the complexity of the microbial diversity associated to soils in these extreme ecosystems. Despite the different geographic location of arid lands and deserts across the world, the bacterial communities of lithic substrates were dominated by *Cyanobacteria* (DiRuggiero et al. 2013). In addition, *Proteobacteria*, *Firmicutes*, *Actinobacteria* and *Bacteroidetes* are the main phyla generally detected in these soils. In the Taklamakan desert, the largest mobile desert in Asia (China), fifteen phyla were obtained but the most abundant were *Proteobacteria* (25.10%), *Firmicutes* (24.8%), *Bacteroidetes* (22.7%) and *Actinobacteria* (8.9%), respectively (An et al. 2013). In another Asian desert, the Gobi desert, 13 phyla were observed confirming the dominance of *Firmicutes* (69.9 %), *Proteobacteria* (12.2%) and *Bacteroidetes* (8.2%) (An et al. 2013).

The Sonoran and Mohave deserts in North America present BSCs bacterial communities dominated by *Cyanobacteria* and a few proportion of bacteria related to *Acidobacteria*, *Actinobacteria*, *Bacteroidetes*, *Proteobacteria*, *Chloroflexi* and *Deinococcus* phyla. The bacterial communities in the Atacama Desert, the oldest and driest desert located in South America, showed the dominance of *Actinobacteria* and *Chloroflexi* with a low abundance of *Acidobacteria* and *Proteobacteria* (Neilson et al. 2012). These data have been confirmed also by the characterization of the bacterial community in the Tataouine Desert, a part of the world largest Sahara Desert in South Tunisia (Chanal et al. 2006). The common diversity traits observed in the bacterial communities of different deserts may be attributed to the largely common harsh environmental conditions of all these deserts, which are however affected by microbial cell inputs determined by the circulation of the airborne dust associated to sand storms (Nagy et al. 2005).

Despite the presence of similar bacterial community in arid lands and deserts, plants are able to shape and select specific root-associated bacterial communities that include bacteria capable to cope with the abiotic stress of these ecosystems (Table 1, Figure 1).

Several studies confirmed that the so called rhizosphere effect holds as well in desert ecosystems. 16S rRNA gene sequences produced by PCR-DGGE analysis of the bacterial community associated with the roots of *Larrea tridentate* located in the Mohave Desert of southern California, revealed a predominance of *Proteobacteria* (*Bradyrhizobiaceae*, *Rhodospirillaceae*, *Pseudomonadaceae*, *Aurantimonadaceae*, *Enterobacteriaceae*, *Xanthomonadaceae*, and *Alcaligenaceae*), *Bacteroidetes* (*Chitinophagaceae* and *Flexibacteraceae*), *Firmicutes*

(*Bacillaceae*), and *Actinobacteria* (*Micrococcaceae*) (Jorquera et al. 2012). In arid, yet cultivated soils in Egypt, the bacterial communities associated to the rhizosphere of pepper and medical plants were prevalently colonized by *Firmicutes* and *Proteobacteria*, while the bulk soil was characterized by the abundance of *Actinobacteria* and *Firmicutes* (Marasco et al. 2012; Koberl et al. 2011). In the same case study, Marasco et al. (2012) found different distribution of cultivable bacterial genera in different fractions of root system. *Bacillus* spp. (68% of the isolates) were mainly isolated from the endosphere, while *Klebsiella* spp. were dominating the isolate collections from the rhizosphere and the root surrounding soil, representing 61% and 44% of the isolates, respectively (Marasco et al. 2012). Ferjani et al. (2015) observed in date palms from South Tunisian oases a rhizosphere community completely different from that in the root surrounding soil, supporting the consideration that date palm root exudates are strongly shaping the bacterial community. A rhizosphere effect was also observed in the halophyte *Salicornia* sp. sampled from the Chotts and Sebkha saline systems in the South of Tunisia (Mapelli et al. 2013). All these studies proved that arid environments select very diverse bacterial communities that are shaped by the resources made available by the plant roots (Figure 1).

Ecological drivers selecting the plant-associated microbiome

Over the past decade, many research works have been focused on the plant associated microbiome selection. Progress in molecular tools has increased our understanding of the composition, the function and the ecological drivers of plant associated microbial assemblages. Despite the various microenvironments of the plant, including the phyllosphere, carposphere and endosphere, the rhizosphere has been the most investigated. A particular attention has been addressed to explore the PGPR diversity in this compartment in relation to different ecological drivers. The rhizosphere is defined as the soil fraction adhering to root plant strongly influenced by root exudates. It is well documented that the composition of root exudates depends on plant type, growth stage and environmental conditions (Duineveld et al. 1998; Gabriele et al. 2001; Appuhn and Joergensen 2006; Van Overbeek and Van Elsas 2008; Cavaglieri and Etcheverry 2009). Further studies showed how the composition of root exudates determines the recruitment of plant-associated bacteria. It has been shown that root exudates have a significant role in shaping the abundance of rhizosphere bacterial communities in herbaceous and arboreal plants (Zhang et al. 2014). Besides, it has been recently demonstrated that plant genotypic variations can also influence the rhizosphere associated microbiome (Haney et al. 2015). Interestingly, it has been shown in the same work that accessions of *Arabidopsis*

177 *thaliana* inhibited specifically some *Pseudomonadacea* species, namely *P. brassicacearum*, *P. fluorescens* and *P.*
178 *syringae*, without affecting most of the microbiome. Hence, plant genotype is a crucial factor in determining plant
179 associated bacteria that influence the plant health and physiology according to specific biotic and abiotic stresses.
180 Furthermore, it has been proved that *Olea europaea* L. genotype has a more relevant impact on endophytic
181 communities in olive leaves compared to the soil type, the environmental conditions and the geographic location
182 (Müller et al. 2015). This study has been performed on 10 *Olea europaea* L. cultivars leaves sampled from olive
183 trees growing at a single agricultural site in Spain and from nine wild olive trees developing in natural habitats in
184 Greece, Cyprus and on Madeira Island. A strong correlation between bacteria endophytic composition and plant
185 genotypes has been highlighted.

186 In addition to the selection operated by plants, abiotic stresses are the selective forces contributing to shape the
187 bacterial community associated to roots (Figure 2). A complex interaction between environmental and abiotic
188 factors was shown to play an important role in shaping bacterial diversity, as well as to affect the properties of soils.
189 It has been demonstrated that the biological state of agricultural soils and land use history play an important role in
190 shaping the bacterial communities (Paula et al. 1992; Latour et al. 1996; Lazarovits and Nowak 1997; Garbeva et al.
191 2008). In fact, plant growth potential of PGPR is more stimulated in nutrient-deficient soil than in a nutrient-rich
192 ones (Egamberdiyeva 2007). In a comparative study, Yanxia et al. (2009) showed that bacterial communities in the
193 soybean rhizosphere were more stable in clayey soil comparing to the sandy soil (Yanxia et al. 2009). Both soil
194 types and land use history parameters were shown to affect bacterial community to a greater extent than plant
195 species. Different plant types (maize, oat, barley and grass) were cultivated under greenhouse conditions in soils
196 with different land use histories. The previous land use was the main significant factor affecting the composition of
197 the *Burkholderia* community (Salles et al. 2004). Also the soil type showed an effect on *Pseudomonas* diversity, but
198 the soil factor exerted a preeminent influence on the bacterial communities' composition. Besides, Latour et al.
199 (1996) evaluated the bacterial diversity of roots associated bacteria of two different plant species. They
200 demonstrated that both soil type and host plant affect the bacterial diversity, though, the soil is the dominant factor
201 (Latour et al. 1996). In another research study, microbial diversity has been assessed near *Reaumuria negevensis*
202 plant growing in the Negev Desert (Saul-Tcherkas and Steinberger 2011). It has been demonstrated that bacterial
203 communities' abundance is closely related to seasonal variations. In fact, *Actinobacteria* was the dominant phylum
204 in all seasons except in winter. However, in winter season, *Acidobacteria* phylum reaches its highest density

(56.3%) and substitute *Actinobacteria* phylum, which decreases to 4.2%. Beside, *Proteobacteria* phylum increases in the winter season. In the other hand, *Bacteroidetes* and *Chloroflexi* phyla were higher in the summer season and lower in winter and autumn, though, *Gemmatimonadetes* phylum increased in autumn. Therefore, multiple ecological players shape the plant recruited microbiome. This peculiar plant associated bacterial assemblages are presumably involved in an adaptation strategy that allows the plants to overcome harsh conditions in arid lands.

Functional services of plant-associated microbiomes in arid areas

Considering the importance and the potential use of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria for agronomic and environmental applications, several studies focused not only on the bacterial diversity but also on the PGPR ‘ecological role’. In this context, the interest in exploring PGPR bacteria naturally adapted to harsh arid ecosystems is widely increased especially for those associated to plants exposed to water shortage and salinity (Marasco et al. 2013b; Daffonchio et al. 2015).

In this context, a research work has been carried out to assess the microbial diversity and promoting growth potential of grapevine (*Vitis vinifera*) rhizobacteria sampled from three distinct Mediterranean sites: Tunisia, Egypt and Italy (Marasco et al. 2013a). Basing on cultivation dependent and independent approaches, the bacterial community associated to grapevine root system (root tissues, rhizosphere, and root-surrounding soil) has been assessed. A phylogenetic study showed the affiliation of the different root associated bacteria to five phyla: *Acidobacteria*, *Actinobacteria*, *Firmicutes*, *Proteobacteria* and *Bacteroidetes*. *Alphaproteobacteria* was dominant in all rhizospheric soils sampled from the different countries. According to DGGE analysis, soil endophyte fractions presented a limited diversity compared to the other root system samples. It has been explained that this low microbial diversity can be the result of a strong bacterial selection in the root system that imposes specific physiological requirements within the endosphere. However, a considerable endosphere and rhizosphere bacterial diversity has been reported in the different latitudinal sites examined. Despite this diversity, it has been demonstrated that bacterial PGP potential remained unchanged in the different rhizobacterial collections even though bio-pedo-climatic conditions were completely different in the studied sites (different cultivars, soil type and climate) (Figure 2). This functional redundancy in grapevine root associated bacteria proves the strong functional equilibrium of promoting growth bacteria despite the environmental variation. Such a property may protect

grapevine from harsh conditions and ensure its survival regardless environmental constraints, mainly in arid systems (Marasco et al. 2013a).

A recent work on the date palm rhizosphere in the oasis ecosystems of Southern Tunisia, reported that the shape of rhizobacterial communities is correlated with geo-climatic features along a north-south aridity transect (Ferjani et al. 2015). Such bacterial community segregation between the different oases was associated with the harsher conditions in the southern oases close to the Grand Erg Oriental desert, respect to the mountain oases. The cultivable bacteria associated to the date palm rhizosphere belonged to *Proteobacteria*, *Actinobacteria* and *Firmicutes*, with *Gammaproteobacteria* dominating followed by *Actinobacteria*. The majority (85%) of isolates affiliated to the different phyla showed multiple plant growth promotion activities (Table 1). Identifying environmental factors contributing to microbial community variation at a large spatial scale can help in assessing microbial communities usable for desert farming. Date palm root system showed a complex diversity that exhibited a reservoir of PGPR adapted to thrive in the harsh conditions of the desert oases (Ferjani et al. 2015).

The rhizosphere of the halophyte *Salicornia* sp. obtained from the Sebkha and Chott hypersaline ecosystems in Southern Tunisia showed a high bacterial diversity and a large collection (475 isolates) of halophilic and halotolerant bacteria has been established. Twenty *Halomonas* isolates showed resistance to a wide set of abiotic stresses and performed different PGP activities *in vitro* mainly phosphate solubilisation, ammonia and indole-3-acetic acid production and potential nitrogen fixation. These results demonstrate the relevant potential of these bacteria to promote plant growth under the harsh salinity and drought conditions (Mapelli et al. 2013).

In another study, the rhizosphere of cactus plants growing on barren mineral substrates in North American deserts has been shown to contain dense layers of bacteria and fungi. The dominant bacterial groups were represented by *Pseudomonads*, *Bacilli* and *Actinomycetes* that have been shown to be able to dissolve several rock types and minerals, releasing significant amounts of useful minerals for plants (Bashan and de-Bashan 2010). Several PGPR strains may enhance root hair size and number, facilitating the mineral uptake capacity of the plant (de Freitas and Germida 1992).

An assessment of the bacterial diversity associated to pepper (*Capsicum annuum* L.) cultivated in a traditional farm subjected to desert farming practices in Egypt showed the presence of a dense and diverse bacterial population in the rhizosphere and the root surrounding soil. Conversely, the bacterial community associated to the endosphere was much less abundant presumably due to the selection exerted by the plant root tissues that select specific bacterial

colonizers. Most of the isolates (95%) presented *in vitro* multiple plant growth promoting (PGP) activities and stress resistance capabilities. It has been also demonstrated that under desert farming, PGP bacteria are able of enhancing plant photosynthetic activity and biomass synthesis (up to 40%) under drought stress (Marasco et al. 2012). To evaluate long-term agriculture impact on arid soil in organic desert farming in Sekem (Egypt), Koberl et al. (2011) analysed microbial communities of the desert soil as well as those associated with cultivated medicinal plants *Matricaria chamomilla*, *Calendula officinalis* and *Solanum distichum*. The desert soil was dominated by two phylotypes affiliated to *Ochrobactrum sp.* and *Rhodococcus sp.* which were also found in all samples from the rhizosphere and endorhiza of all the three medicinal plants. However, the rhizosphere and the endosphere of the medicinal plants presented a clear plant-specific effect since they shared only 20% of the bacterial community with the bulk desert soil. It has been demonstrated that indigenous desert microorganisms promote plant health in desert agro-ecosystems via an antagonist potential towards phytopathogens (Koberl et al. 2011). All these studies indicate that arid land conditions select efficient PGPR capable of resisting harsh conditions and to sustain crop production under the desert farming practices (Figure 1 and 2).

Biotechnological potential of PGP microbes and feasibility of their application

Many studies have shown the important role of associated root bacteria in increasing crop yield and soil fertility (Desai et al. 2012; Deivanai et al. 2014; Nadeem et al. 2014; Kumar et al. 2014) not only in the normal conditions but also under biotic and abiotic stresses. This potential is currently applied for desert farming (Koberl et al. 2011) and for restoration and reforestation of eroded desert lands (Chanway 1997; Bashan et al. 2012). It has been proved that one of the consistent strategies for enhancing *in vivo* effect of PGP microbes on plants is multiple inoculations and stress protecting bioformulations (Adesemoye et al. 2008; Wang et al. 2012). Beside, PGPR contribute to protect plant health against fungal, bacterial, nematode and even viral diseases in arid environments which are propitious to phyto-pathogens attacks (Rodríguez-Díaz et al. 2008; Almaghrabi et al. 2013). Fungal biocontrol has been mostly explored given its wide extension and devastating effect on crop yield (Ait Kaki et al. 2013; Siddiqui 2006; Recep et al. 2009; Muñoz et al. 2009). A research study on rhizobacteria associated with some desert plants in Saudi Arabia has been carried out to identify and to select effective isolates against phytopathogenic fungi. This investigation allowed the identification of successful isolates to *Bacillus spp.*,

Enterobacter spp. and *Pseudomonas spp.* Based on plant growth promotion properties, resilience to harsh conditions and antagonistic potentials, the strains have been proposed as biofertilizer candidates (El-Sayed et al. 2014). Nevertheless, the application of such inoculum in agrobiolgy, cannot cover the broad-spectrum disease control given the variability of cultivar varieties, environmental conditions and soil types. It can be only applied in niche applications especially with weakly domesticated crop in growth substrates lacking antagonists (Cassells and Rafferty-McArdle 2012). However, despite significant biocontrol activities against plant pathogens has been proved for PGPR in laboratory and in the greenhouse, field results are still uncertain since autochthonous community outcompete the added allochthonous formulation.

The biotechnological potential enclosed in the extreme arid and saline environments is not limited to the agriculture application. Raddadi et al. 2013 reported the production of halo-alkalitolerant endoglucanase by *Paenibacillus tarimensis* isolated from the inland saline system Chott El Fjej in South Tunisia. These cellulases were functional in a broad pH range, at high temperature and salt concentration up to 5M NaCl and 4.6M KCl. Consequently, they are promising candidate for industrial applications (Raddadi et al. 2013). Strains and enzymes isolated from arid extreme environments could be applied in bioremediation of polluted soils (Mapelli et al. 2012), especially under phytoremediation approaches for those strains capable to thrive in the root ecosystem. Indeed, phytoremediation processes have been proposed for enhancing plant adaptation and growth in soil and water contaminated with organic pollutants (Afzal et al. 2014) (Figure 2).

Furthermore, arid environment present deficiency in nitrogen compound, which implies symbiotic association between nitrogen fixing organisms and plants to increase the level of nitrogen and the plant growth in arid lands. *Rhizobia* are widely described as the most efficient nitrogen fixing bacteria especially rhizobium-legume symbiosis system (Zahran et al. 1999). Moreover, Requena et al. reported a combination between PGPR, arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and *Rhizobium spp.* isolated from semi-arid environment for legume plant inoculation to establish Mediterranean semi-arid ecosystems revegetation (Requena et al. 1997).

Conclusion

Drought stress is an environmental threat affecting plant yield and productivity. As discussed in this review, arid ecosystems harbour diverse microbial communities. In such ecosystems, PGPR associated to plant roots can be very

active in supporting plant improvement, health and resistance to drought stress. Major efforts have still to be implemented for the understanding of the factors that regulate the plant microbe interactions in the root system and the mechanisms that are behind the drought resistance conferred to the plants by the root-associated bacteria. As well, despite a huge body of literature is available about PGPR, the ecological factors determining their recruitment by the plant and the assemblage of effective bacterial communities in the rhizosphere and the endosphere remain elusive. It is evident that the assemblage of these bacterial communities is driven by different ecological factors, including soil type, land history, cultivar variety, abiotic stresses, geo-climatic factors and by the type of plant and its growing conditions. However, we are still far from understanding the relative weight of these factors in the establishment of the root meta-organism. The clarifications of these factors regulating the recruitment and the assemblage of drought resistance-inducing PGPR communities by the plant roots will allow to move PGPR from a prominent biotechnological tools yet to be exploited for agricultural, environmental and industrial purposes to a huge implementable biotechnological resource for agriculture.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank for financial support the European Union in the ambit of project BIODESERT (EU FP7-CSA-SA REGPOT-2008-2, grant agreement no. 245746), and the Tunisian Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific research in the ambit of the laboratory projects LR MBA206 and LR11ES31.

335

336 References

- 337 Adesemoye AO, Torbert HA, Kloepper JW (2008) Enhanced plant nutrient use efficiency with PGPR and AMF in
338 an integrated nutrient management system. *Canadian journal of microbiology* 54 (10):876-886. doi:10.1139/w08-
339 081
- 340 Afzal M, Khan QM, Sessitsch A (2014) Endophytic bacteria: Prospects and applications for the phytoremediation of
341 organic pollutants. *Chemosphere* 117c:232-242. doi: 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2014.06.078
- 342 Ait Kaki A, Kacem Chaouche N, Dehimat L, Milet A, Youcef-Ali M, Ongena M, Thonart P (2013) Biocontrol and
343 Plant Growth Promotion Characterization of *Bacillus* Species Isolated from *Calendula officinalis* Rhizosphere.
344 *Indian journal of microbiology* 53 (4):447-452. doi: 10.1007/s12088-013-0395-y
- 345 Almaghrabi OA, Massoud SI, Abdelmoneim TS (2013) Influence of inoculation with plant growth promoting
346 rhizobacteria (PGPR) on tomato plant growth and nematode reproduction under greenhouse conditions. *Saudi*
347 *Journal of Biological Sciences* 20 (1):57-61. doi: 10.1016/j.sjbs.2012.10.004
- 348 An S, Couteau C, Luo F, Neveu J, DuBow MS (2013) Bacterial diversity of surface sand samples from the Gobi and
349 Taklamaken deserts. *Microbial ecology* 66 (4):850-860. doi: 10.1007/s00248-013-0276-2
- 350 Appuhn A, Joergensen RG (2006) Microbial colonization of roots as a function of plant species. *Soil Biology &*
351 *Biochemistry* 38:1040-1051
- 352 Bae H, Sicher RC, Kim MS, Kim S-H, Strem MD, Melnick RL, Bailey BA (2009) The beneficial endophyte
353 *Trichoderma hamatum* isolate DIS 219b promotes growth and delays the onset of the drought response in
354 *Theobroma cacao*. *Journal of experimental botany* 60 (11):3279-3295
- 355 Backhaus S, Wiehl D, Beierkuhnlein C, Jentsch A, Wellstein C (2014) Warming and drought do not influence the
356 palatability of *Quercus pubescens* willd leaves of four European provenances. *Arthropod-Plant Interactions* 8
357 (4):329-337. doi: 10.1007/s11829-014-9313-4
- 358 Bashan Y, de-Bashan LE (2010) Microbial populations of arid lands and their potential for restoration of deserts. In:
359 *Soil biology and agriculture in the tropics*. Springer, pp 109-137
- 360 Bashan Y, Salazar BG, Moreno M, Lopez BR, Linderman RG (2012) Restoration of eroded soil in the Sonoran
361 Desert with native leguminous trees using plant growth-promoting microorganisms and limited amounts of compost
362 and water. *Journal of environmental management* 102:26-36. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2011.12.032
- 363 Begley M, Gahan CG, Hill C (2002) Bile stress response in *Listeria monocytogenes* LO28: adaptation, cross-
364 protection, and identification of genetic loci involved in bile resistance. *Applied and environmental microbiology* 68
365 (12):6005-6012
- 366 Bohnert HJ, Nelson DE, Jensen RG (1995) Adaptations to environmental stresses. *The plant cell* 7 (7):1099
- 367 Boor KJ (2006) Bacterial stress responses: what doesn't kill them can make them stronger. *PLoS biology* 4 (1). doi:
368 10.1371/journal.pbio.0040023
- 369 Borin S, Ventura S, Tambone F, Mapelli F, Schubotz F, Brusetti L, Scaglia B, D'Acqui LP, Solheim B, Turicchia S,
370 Marasco R, Hinrichs KU, Baldi F, Adani F, Daffonchio D (2010) Rock weathering creates oases of life in a High
371 Arctic desert. *Environmental microbiology* 12 (2):293-303. doi: 10.1111/j.1462-2920.2009.02059

372 Cankar K, Kraigher H, Ravnikar M, Rupnik M (2005) Bacterial endophytes from seeds of Norway spruce (*Picea*
373 *abies* L. Karst). FEMS Microbiology Letters 244 (2):341-345. doi: c10.1016/j.femsle.2005.02.008

374 Cassells A, Rafferty-McArdle S (2012) Priming of Plant Defenses by PGPR against Fungal and Bacterial Plant
375 Foliar Pathogens. In: Maheshwari DK (ed) Bacteria in Agrobiolgy: Stress Management. Springer Berlin
376 Heidelberg, pp 1-26. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-23465-1_1

377 Cavaglieri LOJ, Etcheverry M (2009) Rhizosphere microbial community structure at different maize plant growth
378 stages and root locations. Microbiological Research 164:391-399

379 Chanal A, Chapon V, Benzerara K, Barakat M, Christen R, Achouak W, Barras F, Heulin T (2006) The desert of
380 Tataouine: an extreme environment that hosts a wide diversity of microorganisms and radiotolerant bacteria.
381 Environmental Microbiology 8 (3):514-525. doi: 10.1111/j.1462-2920.2005.00921.x

382 Chanway CP (1997) Inoculation of Tree Roots with Plant Growth Promoting Soil Bacteria: An Emerging
383 Technology for Reforestation. Forest Science 43 (1):99-112

384 Colica G, Li H, Rossi F, Li D, Liu Y, De Philippis R (2014) Microbial secreted exopolysaccharides affect the
385 hydrological behavior of induced biological soil crusts in desert sandy soils. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 68:62-
386 70. doi: 10.1016/j.soilbio.2013.09.017

387 Compant S, Duffy B, Nowak J, Clement C, Barka EA (2005) Use of plant growth-promoting bacteria for biocontrol
388 of plant diseases: principles, mechanisms of action, and future prospects. Applied and environmental microbiology
389 71 (9):4951-4959. doi: 10.1128/aem.71.9.4951-4959.2005

390 Costacurta A, Vanderleyden J (1995) Synthesis of phytohormones by plant-associated bacteria. Critical reviews in
391 microbiology 21 (1):1-18

392 Couillerot O, Prigent-Combaret C, Caballero-Mellado J, Moënne-Loccoz Y (2009) *Pseudomonas fluorescens* and
393 closely-related fluorescent pseudomonads as biocontrol agents of soil-borne phytopathogens. Letters in applied
394 microbiology 48 (5):505-512

395 Daffonchio D, Hirt H, Berg G (2015) Plant-Microbe Interactions and Water Management in Arid and Saline Soils.
396 In: Lugtenberg B (ed) Principles of Plant-Microbe Interactions. Springer International Publishing, pp 265-276. doi:
397 10.1007/978-3-319-08575-3_28

398 Danhorn T, Fuqua C (2007) Biofilm formation by plant-associated bacteria. Annu Rev Microbiol 61:401-422

399 De-Bashan LE, Hernandez JP, Nelson KN, Bashan Y, Maier RM (2010) Growth of Quailbush in Acidic,
400 Metalliferous Desert Mine Tailings: Effect of *Azospirillum brasilense* Sp6 on Biomass Production and Rhizosphere
401 Community Structure. Microbial ecology 60 (4):915-927. doi: 10.1007/s00248-010-9713-7

402 De Freitas JR, Germida JJ (1992) Growth promotion of winter wheat by fluorescent pseudomonads under growth
403 chamber conditions. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 24 (11):1127-1135. doi: 10.1016/0038-0717(92)90063-4

404 Deivanai S, Bindusara AS, Prabhakaran G, Bhore SJ (2014) Culturable bacterial endophytes isolated from
405 Mangrove tree (*Rhizophora apiculata* Blume) enhance seedling growth in Rice. Journal of natural science, biology,
406 and medicine 5 (2):437-444. doi: 10.4103/0976-9668.136233

407 Desai S, Grover M, Amalraj EL, Kumar GP, Ahmed SKM (2012) Exploiting Plant Growth Promoting
408 Rhizomicroorganisms for Enhanced Crop Productivity. In: Satyanarayana T, Johri BN (eds) Microorganisms in
409 Sustainable Agriculture and Biotechnology. Springer Netherlands, pp 227-241. doi: 10.1007/978-94-007-2214-9_12

410 Dias ACF, Costa FEC, Andreote FD, Lacava PT, Teixeira MA, Assumpção LC, Araújo WL, Azevedo JL, Melo IS
411 (2009) Isolation of micropropagated strawberry endophytic bacteria and assessment of their potential for plant
412 growth promotion. *World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology* 25 (2):189-195. doi:10.1007/s11274-008-
413 9878-0

414 DiRuggiero J, Wierchos J, Robinson CK, Souterre T, Ravel J, Artieda O, Souza-Egipsy V, Ascaso C (2013)
415 Microbial colonization of chasmoendolithic habitats in the hyper-arid zone of the Atacama Desert. *Biogeosciences*
416 10 (4):2439-2450. doi: 10.5194/bg-10-2439-2013

417 Doty SL (2008) Enhancing phytoremediation through the use of transgenics and endophytes. *New Phytologist* 179
418 (2):318-333

419 Duineveld BM, Rosado AS, van Elsas JD, van Veen JA (1998) Analysis of the Dynamics of Bacterial Communities
420 in the Rhizosphere of the Chrysanthemum via Denaturing Gradient Gel Electrophoresis and Substrate Utilization
421 Patterns. *Applied and environmental microbiology* 64 (12):4950-4957

422 Egamberdiyeva D (2007) The effect of plant growth promoting bacteria on growth and nutrient uptake of maize in
423 two different soils. *Applied Soil Ecology* 36 (2–3):184-189. doi: 10.1016/j.apsoil.2007.02.005

424 El-Sayed WS, Akhkha A, El-Naggar MY, Elbadry M (2014) In vitro antagonistic activity, plant growth promoting
425 traits and phylogenetic affiliation of rhizobacteria associated with wild plants grown in arid soil. *Frontiers in*
426 *microbiology* 5

427 Etesami H, Mirsyed Hosseini H, Alikhani HA (2014) In planta selection of plant growth promoting endophytic
428 bacteria for rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Journal of soil science and plant nutrition* 14:491-503

429 Falcão LL, Silva-Werneck JO, Vilarinho BR, da Silva JP, Pomella AWV, Marcellino LH (2014) Antimicrobial and
430 plant growth-promoting properties of the cacao endophyte *Bacillus subtilis* ALB629. *Journal of Applied*
431 *Microbiology* 116 (6):1584-1592. doi:10.1111/jam.12485

432 Ferjani R, Marasco R, Rolli E, Cherif H, Cherif A, Gtari M, Boudabous A, Daffonchio D, Ouzari H-I (2015) The
433 Date Palm Tree Rhizosphere Is a Niche for Plant Growth Promoting Bacteria in the Oasis Ecosystem. *BioMed*
434 *Research International* 2015. doi: 10.1155/2015/153851

435

436 Forchetti G, Masciarelli O, Alemanno S, Alvarez D, Abdala G (2007) Endophytic bacteria in sunflower (*Helianthus*
437 *annuus* L.): isolation, characterization, and production of jasmonates and abscisic acid in culture medium. *Applied*
438 *microbiology and biotechnology* 76 (5):1145-1152

439

440 Gabriele W, Regine N, Horst B (2001) Variation of Microbial Communities in Soil, Rhizosphere, and Rhizoplane in
441 Response to Crop Species, Soil Type, and Crop Development. *Applied and environmental microbiology* 67
442 (12):5849-5854

443 Germaine KJ, Liu X, Cabellos GG, Hogan JP, Ryan D, Dowling DN (2006) Bacterial endophyte-enhanced
444 phytoremediation of the organochlorine herbicide 2, 4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid. *FEMS microbiology ecology* 57
445 (2):302-310

446 Garbeva P, Van Elsas JD, Van Veen JA (2008) Rhizosphere microbial community and its response to plant species
447 and soil history. *Plant Soil* 302:19-32

448 Graham PH, Vance CP (2000) Nitrogen fixation in perspective: An overview of research and extension needs. *Field*
449 *Crops Research* 65 (2-3):93-106. doi: 10.1016/S0378-4290(99)00080-5

450 Hallmann J, Quadt-Hallmann A, Mahaffee W, Kloepper J (1997) Bacterial endophytes in agricultural crops.
451 *Canadian journal of microbiology* 43 (10):895-914

452 Haney CH, Samuel BS, Bush J, Ausubel FM (2015) Associations with rhizosphere bacteria can confer an adaptive
453 advantage to plants. *Nature Plants*

454 Jorquera MA, Shaharoon B, Nadeem SM, de la Luz Mora M, Crowley DE (2012) Plant Growth-Promoting
455 Rhizobacteria Associated with Ancient Clones of Creosote Bush (*Larrea tridentata*). *Microbial ecology* 64
456 (4):1008-1017. doi: 10.1007/s00248-012-0071-5

457 Klay I, Pirrello J, Riahi L, Bernadac A, Cherif A, Bouzayen M, Bouzid S (2014) Ethylene Response Factor Sl-ERF.
458 B. 3 Is Responsive to Abiotic Stresses and Mediates Salt and Cold Stress Response Regulation in Tomato. *The*
459 *Scientific World Journal* 2014

460 Koberl M, Muller H, Ramadan EM, Berg G (2011) Desert farming benefits from microbial potential in arid soils and
461 promotes diversity and plant health. *PloS one* 6 (9):e24452. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0024452

462 Kuiper I, Lagendijk EL, Bloemberg GV, Lugtenberg BJJ (2004) Rhizoremediation: A Beneficial Plant-Microbe
463 Interaction. *Molecular Plant-Microbe Interactions* 17 (1):6-15. doi:10.1094/MPMI.2004.17.1.6

464 Kumar A, Maurya BR, Raghuwanshi R (2014) Isolation and characterization of PGPR and their effect on growth,
465 yield and nutrient content in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Biocatalysis and Agricultural Biotechnology* (0). doi:
466 10.1016/j.bcab.2014.08.003

467 Latour X, Corberand T, Laguerre G, Allard F, Lemanceau P (1996) The composition of fluorescent pseudomonad
468 populations associated with roots is influenced by plant and soil type. *Applied and environmental microbiology* 62
469 (7):2449-2456

470 Laukkanen H, Soini H, Kontunen-Soppela S, Hohtola A, Viljanen M (2000) A mycobacterium isolated from tissue
471 cultures of mature *Pinus sylvestris* interferes with growth of Scots pine seedlings. *Tree Physiology* 20:915-920

472 Lazarovits G, Nowak J (1997) Rhizobacteria for Improvement of Plant Growth and Establishment. *Hort Science* 32
473 (2):188-192

474 Lodewyckx C, Vangronsveld J, Porteous F, Moore ER, Taghavi S, Mezgeay M, der Lelie Dv (2002) Endophytic
475 bacteria and their potential applications. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences* 21 (6):583-606

476 Lopez B, Bashan Y, Bacilio M (2011) Endophytic bacteria of *Mammillaria fraileana*, an endemic rock-colonizing
477 cactus of the southern Sonoran Desert. *Archives of microbiology* 193 (7):527-541. doi:10.1007/s00203-011-0695-8

478 Manter DK, Delgado JA, Holm DG, Stong RA (2010) Pyrosequencing reveals a highly diverse and cultivar-specific
479 bacterial endophyte community in potato roots. *Microbial ecology* 60 (1):157-166

480 Mapelli F, Marasco R, Balloi A, Rolli E, Cappitelli F, Daffonchio D, Borin S (2012) Mineral-microbe interactions:
481 Biotechnological potential of bioweathering. *Journal of Biotechnology* 157 (4):473-481. doi:
482 10.1016/j.jbiotec.2011.11.013

483 Mapelli F, Marasco R, Rolli E, Barbato M, Cherif H, Guesmi A, Ouzari I, Daffonchio D, Borin S (2013) Potential
484 for plant growth promotion of Rhizobacteria associated with *Salicornia* growing in Tunisian hypersaline soils.
485 BioMed research international 2013

486 Marasco R, Rolli E, Ettoumi B, Vigani G, Mapelli F, Borin S, Abou-Hadid AF, El-Bahairy UA, Sorlini C, Cherif A,
487 Zocchi G, Daffonchio D (2012) A drought resistance-promoting microbiome is selected by root system under desert
488 farming. PloS one 7 (10):e48479. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0048479

489 Marasco R, Rolli E, Fusi M, Cherif A, Abou-Hadid A, El-Bahairy U, Borin S, Sorlini C, Daffonchio D (2013a)
490 Plant growth promotion potential is equally represented in diverse grapevine root-associated bacterial communities
491 from different biopedoclimatic environments. BioMed research international 2013

492 Marasco R, Rolli E, Vigani G, Borin S, Sorlini C, Ouzari H, Zocchi G, Daffonchio D (2013b) Are drought-
493 resistance promoting bacteria cross-compatible with different plant models? Plant signaling & behavior 8 (10). doi:
494 10.4161/psb.26741

495 McCully M (2005) The rhizosphere: the key functional unit in plant/soil/microbial interactions in the field.
496 Implications for the understanding of allelopathic effects. In: Proceedings of the 4th World Congress on Allelopathy,
497 2005. pp 21-26

498 Melnick RL, Bailey BA, Backman PA (2013) Bacterial endophytes of perennial crops for management of plant
499 disease. In: Bacteria in Agrobiolgy: Disease Management. Springer, pp 49-76

500 Müller H, Berg C, Landa B.B, Auerbach, Moissl-Eichinger C, Berg G (2015) Plant genotype-specific archaeal and
501 bacterial endophytes but similar *Bacillus* antagonists colonize Mediterranean olive trees. Frontiers in Microbiology
502 6. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2015.00138

503 Muñoz Z, Moret A, Garcés S (2009) Assessment of chitosan for inhibition of *Colletotrichum sp.* on tomatoes and
504 grapes. Crop Protection 28 (1):36-40. doi: 10.1016/j.cropro.2008.08.015

505 Nadeem SM, Ahmad M, Zahir ZA, Javaid A, Ashraf M (2014) The role of mycorrhizae and plant growth promoting
506 rhizobacteria (PGPR) in improving crop productivity under stressful environments. Biotechnology Advances 32
507 (2):429-448. doi: 10.1016/j.biotechadv.2013.12.005

508 Nagy ML, Perez A, Garcia-Pichel F (2005) The prokaryotic diversity of biological soil crusts in the Sonoran Desert
509 (Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, AZ). FEMS microbiology ecology 54 (2):233-245. doi:
510 10.1016/j.femsec.2005.03.011

511 Neilands JB (1995) Siderophores: Structure and function of microbial iron transport compounds. Journal of
512 Biological Chemistry 270 (45):26723-26726

513 Neilson JW, Quade J, Ortiz M, Nelson WM, Legatzki A, Tian F, LaComb M, Betancourt JL, Wing RA, Soderlund
514 CA, Maier RM (2012) Life at the hyperarid margin: novel bacterial diversity in arid soils of the Atacama Desert,
515 Chile. Extremophiles: life under extreme conditions 16 (3):553-566. doi: 10.1007/s00792-012-0454-z

516 Othman AA, Amer WM, Fayez M, Hegazi N (2004) Rhizosphere of Sinai desert plants is a potential repository for
517 associative diazotrophs. Microbiological research 159 (3):285-293

518 Park MS, Jung SR, Lee MS, Kim KO, Do JO, Lee KH, Kim SB, Bae KS (2005) Isolation and characterization of
519 bacteria associated with two sand dune plant species, *Calystegia soldanella* and *Elymus mollis*. Journal of
520 Microbiology-Seoul- 43 (3):219

521 Paula MA, Urquiaga S, Siqueira JO, Döbereiner J (1992) Synergistic effects of vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizal
522 fungi and diazotrophic bacteria on nutrition and growth of sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas*). *Biol Fertil Soils* 14
523 (1):61-66. doi: 10.1007/BF00336304

524 Pirttilä AM, Laukkanen H, Pospiech H, Myllylä R, Hohtola A (2000) Detection of intracellular bacteria in the buds
525 of Scotch Pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) by in situ hybridization. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 66: 3073-
526 3077

527 Pointing SB, Belnap J (2012) Microbial colonization and controls in dryland systems. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*
528 10 (8):551-562. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro2831

529 Qin S, Xing K, Jiang J-H, Xu L-H, Li W-J (2011) Biodiversity, bioactive natural products and biotechnological
530 potential of plant-associated endophytic Actinobacteria. *Applied microbiology and biotechnology* 89 (3):457-473

531 Raddadi N, Cherif A, Daffonchio D, Fava F (2013) Halo-alkalitolerant and thermostable cellulases with improved
532 tolerance to ionic liquids and organic solvents from *Paenibacillus tarimensis* isolated from the Chott El Fejej, Sahara
533 desert, Tunisia. *Bioresource technology* 150:121-128. doi: 10.1016/j.biortech.2013.09.089

534 Recep K, Fikretin S, Erkol D, Cafer E (2009) Biological control of the potato dry rot caused by *Fusarium* species
535 using PGPR strains. *Biological Control* 50 (2):194-198

536 Requena N, Jimenez I, Toro M, Barea JM (1997) Interactions between plant-growth promoting rhizobacteria
537 (PGPR), arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and *Rhizobium spp.* in the rhizosphere of *Anthyllis cytisoides*, a model
538 legume for revegetation in mediterranean semi-arid ecosystems. *New Phytol* 136 : 667-677

539 Rhoden SA, Garcia A, Santos E Silva MC, Azevedo JL, Pamphile JA (2015) Phylogenetic analysis of endophytic
540 bacterial isolates from leaves of the medicinal plant *Trichilia elegans* A. Juss. (Meliaceae). *Genetics and Molecular*
541 *Research* 14 (1):1515-1525. doi: 10.4238/2015.February.20.7

542 Richardson AE (2001) Prospects for using soil microorganisms to improve the acquisition of phosphorus by plants.
543 *Functional Plant Biology* 28 (9):897-906

544 Richardson AE, Barea J-M, McNeill AM, Prigent-Combaret C (2009) Acquisition of phosphorus and nitrogen in the
545 rhizosphere and plant growth promotion by microorganisms. *Plant and soil* 321 (1-2):305-339

546 Rodríguez-Díaz M, Rodelas-Gonzalés B, Pozo-Clemente C, Martínez-Toledo MV, González-López J (2008) A
547 review on the taxonomy and possible screening traits of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria. *Plant-Bacteria*
548 *Interactions: Strategies and Techniques to Promote Plant Growth*: 55-80

549 Rosenblueth M, Martínez-Romero E (2006) Bacterial endophytes and their interactions with hosts. *Molecular plant-*
550 *microbe interactions* 19 (8):827-837

551 Ryan RP, Germaine K, Franks A, Ryan DJ, Dowling DN (2008) Bacterial endophytes: recent developments and
552 applications. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 278 (1):1-9. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6968.2007.00918.x

553 Saharan B, Nehra V (2011) Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria: a critical review. *Life Sci Med Res* 21:1-30

554 Salles JF, Van Veen JA, Van Elsas JD (2004) Multivariate analyses of *Burkholderia* species in soil: effect of crop
555 and land use history. *Applied and environmental microbiology* 70 (7):4012-4020

556 Sandhya V, Ali SZ, Venkateswarlu B, Reddy G, Grover M (2010) Effect of osmotic stress on plant growth
557 promoting *Pseudomonas spp.* *Archives of microbiology* 192 (10):867-876. doi: 10.1007/s00203-010-0613-5

558 Saul-Tcherkas V, Steinberger Y (2011) Soil Microbial Diversity in the Vicinity of a Negev Desert Shrub—
559 *Reaumuria negevensis*. Microbial ecology 61 (1):64-81. doi:10.1007/s00248-010-9763-x

560 Sgroi V, Cassán F, Masciarelli O, Del Papa MF, Lagares A, Luna V (2009) Isolation and characterization of
561 endophytic plant growth-promoting (PGPB) or stress homeostasis-regulating (PSHB) bacteria associated to the
562 halophyte *Prosopis strombulifera*. Applied microbiology and Biotechnology 85 (2):371-381

563 Shelef O, Helman Y, Friedman ALL, Behar A, Rachmilevitch S (2013) Tri-party underground symbiosis between a
564 weevil, bacteria and a desert plant. PloS one 8 (11). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0076588

565 Shukla KP, Sharma S, Singh NK, Singh V, Tiwari K, Singh S (2013) Nature and role of root exudates: Efficacy in
566 bioremediation. African Journal of Biotechnology 10 (48):9717-9724

567 Siddiqui ZA (2006) PGPR: Prospective biocontrol agents of plant pathogens. In: PGPR: biocontrol and
568 biofertilization. Springer, pp 111-142

569 Spaepen S, Vanderleyden J, Remans R (2007) Indole-3-acetic acid in microbial and microorganism-plant signaling.
570 FEMS microbiology reviews 31 (4):425-448

571 Strobel G (2007) Plant-Associated Microorganisms (Endophytes) as a New Source of Bioactive Natural Products.
572 Medicinal Plant Biotechnology: From Basic Research to Industrial Applications:49-72

573 Ulrich K, Ulrich A, Ewald D (2008) *Paenibacillus* - a predominant endophytic bacterium colonizing tissue cultures
574 of woody plants. Plant Cell Tissue and Organ Culture 93:347-351

575 Van Loon L, Bakker P, Pieterse C (1997) Mechanisms of PGPR-induced resistance against pathogens.

576 Van Overbeek L, Van Elsas JD (2008) Effects of plant genotype and growth stage on the structure of bacterial
577 communities associated with potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.). FEMS microbiology ecology 64:283-296

578 Wang CJ, Yang W, Wang C, Gu C, Niu DD, Liu HX, Wang YP, Guo JH (2012) Induction of drought tolerance in
579 cucumber plants by a consortium of three plant growth-promoting rhizobacterium strains. PloS one 7 (12):e52565.
580 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0052565

581 Whitford WG (2002) Ecology of desert systems. Academic Press,

582 Xia Y, Greissworth E, Mucci C, Williams MA, De Bolt S (2013) Characterization of culturable bacterial endophytes
583 of switchgrass (*Panicum virgatum* L.) and their capacity to influence plant growth. GCB Bioenergy 5 (6):674-682

584 Xu Y, Rossi F, Colica G, Deng S, De Philippis R, Chen L (2013) Use of cyanobacterial polysaccharides to promote
585 shrub performances in desert soils: a potential approach for the restoration of desertified areas. Biol Fertil Soils 49
586 (2):143-152

587 Yanxia Xu GW, Jian J, Junjie L, Qiuying Z, Xiaobing L (2009) Bacterial communities in soybean rhizosphere in
588 response to soil type, soybean genotype, and their growth stage. Soil Biology & Biochemistry 41:919-925

589 Zahran H.H (1999) Rhizobium-Legume Symbiosis and Nitrogen Fixation under Severe Conditions and in an Arid
590 Climate. Microbiology and Molecular biology Reviews: 968–989

591 Zhang N, Wang D, Liu Y, Li S, Shen Q, Zhang R (2014) Effects of different plant root exudates and their organic
592 acid components on chemotaxis, biofilm formation and colonization by beneficial rhizosphere-associated bacterial
593 strains. Plant and Soil 374 (1-2):689-700

594 Zinniel DK, Lambrecht P, Harris NB, Feng Z, Kuczmariski D, Higley P, Ishimaru CA, Arunakumari A, Barletta RG,
595 Vidaver AK (2002) Isolation and characterization of endophytic colonizing bacteria from agronomic crops and
596 prairie plants. *Applied and environmental microbiology* 68 (5):2198-2208

597

598

599

600

Table 1: Diversity of plant associated bacterial assemblages in desert and arid land systems

Figure 1: Location in world map and distribution of the arid lands and desert ecosystems sites where studies were conducted on the diversity of plant-associated microbial assemblages as reported in Table 1. Microbial communities' diversity is shaped by the abiotic factors (arid conditions) and by the plant-related factors (Fig. 2). Microorganisms were detected by culture-dependent (green dots and letters), and-independent approaches (red dots and letters) or both (black dot). *Gammaproteobacteria* (Gp) are the most encountered class in almost all the prospected sites. *Alphaproteobacteria* (Ap) and *Firmicutes* (F) showed also high occurrence. Independently from each bacterial community components, PGP functional redundancy is noticed leading to functional services. These PGPR from arid lands hold the potential to sustain crop production under the desert farming practices. Detected Phyla: P, *Proteobacteria* (Gp, *Gammaproteobacteria*; Ps, *Pseudomonas*; Az, *Azotobacter*; En, *Enterobacter*; Ch, *Chryseomonas*; Hm, *Halomonas*; Ku, *Kushneria*; Cr, *Chromohalobacter*); (Ap, *Alphaproteobacteria*; Or, *Ochrabactrum*; Ag, *Agrobacterium*); (Bp, *Betaproteobacteria*; Ac, *Achromobacter*); F, *Firmicutes* (Bc, *Bacillus*; Ly, *Lysinibacillus*; Br, *Brevibacillus*; Pn, *Paenibacillus*; Vg, *Virgibacillus*; Mr, *Marinococcus*); A, *Actinobacteria* (Rh, *Rhodococcus*; Ns, *Nesterenkonia*) and B, *Bacteroidetes*; (Sp, *Sphingobacteria*).

Figure 2: Plant associated bacterial assemblages: Ecological drivers, functions and applications.

In arid environments, plants recruit diverse bacterial communities to undertake the harsh environmental conditions. Within the phyllosphere and the rhizosphere plant compartments, bacteria colonizing the rhizosphere and the endosphere are the most investigated. They are shaped by several ecological drivers. Plant related factors determine the plant associated microbiome depending on the plant type, its growth stage and the composition of its root exudates. Beside, plant genotype is also a crucial factor in determining plant associated bacteria depending on the cultivar or the ecotype. Abiotic stresses contribute to this bacterial communities' recruitment. Abiotic factors are related to the typical climate of the arid lands and deserts characterized by seasonal variations, high UV radiations and temperature and low precipitations. The biological state of agricultural soils and the land use history that affect the soil nutrients richness, structure, moisture and salinity, are also key ecological drivers. Despite the microbial diversity of PGP bacteria, functional redundancy has been shown. It proves a strong functional equilibrium although

the environmental variations. This distinctive characteristic can preserve plants from harsh conditions and ensure their survival regardless arid systems environmental constraints. These functions consist on plant growth promotion under harsh salinity and drought conditions, phytohormones production, facilitation of mineral and nutrient availability and uptake capacity as well as the promotion of plant health via antagonistic potential towards phytopathogens. PGP bacteria are endowed with diverse biotechnological potentials. They can be evolved in agricultural applications as biofertilizers and agents for phytopathogens biocontrol. They may be further used in phytoremediation for xenobiotic polluted soils. PGP bacteria can also be employed in industrial application, such as detergents, textiles and paper industries, thanks to their high resistance to salinity and high temperature in addition to their thermostability and tolerance of harsh chemical compounds.

table
Click here to download table: Table 1 PS Soussi et al.2015 R1.doc

Sites and Characteristics	Host plant/Plant part	Dominant Phyla / Isolated Strains (PGPR traits)	References
CULTURE-INDEPENDENT APPROACH			
Mohave desert (Southwest North America) Dry/Arid (1)	<i>Larrea tridentat</i> (Rhizosphere)	<i>Proteobacteria</i> <i>Bacteroidetes</i> <i>Firmicutes</i>	Jorquera et al. 2012
"Le Frecce" farm (North Itlay) Humid (6)	<i>Vitis vinifera</i> (Roots endosphere) <i>Vitis vinifera</i> (Rhizosphere)	<i>Actinobacteria</i> <i>Alphaproteobacteria</i> <i>Gammaproteobacteria</i>	Marasco et al. 2013a
Farm in Cairo periphery (Cairo -North West Egypt) Arid (10)	<i>Vitis vinifera</i> (Roots endosphere, Rhizosphere)	<i>Sphingobacteria</i> <i>Alphaproteobacteria</i>	Marasco et al. 2013a
Sekem farms (Egypt) Arid (11)	<i>Matricaria chamomilla</i> L. (Rhizosphere, Roots endosphere) <i>Calendula officinalis</i> L.(Rhizosphere , Roots endosphere) <i>Solanum distichum</i> (Rhizosphere , Roots endosphere)	<i>Ochrobactrum</i> sp. <i>Rhodococcus</i> sp.	Korbel et al. 2011
Mornag Vineyards (North Tunisia)	<i>Vitis vinifera</i> (Roots endosphere)	<i>Actinobacteria</i> <i>Alphaproteobacteria</i>	Marasco et al. 2013a

Semi-arid (7)	<i>Vitis vinifera</i> (Rhizosphere)	<i>Betaproteobacteria</i> <i>Sphingobacteria</i> <i>Alphaproteobacteria</i> <i>Betaproteobacteria</i>	
Sebkha and Chott (Southern Tunisia)	<i>Salicornia</i> (Rhizosphere)	<i>Betaproteobacteria</i> <i>Alphaproteobacteria</i>	Mapelli et al. 2013
Hypersaline soils (8)		<i>Firmicutes</i>	
CULTURE-DEPENDENT APPROACH			
Arid land	<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> L (Rhizosphere)	<i>Pseudomonas</i> (PS, PH, Si, Am) (9)	Sandhya et al. 2010
India	<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> L (Rhizosphere)		
Arid (13)	<i>Zea mays</i> L (Rhizosphere)		
Southern Sonoran Desert (North America)	<i>Mammillaria fraileana</i> (Endosphere, Roots cortex)	<i>Azotobacter vinelandii</i> (NF)	Lopez et al. 2011
Subtropical, hot, dry (3)	<i>Mammillaria fraileana</i> (Endosphere, Roots cylinder)	<i>Pseudomonas Putida</i> (PS) <i>Enterobacter sakazakii</i> (PS) <i>Bacillus megaterium</i> (PS)	
El Bebedero saline	<i>Prosopis strombulifera</i> (Roots endosphere)	<i>Lysinibacillus fusiformis</i> (NF, PH)	Sgroy et al. 2009

(San Luis, Argentina)		<i>Bacillus subtilis</i> (NF, ACC, PH)	
Saline system 5		<i>Brevibacterium halotolerans</i> (NF, ACC, AF, PH)	
		<i>Bacillus licheniformis</i> (NF, ACC, PH)	
		<i>Bacillus pumilus</i> (NF, ACC, AF, PH)	
		<i>Achromobacter xylosoxidans</i> (NF, ACC, PH)	
		<i>Pseudomonas putida</i> (Si, NF, ACC, PH)	
Tae-An sand dunes	<i>Calystegia soldanella</i> (Rhizosphere)	<i>Gammaproteobacteria</i>	Park et al. 2005
(Chungnam- South Korea)		<i>Bacteroidetes</i> , <i>Actinobacteria</i>	
Desert 14	<i>Calystegia soldanella</i> (Roots)	<i>Gammaproteobacteria</i>	
		<i>Alphaproteobacteria</i> , <i>Actinobacteria</i>	
	<i>Elymus mollis</i> (Rhizosphere)	<i>Gammaproteobacteria</i> ,	
		<i>Bacteroidetes</i> , <i>Actinobacteria</i>	
	<i>Elymus mollis</i> (Roots)	<i>Gammaproteobacteria</i>	
Sinai desert	<i>Panicum turgidum</i> (Rhizosphere)	<i>Paenibacillus macerans</i> (NF)	Othman et al. 2004
(Egypt)		<i>Bacillus circulans</i> (NF)	
Arid to desert 12		<i>Agrobacterium radiobacter</i> (NF)	
		<i>Chryseomonas luteola</i> (NF)	
		<i>Bacillus circulans</i> (NF)	
	<i>Panicum turgidum</i> (Intact root)	<i>Bacillus circulans</i> (NF)	

		<i>Enterobacter agglomerans</i> (NF)	
Oases (Southern Tunisia) Arid (9)	<i>Phoenix dactylifera</i> L.(Rhizosphere)	<i>Gammaproteobacteria</i> <i>Actinobacteria</i>	Ferjani et al. 2014
Western Kentucky coal fields (USA) Moderate climate (2)	<i>Panicum virgatum</i> L. (Shoot, root and seeds)	<i>Firmicutes</i> <i>Proteobacteria</i> <i>Actinobacteria</i>	Xia et al. 2013
Cordóba (Argentina) Cultivation under drought conditions (4)	<i>Helianthus annuus</i> (Roots)	<i>Achromobacter xiloxidans</i> (NF, AF, PH) <i>Bacillus</i> sp. (NF, AF, PH)	Forchetti et al. 2007
Sebkha and Chott (Southern Tunisia) Hypersaline soils (8)	<i>Salicornia</i> (Rhizosphere)	<i>Halomonas taeheungii</i> (ACC, PA, Am) <i>Halomonas xinjiangensis</i> (ACC, PA, Am) <i>Halomonas elongate</i> (NF, PA, Am), <i>H. eurihalina</i> (NF, PA, Am), <i>H. indalina</i> (NF, PA, Am), <i>Kushneria marisflavi</i> (NF, PA, Am), <i>Chromohalobacter canadensis</i> (NF, PA, Am) <i>Marinococcus</i> (PA, Am), <i>Nesterenkonia</i> (PA, Am), <i>Virgibacillus</i> (PA, Am)	Mapelli et al. 2013

(a). Site number in Figure 1; (b). Plant Growth Promoting activities: Nitrogen Fixation (NF), Phosphate Solubilization (PS), Phytohormones production (PH), Siderophore production (Si), Ammonia production (Am), 1 aminocyclo-propane-1-carboxylate deaminase production (ACC), antifungal activity (AF), Protease Activity (PA).

colour figure
Click here to download colour figure: PS Soussi et al 2015 - PLSO-D-15-00792- Figure 1 R1.ppt

colour figure

[Click here to download colour figure: PS Soussi et al 2015 - PLSO-D-15-00792- Figure 2 R1.ppt](#)