



ISSN: 0976-3031

Available Online at <http://www.recentscientific.com>

CODEN: IJRSFP (USA)

International Journal of Recent Scientific Research  
Vol. 10, Issue, 01(C), pp. 30321-30325, January, 2019

**International Journal of  
Recent Scientific  
Research**

DOI: 10.24327/IJRSR

## Research Article

# EFFECT OF DIFFERENT BIO-FERTILIZERS ON THE BIOCHEMICAL PARAMETERS OF *SOLANUM NIGRUM* L. AND *AMARANTHUS VIRIDIS* L.

\*Gayathri, V and Malathi R

Department of Botany, Avinashilingam Institute for Home Science and Higher Education for Women, Coimbatore

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2019.1001.3034>

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History:

Received 4<sup>th</sup> October, 2018  
Received in revised form 25<sup>th</sup>  
October, 2018  
Accepted 18<sup>th</sup> December, 2018  
Published online 28<sup>th</sup> January, 2019

#### Key Words:

*Azospirillum*, carbohydrate, chlorophyll,  
phosphobacteria, protein, VAM fungi

### ABSTRACT

The bio-fertilizers play a major role in organic farming. In the present study, the various biochemical parameters such as chlorophyll, protein and carbohydrate were estimated at different stages of growth of the two test plants by the application of biofertilizers such as *Azospirillum*, Phosphobacteria and VAM fungi. The chlorophyll *a* total chlorophyll content was found to be higher in tomato plants treated with *Azospirillum* on 30<sup>th</sup> day and 45<sup>th</sup> day, but on the 60<sup>th</sup> day, the chlorophyll *a* content was found to be higher in plants treated with VAM fungi. In the case of chlorophyll *b*, it was found that on the 30<sup>th</sup> day, the content was higher in VAM treated plants and on the 45<sup>th</sup> day and 60<sup>th</sup> day, it was observed to be more in *Azospirillum* treated and combination of fertilizers respectively. In *Amaranthusviridis* L., the chlorophyll *a* was found to be higher in plants treated with *Azospirillum* on the 30<sup>th</sup> day. Chlorophyll *b* was found to be higher in plants treated with VAM fungi and total chlorophyll in plants treated with combination of fertilizers. On the 45<sup>th</sup> day, the chlorophyll *a* was found to be higher in T<sub>4</sub> and chlorophyll *b* and total chlorophyll was higher in plants treated with Phosphobacteria. The protein content in tomato plant was higher in T<sub>2</sub> on the 30<sup>th</sup> day, T<sub>4</sub> on the 45<sup>th</sup> day and T<sub>3</sub> on the 60<sup>th</sup> day. The carbohydrate content was found to be more in T<sub>2</sub> on the 30<sup>th</sup> day, T<sub>1</sub> on the 45<sup>th</sup> day and T<sub>4</sub> on the 60<sup>th</sup> day. In *Amaranthusviridis* L., the protein content was observed to be higher in T<sub>2</sub> on the 30<sup>th</sup> day and T<sub>4</sub> on the 45<sup>th</sup> day. Similarly, the carbohydrate content was also found to be more in T<sub>2</sub> on the 30<sup>th</sup> day and T<sub>3</sub> on the 45<sup>th</sup> day.

Copyright © Gayathri, V and Malathi R, 2019, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

## INTRODUCTION

India is an agriculture based country. In order to feed the ever growing populations, India has to increase the per unit area productivity. Bio-fertilizers are one of the best modern tools for agriculture. It is a gift of our modern agriculture science. Bio-fertilizers are applied in the agriculture field as a replacement of our conventional fertilizers consisting of compost, household wastes and green manure. One of the benefits from bio-fertilizers is a contribution from population of microorganism available. Bio-fertilizers such as *Rhizobium*, *Azospirillum* and Phosphobacteria provide nitrogen and phosphorus nutrients to crop plants through nitrogen fixation and phosphorous solubilization processes. These Bio-fertilizers could be effectively utilized for rice, pulses, millets, cotton, sugarcane, ladies finger, tomato, vegetable and other horticulture crops. Saeed *et al.* (2015) have reported a significant increase in fruit yield of tomato when treated with different levels of phosphate and bio-fertilizer.

A significant improvement in growth and biochemical parameters of *Vigna unguiculata* has been reported by Badaret *et al.*, (2015). They studied the influence of organic, inorganic and bio-fertilizers on physical and biochemical parameters of *Vigna unguiculata*. Kavitha *et al.* (2013) investigated different combinations of bio-fertilizer (*Azospirillum*) on the growth of a green leafy vegetable *Amaranthus tristis* and found a significant change in biometric parameters and increase in biochemical constituents. Earlier studies on the nutritional value of *Amaranthus* spp. (Schonfeldt and Pretorius, 2011) have proved that raw leaves of *A. tricolor*, *Cleome gynandra* L. and *Corchorus olitorius* L. contain higher concentration of iron, zinc as well as phosphorus and calcium.

### Nutrition

A tomato contains 95% water, 4% carbohydrates and less than 1% each of fat and protein. In a 100gram amount, raw tomatoes supply 18 calories and are a moderate source of vitamin C (17% of the Daily Value), but otherwise are absent of significant nutrient content.

\*Corresponding author: Gayathri, V

Department of Botany, Avinashilingam Institute for Home Science and Higher Education for Women, Coimbatore

*Amaranthus viridis* L. is often harvested from the wild as a source of food and medicine for local use. It is sometimes cultivated in the Tropics for its edible leaves. *Amaranthus viridis* is a cosmopolitan species in the botanical family Amaranthaceae and is commonly known as slender amaranth or green amaranth.

The main objective of the current research is to study the efficiency of three different bio-fertilizers namely *Azospirillum*, Phosphobacteria and Vesicular Arbuscular Mycorrhizal fungi on the biochemical aspect of *Solanum lycopersicum* L. and *Amaranthus viridis* L. in pot culture study.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The plants taken for the present study were *Solanum lycopersicum* L. belonging to the family Solanaceae and *Amaranthus viridis* L. belonging to the family Amaranthaceae. Biochemical studies were carried out under different treatments of biofertilizers namely *Azospirillum*, Phosphobacteria and Vesicular Arbuscular Mycorrhiza during different stages of growth of the plants.

### Collection of the seeds

Seeds of *Solanum lycopersicum* L. and *Amaranthus viridis* L. were obtained from Tamil Nadu Agricultural University Coimbatore.

### Collection of biofertilizers

The bio-fertilizers such as *Azospirillum*, VAM and Phosphobacteria were collected from TNAU, Coimbatore.

### Bio-Fertilizers

#### *Azospirillum*

They are called as associative endosymbiont on roots of grasses and similar types of plants. They are known to fix atmospheric nitrogen and benefit host plants by supplying growth hormones and vitamins. *Azospirillum* is considered to be more efficient and it has been reported that *Azospirillum* inoculation increases the growth, nitrogen uptake and yield in number of crops (Mallikarjuna Rao *et al.*, 2014).

#### Vesicular Arbuscular Mycorrhiza (VAM)

Mycorrhiza is a mutualistic association between plant roots and fungal mycelia. Many graminaceous plants, legumes and horticultural crops are highly susceptible to VAM colonization. The transfer of nutrients mainly phosphorus from the soil to the cells of the root cortex is mediated by intracellular obligate fungal endosymbiont of the genera *Glomus*, *Gigaspora*, *Endosone*, etc. which possess vesicles for storage of nutrients and arbuscules for funneling these nutrients into the root system.

The mycorrhizal fungi mobilize phosphates and other micronutrients like zinc, boron and molybdenum from adjacent soil to the root system through hyphal network (Mallikarjuna Rao *et al.*, 2014)

#### Phosphobacteria

Microorganisms are also involved in the availability of phosphorus, the second most important nutrient required by crop plants. The phosphate solubilizing bacteria (PSB) solubilize the insoluble phosphates and make them available

for crop plants in the rhizosphere region (Mallikarjuna Rao *et al.*, 2014)

## METHODS

### Pot Culture Experiment

The seeds obtained from TNAU, Coimbatore were soaked in different organic fertilizers overnight. Later, the seeds were sown in pots (30cm×24cm×30cm sized pots) containing red soil and sandy soil in the ratio 1:1. The treated pots were maintained in triplicates. The effect of different organic fertilizers on the growth, biochemical and yield parameters of *Solanum lycopersicum* L. and *Amaranthus viridis* L. were assessed. The biochemical parameters at different stages of growth of the plants were analyzed. Thulasi extract was sprayed at intervals to control the growth of insects. The different organic fertilizer treatments given were:

- T<sub>0</sub>-Control
- T<sub>1</sub>-*Azospirillum*
- T<sub>2</sub>-Vesicular Arbuscular mycorrhiza
- T<sub>3</sub>-Phosphobacteria
- T<sub>4</sub>-*Azospirillum* + VAM + Phosphobacteria

### Biochemical Parameters

The estimation of Chlorophyll, Protein and Carbohydrate were done using standard procedures  
Chlorophyll (Arnon, 1949)  
Protein (Lowry *et al.*, 1951)  
Carbohydrate (Hedge and Hofreiter, 1962)

### Statistical Analysis

The data obtained from various biochemical observations were subjected to statistical analysis as per the procedure of Panse and Sukhatme (1978). The significance and critical differences of various treatments were analyzed.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The experiments conducted in *Solanum lycopersicum* L. and *Amaranthus viridis* (L.) using different organic fertilizers treatments showed the following results.

### Biochemical Parameters

#### *Solanum lycopersicum* L.

##### Chlorophyll a, b and Total chlorophyll

In *Solanum lycopersicum* L. grown under different bio-fertilizer treatments, the chlorophyll contents were measured on the 30<sup>th</sup> day, 45<sup>th</sup> day and 60<sup>th</sup> day and tabulated (Table 1, 2 and 3).

Chlorophyll *a* was found to be higher in T<sub>1</sub> (0.166 ± 0.034 mg/g) on 30<sup>th</sup> day, T<sub>1</sub> on 45<sup>th</sup> day (0.242 ± 0.076 mg/g) and T<sub>2</sub> (0.386 ± 0.049) on the 60<sup>th</sup> day. This shows that *Azospirillum* increases the chlorophyll pigments initially, but at later stage of growth, presence of VAM increases the chlorophyll *a* pigment.

The chlorophyll *b* content was found to be higher in T<sub>2</sub> (0.131 ± 0.020 mg/g) on 30<sup>th</sup> day, T<sub>1</sub> (0.429 ± 0.051 mg/g) on 45<sup>th</sup> day and T<sub>4</sub> (0.498 ± 0.204 mg/g) on the 60<sup>th</sup> day. This result shows that the chlorophyll *b* pigment gradually increases when there is combination of bio-fertilizers and on the 60<sup>th</sup> day higher chlorophyll *b* content is observed in T<sub>4</sub> (Table 3).

Similarly, the total chlorophyll content was found to be higher in T<sub>1</sub> (Table 1) on 30<sup>th</sup> day and 45<sup>th</sup> day (Table 2). The values were 0.280 ± 0.023 mg/g and 0.682 ± 0.098 mg/g respectively. On the 60<sup>th</sup> day, total chlorophyll content was higher in T<sub>4</sub> and the value was 0.724 ± 0.204 mg/g. (Table 3).

**Table 1** Chlorophyll a, Chlorophyll b and total chlorophyll content of the *Solanumlycopersicum* L. on the 30<sup>th</sup> day (mg/g f.wt.)

| Treatment      | Chlorophyll a | Chlorophyll b | Total Chlorophyll |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
| T <sub>0</sub> | 0.121 ± 0.010 | 0.080 ± 0.005 | 0.201 ± 0.012     |
| T <sub>1</sub> | 0.166 ± 0.034 | 0.115 ± 0.014 | 0.280 ± 0.023     |
| T <sub>2</sub> | 0.151 ± 0.092 | 0.131 ± 0.020 | 0.197 ± 0.146     |
| T <sub>3</sub> | 0.122 ± 0.013 | 0.087 ± 0.005 | 0.209 ± 0.016     |
| T <sub>4</sub> | 0.131 ± 0.004 | 0.093 ± 0.009 | 0.225 ± 0.012     |
| SEd            | 0.0364        | 0.0098        | 0.0547            |
| CD(P<0.05)     | 0.0810        | 0.0219        | 0.1219            |

Values are mean ± SD of three samples in each group

**Table 2** Chlorophyll a, Chlorophyll b and total chlorophyll content of the *Solanumlycopersicum* L. on the 45<sup>th</sup> day (mg/g f.wt.)

| Treatment      | Chlorophyll a | Chlorophyll b | Total Chlorophyll |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
| T <sub>0</sub> | 0.175 ± 0.041 | 0.227 ± 0.054 | 0.406 ± 0.071     |
| T <sub>1</sub> | 0.185 ± 0.047 | 0.429 ± 0.051 | 0.682 ± 0.098     |
| T <sub>2</sub> | 0.226 ± 0.036 | 0.319 ± 0.098 | 0.544 ± 0.126     |
| T <sub>3</sub> | 0.242 ± 0.076 | 0.321 ± 0.072 | 0.564 ± 0.069     |
| T <sub>4</sub> | 0.202 ± 0.064 | 0.334 ± 0.051 | 0.550 ± 0.016     |
| SEd            | 0.0448        | 0.0553        | 0.0689            |
| CD(P<0.05)     | 0.0999        | 0.1231        | 0.1535            |

Values are mean ± SD of three samples in each group

**Table 3** Chlorophyll a, Chlorophyll b and total chlorophyll content of the *Solanumlycopersicum* L. on the 60<sup>th</sup> day (mg/g f.wt.)

| Treatment      | Chlorophyll a | Chlorophyll b | Total Chlorophyll |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
| T <sub>0</sub> | 0.326 ± 0.024 | 0.355 ± 0.079 | 0.680 ± 0.095     |
| T <sub>1</sub> | 0.278 ± 0.031 | 0.360 ± 0.077 | 0.569 ± 0.182     |
| T <sub>2</sub> | 0.386 ± 0.049 | 0.368 ± 0.022 | 0.701 ± 0.099     |
| T <sub>3</sub> | 0.253 ± 0.049 | 0.444 ± 0.071 | 0.714 ± 0.123     |
| T <sub>4</sub> | 0.227 ± 0.013 | 0.498 ± 0.204 | 0.724 ± 0.204     |
| SEd            | 0.0295        | 0.0887        | 0.1205            |
| CD(P<0.05)     | 0.0656        | 0.1976        | 0.2685            |

Values are mean ± SD of three samples in each group

Earlier, similar results were reported by Selvakumar and Thamizhiniyan (2011) in chilli and Selvakumar *et al.* (2012) in black gram. Higher chlorophyll and protein content have been reported due to the application of *Azotobacter* and *Azospirillum*.

### Protein

The protein content of *Solanum lycopersicum* L. was estimated on the 30<sup>th</sup> day, 45<sup>th</sup> day and 60<sup>th</sup> day and tabulated (Table 4). Two different concentrations 0.1 ml and 0.2 ml of the sample were used for estimation.

On the 30<sup>th</sup> day, the protein content was found to be 3.30±0.62mg/g in T<sub>2</sub> in 0.1ml concentration. On the 45<sup>th</sup> day, the protein was estimated to be higher in T<sub>4</sub> (4.77±0.06mg/g) in 0.1ml concentration. On the 60<sup>th</sup> day, the protein content was higher in T<sub>3</sub> (6.13±0.45mg/g).

Similarly, in 0.2ml concentration of the sample, the protein was higher in T<sub>2</sub> on the 30<sup>th</sup> day (2.07±0.40mg/g), T<sub>4</sub> on the 45<sup>th</sup>

day (2.93±0.15mg/g) and T<sub>4</sub> on the 60<sup>th</sup> day (4.37±0.35mg/g). As the concentration varies, there is drastic variation in the protein content also under different bio fertilizer treatments (Table 4).

Earlier studies by Javed and Panwar (2013) on the effect of biofertilizers, vermicompost and chemical fertilizer on different biochemical parameters of *Glycine max* and *Vigna mungo* have shown increased protein, carbohydrate and phenol content

### Carbohydrate

The carbohydrate content was estimated for *Solanum lycopersicum* L. under different bio fertilizer treatment on 30<sup>th</sup> day, 45<sup>th</sup> day and 60<sup>th</sup> day and tabulated (Table 5).

The carbohydrate content was found to be higher in T<sub>2</sub> on 30<sup>th</sup> day in both the concentrations and the values were 3.47±0.35mg/g and 2.03±0.15mg/g (Table 5).

On the 45<sup>th</sup> day of the plant growth, the carbohydrate content was estimated to be higher in T<sub>1</sub> in both the concentrations and the values were 4.97±0.32mg/g and 3.63±0.50mg/g (Table 5).

On the 60<sup>th</sup> day, the carbohydrate content was found to be more in T<sub>4</sub> in both the concentrations and the readings obtained were 6.47±0.38mg/g and 5.50±0.82mg/g (Table 5).

**Table 4** Protein Content of *Solanumlycopersicum*L. on the 30<sup>th</sup> Day, 45<sup>th</sup> Day and 60<sup>th</sup> Day (mg/g f.wt.)

| Treatments     | 30 <sup>th</sup> Day (mg/g) |             | 45 <sup>th</sup> Day(mg/g) |             | 60 <sup>th</sup> Day(mg/g) |             |
|----------------|-----------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|-------------|
|                | 0.1                         | 0.2         | 0.1                        | 0.2         | 0.1                        | 0.2         |
| T <sub>0</sub> | 2.07 ± 0.25                 | 1.60 ± 0.52 | 3.63 ± 0.21                | 2.33 ± 0.12 | 5.12 ± 0.40                | 3.03 ± 0.12 |
| T <sub>1</sub> | 2.80 ± 0.30                 | 2.00 ± 0.36 | 3.57 ± 0.25                | 2.40 ± 0.10 | 4.67 ± 0.15                | 3.57 ± 0.15 |
| T <sub>2</sub> | 3.30 ± 0.62                 | 2.07 ± 0.40 | 3.47 ± 0.38                | 2.37 ± 0.21 | 4.87 ± 0.47                | 3.97 ± 0.31 |
| T <sub>3</sub> | 2.87 ± 0.25                 | 1.97 ± 0.12 | 3.87 ± 0.40                | 2.63 ± 0.12 | 6.13 ± 0.45                | 4.27 ± 0.49 |
| T <sub>4</sub> | 2.93 ± 0.72                 | 2.03 ± 0.21 | 4.77 ± 0.06                | 2.93 ± 0.15 | 5.37 ± 0.38                | 4.37 ± 0.35 |
| SEd            |                             |             | 0.40925                    |             |                            |             |
| CD(P<0.05)     |                             |             | 0.81961                    |             |                            |             |

Values are mean ± SD of three samples in each group

**Table 5** Carbohydrate content of *Solanumlycopersicum* L. on the 30<sup>th</sup> day, 45<sup>th</sup> day and 60<sup>th</sup> day (mg/g f.wt.)

| Treatments     | 30 <sup>th</sup> Day |             | 45 <sup>th</sup> Day |             | 60 <sup>th</sup> Day |             |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|
|                | 0.1                  | 0.2         | 0.1                  | 0.2         | 0.1                  | 0.2         |
| T <sub>0</sub> | 3.23 ± 0.40          | 1.83 ± 0.06 | 4.00 ± 0.10          | 2.27 ± 0.23 | 4.63 ± 0.15          | 2.33 ± 0.32 |
| T <sub>1</sub> | 2.90 ± 0.26          | 1.80 ± 0.44 | 4.97 ± 0.32          | 3.63 ± 0.50 | 5.90 ± 0.66          | 3.80 ± 0.10 |
| T <sub>2</sub> | 3.47 ± 0.35          | 2.03 ± 0.15 | 3.70 ± 0.36          | 2.20 ± 0.35 | 6.10 ± 0.36          | 3.70 ± 0.46 |
| T <sub>3</sub> | 3.10 ± 0.62          | 1.83 ± 0.40 | 4.70 ± 0.10          | 3.07 ± 0.15 | 5.83 ± 0.67          | 3.63 ± 0.50 |
| T <sub>4</sub> | 3.00 ± 0.17          | 1.87 ± 0.32 | 4.70 ± 0.85          | 3.00 ± 0.20 | 6.47 ± 0.38          | 5.50 ± 0.82 |
| SEd            |                      |             | 0.28674              |             |                      |             |
| CD(P<0.05)     |                      |             | 0.57358              |             |                      |             |

Values are mean ± SD of three samples in each group

### *Amaranthus viridis* L.

#### Chlorophyll a, b and total chlorophyll

The chlorophyll pigments present in the green leafy vegetables were calculated on the 30<sup>th</sup> day and 45<sup>th</sup> day and tabulated (Table 6 & 7).

The chlorophyll a content was higher in T<sub>1</sub> (0.133±0.012mg/g) on the 30<sup>th</sup> day. Chlorophyll b was observed to be more in T<sub>2</sub> (0.225±0.129mg/g) on the 30<sup>th</sup> day and the total chlorophyll content on the 30<sup>th</sup> day was more in T<sub>1</sub> (0.173±0.015mg/g).

On the 45<sup>th</sup> day, there was variation in chlorophyll pigments. The chlorophyll a was higher in T<sub>4</sub> (0.300±0.045mg/g). The chlorophyll b and total chlorophyll was found to be higher in T<sub>3</sub> and the values were estimated to be 0.450±0.141mg/g and 0.678±0.147mg/g respectively (Table 7).

### Protein

The protein content of *Amaranthus viridis* L. was estimated on the 30<sup>th</sup> day and 45<sup>th</sup> day (Table 8). On the 30<sup>th</sup> day, the protein content was found to be higher in T<sub>2</sub> (2.80±1.10mg/g) at 0.1ml concentration. On the 45<sup>th</sup> day, the protein content was found to be higher in T<sub>4</sub> (5.97±0.81mg/g).

**Carbohydrate**

The carbohydrate content of *Amaranthus viridis* L. was estimated on the 30<sup>th</sup> day and 45<sup>th</sup> day and tabulated (Table 9). Higher carbohydrate content was observed in T<sub>2</sub> on the 30<sup>th</sup> day and the value was 2.83±0.83mg/g. On the 45<sup>th</sup> day, the carbohydrate content was found to be higher in T<sub>3</sub> (Phosphobacteria treated plants) and the value was 5.97±0.12mg/g (Table 9). The statistical analysis of various biochemical parameters showed significance at 5% level.

In *Amaranthus dubius*, Manoharan *et al.* (2011) showed an increase in the amount of protein and carbohydrate in plant treated with cyanospray compared to other treatments.

Bio-fertilizers are used to hasten the biological activity of the plants to improve the availability of plant nutrient. The work on the growth and establishment of cashew grafts under greenhouse condition by Shankarappa *et al.* (2017) have shown that the bio fertilizers used increased the growth and nutrient uptake of the cultivar.

**Table 6** Chlorophyll a, Chlorophyll b and total chlorophyll content of the *Amaranthusviridis* L. on the 30<sup>th</sup> day (mg/g f.wt.)

| Treatment      | Chlorophyll a | Chlorophyll b | Total Chlorophyll |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
| T <sub>0</sub> | 0.131 ± 0.013 | 0.101 ± 0.129 | 0.159 ± 0.010     |
| T <sub>1</sub> | 0.133 ± 0.012 | 0.026 ± 0.012 | 0.173 ± 0.015     |
| T <sub>2</sub> | 0.118 ± 0.016 | 0.225 ± 0.189 | 0.153 ± 0.031     |
| T <sub>3</sub> | 0.132 ± 0.022 | 0.032 ± 0.021 | 0.143 ± 0.010     |
| T <sub>4</sub> | 0.090 ± 0.011 | 0.018 ± 0.002 | 0.094 ± 0.036     |
| SEd            | 0.0124        | 0.0842        | 0.0190            |
| CD(P<0.05)     | 0.0276        | 0.1875        | 0.0424            |

Values are mean ± SD of three samples in each group

**Table 7** Chlorophyll a, Chlorophyll b and total chlorophyll content of the *Amaranthusviridis* L. on the 45<sup>th</sup> day (mg/g f.wt.)

| Treatment      | Chlorophyll a | Chlorophyll b | Total Chlorophyll |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
| T <sub>0</sub> | 0.237 ± 0.042 | 0.184 ± 0.097 | 0.479 ± 0.070     |
| T <sub>1</sub> | 0.244 ± 0.080 | 0.244 ± 0.167 | 0.506 ± 0.141     |
| T <sub>2</sub> | 0.250 ± 0.053 | 0.386 ± 0.091 | 0.637 ± 0.133     |
| T <sub>3</sub> | 0.229 ± 0.027 | 0.450 ± 0.141 | 0.678 ± 0.147     |
| T <sub>4</sub> | 0.300 ± 0.045 | 0.266 ± 0.307 | 0.577 ± 0.291     |
| SEd            | 0.0429        | 0.1460        | 0.1407            |
| CD(P<0.05)     | 0.0955        | 0.3253        | 0.3136            |

Values are mean ± SD of three samples in each group

**Table 8** Protein Content of *Amaranthus viridis* L. on the 30<sup>th</sup> Day, and 45<sup>th</sup> day (mg/g f.wt.)

| Treatments     | 30 <sup>th</sup> day |             | 45 <sup>th</sup> day |             |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|
|                | 0.1                  | 0.2         | 0.1                  | 0.2         |
| T <sub>0</sub> | 2.20 ± 0.10          | 1.23 ± 0.15 | 3.87 ± 0.57          | 3.77 ± 2.20 |
| T <sub>1</sub> | 2.30 ± 0.44          | 1.57 ± 0.32 | 5.07 ± 1.38          | 2.90 ± 0.70 |
| T <sub>2</sub> | 2.80 ± 0.10          | 1.33 ± 0.32 | 3.63 ± 0.46          | 2.67 ± 0.70 |
| T <sub>3</sub> | 2.60 ± 0.46          | 1.67 ± 0.49 | 4.87 ± 1.00          | 3.30 ± 0.95 |
| T <sub>4</sub> | 2.43 ± 0.58          | 1.37 ± 0.21 | 5.97 ± 0.81          | 3.77 ± 1.27 |
| SEd            |                      | 0.67594     |                      |             |
| CD(P<0.05)     |                      | 1.36615     |                      |             |

Values are mean ± SD of three samples in each group

**Table 9** Carbohydrate Content of *Amaranthus viridis* L. on the 30<sup>th</sup> day and 45<sup>th</sup> day (mg/g f.wt.)

| Treatments     | 30 <sup>th</sup> day |             | 45 <sup>th</sup> day |             |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|
|                | 0.1                  | 0.2         | 0.1                  | 0.2         |
| T <sub>0</sub> | 1.37 ± 0.32          | 1.07 ± 0.31 | 3.33 ± 0.15          | 2.13 ± 0.23 |
| T <sub>1</sub> | 2.63 ± 0.25          | 1.47 ± 0.06 | 3.63 ± 0.12          | 2.03 ± 0.15 |
| T <sub>2</sub> | 2.83 ± 0.83          | 1.73 ± 0.23 | 3.77 ± 0.15          | 2.20 ± 0.10 |
| T <sub>3</sub> | 2.47 ± 0.40          | 1.83 ± 0.15 | 5.97 ± 0.12          | 3.43 ± 0.42 |
| T <sub>4</sub> | 2.47 ± 0.06          | 1.80 ± 0.10 | 3.50 ± 0.26          | 2.97 ± 0.38 |
| SEd            |                      |             | 0.20303              |             |
| CD(P<0.05)     |                      |             | 0.41035              |             |

Values are mean ± SD of three samples in each group

Studies on the effect of PSB, *Azospirillum* and *Azotobacter* by Choudhary *et al.* (2017) have indicated that the application of bio-fertilizers not only improves the quality of Knol-Khol, but also gives a maximum monetary benefit. Bio-fertilizers are natural fertilizers containing microorganisms that enhance crop productivity through nitrogen fixation, solubilizing of plant nutrients and produce plant growth regulators.

Microbial flora of soil plays an important role in soil health. The microbes present in the environment around the roots influence the plant growth and crop yield. The microorganisms in Bio-fertilizers restore the soils natural nutrient cycle and build soil organic matter. The increased amount of chlorophyll content in leaves treated with organic fertilizers indicates the photosynthetic efficiency of the plants.

Bio-fertilizers are carried-based preparations containing beneficial microorganisms in viable state intended for seed or soil application. In recent years, they have emerged as a promising component of integrated nutrient supply system. They are likely to assume greater significance as a complements or supplements to the chemical fertilizers because of high nutrient turnover, exorbitant cost of fertilizers, soil and environmental protection. Bio-fertilizers are less expensive, eco-friendly, providing plant hormones and help in sustainable crop production through maintenance of soil productivity.

**References**

Arnon, D.E. (1949). Copper enzymes in isolated chloroplast. *Pl. Physiol.*, 24: 1-5.

Badar, R., Malik, H. and Ilyas, A. (2015). Influence of organic, inorganic and biofertilizers on physical and biochemical parameters of *Vigna unguiculata*, *International Journal of Advanced Research*. 3(1): 738-748.

Choudhary, M., Jat, RK., Chand, P. and Choudhary, R.(2017). Effect of bio-fertilizers on growth, yield and quality of knol-khol. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 6(6): 2234-2237.

Hedge, J.E. and Hofreiter, B.T. (1962). Determination of total carbohydrate by anthrone method. *In: Carbohydrate chemistry* (Eds.) Whistler, R.L. and Be Miller, J.N., Academic Press, New York, p.17.

Javed, S. and Panwar, A. (2013). Effect of biofertilizer, vermicompost and chemical fertilizer on different biochemical parameters of *Glycine max* and *Vigna mungo*. *Recent Research in Science and Technology*. 5(1): 40-44.

Kavitha, D. Sivagami Srinivasan and Ranjini (2013). Individual and Combined effect of Biofertilizer, Chemical fertilizer and Vermicompost on

- Amaranthustristis*, *Int.J.Pharm.Sci.Rev.Res.*,20(2): 190-195.
- Lowry, O.H., Rosenbrough, N.S., Farr, A.L. and Randall, R.J. (1951). Protein measurement with folin phenol reagent. *J. Biol. Chem.* 193: 267-273.
- Mallikarjuna Rao, K. and Singh, P.K. Ryingkhun, H.B.K. and Maying, B. (2014). Use of Bio-Fertilizer in Vegetable Production. *Indian Horticulture Journal.* 4(1): 73-76.
- Manoharan, G., Chitra devi, K. and Malliga, P. (2011). Effect of Cyanopith and Cyanospray biofertilizer on *Amaranthus dubius*. *International Journal of Environmental Sciences.* 2: 352-360.
- Panse, V.G. and Sukhatme, P.V. (1978). Statistical methods for agricultural workers, 3<sup>rd</sup>Edn., ICAR, New Delhi, p. 347.
- Saeed, K.S., Ahmed, S.A., Hassan, I.A. and Quader, N.J.(2015). Comparison of different levels of phosphate and Biofertilizer on Growth and Yield on Tomato (*Lycopersicum esculentum* Mill) in green house condition, *American-Eurasian. J.Agr. & Environ. Sci.*,15(2): 210-215.
- Schonfeldt, H. and Pretorius. B. (2011). The nutrient content of five traditional South African dark green leafy vegetables-a preliminary study. *J Food Compos Anal.* 24(8): 1141-1146.
- Selvakumar, G. and Thamizhiniyan, P. (2011). The effect of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal (AM) Fungus *Glomus intraradices* on the Growth and Yield of Chilli (*Capsicum annum* L.) under stress. *World Applied Sciences Journal.* 14(8): 1209-1214.
- Selvakumar, G. Reetha, S. and Thamizhiniyan, P. (2012). Response of Biofertilizers on the growth, yield attributes and associated Protein Profiling changes of Blackgram (*Vigna mungo* L. Hepper.) *World Applied Sciences Journal.* 16(10): 1368-1374.
- Shankarappa, T.K., Mushrif, S.K., Subramanyam, B., Sreenatha, A., Maruthi Prasad, B.N., Aswathanarayana Reddy, N. (2017). Effect of Biofertilizers on Growth and Establishment of Cashew Grafts under Nursery Condition. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences.*6 (8):1959-1965.

**How to cite this article:**

Gayathri, V and Malathi R.2019, Effect of Different bio-Fertilizers on the Biochemical Parameters of Solanum Nigrum l. and Amaranthus Viridis l.. *Int J Recent Sci Res.* 10(01), pp. 30321-30325. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2019.1001.3034>

\*\*\*\*\*