

Physiological Effects of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi (AMF), Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPRs), and *Trichoderma harzianum* on Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) Infected with Branched Broomrape [*Phelipanche ramosa* (L.) Pomel]

ENES FİDAN

enesfidan@ygu.edu.tr

Van Yüzüncü Yıl University

Işık TEPE

Van Yüzüncü Yıl University

Research Article

Keywords: Branched broomrape, Mycorrhizal fungi, PGPR, Tomato, *Trichoderma harzianum*

Posted Date: April 3rd, 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4186595/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Additional Declarations: No competing interests reported.

Abstract

Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.), one of the world's most produced and consumed vegetables, belongs to the Solanaceae family. Branched broomrape [*Phelipanche ramosa* (L.) Pomel; Syn: *Orobancha ramosa* L.] parasitizes many cultivated plants, especially tomatoes. The parasitic weeds, for which there is no effective control method, cause serious yield and quality losses in their host crops. In this study, two different mycorrhiza (AMF) species, *Funneliformis mosseae*, and a commercial product, Endo Roots Soluble (ERS), along with *Trichoderma harzianum* T22, two different plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) isolates (*Pseudomonas caspiana* V30G2 and *Bacillus velezensis* V40K2), were applied to tomatoes. Additionally, a commercial product, Plant Success Great White Premium Mycorrhiza, and their combinations were used to determine the changes occurring in both the plants and the broomrape. This study investigated the number of tubercles, the levels of several oxidative stress enzymes (CAT, catalase, SOD, superoxide dismutase, and APX, ascorbate peroxidase), the level of lipid peroxidation (MDA, malondialdehyde), and the total phenolic and antioxidant contents of tomato plants infected and not infected with broomrape. Compared to the control group, the treatments were found to prevent tubercule formation at rates ranging from 60 to 72.7%. Broomrape infection caused oxidative stress in the tomatoes; the CAT and MDA contents in the broomrape-contaminated plants were greater than those in the noncontaminated plants. The results revealed that some microorganisms and biological preparations applied to tomatoes responded differently to broomrape stress through enzymatic and nonenzymatic antioxidant activities.

Introduction

Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.), a member of the Solanaceae family within the Personatae order, is cultivated in numerous countries across diverse ecologies (Chaudhary et al. 2018; Yan and Khan 2021). Tomatoes are known for their high water content and abundance of minerals, flavonoids, iron, beta-carotene, and vitamins A and C (Saffan et al. 2022; Chen et al. 2023). In recent years, there has been a significant expansion in tomato production areas globally (Lops et al. 2022). However, this increasing production presents various challenges. Tomatoes are particularly vulnerable to weed competition, especially during the early stages following the seedling period (Mennan et al. 2020). Uncontrolled weed growth can lead to yield losses ranging from 45–90% (Ampong and Datta, 1991). Notably, among these weeds, branched broomrape [*Phelipanche ramosa* (L.) Pomel; Syn: *Orobancha ramosa* L.] stands out as one of the most significant threats. Yield losses caused by root parasitic weeds in cultivated plants can reach 100%, depending on factors such as environmental conditions, host sensitivity, attachment time, and intensity (Aksoy and Pekcan, 2014; Fernández-Aparicio et al. 2016).

Broomrape species, belonging to the *Orobancha* and *Phelipanche* genera of the family Orobanchaceae, are predominantly holoparasitic plants (Parker, 2009; McNeal et al. 2013). Broomrape relies on stimulant chemicals released from the roots of their host plants to initiate germination. The primary germination stimulants include sorgoleone, isoflavanone, sesquiterpene lactones, and strigolactones (Demirkan, 1992; Joel, 2007; Parker, 2009). Germinating broomrape seeds parasitize the roots of the host, forming a small,

grass-like structure called a haustorium, with a circumference typically measuring only 2–3 mm (Kadioğlu, 2009). Once attached, broomrape extracts carbohydrates from the phloem and water along with mineral substances from the xylem of the host, thereby negatively impacting the host plant's development (Joel, 2007; Krupp et al. 2019). The proliferation of the broomrape can be attributed to its high seed production, extensive spread, and rapid expansion of cultivation areas for its host crops in recent years (Demirkan, 1992). Exudates released by host plant roots, particularly during early growth stages such as germination and tubercle formation, play crucial roles in the development of this parasitic plant (Vurro et al. 2006; Lops et al. 2017).

Considering the negative effects of pesticides, there is a growing need for sustainable and environmentally friendly methods (Pretty and Pervez 2015). Therefore, studies have focused on practical and environmentally friendly biological control agents as alternatives to chemical control agents (Bhardwaj et al. 2014). Biological preparations, which have recently demonstrated effectiveness in agricultural production and are less harmful to the environment, are promising alternatives to chemicals (Daniel et al. 2022). For this purpose, microorganisms such as fungi and bacteria, which are found in soil microflora and constitute an essential part of the soil, are used as control agents in the biological control of various diseases, pests, and weeds (Glick 2012; Sharma et al. 2020). Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria and fungi, including arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and *Trichoderma* species, are the most important biocontrol agents against different pathogens (Dames 2014; Kumari et al. 2020).

Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) are vital components of natural ecosystems and can form symbioses with plant roots (Prasad et al. 2017). AMF symbiosis is known to protect plants against biotic and abiotic stresses by increasing water and nutrient absorption (Gianinazzi et al. 1996). Many rhizosphere microorganisms, such as AMF, play an essential role in biological control by reducing the germination of parasitic weeds (Lendzemo et al. 2007). Some *Trichoderma* species used for biological control are highly effective at suppressing plant diseases through biological control mechanisms such as hyperparasitism, antibiosis and competition, thereby stimulating plant systemic acquired resistance (SAR) and induced systemic resistance (ISR) (Sood et al. 2020; El-Maraghy et al. 2021). Furthermore, all bacteria that live in plant roots and positively affect plant growth are called plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPRs) (Arshad and Frankenberger 1997). Although the initial applications of PGPRs in crop production were for plant growth promotion, it has been reported that they increase the ISR in plants and can be used as biological control agents, especially against soil-borne pathogens (Altın and Tayyar 2005; İmriz et al. 2014). The relationships with tomato plants, broomrape plants, and plants treated with biological control agents are shown in Fig. 1.

Some plants can respond to high levels of reactive oxygen species (ROS) by activating enzymatic antioxidant defense systems to protect themselves against stressors (Kwon et al. 2002; Cho and Seo 2005). Enzymatic and nonenzymatic antioxidative defense systems exist to prevent the toxic effects of ROS. The enzymatic ROS scavenging mechanisms in plants include superoxide dismutase (SOD), catalase (CAT), peroxidase (POX), ascorbate peroxidase (APX), and glutathione peroxidase (GPX) (Apel and Hirt 2004).

The positive effects of beneficial soil-borne microorganisms on cultivated plants raise the possibility that these microorganisms can also be used in weed control through the enzymatic antioxidant defense system. In recent years, *P. ramosa* (L.) Pomel, a holoparasitic plant, has caused significant yield losses in some crops (tomato, eggplant, tobacco, lentil, etc.). Unfortunately, no effective control method has been developed for this parasitic plant. This study aimed to determine the physiological changes occurring in tomatoes during broomrape infestation and the effects of some of the most emphasized biological preparations on broomrape parasitism.

Materials and Methods

Plant and Biological Materials

The Rio Grande tomato variety (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) was selected as the plant material for this study. Branched broomrape [*Phelipanche ramosa* (L.) Pomel] seeds used in the study were collected from tomato-growing fields in the Van province of Türkiye in 2019. The studies were repeatedly carried out in the laboratories and climate rooms of the Department of Plant Protection, Faculty of Agriculture, Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, from 2021–2022 for two years.

In this study, the ERS (Endo Roots Soluble) commercial AMF strain, *Trichoderma harzianum* preparation (T-22 Planter Box, Bioglobal Ltd.), and MIX preparation (obtained from Plant Revolution, Great White Premium Mycorrhizae, Plant Success) were utilized. Mycorrhizal and plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (*Pseudomonas caspiana* V30G2 and *Bacillus velezensis* V40K2) isolates of *Funneliformis mosseae* (Syn: *Glomus mosseae*) cultured in culture were obtained from the laboratory stocks of Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Plant Protection.

Experimental Design

Broomrape seeds were homogeneously distributed to a depth of 8 cm, approximately 0.05 g per pot, before planting the tomato seeds [modified from Aksoy (2003)]. Tomato seeds were planted in prepared 4-liter pots containing a sterile peat-perlite mixture at a ratio of 2:1. The study followed a randomized plot experimental design with four replications, and two tomato plants were placed in each pot. Hoagland nutrient solution was applied to the seedlings when the first true leaves appeared. Plants were regularly supplied with water and Hoagland nutrient solution as needed (Song et al. 2013).

In this study, tomato and broomrape seeds were sterilized with 70% ethanol, washed with sterile water, and dried on blotting paper (Xu et al. 2014). The procedures performed in the following stages are explained below and given in Table 1.

Before sowing, 2.5 g (150 spores/g) of *F. mosseae* and ERS AMF (250 g/decare) were added to the seed bed in each pot before sowing the tomato seeds in the media prepared for mycorrhiza applications that were not contaminated with broomrape. *T. harzianum* T22 was applied after sowing (106 spores/ml), and *P. caspiana* (V30G2) and *B. velezensis* (V40K2) were applied after the first true leaves of the tomatoes

emerged (1x10⁸ cfu/ml). In the group infected with broomrape, approximately 0.05 g of broomrape seeds were mixed homogeneously to a depth of 8 cm in each pot before planting the tomato seeds, and the treatments were carried out as described above (Turhan and Demir 2013; Güneş 2018). Great White Premium Mycorrhizae (MIX, Plant Success) was applied to the seed beds according to the label. At a rate of 100 millilitres in each pot, 1.25 grams of MIX was added to 7.57 liters of water. This application was repeated for 2 time periods (Rişvanlı 2022).

Table 1
Treatments in the study

Treatments	Uninfected tomatoes with branched broomrape	Infected tomatoes with branched broomrape
K	Untreated (uninfected control)	Unreated (infected control)
M1	AMF (<i>Funneliformis mosseae</i>) inoculation	AMF (<i>Funneliformis mosseae</i>) inoculation
M2	AMF (ERS) inoculation	AMF (ERS) inoculation
P1	<i>Pseudomonas caspiana</i> (V30G2) inoculation	<i>Pseudomonas caspiana</i> (V30G2) inoculation
P2	<i>Bacillus velezensis</i> (V40K2) inoculation	<i>Bacillus velezensis</i> (V40K2) inoculation
TH	<i>Trichoderma harzianum</i> (T22) inoculation	<i>Trichoderma harzianum</i> (T22) inoculation
MIX	Great White Premium Mycorrhiza inoculation	Great White Premium Micorrhiza inoculation
M1P1	<i>F. mosseae</i> + <i>P. caspiana</i> (V30G2) inoculation	<i>F. mosseae</i> + <i>P. caspiana</i> (V30G2) inoculation
M1P2	<i>F. mosseae</i> + <i>B. velezensis</i> (V40K2) inoculation	<i>F. mosseae</i> + <i>B. velezensis</i> (V40K2) inoculation
M2P1	ERS + <i>P. caspiana</i> (V30G2) inoculation	ERS + <i>P. caspiana</i> (V30G2) inoculation
M2P2	ERS + <i>B. velezensis</i> (V40K2) tomato plants inoculation	ERS + <i>B. velezensis</i> (V40K2) inoculation
THM1	<i>T. harzianum</i> T22 + <i>F. mosseae</i> inoculation	<i>T. harzianum</i> T22 + <i>F. mosseae</i> inoculation
THM2	<i>T. harzianum</i> T22 + ERS tomato plants inoculation	<i>T. harzianum</i> T22 + ERS inoculation
THP1	<i>T. harzianum</i> T22 + <i>P. caspiana</i> (V30G2) inoculation	<i>T. harzianum</i> T22 + <i>P. caspiana</i> (V30G2) inoculation
THP2	<i>T. harzianum</i> T22 + <i>B. velezensis</i> (V40K2) inoculation	<i>T. harzianum</i> T22 + <i>B. velezensis</i> (V40K2) inoculation

Number of Tubercles

Tubercles were counted by enumerating the formations generated as a result of broomrape seeds attaching to the roots of the tomato plant.

Enzymatic Assays

One day before harvest, fresh plant samples were collected and stored at -80°C until analysis. Frozen leaf samples were first homogenized with 5 ml cold 50 mM potassium phosphate and 0.1 mM NaEDTA (pH: 7.6) and then centrifuged at 15000 rpm for 30 minutes at 4°C . Superoxide dismutase (SOD) activity was detected spectrophotometrically by inhibiting nitroblue tetrazolium (NBT) at a wavelength of 560 nm (Jebara et al. 2005). A reduction of 50% of the NBT in units was considered to indicate SOD activity. Catalase activity was determined by monitoring the disappearance of H_2O_2 at a wavelength of 240 nm based on the method outlined by Çakmak et al. (1993). Ascorbate peroxidase (APX) activity was measured by H_2O_2 reduction due to ascorbic acid (Nakano and Asada 1981). The supernatant was obtained by homogenizing 1 g of plant sample with the prepared extraction solution at a pH of 7.6. For the reaction solution, 50 mM KH_2PO_4 , 10 mM H_2O_2 , 0.5 mM ascorbic acid, and 0.1 mM Na-EDTA were used. The pH of this mixture was adjusted to 7. After adding 0.1 ml of supernatant and 3 ml of the reaction solution, the absorbance change at a wavelength of 290 nm was recorded in the 1st minute.

Lipid peroxidation (MDA) assays

Plant samples taken one day before harvest were homogenized with 0.1% trichloroacetic acid (TCA) solution and then centrifuged at 15000 rpm for 15 minutes. After centrifugation, 1 ml of the supernatant was removed, and 4 ml of 20% TCA and 0.5% thiobarbituric acid (TBA) were added. This mixture underwent a 30-minute incubation in a 95°C water bath and was then subjected to a second centrifugation at 10000 rpm. The absorbance was determined at 532 and 600 nm in a spectrophotometer, and the MDA content was calculated using a molar absorption coefficient of 155 mM/cm (Heath and Packer 1968).

Total phenolic content and antioxidant activity assays

The total phenol content in leaves was analyzed according to (Swain and Hillis 1959), and the total antioxidant content was analyzed according to FRAP (Benzie and Strain 1996). At the analysis stage, 5 ml of methanol was added to each sample, which was subsequently crushed in a homogenizer and centrifuged at 12000 rpm for 10 min. The resulting supernatant was transferred to 2 ml Eppendorf tubes for analysis. To determine the phenolic content, 150 μl of the extract was removed, and 2400 μl of pure water and 150 μl of Folin-Ciocalteu solution (1:10 solution) were added. Then, this mixture was vortexed for 3–4 seconds, 300 μl of 20% saturated sodium carbonate was added, the mixture was kept at room temperature in the dark for 30 minutes, and the absorbance at 760 nm was read with a spectrophotometer. To determine the total antioxidant activity, a FRAP solution consisting of 150 μl of acetate buffer, TPTZ, and ferric chloride was prepared from the extract. A total of 2850 μl of the prepared FRAPs was transferred to 10 ml glass tubes. Then, the samples were kept in the dark for 30 minutes under room conditions, and readings were taken with a 593 nm wavelength spectrophotometer.

Statistical analyses

The data obtained from the experiment were evaluated using the SPSS statistical package program at a significance level of $p < 0.05$, according to the random plots experimental design. Differences between treatments were determined using Duncan's multiple comparison test (SPSS 2021).

Results and Discussion

Since the studies were conducted in a climate chamber, the differences between years were not statistically significant. Therefore, analyses were performed by combining the data from both years.

Tubercule Density in Tomato Roots Caused by Branched Broomrape

The differences in the number of broomrape tubercles in the roots of tomatoes treated with or without the biological control agent were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$, Table 2, Fig. 2). The data analysis revealed that MIX had at least one tubercle overall (3.75 pots/piece), followed by M1 (5.25 pots/piece), M2P2 (5.37 pots/piece), and TH (5.50 pots/piece). All treatments, except for the THP1 and P1 treatments, decreased broomrape attachment compared to that in the control group; the most effective treatments were MIX, M1, TH, and M2P2. Compared to the control group, MIX, M1, M2P2, and TH prevented tubercle formation by 72.72%, 61.82%, 60.95% and 60.0%, respectively.

Table 2
Effect of Biological Control Agents on the Number of Branched Broomrape
Tubercles in Tomato Roots (Average over Two Years, Number of Tubercles per Pot)

Treatments	Number of tubercles (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Rate of change compared to control (%)
K	13.75 $\pm$ 0.65 ab	
M1	5.25 $\pm$ 0.65 e	-61.82
M2	9.37 $\pm$ 0.84 cd	-31.85
P1	13.75 $\pm$ 1.19 ab	0.00
P2	9.12 $\pm$ 0.48 cd	-33.67
TH	5.50 $\pm$ 0.71 e	-60.00
MIX	3.75 $\pm$ 0.41 e	-72.73
M1P1	9.87 $\pm$ 0.72 bcd	-28.22
M1P2	11.37 $\pm$ 1.21 abc	-17.31
M2P1	10.00 $\pm$ 0.63 bcd	-27.27
M2P2	5.37 $\pm$ 0.71 e	-60.95
THM1	6.87 $\pm$ 0.79 de	-50.04
THM2	9.12 $\pm$ 0.77 cd	-33.67
THP1	15.25 $\pm$ 0.70 a	10.91
THP2	11.62 $\pm$ 0.94 abc	-15.49
Mean	9.33 $\pm$ 0.76	

a, b, c: The difference between the means shown with different letters in the same column is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

Treatments: K: Control, M1: *Funneliformis mosseae*, M2: ERS Commercial AMF, P1: *Pseudomonas caspiana* (V30G2), P2: *Bacillus velezensis* (V40K2), TH: *Trichoderma harzianum* (T22), MIX: Plant Success Great White Premium Mycorrhiza, M1P1: *F. mosseae* + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), M1P2: *F. mosseae* + *B. velezensis* (V40K2), M2P1: ERS + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), M2P2: ERS + *B. velezensis* (V40K2), THM1: *T. harzianum* T22 + *F. mosseae*, THM2: *T. harzianum* T22 + ERS, THP1: *T. harzianum* T22 + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), THP2: *T. harzianum* T22 + *B. velezensis* (V40K2). SE: Standart error.

The results of this study were in parallel with those of several previous studies, and it was observed that all the microorganisms and biological preparations used, except P1 and THP1, prevented the formation of broomrape tubercles. It is thought that the fact that P1 and THP1 application did not prevent the

decrease in tubercle number may be due to an antagonistic effect. Recently, many biological control agents, especially microorganisms such as fungi and bacteria, have become the focus of interest for inhibiting broomrape germination (Dor et al. 2007; Sauerborn et al. 2007). Studies have shown that AMF have the potential to reduce *P. ramosa* infection and partially mitigate its negative effects on tomato plant growth (Gworgwor and Weber 2003; Lendzemo et al. 2007; Fernández et al. 2010). In studies conducted in faba beans, it was reported that the use of AMF, *T. harzanium*, and some bacterial isolates reduced *O. crenata* germination (Hassan and Abakeer 2013). The application of *G. intraradices*, *G. mosseae*, and Glomus Sprint® to tomato plants reduced the percentage of *P. ramosa* tubercles by 22.2%, 42% and 56.8%, respectively (Musa 2012).

Several potential mechanisms are thought to explain the negative effects of biological control agents on weeds. One of them can be considered a direct effect, such as the reaction of the plant's defense system depending on the fungus used and the production of toxic compounds that can inhibit seed germination (Boari and Vurro 2004; Campos et al. 2012). Other researchers (Yoneyama et al. 2007; Fernández et al. 2010) have reported that AMF increase plant nutrient uptake, especially phosphorus, which may be due to a decrease in the amount of germination stimulants such as strigolactone present in root secretions. Therefore, it has been reported that nutrients as well as organic matter applied from the soil may cause serious physiological disorders in the germination of *P. ramosa* seeds with a decrease in weed infestation (Lops et al. 2017). It is also thought that some microorganisms thicken the cell wall of the host plant through enzymes and consequently affect the penetration between the host and the parasite by affecting the vascular connection, making it difficult for the broomrape to attach to the roots of the host plant (Pérez et al. 2005; Brahmi et al. 2016).

Effects of Branched Broomrape Infection and Biological Control Agents on Some Antioxidative Enzymes and MDA Activity in Tomato

Effect on Catalase (CAT) Enzyme Activity

For the antioxidant activity of CAT, as shown in Table 3, the differences between the means of the treatments infected and not infected with broomrape were statistically significant. Compared with that in the noninfected treatment group, the CAT content in the broomrape-infected treatment group increased. Specifically, the CAT activity was 80.95% greater in the plants infected with the branched broomrape than in the control plants.

Table 3

The effect of branched broomrape infestation and biological control agents on the CAT enzyme activity
(mmol g⁻¹ FW)

Treatments	Uninfected with broomrape (Mean ± SE)	Rate of change compared to control (%)	Infected with broomrape (Mean ± SE)	Rate of change compared to control (%)
K	0.0021 ± 0.0002 abc B		0.0038 ± 0.0004 bc A	
M1	0.0024 ± 0.0004 abc	14.77	0.0032 ± 0.0004 bc	-13.89
M2	0.0018 ± 0.0003 abcd B	-13.92	0.0035 ± 0.0002 bc A	-5.56
P1	0.0022 ± 0.0002 abc B	7.23	0.0053 ± 0.0006 a A	41.67
P2	0.0021 ± 0.0003 abc B	-0.20	0.0056 ± 0.0005 a A	50.00
TH	0.0010 ± 0.0001 d B	-50.10	0.0026 ± 0.0003 c A	-30.56
MIX	0.0015 ± 0.0003 cd B	-30.14	0.0025 ± 0.0002 c A	-33.33
M1P1	0.0021 ± 0.0002 abc	1.05	0.0029 ± 0.0003 c	-22.92
M1P2	0.0015 ± 0.0003 cd B	-30.14	0.0035 ± 0.0003 bc A	-5.56
M2P1	0.0026 ± 0.0005 a	22.26	0.0030 ± 0.0007 c	-19.44
M2P2	0.0024 ± 0.0003 ab	17.27	0.0035 ± 0.0006 bc	-6.94
THM1	0.0025 ± 0.0002 a B	19.76	0.0047 ± 0.0005 ab A	25.00
THM2	0.0021 ± 0.0003 abc B	-0.20	0.0040 ± 0.0005 bc A	5.56
THP1	0.0027 ± 0.0003 a	29.12	0.0029 ± 0.0004 c	-23.71
THP2	0.0015 ± 0.0001 bcd B	-27.64	0.0027 ± 0.0005 c A	-27.78
Mean	0.0020 B		0.0036 A	

a, b, c: The difference between the means shown with different letters in the same column is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

A, B: The difference between the treatments with and without weed is significant at $p < 0.05$. SE: Standard error.

Treatments: K: Control, M1: *Funneliformis mosseae*, M2: ERS Commercial AMF, P1: *Pseudomonas caspiana* (V30G2), P2: *Bacillus velezensis* (V40K2), TH: *Trichoderma harzianum* (T22), MIX: Plant Success Great White Premium Mycorrhiza, M1P1: *F. mosseae* + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), M1P2: *F. mosseae* + *B. velezensis* (V40K2), M2P1: ERS + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), M2P2: ERS + *B. velezensis* (V40K2), THM1: *T. harzianum* T22 + *F. mosseae*, THM2: *T. harzianum* T22 + ERS, THP1: *T. harzianum* T22 + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), THP2: *T. harzianum* T22 + *B. velezensis* (V40K2).

Effect on superoxide dismutase (SOD) enzyme activity

For the antioxidative stress enzyme SOD, as shown in Table 4, the differences between the means of the treatments infected and not infected with broomrape were statistically significant. When comparing the treatments with and without broomrape infection, statistically significant differences were observed only for the K, M2, P1, M1P1, M2P1, and THP2 treatments. The highest SOD activity was detected in the P1 and M2P1 treatments, while the lowest SOD activity was detected in the M2 and THP2 treatments. Among the broomrape treatment groups, the highest SOD activity was detected in the M2 and M2P2 treatment groups, while the lowest SOD activity was detected in the M1P1 and THP2 treatment groups.

Table 4

The effect of branched broomrape infestation and biological control agents on the SOD enzyme activity ($\text{U mg}^{-1} \text{FW}$)

Treatment	Uninfected with broomrape (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Rate of change compared to control (%)	Infected with broomrape (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Rate of change compared to control (%)
K	137.99 $\pm$ 13.27 abc A		93.17 $\pm$ 6.51 bcd B	
M1	93.89 $\pm$ 11.48 de	-31.96	105.40 $\pm$ 12.98 bc	13.13
M2	64.93 $\pm$ 8.31 e B	-52.94	168.91 $\pm$ 13.33 a A	81.29
P1	157.66 $\pm$ 9.33 a A	14.25	103.86 $\pm$ 8.75 bc B	11.47
P2	109.01 $\pm$ 16.09 bcd	-21.00	97.17 $\pm$ 4.81 bcd	4.29
TH	88.32 $\pm$ 13.28 de	-36.00	63.48 $\pm$ 9.19 de	-31.87
MIX	112.42 $\pm$ 14.57 bcd	-18.53	86.47 $\pm$ 7.56 bcd	-7.19
M1P1	83.50 $\pm$ 9.31 de A	-39.49	46.97 $\pm$ 4.00 e B	-49.59
M1P2	98.55 $\pm$ 9.53 de	-28.58	88.88 $\pm$ 12.02 bcd	-4.60
M2P1	142.59 $\pm$ 11.48 ab A	3.34	77.96 $\pm$ 15.23 cde B	-16.33
M2P2	95.14 $\pm$ 14.66 de	-31.05	121.51 $\pm$ 9.64 b	30.42
THM1	104.04 $\pm$ 14.12 cde	-24.61	75.28 $\pm$ 16.81 cde	-19.20
THM2	109.98 $\pm$ 12.71 bcd	-20.30	102.77 $\pm$ 19.31 bc	10.30
THP1	99.36 $\pm$ 11.37 de	-28.00	118.49 $\pm$ 6.27 b	27.17
THP2	73.09 $\pm$ 3.99 de B	-47.04	111.48 $\pm$ 14.26 bc A	19.65
Mean	104.7 $\pm$ 3.66		97.45 $\pm$ 3.77	

a, b, c: The difference between the means shown with different letters in the same column is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

A, B: The difference between the treatments with and without weed is significant at $p < 0.05$. SE: Standard error.

Treatments: K: Control, M1: *Funneliformis mosseae*, M2: ERS Commercial AMF, P1: *Pseudomonas caspiana* (V30G2), P2: *Bacillus velezensis* (V40K2), TH: *Trichoderma harzianum* (T22), MIX: Plant Success Great White Premium Mycorrhiza, M1P1: *F. mosseae* + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), M1P2: *F. mosseae* + *B. velezensis* (V40K2), M2P1: ERS + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), M2P2: ERS + *B. velezensis* (V40K2), THM1: *T. harzianum* T22 + *F. mosseae*, THM2: *T. harzianum* T22 + ERS, THP1: *T. harzianum* T22 + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), THP2: *T. harzianum* T22 + *B. velezensis* (V40K2).

Effect on Ascorbate Peroxidase (APX) Enzyme Activity

According to the APX activity data in Table 5, the differences between the treatments with and without broomrape infection were found to be statistically significant. Comparing the branched broomrape infected and uninfected treatments, the differences between the means were significant only for the K, P2, M1P2, THM1, and THP2 treatments. The highest APX content was detected in K and M1 in the treatments not infected with broomrape, while the highest APX content was detected in P2 and THM1 in the infection treatments. The lowest APX content was detected in P2, M1P2, M2P2, and THM1 in the noninfected treatments, and the lowest APX content was detected in P1, M2P2 and THP2 in the infected treatments.

Table 5

The effect of branched broomrape infestation and biological control agents on the APX enzyme activity ($\text{mmol g}^{-1} \text{FW}$) in tomato

Treatment	Uninfected with broomrape (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Rate of change compared to control (%)	Infected with broomrape (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Rate of change compared to control (%)
K	0.045 $\pm$ 0.005 a A		0.027 $\pm$ 0.004 cde B	
M1	0.031 $\pm$ 0.006 b	-30.00	0.038 $\pm$ 0.005 abc	41.67
M2	0.029 $\pm$ 0.003 bc	-35.00	0.025 $\pm$ 0.003 cde	-5.55
P1	0.022 $\pm$ 0.003 bcd	-50.00	0.018 $\pm$ 0.001 e	-33.33
P2	0.018 $\pm$ 0.001 d B	-60.00	0.043 $\pm$ 0.006 a A	61.11
TH	0.022 $\pm$ 0.003 bcd	-50.00	0.033 $\pm$ 0.005 abcd	22.22
MIX	0.024 $\pm$ 0.003 bcd	-46.67	0.025 $\pm$ 0.003 cde	-5.55
M1P1	0.021 $\pm$ 0.002 bcd	-53.33	0.029 $\pm$ 0.006 bcde	8.33
M1P2	0.020 $\pm$ 0.002 cd B	-55.00	0.033 $\pm$ 0.005 abcd A	25.00
M2P1	0.022 $\pm$ 0.003 bcd	-50.00	0.028 $\pm$ 0.006 bcde	5.56
M2P2	0.020 $\pm$ 0.002 cd	-55.00	0.018 $\pm$ 0.001 e	-33.33
THM1	0.020 $\pm$ 0.002 cd B	-55.00	0.040 $\pm$ 0.004 ab A	50.00
THM2	0.025 $\pm$ 0.003 bcd	-43.33	0.024 $\pm$ 0.003 de	-11.09
THP1	0.030 $\pm$ 0.004 bc	-33.33	0.020 $\pm$ 0.002 de	-25.00
THP2	0.028 $\pm$ 0.003 bcd A	-38.33	0.018 $\pm$ 0.001 e B	-33.33
Mean	0.025		0.028	

a, b, c: The difference between the means shown with different letters in the same column is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

A, B: The difference between the treatments with and without weed is significant at $p < 0.05$. SE: Standart error.

Treatments: K: Control, M1: *Funneliformis mosseae*, M2: ERS Commercial AMF, P1: *Pseudomonas caspiana* (V30G2), P2: *Bacillus velezensis* (V40K2), TH: *Trichoderma harzianum* (T22), MIX: Plant Success Great White Premium Mycorrhiza, M1P1: *F. mosseae*+ *P. caspiana* (V30G2), M1P2: *F. mosseae*+ *P. caspiana* (V30G2), M2P1: *F. mosseae*+ *B. velezensis* (V40K2), M2P2: *F. mosseae*+ *B. velezensis* (V40K2), THM1: *T. harzianum* (T22)+ *F. mosseae*, THM2: *T. harzianum* (T22)+ *F. mosseae*, THP1: *T. harzianum* (T22)+ *P. caspiana* (V30G2), THP2: *T. harzianum* (T22)+ *P. caspiana* (V30G2).

B. velezensis (V40K2), M2P1: ERS + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), M2P2: ERS + *B. velezensis* (V40K2), THM1: *T. harzianum* T22 + *F. mosseae*, THM2: *T. harzianum* T22 + ERS, THP1: *T. harzianum* T22 + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), THP2: *T. harzianum* T22 + *B. velezensis* (V40K2).

All plants are exposed to biotic and abiotic stresses throughout their life (Davis and Swanson 2001; Jamshidi et al. 2020). Plant enzymes, such as CAT, SOD and APX, play a critical role in the growth and development of plants. These enzymes constitute the antioxidant defense system of plants, protecting them against oxidative stress induced by reactive oxygen species (ROS) (Rajput et al. 2021; Bhat et al. 2022). An increase in the SOD enzyme under biotic and abiotic stress conditions is crucial for plant survival under such stress (Büyük et al. 2012). When the SOD enzyme converts O_2 formed under stress conditions into H_2O_2 and O_2 , the CAT enzyme directly converts H_2O_2 into H_2O and O_2 , thereby shielding the plant against stress factors (Van Camp et al. 1997). Antioxidant enzymes such as ascorbate peroxidase (APX), glutathione reductase, catalase (CAT), and superoxide dismutase (SOD) reduce ROS production, preventing the harmful accumulation of H_2O_2 (Gill and Tuteja 2010; Kang et al. 2014).

Researchers have reported that plants respond differently to oxidative stress conditions in weeds (Davis and Swanson 2001; Caverzan et al. 2019). The complex structure of beneficial microorganisms is the main reason that different microorganism treatments affect enzyme activity in plants in various ways. Plants tend to determine the optimal strategy to minimize damage caused by pest organisms, resulting in diverse responses of microorganisms to pests (Van der Putten et al. 2001; Caccavo et al. 2022). For instance, Madany et al. (2020) reported that CAT activity was significantly greater in tomato plants infected with broomrape than in uninfected control plants. Chen et al. (1993) reported that, along with the increase in CAT activity, plant cell wall resistance also increased, serving as a signal for the stimulation of defense genes. In three sunflower cultivars contaminated with broomrape, it was observed that broomrape caused variations in total SOD activity depending on the attachment time (Demirbaş and Acar 2008). Alam et al. (2023) reported that the APX content in three different tomato cultivars grown under drought stress differed according to the AMF species. In a study investigating the effects of *F. oxysporum* on *Orobanch* spp., it was determined that compared with the control treatment, *F. oxysporum* treatment increased the SOD content and decreased the CAT content (Aybeke, 2017). This is thought to be related to the penetration of the parasite into the tissue and the development of resistance against ROS in cells (Demirbaş and Acar, 2008).

In this study, the CAT content was significantly greater in the branched broomrape-infected plants than in the uninfected plants. The SOD content varied in both the broomrape-infected and uninfected treatments, showing an increase in some treatments and a decrease in others. Compared with that in the control group, the APX content decreased in the plants not infected with broomrape; however, compared with that in the control group, the APX content increased in some treatments and decreased in others in the plants infected with broomrape. Similarly, in a previous study conducted in various parts of the world, under stress conditions caused by broomrape infection, both the increase and decrease in the oxidative enzyme content increased and decreased, respectively.

Effect on Lipid Peroxidation [Malondialdehyde (MDA)] Activity

For the MDA content shown in Table 6, the differences between the means of the treatments not infected with broomrape were found to be statistically insignificant, while the differences between the means of the infected treatments were significant. The MDA content increased in all the treatments except for the K and M1P1 treatments compared with that in the uninfected treatment. The MDA content increased in all treatments in the presence of broomrape infection compared to that in the control group.

Table 6

The effect of branched broomrape infestation and biological control agents on the MDA content ($\mu\text{mol g}^{-1}$ FW)

Treatment	Uninfected with broomrape (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Rate of change compared to control (%)	Infected with broomrape (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Rate of change compared to control (%)
K	3.00 $\pm$ 0.23 A		2.12 $\pm$ 0.20 d B	
M1	3.10 $\pm$ 0.44	3.32	4.52 $\pm$ 0.88 ab	112.93
M2	2.77 $\pm$ 0.26 B	-7.44	5.00 $\pm$ 0.88 a A	135.74
P1	2.32 $\pm$ 0.32	-22.69	2.53 $\pm$ 0.51 cd	19.39
P2	2.08 $\pm$ 0.26 B	-30.76	3.24 $\pm$ 0.37 bcd A	52.60
TH	2.87 $\pm$ 0.36	-4.22	3.90 $\pm$ 0.65 abc	84.03
MIX	3.11 $\pm$ 0.33	3.68	3.68 $\pm$ 0.42 abcd	73.38
M1P1	2.71 $\pm$ 0.43	-9.60	2.55 $\pm$ 0.30 cd	20.15
M1P2	2.79 $\pm$ 0.33 B	-6.91	4.49 $\pm$ 0.26 ab A	111.91
M2P1	2.53 $\pm$ 0.29 B	-15.70	3.58 $\pm$ 0.23 abcd A	68.82
M2P2	2.60 $\pm$ 0.27 B	-13.18	4.08 $\pm$ 0.45 abc A	92.52
THM1	2.91 $\pm$ 0.41	-2.78	3.46 $\pm$ 0.53 abcd	63.24
THM2	3.48 $\pm$ 0.31	16.14	4.10 $\pm$ 0.36 abc	93.54
THP1	2.98 $\pm$ 0.50	-0.63	3.78 $\pm$ 0.22 abc	78.45
THP2	1.77 $\pm$ 0.20 B	-41.08	3.81 $\pm$ 0.55 abc A	79.47
Mean	2.73 $\pm$ 0.9 B		3.66 $\pm$ 0.14 A	

a, b, c: The difference between the means shown with different letters in the same column is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

A, B: The difference between the treatments with and without weed is significant at $p < 0.05$. SE: Standard error.

Treatments: K: Control, M1: *Funneliformis mosseae*, M2: ERS Commercial AMF, P1: *Pseudomonas caspiana* (V30G2), P2: *Bacillus velezensis* (V40K2), TH: *Trichoderma harzianum* (T22), MIX: Plant Success Great White Premium Mycorrhiza, M1P1: *F. mosseae* + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), M1P2: *F. mosseae* + *B. velezensis* (V40K2), M2P1: ERS + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), M2P2: ERS + *B. velezensis* (V40K2), THM1: *T. harzianum* T22 + *F. mosseae*, THM2: *T. harzianum* T22 + ERS, THP1: *T. harzianum* T22 + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), THP2: *T. harzianum* T22 + *B. velezensis* (V40K2).

ROS cause increased lipid peroxidation in plants, and ROS production is inevitable in response to stress (Abogadallah 2010; Jamshidi et al. 2020). Lipid peroxidation leads to cell membrane damage, loss of cell fluid, and cell death, resulting in the plant producing MDA. In other words, the greater the degree of damage to the cell membrane structure, the greater the MDA content (Dhindsa and Matowe 1981; Yonghua et al. 2005). Therefore, MDA, a product of lipid peroxidation, is considered a biochemical indicator of oxidative damage (Apel and Hirt 2004). Madany et al. (2020) reported that IAA (indole acetic acid) and SA (salicylic acid) application to seeds had no significant effect on the MDA content in tomatoes compared to the control group, but the MDA content increased by 34% in tomatoes infected with broomrape. In cucumber studies, the MDA content increased in all cucumber genotypes as a result of *P. aegyptiaca* infection compared to that in the control (Faradonbeh et al. 2020; Faradonbeh et al. 2021). This study revealed that the MDA content generally increased in the broomrape-infected plants compared to that in the uninfected plants. In addition, in parallel with the studies mentioned above and in previous years, it was determined that the MDA content increased in the treatments infected with broomrape compared to the control.

Effects of Branched Broomrape Contamination and Biological Control Agents on Total Phenolic and Antioxidant Substances in Tomato

The differences between the means of both the infected and noninfected treatments were found to be statistically significant for the amount of phenolic substances given in Table 7. The greatest amount of phenolic matter was found in the M2 and M2P1 treatment groups in the noninfected treatment group, and the greatest amount was found in the THP2 and THP1 treatment groups in the infected treatment group. The lowest phenolic content was found in P1 and K in the uninfected treatments, and the lowest phenolic content was found in THM1 and P1 in the infected treatments. Compared with those in the control treatments, there was no significant increase in the amount of total phenolic substances in either the infected or noninfected plants, but there were differences between the treatments.

Table 7

The effect of branched broomrape infestation and biological control agents on total phenolic matter content (mg GAE/100 g)

Treatment	Uninfected with broomrape (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Rate of change compared to control (%)	Infected with broomrape (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Rate of change compared to control (%)
K	22.01 $\pm$ 1.70 c		25.82 $\pm$ 0.53 cdef	
M1	25.22 $\pm$ 0.65 abc	14.59	23.67 $\pm$ 0.71 ef	-8.30
M2	27.82 $\pm$ 1.76 a	26.44	25.73 $\pm$ 1.31 cdef	-0.35
P1	21.23 $\pm$ 1.07 c	-3.53	22.70 $\pm$ 1.43 f	-12.08
P2	24.80 $\pm$ 0.62 abc	12.70	27.32 $\pm$ 1.23 bcde	5.83
TH	23.28 $\pm$ 0.61 bc	5.77	24.68 $\pm$ 1.92 def	-4.41
MIX	22.48 $\pm$ 1.13 c B	2.15	27.88 $\pm$ 1.21 bcd A	7.97
M1P1	22.57 $\pm$ 1.37 c B	2.56	28.71 $\pm$ 0.85 abcd B	11.20
M1P2	27.27 $\pm$ 0.90 ab	23.92	29.05 $\pm$ 0.77 abc	12.52
M2P1	27.77 $\pm$ 1.11 a	26.20	25.93 $\pm$ 0.54 cdef	0.44
M2P2	27.57 $\pm$ 1.37 a	25.30	27.81 $\pm$ 1.56 bcd	7.74
THM1	23.99 $\pm$ 1.79 abc	9.01	22.66 $\pm$ 1.52 f	-12.22
THM2	25.47 $\pm$ 1.73 abc	15.72	27.98 $\pm$ 1.62 bcd	8.38
THP1	24.55 $\pm$ 1.54 abc B	11.57	30.90 $\pm$ 1.65 ab A	19.71
THP2	23.22 $\pm$ 0.78 bc B	5.51	32.41 $\pm$ 1.03 a A	25.56
Mean	24.62 $\pm$ 0.36 B		26.88 $\pm$ 0.39 A	

a, b, c: The difference between the means shown with different letters in the same column is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

A, B: The difference between the treatments with and without weed is significant at $p < 0.05$. SE: Standart error.

Treatments: K: Control, M1: *Funneliformis mosseae*, M2: ERS Commercial AMF, P1: *Pseudomonas caspiana* (V30G2), P2: *Bacillus velezensis* (V40K2), TH: *Trichoderma harzianum* (T22), MIX: Plant Success Great White Premium Mycorrhiza, M1P1: *F. mosseae* + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), M1P2: *F. mosseae* + *B. velezensis* (V40K2), M2P1: ERS + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), M2P2: ERS + *B. velezensis* (V40K2), THM1: *T.*

harzianum T22 + *F. mosseae*, THM2: *T. harzianum* T22 + ERS, THP1: *T. harzianum* T22 + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), THP2: *T. harzianum* T22 + *B. velezensis* (V40K2).

The total antioxidant content shown in Table 8 revealed statistically significant differences between the means of both the infected and noninfected treatments. In the noninfected treatments, the highest total antioxidant amounts were observed in the M1 and M2P1 treatments, whereas in the infected treatments, the highest total antioxidant amounts were found in the M1 and M1P1 treatments. Conversely, the lowest levels of total antioxidants were found in M2P2 and P1 in the noninfected treatments and in THP1 and M2P1 in the infected treatments. Upon comparing the plants infected and not infected with broomrape to the control plants, an increase in the total antioxidant amount was observed in some treatments, while a decrease was observed in others.

Table 8

The effect of branched broomrape infestation and biological control agents on the total antioxidant content (Trolox μmol (Trolox equivalent) TE/100g)

Treatment	Uninfected with broomrape (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Rate of change compared to control (%)	Infected with broomrape (Mean $\pm$ SE)	Rate of change compared to control (%)
K	238.12 $\pm$ 13.34 bc		189.64 $\pm$ 21.65 abcd	
M1	326.76 $\pm$ 30.04 a	37.22	259.33 $\pm$ 25.98 a	36.75
M2	232.68 $\pm$ 11.29 cd	-2.29	214.79 $\pm$ 29.39 abc	13.26
P1	166.15 $\pm$ 14.99 ef	-30.22	220.70 $\pm$ 54.29 ab	16.38
P2	213.73 $\pm$ 15.37 cde A	-10.24	134.33 $\pm$ 13.60 def B	-29.16
TH	192.67 $\pm$ 11.00 cde	-19.09	214.64 $\pm$ 17.15 abc	13.18
MIX	239.03 $\pm$ 34.62 bc	0.38	187.74 $\pm$ 11.35 abcd	-1.00
M1P1	169.18 $\pm$ 13.85 ef B	-28.95	258.58 $\pm$ 24.91 a A	36.35
M1P2	210.09 $\pm$ 16.75 cde	-11.77	226.00 $\pm$ 11.08 ab	19.18
M2P1	291.15 $\pm$ 28.98 ab A	22.27	105.17 $\pm$ 11.48 ef B	-44.54
M2P2	127.89 $\pm$ 10.19 f	-46.29	105.58 $\pm$ 9.42 ef	-44.32
THM1	174.48 $\pm$ 23.41 def	-26.72	164.26 $\pm$ 24.92 bcde	-13.38
THM2	168.48 $\pm$ 12.55 ef	-29.25	145.64 $\pm$ 6.46 cde	-23.20
THP1	222.59 $\pm$ 11.04 cde A	-6.52	69.62 $\pm$ 3.28 e B	-63.29
THP2	182.78 $\pm$ 16.19 cdef	-23.24	172.02 $\pm$ 12.72 bcde	-9.29
Mean	210.39 $\pm$ 6.5 A		177.87 $\pm$ 7.37 B	

a, b, c: The difference between the means shown with different letters in the same column is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

A, B: The difference between the treatments with and without weed is significant at $p < 0.05$. SE: Standart error.

Treatments: K: Control, M1: *Funneliformis mosseae*, M2: ERS Commercial AMF, P1: *Pseudomonas caspiana* (V30G2), P2: *Bacillus velezensis* (V40K2), TH: *Trichoderma harzianum* (T22), MIX: Plant Success Great White Premium Mycorrhiza, M1P1: *F. mosseae*+ *P. caspiana* (V30G2), M1P2: *F. mosseae*+ *B. velezensis* (V40K2), M2P1: ERS + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), M2P2: ERS + *B. velezensis* (V40K2), THM1: *T. harzianum* T22 + *F. mosseae*, THM2: *T. harzianum* T22 + ERS, THP1: *T. harzianum* T22 + *P. caspiana* (V30G2), THP2: *T. harzianum* T22 + *B. velezensis* (V40K2).

Phenolic compounds, which are found in many plant organs, are nonenzymatic secondary metabolism products. These compounds play a role in ecological and physiological events and have antioxidant activity (Kıpçak et al. 2019). The total phenolic content of host plants can be affected by the use of biological control agents (Doley and Jite, 2014). In addition, the total phenolic content also changes due to infection of host plants by pathogens (Singh et al. 2013). Singh et al. (2013) reported that differences in the host plant's total antioxidant activity occurred due to pathogen infection, while Doley and Jite (2014) reported that the total antioxidant content was affected by the use of biological control agents. Faradonbeh et al. (2020) reported that increased phenol compounds in sunflower due to broomrape contamination can be considered a protective response against *O. cumuna*. This study examined the impacts of several mycorrhiza species on organic carrot farming and revealed that antioxidant activity was positively impacted. (Kiracı et al. 2014). In one study, it was determined that the biological control agents used in tomatoes did not have a significant effect on total phenolic matter or antioxidant activity, and there were changes depending on the application (Boyno et al. 2022). According to the data obtained in the present study, compared with those in the control group, the total phenolic matter and antioxidant content in plants not infected with broomrape increased in some treatment groups but decreased in other treatment groups.

Conclusion

As a result of the study, the number of broomrape tubercles decreased in all treatments except for the P1 and THP1 treatments compared to that in the control group. MIX, M1, TH, M2P2, THM1, and THM1 were the most effective treatments for preventing the attachment of the weed by 50–72%. It was also observed that oxidative stress occurred in the plants infected with broomrape, and the plants responded differently to this stress. According to the total phenolic matter and antioxidant activity data, there was no statistically significant increase or decrease in phenolic matter content in the plants infected with broomrape compared to the control plants. These results support the theory that biological control agents negatively affect broomrape attachment, a problem for which no successful control strategy has been developed to date. Nevertheless, there is a paucity of precise information elucidating the mechanisms through which these microorganisms curtail broomrape germination. This finding suggests a plausible association with soil-dwelling microorganisms during the dormancy phase of broomrape seeds. This theory suggests that enzymatic mechanisms that increase cell wall thickness are the result of soil microbes that improve plant nutrient uptake. In addition, a decrease in stimulants secreted by the host and an increase in systemic resistance in the plant are the other suggested causative causes. This investigation investigated the significance of introducing a novel paradigm for broomrape control by

leveraging the use of microorganisms and biological control agents that preserve the natural ecosystem and mitigate physiological perturbations during broomrape infection.

Declarations

Conflict of interest

E. Fidan and I. Tepe declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

This study was funded by Van Yuzuncu Yıl University, Scientific Research Projects Department (FDK-2020-8850).

Author Contribution

Enes Fidan and Işık Tepe designed the study and carried out the experiments. They also revised and edited the manuscript.

Acknowledgments

This study was produced from the E. Fidan's PhD thesis.

References

1. Abogadallah GM 2010. Insights into the significance of antioxidative defense under salt stress. *Plant signaling & behavior*, 5(4): 369–374. <https://doi.org/10.4161/psb.5.4.10873>
2. Aksoy E 2003. Canavarotu türlerinin (*Orobanchae* spp.) Çukurova Bölgesi'ndeki önemi ve mücadele olanakları üzerine araştırmalar. Çukurova Üniversitesi.
3. Aksoy E Pekcan V. 2014. Canavar otları (*Orobanchae* spp., *Phelipanche* spp.) ve Mücadelesi. Gıda, Tarım ve Hayvancılık Bakanlığı Tarımsal Araştırmalar ve Politikalar Genel Müdürlüğü Bitki Sağlığı Araştırmaları Daire Başkanlığı Yayınları, Ankara, 80s.
4. Alam MZ, Choudhury TR, Mridha M 2023. Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi Enhance Biomass Growth, Mineral Content, and Antioxidant Activity in Tomato Plants under Drought Stress. *Journal of Food Quality*, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/2581608>
5. Altın N, Tayyar B 2005. Bitki gelişimini uyaran kök bakterilerinin genel özellikleri ve etkileri. *Anadolu Ege Tarımsal Araştırma Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 15(2): 87–103.
6. Ampong NK, De Datta SK 1991. A handbook for weed control in rice: *Int. Rice Res. Inst.*

7. Apel K, Hirt H 2004. Reactive oxygen species: metabolism, oxidative stress, and signal transduction. *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.*, 55: 373–399. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.arplant.55.031903.141701>
8. Arshad, M, Frankenberger JWT 1997. Plant growth-regulating substances in the rhizosphere: microbial production and functions. *Advances in agronomy*, 62: 45–151. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113\(08\)60567-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113(08)60567-2)
9. Aybeke M 2017. *Fusarium* infection causes genotoxic disorders and antioxidant-based damages in *Orobanch* spp. *Microbiological Research*, 201: 46–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2017.05.001>
10. Benzie IF, Strain JJ 1996. The ferric reducing ability of plasma (FRAP) as a measure of “antioxidant power”: the FRAP assay. *Analytical biochemistry*, 239(1): 70–76. <https://doi.org/10.1006/abio.1996.0292>
11. Bhardwaj D, Ansari MW, Sahoo RK, Tuteja N 2014. Biofertilizers function as key player in sustainable agriculture by improving soil fertility, plant tolerance and crop productivity. *Microbial cell factories*, 13: 1–10.
12. Bhat MY, Gul MZ, Dar JS 2022. Gene Expression and Role of Antioxidant Enzymes in Crop Plants Under Stress, *Antioxidant Defense in Plants: Molecular Basis of Regulation*: 31–56: Springer.
13. Boari A, Vurro M 2004. Evaluation of *Fusarium* spp. and other fungi as biological control agents of broomrape (*Orobancha ramosa*). *Biological Control*, 30(2): 212–219.
14. Boyno G, Demir S, Danesh YR 2022. Effects of some biological agents on the growth and biochemical parameters of tomato plants infected with *Alternaria solani* (Ellis & Martin) Sorauer. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*, 162(1): 19–29.
15. Brahmi I, Mabrouk Y, Brun G, Delavault P, Belhadj O, Simier P 2016. Phenotypical and biochemical characterisation of resistance for parasitic weed (*Orobancha foetida* Poir.) in radiation-mutagenised mutants of chickpea. *Pest management science*, 72(12): 2330–2338. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.4278>
16. Büyük İ, Soydam AS, Aras S 2012. Bitkilerin stres koşullarına verdiği moleküler cevaplar. *Turkish Bulletin of Hygiene & Experimental Biology/Türk Hijyen ve Deneysel Biyoloji*, 69(2): 97–110.
17. Caccavo V, Forlano P, Mang SM, Fanti P, Nuzzaci M, Battaglia D, Trotta V 2022. Effects of *Trichoderma harzianum* Strain T22 on the Arthropod Community Associated with Tomato Plants and on the Crop Performance in an Experimental Field. *Insects*, 13(5): 418. <https://doi.org/10.3390/insects13050418>
18. Campos SL, García MJ, Segundo BS 2012. The arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis promotes the systemic induction of regulatory defence-related genes in rice leaves and confers resistance to pathogen infection. *Molecular plant pathology*, 13(6): 579–592. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1364-3703.2011.00773.x>
19. Caverzan A, Piasecki C, Chavarria G, Stewart JCN, Vargas L 2019. Defenses against ROS in crops and weeds: The effects of interference and herbicides. *International journal of molecular sciences*, 20(5): 1086. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms20051086>

20. Chaudhary P, Sharma A, Singh B, Nagpal AK 2018. Bioactivities of phytochemicals present in tomato. *Journal of food science and technology*, 55: 2833–2849.
21. Chen K, Tian R, Xu G, Wu K, Liu Y, Jiang F 2023. Characterizations of konjac glucomannan/curdlan edible coatings and the preservation effect on cherry tomatoes. *International Journal of Biological Macromolecules*, 232: 123359.
22. Chen Z, Silva H, Klessig DF 1993. Active oxygen species in the induction of plant systemic acquired resistance by salicylic acid. *Science*, 262(5141): 1883–1886. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.82660>
23. Cho UH, Seo NH 2005. Oxidative stress in *Arabidopsis thaliana* exposed to cadmium is due to hydrogen peroxide accumulation. *Plant Science*, 168(1): 113–120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plantsci.2004.07.021>
24. Çakmak İ, Strbac D, Marschner H 1993. Activities of hydrogen peroxide-scavenging enzymes in germinating wheat seeds. *Journal of experimental botany*, 44(1): 127–132. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/44.1.127>
25. Dames JF 2014. Biological Control: PGPR and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi working together. *Use of Microbes for the Alleviation of Soil Stresses: Volume 2: Alleviation of Soil Stress by PGPR and Mycorrhizal Fungi*: 39–53.
26. Daniel AI, Fadaka AO, Gokul A, Bakare OO, Aina O, Fisher S, Burt AF, Mavumengwana V, Keyster M, Klein A 2022. Biofertilizer: the future of food security and food safety. *Microorganisms*, 10(6): 1220. <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms10061220>
27. Davis, DG, Swanson HR 2001. Activity of stress-related enzymes in the perennial weed leafy spurge (*Euphorbia esula* L.). *Environmental and experimental botany*, 46(2): 95–108. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0098-8472\(01\)00081-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0098-8472(01)00081-8)
28. Demirbaş S, Acar O 2008. Superoxide dismutase and peroxidase activities from antioxidative enzymes in *Helianthus annuus* L. roots during *Orobanche cumana* Wallr. penetration. *Fresenius Environmental Bulletin*, 17(8a): 1038–1044.
29. Demirkan H 1992. Marmara Bölgesi Domates Alanlarında Sorun Olan Canavarotunun Biyolojisi ve Mücadelesi Üzerinde Araştırmalar. Ege Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Bitki Koruma Bölümü Doktora Tezi, İzmir.
30. Dhindsa RS, Matowe W 1981. Drought tolerance in two mosses: correlated with enzymatic defence against lipid peroxidation. *Journal of experimental botany*, 32(1): 79–91. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/32.1.79>
31. Doley K, Jite PK 2014. Interaction effects of *Glomus fasciculatum* and *Trichoderma viride* inoculations on groundnut plants inoculated with pathogen *Macrophomina phaseolina*. *IJAS*, 4(9): 281–288.
32. Dor E, Evidente A, Amalfitano C, Agrelli D, Hershenhorn J 2007. The influence of growth conditions on biomass, toxins and pathogenicity of *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. orthoceras, a potential agent for broomrape biocontrol. *Weed Research*, 47(4): 345–352. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3180.2007.00567.x>

33. El-Maraghy S, Tohamy A, Hussein K 2021. Plant protection properties of the Plant Growth-Promoting Fungi (PGPF): Mechanisms and potentiality. *Curr. Res. Environ. Appl. Mycol*, 11(1): 391–415.
34. Faradonbeh H, Nayerehalsadat H, Darbandi El, Karimmojeni H, Nezami A 2020. Physiological and growth responses of cucumber (*Cucumis sativus* L.) genotypes to Egyptian broomrape (*Phelipanche aegyptiaca* (Pers.) Pomel) parasitism. *Acta Physiologiae Plantarum*, 42: 1–15.
35. Faradonbeh H, Nayerehalsadat Izadi DE, Karimmojeni H, Nezami A 2021. The morphological and physiological traits of *Cucumis sativus*-*Phelipanche aegyptiaca* association affected by arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi symbiosis. *Journal of Crop Protection*, 10(4): 669–684.
36. Fernández-Aparicio M, Flores F, Rubiales D 2016. The effect of *Orobancha crenata* infection severity in faba bean, field pea, and grass pea productivity. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 7: 1409. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2016.01409>
37. Fernández-Aparicio M, García-Garrido J, Ocampo JA, Rubiales D 2010. Colonisation of field pea roots by arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi reduces *Orobancha* and *Phelipanche* species seed germination. *Weed research*, 50(3): 262–268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3180.2010.00771.x>
38. Gianinazzi-Pearson V, Gollotte A, Cordier C, Gianinazzi S 1996. Root defence responses in relation to cell and tissue invasion by symbiotic microorganisms: cytological investigations, Histology, ultrastructure and molecular cytology of plant-microorganism interactions: 177–191: Springer.
39. Gill SS, Tuteja N 2010. Reactive oxygen species and antioxidant machinery in abiotic stress tolerance in crop plants. *Plant physiology and biochemistry*, 48(12): 909–930. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plaphy.2010.08.016>
40. Glick BR 2012. Plant growth-promoting bacteria: mechanisms and applications. *Scientifica*, 2012: 15. <https://doi.org/10.6064/2012/963401>
41. Güneş H 2018. Brassicaceae, Chenopodiaceae, Urticaceae familyalarına ait bazı bitkilerin arbusküler mikorhizal fungus (AMF) ve Bitki Gelişimini Teşvik Eden Rhizobakterlerle ilişkisi. MsC thesis, Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Türkiye.
42. Gworgwor NA, Weber HC 2003. Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi-parasite-host interaction for the control of *Striga hermonthica* (Del.) Benth. in sorghum [*Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench]. *Mycorrhiza*, 13: 277–281.
43. Hassan MM, Abakeer RA 2013. Effects of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) and bacterial strains on *Orobancha crenata* Forsk, on faba bean. *Universal Journal of Applied Science*, 1(1): 27–32.
44. Heath RL, Packer L 1968. Photoperoxidation in isolated chloroplasts: I. Kinetics and stoichiometry of fatty acid peroxidation. *Archives of biochemistry and biophysics*, 125(1): 189–198. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-9861\(68\)90654-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-9861(68)90654-1)
45. İmriz G, Özdemir F, Topal İ, Ercan B, Taş M, Yakışır E, Okur O 2014. Bitkisel üretimde bitki gelişimini teşvik eden rizobakteri (PGPR)'ler ve etki mekanizmaları. *Elektronik Mikrobiyoloji Dergisi*, 12(2): 1–19.
46. Jamshidi GK, Moosavi SS, Amirmahani F, Salehi F, Nazari M 2020. Assessment of changes in growth traits, oxidative stress parameters, and enzymatic and non-enzymatic antioxidant defense

- mechanisms in *Lepidium draba* plant under osmotic stress induced by polyethylene glycol. *Protoplasma*, 257: 459–473.
47. Jebara S, Jebara M, Limam F, Aouani ME 2005. Changes in ascorbate peroxidase, catalase, guaiacol peroxidase and superoxide dismutase activities in common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris*) nodules under salt stress. *Journal of plant physiology*, 162(8): 929–936.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jplph.2004.10.005>
 48. Joel D 2007. Direct infection of potato tubers by the root parasite *Orobanche aegyptiaca*. *Weed Research*, 47(4): 276–279. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3180.2007.00570.x>
 49. Kadioğlu İ 2009. Canavar otunun (*Orobanche* spp.) tanımı, zararları ve mücadelesi.
 50. Kang G, Li G, Guo T 2014. Molecular mechanism of salicylic acid-induced abiotic stress tolerance in higher plants. *Acta Physiologiae Plantarum*, 36: 2287–2297.
 51. Kıpçak S, Ekincialp A, Erdinç Ç, Kabay T, Şensoy S 2019. Tuz Stresinin Farklı Fasulye Genotiplerinde Bazı Besin Elementi İçeriği ile Toplam Antioksidan ve Toplam Fenol İçeriğine Etkisi. *Yuzuncu Yıl University Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 29(1): 136–144.
<https://doi.org/10.29133/yyutbd.504748>
 52. Kiracı S, Gönülal E, Padem H 2014. Farklı Mikoriza Türlerinin Organik Havuç Yetiştiriciliğinde Kalite Özellikleri Üzerine Etkileri. *Tekirdağ Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(1): 106–113.
 53. Krupp A, Heller A, Spring O 2019. Development of phloem connection between the parasitic plant *Orobanche cumana* and its host sunflower. *Protoplasma*, 256: 1385–1397.
 54. Kumari S, Bharat NK, Thakur AK 2020. Role of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) and bio-control agents (BCAs) in crop production. *International Journal of Economic Plants*, 7(3): 144–150.
 55. Kwon SY, Jeong YJ, Lee HS, Kim J, Cho K, Allen R, Kwak SS 2002. Enhanced tolerances of transgenic tobacco plants expressing both superoxide dismutase and ascorbate peroxidase in chloroplasts against methyl viologen-mediated oxidative stress. *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 25(7): 873–882.
<https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3040.2002.00870.x>
 56. Lenzemo VW, Kuyper TW, Matusova R, Bouwmeester HJ, Ast AV 2007. Colonization by arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi of sorghum leads to reduced germination and subsequent attachment and emergence of *Striga hermonthica*. *Plant signaling & behavior*, 2(1): 58–62.
<https://doi.org/10.4161/psb.2.1.3884>
 57. Lops F, Disciglio G, Carlucci A, Gatta G, Frabboni L, Tarantino A, Tarantino E 2017. Biological methods to control parasitic weed *Phelipanche ramosa* L. Pomel in the field tomato Crop. *International Journal of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering*, 11(3): 264–267.
 58. Lops F, Frabboni L, Carlucci A, Tarantino A, Raimondo ML, Disciglio G 2022. Management of Branched Broomrape in Field Processing Tomato Crop, *Tomato-From Cultivation to Processing Technology*: IntechOpen.
 59. Madany MM, Zinta G, Abuelsoud W, Hozzein WN, Selim S, Asard H, Abd Elgawad H 2020. Hormonal seed-priming improves tomato resistance against broomrape infection. *Journal of Plant Physiology*, 250: 153184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jplph.2020.153184>

60. McNeal JR, Bennett JR, Wolfe AD, Mathews S 2013. Phylogeny and origins of holoparasitism in Orobanchaceae. *American journal of botany*, 100(5): 971–983. <https://doi.org/10.3732/ajb.1200448>
61. Mennan H, Jabran K, Zandstra BH, Pala F 2020. Non-chemical weed management in vegetables by using cover crops: A review. *Agronomy*, 10(2): 257. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy10020257>
62. Musa TSA 2012. Development and Integration of Biocontrol Products in Branched Broomrape (*Phelipanche ramosa*) management in Tomato: Cuvillier Verlag.
63. Nakano Y, Asada K 1981. Hydrogen peroxide is scavenged by ascorbate-specific peroxidase in spinach chloroplasts. *Plant and cell physiology*, 22(5): 867–880. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.pcp.a076232>
64. Parker C 2009. Observations on the current status of Orobanche and Striga problems worldwide. *Pest Management Science: formerly Pesticide Science*, 65(5): 453–459. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.1713>
65. Pérez LA, Jorrín J, Cubero J, Rubiales D 2005. *Orobanche crenata* resistance and avoidance in pea (*Pisum* spp.) operate at different developmental stages of the parasite. *Weed Research*, 45(5): 379–387. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3180.2005.00464.x>
66. Prasad R, Bhola D, Akdi K, Cruz C, KVSS S, Tuteja N, Varma A 2017. Introduction to mycorrhiza: historical development. *Mycorrhiza-function, diversity, state of the Art*: 1–7.
67. Pretty J, Pervez BZ 2015. Integrated pest management for sustainable intensification of agriculture in Asia and Africa. *Insects*, 6(1): 152–182. <https://doi.org/10.3390/insects6010152>
68. Rajput VD, Harish Singh RK, Verma KK, Sharma L, Quiroz FR, Meena M, Gour VS, Minkina T, Sushkova S 2021. Recent developments in enzymatic antioxidant defence mechanism in plants with special reference to abiotic stress. *Biology*, 10(4): 267. <https://doi.org/10.3390/biology10040267>
69. Rişvanli MR 2022. *Trichoderma harzianum* Uygulanmış Patates ve Pamuk Bitkisi Üzerinde, *Spodoptera Exigua*'nın Popülasyon Performansı ve Beslenme Kapasitesinin Belirlenmesi, Ph.D thesis, Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Van, Türkiye.
70. Saffan MM, Koriem MA, El-Henawy A, El-Mahdy S, El-Ramady H, Elbehiry F, Omara AED, Bayoumi Y, Badgar K, Prokisch J 2022. Sustainable production of tomato plants (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) under low-quality irrigation water as affected by bio-nanofertilizers of selenium and copper. *Sustainability*, 14(6): 3236. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14063236>
71. Sauerborn J, Müller-Stöver D, Hershenhorn J 2007. The role of biological control in managing parasitic weeds. *Crop protection*, 26(3): 246–254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2005.12.012>
72. Sharma K, Malhi GS, Gupta G, Kaur M 2020. Biological weed control: a way to sustainable weed management. *Indian farmer*, 7(9): 853–860.
73. Singh A, Sarma BK, Upadhyay RS, Singh HB. 2013. Compatible rhizosphere microbes mediated alleviation of biotic stress in chickpea through enhanced antioxidant and phenylpropanoid activities. *Microbiological Research*, 168(1): 33–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2012.07.001>
74. Song YY, Ye M, Li CY, Wang RL, Wei XC, Luo SM, Zeng RS 2013. Priming of anti-herbivore defense in tomato by arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus and involvement of the jasmonate pathway. *Journal of*

- Chemical Ecology, 39: 1036–1044.
75. Sood M, Kapoor D, Kumar V, Sheteiwy MS, Ramakrishnan M, Landi M, Araniti F, Sharma A 2020. *Trichoderma*: The “secrets” of a multit talented biocontrol agent. *Plants*, 9(6): 762. <https://doi.org/10.3390/plants9060762>
76. SPSS 2021. IBM SPSS Statistics 22.0 for Windows. Armonk, N.Y..
77. Swain T, Hillis W 1959. The phenolic constituents of *Prunus domestica* L. The quantitative analysis of phenolic constituents. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, 10(1): 63–68. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.2740100110>
78. Turhan P, Demir S 2013. Çilekte siyah kök çürüklüğü (*Rhizoctonia solani* Kühn.) hastalığına karşı bazı biyolojik mücadele elemanlarının etkileri. *Türkiye Biyolojik Mücadele Dergisi*, 4(2): 125–140.
79. Van Camp W, Inzé D, Van MM 1997. The regulation and function of tobacco superoxide dismutases. *Free Radical Biology and Medicine*, 23(3): 515–520. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0891-5849\(97\)00112-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0891-5849(97)00112-3)
80. Van der Putten WH, Vet LE, Harvey JA, Wäckers FL 2001. Linking above-and belowground multitrophic interactions of plants, herbivores, pathogens, and their antagonists. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 16(10): 547–554. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(01\)02265-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(01)02265-0)
81. Vurro M, Boari A, Pilgeram AL, Sands DC 2006. Exogenous amino acids inhibit seed germination and tubercle formation by *Orobancha ramosa* (broomrape): potential application for management of parasitic weeds. *Biological Control*, 36(2): 258–265. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2005.09.017>
82. Xu M, Sheng J, Chen L, Men Y, Gan L, Guo S, Shen L 2014. Bacterial community compositions of tomato (*Lycopersicum esculentum* Mill.) seeds and plant growth promoting activity of ACC deaminase producing *Bacillus subtilis* (HYT-12-1) on tomato seedlings. *World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 30: 835–845.
83. Yan L, Khan RAA 2021. Biological control of bacterial wilt in tomato through the metabolites produced by the biocontrol fungus, *Trichoderma harzianum*. *Egyptian Journal of Biological Pest Control*, 31(1): 1–9.
84. Yoneyama K, Xie X, Kusumoto D, Sekimoto H, Sugimoto Y, Takeuchi Y, Yoneyama K 2007. Nitrogen deficiency as well as phosphorus deficiency in sorghum promotes the production and exudation of 5-deoxystrigol, the host recognition signal for arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and root parasites. *Planta*, 227: 125–132.
85. Yonghua Q, Shanglong Z, Asghar S, Lingxiao Z, Qiaoping Q, Kunsong C, Changjie X 2005. Regeneration mechanism of Toyonoka strawberry under different color plastic films. *Plant Science*, 168(6): 1425–1431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plantsci.2004.11.016>

Figures




Figure 1

Relationship with tomato, broomrape, and biological control agents (BCA)




Figure 2

The number of tubercles on tomato roots as a result of different treatments