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ABSTRACT

Aim: The aim of this study is to screen and determine the biodegradation potential of the endophytic bacteria isolated from roots and leaves of mangrove plants.

Methodology: In this work were isolated, identified and screened endophytic bacteria from roots of Rhizophora mangle, Avicennia germinans and Acrostichum aureum; the three major species of mangrove plants found in the Niger Delta. The roots were transported in a sterile bag to the Microbiology Laboratory and treated using standard Microbiological techniques. The organisms isolated include: Pseudomonas sp, Bacillus sp, Staphylococcus sp, Micrococcus sp, Klebsiella sp, Azotobacter sp, Nitrobacter sp, and Nitrosomonas sp. These organisms were screened for their ability to degrade crude oil by analyzing them using an ultra-violet spectrophotometer at a wavelength of 600nm and through a colorimetric test that involves the use of 2,6, Dichlorophenol-indophenol (DCPIP) as the metabolic activity indicator for a 14 days period.

*Corresponding author: E-mail: abisom2010@gmail.com;
Results: According to the colorimetric test, isolates that were positive hydrocarbon degraders were observed by a colour change from blue to colourless, which include: *Pseudomonas* sp, *Staphylococcus* sp, *Bacillus* sp, *Klebsiella* sp and *Nitrobacter* sp, while those that changed from blue to pink (an indication of a negative reaction) were: *Nitrosomonas* sp, *Bacillus* sp, *Micrococcus* sp, *Staphylococcus* sp, *Azotobacter* sp and *Klebsiella* sp. Amount degraded and percentage biodegradation ranged from *Micrococcus* sp 278.6 (6.2%) < *Azotobacter* sp. 1242.8 (17.8%) < *Nitrosomonas* sp 1392.9 (19.9%) < *Staphylococcus* sp1543.0 (22.1%) < *Bacillus* sp 17927.8 (25.6%) < *Nitrobacter* sp 1935.7 (28%) < *Klebsiella* sp 3392.9 (48.5%) < *Bacillus* sp 3671.4 (52.5%) < *Pseudomonas* sp 4942.8 (70%).

Conclusion: *Pseudomonas* and *Bacillus* species demonstrated the highest potential to degrade crude oil and can therefore be used in bioremediation of water ecosystem impacted by crude oil. Hence, the scientific contribution of this research is related to identifying several culturable groups of bacteria that might be directed to these further biotechnological approaches.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Mangrove ecosystems are of great ecological and economic importance as they play various vital roles at the land-sea interface, provide food, breeding grounds and nursery sites for a variety of terrestrial and marine organisms, used for human sustainability and livelihoods (food, timber, fuel and medicine), and they also offer protection against catastrophic events, such as tsunami, tropical cyclones and tidal bores and can dampen shoreline erosion [1].

Mangrove forests occur at the interface of terrestrial and marine ecosystems portraying a rich biological diversity of plants, animals and microorganisms. Microbes are important part of the mangrove environment as they contribute to the productivity of the mangrove ecosystem. They play a very critical role in creating and maintaining this biosphere and also serve as a source of biotechnologically valuable and important products by participating in various steps of decomposition and mineralization of leaf litter; by being able to recycle nutrients, produce and consume gases that affect global climate, destroy pollutants, treat anthropogenic wastes and can also be used for biological control of plant and animal pests. Microorganisms from mangrove environments are a major source of antimicrobial agents and also produce a wide range of important medicinal compounds, including enzymes, antitumor agents, insecticides, vitamins, immunosuppressants and immune modulators [2].

Endophytes are microorganisms that live in plant tissues partly or all their lifecycle without causing any symptoms of disease in the host [3]. These microbes are often bacteria or fungi, found in various plant organs such as seeds, roots, stems, leaves, flowers and fruits that colonize host tissues similar to a pathogen. Studies have shown that the endophytic association with the host contributes significantly to accelerated seedling emergence, enhanced plant growth, improved resistance against various phytopathogens and abiotic stresses. Endophytic microorganisms can safeguard the hosts against numerous biotic and abiotic factors such as attack of insects, pathogens and herbivores [4].

Various groups of bacteria are found in the mangrove ecosystem where they are known to perform diverse activities including photosynthesis, nitrogen fixation and methanogenesis [5,6,7]. The over-exploitation of mangroves is of today's concern because it threatened the sustainability of the ecosystems. Microorganisms from mangrove ecosystems contain useful enzymes, proteins, antibiotics and salt-tolerant genes, all of which have biotechnological significance [2]. Little is known about bacterial mangrove communities, but these microorganisms may have high biotechnological potential [8]. Recently developed technologies in molecular biology and genetics offer great promise to explore the potential of microbial diversity. The objective of this study is to isolate and screen the endophytic bacteria from the roots of mangrove plants within a crude oil-polluted environment and to determine their biodegradability potential.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Description of Study Area

The roots of mangrove plants used in this study were collected from the Creek Road waterfront (Bonny Jetty) in Old Port Harcourt Township,
Rivers State, Nigeria. The area has lots of mangrove species and also was an area that witnesses lots of pollution from wastes and activities from speedboats transporting passengers, carpenters building boats, boats transporting wood, diesel, fuel and even crude oil from illegal oil refineries as their products are sometimes discharged, dumped or even burnt in the river. The location is situated at Longitude 4° 45 10.13976”N and Latitude 7° 14.13012 E.

2.2 Collection of Materials

The plants collected were placed separately in sterile polyethylene bags and transported first to Department of Plant Science & Biotechnology Laboratory for identification of the plants and then to Microbiology laboratory, of the Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, for Microbiological analysis.
3. MEDIA USED

Nutrient Agar (TM Media)(g/L): Beef extract (1.50), Yeast extract (1.50), Peptic digest animal tissue (5.00), Sodium chloride (5.00), pH 7.4±0.2 at 25°C; Phosphate Buffered Saline (g/l): NaHPO$_4$ (1.44), Sodium Chloride (3), Potassium Chloride (0.2), KH$_2$PO$_4$ (0.24); Mineral Salt Agar (g/l): K$_2$HPO$_4$ (0.5), MgSO$_4$.7H$_2$O (0.3), NaCl (0.3), MnSO$_4$.H$_2$O (0.02), FeSO$_4$.6H$_2$O (0.03), NaNO$_2$ (0.03), Agar (0.5), Fungusol, Distilled water (200ml); Burk's N-free Agar; Glucose (10), K$_2$HPO$_4$(0.41), K$_2$HPO$_4$ (0.52), Na$_2$SO$_4$ (0.05), CaCl$_2$ (0.2), MgSO$_4$.7H$_2$O (0.1), FeSO$_4$.7H$_2$O (0.005), Agar (15.0), Distilled water (1000ml); Winogradsky (Nitrosomonas); (NH)$_4$SO$_4$ (2.0), K$_2$HPO$_4$ (1.0), MgSO$_4$.7H$_2$O (0.5), NaCl (2.0), FeSO$_4$.6H$_2$O (0.4), CaCO$_3$ (0.01), Agar (15.0), Distilled water (1000ml); Winogradsky (Nitrobacter); KNO$_3$ (0.1), Na$_2$CO$_3$ (1.0), NaCl (0.5), FeSO$_4$.7H$_2$O (0.4), Agar (15.0), Distilled water (1000ml).

3.1 Sample Preparation/Processing

The roots of the mangrove plants were treated to obtain only the endophytic bacteria. The roots were first washed under running water thoroughly to remove surface adhering debris. They were washed with sterile distilled water for 5 minutes, surface-sterilized with 70% ethanol for 1 minute, then with 3% sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl solution) for 3mins and rinsed 6 times in sterile distilled water in different containers. Thereafter, they were cut into small pieces, and grounded separately with already sterilized mortar and pestle to make slurries. Ten-fold serial dilution of the plant slurry was made up to $10^6$ dilutions. Thereafter, an aliquot of 0.1ml of the appropriate dilutions was inoculated aseptically into different properly dried media plates; Burk’s N-Free Agar($10^3$), Winogradsky Agar ($10^5$) (for both Nitrosomonas and Nitrobacter), Mineral Salt Agar ($10^5$) and Nutrient Agar ($10^6$). Using vapour phase diffusion method, filter papers were soaked with 2ml of crude oil and placed on the cover of the plate containing Mineral Salt Agar (MSA). The cultured plates were incubated at 37°C for 24hours for the nutrient agar, the modified Winogradsky by [6] used was incubated at 37°C for 3days while the previous Winogradsky agar was incubated for 5-7 days and finally, the Mineral Salt Agar was incubated at same 37°C for 5-7 days. After incubation, bacterial colonies were differentiated and counted based on their morphological characteristics. Individual colonies were picked randomly and sub-cultured by streaking them onto nutrient Agar plates using the streak plate technique and incubated at 37°C [9,6].

3.2 Screening of Isolates

The microbial isolates were screened twice. Overnight pure cultures were used for the screening. Broth of the organisms was first prepared by transferring the pure culture into properly labeled test tubes containing normal saline (that has been autoclaved and allowed to cool and agitated).

The method described by [10] was applied, 9ml of MSA (Mineral salts agar), tween 8 (surfactant), Dichlorophenol-indophenol (indicator), and 0.5ml of crude oil were put into test tubes. After capping, all the test tubes were autoclaved at 121°C at 15PSI for 15minutes, then allowed to cool and labeled, 0.5ml of the broth (standardized bacterial cell suspension of the respective bacterial isolates) was transferred into the labeled test tubes containing crude oil. The test tubes which served as controls were not
inoculated. All test tubes were incubated for 14 days and their potential to utilize hydrocarbon was determined by observing the colour changes in the test tube on days 1, 7 and 14 and then each tube was analyzed for optical density (OD) using a spectrophotometer on days 1, 7 and 14 respectively to measure the amount of light absorbed by the solution so to determine the organism that has higher potential to degrade hydrocarbon as described by [11]. The optical density of the culture was measured at 600nm. The change in colour from blue to colourless was an indication that hydrocarbon degradation had occurred in those test tubes while those that changed from blue to pink were an indication of a negative result for hydrocarbon degradation. The endophytic bacteria with higher potential to degrade crude oil were used for the remediation study.

Three of the endophytic bacteria that showed greater potential to degrade crude oil were used for the remediation study.

The concentration of absorbance was calculated using the calibration curve for TH (Total hydrocarbon content) as adopted by [6,12] as follows:

\[ Y = 0.28 + 0.0609 \]
\[ Y = \text{absorbance} \]
\[ X = \text{mg/ml} + \text{conc of oil in xylene} \]
\[ X = Y - 0.0609 \times 0.28 \]
\[ THC = X \times 1000 \times 0.5 \]

Where \( X \) = concentration calculated from absorbance

1000 = Value used to convert from g to mg

0.5 = quantity of crude oil used equation 1

### 3.3 Percentage (%) Biodegradation Rate

This was calculated using the formula adopted by [12] as follows.

Step 1: the amount of pollutant remediated equals the initial concentration of pollutant (Day 1) minus the final concentration of the pollutant at the end of the experiment.

Step 2: percentage (%) bioremediation = the amount of pollutant remediated divided by initial concentration of pollutant (Day 1) multiplied by 100.

\[ B_c = I_c - F_c \]
\[ B_x = I_c - I_0 \]

Where,

\[ B_c = \text{Amount of pollutant degraded} \]
\[ I_c = \text{the initial concentration of pollutant (Day 0)} \]
\[ F_c = \text{the final concentration of the pollutant at end of the experiment} \]
\[ B_x = \text{Actual amount of the pollutant in the test medium} \]
\[ I_0 = \text{the initial concentration of control of crude oil polluted water at Day 0} \]
\[ \%\text{Bioremediation} = B_c \times 100 \times B_x \]

#### Chart 1. Screening setup

| Isolates                   | Volume of MSA (ml) | Volume of Crude oil (ml) | Volume Broth of Organisms (ml) | Total volume (ml) |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| Control                    | 9                  | 0.5 (0.45g)              | 0.5                            | 10                |
| *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*   | 9                  | 0.5 (0.45g)              | 0.5                            | 10                |
| (MW369466)                 |                    |                          |                                |                   |
| *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*   | 9                  | 0.5 (0.45g)              | 0.5                            | 10                |
| (MN314747)                 |                    |                          |                                |                   |
| *Micrococcus sp*           | 9                  | 0.5 (0.45g)              | 0.5                            | 10                |
| *Azotobacter sp*           | 9                  | 0.5 (0.45g)              | 0.5                            | 10                |
| *Staphylococcus sp*        | 9                  | 0.5 (0.45g)              | 0.5                            | 10                |
| *Brevibacillus brevis*     | 9                  | 0.5 (0.45g)              | 0.5                            | 10                |
| *Staphylococcus sp*        | 9                  | 0.5 (0.45g)              | 0.5                            | 10                |
| *Bacillus sp*              | 9                  | 0.5 (0.45g)              | 0.5                            | 10                |
| *Nitrosomonas sp*          | 9                  | 0.5 (0.45g)              | 0.5                            | 10                |
| *Bacillus amylophilus*     | 9                  | 0.5 (0.45g)              | 0.5                            | 10                |
| *Nitrobacter sp*           | 9                  | 0.5 (0.45g)              | 0.5                            | 10                |
| *Klebsiella sp*            | 9                  | 0.5 (0.45g)              | 0.5                            | 10                |
| *Klebsiella pneumonia*     | 9                  | 0.5 (0.45g)              | 0.5                            | 10                |
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The mangrove plant samples used were identified in the Department of Plant Science & Biotechnology laboratory as: Avicennia germinans (Black mangrove), Rhizophora mangle (Red mangrove) and Acrostichum aureum (golden leather fern).

Eight (8) bacterial genera were isolated from the mangrove plant which include; Pseudomonas sp, Micrococcus sp, Nitrobacter sp, Nitrosomonas sp, Staphylococcus sp, Azotobacter sp, Klebsiella sp and Bacillus sp.

The results of the screening using a spectrophotometer to determine the organisms with the highest biodegradation potential are presented below in Table 1. According to the results, Pseudomonas aeruginosa (MN314747) degraded the hydrocarbon most at a percentage (%) value of 71% (4942.8), followed by Brevibacillus brevis at 59% (4100), then Bacillus amyloliquefaciens at a value of 53% (3671.4), followed by Klebsiella pneumoniae at a value of 49% (3392.9), then Pseudomonas aeruginosa (MW369466 at 35% (2450), then Klebsiella sp with a degradation value of 34.1% (1957.1), followed by Nitrobacter sp with a value of 28% (1935.7), followed by Bacillus sp with a degradation value of 26% (1792.8), then Staphylococcus aureus with a degradation value of 21.1% (1473.1), then Nitrosomonas sp with a value of 20% (1392.9), followed by Azotobacter sp with a degradation value of 18% (1242.8), then Staphylococcus sp with a value of 17.3% (1210.7) while Micrococcus sp had the lowest biodegradation potential at a value of 6% (434.6).

Table 1. Test for biodegradation potential

| Isolates                                      | Day 1 | Day 7 | Day 14 | Amount degraded (mg/L) | % degraded |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|------------------------|------------|
| Control                                       | 6993.6| 5672.1| 5429.3 | 1564.4                 | 23.5%      |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa (MW369466)            | 4993.6| 3036.4| 2543.6 | 2450                   | 35%        |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa (MN314747)            | 6036.4| 3050.7| 1093.6 | 4942.8                 | 71%        |
| Micrococcus sp                                | 4122.2| 3842.9| 3687.6 | 434.6                  | 6%         |
| Azotobacter sp                                | 4529.2| 4065  | 3286.4 | 1242.8                 | 18%        |
| Staphylococcus sp                             | 5978.5| 5075.6| 4767.8 | 1210.7                 | 17.3%      |
| Brevi bacillus brevis                         | 5993.6| 4865  | 1893.6 | 4100                   | 59%        |
| Staphylococcus sp                             | 5922.7| 4927.5| 4449.6 | 1473.1                 | 21.1%      |
| Bacillus sp                                   | 5779.2| 6350.8| 3986.4 | 1792.8                 | 26%        |
| Nitrosomonas sp                               | 6107.9| 5229.3| 3715   | 1392.9                 | 20%        |
| Bacillus amyloliquefaciens                    | 6272.1| 4315  | 2600.7 | 3671.4                 | 53%        |
| Nitrobacter sp                                | 5908.5| 4321.6| 3951.4 | 1957.1                 | 28%        |
| Klebsiella sp                                 | 5707.9| 4993.6| 3322.1 | 2385.8                 | 34.1%      |
| Klebsiella pneumoniae                         | 5186.4| 6536.4| 1793.5 | 3392.9                 | 49%        |

Table 2. Screening using surfactant and indicator

| Isolates                                      | Reaction | Colouration |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------|-------------|
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa (MW369466)             | +ve      | Colourless  |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa (MN314747)             | +ve      | Colourless  |
| Micrococcus sp                                | -ve      | Pink        |
| Azotobacter sp                                | -ve      | Pink        |
| Staphylococcus sp                             | -ve      | Pink        |
| Brevi bacillus brevis                         | +ve      | Colourless  |
| Bacillus sp                                   | -ve      | Pink        |
| Staphylococcus aureus                         | +ve      | Colourless  |
| Nitrosomonas sp                               | -ve      | Pink        |
| Bacillus amyloliquefaciens                    | +ve      | Colourless  |
| Nitrobacter sp                                | +ve      | Colourless  |
| Klebsiella sp                                 | -ve      | Pink        |
| Klebsiella pneumoniae                         | +ve      | Colourless  |
4.1 Screening Using Surfactant and Indicator

For the screening using tween 80 (surfactant) and Dichlorophenol-indophenol (indicator), the results are presented in Table 2; the colour change from blue to colourless indicates a positive result of hydrocarbon degradation and those that changed from blue to pink is an indication of a negative result. According to the results, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (MN314747), *Brevibacillus brevis*, *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Nitrobacter* sp and *Staphylococcus aureus* were positive as the turned colourless by day 14, while *Azotobacter* sp, *Staphylococcus* sp, *Micrococcus* sp, *Bacillus* sp and *Nitrosomonas* sp turned pink by day 14 showing a negative result.

4.2 Evaluating Hydrocarbon Utilizing Potential of the Endophytic Bacteria

Screening of the isolates was done using two different methods to evaluate their hydrocarbon utilizing potential. The readings from the spectrophotometer were used to determine the isolates with the highest biodegradation potential by subtracting the reading of Day 14 from the reading on Day 1 using the formula adopted by [6]. All the isolates showed the ability to degrade hydrocarbon as its been reported that more than 79 bacterial genera e.g. *Pseudomonas, Staphylococcus, Acinetobacter, Streptococcus, Enterobacter*, etc have been found to play vital roles in petroleum hydrocarbon degradation [13,14,15,16]. According to the results, the amount degraded and percentage degradation rate are shown in Figs. 1 and 2 respectively. The rate of crude oil degradation is as follows: *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (MN314747), which showed the highest hydrocarbon degradation potential with a value of 4942.8 mg/l at 71% > *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* with a value of 4100 mg/l at 59% > *Brevibacillus brevis* with a value of 3671.4 mg/l at 53 > *Klebsiella pneumoniae* with a value of 3392.9 mg/l at 49% > *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (MW369466) with a value of 2450 mg/l at 35% > *Nitrobacter* sp with a value of 1957.1 at 28% > *Bacillus* sp 1792.8 (26%) > *Staphylococcus* sp 1473.1 (21.1%) > *Nitrosomonas* sp. 1392.9 (20%) > *Azotobacter* sp 1242.8 (18%) > *Staphylococcus* sp 1210.7 (17.3%) > *Micrococcus* sp 434.6 (6%). This confirms or emphasizes the thought of [17] that *Pseudomonas* and *Bacillus* species are more adapted to survival and biodegradation in marine environments. Obi et al, 2016 [18] also reported *Pseudomonas* sp as the best degrader when compared with others in their study because *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* is a typical strain for rhamnolipid production and can utilize crude oil as the sole carbon source [19].

The surfactant and indicator were also used to identify the hydrocarbon degraders by monitoring the colour change at the end of the 14 days. Seven of the thirteen isolates (*Staphylococcus* sp, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (MW369466), *Klebsiella pneumoniae, Bacillus amyloliquefaciens, Brevibacillus brevis, Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (MN314747), *Nitrobacter* sp) showed a positive reaction as they turned colourless while six (*Micrococcus* sp, *Klebsiella* sp, *Azotobacter* sp, *Staphylococcus* sp, *Bacillus* sp and *Nitrosomonas* sp) showed a negative reaction as they turned pink [20-26].

![Fig. 1. Amount of crude oil degraded by the isolates](image-url)
The screening using surfactant and indicator were compared against the screening with a spectrophotometer and the organisms with the highest degradation rate showed a positive result with a colour change from blue to colourless. The five (5) isolates that showed a higher degradation rate changed to colourless confirmation of the hydrocarbon-degrading ability. They were then picked for further study [27-29].

5. CONCLUSION

Results of this research revealed that, the mangrove plants roots and leaves contains high numbers of active endophytic bacteria [30-33]. The organisms isolated include: *Pseudomonas sp*, *Bacillus sp*, *Staphylococcus sp*, *Micrococcus sp*, *Klebsiella sp*, *Azotobacter sp*, *Nitrobacter sp*, and *Nitrosomonas sp*.

Most of the organisms identified in this study possess catabolic abilities and showed the ability to degrade crude oil. It was observed that, the mangrove plants (roots and leaves) harbour bacterial genera that may play important role in the nitrogen cycle and may also bring about bioremediation of polluted environment. Hence, a consortium of these bacteria can be used to clean up oil spills in hydrocarbon polluted environment.
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