

Review

Biofertilization and Bioremediation—How Can Microbiological Technology Assist the Ecological Crisis in Developing Countries?

Christine C. Gaylarde ¹  and Estefan M. da Fonseca ^{2,*} ¹ Department of Microbiology and Plant Biology, Oklahoma University, 770 Van Vleet Oval, Norman, OK 73019, USA² Department of Geology and Geophysics/LAGEMAR–Laboratório de Geologia Marinha, Instituto de Geociências, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Avenida Litorânea s/n, Niterói 24210-340, RJ, Brazil

* Correspondence: estefanmonteiro@id.uff.br

Abstract: The increasing global demand for food caused by a growing world population has resulted in environmental problems, such as the destruction of ecologically significant biomes and pollution of ecosystems. At the same time, the intensification of crop production in modern agriculture has led to the extensive use of synthetic fertilizers to achieve higher yields. Although chemical fertilizers provide essential nutrients and accelerate crop growth, they also pose significant health and environmental risks, including pollution of groundwater and other bodies of water such as rivers and lakes. Soils that have been destabilized by indiscriminate clearing of vegetation undergo a desertification process that has profound effects on microbial ecological succession, impacting biogeochemical cycling and thus the foundation of the ecosystem. Tropical countries have positive aspects that can be utilized to their advantage, such as warmer climates, leading to increased primary productivity and, as a result, greater biodiversity. As an eco-friendly, cost-effective, and easy-to-apply alternative, biofertilizers have emerged as a solution to this issue. Biofertilizers consist of a diverse group of microorganisms that is able to promote plant growth and enhance soil health, even under challenging abiotic stress conditions. They can include plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria, arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi, and other beneficial microbial consortia. Bioremediators, on the other hand, are microorganisms that can reduce soil and water pollution or otherwise improve impacted environments. So, the use of microbial biotechnology relies on understanding the relationships among microorganisms and their environments, and, inversely, how abiotic factors influence microbial activity. The recent introduction of genetically modified microorganisms into the gamut of biofertilizers and bioremediators requires further studies to assess potential adverse effects in various ecosystems. This article reviews and discusses these two soil correcting/improving processes with the aim of stimulating their use in developing tropical countries.

Keywords: microorganisms; biostimulation; biogeochemical cycles; extreme environments; soil pollution



Academic Editor: Nurettin Sahiner

Received: 31 October 2024

Revised: 27 March 2025

Accepted: 29 March 2025

Published: 10 April 2025

Citation: Gaylarde, C.C.; da Fonseca, E.M. Biofertilization and Bioremediation—How Can Microbiological Technology Assist the Ecological Crisis in Developing Countries? *Micro* **2025**, *5*, 18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/micro5020018>

Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.

Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland.

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Developing countries are facing a series of critical environmental issues due to the mismatch between their pace of development and their role in the global context [1,2]. Given their relatively short history, they have not had sufficient time to catch up with the global pace set by developed nations. Consequently, these countries are already showing signs of the impact of recent industrialization and urbanization [3]. Rapid development, population growth, inadequate responses to climate and environmental risks, and inefficiencies in

governance and environmental management pose substantial environmental challenges for developing countries [4].

A significant number of these countries are located in warmer climates, allowing them to become major global food producers and leading to the excessive use of their land for agriculture. Unfortunately, this can lead to biomes that are rich in biodiversity being destroyed to make way for monocultures of food plants, depleting ecosystems and their soils. Additionally, chemical fertilizers introduced into these systems to boost agricultural productivity potentially disrupt the local soil geochemical balance and affect adjacent environments such as rivers, lakes, and coastal areas [5]. Ultimately, this process can lead to imbalances in water bodies, resulting in hyperproductivity and subsequent eutrophication [6].

In this sense, tropical soil ecosystems exhibit a rich tapestry of diversity and complexity, setting them apart from their temperate counterparts. Within the expansive realms of the tropics, a myriad of ecosystems serves as the canvas for diverse microbial niches and evolutionary processes [7]. The relationship between latitude and bacterial diversity is not statistically significant, but communities can be aptly characterized by their ecotypes and functional attributes. Delving into desert soils, where extremes of solar radiation, minimal precipitation, and fluctuating temperatures prevail, one discovers the existence of intricately diverse bacterial communities, a subject briefly touched upon here. In the semi-arid tropical biomes dominated by grassy vegetation, a resilient and dry-adapted bacterial biodiversity coexists harmoniously with plants [7]. Venturing into water-rich tropical environments, encompassing rainforest soils and the sediments of mangroves, unveils an astonishing array of diversity, harboring untapped biotechnological potential. It is noteworthy that tropical soils play a crucial role in providing sustenance for around 40% of the world's population, with a significant portion residing in developing countries. In Brazil, the application of microbial inoculants, like biofertilizers derived from tropical soils, has yielded substantial improvements in large-scale food production. This particular brand of biotechnology is now being shared by Embrapa (Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation, Brasilia, Brazil) with tropical nations in Africa. The utilization of tropical soil bacteria extends beyond agriculture, with applications in remediating polluted soils, promoting reforestation, and safeguarding water resources [8]. However, the imperative lies in scaling up these efforts across all tropical regions. Preserving designated areas within the intricate tapestry of tropical ecosystems becomes paramount, ensuring that the invaluable soil microbial gene pool remains intact for the benefit of future generations [8].

Soil, plant, and water-associated microorganisms play a vital role in ecosystem functioning, participating in biogeochemical cycles and degrading organic matter [9]. Over 80 coexisting beneficial soil microorganisms, including photosynthetic bacteria, lactic acid bacteria, yeasts, actinomycetes, and fermenting fungi had been identified by 2014 [10]; with the greater use of DNA-based technologies, this number has increased substantially. These microorganisms can be employed as biofertilizers, to replace the harmful chemicals still being used. Ranipa et al. (2023) [11] noted the role of biofertilizers in sustainable agriculture and reviewed various organisms and their applications. Zhang et al. (2021) [12] investigated the role of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in symbiosis with plants, revealing their catalytic effect on organic matter decomposition. This symbiosis was also found to promote soil aggregation and contribute to soil stabilization through mycelial growth, ultimately enhancing nutrient uptake, particularly phosphorus, by plants. Kheirfam et al. (2017) [13] demonstrated that soil crusts enriched with beneficial microorganisms improved soil properties; poor soils could be improved by adding cyanobacteria, for instance. The application of these bacteria proved to be a rapid, long-lasting, environmentally friendly, and cost-effective technique for enhancing soil quality [14]. Liu et al. (2022) [14] demonstrated that the application of biofertilizers resulted in the increased presence of beneficial bacteria,

while reducing the population of pathogenic bacteria (such as *Leifsonia*), within the sugarcane rhizosphere. This shift in microbial communities could help mitigate or hinder the development of diseases.

These examples underscore the significance of biofertilizers, microorganism-based fertilizers, in sustainable agriculture; they have a long-lasting impact on soil fertility [15,16]. In addition, the ability of microorganisms to balance soils and water bodies and to degrade toxic compounds provides them with another important use, commonly referred to as bioremediation.

Biofertilizers and bioremediators are formulations comprising living microbial cells, either a single strain or multiple strains (a consortium), that enhance plant growth by increasing nutrient availability and acquisition and reducing adverse conditions. The term “biofertilizer” has evolved over the past 30 years and has received various interpretations [17]. Macik et al. (2020) [18] pointed out that the most common misconception in this nomenclature arises when microbial inoculants with other beneficial activities (e.g., biopesticides and phytoestrogens) are included under the umbrella of biofertilizers. Plant growth-promoting bacteria and rhizobacteria (PGPB/PGPR) may also be distinguished, as not all PGPB/PGPR function as biofertilizers [19]. However, it is worth mentioning that biofertilizers can offer additional direct and indirect benefits for plant growth, including phytoestrogen stimulation, enhanced tolerance to abiotic stress, and control of plant pathogens [20–22].

Thus, taking into consideration the information contextualized above, it is understood that the global demand for food is expected to continue growing at an accelerated pace, a fact that negatively impacts the environment in various ways. On the other hand, the specific environmental characteristics of tropical countries can aid in the improvement of agricultural production techniques and the recovery of more sustainable and effective environments, including biostimulation and bioremediation, which should be further enhanced and more intensively applied. This article provides a brief compilation of data regarding the environmental impacts resulting from unchecked global development, which has led to the indiscriminate use of chemical fertilizers. It highlights the advantages and importance of these “bio-tools” as potential sustainable methods for managing natural resources.

2. Biofertilizers and Bioremediators

One of the key elements of fertile soil is the presence of beneficial soil microbiota, which plays a crucial role in enhancing the nutrient pool through biogeochemical processes in the soil. Consequently, it is essential for biofertilizers (microbial inoculants) to be compatible with the soil environment [23]. However, a significant proportion of arable soils worldwide does not offer ideal cultivation conditions due to various abiotic stressors, such as the presence of organic pollutants [24] or heavy metals [25], drought [26], salinity [27], and extreme temperature variations [28]. Among these stressors, the release of metals from diverse human activities [29–31] poses a substantial threat to the sustainability of crop production systems.

Biofertilizers and bioremediators consist of organic or composite products containing living microorganisms with the ability to enhance biogeochemical cycles and, as a result, increase primary productivity and environmental health. The basic difference between the two lies in their purpose and consequent composition: Biofertilizers are used to enhance crop productivity, while bioremediators are employed for the removal of excessive or toxic compounds [32]. In the particular case of biofertilizers, they are mainly used in agriculture as an alternative to traditional chemical fertilizers, since they can play a significant role in providing essential plant nutrients, such as nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium, in a more sustainable manner. Various biofertilizer types are available, including nitrogen-fixing varieties, mycorrhizae (fostering symbiotic associations between fungi and plant roots to

enhance nutrient absorption), phosphorus-solubilizing bacteria, and liquid fertilizers containing microorganisms that facilitate organic matter decomposition, thus enhancing soil structure and nutrient availability [33]. In comparison to chemical fertilizers, biofertilizers are deemed more sustainable, as they reduce the dependence on harsh chemicals, promote soil well-being, and, in many instances, encourage environmentally friendly agricultural practices [34–38]. Bioremediators, on the other hand, contribute to the reduction of pollution and the associated environmental impact stemming from conventional agriculture, deforestation of forests with concomitant soil degradation, and the ultimate contamination of soil and water bodies.

2.1. Agricultural Fertilization

The global human population continues to expand at a concerning rate, giving rise to various issues, including food insecurity [39,40]. To ensure the supply of food, it is imperative to enhance crop production through fertile agrosystems. Soil fertility and crop productivity are often used interchangeably; however, they differ significantly. Soil fertility refers to the inherent capacity of soil to provide essential plant nutrients in sufficient quantities [41,42], while crop productivity is defined as $H/P \times Y$, where H is acres harvested, P is acres planted, and Y is the yield per acre. Both, however, rely on the availability of essential plant nutrients such as N, P, K, Ca, Mg, S, Cu, Cl, and Si. These nutrients are produced by the natural decomposition of soil organic matter and the addition of chemical fertilizers. Inoculating biofertilizers represent a promising approach for enhancing crop productivity while decreasing reliance on synthetic fertilizers, thereby promoting environmentally sustainable agriculture [43–45].

Microbial inoculants play a crucial role in accelerating the decomposition process, which results in the release of these essential nutrients. This, in turn, leads to an overall increase in crop productivity [46]. As the global population currently stands at around 8 billion people and is projected to reach 9.7 billion by 2050, there is a pressing need to produce 321 million tons of food to feed this growing populace [47]. However, relying solely on chemical fertilizers is no longer a sustainable solution due to their cost and detrimental effects on soil health. The emphasis is shifting toward cost-effective, environmentally friendly, and sustainable biofertilizers, which not only enhance the physical, chemical, and biological properties of the soil but also boost crop yield per unit area [48].

Biofertilizers are also gaining attention for their potential use in challenging environments, such as those with elevated temperatures, saline soils, water scarcity, fluctuating pH levels, and the presence of environmental stressors like protein and heavy metal contaminants [49]. Their impact extends to the modulation of microbial communities within the rhizosphere, thus exerting an influence on the soil's overall ecosystem [50].

The use of biofertilizers enhances both the function and structure of soil microorganisms and has implications for the physicochemical properties of the soil [51]. The effects of introducing plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) can be quite variable, impacting indigenous microbial populations in various ways. Some remain unaffected, while others may experience either stimulation or inhibition of their growth [52]. For instance, the probiotic strain *Stenotrophomonas acidaminiphila* BJ1 was found to increase the bacterial population in the rhizosphere of *Vicia faba* in chlorothalonil-polluted soil [53]. Numerous studies have assessed the impact of microbial inoculants on soil microorganisms [54–56]. As early examples, we may cite Upadhyay et al. (2012a) [56], who reported positive effects on the growth and antioxidant status of wheat under saline conditions when inoculated with two PGPR strains, *Bacillus subtilis* SU47 and *Arthrobacter* sp. SU18, and Gangwar et al. (2013) [57], who observed enhanced root length, shoot length, root dry

weight, and shoot dry weight of Mung Bean (*Vigna radiata* L.) following dual inoculation with plant growth-promoting *Pseudomonas putida* and *Trichoderma viride*.

2.2. Afforestation and Biostimulation

Afforestation involves the establishment of trees on land that has not been previously managed for forests or has been without forests for a minimum of 50 years (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change) [58]. It serves as a crucial restoration method for reclaiming abandoned agricultural and degraded land. A substantial portion of today's agricultural land was once covered by forests. The ever-increasing human population and the rising need for food and fiber has led to the expansion of agricultural activities, resulting in the conversion of forested areas into agricultural land [59]. The global agricultural land area increased from 15.84106 km² in 1983 to 16.79106 km² in 2003 [60]. As depicted in Figure 1, the escalating demand for agricultural land has caused the world to lose approximately one-third of its forests over the centuries.




Figure 1. Land use variation over the millennia. (Modified from: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2021/02/ice-age-forest-lost-demand-agriculture/>, accessed on 1 May 2024).

The growing human and livestock population, uncontrolled extraction of forest resources, frequent forest fires, and mining operations have all contributed to soil erosion, diminished fertility, reduced moisture levels, and declining forest productivity. These issues create a multitude of challenges in ecosystem restoration. Consequently, soil-residing microbial inoculants play a vital and integral role in our soils, primarily by enhancing plant growth through nutrient accessibility, nitrogen fixation, the mobilization of otherwise unavailable nutrients, and the production of antifungal substances [61]. More specifically, deforestation for cattle production brings a series of impacts to the soil. Soil degradation can be classified as one of the most perilous human activities on the Earth's surface, due to the fact that soil is not immediately renewable [62]. When deforestation reaches a stage that

makes reoccupation by secondary forest impossible, the soil becomes exposed or occupied by low grasses, leading to changes in several abiotic factors that may result in desertification. Factors such as inappropriate temperature and salinity can make it impossible for the reestablishment of plant ecological succession, thus preventing the recolonization of deforested areas. Below, some impacts of deforestation on the abiotic parameters of the soil are listed, mentioning how the application of biofertilizers can contribute to the environmental restoration process. It should be taken into consideration, however, that the majority of studies on biostimulation are related to agriculture, with limited tests conducted on native species in tropical forests.

2.2.1. Temperature

Once soil is exposed by deforestation, the direct incidence of sunlight on the soil surface causes an increase in ambient temperature. This affects plant physiology by increasing respiration rates and leaf transpiration, altering photosynthate allocation [63,64]. The enzyme ribulose biphosphate carboxylase/oxygenase (Rubisco), which produces organic carbon from the inorganic carbon dioxide in the air (Figure 2), is one of those affected.




Figure 2. Role of the rubisco molecule in plant primary production and cellular respiration. Modified from Gupta and Kim, 2015 [65].

At high temperatures, Rubisco's affinity for carbon dioxide decreases, while its affinity for oxygen increases [66,67]. Carbon dioxide solubility decreases more than that of oxygen with rising temperatures, resulting in reduced carbon dioxide concentration in the chloroplast compared to oxygen [68]. Additionally, plants close their stomata to reduce water loss through evapotranspiration when temperatures rise. Stomatal closure leads to a rapid decline in carbon dioxide concentration, while the oxygen concentration increases, limiting photosynthesis and increasing photorespiration [69].

Heat stress triggers complex molecular, biochemical, and physiological responses in plants [66], leading to the synthesis of heat shock proteins, reactive oxygen species (ROS), osmoprotectant compounds, amino acids, sugars, and sulfur compounds [70]. Consequently, heat stress stimulates oxidative stress and ROS production, which are detected by histidine kinases and heat stress factors (Hsfs). Redox-sensitive transcription factors downstream from these signals are activated through the mitogen-activated-protein kinases signaling pathway, subsequently turning on other transcription factors (e.g., BF1c and Rboh) to trigger the expression of genes involved in the synthesis of antioxidant enzymes [71]. However, although ROS accumulate during abiotic stresses, such as heat, ROS themselves are toxic and can react with cell components; the classical response to heat

stress involves Hsfs, HSPs and various levels of ROS [72]. The heat shock response is a complex and finely tuned system.

Hormonal signaling plays a significant role in heat stress responses, with ethylene acting as a major gaseous phytohormone [73–75]. Ethylene is involved not only in processes like senescence, development, and plant physiology but also in plant responses to various abiotic stressors, including heat, salinity, and drought [74–76]. The protection of plants against heat stress can be enhanced by microbial biostimulants. For instance, the synthesis of enzymes that degrade ROS, such as superoxide, catalase, peroxidases, and dismutase, can improve heat stress tolerance in plants. This enhancement can be observed in plants colonized by beneficial bacteria like *Pseudomonas* and *Bacillus*, as well as mycorrhizal fungi like *Septoglomus deserticola* and *Septoglomus constrictum* [77]. Some available biostimulants contain *P. fluorescens* and *P. aeruginosa*, which contribute to improving soil quality and heat stress tolerance, working as bioremediators and phytostimulators and enhancing soil fertility [67]. Similarly, *Bacillus* spp. have been developed not only as biopesticides but also in the form of biostimulant products. While these microorganisms are utilized in various commercial treatments, whether individually or in combination, their potential to mitigate heat stress is not always highlighted as one of their benefits [78].

The use of microorganisms capable of reducing ethylene emissions holds promise, because decreasing ethylene levels during stressful situations could help plants avoid the detrimental effects of heat stress [79]. Bacteria that possess 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic acid (ACC) deaminase activity appear to be particularly promising, including species like *Bacillus subtilis* BERA 7, *Leclercia adecarboxylata* MO1, *Pseudomonas fluorescens* YsS6, and *Pseudomonas migulae* 8R6 [80]. For example, the ACC deaminase-producing *Paraburkholderia phytofirmans* PsJN has been found to support normal tomato development under heat stress [81]; however, this strain has not yet been commercialized [67].

Despite the documented positive effects of biostimulants as mitigators of thermal stress, further research is needed to better understand their mechanisms of action and to develop efficient formulations that can mitigate the impact of heat stress in the recuperation of desertified areas.

2.2.2. Salinity

Soil serves as a reservoir of biodiversity, but the worldwide issue of soil salinization poses a significant threat to crop cultivation, affecting all living organisms and hindering the achievement of sustainable development goals, particularly in ensuring food security. Salinity in soil can be attributed to a variety of natural and human activities. Reduced water availability and osmotic pressure in saline soil are indicated by poor seed germination, leaf wilting, and in extreme instances, the death of plants [82]. Mitsuchi et al. (1989) [83] conducted a review of both natural and human-induced factors contributing to soil salinization. Of the various human-induced factors, salinization resulting from deforestation was considered to be prevalent. In saline soil, the accumulation of solutes reduces the osmotic potential of the liquid phase, limiting water absorption by plant roots [84]. Soil salinization affects approximately 30% of total arable land in Mediterranean regions [85]. Drought stress and the resulting soil salinization are major contributors to desertification in overexploited regions, affecting soil biodiversity and composition and leading to plant deterioration, reduced soil coverage, and subsequent soil erosion [86]. Drylands now cover 46% of the world's land surface, impacting around 250 million people in developing countries [87].

Plant tolerance to drought and salinity can be enhanced by microbial biostimulants through various direct and plant-mediated processes. For example, microbial biostimulants can produce bacterial exopolysaccharides that improve the soil structure by forming micro- and macroaggregates [88], promoting plant growth under water stress conditions [67]. Ad-

ditionally, exopolysaccharides form hydrophilic biofilms, creating a microenvironment that retains water by shielding microbes from drought stress [89] and binding Na⁺ ions to reduce their uptake by plants [90,91]. Examples of bacteria that produce protective exopolysaccharides include *Pseudomonas* spp. PF23 [90], *Pseudomonas putida* GAP-P45 [92], and *Bacillus licheniformis* [93]. Root capacity can also be strengthened by mycorrhizal fungi [94], leading to increased root biomass, improved soil structure, enhanced water retention, and reduced leaching of mineral nutrients [95,96]. For instance, the arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus, *Glomus* sp., produces a glycoprotein called glomalin, which enhances soil structure, plant growth, and drought tolerance [97]. Similarly, ascomycetes (*P. glomerata* LWL2, *Exophiala* sp. LHL08, *P. formosus* LHL10, and *Penicillium* sp. LWL3) colonize cucumber plants, enhancing leaf development and chlorophyll content under drought stress [94,98].

In addition to promoting root development, mycorrhizal fungi can improve water absorption through aquaporins [99], a family of integral membrane transporters that facilitate water movement through the cell membrane [100]. For example, *Glomus intraradices* colonizes common bean plants and mitigates water stress by affecting aquaporin activity and improving water conductivity in the roots [99,101]. *G. intraradices*, often found in commercial products, is typically formulated in combination with various beneficial bacterial and fungal strains but is available in single formulations [78].

Microbial biostimulants offer various supplementary benefits when it comes to alleviating the effects of drought stress in associated plants. These advantages encompass the enhancement of antioxidant defenses, the synthesis of protective osmolytes such as glycine betaine as well as phytohormones, and the emission of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) [102,103]. Drought stress often triggers increased ethylene production, which impedes plant growth. Microbial biostimulants, like *Pseudomonas fluorescens*, can address this issue by reducing aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic acid (ACC) levels, consequently restricting ethylene production and mitigating ethylene-mediated inhibition [79]. Numerous microbial species, including *Staphylococcus* sp. Acb12, *Staphylococcus* sp. Acb13, *Staphylococcus* sp. Acb14, *Bacillus*, *Achromobacter*, *Klebsiella*, and *Citrobacter* spp., also synthesize ACC, offering the potential to alleviate the consequences of drought and salt stress [104,105]. Beneficial microorganisms that possess ACC deaminase activity, such as *Achromobacter piechaudii* ARV8 in pepper and tomato plants [106] and *Pseudomonas fluorescens* TDK1 in peanut seedlings [106], can assist in mitigating these unfavorable impacts. Furthermore, *Achromobacter* spp. and *Pseudomonas* spp. are recognized for their ability to stimulate plant growth and enhance soil quality [78].

According to Ouyang et al. (2017) [107], microbial biostimulants have the ability to biosynthesize indole acetic acid (IAA), which serves to stimulate the growth of plants and the proliferation of their root systems when they are exposed to drought stress. These authors suggested that this phenomenon is observed in various bacterial species, such as those falling within the genera *Alcaligenes*, *Sinorhizobium*, *Serratia*, *Bacillus*, and *Arthrobacter*. The bacterium *Pseudomonas chlororaphis* TSAU13, renowned for its ability to produce IAA, can bolster the resistance of cucumber and tomato plants to drought and salinity when introduced in salt-stressed conditions [108]. Similarly, the mycorrhizal fungus *Funneliformis mosseae* elevates IAA concentrations in the roots, fosters the development of root hairs, and stimulates the growth of orange plants experiencing drought stress [109]. Specific commercial products derived from *Funneliformis mosseae* can enhance plant nutrient and water uptake [67]. Microorganisms proficient in producing cytokinins and gibberellins can alleviate water stress by promoting stomatal opening and encouraging shoot growth in conditions of restricted water availability [110]. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) of the *Acinetobacter*, *Pseudomonas*, and *Burkholderia* genera can generate gibberellins and can augment the growth of cucumber plants under salt and drought stress [111].

Despite their promising attributes, there are presently no commercially available products based on these species.

Following exposure to drought stress, the production of abscisic acid (ABA) increases, leading to stomatal closure. In soybean plants, the introduction of *Pseudomonas putida* H-2-3 decreases abscisic acid (ABA) levels, reducing the impact of drought stress [112]. *P. putida* is commonly used in conjunction with *B. subtilis* to enhance soil fertility, rather than specifically for alleviating drought stress. Similarly, the inoculation of lettuce with *Glomus intraradices* leads to a reduction in ABA concentration and increased resistance to salt [113]. ABA and water scarcity typically lead to increased ethylene production, which can inhibit plant development.

Water stress leads to the generation of reactive oxygen species (ROS) and subsequent oxidative damage to lipids, nucleic acids, and proteins. Many microorganisms can counteract the effects of elevated ROS by either producing antioxidant compounds or increasing the activity of antioxidant enzymes, such as peroxidases and catalase, in plants [114]. *Pseudomonas* species increase catalase activity in basil plants under water stress [115]. Similarly, *Pseudomonas* species, *Bacillus lentus*, and *Azospirillum brasilense* are microbial bioinoculants that have been employed individually or in consortia to mitigate drought stress in crops [67]. Ascorbate, peroxidase, and glutathione peroxidase in *Pseudomonas* species, *Bacillus lentus*, and *Azospirillum brasilense* have been utilized to alleviate drought stress [115].

The accumulation of osmocompatible solutes is a strategy employed by plants to combat water stress, allowing the buildup of inorganic and organic solutes in the vacuole and cytosol, respectively. This lowers the osmotic potential of the cell and maintains turgor pressure in water-stressed conditions [67]. Numerous bacteria can produce osmolytes [116], which often collaborate with osmolytes synthesized by the host plant, such as proline, to reduce osmotic potential and stabilize cell wall components [117]. The phosphate-solubilizing bacterium *Bacillus polymyxa*, when introduced to specific plants, produces proline, reducing the effects of water stress [118]. Betaine, produced by osmotolerant bacteria such as *Streptomyces tendae* F4 in the rhizosphere, can work in conjunction with the betaine produced by the host rice plant, increasing its tolerance to water stress [119]. Despite these promising results, *Bacillus polymyxa* is not yet available as a commercial product.

Some bacteria can interact with plants through volatile organic compounds (VOCs), which can induce stress adaptation responses related to mineral uptake, water conservation, and root growth [120]. Although the significance of hormone signaling pathways has been established [121], the underlying mechanisms of VOC-mediated interactions between plants and microbes under extreme conditions remain largely unexplored. Microbial VOCs can have positive effects on plants, such as the synthesis of osmoprotectants and regulation of stomatal closure [122] and increased plant fitness by 2,3-butanediol [67]. Compounds like 1-heptanol, 3-methyl-butanol, and 2-undecanone produced by *Paraburkholderia phytofirmans* enhance salinity tolerance [123], while butyrolactone and 1-butanol promote root growth and carbon exchange in the rhizosphere [124]. The production of VOCs by *Bacillus thuringiensis* AZP2 has been instrumental in mitigating drought stress in wheat [125]. The future development of VOCs for plant promotion will likely depend on the identification of stress-induced signaling pathways.

Although numerous microorganisms have demonstrated the ability to protect plants from water stress, only a limited number of commercial biofertilizers are available. Many of these are based on combinations of microorganisms, including *Azospirillum brasilense*, *Bacillus altitudinis*, *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens*, *Bacillus licheniformis*, *Cellulomonas cellasea*, *Pseudomonas fluorescens*, *Pseudomonas putida*, *Pseudomonas stutzeri*, *Streptomyces albidoflavus*, *Glomus* species, and *Trichoderma* species. These microorganisms exhibit not only the capacity to mitigate water stress but also the ability to enhance plant yields through the production

of exopolysaccharides and the enrichment of nutrients and soil organic matter [78]. The development and production of more universally applicable commercial products, effective across various ecosystems, will greatly contribute to the mitigation of water stress in plants.

2.2.3. Flooding, Water Pooling, and Heavy Precipitation

The root systems of trees help stabilize the soil, which, in turn, reduces the risk of flooding and erosion; trees also play a crucial role in soaking up excess water during the rainy season. However, when trees are removed from the environment, heavy rains, typical of tropical countries, can have severe consequences. Precipitation washes away essential topsoil and the nutrients in it. Flooding impacts approximately 13% of the Earth's surface, and it is anticipated that the frequency and intensity of heavy rainfall events will increase globally in the future [67]. Heavy floods and rain result in water stagnation, causing root anoxia and hypoxia. When roots are subjected to flooding, they produce substantial amounts of the enzyme 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylate (ACC) synthase, which is involved in ethylene production [67]. ACC oxidase, another enzyme required for the final step in ethylene biosynthesis, depends on oxygen for its catalytic activity. ACC is transported to the aerial parts of the plant through the xylem [126], where it is converted into ethylene, leading to symptoms such as wilting, chlorosis, leaf necrosis, fruit and flower loss, and reduced crop yields [79]. Microbial biostimulants, through their ACC deaminase activity, can help to alleviate the stress caused by water stagnation by reducing endogenous ethylene levels [79,127]. Plants inoculated with ACC deaminase-producing strains of *Pseudomonas* spp. and *Enterobacter* spp. exhibit reduced anoxia stress and improved germination [67,128]. *Pseudomonas* and *Enterobacter* spp. can increase stress tolerance, although they do not specifically protect against waterlogging. *Pseudomonas* sp. [129] and *Streptomyces* sp. GMKU 336 [130] can increase chlorophyll content, plant growth, biomass, adventitious root formation, and leaf area, while reducing ethylene levels. *S. lydicus* WYEC 108 and *Streptomyces* K61 are beneficial bacteria often used against biotic stresses [131,132]. Future research should aim to develop more microbial biostimulants and comprehensively explore the potential of existing commercial products for mitigating water stress.

2.2.4. Imbalanced Nutrient Recycling

Forest degradation has profound effects on nutrient cycles. Along with its impact on ecosystem functions, it is exacerbated by changes in terrestrial environments. The primary anthropogenic influences on forests are logging and excessive pollution loads. Both processes have detrimental effects on the soil which subsequently hinder the natural regeneration of the forest [133]. The harm inflicted on forest soils jeopardizes the potential restoration of the original plant community, because environmental fluctuations become deregulated. The soil's ability to regulate environmental fluctuations relies on the continuous cycling of organic matter and sustained fertility. Disruption in forest nutrient cycles hampers effective land management, including sustainable landscape management [134].

An example is the Brazilian Amazon rainforest, which faces a significant threat from the expansion of cattle ranching activities [135,136]. During this process, farmers not only extract valuable timber, but also burn the remaining vegetation and replace it with fast-growing grasses [137]. This slash-and-burn technique alters the physical, chemical, and biological properties of the soil, facilitating the establishment of pastures in the Amazon region [138]. This practice is unsustainable, and pastures experience a rapid decline in productivity, ultimately becoming degraded and abandoned [139]. Under ideal conditions, 'secondary forest' is gradually formed [140], but studies suggest that deforestation is becoming increasingly common in the Brazilian Amazon region. Even though Carvalho et al. (2019) [141] stated that these secondary forest areas are expanding, cover-

ing more than 100,000 km², there is a need for more research on the re-establishment of secondary forests, especially with respect to soil microorganisms and nutrient cycling [142].

Phosphorus is considered an essential nutrient for plant growth, although it can limit primary productivity in various environments, including tropical and subtropical forests [143] (Figure 3). These regions typically have soils with high levels of iron and aluminum oxides due to intense weathering processes, which are exacerbated by the heavy rainfall and high temperatures in these areas. Fe and Al oxides can bind P, making it less available to plants [144,145]. Consequently, many plants rely on the recycling of P from litterfall and microbial P turnover [146].




Figure 3. An overview of the phosphorus cycle in nature (Modified from Shrivastava et al., 2018 [147]).

Land-use changes negatively impact soil P dynamics in the Amazon region [145,148]. This is because the conversion of pristine forests to pasture using the slash-and-burn method alters P lability and increases P levels in more recalcitrant pools [145]. It can also release substantial amounts of nitrogen and P from forest biomass, which can be lost through leaching and runoff [149,150].

There is limited research and information available regarding the effects of secondary forest re-establishment on P dynamics. Existing studies suggest that secondary forest re-establishment has the potential to promote a gradual recovery of soil P [9,151,152]. According to those authors, the increase in plant diversity, the restoration of certain soil physicochemical properties (e.g., pH), and enzymatic activity (e.g., C, N, P, S enzymes) may favor specific bacterial and fungal groups such as P-mineralizing and P-solubilizing microorganisms. These groups play crucial roles in P transformation processes and availability. They are primarily involved in three key soil processes: (i) mineralization, (ii) solubilization, and (iii) immobilization [153] (Figure 3). These microorganisms produce enzymes that break down ester-phosphate bonds, releasing orthophosphate from recalcitrant organic P forms, as explained by Arenberg and Arai (2019) [154]. They possess genes encoding enzymes such as phytase (appA), alkaline phosphatase (phoD), acid phosphatase (olpA),

phosphonatase (phnX), and C–P lyases (phn), which can mineralize organic-P compounds in soils [155,156].

P-solubilizing microorganisms can also produce and release organic acids like oxalic acid, malic acid, formic acid, citric acid, and gluconic acid. These acids can solubilize recalcitrant inorganic-P forms in soils [155,157]. They possess genes such as GCD (encoding glucose dehydrogenase) and the cofactor PQQ gene (encoding pyrroloquinoline quinone) that regulate the solubilization of unavailable inorganic P forms [158].

Microorganisms involved in P immobilization, on the other hand, can assimilate inorganic P into their biomass, competing with plants for available P [153]. They possess pst and pit transporter genes, which assist in the assimilation of inorganic P under P-limited and P-rich conditions.

The microbial groups involved in P transformations are ubiquitous in soils, but their population and activity are influenced by different environmental requirements [159]. They are also sensitive to disturbances, particularly changes in soil physicochemical properties [160,161]. This is a significant concern; previous studies have indicated that the conversion of pristine forests to pasture in the Amazon region alters soil physicochemical properties and the overall composition of the soil microbial community [125,162,163].

2.2.5. Soil Compaction by Cattle

Cattle trampling of agricultural soil can cause the collapse of larger soil pores, producing smaller pores. This leads to increased soil density and greater resistance to soil penetration, ultimately promoting more soil compaction. This, in turn, hinders the re-growth and renewal of pastures, resulting in reduced overall productivity [164]. Thus, soil compaction is closely linked to significant soil degradation processes, which manifest as reduced soil aeration, diminished water infiltration rates, and an increased risk of flooding and surface runoff [165–168]. These processes collectively have a negative impact on soil productive capacity [169]. Factors such as soil type, moisture content, and grazing management practices (like stocking rate, stocking density, and timing of activities) can exacerbate this soil compaction [164,170]. It is well-recognized that the risk is heightened when the soil moisture content increases [171,172], as generally occurs in the wet summer seasons, which are thus the most vulnerable to soil compaction.

Currently, there are no reported studies that involve microorganisms and the impact of soil compaction resulting from cattle farming. However, some authors have addressed the use of biochar to mitigate this problem. Biochar is a carbon-rich material produced by the thermal decomposition of organic matter (such as agricultural residues, wood chips, or manure) in a low-oxygen environment through a process called pyrolysis. It is primarily used as a soil amendment to improve soil fertility, enhance water retention, and sequester carbon, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation. Gao and DeLuca (2022) [173] suggested that soil compaction and the consequent reduction in soil moisture and aeration may affect nutrient cycling, hindering natural repopulation with vegetation. There is thus a potential for enhancing nutrient cycling through the addition of specific microbial strains. The above authors noted an increase in soil organic matter and P content with biochar application; the use of microorganisms could further enhance this. Soil biofertilization could also stimulate primary production, leading to bioturbation by roots and detritivorous animals, thus promoting soil aeration. However, specific studies in tropical soils need to be carried out to substantiate this hypothesis. Porous materials can also play a crucial role in substrate enhancement [26,174,175]. Incorporating porous materials into the substrate augments soil porosity, elevates aeration rates [176], provides a conducive environment for microbial communities to thrive [177,178], and fosters the development of plant roots [179].

2.3. Treatment of Polluted Soils (Bioremediation)

The use of industrial effluents to irrigate agricultural crops is particularly prevalent in poor and less environmentally aware countries. This leads to the buildup of toxic substances in the soil with resulting effects on agricultural production and produce. Over the last decade, there has been a consistent growth in the number of publications discussing the application of microorganisms for the remediation of heavy metals and other contaminants in such polluted environments. While bacteria and fungi have been the predominant choices, yeasts and algae are also employed—the latter phylum mainly, but not exclusively, in aqueous environments [180]. Bioremediation usually relies on the metabolic activity of either a single organism or a consortium of microorganisms [181]. In this process, the transformation of contaminants may not provide significant benefits to the cell; in such cases, it is termed non-beneficial biotransformation [182,183]. Numerous studies have demonstrated that many organisms, both prokaryotes and eukaryotes, possess a natural capacity for biosorbing toxic heavy metal ions [184,185]; the biosorption sites may be located on or in the cells, or in the extracellular polymeric layer (EPS) of the microorganisms [186–189]. Alternative methods of bioremediating heavy metal contaminated soil include the use of microorganisms that change the toxicity of the metal by altering its oxidation state or by methylation [190–193]. Examples of bacteria, fungi, and yeasts that have been studied and strategically employed in bioremediation applications for heavy metals in soil are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Some microorganisms that have been used for bioremediation of heavy metal-contaminated soils.

Microbial Inoculum	Heavy Metal(s)	Reference
Bacteria:		
<i>Arthrobacter</i> spp.	Cd	[194]
<i>Pseudomonas veronii</i>	Cd, Zn, Cu	[195]
<i>Burkholderia</i> spp.	Zn, Pb, Mn, Cd, Cu, As	[196]
<i>Kocuria flava</i>	Cu	[197]
<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	Pb, Cd, Cr	[198]
<i>Sporosarcina ginsengisoli</i>	As	[199]
<i>Serratia</i> sp.	Ni, Cd	[200]
<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i> KJ-46, <i>E. cloacae</i> KJ-47, <i>Sporosarcina soli</i> B-22, and <i>Viridibacillus arenosi</i> B-21	Cd, Pb, Cu	[201]
<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i> B2-DHA	Cr(VI)	[202]
<i>Brevibacillus parabrevis</i> OZF 5	Cr(VI), Zn	[203]
<i>Cupriavidus metallidurans</i> LBJ and <i>Pseudomonas stutzeri</i> LBR	Pb	[204]
<i>Acinetobacter</i> sp. LSN-10	Mn(II)	[205]
<i>Achromobacter denitrificans</i> , <i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i> , and <i>Rhizobium radiobacter</i>	Cd, Hg, As, Pb, Ni	[206]
Cyanobacteria		
<i>Gloeomargarita lithophora</i> and <i>Cyanothece</i> sp.	Sr	[207]
<i>Nostoc minutum</i> and <i>Anabaena spiroides</i>	Pb, Cd, Ni	[208]
Fungi		
<i>Simplicillium chinense</i>	Cd, Pb	[209]
<i>Penicillium</i> sp.	Hg	[210]
<i>Penicillium chrysogenum</i> FMS2	Cd	[211]
<i>Aspergillus versicolor</i>	Cr, Ni, Cu	[212]
<i>Aspergillus fumigatus</i>	Pb(II)	[213]
<i>Aspergillus</i> spp.	Cd, Cu	[214]
<i>Gloeophyllum sepiarium</i>	Cr	[196]
<i>Perenniporia subtephropora</i> , <i>Daldinia starbaeckii</i> , <i>Phanerochaete conrescens</i> , <i>Cerrena aurantiopora</i> , <i>Fusarium equiseti</i> , <i>Polyporales</i> sp., <i>Aspergillus niger</i> , <i>Aspergillus fumigatus</i> , and <i>Trametes versicolor</i>	As, Mn, Cu, Cr, and Fe	[215]

Table 1. Cont.

Microbial Inoculum	Heavy Metal(s)	Reference
Yeasts		
<i>Candida tropicalis</i>	Cr(VI)	[216]
<i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i>	Pb, Cd	[217]
<i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i>	Cd, Hg	[218]
Mixed consortia		
<i>Chlorella thermophila</i> SM01, <i>Leptolyngbya</i> sp. XZMQ and <i>Bacillus</i> XZM	As	[219]
<i>Leptolyngbya</i> sp. XZ1 and <i>Bacillus</i> sp. S1	Cd	[220]

Rhizobacteria have been suggested to be particularly useful for the bioremediation of heavy metal-contaminated soils; the mechanisms of metal removal include chelation by siderophores, biotransformation (change to a less damaging oxidation number or methylation to reduce toxicity), biosorption and bioaccumulation in the cells, precipitation, ACC deaminase action, and biomineralization [220]. Biotechnological approaches by other microorganisms encompass bioleaching, bioextraction, and bioencapsulation [221,222], although not all of these are applicable to soil in situ.

When a contaminated site contains various pollutants, effective remediation requires a diverse array of microorganisms. Many microorganisms can degrade petroleum hydrocarbons, using them as a source of carbon and energy. The selection of these organisms for bioremediation varies based on the chemical nature of the pollutants and must be made carefully, as they can only thrive in the presence of a limited range of chemical contaminants. The efficiency of the degradation process is linked to the microbial capacity to introduce molecular oxygen into the hydrocarbon and generate intermediates that enter the cell's energy-yielding metabolic pathways. Some bacteria have chemotactic responses, actively seeking out contaminants [223], while many produce powerful surface-active compounds that emulsify oil in water, aiding its uptake by the cells and hence removal from the soil [224]. Bacteria capable of degrading petroleum products include genera such as *Pseudomonas*, *Aeromonas*, *Moraxella*, *Beijerinckia*, *Flavobacteria*, *Chromobacterium*, *Nocardia*, *Corynebacterium*, *Streptomyces*, *Bacillus*, *Arthrobacter*, and *Aeromonas*, as well as cyanobacteria [221,225], and certain yeasts [32]. One example is *Pseudomonas putida* MHF 7109 isolated from cow dung, which can be used for the biodegradation of selected petroleum hydrocarbon compounds, including benzene, toluene, and o-xylene (BTX) [186].

3. Genetically Modified Microorganisms for Bioremediation

Genetic engineering is a fundamental method to modify the metabolic pathways of microorganisms and improve their bioremediating activity, increasing efficiency and reducing the time required to produce the required effect. Genetic engineering can be applied to modify microorganisms to exhibit features like accelerated growth, tolerance to extreme environmental conditions and pH fluctuations, and cost-effective cultivation. Omics technologies, e.g., genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics and metabolomics, are being employed to increase our understanding of relevant microbial metabolisms, such as responses to heavy metals and high salt concentrations, and to indicate the appropriate engineering of potential microbial inoculants, with increased resistance and degrading activities for soil pollutants like heavy metals and hydrocarbons [226–228]. Perceived hazards in the release of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), however, have led to problems in legislation for their placement on the market [229]. Similarly, care must be taken when releasing genetically modified microorganisms (GMMs), defined as “microorganisms in which the genetic material has been altered in a way that does not occur naturally by mating and/or natural recombination” [230]. For this reason, genetic manipulations

included in GMMs may include inbuilt senescence genes, so that unexpected negative interactions with native organisms will be limited [231]. Nevertheless, research on the use of GMMs in soil bioremediation in situ is now rather restricted.

The techniques used in the production of GMMs are beyond the remit of this article, but for those interested, there is a wealth of papers published on this topic [232–235].

4. Environmental Parameters Influencing Microbial Fertilization and Bioremediation in Soils

Bioremediation involves harnessing microorganisms, including bacteria, algae, and fungi, as well as plants, to expedite the breakdown, alteration, elimination, immobilization, or detoxification of diverse physical and chemical contaminants in the environment. Microorganisms can employ metabolic pathways to accelerate biochemical reactions that break down pollutants [236–238]. For bioremediation to be effective, microorganisms must be supplied with the necessary energy and nutrients to support their growth. Various factors, including physical, chemical, biological, soil type, carbon and nitrogen sources, and the type of microorganisms (whether single or a consortium), influence the efficacy of bioremediation [239]. Microbial consortia often exhibit multifunctionality and resistance and thus are more efficient than a single microorganism [240]. These may be natural microbial communities. For instance, carbon, one of the most crucial nutrients, was found to enhance in situ bioremediation by increasing natural consortium metabolic activity and expediting the breakdown of existing pollutants [241]. Soil type also impacts bioremediation, with sandy soils generally achieving higher levels of pollutant bioremediation than clay [242]. The factors influencing bioremediation and the methods employed for soil remediation, both in situ and ex situ, are discussed by da Silva et al. (2020) [243]. These factors include microbial population, contaminant accessibility, and the physicochemical characteristics of the environment (Figure 4). The same considerations apply to the use of biofertilizers. Extra activities involved may be the excretion of phytohormones, the suppression of phytopathogens, and the protection of plants from various types of stress [18,244].

4.1. Temperature

An important physical factor that significantly influences the survival of microorganisms as well as the degradation of pollutants is temperature. For example, in cold regions such as the Arctic, the natural degradation of oil is slow, creating a greater reliance on microbes to remediate oil spills. In these conditions, sub-zero temperatures can freeze the transport channels of microorganisms, hindering their ability to carry out metabolic processes. Temperature also has a direct impact on the turnover of enzymes involved in degradation, which may vary depending on the pollutant. The physiological properties of microorganisms are influenced by temperature, which can either accelerate or decelerate the bioremediation process. Higher temperatures generally promote increased microbial activity up to a certain limit, and this activity typically decreases if temperatures rise or fall abruptly, eventually ceasing altogether at temperature extremes [245,246]. However, extremophilic microorganisms, i.e., thermophiles and psychrophiles, are active in extreme environments such as the tropics and polar regions and can be used in bioremediation and biofertilization in such areas, as well as in other extreme environments [247–251].

4.2. Salinity

One of the factors that can limit bioremediation and that could be tackled by the use of extremophiles is salinity. Salt levels in soils used for agriculture are rising because of natural and anthropic activities [252]. Unsustainable soil management, such as irrigation with brackish water or overapplication of fertilizers, are responsible for some of these [253].

Hypersaline soils not only reduce plant growth but also limit the possibilities of bioremediation. Non-saline soils have been shown to have approximately four times higher total petroleum hydrocarbon biodegradation compared to saline (1% NaCl) soils [254]. Salinity reduces the bioremediation of motor oil [255] and petroleum hydrocarbons [256,257] in soil. Nguyen et al. (2021) [258] suggested that salinity exposure may influence Cr(VI) bioremediation. Cr-resistant microorganisms may be able to deal with this problem [193]. There are several examples of the use, or potential use, of halophiles in the bioremediation of polluted environments [234,259–263]. Although still undergoing considerable research effort, the use of halophilic microorganisms for bioremediation in, or of, saline environments appear to be a real possibility [248,259,264]




Figure 4. Environmental Parameters Influencing Microbial Fertilization or Bioremediation.

4.3. pH

The acidity, alkalinity, and basicity of a compound influence microbial metabolism and the bioremediation process. Soil pH, similarly, has an impact on nutrient availability as well as enzyme activity. Soil pH can be used to predict microbial growth since even slight pH variations have a notable effect on metabolic processes [265]. In the case of petroleum hydrocarbon biodegradation, a pH close to neutrality is optimal [266], but this will clearly vary depending on the pollutant and the microorganisms. For example, modeling the removal of the antibiotic, azithromycin, from contaminated soil by various fungi showed pH to be the most important physicochemical parameter, with the optimum pH being 5.5 [267]. Acidophilic methanotrophs, growing optimally at pH 5 or below, have been suggested for the bioremediation of chlorinated volatile organic compounds in groundwater aquifers [268]. It should be noted, however, that biofertilizers themselves may be able to alter soil pH advantageously [269].

4.4. Microbiological Diversity

Quite apart from the microorganisms added to attain the desired effect, the resident microbiota will have a large part to play in the final outcome of a bioremediation or biofer-

tilization treatment. There will be competition between the autochthonous and the added species, as well as between the indigenous microorganisms themselves [270,271]. For example, when petroleum degrading bacteria (PDB) *Acinetobacter radioresistens* KA5 and *Enterobacter hormaechei* KA6 were inoculated into soil containing indigenous microorganisms, the level of petroleum breakdown was considerably lower than that achieved by the PDB alone [272]. When two different types of pollutants require removal, or when biofertilization is the aim, the choice of augmenting microorganisms becomes much more complex; antagonistic or highly competitive interactions must be closely monitored. The negative effects of one pollutant on the degradation of another are discussed and exemplified by Olaniran et al. (2013) [273], but double bioremediation is achievable, although perhaps not at maximum efficiency. In the case of metal-contaminated soils, one approach is to use metal-resistant microorganisms. Roane et al. (2001) [195] isolated four bacterial strains of different genera that reduced soluble Cd levels in the contaminated soil and also supported the degradation of 500- $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$ 2,4-D by the cadmium-sensitive 2,4-D degrader *Ralstonia eutropha* JMP134, while Wani et al. (2023) [204] reported that *Brevibacillus parabrevis* OZF5 removed both Cr and hydrocarbons from contaminated soil, enhancing growth of beans. Microbial surfactants, such as surfactin, rhamnolipid, and sophorolipids, may also be used to augment the bioremediation of various pollutants, including DDT, atrazine, hexachlorocyclohexane and cyprodinil [274], as well as the most widespread hydrocarbons [273].

Finally, it must be noted that any change in the structure of the microbial community can result in shifts not only in temperature adaptation at the community level but also in growth strategies: copiotrophs can promptly respond to favorable environmental conditions and proliferate rapidly when labile carbon sources are available. In contrast, oligotrophs display gradual, sustained growth under conditions of low carbon and nutrient availability, finally yielding a higher biomass per unit substrate [275,276]. As eloquently articulated by Neidhardt (1999) [277], when the primary objective is growth, delving exclusively into individual enzymes and genes, or even isolated pathways and mechanisms, is insufficient. There comes a point where one must return to the holistic perspective of the entire cell and consider the coordinated orchestration of various processes. When several microbial species are mixed, the community must work together to grow and become active in the bioremediation/biofertilization process in a symbiosis [278].

4.5. Oxygen Levels

The biodegradation process is directly related to the available oxygen content in the environment. Most bioremediation systems run under aerobic conditions [279]. Often, however, in aquatic sediments, sludges or compacted soils, for example, there is limited oxygen available. With the impossibility to aerate the environment, the use of anaerobic decomposers or facultative organisms can be more effective [280]. Ji et al. (2014) [281] investigated how the activities of microorganisms were influenced by the presence of dissolved oxygen (DO) in polluted river water. Their study revealed that the removal efficiency of different substances, such as chemical oxygen demand, total phosphorus, and ammonia nitrogen, increased with higher levels of DO, showing improvements of 4.59%, 18.18%, and 34.34%, respectively, suggesting that this bioremediation works even under aerobic conditions.

Petroleum-contaminated sludge is a particular problem in coastal wetlands, where costly physicochemical treatment is currently the norm [282]. Anaerobic bioremediation, utilizing sulfate-reducing bacteria, denitrifying bacteria, iron and manganese reducing bacteria, and, particularly, methanogenic bacteria, is more economical, although it is currently less efficient than aerobic bioremediation [283]. Intermittent oxygen supplies may also be useful in some cases. For example, Chen et al. (2023) [283] found that

intermittent microoxygenation facilitated codegradation of trichloroethane and toluene; the main bacterial genera responsible for the dechlorination were *Dehalococcoides* and, mainly, *Dehalogenimonas*. One possibility could be the use of cyanobacteria, which can grow anaerobically under the correct conditions and produce oxygen by photosynthesis. Their potential as biofertilizers in green technology is discussed by Bhuyan et al. (2023) [284].

4.6. Soil Moisture

The soil moisture content is also an important factor in accelerating biogeochemical processes. Soil that is excessively waterlogged is not suitable for microbiological treatment [285]. The moisture level in the soil impacts the movement of water and soluble nutrients in and out of microorganisms, and excessive moisture diminishes oxygen levels during the aerobic process [286] and hence bioremediation [287]. With this effect of soil moisture in mind, Naorem (2022) [288] considered the potential effects of climate change on biodeterioration efficiency. Bahmani et al. (2018) [289], using laboratory experiments and various moisture levels in hydrocarbon-contaminated soil, developed a mathematical model for this process. They defined a first-order rate equation for the removal of total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH); this equation held good between a specific moisture value at which the constant is zero and that at which the constant reaches its maximum.

$$v \, d\theta / dt = q_{in} - q_{out} \quad (1) \quad q_{in} = 0 \quad (2) \quad q_{out} = APET (\theta - \theta_r / \theta_{sat} - \theta_r)$$

where v = volume of beaker, θ = water content, q = volumetric flow rate of water, A = surface of beaker, PET = potential evaporation (constant during their experiment at $0.00495 \, \text{m day}^{-1}$), θ_r = residual water content, and θ_{sat} = saturation water content.

In their study, the best TPH removal from a sandy clay soil was achieved by adjusting the water to 60% capacity and adding water every 2 days. This moisture level was higher than that quoted by other workers. For example, Kumari et al. (2023) [290] suggested 35%. However, Zeng et al. (2023) [291] and Norozpour et al. (2023) [292] suggested 60% and 70–80%, respectively. These authors were all working with PAH-contamination.

4.7. Nutrient Availability

Nutrients play a crucial role in influencing the growth of microorganisms and the rate of biodegradation. Enhancing the soil C:N:P ratio can significantly enhance biodegradation efficiency, particularly when vital nutrients like nitrogen and phosphorus are provided. When these nutrients are present in low concentrations, the degradation of hydrocarbons is constrained. The addition of extraneous nutrients, such as glucose, can augment pollutant removal by stimulating microbial activity [293]. The introduction of nutrients is particularly important for bioremediation activities in cold environments; it can boost the metabolic activity and diversity of microorganisms and, consequently, the rate of biodegradation [81]. Microbes that consume oil rely on these essential nutrients to thrive, and they are typically present in limited quantities in natural settings [294,295].

Cavazolli et al. (2023) [296] used DNA sequencing techniques to investigate the bacterial populations of soil co-contaminated with heavy metals and hydrocarbons. Bioremediation was carried out using meat and bone meal (MBM) as nutrient addition and cyclodextrin (Cdx) as a surfactant to release previously unavailable nutrients. After 12 weeks, only Cdx had increased bacterial diversity more than the control soil; MBM accelerated the change in populations, but the final diversity after 12 weeks was not altered. Oil-degrading groups of bacteria increased in prevalence during the procedure, but the hydrocarbon and heavy metal levels were not determined. The effects of the addition of any specific nutrient, or nutrients, to contaminated soil are difficult, perhaps impossible, to predict and should be carefully monitored.

4.8. Pollutant Complexity

The release of diverse chemical pollutants into the environment by industries can disrupt the delicate equilibrium of ecosystems. Anthropogenic pollutants in particular tend to exhibit greater complexity and heightened resistance to degradation, necessitating the use of specific bioremediating strains capable of withstanding the toxicity of substances such as metals and hydrocarbons [297]. It has been suggested that GMOs and mixed strains of microorganisms may be the preferred route for future treatment of complex pollutants [298,299]. While the potential of GMOs in bioremediation is substantial, its practical application is circumscribed in various ways [300] and the discussion above (Section 3) points out the problems of this approach.

Li et al. (2020) [301] suggested that fungi may be more appropriate for the degradation of complex pollutants. Fungi may oxidize pollutants extracellularly using laccases, manganese peroxidases, and lignin peroxidases, or intracellularly using cytochrome P450, reductive dehalogenases, and nitroreductases [302]. Recently, innovative remediation techniques have been proposed, including the utilization of extracellular and/or cell-free enzymes, together with metabolomics and proteomics to study the response of the microorganisms to complex and mixed pollutants [302,303]. Using a single microbial species in a bioremediation treatment for complex molecules is unlikely to achieve success. Microbial consortia are now being intensely studied to find species that can survive and work together. The engineering of microbial consortia is discussed by Li et al. (2021) [304]; they considered two main approaches: “bottom-up” and “top-down”. Interactions between microorganisms include antagonism and symbiosis; the bottom-up approach involves reconfiguring negative interactions to ensure co-survival and continued activity. The top-down approach involves modifying the environment to compel the organisms to perform the desired activities; this is not an easy option because of the complexity of the microbial interactions. The bottom-up approach requires a detailed knowledge of the metabolism and interactions of the consortium members. New omics techniques have allowed this to become a less onerous and more achievable goal and will assist the development of consortia for the bioremediation of complex pollutants such as PAHs.

Cell-free systems have also been investigated for the bioremediation of pollutants such as organophosphate pesticides [305], aromatic polymers like chlorophenols [306], and nitrile and amide-based xenobiotics [307]. The immobilization of the enzymes on a suitable, and economic, material can be advantageous to ensure their continued activity, but the support must be carefully chosen to prevent any reduction in efficacy [308]. Screening of microorganisms for enzyme activities, in addition to being used for the identification of potential enzymes to be extracted or engineered, could also be used in place of laboratory biodegradation tests for detection of efficient functional isolates for bioremediation procedures [309].

5. Risks to Ecosystem Health: Impact on the Local Biota

In theory, biofertilization and bioremediation approaches should lead to minimal or well-controlled consequences concerning factors such as dispersal, persistence, alterations to microbial function and biogeochemical cycles, and shifts in the ecosystem communities [310]. A substantial area of concern lies in the potential impact of introduced microorganisms on the existing microbiome, which may result from direct ecological interactions, be they cooperative or antagonistic in nature. Invasive, alien species are bad for ecosystems, since they may reduce biodiversity and disrupt food chains, including our own. Species from other regions that establish self-sustaining populations in an invaded area are referred to as naturalized species. Among naturalized species, those that quickly spread beyond the site of their initial introduction in the invaded region are classified as invasive, as described by Richardson et al. (2000) [311], Pyšek et al. (2004) [312], and Blackburn et al. (2011) [313].

For instance, the chestnut blight fungus entered North America surreptitiously through contaminated nursery stock [314], leading to the demise of four billion trees over a span of 40 years. Especially in tropical regions, like South Asia and South America, plant invasions are one of several factors that threaten the local biodiversity. The economic and social challenges resulting from plant invasions are on the rise across all continents. The expenses directly associated with the harm caused by invasive species are thirteen times greater than the costs incurred for their management [315].

Finally, biological invasions rank as the fifth most significant driver of global environmental change, according to IPBES 2019 [316]. Approximately 14,000 taxa, constituting about 4% of the world's flora, are recognized to have naturalized from the global plant species pool [317,318]. Among them, around 2500 species have been identified as invasive, with the Asteraceae family contributing the highest number of naturalized taxa [319]. Escalating international trade has led to a global increase in the number of invasive species [320].

The phenomenon of horizontal gene transfer has also been identified as a relevant consideration [321–323]. Horizontal gene transfer involves the transfer of genetic information between organisms, facilitating the dissemination of antibiotic resistance genes among bacteria, excluding those passed from parent to offspring. This process contributes to the evolution of pathogens [323]. For instance, the simple use of manure as an organic fertilizer in agriculture introduces fecal bacteria, along with their plasmids and antimicrobial resistance genes, into the soil. The exchange of genetic material, which includes plasmids [324] and even entire genomic segments, is particularly prevalent in the rhizosphere—an area rich in microbial activity. Such exchanges have been observed even between species that are quite distantly related. There have, for example, been documented cases of gene transfer between *Pseudomonas putida* and *E. coli* facilitated by the TOL plasmid (pWW0) [324]. Macedo et al. (2022) [325], through a microcosm study involving *E. coli*, recorded the successful transference of a broad host range plasmid to soil and manure bacteria by conjugation [326]. Similar instances of plasmid transfer have been witnessed within various strains of *Azotobacter vinelandii*. Martínez-Carranza et al. (2019) [327] suggested that *A. vinelandii* may have a polyphyletic origin, with a genomic resemblance to the pathogenic bacterium *P. aeruginosa*. This hypothesis opens up the possibility of horizontal transfer from *P. aeruginosa* to *A. vinelandii* of genetic information encoding pathogenicity [327].

It has been suggested that microorganisms may influence ecosystem biodiversity or induce infections in humans, animals, or plants, thereby having an adverse environmental impact. As a response to this concern, the European authorities have tried to protect humans, plants, animals, and the environment by developing European Regulation (EU) 2019/1009 [328] on biofertilizers.

Our current understanding suggests that plants are not isolated entities; instead, they exist in association with a diverse range of microbes [329]. Introduced microorganisms can indirectly alter resident microbial communities by influencing plant physiology and morphology via the acquisition of nutrients, reduction of plant stress, and suppression of plant diseases. For instance, some plant growth-promoting microbes are known to modify root architecture and exudation [330], which can impact rhizosphere communities [331,332]. In mixed plant communities, indirect effects on the resident microbiome could also occur if the introduced microorganism induces changes in plant diversity and composition, as has been seen with some AMF inoculants [331,332].

Inoculation with rhizobia, commonly used in biofertilizers, has shown significant effects on soil and plant-associated microbial communities in soybean [333], alfalfa [334], and common bean crops [335]. These effects can extend beyond the rhizosphere. Field inoculation of *Phaseolus vulgaris* with two native rhizobia strains (separately or combined) altered the structure and increased the phylotype richness of bacterial communities in the

bulk soil [336]. Changes in microbial structure can result from both positive and negative interactions of rhizobia with the rhizosphere microbiome. The close relationship between root endophytes and root tissues facilitates the exchange of nutrients between plants and microbes [337]. For instance, *Azospirillum*, a bacterial genus known for its free-living organisms with nitrogen-fixing capabilities, among other plant growth-promoting traits, has shown variable effects on the resident microbiome [337]. Inoculation of maize with *A. lipoferum* induced a shift in the composition of rhizosphere bacterial communities lasting for at least one month [338]. However, variable results were observed when inoculating the same or other crops with *A. brasilense* [339,340], even though this bacterium can induce physiological and morphological changes in the root system.

According to Trabelsi and Mhamdi (2013) [337], the effects of *Azospirillum* inoculation on rhizosphere microorganisms are likely driven by nitrogen dynamics, although a wide array of factors are involved. While rhizobia and *Azospirillum* have been more widely studied regarding their effects on the resident microbiome, research on other taxa, such as *Pseudomonas* sp., remains limited, even though they could potentially modify both bacterial and fungal communities [341,342].

Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) biofertilizers are the most widely used and readily available, despite insufficient evaluation of ecological risks associated with their field application [332,343]. The introduction of non-native AMF can impact indigenous AMF communities in various ways, such as displacing them and reducing their diversity [344] or altering their composition [345], although these effects on the native AMF community may not always be evident [346]. In a study conducted by Jin et al. (2013b) [347], a diverse AMF inoculum had a less pronounced positive impact on plant fitness but had a milder influence on the composition of subsequent AMF communities. In addition to affecting native mycorrhizal fungi, introduced AMF can disrupt other soil microbial communities, especially those associated with their extraradical mycelium, known as the mycorrhizosphere [337].

The influence of AMF on soil microbial communities appears to be variable and is influenced by multiple factors [348–350]. For instance, among the principal factors influencing microbial activity lies the microbial capability to reduce organic materials, utilizing them as sources of energy. The average oxidation state of carbon in a contaminant represents an effective energy source for aerobic heterotrophic organisms. A heightened oxidation state, consequently, correlates with a diminished energy yield, thereby offering a reduced energy output for microbial degradation. The outcome of any biodegradation undertaking is contingent upon various factors, encompassing microbial dynamics (population diversity, enzyme activities, and biomass concentration), substrate attributes (physical and chemical properties, molecular concentration, and structure), and an assortment of environmental determinants (pH, moisture content, temperature, electrical conductivity, availability of electron acceptors and carbon, and energy sources). These parameters exert an influence on the adaptation period of microorganisms to the given substrate. The concentration and molecular structure of contaminants wield substantial influence over the feasibility of bioremediation practices and the nature of microbial metamorphosis, determining whether the compound will function as a primary, secondary, or co-metabolic substrate [351].

Notably, bacteria residing in the mycorrhizosphere have demonstrated plant growth-promoting activity and are believed to work in synergy with AMF [352]. The impact of non-AMF fungal inoculants has received less attention, but there is evidence that endophytic fungi [353,354] and *Trichoderma* spp. [287] can induce changes in local microbial communities.

The impact of introduced microorganisms on existing microbial communities' hinges, to some extent, on their abundance, survival, and persistence within an ecosystem [355]. This intricate relationship implies that the very traits that contribute to successful plant growth promotion also elevate the risk of ecological invasion. Surprisingly, there is a

dearth of comprehensive studies that delve into the consequences of large-scale, repeated inoculations, as well as the enduring effects, both in the long term and across subsequent crops [322,337]. Hart et al. (2018) [333] emphasized the significance of long-term repercussions, particularly concerning AMF inoculants. The assessment of the establishment and endurance of AMF inoculants is compounded by their complex genetic makeup. These concerns become all the more alarming when considering that the effects of inoculation may linger, even as the population of introduced microorganisms diminishes [339]. One of the underlying mechanisms responsible for these enduring “legacy” effects is the phenomenon of plant–soil feedback. This is more likely to occur when the introduced microorganism has a symbiotic relationship with or a strong affinity for a specific plant, potentially affecting non-target plants within the agroecosystem [335,355].

The diverse outcomes witnessed when introducing microorganisms through inoculation into the resident microbiome imply a multifaceted interplay of influencing factors, notably including the host plant [349]. Correa et al. (2007) [342] found that a plant’s genetic makeup exerts control over the genetic and physiological responses of phyllosphere and rhizoplane bacterial communities to *A. brasilense* seed inoculation. Rhizosphere bacterial communities were found to respond differently to *A. brasilense* at distinct growth stages of the crop, displaying more pronounced effects during the jointing stage than the grain-filling stage [356].

The resident microbiome susceptibility and buffering capacity can vary considerably depending on its diversity [357,358] and the presence of specific antagonistic or synergistic taxa [359,360]. Environmental conditions, such as soil moisture [352,360] and light intensity [348], may emerge as pivotal factors in regulating the influence of introduced microorganisms.

In general, it appears that the majority of studies investigating the effects of biofertilizers tend to place emphasis on structural attributes rather than functional aspects [338]. Recognizing the functional implications of these alterations is of paramount importance, as they exert a direct influence on ecosystem operation and well-being. To tackle the complexities of these ongoing dynamics and foresee microbial responses in natural conditions, multidimensional omics and advanced data analysis serve as indispensable tools [357,361]. The question remains as to the lasting environmental impact of introduced microorganisms, encompassing their potential for long-term and legacy effects. Additionally, there is a need for more in-depth exploration regarding genetically modified microorganisms, encompassing considerations of metabolic load [362] and the associated risks of horizontal gene transfer and dispersion [363,364]. Diverse inoculants may emerge as a more environmentally benign alternative, as implied by studies on AMF or *Bacillus* spp. [77].

Bioremediation as a method presents its own set of constraints. The microbial breakdown of specific chemicals may lead to the creation of intermediary substances that not only prove more toxic but also exhibit greater mobility than the original compound. For example, the reductive dehalogenation of TCE can result in the accumulation of vinyl chloride, a highly toxic and carcinogenic byproduct. Hence, bioremediation is a technology demanding extensive research and a comprehensive understanding of microbial processes prior to its implementation; failure to do so could have even more severe repercussions for the ecosystem than the initial contaminant itself [365].

6. Economic Feasibility

Their affordability, environmental compatibility, and ability to enhance soil organic matter position microbial technologies as an effective approach to promoting sustainable agriculture. The improved cost-effectiveness and overall economic viability have demonstrated the potential of biofertilization, encouraging farmers to consider its adoption in the future [366]. In response, various companies have developed a range of biofertilizers

that are widely utilized in the market. AgriLife®, for example, has introduced fifteen biofertilizer products targeting nutrient enhancement through nitrogen fixers, phosphate solubilizers, and potassium-, ferrous-, sulfur-, manganese-, and zinc-mobilizing microbes. Each biofertilizer is tailored to address specific nutrient needs and contains a unique bacterial strain [367].

TagTeam®, a multi-functional inoculant, is specifically designed for legume crops. It enhances phosphate utilization and nitrogen fixation through the combined action of *Penicillium bilaii* and rhizobia strains. Available in both granular and liquid forms, TagTeam is suitable for application on soybeans, peas, dry beans, lentils, and chickpeas [368].

JumpStart®, a notable product, utilizes *Penicillium bilaii*, a fungus that improves phosphate availability for plants. By colonizing plant roots, *P. bilaii* releases organic compounds into the soil, breaking the bonds between phosphate and other elements, thus increasing phosphate accessibility for plants while deriving nutrients from the host plant in a symbiotic relationship. This biofertilizer is particularly effective for crops such as canola, wheat, and legumes [369].

RhizoMyco® is another innovative biofertilizer containing a blend of eighteen species of endo- and ectomycorrhizae, along with growth-promoting agents. Offered in soluble or injectable forms, it provides a broad spectrum of benefits by improving nutrient absorption and expanding root systems [370].

RhizoMyx®, a widely recognized endomycorrhizal inoculant, is formulated to enhance plant performance by fostering root nodule development and increasing the availability of essential nutrients [371].

Despite the relatively high availability of biofertilizers on the market, their accessibility to small-scale farmers in Brazil, for example, remains limited. This is primarily due to a lack of promotion and insufficient information on the subject. Additionally, Brazilian environmental agencies have limited knowledge about this technology, which creates a series of barriers to its effective use across the country.

In Brazil, theoretically, it is mandatory to present a list of organisms comprising the microbial strains used in biofertilizers. However, since living organisms cannot be patented or registered by private entities in Brazil, laboratories often do not disclose the actual composition of their products when obtaining licenses. Furthermore, the inability of regulatory agencies to verify the declared composition allows for the practice of misinformation, significantly hindering the development of products by small laboratories.

Finally, the aim of this article is to promote the use of biotechnologies not only by large producers but also by family farmers in developing countries. It is understood that the widespread dissemination of these technologies, both for agricultural production and for bioremediation projects in soils and aquatic environments, is essential to raise awareness among environmental stakeholders about the various possibilities to be explored in this field of research.

7. Challenges and Most Recent Developments

Although not yet standard in wastewater treatment systems (WWTS), bioremediation is being increasingly considered for this purpose. It can reduce toxins that are not removed by standard treatment [372], including microplastics [373]. The concept of the circular economy requires a sustainable approach for reusing, recycling, and recovering materials, particularly relevant for wastewater treatment, where current methods are less than perfect. Colla et al. [374] discussed the achievements and potential achievements of the circular economy in the management of agricultural wastes, and Arias et al. [375] provided an integrated review of life cycle assessments, economic aspects, and social analysis with respect to the circular economy as applied to waste treatment processes. Bioremediation techniques could

offer a path toward more environmentally acceptable waste treatment [376,377]. A recent paper combined the techniques of bioremediation and biofertilization: Schmuck et al. [377] considered the advantages of using municipal wastewater as a valuable source of raw materials and suggested that microalgae (e.g., *Chlorella*) be included in WWTS to produce value-added products, such as lipids and carbohydrates. This forms part of the concept of biorefineries, converting municipal wastewater into useful products such as fertilizers and bioenergy [378,379]. Finally, the use of microbe-mediated nanoparticles for the control of pollution (e.g., metals) was cited as an example of an emerging technological use of microorganisms [380].

Although these biotechnologies promise extremely desirable improvements for the agroindustry, there are considerable challenges in the development of their routine use. The biofertilizer market could be revolutionized by genetic engineering, which promises products tailored to specific crop requirements, but the gap between development and routine use is still large [381]. Problems such as the necessary long-term survival of the added microorganisms, especially if conditions are, or become, adverse [382], might be solved by genetic engineering; however, the complex interactions between introduced and native microorganisms are more difficult to tackle and will vary depending on the environment into which the new organisms are introduced. It is difficult to envisage specific bioremediating organisms for each type of soil and local environmental conditions. These are not the only problems to be overcome; perhaps even more challenging is the current attitude of the public, who not only has a negative attitude to agrochemicals in current use, but also, in many cases, a distrust of DNA engineering. There will have to be rigorous vetting, followed by education and effective marketing before these new biotechnologies become acceptable worldwide.

8. Future Directions and Policy Implications

As indicated in this article, the extensive availability of data on soil stimulation and remediation biotechnology reflects advances primarily made by developed countries, whose results often address objectives different from the needs of developing countries, particularly those with hotter climates. These advances are also likely focused on market-oriented goals, which are far removed from the public policies required for socio-environmental sustainability.

The use of biotechnology on various scales should not be solely profit-driven but also serve as a tool for social welfare, especially for the underprivileged segments of society, which constitute the majority in the social pyramid of poorer countries. As previously illustrated, the use of biotechnology in small-scale family farming communities in Brazil is still in its early stages, despite its significant importance to national organic agriculture production [383]. Therefore, promoting the broader use of biostimulants is essential in this sector. On the other hand, few examples exist of projects focusing on the revitalization of environments inhabited by low-income populations, where the lack of sanitation infrastructure leads to issues such as domestic sewage disposal, resulting in environmental imbalance through the disruption of microbial trophic networks. This disruption breaks the critical links represented by sensitive microbiotic species, neutralizing the cooperation among diverse microorganisms within a specific strain. Consequently, this leads to the accumulation of organic matter, anoxia, and other phases stemming from the overload of decomposing material.

One of the key potential social challenges that could be addressed through nutrient recycling bio-stimulation methods is the development of alternative sanitation techniques for areas where installing domestic waste collection networks is financially unfeasible. Notable examples include streams running through impoverished urban communities in large metropolitan areas such as Rio de Janeiro. In these regions, the steep topography

of favelas makes conventional sewage systems impractical. The possible introduction of bioremediators as a method to purify these water bodies could facilitate the degradation of organic waste from low-income households using the streams as sewage outlets. This, in turn, could result in nutrient recycling that fertilizes downstream water bodies, such as bays or beaches. The theoretical benefits are numerous, including improved water quality and increased productivity in estuarine environments.

It is understood that various other initiatives could be undertaken to integrate biotechnology into government projects. However, the primary obstacle remains the limited technical capacity of the governmental agencies responsible for implementing public policies. At this juncture, it becomes evident that, as proposed in this article, the widespread dissemination of microbiotechnological techniques within governmental technical departments is of the utmost urgency. To achieve this, a partnership between academia and the government in developing public policies may be the most effective path forward.

9. Conclusions and Perspectives

Currently, developing countries are going through particular historical phases compared to those experienced by developed nations. This is due to both globalization, which defines their role in the global context, and their geographical characteristics, which directly influence their ecological, cultural, and productive dynamics. Consequently, they are currently grappling with issues stemming from their rapid industrialization, lacking the necessary infrastructure and cultural maturity to address the adverse effects of development. On the other hand, their natural attributes bestow upon them advantages that have not yet been fully harnessed. The warm climate, coupled with increased sunlight and more intense weathering, results in higher primary productivity and, thus greater biodiversity, which could serve as a key to their sustainable development. Throughout this review, we briefly discussed characteristics related to the communities of microorganisms in nature, as well as the effects of microbial coexistence. It becomes evident that there is a direct relationship between environmental health and the microbial balance. The targeted use of these microorganisms can lead to beneficial effects on ecosystems. Introducing microbial strains into low-quality soils, which are typically unfavorable for plant growth, has several benefits. It not only enhances soil fertility, boosts nutrient cycling, and mitigates soil salinity, but also enhances the profitability of cash crops and fosters the sustainability of farming practices. Thus, the key to sustainable development lies in the proper management of these biological tools. Understanding the product of the interaction between microorganisms and environmental factors is essential for the development of cost-effective, sustainable environmental management techniques.

Bioremediation is a burgeoning technology that can be employed in conjunction with other physical and chemical treatments to comprehensively address a wide range of environmental pollutants. In addition to helping to solve a range of other environmental issues, further in-depth studies on its other uses should be undertaken to fully explore the potential of microbial biotechnology, which appears to offer a sustainable approach to environmental pollution management. It is imperative to establish a synergistic relationship between the environmental influences on the fate and behavior of environmental contaminants and the selection and efficacy of the most suitable bioremediation technique, as well as other pertinent methods, to ensure the efficient and successful execution and monitoring of bioremediation processes.

The vast majority of articles published on the effects of using microorganisms in bioremediation, particularly studies on the use of microbial strains in the remediation of natural environments, have revealed a range of methodological limitations, like the use of known and secure microbiota species, the use of host species with short-life cycles, the

control and manipulation of mineral nutrients level in soil, and the appropriate combination of microbial species and host plant. It is essential to bear in mind that the majority of this research has been conducted in temperate climates. This article proposes that the environmental conditions of tropical regions could offer an advantage for the utilization of this more ecologically sustainable technology, which could usefully be employed to tackle problems in developing countries.

Author Contributions: C.C.G. and E.M.d.F.: conception; development of the theory; discussion of results and contribution to final manuscript. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: This research was funded by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq).

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. Hart, M.M.; Antunes, P.M.; Chaudhary, V.B.; Abbott, L.K. Fungal inoculants in the field: Is the reward greater than the risk? *Funct. Ecol.* **2018**, *32*, 126–135. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
2. Benzerrouk, Z.; Abid, M.; Sekrafi, H. Pollution haven or halo effect? A comparative analysis of developing and developed countries. *Energy Rep.* **2021**, *7*, 4862–4871. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
3. Ameen, R.F.M.; Mourshed, M. Urban environmental challenges in developing countries—A stakeholder perspective. *Habitat Int.* **2017**, *64*, 1–10. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
4. Zhang, S.; Xu, G.; Shu, Y.; Zhu, J.; Cheng, W. Comparing developed and emerging nations' Economic development with environmental footprint for low-carbon competitiveness. *Heliyon* **2024**, *10*, e34039. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
5. Akhtar, N.; Syakir Ishak, M.I.; Bhawani, S.A.; Umar, K. Various Natural and Anthropogenic Factors Responsible for Water Quality Degradation: A Review. *Water* **2021**, *13*, 2660. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
6. Withers, P.J.A.; Neal, C.; Jarvie, H.P.; Doody, D.G. Agriculture and Eutrophication: Where Do We Go from Here? *Sustainability* **2014**, *6*, 5853–5875. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
7. Parkinson, D.; Coleman, D.C. Microbial communities, activity and biomass. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **1991**, *24*, 3–33. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
8. Macrae, A.; Coelho, R.R.R.; Peixoto, R.; Rosado, A.S. Tropical Soil Microbial Communities. In *The Prokaryotes*; Rosenberg, E., DeLong, E.F., Lory, S., Stackebrandt, E., Thompson, F., Eds.; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2013. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
9. Paul, E.A. *Soil Microbiology, Ecology and Biochemistry*; Elsevier: London, UK, 2015. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
10. Talaat, N.B.; Ghoniem, A.E.; Abdelhamid, M.T.; Shawky, B.T. Effective microorganisms improve growth performance, alter nutrients acquisition and induce compatible solutes accumulation in common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) plants subjected to salinity stress. *Plant Growth Regul.* **2014**, *75*, 281–295. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
11. Ranipa, N.; Harkhani, K.; Sharma, A.K. Biofertilizer-A Key Player in Enhancing Soil Fertility and Agricultural Sustainability. *Int. J. Agric. Environ. Biotechnol.* **2023**, *16*, 121–134. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
12. Zhang, Z.; Shi, Z.; Yang, J.; Hao, B.; Hao, L.; Diao, F.; Wang, L.; Bao, Z.; Guo, W. A new strategy for evaluating the improvement effectiveness of degraded soil based on the synergy and diversity of microbial ecological function. *Ecol. Indic.* **2021**, *120*, 106917. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
13. Kheirfam, H.; Sadeghi, S.H.; Homaei, M.; Darki, B.Z. Quality improvement of an erosion-prone soil through microbial enrichment. *Soil Tillage Res.* **2017**, *165*, 230–238. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
14. Liu, Q.; Pang, Z.; Yang, Z.; Nyumah, F.; Hu, C.; Lin, W.; Yuan, Z. Bio-fertilizer Affects Structural Dynamics, Function, and Network Patterns of the Sugarcane Rhizospheric Microbiota. *Microb. Ecol.* **2022**, *84*, 1195–1211. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
15. Bargaz, A.; Lyamlouli, K.; Chtouki, M.; Zeroual, Y.; Dhiba, D. Soil microbial resources for improving fertilizers efficiency in an integrated plant nutrient management system. *Front. Microbiol.* **2018**, *9*, 1606. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
16. Singh, M.; Singh, D.; Gupta, A.; Pandey, K.D.; Singh, P.K.; Kumar, A. Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria. In *PGPR Amelioration in Sustainable Agriculture*; Singh, A.K., Kumar, A., Singh, P.K., Eds.; Elsevier: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2019; pp. 41–66. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
17. El-Ghamry, A.; Mosa, A.; Alshaal, T.; El-Ramady, H. Nanofertilizers vs. biofertilizers: New insights. *Environ. Biodivers. Soil Secur.* **2018**, *2*, 40–50. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

18. Maçik, M.; Gryta, A.; Fraç, M. Biofertilizers in agriculture: An overview on concepts, strategies and effects on soil microorganisms. *Adv. Agron.* **2020**, *162*, 31–87. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
19. Riaz, U.; Mehdi, S.M.; Iqbal, S.; Khalid, H.I.; Qadir, A.A.; Anum, W.; Ahmad, M.; Murtaza, G. Bio-fertilizers: Eco-friendly approach for plant and soil environment. In *Bioremediation and Biotechnology: Sustainable Approaches to Pollution Degradation*; Hakeem, K.R., Bhat, R.A., Qadri, H., Eds.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2020.
20. Ferreira, M.J.; Silva, H.; Cunha, A. Siderophore-producing rhizobacteria as a promising tool for empowering plants to cope with iron limitation in saline soils: A review. *Pedosphere* **2019**, *29*, 409–420. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
21. Liu, N.; Shao, C.; Sun, H.; Liu, Z.; Guan, Y.; Wu, L.; Zhang, L.; Pan, X.; Zhang, Z.; Zhang, Y.; et al. Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi biofertilizer improves American ginseng (*Panax quinquefolius* L.) growth under the continuous cropping regime. *Geoderma* **2020**, *363*, 114155. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
22. Shirmohammadi, E.; Alikhani, H.A.; Pourbabaei, A.A.; Etesami, H. Improved phosphorus (P) uptake and yield of rainfed wheat fed with p fertilizer by drought-tolerant phosphate-solubilizing fluorescent pseudomonads strains: A field study in drylands. *J. Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.* **2020**, *20*, 2195–2211. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
23. Mercado-Blanco, J.; Abrantes, I.; Caracciolo, A.B.; Bevivino, A.; Ciancio, A.; Grenni, P. Belowground microbiota and the health of tree crops. *Front. Microbiol.* **2018**, *9*, 1006. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
24. Tomar, O.; Akarca, G.; Çağlar, A.; Beykaya, M.; Gok, V. The effects of kefir grain and starter culture on kefir produced from cow and buffalo milk during storage periods. *Food Sci. Technol.* **2019**, *40*, 238–244. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
25. Rizvi, A.; Zaidi, A.; Ameen, F.; Ahmed, B.; Alkahtani, M.; Khan, M. Heavy metal induced stress on wheat: Phytotoxicity and microbiological management. *RSC Adv.* **2020**, 38379. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
26. Wang, X.; Wang, J.; Song, S.; Rao, P.; Wang, R.; Liu, S. Preparation and properties of soil conditioner microspheres based on self-assembled potassium alginate and chitosan. *Int. J. Biol. Macromol.* **2020**, *147*, 877–889. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
27. Zahra, N.; Raza, Z.A.; Mahmood, S. Effect of salinity stress on various growth and physiological attributes of two contrasting maize genotypes. *Braz. Arch. Biol. Technol.* **2020**, *63*, e20200072. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
28. Narayanan, S. Effects of high temperature stress and traits associated with tolerance in wheat. *Open Access J. Sci.* **2018**, *2*, 177–186. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
29. Bankole, M.T.; Abdulkareem, A.S.; Mohammed, I.A.; Ochigbo, S.S.; Tijani, J.; Abubakre, O.K.; Roos, W.D. Selected heavy metals removal from electroplating wastewater by purified and polyhydroxybutyrate functionalized carbon nanotubes adsorbents. *Sci. Rep.* **2019**, 92019, 4475. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
30. Adamiec, E.; Jarosz-Krzemińska, E.; Wieszała, R. Heavy metals from non-exhaust vehicle emissions in urban and motorway road dusts. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* **2016**, *188*, 369. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
31. Luo, X.; Wu, C.; Lin, Y.; Li, W.; Deng, M.; Tan, J.; Xue, S. Soil heavy metal pollution from Pb/Zn smelting regions in China and the remediation potential of biomineralization. *J. Environ. Sci.* **2023**, *125*, 662–677. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
32. Kumar, S.; Diksha Sindhu, S.S.; Kumar, R. Biofertilizers: An ecofriendly technology for nutrient recycling and environmental sustainability. *Curr. Res. Microb. Sci.* **2021**, *20*, 100094. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
33. Kumar, R.; Chaudhry, V.; Prakash, O. Editorial: Multi-omics profiling of unique niches to reveal the microbial and metabolite composition. *Front. Microbiol.* **2022**, *13*, 997191. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
34. Adesemoye, A.O.; Torbert, H.A.; Kloepper, J.W. Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria allows reduced application rates of chemical fertilizers. *Microb. Ecol.* **2009**, *58*, 921–929. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
35. Bertola, M.; Mattarozzi, M.; Sanangelantoni, A.M.; Carer, M.; Visioli, G. PGPB colonizing three-year biochar-amended soil: Towards biochar-mediated biofertilization. *J. Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.* **2019**, *19*, 841–850. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
36. Ullah, N.; Ditta, A.; Khalid, A.; Mehmood, S.; Rizwan, M.S.; Ashraf, M.; Mubeen, F.; Imtiaz, M.; Iqbal, M.M. Integrated effect of algal biochar and plant growth promoting rhizobacteria on physiology and growth of maize under deficit irrigations. *J. Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.* **2019**, *20*, 346–356. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
37. Murgese, P.; Santamaria, P.; Leoni, B.; Crecchio, C. Ameliorative effects of PGPB on yield, physiological parameters, and nutrient transporter genes expression in Barattiere (*Cucumis melo* L.). *J. Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.* **2020**, *20*, 784–793. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
38. Fasusi, O.A.; Cruz, C.; Babalola, O.O. Agricultural sustainability: Microbial biofertilizers in rhizosphere management. *Agriculture* **2021**, *11*, 163. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
39. Igiri, B.E.; Okoduwa, S.I.; Idoko, G.O.; Akabuogu, E.P.; Adeyi, A.O.; Ejiogu, I.K. Toxicity and bioremediation of heavy metals contaminated ecosystem from tannery wastewater: A review. *J. Toxicol.* **2018**, *2018*, 2568038. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
40. Salcedo Gastelum, L.A.; Díaz Rodríguez, A.M.; Félix Pablos, C.M.; Parra Cota, F.I.; Santoyo, G.; Puente, M.L. The current and future role of microbial culture collections in world food security. *Front. Sustain. Food Syst.* **2020**, *4*, 291. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
41. Panda, S.C. *Organic Farming for Sustainable Agriculture*, 3rd ed.; Kalyani: New Delhi, India, 2018; ISBN 10. 9327216334.
42. Basu, A.; Prasad, P.; Das, S.N.; Kalam, S.; Sayyed, R.Z.; Reddy, M.S.; El Enshasy, H. Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) as green bioinoculants: Recent developments, constraints, and prospects. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 1140. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
43. Chakraborty, T.; Akhtar, N. Biofertilizers: Prospects and challenges for future. *Biofertilizers* **2021**, *1*, 575–590. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

44. Mohanty, P.; Singh, P.K.; Chakraborty, D.; Mishra, S.; Pattnaik, R. Insight into the role of PGPR in sustainable agriculture and environment. *Front. Sustain. Food Syst.* **2021**, *5*, 667150. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
45. Pii, Y.; Mimmo, T.; Tomasi, N.; Terzano, R.; Cesco, S.; Crecchio, C. Microbial interactions in the rhizosphere: Beneficial influences of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria on nutrient acquisition process. *A Rev. Biol. Fertil. Soils* **2015**, *51*, 403–415. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
46. Conway, G. One Billion Hungry: Can we Feed the World? Comstock Publishing Associates: Ithaca, NY, USA, 2012.
47. Kumar, R.; Kumawat, N.; Sahu, Y.K. Role of biofertilizers in agriculture. *Pop. Kheti* **2017**, *5*, 63–66.
48. Odoh, C.K.; Sam, K.; Zabbey, N.; Eze, C.N.; Nwankwegu, A.S.; Laku, C.; Dumpe, B.B. Microbial consortium as biofertilizers for crops growing under extreme habitats. In *Plant Microbiomes for Sustainable Agriculture*; Yadav, A.N., Singh, J., Rastegari, A.A., Yadav, N., Eds.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2020; pp. 381–424.
49. Vejan, P.; Abdullah, R.; Khadiran, T.; Ismail, S.; Boyce, A.N. Role of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria in agricultural sustainability—A review. *Molecules* **2016**, *21*, 573. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
50. Berg, G. Plant-microbe interactions promoting plant growth and health: Perspectives for controlled use of microorganisms in agriculture. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **2009**, *84*, 11–18. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
51. Mendes, L.W.; Brossi, M.J.L.; Kuramae, E.E.; Tsai, S.M. Land-use system shapes soil bacterial communities in Southeastern Amazon region. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* **2015**, *95*, 151–160. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
52. Zhang, Q.; Saleem, M.; Wang, C. Probiotic strain *Stenotrophomonas acidaminiphila* BJ1 degrades and reduces chlorothalonil toxicity to soil enzymes, microbial communities and plant roots. *AMB Express* **2017**, *7*, 227. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
53. Etesami, H.; Emami, S.; Alikhani, H.A. Potassium solubilizing bacteria (KSB): Mechanisms, promotion of plant growth, and future prospects A review. *J. Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.* **2017**, *17*, 897–911. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
54. Qi, Y.; Liu, H.; Zhang, B.; Geng, M.; Cai, X.; Wang, J.; Wang, Y. Investigating the effect of microbial inoculants Frankia F1 on growth-promotion, rhizosphere soil physicochemical properties, and bacterial community of ginseng. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* **2022**, *172*, 104369. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
55. Yang, W.; Zhao, Y.; Yang, Y.; Zhang, M.; Mao, X.; Guo, Y.; Li, X.; Tao, B.; Qi, Y.; Ma, L.; et al. Co-application of biochar and microbial inoculants increases soil phosphorus and potassium fertility and improves soil health and tomato growth. *J. Soils Sediments* **2023**, *23*, 947–957. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
56. Upadhyay, S.K.; Singh, J.S.; Saxena, A.K.; Singh, D.P. Impact of PGPR inoculation on growth and antioxidant status of wheat under saline conditions. *Plant Biol.* **2012**, *14*, 605–611. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
57. Gangwar, R.K.; Bhushan, G.; Singh, J.; Upadhyay, S.K.; Singh, A.P. Combined effects of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria and fungi on mung bean (*Vigna radiata* L.). *Int. J. Pharm. Sci. Res.* **2013**, *4*, 4422–4426. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
58. Niu, X.; Duiker, S.W. Carbon sequestration potential by afforestation of marginal agricultural land in the Midwestern US. *For. Ecol. Manag.* **2006**, *223*, 415–427. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
59. Rudel, T.; Coomes Oliver, M.; Emilio, F.; Achard, A.; Arild, X.; Jianchu, L.E. Forest Transitions: Towards a Global Understanding of Land Use Change. *Glob. Environ. Change* **2005**, *15*, 23–31. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
60. Benayas, J.; Martins, A.; Nicolau, J.; Schulz, J. Abandonment of agricultural land: An overview of drivers and consequences. *CAB Rev. Perspect. Agric. Vet. Sci. Nutr. Nat. Resour.* **2007**, *2*, 14. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
61. Asif, M.; Mughal, A.H.; Bisma, R.; Mehdi, Z.; Saima, S.; Ajaz, M.; Malik, M.A.; Masood, A.; Sidique, S. Application of Different Strains of Biofertilizers for Raising Quality Forest Nursery. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. Appl. Sci.* **2018**, *7*, 3680–3686. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
62. Samec, P.; Kučera, A.; Tomášová, G. Soil Degradation Processes Linked to Long-Term Forest-Type Damage. *Intech Open* **2023**. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
63. Munns, R. Comparative physiology of salt and water stress. *Plant Cell Environ.* **2002**, *25*, 239–250. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
64. Malhotra, S. Horticultural crops and climate change: A review. *Indian J. Agric. Sci.* **2017**, *87*, 12–22. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
65. Gupta, R.; Kim, S.T. Depletion of RuBisCO protein using the protamine sulfate precipitation method. *Methods Mol. Biol.* **2017**, *1295*, 225–233. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
66. Jordan, D.B.; Ogren, W.L. The CO₂/O₂ specificity of ribulose 1, 5-bisphosphate carboxylase/oxygenase. *Planta* **1984**, *161*, 308–313. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
67. Sangiorgio, D.; Cellini, A.; Donati, I.; Pastore, C.; Onofrietti, C.; Spinelli, F. Facing climate change: Application of microbial biostimulants to mitigate stress in horticultural crops. *Agronomy* **2020**, *10*, 794. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
68. Ku, S.-B.; Edwards, G.E. Oxygen inhibition of photosynthesis: I. Temperature dependence and relation to O₂/CO₂ solubility ratio. *Plant Physiol.* **1977**, *59*, 986–990. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
69. Bhattacharya, A. Effect of high temperature on carbohydrate metabolism in plants. In *Effect of High Temperature on Crop Productivity and Metabolism of Macro Molecules*; Bhattacharya, A., Ed.; Academic Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2019; pp. 115–216.
70. Shulaev, V.; Cortes, D.; Miller, G.; Mittler, R. Metabolomics for plant stress response. *Physiol. Plant* **2008**, *132*, 199–208. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
71. Qu, A.-L.; Ding, Y.-F.; Jiang, Q.; Zhu, C. Molecular mechanisms of the plant heat stress response. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* **2013**, *432*, 203–207. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
72. Driedonks, N.; Xu, J.; Peters, J.L.; Park, S.; Rieu, I. Multi-level interactions between heat shock factors, heat shock proteins, and the redox system regulate acclimation to heat. *Front. Plant Sci.* **2015**, *6*, 999. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

73. Byerlee, D.; Stevenson, J.; Villoria, N. Does intensification slow crop land expansion or encourage deforestation? *Glob. Food Secur.* **2014**, *3*, 92–98. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
74. Husain, T.; Fatima, A.; Suhel, M.; Singh, S.; Sharma, A.; Prasad, S.M.; Singh, V.P. A brief appraisal of ethylene signaling under abiotic stress in plants. *Plant Signal. Behav.* **2020**, *15*, 1782051. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
75. Fatma, M.; Asgher, M.; Iqbal, N.; Rasheed, F.; Sehar, Z.; Sofo, A.; Khan, N.A. Ethylene Signaling under Stressful Environments: Analyzing Collaborative Knowledge. *Plants* **2022**, *11*, 2211. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
76. Dubois, M.; Van Den Broeck, L.; Inzé, D. The pivotal role of ethylene in plant growth. *Trends Plant Sci* **2018**, *23*, 311–323. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
77. Duc, N.H.; Csintalan, Z.; Posta, K. Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi mitigate negative effects of combined drought and heat stress on tomato plants. *Plant Physiol. Biochem.* **2018**, *132*, 297–307. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
78. Fadji, A.E.; Babalola, O.O.; Santoyo, G.; Perazzolli, M. The Potential Role of Microbial Biostimulants in the Amelioration of Climate Change-Associated Abiotic Stresses on Crops. *Front. Microbiol.* **2022**, *12*, 829099. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
79. Glick, B.R. Bacteria with ACC deaminase can promote plant growth and help to feed the world. *Microbiol. Res.* **2014**, *169*, 30–39. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
80. Orozco-Mosqueda, M.D.C.; Glick, B.; Santoyo, G. ACC deaminase in plant growth-promoting bacteria (PGPB): An efficient mechanism to counter salt stress in crops. *Microbiol. Res.* **2020**, *235*, 126439. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
81. Esmaeel, Q.; Miotto, L.; Rondeau, M.; Leclère, V.; Clément, C.; Jacquard, C.; Sanchez, L.; Barka, E.A. *Paraburkholderia phytofirmans* PsJN-plants interaction: From perception to the induced mechanisms. *Front. Microbiol.* **2018**, *9*, 2093. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
82. Kundu, S.; Perinjelil, S.J.; Thakur, N.D. Chapter 11-Soil salinization and bioremediation using halophiles and halotolerant microorganisms. In *Mitigation of Plant Abiotic Stress by Microorganisms*; Santoyo, G., Kumar, A., Aamir, M., Uthandi, S., Eds.; Academic Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2022; pp. 231–256. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
83. Mitsuchi, M.; Wichaidit, P.; Jeungnijirund, S. Soils of the Northeast Plateau, Thailand. Technical bulletin of the Tropical Agriculture Research Center. Japan, No. 25. 1989. Available online: <https://www.jircas.go.jp/en/publication/techarc/25/1> (accessed on 24 January 2024).
84. Sharifi, R.; Ryu, C.M. Sniffing bacterial volatile compounds for healthier plants. *Curr. Opin. Plant Biol.* **2018**, *44*, 88–97. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
85. Rasool, S.; Hameed, A.; Azooz, M.; Siddiqi, T.; Ahmad, P. Salt stress: Causes, types and responses of plants. In *Ecophysiology and Responses of Plants Under Salt Stress*; Prasad, M.N.V., Ahmad, P., Eds.; Springer: New York, NY, USA, 2013; pp. 1–24. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
86. Vicente-Serrano, S.M.; Quiring, S.M.; Pena-Gallardo, M.; Yuan, S.; Dominguez-Castro, F. A review of environmental droughts: Increased risk under global warming? *Earth-Sci. Rev.* **2020**, *201*, 102953. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
87. Huang, J.; Zhang, G.; Zhang, Y.; Guan, X.; Wei, Y.; Guo, R. Global desertification vulnerability to climate change and human activities. *Land Degrad. Dev.* **2020**, *31*, 1380–1391. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
88. Grover, M.; Ali, S.Z.; Sandhya, V.; Rasul, A.; Venkateswarlu, B. Role of microorganisms in adaptation of agriculture crops to abiotic stresses. *World J. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **2011**, *27*, 1231–1240. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
89. Nwodo, U.U.; Green, E.; Okoh, A.I. Bacterial exopolysaccharides: Functionality and prospects. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **2012**, *13*, 14002–14015. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
90. Tewari, S.; Arora, N.K. Multifunctional exopolysaccharides from *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* PF23 involved in plant growth stimulation, biocontrol and stress amelioration in sunflower under saline conditions. *Curr. Microbiol.* **2014**, *69*, 484–494. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
91. Abd El-Ghany, M.F.; Attia, M. Effect of Exopolysaccharide-Producing Bacteria and Melatonin on Faba Bean Production in Saline and Non-Saline Soil. *Agronomy* **2020**, *10*, 316. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
92. Tallon, R.; Bressollier, P.; Urdaci, M.C. Isolation and characterization of two exopolysaccharides produced by *Lactobacillus plantarum* EP56. *Res. Microbiol.* **2003**, *154*, 705–712. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
93. Singh, R.P.; Jha, P.N. A halotolerant bacterium *Bacillus licheniformis* HSW-16 augments induced systemic tolerance to salt stress in wheat plant (*Triticum aestivum*). *Front. Plant Sci.* **2016**, *7*, 1890. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
94. Khan, A.L.; Hussain, J.; Al-Harrasi, A.; Al-Rawahi, A.; Lee, I.-J. Endophytic fungi: Resource for gibberellins and crop abiotic stress resistance. *Crit. Rev. Biotechnol.* **2015**, *35*, 62–74. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
95. Cavagnaro, T.R.; Bender, S.F.; Asghari, H.R.; Heijden, M.G.A.V. The role of arbuscular mycorrhizas in reducing soil nutrient loss. *Trends Plant Sci.* **2015**, *20*, 283–290. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
96. Santoyo, G.; Gamalero, E.; Glick, B.R. Mycorrhizal-bacterial amelioration of plant abiotic and biotic stress. *Front. Sustain. Food Syst.* **2021**, *5*, 139. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
97. Gong, M.; Tang, M.; Chen, H.; Zhang, Q.; Feng, X. Effects of two *Glomus* species on the growth and physiological performance of *Sophora davidii* seedlings under water stress. *New For.* **2013**, *44*, 399–408. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
98. Fadji, A.E.; Ayangbenro, A.S.; Babalola, O.O. Organic Farming enhances the diversity and community structure of endophytic archaea and fungi in maize plant: A shotgun approach. *J. Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.* **2020**, *20*, 2587–2599. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
99. Aroca, R.; Porcel, R.; Ruiz-Lozano, J.M. How does arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis regulate root hydraulic properties and plasma membrane aquaporins in *Phaseolus vulgaris* under drought, cold or salinity stresses? *New Phytol.* **2007**, *173*, 808–816. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

100. Bray, E. A Response to abiotic stress. In *Biochemistry and Molecular Biology of Plants*; Buchanan, B.B., Gruissem, W., Jones, R.L., Eds.; ASPP: Rockville, MD, USA, 2000; pp. 1158–1203.
101. Omomowo, I.O.; Fadiji, A.E.; Omomowo, O.I. Assessment of bio-efficacy of *Glomus versiforme* and *Trichoderma harzianum* in inhibiting powdery mildew disease and enhancing the growth of cowpea. *Ann. Agric. Sci.* **2018**, *63*, 9–17. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
102. Kaushal, M.; Wani, S.P. Plant-growth-promoting rhizobacteria: Drought stress alleviators to ameliorate crop production in drylands. *Ann. Microbiol.* **2016**, *66*, 35–42. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
103. Marasco, R.; Rolli, E.; Ettoumi, B.; Vigani, G.; Mapelli, F.; Borin, S.; Abou-Hadid, A.F.; El-Beairy, U.A.; Sorlini, C.; Cherif, A.; et al. A drought resistance-promoting microbiome is selected by root system under desert farming. *PLoS ONE* **2012**, *7*, 48479. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
104. Jayakumar, A.; Padmakumar, P.; Nair, I.C.; Radhakrishnan, E. Drought tolerant bacterial endophytes with potential plant probiotic effects from *Ananas comosus*. *Biologia* **2020**, *75*, 1769–1778. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
105. Mayak, S.; Tirosh, T.; Glick, B.R. Plant growth-promoting bacteria that confer resistance to water stress in tomatoes and peppers. *Plant Sci.* **2004**, *166*, 525–530. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
106. Saravanakumar, D.; Samiyappan, R. ACC deaminase from *Pseudomonas fluorescens* mediated saline resistance in groundnut (*Arachis hypogea*) plants. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **2007**, *102*, 1283–1292. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
107. Ouyang, L.; Pei, H.; Xu, Z. Low nitrogen stress stimulating the indole-3-acetic acid biosynthesis of *Serratia* sp. ZM is vital for the survival of the bacterium and its plant growth-promoting characteristic. *Arch. Microbiol.* **2017**, *199*, 425–432. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
108. Egamberdieva, D. Survival of *Pseudomonas extremorientalis* TSAU20 and *P. chlororaphis* TSAU13 in the rhizosphere of common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris*) under saline conditions. *Plant Soil Environ.* **2011**, *57*, 122–127. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
109. Liu, C.-Y.; Zhang, F.; Zhang, D.-J.; Srivastava, A.; Wu, Q.-S.; Zou, Y.-N. Mycorrhiza stimulates root-hair growth and IAA synthesis and transport in trifoliate orange under drought stress. *Sci. Rep.* **2018**, *8*, 1978. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
110. Liu, F.; Xing, S.; Ma, H.; Du, Z.; Ma, B. Cytokinin-producing, plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria that confer resistance to drought stress in *Platycladus orientalis* container seedlings. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **2013**, *97*, 9155–9164. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
111. Kang, S.-M.; Radhakrishnan, R.; You, Y.-H.; Khan, A.L.; Park, J.-M.; Lee, S.-M.; Lee, I.J. Cucumber performance is improved by inoculation with plant growth-promoting microorganisms. *Acta Agric. Scand. Sect. B—Soil Plant Sci.* **2015**, *65*, 36–44. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
112. Shaffique, S.; Hussain, S.; Kang, S.M.; Imran, M.; Injamum-Ul-Hoque, M.; Khan, M.A.; Lee, I.J. Phytohormonal modulation of the drought stress in soybean: Outlook, research progress, and cross-talk. *Front. Plant Sci.* **2023**, *14*, 1237295. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
113. Jahromi, F.; Aroca, R.; Porcel, R.; Ruiz-Lozano, J.M. Influence of salinity on the in vitro development of *Glomus intraradices* and on the in vivo physiological and molecular responses of mycorrhizal lettuce plants. *Microb. Ecol.* **2008**, *55*, 45–53. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
114. Vurukonda, S.S.K.P.; Vardharajula, S.; Shrivastava, M.; Skz, A. Enhancement of drought stress tolerance in crops by plant growth promoting rhizobacteria. *Microbiol. Res.* **2016**, *184*, 13–24. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
115. Heidari, M.; Golpayegani, A. Effects of water stress and inoculation with plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) on antioxidant status and photosynthetic pigments in basil (*Ocimum basilicum* L.). *J. Saudi Soc. Agric. Sci.* **2012**, *11*, 57–61. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
116. Paul, S.; Bag, S.K.; Das, S.; Harvill, E.T.; Dutta, C. Molecular signature of hypersaline adaptation: Insights from genome and proteome composition of halophilic prokaryotes. *Genome Biol.* **2008**, *9*, R70. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
117. Sanders, G.J.; Arndt, S.K. Osmotic adjustment under drought conditions. In *Plant Responses to Drought Stress*; Hernandez-Ros, R.A., Ed.; Springer: Berlin, Germany, 2012; pp. 199–229. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
118. Shintu, P.; Jayaram, K. Phosphate solubilising bacteria (*Bacillus polymyxa*)—An effective approach to mitigate drought in tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.). *Trop. Plant Res.* **2015**, *2*, 17–22.
119. Dimkpa, C.; Merten, D.; Svatoš, A.; Büchel, G.; Kothe, E. Siderophores mediate reduced and increased uptake of cadmium by *Streptomyces tendae* F4 and sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*), respectively. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **2009**, *107*, 1687–1696. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
120. Bailly, A.; Groenhagen, U.; Schulz, S.; Geisler, M.; Eberl, L.; Weisskopf, L. The inter-kingdom volatile signal indole promotes root development by interfering with auxin signalling. *Plant J.* **2014**, *80*, 758–771. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
121. Bhattacharyya, D.; Garladinne, M.; Lee, Y.H. Volatile indole produced by rhizobacterium *Proteus vulgaris* JBLS202 stimulates growth of *Arabidopsis thaliana* through auxin, cytokinin, and brassinosteroid pathways. *J. Plant Growth Regul.* **2015**, *34*, 158–168. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
122. Zhang, H.; Murzello, C.; Sun, Y.; Kim, M.-S.; Xie, X.; Jeter, R.M.; Zak, J.C.; Dowd, S.E.; Paré, P.W. Choline and osmotic-stress tolerance induced in *Arabidopsis* by the soil microbe *Bacillus subtilis* (GB03). *Mol. Plant Microbe Interact.* **2010**, *23*, 1097–1104. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
123. Ledger, T.; Rojas, S.; Timmermann, T.; Pinedo, I.; Poupin, M.J.; Garrido, T.; Richter, P.; Tamayo, J.; Donoso, R. Volatile-mediated effects predominate in Paraburkholderia phytofirmans growth promotion and salt stress tolerance of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Front. Microbiol.* **2016**, *7*, 1838. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
124. Gutiérrez-Luna, F.M.; López-Bucio, J.; Altamirano-Hernández, J.; Valencia-Cantero, E.; De La Cruz, H.R.; Macías-Rodríguez, L. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria modulate root-system architecture in *Arabidopsis thaliana* through volatile organic compound emission. *Symbiosis* **2010**, *51*, 75–83. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
125. Khan, M.A.; Asaf, S.; Khan, A.L.; Ullah, I.; Ali, S.; Kang, S.-M.; Lee, I.J. Alleviation of salt stress response in soybean plants with the endophytic bacterial isolate *Curtobacterium* sp. SAK1. *Ann. Microbiol.* **2019**, *69*, 797–800. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

126. Else, M.A.; Jackson, M.B. Transport of 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic acid (ACC) in the transpiration stream of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*) in relation to foliar ethylene production and petiole epinasty. *Funct. Plant Biol.* **1998**, *25*, 453–458. [CrossRef]
127. Ali, S.; Kim, W.-C. Plant growth promotion under water: Decrease of waterlogging-induced ACC and ethylene levels by ACC deaminase-producing bacteria. *Front. Microbiol.* **2018**, *9*, 1096. [CrossRef]
128. Grichko, V.P.; Glick, B.R. Amelioration of flooding stress by ACC deaminase-containing plant growth-promoting bacteria. *Plant Physiol. Biochem.* **2001**, *39*, 11–17. [CrossRef]
129. Li, T.; Hu, Y.-J.; Hao, Z.-P.; Li, H.; Chen, B.-D. Aquaporin genes GintAQPF1 and GintAQPF2 from *Glomus intraradices* contribute to plant drought tolerance. *Plant Signal. Behav.* **2013**, *8*, 24030. [CrossRef]
130. Jaensaeng, R.; Jantasuriyarat, C.; Thamchaipenet, A. Positive role of 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylate deaminase-producing endophytic *Streptomyces* sp. GMKU 336 on flooding resistance of mung bean. *Agric. Nat. Resour.* **2018**, *52*, 330–334. [CrossRef]
131. Fravel, D.R. Commercialization and Implementation of Biocontrol. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* **2005**, *43*, 337–359. [CrossRef]
132. Manikandan, A.; Anandham, R.; Johnson, I.; Krishnamoorthy, R.; Senthilkumar, M.; Raghu, R.; Gopal, N.O.; Mukherjee, P.K. *Bacillus* and *Streptomyces* for Management of Biotic Stresses in Plants for Sustainable Agriculture. In *Plant Microbiome for Plant Productivity and Sustainable Agriculture*; Chhabra, S., Prasad, R., Maddela, N.R., Tuteja, N., Eds.; Springer Nature: Singapore, 2023; pp. 263–288. [CrossRef]
133. Hansen, M.C.; Potapov, P.V.; Moore, R.; Hancher, M.; Turubanova, S.A.; Tyukavina, A.; Thau, D.; Stehman, S.V.; Goetz, S.J.; Loveland, T.R.; et al. High-resolution global maps of 21st-century forest cover change. *Science* **2013**, *342*, 850–853. [CrossRef]
134. Bernal, S.; Hedin, L.O.; Likens, G.E.; Gerber, S.; Buso, D.C. Complex response of the forest nitrogen cycle to climate change. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2012**, *109*, 3406–3411. [CrossRef]
135. Vale, P.; Gibbs, H.; Vale, R.; Christie, M.; Florence, E.; Munger, J.; Sabaini, D. The expansion of intensive beef farming to the Brazilian Amazon. *Glob. Environ. Change* **2019**, *57*, 101922. [CrossRef]
136. INPE. National Institute for Space Research. 2021. Available online: <http://www.inpe.br/> (accessed on 2 October 2023).
137. Navarrete, A.A.; Tsai, S.M.; Mendes, L.W.; Faust, K.; de Hollander, M.; Cassman, N.A.; Raes, J.; van Veen, J.A.; Kuramae, E.E. Soil microbiome responses to the short-term effects of Amazonian deforestation. *Mol. Ecol.* **2015**, *24*, 2433–2448. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
138. Melo, V.F.; Orrut a, A.G.; Motta, A.C.V.; Testoni, S.A. Land use and changes in soil morphology and physical-chemical properties in Southern Amazon. *Rev. Bras. Ci ncia Solo* **2017**, *41*, e0170034. [CrossRef]
139. Souza Braz, A.M.; Fernandes, A.R.; Alleoni, L.R.F. Soil attributes after the conversion from forest to pasture in Amazon. *Land Degrad. Dev.* **2011**, *24*, 33–38. [CrossRef]
140. Cenciani, K.; Lambais, M.R.; Cerri, C.C.; de Azevedo, F.; Eigl, B.J. Bacteria diversity and microbial biomass in forest, pasture and fallow soils in the southwestern amazon basin. *Rev. Bras. Ci ncia Solo* **2009**, *33*, 907–916. [CrossRef]
141. Carvalho, R.; Adami, M.; Amaral, S.; Bezerra, F.; de Aguiar, A.P.D. Changes in secondary vegetation dynamics in a context of decreasing deforestation rates in Par , Brazilian Amazon. *Appl. Geogr.* **2019**, *106*, 40–49. [CrossRef]
142. Pedrinho, A.; Mendes, L.W.; Merloti, L.F.; Andreote, F.D.; Tsai, S.M. The natural recovery of soil microbial community and nitrogen functions after pasture abandonment in the Amazon region. *FEMS Microb. Ecol.* **2020**, *96*, 49. [CrossRef]
143. Porder, S.; Vitousek, P.M.; Chadwick, O.A.; Chamberlain, C.P.; Hilley, G.E. Uplift, erosion, and phosphorus limitation in terrestrial ecosystems. *Ecosystems* **2007**, *10*, 159–171. [CrossRef]
144. Gama-Rodrigues, A.C.; Sales, M.V.S.; Silva, P.S.D.; Comerford, N.B.; Cropper, W.P.; Gama-Rodrigues, E.F. An exploratory analysis of phosphorus transformations in tropical soils using structural equation modeling. *Biogeochemistry* **2014**, *118*, 453–469. [CrossRef]
145. Soltangheisi, A.; Moraes, M.T.; Cherubin, M.R.; Alvarez, D.O.; Souza, L.F.; Bieluczyk, W.; Navroski, D.; Teles, A.P.B.; Pavinato, P.S.; Martinelli, L.A.; et al. Forest conversion to pasture affects soil phosphorus dynamics and T nutritional status in Brazilian Amazon. *Soil Tillage Res.* **2019**, *194*, 104330. [CrossRef]
146. Johnson, A.H.; Frizano, J.; Vann, D.R. Biogeochemical implications of labile phosphorus in forest soils determined by the Hedley fractionation procedure. *Oecologia* **2003**, *135*, 487–499. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
147. Shrivastava, M.; Srivastava, P.; D’Souza, S. Phosphate-Solubilizing Microbes: Diversity and Phosphates Solubilization Mechanism. In *Role of Rhizospheric Microbes in Soil*; Meena, V., Ed.; Springer: Singapore, 2018. [CrossRef]
148. Chavarro-Bermeo, J.P.; Arruda, B.; Mora-Motta, D.A.; Bejarano-Herrera, W.; Ortiz-Morea, F.A.; Somenahally, A.; Silva-Olaya, A.M. Responses of soil phosphorus fractions to land-use change in Colombian Amazon. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 2285. [CrossRef]
149. Hamer, U.; Potthast, K.; Burneo, J.I.; Makeschin, F. Nutrient stocks and phosphorus fractions in mountain soils of Southern Ecuador after conversion of forest to pasture. *Biogeochemistry* **2013**, *112*, 495–510. [CrossRef]
150. Garcia-Montiel, D.C.; Neill, C.; Melillo, J.; Thomas, S.; Steudler, P.A.; Cerri, C.C. Soil phosphorus transformations following forest clearing for pasture in the Brazilian Amazon. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* **2000**, *64*, 1792–1804. [CrossRef]
151. Fu, D.; Wu, X.; Duan, C.; Chadwick, D.R.; Jones, D.L. Response of soil phosphorus fractions and fluxes to different vegetation restoration types in a subtropical mountain ecosystem. *Catena* **2020**, *193*, 104663. [CrossRef]
152. Teixeira, H.M.; Cardoso, I.M.; Bianchi, F.J.J.A.; Silva, A.C.; Jamme, D.; Pena-Claros, M. Linking vegetation and soil functions during secondary forest succession in the Atlantic forest. *For. Ecol. Manag.* **2020**, *457*, 117696. [CrossRef]

153. Richardson, A.E.; Simpson, R.J. Soil microorganisms mediating phosphorus availability update on microbial phosphorus. *Plant Physiol.* **2011**, *156*, 989–996. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
154. Arenberg, M.R.; Arai, Y. *Uncertainties in Soil Physicochemical Factors Controlling Phosphorus Mineralization and Immobilization Processes*, 1st ed.; Elsevier: London, UK, 2019. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
155. Rodríguez, H.; Fraga, R.; Gonzalez, T.; Bashan, Y. Genetics of phosphate solubilization and its potential applications for improving plant growth-promoting bacteria. *Plant Soil* **2006**, *287*, 15–21. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
156. Dai, X.; Zhou, W.; Liu, G.; Liang, G.; He, P.; Liu, Z. Soil C/N and pH together as a comprehensive indicator for evaluating the effects of organic substitution management in subtropical paddy fields after application of high-quality amendments. *Geoderma* **2019**, *337*, 1116–1125. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
157. Alor, E.T.; Glick, B.R.; Babalola, O.O. Microbial phosphorus solubilization and its potential for use in sustainable agriculture. *Front. Microbiol.* **2017**, *8*, 971. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
158. Khan, S.M.; Zaidi, A.; Wani, P.A. Role of phosphate-solubilizing microorganism in sustainable agriculture: A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* **2009**, *27*, 29–43. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
159. Gupta, V.K.; Paul, S.; Dutta, C. Geography, Ethnicity or Subsistence-Specific Variations in Human Microbiome Composition and Diversity. *Front. Microbiol.* **2017**, *8*, 1162. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
160. Khan, M.S.; Ahmad, E.; Zaidi, A.; Oves, M. Functional aspect of phosphate solubilizing bacteria: Importance in crop production. In *Bacteria in Agrobiolgy: Crop Productivity*; Maheshwari, D.K., Ed.; Springer: Berlin, Germany, 2013. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
161. Bi, Q.F.; Li, K.J.; Zheng, B.X.; Liu, X.P.; Li, H.Z.; Jin, B.J.; Ding, K.; Yang, X.R.; Lin, X.Y.; Zhu, Y.G. Partial replacement inorganic phosphorus (P) by organic manure reshapes phosphate mobilizing bacterial communities and promotes P bioavailability in a paddy soil. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2019**, *3*, 134977. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
162. Mendes, L.W.; Tsai, S.M.; Navarrete, A.A.; de Hollander, M.; van Veen, J.A.; Kuramae, E.E. Soil-borne microbiome: Linking diversity to function. *Microb. Ecol.* **2015**, *70*, 255–265. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
163. Pedrinho, A.; Mendes, L.W.; Merloti, L.F.; Fonseca, M.C.; Cannavan, F.S.; Tsai, S.M. Forest-to-pasture conversion and recovery based on assessment of microbial communities in Eastern Amazon rainforest. *FEMS Microb. Ecol.* **2019**, *95*, 236. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
164. Batista, P.; Almeida, G.; Silva, J.; Pandorfi, H.; Silva, M.; Silva, R.; Melo, F.; Junior, J. Short-term grazing and its impacts on soil and pasture degradation. *Dyna* **2020**, *87*, 123–128. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
165. Sharrow, S. Soil compaction by grazing livestock in silvopastures as evidenced by changes in soil physical properties. *Agrofor. Syst.* **2007**, *71*, 215–223. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
166. Pentos, K.; Pieczarka, K.; Serwata, K. The relationship between soil electrical parameters and compaction of sandy clay loam soil. *Agriculture* **2021**, *11*, 114. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
167. Moraes, M.T.; Silva, V.; Zwirtes, A.; Carlesso, R. Use of penetrometers in agriculture: A review. *Rev. Eng. Agrícola* **2014**, *34*, 179–193. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
168. Krajco, J. Detection of Soil Compaction Using Soil Electrical Conductivity. Master's Thesis, Cranfield University, Silsoe, UK, 2007; pp. 3–92.
169. Nawaz, M.F.; Bourrié, G.; Trolard, F. Soil compaction impact and modelling. *A Rev. Agron. Sustain. Dev.* **2017**, *33*, 291–309. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
170. Mayerfeld, D.; Kruger, E.; Gildersleeve, R.; Rickenbach, M. Impacts of different grazing approaches on woodland ecosystem properties. *Agrofor. Syst.* **2022**, *96*, 527–540. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
171. Medina, M.C. Effects of soil compaction by trampling of animals in soil productivity. Remediations. *Rev. Colomb. Cienc. Anim.* **2016**, *8*, 88–93. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
172. Donkor, N.T.; Gedir, J.V.; Hudson, R.J.; Bork, E.W.; Chanasyk, D.S.; Naeth, M.A. Impacts of grazing systems on soil compaction and pasture production in Alberta. *Can. J. Soil Sci.* **2002**, *82*, 1–8. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
173. Gao, S.; DeLuca, T.H. Rangeland application of biochar and rotational grazing interact to influence soil and plant nutrient dynamics. *Geoderma* **2022**, *408*, 115572. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
174. An, N.; Zhang, L.; Liu, Y.; Shen, S.; Li, N.; Wu, Z.; Yang, J.; Han, W.; Han, X. Biochar application with reduced chemical fertilizers improves soil pore structure and rice productivity. *Chemosphere* **2022**, *298*, 134304. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
175. Xiang, K.; Li, S.; Chen, J.; Wu, Y.; Li, Y.; Yang, F.; Pan, Y.; Dai, W.; Wang, J.; Wang, X.; et al. Preparation and performance study of recyclable microsphere soil conditioner based on magnetic metal organic framework structure. *Colloids Surf. A Physicochem. Eng.* **2022**, *640*, 128447. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
176. Yan, H.; Zhu, X.; Dai, F.; He, Y.; Jing, X.; Song, P.; Wang, R. Porous geopolymer based eco-friendly multifunctional slow-release fertilizers for promoting plant growth. *Colloids Surf. A Physicochem. Eng. Asp.* **2021**, *631*, 127646. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
177. Cui, Q.; Xia, J.; Yang, H.; Liu, J.; Shao, P. Biochar and effective microorganisms promote *Sesbania cannabina* growth and soil quality in the coastal saline-alkali soil of the Yellow River Delta, China. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, *756*, 143801. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
178. Wu, C.; Zhi, D.; Yao, B. Immobilization of microbes on biochar for water and soil remediation: A review. *Environ. Res.* **2022**, *212*, 113226. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

179. Zhou, H.; Whalley, W.R.; Hawkesford, M.J.; Ashton, R.W.; Atkinson, B.; Atkinson, J.A.; Sturrock, C.J.; Bennett, M.J.; Mooney, S.J. The interaction between wheat roots and soil pores in structured field soil. *J. Exp. Bot.* **2021**, *72*, 747–756. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
180. Coelho, L.M.; Rezende, H.C.; Coelho, L.M.; de Sousa, P.A.R.; Melo, D.F.O.; Coelho, N.M.M. Bioremediation of Polluted Waters Using Microorganisms. *Adv. Bioremediat. Wastewater Polluted Soil* **2015**, *10*, 60770. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
181. Nicolaou, S.A.; Gaida, S.M.; Papoutsakis, E.T. A comparative view of metabolite and substrate stress and tolerance in microbial bioprocessing: From biofuels and chemicals, to biocatalysis and bioremediation. *Metab. Eng.* **2010**, *12*, 307–331. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
182. Kumar, A.; Bisht, B.S.; Joshi, V.D.; Dhewa, T. Review on bioremediation of polluted environment: A management tool. *Int. J. Environ. Sci.* **2011**, *1*, 1079–1093.
183. Wasilkowski, D.; Swedziol, Z.; Mroziak, A. The applicability of genetically modified microorganisms in bioremediation of contaminated environments. *Chemik* **2012**, *66*, 822–826.
184. Singh, S.; Parihar, P.; Singh, R.; Singh, V.P.; Prasad, S.M. Heavy Metal Tolerance in Plants: Role of Transcriptomics, Proteomics, Metabolomics, and Ionomics. *Front. Plant Sci.* **2016**, *6*, 1143. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
185. Mushtaq, S.; Bareen, F.E.; Tayyeb, A. Equilibrium kinetics and thermodynamic studies on biosorption of heavy metals by metal-resistant strains of *Trichoderma* isolated from tannery solid waste. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* **2023**, *30*, 10925–10954. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
186. Atuchin, V.V.; Asyakina, L.K.; Serazetdinova, Y.R.; Frolova, A.S.; Velichkovich, N.S.; Prosekov, A.Y. Microorganisms for Bioremediation of Soils Contaminated with Heavy Metals. *Microorganisms* **2023**, *11*, 864. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
187. Effendi, A.J.; Mastroiani, L.J.; Suhardi, S.H.; Ramadan, B.S. Potential use of extracellular polymeric substances (EPS) of *Bacillus subtilis* for biosorption of mercury produced from soil-washing effluent. *Bioresour. Technol. Rep.* **2023**, *22*, 101481. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
188. Mathivanan, K.; Chandirika, J.U.; Srinivasan, R.; Charles, P.E.; Rajaram, R.; Zhang, R. Exopolymeric substances production by *Bacillus cereus* KMS3-1 enhanced its biosorption efficiency in removing Cd²⁺ and Pb²⁺ in single and binary metal mixtures. *Environ. Res* **2023**, *228*, 115917. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
189. Nagmote, M.S.; Rai, A.R.; Sharma, R.; Desimone, M.F.; Chaudhary, R.G.; Singh, N.B. (Eds.) Bioremediation of Heavy Metals Using Microorganisms. In *Genetically Engineered Organisms in Bioremediation*; CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, USA, 2024; pp. 168–190. ISBN 9781003188568.
190. Rahman, M.A.; Hassler, C. Is arsenic biotransformation a detoxification mechanism for microorganisms? *Aquat. Toxicol.* **2014**, *146*, 212–219. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
191. Mala, J.G.S.; Sujatha, D.; Rose, C. Inducible chromate reductase exhibiting extracellular activity in *Bacillus methylotrophicus* for chromium bioremediation. *Microbiol. Res.* **2015**, *170*, 235–241. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
192. Barkay, T.; Gu, B. Demethylation—The other side of the mercury methylation coin: A critical review. *ACS Environ. Au* **2021**, *2*, 77–97. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
193. Rahman, Z.; Thomas, L.; Chetri, S.P.; Bodhankar, S.; Kumar, V.; Naidu, R. A comprehensive review on chromium (Cr) contamination and Cr (VI)-resistant extremophiles in diverse extreme environments. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2023**, *30*, 59163–59193. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
194. Abd Elnabi, M.K.; Elkaliny, N.E.; Elyazied, M.M.; Azab, S.H.; Elkhaila, S.A.; Elmasry, S.; Mouhamed, M.S.; Shalamesh, E.M.; Alhoriény, N.A.; Abd Elaty, A.E.; et al. Toxicity of Heavy Metals and Recent Advances in Their Removal: A Review. *Toxics* **2023**, *11*, 580. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
195. Roane, T.M.; Josephson, K.L.; Pepper, I.L. Dual-bioaugmentation strategy to enhance remediation of cocontaminated soil. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2001**, *67*, 3208–3215. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
196. Vullo, D.L.; Ceretti, H.M.; Daniel, M.A.; Ramírez, S.A.; Zalts, A. Cadmium, zinc and copper biosorption mediated by *Pseudomonas veronii* 2E. *Bioresour. Technol.* **2008**, *99*, 5574–5581. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
197. Yang, Z.; Zhang, Z.; Chai, L.; Wang, Y.; Liu, Y.; Xiao, R. Bioleaching remediation of heavy metal-contaminated soils using *Burkholderia* sp. Z-90. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2016**, *301*, 145–152. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
198. Achal, V.; Pan, X.; Zhang, D. Remediation of copper-contaminated soil by *Kocuria flava* CR1, based on microbially induced calcite precipitation. *Ecol. Eng.* **2011**, *37*, 1601–1605. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
199. Ayangbenro, A.S.; Babalola, O.O. Genomic analysis of *Bacillus cereus* NWUAB01 and its heavy metal removal from polluted soil. *Sci. Rep.* **2020**, *10*, 19660. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
200. Achal, V.; Pan, X.; Fu, Q.; Zhang, D. Biomineralization based remediation of As (III) contaminated soil by *Sporosarcina ginsengisoli*. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2012**, *201–202*, 178–184. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
201. Li, X.; Dong, S.; Yao, Y.; Shi, W.; Wu, M.; Xu, H. Inoculation of bacteria for the bioremediation of heavy metals contaminated soil by *Agrobacterium aegerita*. *RSC Adv.* **2016**, *6*, 65816–65824. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
202. Kang, C.H.; Kwon, Y.J.; So, J.S. Bioremediation of heavy metals by using bacterial mixtures. *Ecol. Eng.* **2016**, *89*, 64–69. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
203. Rahman, A.; Nahar, N.; Nawani, N.N.; Jass, J.; Hossain, K.; Saud, Z.A.; Saha, A.K.; Ghosh, S.; Olsson, B.; Mandal, A. Bioremediation of hexavalent chromium (VI) by a soil-borne bacterium, *Enterobacter cloacae* B2-DHA. *J. Environ. Sci. Health* **2015**, *50*, 1136–1147. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
204. Wani, P.A.; Rafi, N.; Wani, U.; Bilikis, A.H.; Khan, M.S.A. Simultaneous bioremediation of heavy metals and biodegradation of hydrocarbons by metal resistant *Brevibacillus parabrevis* OZF5 improves plant growth promotion. *Bioremediat. J.* **2023**, *27*, 20–31. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

205. Ridene, S.; Werfelli, N.; Mansouri, A.; Landoulsi, A.; Abbes, C. Bioremediation potential of consortium *Pseudomonas stutzeri* LBR and *Cupriavidus metallidurans* LBJ in soil polluted by lead. *PLoS ONE* **2023**, *18*, e0284120. [CrossRef]
206. Vishwakarma, S.K.; Patil, A.; Pandey, A.; Arya, M. Biosorption of Heavy Metal (Mn^{2+}) by Thermophilic Bacterial Strains Isolated from Surya Kund Hot Spring, Yamunotri, Uttarakhand. *Biotechnol. Appl. Biochem.* **2023**, *196*, 2518–2533. [CrossRef]
207. Cam, N.; Benzerara, K.; Georgelin, T.; Jaber, M.; Lambert, J.F.; Poinot, M.; Skouri-Panet, F.; Cordier, L. Selective uptake of alkaline earth metals by cyanobacteria forming intracellular carbonates. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2016**, *50*, 11654–11662. [CrossRef]
208. Al-Sherif, A.; Abd El-Hameed, M.S.; Mahmoud, M.A.; Ahmed, H.S. Use of cyanobacteria and organic fertilizer mixture as soil bioremediation. *Am.-Eurasian J. Agric. Environ. Sci.* **2015**, *15*, 794–799. [CrossRef]
209. Jin, Z.; Deng, S.; Wen, Y.; Jin, Y.; Pan, L.; Zhang, Y.; Black, T.; Jones, K.C.; Zhang, H.; Zhang, D. Application of *Simplicillium chinense* for Cd and Pb biosorption and enhancing heavy metal phytoremediation of soils. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2019**, *697*, 134148. [CrossRef]
210. Chang, J.; Shi, Y.; Si, G.; Yang, Q.; Dong, J.; Chen, J. The bioremediation potentials and mercury (II)-resistant mechanisms of a novel fungus *Penicillium* spp. DC-F11 isolated from contaminated soil. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2020**, *396*, 122638. [CrossRef]
211. Din, G.; Hassan, A.; Dunlap, J.; Ripp, S.; Shah, A. Cadmium tolerance and bioremediation potential of filamentous fungus *Penicillium chrysogenum* FMS2 isolated from soil. *Int. J. Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2021**, *19*, 2761–2770. [CrossRef]
212. Tastan, B.E.; Ertugrul, S.; Donmez, G. Effective bioremoval of reactive dye and heavy metals by *Aspergillus versicolor*. *Bioresour. Technol.* **2010**, *101*, 870–876. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
213. Ramasamy, R.K.; Congeevaram, S.; Thamaraiselvi, K. Evaluation of isolated fungal strain from e-waste recycling facility for effective sorption of toxic heavy metal Pb (II) ions and fungal protein molecular characterization—a Mycoremediation approach. *Asian J. Exp. Biol. Sci.* **2011**, *2*, 342–347.
214. Hasgül, E.; Malkoç, S.; Güven, A.; Dede, A.; Güven, K. Biosorption of cadmium and copper by *Aspergillus* spp. isolated from industrial ceramic waste sludge. *Biodivers. Conserv.* **2019**, *12*, 44–56. [CrossRef]
215. Hassan, A.; Periathamby, A.; Ahmed, A.; Innocent, O.; Hamid, F.S. Effective bioremediation of heavy metal-contaminated landfill soil through bioaugmentation using consortia of fungi. *J. Soils Sediments* **2020**, *20*, 66–80. [CrossRef]
216. Bahafid, W.; Tahri Joutey, N.; Saye, H.; Boularab, I.E.L.; Ghachtouli, N. Bioaugmentation of chromium-polluted soil microcosms with *Candida tropicalis* diminishes phytoavailable chromium. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **2013**, *115*, 727–734. [CrossRef]
217. Damodaran, D.; Suresh, G.; Mohan, R. Bioremediation of soil by removing heavy metals using *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. In Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Environmental Science and Technology, Singapore, 26 February 2011.
218. Imam, S.A.; Rajpoot, I.K.; Gajjar, B.; Sachdeva, A. Comparative study of heavy metal bioremediation in soil by *Bacillus subtilis* and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Indian J. Sci. Technol.* **2016**, *9*, 1–7. [CrossRef]
219. Mao, Q.; Xie, X.; Pinzon-Núñez, D.A.; Xie, Z.; Liu, T.; Irshad, S. Native microalgae and *Bacillus* XZM remediate arsenic-contaminated soil by forming biological soil crusts. *J. Environ. Manag.* **2023**, *345*, 118858. [CrossRef]
220. Ri, C.; Tao, Y.; Tu, J.; Li, X.; She, S.; Hou, L.; Fu, Y.; Chen, L. Improvement of the Cd removal efficiency of a filamentous cyanobacterium *Leptolyngbya* sp. XZ1 through co-culture with *Bacillus* sp. S1. *J. Appl. Phycol.* **2023**, *35*, 2935–2944. [CrossRef]
221. Gupta, R.; Khan, F.; Alqahtani, F.M.; Hashem, M.; Ahmad, F. Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR) Assisted Bioremediation of Heavy Metal Toxicity. *Appl. Biochem. Biotechnol.* **2023**, *196*, 2928–2956. [CrossRef]
222. Ledin, M. Accumulation of metals by microorganisms—Processes and importance for soil systems. *Earth-Sci. Rev.* **2000**, *51*, 1–31. [CrossRef]
223. Thapa, B.; Kumar, A.; Ghimire, A.A. Review on bioremediation of petroleum hydrocarbon contaminants in soil. Kathmandu University Journal of Science. *Eng. Technol.* **2012**, *8*, 164–170. [CrossRef]
224. Gao, B.; Wang, X.; Ford, R.M. Chemotaxis along local chemical gradients enhanced bacteria dispersion and PAH bioavailability in a heterogenous porous medium. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2023**, *859*, 160004. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
225. Purnomo, A.S.; Putra, S.R.; Putro, H.S.; Hamzah, A.; Rohma, N.A.; Rohmah, A.A.; Rizqi, H.D.; Tangahu, B.V.; Warmadewanthi, I.D.A.A.; Shimizu, K. The application of biosurfactant-producing bacteria immobilized in PVA/SA/bentonite bio-composite for hydrocarbon-contaminated soil bioremediation. *RSC Adv.* **2023**, *13*, 21163–21170. [CrossRef]
226. Ling, H.; Hou, J.; Du, M.; Zhang, Y.; Liu, W.; Christie, P.; Luo, Y. Surfactant-enhanced bioremediation of petroleum-contaminated soil and microbial community response: A field study. *Chemosphere* **2023**, *322*, 138225. [CrossRef]
227. Malik, G.; Arora, R.; Chaturvedi, R.; Paul, M.S. Implementation of genetic engineering and novel omics approaches to enhance bioremediation: A focused review. *Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* **2022**, *108*, 443–450. [CrossRef]
228. Shyam, K.; Kumar, N.; Chandel, H.; Dogra, A.S.; Sharma, G.; Saxena, G. Omics Technologies in Environmental Microbiology and Microbial Ecology: Insightful Applications in Bioremediation Research. In *Genomics Approach to Bioremediation: Principles, Tools, and Emerging Technologies*; Wiley Online Library: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2023; pp. 433–454. [CrossRef]
229. Wesseler, J.; Kleter, G.; Meulenbroek, M.; Purnhagen, K.P. EU regulation of genetically modified microorganisms in light of new policy developments: Possible implications for EU bioeconomy investments. *Appl. Econ. Perspect. Policy* **2023**, *45*, 839–859. [CrossRef]
230. Directive 2009/41/EC, European Parliament. 2009. Available online: <https://www.fao.org/faolex/results/details/en/c/LEX-FAOC138068/> (accessed on 28 March 2025).

231. Perera, I.C.; Hemamali, E.H. Genetically Modified Organisms for Bioremediation: Current Research and Advancements. In *Bioremediation of Environmental Pollutants*; Suyal, D.C., Soni, R., Eds.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2022. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
232. Sharma, B.; Shukla, P. A comparative analysis of heavy metal bioaccumulation and functional gene annotation towards multiple metal resistant potential by *Ochrobactrum intermedium* BPS-20 and *Ochrobactrum ciceri* BPS-26. *Bioresour. Technol.* **2021**, *320*, 124330. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
233. Rafeeq, H.; Afsheen, N.; Rafique, S.; Arshad, A.; Intisar, M.; Hussain, A.; Bilal, M.; Iqbal, H.M. Genetically engineered microorganisms for environmental remediation. *Chemosphere* **2023**, *310*, 136751. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
234. Turkey, S.R.; Ram, S.; Chandrashekhar, P.; Mishra, S. Bioremediation of Soils Polluted with Hexavalent Chromium Using Bacteria. In *Industrial Wastewater Reuse*; Shah, M.P., Ed.; Springer: Singapore, 2023. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
235. Zhang, S.; Zhang, M.; Han, F.; Liu, Z.; Zhao, C.; Lei, J.; Zhou, W. Enhanced degradation of petroleum in saline soil by nitrogen stimulation and halophilic emulsifying bacteria *Bacillus* sp. Z-13. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2023**, *459*, 132102. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
236. Elmore, J.R.; Dexter, G.N.; Baldino, H.; Huenemann, J.D.; Francis, R.; Peabody, G.L.; Martinez-Baird, J.; Riley, L.A.; Simmons, T.; Coleman-Derr, D.; et al. High-throughput genetic engineering of nonmodel and undomesticated bacteria via iterative site-specific genome integration. *Sci. Adv.* **2023**, *9*, 1285. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
237. Nannipieri, P.; Kandeler, E.; Ruggiero, P. Enzyme activities and microbiological and biochemical processes in soil. *Enzym. Environ.* **2002**, *30*, 1–33.
238. Khalid, F.; Hashmi, M.Z.; Jamil, N.; Qadir, A.; Ali, M.I. Microbial and enzymatic degradation of PCBs from e-waste-contaminated sites: A review. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* **2021**, *28*, 10474–10487. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
239. Garg, S.K.; Tripathi, M.; Srinath, T. Strategies for chromium bioremediation of tannery effluent. *Rev. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* **2012**, *217*, 75–140. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
240. Abatenh, E.; Gizaw, B.; Tsegaye, Z.; Wassie, M. The role of microorganisms in bioremediation—A review. *J. Environ. Biol.* **2017**, *2*, 38–46. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
241. Alvarez, A.; Saez, J.M.; Costa, J.S.D.; Colin, V.L.; Fuentes, M.S.; Cuozzo, S.A.; Benimeli, C.; Polti, M.A.; Amoroso, M.J. Actinobacteria: Current research and perspectives for bioremediation of pesticides and heavy metals. *Chemosphere* **2017**, *166*, 41–62. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
242. Haghollahi, A.; Fazelipour, M.H.; Schaffie, M. The effect of soil type on the bioremediation of petroleum contaminated soils. *J. Environ. Manag.* **2016**, *180*, 197–201. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
243. da Silva, I.G.S.; Gomes de Almeida, F.C.; Padilha da Rocha e Silva, N.M.; Casazza, A.A.; Converti, A.; Asfora Sarubbo, L. Soil Bioremediation: Overview of Technologies and Trends. *Energies* **2020**, *13*, 4664. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
244. Ng, Z.Y.; Ajeng, A.A.; Cheah, W.Y.; Ng, E.P.; Abdullah, R.; Ling, T.C. Towards circular economy: Potential of microalgae–bacterial-based biofertilizer on plants. *J. Environ. Manag.* **2024**, *349*, 119445. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
245. Ren, X.; Zeng, G.; Tang, L.; Wang, J.; Wan, J.; Wang, J. The potential impact on the biodegradation of organic pollutants from composting technology for soil remediation. *Waste Manag.* **2018**, *72*, 138–149. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
246. Sharma, P.; Singh, S.P.; Parakh, S.K.; Tong, Y.W. Health hazards of hexavalent chromium (Cr (VI)) and its microbial reduction. *Bioengineered* **2022**, *13*, 4923–4938. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
247. Giovanella, P.; Vieira, G.A.; Otero, I.V.R.; Pellizzer, E.P.; de Jesus Fontes, B.; Sette, L.D. Metal and organic pollutants bioremediation by extremophile microorganisms. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2020**, *382*, 121024. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
248. Hualpa-Cutipa, E.; Acosta, R.A.S.; Cariga, O.J.M.; Espinoza-Medina, M.A.; Hansen-Reyes, M.; Medina-Cerna, D.; Olanda, M.C.; Cortez-Lázaro, A.A. Omics Insights into Cold Environments: Cold-Tolerant Microorganisms and their Potential Use in Bioremediation. In *Omics Insights in Environmental Bioremediation*; Kumar, V., Thakur, I.S., Eds.; Springer Nature: Singapore, 2022; pp. 437–453.
249. Chaturvedi, R. Extremophiles: Biofactories for Bioremediation. In *Integrative Approaches to Biotechnology*; CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, USA, 2024; pp. 171–185. ISBN 9781003324706.
250. Abdelaziz, S.; Belal, E.E.; Al-Quwaie, D.A.; Ashkan, M.F.; Alqahtani, F.S.; El-Tarabily, K.A.; El-Mageed, T.A.A.; Shami, A.; Nader, M.M.; Hemeda, N.F. Extremophilic bacterial strains as plant growth promoters and biocontrol agents against *Pythium ultimum* and *Rhizocotnia solani*. *Plant Pathol. J.* **2023**, *105*, 1347–1369. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
251. Santos, A.P.; Belfiore, C.; Úrbez, C.; Ferrando, A.; Blázquez, M.A.; Farías, M.E. Extremophiles as plant probiotics to promote germination and alleviate salt stress in soybean. *J. Plant Growth Regul.* **2023**, *42*, 946–959. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
252. Stavi, I.; Thevs, N.; Priori, S. Soil salinity and sodicity in drylands: A review of causes, effects, monitoring, and restoration measures. *Front. Environ. Sci.* **2021**, *9*, 712831. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
253. Navarro-Torre, S.; Garcia-Caparrós, P.; Nogales, A.; Abreu, M.M.; Santos, E.; Cortinhas, A.L.; Caperta, A.D. Sustainable agricultural management of saline soils in arid and semi-arid Mediterranean regions through halophytes, microbial and soil-based technologies. *Environ. Exp. Bot.* **2023**, *212*, 105397. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
254. Atai, E.; Jumbo, R.; Cowley, T.; Azuazu, I.; Coulon, F.; Pawlett, M. Efficacy of bioadmixtures in reducing the influence of salinity on the bioremediation of oil-contaminated soil. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2023**, *892*, 164720. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
255. Rhykerd, R.L.; Weaver, R.W.; McInnes, K.J. Influence of salinity on bioremediation of oil in soil. *Environ. Pollut.* **1995**, *90*, 127–130. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

256. Qin, X.; Tang, J.C.; Li, D.S.; Zhang, Q.M. Effect of salinity on the bioremediation of petroleum hydrocarbons in a saline-alkaline soil. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* **2012**, *55*, 2107. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
257. Kansour, M.K.; Al-Mailem, D.M. Bioremediation of two oil-contaminated Kuwaiti hyper-saline soils by cross bioaugmentation and the role of indigenous halophilic/halotolerant hydrocarbonoclastic bacteria. *Environ. Technol. Innov.* **2023**, *32*, 352–1864. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
258. Nguyen Quoc, K.; Le Vinh, T.; Le Thanh, Q.; Tran Ngoc, H.; Do Thi, X.; Huynh Huu, D.; Ly Ngoc Thanh, X.; Le Thi My, T. Effects of biofertilizer supplementation, *Rhodopseudomonas* spp; on nitrogen and phosphorus uptakes, growth, and yield of sesame (*Sesamum indicum* L.) on salt-affected soil. *J. Plant Nutr.* **2023**, *47*, 1–17. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
259. Hadibarata, T.; Kristanti, R.A.; Bilal, M.; Yilmaz, M.; Sathishkumar, P. Biodegradation mechanism of chlorpyrifos by halophilic bacterium *Hortaea* sp. B15. *Chemosphere* **2023**, *312*, 137260. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
260. Kannan, K.; Sivaperumal, P. Marine halophilic archaeal isolate *Halococcus* sp. with emphasis on bioremediation of radionuclides through extracellular biomolecules. *J. Chem. Technol. Biotechnol.* **2023**. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
261. Iqbal, S.; Hasni, M.S.; Malik, Y.; Baloch, S.; Aamir, R. Halophilic Fungi: Versatile Microorganisms for Biotechnological Advancements. *Pak-Euro J. Med. Life Sci.* **2023**, *6*, 191–198. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
262. Martínez-Espinosa, R.M.; Kumar, S.; Upadhyay, S.K.; Orhan, F. Editorial: Adaptation of halophilic/halotolerant microorganisms and their applications. *Front. Microbiol.* **2023**, *22*, 1252921. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
263. Wang, J.; Liu, Y.; Ma, Y.; Wang, X.; Zhang, B.; Zhang, G.; Bahadur, A.; Chen, T.; Liu, G.; Zhang, W.; et al. Research progress regarding the role of halophilic and halotolerant microorganisms in the eco-environmental sustainability and conservation. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2023**, *418*, 138054. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
264. Barghoth, M.G.; Desouky, S.E.; Radwan, A.A.; Shah, M.P.; Salem, S.S. Characterizations of highly efficient moderately halophilic toluene degrading *exiguobacterium mexicanum* M7 strain isolated from Egyptian saline sediments. *Biotechnol. Genet. Eng. Rev.* **2023**, *40*, 454–472. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
265. Rajkumar, R.; Kurinjimalar, C. Microbiological Activity for Soil and Plant Health Management. In *Microbes and Plant Mineral Nutrition*; Springer: Singapore, 2021; pp. 111–132. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
266. Radhakrishnan, A.; Balaganesh, P.; Vasudevan, M.; Natarajan, N.; Chauhan, A.; Arora, J.; Ranjan, A.; Rajput, V.D.; Sushkova, S.; Minkina, T.; et al. Bioremediation of Hydrocarbon Pollutants: Recent Promising Sustainable Approaches, Scope, and Challenges. *Sustainability* **2023**, *15*, 5847. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
267. Jalali, F.M.; Chahkandi, B.; Gheibi, M.; Eftekhari, M.; Behzadian, K.; Campos, L.C. Developing a smart and clean technology for bioremediation of antibiotic contamination in arable lands. *Sustain. Chem. Pharm.* **2023**, *33*, 101127. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
268. Hwangbo, M.; Shao, Y.; Hatzinger, P.B.; Chu, K.-H. Acidophilic methanotrophs: Occurrence, diversity, and possible bioremediation applications. *Environ. Microbiol. Rep.* **2023**, *15*, 265–281. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
269. Nguyen Quoc, B.; Armenta, M.; Carter, J.A.; Bucher, R.; Sukapantharam, P.; Bryson, S.J.; Stahl, D.A.; Stensel, H.D.; Winkler, M.-K.H. An investigation into the optimal granular sludge size for simultaneous nitrogen and phosphate removal. *Water Res* **2021**, *198*, 117119. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
270. Alegbeleye, O.O.; Opeolu, B.O.; Jackson, V.A. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons: A critical review of environmental occurrence and bioremediation. *Environ. Manag.* **2017**, *60*, 758–783. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
271. Sodhi, K.K.; Kumar, M.; Singh, D.K. Insight into the amoxicillin resistance, ecotoxicity, and remediation strategies. *J. Water Process Eng.* **2021**, *39*, 101858. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
272. Abtahi, H.; Parhamfar, M.; Saeedi, R.; Villasenor, J.; Sartaj, M.; Kumar, V.; Coulon, F.; Parhamfar, M.; Didehdar, M.; Koolivand, A. Effect of competition between petroleum-degrading bacteria and indigenous compost microorganisms on the efficiency of petroleum sludge bioremediation: Field application of mineral-based culture in the composting process. *J. Environ. Manag.* **2020**, *258*, 110013. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
273. Olaniran, A.; Balgobind, A.; Pillay, B. Bioavailability of Heavy Metals in Soil: Impact on Microbial Biodegradation of Organic Compounds and Possible Improvement Strategies. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **2013**, *14*, 10197–10228. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
274. Sar, P.; Kundu, S.; Ghosh, A.; Saha, B. Natural surfactant mediated bioremediation approaches for contaminated soil. *RSC Adv.* **2023**, *13*, 30586–30605. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
275. Roller, B.; Schmidt, T. The physiology and ecological implications of efficient growth. *ISME J.* **2015**, *9*, 1481–1487. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
276. Ho, A.; Di Leonardo, D.P.; Bodelier, P.L.E. Revisiting life strategy concepts in environmental microbial ecology. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* **2017**, *93*, 3. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
277. Neidhardt, F.C. Bacterial growth: Constant obsession with dN/dt. *J. Bacteriol.* **1999**, *181*, 7405–7408. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
278. Moqsud, M.A.; Yoshitake, J.; Bushra, Q.S.; Hyodo, M.; Omine, K.; Strik, D. Compost in plant microbial fuel cell for bioelectricity generation. *Waste Manag.* **2015**, *36*, 63–69. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
279. Irfan, S.; Ranjha, M.M.A.N.; Shafique, B.; Ullah, M.I.; Siddiqui, A.R.; Wang, L. Bioremediation of Soil: An Overview. In *Advances in Bioremediation and Phytoremediation for Sustainable Soil Management*; Malik, J.A., Ed.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2022. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
280. Mazumder, M.A.R.; Jubayer, M.F.; Ranganathan, T.V. Biotechnology for Zero Waste: Emerging Waste Management Techniques. In *Biodegradation of Plastics by Microorganisms*; John Wiley & Sons: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2022; pp. 123–141. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

281. Ji, M.; Zhu, J.; Zhu, R.; Chen, J.; Wang, C. Experiments on the Effects of Dissolved Oxygen on the Free and Immobilization Effective Microorganisms (EM) in Treating Polluted River Water. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Material and Environmental Engineering (ICMAEE 2014), Jiujiang, China, 21–23 March 2014. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
282. Wang, B.; Kuang, S.; Shao, H.; Wang, L.; Wang, H. Anaerobic-petroleum degrading bacteria: Diversity and biotechnological applications for improving coastal soil. *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.* **2021**, *224*, 112646. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
283. Chen, W.Y.; Wu, J.H.; Wang, B.N. Intermittent Oxygen Supply Facilitates Codegradation of Trichloroethene and Toluene by Anaerobic Consortia. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2023**, *57*, 10252–10262. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
284. Bhuyan, P.P.; Nayak, R.; Jena, M.; Pradhan, B. Convolved role of cyanobacteria as biofertilizer: An insight of sustainable agriculture. *Vegetos* **2023**, *36*, 309–321. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
285. Jangir, C.K.; Kumar, S.; Meena, R.S. Sustainable agriculture. In *Significance of Soil Organic Matter to Soil Quality and Evaluation of Sustainability*; Scientific Publisher: Jodhpur, India, 2019; pp. 357–381.
286. Bauder, D.L. Bioremediation of Contaminated Soil. Retrieved Febr. **2006**, 7, 2014.
287. Gao, H.; Wu, M.; Liu, H.; Ou, Y.; Zhang, T.; Duan, X. Unraveling the Positive Effect of Soil Moisture on the Bioaugmentation of Petroleum-Contaminated Soil Using Bioinformatics. *Microb. Ecol.* **2023**, *86*, 2436–2446. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
288. Naorem, A. Will Climate Change Alter the Efficiency of Bioremediation? In *Advances in Bioremediation and Phytoremediation for Sustainable Soil Management*; Malik, J.A., Ed.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2022. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
289. Bahmani, F.; Ataei, S.A.; Mikaili, M.A. The Effect of Moisture Content Variation on the Bioremediation of Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soils: Modeling and Experimental Investigation. *J. Environ. Anal. Chem.* **2018**, *5*, 236. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
290. Kumari, S.; Gautam, K.; Seth, M.; Anbumani, S.; Manickam, N. Bioremediation of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in crude oil by bacterial consortium in soil amended with *Eisenia fetida* and rhamnolipid. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* **2023**, *30*, 82517–82531. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
291. Zeng, J.; Wu, R.; Peng, T.; Li, Q.; Wang, Q.; Wu, Y.; Song, X.; Lin, X. Low-temperature thermally enhanced bioremediation of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon-contaminated soil: Effects on fate, toxicity and bacterial communities. *Environ. Pollut.* **2023**, *335*, 122247. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
292. Norozpour, M.; Sarikhani, M.R.; Aliasgharzad, N. Monitoring of soil respiration changes in a heavy naphtha-contaminated sandy loam soil under different bioremediation treatments. *Water Soil Sci.* **2023**, *33*, 53–72. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
293. Peekate, L.P.; Diepiriye, A.D.; Amadi, M.C. Effect of glucose on biodegradation of hydrocarbons in crude-oil polluted soil undergoing bioremediation. *Asia J. Appl. Microbiol.* **2023**, *10*, 61–69. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
294. Mupambwa, H.A.; Mnkeni, P.N.S. Optimizing the vermicomposting of organic wastes amended with inorganic materials for production of nutrient-rich organic fertilizers: A review. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* **2018**, *25*, 10577–10595. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
295. Kebede, G.; Tafese, T.; Abda, E.M.; Kamaraj, M.; Assefa, F. Factors influencing the bacterial bioremediation of hydrocarbon contaminants in the soil: Mechanisms and impacts. *J. Chem.* **2021**, *2021*, 9823362. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
296. Cavazzoli, S.; Squartini, A.; Sinkkonen, A.; Romantschuk, M.; Rantalainen, A.L.; Selonon, V.; Roslund, M.I. Nutritional additives dominance in driving the bacterial communities succession and bioremediation of hydrocarbon and heavy metal contaminated soil microcosms. *Microbiol. Res.* **2023**, *270*, 127343. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
297. Bala, S.; Garg, D.; Thirumalesh, B.V.; Sharma, M.; Sridhar, K.; Inbara, B.S.; Tripathi, M. Recent Strategies for Bioremediation of Emerging Pollutants: A Review for a Green and Sustainable Environment. *Toxics* **2022**, *10*, 484. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
298. Bilal, M.; Iqbal, H.M. Microbial bioremediation as a robust process to mitigate pollutants of environmental concern. *Case Stud. Chem. Environ. Eng.* **2020**, *2*, 100011. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
299. Sharma, B.; Shukla, P. Futuristic avenues of metabolic engineering techniques in bioremediation. *Biotechnol. Appl. Biochem.* **2022**, *69*, 51–60. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
300. Basak, B.; Dey, A. Bioremediation Approaches for Recalcitrant Pollutants: Potentiality, Successes and Limitation. In *Toxicity and Waste Management Using Bioremediation*; IGI Global: Hershey, PA, USA, 2015. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
301. Li, Q.; Liu, J.; Gadd, G.M. Fungal bioremediation of soil co-contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons and toxic metals. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **2020**, *104*, 8999–9008. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
302. Gupta, K.; Biswas, R.; Sarkar, A. Advancement of Omics: Prospects for Bioremediation of Contaminated Soils. In *Microbial Bioremediation & Biodegradation*; Shah, M., Ed.; Springer: Singapore, 2020. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
303. Rathore, S.; Varshney, A.; Mohan, S.; Dahiya, P. An innovative approach of bioremediation in enzymatic degradation of xenobiotics. *Biotechnol. Genet. Eng. Rev.* **2022**, *38*, 1–32. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
304. Li, X.; Wu, S.; Dong, Y.; Fan, H.; Bai, Z.; Zhuang, X. Engineering Microbial Consortia towards Bioremediation. *Water* **2021**, *13*, 2928. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
305. Mali, H.; Shah, C.; Raghunandan, B.H.; Prajapati, A.S.; Patel, D.H.; Trivedi, U.; Subramanian, R.B. Organophosphate pesticides an emerging environmental contaminant: Pollution, toxicity, bioremediation progress, and remaining challenges. *J. Environ. Sci.* **2023**, *127*, 234–250. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
306. Khatoun, N.; Jamal, A.; Ali, M.I. Polymeric pollutant biodegradation through microbial oxidoreductase: A better strategy to safe environment. *Int. J. Biol. Macromol.* **2017**, *105*, 9–16. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)

307. Peter, J.K.; Singh, R.; Yadav, A.K.; Kothari, R.; Mehta, P.K. Toxicity of nitriles/amides-based products in the environment and their enzymatic bioremediation. *J. Hazard. Mater. Adv.* **2023**, *13*, 100389. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
308. Wang, L.; Du, X.; Li, Y.; Bai, Y.; Tang, T.; Wu, J.; Liang, H.; Gao, D. Enzyme immobilization as a sustainable approach toward ecological remediation of organic-contaminated soils: Advances, issues, and future perspectives. *Crit. Rev. Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2023**, *53*, 1684–1708. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
309. Wang, S.; Cheng, F.; Guo, S. Highly efficient screening and optimal combination of functional isolates for bioremediation of hydrocarbon-polluted soil. *Environ. Res.* **2023**, *219*, 115064. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
310. Bashan, Y.; De-Bashan, L.E.; Prabhu, S.R.; Hernandez, J.P. Advances in plant growth-promoting bacterial inoculant technology: Formulations and practical perspectives (1998–2013). *Plant Soil* **2014**, *378*, 1–33. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
311. Richardson, D.M.; Pyšek, P.; Rejmanek, M.; Barbour, M.G.; Panetta, F.D.; West, C.J. Naturalization and invasion of alien plants: Concepts and definitions. *Divers. Distrib.* **2000**, *6*, 93–107. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
312. Pyšek, P.; Richardson, D.M.; Rejmánek, M.; Webster, G.L.; Williamson, M.; Kirschner, J. Alien plants in checklists and floras: Towards better communication between taxonomists and ecologists. *Taxon* **2004**, *53*, 131–143. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
313. Blackburn, T.M.; Pyšek, P.; Bacher, S.; Carlton, J.T.; Duncan, R.P.; Jarošík, V.; Wilson, J.R.; Richardson, D.M. A proposed unified framework for biological invasions. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **2011**, *26*, 333–339. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
314. Newhouse, J.R. Chestnut Blight. *Sci. Am.* **1990**, *263*, 106–111. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
315. Diagne, C.; Leroy, B.; Vaissière, A.C.; Gozlan, R.E.; Roiz, D.; Jarić, I.; Salles, J.M.; Bradshaw, C.J.; Courchamp, F. High and rising economic costs of biological invasions worldwide. *Nature* **2021**, *592*, 571–576. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
316. IPBES Secretariat. IPBES Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. IPBES Secretariat: Bonn, Germany, 2019; pp. 1–1148. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
317. van Kleunen, M.; Dawson, W.; Essl, F.; Pergl, J.; Winter, M.; Weber, E.; Kreft, H.; Weigelt, P.; Kartesz, J.; Nishino, J.; et al. Global exchange and accumulation of non-native species. *Nature* **2015**, *525*, 100–103. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
318. van Kleunen, M.; Pyšek, P.; Dawson, W.; Essl, F.; Kreft, H.; Pergl, J.; Weigelt, P.; Stein, A.; Dullinger, S.; König, C.; et al. The Global Naturalized Alien Flora (GloNAF) database. *Ecology* **2019**, *100*, e02542. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
319. Pyšek, P.; Pergl, J.; Essl, F.; Lenzner, B.; Dawson, W.; Kreft, H.; Weigelt, P.; Winter, M.; Kartesz, J.; Nishino, M.; et al. Naturalized alien flora of the world: Species diversity, taxonomic and phylogenetic patterns, geographic distribution and global hotspots of plant invasion. *Preslia* **2017**, *89*, 203–274. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
320. Seebens, H.; Essl, F.; Dawson, W.; Fuentes, N.; Moser, D.; Pergl, J.; Pyšek, P.; van Kleunen, M.; Weber, E.; Winter, M.; et al. Global trade will accelerate plant invasions in emerging economies under climate change. *Glob. Change Biol.* **2015**, *21*, 4128–4140. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
321. Glick, B.R. *Beneficial Plant-Bacterial Interactions*, 2nd ed.; Springer International Publishing: Cham, Switzerland, 2020. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
322. Mawarda, P.C.; Le Roux, X.; Dirk van Elsas, J.; Salles, J.F. Deliberate introduction of invisible invaders: A critical appraisal of the impact of microbial inoculants on soil microbial communities. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* **2020**, *148*, 107874. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
323. Arnold, B.J.; Huang, I.T.; Hanage, W.P. Horizontal gene transfer and adaptive evolution in bacteria. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **2022**, *20*, 206–218. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
324. Burmeister, A. Horizontal Gene Transfer. *Evol. Med. Public Health* **2015**, *2015*, 193–194. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
325. Macedo, G.; Olesen, A.K.; Maccario, L.; Hernandez Leal, L.V.D.; Maas, P.; Heederik, D.; Mevius, D.; Sørensen, S.J.; Schmitt, H. Horizontal Gene Transfer of an IncP1 Plasmid to Soil Bacterial Community Introduced by Escherichia coli through Manure Amendment in Soil Microcosms. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2022**, *56*, 11398–11408. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
326. Ronchel, M.C.; Ramos-Díaz, M.; Ramos, J.L. Retrotransfer of DNA in the rhizosphere. *Environ. Microbiol.* **2000**, *2*, 319–323. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
327. Martínez-Carranza, E.; García-Reyes, S.; González-Valdez, A.; Soberón-Chávez, G. Tracking the genome of four Pseudomonas aeruginosa isolates that have a defective Las quorum-sensing system, but are still virulent. *Access Microbiol.* **2020**, *2*, acmi000132. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
328. European Regulation (EU) 2019/1009. Available online: [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=PL_COM:Ares\(2021\)898281](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=PL_COM:Ares(2021)898281) (accessed on 1 May 2024).
329. Dastogeer, K.M.G.; Tumpa, F.H.; Sultana, A.; Akter, M.A.; Chakraborty, A. Plant microbiome—An account of the factors that shape community composition and diversity. *Curr. Plant Biol.* **2020**, *23*, 100161. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
330. Vacheron, J.; Renoud, S.; Muller, D.; Babalola, O.O.; Prigent-Combaret, C. Handbook for Azospirillum. Technical Issues and Protocols. Everything practical you always wanted to know about Azospirillum sp. but were afraid to ask. In *Alleviation of Abiotic and Biotic Stresses in Plants by Azospirillum*; Cassan, F.D., Okon, Y., Cecilia, M., Creus, M.C., Eds.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2015; pp. 333–365.
331. Jones, D.L. Organic acids in the rhizosphere—A critical review. *Plant Soil* **1998**, *205*, 25–44. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
332. Saleem, M.; Law, A.D.; Sahib, M.R.; Pervaiz, Z.H.; Zhang, Q. Impact of root system architecture on rhizosphere and root microbiome. *Rhizosphere* **2018**, *6*, 47–51. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
333. Keswani, C.; Prakash, O.; Bharti, N.; Vilchez, J.I.; Sansinenea, E.; Lally, R.D.; Borriss, R.; Singh, S.P.; Gupta, V.K.; Fraceto, L.F.; et al. Re-addressing the biosafety issues of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2019**, *690*, 841–852. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

334. Zhong, Y.; Yang, Y.; Liu, P.; Xu, R.; Rensing, C.; Fu, X.; Liao, H. Genotype and rhizobium inoculation modulate the assembly of soybean rhizobacterial communities. *Plant Cell Environ.* **2019**, *42*, 2028–2044. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
335. Schwieger, F.; Tebbe, C.C. Effect of field inoculation with *Sinorhizobium meliloti* L33 on the composition of bacterial communities in rhizospheres of a target plant (*Medicago sativa*) and a non-target plant (*Chenopodium album*)—Linking of 16S rRNA gene-based single-strand conformation polymorphism community profiles to the diversity of cultivated bacteria. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2000**, *66*, 3556–3565. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
336. Horácio, E.H.; Zucareli, C.; Gavilanes, F.Z.; Yunes, J.S.; Sanzovo, A.W.d.S.; Andrade, D.S. Co-inoculação de rizobio, azospirillum e cianobactérias no aumento da produção de feijão comum. *Semin. Ciências Agrárias* **2020**, *41* 5supl. S1, 2015–2028. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
337. Trabelsi, D.; Mhamdi, R. Microbial inoculants and their impact on soil microbial communities: A review. *BioMed Res. Int.* **2013**, *2013*, 863240. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
338. Harman, G.E.; Uphoff, N. Symbiotic root-endophytic soil microbes improve crop productivity and provide environmental benefits. *Scientifica* **2019**, *2019*, 9106395. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
339. Baudoin, E.; Nazare, S.; Mougel, C.; Ranjard, L.; Moënné-Loccoz, Y. Impact of inoculation with the phytostimulatory PGPR *Azospirillum lipoferum* CRT1 on the genetic structure of the rhizobacterial community of field-grown maize. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* **2009**, *41*, 409–413. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
340. Herschkovitz, Y.; Lerner, A.; Davidov, Y.; Okon, Y.; Jurkevitch, E. *Azospirillum brasilense* does not affect population structure of specific rhizobacterial communities of inoculated maize (*Zea mays*). *Environ. Microbiol.* **2005**, *7*, 1847–1852. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
341. Lerner, A.; Herschkovitz, Y.; Baudoin, E.; Nazaret, S.; Moenne-Loccoz, Y.; Okon, Y.; Jurkevitch, E. Effect of *Azospirillum brasilense* inoculation on rhizobacterial communities analyzed by denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis and automated ribosomal intergenic spacer analysis. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* **2006**, *38*, 1212–1218. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
342. Correa, O.S.; Romero, A.M.; Montecchia, M.S.; Soria, M.A. Tomato genotype and *Azospirillum* inoculation modulate the changes in bacterial communities associated with roots and leaves. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **2007**, *102*, 781–786. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
343. Andreote, F.D.; De Araújo, W.L.; De Azevedo, J.L.; Van Elsas, J.D.; Da Rocha, U.N.; Van Overbeek, L.S. Endophytic colonization of potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) by a novel competent bacterial endophyte, *Pseudomonas putida* strain P9, and its effect on associated bacterial communities. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2009**, *75*, 3396–3406. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
344. Gao, G.; Yin, D.; Chen, S.; Xia, F.; Yang, J.; Li, Q.; Wang, W. Effect of biocontrol agent *Pseudomonas fluorescens* 2P24 on soil fungal community in cucumber rhizosphere using T-RFLP and DGGE. *PLoS ONE* **2012**, *7*, 31806. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
345. Basiru, S.; Mwanza, H.P.; Hijri, M. Analysis of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungal Inoculant Benchmarks. *Microorganisms* **2020**, *9*, 81. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
346. Koch, A.M.; Antunes, P.M.; Barto, E.K.; Cipollini, D.; Mummey, D.L.; Klironomos, J.N. The effects of arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) fungal and garlic mustard introductions on native AM fungal diversity. *Biol. Invasions* **2011**, *13*, 1627–1639. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
347. Jin, H.; Germida, J.J.; Walley, F.L. Impact of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal inoculants on subsequent arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi colonization in pot-cultured field pea (*Pisum sativum* L.). *Mycorrhiza* **2013**, *23*, 45–59. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
348. Antunes, P.M.; Koch, A.M.; Dunfield, K.E.; Hart, M.M.; Downing, A.; Rillig, M.C.; Klironomos, J.N. Influence of commercial inoculation with *Glomus intraradices* on the structure and functioning of an AM fungal community from an agricultural site. *Plant Soil* **2009**, *317*, 257–266. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
349. Marschner, P.; Timonen, S. Interactions between plant species and mycorrhizal colonization on the bacterial community composition in the rhizosphere. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* **2005**, *28*, 23–36. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
350. Cavagnaro, T.; Jackson, L.E.; Six, J.; Ferris, H.; Goya, S.; Asami, D.; Scow, K.M. Arbuscular mycorrhizas, microbial communities, nutrient availability, and soil aggregates in organic tomato production. *Plant Soil* **2006**, *282*, 209–225. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
351. Monokrousos, N.; Papatheodorou, E.M.; Orfanoudakis, M.; Jones, D.G.; Scullion, J.; Stamou, G.P. The effects of plant type, AMF inoculation and water regime on rhizosphere microbial communities. *Eur. J. Soil Sci.* **2020**, *71*, 265–278. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
352. Salilh, F.Z.; Tarekegn, M.M. Cleaning polluted environments by bioremediation: Review. *IJESC* **2020**, *10*, 27112–27121.
353. Agnolucci, M.; Avio, L.; Pepe, A.; Turrini, A.; Cristani, C.; Bonini, P.; Cirino, V.; Colosimo, F.; Ruzzi, M.; Giovannetti, M. Bacteria associated with a commercial mycorrhizal inoculum: Community composition and multifunctional activity as assessed by illumina sequencing and culture-dependent tools. *Front. Plant Sci.* **2019**, *9*, 1956. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
354. Casas, C.; Omacini, M.; Montecchia, M.S.; Correa, O.S. Soil microbial community responses to the fungal endophyte *Neotyphodium* in Italian ryegrass. *Plant Soil* **2011**, *340*, 347–355. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
355. Rojas, X.; Guo, J.; Leff, J.W.; McNear, D.H.; Fierer, N.; McCulley, R.L. Infection with a shoot-specific fungal endophyte (*Epichloë*) alters tall fescue soil microbial communities. *Microb. Ecol.* **2016**, *72*, 197–206. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
356. Ambrosini, A.; de Souza, R.; Passaglia, L.M. Ecological role of bacterial inoculants and their potential impact on soil microbial diversity. *Plant Soil* **2016**, *400*, 193–207. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
357. Di Salvo, L.P.; Ferrando, L.; Fernández-Scavino, A.; García de Salamone, I.E. Microorganisms reveal what plants do not: Wheat growth and rhizosphere microbial communities after *Azospirillum brasilense* inoculation and nitrogen fertilization under field conditions. *Plant Soil* **2018**, *424*, 405–417. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

358. Eisenhauer, N.; Schulz, W.; Scheu, S.; Jousset, A. Niche dimensionality links biodiversity and invasibility of microbial communities. *Funct. Ecol.* **2013**, *27*, 282–288. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
359. Mar Vázquez, M.; César, S.; Azcón, R.; Barea, J.M. Interactions between arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and other microbial inoculants (*Azospirillum*, *Pseudomonas*, *Trichoderma*) and their effects on microbial population and enzyme activities in the rhizosphere of maize plants. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* **2000**, *15*, 261–272. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
360. Asiloglu, R.; Shiroishi, K.; Suzuki, K.; Turgay, O.C.; Murase, J.; Harada, N. Protist-enhanced survival of a plant growth promoting rhizobacteria, *Azospirillum* sp. B510, and the growth of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) plants. *Appl. Soil. Ecol.* **2020**, *154*, 103599. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
361. He, C.; Wang, W.; Hou, J. Plant growth and soil microbial impacts of enhancing licorice with inoculating dark septate endophytes under drought stress. *Front. Microbiol.* **2019**, *10*, 2277. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
362. Timmusk, S.; Behers, L.; Muthoni, J.; Muraya, A.; Aronsson, A.-C. Perspectives and challenges of microbial application for crop improvement. *Front. Plant Sci.* **2017**, *8*, 49. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
363. Hirsch, P.R. Release of transgenic bacterial inoculants—Rhizobia as a case study. *Plant Soil* **2004**, *266*, 1–10. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
364. Bellanger, X.; Guilloteau, H.; Bonot, S.; Merlin, C. Demonstrating plasmid-based horizontal gene transfer in complex environmental matrices: A practical approach for a critical review. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2014**, *493*, 872–882. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
365. Megharaj, M.; Venkateswarlu, K.; Naidu, R. Bioremediation. In *Encyclopedia of Toxicology*, 3rd ed.; Wexler, P., Ed.; Academic Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2014; pp. 485–489. ISBN 9780123864550. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
366. Lata, S.; Jha, A.; Sharma, M.; Dhawan, S.; Damathia, B. Industrial Sustainability: Economics, Cost, and Bioavailability of Biofertilizers. In *Metabolomics, Proteomes and Gene Editing Approaches in Biofertilizer Industry*; Springer Nature: Singapore, 2023. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
367. Mehnaz, S. An overview of globally available bioformulations. In *Bioformulations: For Sustainable Agriculture*; Arora, N.K., Ed.; Springer: Delhi, India, 2016; pp. 267–281. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
368. Tian, G.; Chiu, C.-Y.; Oladeji, O.; Johnston, T.; Morgan, B.; Cox, A.; Granato, T.; Zhang, H.; Podczewinski, E. JumpStart of soil organic matter with highly stabilized organic amendment: Implication for climate-smart agriculture. *Environ. Chall.* **2023**, *12*, 100726. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
369. Allouzi, M.M.A.; Allouzi, S.M.A.; Keng, Z.X.; Supramaniam, C.V.; Singh, A.; Chong, S. Liquid biofertilizers as a sustainable solution for agriculture. *Heliyon* **2022**, *8*, e12609. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
370. Poddar, R.; Sen, A.; Kundu, R.; Das, H.; Bandopadhyay, P. Response of Various Mycorrhizal Inoculants on Rice Growth, Productivity and Nutrient Uptake. *Int. J. Bio-Resour. Stress Manag.* **2020**, *11*, 171–177. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
371. More, S.A.; Tambe, D.N.; Khamkar, M.B.; Gurav, S.B. Effect of Rhizomyx (combination of different *Glomus* spp.) on plant health, disease incidence, yield and storability of Potato (*Solanum tuberosum*). *Ecol. Environ. Conserv.* **2014**, *20*, 803–806.
372. Aswal, R.S.; Prasad, M.; Kumar, A. Valorization of wastewater through bioremediation approach. In *Biotechnologies for Wastewater Treatment and Resource Recovery*; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2025; pp. 367–375. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
373. Sousa, P.; Kinney, K.A.; Sousa, C.A.; Simões, M. Microalgae for microplastic removal from water and wastewater: A review. *Environ. Chem. Lett.* **2025**, *23*, 611–648. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
374. Colla, L.M.; Rempel, A.; Simon, V.; Berwian, G.; Braun, J.; Freitag, J.; Bender, L.; Fagundes, V.D. Circular economy achievements in agroindustrial waste managements: A current opinion. In *Sustainable Management of Agro-Food Waste*; Academic Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2025; pp. 1–11. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
375. Arias, A.; Feijoo, G.; Moreira, M.T.; Tukker, A.; Cucurachi, S. Advancing waste valorization and end-of-life strategies in the bioeconomy through multi-criteria approaches and the safe and sustainable by design framework. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* **2025**, *207*, 14907. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
376. Srivastava, N.; Maurya, V.K.; Bee, Z.; Singh, N.; Khare, S.; Singh, S.; Agarwal, N.; Rai, P.K. Green Solutions for a blue planet: Harnessing bioremediation for sustainable development and circular economies. In *Biotechnologies for Wastewater Treatment and Resource Recovery*; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2025; pp. 283–296. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
377. Schmuck, J.; Reno, U.; Regaldo, L.; Romero, N.; Polla, W.; Gagnetten, A.M. Current progress and challenges of municipal wastewater phycoremediation and microalgae-based biorefinery. In *Bio Refinery of Wastewater Treatment*; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2025; pp. 19–42. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
378. Bansode, S.A. Municipal wastewater as potential biorefinery. In *Bio Refinery of Wastewater Treatment*; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2025; pp. 53–67. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
379. Sen, D.; Sarkar, A.R. Role of membrane science in the sustainable development of an algal based biorefinery for industrial effluents treatment. In *Biorefinery of Industrial Effluents for a Sustainable Circular Economy*; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2025; pp. 223–234. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
380. Ashraf, M.H.; Khalid, H.; Zainab, M.; Riaz, M.A.; Ullah, R.H.; Hussain, N. Role of microbe-mediated nanoparticles for sustainable pollution control. In *Nanoparticles Synthesis by Soil Microbes*; Academic Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2025; pp. 169–189. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
381. Yadav, A.; Yadav, K. Challenges and opportunities in biofertilizer commercialization. *SVOA Microbiol.* **2024**, *5*, 01–14. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

-
382. Ke, J.; Wang, B.; Yoshikuni, Y. Microbiome engineering: Synthetic biology of plant-associated microbiomes in sustainable agriculture. *Trends Biotechnol.* **2021**, *39*, 244–261. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
383. Tanure, T.M.P.; Domingues, E.P.; Magalhães, A.S. Regional impacts of climate change on agricultural productivity: Evidence on large-scale and family farming in Brazil. *Rev. Econ. Sociol. Rural.* **2024**, *62*, e262515. [[CrossRef](#)]

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.