

Role of Rhizobacterial Secondary Metabolites in Crop Protection Against Agricultural Pests and Diseases

Luis Andrés Yarzábal^{1,2} and Eduardo J. Chica³

¹Unit of Health and Wellbeing, Catholic University of Cuenca, Cuenca, Ecuador ²School of Biology, Faculty of Sciences, University of Los Andes, Mérida, Venezuela ³Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, University of Cuenca, Cuenca, Ecuador

OUTLINE

3.1 Introduction	31	3.5 Regulation of Secondary Metabolites' Production	42
3.2 Early Uses of Biocontrol Methods in Agriculture	32	3.5.1 Regulation by Root Exudates Composition	43
3.3 Microbial Secondary Metabolites	33	3.5.2 Regulation by Microbial Signals (Quorum-Sensing Signals)	43
3.4 Rhizobacterial Secondary Metabolites and Biological Control	34	3.6 Microbial Metabolites and Biopesticides Development	44
3.4.1 Antibiotics	34	3.7 Concluding Remarks	45
3.4.2 Iron Sequestering	39	References	46
3.4.3 Chemical Communication Interference	40		
3.4.4 Priming of Induced Systemic Resistance	41		

3.1 INTRODUCTION

For more than a century, farmers and scientists have been aware of the existence of the so-called “suppressive soils.” In these soils, the manifestation of soilborne plant diseases—caused by a preexistent or an inoculated pathogen—is either kept to a minimum or completely absent, even if a susceptible plant host is cultivated in there. The reasons explaining this lack of infectivity are diverse: the pathogens may either fail to colonize or persist in these soils; if they are established, they may cause little or no damage to crops; or they may infect crops and cause some disease symptoms at first but, with successive cropping, the disease declines [1,2].

Even though some abiotic factors may account for this *suppressiveness* (including pH, organic matter, and/or clay content), this intriguing phenomenon is very often the consequence of soil microbial activity [3]. Indeed, when a plant pathogen is introduced into a naturally suppressive soil, the severity of the disease it causes is attenuated or suppressed by the activity of the indigenous microbial communities. This suppression may be either general (i.e., due to the antagonistic activity of the entire microbial community) or specific (i.e., due to the