# International Journal of Chemical Studies

P-ISSN: 2349-8528 E-ISSN: 2321-4902 IJCS 2018; 6(6): 2464-2469 © 2018 IJCS Received: 19-09-2018 Accepted: 23-10-2018

#### Kathari Lakshmaiah

Department of Floriculture and Landscape Gardening, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

#### P Aruna

Department of Floriculture and Landscape Gardening, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

#### M Ganga

Department of Floriculture and Landscape Gardening, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

Correspondence Kathari Lakshmaiah Department of Floriculture and Landscape Gardening, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

# Physiological studies and nutrient analysis on the suitability of *Clerodendrum inermi*, *Leucophyllum frutescens* and *Acalypha hispida* shrubs for use in landscaping under salinity conditions

# Kathari Lakshmaiah, P Aruna and M Ganga

#### Abstract

The present study pertains to the effect of salt stress on three ornamental shrubs of Clerodendrum inerme, Leucophyllum frutescens and Acalypha hispida and their suitability for salinity condition. Ten saline treatments were taken viz., 6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 42, 48, 54 dS/m and 0.04 dS/m (Control). The treatments were imposed by irrigating the plants with desired amount of NaCl dissolved in irrigation water. Plants were watered on alternate days (1 litre plant<sup>-1</sup>) to simulated salinity conditions as seen near coastal belt. The observations were recorded on physiological parameters and nutrient analysis (K, Na), Clerodendrum and Leucophyllum were tolerant to salinity. Leucophyllum and Clerodendrum experienced a strong reduction in growth and a delay in flowering but no toxicity symptoms or mortality was recorded. These species were found to be moderate NaCl accumulators. Acalypha was sensitive to salinity, as 50% of the plants exhibited mortality and the surviving ones experienced a heavy reduction of growth and increased accumulation of NaCl in the leaves. Physiological parameters of relative water content (RWC) and membrane stability index which were found to decrease with increase in salt concentrations. Clerodendrum registered higher total chlorophyll content (SPAD value 56.73), membrane stability index (49.9 %) and Leucophyllum registered higher relative water content (70.13 %) at higher level of salt concentrations (54 dSm<sup>-1</sup>). At higher salt levels, the percentage of nutrient contents were recorded as the K<sup>+</sup> concentration was found to be decreased with increasing levels of salt concentration. In the present investigation, Leucophyllum frutescens and Acalypha hispida were recorded as higher K<sup>+</sup> content (1.05 and 1.02% respectively) in the leaf at higher salt levels followed by *Clerodendrum inerme* (0.94%).

Keywords: salinity, physiological parameters, RWC, membrane stability index

#### Introduction

Among the commercial ornamental plants, *Clerodendrum inerme* (Verbenaceae) is a much branched, straggling shrub, 1-2 m tall. The plant is tough to sustain periodic trimming well, and hence, is commonly used as a hedge plant in India. It grows well on the beach, tolerating all the salty water sprays. Within India, it is found throughout, particularly near coastal regions. *Acalypha hispida*, the Chenille plant is a flowering shrub which belongs to the family Euphorbiaceae. Acalypha is the fourth largest genus of the Euphorbiaceae family, and contains many plants native to Hawaii and Oceania. The plant is dioecious, and therefore there are distinct male and female members of the species. The female plant bears pistillate flowers which range in colour from purple to bright red, and grow in clusters along catkins. This feature is the primary reason the plant bears the nickname "red-hot cat tail". The pistillates will grow all year long as long as the temperatures are favourable. *Leucophyllum frutescens* is an evergreen shrub in the figwort family, Scrophulariaceae, native to the state of Texas in the south western United States and northern Mexico. Hence, it is popularly called as 'Texas Sage', commonly used for edge in warmer and drier areas.

Salinity is one of the major environmental factors limiting plant growth and productivity. It is estimated that about one-third of world's cultivated land is affected by salinity (Kaya *et al.*, 2003)<sup>[12]</sup>. Worldwide, more than 800 million hectares of land are salt affected and tolerance to this salinity differs greatly among plant species (Munns and Tester, 2008)<sup>[5]</sup>. In India alone, about 30 million hectares of coastal land is lying barren and uncultivable because of soil affected by salinity. Salt stress in soil or water is one of the major stresses especially in arid

and semi-arid regions and can severely limit plant growth and productivity (Allakhverdier *et al.*, 2000). It is a common environmental problem and an important factor limiting crop production, since it is a combined result of the complex interactions among different Physiological processes (Singh and Chatrath, 2001; Munns and Tester, 2008) <sup>[26, 5]</sup>.

Of late, one of the major factors in the salt tolerance is believed to be the existence of succulence. Halophytes survive salt concentration equal to or greater than that of seawater and possess physiological mechanisms that maintain lower water potential inside the cell than that in the soil (Munns and Termaat, 1986)<sup>[8]</sup>. In saline environment, controlling the salt concentration of the aerial plant parts by restriction of entry through the roots (is there any role of caspacian layer in roots) and limiting transport to the shoots is an important mechanism allowing plants to survive and grow under salinity (Colmer et al., 2005) [6]. The main effect of salinity on glycophytes is reduced growth (Munns and Termaat, 1986)<sup>[8]</sup> and this reduction has been used in many studies as a measure of resistance to saline conditions (Sanchez-Blanco et al., 1991)<sup>[22]</sup>. In most arid and semiarid areas, salinity is accentuated by competition for high quality water among agriculture, industry and landscape users which has promoted the use of alternative water sources for irrigation. Thus marginal quality water, somewhat saline, will become important in these areas (Chartzoulakis et al., 2002) <sup>[5]</sup> and could be used for the irrigation of ornamental plants (Carter *et al.*, 2005)<sup>[3]</sup>. However, the use of low quality water for irrigation affects plants in different ways, depending on the degree of salt tolerance of the species and even within a given species (Sanchez-Blanco et al., 2003)<sup>[23]</sup>.

Hence, the objective of this study was physiologically assessing the growth pattern of three popular ornamental shrubs (*Leucophyllum frutescence*, *Acalypha hispida* and *Clerodendrum inerme*) and also to estimate the percentage of nutrient contents (K, Na) of the respective shrubs under different salt concentration levels.

#### **Material and Methods**

The experiment was conducted at the Botanic Gardens, Department of Floriculture and Landscaping, Horticultural College and Research Institute, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore during 2015-2016.

#### Soil characteristics

The media used for growing was pure river sand which was filled in the plot to a depth of 30 cm from the growth level and. The media was analyzed for physical and chemical properties and the results are presented in Table. 1.

Table 1: Physical and Chemical properties of the media (River sand)

S. No	Parameters	Value
1	Organic carbon	0.56%
2	pH	8.61
3	EC	0.06 dS m <sup>-1</sup>
4	Available N	76 kg ha <sup>-1</sup>
5	Available P(Olsen's)	9.9 kg ha <sup>-1</sup>
6	Available K	204 kg ha <sup>-1</sup>
7	Available Zn	0.72 ppm
8	Available Cu	1.79 ppm
9	Available Fe	0.54 ppm
10	Available Mn	2.41 ppm
11	Available S	28 ppm
12	Extractable Mg	69.5 ppm
13	Extractable Ca	85.9 ppm

#### Water composition

The experimental field was irrigated using potable water during the initial period of plant establishment. The properties of the irrigation water were used are given in Table. 2

 Table 2: Composition of Salts and Residual ions from the irrigated water

S. no	Parameters	Value				
1.	pН	6.26				
2.	EC	0.04 dS/m				
3.	Ca	0.64 meq/L				
4.	Mg	0.55 meq/L				
5.	Na	0.03 meq/L				
6.	K	0.02 meq/L				
7.	HCO <sub>3</sub>	0.80 meq/L				
8.	Cl	1.60 meq/L				
9.	SAR	0.04				
10.	Adjusted SAR	0.04				
	Salt Species (meq/L)					
1.	Calcium bicarbonate	0.64				
2.	Magnesium bicarbonate	0.16				
3.	Magnesium chloride	0.39				
4.	Sodium chloride	0.03				
5.	Potassium chloride	0.02				
	Residuations (meq/L)					
1.	Chloride	1.16				

#### List of plant species used for the screening study

The plant species involved in the study and their source is furnished below.

Common name	Botanical name	Source
Glory bower	Clerodendrum inerme	Botanic Gardens, TNAU
Purple sage	Leucophyllum frutescens	Botanic Gardens, TNAU
Red-hot cat tail	Acalypha hispida	Botanic Gardens, TNAU

The selected plantspecies were screened for tolerance to various levels of salinity stress, based on the observations carried out on growth, morphological, physiological, and biochemical parameters.

#### Statistical design

**Design:** Factorial Completely Randomized Design (FCRD)

S. No	Factor	Species	/ levels in factor					
	Easten 1. Diant	P <sub>1</sub> -Cler	odendrum inerme					
1	Factor I -Plant	P <sub>2</sub> - Leucophyllum frutescens						
	species	P <sub>3</sub> - Acalypha hispida						
		S1- 6 dS m <sup>-1</sup>	S <sub>6</sub> - 36 dS m <sup>-1</sup>					
	Esster 2	S <sub>2</sub> - 12 dS m <sup>-1</sup>	S7 - 42dS m <sup>-1</sup>					
2	Factor 2 -	S <sub>3</sub> - 18 dS m <sup>-1</sup>	S <sub>8</sub> - 48 dS m <sup>-1</sup>					
	Samily Levels	S4 - 24 dS m <sup>-1</sup>	S <sub>9</sub> - 54 dS m <sup>-1</sup>					
		S5 - 30 dS m <sup>-1</sup>	$S_{10} - 0.04 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$ (Control)					

Duration of the study: 90 days

Number of replications: 2

#### Planting and study period

The cuttings were planted during August, 2015 in earthen pots of 40 x 30 cm size, provided with drainage holes at the bottom. The pots were filled with 5 kg soil containing mixture of sand, soil and FYM in the ratio of 1:2:1. The plants were maintained at optimal conditions by watering, weeding, manuring and plant protection sprays and were allowed to grow until they attained three to four fully mature leaves (90 days). The salinity stress treatments as indicated below were imposed when the plants attained three months of age so as to evaluate the influence of salt stress.

### **Imposition of salt stress**

The stress treatments were imposed by irrigating with the NaCl dissolved water. Plants were watered at alternate days (1 litre plant<sup>-1</sup>) with NaCl dissolved water to provide respective concentration of EC (6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 42, 48, 54 dS/m and 0.04 dS/m (Control) after measuring the moisture content of the soil. For control, set of plants was maintained adjacent to the each of the treatment. The control (T<sub>10</sub>) plant were irrigated with water (EC = 0.04 dS/m and 6.8 pH) without any added NaCl. The treatment details are as follows.

Treatment	details
Treatment	details

<b>Treatment Notation</b>	EC (dS/m)
$T_1$	6
$T_2$	12
T <sub>3</sub>	18
$T_4$	24
T5	30
T <sub>6</sub>	36
<b>T</b> <sub>7</sub>	42
$T_8$	48
<b>T</b> 9	54
Control- T <sub>10</sub>	0.04(Siruvani water)*

\*Siruvani water is from Siruvani river in Coimbatore, which is a major source of drinking water.

# **Result and Discussion**

Physiological assessment and percentage of nutrient contents on the growth pattern of three popular ornamental shrubs frutescence, Acalypha (Leucophyllum hispida and Clerodendrum inerme) under different salt concentration levels. Relative water content is an appropriate method to assess the plant water status, which in turn can be used to screen the plants for stress tolerance. Among the plant species, maximum mean RWC (76.46%) was observed in, Clerodendrum inerme followed by Leucophyllum frutescens (75.17%) and the minimum mean RWC (50.31%) was observed in Acalypha hispida. RWC in plants is mainly dependant on the water status of the rhizosphere (Saeed et al., 2014) <sup>[21]</sup>. In the present study, it could be observed that

salinity levels resulted in drastic reductions in RWC, especially at higher concentrations of NaCl. The plant species exhibited differential rates of reduction in RWC in the ten salt stress levels tested. Among the treatments, the control registered highest RWC. The RWC was less in Acalypha *hispida* in the treatments  $T_6 - T_9$  compared to *Clerodendrum* inerme and Leucophyllum frutescence which maintained higher level of RWC, whereas the susceptible registered least RWC (<65.3%). Among different salt concentrations, the maximum mean RWC (91.53 %) was observed in T<sub>10</sub> control (0.04 dS/m) and the minimum mean relative water content (45.40 %) was observed in T<sub>8</sub> (48 dS/m) treatment. The decrease in RWC may be to be due to high salt concentration of the external solution, which causes osmotic stress and dehydration at the cellular level. In addition, lowering the water potential in the protoplast alters the integrity of photosynthetic apparatus via photo-phosphoryliosis and electron transfer. The findings of this experiment were in accordance to the observations reported by Neocleous and Vasilakakis (2007) <sup>[16]</sup>; Hajiboland et al., 2014 <sup>[10]</sup> and Khayyat et al., 2014<sup>[13]</sup>. The result of the experiment revealed that the relative water content exhibited significant difference in the interactions of plant species and salt levels. The maximum relative water content was recorded in  $P_3T_{10}$ (95.06%), followed by  $P_1T_{10}$  (93.10%) and  $P_2T_{10}$  (86.44%). The minimum relative water content was recorded in  $P_1T_9$ (65.98%), followed by P<sub>1</sub>T<sub>8</sub> (66.72%) (Table.3)

A significant reduction in membrane stability index (MSI) in leaf due to imposed salt stress was observed in all the plants. Among interaction, the maximum MSI (73.79%) was observed in *Clerodendrum inerme*, in control, and the minimum MSI (43.0 %) was observed in *Leucophyllum frutescens*. with T<sub>9</sub> (54 dS/m) treatment. Osmotic stress can be triggered by decreased water potential at low or moderate salinity levels, which in turn causes cell dehydration (Ondrasek *et al.*, 2009) <sup>[18]</sup>. This influences water and nutrient uptake and stomatal closure (partially or fully) leading to reduction in transpiration and CO<sub>2</sub> accumulation, reduction in cell growth and development, decreased leaf area and chlorophyll content, accelerated defoliation and senescence, ultimately resulting mortality of plant (Shannon and Grive, 1999) <sup>[25]</sup>. (Table.4)

Table 3: Effect of salinity on relative water of	content (RWC) of Clerodendrum inerm	ie, Leucophyllum frutescens a	and Acalypha hispida
--	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------

Relative water content (%)												
<b>T</b> 1	<b>T</b> <sub>2</sub>	<b>T</b> 3	<b>T</b> 4	T5	<b>T</b> 6	<b>T</b> 7	<b>T</b> 8	T9	T <sub>10</sub>	Mean		
87.93	80.34	76.58	74.34	70.34	68.35	68.00	66.72	65.98	93.10	75.17		
83.87	80.67	78.43	76.12	73.68	72.67	71.65	70.89	70.13	86.44	76.46		
87.59	84.19	81.02	78.58	76.23	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	95.06	50.31		
86.46	81.73	78.68	76.35	73.42	47.04	46.58	45.90	45.40	91.53	67.31		
		Р			Т		РХТ					
	0	.73		1.34				2.33				
	1.5	50**				4.76**						
ecies		S	alt concen	trations (c	lS/m)							
rum iner	те	T1-6	T4 - 24	T7 - 42	- 42		** <b>I</b> ]	liahler ai	anifiaan			
2 - Leucophyllum frutescens			T5 - 30	T <sub>8</sub> - 48	110 - 0.04		***Hignly significant					
P <sub>3</sub> - Acalypha hispida			T <sub>6</sub> - 36	T9 - 54	(contro	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,						
	T1           87.93           83.87           87.59           86.46           ecies           rum iner           m frutesco           a hispida	T1         T2           87.93         80.34           83.87         80.67           87.59         84.19           86.46         81.73           0         1.5           ecies         1.5           rum inerme         m frutescens           a hispida         1.5	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Ref           T1         T2         T3         T4 $87.93$ $80.34$ $76.58$ $74.34$ $83.87$ $80.67$ $78.43$ $76.12$ $87.59$ $84.19$ $81.02$ $78.58$ $86.46$ $81.73$ $78.68$ $76.35$ P           0.73           1.50**           ecies         Salt concent           rum inerme $T_1-6$ $T_4 - 24$ m frutescens $T_2 - 12$ $T_5 - 30$ a hispida $T_3 - 18$ $T_6 - 36$	Relative wat           T1         T2         T3         T4         T5 $87.93$ $80.34$ $76.58$ $74.34$ $70.34$ $83.87$ $80.67$ $78.43$ $76.12$ $73.68$ $87.59$ $84.19$ $81.02$ $78.58$ $76.23$ $86.46$ $81.73$ $78.68$ $76.35$ $73.42$ P $0.73$ $0.73$ ecies         Salt concentrations (or rum inerme $T_{1-6}$ $T_4 - 24$ $T_7 - 42$ $m$ frutescens $T_2 - 12$ $T_5 - 30$ $T_8 - 48$ $a$ hispida $T_3 - 18$ $T_6 - 36$ $T_9 - 54$	Relative water contended           T1         T2         T3         T4         T5         T6 $87.93$ $80.34$ $76.58$ $74.34$ $70.34$ $68.35$ $83.87$ $80.67$ $78.43$ $76.12$ $73.68$ $72.67$ $87.59$ $84.19$ $81.02$ $78.58$ $76.23$ $0.10$ $86.46$ $81.73$ $78.68$ $76.35$ $73.42$ $47.04$ P         T           0.73         1.3.3           1.50**         2.75           ecies         Salt concentrations (dS/m)           rum inerme         T1-6         T4 - 24         T7 - 42 $m$ frutescens         T2 - 12         T5 - 30         T8 - 48         T10 - 0. $a$ hispida         T3 - 18         T6 - 36         T9 - 54         T10 - 0.	Relative water contert (%)           T1         T2         T3         T4         T5         T6         T7           87.93         80.34         76.58         74.34         70.34         68.35         68.00           83.87         80.67         78.43         76.12         73.68         72.67         71.65           87.59         84.19         81.02         78.58         76.23         0.10         0.10           86.46         81.73         78.68         76.35         73.42         47.04         46.58           P         T           0.73         1.34         1.50**         2.75**           ecies         Salt concentrations (dS/m)           rum inerme         T1-6         T4 - 24         T7 - 42           m frutescens         T2 - 12         T5 - 30         T8 - 48         T0-0.04           a hispida         T3 - 18         T6 - 36         T9 - 54         T0-0.4	Relative water content (%)           T1         T2         T3         T4         T5         T6         T7         T8           87.93         80.34         76.58         74.34         70.34         68.35         68.00         66.72           83.87         80.67         78.43         76.12         73.68         72.67         71.65         70.89           87.59         84.19         81.02         78.58         76.23         0.10         0.10         0.10           86.46         81.73         78.68         76.35         73.42         47.04         46.58         45.90           P         T           0.73         1.34         2.75**           ecies         Salt concentrations (dS/m)         2.75**           rum inerme         T1-6         T4 - 24         T7 - 42         T10 - 0.04         (control)           m frutescens         T2 - 12         T5 - 30         T8 - 48         (control)         **H	Relative water content (%)T1T2T3T4T5T6T7T8T9 $87.93$ $80.34$ $76.58$ $74.34$ $70.34$ $68.35$ $68.00$ $66.72$ $65.98$ $83.87$ $80.67$ $78.43$ $76.12$ $73.68$ $72.67$ $71.65$ $70.89$ $70.13$ $87.59$ $84.19$ $81.02$ $78.58$ $76.23$ $0.10$ $0.10$ $0.10$ $0.10$ $86.46$ $81.73$ $78.68$ $76.35$ $73.42$ $47.04$ $46.58$ $45.90$ $45.40$ PT $0.73$ $1.34$ $2.75**$ eciesSalt concentrations (dS/m) $r_{1.6}$ $T_4 - 24$ $T_7 - 42$ <i>mfrutescens</i> $T_2 - 12$ $T_5 - 30$ $T_8 - 48$ $T_{10} - 0.04$ <i>a hispida</i> $T_3 - 18$ $T_6 - 36$ $T_9 - 54$ $T_{10} - 0.04$	Relative water content (%)T1T2T3T4T5T6T7T8T9T1087.9380.3476.5874.3470.3468.3568.0066.7265.9893.1083.8780.6778.4376.1273.6872.6771.6570.8970.1386.4487.5984.1981.0278.5876.230.100.100.1095.0686.4681.7378.6876.3573.4247.0446.5845.9045.4091.53PTP X T0.731.342.331.50**2.75**4.76**eciesSalt concentrations (dS/m)T10 - 0.04 (control)T10 - 0.04 (control)**Highly significan <i>nfrutescens</i> T2 - 12T5 - 30T8 - 48 T3 - 18T6 - 36T9 - 54**Highly significan		

\*Significant at 5% level

Table 4: Effect of salt stress on Membrane Stability Index (%) of Clerodendrum inerme, Leucophyllum frutescens and Acalypha hispida

				3.6	1 04	1 ·1·4 T					
Treatmonts				Mem	brane Sta	bility Inc	lex (%)				
Treatments	$T_1$	$T_2$	<b>T</b> <sub>3</sub>	$T_4$	T5	<b>T</b> 6	$T_7$	<b>T</b> <sub>8</sub>	T9	T <sub>10</sub>	Mean
<b>P</b> <sub>1</sub>	72.42	68.41	65.76	64.02	60.76	57.32	54.76	52.91	49.95	73.79	62.01
$P_2$	67.32	64.31	61.87	57.08	54.69	50.82	48.04	45.97	43	70.32	56.34
P3	66.31	63.59	60.17	58.14	55.01	52.44	50.1	49.03	48.09	67.47	57.04
Mean	68.68	65.44	62.6	59.75	56.82	53.53	50.97	49.3	47.01	70.53	58.46
Interactions		]	Р			Т			РХТ		
SE(d)		0.	59		1.08				1.87		
CD (P=0.05)		1.2	1**			2.21	**		3.83**		
Plant sp	vecies		S	alt concer	trations (d	lS/m)			- ·		
P <sub>1</sub> - Clerodend	lrum inern	m inerme $T_1-6$ $T_4-24$				то	04	44TT 11 · · · ·			
P2 - Leucophyllu	um frutesc	ens	T <sub>2</sub> - 12	T <sub>5</sub> - 30	T <sub>8</sub> - 48	(Control)			fightly significant		
P <sub>3</sub> - Acalyph	na hispida	<i>hispida</i> T <sub>3</sub> - 18 T <sub>6</sub> - 36				(Contro	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				
C' C + + 50/ 1	1										

\*Significant at 5% level

Total chlorophyll index was recorded among the plant species, maximum mean chlorophyll index (56.04) was observed in Leucophyllum followed by Clerodendrum (55.19). The minimum mean chlorophyll index (21.10) was observed in Acalypha hispida. In different salt concentrations, the maximum mean chlorophyll index (56.32) was observed in control (0.04dS/m) and the minimum mean chlorophyll index (34.95) was observed in treatments T<sub>8</sub> (48dS/m). SPAD value has a strong positive and significant correlation with chlorophyll a, b, total chlorophyll and RWC. The trend of SPAD values observed in the study in three plant species followed the trend of chlorophyll and indicated that Clerodendrum inerme, and Leucophyllum frutescens were less affected at  $T_{10}$  (control) (0.04dS/m) (62.74), Higher reductions were observed at higher salt concentrations. Significant differences were observed in the interaction effect between plant species and salt levels. The maximum chlorophyll index was recorded in  $P_1T_{10}$  (62.74), followed by  $P_1T_1$  (61.22),  $P_2T_1$ (59.34), P<sub>1</sub>T<sub>2</sub>(57.93) which are all on par with each other. The minimum chlorophyll index was recorded in  $P_3T_5$  (26.16). Chlorophyll a concentration is usually reduced by salinity because of suppression of specific enzymes responsible for synthesis of photosynthetic pigments (Murkute *et al.*, 2006) <sup>[15]</sup> (Table.5).



Plate 1: Field view

Treatments				Chloro	phyll ind	lex (SPA	AD valu	ue)			
Treatments	<b>T</b> 1	$T_2$	<b>T</b> 3	<b>T</b> 4	<b>T</b> 5	<b>T</b> 6	<b>T</b> 7	<b>T</b> 8	T9	T <sub>10</sub>	Mean
<b>P</b> <sub>1</sub>	61.22	57.93	57.39	56.1	53.37	52.72	51.03	49.95	49.51	62.74	55.19
P2	59.34	57.26	57.24	56.43	54.35	52.68	53.73	54.9	56.73	57.8	56.04
P3	40.35	36.35	32.91	26.48	26.16	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	48.42	21.10
Mean	53.63	50.51	49.18	46.33	44.62	35.16	34.95	34.98	35.44	56.32	44.11
Interactions		]	Р		Т				РХТ		
SE(d)		0.2	277		0.506				0.877		
CD (P=0.05)		0.50	56**		1.034**				1.792**		
Plant sp	pecies		Sal	t concen	trations (	(dS/m)					
P <sub>1</sub> - Clerodendrum inerme			T1-6	T4 - 24	T <sub>7</sub> - 42			ψψ <b>ΙΙ 1 1 · · (* · ·</b>			nt.
P <sub>2</sub> - Leucophyllum frutescens			T <sub>2</sub> - 12	T5 - 30	T <sub>8</sub> - 48	T <sub>10</sub> - 0	.04	ччп	gmy si	giinica	m
P <sub>3</sub> - Acalyph	a hispid	'a	T3 - 18	T <sub>6</sub> - 36	T9 - 54						

Table 5: Effect of salinity on chlorophyll index (SPAD value) of Clerodendrum inerme, Leucophyllum frutescens and Acalypha hispida

\*Significant at 5% level

#### Nutrient analysis

In the present investigation, *Clerodendrum inerme* and *Acalypha hispida* recorded lower increase in potassium content (0.94% and 1.02% respectively) in the leaf under T<sub>9</sub> treatment and least decreasein *Leucophyllum frutescens* (1.05% respectively) in the leaf under T<sub>9</sub> treatment. The effect of salt stress on leaf potassium content was differed among the plants were among the plants, maximum mean leaf potassium content (1.68%) was observed in *Acalypha hispida*, whereas the minimum mean leaf potassium content (1.60%) was observed in *Clerodendrum inerme*. Among the treatments, the maximum mean leaf potassium content (2.07%) was observed in control, the minimum mean leaf potassium content (1.00%) was observed in treatments T<sub>9</sub>. A significant reduction in

leaf potassium content in leaf due to imposed salt stress in all the plants. Among interaction, the maximum mean leaf potassium (2.08) was observed in *Leucophyllum frutescens* in control, and the minimum mean leaf potassium content (1.01%) was observed in *Clerodendrum inerme* with T<sub>8</sub> (48 dS/m) (Table.6) the reason might be due to increased K uptake implicates in reducing the toxic ions entering into the plants from the soil solution, and such exclusion mechanism can be an added advantage to the tolerant variety. It is well documented that a greater degree of salt tolerance in plants is associated with a more efficient system for the selective uptake of K<sup>+</sup> over Na<sup>+</sup> (Noble and Rogers, 1992; Ashraf and O'Leary, 1996). In conditions, where the salt concentration is higher in soil, the plant gets more sodium (Na+) ions than it requires and thereby blocks the intake of potassium (K+) and calcium (Ca+) ions into the leaves (Turhan and Seniz, 2010)  $^{[27]}$ .

Based on the above findings, it can be concluded that under high salinity stress, the three plant species exhibited lower levels of Na<sup>+</sup> concentrations. Moreover, salt stress increased the  $Na^+$  concentrations concomitant with a decrease in  $K^+$ accumulations in comparatively salt sensitive plants. Thus, in addition to the toxic effects of high concentrations of Na<sup>+</sup> in plant tissue, the salinity also induced changes in mineral nutrition uptake and thereby. Furthermore, tolerant nature of Clerodendrum inerme, Leucophyllum frutescens and Acalypha hispida plant species may be due to uptake and further accumulation of Na<sup>+</sup>. Among the plants, maximum mean leaf sodium content (0.55 %) was observed in plant Clerodendrum inerme, whereas the minimum mean leaf sodium content (0.53 %) was observed in Acalypha hispida and Leucophyllum frutescens. Among the treatments, the maximum mean leaf sodium content (0.69%) was observed in treatment T<sub>9</sub> and the minimum mean leaf sodium content (0.41 %) was observed in. control. Sodium ion concentrations in leaf tissues increased with increasing salinity in all plants. The maximum leaf sodium content (0.70%) was recorded in Leucophyllum frutescens, and the minimum leaf sodium content (0.39%) was recorded in Acalypha hispida (Table.7). The findings of this experiment was in accordance with results of study conducted by Pandey et al. (2014)<sup>[19]</sup> in olive, Hajiboland et al. (2014) [10] in pistachio seedlings and Schmutz and Ludders (1999) <sup>[23]</sup> in mango. These results are similar to those of Dudeck et al. (1983) [7] who reported a reduction in K but increment in Na levels in Bermuda grass cultivars. Qian et al. (2000)<sup>[20]</sup> noted a reduction in K and an increase in shoot Na concentration of Zoysia grass cultivars at 42.5dS m<sup>-1</sup>. When NaCl level increased to 15 dS m<sup>-1</sup>, the plants exposed to saline stress might have also encountered difficulty in obtaining required nutrients due to modified selectivity of nutrients. The requirement for increased nutrient concentration in the medium of NaCl stressed plants is due to competition by Na with cations (K, Ca, and Mg) (Yeo and Flowers, 1984) <sup>[28]</sup>. Accumulation of cytoplasmic Na<sup>+</sup> can interfere with the catalytic role of  $K^+$  related to many metabolic processes including conversion of sugars to starch biosynthesis (Chartzoulakis et al., 2006)<sup>[4]</sup>. When the ion concentration in the cytoplasm generally ranges from 100 to 200 mM, the cytoplasm and shows a strong affinity for K over Na, Mg over Ca and phosphate over chloride or nitrate. Under saline conditions, large quantities of inorganic salts (mainly NaCl) absorbed into the leaves are accumulated mainly in the vacuole (Heslop-Harrison and Reger, 1986)<sup>[11]</sup> reported that a halophyte such as Suaeda martitima showed optimum growth under high salt concentration. Most of the plants die under salinity due to accumulation of Na<sup>+</sup> or Cl<sup>-</sup> which may limit the flow of carbon compound to meristem and growing zones in leaves, which leads to death of plants.

Table 6: Effect of salinity on Potassium content (%) of Clerodendrum inerme, Leucophyllum frutescens and Acalypha hispida

Treatmonte				]	Potassiur	n cont	ent (	%)				
Treatments	<b>T</b> <sub>1</sub>	$T_2$	<b>T</b> <sub>3</sub>	<b>T</b> 4	<b>T</b> 5	T <sub>6</sub>	<b>T</b> <sub>7</sub>	<b>T</b> <sub>8</sub>	T9	T <sub>10</sub>	Mean	
<b>P</b> <sub>1</sub>	2.06	1.92	1.82	1.75	1.55	1.48	1.37	1.01	0.94	2.07	1.60	
$P_2$	2.07	1.98	1.76	1.71	1.68	1.63	1.54	1.20	1.05	2.08	1.67	
<b>P</b> <sub>3</sub>	2.03	2.04	1.77	1.76	1.69	1.69	1.59	1.20	1.02	2.05	1.68	
Mean	2.05	1.98	1.78	1.74	1.64	1.60	1.50	1.14	1.00	2.07	1.65	
Interactions			Р		Т					РХТ		
SE(d)		(	).01		0.01					0.02		
CD (P=0.05)		(	0.02		0.03					0.05**		
Plant spec	ies			Salt cor	ncentratio	ns (dS	/m)					
P <sub>1</sub> - Clerodendru	ıe	T1-6	T <sub>4</sub> - 24	T <sub>7</sub> - 42 T 0.04								
P <sub>2</sub> - Leucophyllum frutescens			T <sub>2</sub> - 12	T <sub>5</sub> - 30	T <sub>8</sub> - 48	110 - 0.04						
P <sub>3</sub> - Acalypha	hispida		T <sub>3</sub> - 18 T <sub>6</sub> - 36 T		T9 - 54	54						

\*Significant at 5% level

Table 7: Effect of salinity on Sodium content (%) of Clerodendrum inerme, Leucophyllum frutescens and Acalypha hispida

Truchter	Sodium content (%)										
Treatments	<b>T</b> <sub>1</sub>	<b>T</b> <sub>2</sub>	<b>T</b> 3	<b>T</b> 4	<b>T</b> 5	<b>T</b> 6	<b>T</b> 7	<b>T</b> 8	Т9	T <sub>10</sub>	Mean
<b>P</b> <sub>1</sub>	0.45	0.49	0.49	0.51	0.52	0.57	0.63	0.67	0.69	0.44	0.55
P2	0.42	0.45	0.48	0.53	0.55	0.57	0.57	0.65	0.70	0.40	0.53
P3	0.43	0.43	0.47	0.53	0.55	0.58	0.57	0.63	0.69	0.39	0.53
Mean	0.43	0.46	0.48	0.52	0.54	0.57	0.59	0.65	0.69	0.41	0.54
Interactions		Р	1		Т				РХТ		
SE(d)		0.0	02		0.005				0.009		
CD (P=0.05)		0.0	06		0.010				0.018**		
Plant spec	ies		Sa	lt conc	entrations	s (dS/m)					
P <sub>1</sub> - Clerodendru	ne	T <sub>1</sub> -6	T4 - 24	T <sub>7</sub> - 42	T <sub>7</sub> - 42		**11	able	.: an:f:	aant	
P2 - Leucophyllum frutescens			T <sub>2</sub> - 12	T5 - 30	T <sub>8</sub> - 48	(Control)		**Highly significant			
P <sub>3</sub> - Acalypha	hispida		T3 - 18	T6 - 36	T9 - 54	(Contra	01)				

\*Significant at 5% level

### Conclusion

The present work is done with objectives to analyze the physiological parameters and percentage of nutrient contents (K, Na) in three poular shrubs of *Leucophyllum frutescens, Clerodendrum inerme, Acalypha hispida* for use in landscaping under saline conditions as proven by earlier

authors. Based on the overall performance for physiological parameters and percentage of nutrient contents, it can be concluded that salinity tolerance level and of plant species for saline conditions is in order of *Leucophyllum frutescens* >*Clerodendrum inerme*> *Acalypha hispida*. Hence, *Leucophyllum frutescens* and *Clerodendrum inerme*; may be

recommended for saline situations such as beach resorts, coastal areas, etc.

# References

- 1. Allakhaverdiev SI, A Skamoto, Y Nishiyama, M Inaba, N Murata. Ionic and osmotic effects of NaCl-induced inactivation of photosystems I and II in *Synechococcus sp.* Plant Physiol. 2000; 123:1047-1056.
- 2. Ashraf M, JWO Leary. Responses of some newly developed salt-tolerant genotypes of spring wheat to salt stress, water relations and photosynthetic capacity. Acta Bot. Neerl. 1996; 45:29-39.
- 3. Carter CT, Grieve CM, Poss JA, Suarez DL. Production and ion uptake of Celosia argentea irrigated with saline wastewaters. Sci. Hort. 2005; 106:381-394.
- Chartzoulakis K, G Psarras, S Vemmos, M Loupassaki, M Bertaki. Responce of two olive cultivars to salt stress and potassium supplement. J Plant Nutr. 2006; 29:2063-2078.
- Chartzoulakis K, M Loupassaki, M Bertaki, I Androulakis. Effects of NaCl salinity on growth, ion content and CO2 assimilation rate of six olive cultivars. Scientia Hort. 2002; 96:235-247.
- 6. Colmer TD, Munns R, Flowers TJ. Improving salt tolerance of wheat and barley: future prospects, Aust. J. of Exp. Agri.2005; 45:1425-1443.
- DudeckAE, S Singh,EC Giordano, TA Nell, DB McConnel. Effect of sodium chloride on Cynodon turf grasses. Agron. J.1983; 75:927-930.
- 8. Ghoulam C, A Foursy, K Fares. Effects of salt stress on growth, inorganic ions and proline accumulation in relation to osmotic adjustment in five sugar beet cultivars. Environ. Exp. Bot. 2002; 47:39-50.
- 9. Gopalachari NC. Changes in the activities of certain oxidizing enzymes during germination and seedling development of Phaseolus mungo and Sorghum vulgare. Indian J Exp. Biol. 1963; 1:98-100.
- Hajiboland R, F Norouzi, C Poschenrieder. Growth, physiological, biochemical and ionic responses of pistachio seedlings to mild and high salinity. Trees. 2014; 28:1065–1078.
- 11. Heslop-Harrision JS, BJ Reger. Cloride and Potassiumions and turdigityin the grass stigma. J. Plant Physiol. 1986; 124:55-60.
- 12. Kaya C, Higgs D, Ince F, Amador BM, Cakir A, Sakar E. Ameliorative effects of potassium phosphate on saltstressed pepper and cucumber. J. Plant Nutr. 2003; 26:807-820.
- 13. Khayyat M, A Tehranifar, GH Davarynejad, MH Sayyari-Zahan. Vegetative growth, compatible solute accumulation, ion partitioning and chlorophyll fluorescence of 'Malas-e-Saveh' and 'Shishe-Kab' pomegranates in response to salinity stress. Photosynthetica. 2014; 52(2):301-312.
- 14. Munns R, A Termaat. Whole plant response to salinity, Aust. J. of Plant Physio. 1986; 13:143-160.
- 15. Murkute A, S Sharma, S Singh. Studies on salt stress tolerance of citrus rootstock genotypes with arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. Hort Sci. 2006; 33:70-76.
- Neocleous D, M Vasilakakis. Effects of NaCl stress on red raspberry (*Rubus idaeus* L. 'Autumn Bliss'). Scientia Hort. 2007; 112:282-289.
- 17. Noble CL, ME Rogers, Arguments for the use of physiological criteria for improving the salt tolerance in crops. Plant Physiol. 1992; 146:99-107.

- Ondrasek G, Z Rengel, D Romic, M Poljak, M Romic. Accumulation of non-essential elements in radish plants grown in salt-affected and cadmium contaminated environment. Cereal Research Communications. 2009; 37:9-12.
- 19. Pandey P, AK Singh, AK Dubey, OP Aswathi. Effect of salinity stress on growth and nutrient uptake in polyembryonic mango rootstocks. Indian J Hort. 2014; 71(1):28-34.
- 20. Qian YL, MC Engelke, MJV Poster. Salinity effects on Zoysia grass cultivars and experimental line. Crop Science.2000; 40:488-492.
- 21. Saeed R, S Mirza, R Ahmad. Electrolyte leakage and relative water content as affected by organic mulch in okra plant (*Abelmoschus esculentus* (L.) Moench) grown under salinity. Fuuast J. Biol. 2014; 4(2):221-227.
- 22. Sanchez-Blanco MJ, Bolaroan MC, JJ Alarcoan, A Torrecillas. Salinity effects on water relations in Lycopersicon esculentum and its wild salt-tolerant relative species. Physiol. Plant. 1991; 83:269-274.
- 23. Sanchez-Blanco MJ, P Rodriguez, E Olmos, MA Morales, A Torrecillas. Contrasting physiological responses of dwarf sea-lavender and marguerite to simulated sea aerosol deposition. J Environ. Qual.2003; 32:3338-3344.
- 24. Schmutz U, P Ludders. Effect of NaCl salinity on growth, leaf gas exchange and mineral composition of grafted mango rootstocks (var. '13-1' and 'Turpentine'). Gartenbauwissenschaft. 1999; 64(2):60-64.
- 25. Shannon MC, CM Grieve. Tolerance of vegetable crops to salinity. Scientia Horti. 1999; 78:5-38.
- 26. Singh KN, R Chatrath MP, Reynalds L, Ortiz-Monasterio A McNab, salinity tolerance in application of physiology in Wheat Breeding. CIMMYT. Mexico, 2001, 101-110.
- Turhan A, V Seniz. Salt tolerance of some tomato genotypes grown in Turkey. J Food Ag. Environ. 2010; 8(3-4):332-339.
- Yeo AR, TJ Flowers. Mechanisms of salinity resistance in rice and their role as physiological criteria in plant breeding. In: RC Staples, and GA Toenniessen eds., Salinity Tolerance in plants – Strategies for Crop Improvement. Wiley, New York, 1984, 151-170.