

RESEARCH ARTICLE

OPEN ACCESS

Morpho-physiological response of *Acacia auriculiformis* as influenced by seawater induced salinity stress

Mohammad Mezanur-Rahman^{*1}, Md Anamul-Haque², Sheikh Arafat-Islam-Nihad³, Mohammad Mahmudul-Hasan-Akand² and Mohammad Ruhul-Amin-Howlader¹

¹ Department of Agroforestry and Environment, Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Agricultural University, Gazipur – 1706, Bangladesh. ² Department of Agronomy, Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Agricultural University, Gazipur – 1706, Bangladesh. ³ Department of Crop Botany, Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Agricultural University, Gazipur – 1706, Bangladesh

Abstract

Aim of the study: To evaluate the morpho-physiological changes of Acacia auriculiformis in response to seawater induced salinity stress along with its tolerance limit.

Area of study: Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Agricultural University, Bangladesh.

Material and methods: Three saline treatments (4, 8, 12 dS m⁻¹) were applied to six-month aged *Acacia auriculiformis* seedlings from January 2014 to June 2014 and the tap water was used as control treatment. To observe salinity effects, the following parameters were measured by using various established techniques: plant height and leaf number, plant biomass, shoot and root distribution as well as shoot and root density, water uptake capacity (WUC), water saturation deficit (WSD) and water retention capacity (WRC), exudation rate, and cell membrane stability.

Main results: Diluted seawater caused a notable reduction in shoot and root distribution in addition to shoot and root density, though plant height, leaf number and plant biomass were found to be decreased to some extent compared to control plants. Water status of the plant also altered when plants were subjected to salinity stress. Nevertheless, membrane stability revealed good findings towards salinity tolerance.

Research highlights: Considering the above facts, despite salinity exerts some negative effects on overall plant performance, interestingly the percent reduction value doesn't exceed 50% as compared to control plants, and the plants were successful to tolerate salinity stress till the end of the experiment (150 days) through adopting some tolerance mechanisms.

Keywords: Salt stress; halophytes; growth parameters; WUC; exudation rate; membrane stability.

Abbreviations used: BSMRAU (Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Agricultural University); RCBD (randomized complete block design); DATI (days after treatment imposition); RWC (relative water content); WUC (water uptake capacity); WSD (water saturation deficit); WRC (water retention capacity); FW (fresh weight); DW (dry weight); TW (turgid weight); ROS (reactive oxygen species).

Citation: Mezanur-Rahman, M., Anamul-Haque, M., Arafat-Islam-Nihad, S., Mahmudul-Hasan-Akand, M., Ruhul-Amin-Howlader, M. (2016). Morpho-physiological response of *Acacia auriculiformis* as influenced by seawater induced salinity stress. Forest Systems, Volume 25, Issue 3, e071. http://dx.doi.org/10.5424/fs/2016253-09386.

Received: 31 Jan 2016. Accepted: 14 Jul 2016.

Copyright © **2016 INIA.** This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial (by-nc) Spain 3.0 Licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Funding: Department of Agroforestry and Environment, Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Agricultural University & the Ministry of Science and Technology, Government of Bangladesh.

Competing interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Correspondence should be addressed to Mohammad Mezanur Rahman: shaon_pstu@yahoo.com

Introduction

Soil and groundwater salinization is one of the oldest and most austere environmental problems, posing critical challenges for the managing of agrarian and natural areas. These problems are pervasive all through the world, affecting circa ~831-950 million hectares, which incorporates 397 and 434 million hectares of saline and sodic soils correspondingly (Teakle & Tyerman, 2010). The most alarming point is that, each year around 1.5 million ha of land are being taken out of production because of excessive salinity levels (Munns & Tester, 2008); and if it proceeds in such way, there are chances that half of cultivable terrains will be lost by the middle of the 21st century (Mahajan & Tuteja, 2005). Due to its annihilate nature, in a few parts of the world salinity is alluding as "Silent Killer" of natural production since it slowly kills plants and soil organism or as "White Death" since it conjures up white images of lifeless shining lands covered with dead trees (Tanji, 1990). High salinity causes diverse cooperative events that adversely affect all plant formative stages (Lee *et al.*, 2013); with corresponding pernicious impacts on the plant yield resulting lessening of agricultural outputs by billions of dollars per annum, with remediation activities being troublesome and costly (Nosetto *et al.*, 2013). The rate of plant growth relies upon a couple of principle events, for instance, cell division, cell enlargement and cell differentiation, together with genetic, morphological, physiological, biochemical and ecological activities and their intricate interactions, that are severely overwhelmed by salinity stress (Taiz & Zeiger, 2006; Islam *et al.*, 2015).

Salinity stress not only threats world agriculture, but also jeopardizes Bangladesh food security (Islam et al., 2016). The sustainable livelihoods of millions of people of Bangladesh hinge on agriculture, which acts as a mainstay of the economy, are severely plagued by salinity stress (Abdullah & Rahman, 2015; Haque & Haque, 2016; Islam et al., 2016). In spite of the yield of the alleged salt tolerant shallow rooted glycophytes is severely reduced under ultra-saline soils, the halophyte species can be efficaciously grown in salty environment where the level of saltiness may stretch around 200 mM and more. There are various species of halophytes suited to grow in saline decumbent area (Hasan et al., 2016). However, the fast-growing nature of Acacia auriculiformis and its good adaptability in degraded soil condition, especially in saline soils, it has been considered a priority species in the short-rotation plantations in Bangladesh, such as social forestry and agroforestry projects in the coastal belts (Islam et al., 2007, Abdullah et al., 2015). It is a fast growing nitrogen fixing multipurpose tree species which prevents exposure of soils to direct radiation from the sun using its perennial foliage as well as crown cover, and reduce the evaporation rate, resulting in less salt accumulation in the top soils (Tham & Liew, 2012; Khan et al., 2014; Sohel et al., 2016). Furthermore, it is extensively used to provide shade, form windbreaks, and the wood has been used widely for charcoal, fuel, pulp, tool handles, oars, paddles, packing cases, and furniture manufacturing (Shukla et al., 2007; Chowdhury et al., 2013). Therefore, if Acacia auriculiformis can be brought under plantation in the saline prone area, the existing agrarian land will be more productive through minimizing the detrimental effects of salts as well as to sustain crop productivity, which will help to maintain a wide range of ecological security.

Nevertheless, salinity tolerance limit alongside morpho-physiological response of *Acacia auriculiformis* to salinity stress is not well understood yet. Therefore, the main goal of this study was to appraise the effect of seawater induced salinity stress on the morphological and physiological features of *Acacia auriculiformis* plants.

Material and methods

A pot experiment was carried out in the research field of the Department of Agroforestry and Environment, Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Agricultural University (BSMRAU) (24° 09` N; 90° 26` E), Bangladesh, from January 2014 to June 2014. The size of every single pot was 28 cm (L.) \times 30 cm (W.) and filled with a mixture of soil and cowdung at a ratio of 4:1, which was treated with formaldehyde to curtail soil borne disease. Each pot contained 14.50 kg of soil, which was equivalent to 12.04 kg oven dry soil and holds about 17% moisture at field capacity (FC).

The experiment was conducted in a randomized complete block design (RCBD) with five replications and four treatments. The saline treatment variables were 4, 8 and 12 dS m⁻¹ and the tap water was used as control treatment (0 dS m⁻¹). Salinity treatments were prepared by the intermixing of sea water and tap water in different proportion to obtain desired electrical conductivity value. Six months aged seedlings of *Acacia auriculiformis* were used for this study. Ten days after transplanting, the plants were irrigated with either tap water or differently diluted seawater (4, 8, 12 dS m⁻¹) till the end of the experiment.

Plant height and leaf number were measured at every one-month interval by using measuring scale and simple counting method correspondingly. At the end of the experiment, i.e. 150 days after treatment imposition (DAT), for determining total dry mass, plants were removed from the soil and washed in running tap water for a short period of time to eliminate loose soil particles and then they were placed on dry polyethylene sheets to allow any free surface moisture to dry out. After that, plants were divided into root and shoot and, fresh weight was taken through an electronic balance. Thereafter, the leaves were immersed in distilled water for 24 hours at room temperature in the dark. These leaves were weighed to record the turgid (saturated) weight after excess water was removed by gently wrapping the leaves with a paper towel. Plant materials were placed in paper bags afterwards and allowed for oven dry at 80°C for 72 hours. After oven drying, dry weight of the samples was taken followed by a few minutes of cooling in the dry environment. Shoot and root distributions well as shoot and root densities were measured according to the equation described by Arduini et *al.* (1994) as follows:

Shoot or root distribution = Fresh Mass/Length Shoot or root density = Dry Mass/Length

Water Uptake Capacity (WUC) was measured by

using the following formula (Sangakkara *et al.*, 1996):

$$WUC = \frac{(TW - FW)}{DW}$$

Where,

TW = Turgid weight of the leaf

FW = Fresh weight of the leaf

DW = Dry weight of the leaf

The water saturation deficit was measured by the following formula (Sangakkara *et al.*, 1996):

Water Saturation Deficit (WSD %) = 100 - RWC

Where, RWC = Relative water content

Water retention capacity (WRC) is the ratio of the turgid weight and dry weight of a tissue and was estimated by the following formula (Sangakkara *et al.*, 1996):

WRC =
$$\frac{TW}{DW}$$

Where,

TW = Turgid weight of the leaf

DW = Dry weight of the leaf

The xylem exudation rate was measured at 5 cm above from the stem base of control and stressed plants after 150 days of treatment imposition. At first, dry cotton was weighed. A slanting cut on the stem was made with a sharp knife. Then the weighed cotton was placed on the cut surface. The exudation of sap was collected from the stem for 1 hour at a normal temperature. The final weight of the cotton with sap was measured. The exudation rate (mg h⁻¹) was calculated by deducting dry cotton weight from the sap containing cotton weight and expressed as per hour basis as follows (Akhtar *et al.*, 2013):

Exudation rate =
$$\frac{(\text{Weight of cotton} + \text{sap}) - (\text{Weight of cotton})}{\text{Time (hr)}}$$

Degree of succulence and the degree of sclerophylly was estimated by using the equation as follows:

Degree of succulence = Water amount / Leaf area (Delf, 1912)

Where, water amount = fresh Mass - dry mass

Degree of sclerophylly = Dry mass / Leaf area (Witkoswski & Lamont, 1991)

Membrane stability was assessed by measuring the electrolyte leakage (EL %) from leaf tissue into refined water after 90 and 150 days after treatment imposition using the formula described by Sairam (1994). However, percent reduction value and relative value were

calculated using the following equation (Hasegawa *et al.*, 2000).

 $Percent reduction = \frac{Control treatment value - Saline treatment value}{Control treatment value} \times 100$

Relative value =
$$\frac{\text{Saline treatment value}}{\text{Control treatment value}} \times 100$$

The data were subjected to one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and different letters indicate the significant differences between treatments at p<0.05, according to least significant difference test (LSD) analysed using Statistix 10 software package. Data represented in the Tables and Figures are means \pm standard errors (SE) of five replications for each treatment.

Results

Salinity stressed plant height and leaf number results indicate that the progressive increase in salinity levels triggers an increase in the percent reduction of the plant height and leaf number over control treatment. This increase reaches the severe level after 150 days after treatment (Fig. 1a, b). Plant height was reduced by 5.56, 21.16 and 29.69% at 4, 8, 12 dS m⁻¹ salinity levels, respectively, in relation to the control plants at 150 DAT (Fig 1a). Whereas, the number of leaves reduced by 1.11, 1.20 and 1.30 times compared to that of control plants at the same salinity levels and days after treatment imposition (Fig. 1b).

There was a significant (P<0.01) negative effect of salt stress on plant biomass, shoot and root distribution as well as shoot and root density of *Acacia auriculiformis* plants (Table 1). While compared with the values of control plants, it was apparent that the mean values and the percent reduction differences were higher in plants that had been treated with 12 dS m⁻¹ salinity level (Table 1), being the total dry mass the variable which suffered the higher reduction (about 50% compared to control plants).

Water uptake is essential for cell expansion and plant growth. The water uptake capacity (WUC) quantifies the ability of a plant to absorb water per unit dry weight in relation to turgid weight; water saturation deficit (WSD) indicates the degree of water deficit in plants, and water retention capacity (WRC) of leaf provides information on the capacity of a plant cell to retain water. With the increase of salinization period and salinity level, mean values of WUC and WSD were increased, while salinization had less effect on the mean value of the water retention capacity of *Acacia auriculiformis* plants (Table 2). In this regard, at 150 days after treatment imposition with 12 dS m⁻¹ salinity level,



Figure 1. Response of (a) plant height (cm) and (b) number of leaves of *Acacia auriculiformis* to different salinity levels at different days after treatment imposition. Means followed by a common letter are not significantly different at 5% level by LSD. Error bars represent standard error (\pm) . Error bars fit within the plot symbol if not shown.

the plants showed higher relative value (% of control) of WSD (486.16%) and WUC (215.70%) than control plants, while WRC responded in an opposite manner, i.e. it was reduced to 40.88% compared to control plants.

There was no noteworthy difference in the degree of succulence, however, the degree of schlerophylly showed a noticeable divergence between control and stressed plants (Table 3). In response to seawater stress, the mean value of exudation rate showed considerable variations in comparison with those of the control plants (Table 3). The highest percent reduction value (45.51) was noticed under 12 dS m^{-1} salinity level followed by 8 dS m^{-1} as moderate salinity level (35.31).

The membrane stability of *Acacia auriculiformis* plants was significantly increased by the three evaluated levels of salt stress at both measurement periods (Fig. 2). In this regard, after 90 days of treatment imposition at 4, 8 and 12 dS m⁻¹ salinity levels, the membrane stability index was significantly (P<0.01) decreased by 3.29, 4.36 and 9.62 % respectively, compared with that of control plants. At 150 days after treatment imposition, the membrane stability index was

Salinity levels (dS m ⁻¹)	Total fresh weight (g)	Total dry weight (g)	Shoot Distribution (g cm ⁻¹)	Shoot Density (g cm ⁻¹)	Root Distribution (g cm ⁻¹)	Root Density (g cm ⁻¹)
Control	556.93 ± 11.73 a	$260.78 \pm 4.40 \text{ a}$	$3.91 \pm 0.07 \text{ a}$	1.96 ± 0.02 a	$0.92\pm0.01~a$	$0.29\pm0.003\ s$
(Mean Value)						
4	446.95 ± 2.30 b	202.11 ± 2.96 a	3.36 ± 0.04 b	$1.63 \pm 0.01 \text{ b}$	0.91 ± 0.006 a	$0.26 \pm 0.003 \text{ b}$
	(19.74 ± 0.41) c	(22.49± 0.78) c	(14.02 ± 1.07) a	(16.33 ± 0.97) c	(0.58 ± 0.17) b	(10.07 ± 1.26) b
8	365.51 ± 6.45 c	159.11± 2.70 c	3.26 ± 0.08 b	1.56 ± 0.03 b	0.89 ± 0.01 a	$0.22 \pm 0.003 bc$
	(34.37 ± 1.15) b	(38.71 ± 1.06) b	(16.48 ± 2.27) a	(20.33 ± 2.02) b	(2.18 ± 0.28) b	(20.96 ± 1.30) a
12	314.27 ± 3.38 d	$131.13 \pm 1.02d$	3.19 ± 0.02 c	$1.44 \pm 0.01 \text{ c}$	0.84± 0.01 b	0.21 ± 0.006 c
	(43.57 ± 0.60) a	(49.71 ± 0.43) a	(18.20 ± 0.61) a	(26.35 ± 0.89) a	(7.71 ± 1.68) a	(26.56 ± 2.18) a

Table 1. Effect of seawater induced salinity on total fresh mass, total dry mass, shoot and root distribution, shoot and root density of *Acacia auriculiformis* plants after 150 days of treatment imposition

Values are means \pm SE of five independent replications (n = 5). Different letters within the column indicate statistically significant differences between treatments, according to least significant difference test (p < 0.05). Values within parenthesis indicate the percent reduction value over control.

Table 2.	Effect	of seaw	ater	induced	l salini	ty on	water	uptake	capacity	, water	saturation	deficit	: and
water rete	ention of	capacity	of A	cacia a	uriculij	formi	s plant	s at diff	erent day	s after	treatment i	mposit	tion

Days after treatment imposition (DATI)	Salinity levels (dS m ⁻¹)	Water uptake capacity	Water saturation deficit (%)	Water retention capacity
30	Control 4 8 12	$\begin{array}{c} 0.29 \pm 0.04 \ a \\ 0.40 \pm 0.03 \ ab \\ 0.40 \pm 0.06 \ ab \\ 0.45 \pm 0.02 \ a \end{array}$	8.97 ± 0.62 c 15.07 ± 1.37 b 20.31 ± 3.02 ab 24.38 ± 1.08 a	4.30 ± 0.33 a 3.71 ± 0.13 a 2.99 ± 0.10 b 2.84 ± 0.05 b
60	Control 4 8 12	$\begin{array}{c} 0.32 \pm 0.03 \ b\\ 0.43 \pm 0.04 \ ab\\ 0.45 \pm 0.05 \ ab\\ 0.53 \pm 0.06 \ a \end{array}$	9.94 ± 0.73 c 16.22 ± 2.09 bc 23.10 ± 2.42 ab 28.78 ± 3.34 a	4.30 ± 0.36 a 3.71 ± 0.16 a 2.98 ± 0.14 b 2.84 ± 0.03 b
90	Control 4 8 12	$\begin{array}{c} 0.32 \pm 0.05 \text{ b} \\ 0.53 \pm 0.07 \text{ ab} \\ 0.54 \pm 0.11 \text{ ab} \\ 0.62 \pm 0.11 \text{ a} \end{array}$	10.57 ± 1.72 c 21.45 ± 3.34 b 27.71 ± 3.40 ab 36.72 ± 3.78 a	4.13 ± 0.21 a 3.58 ± 0.20 a 2.90 ± 0.20 b 2.65 ± 0.20 a
120	Control 4 8 12	$\begin{array}{c} 0.32 \pm 0.05 \text{ b} \\ 0.61 \pm 0.04 \text{ a} \\ 0.66 \pm 0.06 \text{ a} \\ 0.68 \pm 0.08 \text{ a} \end{array}$	10.93 ± 1.47 c 27.87 ± 2.66 b 37.55 ± 1.72 a 43.64 ± 3.34 a	$3.90 \pm 0.10 \text{ a}$ $3.24 \pm 0.15 \text{ b}$ $2.76 \pm 0.12 \text{ bc}$ $2.63 \pm 0.26 \text{ c}$
150	Control 4 8 12	$\begin{array}{c} 0.32 \pm 0.32 \ b\\ 0.65 \pm 0.61 \ a\\ 0.69 \pm 0.66 \ a\\ 0.70 \pm 0.69 \ a \end{array}$	11.17 ± 1.83 c 33.91 ± 4.19 b 47.99 ± 5.80 a 54.31 ± 5.38 a	3.93 ± 0.16 a 2.96 ± 0.22 b 2.49 ± 0.16 bc 2.33 ± 0.14 c

Values are means \pm SE of five independent replications (n = 5). Different letters within the column indicate statistically significant differences between treatments, according to least significant difference test (p < 0.05).

lessened by 2.84, 7.72 and 13.09% at 4, 8, 12 dS m^{-1} salinity levels, respectively (Fig. 2).

Discussion

Plant height represents the growing nature of the plants, which plays an important role in assessing the growth performance of the plant. Irrigation with seawater significantly reduced the plant height of acacia in this study (Fig. 1a). However, the plants continued to grow successfully throughout the duration of the study in spite of higher salinity levels. Reduction in plant height due to salt stress may be attributed to the effects of salts in retarding the processes of cell division and cell expansion upon which growth depends on (Netondo *et al.*, 2004; Radi *et al.*, 2013). The results what we found are conforming to the results of Sohail

Salinity levels (dS m ⁻¹)	Degree of succulence (mg cm ⁻²)	Degree of schlerophylly (mg cm ⁻²)	Exudation rate (mg h ⁻¹)
Control	1.43 ± 1.37 a	1.25 ± 0.02 a	1754.0 ± 0.06 a
(Mean Value)	1		
4	1.39 ± 1.18 a	$1.15 \pm 0.01 \text{ b}$	1342.0 ± 0.06 b
8	1.37 ± 0.54 a	1.06 ± 0.02 c	1134.6 ± 0.07 c
12	1.36 ± 1.25 a	$0.97\pm0.01~d$	$995.6 \pm 0.03 \text{ d}$

 Table 3. Effect of seawater induced salinity on degree of succulence, degree of schlerophylly and exudation rate of Acacia auriculiformis plants after 150 days of treatment imposition

Values are means \pm SE of five independent replications (n = 5). Different letters within the column indicate statistically significant differences between treatments, according to least significant difference test (p < 0.05).

et al. (2010) on Ziziphus spina-christi and Gao et al. (2014) on potato plantlets. The number of leaves found to be decreased to progressing salinity levels (Fig. 1b). Inhibition of the formation of leaf primodia under salinity stress could be the probable reason for the reduction in leaf number. The decrease in leaf number may further be carried over due to the accumulation of sodium chloride in the cell walls and cytoplasm of the older leaves. At the same time, their vacuole saps cannot accumulate more salt and, thereby increases the concentration of salt inside the cells, which ultimately leads to their quick death (Munns, 2002). Munns & Tester (2008) also stated that the ion-specific phase of plant response to salinity stress starts when salt accumulates to toxic level in the old leaves (which are no longer expanding, so no longer diluting the salt arriving in them as younger growing leaves do), and they die and cause a decrease in the leaf number. These results are similar to the results of da Silva et al. (2008) on Spondias tuberosa plants and Mahmood et al. (2009) on Acacia ampliceps.

Decreasing trend of biomass production (Table 1) under salinity stress might be due to inadequate availability of nutrients present in the growth medium and the decreased water entry rate of the plants and/or the deceased in photosynthetic output with a suppressed supply of CO₂ Corroborate findings was also reported by Qureshi et al. (2000) on Eucalyptus camaldulensis plants. Nonetheless, shoot and root density represents dry mass production per unit of shoot and root length respectively. In contrast, shoot and root distribution epitomizes fresh mass accumulated per unit of shoot and root length, respectively. The reduction in both density and distribution of acacia biomass in this study may reflect the effect of salinity on decreasing shoot and root biomass (fresh and dry masses). In this respect, Chopart et al. (2008) stated that evaluation of shoot/root density and distribution could be considered

as a key factor for water and nutrient uptake by a plant from the soil. These results were in harmony with those obtained by Seckin *et al.*, (2010) on barley cultivars and Ali (2009) on wheat cultivars.

Water stress is one of the first and most obvious effects of salinity and thus the determination of water relations is crucial for understanding salinity tolerance mechanisms of a plant (Netondo et al., 2004). Plant water status is important not only for its growth under favourable environmental conditions, but also for its ability to tolerate water deficit and high salt levels (Blumwald, 2000). Additionally, the importance of the internal water balance in plant water relations is generally accepted because of the close relationship between the balance and turgidity to the rates of physiological processes that control the quality and quantity of growth (Aldesuquy et al., 2009). In this experiment, it was found that seawater induced salinity had a conspicuous effect on plant water status (Table 2). The altering of water status may be ascribed by, in transpiring plants; water is thought to come from the soil through osmosis process, and this water goes into the transpiration stream through apoplastic and symplastic pathways. However, seawater stress is responsible for changing the situation because of restricted transpiration. The reduction of transpiration hinders water uptake from the soils because of injury in the root systems, which ultimately causes the disparity of water status in plants. Lower water uptake is thought to be accountable for lessening exudation rate (Table 3). Exudation rate means coming out of sap from a vigorously growing stem of a plant when it is cut off just above the ground level. The results reported by many researchers (Papadopoulos, 1987; Pessarakli & Tucker, 1985, Kabir et al., 2005) correspond to the results we obtained.

Salt stress induced a non-significant decline in the degree of leaf succulence, but noticeable divergence was found in the degree of sclerophylly (Table 3). In accordance with our results, leaf succulence was found to decrease in three varieties of salt-stressed sunflower plants and two wheat cultivars (Welch & Rieseberg, 2002; Aldesuguy et al., 2012). This may be explained on the basis that less absorbed water means less water content of the growing leaves resulting in less relative water content. Decreased relative water content aggravates more water saturation deficit, therefore causing less leaf succulence and more sclerophylly (Aldesuquy et al., 2012). On the contrary, in Bruguiera parviflora, leaf succulence increased with increasing salinity (Parida et al., 2004). Increased leaf succulence might have resulted from the increase in water uptake and turgor pressure as a result of cells having a higher solute concentration (Jennings, 1976). It is worthy to



Fig. 2. Response of membrane stability index of leaves of *Acacia auriculiformis* to different salinity levels at different days after treatment imposition. Means followed by a common letter are not significantly different at 5% level by LSD. Error bars represent standard error (\pm) . Error bars fit within the plot symbol if not shown.

mention that the plants having a higher degree of leaf succulence and lower extent of leaf sclerophylly are considered as a salt tolerant plant (Aldesuquy *et al.*, 2012). Degree of schlerophylly is considered as an adaptation feature to water deficit as well as low nutrients in the growth medium. Furthermore, it enhances the leaf longevity by protecting the leaf thereby increasing leaf carbon gain (Edwards *et al.*, 2000) to maintain its physiological process.

The cell membrane, being at the interface between the cells and its surroundings, is the first organelle that is susceptible to salinity stress and the capacity of maintaining its integrity is an important process related to plant resistance against salt stress (Xu et al., 2010; Hichem et al., 2009; Ali et al., 2008). Increasing the salinity level in the present study caused a noticeable decrease in the membrane stability index (MSI) of acacia plants compared with those of the reference control plants (Fig. 2). The integrity of the membrane is disrupted due to peroxidation of lipids by reactive oxygen species (ROS) in the membrane system, resulting in the decrement of membrane stability (Tuna et al., 2013; Kaya et al., 2009; Tuna et al., 2007). This result is in harmony with Abeer et al. (2015) found on tomato cultivars and Hassanein et al. (2012) on Vicia faba L. plants.

It could be concluded that as this study was carried out at the seedling stage, the studied plants showed at some extent a high degree of salt tolerance but performed better at the moderate salinity level. The adverse effect of salinity stress was noticeable to the whole plant and appeared during all developmental stages. The percent reduction in plant morphological characters was conspicuous at the highest level, i.e. 12 dS m⁻¹ of seawater induced salinity. Interestingly, at that high salinity level, most of the plant parameters reduced to less than 50% compared to the control plants. Physiological processes of the plants also altered to some extent under elevated salinity levels. Nevertheless, established plants of this species may be tolerant to salt stress higher than the level used in this study because seedlings are more sensitive to high soluble-salt levels than established plants.

Acknowledgements

The authors like to thank Head of the department and other concern personnel for valuable guide and support.

References

- Abeer H, Abd-Allah EF, Alqarawi AA, Alwhibi-Mona S, Alenazi MM, Dilfuza Egamberdieva, Ahmad P, 2015. Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi mitigates NaCl induced adverse effects on *Solanum lycopersicum* L. Pak J Bot 47(1): 327-340.
- Abdullah HM, Rahman MM, 2015. Initiating rain water harvest technology for climate change induced drought resilient agriculture: scopes and challenges in Bangladesh. J Agr Eniron Int Dev 109(2): 189-208.
- Abdullah HM, Mahboob MG, Rahman MM, Ahmed T, 2015. Monitoring natural sal forest cover in Modhupur, Bang-

ladesh using temporal Landsat imagery during 1972-2015. Int J Enviro 5(1): 1-7.

- Akhtar N, Hossainn F, Karim A, 2013. Influence of calcium on water relation of two cultivars of wheat under salt stress. Int J Environ 2(1): 1-8. http://dx.doi.org/10.3126/ ije.v2i1.9202.
- Aldesuquy HS, Abo-Hamed SA, Abbas MA, Elhakem AH, 2009. Effect of glycine betaine and salicylic acid on growth and productivity of droughted wheat cultivars. I. Osmolytes in relation to osmotic adjustment and grain yield. J Environ Sci Mansoura University 37: 13-33.
- Aldesuquy HS, Baka ZA, El-Shehaby OA, Ghanem HE, 2012. Varietal differences in growth vigor, water relations, protein and nucleic acids content of two wheat varieties grown under seawater stress. J Stress Physiol Biochem 8: 24-47.
- Ali A, 2009. Influence of silicon on wheat grown under saline environments. Doctoral thesis, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan.
- Ali B, Hayat S, Hasan SA, Hayat Q, Yadav S, Fariduddin Q, Ahmad A, 2008. A role for brassinosteroids in the amelioration of aluminium stress through antioxidant system in mungbean (*Vigna radita* L. Wilczek). Environ Exp Bot 62: 153-159. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2007.07.014.
- Arduini I, Godbold DG, Onnis A, 1994. Cadmium and copper change root growth and morphology of *Pinus pinea* and *Pinus pinaster* seedlings. Physiol Plant 92: 675-680. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-3054.1994. tb03039.x.
- Blumwald E, 2000. Sodium transport and salt tolerance in plants. Curr Opin Cell Biol 12: 431-434. http://dx.doi. org/10.1016/S0955-0674(00)00112-5.
- Chopart JL, Le-Mézo L, Mézino M, 2008. Software application for processing root data from impact counts on soil profiles. User Guide, Technol. Document. pp: 26-28.
- Chowdhury MQ, Ishiguri F, Hiraiwa T, Takashima Y, Iizuka K, Yokota S, Yoshizawa N, 2013. Anatomical property variation in *Acacia auriculiformis* growing in Bangladesh. Int Wood Prod J 4(2): 75-80. http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/2 042645313Y.000000032.
- da Silva EC, Nogueira RJ, de Araújo FP, de Melo NF, de Azevedo Neto AD, 2008. Physiological responses to salt stress in young umbu plants. Environ Exp Bot 63: 147-157. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2007.11.010.
- Delf EM, 1912. Transpiration in succulent plants. Annals of Bot 26: 409-440.
- Edwards C, Read J, Sanso G, 2000. Characterising sclerophylly: some mechanical properties of leaves from heath and forest. Oecologia 123: 158-167. http://dx.doi. org/10.1007/s004420051001.
- Gao HJ, Yang HY, Bai JP, Liang XY, Lou Y, Zhang JL, Wang D, Zhang JL, Niu SQ, Chen YL, 2014. Ultrastructural and physiological responses of potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) plantlets to gradient saline stress. Front Plant Sci 5.
- Ghoulam C, Foursy A, Fares K, 2002. Effects of salt stress on growth, inorganic ions and proline accumulation in relation to osmotic adjustment in five sugar beet cultivars. Environ Exp Bot 47: 39-50. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/ S0098-8472(01)00109-5.

- Haque MA, Haque, MM, 2016. Growth, yield and nitrogen use efficiency of new rice variety under variable nitrogen rates. Am J Plant Sci 7 (3): 612-622. http://dx.doi. org/10.4236/ajps.2016.73054.
- Hasan M, Rahim MA, Islam AKMS, Rahman MM, Rahman MA, Naher N, 2016. Effect of management practices on the growth and yield of lime and lemon. Intl J Biosci 8(6): 22-33. http://dx.doi.org/10.12692/ijb/8.6.22-33.
- Hasegawa PM, Bressan RA, Zhu JK, Bohnert HJ, 2000. Plant cellular and molecular responses to high salinity. Annu Rev Plant Biol 51(1): 463-99. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/ annurev.arplant.51.1.463.
- Hashem A, Abd-Allah EF, Alqarawi AA, Alwhibi Mona S, Alenazi MM, Dilfuza E, 2015. Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi mitigates NaCl induced adverse effects on *Solanum lycopersicum* L. Pak J Bot 47(1): 327-340.
- Hassanein RA, Hashem HA, Khalil RR, 2012. Stigmasterol treatment increases salt stress tolerance of faba bean plants by enhancing antioxidant systems. Plant Omics 5(5): 476.
- Hichem H, Mounir D, Naceur EA, 2009. Differential responses of two maize (*Zea mays* L.) varieties to salt stress: changes on polyphenols composition of foliage and oxidative damages. Ind Crops Prod 30: 144-151. http://dx.doi. org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2009.03.003.
- Islam AKMS, Nath UK, Rai PK, Rahman MM, Haque MA, Rahman MA, 2016. Genetic study and selection of soybean lines for higher yield. Intl J Biosci 8(2): 209-217.
- Islam AKMS, Rana MS, Rahman MM, Mian MJA, Rahman MM, Rahman MA, Naher N, 2016. Growth, yield and nutrient uptake capacity of rice under different sulphur levels. Turkish J Agri.-Food Sci. Techno 4(7): 557-565.
- Islam M, Hoque MA, Reza MM, Rahman MM, 2015. Contribution of boron doses on growth and yield of different broccoli genotypes. Int J Sustain Crop Prod 10(2): 14-20.
- Islam MZ, Baset MA, Akter A, Rahman MH, 2007. Biochemical attributes of mutant rice under different saline levels. Int J Sustain Crop Prod 2(3): 17-21.
- Jennings DH, 1976. The effects of sodium chloride on higher plants. Biol Rev 51: 453-458. http://dx.doi. org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.1976.tb01064.x.
- Kabir ME, Hamid A, Haque MM, Nawata E, Karim MA, 2005. Effect of nitrogen fertilizer on salinity tolerance of mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek). Japanese J Trop Agr 49 (2): 119-125.
- Kaya C, Ashraf M, Sonmez O, Aydenir S, Tuna AL, Cullu MA, 2009. The influence of arbuscular mycorrhizal colonization on key growth parameters and fruit yield of pepper plants grown at high salinity. Scient Horticul 121(1): 1-6. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2009.01.001.
- Khan BM, Hossain MK, Mridha MA, 2014. Improving *Acacia auriculiformis* seedlings using microbial inoculant (Beneficial Microorganisms). J For Res 25(2): 359-364. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11676-013-0421-2.
- Lee MH, Cho EJ, Wi SG, Bae H, 2013. Divergences in morphological changes and antioxidant responses in salttolerant and salt-sensitive rice seedlings after salt stress. Plant Physiol Biochem 70: 325-335. http://dx.doi. org/10.1016/j.plaphy.2013.05.047.

- Mahajan S, Tuteja N, 2005. Cold, salinity and drought stresses: an overview. Arch Biochem Biophys 444: 139-158. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.abb.2005.10.018.
- Mahmood K, Sarwar G, Hussain N, Schmeisky H, Muhammad S, 2009. Effect of soil salinity and sodicity on growth parameters of *Acacia ampliceps*. Pak J Agric Res 22: 3-4.
- Munns R, 2002. Comparative physiology of salt and water stress. Plant Cell Environ 25: 239-250. http://dx.doi. org/10.1046/j.0016-8025.2001.00808.x.
- Munns R, Tester M, 2008. Mechanisms of salt tolerance, Annu Rev Plant Biol 59: 651-681. http://dx.doi. org/10.1146/annurev.arplant.59.032607.092911.
- Netondo GW, Onyango JC, Beck E, 2004. Sorghum and salinity. I. Response of growth, water relations and ion accumulation to NaCl salinity. Crop Sci 44: 797-805. http://dx.doi.org/10.2135/cropsci2004.7970.
- Nosetto MD, Acosta AM, Jayawickreme DH, Ballesteros SI, Jackson RB, Jobbágy EG, 2013. Land-use and topography shape soil and groundwater salinity in central Argentina. Agric Water Manag 129: 120-129. http://dx.doi. org/10.1016/j.agwat.2013.07.017.
- Papadopoulos I, 1987. Effects of residual soil salinity resulting from irrigation with sulphate waters on lettuce. Plant Soil 97(2): 171-177. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/ BF02374939.
- Parida AK, Das AB, Mittra B, 2004. Effects of salt on growth, ion accumulation photosynthesis and leaf anatomy of the mangrove, *Bruguiera parviflora*. Trees-Struct Funct 18: 167-174. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00468-003-0293-8.
- Pessarakli M, Tucker T, 1985. Uptake of nitrogen-15 by cotton under salt stress. Soil Sci Soc Am J 49: 149-152. http://dx.doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1985.0361599500490001 0030x.
- Qureshi TM, Aslam M, Hussain F, Ashraf MY, 2000. Performance of *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* under different types of salt-affected soils. Int J Agri Biol 2(1): 45.
- Radi AA, Farghaly FA, Hamada AM, 2013. Physiological and biochemical responses of salt-tolerant and salt-sensitive wheat and bean cultivars to salinity. J Biol Earth Sci 3(1): 72-88.
- Sairam RK, 1994. Effects of homobrassinolide application on plant metabolism and grain yield under irrigated and moisture stress conditions of two wheat varieties. Plant Growth Regul 14: 173-181. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/ BF00025220.
- Sangakkara UR, Hartwig UA, Nösberger J, 1996. Response of root branching and shoot water potentials of french beans (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) to soil moisture and fertilizer potassium. J Agron Crop Sci 177(3): 165-173. http:// dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-037X.1996.tb00234.x.

- Seckin B, Turkan I, Sekmen AH, Ozfidan C, 2010. The role of antioxidant defense systems at differential salt tolerance of *Hordeum marinum* (sea barley grass) and *Hordeum vulgare* L. (cultivated barley). Environ and Exp Bot 69: 76-85. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2010.02.013.
- Shukla SR, Rao RV, Sharma SK, Kumar P, Sudheendra R, Shashikala S, 2007. Physical and mechanical properties of plantation-grown *Acacia auriculiformis* of three different ages. J Aust For 70(2): 86-92. http://dx.doi.org/10 .1080/00049158.2007.10675007.
- Sohail M, Saied AS, Gebauer J, Buerkert A, 2010. Effect of NaCl Salinity on Growth and Mineral Composition of *Ziziphus spina-christi* (L.) Willd. J Agr Rural Dev Trop 110(2): 107-14.
- Sohel MH, Miah MR, Mohiuddin SJ, Islam AKMS, Rahman MM, Haque MA, 2016. Correlation and path coefficient analysis of blackgram (*Vigna mungo* L.). J Biosci Agric Res 07(2): 621-629.
- Taiz L, Zeiger E, 2006. Plant physiology, 4th edition, Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, UK.
- Tanji KK, 1990. Agricultural Salinity Assessment and Managements, ASCE Manual and Reports on Engineering Practice No. 71. American Society of Civil Engineers, New York.
- Teakle NL, Tyerman SD, 2010. Mechanisms of Cl⁻ transport contributing to salt tolerance. Plant Cell Environ 33: 566-589. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.2009.02060.x.
- Tham MW, Liew KC, 2012. Optimization of extraction conditions with respect to temperature and methanol solvent for sapwood, heartwood and bark extract of *Acacia auriculiformis*. J Indian Acad Wood Sci 9(2): 101-104. http:// dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13196-012-0073-4.
- Tuna AL, Kaya C, Altunlu H, Ashraf M, 2013. Mitigation effects of non-enzymatic antioxidants in maize (*Zea mays* L.) plants under salinity stress. Aust J Crop Sci. 7(8): 1181.
- Tuna AL, Kaya C, Ashraf M, Altunlu H, Yokas I, Yagmur B, 2007. The effects of calcium sulphate on growth, membrane stability and nutrient uptake of tomato plants grown under salt stress. Environ Exper Bot 59: 173-178. http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2005.12.007.
- Welch ME, Rieseberg LH, 2002. Habitat divergence between a homoploid hybrid sunflower species, *Helianthus paradoxus* (Asteraceae), and its progenitors. Am J Bot 89: 472-479. http://dx.doi.org/10.3732/ajb.89.3.472.
- Witkoswski ETF, Lamont BB, 1991. Leaf specific mass confounds leaf density and thickness. Oecologia 84: 362-370.
- Xu F, Li L, Huang X, Cheng H, Wang Y, Cheng S, 2010. Antioxidant and antibacterial properties of the leaves and stems of *Premna microphylla*. J Med Plant Res 4: 2544-2550. http://dx.doi.org/10.5897/JMPR09.548.