

An-Najah National University

Faculty of Graduate Studies

**Phytoremediation for Treatment of Brackish Water from Reverse
Osmosis Plant**

By

Rinad Jalal Yahya Hamed

Supervisors

Dr. Shehdah Jodeh

Co- Supervisors

Dr. Raed Alkowni

**This Thesis is Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Chemistry, Faculty of Graduate Studies, An-
Najah National University, Nablus- Palestine.**

2014

**Phytoremediation for Treatment of Brackish Water from
Reverse Osmosis Plant**

By

Rinad Jalal Yahya Hamed

This Thesis Was Defended Successfully on 21/8/2014, and approved by:

Defense Committee Members

Signature

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Dr. Shehdah Jodeh/ Supervisor | |
| 2. Dr. Raed Alkowni/ Co-Supervisor | |
| 3. Dr. Subhi Samhan / External Examiner | |
| 4. Dr. Ghaleb Odwan / Internal Examiner | |

Dedication

After thank Allah for my graduation, my special thanks for my Dad and my Mom and whole of my family and every one for everything in this life and for this moment to let me stand with proud.

Finally my special thanks for Nagham and Anees both of you make me strong in this life with ambition towards the best for you and for the reconstruction of our beloved country.

Acknowledgements

After thank Allah for my graduation, I would like to thank Dr. Shehdah Jodeh for his supervision and continued support, Dr. Raed Alkowni for his help, supervision and continued support, Prof. Glick from Waterloo University – Canada for his bacteria supplement.

My special thanks to Palestinian Water Authority and MEDRC (Middle East Desalination Research Center) for their foundation ,and this wonderful opportunity to work on this topic, especially the environmental issues are within my concern, Moreover the cooperation for analysis of plant photosynthesis in different labs.

الاقرار

أنا الموقع ادناه مقدم الرسالة التي تحمل عنوان:

Phytoremediation for Treatment of Brackish Water from Reverse Osmosis Plant

أقر بان ما اشتملت عليه هذه الرسالة انما هو نتاج جهدي الخاص. باستثناء ما تمت الاشارة اليه
حيثما ورد وان هذه الرسالة ككل من او جزء منها لم يقدم من قبل لنيل أي درجة او بحث علمي او
بحثي لدى أي مؤسسة تعليمية او بحثية اخرى.

Declaration

The work provided in this thesis, unless otherwise referenced, is the
researcher's own work, and has not been submitted elsewhere for any other
degree or qualification.

Student's name:

اسم الطالب:

Signature:

التوقيع:

Date:

التاريخ:

Table of Contents

No.	Contents	Page
	Dedication	iii
	Acknowledgements	iv
	Declaration	v
	List of abbreviation	xiv
	Chlorophyll Fluorescence Nomenclature	xv
	List of Tables	viii
	List of Figures	x
	List of Schemes	xiii
	Abstract	xvi
	Chapter one: Introduction	1
1.1	Importance of water	1
1.2	Literature Review	2
1.3	Objective	4
1.4	Justification	5
	Chapter two: Background	6
2.1	Reverse Osmosis plants	6
2.2	Definitions of brackish water and generated brackish water	7
2.3	Measurement of brackish water parameters	8
2.4	Effect of brackish water on environment	9
2.4.1	Impact of brackish water on soil quality.	9
2.4.2	Impact of brackish water on plants	11
2.4.2.1	Ion specific damage	12
2.4.2.1.1	Na ⁺ ion toxicity.	12
2.4.2.1.2	Cl ⁻ ion toxicity	13
2.5	Salt tolerance level in plant and its mechanisms	13
2.5.1	Osmotic stress	14
2.5.2	Ion selectivity stress	15
2.5.3	Oxidative stress	16
2.5.4	Salt stress and photosynthesis	17
2.6	Remediation techniques	18
2.6.1	Phytoremediation.	18
2.7	Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR)	19
2.7.1	PGPR and brackish water.	22
2.7.2	Ethylene and ACC deaminase	22
2.7.3	Auxin production by ACC deaminase producing PGPR	23
2.8	Effect of ROS on seed germination plant	24
2.9	Pulse Amplitude Modulated (PAM) Fluorometry	26

	Chapter 3: Material and Methods	30
3.1	Selecting and culturing PGPR	30
3.2	Seed treatment with PGPR	31
3.3	H ₂ O ₂ imbibing of seeds	32
3.4	Measurement of PGPR growth curve at saline condition	32
3.5	Measurement of soil salinity	33
3.6	Preparation and measurement of brackish water by using Electrical Conductivity	35
3.7	Greenhouse plant germination and growth assays	35
3.8	Salt accumulation in plant	46
3.9	Measurement of photosynthesis with PAM fluorometry	47
3.10	Assessment of plant cell membrane stability using the electrolyte leakage methods	48
	Chapter 4: Result and Discussion	49
4.1	Measurements of PGPR growth under saline NaCl solution	49
4.2	Soil Electrical Conductivity	53
4.3	Brackish water parameters measurements	56
4.4	Measurements of photosynthesis with PAM fluorometry	58
4.5	Green house studies and dry biomass determination	80
4.6	Salt accumulation in plant	92
4.7	Assessment of plant cell membrane stability using the electrolyte leakage methods	96
	Conclusion	100
	Recommended future work	115
	Annex	116
	Reference	124
	الملخص	ب

List of Tables

No.	Contents	Page
1.1	Classification of water categories according to TDS in mg/L.	
2.1	Classification of water categories according to TDS in mg/L.	
2.2	Classification of Soils by EC and SAR	
2.3	Tolerance Mechanisms of Halophytes	
2.4	Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria mechanisms	
2.5	Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria strains	
3.1	Trials Schemes	
4.1	Average absorbance of UW3 grown in NaCl - (TSB) solution (0 g, 0.05g, 0.08g, 0.10g, 0.16g, and 0.24g) medium at $\lambda = 600$ nm.	
4.2	Calculated of control calculation of UW3 grown:	
4.3	% control of UW3 grown.	
4.4	Experimental measurements of (TDS) for random samples of autoclaved Loam soil, each parameter were performed in triplicate.	
4.5	Calculated experimental measurements of EC for random samples of autoclaved loam soil, each parameter was performed in triplicate.	
4.6	Pulse Amplitude modulated flourometry measurement for Fv/Fm for Barley Plants, each trial repeated in 4 replicates.	
4.7	Pulse Amplitude modulated flourometry measurement for control Barley irrigated with fresh water.	
4.8	Measurement of root and shoot wet mass (g) for Barley plant trials after 30 days.	
4.9	Measurement of root and shoot wet mass (g) for Malt plant trials after 30 days.	
4.10	Measurement of root and shoot dry mass (g) for Barley plant trials after 30 days.	
4.11	Differences between wet biomass and dry biomass for	

	Barley plant trials.	
4.12	Measurement of root and shoot dry mass (g) for Malt plant trials after 30 days.	
4.13	Differences between wet biomass and dry biomass for Malt plant trials.	
4.14	Measurement of lengths of shoot (cm) after 14 days, 30 days and root lengths (cm) after 30 days for Barley plant	
4.15	Measurement of lengths of shoot (cm) after 14 days, 30 days and root lengths (cm) after 30 days for Malt plant.	
4.16	T-test to distinguish between Barley plant and Malt plant responses to bacteria	
4.17	Measurement of salt accumulation of Na Cl ions (mg/g dry weight) in Barley plant shoots tissue.	
4.18	Measurement of electrolyte leakage methods as TDS in mg/L in Barley plant root tissue trials.	

List of Figures

No.	Contents	Page
2.1	Schematic diagram of PGPR containing ACC deaminase lower the ethylene hormone, ACC	
2.2	Two paths one for open stomata represented by A and second one for closure stomata represented by B.	
2.3	Schematic of the thylakoid membrane showing the components of photosynthetic electron transport chain	
2.4	Nomenclature of PAM fluorescence parameters for dark-adapted leaf.	
3.1	Greenhouse model, miniature greenhouse built in backyard of my house. All pots were placed inside in rows to make it easy for irrigation, Greenhouse temperature was measured twice daily. No human interference for the temperature or light intensity during the period of the experiments.	
4.1	Absorbance of bacteria grown in saline (0 g, 0.05g, 0.08g, 0.10g, 0.16g, and 0.24g NaCl)/20 mL tryptic soy broth (TSB) medium at 600 nm at each time.	
4.2	electrical conductivity parameter for calibration	
4.3	Measurement of soil salinity as TDS (total dissolved salts) after 30 days of cultivation period at temp 17°C. according to data in Annex 1.	
4.4	Measurement of electrical conductivity measurement as total dissolved salts (TDS) for two syntheses brackish water samples before used in irrigation. TDS measurement after irrigation include for decent water as shown in Annex 3.	
4.5	Photography random selection of Barley plant measurement for Control Barley irrigated with fresh water:..	
4.6	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry spectra for control Barley irrigated with fresh water	
4.7	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry Chart for control Barley plant irrigated with fresh water	
4.8	Pulse Amplitude modulated fluorometry spectra for Barley plant irrigated with 6000mg/L of brackish water :	
4.9	Pulse Amplitude modulated fluorometry chart for Barley plant irrigated with 6000mg/L of brackish water.	
4.10	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry spactra for Barley plant irrigated with 10000mg/L water	
4.11	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry chart for Barley	

	plant irrigated with 10000mg/L water.	
4.12	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	
4.13	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	
4.14	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.15	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.16	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.17	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.18	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	
4.19	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	
4.20	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.21	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.22	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.23	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.24	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with fresh water	
4.25	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with fresh water	
4.26	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.27	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of	

	brackish water	
4.28	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.29	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.30	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	
4.31	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	
4.32	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.33	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.34	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.35	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.36	Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	
4.37	Measurement of root and shoot wet mass (g) for Barley plant trials after 30 days.	
4.38	Measurement of root and shoot wet mass (g) for Malt plant trials after 30 days.	
4.39	Measurement of root and shoot dry mass (g) for Barley Planttrials after 30 days.	
4.40	show differences between wet biomass and dry biomass of Root+ Shoot (g)/0.114m ² of pot after 30 days for Barley plant trials	
4.41	Measurement of root and shoot dry mass (g) for Malt plant trials after 30 days.	
4.42	Differences between wet biomass and dry biomass for Malt plant trials.	
4.43	Differences between wet biomass and dry biomass for Malt	

	plant trials	
4.44	Measurement of lengths of shoot (cm) after 14 days, 30 days and root lengths (cm) after 30 days for Barley Plant.	
4.45	Measurement of lengths of shoot (cm) after 14 days, 30 days and root lengths (cm) after 30 days for Malt Plant.	
4.46	Measurement of salt accumulation of Na Cl ions (g/g dry weight) in Barley plant root tissue.	
4.47	Measurement of electrolyte leakage methods as TDS in mg/L in Barley plant root tissue trials.	
4.48	Picture where (A) represent trial of control Barley plant irrigated with fresh water, (B) trials of treatment of Barley plant with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 6000mg/L.	
4.49	Picture where (A) represent trial of control Barley plant irrigated with fresh water, (B) trials of treatment of Barley Plant with UW3 irrigated with 6000mg/L.	
4.50	Picture where (A) represent trial of control Barley plant irrigated with fresh water, (B) trials of treatment of Barley plant with UW4 irrigated with 6000mg/L.	
4.51	Picture where (A) represent trial of control Barley plant irrigated with fresh water, (B) trials of treatment of Barley plant with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000mg/L.	
4.52	Picture where (A) represent trial of control Barley plant irrigated with fresh water, (B) trials of treatment of Barley plant with UW3 irrigated with 10000mg/L.	
4.53	Picture where (A) represent trial of control Barley plant irrigated with fresh water, (B) trials of treatment of Barley plant with UW4 irrigated with 10000mg/L.	

List of Schemes

No.	Contents	Page
3.1	Control seeds pots used in this experiments. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt plants.	
3.2	Seeds pots germinated with pseudomonas putida (UW3) used in this experiments. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt plants	
3.3	Seeds pots germinated with pseudomonas putida (UW4) used in this experiments. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt plants.	
3.4	Seeds pots germinated with pseudomonas putida (UW3+UW4) used in this experiments. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt plants.	
3.5	Seeds pots germinated with pseudomonas putida (UW3+H ₂ O ₂) used in this experiments. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and	

	(b) for Malt plants.	
3.6	Seeds pots germinated with H ₂ O ₂ used in this experiment. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt Plants	

List of Abbreviations

ACC	1-Amino Cyclopropane-1-Carboxylate
AL	Actinic Light used in PAM fluorometry
CEC	Cation Exchange Capacity
dd H₂O	De-ionized and Distilled water
EC	Electrical Conductivity
EC_{1:2}	Electrical Conductivity of a soil extract with 1 part of soil to 2 parts of water (w/v)
ECe	Electrical Conductivity of a saturated soil paste extract
FR	Far Red light used in PAM fluorometry
IAA	Indole-3-Acetic Acid
LHCI	Light Harvesting Chlorophyll Protein Complex I
LHCII	Light Harvesting Chlorophyll Protein Complex II
ML	Modulated Measuring Light used in PAM fluorometry
OEC	Oxygen Evolving Complex
PPM	Part Per Million
PAM	Pulse Amplitude Modulated
Pheo	Pheophytin
PGPR	Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria isolated based on ACC deaminase activity
PSI	Photosystem I
PSII	Photosystem II
PQ	Oxidized Plasto Quinol pool
PQH	Reduced Plasto Quinol pool
ROS	Reactive Oxygen Species
SAM	S-Adenosyl-Methionine
SAR	Sodium Adsorption Ratio
SP	Saturating Pulse used in PAM fluorometry
TSB	Tryptic Soy Broth
RO	Reverse Osmosis
UW3	<i>Pseudomonas putida</i>
UW4	<i>Pseudomonas putida</i>
C³	Cubic Meter
mM	Mile Molarity
R.P.M	Round Per Minute
PPT	Part Per Thousand
Kc	Crop Coefficient
ARF	Auxin Responses Factor
MAPK	Nitrogen – Activated Protein
QACS	Quaternary Ammonium Compounds
ICP	Inductive Coupled Plasma

OD	Optical Density
IAA	Indo-3-Acetic Acid
Ado Met	S- Adenosyl Methionie

Chlorophyll Fluorescence Nomenclature

F	Actual fluorescence intensity at any given time.
F'	Fluorescence at any light level and induction state. Some PSII closed ($0 \leq qP \leq 1$, $0 \leq qN \leq 1$), some ΔpH
F _o	Minimal fluorescence in dark-adapted tissue; fluorescence intensity with all PSII reaction centers open while the photosynthetic membrane is in the non-energized state ($qP = 1$ and $qN = 0$); ΔpH . It can also be used for the O level in Kautsky nomenclature.
F _m	Maximal fluorescence in dark-adapted tissue; fluorescence intensity with all PSII reaction centers closed ($qP = 0$), all non-photochemical quenching processes are at a minimum ($qN = 0$); no ΔpH
F _v	Variable fluorescence in dark-adapted tissue; maximum variable fluorescence in the state when all non-photochemical processes are at a minimum ($qP = 1 \rightarrow 0$, $qN = 0$), i.e. $F_m - F_o$
F _s	Fluorescence in steady states; defined by an author as a period within which the fluorescence intensity does not change while the external circumstances remain constant
F _s '	Steady-state fluorescence at any light level. Some PSII closed ($0 \leq qP \leq 1$, $0 \leq qN \leq 1$), some ΔpH
F _v /F _m	Exciton transfer efficiency in dark-adapted tissue; $(F_m - F_o)/F_m$
F _o '	Minimal fluorescence in light-adapted tissue (quick application of Far-Red PSI light); fluorescence intensity with all PSII reaction centers open in any light adapted state ($qP = 1$ and $qN \geq 0$), some ΔpH
F _m '	Maximal fluorescence in light-adapted tissue; fluorescence intensity with all PSII reaction centers closed in any light adapted state ($qP = 0$ and $qN \geq 0$)
F _v '	Variable fluorescence in light-adapted tissue; maximum variable fluorescence in any light adapted state, i.e. $F_m' - F_o'$, caused by closure of PSII in the light ($qP = x \rightarrow 0$, $0 < qN \leq 1$)
F _v '/F _m '	Exciton transfer efficiency in light-adapted tissue; $(F_m' - F_o')/F_m'$
qP	Photochemical quenching; $(F_m' - F)/(F_m' - F_o')$
qN	Non-photochemical quenching; $1 - (F_m' - F_o')/(F_m - F_o)$
Yield	Effective quantum yield of PSII; $(F_m' - F_s)/F_m'$

Phytoremediation for Treatment of Brackish Water from Reverse Osmosis Plant

By

Rinad Jalal Yahya Hamed

Supervisors

Dr. Shehdah Jodeh

Co- Supervisors

Dr. Raed Alkowni

Abstract

Brackish water as byproduct from Reverse Osmosis plant (RO) after desalination process, this considered as environmentally impact from RO usage. It contains significant concentrations of dissolved salts ions such as Na^+ , Cl^- , Ca^{2+} , Mg^{2+} , K^+ , SO_4^{2-} , and CO_3^{2-} as major ions. Total Dissolved Salts (TDS) of these ions ranged from (5000 mg/L -10000mg/L). Depletion of brackish water in unfriendly environmental ways causes plant growth inhibition due to osmotic stress caused to plant and soil; also will limiting the fields for agricultural use in the country. Phytoremediation are one of the methods can be used for water and land salt remediation.

In phytoremediation techniques plants are used to extract, immobilize and degrade contaminants. The phytoextraction of salts relies on the uptake of ions into plants biomass during brackish water irrigation process. Salts ions are up taken by plants, sequestered and harvested as a plant biomass. This method removes the salts from soil and/or brackish water and leaving the environment clean.

As high salt concentrations inhibit plant growth, Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR) were found to improve plant growth by lowering production of stress ethylene compound within plants, thereby increasing the biomass and photosynthetic activity.

In this research, PGPRs were implemented to investigate the efficiency of phytoremediation techniques for treatment of generated brackish water. Two strains of PGPR (UW3, *Pseudomonas putida*. UW4, *Pseudomonas putida*) were isolated from natural compound and obtained from Prof. Glick –Waterloo University – Canada, had been selected to be used with two plants: Barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) and Malt plants (*Panicum maximum* Jacq.). Trials include treatment of these plants with PGPR and without PGPR in order to study the effects of PGPRs on the plant responses toward brackish water irrigation. All trials were carried in a designed green house.

The results showed that PGPRs had significant effects on plant growth (biomass), photosynthetic activity, membrane stability, and root and shoot lengths increase under salt stress by (compared to control trials treated without PGPRs and irrigated with fresh water and brackish water.

Greenhouse studies showed that plants treated with PGPRs and irrigated with brackish water increased significantly in biomass percentage for trails treated with fresh ware , 6000 mg/L of brackish water, 10000mg/L of brackish water related for Treated Barley seeds with UW3 (237.31%, 249.40%, 156.11%) and for Treated Barley seeds with UW4 (156.11%,

237.31%, 288.83%) and for trials treated with UW3 and UW4 (128.12%, 267.67%, 288.56%) compared to control trials without PGPR irrigated either with fresh water (dd H₂O) (100%), or 6000 mg/L (8.98 %) and 10000 mg/L of brackish water (150.08%). It was noticed that the PGPRs treated plants had (283%), increase in their root and shoot length (respectively). Salt ions accumulation was found to be increased in shoots (159.09mmol, 179.73mmol) /0.114m² of pots. TDS for decant water decreased to reach (0.101 mg/L). Electrolyte leakage assay showed that plant treated with PGPRs resulted in same values for trials treated with fresh water, less electrolyte leakage from membrane equal to 304 mg/L.

In addition, the several chlorophyll a fluorescence parameters, Fv/Fm, Y (II), and QN obtained from Pulse Amplitude Modulation (PAM) fluorometry showed that treated plants with PGPRs resulted in improvement in their photosynthesis under brackish water.

The novel results of this research study that carried for the first time where PGPRs *Pseudomonas putida* (UW3, UW4) had been used for improving the phytoremediation activities of two salt tolerant plants: Barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) and Malt plants (*Panicum maximum* Jacq.) had showed a very clear and significant improvements of high salt uptake and thus high phytoremediation activities of these plants once they were treated with PGPRs. The results of this research will be considered as an outbreak in the phytoremediation science and future applications.

Chapter One

Introduction

Background

1.1 Importance of water

Water is considered to be basic and vital component of the social, economic, political fabric of Palestine. Its sector represents the basic foundation for sovereignty and attachment to our land, there is limited source, classified into surface and ground water. Depletion of water resources recently and deterioration of it becomes the key of environmental challenges; it requires urgent action to treat water to an appropriate quality and quantity for meeting disposal and beneficial reuses [Marie and Vengosh, 2001; Yasser, 2006].

Many techniques and operations have been implemented to treat wastewater and saline water in Palestine. Four RO plants exist in Jericho for treatment brackish and brackish water. This operation has side product such as generated brackish water. Disposal of it cause salinity of soil, and inhibit plant growth. To minimize effect of brackish water disposal into environment, many researchers have been put into finding economical and effective methods for treatments of it through many feasible processes [Assaf, 2004].

Phytoremediation technique it's a technique uses of plants to take up ions into their biomass, then above ground biomass can be harvested, Still, until now days Phytoremediation process didn't use widely due to high salinity inhibit plant growth even tolerant plant species[USEPA, 2000].

In this study, phytoremediation technique implemented for treatment of generated brackish water from reverse osmosis plant using Barley Plant(*Hordeum vulgare L.*) and Malt Plant(*Panicum maximum Jacq.*), these plants germinated with PGPR. Some of trials with PGPR imbibed with hydrogen peroxide to study the effect of antioxidant resistance damage cause by production of reactive oxygen radical under salt stress.

1.2 Literature Review:

No Large scale mentioned about reverse osmosis method in treatment generated brackish water; reviewed paper only handled refinement of pores of membrane for distillation. Amount of fresh water added to lower the ions concentration in water. In (2003) Tchobanoglous et al. provided about brackish management and examined broader context of brackish treatment. The treatment technologies include membrane filtration process such as reverse osmosis; Ion exchange process such as electrolysis or weak acid cation; and exchange or evaporation process such as brackish concentrators.

Mac neill (2011) mentioned remediation methods for salt impacted soils include excavation, leaching, electronic restoration and phytoremendaiton. Phytoremediation enhanced with PGPR shown satisfactory results in infiltration of soils salinity by sequester ions by biomass of plant.

As outlined in by Glick and Penrose, in (1998) PGPR improved plant growth under stressful condition by lowering the ethylene stress hormone, and in (2009, 2014) other researches handled germination of seed with plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) [Munees and mulugeta, 2014; Wu, 2009]. Their research applied on field trial with many different species' of tall wheat, rice and Barley plants in saline soil. In (2009) Shan and McNeill in (2011) determined effect of H_2O_2 seed imbibitions' on rate of germination under saline condition, both alone and in combination with PGPR treatment for Barley and tall wheat grass.

1.3 Objective:

- 1- Study the effect of Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR) on plants in terms of biomass production and photosynthetic activity under salt stress will be examined.
- 2- Study the effect of PGPR on plants cells integrity: salt ions entry damage cell membrane, and increase its permeability will be studied.

3- Measure NaCl accumulations in plants and compared it with control plants trials.

4- Study the effect of antioxidant hydrogen peroxide on seed germination rate under brackish water will be examined.

1.4 Justification:

In our country large amount of generated brackish water (about 10-12 million m³) produced daily from each of five stations of reverse osmosis plants in Jericho districts. Brackish water were disposed in unfriendly environmental ways by spilled them out in soils and/or streams which created further to environmental problems [Palestinian water Authority, 2013].

Moreover, brackish water from ground water at Jericho area wells and ranged for TDS according to Table 1.1

Recently some researches proved the effective of Phytoremediation technique in soil salinity treatment. In this research, Phytoremediation will be implemented as a method for treatment of generated brackish water by using selected tolerant plants species germinated with PGPRs at Palestine. The results of these experiments will be used for successful treatments of brackish water field.

**Table 1.1: Classification of water categories according to TDS in mg/L
(Palestinian water Authority, 2013).**

TDS of water in mg/L			
Fresh water	Brackish water	Sea water	Brackish
0-1500	1500-10000	10000-35000	> 50000

Chapter Two

Background

2.1 Reverse Osmosis plants:

For any natural process between two solvents differ in concentration with semi membrane located between them, the solvents start to move from an area of low solute concentration (high water potential) through membrane to an area of high solute concentration (low water potential), This process named as osmotic process[Arnot et al. , 2011].

Any applied external forces such as pressure to reverse this natural flow become a new process named as reverse osmotic process which is defined as a process of forcing a solvent from a region of high solute concentration through membrane to a region of low solute concentration [Al Agha et al., 2005 and Arnot, 2011].

This reverse osmotic process depends on manufacturing reverse osmosis plant for water purification where reverse osmosis takes place through denser layer polymer matrix- membrane; either of interfacial polymerized layer or natural skin differs in size of pores, according to type of molecules and ions needed to be removed to produce portable water.

Pure solvent produced from the plant and the other solute which contains higher concentration of salt ions retained into the pressurized side of membrane, named as generated brackish water. It's by product for this process.

This process cannot be considered as economical process. It requires high pressure usually (2-17 bar) for fresh water and brackish water, and (40 – 82 bar) for sea water [Marie and Vengosh, 2001]. One of the most disadvantages is a large quantity of brackish water produced (10-12 million m³) produced daily from five stationeries' in Jericho district.

2.2 Definitions of brackish water and generated brackish water:

Brackish water term is similar to generated brackish water term in salt ions contents. These differ in terms only to distinguish the latter term as industrial waste generated from reverse osmosis plant.

Brackish water defined as a solution contains significant concentrations of dissolved salts ions. Typically it contain high levels of free ions such as Na⁺, Cl⁻, Ca⁺², Mg⁺², K⁺¹, SO⁻², and CO₃⁻² as major ions. These concentration usually expressed as total dissolved salts per liter in units of parts per thousand (per mille) or parts per million (mg/L) [Al Agha et al, 2005; Arnot et al, 2011].

TDS (Total Dissolved Salts) parameter for generated Brackish water produced from reverse osmosis plants in Jericho districts range from 5000-10000 mg/L TDS [Marie and Vengosh, 2011].

2.3 Measurement of brackish water parameters:

Electrical conductivity is an instrument used for electrolysis of brackish water measurements which measures total amount of minerals salts present in water. The mineral salts constitute of a mixture of electrolytes. These constituents are usually reported in units of total dissolved salts (mg/L) or (mg/L), or desiemns /Liter (ds/L) [Al Agha et al, 2005; Arnot et al, 2011]. Table 2.1 shows water salinity based on total dissolved salts in water.

Table 2.1: Classification of water categories according to TDS in mg/L.

TDS of water in mg/L			
Fresh water	Brackish water	Sea water	Brackish
0-1500	1500-10000	10000-35000	> 50000

The TDS in water between ranges 5000-10000 mg/L consider as highly brackish water. But in this research brackish term were taken instead of highly brackish term to make it easy for reader. Also brackish water was synthesized in lab.

2.4 Effect of brackish water on environment:

Disposal of generated brackish water into environment cause problems issues to soils and plants.

2.4.1 Impacts of brackish water on soil quality:

Brackish affects soil structure and increases salinity of soil, especially Na^+ and Cl^- , according to amount of ions impact soil ,the soil classified from saline to sodic depend on (conductivity of a saturated paste) EC_e , and high Sodium Adsorption Ratio (SAR)[Bohn et al., 1985].

Sodium is particular concern for soil quality. Where negatively charged particles from soil structure, these negatively charged particles typically matched with divalent cations which they are calcium and magnesium. This composition connects clay particles into large flocs. These flocs don't pack tightly to allow for air, water and roots to pass through it easily. Additions of sodium ions as monovalent cations result in exchange between monovalent and divalent cations at negative charges in soil particles. These exchange results in variation in soil structure cause disruption on flocculation of soil, where flocs disperse, and soil particles pack more tightly [Bohn et al., 1985; Cramer,2002].

For measurement of soil salinity EC, TDS, SAR parameters are used for determination of salinity of soil and its quality where:

EC term abbreviated for Electrical Conductivity for soil solution extract. This measured index of total concentration of ionized solutes in an aqueous sample and reports in units of deciSiemens/meter (ds/m) or Total Dissolved Salts (mg/l.) [Alva et al., 1991 and Walton et al., 1989].

$$EC_e = K \times EC_{x:y} \dots\dots\dots \text{Equation (1)}$$

Where:

EC_e defined as soil sample with deionized water added just to the saturation points.

$EC_{x:y}$ where x mass of soil and y is volume of water used to make the saturation point.

K it's an empirically determined conversion factor between two formulas shown above, usually the k value for the equation below is typically between 2 and 4, and it based on the ionic content [Alva et al., 1991].

TDS is another parameter refers to total dissolved solids. This is less common measurement for ions salts, report amount of dissolved ions in any solution with units of mg/L, by weighing precipitated minerals of filtered brackish water after dried of known volume for total sample. TDS can be related to electrical conductivity by following equation: [Alva et al., 1991].

$$TDS = k \times EC \dots\dots\dots \text{Equation (2)}$$

On the other hand, SAR term refers to sodium adsorption ratio which determines risk of damage happen to soil structure by sodium ion related to calcium and magnesium cations as shown below:

$$SAR = \frac{[Na^+]}{\sqrt{\frac{([Ca^{2+}] + [Mg^{2+}])}{2}}} \dots\dots\dots \text{Equation (3)}$$

This equation presents a comparison of concentration of sodium ion to

calcium and magnesium ion, typically these divalent cations act as counter ions in soil flocculation [Alva et al., 1991].

These parameters help for determination of salinity in soils; Table 2.2 shows ranges of reference measurement value of soil salinity indicate best soil can be used for cultivation.

Table 2.2: Classification of Soils by EC and SAR [Mac neill, 2011]

Criteria	Unconditional Use	Moderately Saline	Saline	Highly Saline
EC(dS/m)	< 2	3-5	6-8	> 8
SAR	< 5	6-8	9-12	> 12

The EC and SAR are parameters show the levels of salinity of soils as shown in Table 2.2, where best condition for plant growth for salinity below a value of 2 ds/m and for sodicity as measured by the SAR are below 4 or 5.

These references values reported in Table 2.2 used in study for determination of salinity of soil.

2.4.2 Impact of brackish water on plants:

Impact of brackish water is the most severe environmental stress on plants. The common ions stress and inhibit plant growth are sodium and chloride. When these ions enter the soil and surround the rhizosphere- part of root-. It causes differences between water potential in roots above water potential

in soils. This change lowers the movement of water from soil into rhizosphere, limiting water and nutrient uptake [Aard, 2007; Ashraf, 2004; Das and Parida, 2005].

2.4.2.1 Ion specific damage:

2.4.2.1.1 Na⁺ ion toxicity:

Na⁺ is the primary causes of disorder from enzyme activation to protein synthesis. It considered more toxic than Cl⁻ ion.

Once high concentration of Na⁺ enters rhizosphere, it rapidly translocate to shoots via the xylem. Then it does accumulate in leaves result in necrosis and short of lifetimes of individual leaves.

Moreover, sodium has numerous physiological effects. It causes deficiencies of other nutrients by interfering with ion transporters K⁺. K⁺ is essential to activate more than 50 enzymes and synthesis of protein which play role in cellular functions. This interfering happen due to Na⁺ is similar to ionic radius to K⁺ this similarity allow for competition between these two ions. This competition results in an overabundance of sodium in tissue compared to potassium, and enters in coordination with t-RNA, resulting inhibited protein synthesis, leads disruption these cellular functions[Blaha et al. , 2000; Blumwald and Aharon , 2000 ; Carden et al. , 2003].

The same competitive is found with displacement with calcium ion by sodium ion, where it lowered calcium concentration within plant. This

competitive impair gas exchange rate for photosynthesis. Even deficiencies of magnesium due to sodium entrance inhibit photosynthetic rates in plants, further chlorophyll synthesis and functions [Parida and Das, 2005].

2.4.2.1.2 Cl⁻ ion toxicity:

Chloride ion requires in plants to some limited levels as vital ions inside plants. It's involved in photosynthesis mechanisms, in adjusting osmotic potential, and maintains electrical charge through membrane [Naidoo and Somaru, 2008].

Excess levels than required for plants process causes toxicity and inhibition of photosynthesis process. Its accumulation causes toxicity to leaves [James et al, 2006; Naidoo and Somaru, 2008].

2.5 Salt tolerance level in plant and its mechanisms:

Plants are divided into two groups according to their ability to tolerate salt which they are Halophytes and Glycophytes. Halophytes are more adapted to salt stress than Glycophytes. Differences between these groups are in the stability of their enzymes and physiological process; even Halophytes are inhibited at some point of high concentration of salts [Das and Parida, 2005 et al.].

Some examples of salt tolerance plant as: Oats, Barley, and Wheat. Also for tolerant grass include: tall wheatgrass, and alkali grass [Ashraf, 2004; Niazi et al, 1991].

Tolerance mechanism of Halophytes can be classified into avoidance or adaptation or accumulation as shown in Table 2.3 [Munns and Tester , 2008].

Table 2.3: Tolerance mechanisms of Halophytes [Munns and Tester, 2008].

Avoidance	1- Grow only during favorable seasons 2- Grow only in favorable areas. 3- Limitation of root growth to select soil horizons
Adaptation Process	1-Selectivity against Na and Cl. 2- Exclusion of salt from shoots. 3- Diversion of salt out of assimilating tissues. 4- Compartmentalization of salts with in plant, tissue, and cells
Tolerance	1- Increase salt tolerance of tissue, cells and organelles. 2- Increase in halo –succulence: a) Increase in leaf –succulence. b) Increase in stem –succulence relation of leaves.

2.5.1 Osmotic stress:

Osmotic results when these ions enter the soil and surround the rhizosphere- part of root-. It causes differences between water potential in roots above water potential in soils. This change lowers the movement of water from soil into rhizosphere, limiting water and nutrient uptake [Aard, 2007; Ashraf, 2004; Das and Parida, 2005].

In order to overcome osmotic stress it should counteract its action by continuously pump sodium and chloride ions to above ground tissue. This

process has been effectively employed by Halophytes .it consider as key to distinguish it from Glycophytes. Another mechanism includes biosynthesis a series of organic compounds, called: compatible osmolytes. Compatible osmolytes compounds are usually molecular weight, high- water soluble and non-toxic at higher cellular content, such as sugars, acids, Quaternary Ammonium Compounds (QACS). These compatible osmolytes can counteract negative effects of high osmotic pressures in plant tissues. Proline is another synthesized compound also widely used in plants cytosol, under salts stress. The precursor for Proline bio synthesis is glutamic acid, and two enzymes pyrroline-S- carboxylate synthases reductase (P5CR). It acts as correlation with salt stress tolerance [Munees and Mulugeta, 2014; Munns, 1993; Munns and Tester, 2008].

2.5.2 Ion selectivity stress:

To cope brackish water effect plants tend to be selectivity of ions, by taken up ions into plants and exclude those are toxic. It is stored in vacuoles within plant cells to maintain osmotic potential in the vacuole and cytoplasm. This translocation of Na^+ is achieved via Na^+ diffusion channels, Na^+ pumps, and Na^+/H^+ antiporters, when Na^+ accumulates in vacuole, osmotic potential balanced between the cytoplasm and vacuole ,moreover the stress can be resolved by synthesis and accumulation of organic solutes that do not inhibit biochemical reactions in plants such as Proline and Sucrose[Apse et al. ,2011 ;Carden et al. ,2003 ; Karely et al. ,2000].

2.5.3 Oxidative stress:

Under non- stressed conditions, the photo system process inside chloroplasts run naturally with production of byproduct which is Reactive Oxygen Species (R O S). R O S represented as: Singlet oxygen ($^1\text{O}_2$), superoxide (O_2^-), hydroxyl group (HO^\cdot), and hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2). These byproducts produced in rate of 240 mM s^{-1} for superoxide, and 0.5 mM for hydrogen peroxide under non stressed conditions [Apel and Hirt, 2011].

While under salt stress, plants need to maintain turgor pressure and compartmentalization, so induced osmotic pressure leads to stomata closure, cause immediately decrease in CO_2 diffusion rate and photosynthetic fixation of CO_2 , this increases rate of superoxide to $240\text{-}720 \text{ mM s}^{-1}$ and for hydrogen peroxide $5\text{-}15 \text{ mM}$. This rapid increase of ROS in cells is called “oxidative burst”, where it distrust the cellular metabolisms [Apel and Hirt, 2011; Babu et al., 2001 and Wahid et al, 2007].

According to studies done by [Apel and Hirt, 2011; Babu et al., 2001; Wahid et al, 2007], other reasons causes increasing rate of ROS under salt stress are:

- (1) Closure of stomata to prevent water evaporates. This closure leads restriction in supply of CO_2 , lead to underperformance of Calvin cycle which fixes carbon and NADP^+ (electron acceptor). Under this salt stress, less amount of NADP^+ produces. Thus electron transfer to

reduced molecular oxygen is reduced to superoxide by ferredoxin in photo system I (PSI).

- (2) Enzyme responsible of electron transports systems affected by ion toxicity. Under salt stress when light energy captured by the light harvesting complex (LHC) exists a triplet (ground state) to singlet oxygen, which is represented of ROS.
- (3) Under non –stressed condition, 10% of electron leak out from the transport chain. While under stress condition the amount of leakage of electrons increase in photo system (II) reaction center this raise in leakage of electron produces more superoxide and hydrogen peroxide.

2.5.4. Salt stress and photosynthesis:

Photosynthesis is a physiological process in plant uses energy to form O₂, carbohydrates and ATP (adenosine triphosphate). The process starts with absorption of light and convert of photon energy to electron. Then electron excited to higher energy levels through electron transport chain in thylakoid membrane, ended with change NADP⁺ to NADPH form and adenosine triphosphate (ATP) [Baker ,2008; Flexas et al. , 2004].

Salt stress impaired photosynthesis process by restriction availability of CO₂ for carboxylation reaction due to stomata closure. Accumulation of high concentration of salts in photosynthesis tissues result in swelling of thylakoids, and distortion of chloroplast membrane; disrupt all process in plant. Measurement of photosynthesis can be used as another indicator of

plants under salt stress using pulse amplitude modulated fluorescence spectroscopy [Beer, 2008; Meloni and Oliva, 2003].

2.6 Remediation techniques:

Remediation of soil affected by brackish is achieved by physical removal of ions from soil. Physical removal techniques include: excavation, leaching and recovery, electro kinetic restoration, and photo remediation [Qadir et al.2007; Zhang et al. 2005].

Next section handled phytoremediation techniques explained in details.

2.6.1 Phytoremediation:

Phytoremediation is a physical removal technique, which is implemented in this research. This technique differs from other mentioned techniques by using plants to mitigate organic and inorganic contaminants in soils [USEPA, 2000].

Advantages of phytoremediation techniques over other mentioned remediation techniques depend on cost- effective, economical easily applied [Su et al.2008].

Phytoremediation has different mechanisms based on contaminates fates. These mechanisms are: degradation, extraction, volatilization, transformation, filtration or combinations of these. The mechanism carried in this study is phyto-extraction mechanisms in which plants take up salts ions during irrigation with brackish water, and accumulate it in above

ground portions of plant. After biomass reached its crop coefficient (K_c) it can be harvested lead to clean soil. Even there is limitation to its advantages, phytoremediation consider as time consuming. It requires several growing seasons to lower levels of salts or unwanted contaminants as mentioned by study of Shan (2008), beside high levels of salts inhibited plant growth and germinations. Even for salt tolerant plants species. But still high levels of salinity over requirements can severely diminish plant growth or tiger a wide negative response in plants [James et al, 2006; Munns and Tester, 2008; Shan, 2009].

2.7 Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR):

Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria is naturally occurring bacteria which is abbreviated to PGPR term. Rhizosphere refers to narrow zone of soil direct surround around the root system of plant. These microbes naturally motivated plant growth promotion through direct and indirect mechanisms shown in Table 2.4, and Table 2.5 shows examples of some of these strains via its functions [Munees and Mulugeta , 2014 ; Wu ,2009].

Table 2.4: Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria mechanisms [Munees and Mulugeta, 2014].

PGPR action through directly and indirectly mechanism	1- Nitrogen Fixation
	2- Hormone Production
	3- Helps in Nodulation
	4- Nutrient Uptake
	5- Siderphores production bio control

Phytoextraction depends on ability of plant to grow and extract contaminants of salt in its biomass. High concentration of salts above effectiveness of remediation process cause to produce ethylene hormone stress, this hormone lowers rates of germination and biomass production .One way to enhance plants growth under stress is to lower hormone stress in plants, this can be done by plant growth promoting rhizobacteria [Glick and Penrose ,1998 ; Kende ,1993; Qadir et al. ,1996 ; Wu, 2009].

Direct mechanisms include: production enhancement substances, facilitate acquisition of nitrogen, phosphorous, and any required mineral for growth also motivation plant hormone concentration levels.

Indirect mechanisms involve decreasing inhibitory effects of many pathways limit plant growth or effect photosynthesis process [Glick and Penrose, 1998; Munees and Mulugeta, 2014].

Table 2.5: Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria strains [Munees and Mulugeta, 2014].

PGPR	Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria Strains
<i>Pseudomonas putida</i>	IAA, siderophores, HCN, ammonia, exopolysaccharides, phosphate solubilization
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	IAA, siderophores, HCN, ammonia, exopolysaccharides, phosphate solubilization
<i>Klebsiella</i> sp.	IAA, siderophores, HCN, ammonia, exopolysaccharides, phosphate solubilization
<i>Enterobacter asburiae</i>	IAA, siderophores, HCN, ammonia, exopolysaccharides, phosphate solubilization
<i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. A3R3	IAA, siderophores
<i>Psychrobacter</i> sp. SRS8	Heavy metal mobilization
<i>Bradyrhizobium</i> sp.	IAA, siderophores, HCN, ammonia, exopolysaccharides
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> 4EA	Siderophores
<i>Bradyrhizobium</i> sp. 750, <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp., <i>Ochrobactrum cytisi</i>	Heavy metal mobilization
<i>Bacillus</i> species PSB10	IAA, siderophores, HCN, ammonia
<i>Paenibacillus polymyxa</i>	IAA, siderophores
<i>Rhizobium phaseoli</i>	IAA
<i>Stenotrophomonas Maltophilia</i>	Nitrogenase activity, phosphate solubilization, IAA, ACC Deaminase

For this study chosen strains which are UW3 and UW4 implement indirectly mechanism which explained in details in next section.

2.7.1. PGPR and brackish water:

In presence of up to 172 mM NaCl Glick (1998) reported that PGPR strains had high ACC deaminase activity, enhanced to more resistance under saline condition which is observed increase yields, with enhancement of nitrogen fixation as shown in Figure 2.1 [Shan ,2009].

2.7.2. Ethylene and ACC deaminase:

Naturally produced ethylene is necessary components for many plants for seed germination. But high levels of it can impede plant growth. PGPR are able to inhibit production of high concentration of ethylene through hydrolyzed ethylene precursor ACC [Glick, 1995].

ACC deaminase defines as amino cyclopropane-1-carboxylate (ACC) deaminase produced by some strains of PGPR. Under salt stress inside plant root ACC synthesis converts S- adenosyl methionie (AdoMet) into ACC which convert after that to ethylene by oxidation of ACC, where high concentration of ethylene cause stress to plant and growth inhabitation, so existence of PGPR on the rhizosphere of roots exuded ACC, and by the enzyme ACC deaminase its hydrolyzed to ammonia and α -ketobutyrate, this lead to take another pathway in the reaction result in decrease in amount of ethylene and thereby alleviates ethylene –induced stress and prevent inhabitation of root elongation. [Glick, 2004; Munees and Mulugeta, 2014; Mac neill, 2011; Wu, 2009]. The path ways is shown in Figure 2.1




Figure 2.1: Schematic diagram of PGPR containing ACC deaminase lower the ethylene hormone, ACC [Shan, 2009].

In 1995, 1997, and 1998 Glick and coworker had showed that ACC deaminase producing bacteria have been promoted plant growth under different environmental stress include: salt stress, water logging, heavy metals drought, petroleum exposure, metal organic contaminants .Consequently, PGPR effect on plant appear in longer root length shoot length [Gilck, 2004; Glick, 1995; Glick and Bashan, 1997; Glick and Penrose, 1998].

2.7.3. Auxin production by ACC deaminase producing PGPR:

Some strains of PGPR such as *pseudomonas putida* UW3 and *pseudomonas putida* UW4 secrete Indo-3-Acetic Acid (IAA), which consider as regulator for plant growth and it enter plant cells to stimulate root growth. Also it stimulates ACC synthesis, as consequence, the

concentration on ethylene depends on the balance of the IAA and ACC deaminase [Glick and Penrose, 1998; Munees and Mulugeta, 2014].

In 2004 Glick et al. proposed a model to explain how ethylene and IAA interact as feedback loop; decrease in levels of ethylene by ACC deaminase not only regulates plant stress responses. Also relieves ethylene repressed Auxin Responses Factor (ARF) synthesis lead to plant growth promotion resulted from both stress alleviation and growth stimulation [Glick, 2004].

However, with increase in ARF synthesis, ACC Synthesis is also simulated to produce more ACC and ethylene. This represses ARF synthesis. In this way ethylene limits its own production.

2.8. Effects of ROS on seed germination plant:

Under stress production of ethylene hormone in high concentration and plants resort to closure its stomata to limit water loss by evaporation. This closure procedure halts gas exchange between plants and atmosphere where this halts increase in content of oxygen species compared to carbon dioxide concentration, where carbon dioxide consider more necessary than oxygen species for carbon fixation and acceptance of electron from photosystem I and photosystem II. Oxygen species convert to reactive oxygen radical as mentioned in pervious section, and disrupt plant physiological [Apel and Hirt, 2011; Babu et al., 2001; Wahid et al., 2007].




Figure 2.2: Two paths one for open stomata represented by A and second one for closed stomata represented by B [Apel and Hirt, 2011; Babu et al., 2001].

Figure 2.2 shows Transfer of light through photosystems II and photosystemI in plants. Diagram (A) shows the normal movement of electrons, resulting in CO₂ as terminal electron acceptor and fixation of carbon into sugars. Diagram B shows exposure to osmotic stress resulting in closure of stomata, resulting in reactive oxygen species as terminal electron acceptor [Mac Neil, 2011].

Notice electron movements for closed stomata pathway, if O₂ is the final electron acceptor, it will result in reactive oxygen species. This species interact with DNA, pigments, protein, lipids and other essential cellular components leading to a series of random destructive process. For DNA and protein include denaturation, also loss of membrane integrity [Apel and Hirt, 2011; Babu et al., 2001; Wahid et al., 2007].

Meanwhile, for open stomata 20-25% of electrons diverted to formation of reactive oxygen species, these little amounts of it participate in cell signaling. It represent as antioxidant as H_2O_2 which activate several nitrogen – activated protein (MAPK). MAPK represents central for mediating cellular responses to multiple stress [Mac Neil, 2011; Miller et al., 2010; Mittler, 2002; Wahid et al., 2007].

In this experiment exogenously imbibing of H_2O_2 solution to seed at concentration of 60 mM as recommended from previous study by Mac Neill, 2011 to study antioxidants activation under brackish water effect [Mac Neil, 2011; Meloni and Oliva ,2003 ; Miller et al. ,2010].

2.9 Pulse Amplitude Modulated (PAM) Fluorometry:

Photosynthetic performance of plants evaluated through the chlorophyll fluorescence measurement. Biophysical process carries through three main protein complexes PSII. The cytochrome b6/f complex and PSI as shown in Figure 2.3. Photosystem II (PSII) located on the membrane of plants and consists of light –harvesting center II (LHCII), Oxygen –evolving complex (OEC), Reaction center (P680), Primary electron acceptor pheophytin (Pheo), and secondary acceptor Q_A and Q_B . Photosystem I (PSI) contain light –harvesting center I (LHCI) and reactions center p700 number of electron acceptor [Beer, 2008].




Figure 2.3: Schematic of the thylakoid membrane showing the components of photosynthetic electron transport chain [Beer, 2008].

When light absorbed by chlorophyll it passes one of these following ways:

- 1- Dissipation as heat.
- 2- Remission as light.
- 3- Energy to drive photosynthesis.

In this research, (PAM) fluorometry measured chlorophyll a fluorescence. Recoding information from instrument indicates functionally of PSII as flow of electron, rate of photosynthesis by emitted light from the pulse, and measured light. Taken heat dissipation is relatively constant during measurements. The following charts indicate several chlorophyll fluorescence parameters, as: F_v/F_m , yield, Q_p , Q_n , as shown in Figure 2.4 [Mac Neil, 2011].




Figure 2.4: Nomenclature of PAM fluorescence parameters for dark-adapted leaf [Mac Neil, 2011].

These parameters used to assess the effective of photochemistry in plants. Beside in this study they are as indication effect of salinity on photosynthetic electron transports.

Each term abbreviated for the following:

ML term: refer for modulated measuring light.

SP term: saturating pulse.

AL term: for incident light.

FR term for: far-red light.

Fv term: is the variable difference fluorescence between Fm and F0.

F_m term: is the maximal fluorescence of dark –adapted tissue.

F_mterm: is the maximal fluorescence of light –adapted tissue.

F_o term: is the minimal fluorescence.

F_s term: is s the stead –state fluorescence.

Yield parameter equal to:

$$\text{Yield} = F_v / F_m \dots\dots\dots \text{Equation 4}$$

$$F_v = F_m - F_o \dots\dots\dots \text{Equation 5}$$

It represent maximum quantum yield of PSII center when it's open.

Y is another calculation of yield at steady state photosynthesis and represented by:

$$Y = [F_m - F_s / F_m] \dots\dots\dots \text{Equation 7}$$

Optimal values for yield ranges between 0.5 to 0.75, lowered value indicates that plant is stressed.

q_p term is photochemical quenching represented as

$$q_p = [(F_m' - F_s) / (F_m' - F_o)] \dots\dots\dots \text{Equation 8}$$

q_n term is non-photochemical quenching of fluorescence which is represented by

$$[1 - (F_m' - F_o) / (F_m - F_o)] \dots\dots\dots \text{Equation 9}$$

Value of q_p indicate PSII reaction center that are open and equal the approximate oxidation of PSII, while q_n parameter related to the dissipation of energy as heat and photo inhibition [Shan,2009].

Chapter Three

Material and Methods

3.1. Selecting and culturing PGPR:

In this research two salt tolerant plants species selected [Barley plant (*Hordeum vulgare* L.), and Malt plant (*Panicum maximum* Jacq.) and used for phytoremediation. In order to increase their liability and tolerance to salty conditions, trials tested by incorporating them with plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR): UW3 and UW4 (*Pseudomonas putida*). These strains will be used in coating seeds separately, or in combination.

These two bacterial strains: *Pseudomonas putida*, UW3 and UW4; had been selected and brought from Professor Glick lab; at Waterloo University; in Canada, were grown in Tryptic Soy Growth (TSB) media. The media for UW3 growth was the only one that contained 100 mg/L of Ampicillin antibiotic (AMP). Solid media had been prepared by addition of 7.5g of agar for preparation of solid plates. Bacterial strains were cultured on solid and liquid media for each strain at 30°C for overnight. Some of these prepared bacteria were transferred to sterile falcon tubes with addition of glycerol layer (1:1) volume and stored at -80 °C as stock liquid solutions.

For liquid cultures preparations, bacterial inoculums had been transferred to 50 mL falcon tubes containing proper TSB media and incubated at 30°C

with shaking at 200 r.p.m in rotatory shaker (orbital shaking incubator, labtech, LSI-3016 A) for 26 hour.

3.2. Seed treatment with PGPR:

Cultures for each strain were transferred to two 50 mL falcon tubes separately, followed by centrifugation at 2000 r.p.m for 20 minutes using (Universal 320 R). The pellets were resuspended in (10 mL) of dd H₂O and the Optical density (OD) had been measured for each strain at wavelength 600 nm by UV- spectrophotometer (Spectro UV-Vis Dual Beam -8 Auto cell, UVS- 2700) to have 1.5 (OD) for UW3 which is perfect germination and 2.0(OD) for UW4 include for perfect germination (Mac Neil, 2011; Shan, 2009).

For adhesion process of bacterial cells to the seeds surfaces, methylcellulose white gel polymer was prepared. Briefly, 7g of methylcellulose powder were dissolved in 500 mL of distilled – deionized water (ddH₂O); stirred for one hour until most of clumps had been dissolved, before they were autoclaved for 20 minutes at 110 °C and 100 psi using auto cleave (EQUUS steam sterilization auto cleave).The resulted polymer was white gel and it becomes clear gel upon cooling.

The next step was including the adhesion process by adding of 2.5 volumes of methylcellulose polymers to one volume of bacterial suspension. Then the bacterial-methylcellulose polymers incorporated with (2.5:1) volume for Malt seeds and up to (7:1) volume for Barley seeds. It is worth to

mention that plant seeds had been disinfection previously by soaked in bleach sodium hypochlorite (1%M) for 10 minutes, followed by three times washing with ddH₂O.

After seeds treatments with PGPR, they were dried for 5 minutes at room temp before they were transferred into sealed autoclaved plastic bags, and then stored at 4 °C for one week prior usage.

3.3. H₂O₂ imbibing of seeds:

This exogenously imbibing of H₂O₂ solution to seed to study antioxidants activation under brackish water effect, and not depend on ozone in air due the process of coating done to seed before germination.

Seeds had been soaked in prepared solution of 60 mM H₂O₂ for 3 hours as recommended from experiments of Mc niell, 2011, after imbibing process, part of seeds was treated with UW3 strain as mentioned in section 3.2. Others were soaked only in H₂O₂ and both were transferred to autoclaved sealed plastic bags stored at 4 °C and used within one week of imbibition.

3.4. Measurement of PGPR growth curve at saline condition:

Saline Media were prepared to study growth of PGPR at different saline condition for testing their performance to salt especially salt ions (Na⁺ and Cl⁻) ions. Salt ionic compound concentrations usually found in brackish water were between 5000-10000 mg/L. For that, Tryptic Soy Broth (TSB) media with different concentration of NaCl (0.05g, 0.08 g, 0.16g, and 0.24

g,) were prepared in 50 mL falcon tubes containing of TSB in 20 mL liquid solution.

After that, *Pseudomonas putida*, UW3 was cultured in each falcon tubes at 30 ± 1 °C and shacked at 200 r.p.m for 10 hours by shaker (orbital shaking incubator, lab tech, LSI-3016 A). Then, optical density (OD) read for each falcon tube was at wavelength 600 nm by UV- spectrophotometer (Spectro UV-Vis Dual Beam -8 Auto cell, UVS- 2700) at different time intervals from 1 – 8 hours to study the bacterial growth responses within each range of dissolved salts of brackish water. Each absorbance measurement was performed in triplicate at each time for ensuring the accuracy of readings, and OD at zero time was read, with – ve control.

3.5. Measurement of soil salinity:

Soil samples were selected to be loam soil collected from An-Najah field campus, where they similar in texture to Jericho area soil. The soil samples were filled in bags and autoclaved (EQUUS steam sterilization auto cleave) to ensure removal of any bacterial and/or fungi infections. Then soils were allowed to dry to remove moisture, and sieved using 10 mm particle size sieve.

Electrical conductivity was measured for randomly chosen samples. Measurement based upon E_{Ce} (soil saturated with water) and E_{C1:2} (1:2 represent ratio of soil to water extract). These measurements were carried out according to published procedure by Chang (2007), measurements for

two parameters were performed in triplicate. $EC_{1:2}$ measurement done by addition of 15 g of sterile-soil to 30 mL of distilled –deionized water (ddH_2O) in 50 mL sterile falcon tube. The mixtures were shaken on rotator shaker (Orbital shaking incubator, lab tech, LSI-3016 A) at 200 r.p.m for 30 minutes to make them homogenous mixtures, and then centrifuged at 2000r.p.m for 10 minute (Universal 320 R). Then electrical conductivity was measured for supernatant using electrical conductivity meter instrument (4510 – conductivity meter, Jen way).

For EC_e (soil saturated with water) measurements; 50 g of sterile soil was mixed with sufficient ddH_2O in 100 mL beaker till reach saturation. Where saturation, point indicated by shining appearance of the paste. The paste allowed settling down at least 4- hours to ensure the saturation criteria after saturation criteria had been reached, the mixture then centrifuged at 2000 r.p.m for 10 minutes by centrifuge (Universal 320 R). Electrical conductivity of the filtrate and supernatant were measured by electrical conductivity meter (4510 –conductivity meter, Jenway), and K value was determined by ratio between $EC_{1:2}$ to EC_e .

After salinity measurements, soil samples were filled in plastic pots of 17* 16*15 cm (length*width* height) with 12 medium holes at bottom for drainage. Then each pot was filled with 350 gram of sieved soil.

3.6. Preparation and measurement of brackish water by using Electrical Conductivity:

Two concentration of brackish water were prepared in lab which equal to 6000 and 10000mg/L, that had been chosen based on daily ranges of generated brackish water obtained from Jericho reverse osmosis plant. The two prepared concentrations contained four salts which are: (NaCl, KNO₃, MgCl₂, and CaCO₃). For preparation of concentration of 6000 mg/L, 3g of NaCl was added to 1g of each compounds KNO₃, MgCl₂, CaCO₃ separately, in 1 liter of warm distilled water and stirred to make homogeneous solution. On other hand for concentration of 10000 mg/L 7 g of NaCl were added to 1 g for other compound added separately in 1 liter of warm distilled water. After that electrical conductivity for both solution were measured to ensure total dissolved ions within prepared.

During irrigation period, descended water due to gravity forces (gravitational water) were collected for measurement to detect any contaminant ions that could be leached out. These measurements were included also the determination for how much leaching water could be arrived to ground water and cause salinity.

3.7. Greenhouse plant germination and growth assays:

The two salt tolerant plant species used in this research (Barley and Malt plants) were obtained from National Agriculture Research Center (NARC) - Ministry of Agriculture, Jenin.

About 20 seeds of each plant were grown in sterile pots with 100-200cm³ sterile loamy soils. The seeds were germinated on the top of each pot after covering them with a thin layer of about 5 cm of soil. The total numbers of pots were 36 representing the number of trials that made for this research study as shown in the schemes 3.1-3.6. Each pot was placed on aluminum trays with dimensions (16*10*6) (length *width*height) to collect the gravitational water that will be used later for measurement of soil leaked ions left after each irrigation, and seeds for treated trials all of them were grown.

All pots were planted in early February in 2014; and maintained in miniature greenhouse built in backyard of my house. All pots were placed inside in rows to make it easy for irrigation (Figure 3.1). This was to mimic the climate condition in Jericho. Greenhouse temperature was measured twice daily. No human interference for the temperature or light intensity during the period of the experiments.

Before germination all pots were irrigated with fresh water twice daily for five days. Pitchers used with holes to regulate operation of irrigation. After that each pot was irrigated to type of water it was labeled for, once on daily basis.

During growth stages plants had been photographed and the length shoot were measured, before it reached crop coefficient (K_c) end cycle of its life. After 30 days all plants were taken from pots and subjected to tests.




Figure 3.1: Greenhouse model, miniature greenhouse built in backyard of my house. All pots were placed inside in rows to make it easy for irrigation, Greenhouse temperature was measured twice daily. No human interference for the temperature or light intensity during the period of the experiments.

Control seeds pots used in this experiments. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt Plants.




(a)



(b)



Scheme 3.1: Control seeds pots used in this experiments. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt Plants.

Seeds pots germinated with *pseudomonas putida* (UW3) used in this experiments. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt Plants





Scheme 3.2: Seeds pots germinated with *pseudomonas putida* (UW3) used in this experiments. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt Plants

Seeds pots germinated with *pseudomonas putida* (UW4) used in this experiments. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt Plants





Scheme 3.3: Seeds pots germinated with *pseudomonas putida* (UW4) used in this experiments. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt Plants.

Seeds pots germinated with *pseudomonas putida* (UW3+UW4) used in this experiments. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt Plants.





Scheme 3.4: Seeds pots germinated with *pseudomonas putida* (UW3+UW4) used in this experiments. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt Plants.

Seeds pots germinated with *pseudomonas putida* (UW3+ H₂O₂) used in this experiments. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt Plants



Scheme 3.5: Seeds pots germinated with *pseudomonas putida* (UW3+ H₂O₂) used in this experiments. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt Plants.

Seeds pots germinated with H₂O₂ used in this experiment. One pot was irrigated with fresh tape water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt Plants.



Scheme 3.6: Seeds pots germinated with H_2O_2 used in this experiment. One pot was irrigated with fresh tap water; the second one was irrigated with brackish water of 6000 mg/L; and the last one was irrigated with brackish water of 10000 mg/L. Each pot contained an average of twenty seeds; (a) for Barley and (b) for Malt Plants.

Table3.1: Trials Schemes.[illegible]

Malt	Irrigation with :	Irrigation with :	Irrigation with :	Irrigation with :	Irrigation with :	Irrigation with :
	-Fresh water	-Fresh water	-Fresh water	-Fresh water	-Fresh water	-Fresh water
	-6000mg/L of brackish water	-6000 mg/L of brackish water	-6000 mg/L of brackish water	-6000 mg/L of brackish water	-6000 mg/L of brackish water	-6000 mg/L of brackish water
	-10000mg/L of brackish water	-10000 mg/L of brackish water	-10000 mg/L of brackish water	-10000 mg/L of brackish water	-10000 mg/L of brackish water	-10000 mg/L of brackish water

Measurements include for wet mass in (g) and for dry mass in (g) with differences between wet and dry Length measurements. This procedure was done to compare between trials.

The percentage of wet mass after 30 days = root+ shoot wet mass (g) for each trial / control wet mass for root+ shoot.

Area of pots = 0.114m^2

% of dry = total dry for any trial /total dry of control barley irrigated with fresh water.

3.8. Salt accumulation in plants:

Salt accumulation test was used in this study to determine the effectiveness of phytoextraction mechanism of the tested plants. It was used to determine how much of salt ions have been eliminated from brackish water. This method was carried for all trials by taking roots and shoots of plants after 30 days, after they were washed with tap H_2O and air dried for 5 days.

Shoot tissues were analyzed for Na^+ concentration by taking 1.0 g of plant shoot tissues into 50 mL Taylor tube. Adding 10 mL of concentrated nitric acid to tube to make decomposition and it was leaved overnight. The tube was heated at 125°C for 4 hours, after that it allowed cooling. then diluted to 12.5 mL with concentrated nitric acid, and 50 mL of distilled water was added to tube, and mixed then aspirated directly into plasma for Inductive Coupled Plasma ICP .

For chloride ion analysis, a titration method with AgNO_3 was applied.

3.9. Measurement of Photosynthesis with (PAM) Fluorometry:

Barley Plant trials were measured for their photosynthesis activities using pulse amplitude modulated fluorometry (LUCAM, Fluor cam version 15.1.0). Samples were dark adapted for 20 minutes by turned off all lambs in lab before pulse amplitude modulated analysis were carried out to ensure the PSII centers were open. The F_0 minimum fluorescence was adjusted to 0.10-12 million \pm 0.040 by changing the Florescence rate. Analyses were done for randomly chosen roots from different trials with no other light interference to ensure only fluorescence light were measured.

For the F_m measurements, a single non modulated saturating 0.6 s light pulse was used. Then F_s were measured after 30 second using non modulated 640-700 nm actinic radiation. After this step plants were left for 14 minutes to ensure the fluorescence was reached steady state. A single non modulated saturating 0.6 s light pulse was excited every minute to measure the F_m , in presence of actinic light.

Then all resulted parameters (F_v/F_m , yield, qPN) were measured and marked on graphs.

3.10. Assessment of plant cell membrane stability using the Electrolyte leakage methods:

For each trial fresh shoot samples (1 g fresh weight) of similar size were cut into approximately 3 cm long segments, washed with ddH₂O, and dried with a Kim wipe. Segments were submerged in 10 mL of ddH₂O in a 20 mL test tube and were placed into vacuum desiccators (Savant, 100). Each sample was subjected to a vacuum at a rate of 100L/min for 2 hours. Then Electrical Conductivity (EC) value of the solution was measured at room temperature of 23±1 °C using an electrical-conductivity meter (4510 – conductivity meter, Jenway).

Chapter Four

Results and Discussion

4.1. Measurement of PGPR growth under saline NaCl solutions:

Different concentrations of NaCl – TSB solution were prepared, to test performance of PGPR salt tolerance on two plant species “Barley and Malt”, and for testing their performance to salt, especially salt ions (Na^+ and Cl^-) ions as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Average absorbance of UW3 grown in NaCl - (TSB) solution (0 g, 0.05g, 0.08g, 0.10g, 0.16g, and 0.24g) medium at $\lambda = 600$ nm.

	Absorbance at $\lambda = 600$ nm				
Weight of NaCl	1 hour	3 hours	5 hours	7 hours	8 hours
0.05g	0.46	0.47	0.49	0.50	0.56
0.08g	0.43	0.47	0.44	0.49	0.52
0.10g	0.34	0.48	0.41	0.48	0.55
0.16g	0.40	0.41	0.37	0.38	0.47
0.24g	0.38	0.39	0.47	0.53	0.56
0g	0.46	0.49	0.54	0.60	0.70

For ratio of measurement or control measurement = Absorbance of bacteria grown in saline for each weight / Absorbance control (0 g NaCl) at 8 hours. As shown in Table 4.2.

Control (0 g NaCl) = Absorbance of bacteria UW3 grown in control (0 g NaCl) at each time / Absorbance of the bacteria grown in control(0 g NaCl) at 8 hours.

Table 4.2: Calculated of control calculation of UW3 grown.

	Control - Absorbance at $\lambda = 600$ nm				
weight of NaCl	1 hour	3 hours	5 hours	7 hours	8 hours
0.05g	0.65	0.70	0.67	0.70	0.80
0.08g	0.61	0.67	0.63	0.70	0.75
0.10g	0.49	0.68	0.58	0.68	0.78
0.16g	0.56	0.57	0.52	0.55	0.67
0.24g	0.57	0.55	0.66	0.76	0.79
0g	0.65	0.71	0.77	0.86	1.00

Table 4.3 shown % control of bacteria grown in saline (0 g, 0.05g, 0.08g, 0.10g, 0.16g, and 0.24g NaCl) / 20 mL (TSB) medium at $\lambda = 600$ nm at each time.

Table 4.3: % control of UW3 grown.

	% of control -Absorbance at $\lambda = 600$ nm				
weight of NaCl	1 hour	3 hours	5 hours	7 hours	8 hours
0.05g	65%	70%	66%	70%	80%
0.08g	61%	66%	63%	69%	74%
0.10g	48%	67%	57%	68%	78%
0.16g	56%	56%	52%	54%	66%
0.24g	56%	55%	66%	76%	79%
0g	64%	70%	77%	85%	100

Figure 4.1 show % of control –Absorbance for UW3 at $\lambda = 600$ nm in NaCl - (TSB) solution (0 g, 0.05g, 0.08g, 0.10g, 0.16g, and 0.24g).




Figure 4.1: show % of control -Absorbance for UW3 at $\lambda = 600$ nm in NaCl - (TSB) solution (0 g, 0.05g, 0.08g, 0.10g, 0.16g, and 0.24g) .

The measurements done until 8 hours and after that maximum efficiency is reached, then become constant after 8 hours, and for OD measurements and % of control as in (Table 4.1-Table4.3 and Figure 4.1) it showed UW3 germination were increased under saline condition at different time interval, until it reached maximum levels and it became constant without any incensement after 8 hours.

This increase indicated that salinity tolerant performances of PGPRs were increased [Shan, 2009], Moreover increased in growth had been shown for TSB medias containing (0.08g, 0.10g, 0.24g) to be as (74.55%, 78.31%,

79.68 %) respectively at 8 hours incubation, surprisingly, the least measurement of bacterial growth was obtained for 0.16g salts contained media (66.88%), and may be this related to some performance of germination of bacteria in the tube.

UW3 strains were chosen only for these measurements, since there is no differences UW4 act similar mechanism as UW3.

This test can be applied in future research to study if the performance of PGPR increased with time, which will indicate more biomass produced.

Shan (2009), study tolerance of UW3, UW4 strains under saline condition (0.5%-2.0% g) were observed. For UW3 and UW4, their growths were increased.

4.2. Soil Electrical Conductivity:

Measurements of soil salinity before used in experiment to study changes in EC when irrigated with brackish water. Experimental measurements of (TDS) for random samples of autoclaved Loam soil are shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Experimental measurements of (TDS) for random samples of autoclaved Loam soil, each parameter was performed in triplicate.

Name of parameter	Trial 1 TDS (mg/L)	Trial 2 TDS(mg/L)	Trial 3 TDS(mg/L)	Average	Standard deviation
ECe	70.0	72	67.2	69.7	2.4
EC 1:2	47.7	44.7	46.3	46.2	1.5

According to equation:

$$\text{TDS (mg/l)} = \text{EC (dS/m)} \times 640 \dots\dots\dots \text{Equation (6)}$$

For EC between 0.1 and 5.0 ds/m.

Calculated experimental measurements of EC for random samples of autoclaved loam soil are shown in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Calculated experimental measurements of EC for random samples of autoclaved loam soil, each parameter was performed in triplicate.

Name of parameter	Trial 1 ds/m	Trial 2 ds/m	Trial 3 ds/m	Average	Standard deviation
ECe	0.109	0.112	0.105	0.109	0.003
EC 1:2	0.075d	0.068	0.072	0.0717	0.003

Measurements of soil salinity as TDS after 30 days of cultivation period at temp 17°C, according to data in Annex 1 and Figure 4.3.




Figure 4.3: Measurements of soil salinity as EC after 30 days of cultivation period at temp 17°C. according to data in Annex 1.

According to equation:

$$\text{TDS (mg/l)} = \text{EC (dS/m)} \times 640 \dots \dots \dots \text{Equation (6)}$$

For EC between 0.1 and 5.0 ds/m.

Calculated experimental measurements of (EC) in unit ds/l each trial after 30 days is shown in Annex 2, each parameter was performed in triplicate.

Texture of soil sample used in this study were similar to texture exist in Jericho area, which is loamy texture in order to be implemented this study in field trial in Jericho area.

According to results in (Annex .1, Annex.2, and Figure 4.3), Barley plant trials treated with PGPRs irrigated with brackish water ; their EC and TDS values before and after 30 days showed no obvious changes in measurement, and values were closed to control trial irrigated with fresh water ,this indicated accumulation of salts in biomass, furthermore trials treated with H_2O_2 ; were slightly similar to trials irrigated with brackish water; indicating that PGPR enhance more salt uptake into plant biomass.

In Malt plant trials results were not promising in promoting plant growth, even for trials with PGPRs there values still less than values for Barley plant trial, this can be related to some specific response of plant with these microbes.

4.3. Brackish water parameters measurements:

Annex 3 and Figure 4.4 showed salinity measurements as TDS for two synthetic brackish water samples before used in irrigation, and TDS measurements after irrigation include for decent water (gravitational water), it detect any contaminant ions that could be leached out. These measurements were included also for determination of how much leaching water could be arrived to ground water and cause salinity.




Figure 4.4 Measurements of electrical conductivity measurement as (TDS) for two synthetic brackish water samples before used in irrigation. TDS measurement after irrigation include for decent water as shown in Annex 3.

TDS measurements for decent water for trials were shown in Annex 3 and Figure 4.4, for trials treated with PGPRs their measurements values were less than control trials, this indicate that PGPR help in increasingly phyextraction mechanism for salt uptake into by leaf –, and stem – succulence. Trials included combination UW3 and UW4 shown no significant for their combination over treated trials separately as shown in TDS measurement, which mean same salt accumulation in plants tissues.

TDS for decent brackish water of trials of barley seeds with H_2O_2 irrigated with 6000 mg/L and 10000 mg/L brackish water give :(4.89 g/l, 8.87g/l)

compared to control (5.94 g/l, 9.92 g/l), this mean only tolerance mechanisms could happened, while hydrogen peroxide aid plant to overcome oxidative stress through participated in cell signaling, (MAPK) nitrogen –activated protein kinase represents central for mediating cellular responses to multiple stress.[Mac neil , 2011], and this can be studies as separated field study.

TDS measurements for Malt plant trials results showed not obvious significant combination of both strains to raise salt accumulation of plant to slat and increase plant growth promotion over treated separately.

Barely plant responded more to PGPR than malt plant; this attribute could be due to large surface area for Barley seeds that has compared to Malt seeds so more bacteria strains have been adhesion to surface of Barley seeds, another reason may be related to some specie –specific differences in physiology and anatomy as well as specific differences in conditions required for optimal growth for Malt plant differ from Barley plant. This may indicate also that Malt plant may need different PGPR strains other than those UW3, UW4 for their optimal growth condition.

4.5. Measurements of photosynthesis with (PAM) fluorometry:

Photosynthesis activities of Barley plant trials were measured using (PAM). Table 4.6 includes measurement for Fv/Fm for Barley plants trials.

Table 4.6: PAM fluorometry measurements for Fv/Fm for Barley plants, each trial repeated in 4 replicates.

Treatment	Fv/Fm
Control Barley irrigated with fresh water	0.785
Control Barley irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	0.659
Control Barley irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	0.594
Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	0.790
Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	0.775
Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	0.788
Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	0.796
Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	0.756
Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	0.778
Treated Barley seeds with UW3 + UW4 irrigated with fresh water	0.736
Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	0.776
Treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	0.796
Treated Barley seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	0.723
Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	0.749
Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	0.769
Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	0.749
Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	0.686
Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	0.688

According to Eq. (4) and Eq. (5) maximal yield of PSII (Fv/Fm) ratio was calculated, where typical value of it is equal to 0.8 [Mac Neil, 2011].

Trails treated with PGPR irrigated with brackish water their values were closed to 0.8, while control trials their vales were ranged from (0.5 -0.6), which mean that plant is under stress, and its photosynthesis not proceed as it should.

These indicate the performance of PGPR in increase the photosynthetic activity under salt stress, bedside it was obvious in root there color were dark- green and taller.

But trials treated only with H_2O_2 their values were closed to control trials which mean there is no significant contribution of peroxide in activating cell signaling.

For trials treated with both strains UW3 +UW4 compared to trials treated with strain separately. The maximum yields of PSII of Fv/Fm were not significant higher; these indicate performance of trials with both strains show same effective to tolerate to salinity and same performance of photosynthetic, as trials treated separately.

Other photosynthesis parameters measurements, such as $(Y(II))$, NPQ) were measured, as shown below for each trial has its own spectra, include in Tables, and Figures.

1- Control Barley plant irrigated with fresh water:

Replicate of measurements depend upon random selection for each Barley plant trial it include 4 replicate are shown in Figure 4.5.




Figure 4.5: photography random selection of Barley plant measurements for Control Barley irrigated with fresh water.

F_s parameter was measured after 30 second using non modulated 640-700 nm actinic radiation, after this step plants were left for 14 minutes to ensure the fluorescence was reached steady state, as shown in spectra 4.6 and same was done for all trials.




Figure 4.6: PAM fluorometry spectra for control Barley irrigated with fresh water.

Table 4.7 and Figure 4.7 showed PAM fluorometry measurements for yield (Y (II)) and average NPQ with standard deviation for control Barley trial.

Tables for other trials showed in Annexex.

Table 4.7: PAM fluorometry measurement for control Barley irrigated with fresh water:

Time (min:sec)	Average Y(II)	Standard deviation	Average NPQ	Standard deviation
0:0	0.7797	0.0192	0.0064	0.0008
0:0:42	0.1595	0.0274	0.0015	0.0008
0:0:62	0.1975	0.0418	0.2513	0.0354
0:0:83	0.2577	0.0466	0.3836	0.0462
0:0:103	0.3083	0.0490	0.3950	0.0532
0:0:123	0.3295	0.0473	0.3925	0.0555
0:0:143	0.3613	0.0443	0.3712	0.0562
0:02:44	0.3727	0.0405	0.3621	0.0555
0:03:04	0.3855	0.0377	0.3505	0.0538
0:03:24	0.3882	0.0382	0.3465	0.0535
0:03:45	0.3880	0.0386	0.3455	0.0521
0:04:05	0.3982	0.0399	0.3377	0.0522
0:04:25	0.4052	0.0354	0.3294	0.0491
0:04:45	0.4165	0.0362	0.3222	0.0489
0:05:06	0.4197	0.0341	0.3192	0.0463
0:05:20	0.6025	0.0368	0.2147	0.0374
0:05:32	0.6137	0.0333	0.1962	0.0305
0:05:46	0.6322	0.0280	0.1757	0.0233
0:06:04	0.6512	0.0234	0.1562	0.0149
0:06:24	0.6633	0.02164	0.1445	0.0113
0:06:48	0.673	0.0171	0.1315	0.0065
0:07:18	0.6865	0.0164	0.1197	0.0047
0:07:53	0.6943	0.0143	0.1117	0.0055
0:08:35	0.7002	0.0128	0.1065	0.0041




Figure 4.7: PAM fluorometry Chart for control Barley irrigated with fresh water.

2- Barley plant irrigated with 6000 mg/L of Brackish water :

PAM fluorometry spectra and chart for Barley plant irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water shown in Figure 4.8 and Figure 4.9.




Figure 4.8: PAM fluorometry spectra for Barley Plant irrigated with 6000mg/L of brackish water.




Figure 4.9: PAM fluorometry chart for Barley Plant irrigated with 6000mg/L of brackish water as shown in Annex 5.

3-Barley plant irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water:

PAM fluorometry spectra and chart for Barley plant irrigated with 10000mg/L brackish water shown in Figure 4.10 and Figure 4.11.




Figure 4.10: PAM fluorometry spectra for Barley plant irrigated with 10000mg/L brackish water.




Figure 4.11: PAM fluorometry chart for Barley plant irrigated with 10000mg/L brackish water as shown Annex6

4-Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water:

PAM fluorometry spectra and chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water as shown in Figure 4.12 and Figure 4.13.




Figure 4.12: PAM fluorometry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water.




Figure 4.13: PAM fluorometry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water as shown in Annex 7.

5-Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water:

PAM fluorometry spectra and chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water as shown in Figure 4.14 and Figure 4.15.




Figure 4.14: PAM fluorometry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water.




Figure 4.15: PAM fluorometry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water as shown in Annex 8.

6-Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water:

PAM fluorometry spectra and chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water as shown in Figure 4.16 and Figure 4.17.




Figure 4.16: PAM fluorometry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water.




Figure 4.17: PAM fluorometry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water as shown in Annex 9.

7- Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water:

PAM fluorometry spectra and chart for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water as shown in Figure 4.18 and Figure 4.19.




Figure 4.18: PAM fluorometry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water.




Figure 4.19: PAM fluorometry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water for data in Annex10.

8-Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water:

PAM fluorometry spectra and chart for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water as shown in Figure 4.20 and Figure 4.21.




Figure 4.20: PAM fluorometry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water.




Figure 4.21: PAM fluorometry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water for data in Annex11.

9-Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water:

PAM fluorometry spectra and chart for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water as shown in Figure 4.22 and Figure 4.23.




Figure 4.22: PAM fluorometry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water.




Figure 4.23: PAM fluorometry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water for data in Annex12.

10-Treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with fresh water

PAM fluorometry spectra and chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with fresh water as shown in Figure 4.24 and figure 4.25.




Figure 4.24: PAM fluorometry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with fresh water.




Figure 4.25: PAM fluorometry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with fresh water for data in Annex13.

11-Treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water:

PAM fluorometry spectra and chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water as shown in Figure 4.26 and figure 4.27.




Figure 4.26: PAM fluorometry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water.




Figure 4.27: PAM fluorometry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water, for data in Annex14.

12-Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water:

PAM fluorometry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water as shown in Figure 4.28 and figure 4.29.




Figure 4.28: PAM fluorometry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water.




Figure 4.29: PAM fluorometry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water, for data in Annex15.

13-Treated Barley seeds with UW3+H₂O₂ irrigated with fresh water:

PAM fluorometry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H₂O₂ irrigated with fresh water as shown in Figure 4.30 and Figure 4.31.




Figure 4.30: PAM fluorometry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H₂O₂ irrigated with fresh water.




Figure 4.31: PAM fluorometry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H₂O₂ irrigated with fresh water, for data in Annex16

14-Treated Barley seeds with UW3+H₂O₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water:

PAM fluorometry spectra and chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H₂O₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water as shown in Figure 4.32 and Figure 4.33.




Figure 4.32: PAM fluorometry spectra for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H₂O₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water.




Figure 4.33: PAM fluorometry chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H₂O₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water, for data in Annex17.

15- Treated Barley seeds with UW3+H₂O₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water :

Pulse Amplitude modulated fluorometry spectra and chart for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H₂O₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water as shown in Figure 4.34 and Figure 4.35.




Figure 4.34: PAM fluorometry spectra for treated barley seeds with UW3+H₂O₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water.




Figure 4.35: PAM fluorometry chart for treated barley seeds with UW3+H₂O₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water, for data in Annex18.

Measurements include function of PSII as flow of electron, rate of photosynthesis by emitted light from the pulse, and measured light. Heat dissipation is relatively constant during measurements.

Measurements showed several chlorophyll fluorescence parameters which are: (Y (II), NPQ). These parameters were measured at minimal fluorescence in dark –adapted plant tissue (F_0) and at maximal fluorescence (F_m), steady state fluorescence (F_s) shown in each spectra, where optimum value ranged between (0.15-0.17) larger than this value mean plant in under stress, and give indication of effect of salt stress on photosynthetic electron transport, [Mac Neil, 2011]. Control trials irrigated with brackish water their values were large (0.19-0.23) compared to trials with PGPR irrigated with brackish water (0.15-0.17), these results indicate damaged happen inside cell for trials without PGPR.

Trials treated with PGPR, there photosynthesis measurement (Y (II), NPQ), as in spectra and chart were similar to measurement of control trials treated with fresh water for both trials with or without PGPR, moreover photosynthetic values were shown compared to control values, this mean that PGPRs increase photosynthetic activity inside plant, besides that, it was obvious in root there color was dark - green color for shoot and taller leaves [Mac Neil, 2011].

For other trials in Figures (4.5-4.35) and Annex (5-18) stress appeared as decrease for values of Average Y (II) and Average NPQ for trials treated without PGPR compared to trials treated with PGPR.

The reason for decrease in photosynthesis in trials without PGPR can be related for accumulation of high concentration of salts in tissue that responsible for photosynthesis process. It could be as a result of swelling of thylakoids, and distortion of chloroplast membrane; which lead to disrupt all process in plant [Mac Neil, 2011].

Malt Plant leaves was light green color, this indicated that there were no full photosynthesis processes and didn't show positive response to PGPR treatment as expected. Thus, measurement of photosynthesis by PAM fluorometry instrument include only for barely plant.

For trials treated with both strains UW3 +UW4 compared to trials treated with strain separately, the maximum yields of PSII were not significant higher. This indicates performance of trials with both strains show same effective to tolerate to salinity and same performance of photosynthetic, as trials treated separately.

Shan (2009) study showed some plant species such as barley plant with PGPR showed high performance of photosynthesis activity in saline soil.

Mc neill (2011) study showed photosynthesis activities for different plants species such as Barley, oats, and tall wheatgrass treated with PGPR and

grown in saline soil field, high performance of their photosynthesis activity.

4.6. Green house studies and dry biomass determination:

Green house studies include measurements of mass for two species plants (Barley, Malt) trials. Measurements include for wet mass in (g) and for dry mass in (g) with differences between wet and dry Length measurements. This procedure was done to compare between trials.

Measurements of root and shoot wet mass (g) for Barley plant trials after 30 days are shown in Table 4.8 and Figure 4.37.

Table 4.8: Measurements of root and shoot wet mass (g) for Barley plant trials after 30 days.

Num	Treatment	Root+ Shoot wet mass (g) After 30 days	% of wet mass	Significant value
1	Control Barley irrigated with fresh water	85.7	100	
2	Control Barley irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	84.3	98.4	
3	Control Barley irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	89.4	104.3	Sig
4	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	165.3	192.9	
5	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	193.8	226.2	
6	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	240.8	285.7	Sig
7	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	176.2	205.6	
8	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	189.3	220.9	
9	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	215.3	251.2	Sig
10	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 + UW4 irrigated with fresh water	203.4	237.3	
11	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	206.3	240.7	
12	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of Brackish water	280.8	148.3	
13	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	95.3	111.2	
14	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	202.3	236.1	
15	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	207.5	242.1	Sig
16	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	178.6	208.4	
17	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	189.6	221.2	
18	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	189.8	221.5	




Figure 4.37: Measurements of root and shoot wet mass (g) for Barley plant trials after 30 days.

Wet mass measurements for root and shoot after 30 days are shown for trials of barley seeds treated with UW3, UW4, and (UW3+ UW4) irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water gave higher weights (224.2%, 220.9%, and 237.3%) respectively compared with control Barley (98.4%) subjected to the same salt concentration.

Also trials irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water for trials treated with UW3, UW4, and (UW3+UW4) gave higher values: (285.73%, 251.23% and 148.29%) compared to control trial (104.3%).

These values indicated there is accumulation of salt happen into biomass of trials treated with PGPR, beside PGPR increased phytoremediation mechanisms and salt uptake into biomass, and increase stem –succulence

compared to control treatment. Meanwhile control treatment effected by salinity from brackish water lead to less accumulation of salt in biomass, and only tolerance mechanisms of plant play its role. [Mac Neil, 2011].

Compared between combinations treated of trials compared to treat of trials with strains separately, especially trials irrigated with 10000 mg/L the combination didn't show significant results.

Trials include treated Barley seeds with UW3+ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water , and with 10000 mg/L of brackish water gives value : (236.1%, 242.1%) compared to control (98.4%, 104.3%), and compared to trials treated with only UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L and 10000 mg/L of brackish water had values (220.9%, 251.2 %).These result indicated significant differences and there some contribution of hydrogen peroxide as antioxidant in participating in cell signaling, several nitrogen –activated protein kinase (MAPK) [Mac Neil, 2011], and this can be separated field study in future.

Trails treated only with H₂O₂ only there were no differences between the wet mas measurement may be this can be related only antioxidant role and tolerance mechanism.

Measurements of root and shoot wet mass (g) for Malt plant trials after 30 days are shown in Table 4.9 and Figure 4.38.

Table 4.9: Measurements of root and shoot wet mass (g) for Malt plant trials after 30 days.

Num	Treatment	Root + Shoot wet mass (g) After 30 days	% of wet mass	Significant value
1	Control Malt irrigated with fresh water	12.4	100	
2	Control Malt irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	10.04	81.2	
3	Control Malt irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	7.9	64.2	
4	Treated Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	29.8	240.7	
5	Treated Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	30.6	247.0	
6	Treated Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	31.6	255.8	Sig
7	Treated Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	30.2	244.4	
8	Treated Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	26.2	212.1	
9	Treated Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	34.5	114.1	
10	Treated Malt seeds with UW3 + UW4 irrigated with fresh water	29.2	236.4	
11	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+ UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	32.1	259.4	
12	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	35.6	288.1	Sig
13	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	14.4	102.5	
14	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	15.7	127.1	
15	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	14.9	121.1	
16	Treated Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	12.7	103.1	
17	Treated Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	14.3	115.8	Sig
18	Treated Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	13.2	107.0	Sig




Figure 4.38: Measurements of root and shoot wet mass (g) for Malt Plant trials after 30 days.

Trials of Malt seeds treated with UW3, UW4, and UW3+UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water (Table 4.9 and Figure 4.38) giving total biomass values as (247.1%, 212.1%, 259.4%) compared to control ones (81.16%).

Beside for trial of Malt seeds with UW3, UW4, and UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water were given (255.8%, 114.1%, 288.1%) compared to control Malt irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water (64.2%).

It is noticed PGPR increased phytoremediation mechanisms, salt uptake into plant biomass. For those trials treated with PGPR, the accumulation of

salt in biomass increase production of biomass compared to controls which were affected by salinity [Mac Neil, 2011].

Moreover for trials irrigated with 10000 mg/L accumulated more salt inside biomass which were observed in weights, than 6000 mg/L.

Compared between combinations treated of trials compared to treat of trials with strains separately, especially trials irrigated with 10000 mg/L the combination didn't show significant results.

Trials include treated Malt seeds with UW3+ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water, and with 10000 mg/L of brackish water gives value : (127.1%, 121.1%) compared to control, and compared to trials treated with only UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L and 10000 mg/L of brackish water had values.

These result indicated significant differences and there some contribution of hydrogen peroxide as antioxidant in participating in cell signaling, several nitrogen –activated protein kinase (MAPK) [Mac Neil, 2011], and this can be separated field study in future.

Trails treated only with H₂O₂ only there were no differences between the wet mas measurement may be this can be related only antioxidant role and tolerance mechanism.

For dry mass measurements included root and shoot dry mass (g) for Barley and Malt plant trials after 30 days separately. Differences between measurements were included in order to calculate how much water absorbed by tissue.

Measurements of root and shoot dry mass (g) for Barley plant trials after 30 days, and difference between dry and wet mass are shown in Tables (4.10, 4.11) ,Figure (4.39, 4.40).

Table 4.10: Measurements of root and shoot dry mass (g) for Barley plant trials after 30 days.

Num	Treatment	Root dry mass (g)	Shoot dry mass (g)	Total dry mass	% of dry mass	Significant value
1	Control Barley irrigated with fresh water	40.5	35.6	76.1	100	
2	Control Barley irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	6.1	0.713	6.8	8.98	
3	Control Barley irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	9.3	0.923	10.2	150.08	Sig
4	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	35.6	83.2	118.8	156.11	
5	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	93.4	87.2	180.6	237.31	
6	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	120.5	69.3	189.8	249.40	Sig
7	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	45.6	73.2	118.8	156.11	
8	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	103.4	77.2	180.6	237.31	
9	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	140.5	79.3	219.8	288.83	Sig
10	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 + UW4 irrigated with fresh water	34.3	63.2	97.5	128.12	
11	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of Brackish water	115.4	88.3	203.7	267.67	
12	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	142.3	77.3	219.6	288.56	Sig
13	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	45.6	43.2	88.8	116.68	
14	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	93.4	87.2	180.6	237.31	
15	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	120.5	69.3	189.8	249.40	Sig
16	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	43.5	25.6	69.1	90.80	Sig
17	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	7.1	0.613	7.735	10.16	

18	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	62.3	0.892	63.192	83.03	Sig
----	---	------	-------	--------	-------	-----




Figure 4.39: Measurement of root and shoot dry mass (g) for Barley plant trials after 30 days.

Table 4.11: Differences between wet biomass and dry biomass for Barley plant trials.

Num	Treatment	Total Dry mass	Total wet \mass	Difference(wet-dry)	Significant
1	Control Barley irrigated with fresh water	76.1	85.7	9.6	
2	Control Barley irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	6.8	84.3	77.4	
3	Control Barley irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	10.3	89.4	79.1	Sig
4	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	118.8	165.3	46.5	
5	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	180.6	193.8	13.2	
6	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	189.8	240.8	51.07	Sig
7	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	118.8	176.2	57.4	Sig
8	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	180.6	189.3	8.7	
9	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	219.8	215.3	4.5	
10	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 + UW4 irrigated with fresh water	97.5	203.4	105.9	Sig
11	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	203.7	206.3	2.6	
12	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	219.6	280.8	61.2	
13	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	88.8	95.3	6.5	
14	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of	180.6	202.3	21.7	Sig

	brackish water				
15	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	189.8	207.5	17.7	
16	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	69.1	178.6	109.5	
17	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	7.7	189.6	181.8	Sig
18	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	63.1	189.8	126.6	




Figure 4.40: Differences between wet biomass and dry biomass for Barley Plant trials.

Dry biomass measurement shown (Table 4.11, Figure 4.40 and Figure 4.41) for Barley seeds treated with UW3, UW4 and UW3+ UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water were: (237.3 %, 237.3%, and 267.7%) compared to control (9.0%).

There were large differences between measurements for those trials with PGPR related to trials without PGPR, furthermore there were increase in root and shoot dry biomass.

Measurement of trials of Barley seeds with UW3, UW4, and UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water were: (249.4 %, 288.8%, and 288.6%), compared to control Barley irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water (150.1 %).

Trial with PGPR promote plant more control mechanisms over others trials without PGPR in compartmentalization of salt into vacuoles, synthesis of osmolytes and exclusion of salts ions by roots. Promote plant growth to complete their life cycle under stressed condition [Mac Neil, 2011].

Trial of Barley seeds with UW3+ H_2O_2 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water its equal (237.3 %), compared to control trial. trials treated Barley seeds with H_2O_2 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water (10.2%), this mean there was accumulation of salts inside biomass, and some contribution of hydrogen peroxide as antioxidant in participating in cell signaling, several nitrogen –activated protein kinase (MAPK) [Mac Neil, 2011], and this can be separated field study in future.

Same for measurement of trials of Barley seeds with UW3+ H₂O₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water was equal to (249.4%) compared to control. Meanwhile for trial with only H₂O₂ its value was (83.0%) which was closed to control one.

These measurements showed that salinity inhibit plant growth for control trials. There was decrease in shoot thickness which attributed to reduced plant cell intercellular space. Less chlorophyll content relative to one treated with PGPR ad one irrigated with fresh water.

Measurements of trials treated with PGPR indicate that ACC deaminase – producing by PGPR oxidize ACC to ammonia and α -ketobutyrate. Hence these compounds promote plant growth and lower concentration of ethylene hormone increase plant growth. Furthermore PGPR synthesized IAA compound which stimulate plant growth promotion, which was obvious for trials this study for irrigated with 6000 mg/L and 10000mg/L [Shan, 2009].

Measurements of root and shoot dry mass (g) for Malt plant trials after 30 days, and difference between dry mass and wet mass are shown in Tables (4.12, 4.13) and Figure (4.41, 4.42).

Table 4.12: Measurements of root and shoot dry mass (g) for Malt Plant trials after 30 days.

Num	Treatment	Root dry mass (g)	Shoot dry mass (g)	Total Dry mass	% of dry mass	Significant
1	Control Malt irrigated with fresh water	1.234	0.453	1.687	100	
2	Control Malt irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	0.564	0.311	0.875	51.86	
3	Control Malt irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	0.234	0.136	0.37	42.28	
4	Treated Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	1.354	0.722	2.076	561.08	Sig
5	Treated Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	2.541	0.731	3.272	157.61	Sig
6	Treated Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	2.785	0.624	3.409	104.18	
7	Treated Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	1.674	0.534	2.208	64.76	
8	Treated Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	1.985	0.604	2.589	117.26	Sig
9	Treated Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	1.967	0.957	2.924	112.94	
10	Treated Malt seeds with UW3 + UW4 irrigated with fresh water	2.497	0.935	3.432	117.37	Sig
11	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+ UW4 irrigated with 6000	2.567	0.856	3.423	99.74	

	mg/L of brackish water					
12	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	1.785	0.277	2.062	60.24	
13	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	0.567	0.144	0.711	34.48	
14	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	0.854	0.670	1.524	214.34	Sig
15	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	0.875	0.547	1.422	93.31	
16	Treated Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	0.452	0.164	0.616	43.33	
17	Treated Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	0.324	0.054	0.378	61.36	
18	Treated Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	0.275	0.264	0.539	142.59	Sig

Measurement of dry mass for malt plant (g)




Figure 4.41: Measurements of root and shoot dry mass (g) for Malt Plant trials after 30 days.

Table 4.13: Differences between wet biomass and dry biomass for Malt Plant trials

Treatment	Total Dry mass(g)	Total wet mass(g)	Difference(wet-dry)	Significant value
Control Malt irrigated with fresh water	1.68	12.37	10.68	Sig
Control Malt irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	0.87	10.04	9.165	
Control Malt irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	0.37	7.94	7.57	
Treated Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	2.07	29.78	27.70	
Treated Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	3.27	30.56	27.28	
Treated Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	3.41	31.64	28.23	Sig
Treated Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	2.21	30.23	28.02	Sig
Treated Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	2.58	26.24	23.65	
Treated Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	2.92	34.50	31.57	Sig
Treated Malt seeds with UW3 + UW4 irrigated with fresh water	3.43	29.24	25.81	
Treated Malt seeds with UW3+ UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	3.42	32.09	28.66	
Treated Malt seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	2.06	35.64	33.57	Sig
Treated Malt seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	0.71	14.35	13.63	
Treated Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	1.52	15.72	14.19	Sig
Treated Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	1.42	14.98	13.55	
Treated Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	0.62	12.75	12.13	

Treated Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	0.38	14.32	13.94	Sig
Treated Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	0.54	13.24	12.70	




Figure 4.42: Differences between wet biomass and dry biomass for Malt plant trials.

Malt plant seeds as in (Table 4.12, Figure 4.43 and Figure 4.44) treated with UW3, UW4 and UW3+ UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water were: (157.6 %, 117.3 %, and 99.7%) compared to control (51.9%).

Measurements of Malt plant trial treated with UW3, UW4, and with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water were: (104.2%; 112.9%; 60.2%) compared (42.3%).

Measurements for trials treated Malt seeds with UW3+ H₂O₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water , and irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish

water were: (14.2 %, 13.6 %) compared to control the values were closed to it.

Trials of Malt seeds with H_2O_2 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water, and irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water were: (13.9 %, 12.7%).

Final Measurements include measurement lengths for shoot (cm) after 14 days, 30 days and for root lengths (cm) for Barley plant after 30 days as shown in Tables 4.14 and Figure 4.43.

Table 4.14: Measurements of lengths of shoot (cm) after 14 days, 30 days and root lengths (cm) after 30 days for Barley plant.

Barley Plant num	Treatment	Length of Shoot after 14 days	Length of Shoot after 30 days	Length of root after 30 days	Significant value
1	Control Barley irrigated with fresh water	2-3cm	6-9cm	13-15cm	Sig
2	Control Barley irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	3-4cm	5-7 cm	10-13 cm	
3	Control Barley irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	4-5cm	5-8 cm	11-13 cm	
4	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	3-4cm	7-9 cm	20-23ccm	
5	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	6-9cm	10-13 cm	27-29cm	Sig
6	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	7-11cm	11-13 cm	29-32 cm	Sig
7	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	2-4cm	7-9 cm	21-25ccm	
8	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	7-12cm	11-14 cm	26-30cm	Sig
9	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	9-13cm	12-14 cm	27-32cm	Sig
10	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 + UW4 irrigated with fresh water	6-11cm	9-10 cm	23-26ccm	
11	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	11-15cm	11-15 cm	29-32cm	Sig
12	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with	11-16cm	12-15 cm	30-36cm	Sig

	10000 mg/L of brackish water				
13	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	6-9cm	8-10 cm	19-24ccm	
14	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	7-9cm	12-13 cm	25-28cm	Sig
15	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	8-12cm	11-14 cm	27-29 cm	Sig
16	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	4-5cm	6-8 cm	9-13ccm	
17	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	5-8cm	9-11 cm	15-17cm	Sig
18	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	4-7cm	10-12 cm	14-16 cm	




Figure 4.43: Measurements of lengths of shoot (cm) after 14 days, 30 days and root lengths (cm) after 30 days for Barley Plant.

Lengths of root and shoots had been shown in Table 4.14, Table 4.15 and Figure 4.44 and Figure 4.45; where PGPR contributed to increase lengths for Barley and Malt Plants shoots and roots more than controls. The measurement of lengths were more for trials treated with PGPR irrigated with Brackish water compared to trials irrigated with fresh water suggesting that PGPR promote vigorous growth for both plants under salt stress .

Beside it was noticed that PGPR under high concentration of salt, it enhance plant growth promotion for roots and shoots to overcome stress, even between individual trials treated with different concentration of water concentration it was noticed that lengths for root and shoot were significant in measurement more than other.

For trials treated with both strains UW3 +UW4 compared to trials treated with strain separately, the difference in lengths were significant. This indicates performance of trials with both strains show high effective to tolerate to salinity and same performance of photosynthetic, as trials treated separately.

Table 4.15 and Figure 4.45 include measurements lengths for shoot (cm) and root (cm) after 14 days, 30 days for Malt Plant after 30 days.

Table 4.15: Measurements of lengths of shoot (cm) after 14 days, 30 days and root lengths (cm) after 30 days for Malt plant.

Malt PlantNum	Treatment	Length of Shoot after 14 days	Length of Shoot after 30 days	Length of root after 30 days	Significant Value
1	Control Malt irrigated with fresh water	1- 3 cm	1- 2 cm	1- 3 cm	
2	Control Malt irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	1- 2 cm	2- 4 cm	1- 2 cm	
3	Control Malt irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	2-3 cm	2-4 cm	4- 5cm	
4	Treated Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	2-3 cm	3- 5 cm	4- 5 cm	
5	Treated Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	2-4 cm	2- 4 cm	5- 6 cm	Sig
6	Treated Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	3-4 cm	2-3 cm	5-7 cm	Sig
7	Treated Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	1- 2 cm	1- 3 cm	3- 4 cm	
8	Treated Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	2- 4 cm	2- 4 cm	4- 6 cm	Sig
9	Treated Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	3-4 cm	3-5 cm	2-3 cm	
10	Treated Malt seeds with UW3 + UW4 irrigated with fresh water	1- 3cm	2- 3 cm	1- 3 cm	
12	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+ UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	2-3 cm	1- 2 cm	1- 2 cm	
13	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	2-4 cm	2-3 cm	2-3 cm	Sig
14	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	1- 2 cm	1- 3 cm	1- 3 cm	

15	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	2- 3 cm	1- 2 cm	3- 5 cm	
16	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	2-4 cm	2-3 cm	3-4 cm	
17	Treated Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	1- 2cm	1- 3 cm	2- 6 cm	
18	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	1-3 cm	2- 4 cm	3- 5 cm	
19	Treated Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	2-3 cm	1-4 cm	2-3 cm	




Figure 4.45: Measurements of lengths of shoot (cm) after 14 days, 30 days and root lengths (cm) after 30 days for Malt plant.

Lengths of root and shoots had been shown in Table 4.14, Table 4.15 and Figure 4.44 and Figure 4.45; where PGPR contributed to increase lengths for Barley and Malt Plants shoots and roots more than controls. The measurement of lengths were more for trials treated with PGPR irrigated with Brackish water compared to trials irrigated with fresh water suggesting that PGPR promote vigorous growth for both plants under salt stress .

For trials treated with both strains UW3 +UW4 compared to trials treated with strain separately, difference were not significant higher especially for 10000 mg /L. This indicates performance of trials with both strains show same effective to tolerate to salinity, as trials treated separately.

Followed pictures represent photos for some trials for comparing between them in visual differences:




Figure 4.48: Picture where (A) represent trial of control Barley plant irrigated with fresh water, (B) trials of treatment of Barley plant with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 6000mg/L.




Figure 4.49: Picture where (A) represent trial of control Barley plant irrigated with fresh water, (B) trials of treatment of Barley plant with UW3 irrigated with 6000mg/L.




Figure 4.50: Picture where (A) represent trial of control Barley plant irrigated with fresh water, (B) trials of treatment of Barley plant with UW4 irrigated with 6000mg/L.




Figure 4.51: Picture where (A) represent trial of control Barley plant irrigated with fresh water, (B) trials of treatment of Barley plant with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000mg/L




Figure 4.52: Picture where (A) represent trial of control Barley plant irrigated with fresh water, (B) trials of treatment of Barley plant with UW3 irrigated with 10000mg/L




Figure 4.53: Picture where (A) represent trial of control Barley plant irrigated with fresh water, (B) trials of treatment of Barley plant with UW4 irrigated with 10000mg/L

Figures 4.48-4.53 showed leaves of Barley Plants that treated with PGPR as taller –thicker, and green darker color compared to untreated ones. Besides that, their roots were longer compared to untreated plants. Thus, PGPR affected photosynthetic activity even under irrigation with salt solution.

For control trials without PGPR irrigated with two different concentration of brackish water; the colors of their leaves were visibly pale green. Some leaves turned to yellow and shorter -smaller .Some followed by premature necrosis. Even they reached their growth cycle end before crop coefficient.

To distinguish between which plants species responded to bacteria strain .T-test applied to it. Even Barley and Malt plant consider two species tolerant to salty conditions, the response of Barley plant to these microbes were more than Malt according to Table 4.14 T-test. This attribute could be due to large surface area for Barley seeds that has compared to Malt seeds. More bacteria strains have been adhesion to surface of Barley seeds. Another reason may be related to some specie –specific differences in physiology and anatomy as well as specific differences in conditions required for optimal growth for Malt plant differ from Barley Plant. This may indicate also that Malt plant may need different PGPR strains other than those UW3, UW4 for their optimal growth condition.

Table 4.16: T-test to distinguish between Barley plant and Malt plant responses to bacteria

Group Statistics

Plant		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Mass	Barely	12	126.3	84.00	24.24
	Malt	12	1.6	.800	.23

4.7. Salt accumulation in plant:

Salt accumulation test was used in this study to determine the effectiveness of phytoextraction mechanism of the tested plants, it was used to determine the amount of salt ions have been eliminated from brackish water. This method was carried out trials by taking roots and shoots of plants for all trials are shown in Table 4.17.

Table4.17: Measurement of salt accumulation of Na Cl ions (mg/g dry weight) in Barley Plant shoots tissue.

#	Treatment	Na (mg/g dry weight)	Cl (mg/g dry weight)	NaCl (mg/g dry weight)	Total Dry mass(g)	weight total ion in total dry mass (mg)/0.114m ² of pot	Concentration of mmol / 0.114m ² of pot	Ratio of Cl/Na	Significant Value
1	Control Barley irrigated with fresh water	0.659	0.457	1.116	76.1	84.926	1.826	0.693	
2	Control Barley irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	0.956	0.975	1.931	6.835	13.198	0.283	1.019	Sig
3	Control Barley irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	1.974	1.564	3.538	10.258	36.292	0.780	0.792	
4	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	2.378	1.326	3.704	118.8	440.035	9.4631	0.557	
5	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	7.666	5.524	13.19	180.6	2382.114	51.228	0.720	
6	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	23.65	15.324	38.978	189.8	7398.024	159.097	0.647	Sig
7	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	3.475	2.436	5.911	118.8	702.226	15.101	0.601	
8	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	6.146	4.223	10.369	180.6	1872.641	40.271	0.787	Sig
9	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated	26.81	11.014	37.828	219.8	8314.594	178.808	0.910	Sig

	with 10000 mg/L of brackish water								
10	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 + UW4 irrigated with fresh water	3.008	0.786	3.794	97.5	369.915	7.9551	0.261	
11	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	9.147	3.020	12.167	203.7	2478.417	53.299	0.330	Sig
12	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	28.05	10.004	38.058	219.6	8357.536	179.731	0.356	Sig
13	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	2.078	1.341	3.419	88.8	303.607	6.529	0.645	
14	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	5.457	3.224	8.681	180.6	1567.788	33.715	0.690	Sig
15	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	18.35	7.972	26.327	189.80	4996.864	107.459	0.434	Sig
16	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	2.378	1.326	3.704	69.100	255.946	5.504	0.557	Sig
17	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	2.765	1.524	4.289	7.735	33.175	0.713	0.551	
18	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	4.954	2.324	7.278	63.192	459.911	9.890	0.469	

For weight of salt accumulation of Na/ Cl ions (mg/g dry weight) compared to theoretical weight is shown in Figure 4.46.




Figure 4.46: Measurement of salt accumulation of Na Cl ions (mg/g dry weight) in Barley plant root tissue.

Plant shoot tissue that analyzed for ion accumulation (Table4.17 and Figure4.46) showed total ion weight in total dry mass (g) for Barley seeds treated with UW3, trial of Barley seeds treated with UW4, and both UW3 + UW4, irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water were (2382.1 mg, 1872.6 mg, and 2478.4 mg) compared to control (13.2 mg).

Measurements for trial of Barley seeds treated with UW3, trial of Barley seeds with UW4, and both UW3+ UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water (7398.0 mg, 8314.6 mg, and 8357.5 mg) compared to control Barley irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water (36.3 mg).

Measurements for trials of Barley seeds with UW3+ H₂O₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water, irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water (1567.8 mg, 4996.9 mg) compared to control Barley irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water (13.2 mg) and control Barley irrigated with 10000

mg/L of brackish water (36.3 mg), measurements of salt ion uptake analyses were more for trials with PGPR compared with trials without PGPR.

NaCl accumulation in plant tissue for total dry mass ranged from 36.3-8357.5 mg, and for Ratio of Cl/Na 0.6-1.01 for experimental results compared to theoretical atomic weight equal 1.5. These results indicate that accumulations of Na^+ and Cl^- ions in plant tissue were uneven where Na^+ accumulations were greater than Cl^- ; suggesting that plant utilizes more Cl for their biosynthesis.

Moreover, these concentrations of salt don't effect to use these plants as forage food for animals, when compared with theoretical ratio.

4.7 Assessment of plant cell membrane stability using the electrolyte leakage methods.

This method describes assessing membrane permeability in relation to salt stress. In this study increase in salt affect plant membrane permeability, where measurement of electrolyte leakage methods as TDS in mg/L in Barley plant root tissue trials is shown in Table 4.18 and Figure 4.47.

Table4.18: Measurements of electrolyte leakage methods as TDS in mg/L in Barley plant root tissue trials.

Num	Treatment	TDS mg/L	Signif icant result
1	Control Barley irrigated with fresh water	304	Sig
2	Control Barley irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	503	--
3	Control Barley irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	754	--
4	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	302	Sig
5	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	302	Sig
6	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	513	Sig
7	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	104	Sig
8	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	303	Sig
9	Treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	554	Sig
10	Treated Barley seeds with UW3 + UW4 irrigated with fresh water	202	Sig
11	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	302	Sig
12	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	513	Sig
13	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	204	Sig
14	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	323	Sig
15	Treated Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	524	Sig
16	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	202	Sig

17	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water	502	--
18	Treated Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water	813	--




Figure 4.47: Measurements of electrolyte leakage methods as TDS in mg/L in Barley plant root tissue trials.

This experiment was performed using Barley plants for all trials and TDS measured as shown in Table 4.18 and Figure 4.47. The measurements of ion leakage plant tissue are a method for assessing membrane permeability in relation to salt stress. In this study increase in salts affect plant membrane permeability, as indicated by higher ion leakage.

Results revealed that salinity had increased the amount of electrolyte leakage from plant cell membrane in general for control trials and one treated only with H₂O₂, and salinity made cell membrane more permeable, which observed in results compared to control fresh water, Even though plant cell membranes in trials treated with PGPRs, were found having less

electron leakage, compared to control one treated irrigated with brackish water. In this tale, implicate PGPR in protection of plant cell membranes were possible by promoting synthesis of lipids that considered as structural constituents of most of cellular membrane [Shan, 2009].

Conclusion:

- 1- Specifically, trials treated with PGPRs had showed significant improvements in salt accumulation for the plants (Barley and Malt) that used in these experiments, indicated that these two plants successfully can be used in phytoremediation process in combination of the PGPRs (*Pseudomonas pituda* UW3 and/or UW4), with an advantage of Barley over Malt Plant.
- 2- Results had showed that these PGPRs increase the cell membrane stability as demonstrated by less electrolyte leakage from plant cells relative to plants that were not treated with PGPR.
- 3- Results from pulse amplitude modulated fluorometry (PAM) studies indicated that these plants which treated with PGPR had increased photosynthesis rate thus prevented salinity damage to photosystems compared to those untreated ones.
- 4- Biomass measurements showed a significant mass increase for those plants treated with PGPRs compared with those control (untreated); which biomass production could enhance phytoremediation efficiency, as well as be used as forage food for animals.

Recommended future work:

The results of this research study are highly recommended to be implemented in area space field. In addition to that we highly recommend using other plant species with these PGPRs and comparing their responses to brackish water conditions, besides testing other strains combined with other plant species irrigated with different concentration of salts, beside investigating ability for human consumption such these crops .

Beside performance of PGPR can be studied for their high ability of producing more biomass within time.

References

1. Aard. (2007). Government report: **Salt tolerance of plants.** *Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development.*
2. Al Agha E., et al. (2005). **Desalination in the Gaza Strip: drinking water supply and environmental impact.**
3. Alghoul, M., et al.. (2009). **Renewable and sustainable energy: reviews.** 13:2661-2667.
4. Al-Karaki G. (2001). **Germination, sodium, and potassium concentrations of Barley seeds as influenced by salinity.** *Journal of Plant Nutrition* 24(3):511-522.
5. Alva, A., et al. (1991). Relationship **between ionic strength and electrical conductivity.** *Soil Science*, 152(4), 239-242.
6. Andersson B., Barber J. (1994). **Composition, organization and dynamics of thylakoid membranes.** *Advances in Molecular and Cell Biology* 10:1-53.
7. Apel K., Hirt H. (2011). **Reactive oxygen species: Metabolism oxidative stress and signal transduction.** 53:373-399.
8. Apse M., et al.. (1999). **Salt tolerance conferred by over expression of a vacuolar Na^+/H^+ antiport in *Arabidopsis*.** *Science* 285:1256-1258.
9. Arnot T., et al. (2011). **A review of reverse osmosis membrane materials for desalination –development to date and future potential.** *Journal of Membrane Science.*

10. Ashraf, M. (2004). **Some important physiological selection criteria for salt tolerance in plants.** *Flora*, 199(5), 361-376.
11. Assaf. (2004). **Water as human right: the understanding of water in Palestine.***boell .de-k-assaf-Global Issues Papers.*
12. Babu T., et al. (2001). **Synergistic effects of a photooxidized polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon and copper on photosynthesis and plant growth: evidence that in vivo formation of reactive oxygen species is a mechanism of copper toxicity.** *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 20:1351-1358.
13. Baker N. (2008). **Chlorophyll fluorescence: a probe of photosynthesis in vivo.** *Annual Review of Plant Biology* 59:89-113.
14. Bates L., et al. (1973). **Rapid determination of free proline for water stress studies.** *Plant and Soil* 39(1):205-207.
15. Beauregard M., et al. (1987). **Sulfate inhibition of photosystem II oxygen evolving complex.** *Applied Biochemistry and Biotechnology* 16:109-117.
16. Beer E. (2008). **Measuring rate of photosynthesis of two tropical sea grasses by pulse amplitude modulated fluorometry.** *Aquatic Botany.*
17. Belkhodja, R., et al. (1994). **Chlorophyll fluorescence as a possible tool for salinity tolerance screening in Barley (hordeum vulgare L.).** *Plant Physiology*, 104(2), 667-673.
18. Björkman, O., Demming B. (1987). **Photon yield of O₂ evolution and chlorophyll fluorescence characteristics at 77 K among vascular plants of diverse origins.** *Planta*, 170(4), 489-504.

19. Blaha, G., et al. (2000). **Preparation of functional ribosomal complexes and effect of buffer conditions on tRNA positions observed by cryoelectron microscopy.** *Methods in Enzymology*, 317, 292-309.
20. Blumwald E, Aharon G. (2000). **Sodium transport in plantcells.** *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta* 1465:140-151
21. Bohn, et al. (1985). **Soil chemistry (Second ed.).** *New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.*
22. Brand-Williams, W., et al. (1995). **Use of a free radical method to evaluate antioxidant activity.** *Lebensmittel-Wissenschaft Und Technology/Food Science and Technology*, 28, 25-30.
23. Breckle S. (1995). **How do halophytes overcome salinity?** *Biology of Salt Tolerant Plants: Karachi*. p 199-213.
24. Breckle S. (1990). **Salinity tolerance of different halophyte types.** In N. El Bassam, M.Dambroth & B. C. Loughman (Eds.), *Genetic aspects of plant mineral nutrition* (pp. 167-175).
25. Burnett D., Siddiqui M. (2006) .**Recovery of fresh water from desalination of brackish produced during oil and gas production operation**
26. Cakmak, I. (2000). **Possible roles of zinc in protecting plantcells from damage by reactive oxygen species.** *New Phytologist*, 146(2), 185-205.
27. Cakmak, I. (2005). **The role of potassium in alleviating detrimental effects of abiotic stresses in plants.** *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*, 168, 521-530.

28. Carden D., et al. (2003). **Single-cell measurements of the contributions of cytosolic Na⁺ and K⁺ to salt tolerance.** *Plant Physiology* 131:676683
29. Chang P. (2007). **The use of plantgrowth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) and anarbuscular mycorrhizal fungus (AMF) to improve plantgrowth in saline soils for phytoremediation.** *Waterloo: University of Waterloo.*
30. Chang, P. (2008). **Use of plantgrowth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) and an arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus (AMF) to improve plantgrowth in saline soils for phytoremediation .***Waterloo, Ont.: University of Waterloo.*
31. Chang W., Rui Y. (2005). **Review on brackish disposal from desalination plants.**
32. Cheng Z., Glick B. (2007). **1 -aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylate deaminase from *Pseudomonas putida* UW4 facilitates the growth of canola in the presence of salt.** *Canadian Journal of Microbiology* 53(7):912-918.
33. Cheng, Z., et al. (2007). **1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylate deaminase from *pseudomonas putida* UW4 facilitates the growth of canola in the presence of salt.** *Canadian Journal of Microbiology*, 53, 912-918.
34. Cramer G. (2002). **Sodium-calcium interactions under salinity stress.** *Environment-Plants-Molecules. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.* p 205-228.

35. Das A., Parida K. (2005). **Salt tolerance and salinity affect on plants a review.** *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety*. 60(3): 324–349.
36. Davenport R., Tester M. (2003). **Na⁺ tolerance and Na⁺ transport in higher plants.** *Annals of Botany*. 91(5):503-527.
37. Environmental Sciences Division. (2001). **Salt contamination assessment & remediation guidelines.** *Alberta Environment*.
38. Executive summery for the strategic water sector plantin Palestine 2011-2013.
39. Flexas, J., et al. (2004). **Diffusive and metabolic limitations to photosynthesis under drought and salinity in C-3 plants.** *Plant Biology*, 6(3), 269-279.
40. Flowers, T. J., Yeo, A. R. (1988). **Ion relations of salt tolerance.** *New York: Longman Scientific & Technical*.
41. Frahy G., Schopfer P. (2001). **Release of reactive oxygen intermediates super oxide radical hydrogen peroxide and hydroxyl radicals and peroxidase in germinating radish seeds controlled by lights, gibbevellin and abscisic acid.** 25(4).
42. Gerhardt, K. E., et al. (2009). **Phytoremediation and rhizoremediation of organic soil contaminants: Potential and challenges.** *Plant Science*, 176, 20-30.
43. Glenn, E., Brown, J., Blumwald, E. (1999). **Salt tolerance and crop potential of halophytes.** *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences*, 18(2), 227-255.

44. Glick B. (2004). **Bacterial ACC deaminase and the alleviation of plantstress.** *Advances in Applied Microbiology* 56:291-312.
45. Glick B. (1995). **The enhancement of plant-growth by free-living bacteria.** *Canadian Journal of Microbiology* 41(2):109-117.
46. Glick B., Bashan Y. (1997). **Genetic manipulation of plantgrowth-promoting bacteria to enhance biocontrol of fungal phytophathogens. .** *Biotechnology Advances* 15:353378.
47. Glick B., Penrose D. (1998). **A model for the lowering of plantethylene concentrations by plantgrowth promoting bacteria.** *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 190(1):63-68.
48. Handaly J., et al. (2005). **Impact of land of reject brackish water from desalination plants on soil and ground water.** *European Desalination Society*.
49. Hopkins, W. D. (1995). **Introduction to plantphysiology.** New York: J. Wiley.
50. Huang X., et al. (2004). **A multi-process phytoremediation system for removal of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons from contaminated soils.** *Environmental Pollution* 130(3):465-476.
51. James R., et al. (2006). **Photosynthetic capacity is related to the cellular and sub cellular partitioning of Na^+ , K^+ and Cl^- in salt-affected Barley and durum wheat.** *PlantCell and Environment* 29(12):2185-2197.

52. Janzen H., Chang C. (1988). **Cation concentrations in the saturation extract and soil solution extract of soil salinized with various sulfate salts.** *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis* 19(4):405-430.
53. Juneau P, Popovic R. (1999). **Evidence for the rapid phyto toxicity and environmental stress evaluation using the PAM fluorometric method: importance and future application.** *Ecotoxicology* 8(6):449-455.
54. Kamilova F., Lugtenberg B. (2009). **Plantgrowth promoting rhizobacteria.** 63:541-556.
55. Karley AJ., et al. (2000). **Where do all the ions go? The cellular basis of differential ion accumulation in leaf cells.** *Trends in Plant Science* 5(11):465-470.
56. Kende H. (1993). **Ethylene biosynthesis.** *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology* 44:283-307.
57. Kirkhan M., Wahla I. (2008). **Heavy metal displacement in salt water irrigated during phytoremediation.** *Environmental Pollution Journal.* 155.
58. Krause G., Weis E. (1991). **Chlorophyll fluorescence and photosynthesis: the basics.** *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology* 42:313-349.
59. Lees H. (2005). **The effects of cadmium and 1, 2-ATQ on reactive oxygen species (ROS) production, photosynthesis and gene expression in *Lemna gibba* (Duckweed).** *Waterloo: University of Waterloo.*

60. Loah, L. (2007). **Plant responses to Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria.**
61. Long S, Baker N. (1986). **Saline terrestrial environments. Photosynthesis in Contrasting Environments.** *New York: Elsevier.* p 63-102.
62. Mac Neil, G. (2011). **Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria enhanced phytoremediation of saline soils and salt uptake into plant biomass.** Waterloo University, Canada.
63. Malaeh, L. (2011). **Reverse osmosis technology for water treatment. State of the art review.** *Desalination.*
64. Marie A., Vengosh A. (2001). **Source of salinity in ground water from Jericho area, Jordan Valley.** *Wily Online Library-Ground water.*
65. Mayak S, et al. (2004). **Plant growth-promoting bacteria confer resistance in tomato plants to salt stress.** *Plant Physiology and Biochemistry* 42(6):565-572.
66. Mayak S, et al. (2004). **Plant growth-promoting bacteria that confer resistance to water stress in tomato and pepper.** *Plant Science* 166:525-530.
67. Meloni D., Oliva C. (2003). **Photosynthesis and activity of superoxide dismutase, peroxidase and glutathione reductase in cotton under salt stress.** *Environmental and Experimental Botany* 49:69-76.
68. Miller, G., et al. (2010). **Reactive oxygen species homeostasis and signaling during drought and salinity stresses.** *Plant Cell and Environment*, 33(4), 453-467.

69. Mittler R. (2002). **Oxidative stress, antioxidants and stress tolerance.** *Trends PlantScience* 7:405-410.
70. Munees A., Mulugeta K. (2014). **Mechanisms of application of plantgrowth promoting rhizobacteria: current perspective.** 26 (1): 1-20.
71. Munns R. (1993). **Physiological processes limiting plantgrowth in saline soils: some dogmas and hypotheses.** *Plant, Cell and Environment* 16:15-24.
72. Munns R, Tester M. (2008). **Mechanisms of Salinity Tolerance.** *Annual Review of PlantBiology* 59:651-681.
73. Naidoo G, Somaru R. (2008). **Morphological and physiological responses of the halophyte, *Odyssea paucinervis* (Staph) (Poaceae), to salinity.** *Flora* 203:437-447.
74. Netondo G., et al. (2004). **Sorghum and salinity: I. response of growth, water relations, and ion accumulation to NaCl salinity.** *Crop Science* 44:797-805.
75. Niazi M., et al. (1991). **Salinity tolerance in different cultivars of Barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.).** *Biologia Plantarum* 34(5-6):465-469.
76. Northcote K. (1972). **Australian soils with saline and sodic properties**
77. Olesen K, Andreasson L-E. (2003). **The function of the chloride ion in photosynthetic oxygen evolution.** *Biochemistry* 42(7):2025-2035.
78. Palestinian Water Authority,2014.

79. Papageorgiou G. (2004). **Chlorophyll *a* fluorescence: a signature of photosynthesis**. *Advances in Photosynthesis and Respiration*: 43-63.
80. Parida A., Das A. (2005). **Salt tolerance and salinity effects on plants: a review**. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety* 60:324 -349.
81. Penrose D., Glick B. (2003). **Methods for isolating and characterizing ACC deaminase containing plantgrowth-promoting rhizobacteria**. *Physiologia Plantarum* 118(1):1015.
82. Qadir M, et al. (2007). **Phytoremediation of sodicand saline-sodic soils**. *Advances in Agronomy*, Vol 96. P197-247.
83. Qadir M, et al. (1996). **Reclamation of a saline-sodic soil by gypsum and *Leptochloa fusca***. *Geoderma* 74:207-217.
84. Ravishenkar G., Suresh B. (2004). **Phytoremediation a novel and promising approach for environmental cleanup**. *Central Food Technological Research institute, Indiana*. 24(2, 3):97-124.
85. Shan, S. (2009). **Enhanced phytoremediation of salt impacted soils using plantgrowth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR)**. Waterloo University, Canada.
86. Smits E. (2005). **Phytoremediation**. *Annual Review of PlantBiology* 56:15-39.
87. Su Y, et al. (2008). **Phytoextraction and accumulation of mercury in three plantspecies: Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*), beard grass (*Polypogon monspeliensis*), and Chinese brake fern (*Pteris vittata*)**. *International Journal of Phytoremediation* 10(6):547-560.

88. Tchobanoglous, et al. (2003). **Wastewater Engineering (Treatment Disposal Reuse)** / Metcalf & Eddy, Inc. (4th ed.). *McGraw-Hill Book Company*.
89. Tester, M., Davenport, R. (2003). **Na⁺ tolerance and Na⁺ transport in higher plants**. *Annals of Botany*, 91(5), 503-527
90. USEPA. (2000). **Government report: Introduction to phytoremediation**. The U.S.Environmental Protection Agency.
91. Veselov D.,et al.. (2008). **The effects of NaCl treatment of water relations, growth, and ABA content in Barley cultivars differing in drought tolerance**. *Journal of PlantGrowth Regulation* 27:380-386.
92. Wahid, A., et al. S. (2007). **Pretreatment of seed with H₂O₂ improves salt tolerance of wheat seedlings by alleviation of oxidative damage and expression of stress proteins**. *Journal of PlantPhysiology*, 164, 283-294.
93. Walton, N. (1989). **Electrical conductivity and total dissolved solids - what is their precise relationship?** *Desalination*, 72, 275-292.
94. Woolhouse H. (1983). **Toxicity and tolerance in the responses of plants to metals**. *Encyclopedia of PlantPhysiology*. 245-300.
95. Wu, S. (2009). **Enhanced phytoremediation of salt-impacted soils using plantgrowth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR)**. *Waterloo, Ont.: University of Waterloo*.
96. Yasser H. (2006).**Virtual water as a policy instrument for achieving water security in Palestine**. *Jabalia Camp. Water Resources in the Middle East*.

97. Zhang H, et al. (2005). **Soil salinity using saturated paste and 1 : 1 soil to water extracts** . *Soil Society of America Journal* 69(4):1146-1151.
98. Zhao G., et al. (2007). **Growth, gas exchange, chlorophyll fluorescence, and ion content of naked oat in response to salinity**. *Crop Science* 47(123-131).
99. Zhong,H. (2011). **Salt mass balance study and plantphysiological responses for an enhanced salt phytoremediation system**. Waterloo University, Canada.
100. Zhu JK. (2004). **Plantsalt tolerance**. 6(1.2).
100. Zhu J-K. (2001). **Plantsalt tolerance**. *Trends in PlantScience* 6(2):66-71.

Annexes

Annex.1 Measurements of soil salinity as TDS after 30 days of cultivation period at Temp 17°C.

num	Name of parameter	Trial num 1 TDS (mg/l)	Trial num 2 TDS (mg/l)	Trial num 3 TDS (mg/l)	Average	Standard deviation
1	ECe control soil irrigated with fresh water	65.0	65.6	64.2	64.7	0.2
2	EC 1:2 control soil irrigated with fresh water	45.8	49.0	45.3	46.7	2.007
3	ECe control soil irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	90.5	89.6	90.4	90.1	0.4
4	EC 1:2 control soil irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	50.6	50.7	50.9	50.7	0.1
5	ECe control soil irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	95.8	95.7	94.6	95.3	0.6
6	EC 1:2 control soil irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	60.4	61.2	59.8	60.4	0.7
7	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	65.4	65.7	64.5	65.2	0.6
8	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	44.8	44.5	44.6	44.6	0.1
9	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	69.0	69.2	69.4	69.2	0.2
10	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	50.7	52.7	51.3	51.5	1.0
11	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3 with 10000 mg/L brackish water	70.6	72.5	69.5	70.8	1.5
12	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	50.3	52.5	48.7	50.5	1.9
14	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	66.4	65.9	66.5	66.2	0.3
15	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	43.8	43.5	43.6	44.6	0.1
16	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	89.0	89.2	89.4	89.2	0.2
17	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	60.7	60.7	60.3	60.5	0.2
18	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3 with 10000 mg/L Brackish water	96.6	95.8	96.5	96.3	0.4
19	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	60.3	60.5	60.7	60.5	0.2
20	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	65.3	65.4	65.0	60.5	0.2
21	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	46.3	46.5	46.4	46.4	0.1
22	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	69.0	69.2	69.4	69.2	0.2
23	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	50.7	52.7	51.3	51.5	1.0
24	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW4 with 10000 mg/L brackish water	73.5	72.9	73.4	73.2	0.3
25	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	51.2	51.7	51.4	51.4	0.2

26	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	59.6	59.7	59.5	59.6	0.1
27	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	45.8	46.7	45.8	46.1	0.5
28	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW4irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	89.0	89.2	89.4	89.2	0.2
29	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW4irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	61.5	61.5	61.3	61.4	0.1
30	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW4with 10000 mg/L Brackish water	87.1	88.2	87.4	87.5	0.5
31	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW4irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	59.9	60.0	60.1	60	0.1
32	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with fresh water	63.0	63.5	63.8	63.4	0.4
33	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with fresh water	42.1	43.0	42.6	42.5	0.4
34	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	64.0	64.2	64.3	64.1	0.1
35	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3 +UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	45.3	45.7	50.3	47.1	2.7
36	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+UW4with 10000 mg/L brackish water	68.4	68.2	68.1	68.2	0.1
37	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+UW4irrigated with 10000 mg/L Brackish water	43.3	43.5	44.7	43.8	0.7
38	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with fresh water	57.4	57.4	57.5	57.4	0.1
39	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with fresh water	46.8	46.7	46.8	46.7	0.1
40	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	84.0	84.2	84.7	84.3	0.3
41	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+UW4irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	62.5	62.4	63.	62.6	0.3
42	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+UW4with 10000 mg/L brackish water	87.1	88.2	87.4	87.5	0.5
43	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	56.9	56.0	56.5	56.4	0.4
44	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	64.0	64.3	64.2	64.1	0.1
45	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	43.8	43.5	43.6	43.6	0.1
46	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	87.5	87.6	90.4	88.5	1.6
47	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	46.6	46.8	48.9	47.7	1.2
48	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ with 10000 mg/L brackish water	93.0	92.5	91.9	92.5	0.5
49	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	58.4	58.2	59.0	58.5	1.2
50	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	63.4	63.0	63.2	63.2	0.5
51	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	43.8	45.0	45.3	44.7	0.4
52	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	82.5	83.6	82.4	82.8	0.2

53	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	48.6	49.7	50.6	49.6	1.0
54	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ with 10000 mg/L brackish water	93.8	92.7	92.6	93.0	0.6
55	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	57.4	58.2	58.8	58.1	0.7
56	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	63.0	63.0	63.2	63.1	0.1
57	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	42.8	42.0	42.3	42.4	0.4
58	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	88.05	89.0	88.4	88.5	0.4
59	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	47.6	47.7	47.9	47.7	0.1
60	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ with 10000 mg/L brackish water	91.0	91.7	91.6	91.4	0.3
61	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L	58.4	58.2	58.8	58.4	0.3
62	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	64.0	64.3	64.4	64.2	0.2
63	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	43.8	43.0	43.3	43.3	0.4
64	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	83.05	83.0	83.4	83.15	0.2
65	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	50.6	50.7	50.9	50.73	0.1
66	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ with 10000 mg/L brackish water	94.0	94.3	94.6	94.3	0.3
67	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	59.4	59.2	59.5	59.3	1.5

Annex.2: Calculated experimental measurement of Electrical conductivity (EC) in unit ds/l each trials after 20 days, each parameter was performed in triplicate at Temp 17 °C

num	Name of parameter	Trial num 1 ds/l	Trial num 2 ds/l	Trial num 3 ds/l	Average	SD
1	ECe control soil irrigated with fresh water	0.101	0.102	0.100	0.101	0.001
2	EC 1:2 control soil irrigated with fresh water	0.071	0.076	0.070	0.072	0.003
3	ECe control soil irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	0.142	0.14	0.141	0.140	0.007
4	EC 1:2 control soil irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	0.079	0.079	0.079	0.079	0.002
5	ECe control soil irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.149	0.149	0.147	0.149	0.001
6	EC 1:2 control soil irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.094	0.095	0.093	0.094	0.001
7	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	0.102	0.102	0.100	0.101	0.009
8	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	0.101	0.102	0.100	0.101	0.001
9	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	0.07	0.069	0.069	0.069	0.002
10	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	0.107	0.108	0.108	0.108	0.003
11	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3 with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.079	0.082	0.080	0.080	0.001
12	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.110	0.113	0.108	0.110	0.002
14	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	0.078	0.082	0.076	0.078	0.003
15	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water	0.103	0.102	0.103	0.103	0.006
16	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	0.139	0.139	0.139	0.139	0.003
17	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	0.094	0.094	0.094	0.101	0.003
18	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3 with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.150	0.149	0.150	0.150	0.001
19	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.094	0.094	0.094	0.094	0.003
20	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	0.102	0.102	0.101	0.101	0.001
21	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW4	0.072	0.073	0.072	0.072	0.005

	irrigated with fresh water					
22	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW4irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	0.107	0.108	0.108	0.108	0.003
23	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW4irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	0.079	0.082	0.080	0.081	0.001
24	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW4with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.114	0.113	0.114	0.114	0.008
25	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW4irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.08	0.080	0.080	0.080	0.003
26	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	0.093	0.093	0.092	0.093	0.001
27	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water	0.0715625	0.0729687	0.071562	0.07203125	0.008
28	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW4irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	0.139	0.139	0.139	0.1393	0.001
29	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW4irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	0.096	0.096	0.095	0.095	0.006
30	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW4with 10000 mg/L Brackish water	0.136	0.137	0.136	0.137	0.007
31	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW4irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.093	0.093	0.093	0.093	0.002
32	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with fresh water	0.098	0.099	0.099	0.099	0.002
33	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with fresh water	0.065	0.067	0.066	0.066	0.004
34	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	0.1	0.100	0.100	0.100	0.002
35	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3 +UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	0.070	0.071	0.078	0.073	0.001
36	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+UW4with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.107	0.106	0.106	0.106	0.009
37	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+UW4irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.067	0.067	0.069	0.068	0.002
38	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with fresh water	0.089	0.089	0.089	0.089	0.009
39	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with fresh water	0.073	0.072	0.073	0.073	0.005
40	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	0.131	0.132	0.132	0.132	0.005
41	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with	0.097	0.097	0.098	0.097	0.001

	UW3+UW4irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water					
42	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+UW4with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.136	0.137	0.136	0.136	0.001
43	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.088	0.087	0.088	0.088	0.002
44	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	0.100	0.100	0.100	0.100	0.002
45	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	0.068	0.067	0.068	0.670	0.001
46	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	0.136	0.136	0.141	0.138	0.008
47	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	0.072	0.073	0.076	0.074	0.006
48	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.145	0.144	0.143	0.143	0.003
49	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L Brackish water	0.091	0.090	0.092	0.091	0.001
50	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	0.099	0.098	0.098	0.099	0.001
51	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	0.068	0.070	0.070	0.069	0.001
52	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L Brackish water	0.128	0.130	0.128	0.129	0.001
53	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L Brackish water	0.075	0.077	0.079	0.077	0.001
54	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ with 10000 mg/L Brackish water	0.146	0.144	0.144	0.145	0.017
55	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with UW3+ H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L Brackish water	0.089	0.090	0.091	0.086	0.006
56	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	0.098	0.098	0.098	0.098	0.007
57	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	0.066	0.065	0.066	0.066	0.002
58	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L Brackish water	0.137	0.139	0.138	0.138	0.005
59	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L Brackish water	0.074	0.074	0.074	0.74	0.004
60	ECe soil contain Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ with 10000 mg/L Brackish water	0.142	0.143	0.143	0.111	0.003
61	EC 1:2 soil contain Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L	0.091	0.090	0.091	0.091	0.006
62	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with	0.100	0.100	0.101	0.100	0.003


	H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water					
63	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with fresh water	0.068	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.004
64	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L Brackish water	0.129	0.129	0.130	0.129	0.003
65	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L Brackish water	0.079	0.079	0.079	0.079	0.002
66	ECe soil contain Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.146	0.147	0.147	0.147	0.004
67	EC 1:2 soil contain Malt seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	0.092	0.092	0.092	0.097	0.002

Annex.3: Measurement of electrical conductivity of brackish water for two syntheses samples before and for decants water for each trial. Each trial was performed in triplicate

Name of parameter	Trial num 1 TDS (g/l)	Trial num 2 TDS(g/l)	Trial num 3 TDS(g/l)	Average	Standard deviation
EC for 6000mg/L of brackish water before irrigation	5.98	5.89	5.95	5.94	0.04
EC for 10000mg/L of brackish water before irrigation	9.87	9.94	9.96	9.92	0.04
EC for decent brackish water of Barley seeds with UW3irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	3.65	3.67	3.64	3.65	0.01
EC for decent water of Barley seeds with UW3irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	6.94	6.90	6.87	6.90	0.03
EC for decent brackish water of Malt seeds with UW3irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	4.89	4.90	4.92	4.90	0.01
EC for decent water of Malt seeds with UW3irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	8.70	8.75	8.74	8.73	0.02
EC for decent brackish water of Barley seeds with UW4irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	3.25	3.28	3.26	3.26	0.01
EC for decent water of Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	6.17	6.13	6.15	6.15	0.02
EC for decent Brackish water of Malt seeds with UW4irrigated with 6000 mg/L Brackish water	4.75	4.76	4.79	4.76	0.02
EC for decent water of Malt seeds with UW4irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	7.77	7.79	7.77	7.77	0.01
EC for decent brackish	2.85	2.87	2.84	2.85	0.01

water of Barley seeds with UW3 +UW4irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water					
EC for decent water of Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	6.47	6.43	6.45	6.45	0.02
EC for decent brackish water of Malt seeds with UW3+UW4irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	3.86	3.85	3.82	3.84	0.02
EC for decent water of Malt seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L Brackish water	7.70	7.65	7.68	7.67	0.02
EC for decent brackish water of Barley seeds with UW3+H2O2irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	3.16	3.15	3.13	3.14	0.01
EC for decent water of Barley seeds with UW3+H2O2 irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	6.70	6.65	6.68	6.67	0.02
EC for decent brackish water of Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	4. 88	4.89	4.90	4.89	0.01
EC for decent water of Barley seeds with H ₂ O ₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	8.89	8.87	8.85	8.87	0.02
EC for decent Brackish water of Malt seeds with irrigated with 6000 mg/L brackish water	5.10	5.09	5.02	5.07	0.04
EC for decent brackish water of Malt seeds with irrigated with 10000 mg/L brackish water	9.87	9.94	9.96	9.92	0.04

Annex.4 picture for trials selected random trials



Annex.5: Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry measurement for Barley plant irrigated with 6000 of brackish water.

Time Min: Sec	Average Y(II)	Standard deviation	Average NPQ	Standard deviation
0:00:00	0.779	0.019	0.006	0.001
0:00:42	0.159	0.027	0.001	0.001
0:01:02	0.197	0.041	0.251	0.035
0:01:23	0.257	0.046	0.383	0.046
0:01:43	0.308	0.049	0.395	0.053
0:02:03	0.329	0.047	0.392	0.055
0:02:23	0.361	0.044	0.371	0.056
0:02:44	0.372	0.040	0.362	0.055
0:03:04	0.385	0.037	0.350	0.053
0:03:24	0.388	0.038	0.346	0.053
0:03:45	0.388	0.038	0.345	0.052
0:04:05	0.398	0.039	0.337	0.052
0:04:25	0.405	0.035	0.329	0.049
0:04:45	0.416	0.036	0.322	0.048
0:05:06	0.419	0.034	0.319	0.046
0:05:20	0.602	0.036	0.214	0.037
0:05:32	0.613	0.033	0.196	0.030
0:05:46	0.632	0.028	0.175	0.023
0:06:04	0.651	0.023	0.156	0.014
0:06:24	0.666	0.021	0.144	0.011
0:06:48	0.673	0.017	0.131	0.006
0:07:18	0.686	0.016	0.119	0.004
0:07:53	0.694	0.014	0.111	0.005

Annex.6: Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry measurement for Barley plant irrigated with 10000 of brackish water.

Time Min:Sec	Average Y(II)	Standard deviation	Average NPQ	Standard deviation
0:00:00	0.779	0.012	0.005	0
0:00:42	0.238	0.041	0	0
0:01:02	0.267	0.055	0.197	0.036
0:01:23	0.301	0.058	0.312	0.055
0:01:43	0.321	0.057	0.335	0.062
0:02:03	0.378	0.052	0.306	0.065
0:02:23	0.396	0.043	0.296	0.060
0:02:44	0.415	0.043	0.281	0.059
0:03:04	0.416	0.036	0.281	0.053
0:03:24	0.404	0.029	0.289	0.047
0:03:45	0.408	0.026	0.289	0.041
0:04:05	0.406	0.027	0.295	0.040
0:04:25	0.408	0.020	0.296	0.032
0:04:45	0.416	0.019	0.295	0.030
0:05:06	0.410	0.022	0.301	0.030
0:05:20	0.603	0.018	0.195	0.019
0:05:32	0.617	0.019	0.179	0.015
0:05:46	0.627	0.015	0.168	0.008
0:06:04	0.635	0.018	0.158	0.009
0:06:24	0.644	0.011	0.148	0.007
0:06:48	0.657	0.017	0.131	0.006
0:07:18	0.665	0.016	0.119	0.004

Annex.7: Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry measurement for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with fresh water.

Time Min:Sec	Average Y(II)	Standard deviation	Average NPQ	Standard deviation
0:00:00	0.786	0.008	0.005	0.001
0:00:42	0.217	0.015	0.005	0.001
0:01:02	0.351	0.008	0.231	0.027
0:01:23	0.429	0.008	0.234	0.026
0:01:43	0.451	0.013	0.210	0.023
0:02:03	0.479	0.013	0.183	0.018
0:02:23	0.484	0.015	0.182	0.014
0:02:44	0.482	0.012	0.193	0.012
0:03:04	0.486	0.014	0.205	0.012
0:03:24	0.489	0.017	0.214	0.013
0:03:45	0.492	0.019	0.225	0.014
0:04:05	0.487	0.021	0.237	0.016
0:04:25	0.488	0.022	0.242	0.017
0:04:45	0.480	0.023	0.250	0.016
0:05:06	0.488	0.023	0.250	0.017
0:05:20	0.631	0.016	0.178	0.010
0:05:32	0.644	0.013	0.164	0.007
0:05:46	0.653	0.009	0.156	0.004
0:06:04	0.657	0.011	0.153	0.005
0:06:24	0.667	0.009	0.143	0.002
0:06:48	0.679	0.008	0.133	0.002
0:07:18	0.688	0.008	0.120	0.002
0:07:53	0.700	0.012	0.115	0.006

Annex.8: Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry measurement for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water.

Time Min: sec	Average Y(II)	Standard deviation	Average NPQ	Standard deviation
0:00:00	0.769	0.009	0.006	0.001
0:00:42	0.155	0.030	0	0.005
0:01:02	0.197	0.043	0.299	0.028
0:01:23	0.258	0.047	0.422	0.018
0:01:43	0.283	0.043	0.442	0.02
0:02:03	0.318	0.044	0.423	0.0383
0:02:23	0.346	0.040	0.401	0.041
0:02:44	0.353	0.034	0.389	0.041
0:03:04	0.363	0.033	0.379	0.044
0:03:24	0.373	0.028	0.366	0.043
0:03:45	0.385	0.023	0.351	0.039
0:04:05	0.388	0.025	0.346	0.042
0:04:25	0.397	0.018	0.332	0.036
0:04:45	0.397	0.015	0.328	0.033
0:05:06	0.412	0.013	0.313	0.028
0:05:20	0.593	0.009	0.207	0.016
0:05:32	0.600	0.004	0.195	0.012
0:05:46	0.612	0.005	0.185	0.010
0:06:04	0.624	0.003	0.172	0.007
0:06:24	0.641	0.002	0.159	0.004
0:06:48	0.646	0.007	0.151	0.004
0:07:18	0.658	0.005	0.141	0.006

Annex.9: Pulse Amplitude modulated floumery measurement for treated Barley seeds with UW3 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water.

Time Min:Sec	Average Y(II)	Standard deviation	Average NPQ	Standard deviation
0:00:00	0.769	0.009	0.006	0.001
0:00:42	0.155	0.030	0	0.005
0:01:02	0.197	0.043	0.299	0.028
0:01:23	0.258	0.047	0.422	0.018
0:01:43	0.283	0.043	0.442	0.024
0:02:03	0.318	0.044	0.423	0.038
0:02:23	0.346	0.040	0.401	0.041
0:02:44	0.353	0.034	0.389	0.041
0:03:04	0.363	0.033	0.379	0.044
0:03:24	0.373	0.028	0.366	0.043
0:03:45	0.385	0.023	0.351	0.039
0:04:05	0.388	0.025	0.346	0.048
0:04:25	0.397	0.018	0.332	0.036
0:04:45	0.397	0.015	0.328	0.033
0:05:06	0.412	0.013	0.313	0.028
0:05:20	0.5937	0.009	0.207	0.016
0:05:32	0.600	0.004	0.195	0.012
0:05:46	0.612	0.005	0.185	0.010
0:06:04	0.624	0.003	0.172	0.007
0:06:24	0.641	0.002	0.159	0.004
0:06:48	0.646	0.007	0.151	0.004
0:07:18	0.658	0.005	0.141	0.006

Annex.10: Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry measurement for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with fresh water

Time Min: Sec	Average Y(II)	Standard deviation	Average NPQ	Standard deviation
0:00:00	0.786	0.008	0.005	0.005
0:00:42	0.217	0.015	0.005	0.001
0:01:02	0.351	0.008	0.231	0.027
0:01:23	0.429	0.008	0.234	0.026
0:01:43	0.451	0.013	0.210	0.023
0:02:03	0.479	0.013	0.183	0.018
0:02:23	0.484	0.015	0.182	0.014
0:02:44	0.482	0.012	0.193	0.012
0:03:04	0.486	0.014	0.205	0.012
0:03:24	0.489	0.017	0.216	0.013
0:03:45	0.490	0.019	0.225	0.014
0:04:05	0.487	0.021	0.237	0.016
0:04:25	0.488	0.022	0.242	0.017
0:04:45	0.480	0.023	0.250	0.0166
0:05:06	0.488	0.023	0.250	0.017
0:05:20	0.631	0.016	0.178	0.010
0:05:32	0.644	0.013	0.164	0.007
0:05:46	0.653	0.009	0.156	0.004
0:06:04	0.657	0.011	0.153	0.005
0:06:24	0.667	0.009	0.143	0.002
0:06:48	0.679	0.008	0.133	0.002
0:07:18	0.688	0.008	0.126	0.002
0:07:53	0.7	0.012	0.115	0.006

Annex.11: Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry measurement for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water .

Time Min:Sec	Average Y(II)	Standard deviation	Average NPQ	Standard deviation
0:00:00	0.769	0.009	0.006	0.001
0:00:42	0.155	0.030	0	0.005
0:01:02	0.197	0.043	0.299	0.028
0:01:23	0.258	0.047	0.422	0.018
0:01:43	0.283	0.043	0.442	0.024
0:02:03	0.318	0.044	0.423	0.038
0:02:23	0.346	0.040	0.401	0.041
0:02:44	0.353	0.034	0.389	0.041
0:03:04	0.363	0.033	0.379	0.044
0:03:24	0.373	0.028	0.366	0.043
0:03:45	0.385	0.023	0.351	0.039
0:04:05	0.388	0.025	0.346	0.042
0:04:25	0.397	0.018	0.332	0.036
0:04:45	0.397	0.015	0.328	0.033
0:05:06	0.412	0.013	0.313	0.028
0:05:20	0.593	0.009	0.207	0.016
0:05:32	0.600	0.004	0.195	0.012
0:05:46	0.612	0.005	0.185	0.010
0:06:04	0.624	0.003	0.172	0.007
0:06:24	0.641	0.002	0.159	0.004
0:06:48	0.646	0.007	0.151	0.004
0:07:18	0.658	0.005	0.141	0.006

Annex.12: Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry measurement for treated Barley seeds with UW4 irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water.

Time Min:Sec	Average Y(II)	Standard deviation	Average NPQ	Standard deviation
0:00:00	0.769	0.009	0.006	0.001
0:00:42	0.155	0.030	0	0.005
0:01:02	0.197	0.043	0.299	0.028
0:01:23	0.258	0.047	0.422	0.018
0:01:43	0.283	0.043	0.442	0.024
0:02:03	0.318	0.044	0.423	0.038
0:02:23	0.346	0.040	0.401	0.041
0:02:44	0.353	0.034	0.389	0.041
0:03:04	0.363	0.033	0.379	0.044
0:03:24	0.373	0.028	0.366	0.043
0:03:45	0.385	0.023	0.351	0.039
0:04:05	0.388	0.025	0.346	0.042
0:04:25	0.397	0.018	0.332	0.036
0:04:45	0.397	0.015	0.328	0.033
0:05:06	0.412	0.013	0.313	0.028
0:05:20	0.593	0.009	0.207	0.019
0:05:32	0.600	0.004	0.195	0.012
0:05:46	0.612	0.005	0.185	0.010
0:06:04	0.624	0.003	0.172	0.007
0:06:24	0.641	0.002	0.159	0.004
0:06:48	0.646	0.007	0.151	0.004
0:07:18	0.658	0.005	0.141	0.006

Annex.13: Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry measurement for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated fresh water

Time Min : sec	Average Y(II)	Standard deviation	Average NPQ	Standard deviation
0:00:00	0.786	0.008	0.005	0.001
0:00:42	0.217	0.015	0.005	0.001
0:01:02	0.351	0.008	0.231	0.027
0:01:23	0.429	0.008	0.234	0.026
0:01:43	0.451	0.013	0.210	0.023
0:02:03	0.479	0.013	0.183	0.018
0:02:23	0.484	0.015	0.182	0.014
0:02:44	0.482	0.012	0.193	0.012
0:03:04	0.486	0.014	0.205	0.012
0:03:24	0.489	0.017	0.216	0.013
0:03:45	0.490	0.019	0.225	0.014
0:04:05	0.487	0.021	0.237	0.016
0:04:25	0.488	0.022	0.242	0.017
0:04:45	0.480	0.023	0.250	0.016
0:05:06	0.488	0.023	0.250	0.017
0:05:20	0.631	0.016	0.178	0.010
0:05:32	0.644	0.013	0.164	0.007
0:05:46	0.653	0.009	0.156	0.004
0:06:04	0.657	0.011	0.153	0.005
0:06:24	0.667	0.009	0.143	0.002
0:06:48	0.679	0.008	0.133	0.002
0:07:18	0.688	0.008	0.126	0.002
0:07:53	0.700	0.012	0.115	0.006

Annex.14: Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry measurement for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated 6000 mg/L of brackish water.

Time Min : sec	Average Y(II)	Standard deviation	Average NPQ	Standard deviation
0:00:00	0.769	0.009	0.006	0.001
0:00:42	0.155	0.030	0	0.005
0:01:02	0.197	0.043	0.299	0.028
0:01:23	0.258	0.047	0.422	0.018
0:01:43	0.283	0.043	0.442	0.024
0:02:03	0.318	0.044	0.423	0.038
0:02:23	0.346	0.040	0.401	0.041
0:02:44	0.353	0.034	0.389	0.041
0:03:04	0.363	0.033	0.379	0.044
0:03:24	0.373	0.028	0.366	0.043
0:03:45	0.385	0.023	0.351	0.039
0:04:05	0.388	0.025	0.346	0.042
0:04:25	0.397	0.018	0.332	0.036
0:04:45	0.397	0.015	0.328	0.033
0:05:06	0.412	0.013	0.313	0.028
0:05:20	0.593	0.009	0.207	0.016
0:05:32	0.600	0.004	0.195	0.012
0:05:46	0.612	0.0053	0.185	0.010
0:06:04	0.624	0.003	0.172	0.007
0:06:24	0.641	0.002	0.159	0.004
0:06:48	0.646	0.007	0.151	0.004
0:07:18	0.658	0.005	0.141	0.006

Annex.15: Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry measurement for treated Barley seeds with UW3+UW4 irrigated with 10000mg/L of brackish water

Time Min: sec	Average Y(II)	Standard deviation	Average NPQ	Standard deviation
0:00:00	0.769	0.009	0.006	0.001
0:00:42	0.155	0.030	0.00	0.005
0:01:02	0.197	0.043	0.2993	0.028
0:01:23	0.258	0.047	0.422	0.018
0:01:43	0.283	0.043	0.442	0.024
0:02:03	0.318	0.044	0.423	0.038
0:02:23	0.346	0.040	0.401	0.041
0:02:44	0.353	0.034	0.389	0.041
0:03:04	0.363	0.033	0.379	0.044
0:03:24	0.373	0.028	0.366	0.043
0:03:45	0.385	0.023	0.351	0.039
0:04:05	0.388	0.025	0.346	0.042
0:04:25	0.397	0.018	0.332	0.036
0:04:45	0.397	0.015	0.328	0.033
0:05:06	0.412	0.013	0.313	0.028
0:05:20	0.593	0.009	0.207	0.016
0:05:32	0.600	0.004	0.195	0.012
0:05:46	0.612	0.005	0.185	0.010
0:06:04	0.624	0.003	0.172	0.007
0:06:24	0.641	0.002	0.159	0.004
0:06:48	0.646	0.007	0.151	0.004
0:07:18	0.658	0.005	0.141	0.006

Annex.16: Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry measurement for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H₂O₂ irrigated with fresh water

Time Min: Sec	Average Y(II)	Standard deviation	Average NPQ	Standard deviation
0:00:00	0.779	0.019	0.006	0.001
0:00:42	0.159	0.027	0.001	0.001
0:01:02	0.197	0.041	0.251	0.035
0:01:23	0.257	0.046	0.383	0.046
0:01:43	0.308	0.049	0.395	0.053
0:02:03	0.329	0.047	0.392	0.055
0:02:23	0.361	0.044	0.371	0.056
0:02:44	0.372	0.040	0.362	0.055
0:03:04	0.385	0.037	0.350	0.053
0:03:24	0.388	0.038	0.346	0.053
0:03:45	0.388	0.038	0.345	0.052
0:04:05	0.398	0.039	0.337	0.052
0:04:25	0.405	0.035	0.329	0.049
0:04:45	0.416	0.036	0.322	0.048
0:05:06	0.419	0.034	0.319	0.046
0:05:20	0.602	0.036	0.214	0.037
0:05:32	0.613	0.033	0.196	0.030
0:05:46	0.632	0.028	0.175	0.023
0:06:04	0.651	0.023	0.156	0.014
0:06:24	0.66	0.021	0.144	0.011
0:06:48	0.673	0.017	0.131	0.006
0:07:18	0.686	0.016	0.119	0.004
0:07:53	0.694	0.014	0.11	0.005
0:08:35	0.700	0.012	0.106	0.004

Annex.17: Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry measurement for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H₂O₂ irrigated with 6000 mg/L of brackish water

Time Min:sec	Average Y(II)	Standard deviation	Average NPQ	Standard deviation
0:00:00	0.769	0.009	0.006	0.001
0:00:42	0.155	0.030	0	0.005
0:01:02	0.197	0.043	0.299	0.028
0:01:23	0.258	0.047	0.422	0.018
0:01:43	0.283	0.043	0.442	0.024
0:02:03	0.318	0.044	0.423	0.038
0:02:23	0.346	0.040	0.401	0.041
0:02:44	0.353	0.034	0.389	0.041
0:03:04	0.363	0.033	0.379	0.044
0:03:24	0.373	0.028	0.366	0.043
0:03:45	0.385	0.023	0.351	0.039
0:04:05	0.388	0.025	0.346	0.042
0:04:25	0.397	0.018	0.332	0.036
0:04:45	0.397	0.015	0.328	0.033
0:05:06	0.412	0.013	0.313	0.028
0:05:20	0.593	0.009	0.207	0.016
0:05:32	0.600	0.004	0.195	0.012
0:05:46	0.615	0.005	0.185	0.010
0:06:04	0.624	0.003	0.172	0.007
0:06:24	0.641	0.002	0.159	0.004
0:06:48	0.646	0.007	0.151	0.004
0:07:18	0.658	0.005	0.141	0.006

Annex.18: Pulse Amplitude modulated floumetry measurement for treated Barley seeds with UW3+H₂O₂ irrigated with 10000 mg/L of brackish water

Time	Average Y(II)	Standard deviation	Average NPQ	Standard deviation
0:00:00	0.769	0.009	0.006	0.001
0:00:42	0.155	0.030	0	0.001
0:01:02	0.197	0.043	0.299	0.028
0:01:23	0.258	0.047	0.422	0.018
0:01:43	0.283	0.043	0.442	0.024
0:02:03	0.318	0.044	0.423	0.038
0:02:23	0.346	0.040	0.401	0.041
0:02:44	0.353	0.034	0.389	0.041
0:03:04	0.363	0.033	0.379	0.044
0:03:24	0.373	0.028	0.366	0.043
0:03:45	0.385	0.023	0.351	0.039
0:04:05	0.388	0.025	0.346	0.042
0:04:25	0.397	0.018	0.332	0.036
0:04:45	0.397	0.015	0.328	0.033
0:05:06	0.412	0.013	0.313	0.028
0:05:20	0.593	0.009	0.207	0.016
0:05:32	0.600	0.004	0.195	0.012
0:05:46	0.612	0.005	0.185	0.010
0:06:04	0.624	0.003	0.172	0.007
0:06:24	0.641	0.002	0.159	0.004
0:06:48	0.646	0.007	0.151	0.004
0:07:18	0.658	0.005	0.141	0.006

جامعة النجاح الوطنية

كلية الدراسات العليا

إستخدام تقنية علاج النبات في علاج المياه المالحة الناتجة

من محطات التناضح العكسي

إعداد

رناد جلال يحيى حامد

إشراف

د. شحده جودة

د. رائد الكوني

قدمت هذه الأطروحة استكمالاً لمتطلبات الحصول على درجة الماجستير في الكيمياء بكلية الدراسات العليا في جامعة النجاح الوطنية في نابلس - فلسطين.

2014

ب

إستخدام تقنية علاج النبات في علاج المياه المالحة الناتجة

من محطات التناضح العكسي

اعداد

رناد جلال يحيى حامد

اشراف

د. شحده جودة

د. رائد الكوني

الملخص

تعتبر المياه عالية الملوحة ناتجا ثانويا يصدر عن محطات التناضح العكسي بعد عملية تحلية المياه. بحيث أن نسبة محتواها من أيونات الأملاح الذائبة مابين (5000-10000 mg/L). والبعض منها يتواجد بنسب عالية مقارنة بالأخرى كأيون الصوديوم وأيون الكلور وأيونات الكالسيوم والمغنيسيوم والبوتاسيوم والكربونات والكبريتات.

تعد هذه المياه كملوث للبيئة لإحتوائها على تلك التراكيز العالية من الأملاح ، بحيث أنها تسبب مشاكل للتربة والنباتات وتحد من تطور المجال الزراعي في فلسطين .

في الأونة الأخيرة تم تطبيق الأبحاث في علاج تلك المياه، من خلال تخفيف تراكيز الاملاح بإضافة المياه الحلوة، وتقنية اخرى تسمى بتقنية علاج النبات، حيث تعتمد هذه التقنية بشكل رئيسي على النبات المتحمل للملوحة في عملية إستخراج الأملاح وتجميعها في الكتلة الحيوية.

بشكل عام، عند مرحلة معينة تعمل التراكيز العالية من الأملاح على تثبيط نمو النبتة حتى وإن كانت من النوع المتحمل للملوحة ، لذلك درست بعض الابحاث تأثير نوع من أنواع البكتيريا المسماه بPGPR في تعزيز نمو النباتات وتحسينه عن طريق خفض إنتاج مركب الإثيلين المنتج في فترة إجهاد النبتة وتثبيط نموها، لكن تقوم هذه البكتيريا على تحسين عملية البناء الضوئي تحت الجهد المتعرضة له ، مما يزيد من قابليتها لإمتصاص أكبر قدر من الأملاح وتخزينه في كتلتها الحيوية.

في هذه الورقة البحثية تم اعتماد تقنية علاج النبات وتهجين بذور النبات بالسلالتين UW3 و UW4 المعزولة من مختبر البرفسور غليك واترلو في جامعة كندا. لزيادة قابلية النبتة في التخلص من الأملاح أثناء عملية الري ، وتجميعها في الكتلة الحيوية ومن ثم حصادها، وهكذا يتم التخلص من المياه عالية الملوحة بطرق ودية للبيئة.

شملت المعاملات في التجربة معاملات لبذور الشعير والمليت المهجنة بسلالة UW3 ، معاملات مهجنة بسلالة ال UW4 ، معاملات مهجنة بتلك السلالتين معا ، و معاملات دون أي تهجين أو معالجة لتعتبر المرجعية، كما تم إضافة معاملات أخرى احتوت تهجين البذور بسلالة ال UW3 مع الهيدروجين بيروكسيد، ومعاملات تمت معاملتها بالهيدرجين بيروكسيد لوحده. وتم تقسيم كل معاملة وري مجموعة منها بالماء العذب، وأخرى بمحلول المياه عالي الملوحة تركيز 6000 mg/L ، وأخرى بمحلول 10000 mg/L. وتم تنفيذها في دفينة زراعية صممت في حديقة المنزل.

أظهرت النتائج أن تأثير PGPR أدى إلى زيادة في نمو النبات و النشاط الضوئي والاستقرار الغشائي، وكما لوحظ زيادة أطوال الجذور للمعاملات المعالجة بتلك السلالات حتى وإن كانت تحت جهد الأملاح مقارنة مع المعاملات المرجعية المروية سواء بالمياه العذبة أو التراكيز الأخرى من محاليل المياه المالحة. وكما لوحظ زيادة الكتلة الحيوية لمعاملات ال PGPR بحيث كانت للمعاملات المهجنة بسلالة UW3 (156.11%, 249.40%, 237.31%) ، و المهجنة بسلالة ال UW4 (156.11%, 237.31%, 288.83%) ، والمهجنة بتلك السلالتين مع بعضهما (128.12%, 267.67%, 288.56%) بينما المعاملات المرجعية كانت (8.98, 100%, 150.08%).

وكما أظهرت الدراسة أن فحص تسرب الالكترونات للمعاملات مع PGPR المروية بمحاليل المياه المالحة وتساوي 304 mg/l وهي نفس القيم للمعاملات المروية بالمياه العذبة، مما يعني أن تسرب الالكترونات داخل الغشاء أقل من المعاملات دون ال PGPR والمروية بمحاليل المياه المالحة بحيث أن تسرب الالكترونات داخل الغشاء كان أعلى مما أدى إلى دمار الخلية.

وكما تم استخدام جهاز PAM لقياس سير عملية البناء الضوئي داخل النبتة إن كانت ضمن معدلاتها الطبيعية ، فأظهرت النتائج للمعاملات التي خضعت للمعالجة بسلالات ال PGPR والمروية بمحاليل المياه المالحة لم تتأثر لديها سير عملية البناء الضوئي داخلها ولم تتعرض لأي إجهاد ملحي على عكس المعاملات المرجعية والمروية بمحاليل المياه المالحة بحيث أظهرت القياسات أن هناك تراجع ملحوظ لعملية البناء الضوئي مما يدل على أن النبتة تعاني من إجهاد وزيادة في تركيز مركب الاثيلين المثبط لنموها .