# INTERACTIVE IMPACTS OF ENDOPHYTIC FUNGUS TRICHODERMA HAMATUM AND BIOCHAR ON SALINITY TOLERANCE OF ALFALFA (MEDICAGO SATIVA L.)

# HMIDAH ABDULHADI AL-ABKARI<sup>1</sup>, ABEER HASHEM<sup>1</sup>, AMAL A. AL-HAZZANI<sup>1</sup> AND ELSAYED FATHI ABD\_ALLAH<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Botany and Microbiology Department, College of Science, King Saud University, Riyadh 11451, Saudi Arabia <sup>2</sup>Plant Production Department, College of Food and Agricultural Sciences, King Saud University, Riyadh 11451, Saudi Arabia <sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author's email: eabdallah@ksu.edu.sa

## Abstract

There are various reports available that confirm positive impact of biochar (BC) application with endophytic microbial strain to alleviate the adverse impact of abiotic stress on the plant development. Although, BC interactions with root-associated fungi are poorly understood. In the current study, we have used endophytic Trichoderma hamatum (TH) stain and BC to combat the salinity stress challenge in the alfalfa plant. As it is well known that, salinity stress adversely affected the morphological yields like length of root and shoot, dry and fresh weight of root and shoot, photosynthetic pigments, nodule dynamics and mineral contents in the alfalfa plants. In addition, salinity stress enhances the concentrations of stress markers such as malondialdehyde (MDA), H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, proline, and glycine betaine (GB) content while reduced the concentration of antioxidative enzymes such as superoxidedismutase activity (SOD) catalase (CAT), ascorbate peroxidase (APX) and glutathione reductase (GR). However the single of combined treatments of TH stain and BC showed modulatory impact of the morphological yields and enhanced the root fresh eight by 75%, 25% and 160%; shoot height by 68% 34% and 39%, photosynthetic pigments, Chl a increased by 34%, 24% and 48%; Chl b 21%,0%, 31%; Chl a+b 17%,15% and 18%; Carotenoids 55, 5% and 36% and total pigments 22%, 14% and 40%; similarly nodule number increased by 78%, 10% and 128%, soluble proteins by 145%, 72% and 200%, leg haemoglobin content 50%,25% and 61%, and nodules nitrogenase activity 77%, 31% and 109%; antioxidative enzymes SOD increased by 6%, 2% and 9%, catalase activity increased by 6%, 2% and 11%, APX activity increased by 19%, 7% and 29% and GR content increased by 10%, 1% and 24% after treatment of TH, BC and combined application of TH, BC respectively under saline conditions. However, reduced the concentration of osmolytes such as content of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> was decreased by 39%, 27%,43%, MDA content decreased by 52%, 17% and 60%; the proline content decreased by 27%, 27% and 54% and the content of GB decreased by 19%, 10% and 65.30% after treatment with TH, BC and combination of TH and BC respectively. Although the extent of effect of treatments was lower in case of single treatments of BC, while maximum effect was observed in the combined application of TH and BC.

Key words: Medicago sativa L., Photosynthetic pigments, Mineral elements, Osmolytes, Antioxidative enzymes.

### Introduction

In the current regime of changing climatic conditions and global warming ensuring food security for the rising global population is one of the most challenging tasks. In last two decades changing climatic conditions and advent of different stress factors poses negative impact on the agricultural productivity (Tchonkouang et al., 2024). Salinity is one of the challenging abiotic stress that affect approx., 1128 million hectares land worldwide and severally affect the agricultural productivity. Although previous studies stated use of brackish and coastal water for agricultural irrigations are the two major factors of salinity in the agricultural land (Du et al., 2023). The advent of salinity adversely affects the growth and survivality of plant irrespective of their growth stages (Mal & Panchal, 2024; Fatima et al., 2024). In general, the salinity stress affects the plant physiology via disturbing ionic balance, which also results in the disturbance of osmotic balance that results in the irregularity in cell physiology, water movement, lower relative water capacity, stomata closure etc. (Verma et al., 2021; Mal & Panchal, 2024). Additionally, stress factors especially salinity stress generate excessive amount of reactive oxygen species (ROS) which results in the degradation of cell macromolecules including the nucleic acid, cell wall plant cell death (EL-Bauome et al., 2024). Moreover, salinity stress also affects the biosynthetic pathways of the chlorophyll and other morphological yields such as stem and root growth (El-Taher et al., 2021).

However, the degree or extent of adverse impact depend upon the concentration of salt or duration of the salinity exposure. The long-term exposure or elevated salt concentration adversely affect plant physiology and lead to the death of plants (Kumar et al., 2021). As the plants are sessile organisms, facing the risk of stresses, however the plants system developed or induced some defensive mechanisms to mitigate the challenges of stresses. Plant developed various types of modification in their physiological, metabolic, anatomical and morphological characteristics to resist and cope with stresses (Imran et al., 2021). The plant systems produce various types of antioxidative enzymes, that mediate crucial role in scavenging oxygen or nitrogen free radicals. In addition, led to modifications in photosynthetic organelles that help in managing water relations (El-Beltagi et al., 2023). To mitigate the challenges of salinity stress in last few years various approaches such as desalination, conservation of water and soil, mulching, salt resistant species, control of sea water intrusion and utilization of microbial species have been widely practiced (Ondrasek et al., 2022). However, among them, utilization of microbial species such as bacteria, fungi, cyanobacteria as plant or soil inoculants have been frequently used throughout the world (Kumawat et al., 2023). The utilization of microbial strains for the salinity stress management emerges as a sustainable and cost-effective approach. In addition, the symbiotic relation of the microbes with the plants also helps in modulating plant growth or protecting the plant from the pathogen invasion via

synthesising phytohormones, nutrients acquisition, section of antimicrobial compounds etc. However, during the salinity stress conditions the microbial strains synthesizes the compounds or nutrients which help in resistance against the salinity stresses. In addition, the microbial strains synthesize various types of antioxidant enzymes such as superoxide dismutases (SOD), catalases (CAT), ascorbate peroxidase (APX), glutathione reductase (GR) that play significant role in quenching free radical of ROS generated during the stress conditions (Verma et al., 2021). However nowadays endophytic strains have been preferred to use as bio inoculants to mitigate the challenges of salinity stress. The better colonization efficacy and effective acclimatization potential make the endophytic strains more potent than other rhizospheric microbial species (Verma et al., 2021). It has been reported that all the plants have at least some endophytic microorganisms and their number or concentrations varies among different plant organs (Kumar et al., 2016; Mushtaq et al., 2023). In the recent past fungal strains including the Trichoderma have been used as inoculants to improve the agricultural productivity. In addition, different Trichoderma sp. wildly used in the sustainable agriculture (Guzmán-Guzmán et al., 2023). In the previous studies different authors reported role of Trichoderma as biofertlizers, or biocontrol agents in stimulating plant growth promotion or protecting plants from pathogen invasions (Abd El-Rahman and Mohamed, 2014). The utilization of Trichodrma species directly or indirectly induces phytohormone modulation, nutrients acquisition, synthesis of antimicrobial compounds and antioxidative enzymes (Ahmad et al., 2015; Wahab et al., 2023). BC, generally referred as black carbon a rich in the nutrients or mineral compositions composed of different biomass source like kitchen, agro or vegetable wastes or other biological byproducts, currently used for the amendments of soil (Danesh et al., 2023). However, in the agricultural fields BC used to improves the soil productivity via supplementation of mineral nutrients, cations such as K<sup>+</sup>, Ca<sup>2+,</sup> Mg<sup>2+,</sup> and P, making availability of nitrogen or phosphorous in the soil (Khedulkar et al., 2023). Alfalfa (Medicago sativa L.) is one of the legume forages, cultivated throughout the world, due to high protein content (Scasta et al., 2012). The elevated salt concentration negatively impacts the growth and productivity of alfaalfa. Although, studies showed that alfalfa species can tolerate moderate level of salinity (Ferreira et al., 2015). But studies also showed that enhanced concentration of salinity reduced the morphological yields such plant height, ratio of stem-leaf and biomass yields (Cornacchione et al., 2017). Therefore, the present study has been designed to evaluate the impact of salinity stress on the morphological yields, photosynthetic pigments, antioxidative markers, absorption of mineral nutrients of the alfalfa plant and how the single or combined treatment of TH and BC affect the growth and productivity of alfalfa plant under salinity stress.

# **Material and Methods**

**Plant,** *Trichoderma* and biochar: The Alfalfa (*Medicago sativa* L., cv Nubaria-1) seeds obtained from Agricultural Research Center, Ministry of Agriculture, Giza, Egypt. The endophytic strain *Trichoderma hamatum* (Bonord.), Bainier, was previously isolated and identified by professor Abeer Hashem (Hashem *et al.*, 2014). TH was

subculture in the potato dextrose agar (PDA) medium for 2-3 times at the room temperature and further used for the experiment. Shells of the Indian white shrimp (*Fenneropenaeus indicus*) were collected from local seafood markets (Al Qatif, Saudi Arabia) and cleaned carefully then dried (80°C for 12 h). The dried samples were crushed and sieved (sieve in 0.15 mm, 100-mesh). The dried samples were subjected to slow pyrolysis at 500°C with a 40 min holding period to generate biochar according to the method described by Liu *et al.*, (2021).

Experimental design: This research was conducted in a growth chamber at King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, College of Food and Agricultural Sciences. The seeds were then washed or surface sterilized (0.01% Mercury chloride or HgCl<sub>2</sub>) for the 2 minutes then washed with distilled water three successive times. The seeds were then sown in the experimental pot for growing, then after treated with BC 1% and approximately 800 spores of endophytic TH using protocol of Hashem et al., (2016) and stored in the controlled condition. The pots were watered during time to time for proper growth of alfalfa seeds. After passing of 20 days the pots were divided in two groups, first group treated with normal tap water, while second group were treated with saline water having concentration of 125 mM NaCl. Further each group was further categorized into four subgroups: 1) no treatment (control); 2) treated with TH; 3) treated with BC and 4) treated with TH and BC combinedly.

**Measurement of growth parameters:** For the measurement of morphological yields in of alfalfa various parameters such as shoot height, Root Depth, shoot fresh weight, root fresh weight, shoot dry weight root dry weight, root/ stem ratio or the branch number were considered. After completion of one month of growth total five plants (randomly selected) were brought to the laboratory and manually measured the root length, shoot height. However, to measure the dry weight samples were oven-dried at 70°C for 24 h and then measured.

**Estimation of photosynthetic pigments:** The protocol of Vernon & Seely (1966) described in details by Lichtenthaler (1987) used for extraction and estimation of photosynthetic pigments (chlorophyll a, b and carotenoids using acetone (80%, v/v), the colour intensity was measured at 470, 652, and 665 nm spectrophotometrically.

**Nodulation dynamics, nodule activity and total proteins content:** The nodule dynamics of the alfalfa plants were evaluated using the standard protocol of Abd\_Allah *et al.*, (2015). Although the concentration of leghaemoglobin in the alfalfa root nodules were determined by Keilin & Wang (1945) protocol and the nitrogen contents in the alfalfa were determined by following the standard protocol of (Allen, 1953).

**Estimation of mineral ion contents:** The mineral ions contents (Na<sup>+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup>, P and Ca<sup>2+</sup>) accumulated in the leaves of alfalfa were carried out using micro-Kjeldahl apparatus following the slandered protocol. To determine the nitrogen contents stranded protocol of Bremner (1960)

were followed. However, P (Sen Tran *et al.*, 1988), Na<sup>+</sup> Wolf (1982), K<sup>+</sup> (Page *et al.*, 1982) and Ca<sup>2+</sup> ions were estimated using protocol of (Hunter and Hall, 1953).

**Determination of MDA, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, proline, and Glycine beraine (GB) content:** The methods described by Heath and Packer (1968), Mukherjee & Choudhuri (1983), Bates *et al.*, (1973) and Habib *et al.*, (2012) used for estimation of malondialdehyde (MDA), H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, proline and GB, respectively.

**Determination of antioxidant enzymes:** The assay of antioxidative enzymes activity estimated following standard protocols of Beauchamp & Fridovich (1971) for SOD, Aebi (1987) for CAT; Nakano & Asada, (1987) for APX and Aravind & Prasad, (2005) for GR, respectively.

**Statistical analysis:** The statistical analysis of experimental data was carried out using the software SPSS 26.00 (Gomez & Gomez, 1984) and the quantitative analyses were obtained after one–way ANOVA and the data's have been considered significance having value of p<0.05 with *Tukey's* post hoc test analysis.

#### Results

**Morphological growth parameters:** During the experiment, treatment of salt results in the decreased morphological yields in compared to the salt non-treated plant. The combined application of TH and BC showed maximum enhancement in the morphological yields in both salts treated and control plants in compared to alone use of TH or the BC. Although the impact of singly applied BC was lower in compared to the TH and combined application of TH and BC.

On studying the impact of TH and BC on the alfalfa different parameters of morphological yields decreased after salt treatment in compared to the non-salt treated control plants. However, in case of control the shoot height increased by 16%, 3% and 15% after treatments with TH, BC and combined application of TH and BC respectively (Table 1). The salt treated plant showed enhancement in shoot height by 68%, 34% and 39% after treatment with TH, BC and combined application of TH and BC respectively. Although no much variation in root depth were observed in the non-salt treated alfalfa during all the three treatments. However, Root fresh weight decreased after the salt treatment in compared to control. The treatment of alfalfa with TH, BC and combined application of TH and BC enhanced the root fresh weight by 75%, 25% and 131% respectively, while after salt treatment enhancements were recorded as 83%, 50% and 160% respectively. Similarly, root dry weight was recorded enhanced by 31%, 25% and 80% in the control plant, however, 33%, 100% and 300% were recorded in the salinity stress plant after treatment with single application of TH, BC and combined application of TH and BC respectively. Although the R/S was found decreased in both control and salt stress plant. The lowest value was recorded in plant treated with BC (31%) followed by TH 19% and the combined application of TH and BC had approximately similar percentage like the control plant. However, during the salinity stress condition the R/S ratio decreased by 17%, 19%

and 4% after treatment with Trichoderma, BC or combinedly TH + BC respectively. The branch number in the alfalfa plants also decreased in the salinity stress condition. However, the treatment of TH and BC singly or combinedly enhanced the branched number in the 84%, 38%, 84% under control condition and 48%, 4%,44% under salinity stress condition after treatment with of TH, BC and combined application of TH and BC respectively.

Impacts of endophytic TH and BC on the photosynthetic pigments: Salinity stress affected the chlorophyll contents, however the treatment of alfalfa plants with the endophytic fungal strain TH and BC singly or combination mitigate the negative effect of salinity stress. Although the impact of BC was minimum and combined application of TH and BC was maximum in recovering or improving the chlorophyll, carotenoids, or total pigment contents (Table 2). In case of control alfalfa plant the contents of Chl a was found enhanced by 24 %, 4% and 51%, however Chl b was found enhanced by 24%, 8% and 56% after treatment with TH, BC and TH + BC respectively. Similar trend was observed for Chl a+b 24%, 5%, 52%, carotenoids 60%, 30%, 80%, total pigments 28 %, 8% and 55% after treatment with TH, BC and TH + BC respectively. However, after salt treatment overall the chlorophyll pigments were decreased in compared to the non-salt treated alfalfa, however the treatment of endophytic TH strains, BC and combined application of endophytic TH strain and BC enhanced the chlorophyll pigments, carotenoids and total pigments in the similar trends. Chl a increased by 34%, 24% and 48%; Chl b 21%,0%, 31%; Chl a+b 17%,15% and 18%; Carotenoids 55, 5% and 36% and total pigments 22%, 14% and 40% after treatments of TH, BC and TH + BC, respectively.

Nodule dynamics: Similar like morphological yields, salinity stress adversely affected the nodules number, soluble proteins, leghaemoglobin and nodule nitrogenise activities. The treatment of endophytic TH strain and BC singly or in combination positively impacted all the parameters. Although the impalement of salinity negatively impacted the nodules number, soluble proteins, leghaemoglobin and nodule nitrogenase activities in compared to the control or non-salt treated alfalfa plant. During treatment's combined application of TH + BC showed maximum impact, however single inoculation of BC showed minimum (Table 3). The control non-salt treated alfalfa the single treatment of TH, BC and combined application of TH and BC significantly enhanced the nodule number by 102%, 36% and 184%, soluble proteins by 50%,10% and 64%, leghaemoglobin content 83%, 29% and 111%, and nodules nitrogenase activity 94%,40% and 136% respectively. Similar types of trends were observed in the salt treated alfalfa plants although the concentration was decreased in compared to the non-salt treated plants. Single treatment of TH, BC and combined application of TH and BC significantly enhanced the nodule number by 78%, 10% and 128%, soluble proteins by 145%, 72% and 200%, leghaemoglobin content 50%,25% and 61%, and nodules nitrogenase activity 77%, 31% and 109% respectively.

Treatment				Without salt (control)	t (control)			
Parameters	Shoot height (cm)	Root depth (cm)	Shoot fresh weight (g)	Root fresh weight (g)	Shoot dry weight (g)	Root dry weight (g)	R/S ratio	Branch number
Plant	$19.5\pm0.96^{a}$	$15.5\pm0.84^{\mathrm{b}}$	$0.42\pm0.06^{a}$	$0.16\pm0.003^{\rm c}$	$0.23\pm0.01^{\circ}$	$0.16\pm0.01^{ m c}$	$0.81\pm0.07^{\rm a}$	$13.0\pm0.5^{\circ}$
P + T. hamatum	$22.6\pm1.58^{\rm a}$	$15.5 \pm 2.42^{b}$	$0.70 \pm 0.142^{a}$	$0.27.89 \pm 0.023^{b}$	$0.29.8\pm0.01^{\rm b}$	$0.21\pm0.001^{\mathrm{b}}$	$0.56\pm0.09^{a}$	$24.00\pm1.46^{\rm a}$
Plant + Biochar	$20.2\pm1.9^{a}$	$15.4 \pm 2.7^{\rm b}$	$0.59\pm0.12^{a}$	$0.20\pm0.02^{ m c}$	$0.24\pm0.01^{\circ}$	$0.20\pm\!0.005^{bc}$	$0.66 \pm 0.15^{a}$	$18.33\pm0.96^{\rm b}$
P + T. hamatum + Biochar	$22.4\pm3.21^{a}$	$20.2 \pm \mathbf{3.6^a}$	$0.76\pm0.01^{a}$	$0.37\pm0.01^{\rm a}$	$0.39\pm0.02^{a}$	$0.30 \pm 0.01^{a}$	$0.81{\pm}0.06^{a}$	$24.67\pm0.8^{\rm a}$
P	0.67	0.085	0.263	0.0003	0.006	0.001	0.33	0.0007
Treatment				With salt	salt			
Parameters	Shoot height (cm)	Root Depth (cm)	Shoot fresh weight (g)	Root fresh weight (g)	Shoot dry weight (g)	Root dry weight (g)	R/S ratio	Branch number
Plant	$16.33 \pm 1.59^{b}$	$13.93\pm1.37^{a}$	$0.35\pm0.02^{ m b}$	$0.06\pm0.01^{\mathrm{b}}$	$0.06\pm0.005^{\rm c}$	$0.03\pm0.004^{\circ}$	$0.92\pm0.12^{a}$	$8.33\pm0.86^{ab}$
P + T. hamatum	$27.40\pm1.93^{a}$	$20.30\pm1.49^{a}$	$0.56\pm0.03^{a}$	$0.11\pm0.003^{ab}$	$0.11\pm0.006^{ab}$	$0.10\pm0.005^{\rm a}$	$0.77\pm0.009^a$	$12.33 \pm 1.06^{a}$
Plant + Biochar	$21.97\pm1.10^{ab}$	$16.20\pm1.74^{\mathrm{a}}$	$0.47\pm0.03^{ m ab}$	$0.09\pm0.006^{\mathrm{b}}$	$0.08\pm0.004^{\rm bc}$	$0.06\pm0.002^{\mathrm{b}}$	$0.75\pm0.10^{a}$	$8.00\pm0.8^{ m b}$
P + T. hamatum + Biochar	$22.83\pm2.27^{ab}$	$19.70\pm1.71^{a}$	$0.42\pm0.12^{\rm ab}$	$0.16\pm0.01^{a}$	$0.14\pm0.01^{a}$	$0.12\pm0.009^{\mathrm{a}}$	$0.89\pm0.133^{\mathrm{a}}$	$12.00\pm1.15^{ab}$
d	0.04	0.26	0.06	0.03	0.004	0.004	0.88	0.079
Data are the representation of mean of three replicates ± Std errors; different letters in the column showed significant difference p<0.05 observed during <i>Tukey post hoc</i> analysis <b>Table 2. Impacts of endophytic</b> <i>Trichoderma hamatum</i> and biochar on the photosynthetic pigments (mg/g fresh weight) of alfalfa under saline of	tean of three replica endophytic <i>Tric</i>	ates ± Std errors; ( <i>hoderma hama</i>	the representation of mean of three replicates ± Std errors; different letters in the column showed significant difference p<0.05 observed during <i>Tukey post hoc</i> analysis Table 2. Impacts of endophytic <i>Trichoderma hamatum</i> and biochar on the photosynthetic pigments (mg/g fresh weight) of alfalfa under saline condition.	umm showed significan he photosynthetic p	it difference p<0.05 ob igments (mg/g fresh	served during <i>Tukey</i> <sub>1</sub> • weight) of alfalfa	<i>post hoc</i> analysis under saline	condition.
Treatment				Wit	Without salt		,	
Parameters		Ch a	Ch b	a + b	a / b	Carotenoids	noids	Total pigs
Plant	0.45	$0.45\pm0.003^{\circ}$	$0.25\pm0.003^{d}$	$0.70\pm0.006^{\rm d}$	$1.77 \pm 0.02^{a}$	$0.10\pm0.005^\circ$	005°	$0.80\pm0.01^d$
$\mathbf{P} + T$ . hamatum	0.56	$0.56\pm0.002^{\rm b}$	$0.31\pm0.002^{\mathrm{b}}$	$0.87\pm0.003^{\rm b}$	$1.81\pm0.01^{a}$	$0.16\pm0.003^{ab}$	.003 <sup>ab</sup>	$1.03\pm0.006^{\rm b}$
Plant + Biochar	0.47	$0.47\pm0.001^{ m c}$	$0.27\pm0.001^{\circ}$	$0.74\pm0.002^{\circ}$	$1.78 \pm 0.008^{a}$	a $0.13 \pm 0.001^{\rm bc}$	.001 <sup>bc</sup>	$0.87 \pm 0.003^{\circ}$
P + T. hamatum + Biochar		0.68 <sup>a</sup>	$0.39^{a}$	$1.07 \pm 0.00 \ 1^{a}$	$1.75 \pm 0.005^{a}$	a 0.18 <sup>a</sup>	Ja	$1.24\pm0.002^{a}$
d		0.003	0.014	0.0183	0.73	0.0128	28	0.008
Treatment				M	With salt			
Parameters		Ch a	Ch b	a + b	a / b	Carotenoids	noids	Total pigs
Plant	0.29	$0.29\pm0.009^{\circ}$	$0.19\pm0.004^{\rm d}$	$0.48\pm0.01^{ m d}$	$1.48\pm0.01^{\rm b}$	$0.19\pm0.008^{\rm b}$	.008 <sup>b</sup>	$0.67\pm0.022^{\circ}$
$\mathbf{P} + T$ . hamatum	0.39	$0.39 \pm 0.005^{\rm b}$	$0.23\pm0.002^{\mathrm{b}}$	$0.62\pm0.008^{\rm b}$	$1.74 \pm 0.01^{a}$	$0.20\pm0.004^{\rm b}$	.004 <sup>b</sup>	$0.82\pm0.01^{\rm b}$
Plant + Biochar	0.36	$0.36\pm0.003^{\mathrm{b}}$	$0.21\pm0.001^{ m c}$	$0.57\pm0.004^{ m c}$	$1.71 \pm 0.006^{a}$	<sup>a</sup> $0.20 \pm 0.002^{b}$	.002 <sup>b</sup>	$0.77\pm0.007^{\mathrm{b}}$
P + T. hamatum + Biochar	0.43	$0.43 \pm 0.001^{a}$	$0.25^{a}$	$0.68\pm0.002^{\rm a}$	$1.76 \pm 0.003^{a}$	<sup>a</sup> $0.26 \pm 0.001^{a}$	.001 <sup>a</sup>	$0.94\pm0.004^{a}$

0.0076

0.0073

0.0021

0.0025

0.0001

0.0037

d

Data are the representation of mean ± Std errors; However different letters in the column denoted significance differences (p<0.05) among them observed during *Tukey post hoc* analysis

	Treatment	1 able 5. IIII pacts of enuopitytic 111000000 mu numuum ht		and prochar on the normation dynamics and norme activity of analia under same conditions Without salt (control)	na unuel samie comunous.
Iait $23.0 \pm 2.3^{d}$ $0.28 \pm 0.00^{b}$ $10.02 \pm 0.06^{d}$ $+.7.$ homatum $48.0 \pm 1.79^{b}$ $0.42 \pm 0.01^{a}$ $18.40 \pm 0.2^{b}$ $11.33 \pm 2.22^{c}$ $0.31 \pm 0.005^{b}$ $12.93 \pm 0.04^{c}$ $18.40 \pm 0.2^{b}$ $17.$ homatum $85.0 \pm 1.20^{b}$ $0.44 \pm 0.02^{a}$ $12.33 \pm 0.22^{c}$ $0.06^{c}$ $1.7.$ homatum $50.69^{c}$ $0.09^{c}$ $0.006^{c}$ $21.23 \pm 0.17^{a}$ $0.009$ $0.000108$ $W$ th satt $0.06^{c}$ $0.06^{c}$ $1.7.$ homatum $10.32 \pm 0.88^{c}$ $0.12 \pm 0.01^{d}$ $5.9 \pm 0.0^{2}$ $1.7.$ homatum $16.67 \pm 0.88^{c}$ $0.12 \pm 0.01^{d}$ $5.9 \pm 0.0^{2}$ $1.7.$ homatum $16.67 \pm 0.88^{c}$ $0.12 \pm 0.01^{d}$ $5.9 \pm 0.0^{2}$ $1.7.$ homatum $16.67 \pm 0.88^{c}$ $0.002^{c}$ $7.03 \pm 0.06^{c}$ $1.7.$ homatum $10.33 \pm 0.88^{c}$ $0.33 \pm 0.01^{c}$ $5.9 \pm 0.02^{c}$ $1.7.$ homatum $10.33 \pm 0.88^{c}$ $0.33 \pm 0.01^{c}$ $5.9 \pm 0.02^{c}$ $1.7.$ homatum $10.33 \pm 0.28^{c}$ $0.33 \pm 0.02^{c}$ $0.0046$	Parameters	Nodules (number/plant root)	Soluble protein (mg/ g fresh wt)	leghaemoglobin concentration (mg/g fresh wt)	Nodule nitrogenase activities (C2H4/ g fresh wt/ hout)
+ T. hamatum         48.0 ± 1.73 <sup>b</sup> 0.42 ± 0.01 <sup>s</sup> 18.40 ± 0.2 <sup>b</sup> int + Biochar         31.33 ± 2.22 <sup>s</sup> 0.31 ± 0.005 <sup>b</sup> 12.93 ± 0.04 <sup>s</sup> int + Biochar         31.33 ± 2.22 <sup>s</sup> 0.31 ± 0.005 <sup>b</sup> 12.93 ± 0.04 <sup>s</sup> rentment         0.0099         0.00108         With salt           rentment         0.0099         0.001018         With salt           arameters         (muber)plant root)         (mg/g fresh wf)         (mg/g fresh wf)           latt         9.33 ± 1.33 <sup>s</sup> 0.12 ± 0.011 <sup>d</sup> \$5.5 ± 0.10 <sup>3</sup> arameters         (muber)plant root)         (mg/g fresh wf)         (mg/g fresh wf)           latt         9.33 ± 1.3 <sup>s</sup> 0.12 ± 0.01 <sup>d</sup> \$3.6 ± 0.0 <sup>3</sup> t <t, hamatum<="" td="">         16.67 ± 0.88<sup>s</sup>         0.269 ± 0.00<sup>s</sup>         \$0.04<sup>s</sup> = 0.2<sup>s</sup>           latt         9.03 ± 0.02<sup>s</sup>         0.004<sup>s</sup>         \$0.04<sup>s</sup> = 0.0<sup>2<sup>s</sup></sup>           t<t, hamatum<="" td="">         10.33 ± 0.88<sup>s</sup>         0.33 ± 0.02<sup>s</sup>         \$0.04<sup>s</sup> = 0.0<sup>2<sup>s</sup></sup>           t<t, hamatum<="" td="">         10.33 ± 0.88<sup>s</sup>         0.33 ± 0.02<sup>s</sup>         \$0.04<sup>s</sup> = 0.0<sup>2<sup>s</sup></sup>           t<t, hamatum<="" td="">         10.33 ± 0.88<sup>s</sup>         0.33 ± 0.02<sup>s</sup>         \$0.04<sup>s</sup> = 0.0<sup>2<sup>s</sup></sup>           t<t, hamatum<="" td=""></t,></t,></t,></t,></t,>	Plant	$23.0 \pm 2.3^{d}$	$0.28\pm0.009^{\mathrm{b}}$	$10.02\pm0.069^{d}$	$0.50\pm0.009^d$
	P + T. hamatum	$48.0 \pm 1.73^{ m b}$	$0.42\pm0.01^{a}$	$18.40\pm0.2^{ m b}$	$0.97\pm0.02^{\mathrm{b}}$
+ T. handatum + Biochar $65.67 \pm 1.20^4$ $0.46 \pm 0.02^4$ $21.22 \pm 0.17^4$ reatment         Nodules $0.000108$ Nith satt $0.006$ reatment         Nodules         Soluble protein         legnaemoglobin concentration $0.006$ arameters         (number/plant root) $0.000168$ Soluble protein         legnaemoglobin concentration $0.006$ arameters         (number/plant root) $0.012 \pm 0.011^4$ $5.59 \pm 0.103^4$ $0.006$ lant         Biochar $16.67 \pm 0.88^6$ $0.269 \pm 0.00^2^6$ $8.46 \pm 0.2^6$ h.T. hanatum $16.67 \pm 0.88^6$ $0.209^4$ $0.002^2$ $7.03 \pm 0.04^4$ lant + Biochar $10.33 \pm 0.88^6$ $0.33 \pm 0.01^3$ $0.0046$ $3.46 \pm 0.2^6$ A.T. hanatum         Nithout sati (control) $0.0046$ $3.573 \pm 0.3^6$ $5.03 \pm 0.02^4$ Int         Table 4. Impacts of endophytic T. hanatum and biochar on the elements accumulation in leaf (mgg dry weight) of alfalfa uncenters $7.03 \pm 0.02^6$ Table 4. Impacts of endophytic T. hanatum and biochar on the elements accumulation in leaf (mgg dry weight) of alfalfa uncenters $7.03 \pm 0.02^4$ $8.94 \pm 0.41^6$ <th< td=""><td>Plant + Biochar</td><td><math>31.33 \pm 2.22^{\circ}</math></td><td><math>0.31\pm0.005^{\mathrm{b}}</math></td><td><math>12.93 \pm 0.04^{\circ}</math></td><td><math>0.70\pm0.01^{ m c}</math></td></th<>	Plant + Biochar	$31.33 \pm 2.22^{\circ}$	$0.31\pm0.005^{\mathrm{b}}$	$12.93 \pm 0.04^{\circ}$	$0.70\pm0.01^{ m c}$
nonline         0.0099         0.000108         0.006           retinent         Nith salt         0.006           retinent         Nith salt         0.006           retinent         (mg/g fresh wt)         (mg/g fresh wt)         0.006           latt         933 ± 1.33         0.12 ± 0.011 <sup>4</sup> 55.95 ± 0.03 <sup>4</sup> Nith salt $T$ haratum         16.67 ± 0.88°         0.269 ± 0.07 <sup>6</sup> 8.46 ± 0.2 <sup>6</sup> Nith salt         Nith salt $T$ haratum         16.67 ± 0.88°         0.269 ± 0.01 <sup>4</sup> 5.59 ± 0.03 <sup>4</sup> 5.59 ± 0.03 <sup>4</sup> Nith salt $T$ haratum         16.67 ± 0.88°         0.269 ± 0.07 <sup>6</sup> 8.46 ± 0.2 <sup>6</sup> Nith salt         Nith	P + T. hamatum + Biochar	$65.67 \pm 1.20^{a}$	$0.46\pm0.02^{\rm a}$	$21.22 \pm 0.17^{a}$	$1.18\pm0.02^{a}$
reatmentWith saltreatmentWith saltarametersNodulesSoluble proteinleghaemoglobin concentrationlant $(number/plant root)$ $(ngg fresh wt)$ $(ngg fresh wt)$ lant $(number/plant root)$ $(ngg fresh wt)$ $(ngg fresh wt)$ $T$ haratum $(6.71 \pm 0.81^{\circ})$ $0.12 \pm 0.011^{d}$ $5.59 \pm 0.103^{d}$ $T$ haratum $(6.71 \pm 0.88^{\circ})$ $0.19 \pm 0.02^{\circ}$ $7.03 \pm 0.04^{\circ}$ $5.94 \pm 0.02^{d}$ $T$ haratumBiochar $10.33 \pm 0.01^{\circ}$ $0.094$ $0.0046$ $0.06^{\circ}$ $T$ haratumBiochar $11.33 \pm 0.88^{\circ}$ $0.19 \pm 0.02^{\circ}$ $7.03 \pm 0.02^{\circ}$ $T$ haratumBiochar $11.11 \pm 0.07^{\circ}$ $35.73 \pm 0.01^{\circ}$ $9.05 \pm 0.02^{\circ}$ $T$ arametersNat $NatK^{*}K^{*}K^{*}T haratumBiochar71.11 \pm 0.07^{\circ}35.73 \pm 0.3^{\circ}8.94 \pm 0.41^{\circ}R = T haratum46.3 \pm 0.22^{\circ}0.002^{\circ}0.002^{\circ}R = T haratumBiochar71.11 \pm 0.07^{\circ}35.73 \pm 0.3^{\circ}8.94 \pm 0.41^{\circ}R = T haratum80.01^{\circ}8.94 \pm 0.41^{\circ}10.02^{\circ}R = T haratum80.01^{\circ}0.002^{\circ}0.002^{\circ}0.002^{\circ}R = T haratum80.01^{\circ}0.002^{\circ}0.002^{\circ}0.002^{\circ}R = T haratum80.84 \pm 0.43^{\circ}10.84 \pm 0.23^{\circ}0.002^{\circ}R = T haratum80.84 \pm 0.43^{\circ}10.84 \pm 0.23^{\circ}0.002^{\circ}R = T haratum$	<i>b</i>	0.0099	0.000108	0.006	0.0019
arametersNodulesSoluble proteinleghaemoglobin concentrationilant(mumber/plant root)(mg/g fresh wt)(mg/g fresh wt)(mg/g fresh wt)lant $1.2 \pm 0.011^4$ $5.59 \pm 0.103^4$ $5.59 \pm 0.103^4$ $T. hamatum$ $1667 \pm 0.88^6$ $0.269 \pm 0.007^6$ $8.46 \pm 0.2^6$ lant + Biochar $1.55 \pm 0.88^6$ $0.33 \pm 0.02^6$ $7.03 \pm 0.04^6$ $T. hamatum$ $1667 \pm 0.88^6$ $0.33 \pm 0.02^6$ $7.03 \pm 0.04^6$ $T. hamatum$ $10.0029$ $0.33 \pm 0.01^3$ $0.0046$ $T. hamatum21.33 \pm 0.88^60.33 \pm 0.02^60.0046T. hamatum21.33 \pm 0.88^60.33 \pm 0.01^30.0046T. hamatum21.33 \pm 0.88^60.33 \pm 0.02^60.0046T. hamatum8.4 \pm 0.49^60.00461.046T. hamatum46.3 \pm 0.22^641.19 \pm 0.24^68.94 \pm 0.41^61. hamatum46.3 \pm 0.22^641.13 \pm 0.24^68.94 \pm 0.40^61. hamatum8.95 \pm 0.26^60.00230.00261. hamatum8.94 \pm 0.41^66.99 \pm 0.006^61. hamatum8.84 \pm 0.49^66.90 \pm 0.002^61. hamatum8.94 \pm 0.41^68.94 \pm 0.41^61. hamatum8.94 \pm 0.41^68.94 \pm 0.41^61. hamatum8.94 \pm 0.41^68.94 \pm 0.41^61. hamatum8.94 \pm 0.41^68.94 \pm 0.002^61. hamatum8.94 \pm 0.41^68.94 \pm 0.006^61. hamatum8.94 \pm 0.41^68.94 \pm 0.006^61. hamatum<$	Treatment			With salt	
Int         Sign to the second of the s	Parameters	Nodules (numher/nlant root)	Soluble protein (mø/ ø fresh wt)	leghaemoglobin concentration (mo/o fresh wt)	Nodule nitrogenase activities (C3H4/ 9 fresh wt/ hout)
math $5.05 \pm 0.07^{\circ}$ $5.05 \pm 0.07^{\circ}$ $5.05 \pm 0.02^{\circ}$ Int H Biochar $10.33 \pm 0.08^{\circ}$ $0.19 \pm 0.02^{\circ}$ $7.03 \pm 0.06^{\circ}$ $T$ , handtum + Biochar $10.33 \pm 0.88^{\circ}$ $0.33 \pm 0.01^{\circ}$ $9.05 \pm 0.05^{\circ}$ $T$ , handtum + Biochar $10.33 \pm 0.88^{\circ}$ $0.33 \pm 0.01^{\circ}$ $9.05 \pm 0.05^{\circ}$ $T$ , handtum + Biochar $10.33 \pm 0.88^{\circ}$ $0.33 \pm 0.01^{\circ}$ $9.05 \pm 0.05^{\circ}$ $0.0094$ $0.0094$ $0.0046$ $0.0046$ $T$ alb (4, Impacts of endophytic $T$ , handtum and biochar on the elements accumulation in leaf (mg/g dry weight) of alfalfa under salit           reatment $Na^{+}$ $K^{+}$ $Without salt (control)$ arameters $Na^{+}$ $K^{+}$ $K^{+}$ $K^{+}$ $T$ , handtum $46.3 \pm 0.22^{\circ}$ $41.19 \pm 0.24^{\circ}$ $8.94 \pm 0.41^{\circ}$ latt $46.3 \pm 0.02^{\circ}$ $0.002^{\circ}$ $0.002^{\circ}$ latt $1.007^{\circ}$ $35.73 \pm 0.3^{\circ}$ $0.002^{\circ}$ latt $1.11 \pm 0.07^{\circ}$ $3.573 \pm 0.3^{\circ}$ $0.002^{\circ}$ latt $1.0007^{\circ}$ $11.35 \pm 0.02^{\circ}$	Dlant	0 33 + 1 330	0 1 2 + 0 011d	5 50 + 0 103d	0.010+0.07d
	P + T hamatum	$16.67 \pm 0.88^{b}$	$0.269 \pm 0.007^{b}$	$8.46 \pm 0.2^{b}$	$0.389 \pm 0.008^{b}$
+ T. ham reatmen arametei lant + T. ham + T. ham reatmen lant + T. ham lant + Bic lant + T. ham	Plant + Biochar	$10.33\pm0.88^{\circ}$	$0.19\pm0.002^{\circ}$	$7.03\pm0.04^{ m c}$	$0.29\pm0.05^{\circ}$
reatmen arametei lant + T. ham + T. ham reatmen lant + T. ham + T. ham	P + T. hamatum + Biochar	$21.33\pm0.88^{a}$	$0.33\pm0.01^{a}$	$9.05 \pm 0.05^{a}$	$0.46\pm0.009^{a}$
reatmen arametei lant + T. ham + T. ham reatmen lant + T. ham + T. ham	р	0.0094	0.0059	0.0046	0.0012
s $Na^{+}$ $K^{+}$ $K^{+}$ $K/Na$ $71.11 \pm 0.07^{a}$ $35.73 \pm 0.3^{c}$ $5.03 \pm 0.02^{d}$ $71.11 \pm 0.07^{a}$ $35.73 \pm 0.3^{c}$ $5.03 \pm 0.02^{d}$ char $59.9 \pm 0.07^{b}$ $41.19 \pm 0.24^{b}$ $8.94 \pm 0.41^{b}$ char $59.9 \pm 0.00^{d}$ $44.62 \pm 0.49^{b}$ $6.90 \pm 0.009^{c}$ chum + Biochar $32.9 \pm 0.00^{d}$ $44.62 \pm 0.43^{a}$ $13.59 \pm 0.2^{a}$ $0.0019$ $0.0023$ $0.0026$ $0.0026$ s $Na^{+}$ $K^{+}$ $K'Na$ s $Na^{+}$ $K^{+}$ $0.0026$ chum + Biochar $23.68 \pm 0.68^{a}$ $21.11 \pm 0.11^{d}$ s $0.39 \pm 0.006^{d}$ $1.35 \pm 0.005^{b}$ chum + Biochar $20.81 \pm 1.07^{c}$ $26.48 \pm 0.31^{c}$ chum + Biochar $17.43 \pm 0.37^{d}$ $30.68 \pm 0.22^{a}$ $0.0083$ $0.0073$ $0.0073$ $0.0087$	Treatment	•	M	(ithout salt (control)	
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Parameters	Na <sup>+</sup>		K/Na	Ca <sup>2+</sup>
thm thm $46.3 \pm 0.22^{\circ}$ $41.19 \pm 0.24^{\circ}$ $8.94 \pm 0.41^{\circ}$ char $59.9 \pm 0.07^{\circ}$ $41.28 \pm 0.49^{\circ}$ $6.90 \pm 0.009^{\circ}$ thm H Biochar $32.9 \pm 0.00^{\circ}$ $41.62 \pm 0.43^{\circ}$ $13.59 \pm 0.2^{\circ}$ 0.0019 $0.0023$ $0.0026Nith salt 0.0026Nith salt \mathbf{N} \mathbf$	Plant	$71.11 \pm 0.07^{a}$	$35.73\pm0.3^{\circ}$	$5.03\pm0.02^{d}$	$7.84 \pm 0.17^{d}$
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\mathbf{P} + T$ . hamatum	$46.3 \pm 0.22^{\circ}$	$41.19 \pm 0.24^{b}$	$8.94\pm0.41^{\rm b}$	$8.93\pm0.099^{\rm b}$
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Plant + Biochar	$59.9\pm0.07^{ m b}$	$41.28 \pm 0.49^{b}$	$6.90\pm0.009^{\rm c}$	$8.37\pm0.10^{ m c}$
	P + T. hamatum + Biochar	$32.9 \pm 0.00  ^{d}$	$44.62\pm0.43^{a}$	$13.59\pm0.2^{a}$	$9.32\pm0.02^{a}$
sNa+With saltsNa+ $\mathbf{K}^+$ With saltsNa+ $\mathbf{K}^+$ 0.39 $\pm 0.006^d$ turm $53.68 \pm 0.68^a$ $21.11 \pm 0.11^d$ $0.39 \pm 0.006^d$ turm + Biochar $20.81 \pm 1.07^c$ $27.95 \pm 0.40^b$ $1.35 \pm 0.005^b$ turm + Biochar $17.43 \pm 0.37^d$ $30.68 \pm 0.22^a$ $1.06 \pm 0.006^c$ turm + Biochar $17.43 \pm 0.37^d$ $30.68 \pm 0.22^a$ $1.76 \pm 0.02^a$ turm + Biochar $0.0083$ $0.0073$ $0.0087$	d	0.0019	0.0023	0.0026	0.0077
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \mathbf{Na+} & \mathbf{K^+} & \mathbf{K^/Na} & \mathbf{K^/Na} \\ \hline & 53.68 \pm 0.68^a & 21.11 \pm 0.11^d & 0.39 \pm 0.006^d \\ \hline & 53.68 \pm 0.68^a & 27.95 \pm 0.40^b & 1.35 \pm 0.005^b \\ har & 20.81 \pm 1.07^c & 27.95 \pm 0.40^b & 1.35 \pm 0.005^b \\ har & 24.91 \pm 0.15^b & 26.48 \pm 0.31^c & 1.06 \pm 0.006^c \\ \hline & 11.76 \pm 0.02^a & 1.76 \pm 0.02^a \\ \hline & 0.0083 & 0.0073 & 0.0087 \\ \hline \end{array} $	Treatment			With salt	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Parameters	Na+	$\mathbf{K}^+$	K/ Na	Ca <sup>2+</sup>
$20.81 \pm 1.07^{c}$ $27.95 \pm 0.40^{b}$ $1.35 \pm 0.005^{b}$ $24.91 \pm 0.15^{b}$ $26.48 \pm 0.31^{c}$ $1.06 \pm 0.006^{c}$ $17.43 \pm 0.37^{d}$ $30.68 \pm 0.22^{a}$ $1.76 \pm 0.02^{a}$ $0.0083$ $0.0073$ $0.0087$	Plant	$53.68\pm0.68^{a}$	$21.11 \pm 0.11^{d}$	$0.39\pm0.006^{d}$	$4.08\pm0.06^{\rm c}$
$\begin{array}{cccccc} 24.91 \pm 0.15^{b} & 26.48 \pm 0.31^{c} & 1.06 \pm 0.006^{c} \\ 17.43 \pm 0.37^{d} & 30.68 \pm 0.22^{a} & 1.76 \pm 0.02^{a} \\ 0.0083 & 0.0073 & 0.0087 \end{array}$	P + T. hamatum	$20.81 \pm 1.07^{\circ}$	$27.95 \pm 0.40^{\mathrm{b}}$	$1.35\pm0.005^{\mathrm{b}}$	$6.02\pm0.006^{\rm b}$
$17.43 \pm 0.37^d$ $30.68 \pm 0.22^a$ $1.76 \pm 0.02^a$ $0.0083$ $0.0073$ $0.0087$	Plant + Biochar	$24.91 \pm 0.15^{\mathrm{b}}$	$26.48\pm0.31^{\circ}$	$1.06\pm0.006^{\circ}$	$5.94\pm0.13^{b}$
0.0073 0.0087	P + T. hamatum + Biochar	$17.43\pm0.37^{d}$	$30.68\pm0.22^a$	$1.76\pm0.02^{\mathrm{a}}$	$6.77\pm0.02^{a}$
	b	0.0083	0.0073	0.0087	0.0091

	5. Impacts of endophytic T. hu	<i>umatum</i> and biochar on the oxida	Table 5. Impacts of endophytic <i>T. hamatum</i> and biochar on the oxidative stress marker of alfalfa under saline conditions.	ne conditions.
Treatment			Without salt	
Douomotouc	$H_2O_2$	MDA	Proline	GB
rarameters	(µg/ g fresh weight)	(nmol/ g fresh weight)	μmol / g fresh weight	(µMol/g fresh weight)
Plant	$240.07 \pm 2.83^{a}$	$19.67\pm0.07^{\mathrm{a}}$	$13.47 \pm 0.44^{\mathrm{b}}$	$26.90\pm0.55^{\rm b}$
P + T. hamatum	$204.5 \pm 4.5^{\circ}$	$16.23 \pm 0.43^{b}$	$15.77\pm0.20^{a}$	$29.40\pm0.15^{a}$
Plant + Biochar	$228.13 \pm 1.72^{b}$	$19.27\pm0.44^{a}$	$13.37\pm0.24^{\mathrm{b}}$	$27.07\pm0.14^{\mathrm{b}}$
P + T. hamatum + Biochar	$187.80\pm3.08^{\rm d}$	$15.47 \pm 0.17^{\rm b}$	$16.13 \pm 0.14^{a}$	$30.27 \pm 0.24^{a}$
d	0.0012	0.0005	0.00015	0.00014
Treatment			With salt	
Doutout	$H_2O_2$	MDA	Proline	GB
rarameters	(µg/ g fresh weight)	(nmol/ g fresh weight)	(μmol / g fresh weight)	(μMol/g fresh weight)
Plant	$438.33 \pm 7.2^{a}$	$78.80 \pm 3.1^{a}$	$50.23 \pm 0.82^{a}$	$50.17\pm0.75^{a}$
$\mathbf{P} + T$ . hamatum	$269.50\pm1.10^{\rm c}$	$38.13 \pm 1.29^{\circ}$	$26.73 \pm 2.91^{\circ}$	$40.93\pm0.43^{\rm b}$
Plant + Biochar	$321.23 \pm 2.42^{b}$	$66.13 \pm 0.50^{b}$	$36.50 \pm 0.55^{\rm b}$	$48.57 \pm 0.86^{a}$
P + T. <i>hamatum</i> + Biochar	$251.17 \pm 1.47^{d}$	$31.63\pm0.66^{\mathrm{d}}$	$23.07\pm0.20^{\circ}$	$34.70\pm0.34^{\circ}$
d	0.0028	0.0014	0.0070	0.004
Table	6. Impacts of endophytic T. I	<i>iamatum</i> and biochar on the anti-	Table 6. Impacts of endophytic T. hamatum and biochar on the antioxidant enzymes of alfalfa under saline conditions.	le conditions.
Treatment		Withou	Without salt (control plant)	
Davamatare	SOD	CAT	APX	GR
	(EU/ mg protein)	(EU/ mg protein)	(EU/ mg protein)	(EU/ mg protein enzymes)
Plant	$63.99 \pm 1.07^{d}$	$53.29 \pm 0.51^{a}$	$6.20\pm0.04^{\rm d}$	$11.85 \pm 0.11^{\circ}$
P + T. hamatum	$69.17\pm0.55^{\mathrm{b}}$	$58.19 \pm 0.11^{a}$	$7.96\pm0.03^{ m b}$	$12.75\pm0.14^{ m b}$
Plant + Biochar	$66.57 \pm 0.31^{\circ}$	$55.66 \pm 0.06^{a}$	$6.99 \pm 0.02^{\circ}$	$12.05\pm0.08^{\rm c}$
P + T. hamatum + Biochar	$71.90\pm0.17^{a}$	$202.12 \pm 0.20^{a}$	$8.38 \pm 0.05^{a}$	$13.50 \pm 0.13^{a}$
d	0.0002	0.440	0.0036	0.0034
Treatment			With salt	
Daramatare	SOD	CAT	APX	GR
	(EU/ mg protein)	(EU/ mg protein)	(EU/ mg protein)	(EU/ mg protein enzymes)
Plant	$88.96\pm0.68^{\rm d}$	$71.1 \pm 0.11^{d}$	$10.93\pm0.06^{\rm d}$	$13.86\pm0.07^{\mathrm{c}}$
P + T. hamatum	$94.78\pm0.28^{ m b}$	$75.80\pm0.24^{\mathrm{b}}$	$13.02\pm0.11^{\mathrm{b}}$	$15.26\pm0.188^{\rm b}$
Plant + Biochar	$91.13\pm0.16^{\circ}$	$72.83\pm0.14^{ m c}$	$11.74\pm0.06^{\rm c}$	$14.03\pm0.10^{\circ}$
P + T. hamatum + Biochar	$97.57 \pm 0.25^{a}$	$79.15 \pm 0.08^{a}$	$14.16\pm0.05^{\rm a}$	$17.20\pm0.04^{\rm a}$
<i>d</i>	0.0020	0.0015	0.0077	0.0059
Data are the representation of mean	$i \pm Std$ errors; However different le	stters in the column denoted significand	Data are the representation of mean ± Std errors; However different letters in the column denoted significance differences (p<0.05) among them observed during Tukey post hoc analysis	l during Tukey post hoc analysis

Mineral ion contents: The data presented in the Table 4 showed that treatment of endophytic TH strain and BC singly or in combination positively impacted mineral contents of Na<sup>+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup>, K/ Na, and Ca<sup>2+</sup> in the leaves of control or salt treated alfalfa plants. Although the treatment of salt reduces the overall contents of the mineral elements in compared to non-salt treated alfaalfa plants except Na<sup>+</sup>. The treatment of salt significantly decreased the contents of K+, K/ Na, and Ca  $^{2+}$ . However, the treatment of TH strain and BC singly or in combination positively modulates the contents of mineral elements except Na<sup>+</sup>. In case of Na<sup>+</sup> the content was decreased by 35%, 16% and 56%, K<sup>+</sup> concentration increased by 15%, 15% and 24% ratio of K/Na increased by 77%, 37% and 170%, and the concentration of  $Ca^{2+}$  increased by 13%, 6% and 18% after treatment with TH, BC and combination of TH + BC respectively. Similar types of trends were observed in the salt treated alfalfa leaves the concentration of Na<sup>+</sup> was reduced by 62%, 54% and 68%, concentration of K<sup>+</sup> was increased by 32 %, 25% and 45%; ration of K/Na was increased by 246%, 171% and 351% and  $Ca^{2+}$ was increased by 47%, 45% and 65% after treatment with TH, BC and combination of TH + BC respectively.

Oxidative stress markers: The onset of salinity stress enhanced the oxidative stress enzymes or markers. In this study the salt treatment enhanced the oxidative stress markers such H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, MDA, Proline or Glycine betaine contents in compared to the control. However, the treatment of endophytic TH strain and BC singly or in combination reduced the contents (Table 5). During the experiment in control (non-salt treated alfalfa) the content H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> decreased by 15%, 5% and 22%, the content of MDA decreased by 18%, 3% and 22%. The concentration of proline was increased by 17%, decreased by 1% and increased by 19%, and the content of GD was increased by 9%, 3% and 12% after treatment with TH, BC and combination of TH + BC respectively. Increase of salt treated plant similar types of trends was observed, the content of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> was decreased by 39%, 27%, 43%, MDA content decreased by 52%, 17% and 60%; the proline content decreased by 27%, 27% and 54% and the content of GB decreased by 19%, 10% and 65.30% after treatment with TH, BC and combination of TH + BC, respectively.

Data are the representation of mean  $\pm$  Std errors; However different letters in the column denoted significance differences (p<0.05) among them observed during *Tukey post hoc* analysis.

Antioxidant enzymes activity: During experiment the activity of antioxidative enzymes increased with single TH, BC or combined treatment of TH + BC in both non-salt treated or salt treated alfalfa plant (Table 6). In case of non-salt treated, SOD activity significantly increased by 8%, 4% and 12%, catalase activity increased by 9%,4% and 6%, APX activity increased by 28%, 12%, 35% and GR content increased by 7%, 1% and 13% after treatment with TH, BC and combination of TH + BC respectively. Similar types of trend were observed in salt treated plant the activity increased by 6%, 2% and 9%, catalase activity increased by 19%, 7% and 29% and GR activity increased by 10%, 1% and 24% after treatment with TH, BC and combination of TH + BC respectively.

### Discussion

Plants are a sessile organism, highly susceptible against the biotic and abiotic stress, that showed adverse detrimental on the plants irrespective of their plant growth stages (Solanki et al., 2023). The saline conditions generally imbalance the mineral ions concentration which results in the imbalance of ions or causes specific ion toxicity or changes in osmotic potential. In addition, results in the decrement of osmotic potential that makes difficult for plants to absorb water, which can disrupt normal physiological processes and impede growth (Acosta-Motos et al., 2017). Although the level of toxicity and their effect on plants depends upon the concentration and exposure time (Taiz et al., 2015). The excessive concentration of salt in the soil causes lower solute potential, which ultimately lowered water potential and the plant continue to absorb water and maintain cellular turgor pressure under these saline conditions, because for the survival it is mandatory that their internal water potential should be lower than the surrounding soil (Zhao et al., 2021).

Morphological growth parameters: In this study, salt treatments result in the lowering of morphological yields in compared to control, however, control or the salt treated plant showed enhancement in the morphological yields after single or combined treatment of TH and BC. In the previous experiments authors also reported stimulatory impact of BC on the plants. The treatment of BC modulates the bioavailability of mineral ions to the plants (Hossain Sani et al., 2020). In addition, modulates the phytohormones levels especially indole acetic acid or gibberellin that directly play crucial role in root growth initiation, cell division, enhancement in shoot and root height or other morphological parameters (Langeroodi et al., 2019). The strain of Trichoderma also reported for the significant contribution in enhancing the morphological yields via modulating the phytohormones level, enhancing nutrients acquisition to the plants (Khadka & Uphoff, 2019). However previously published report also stated that utilization of TH enhanced the morphological yields especially the root growth and branching via synthesis of indole acetic acid (Hashem et al., 2016). Further, Hashem et al., (2019) reported the role of Trichoderma in diminishing the ABA accumulation during the stress condition and promoting cytokinin that helps in modulating the plant shoot heights. The application of TH and BC combinedly show stimulatory effect in plant growth or morphological yields under saline conditions. The utilization of Trichoderma helps in absorbing water or nutrients from the deep soil even under the saline conditions with the help of mycelium, however utilization of BC full fill the requirements of essential nutrients (Sun et al., 2020). Additionally, BC helps in maintaining soil moisture or relative water content (Langeroodi et al., 2019).

**Photosynthetic pigments:** In the previous published report, it has been mentioned that abiotic stress conditions can lead to the degradation or reduction of photosynthetic pigments especially the chlorophyll or carotenoids. The reason for this reduction in chlorophyll yields are the inhibitions of enzymes such as  $\delta$ - aminolevulinic acid dehydratase and

protochlorophyllide reductase. Additionally, studies also showed that salinity also adversely affect or degrade the enzymes such as RuBP (ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate) carboxylase and ATP synthase, which play crucial role in electron transport chain (Amanullah & Khan, 2023). The degradation of these enzymes resulted in damage of thylakoids membrane or chloroplasts and the imbalance stomata conductance. In addition, the salinity stress affects the conductance or concentration of some essential ions such as Mg<sup>2+</sup>, Fe<sup>2+</sup>, Zn<sup>2+</sup> etc, which are required for the synthesis of chlorophyll (Ahmad et al., 2015). Similarly, the synthesis of carotenoids also decreased during the salinity stress conditions due to adverse impact of salinity on the carotenoid's precursors  $\beta$ -carotene and zeaxanthin (Akladious & Mohamed, 2018). In our experiment, the salinity stress condition decreased the photosynthetic pigments such as Chl, carotenoids or the total pigment in compared to the control. However, application TH and BC singly or combination enhanced the photosynthetic pigments. Although the extent of enhancement was lower in single application of BC and maximum observed in the coinoculation of TH or BC. The application of BC improves the soil physiochemical characteristics properties, which are required for the optimum growth of plants (Batool et al., 2022). These improvements help in restoring the chlorophyll synthesis. Although co-inoculation of TH and BC showed promising results in compared to single application as the BC indirectly improves the soil physiochemical properties supports the growth of natural microflora including the fungal species, which improves the water holding capacity of the plants, absorption of mineral nutrients required for the synthesis of chlorophyll molecules during the stress conditions (Batool et al., 2022; Amanullah & Khan, 2023). Similar types of results improved photosynthetic pigments were reported by Ahmad et al., (2015) after application of TH under saline conditions in Brassica juncea. Morever, Kumar et al., (2020) reported the significant effect of single or the combined application of TH, BC, in improving photosynthetic pigments in spinach under salinity stress.

Nodules, leghaemoglobins and nodule nitrogenase activity: In our experiment, salinity stress condition decreased the number of nodules, leghaemoglobin, and nodule nitrogenase activity. However alone or coinoculation of TH and BC enhanced the nodule numbers, leghaemoglobin and nodule nitrogenase activity. It has been generally observed that salinity stress condition generally impairs the signaling pathways between plant roots and the Trichoderma species, which is required for the nodule formation. However, during the salinity stress the elevated level of salt concentration increased the osmotic pressure and also causes ion toxicity, which results in the damaging of nodule cells (Mushtaq et al., 2021). Leghaemoglobin is crucial for transporting oxygen to the nitrogen-fixing bacteria in the nodules while maintaining a low oxygen concentration to protect the nitrogenase enzyme. However, the onset of salinity stress lowers the leghaemoglobin synthesis via impaired oxygen transport (Verma et al., 2023). In addition, the decreased leghaemoglobin levels under salinity stress lead to higher oxygen concentrations in the nodules, which inactivate the nitrogenase enzyme, and ultimately reduced the nitrogen fixation efficiency. As the nitrogenase enzymes is highly prone to the oxygen presence and enhancement in the oxygen level can lead to the inactivation of enzyme activity (Quilliam *et al.*, 2012; Ma *et al.*, 2019). Salinity stress generally decreased the leghaemoglobin's synthesis and damage the structures and functions of nodules. Additionally, as for the normal functioning of nitrogenase optimum energy is required but the salinity stress condition reduced overall the energy availability by impairing photosynthesis pigments. In addition, enhanced concentration of salt ions generally imbalances the cell homeostasis and disrupt the normal enzymatic activity of nitrogenase (Tejera *et al.*, 2004).

In this study alone or co-inoculation of TH and BC positively modulates the number of nodules, leghaemoglobin and nodule nitrogenase activity nr salinity stress conditions. It has been generally observed that BC mediate role in availability of mineral elements and also play crucial role in absorbing excess salt concentration (Ma et al., 2019). In addition, provide favourable conditions for the rhizobium and other nitrogen fixing microbe for the colonization and nodule formation (Ma et al., 2019). However, Trichoderma also play pivotal role in improving root architecture, making it easier for rhizobia to establish effective nodulation (Farhangi-Abriz & Torabian, 2018). BC also play pivotal role in the efficient synthesis and functioning of leghemoglobins, which are crucial for oxygen transport in nodules (Farhangi-Abriz & Torabian, 2018). However, Trichoderma enhance the antioxidant defence system in plants, reducing oxidative damage caused by salinity stress. This can help maintain the integrity and functionality of leghaemoglobin in the nodules, ensuring proper oxygen regulation for nitrogen fixation.

**Nodule nitrogenase activity**: Application of BC also help in providing a stable and favourable microenvironment within the nodules, protecting the nitrogenase enzyme from inactivation by high oxygen levels (Quilliam *et al.*, 2012). Whereas, it has been assumed that *Trichoderma* enhances enhancing energy system and nutrient uptake under the salinity stress condition, which favour the nodule nitrogenase activity and ultimately nitrogen fixation processes (Ma *et al.*, 2019).

Mineral elements: In the experiment salinity stress condition decreased the K<sup>+</sup>, K/ Na, and Ca<sup>2+</sup> in compared to the control except Na<sup>+</sup>, However, alone or coinoculation of TH and BC enhanced the mineral concentration in the alfalfa leaves. In the previous studies it has been reported that application of BC significantly enhanced the physicochemical properties of soil. As the BC are mineral rich and contains different ions such as Ca<sup>2+</sup>, Mg<sup>+</sup>, which play pivotal role in ion exchange with the salt ions. In addition, also act as a catalyst for various physiochemical or biochemical phenomenon (Abd El-Naby et al., 2019). Current finding of our results showed combined application of TH and BC enhanced the concentration Na<sup>+</sup> ions and decreased the concentration of other mineral ions after single or combined application of TH and BC. Similar types of observation were also reported by Wang et al., (2013) after single or combined application of Trichoderma and BC in the spinach plants. Also, it has been reported enhancement in N, P, and K the

essential nutrients after treatments of Trichoderma and organic amendments in the Canola plants. Hossain Sani et al., (2020) similar observation in the tomato plant. Also reported similar types of observation in the spinach plant and also found elevated concentration of Na<sup>+</sup> and decreased concentration of other minerals ions. Although the enhanced level of Na<sup>+</sup> ions has been found in the plant may be due to the rooting Na<sup>+</sup> ions or improved soil (Wang et al., 2013). However, the concentration of K<sup>+</sup> ions was found maximum in case of both the control or the salt treated plants after treatment of singly or combinedly with Trichoderma and BC. In the previous study Wang et al., (2014) reported that the combined application improves the ion exchange capacity of K+ and limit the Na<sup>+</sup> entry, which results in the enhanced uptake of K<sup>+</sup> in the plants (Wang et al., 2014). The application of BC help in lowering the concentration of Na<sup>+</sup> due to high absorption potential but mediate significant role in ion exchange with Ca<sup>2+</sup> and Mg<sup>2+</sup> (Hashem *et al.*, 2016).

Oxidative stress markers: The abiotic stress conditions like salinity or draught lead to the generation of ROS, which adversely affect the plant via disrupting membrane potential, lipid peroxidation and negatively impacting plant genetic materials (Hu et al., 2012. El-Beltagi et al., 2023). However, the osmoprotectants protect the plants during the oxidative stress conditions via protecting cell membrane, nucleic acids or other biomolecules (Farhangi-Abriz & Torabian, 2017). The application of BC or Trichoderma protect the plant from salinity stress conditions via improving the osmoprotectants contents in the alfalfa plant. Similar type of observation was also reported by Amanullah & Khan (2023) after application of T. asperellum and BC in the maize plant. Plants synthesizes extensive amount of reactive oxygen or reactive nitrogen species under stress conditions. During the salinity stress plants also releases various types of oxidative stress markers like H2O2, MDA, proline, GB etc (Ahanger & Agarwal, 2017; Mohamed et al., 2018). In the present study alfalfa plants releases these oxidative stress markers after utilization of single or co-inoculation of TH and BC reduces the contents H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, MDA. In the previous studies stated that BC helps in maintaining the integrity of plasma membrane and also play crucial role in water uptake or water use efficacy that helps in lowering or minimizing the oxidative stress (Hafez et al., 2020). Farhangi-Abriz & Torabian (2017) also reported the potential of BC in lowering H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, and MDA content during salinity stress. Authors also reported the role of *Trichoderma* in reducing the oxidative stress markers. For example, Amanullah and Khan (2023) evaluated the Trichoderma role in reducing MDA content in maize under salinity stress conditions and reported Trichoderma reduces the content of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in the spinach under saline condition. Plants accumulate proline in their cells, which acts as an osmoprotectant and help in maintaining the osmotic and turgor pressure in the cell. The elevated concentration of proline also provide shield to the plants against the oxidative stress. Glycine betaine is an organic compound that helps plants cope with salinity stress. When plants face high salt levels, glycine betaine accumulates in their cells, protecting cellular structures and enzymes from damage (Ashraf & Foolad, 2007).

Antioxidative enzymes markers: The concentration of antioxidative enzymes like SOD, CAT, APX, GR, had been decreased during the salinity stress. However, the single of combined application of Trichoderma and BC enhanced the concentration of antioxidative enzymes. SOD induces the dismutation of superoxide radicals (O<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup>) into H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>2</sub>, which results in the lowering of superoxide radicals and protect the cell from oxidative stress. In previous studies various authors reported enhancement in the concentration of SOD with rising concentration of saltlike tomato (Abdel Latef & Chaoxing 2011), chickpea (Rasool et al., 2013). However, catalase is required for quenching the free radicals generated during oxidative stress conditions. In addition, catalase play an essential role in catalysing the reaction especially breraking down of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> into H<sub>2</sub>O and O<sub>2</sub> and protect the plant cell from oxidative stress. (Van Breusegem et al., 2001). Although the APX also play similar role but have higher affinity for H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, making it potentially more significant in managing or detoxifying ROS during stress. APX scavenge the free radicals generating during the salinity stress conditions via detoxifying H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> concentration by converting H<sub>2</sub>0 and O<sub>2</sub>. In addition, the regeneration of Ascorbate: APX is part of the ascorbate-glutathione cycle, where ascorbate is regenerated from its oxidized form, dehydroascorbate, ensuring a continuous supply of ascorbate for H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> detoxification (Brotman et al., 2013). Ascorbate is an essential antioxidant in the ascorbateglutathione cycle. Studies have shown that plants treated with Trichoderma accumulate higher levels of reduced ascorbate. In addition, the treatment of Trichoderma results in the enhancement of expression pattern of stress genes such as monodehydroascorbate reductase, (MDAR), APX1, and GST that significantly enhances the antioxidant system to combat NaCl-induced oxidative stress (Brotman et al., 2013). Glutathione also play significant role in reducing H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> to water in the ascorbate-glutathione cycle (Noctor et al., 2002). Herouart et al., (1993) found that glutathione induces Cu/Zn superoxide dismutase expression pattern in tobacco plant. Studies have also shown that glutathione related enzymes get induced after treatment with Trichoderma (Shoresh & Harman, 2008). GR is crucial for maintaining the GSH/GSSG ratio, which is necessary for ascorbate regeneration and the activation of several important enzymes involved in CO2 fixation (Bierbaumer et al., 2023). The protective function of glutathione transferase may stem from its role in eliminating 4-hydroxyalkenals (membrane lipid peroxides) and propanol by conjugating them with GSH (Berhane et al., 1994). Additionally, glutathione transferase has been reported to directly detoxify lipid peroxides, as some glutathione transferases possess glutathione peroxidase activity (Forman et al., 2009).

#### Conclusion

The present study showed that the combined application of TH and BC can be recommend for salinity stress management and growth promotion in the alfalfa plants. The studies showed that salinity stress adversely affect the morphological yields, photosynthetic pigments, nodule dynamics and mineral contents in the alfalfa plants. In addition, the salinity stress conditions enhanced the concentrations of osmolytes such as malondialdehyde (MDA),  $H_2O_2$ , proline, and glycine betaine content while reduced the concentration of antioxidative enzymes such as SOD, CAT, APX and GR. However, the single of combined treatments of TH stain and BC showed modulatory impact of the morphological yields, photosynthetic pigments, mineral elements and antioxidative enzymes. The finding of the experiments showed potential of TH and BC in salinity stress management and growth promotion potential of plants under salinity stress condition.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to extend their sincere appreciation to the Researchers Supporting Project Number (RSP2024R134), King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

### References

- Abd El-Naby, F.S., M.A. Naiel, A.A. Al-Sagheer and S.S. Negm. 2019. Dietary chitosan nanoparticles enhance the growth, production performance, and immunity in *Oreochromis niloticus*. *Aquaculture*, 501: 82-89.
- Abd El-Rahman, S. and H.I. Mohamed. 2014. Application of benzothiadiazole and *Trichoderma harzianum* to control *Faba bean* chocolate spot disease and their effect on some physiological and biochemical traits. *Acta Physiol. Plant*, 36: 343-354.
- Abd\_Allah, E.F., A. Hashem, A.A. Alqarawi, A.H. Bahkali and M.S. Alwhibi. 2015. Enhancing growth performance and systemic acquired resistance of medicinal plant *Sesbania sesban* (L.) Merr using arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi under salt stress. *Saudi J. Biol. Sci.*, 22: 274-283.
- Acosta-Motos, J.R., M.F. Ortuño, A. Bernal-Vicente, P. Diaz-Vivancos, M.J. Sanchez-Blanco and J.A. Hernandez. 2017. Plant responses to salt stress: adaptive mechanisms. *Agronomy*, 7: 18.
- Aebi, H.E. 1987. "Catalase in vitro," *In* Methods of Enzymatic Analysis, ed. H. Bergmeyer (Weinheim: Verlag Chemie), 273-286.
- Ahanger, M.A. and R.M. Agarwal. 2017. Salinity stress induced alterations in antioxidant metabolism and nitrogen assimilation in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) as influenced by potassium supplementation. *Plant Physiol. Biochem.*, 115: 449-460.
- Ahmad, P., A. Hashem, E.F. Abd\_Allah, A.A. Alqarawi, R. John, D. Egamberdieva and S. Gucel. 2015. Role of *Trichoderma harzianum* in mitigating NaCl stress in Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) through antioxidative defense system. *Front. Plant Sci.*, 6: 868.
- Ahmad, P., E.F. Abd Allah, A. Hashem, M. Sarwat and S. Gucel. 2016. Exogenous application of selenium mitigates cadmium toxicity in *Brassica juncea* L. (Czern & Cross) by up-regulating antioxidative system and secondary metabolites. *J. Plant Growth Regul.*, 35: 936-950.
- Akladious, S.A. and H.I. Mohamed. 2018. Ameliorative effects of calcium nitrate and humic acid on the growth, yield component and biochemical attribute of pepper (*Capsicum annuum*) plants grown under salt stress. *Sci. Hortic.*, 236: 244-250.
- Allen, M.B. 1953. Experiments in Soil Bacteriology, 1<sup>st</sup> Edn. (Minneapolis: Burgess Pub. Co).
- Amanullah, F. and W.U.D. Khan. 2023. *Trichoderma asperellum* L., coupled the effects of biochar to enhance the growth and physiology of contrasting maize cultivars under copper and nickel stresses. *Plants*, 12: 958.

- Aravind, P. and M.N.V. Prasad. 2005. Modulation of cadmiuminduced oxidative stress in *Ceratophyllum demersum* by zinc involves ascorbate–glutathione cycle and glutathione metabolism. *Plant Physiol. Biochem.*, 43: 107-116.
- Ashraf, M.F.M.R. and M.R. Foolad. 2007. Roles of glycine betaine and proline in improving plant abiotic stress resistance. *Environ. Exp. Bot.*, 59: 206-216.
- Bates, L.S., R.P. Waldren and I. Teare. 1973. Rapid determination of free proline for water-stress studies. *Plant Soil*, 39: 205-207.
- Batool, M., S.U. Rahman, M. Ali, F. Nadeem, M.N. Ashraf, M. Harris, Z. Du and W.U. Khan. 2022. Microbial-assisted soil chromium immobilization through zinc and iron-enriched rice husk biochar. *Front. Microbiol.*, 13: 3401.
- Beneduzi, A., A. Ambrosini and L.M.P. Passaglia. 2012. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR): their potential as antagonists and biocontrol agents. *Genet. Mol. Biol.*, 35: 1044-1051.
- Berhane, K., M. Widersten, Å. Engström, J.W. Kozarich and B. Mannervik. 1994. Detoxication of base propenals and other alpha, beta-unsaturated aldehyde products of radical reactions and lipid peroxidation by human glutathione transferases. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 91(4): 1480-1484.
- Bierbaumer, S, M. Nattermann, L. Schulz, R. Zschoche, T.J. Erb, C.K. Winkler, M. Tinzl and S.M. Glueck. 2023. Enzymatic Conversion of CO<sub>2</sub>: From Natural to Artificial Utilization. *Chem. Rev.*, 10: 123(9): 5702-5754.
- Bremner, JM. 1960. Determination of nitrogen in soil by the Kjeldahl method. *The J. Agri. Sci.*, 55: 11-33.
- Brotman, Y., U. Landau, A. Cuadros-Inostroza, T. Takayuki, A.R. Fernie, I. Chet, A. Viterbo and L. Willmitzer. 2013. Trichoderma-plant root colonization: escaping early plant defense responses and activation of the antioxidant machinery for saline stress tolerance. *PLoS Pathogens*, 9(3): e1003221.
- Cornacchione, M.V. and D.L. Suarez. 2017. Evaluation of Alfalfa (*Medicago sativa* L.) populations' response to salinity stress. *Crop Sci.*, 57: 137-150.
- Danesh, P., P. Niaparast, P. Ghorbannezhad and I. Ali. 2023. Biochar production: Recent developments, applications, and challenges. *Fuel*, 337: 126889.
- Du, Y., X. Liu, L. Zhang and W. Zhou. 2023. Drip irrigation in agricultural saline-alkali land controls soil salinity and improves crop yield: Evidence from a global meta-analysis. *Science of the Total Environment*, 880: 163226.
- EL-Bauome, H.A., S.M. Doklega, S.A. Saleh, A.S. Mohamed, A.A. Suliman and M.A. Abd El-Hady. 2024. Effects of melatonin on lettuce plant growth, antioxidant enzymes and photosynthetic pigments under salinity stress conditions. *Folia Horticulturae*, 36(1): 1-17.
- El-Beltagi, H.S., H.H. Al-Otaibi, A. Parmar, K.M. Ramadan, A.K.D.S. Lobato and M.M. El-Mogy. 2023. Application of potassium humate and salicylic acid to mitigate salinity stress of common bean. *Life*, 13(2): 448.
- El-Taher, A.M., H.S. Abd El-Raouf, N.A. Osman, S.N. Azoz, M.A. Omar, A. Elkelish and M.A. Abd El-Hady. 2021. Effect of salt stress and foliar application of salicylic acid on morphological, biochemical, anatomical, and productivity characteristics of cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L.) plants. *Plants*, 11(1): 115.
- Farhangi-Abriz, S. and S. Torabian. 2017. Antioxidant enzyme and osmotic adjustment changes in bean seedlings as affected by biochar under salt stress. *Eco. Env. Saf.*, 137: 64-70.
- Farhangi-Abriz, S. and S. Torabian. 2018. Biochar improved nodulation and nitrogen metabolism of soybean under salt stress. *Symbiosis*, 74: 215-223.

- Fatima, A., S. Umbreen, S. Sadia, M. Waheed, F. Arshad, M.R. Malik, A. Hashem, A. Kumar and E.F. Abd\_Allah. 2024. Mitigation of salinity-induced adverse effects through exogenous application of gibberellic acid in turnip (*Brassica* rapa L.). Cogent. Food Agric., 10(1): 2392042.
- Ferreira, J.F.S., M.V. Cornacchione, X. Liu and D.L. Suarez. 2015. Nutrient composition, forage parameters, and antioxidant capacity of alfalfa (*Medicago sativa L.*) in response to saline irrigation water. *Agriculture*, 5: 577-597.
- Forman, H.J., H. Zhang and A. Rinna. 2009. Glutathione: overview of its protective roles, measurement, and biosynthesis. *Mol. Aspects Med.*, 30(1-2): 1-12.
- Gomez, K. and A. Gomez. 1984. Statistical procedures for agricultural research. Singapore: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Guzmán-Guzmán, P., A. Kumar, S. de Los Santos-Villalobos, F.I. Parra-Cota, M.D.C. Orozco-Mosqueda, A.E. Fadiji, S. Hyder, O.O. Babalola and G. Santoyo. 2023. *Trichoderma* species: Our best fungal allies in the biocontrol of plant diseases—A review. *Plants*, 12(3): 432.
- Habib, N., M. Ashraf, Q. Ali and R. Perveen. 2012. Response of salt stressed okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus* Moench) plants to foliar-applied glycine betaine and glycine betaine containing sugarbeet extract. S. Afr. J. Bot., 83: 151-158.
- Hafez, E.M., Kheir, A.M., Badawy, S.A., Rashwan, E., Farig, M. and H.S. Osman. 2020. Differences in physiological and biochemical attributes of wheat in response to single and combined salicylic acid and biochar subjected to limited water irrigation in saline sodic soil. *Plants*, 9(10): 1346.
- Hashem, A., A. Kumar, A. Al-Dbass, A.A. Alqarawi, A. Al-Arjani, G. Singh, M. Farooq and E.F. Abd\_Allah. 2019. Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and biochar improves drought tolerance in chickpea. *Saudi J. Bio. Sci.*, 26(3): 614-624.
- Hashem, A., E.F. Abd\_Allah, A.A. Alqarawi, A.A. Al Huqail and D. Egamberdieva. 2014. Alleviation of abiotic salt stress in Ochradenus baccatus (Del.) by Trichoderma hamatum (Bonord.) Bainier. J. Plant Interact., 9(1): 857-868.
- Hashem, A., E.F. Abd\_Allah, A.A. Alqarawi, A.A. Al-Huqail and M.A. Shah. 2016. Induction of osmoregulation and modulation of salt stress in *Acacia gerrardii* Benth. by arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and *Bacillus subtilis* (BERA 71). *Bio. Med. Res. Int.*, 1-11.
- Heath, R.L. and L. Packer. 1968. Photoperoxidation in isolated chloroplasts: i. kinetics and stoichiometry of fatty acid peroxidation. Arch. Bioch. Bioph., 125(1): 189-198.
- Herouart, D., M. Van Montagu and D. Inze. 1993. Redoxactivated expression of the cytosolic copper/zinc superoxide dismutase gene in Nicotiana. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 90(7): 3108-3112.
- Hu, L., H. Li, H. Pang and J. Fu. 2012. Responses of antioxidant gene, protein and enzymes to salinity stress in two genotypes of perennial ryegrass (*Lolium perenne*) differing in salt tolerance. J. Plant Physiol., 169(2): 146-156.
- Hunter, J.G. and A. Hall. 1953. The determination of calcium in plants and soils. *Analyst*, 78(923): 106-110.
- Imran, Q.M., N. Falak, A. Hussain, B.G. Mun and B.W. Yun. 2021. Abiotic stress in plants; stress perception to molecular response and role of biotechnological tools in stress resistance. *Agronomy*, 11(8): 1579.
- Keilin, D. and Y.L. Wang. 1945. Haemoglobin in the root nodules of leguminous plants. *Nature*, 155(3930): 227-229.
- Khadka, R.B. and N. Uphoff. 2019. Effects of *Trichoderma* seedling treatment with system of rice intensification management and with conventional management of transplanted rice. *Peer J.*, 7: e5877.
- Khedulkar, A.P., B. Pandit and R.A. Doong. 2023. Agricultural waste to real worth biochar as a sustainable material for supercapacitor. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 869: 161441. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.161441

- Kumar, A., A.K. Singh, M.S. Kaushik, S.K. Mishra, P. Raj, P.K. Singh and K.D. Pandey. 2017. Interaction of turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.) with beneficial microbes: a review. 3 *Biotech.*, 7: 1-8.
- Kumar, A., K. Saini and T. Bhaskar. 2020. Hydochar and biochar: production, physicochemical properties and technoeconomic analysis. *Bioresour. Technol.*, 310: 123442.
- Kumar, S., G. Li, G., Yang, J., Huang, X., Ji, Q., Liu, Z., Ke, W. and H. Hou. 2021. Effect of salt stress on growth, physiological parameters, and ionic concentration of water dropwort (*Oenanthe javanica*) cultivars. *Front. Plant Sci.*, 12: 660409.
- Kumawat, K.C., B. Sharma, S. Nagpal, A. Kumar, S. Tiwari and R.M. Nair. 2023. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria: Salt stress alleviators to improve crop productivity for sustainable agriculture development. *Front. Plant Sci.*, 13: 1101862.
- Langeroodi, A.R.S., O.A. Osipitan, E. Radicetti and R. Mancinelli. 2020. To what extent arbuscular mycorrhiza can protect chicory (*Cichorium intybus* L.) against drought stress. *Sci. Hortic.*, 263: 109109.
- Latef, A.A.H.A. and H. Chaoxing. 2011. Effect of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi on growth, mineral nutrition, antioxidant enzymes activity and fruit yield of tomato grown under salinity stress. *Sci. Hortic.*, 127(3): 228-233.
- Lichtenthaler, H.K. 1987. Chlorophylls and carotenoids: pigments of photosynthetic biomembranes. Methods in Enzymology, Elsevier: Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 148: 350-382.
- Liu, J., X. Yang, H. Liu, X. Jia and Y. Bao. 2021. Mixed biochar obtained by the co-pyrolysis of shrimp shell with corn straw: co-pyrolysis characteristics and its adsorption capability. *Chemosphere*, 282: 131116.
- Ma, H., D. Egamberdieva, S. Wirth and S. Bellingrath-Kimura. 2019. Effect of biochar and irrigation on soybean-rhizobium symbiotic performance and soil enzymatic activity in field rhizosphere. *Agronomy*, 9(10): 626.
- Mal, S. and S. Panchal. 2024. Drought and salt stress mitigation in crop plants using stress-tolerant auxin-producing endophytic bacteria: A futuristic approach towards sustainable agriculture. *Front. Plant Sci.*, 15: 1422504.
- Mohamed, H.I., S.A. Akladious and H.S. El-Beltagi. 2018. Mitigation the harmful effect of salt stress on physiological, biochemical and anatomical traits by foliar spray with trehalose on wheat cultivars. *Frese. Environ. Bull.*, 27: 7054-7065.
- Mukherjee, S.P. and M.A. Choudhuri. 1983. Implications of water stress-induced changes in the levels of endogenous ascorbic acid and hydrogen peroxide in *Vigna* seedlings. *Physiol. Plant.*, 58(2): 166-170.
- Mushtaq, S., M. Shafiq, M.R. Tariq, A. Sami, M.S. Nawaz-ul-Rehman, M.H.T. Bhatti, M.S. Haider, S. Sadiq, M.T. Abbas, M. Hussain and M.A. Shahid. 2023. Interaction between bacterial endophytes and host plants. *Front. Plant Sci.*, 13: 1092105.
- Mushtaq, Z., S. Faizan, B. Gulzar and K.R. Hakeem. 2021. Inoculation of *Rhizobium alleviates* salinity stress through modulation of growth characteristics, physiological and biochemical attributes, stomatal activities and antioxidant defence in *Cicer arietinum* L. *J. Plant Growth Regul.*, 40: 2148-2163.
- Nakano, Y. and K. Asada. 1987. Purification of ascorbate peroxidase in spinach chloroplasts; its inactivation in ascorbate-depleted medium and reactivation by monodehydroascorbate radical. *Plant Cell Physiol.*, 28(1): 131-140.
- Noctor, G., L. Gomez, H. Vanacker and C.H. Foyer. 2002. Interactions between biosynthesis, compartmentation and transport in the control of glutathione homeostasis and signalling. J. Exp. Bot., 53(372): 1283-1304.

- Ondrasek, G., S. Rathod, K.K. Manohara, C. Gireesh, M.S. Anantha, A.S. Sakhare, B. Parmar, B.K. Yadav, N. Bandumula, F. Raihan and A. Zielińska-Chmielewska. 2022. Salt stress in plants and mitigation approaches. *Plants*, 11(6): 717.
- Page, A., Miller R. and D. Keeney. 1982. Methods of Soil Analysis" part 2: chemical and microbiological properties. Agronomy 920 Am, second edition Wisconsin (USA): Soc Agron Inc Soil Sci Soc Am Inc Pub Madison.
- Quilliam, R., T. DeLuca and D. Jones. 2012. Biochar application reduces nodulation but increases nitrogenase activity in clover. Plant Soil, 366: 83-92.
- Rasool, S., A. Ahmad, T.O. Siddiqi and P. Ahmad. 2013. Changes in growth, lipid peroxidation and some key antioxidant enzymes in chickpea genotypes under salt stress. *Acta Physiol. Plant.*, 35: 1039-1050.
- Sani, Md N.H., M. Hasan, J. Uddain and S. Subramaniam. 2020. Impact of application of *Trichoderma* and biochar on growth, productivity and nutritional quality of tomato under reduced NPK fertilization. *Ann. Agric. Sci.*, 65(1): 107-115.
- Scasta, J.D., C. Trostle and M. Foster. 2012. Evaluating Alfalfa (*Medicago sativa* L.) cultivars for salt tolerance using laboratory, greenhouse and field methods. J. Agric. Sci., 4: 90.
- Sen, T.T., M. Giroux and J.C. Fardeau. 1988. Effects of soil properties on plant-available phosphorus determined by the isotopic dilution phosphorus-32 method. S.S.S.A.J., 52: 1383-1390.
- Shoresh, M. and G.E. Harman. 2008. The molecular basis of shoot responses of maize seedlings to *Trichoderma harzianum* T22 inoculation of the root: a proteomic approach. *Plant Physiol.*, 147(4): 2147-2163.
- Solanki, M.K., N.C. Joshi, P.K. Singh, S.K. Singh, G. Santoyo, L.C.B. de Azevedo and A. Kumar. 2023. From concept to reality: transforming agriculture through innovative rhizosphere engineering for plant health and productivity. *Microbiol. Res.*, 279: 127553.
- Sun, X., H.K. Atiyeh, M. Li and Y. Chen. 2020. Biochar facilitated bioprocessing and biorefinery for productions of biofuel and chemicals: A review. *Bioresour. Technol.*, 295: 122252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2019.122252
- Taiz, L., E. Zeiger, I.M. Møller and A. Murphy. 2015. Plant physiology and Development. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition, Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, CT. 690 pp.
- Tchonkouang, R.D., H. Onyeaka and H. Nkoutchou. 2024. Assessing the vulnerability of food supply chains to climate change-induced disruptions. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 920: 171047.
- Tejera, N.A., R. Campos, J. Sanjuan and C. Lluch. 2004. Nitrogenase and antioxidant enzyme activities in *Phaseolus*

*vulgaris* nodules formed by *Rhizobium tropici* isogenic strains with varying tolerance to salt stress. *J. Plant Physiol.*, 161(3): 329-338.

- Vadassery, J., S. Tripathi, R. Prasad, A. Varma and R. Oelmüller. 2009. Monodehydroascorbate reductase 2 and dehydroascorbate reductase 5 are crucial for a mutualistic interaction between *Piriformospora indica* and *Arabidopsis. J. Plant Physiol.*, 166(12): 1263-1274.
- Van Breusegem, F., E. Vranová, J.F. Dat and D. Inzé. 2001. The role of active oxygen species in plant signal transduction. *Plant Sci.*, 161(3): 405-414.
- Verma, B.K., P. Gangwar and K.A. Varshney. 2023. Effect of soil salinity on the nodulation and leghaemoglobin in two variables of (*Pisum sativum L*). J. Stress Physiol. Biochem., 19(4): 132-138.
- Verma, H., D. Kumar, V. Kumar, M. Kumari, S.K. Singh, V.K. Sharma, S. Droby, G. Santoyo, J.F. White and A. Kumar. 2021. The potential application of endophytes in management of stress from drought and salinity in crop plants. *Microorganisms*, 9(8): 1729.
- Vernon, L. and G. Seely. 1966. Automatic methods for the determination of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium in plant material. *Analyst*, 91: 119-126.
- Wahab, A., M. Muhammad, A. Munir, G. Abdi, W. Zaman, A. Ayaz, C. Khizar and S.P.P. Reddy. 2023. Role of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in regulating growth, enhancing productivity, and potentially influencing ecosystems under abiotic and biotic stresses. *Plants*, 12(17): 3102.
- Wang, L., X. Sun, S. Li, T. Zhang, W. Zhang and P. Zhai. 2014. Application of organic amendments to a coastal saline soil in north China: Effects on soil physical and chemical properties and tree growth. *PLoS One*, 9: e89185.
- Wang, M., Q. Zheng, Q. Shen and S. Guo. 2013. The critical role of potassium in plant stress response. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.*, 14(4): 7370-7390.
- Wolf, B. 1982. A comprehensive system of leaf analyses and its use for diagnosing crop nutrient status. *Comm. Soil Sci. Plant Analysis*, 13(12): 1035-1059.
- Zhang, F., X. Xu, Y. Huo and Y. Xiao. 2019. Trichodermainoculation and mowing synergistically altered soil available nutrients, rhizosphere chemical compounds and soil microbial community, potentially driving alfalfa growth. *Front. Microbiol.*, 9: 3241.
- Zhou, H., G. Zhou, Q. He, L. Zhou, Y. Ji and X. Lv. 2021. Capability of leaf water content and its threshold values in reflection of soil–plant water status in maize during prolonged drought. *Ecol. Indic.*, 124: 107395.

(Received for publication 18 January 2024)