

British Journal of Applied Science & Technology 18(2): 1-8, 2016; Article no.BJAST.30185 ISSN: 2231-0843, NLM ID: 101664541



SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org

Seedling Tolerance of Three Eucalypt Species to Changes in Soil Alkalinity Due to Limestone Addition

E. Farifr¹, S. Aboglila^{1*} and N. Shanak¹

¹Geochemistry and Environmental Chemistry, Azzaytuna University, Tripoli, Libya.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/BJAST/2016/30185 <u>Editor(s):</u> (1) Rares Halbac-Cotoara-Zamfir, Hydrotechnical Engineering Department, "Politehnica" University of Timisoara, Romania. <u>Reviewers:</u> (1) Eugenio Cazzato, University of Bari Aldo Moro, Italy. (2) Amouri Adel Amar, University of Oran, Algeria. (3) Lianxuan Shi, Northeast Normal University, China. Complete Peer review History: <u>http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history/17165</u>

Short Research Article

Received 22nd October 2016 Accepted 29th November 2016 Published 8th December 2016

ABSTRACT

The present research was implemented to analyses the seedling tolerance of three species *Eucalyptus gomphocephala* DC (Myrtaceae) (common name 'Tuart'), *Eucalyptus marginata* Sm. (common name 'Jarrah') and *Corymbia calophylla* (Lindl.) K.D. Hill & J. A. S. Johnson (common name 'Marri') to soil-induced stressor, namely soil alkalinity (limestone). Seeds germinated in shallow trays filled with white sand in a naturally lit glasshouse (control treatment). A liming treatment was conducted with 20% w/w crushed and sifted Tomala limestone adds to potting mix to increase soil pH. The experiment was conducted over 82 days. *E. gomphocephala* is restricted soils overlying limestone on study area and according to total seedling dry weight data and calculated relative growth rates coped best in a limestone-enriched soil. However, when examining all the growth and physiological data collected *C. calophylla* appeared to be the middling tolerant, with no significant difference in leaf allocation or leaf water loss between the well-watered controls and the limestone-enriched treatments whereas the *E. marginata* was the least tolerant with a 14% reduction in stomatal conductance.

Keywords: Eucalypt limestone tolerance; growth and physiology; limestone stresses.

*Corresponding author: E-mail: salem.aboglila@gmail.com;

1. INTRODUCTION

Western Australian soils of calcareous origin are high in pH [1] Moore. The alkalinity-acidity salt of Western Australia soils have been categorised according to their plant toxicity [2] Szabolcs. The common field crops have a preference to a neutral or slightly acidic soil (pH 7) whereas some plants, however, prefer more acidic or alkaline conditions. The pH of soil solution is dependent relative on mineral weathering conditions, and mineral weathering raising pH by releasing base cations (Ca, Mg and K), and therefore the soils that rich in simply weather able minerals tend mostly have higher pH and higher soil solution concentration of Ca, Mg and K [3 Jarvan]. Several nutrient cations such as aluminum (Al³⁺), zinc (Zn²⁺), copper (Cu²⁺), iron(Fe²⁺), manganese (Mn²⁺) and cobalt (Co²⁺) are soluble and available for absorbing by plants when pH value below 5.0, even though their availability may result in ion toxicity as soil pH decreases [4]. These cations are less available in soil in more alkaline environment and usually the soil shows indications of nutrient deficiency, comprise thin plant stems, yellowing and mottling of leaves, and slow and/or short growth. Some elements require a specific pH range. Phosphorus (P) uptake requires a soil pH between 6.0 and 7.5; otherwise it becomes chemically immobile, forming insoluble compounds with iron (Fe) and aluminum (Al) in acid soils and with calcium (Ca) in calcareous soils [4]. Soils that contain calcium sulphate (gypsum), sodium bicarbonate and calcium carbonate can impact of seedling growth because of the effect of increasing soil pH, on micro and macro nutrient availability, particularly phosphorus, nitrogen, copper, zinc, manganese and iron [5]. The pH (in soil solution) of the soils have been documented as being either slightly acid (calcium sulphate). low alkaline (carbon carbonate) and alkaline (sodium bicarbonate) [2].

An excessive addition of calcium carbonate in the soil PH can cause calcium phosphates precipitation phenomenon. It plays an important role in controlling phosphorus activity and its availability in soil solution. The general reaction that explains the interaction of a liming material such as CaCO₃ with water to form OH- ions is as follows [6]. CaCO₃ + H₂O (in soil) \rightarrow Ca²⁺ + HCO⁻³ + OH⁻³

The overall reaction of lime with an acid soil can be expressed by the following 2Al ⁺ 3 CaCO₃ + 3 $H_2O \rightarrow 3 Ca^+ 2Al (OH)_3 + 3CO_2$

Farifr et al.; BJAST, 18(2): 1-8, 2016; Article no.BJAST.30185

Species from the genus Eucalyptus naturally occur in a range of different soil characteristics from alkaline, calcareous or acidic soils acid [7,8,9]. Characteristically, differing tolerance to calcareous circumstances in Eucalyptus has been investigated in relationship between transpacific populations of plants raised from seed collected from trees growing on acidic or alkalinised soils [10,11,12]. For example, Eucalyptus obligua has received particular attention to assess the response of potentially useful species to the pH of the growing medium [10,13,14].About 35 seedlings of Eucalyptus species were grown under amended medium with limestone and dolomite (1:1) and pH range of 5.1 to 8.9 to study a response of ornamental eucalypts from acidic and alkaline habitats [15]. Results indicated that the seedlings growth was generally greater under acidic (pH 5.1-5.6) than under more alkaline conditions. Species demonstrated a range of responses to changes in soil pH, including species that were unaffected even at pH 8.9 such as E. erythrocorys and E. extensa. The tolerance to high pH is associated with a capability to maintain relatively low Ca and Mg and P and Fe concentration ratios < PH 5. The tolerance of six clones from five provenances of E. camaldulensis was examined under controlled conditions of waterlogged, highly saline and highly alkaline soils in a greenhouse where leaves produced under salinity and alkalinity impacts were similar in ion content to those produced prior to the test condition [16,17,18]. Some Eucalyptus species that show growth in soils of relatively high pH, high bicarbonate (HCO³⁻), and low iron (Fe) concentration has potential to live in calcareous or alkaline soils [19,8]. The tolerance of 5 semiarid Western Australia species (E. gracilis, E. halophila, E. kondininensis, E. loxophlebaand, E. platypus var. heterophylla) to alkaline conditions, bicarbonate, and low iron availability was examined by [8]. The study showed that seedlings growing in medium of pH 9, caused a reduction in plant height and leaf production for most of the study species, compared with a species growing in system of pH 6. Iron concentrations in the youngest fully expanded leaves were reduced for seedlings in the pH 9 solution. Eucalvptus halophila was an exception to this. Eucalyptus species may be important in the amelioration of salt-affected [20.21] and alkaline lands [19], the treatment of limestone quarries [20] and mine waste process that often very alkaline, acidic or saline [22,23,24,25]. The research presented in this paper focuses on the tolerance of three eucalypts species to soils enriched by natural limestone, as measured by changes in growth and physiology over 80 days.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Experimental Design

Seeds of the three eucalypt species were germinated in shallow trays filled with white sand in a naturally lit glasshouse. Trays were initially, partly submerged in a larger tray of water containing Pervicur® fungicide (2 mL L^{-1}) to minimize seedling death resulting from fungal infection. Every 3-4 days the trays were rewatered. Seedlings remained in these trays until they had obtained a height of approximately 3 cm. One hundred and twenty seedlings of each species were there transplanted into square individual pots (7 cm wide and 7 cm long by 8 cm deep) filled with soil at a ratio of four parts white sand to two parts peat, each pot containing one seedling. Transplanted seedlings were watered twice weekly until the seedlings had 4-6 leaves or were approximately 6 cm tall. The day before applying the alkalinity treatment, 10 seedlings of each species were randomly selected for harvesting, with each seedling divided into stem, root and leaf components. Biomass of stem, root and leaves were recorded after drying the samples in a drying oven at 80°C for 48 hours, or until constant mass was achieved.

For each species, the remaining seedlings were randomly divided into two treatments. The first treatment had no additional limestone added, and was the control. For the second treatment (the 'limestone' treatment) pots were filled with crushed local Tamala limestone, which had been passed through a 3 mm sieve, and mixed at a rate of 20% by soil weight. Overall 55 seedlings per treatment were used per species. Seedlings in both treatments were watered twice a week with fresh tap water for 12 weeks experiment period.

2.2 Physiological and Growth Measurements

At the end of experiment, about ten seedlings per treatment and species were randomly chosen for chlorophyll and physiological measurements. Chlorophyll content (SPAD-502 meter, Konica Minolta, Japan), stomatal conductance and transpiration (steady state porometer, LI-1600, Li-Cor, Nebraska, USA) were measured on the youngest fully expanded leaf. All measurements were recorded during the mid-morning in full sunlight. The number of leaves and seedling height were measured for ten plants which chosen randomly at the end of the experimental. An additional ten seedling per species and treatment were harvest at the end of experiment, each seedling was divided into stem, leaf and root components. For each seedling all leaves were digitally scanned fresh and total leaf area measured using the image J software (http://rsb.info.hih.gov/ij). All plant material was oven dried at 80°Cfor 48 hours, and the dry weights of each component recorded. Various growth, biomass and leaf area allocation parameters were then calculated for each treatment and species. These included total dry weight, shoot to root ratio, leaf area ration (LAR), leaf weight ratio (LWR), Specific leaf area (SLA) and growth rate (RGR), as defined by McGraw and Garbutt (1990). Dried leaf material were then ground separately through a 40 µm mesh and 2 g subsamples were analysed by the Western Australia's Chemistry Centre for macro and micro element concentrations N was analysed by Kjeldahl digestion and titration the remaining elements were digested by a concentrated HNO3: HCIO3: H2SO4 solution. Other elements were analysed by inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectroscopy (ICP-AES) (e.g. Cu, Fe, Mg, Mn, Zn) and ion exchange chromatography (Cl, B, S, P, K).

2.3 Statistical Analysis

Data was analysed using independent *t*-tests with the statistical program SPSS. Means were determined to be significantly different between treatments (control and limestone) at P values <0.05.36

3. RESULTS

3.1 Corymbia calophylla

After 82 days of the limestone treatment the total seedling dry weight (P=0.008), plant height (P=0.001) and specific leaf area (P=0.004) were negatively impacted by the presence of limestone in *C. calophylla* seedlings (Table 1). *C. calophylla* seedlings growing in the limestone enhanced soils had a lower relative growth rate than the well-watered controls by approximately 20% (Table 1). Limestone seedlings had no significant difference in all Physiology parameters compared with control (Table 1).

Table 1. Growth and physiological parameters of C. calophylla, E. gomphocephala andE. marginata seedlings after 82 days under well watered (control) and limestone-enhancedconditions. Values are mean ±SE for 10 seedlings. LAR=leaf area ratio; LWR=leaf weight ratio;SLA = specific leaf area and RGR= relative growth ratio

C. calophyllaTotal dry weight (g) 2.35 ± 0.22 1.37 ± 0.16 **LAR (mm ² g ¹) 119.1 ± 13.1 15.83 ± 1.30 **LAR (mm ² g ¹) 119.1 ± 13.1 67.90 ± 2.41 NSLWR (g g ¹) 0.61 ± 0.01 0.69 ± 0.02 NSSLA (mm ² g ¹) 193.1 ± 17.1 97.80 ± 4.76 **Leaf number 15.7 ± 1.4 10.00 ± 1.18 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 5.8 ± 1.4 5.89 ± 0.75 NSRGR (mg g ¹ g day ¹) 30.5 24.3 NAChlorophyll content (relative units) 44.28 ± 1.76 40.67 ± 2.22 NSStomatal conductance (mol m ² s ⁻¹) 2.02 ± 0.38 1.11 ± 0.76 NSTotal dry weight (g) 0.39 ± 0.06 0.35 ± 0.01 *Seedling height (cm) 16.6 ± 1.1 8.33 ± 0.9 **LAR (mm ² g ¹) 0.66 ± 0.02 0.72 ± 0.01 NSSLA (mm ² g ¹) 0.66 ± 0.02 0.72 ± 0.01 NSSLA (mm ² g ¹) 13.3 ± 2.4 17.0 ± 1.34 **Leaf number 13.3 ± 2.4 17.0 ± 1.34 **Rot shoot ratio (g g-1) 7.7 ± 1.5 7.29 ± 0.25 NSChlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 * </th <th>Parameters</th> <th>Control</th> <th>Limestone</th> <th>P (t-test)</th>	Parameters	Control	Limestone	P (t-test)							
Total dry weight (g) 2.35 ± 0.22 1.37 ± 0.16 **Seedling height (cm) 30.2 ± 2.1 1.583 ± 1.30 **LAR (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 119.1 ± 13.1 67.90 ± 2.41 NSLWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.61 ± 0.01 0.69 ± 0.02 NSSLA (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 193.1 ± 17.1 97.80 ± 4.76 **Leaf number 15.7 ± 1.4 10.00 ± 1.18 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 5.8 ± 1.4 5.89 ± 0.75 NSRGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 30.5 24.3 NAChlorophyll content (relative units) 44.28 ± 1.76 40.67 ± 2.22 NSStomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 0.06 ± 0.01 0.03 ± 0.01 NSTranspiration (mmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 2.02 ± 0.38 1.11 ± 0.76 NSE gomphocephala**Total dry weight (g) 0.39 ± 0.06 0.35 ± 0.01 *Seedling height (cm) 16.6 ± 1.1 8.33 ± 0.9 **LAR (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 0.66 ± 0.02 0.72 ± 0.01 NSSLA (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 0.66 ± 0.02 0.72 ± 0.01 NSSLA (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 36.8 32.9 NARGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 36.8 32.9 NAChorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 36.8 32.9 NAChorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 36.8 32.9 NSL	C. calophylla										
Seedling height (cm) 30.2 ± 2.1 15.83 ± 1.30 **LAR (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 119.1 ± 13.1 67.90 ± 2.41 NSLWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.61 ± 0.01 0.69 ± 0.02 NSSLA (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 193.1 ± 17.1 97.80 ± 4.76 **Leaf number 15.7 ± 1.4 10.00 ± 1.18 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 5.8 ± 1.4 5.89 ± 0.75 NSRGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 30.5 24.3 NAChlorophyll content (relative units) 44.28 ± 1.76 40.67 ± 2.22 NSStomatal conductance (mol m ² s ⁻¹) 0.06 ± 0.01 0.03 ± 0.01 NSTranspiration (mmol m ² s ⁻¹) 2.02 ± 0.38 1.11 ± 0.76 NSE gomphocephalaUWR (gg (g ⁻¹)12.29 \pm 6.5 87.21 ± 7.3 **LAR (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 185.9 ± 9.0 121.0 ± 11.5 **Leaf number(13.3 \pm 2.4 17.0 ± 1.34 **Root: shoot ratio (g g-1) 7.7 ± 1.5 7.29 ± 0.25 NSRGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 36.8 32.9 NAChlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Standal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 0.33 ± 0.09 0.09 ± 0.02 *Transpiration (mmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 0.33 ± 0.09 0.92 ± 0.25 NSRGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 36.6 32.9 NA <td <="" colspan="3" td=""><td>Total dry weight (g)</td><td>2.35 ± 0.22</td><td>1.37 ± 0.16</td><td>**</td></td>	<td>Total dry weight (g)</td> <td>2.35 ± 0.22</td> <td>1.37 ± 0.16</td> <td>**</td>			Total dry weight (g)	2.35 ± 0.22	1.37 ± 0.16	**				
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Seedling height (cm)	30.2 ± 2.1	15.83 ± 1.30	**							
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	LAR (mm $^{2}_{,}$ g ⁻¹)	119.1 ± 13.1	67.90 ± 2.41	NS							
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	LWR (g g ⁻¹)	0.61 ± 0.01	0.69 ± 0.02	NS							
Leaf number15.7 \pm 1.410.00 \pm 1.18NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1)5.8 \pm 1.45.89 \pm 0.75NSRGR (mg g ¹ g day ¹)30.524.3NAChlorophyll content (relative units)44.28 \pm 1.7640.67 \pm 2.22NSStomatal conductance (mol m ² s ⁻¹)0.06 \pm 0.010.03 \pm 0.01NSTranspiration (mmol m ² s ⁻¹)2.02 \pm 0.381.11 \pm 0.76NSE. gomphocephalaTotal dry weight (g)0.39 \pm 0.060.35 \pm 0.01*Seedling height (cm)16.6 \pm 1.18.33 \pm 0.9**LAR (mm ² g ⁻¹)122.9 \pm 6.587.21 \pm 7.3**LWR (g g ¹)0.66 \pm 0.020.72 \pm 0.01NSSLA (mm ² g ⁻¹)185.9 \pm 9.0121.0 \pm 11.5**Leaf number13.3 \pm 2.417.0 \pm 1.34**Root: shoot ratio (g g-1)7.7 \pm 1.57.29 \pm 0.25NSRGR (mg g ³ g day ¹)36.832.9NAChlorophyll content (relative units)42.92 \pm 1.6337.62 \pm 1.43*Stomatal conductance (mol m ² s ⁻¹)0.33 \pm 0.090.09 \pm 0.02*Transpiration (mmol m ² s ⁻¹)0.33 \pm 0.090.09 \pm 0.02****Seedling height (cm)10.8 \pm 1.67.50 \pm 0.9NSLAR (mm ² g ⁻¹)118.8 \pm 5.172.0 \pm 1.8******Seedling height (cm)0.73 \pm 0.010.58 \pm 0.03** <td>SLA (mm ² g⁻¹)</td> <td>193.1 ± 17.1</td> <td>97.80 ± 4.76</td> <td>**</td>	SLA (mm ² g ⁻¹)	193.1 ± 17.1	97.80 ± 4.76	**							
Root: shoot ratio (g g-1) 5.8 ± 1.4 5.89 ± 0.75 NSRGR (mg g' g day') 30.5 24.3 NAChlorophyll content (relative units) 44.28 ± 1.76 40.67 ± 2.22 NSStomatal conductance (mol m ² s') 0.06 ± 0.01 0.03 ± 0.01 NSTranspiration (mmol m ² s') 2.02 ± 0.38 1.11 ± 0.76 NS E. gomphocephala Total dry weight (g) 0.39 ± 0.06 0.35 ± 0.01 *LAR (mm ² g ¹) 122.9 ± 6.5 87.21 ± 7.3 **LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.66 ± 0.02 0.72 ± 0.01 NSSLA (mm ² g ⁻¹) 185.9 ± 9.0 121.0 ± 11.5 **Leaf number 13.3 ± 2.4 17.0 ± 1.34 **Root: shoot ratio (g g-1) 7.7 ± 1.5 7.29 ± 0.25 NSRGR (mg g' g day' ¹) 36.8 32.9 NAChlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ² s ⁻¹) 0.33 ± 0.09 0.09 ± 0.02 *Total dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 **Seedling height (cm) 10.8 ± 1.6 7.50 ± 0.9 NSLAR (mm ² g ⁻¹) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **Log (g n) 0.72 ± 0.65 87.21 ± 7.3 Total dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 *Total dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.6	Leaf number	15.7± 1.4	10.00 ± 1.18	NS							
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Root: shoot ratio (g g-1)	5.8 ± 1.4	5.89 ± 0.75	NS							
Chlorophyll content (relative units) 44.28 ± 1.76 40.67 ± 2.22 NSStomatal conductance (mol m ² s ⁻¹) 0.06 ± 0.01 0.03 ± 0.01 NSTranspiration (mmol m ² s ⁻¹) 2.02 ± 0.38 1.11 ± 0.76 NS E. gomphocephala Total dry weight (g) 0.39 ± 0.06 0.35 ± 0.01 *Seedling height (cm) 16.6 ± 1.1 8.33 ± 0.9 **LAR (mm ² g ⁻¹) 122.9 ± 6.5 87.21 ± 7.3 **LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.66 ± 0.02 0.72 ± 0.01 NSSLA (mm ² g ⁻¹) 0.66 ± 0.02 0.72 ± 0.01 NSSLA (mm ² g ⁻¹) 0.66 ± 0.02 0.72 ± 0.01 NSSLA (mm ² g ⁻¹) 185.9 ± 9.0 121.0 ± 11.5 **Leaf number 13.3 ± 2.4 17.0 ± 1.34 **Root: shoot ratio (g g-1) 7.7 ± 1.5 7.29 ± 0.25 NSRGR (mg g ¹ g day ⁻¹) 36.8 32.9 NAChlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 0.33 ± 0.09 0.09 ± 0.02 *Transpiration (mmol m ² s ⁻¹) 0.33 ± 0.09 0.09 ± 0.02 *Total dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 **Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 0.38 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **LAR (mm ² g ⁻¹) 118.8 ± 5.1	RGR (mg g⁻¹g day⁻¹)	30.5	24.3	NA							
Stomatal conductance (mol m²s²) 0.06 ± 0.01 0.03 ± 0.01 NSTranspiration (mmol m²s²) 2.02 ± 0.38 1.11 ± 0.76 NSE. gomphocephalaTotal dry weight (g) 0.39 ± 0.06 0.35 ± 0.01 *Seeding height (cm) 16.6 ± 1.1 8.33 ± 0.9 **LAR (mm²g¹) 122.9 ± 6.5 87.21 ± 7.3 **LWR (g g¹) 0.66 ± 0.02 0.72 ± 0.01 NSSLA (mm²g¹) 185.9 ± 9.0 121.0 ± 11.5 **Leaf number 13.3 ± 2.4 17.0 ± 1.34 **RGR (mg g²g day²) 36.8 32.9 NAChlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Stomatal conductance (mol m²s²) 0.33 ± 0.09 0.09 ± 0.02 *Total dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 **E. marginataTotal dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 **LAR (mm²g¹) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LWR (g g¹) 0.73 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **Seedling height (cm) 10.8 ± 1.6 7.50 ± 0.9 NSLar (mm²g¹) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LWR (m²g¹) 161.5 ± 5.8 142.1 ± 34.4 *Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5	Chlorophyll content (relative units)	44.28 ± 1.76	NS								
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} \hline Transpiration (mmol m^{-2} s^{-1}) & 2.02 \pm 0.38 & 1.11 \pm 0.76 & NS \\ \hline \textbf{E. gomphocephala} \\ \hline \textbf{Total dry weight (g)} & 0.39 \pm 0.06 & 0.35 \pm 0.01 & * \\ \hline \textbf{Seedling height (cm)} & 16.6 \pm 1.1 & 8.33 \pm 0.9 & ** \\ LAR (mm^2 g^1) & 122.9 \pm 6.5 & 87.21 \pm 7.3 & ** \\ LWR (g g^1) & 0.66 \pm 0.02 & 0.72 \pm 0.01 & NS \\ \textbf{SLA (mm^2 g^1)} & 185.9 \pm 9.0 & 121.0 \pm 11.5 & ** \\ \text{Leaf number} & 13.3 \pm 2.4 & 17.0 \pm 1.34 & ** \\ \textbf{Root: shoot ratio (g g-1)} & 7.7 \pm 1.5 & 7.29 \pm 0.25 & NS \\ \textbf{RGR (mg g^{-1}g d ay^{-1})} & 36.8 & 32.9 & NA \\ \textbf{Chlorophyll content (relative units)} & 42.92 \pm 1.63 & 37.62 \pm 1.43 & * \\ \textbf{Stomatal conductance (mol m^2 s^{-1})} & 6.95 \pm 3.13 & 1.97 \pm 0.59 & NS \\ \hline \textbf{LAR (mm^2 g^{-1})} & 118.8 \pm 5.1 & 72.0 \pm 1.8 & ** \\ \textbf{LWR (g g^{-1})} & 0.73 \pm 0.01 & 0.58 \pm 0.03 & ** \\ \textbf{LWR (g g^{-1})} & 0.73 \pm 0.01 & 0.58 \pm 0.03 & ** \\ \textbf{LAR (mm^2 g^{-1})} & 161.5 \pm 5.8 & 142.1 \pm 34.4 & * \\ \textbf{Leaf number} & 8.0 \pm 0.6 & 8.2 \pm 0.6 & NS \\ \textbf{Root: shoot ratio (g g-1)} & 33.6 & 23.5 & NA \\ \textbf{RGR (mg g^{-1}g d ay^{-1})} & 46.47 \pm 1.62 & 30.05 \pm 2.85 & * \\ \textbf{Chlorophyll content (relative units)} & 0.49 \pm 0.10 & 0.07 \pm 0.02 & * \\ \textbf{RGR (mg g^{-1}g d ay^{-1})} & 161.5 \pm 5.8 & 142.1 \pm 34.4 & * \\ \textbf{Leaf number} & 8.0 \pm 0.6 & 8.2 \pm 0.6 & NS \\ \textbf{Root: shoot ratio (g g-1)} & 33.6 & 23.5 & NA \\ \textbf{RGR (mg g^{-1}g d ay^{-1})} & 46.47 \pm 1.62 & 30.05 \pm 2.85 & * \\ \textbf{Chlorophyll content (relative units)} & 0.49 \pm 0.10 & 0.07 \pm 0.02 & * \\ \textbf{Stomatal conductance (mol m^{-2}s^{-1})} & 142.9 \pm 2.71 & 4.79 \pm 2.58 & NS \\ \textbf{Stomatal conductance (mol m^{-2}s^{-1})} & 142.9 \pm 2.71 & 4.79 \pm 2.58 & NS \\ \textbf{Stomatal conductance (mol m^{-2}s^{-1})} & 142.9 \pm 2.71 & 4.79 \pm 2.58 & NS \\ \textbf{Stomatal conductance (mol m^{-2}s^{-1})} & 142.9 \pm 2.71 & 4.79 \pm 2.58 & NS \\ \textbf{Stomatal conductance (mol m^{-2}s^{-1})} & 142.9 \pm 2.71 & 4.79 \pm 2.58 & NS \\ \textbf{Stomatal conductance (mol m^{-2}s^{-1})} & 142.9 \pm 2.71 & 4.79 \pm 2.58 & NS \\ \textbf{Stomatal conductance (mol m^{-2}s^{-1})} & 142.9 \pm 2.71 & 4.79 \pm 2.58 & NS \\ \textbf{Stomatal conductance (mol m^{-2}s^{-1})} &$	Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹)	0.06 ± 0.01	0.03 ± 0.01	NS							
E. gomphocephalaTotal dry weight (g) 0.39 ± 0.06 0.35 ± 0.01 *Seedling height (cm) 16.6 ± 1.1 8.33 ± 0.9 **LAR (mm $^2 g^{-1}$) 122.9 ± 6.5 87.21 ± 7.3 **LWR (g g^{-1}) 0.66 ± 0.02 0.72 ± 0.01 NSSLA (mm $^2 g^{-1}$) 185.9 ± 9.0 121.0 ± 11.5 **Leaf number 13.3 ± 2.4 17.0 ± 1.34 **Root: shoot ratio (g g-1) 7.7 ± 1.5 7.29 ± 0.25 NSRGR (mg $g^{-1}g$ day ⁻¹) 36.8 32.9 NAChlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Stomatal conductance (mol m $^2s^{-1}$) 0.33 ± 0.09 0.09 ± 0.02 *Transpiration (mmol m $^2s^{-1}$) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 *Total dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 **Seedling height (cm) 10.8 ± 1.6 7.50 ± 0.9 NSLAR (mm $^2 g^{-1}$) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LWR (g g^{-1}) 0.73 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **SLA (mm $^2 g^{-1}$) 161.5 ± 5.8 142.1 ± 34.4 *Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg $g^{-1}g$ day ⁻¹) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.58 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg $g^{-1}g$ day	Transpiration (mmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹)	2.02 ± 0.38	1.11 ± 0.76	NS							
Total dry weight (g) 0.39 ± 0.06 0.35 ± 0.01 *Seedling height (cm) 16.6 ± 1.1 8.33 ± 0.9 **LAR (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 122.9 ± 6.5 87.21 ± 7.3 **LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.66 ± 0.02 0.72 ± 0.01 NSSLA (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 185.9 ± 9.0 121.0 ± 11.5 **Leaf number 13.3 ± 2.4 17.0 ± 1.34 **Root: shoot ratio (g g-1) 7.7 ± 1.5 7.29 ± 0.25 NSRGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 36.8 32.9 NAChlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 0.33 ± 0.09 0.09 ± 0.02 *Transpiration (mmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 0.35 ± 0.11 1.97 ± 0.59 NSE. marginataUWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 **Seedling height (cm) 10.8 ± 1.6 7.50 ± 0.9 NSLAR (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.73 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **SLA (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 161.5 ± 5.8 142.1 ± 34.4 *Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ² s ⁻¹) <td colspan="11">E. gomphocephala</td>	E. gomphocephala										
Seedling height (cm) 16.6 ± 1.1 8.33 ± 0.9 ***LAR (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 122.9 ± 6.5 87.21 ± 7.3 **LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.66 ± 0.02 0.72 ± 0.01 NSSLA (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 185.9 ± 9.0 121.0 ± 11.5 **Leaf number 13.3 ± 2.4 17.0 ± 1.34 **Root: shoot ratio (g g-1) 7.7 ± 1.5 7.29 ± 0.25 NSRGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 36.8 32.9 NAChlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 0.33 ± 0.09 0.09 ± 0.02 *Transpiration (mmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 6.95 ± 3.13 1.97 ± 0.59 NSLAR (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LAR (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.73 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **LAR (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 161.5 ± 5.8 142.1 ± 34.4 *Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 14.29 ± 2.71 4.79 ± 2.58 NS	Total dry weight (g)	0.39 ± 0.06	0.35 ± 0.01	*							
LAR (mm 2 g ⁻¹)122.9 ± 6.587.21 ± 7.3**LWR (g g ⁻¹)0.66 ± 0.020.72 ± 0.01NSSLA (mm 2 g ⁻¹)185.9 ± 9.0121.0 ± 11.5**Leaf number13.3± 2.417.0 ± 1.34**Root: shoot ratio (g g-1)7.7 ± 1.57.29 ± 0.25NSRGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹)36.832.9NAChlorophyll content (relative units)42.92 ± 1.6337.62 ± 1.43*Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹)0.33 ± 0.090.09 ± 0.02*Transpiration (mmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹)6.95 ± 3.131.97 ± 0.59NSE. marginataTotal dry weight (g)0.70 ± 0.050.32 ± 0.02**LAR (mm 2 g ⁻¹)118.8 ± 5.172.0 ± 1.8**LWR (g g ⁻¹)0.73 ± 0.010.58 ± 0.03****LWR (g g ⁻¹)161.5 ± 5.8142.1 ± 34.4*Leaf number8.0 ± 0.68.2 ± 0.6NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1)33.623.5NANARGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹)46.47 ± 1.6230.05 ± 2.85*Chlorophyll content (relative units)0.49 ± 0.100.07 ± 0.02*Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹)	Seedling height (cm)	16.6 ± 1.1	8.33 ± 0.9	**							
LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.66 ± 0.02 0.72 ± 0.01 NSSLA (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 185.9 ± 9.0 121.0 ± 11.5 **Leaf number 13.3 ± 2.4 17.0 ± 1.34 **Root: shoot ratio (g g-1) 7.7 ± 1.5 7.29 ± 0.25 NSRGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 36.8 32.9 NAChlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 0.33 ± 0.09 0.09 ± 0.02 *Transpiration (mmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 6.95 ± 3.13 1.97 ± 0.59 NSE. marginataTotal dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 **Seedling height (cm)LAR (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.73 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **Laf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 142.9 ± 2.71 4.79 ± 2.58 NS	LAR (mm $^{2}g^{-1}$)	122.9 ± 6.5	87.21 ± 7.3	**							
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	LWR (g g^{-1})	0.66 ± 0.02	0.72 ± 0.01	NS							
Leaf number 13.3 ± 2.4 17.0 ± 1.34 **Root: shoot ratio (g g-1) 7.7 ± 1.5 7.29 ± 0.25 NSRGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 36.8 32.9 NAChlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 0.33 ± 0.09 0.09 ± 0.02 *Transpiration (mmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 6.95 ± 3.13 1.97 ± 0.59 NSE. marginataTotal dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 **Seedling height (cm) 10.8 ± 1.6 7.50 ± 0.9 NSLAR (mm ² g ⁻¹) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.73 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **SLA (mm ² g ⁻¹) 161.5 ± 5.8 142.1 ± 34.4 *Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 14.29 ± 2.71 4.79 ± 2.58 NS	SLA (mm ² g ⁻¹)	185.9 ± 9.0	121.0 ± 11.5	**							
Root: shoot ratio (g g-1) 7.7 ± 1.5 7.29 ± 0.25 NSRGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹)36.832.9NAChlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 0.33 ± 0.09 0.09 ± 0.02 *Transpiration (mmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 6.95 ± 3.13 1.97 ± 0.59 NSE. marginataTotal dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 **Seedling height (cm) 10.8 ± 1.6 7.50 ± 0.9 NSLAR (mm ² g ⁻¹) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.73 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **SLA (mm ² g ⁻¹) 161.5 ± 5.8 142.1 ± 34.4 *Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 14.29 ± 2.71 4.79 ± 2.58 NS	Leaf number	13.3± 2.4	17.0 ± 1.34	**							
RGR (mg g '1 g day'')36.832.9NAChlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Stomatal conductance (mol m'2s') 0.33 ± 0.09 0.09 ± 0.02 *Transpiration (mmol m'2s') 6.95 ± 3.13 1.97 ± 0.59 NS E. marginata Total dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 **Seedling height (cm) 10.8 ± 1.6 7.50 ± 0.9 NSLAR (mm 2g') 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LWR (g g'1) 0.73 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **SLA (mm 2g') 161.5 ± 5.8 142.1 ± 34.4 *Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg g'1g day'1) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 *Stomatal conductance (mol m^2s'1) 14.29 ± 2.71 4.79 ± 2.58 NS	Root: shoot ratio (g g-1)	7.7 ± 1.5	7.29 ± 0.25	NS							
Chlorophyll content (relative units) 42.92 ± 1.63 37.62 ± 1.43 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 0.33 ± 0.09 0.09 ± 0.02 *Transpiration (mmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 6.95 ± 3.13 1.97 ± 0.59 NS E. marginata Total dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 **Seedling height (cm) 10.8 ± 1.6 7.50 ± 0.9 NSLAR (mm ⁻² g ⁻¹) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.73 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **SLA (mm ⁻² g ⁻¹) 161.5 ± 5.8 142.1 ± 34.4 *Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 14.29 ± 2.71 4.79 ± 2.58 NS	RGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹)	36.8	32.9	NA							
Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 0.33 ± 0.09 0.09 ± 0.02 *Transpiration (mmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 6.95 ± 3.13 1.97 ± 0.59 NS E. marginata Total dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 **Seedling height (cm) 10.8 ± 1.6 7.50 ± 0.9 NSLAR (mm ² g ⁻¹) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.73 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **SLA (mm ² g ⁻¹) 161.5 ± 5.8 142.1 ± 34.4 *Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSROC: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 14.29 ± 2.71 4.79 ± 2.58 NS	Chlorophyll content (relative units)	42.92 ± 1.63	37.62 ± 1.43	*							
Transpiration (mmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 6.95 ± 3.13 1.97 ± 0.59 NSE. marginataTotal dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 **Seedling height (cm) 10.8 ± 1.6 7.50 ± 0.9 NSLAR (mm $^2 g^{-1}$) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.73 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **SLA (mm $^2 g^{-1}$) 161.5 ± 5.8 142.1 ± 34.4 *Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 *Stamatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 14.29 ± 2.71 4.79 ± 2.58 NS	Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹)	0.33 ± 0.09	0.09 ± 0.02	*							
E. marginataTotal dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 **Seedling height (cm) 10.8 ± 1.6 7.50 ± 0.9 NSLAR (mm ² g ⁻¹) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.73 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **SLA (mm ² g ⁻¹) 161.5 ± 5.8 142.1 ± 34.4 *Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 14.29 ± 2.71 4.79 ± 2.58 NS	Transpiration (mmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹)	6.95 ±3.13	1.97 ± 0.59	NS							
Total dry weight (g) 0.70 ± 0.05 0.32 ± 0.02 **Seedling height (cm) 10.8 ± 1.6 7.50 ± 0.9 NSLAR (mm $^2 g^{-1}$) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LWR (g g^{-1}) 0.73 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **SLA (mm $^2 g^{-1}$) 161.5 ± 5.8 142.1 ± 34.4 *Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg $g^{-1}g day^{-1}$) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 *Stomatal conductance (mol $m^{-2}s^{-1}$) 14.29 ± 2.71 4.79 ± 2.58 NS		E. marginata									
Seedling height (cm) 10.8 ± 1.6 7.50 ± 0.9 NSLAR (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 118.8 ± 5.1 72.0 ± 1.8 **LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.73 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **SLA (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 161.5 ± 5.8 142.1 ± 34.4 *Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 *Stomatal conductance (mol m $^{-2}s^{-1}$) 14.29 ± 2.71 4.79 ± 2.58 NS	Total dry weight (g)	0.70 ± 0.05	0.32 ± 0.02	**							
LAR (mm 2 g ⁻¹)118.8 ± 5.172.0 ± 1.8**LWR (g g ⁻¹)0.73 ± 0.010.58 ± 0.03**SLA (mm 2 g ⁻¹)161.5 ± 5.8142.1 ± 34.4*Leaf number8.0 ± 0.68.2 ± 0.6NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1)33.623.5NARGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹)46.47 ± 1.6230.05 ± 2.85*Chlorophyll content (relative units)0.49 ± 0.100.07 ± 0.02*Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹)14 29 ± 2.714.79 ± 2.58NS	Seedling height (cm)	10.8 ± 1.6	7.50 ± 0.9	NS							
LWR (g g ⁻¹) 0.73 ± 0.01 0.58 ± 0.03 **SLA (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 161.5 ± 5.8 142.1 ± 34.4 *Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 14.29 ± 2.71 4.79 ± 2.58 NS	LAR (mm $\frac{2}{3}$ g ⁻¹)	118.8 ± 5.1	72.0 ± 1.8	**							
SLA (mm 2 g ⁻¹) 161.5 ± 5.8 142.1 ± 34.4 * Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NS Root: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NA RGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 * Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 * Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 14 29 ± 2.71 4 79 ± 2.58 NS	LWR $(g g^{-1})$	0.73 ± 0.01	0.58 ± 0.03	**							
Leaf number 8.0 ± 0.6 8.2 ± 0.6 NSRoot: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NARGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 *Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 *Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 14.29 ± 2.71 4.79 ± 2.58 NS	SLA (mm ² g ⁻¹)	161.5 ± 5.8	142.1 ± 34.4	*							
Root: shoot ratio (g g-1) 33.6 23.5 NA RGR (mg $g^{-1}g$ day ⁻¹) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 * Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 * Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 14 29 ± 2.71 4.79 ± 2.58 NS	Leaf number	8.0 ± 0.6	8.2 ± 0.6	NS							
RGR (mg $g^{-1}g$ day ⁻¹) 46.47 ± 1.62 30.05 ± 2.85 * Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 * Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 14 29 ± 2.71 4 79 ± 2.58 NS	Root: shoot ratio (g g-1)	33.6	23.5	NA							
Chlorophyll content (relative units) 0.49 ± 0.10 0.07 ± 0.02 * Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) 14 29 ± 2.71 4.79 ± 2.58 NS	RGR (mg g ⁻¹ g day ⁻¹)	46.47 ± 1.62	30.05 ± 2.85	*							
Stomatal conductance (mol $m^{-2}s^{-1}$) 14.29 + 2.71 4.79 + 2.58 NS	Chlorophyll content (relative units)	0.49 ± 0.10	0.07 ± 0.02	*							
	Stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹)	14.29 ± 2.71	4.79 ± 2.58	NS							

(*= 0.05, ** = 0.005, *** = 0.0005, NS= not significant). (NA= not available).

3.2 Eucalyptus gomphocephala

E. gomphocephala seedlings exhibited a negative effect in most of the growth parameters measured in relation to the occurrence of limestone in the soil, except for an increase in leaf number (Table 1). This is supported by a decrease in the relative growth rate. Limestone-effected seedlings had significantly less leaf chlorophyll content (P=0.02) and a decreased stomatal conductance (P=0.05), but not transpiration (P=0. 19) than well watered seedlings.

3.3 Eucalyptus marginata

Seedling total dry weight (P= 0.001), leaf area ratio (P= 0.001), leaf weight ratio (P= 0.004) and specific leaf area (P= 0.01), and root: shoot ratio (P= 0.001) were negatively affected after growing in limestone enriched soils for 82 days (Table 1) with an approximately a 30% decrease in relative growth rate. Limestone-affected seedlings a significant decrease in leaf chlorophyll content (P= 0.01) and stomata conductance (P= 0.05). There was also a decrease in transpiration rate (approximately 70%).

Farifr et al.; BJAST, 18(2): 1-8, 2016; Article no.BJAST.30185

3.4 Leaf Chemistry

Minerals such as boron, iron and manganese were the only mineral nutrients that showed an overall significant decrease in leaf content resulting from liming compared with the control treatment. The decrease boron mineral was greatest for *C. calophylla* seedlings (18% compared with control) whereas decline of iron varied from 56 to 67% and manganese's fall was varied from 31 to 43%. There was no significant increase in leaf calcium concentration in response to liming in either *C. calophylla* or *E. gomphocephala* (Table 2). Leaf magnesium concentrations decreased with increasing alkalinity in all species. There was a significant

effect (P <0.05) of pH on leaf Fe content in three tested *Eucalyptus* examined (Table 2). There was no effect of pH on leaf K concentration in all *Eucalyptus* species.

4. DISCUSSION

The most tolerant species, *E. gomphocephala* has demonstrated significant decline in adult crown health and numbers since the mid and is the most restricted in calcareous soils). However *E. gomphocephala* wasn't the most tolerant to an increase is soil alkalinity, although it displayed the least change in seedling dry weight and relative growth rate. This may due to the limestone mixture used for the experiments

Table 2. Leaf chemistry of three *Eucalyptus* seedlings after 82 days growing under wellwatered (control) and limestone-enhanced conditions. Data represents chemical analysis of ground dried material

Minerals	В	Са	Cu	Fe	K	Mg	Mn	Na	Р		
	mg/kg	%	mg/kg	mg/kg	%	%	mg/kg	%	%		
C. calophylla											
Control	27	0.86	4.8	84	1.36	0.23	120	1.06	0.11		
Limestone	5	0.87	1.8	50	1.8	0.12	42	0.57	0.08		
E. gomphocephala											
Control	33	0.92	22	89	1.48	0.2	220	0.83	0.19		
Limestone	11	1.4	30	50	1.52	0.18	95	0.79	0.18		
E. marginata											
Control	21	1.38	17	61	1.56	0.27	140	1.04	0.14		
Limestone	13	1.18	37	41	1.59	0.23	43	1.46	0.08		
P-value	*	NS	NS	*	NS	NS	*	NS	NS		

(*= 0.05, ** = 0.005 , *** = 0.0005 , NS= not significant.)



Fig. 1. Height comparison between the control and alkalinity treatments of the three *Eucalyptus* seedlings

wasn't reflective of the natural subsurface calcium carbonate concentration experienced by tuart plants in the field. It may also be because alkalinity tolerance is developed over longer periods than the experiments were conducted. Nevertheless the coastal distribution of *E. gomphocephala* suggests an ability of this species to tolerate soil alkalinity. The differences in species high pH tolerance in experiments has been reported in *Eucalyptus* consisted with [10].

The E. gomphocephala is restricted soils overlying limestone on Perth's Swan Coastal Plain, and according to total seedling dry weight data and calculated relative growth rates was the most tolerant to the limestone-enriched soils. All the growth and physiological data pointed out that the C. calophylla is the most tolerant, with no significant difference in leaf allocation or leaf water loss between the well-watered controls and the limestone-enriched treatments. The research showed that the E. Marginata was the least tolerant with a 14% due to reduction in stomatal conductance values. Liming (i.e. the presence of bicarbonate) increases soil pH and is well known to decrease the growth of Eucalypts in agree with studies of [14,22,26,27] and was represented by decreased relative growth rate, seedling height and reduced leaf production in the three target species of this study.

The leaf chemistry analyses for the high pH tolerant C. calophylla and the intolerant E. marginata gives an insight into the basis of discrepancy reaction to changing pH. Liming causes an increase in soil pH, and affects the ability for the seedlings to uptake some mineral nutrients. According to the leaf chemistry results an increase in Ca and decrease in Mg concentrations in the liming trial in the intolerant species, it is probable have been negative effect on some physiological functions and growth ratio on seedlings studied. It has previously been show that a significant increase in soil pH relates to a decrease total Fe content in plant tissues [28,29,30]. James et al. [9] found that lower Fe concentrations of newly produced leaves of Eucalyptus species growing in a growth media of pH 9 demonstrates that the availability and translocation of Fe within seedlings is reduced as a result of both the presence of bicarbonate and the reduced concentration of soil Fe, ultimately limiting seedling growth rate. Similar results were obtained in the present study. Manganese and Boron are both made unavailable to plants with an increase in soil pH, and Eucalyptus species

Farifr et al.; BJAST, 18(2): 1-8, 2016; Article no.BJAST.30185

are known to tolerate a range of soil acidityalkalinity [20].

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDA-TIONSFOR FUTURE WORK

The research has been established that the alkalinity case in the natural environment will ultimately has a negative influence on physiological functions of plantlet, on the other side this influence was varied between the species, applicable to the information that the scholar confirmed the highest tolerance level of Limestone Addition was of E. gomphocephala compared to the tolerance level of C. calophylla and E. marginata was the least tolerant. Novel consequences are obtainable within this manuscript and a great deal models can be proposed for simulation by this method. An additional focus on further environments conditions and flora could recognize the resolution for other environmental troubles.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

- Moore G. (Ed.) Soil guide. A handbook for understanding and managing agricultural soils. Agriculture Western Australia, Perth; 1998.
- 2. Szabolcs I. Salt-affected soils. CRC Press, Inc. Boca Raton, Florida; 1989.
- Jarvan M. Available plant nutrients in growth substrata depending on various lime materials used for neutralizing of bog peat. Agronomy Research. 2004;2:29-37
- 4. Jacobsen ST. Interaction between Plant Nutrients. IV. Interaction between Calcium and Phosphate. Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica Section. 1993b;B 43:6-10.
- Alloway BJ, Jackson AP. The behavior of heavy metals in sewage sludge-amended soils. The Science of the Total Environment. 1991;100:151-17.
- Thomas GW, Hargrove WL. The chemistry of soil acidity. In "Soil Acidityand Liming" (Adams F, ed.), 2nd ed. Agronomy Monograph. 1984;12.
- 7. Stace HCT, Hubble GD, Brewer R, Northcote KH, Sleeman JR, Mulcahy MJ,

Hallsworth EG. A handbook of Australian soils. Rellim Technical Publishers. Glenside, SA; 1968.

- Hall N, Johnston, RD, Chippendale GM. Forest trees of Australia. Australian Government Publishing Service; Canberra; 1975.
- James SA, Bell DT, Robson AD. Growth response of highly tolerant *Eucalyptus* species to alkaline pH, bicarbonate and low iron supply. Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture. 2002;42: 65-70.
- 10. Parsons RF, Speech R. Lime chlorosis and other factors affecting the distribution of *Eucalyptus* on coastal sand in southern Australia. Australia Journal of Botany. 1967; 15: 95-105.
- 11. Anderson CA, Ladiges PY. Acomparison of three populations of *Eucalyptus obliquaL*' herit growing on acid and calcareous soils in southern Victoria. Australia Journal of Botany. 1978;26:93-109.
- Florence RG. The biology of the Eucalyptus forest. In [The biology of Australia Plant. (Eds Pate JS, McComb AJ) University of WesternAustralia Press: Nedlands. 1981;147-80.
- Anderson CA, Ladiges PY. Lime-chlorosis and the effect of ®re on the growth of three seedling populations of *Eucalyptus oblique* L'Herit Australia Journal of Botan y. 1982; 30:47- 66.
- 14. Anderson CA. The effect of high pH and P on the development of limechlorosis in two seedling populations of *Eucalyptus oblique* L'Herit. Plant and Soi I. 1982;69:199-212.
- Symonds WL, Campbell LC, Clemens J. Response of ornamental *Eucalyptus* from acidic and alkaline habitats to potting medium pH. Scientia Horticulturae. 2001; 88:121-131.
- Richare CC, Farrell RC, David T, Bell DT. Morphological and physiological comparisons of conal lines of *Eucalyptus* camaldulensis. II. Responses to water logging, salinity and alkalinity. Australia Journal Plant Physiology.1996;23:509-518.
- Cristiano G, Camposeo S, Fracchiolla M, Vivaldi GA, De Lucia B, Cazzato E. Salinity Differentially affects growth and ecophysiology of two mastic tree (*Pistacia lentiscus* L.) Accessions. Forests, 2016; 7(8)156.

- Cristiano G, De Mastro G, Fracchiolla M, Lasorella C, Tufarelli V, De Lucia B, Cazzato E. Morphological characteristics of different mastic tree (*Pistacia lentiscus* L.) accessions in response to salt stress under nursery conditions. Journal of Plant Sciences. 2016;11:75-80.
- Kinzel H. Influence of limestone, silicates and soil pH on vegetation. In [Physiological plant ecology III. Responses to the chemical and biological environment] (Eds. Lange OL, Nobel PS, Osmond CB, Ziegler H.) Verlag, Berlin. 1983;201-244.
- 20. Van der Moezel PG, Pearce-Pinto GVN, Bell DT. Screening for salt and water logging tolerance in *Eucalyptus* and *Melaleuca* species. Forest Ecology and Management. 1991;40:27-37.
- Bell DT, Wilkins CF, van der Moezel PG, Ward SC. Alkalinity tolerance of woody species used in bauxite waste rehabilitation, Western Australia. Restoration Ecology. 1993;1:51-58.
- 22. Gupta GN, Prasad KG, Subramaniam V, Manivachakam P. Effect of alkalinity on survival and growth of tree seedlings. Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science. 1988;36:537-54
- 23. Ruthrof KX. Improving the success of limestone quarry revegetation. Cave and Karst Science. 1997;24:117-125.
- 24. Singh B. Rehabilitation of alkaline wasteland on the genetic alluvial plains of Uttar Pradesh, India, through a forestation. Land Degradation and Rehabilitation. 1989;1:305-310
- 25. Bell DT, Wilkins CF, van der Moezel PG, Ward SC. Alkalinity tolerance of woody species used in bauxite waste rehabilitation, Western Australia. Restoration Ecology. 1993; 1:51-58
- Ladiges PY. Differential susceptibility of two populations of *Eucalyptus viminalis* Labill to iron chlorosis. Plant and Soil. 1977;48:581-597
- Ladiges PY, Ashton DH. A comparison of some populations of *Eucalypts viminalis* Labill. Growing on calcareous and acid soil in Victoria, Australia. Journal of Ecology. 1977;2:161-178.
- White PF, Robson AD. Responses of lupins (*Lupinus angustifolius* L.) and peas (*Pisum sativum* L.) to Fe deficiency induced by low concentrations of Fe in

Farifr et al.; BJAST, 18(2): 1-8, 2016; Article no.BJAST.30185

solution or by addition of HCO3-. Plant and Soil. 1990;125: 39-47.

- 29. Tang C, Robson AD, Dilworth J. Inadequate iron supply and high bicarbonate impairs the symbiosis of peanuts (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) with different Brady rhizobiumstrains. Plant and Soil. 1991;138:159-168.
- Farrell RCC, Bell DT, Akilan K, Marahall JK. Morphological and physiological comparisons of clonal lines of *Eucalyptus camaldulensis*. II Responses to water logging/ salinity and alkalinity. Australian Journal of Plant Physiology. 1996;23:509-518.

© 2016 Farifr et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history: The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here: http://sciencedomain.org/review-history/17165