

## Original Research Article

# DEVELOPMENT OF ECO-FRIENDLY TECHNOLOGY FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF DRY LAND SALINE SOIL

---

### ABSTRACT

To develop an ecofriendly and economically viable biological technology to alleviate dry land salinity, an incubation experiment was carried out at Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore during 2021-22 in saline soils with varied EC values viz., 4, 5 and 6 dS m<sup>-1</sup> collected from Adivalli village of Coimbatore district, Tamil Nadu. The soils were treated with microbial cultures developed from both TNAU (*Bacillus subtilis*) and CSSRI (CSR-Grow Sure which consists of CSR-M-16 (*Bacillus licheniformis*), CSR-A-11 (*Lysinibacillus fusiformis*), CSR-A-16 (*Lysinibacillus sphaericus*)) at different rates namely 1, 2 and 3 L ha<sup>-1</sup> under two varied moisture regimes i.e., 75% and 100% field capacity. The results of the study showed that application of irrespective of microbial cultures (CSSRI / TNAU) and moisture regimes (75% /100% field capacity) were effective in reducing the soil EC and SAR. The CSR Grow Sure @ 3 L ha<sup>-1</sup> had reduced the salinity to the tune of 7 to 9 % and SAR from 26 to 27 % and it was on par with TNAU culture @ 3 L ha<sup>-1</sup> which also reduced the EC from 6 to 9 % and SAR between 25 and 26 % after 90 days of incubation. The results of both the moisture regimes namely 75% and 100% FC were comparable but little higher effect was pronounced at 100% FC.

*Keywords: TNAU Culture (Bacillus Subtilis), CSR-Grow-Sure Bio-Stimulant, Saline soils, 75% and 100% Field Capacities, Salinity Parameters.*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Soil salinity is one of the damaging environmental stresses, resulting in significant decrease in cultivated land area [1]. And in the world one of the adverse effect of soil sustainability is soil salinity particularly in the arid and semi-arid regions [2]. According to estimates, high salinity affects 20% of total farms and 33% of irrigated agricultural regions around the world [3]. By 2050, it is anticipated that around half of all arable land will be affected by salinity stress [4]. Natural salts accumulation over time is the fundamental cause

of the salinity of the soil. Break down of sodium, calcium, magnesium containing rocks, salt deposition by the wind and surface runoff water are the natural processes of the salinity and secondary salinity forming process is by anthropogenic activities. When the electrical conductivity of a soil exceeds  $4.00 \text{ d Sm}^{-1}$  (approximately  $40 \text{ mMNaCl}$ ), it is classified as saline soils [3]

For remediation of salt affected soils using microbes is cheap and ecofriendly approach [5]. Microbial population in soil are more plentiful on planet, and they are responsible for a variety of ecological and economic functions [6,7,8,9]. These microorganisms are versatile and adaptive to various challenging environmental conditions like salt stress and they are considered to be the first life forms have evolved [10].

Bacteria such as *Achromobacter*, *Arthrobacter*, *Bacillus*, *Chryseobacterium*, *Enterobacter*, *Ochrobactrum*, and *Pseudomonas* isolated from saline soil have been shown in numerous studies to enhance soil properties without any adverse effects to soil [11,12,13]. Among these, *Bacillus* spp. can sustain in adverse conditions [14]. The halophilic nature containing bacterial genus like *Bacillus* spp are having the ability to ameliorate the drought and salinity stress in the soil [15,16,17] by the production of 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylate (ACC) deaminase [18], increase of the nutrient availability in soil by converting insoluble compounds to soluble compounds [19] and make them available by producing organic acids, siderophore and by polysaccharide capsulation around minerals [20]. As well as these microbes conserve the nutrient reserves [21]. Further, usage of microbes for management of saline soils can reduce the fertilizers consumption [22, 23, 24] and increase the soil fertility by mobilization of nutrients in soil [25,26] and improves the properties of soil [27]. As there are many eco-friendly uses by using microorganisms to reclamation the saline soils. The present study is aimed to reclaim the saline soils by using microbial cultures which are having the halophilic in nature that is *Bacillus* spp.

## **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

### **2.1: Collection of soil samples:**

Soil samples of  $4.03$ ,  $5.01$  and  $6.03 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$  were collected from Adivalli village, Udumalpet taluk of Coimbatore district with latitude of  $10^{\circ}41' 44'' \text{ N}$ ,  $10^{\circ}41' 33'' \text{ N}$ ,  $10^{\circ}41' 29'' \text{ N}$  respectively and longitude of  $77^{\circ}09' 21'' \text{ E}$ ,  $77^{\circ}09' 18'' \text{ E}$ ,  $77^{\circ}09' 04'' \text{ E}$  respectively.

### **2.2: Collection of Microbial Cultures**

For the present investigation, microbial consortia CSR-GROW SURE Bio stimulant containing salt tolerant bacterial strains *viz.*, CSR-M-16 (*Bacillus licheniformis*), CSR-A-11

(*Lysinibacillus fusiformis*), CSR-A-16 (*Lysinibacillus sphaericus*) was obtained from Central Soil Salinity Research Institute, Karnal, Haryana and another salinity resistant culture *Bacillus subtilis* isolated by the Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore was also utilized.

### 2.3: Details of the incubation experiment

A known weight of air-dried soil (2 mm sieved 4.03, 5.01 and 6.03 dS m<sup>-1</sup>) was taken (250g) in incubation cups and imposed with different rates of microbial culture. The treatment structure comprised of graded levels of microbial culture at the rate of 1, 2 and 3 L ha<sup>-1</sup> of soil (w/w basis) and replicated thrice in a completely randomized design. Three sets were maintained for destructive sampling. The microbial population of (1.7 x 10<sup>7</sup> CFU per ml) in TNAU Culture and (1.0 x 10<sup>7</sup> CFU per ml) in CSR-Grow Sure Biostimulants were thoroughly mixed with the soil and required quantity of distilled water was added to achieve a final moisture content equivalent to field capacity (75 and 100 %). The soils were incubated at two moisture regimes (75 and 100% field capacity) for three months (90 days) period and based on the weight loss distilled water was added once in two days to the container to maintain a uniform moisture content throughout the incubation period. Destructive sampling was done at intervals viz., 30, 60 and 90 days after incubation and analyzed for important soil characteristics. Moisture factor was computed and applied to express the results on an oven dry basis.

**2.4: Table 1: Treatment details**

Treatments	Other Details
T <sub>1</sub> – Control	Soil EC: 4.03, 5.01, 6.02 dS m <sup>-1</sup>
T <sub>2</sub> - TNAU Culture @ 1 L ha <sup>-1</sup>	Moisture Regimes: 75 and 100% field capacity
T <sub>3</sub> - TNAU Culture @ 2 L ha <sup>-1</sup>	
T <sub>4</sub> - TNAU Culture @ 3 L ha <sup>-1</sup>	
T <sub>5</sub> - CSR- grow sure @ 1 L ha <sup>-1</sup>	Incubation Periods: 30, 60 and 90 Days
T <sub>6</sub> - CSR- grow sure @ 2 L ha <sup>-1</sup>	
T <sub>7</sub> - CSR- grow sure @ 3 L ha <sup>-1</sup>	Replication : 3

### 2.5: Soil analysis

The soils were analyzed for pH and EC by 1:2.5 Soil water extract [28]. Exchangeable cations like calcium, magnesium, sodium, potassium, and anions namely bicarbonates, chlorides by standard methods [29], sulfates by turbidimetric method [30] and computed for salinity parameters viz., sodium absorption ratio [29].

**Table 2: Initial experimental soil properties.**

Soils	Cations (meq kg <sup>-1</sup> )				Anions (meq kg <sup>-1</sup> )			SAR
	Ca <sup>2+</sup>	Mg <sup>2+</sup>	Na <sup>+</sup>	K <sup>+</sup>	HCO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	Cl <sup>-</sup>	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	
4.03 dS m <sup>-1</sup>	10.34	5.48	15.27	7.99	3.42	22.10	13.56	5.43
5.01 dS m <sup>-1</sup>	12.64	6.98	19.103	9.89	3.76	27.003	17.85	6.10
6.02 dS m <sup>-1</sup>	14.58	8.58	23.76	12.04	3.98	35.15	19.83	6.98

## 2.6: Statistical Analysis

The data obtained from the experiment were subjected to statistical analysis using AGRESS software version 7.01. Critical difference (CD) values were calculated for the P < 0.05 whenever "F" test was found significant [31].

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1 Effect of microbial culture on soil EC

The soil EC decreased from the initial value due to addition of microbial cultures with varied rates and the per cent of decrease was increased with increasing rates. Significantly lower mean EC values of 3.77 & 3.76; 4.77 & 4.76 and 5.69 & 5.68 dS m<sup>-1</sup> were recorded in CSR- Grow Sure @ 3 L ha<sup>-1</sup> and it was on par with TNAU culture @ 3 L ha<sup>-1</sup> with mean EC of 3.78 & 3.77; 4.78 & 4.77 and 5.70 & 5.69 dS m<sup>-1</sup> in 4.03, 5.01 and 6.02 dS m<sup>-1</sup> salinity soils under 75 and 100% FC moisture respectively. However, comparing the different moisture regimes, slightly higher values were registered under 100%. Due to cationic adsorption by exopolysacrides makes the EC less in soil treated with *Bacillus* spp [32]. Similar works also done earlier with the application of microbial culture resulted in reduction of EC [33, 34].

Comparing different periods of incubation, there was a significant decrease in the EC value (7 to 9%) with increasing periods of incubation up to three months. For example, the initial EC of soils of 4.03, 5.01 and 6.02 dS m<sup>-1</sup> due to addition of bio stimulants gradually decreased with advancement of incubation periods and it recorded the mean values of 3.90, 3.81 and 3.75; 4.89, 4.81 and 4.75; and 5.87, 5.73 and 5.64 dS m<sup>-1</sup> at 30, 60 and 90 DAI respectively at 75% FC moisture. However higher per cent 3 - 5 % of reduction was observed at 30 DAI and thereafter increased with decreasing rate (1 to 2 % ) up to 60 and 90 DAI. The data provide evidence for the priming effect of microbes. Similar trend with little higher reduction was observed in 100% FC moisture regime. The reasons are apparent. With the advancement of incubation period, the population of the microbes would have been increased and their by the amount of production of Indole Acetic Acid and Absasic Acid also increased might be the reason. Similar findings showed increasing period of incubation

increased the microbial population and their activity in soil, which caused significant reduction in soil EC [35].

The interaction effect between cultures with varied rates and incubation periods on soil EC was significant. Among the treatments, significantly higher reduction in EC was recorded in CSR- Grow sure @ 3 L ha<sup>-1</sup> at 90 DAI with the EC of 3.69 & 3.68; 4.69 & 4.68 and 5.56 & 5.55 in 4.03, 5.01 and 6.02 soils at 75 and 100% FC moisture level respectively and it was at par with TNAU culture @ 3 L ha<sup>-1</sup> at 90 DAI with the EC of 3.70 & 3.69; 4.70 & 4.69 and 5.57 & 5.56 in 4.03; 5.01 and 6.02 dSm<sup>-1</sup> soils at 75 and 100% FC moisture levels respectively. Comparing different soil moisture regimes, both 75 and 100% field capacity moistures produced same trend of reduction in EC however, slightly higher reduction was found at 100% field capacity moisture regime. Hence, it has become clear that application of either CSR- Grow Sure @ 3 L ha<sup>-1</sup> or TNAU culture @ 3 L ha<sup>-1</sup> that can act as a soil amendment and has the capacity to reduce soil salinity from 7 to 9 and 8 to 9% respectively. Further the effect of CSR- Grow Sure / TNAU cultures showed almost similar trend of results in all the EC soils viz., 4.03, 5.01 and 6.02 dS m<sup>-1</sup>.

#### **Effect of microbial culture on soil SAR**

The results of SAR of bio stimulant amended soils showed a significant reduction under all the doses of application. The treatment CSR- Grow Sure @ 3 L ha<sup>-1</sup> application had recorded the higher mean reduction (4.52 & 4.47; 5.02 & 5.13 and 5.84 & 5.80 in 4.03, 5.01 and 6.02 dS m<sup>-1</sup> salinity soils at 75 and 100% FC moisture respectively) and it was at par with application of TNAU culture @ 3 L ha<sup>-1</sup> (4.55 & 4.52; 5.07 & 5.02 and 5.87 & 5.84 in 4.03, 5.01 and 6.02 dS m<sup>-1</sup> salinity soils at 75 and 100% FC moisture respectively) while, the highest value was recorded by control viz. soil without microbial culture (5.46, 6.13 and 7.00 in 4.03, 5.01 and 6.02 dS m<sup>-1</sup> salinity soils respectively). The reduction in SAR could be due to greater absorption of Na<sup>+</sup> by the microbial culture amended soils since the CSR- Grow Sure and TNAU cultures used in the experiment had more affinity to Na<sup>+</sup>. The sodium content in soil was reduced due to uptake of sodium @ 1.272 meq / L by *Bacillus subtilis* and 1.122 meq / L by *Bacillus pumilis* at 1 M NaCl concentration [36]. The sodium which is taken by halotolerant bacteria is replaced by the potassium accumulation in cell through K<sup>+</sup>/Na<sup>+</sup> ion transporters, Na<sup>+</sup>/H<sup>+</sup> antiporters [37]. And also due to displacement of sodium by sulfuric acid produced by *Bacillus* spp [38].

Significant reduction in SAR values was found under different period of incubation and there was a progressive decrease under all periods of incubation up to 90 days except in the control treatment. However significantly higher reduction was found at 90 DAI. The effect of incubation period on SAR was statistically significant at both the moisture

regimes but slightly higher reduction was found at 100% field capacity moisture. In general, the added microbes might have increased its population with days of incubation and accounted for the decrease in Na<sup>+</sup> content in the saline soils. Many studies proved that application of microbes reduced the sodium content in the soil [10, 39].

Comparing different treatments, application of CSR- Grow Sure @ 3 L ha<sup>-1</sup> at 90 DAI reduced SAR significantly to the tune of 26 to 27 % with the mean SAR values of 4.19 & 4.15; 4.65 & 4.61 and 5.38 & 5.34 in 4.03, 5.01 and 6.02 dS m<sup>-1</sup> EC soils at 75 and 100% FC moisture respectively. And it was on par with application of TNAU culture @ 3 L ha<sup>-1</sup>. With mean values of 4.22 & 4.19; 4.69 & 4.65 and 5.41 & 5.38 in 4.03, 5.01 and 6.02 dS m<sup>-1</sup> EC soils at 75 and 100% FC moisture respectively. However a little higher reduction was noted under 100% FC condition. At all times, application of either Grow Sure or TNAU culture at the rate of 3 L ha<sup>-1</sup> recorded the lowest values followed by application of these culture @ 2 and 1 L ha<sup>-1</sup>. The highest value was recorded in control treatment. The reduction in Sodium absorption ratio was due to binding of cations by Bacillus spp[40].

**Table 3: Effect of microbial cultures on EC and SAR at different moistures of 4.03 dSm<sup>-1</sup> soil (Mean of three values)**

75 % Field Capacity at 4.03 dS m <sup>-1</sup>								
Treatments	EC				SAR			
	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI	Mean	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI	Mean
T <sub>1</sub>	4.03	4.04	4.04	<b>4.03</b>	5.43	5.47	5.47	<b>5.46</b>
T <sub>2</sub>	3.89(3.54)	3.79(6.14)	3.72(8.00)	<b>3.80</b>	5.00(8.23)	4.59(16.68)	4.29(23.49)	<b>4.63</b>
T <sub>3</sub>	3.88(3.79)	3.78(6.40)	3.71(8.27)	<b>3.79</b>	4.97(8.84)	4.55(17.68)	4.25(24.35)	<b>4.59</b>
T <sub>4</sub>	3.87(4.05)	3.77(6.67)	3.70(8.54)	<b>3.78</b>	4.93(9.53)	4.51(18.54)	4.22(24.98)	<b>4.55</b>
T <sub>5</sub>	3.88(3.79)	3.78(6.40)	3.71(8.27)	<b>3.79</b>	4.97(8.84)	4.55(17.68)	4.25(24.35)	<b>4.59</b>
T <sub>6</sub>	3.87(4.05)	3.77(6.67)	3.70(8.54)	<b>3.78</b>	4.93(9.53)	4.51(18.54)	4.22(24.98)	<b>4.55</b>
T <sub>7</sub>	3.86(4.31)	3.76(6.93)	3.69(8.81)	<b>3.77</b>	4.90(10.27)	4.46(19.54)	4.19(25.68)	<b>4.52</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>3.75</b>		<b>5.02</b>	<b>4.66</b>	<b>4.41</b>	
	<b>Cultures(C)</b>	<b>Duration(D)</b>	<b>C × D</b>		<b>Cultures(C)</b>	<b>Duration(D)</b>	<b>C × D</b>	
<b>SEd</b>	0.01	0.02	0.03		0.02	0.03	0.05	
<b>CD (0.05)</b>	0.02	0.03	0.05		0.04	0.05	0.09	
100 % Field Capacity 4.03 dS m <sup>-1</sup>								
Treatments	EC				SAR			
	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI	Mean	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI	Mean
T <sub>1</sub>	4.03	4.03	4.04	<b>4.04</b>	5.43	5.43	5.47	<b>5.44</b>
T <sub>2</sub>	3.88(3.79)	3.78 (6.40)	3.71(8.27)	<b>3.79</b>	4.97(8.84)	4.55(17.68)	4.25(24.35)	<b>4.59</b>
T <sub>3</sub>	3.87(4.05)	3.77(6.67)	3.70 (8.54)	<b>3.78</b>	4.93(9.53)	4.51(18.54)	4.22(24.98)	<b>4.55</b>
T <sub>4</sub>	3.86(4.31)	3.76(6.93)	3.69(8.81)	<b>3.77</b>	4.90(10.27)	4.46(19.54)	4.19(25.68)	<b>4.52</b>
T <sub>5</sub>	3.87(4.05)	3.77(6.67)	3.70 (8.54)	<b>3.78</b>	4.93(9.53)	4.51(18.54)	4.22(24.98)	<b>4.55</b>
T <sub>6</sub>	3.86(4.31)	3.76(6.93)	3.69(8.81)	<b>3.77</b>	4.90(10.27)	4.46(19.54)	4.19(25.68)	<b>4.52</b>
T <sub>7</sub>	3.85(4.57)	3.75(7.20)	3.68(9.08)	<b>3.76</b>	4.85(11.22)	4.42(20.52)	4.15(26.76)	<b>4.47</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>3.74</b>		<b>4.99</b>	<b>4.62</b>	<b>4.38</b>	
	<b>Cultures(C)</b>	<b>Duration(D)</b>	<b>C × D</b>		<b>Cultures(C)</b>	<b>Duration(D)</b>	<b>C × D</b>	
<b>SEd</b>	0.02	0.01	0.03		0.03	0.02	0.05	
<b>CD (0.05)</b>	0.03	0.02	0.05		0.07	0.04	0.11	

Table 4: Effect of microbial cultures on EC and SAR at different moistures regimes of 5.01 dS m<sup>-1</sup> soil

75 % Field Capacity at 5.01 dS m <sup>-1</sup>								
Treatments	EC				SAR			
	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI	Mean	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI	Mean
T <sub>1</sub>	5.00	5.02	5.02	<b>5.02</b>	6.10	6.14	6.14	<b>6.13</b>
T <sub>2</sub>	4.89 (2.42)	4.79(4.49)	4.72 (5.92)	<b>4.80</b>	5.57 (9.05)	5.13 (17.20)	4.78 (24.20)	<b>5.16</b>
T <sub>3</sub>	4.88 (2.63)	4.78 (4.70)	4.71 (6.17)	<b>4.79</b>	5.53 (9.86)	5.09 (18.12)	4.74 (25.13)	<b>5.12</b>
T <sub>4</sub>	4.87 (2.83)	4.77 (4.91)	4.70 (6.39)	<b>4.78</b>	5.48 (10.78)	5.04 (19.11)	4.69 (26.08)	<b>5.07</b>
T <sub>5</sub>	4.88 (2.63)	4.78 (4.70)	4.71 (6.17)	<b>4.79</b>	5.53 (9.86)	5.09 (18.12)	4.74 (25.13)	<b>5.12</b>
T <sub>6</sub>	4.87 (2.83)	4.77 (4.91)	4.70 (6.39)	<b>4.78</b>	5.48 (10.78)	5.04 (19.11)	4.69 (26.08)	<b>5.07</b>
T <sub>7</sub>	4.86 (3.04)	4.76 (5.12)	4.69 (6.60)	<b>4.77</b>	5.43 (11.61)	4.98 (20.12)	4.65 (26.32)	<b>5.02</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>4.89</b>	<b>4.81</b>	<b>4.75</b>		<b>5.59</b>	<b>5.22</b>	<b>4.92</b>	
	<b>Cultures(C)</b>	<b>Duration(D)</b>	<b>C × D</b>		<b>Cultures(C)</b>	<b>Duration(D)</b>	<b>C × D</b>	
<b>SEd</b>	0.02	0.01	0.03		0.04	0.03	0.07	
<b>CD (0.05)</b>	0.03	0.03	0.06		0.07	0.05	0.12	
100 % Field Capacity 5.01 dS m <sup>-1</sup>								
Treatments	EC				SAR			
	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI	Mean	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI	Mean
T <sub>1</sub>	5.01	5.01	5.02	<b>5.02</b>	6.10	6.10	6.14	<b>6.13</b>
T <sub>2</sub>	4.88 (2.63)	4.78 (4.70)	4.71 (6.17)	<b>4.79</b>	5.53 (9.86)	5.09 (18.12)	4.74 (25.13)	<b>5.12</b>
T <sub>3</sub>	4.87 (2.83)	4.77 (4.91)	4.70 (6.39)	<b>4.78</b>	5.48 (10.78)	5.04 (19.11)	4.69 (26.08)	<b>5.07</b>
T <sub>4</sub>	4.86 (3.04)	4.76 (5.12)	4.69 (6.60)	<b>4.77</b>	5.43 (11.61)	4.98 (20.12)	4.65 (26.32)	<b>5.02</b>
T <sub>5</sub>	4.87 (2.83)	4.77 (4.91)	4.7 (6.39)	<b>4.78</b>	5.48 (10.78)	5.04 (19.11)	4.69 (26.08)	<b>5.07</b>
T <sub>6</sub>	4.86 (3.04)	4.76 (5.12)	4.69 (6.60)	<b>4.77</b>	5.43 (11.61)	4.98 (20.12)	4.65 (26.32)	<b>5.02</b>
T <sub>7</sub>	4.85 (3.25)	4.75 (5.33)	4.68 (6.81)	<b>4.76</b>	5.39 (12.33)	4.94 (21.08)	4.61 (27.42)	<b>4.98</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>4.89</b>	<b>4.80</b>	<b>4.74</b>		<b>5.55</b>	<b>5.24</b>	<b>4.88</b>	
	<b>Cultures(C)</b>	<b>Duration(D)</b>	<b>C × D</b>		<b>Cultures(C)</b>	<b>Duration(D)</b>	<b>C × D</b>	
<b>SEd</b>	0.02	0.01	0.03		0.04	0.02	0.06	
<b>CD (0.05)</b>	0.03	0.02	0.5		0.08	0.04	0.12	

Table 5: Effect of microbial cultures on EC and SAR at different moistures of 6.02 dS m<sup>-1</sup> soil

75 % Field Capacity at 6.02 dS m <sup>-1</sup>								
Treatments	EC				SAR			
	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI	Mean	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI	Mean
T <sub>1</sub>	6.02	6.03	6.03	<b>6.03</b>	6.98	7.01	7.01	<b>7.00</b>
T <sub>2</sub>	5.86(2.69)	5.70(5.46)	5.59(7.40)	<b>5.72</b>	6.46(7.82)	5.89(16.96)	5.48(24.09)	<b>5.94</b>
T <sub>3</sub>	5.85(2.87)	5.69(5.64)	5.58(7.58)	<b>5.71</b>	6.42(8.38)	5.85(17.67)	5.44(24.75)	<b>5.90</b>
T <sub>4</sub>	5.84(3.04)	5.68(5.81)	5.57(7.77)	<b>5.70</b>	6.39(8.81)	5.81(18.26)	5.41(25.37)	<b>5.87</b>
T <sub>5</sub>	5.85(2.87)	5.69(5.64)	5.58(7.58)	<b>5.71</b>	6.42(8.38)	5.85(17.67)	5.44(24.75)	<b>5.90</b>
T <sub>6</sub>	5.84(3.04)	5.68(5.81)	5.57(7.77)	<b>5.70</b>	6.39(8.81)	5.81(18.26)	5.41(25.37)	<b>5.87</b>
T <sub>7</sub>	5.83(3.21)	5.67(5.99)	5.56(7.95)	<b>5.69</b>	6.36(9.29)	5.77(18.99)	5.38(25.97)	<b>5.84</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>5.87</b>	<b>5.73</b>	<b>5.64</b>		<b>6.49</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>5.65</b>	
	<b>Cultures(C)</b>	<b>Duration(D)</b>	<b>C x D</b>		<b>Cultures(C)</b>	<b>Duration(D)</b>	<b>C x D</b>	
<b>SEd</b>	0.01	0.02	0.03		0.03	0.03	0.06	
<b>CD (0.05)</b>	0.02	0.03	0.05		0.05	0.06	0.11	
100 % Field Capacity 6.02 dS m <sup>-1</sup>								
Treatments	EC				SAR			
	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI	Mean	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI	Mean
T <sub>1</sub>	6.02	6.02	6.03	<b>6.02</b>	6.98	6.98	7.01	<b>6.99</b>
T <sub>2</sub>	5.85(2.87)	5.69(5.64)	5.58(7.58)	<b>5.71</b>	6.42(8.38)	5.85(17.67)	5.44(24.75)	<b>5.90</b>
T <sub>3</sub>	5.84(3.04)	5.68(5.81)	5.57(7.77)	<b>5.70</b>	6.39(8.81)	5.81(18.26)	5.41(25.37)	<b>5.87</b>
T <sub>4</sub>	5.83(3.21)	5.67(5.99)	5.56(7.95)	<b>5.69</b>	6.36(9.29)	5.77(18.99)	5.38(25.97)	<b>5.84</b>
T <sub>5</sub>	5.84(3.04)	5.68(5.81)	5.57(7.77)	<b>5.70</b>	6.39(8.81)	5.81(18.26)	5.41(25.37)	<b>5.87</b>
T <sub>6</sub>	5.83(3.21)	5.67(5.99)	5.56(7.95)	<b>5.69</b>	6.36(9.29)	5.77(18.99)	5.38(25.97)	<b>5.84</b>
T <sub>7</sub>	5.82(3.38)	5.66(6.16)	5.55(8.12)	<b>5.68</b>	6.32(10.04)	5.74(19.51)	5.34(26.75)	<b>5.80</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>5.86</b>	<b>5.72</b>	<b>5.63</b>		<b>6.46</b>	<b>5.96</b>	<b>5.62</b>	
	<b>Cultures(C)</b>	<b>Duration(D)</b>	<b>C x D</b>		<b>Cultures(C)</b>	<b>Duration(D)</b>	<b>C x D</b>	
<b>SEd</b>	0.01	0.03	0.04		0.03	0.03	0.06	
<b>CD (0.05)</b>	0.03	0.06	0.09		0.06	0.07	0.13	

UNDER PEER REVIEW




Figure 1: Effect of Microbial cultures on EC, SAR with different incubation periods at 75% Field Capacity of 4.03 dS m<sup>-1</sup> soil.




Figure 2: Effect of Microbial cultures on EC, SAR with different incubation periods at 100% Field Capacity of 4.03 dS m<sup>-1</sup> soil.




Figure 3: Effect of Microbial cultures on EC, SAR with different incubation periods at 75% Field Capacity of 5.01 dS m<sup>-1</sup> soil.




Figure 4: Effect of Microbial cultures on EC, SAR with different incubation periods at 100% Field Capacity of 5.01 dS m<sup>-1</sup> soil.




Figure 5: Effect of Microbial cultures on EC, SAR with different incubation periods at 75% Field Capacity of 6.02 dS m<sup>-1</sup>.




Figure 6: Effect of Microbial cultures on EC, SAR with different incubation periods at 100% Field Capacity of 6.02 dS m<sup>-1</sup> soil.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

As the chemical amendments are making damage to soils it is better to use microorganisms in reclamation of saline soils. Hence, an eco-friendly technology was developed by using TNAU Microbial Culture (*Bacillus Subtilis*) and CSSRI – Bio stimulant namely CSR-GROW-SURE which is consisting of highly efficient salt tolerant bacterial strains CSR-M-16 (*Bacillus licheniformis*), CSR-A-11 (*Lysinibacillus fusiformis*), CSR-A-16 (*Lysinibacillus sphaericus*). Both the cultures CSR Grow Sure Biostimulant and TNAU culture effective in reducing the saline soil

EC and SAR. The cultures showed almost equal efficiency in all the three 4,5 and 6 dS m<sup>-1</sup> saline soils. The use of Microbial consortia for saline soil management is good for improvement of saline soil properties and reduction in use of chemical amendments by the farmers which will save the cost of production.

## REFERENCES

1. Shahbaz, M., and M. Ashraf. "Improving salinity tolerance in cereals." *Critical reviews in plant sciences* 32, no. 4 (2013): 237-249.
2. Singh, Nandita, and Govind Joseph Chakrapani. "ANN modelling of sediment concentration in the dynamic glacial environment of Gangotri in Himalaya." *Environmental monitoring and assessment* 187, no. 8 (2015): 1-14.
3. Shrivastava, Pooja, and Rajesh Kumar. "Soil salinity: A serious environmental issue and plant growth promoting bacteria as one of the tools for its alleviation." *Saudi journal of biological sciences* 22, no. 2 (2015): 123-131.
4. Jamil, Muhammad, Samina Bashir, Soma Anwar, Sara Bibi, Asia Bangash, Farman Ullah, and EuiShikRha. "Effect of salinity on physiological and biochemical characteristics of different varieties of rice." *Pak. J. Bot* 44, no. 1 (2012): 7-13.
5. Saharan, B. S., and VermaShuchita. "Evaluation of rhizospheric bacteria from *Ocimum* sp. as potential PGPR." *Journal of Microbial and Biochemical Technology* 7, no. 2 (2015): 88-95.
6. Strickland, Michael S., Ernest Osburn, Christian Lauber, Noah Fierer, and Mark A. Bradford. "Litter quality is in the eye of the beholder: initial decomposition rates as a function of inoculum characteristics." *Functional Ecology* 23, no. 3 (2009): 627-636.
7. Bodelier, Paul LE. "Toward understanding, managing, and protecting microbial ecosystems." *Frontiers in microbiology* 2 (2011): 80.
8. Philippot, Laurent, AyméSpor, Catherine Hénault, David Bru, Florian Bizouard, Christopher M. Jones, AmadouSarr, and Pierre-Alain Maron. "Loss in microbial diversity affects nitrogen cycling in soil." *The ISME journal* 7, no. 8 (2013): 1609-1619.
9. Bardgett, Richard D., and Wim H. Van Der Putten. "Belowground biodiversity and ecosystem functioning." *Nature* 515, no. 7528 (2014): 505-511.
10. Arora, Sanjay, Y. P. Singh, A. K. Singh, V. K. Mishra, and D. K. Sharma. "Effect of organic and inorganic amendments in combination with halophilic bacteria on productivity of rice-wheat in sodic soils." *BhartiyaKrishiAnusandhanPatrika* 31, no. 3 (2016): 165-170.
11. Bhise, Komal K., Prashant K. Bhagwat, and Padma BabulalDandge. "Synergistic effect of *Chryseobacteriumgleum* sp. SUK with ACC deaminase activity in alleviation of salt stress and plant growth promotion in *Triticumaestivum* L." *3 Biotech* 7, no. 2 (2017): 1-13.
12. Sharma, S., J. Kulkarni, and B. Jha. "Halotolerantrhizobacteria promote growth and enhance salinity tolerance in peanut. *Front Microbiol* 2016: 1600." (2016).
13. Sarkar, Anumita, Pallab Kumar Ghosh, KrishnenduPramanik, SoumikMitra, Tithi Soren, Sanjeev Pandey, Monohar Hossain Mondal, and TusharKantiMaiti. "A halotolerantEnterobacter sp. displaying ACC deaminase activity promotes rice seedling growth under salt stress." *Research in microbiology* 169, no. 1 (2018): 20-32.
14. Abd\_Allah, ElsayedFathi, Abdulaziz A. Alqarawi, Abeer Hashem, RamalingamRadhakrishnan, Asma A. Al-Huqail, FatmaOlyanNaser Al-Otibi, Jahangir Ahmad Malik, Raedah Ibrahim Alharbi, and DilfuzaEgamberdieva. "Endophytic bacterium *Bacillus subtilis* (BERA 71) improves salt tolerance in chickpea plants by regulating the plant defense mechanisms." *Journal of Plant Interactions* 13, no. 1 (2018): 37-44.

15. Sanjay, Arora, J. VanzaMeghna, Mehta Riddhi, Bhuvachirag, and N. Patel Purvi. "Halophilic microbes for bio-remediation of salt affected soils." *African Journal of Microbiology Research* 8, no. 33 (2014): 3070-3078.
16. Yadav, Ajar Nath, Shashwati Ghosh Sachan, PriyankaVerma, and Anil Kumar Saxena. "Bioprospecting of plant growth promoting psychrotrophic Bacilli from the cold desert of north western Indian Himalayas." (2016).
17. Ahmad, Maqshoof, Iqra Ahmad, Thomas H. Hilger, Sajid M. Nadeem, Muhammad F. Akhtar, Moazzam Jamil, Azhar Hussain, and Zahir A. Zahir. "Preliminary study on phosphate solubilizing *Bacillus subtilis* strain Q3 and *Paenibacillus* sp. strain Q6 for improving cotton growth under alkaline conditions." *PeerJ* 6 (2018): e5122.
18. Dey, R. K. K. P., K. K. Pal, D. M. Bhatt, and S. M. Chauhan. "Growth promotion and yield enhancement of peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) by application of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria." *Microbiological research* 159, no. 4 (2004): 371-394.
19. Egamberdieva, Dilfuza, Stephan Wirth, Sonoko Dorothea Bellingrath-Kimura, Jitendra Mishra, and Naveen K. Arora. "Salt-tolerant plant growth promoting rhizobacteria for enhancing crop productivity of saline soils." *Frontiers in microbiology* 10 (2019): 2791.
20. Shanware, Arti S., Surekha A. Kalkar, and Minal M. Trivedi. "Potassium solubilisers: occurrence, mechanism and their role as competent biofertilizers." *Int J Curr Microbiol App Sci* 3, no. 9 (2014): 622-629.
21. Kaiser, Christina, Matt R. Kilburn, Peta L. Clode, Lucia Fuchslueger, Marianne Koranda, John B. Cliff, Zakaria M. Solaiman, and Daniel V. Murphy. "Exploring the transfer of recent plant photosynthates to soil microbes: mycorrhizal pathway vs direct root exudation." *New Phytologist* 205, no. 4 (2015): 1537-1551.
22. Damodaran, T., R. B. Rai, V. K. Mishra, D. K. Sharma, R. A. Ram, S. Rai, and H. Kumar. "Integrated farming System and livelihood security-An approach." *CSSRI, Karnal* (2011): 1-108.
23. Saharan, B., and VibhaNehra. "Assessment of plant growth promoting attributes of cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*) rhizosphere isolates and their potential as bio-inoculants." *J Environ Res Develop* 5 (2011): 575-583.
24. Glick, Bernard R. "Plant growth-promoting bacteria: mechanisms and applications." *Scientifica* 2012 (2012).
25. Damodaran, T., V. K. Mishra, D. K. Sharma, S. K. Jha, C. L. Verma, R. B. Rai, R. Kannan, A. K. Nayak, and K. Dhama. "Management of sub-soil sodicity for sustainable banana production in sodic soil-an approach." *Int J Curr Res* 5 (2013): 1930-1934.
26. Yadav, Ajar Nath, and Anil Kumar Saxena. "Biodiversity and biotechnological applications of halophilic microbes for sustainable agriculture." *Journal of Applied Biology and Biotechnology* 6, no. 1 (2018): 4-5.
27. Damodaran, T., R. B. Rai, B. K. Pandey, D. K. Sharma, V. K. Misra, Prabhat Kumar, S. K. Jha, Himanshu Dixit, and R. Kannan. "Utilization of native microbial isolates for sodic soil as commercial bio-regulators to increase yield and vase-life of gladiolus." *Indian Journal of Horticulture* 71, no. 2 (2014): 242-246.
28. Jackson, M. "Soil chemical analysis, advanced course: publ. by the author, Dept." Soil Science, Univ. Wisc., Madison, Wisconsin; 1973.
29. Richards, L. A. "Diagnosis and Improvement of Saline and Alkaline Soils. Agricultural Handbook 60, USDA." (1968): 71-82.
30. Tandon, HariLal Singh. *Methods of analysis of soils, plants, waters, fertilisers & organic manures*. Fertiliser Development and Consultation Organisation, 2005.
31. Gomez KA, Gomez AA. *Statistical procedures for agricultural research*. John Wiley & sons; 1984.
32. Zhao, Yanyang, Huaxiao Yan, Jingxuan Zhou, Maurice E. Tucker, Mei Han, Hui Zhao, Guangzhou Mao, Yifan Zhao, and Zuozhen Han. "Bio-precipitation of calcium and magnesium ions through extracellular and intracellular process induced by *Bacillus licheniformis* SRB2." *Minerals* 9, no. 9 (2019): 526.
33. Anees, Muhammad, Arshad Qayyum, Muhammad Jamil, Fayyaz Ur Rehman, Muhammad Abid, Muhammad Saqib Malik, Muhammad Yunas, and KalimUllah. "Role of halotolerant and chitinolytic bacteria in phytoremediation of saline soil using spinach plant." *International Journal of Phytoremediation* 22, no. 6 (2020): 653-661.

34. Hassan, T. U., AsghariBano, IrumNaz, and Manzoor Hussain. "Bacillus cereus: a competent plant growth promoting bacterium of saline sodic field." *Pak. J. Bot* 50, no. 3 (2018): 1029-1037.
35. Damodaran, T., V. K. Mishra, S. K. Jha, Umesh Pankaj, Garima Gupta, and Ram Gopal. "Identification of rhizosphere bacterial diversity with promising salt tolerance, PGP traits and their exploitation for seed germination enhancement in sodic soil." *Agricultural research* 8, no. 1 (2019): 36-43.
36. Damodaran, T., D. K. Sharma, V. K. Mishra, S. K. Jha, R. Kannan, V. Sah, and R. B. Rai. "Isolation of Salt Tolerant EndophyticandRhizospheric Bacteria by Natural Selection and screening for promising plant growth promoting Rhizobacteria [PGPR] and growth vigour in Tomato under sodic soil." (2013).
37. Etesami, Hassan, SomayehEmami, and Hossein Ali Alikhani. "Potassium solubilizing bacteria (KSB):: Mechanisms, promotion of plant growth, and future prospects A review." *Journal of soil science and plant nutrition* 17, no. 4 (2017): 897-911.
38. Stamford, N. P., M. R. Ribeiro, K. P. V. Cunha, A. D. S. Freitas, C. E. R. S. Santos, and S. H. L. Dias. "Effectiveness of sulfur with Acidithiobacillus and gypsum in chemical attributes of a Brazilian sodic soil." *World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology* 23, no. 10 (2007): 1433-1439.
39. Sarathambal, C., and K. Ilamurugu. "Saline tolerant plant growth promoting diazotrophs from rhizosphere of bermuda grass and their effect on rice." *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 45, no. 2 (2013): 80-85.
40. Thomas, Kieth J., and Charles V. Rice. "Revised model of calcium and magnesium binding to the bacterial cell wall." *Biometals* 27, no. 6 (2014): 1361-1370.