## **ORIGINAL PAPER**



# Salicylic acid affects mycorrhizal features, antioxidant enzyme activities and seed yield of linseed under water-deficit stress in open-field conditions

Aida Ansari<sup>1,5</sup> · Jamshid Razmjoo<sup>2</sup> · Mehdi Zarei<sup>3</sup> · Hassan Karimmojeni<sup>4</sup>

Received: 7 May 2020 / Accepted: 12 December 2020 / Published online: 5 January 2021 © Akadémiai Kiadó Zrt. 2021

## Abstract

The research aims were to study salicylic acid (SA) effects on mycorrhiza [hyphal width (HW), vesicle diameter (VD) and mycorrhizal colonization (MC)] and interaction between them on greenness index (GI), drought tolerance index (DTI), antioxidant enzymes activities, and seed yield of linseed under drought. A factorial experiment was conducted in an open-field place with mycorrhiza [non-inoculation, *Funneliformis mosseae* (FM), and *Rhizoglomus intraradices* (RI)], SA (250 µM and non-SA), and irrigation levels [100%, 70%, and 40% field capacity (FC)] as treatments. Severe drought increased VD, MC, superoxide dismutase (SOD), ascorbate peroxidase (APX), and peroxidase activities while decreased GI, DTI, and yield. The RI-linseed had higher MC, GI, SOD, and glutathione reductase (GR) activities, but FM-linseed had greater VD and yield under drought. Inoculated linseed with both mycorrhiza showed a reduction in DTI and yield under SA than non-SA. In RI-linseed, SA increased GI, MC, HW, VD, catalase and GR, but decreased in FM-plants. Mycorrhiza (particularly RI) alleviated drought (40% FC)-caused negative effects on linseed via the improvement of SOD, APX, and GI. Regardless of other treatments, SA had negative effects on HW and VD, but SA effects varied depending on mycorrhizal species so that SA increased HW, VD, and MC in RI. Due to the positive correlation between MC and HW, SA reduces FM colonization by reducing the HW of FM. Totally, SA along with RI species can mitigate the harmful effects of drought and improve tolerance via increasing MC, HW, VD, catalase, peroxidase, and GR activities.

Keywords Catalase · Funneliformis mosseae · Greenness index · Hyphal width · Peroxidase

## Abbreviations

| AM    | Arbuscular mycorrhiza |
|-------|-----------------------|
| 4 DXZ | A 1 / 1               |

APX Ascorbate peroxidase

Mehdi Zarei mehdizarei@shirazu.ac.ir

- <sup>1</sup> Department of Agronomy and Plant Breeding, College of Agriculture, Isfahan University of Technology, 84156-83111 Isfahan, Iran
- <sup>2</sup> Department of Agronomy and Plant Breeding, College of Agriculture, Isfahan University of Technology, 84156-83111 Isfahan, Iran
- <sup>3</sup> Department of Soil Science, School of Agriculture, Shiraz University, 71441-65186 Shiraz, Iran
- <sup>4</sup> Department of Agronomy and Plant Breeding, College of Agriculture, Isfahan University of Technology, 84156-83111 Isfahan, Iran
- <sup>5</sup> Department of Plant Production and Genetics, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Zanjan, 45371-38791 Zanjan, Iran
- CAT Catalase DTI Drought tolerance index FC Field capacity FM Funneliformis mosseae GI Greenness index GR Glutathione reductase HW Hyphal width MC Mycorrhizal colonization POX Peroxidase Rhizoglomus intraradices RI SA Salicylic acid SOD Superoxide dismutase Vesicle diameter VD

# Introduction

Linseed or flaxseed (*Linum usitatissimum* L.) is one of the most important dual-purpose crops for the extraction of oil and fibers (Fila et al. 2018; Shivaraj et al. 2019).

Linseed is a susceptible plant to water stress at seedling, flowering, and early seed development stages due at least partially to its shallow root system (Aghdam et al. 2016; Ansari et al. 2016). Therefore, the alleviation of drought tolerance is vital in linseed production. Many researches are being carried out, to develop strategies to cope with drought (Aghdam et al. 2016; Ansari et al. 2016; He et al. 2017; Kamarudin et al. 2018). In drought-affected soils, plants are highly dependent on arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) fungi, one of the beneficial microorganisms, belonging to the Glomeromycota phylum because of their ability to increase the metabolic activity of plants for stress tolerance (Marulanda et al. 2007; Hashem et al. 2018). These fungi form symbioses with the roots of over 80% of land plant species (Berruti et al. 2016). Mycorrhizal fungi are beneficial for agricultural, endangered, and medicinal plant species and have key roles in increasing water uptake, photosynthetic performance, plant growth, yield improvement, disease control, soil fertility, and nutrient management, as well as enhancing plant tolerance to environmental stresses like drought, heavy metals, and high temperature (Armada et al. 2015; Berruti et al. 2016; Hashem et al. 2018).

Salicylic acid (SA) is a universal metabolite which has various physiological functions including regulation of plant growth and development (Hara et al. 2012; Dempsey and Klessig 2017), increasing chlorophyll content (La et al. 2019), the increment of antioxidant activities and induction of plant resistance to biotic and abiotic stresses such as drought, salt, and heavy metals (Shi et al. 2009; Hara et al. 2012; La et al. 2019). Quiroga et al. (2018) represented that under drought stress, non-AM plants enhanced the percentage of apoplastic water flow by exogenous application of SA, while AM plants reduced it due to the differential effect of SA on root hydraulic conductivity in AM plants under drought. Rui-hong et al. (2009) and Li et al. (2010) concluded that AM and SA application could synergically induce salt-tolerance of strawberry and NO<sub>2</sub>-tolerance of Avena nuda, respectively. Zhang et al. (2019) reported higher endogenous SA concentrations at the root of AM plant and also indicated that mycorrhizal networks transfer the SA signal from disease-infected to neighboring healthy seedlings, to activate defense system and supplying protection to neighboring seedlings against citrus disease. Medina et al. (2003) and Stacey et al. (2006) observed that SA concentrations are inversely correlated with the degree of root colonization and rhizobial infection, respectively. Despite many studies about the effects of AM and SA on different crops separately, there are a few studies about the SA effect on AM organs, and interaction between AM and SA on seed yield and antioxidant enzyme activities (Rui-hong et al. 2009; Li et al. 2010; Ansari et al. 2016; Garg and Bharti 2018). In our previous study, interaction between SA and AM fungi on photosynthetic pigments, relative water content, proline content, leaf area, phosphorus content, mycorrhizal colonization percentage, and mycorrhizal dependency was studied in a growth chamber (Ansari et al. 2016) and in the present study, we thought that exogenous SA increases the diameter of the mycorrhizal organs and thereby affects the AM colonization in open-field conditions, and also hypothesized that SA with AM synergistically enhances drought tolerance of linseed by improving antioxidant defense system. Therefore, the aims of the present research were to study the SA effect on the vesicle diameter and hyphal width, and the interaction between SA and AM on antioxidant enzyme activities and seed yield of linseed plant under different water levels in open-field conditions.

## **Materials and methods**

### **Experimental design and treatments**

A factorial arrangement on a randomized complete block design with six replications (three replications for seed yield and three replications for other traits) was conducted in an open-field place of College of Agriculture, Isfahan University of Technology, Iran. Treatments consisted of three irrigation regimes [100%, 70%, and 40% Field capacity (FC) moisture], mycorrhiza [non-inoculated and inoculated with two AM species: *Funneliformis mosseae* [FM] and *Rhizoglomus intraradices* [RI] syn. *Rhizophagus intraradices* (Baltruschat et al. 2019)] and salicylic acid (SA) treatment (seeds treated with 250 µM SA for 8 h and non-treated seeds).

The linseed plants were grown in an open-field place, having natural conditions: average sunshine duration 12 h, the average maximum temperature of 30.9 °C, the average minimum temperature of 16.1 °C, the average maximum relative humidity of 38.5%, the average minimum relative humidity of 10.5% with a light intensity of 2000 µmol photons  $m^{-2} s^{-1}$  at 1 p.m. (1600–2000 µmol photons  $m^{-2} s^{-1}$ at 11 a.m. to 1 p.m.) in the 51°31'41" E, 32°43'00" N and 1550.4 m altitude. Soil physical and chemical properties were determined (Page et al. 1982). The soil was silty clay loam with FC of 37%, pH of 7.9, available P of 4.6 mg/ kg, total N of 0.09%, available K of 359 mg/kg, diethylenetriaminepentaacetic acid-Fe of 3.3 mg/kg, diethylenetriaminepentaacetic acid-Zn of 0.85 mg/kg, and an organic matter = 1.23%. The soil was sterilized for 1 h by steaming at 121 °C at 1.1 atm vapor pressure in an autoclave.

The AM inoculants consisted of FM and RI (formerly *Glomus mosseae* and *G. intraradices*, respectively, http:// schuessler.userweb.mwn. de/amphylo) that were indigenous and dominant in the non-contaminated area of Anguran Mine, Zanjan, Iran. These two AM fungi were isolated and identified by Zarei et al. (2008a) and Zarei et al. (2010) and prepared through the trap culture [culture medium of autoclaved soil/quartz sand (<1 mm) (1:4, v/v)] of forage sorghum (Sorghum bicolor L.) with spores of FM and RI as single isolate. In general, in order to propagate the fungal species, there were three pots for the FM species, three pots for the RI species, and three pots for the control treatments (without fungal spores). After 4.5 months, the shoots of each pot were picked up at the onset of the reproductive stage, and the contents of pots were retained in the polyethylene bags at 4 °C and finally used to test on linseed plants. The potential of these inoculants (spore numbers of 10–12 spores/g substrate and root colonization of 80–85%) was measured based on the method described by Zarei et al. (2008b) for spore extraction and counting, and assessment of root colonization.

Seeds of linseed (Linum usitatissimum L., genotype SE-13) were disinfected with 5% sodium hypochlorite solution for 30 s and rinsed thrice with distilled water (Sauer and Burroughs 1986; Ditommaso and nurse RE 2004). Then in order to treat the seeds with SA, the seeds were soaked in 250 µM SA for 8 h, and in order not to treat, the seeds were used after disinfection. Twenty-five seeds were planted in each pot with 30 cm diameter and 25 cm height. Most portion of each pot was filled with soil, and 50 g of each AM inoculants was spread on top and covered with the 2 cm soil at sowing time. Control pots consisted of adding 50 g of media from control sorghum trap culture pots as described earlier. Then seeds were placed on the soil and finally covered with 2 cm soil. Due to the volume of the pot and in order to avoid the effect of competition, the plants were thinned to eight plants per pot at the three leaf stage. Plants were watered regularly for 40 days, and then, water stress treatments were imposed. Irrigation regimes were determined based on soil water holding capacity by weighting the pots initially and weighing again after 2 days, and the amount of water lost from the soil was replaced by watering the pots to bring the soil water status back to 100, 70 and 40% FC (Chemikosova et al. 2006; Ansari et al. 2016). In total, in this experiment, we had 18 treatments as follows: 1 = NM + 100% FC + non-SA, 2 = NM + 100% FC + with SA, 3 = NM + 70% FC + non-SA, 4 = NM + 70% FC + with SA, 5 = NM + 40% FC + non-SA, 6 = NM + 40% FC + with SA, 7 = FM + 100% FC + non-SA, 8 = FM + 100% FC + with SA, 9 = FM + 70% FC + non-SA, 10 = FM + 70% FC + with SA, 11 = FM + 40% FC + non-SA, 12 = FM + 40% FC + with SA, 13=RI+100% FC+non-SA, 14=RI+100% FC+with SA, 15 = RI + 70% FC + non-SA, 16 = RI + 70% FC + with SA, 17 = RI + 40% FC + non-SA, 18 = RI + 40% FC + with SA. Each of these treatments had six replications (three replications for measuring seed yield trait and three replications for measuring other traits). Generally, we had 54 pots used to measure seed yield and 54 pots for measuring other traits.

#### Measurements

At the flowering stage (80 days after planting), greenness index (GI) was measured using a Minolta SPAD-502 chlorophyll meter (Minolta Inc., Tokyo, Japan). Measurement of electrolyte leakage was taken according to the method of Lutts et al. (1996). In this method, fresh leaf samples were cut in small pieces and incubated at 25 °C for 24 h in test tubes containing 10 ml of double distilled water to measure initial electrical conductivity (EC1) using the conductivity meter. The samples were then placed in a water bath at 100 °C for 30 min to measure second electrical conductivity (EC2) after reaching room temperature. Then electrolytic leakage was calculated as the EC1 divided by the EC2 and expressed as a percentage. Leaf sampling was then performed to measure antioxidant enzyme activities. Enzyme extraction was carried out in 0-4 °C. Samples (100 mg fresh leaves) were frozen in liquid nitrogen and then homogenized in 1 ml of ice-cold derivation solution containing 50 mM sodium phosphate buffer (pH 7.8), 2 mM Dithiothreitol (DTT), 2 mM Ethylene diamine tetra acetic acid (EDTA), 1% (w/v) polyvinylpyrrolidone-25 (PVP-25), 0.2% (w/v) Triton-×100 and 50 mM Tris-hydrochloride (Tris-HCl) (Nakano and Asada 1981). The homogenate was centrifuged at 14,000×g for 30 min at 4 °C (Centrifuge, Eppendorf 5810R), and the supernatant was collected for soluble protein, catalase (CAT), peroxidase (POX), glutathione reductase (GR), and superoxide dismutase (SOD) assays. For the ascorbate peroxidase (APX) assay, the extraction buffer contained 2 mM of Ascorbate in addition to the above substances. Soluble protein was determined at 595 nm by a spectrophotometer (HITACHI U-1800) according to the method described by Bradford (1976).

Activity of CAT was assayed as a decrease in absorbance at 240 nm for 2 min by a spectrophotometer (HITACHI U-1800) following the decomposition of  $H_2O_2$  (Bergmeyer 1970). The reaction mixture contained 3 ml sodium phosphate buffer (50 mM, pH 7.0) and 4.51  $\mu$ l H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (30%) and 50 µl enzyme extract. The activity of POX was determined using guaiacol oxidation (Herzog and Fahimi 1973) in a reaction mixture containing 3 ml sodium phosphate buffer (50 mM, pH 7.0), 4.51 µl of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (30%), 3.35 µl guaiacol and 50 µl enzyme extract. The increase in absorbance was recorded with the addition of  $H_2O_2$  at 470 nm for 2 min. Activities of APX and GR were assayed following the methods of Nakano and Asada (1981) and Herzog and Fahimi (1973) at 290 and 340 nm, respectively (Spectrophotometer, HITACHI U-1800). The activity of SOD was measured at 560 nm according to the method described by Beauchamp and Fridovich (1971). The reaction mixture contained sodium phosphate buffer (50 mM, pH 7.0), 2 mM EDTA, 13 mM methionine, 1 mM riboflavin, 1 mM Nitro blue tetrazolium (NBT), and 50 µl enzyme extract which illuminated for 15 min. Control was the reaction mixture without enzyme extract that was placed in the light. Blank contained the reaction mixture without enzyme extract that was in the dark. One unit of SOD activity was calculated based on 50% inhibition of NBT light reduction and expressed as Unit/mg FW.

Drought tolerance index (DTI) of AM and non-AM linseed plants was assessed similar to Rabie and Almadini (2005) as the shoot dry weight in drought soils divided by the corresponding shoot dry weight on non-drought soil and expressed as a percentage. Roots were stained following the method of Zarei et al. (2008b). The roots were cleared with 10% KOH, acidified with 2% HCl, and stained with 1% (vol/ vol) Pelikan blue ink in lactic acid. The mycorrhizal colonization (MC) in roots was determined with the grid line intersection method (McGonigle et al. 1990; Zarei et al. 2008b). An eye lens equipped with a micrometer ruler in a microscope (Nikon eclipss E600) with the 400 magnification was used to measure the hyphal width (HW) and vesicle diameter (VD) (Müller et al. 2017). In order to measure seed yield, the seeds were harvested at physiological maturity from the pots related to the seed yield and weighted after reaching a moisture content of 14%. Then the seed yield was determined as g  $plant^{-1}$ .

## Statistical analysis

A three-way factorial  $(3 \times 3 \times 2)$  arranged in a randomized complete block design with three replications was used for data analysis. The first factor was three AM fungi, and the second and third factors were three water levels and two SA treatments, respectively. The GLM procedure of SAS statistical software (SAS Institute Inc. 2009) was used for Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Data of the CAT, POX, GR, and APX activities were transformed and normalized before statistical analysis. When the effects were significant  $(p \le 0.05)$ , differences between means were evaluated for significance by using Duncan multiple range test ( $p \le 0.05$ ). The standard error of treatment means was used as a measure of the data spread. To study the relationship between investigated traits, Pearson's correlation coefficients (r) were calculated using SAS statistical software. The principal component analysis was performed to display the relationship of various parameters with the different treatments using SPSS.

## Results

Analysis of variance for all the studied traits is specified in Table 1. In the open-field conditions, inoculation with FM increased seed yield, DTI, APX, and SOD activities, while inoculation with RI enhanced seed yield, GR activity, and GI in comparison with non-AM plants and had the highest MC (Table 1). Inoculation with both AM fungi, especially RI, decreased electrolyte leakage compared with the non-AM plants (Table 1). Vesicle diameter and HW had the greatest amount in FM species (Table 1). Reduction of FC from 100 to 40% decreased seed yield, GI, and DTI up to 61.5%, 22.8%, and 43.2%, respectively. Drought stress (40% FC) increased MC, VD, SOD, POX, and APX activities compared with 100% FC up to 10.4%, 35.3%, 3%, 90.8%, and 38.1%, respectively. Drought had no significant effect on HW, and CAT and GR activities (Table 1). Reduction of FC from 100 to 40% enhanced electrolyte leakage (Table 1). Treatment with SA decreased HW, DTI, POX, and APX activities up to 8.8%, 29%, 50.2%, and 34.4% compared with the non-SA, respectively. The decline in DTI may be due to decreased POX and APX activities in SA treatment (Table 1). Salicylic acid had no significant effects on MC, VD, GI, electrolyte leakage, and CAT and SOD activities (Table 1). The activity of GR increased significantly under the influence of SA by 73.5% compared with non-SA (Table 1). Interaction between AM fungi and drought stress showed that in non-AM, APX activity (Table 2), and SOD activity (Fig. 1a) were higher at 40% FC compared with 100% FC, while in FM and RI plants, APX and SOD activities were higher at 70% FC. At 40% FC, GI was higher in FM plants and at 100% FC it was greater in RI plants (Table 2). In the non-AM plants and AM-plants, seed yield decreased in drought conditions, especially at 40% FC (Fig. 1b). In non-AM plants, FM plants, and RI plants, 40% FC decreased DTI up to 89.8%, 18.9%, and 31.7% in comparison with 100% FC, respectively (Fig. 1c). At 40% and 100% FC, RI-plants had lower electrolyte leakage in comparison with non-AM plants, while at 70% FC, FM plants had lower electrolyte leakage (Table 2). At 70% and 100% FC, RI species had the highest VD, while FM species had the highest VD at 40% FC (Table 2). At 100% and 40% FC, RI species had the highest MC, while at 70% FC, FM species had the highest MC which had not significant differences with RI species (Table 2).

Interaction between AM fungi and SA indicated that SA increased SOD activity in comparison with non-SA in non-AM plants while decreased it in FM plants and RI plants up to 1.01% and 0.87% compared with non-SA, respectively, which the lowest decline was observed in RI plants (Table 3). Salicylic acid reduced GI in FM plants while increased it in non-AM plants and RI plants (Table 3). Salicylic acid increased electrolyte leakage in FM plants up to 5.3% compared with non-SA, while SA decreased it in RI plants and non-AM plants up to 6.7% and 6.4%, respectively (Table 3). In non-AM plants, SA increased seed yield, while in FM plants and RI plants, SA decreased it up to 18.3% and 12.95%, respectively (Table 3). Salicylic acid increased DTI compared with

| Table 1 Ar    | alysis of vi | ariance and me     | can comparison of       | the main e | ffects of AN       | l, drought stress and    | SA on inve | estigated trait    | s of linseed plant:      | s in the ope | in-field cond      | itions              |          |
|---------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------------------|------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------|
|               |              | Electrolyte l      | eakage (%)              |            | CAT (AA:           | 240min-1 mg-1 prote      | (uic       | POX (ΔA47          | 70min-1 mg-1pro          | tein)        | APX (ΔA            | (290min-1 mg-1      | protein) |
| S.O.V         | df           | Mean of<br>squares | F Value                 | Sig        | Mean of<br>squares | F Value                  | Sig        | Mean of<br>squares | F Value                  | Sig          | Mean of<br>squares | F Value             | Sig      |
| R             | 2            | 32.24              | 6.21**                  | 0.0050     | 0.0118             | 0.61 <sup>ns</sup>       | 0.5479     | 2.585              | 0.97 <sup>ns</sup>       | 0.3888       | 0.0012             | 0.42 <sup>ns</sup>  | 0.6627   |
| М             | 2            | 1021.17            | $196.72^{***}$          | <.0001     | 0.0819             | $4.25^{*}$               | 0.0226     | 32.764             | $12.31^{***}$            | <.0001       | 0.0111             | $3.9^*$             | 0.0299   |
| D             | 7            | 6459.39            | $1244.36^{***}$         | <.0001     | 0.006              | 0.31 ns                  | 0.7365     | 24.76              | 9.3***                   | 0.0006       | 0.0116             | $4.05^*$            | 0.0265   |
| M×D           | 4            | 278.84             | 53.72***                | <.0001     | 0.022              | $1.14^{\mathrm{ns}}$     | 0.3541     | 7.37               | $2.77^{*}$               | 0.0428       | 0.0085             | $2.97^{*}$          | 0.0332   |
| SA            | 1            | 12.04              | 2.32 <sup>ns</sup>      | 0.1371     | 0.0531             | 2.75 <sup>ns</sup>       | 0.1063     | 88.907             | $33.41^{***}$            | <.0001       | 0.0286             | $10^{**}$           | 0.0033   |
| M×SA          | 2            | 19.802             | $3.81^{*}$              | 0.0320     | 0.0577             | 2.99 <sup>ns</sup>       | 0.0635     | 4.759              | $1.79^{\mathrm{ns}}$     | 0.1826       | 0.0059             | 2.08 <sup>ns</sup>  | 0.1404   |
| $D \times SA$ | 7            | 7.716              | 1.49 <sup>ns</sup>      | 0.2405     | 0.027              | 1.4 <sup>ns</sup>        | 0.2610     | 8.343              | $3.14^{\mathrm{ns}}$     | 0.0563       | 0.0041             | 1.44 <sup>ns</sup>  | 0.2500   |
| M×D×SA        | 4            | 13.15              | $2.53  \mathrm{ns}$     | 0.0581     | 0.0694             | $3.6^{*}$                | 0.0150     | 25.231             | 9.48***                  | <.000        | 0.0009             | 0.3 <sup>ns</sup>   | 0.8749   |
| Error         | 34           | 5.191              |                         |            | 0.0193             |                          |            | 2.661              |                          |              | 0.0029             |                     |          |
|               |              |                    | Mean com-               |            |                    | Mean com-                |            |                    | Mean com-                |              |                    | Mean coi            | -        |
|               |              |                    | parison of              |            |                    | parison of               |            |                    | parison of               |              |                    | parison             | of       |
|               |              |                    | the main<br>effects     |            |                    | the main<br>effects      |            |                    | the main<br>effects      |              |                    | the mai<br>effects  | -        |
| (M)           |              |                    |                         |            |                    |                          |            |                    |                          |              |                    |                     |          |
|               | NM           |                    | $39.4\pm 5.31^{a}$      |            |                    | $22.2 \pm 4.09^{a}$      |            |                    | $71.7 \pm 10.53^{\circ}$ | e.           |                    | $3.4 \pm 0.52$      | q.       |
|               | FM           |                    | $27 \pm 3.06^{b}$       |            |                    | $19.3 \pm 1.85^{a}$      |            |                    | $37.9 \pm 8.05^{b}$      |              |                    | $5.1 \pm 0.75$      | a        |
|               | RI           |                    | $25.8 \pm 3.08^{\rm b}$ |            |                    | $12.02 \pm 1.47^{\rm b}$ |            |                    | $36.1 \pm 5.96^{b}$      |              |                    | $3.1 \pm 0.3^{2}$   | q        |
| (D            |              |                    |                         |            |                    |                          |            |                    |                          |              |                    |                     |          |
|               | 100% FC      |                    | $13.7 \pm 0.74^{\circ}$ |            |                    | $19.8 \pm 4.27^{a}$      |            |                    | $32.8 \pm 7.8^{\rm b}$   |              |                    | $2.9\pm0.5$         | р        |
|               | 70% FC       |                    | $27.4 \pm 1.08^{b}$     |            |                    | $17.6 \pm 1.92^{a}$      |            |                    | $50.3 \pm 8.27^{a}$      |              |                    | $4.7 \pm 0.68$      | в        |
|               | 40% FC       |                    | $51.1 \pm 3.13^{a}$     |            |                    | $16.2 \pm 1.82^{a}$      |            |                    | $62.6 \pm 10.15^{\circ}$ | a            |                    | $4\pm0.52^{ab}$     |          |
| (SA)          |              |                    |                         |            |                    |                          |            |                    |                          |              |                    |                     |          |
|               | non-SA       |                    | $31.2 \pm 3.49^{a}$     |            |                    | $20.1 \pm 2.83^{a}$      |            |                    | $64.8 \pm 7.13^{a}$      |              |                    | $4.6 \pm 0.53$      | а        |
|               | with SA      |                    | $30.3 \pm 3.35^{a}$     |            |                    | $15.6 \pm 1.66^{a}$      |            |                    | $32.3 \pm 6.44^{b}$      |              |                    | $3.1 \pm 0.38$      | p        |
|               |              | GR (ΔA340          | min-1 mg-1protei        | (u         | SOD (unit          | mg-1 FW)                 |            | GI                 |                          |              | Seed yield (       | (mg plant-1)        |          |
| S.O.V         | df           | Mean of<br>squares | F Value                 | Sig        | Mean of<br>squares | F Value                  | Sig        | Mean of<br>squares | F Value                  | Sig          | Mean of<br>squares | F Value             | Sig      |
| R             | 2            | 0.00014            | 1.06 <sup>ns</sup>      | 0.3588     | 0.00014            | 2.28 <sup>ns</sup>       | 0.1175     | 43.37              | 5.66**                   | 0.0076       | 50.892             | $0.6^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | 0.5561   |
| М             | 2            | 0.00095            | 7.03**                  | 0.0028     | 0.0006             | 9.35***                  | 0.0006     | 285.4              | 37.22***                 | <.0001       | 2935.33            | 34.44**             | <.0001   |
| D             | 2            | 0.00012            | $0.91^{\mathrm{ns}}$    | 0.4130     | 0.00118            | $18.51^{***}$            | <.0001     | 255.9              | 33.38***                 | <.0001       | 4596.26            | $53.92^{***}$       | <.0001   |
| M×D           | 4            | 0.00027            | 2.03 <sup>ns</sup>      | 0.1127     | 0.000207           | 3.25*                    | 0.0232     | 113.7              | $14.83^{***}$            | <.0001       | 408.989            | $4.8^{**}$          | 0.0035   |
| SA            | 1            | 0.0007             | $5.17^{*}$              | 0.0294     | 0.00004            | 0.07 <sup>ns</sup>       | 0.7967     | 21.13              | 2.76 <sup>ns</sup>       | 0.1061       | 95.425             | 1.12 <sup>ns</sup>  | 0.2975   |
| $M \times SA$ | 7            | 0.00013            | 0.93 <sup>ns</sup>      | 0.4028     | 0.00023            | $3.61^*$                 | 0.0379     | 96.8               | $12.63^{***}$            | <.0001       | 329.411            | $3.86^{*}$          | 0.0307   |
| $D \times SA$ | 7            | 0.0002             | 1.5 <sup>ns</sup>       | 0.2381     | 0.000004           | 0.06 <sup>ns</sup>       | 0.9456     | 15.15              | 1.98 <sup>ns</sup>       | 0.1543       | 75.362             | 0.88 <sup>ns</sup>  | 0.4224   |
| M×D×SA        | 4            | 0.00037            | 2.77*                   | 0.0429     | 0.00012            | 1.8 <sup>ns</sup>        | 0.1507     | 19.29              | 2.52 <sup>ns</sup>       | 0.0594       | 145.15             | 1.7 ns              | 0.1721   |

| <b>Table 1</b> (co | ontinued) |                 |                       |            |                    |                            |                |                    |                             |             |                    |                         |           |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------|
|                    |           | GR (ΔA340       | min-1 mg-1prot        | (uic       | SOD (unit          | mg-1 FW)                   |                | GI                 |                             |             | Seed yield (       | mg plant-1)             |           |
| S.O.V              | df        | Mean of squares | F Value               | Sig        | Mean of<br>squares | F Value                    | Sig            | Mean of<br>squares | F Value                     | Sig         | Mean of<br>squares | F Value                 | Sig       |
| Error              | 34        | 0.00014         |                       |            | 0.000064           |                            |                | 7.6674             |                             |             | 85.238             |                         |           |
|                    |           | Mean comp.      | arison of the ma      | in effects | Mean com           | parison of the main        | 1 effects      | Mean com           | parison of the m            | ain effects | Mean comp          | arison of the main      | n effects |
| (W)                |           |                 |                       |            |                    |                            |                |                    |                             |             |                    |                         |           |
|                    | NM        |                 | $0.095 \pm 0.0111$    | q          |                    | $0.372 \pm 0.0024^{b}$     |                |                    | $24.6 \pm 1.8^{\mathrm{b}}$ |             |                    | $21.9 \pm 4.32^{b}$     |           |
|                    | FM        |                 | $0.098 \pm 0.0112$    | q.         |                    | $0.383 \pm 0.0035^{a}$     |                |                    | $30.5 \pm 1.18^{a}$         |             |                    | $45.6 \pm 3.94^{a}$     |           |
|                    | RI        |                 | $0.225 \pm 0.0601$    | a          |                    | $0.379 \pm 0.0018^{a}$     |                |                    | $32.2 \pm 0.84^{a}$         |             |                    | $41.9 \pm 3.98^{a}$     |           |
| (D                 |           |                 |                       |            |                    |                            |                |                    |                             |             |                    |                         |           |
|                    | 100% FC   |                 | $0.12 \pm 0.016^{a}$  |            |                    | $0.369 \pm 0.0017^{\rm b}$ |                |                    | $32.3 \pm 0.82^{a}$         |             |                    | $52.1 \pm 3.45^{a}$     |           |
|                    | 70% FC    |                 | $0.12 \pm 0.018^{a}$  |            |                    | $0.384 \pm 0.0036^{a}$     |                |                    | $30 \pm 1.42^{b}$           |             |                    | $37.2 \pm 3.44^{b}$     |           |
|                    | 40% FC    |                 | $0.18 \pm 0.061^{a}$  |            |                    | $0.38 \pm 0.0014^{a}$      |                |                    | $24.9 \pm 1.69^{\circ}$     |             |                    | $20.1 \pm 3.93^{\circ}$ |           |
| (SA)               |           |                 |                       |            |                    |                            |                |                    |                             |             |                    |                         |           |
|                    | non-SA    |                 | $0.102 \pm 0.0115$    | q          |                    | $0.3776 \pm 0.00278$       | 3 <sup>a</sup> |                    | $29.7 \pm 1.43^{a}$         |             |                    | $37.8 \pm 4.19^{a}$     |           |
|                    | with SA   |                 | $0.177 \pm 0.0414$    | в.         |                    | $0.3782 \pm 0.00182$       | )a             |                    | $28.5\pm1.03^{\mathrm{a}}$  |             |                    | $35.1 \pm 3.53^{a}$     |           |
|                    |           | DTI (%)         |                       |            | HW (µm)            |                            |                | VD (µm)            |                             |             | MC (%)             |                         |           |
| S.O.V              | df        | Mean of         | F Value               | Sig        | Mean of            | F Value                    | Sig            | Mean of            | F Value                     | Sig         | Mean of            | F Value                 | Sig       |
| ŗ                  |           | squares         | ***\<br>[<br>()       |            | squares            |                            |                | squares            | 30,70                       |             | squares            | 50 TO 0                 |           |
| X                  | 7         | 20,076.41       | 22.76                 | <.0001     | 0.0579             | 0.52                       | 0.5982         | 18.227             | 1.34 "                      | 0.2756      | 11.734             | 0.31                    | 0.7377    |
| Μ                  | 7         | 38,866.52       | 44.06                 | <.0001     | 110.69             | 997.51***                  | <.0001         | 7217.357           | 530.16                      | <.0001      | 14,903.9           | 389.92                  | <.0001    |
| D                  | 7         | 14,580.9        | 16.53                 | <.0001     | 0.0491             | 0.44 <sup>ns</sup>         | 0.6461         | 244.639            | 17.97***                    | <.0001      | 219.96             | 5.75**                  | 0.0070    |
| M×D                | 4         | 4048.67         | 4.59                  | 0.0045     | 0.0397             | 0.36 "                     | 0.8367         | 176.349            | 12.95                       | <.0001      | 191.175            | 5                       | 0.0028    |
| SA                 | 1         | 16,706.19       | 18.94                 | 0.0001     | 0.9316             | 8.4**                      | 0.0065         | 28.131             | 2.07 <sup>ns</sup>          | 0.1597      | 22.893             | 0.60 <sup>ns</sup>      | 0.4443    |
| M×SA               | 7         | 6897.93         | 7.82**                | 0.0016     | 1.022              | $9.21^{**}$                | 0.0006         | 248.156            | $18.23^{***}$               | <.0001      | 178.61             | 4.67*                   | 0.0161    |
| $D \times SA$      | 2         | 259.79          | 0.29 <sup>ns</sup>    | 0.7468     | 0.2848             | 2.57  ns                   | 0.0916         | 10.846             | 0.8 <sup>ns</sup>           | 0.4591      | 359.86             | $9.41^{***}$            | 0.0006    |
| M×D×SA             | 4         | 161.81          | 0.18 <sup>ns</sup>    | 0.9454     | 0.2084             | 1.88 <sup>ns</sup>         | 0.1369         | 9.997              | 0.73 <sup>ns</sup>          | 0.5750      | 271.989            | $7.12^{***}$            | 0.0003    |
| Error              | 34        | 882.135         |                       |            | 0.11097            |                            |                | 13.614             |                             |             | 38.223             |                         |           |
|                    |           |                 | Mean com-             |            |                    | Mean com-                  |                |                    | Mean com-                   |             |                    | Mean com-               |           |
|                    |           |                 | parison of            |            |                    | parison of                 |                |                    | parison of                  |             |                    | parison of              |           |
|                    |           |                 | effects               |            |                    | effects                    |                |                    | effects                     |             |                    | effects                 |           |
| (M)                |           |                 |                       |            |                    |                            |                |                    |                             |             |                    |                         |           |
|                    | NM        |                 | $50.2 \pm 11.96^{b}$  |            |                    | $0\pm0^{\circ}$            |                |                    | $0\pm0^{\rm c}$             |             |                    | $0\pm0^{\rm c}$         |           |
|                    | FM        |                 | $136.3 \pm 13.26^{a}$ |            |                    | $4.4 \pm 0.15^{a}$         |                |                    | $36.38 \pm 2.44^{a}$        |             |                    | $47.4 \pm 2.92^{b}$     |           |
|                    | RI        |                 | $123.6 \pm 12.73^{a}$ |            |                    | $4.12 \pm 0.08^{b}$        |                |                    | $32.68 \pm 1.22^{b}$        |             |                    | $52 \pm 2.62^{a}$       |           |

 $\underline{\textcircled{O}}$  Springer

|     | DTI (   | %)                    | HW (Jum)           | VD (µm)                  | MC (%)                |
|-----|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| D)  |         |                       |                    |                          |                       |
|     | 100% FC | $125.4 \pm 9.71^{a}$  | $2.8 \pm 0.49^{a}$ | $20.08 \pm 3.55^{\rm b}$ | $29.77 \pm 5.76^{b}$  |
|     | 70% FC  | $113 \pm 19.15^{a}$   | $2.83 \pm 0.5^{a}$ | $21.84 \pm 4.02^{b}$     | $36.75 \pm 6.42^{a}$  |
|     | 40% FC  | $71.2 \pm 13.37^{c}$  | $2.9 \pm 0.51^{a}$ | $27.16 \pm 4.92^{a}$     | $32.85 \pm 6.08^{ab}$ |
| SA) |         |                       |                    |                          |                       |
|     | non-SA  | $120.9 \pm 13.48^{a}$ | $3\pm0.42^{a}$     | $23.74 \pm 3.56^{a}$     | $32.47 \pm 4.63^{a}$  |
|     | with SA | $85.8 \pm 10.72^{b}$  | $2.7 \pm 0.38^{b}$ | $22.3 \pm 3.32^{a}$      | $33.77 \pm 5.26^{a}$  |

Catalase, POX <0.01; \*\*\* (p < 0.001); ns (not significant). The results are represented as the mean (n=18 for M, n=18 for D, and n=27 for CAL Field capacity, mosseae, KI Khizoglomus intraradices, FC SA)  $\pm$  standard error. For each parameter, means with the same letter are not significantly different (Duncan's test p < 0.05Funneliformis plants, FM Non-mycorrhizal МN SA Salicylic acid, Peroxidase, APX Ascorbate peroxidase. \* (p<0.05); \*\* (pBlock, M Mycorrhiza, D Drought,

SA Salicylic acid, NM Non-mycorrhizal plants, FM Fumeliformis mosseae, RI Rhizoglomus intraradices, FC Field capacity, DTI Drought tolerance index (p < 0.001); ns (not significant). The results are represented as the mean (n = 18 for M)n = 18 for D, and n = 27 for SA)  $\pm$  standard error. For each parameter, means with the same letter are not significantly different (Duncan's test p < 0.05) \*\*\* *MC* Mycorrhizal colonization, *HW* Hyphal width, *VD* Vesicle diameter. \* (p < 0.05); \*\* (p < 0.01); D Drought, R Block, M Mycorrhiza,

for M, SA Salicylic acid, NM Non-mycorrhizal plants, FM Funneliformis mosseae, RI Rhizoglomus intraradices, FC Field capacity, DTI Drought tolerance index. Vesicle diameter: \*(p < 0.05); \*\*(p < 0.01); \*\*\*(p < 0.001); ns (not significant). The results are represented as the mean (n = 18) n = 18 for D, and n = 27 for SA)  $\pm$  standard error. For each parameter, means with the same letter are not significantly different (Duncan's test p < 0.05) MC Mycorrhizal colonization, HW Hyphal width, VD R Block, M Mycorrhiza, D Drought,

I

non-SA in non-AM plants while decreased it in FM plants and RI plants up to 43.3% and 23.4% compared with non-SA, respectively, in which the lowest decline was observed in RI plants (Fig. 2a). In the open-field conditions, SA decreased VD (Fig. 2b), HW (Fig. 2c), and MC (Table 3) in FM compared with non-SA up to 16.8%, 23.1%, and 8.6%, respectively [when the FM + with SA is compared with its own control (FM + non-SA)], but increased these in RI species up to 0.61%, 17.1%, and 17%, respectively [when the RI+ with SA is compared with its own control (RI+non-SA)]. These results showed that the FM fungus had a negative response to SA, while RI fungus had a positive response to SA in comparison with FM due to the increase in the HW and VD in the application of SA. Lower reduction of DTI in RI plants with SA treatment could be due to the positive response of RI fungus to SA, the lower reduction of SOD activity, and increasing GI.

There was an interaction between AM fungi, drought and SA on MC, CAT, POX, and GR activities. In both RI and FM plants, SA increased MC at 40% FC, while at 100% FC, SA decreased MC in FM plants but increased it in RI plants (Fig. 3). Non-AM plants at 100% FC without SA had the highest CAT activity and RI plants at 100% FC with SA had the lowest CAT activity. In non-AM plants and RI plants, SA increased CAT activity in comparison with non-SA at 40% FC, while in FM plants, SA decreased CAT activity compared with non-SA at 40% FC (Table 4). Non-AM plants at 40% FC without SA had the highest POX activity and RI plants at 100% FC with SA had the lowest POX activity. In non-AM plants and FM plants, SA decreased POX activity compared with non-SA at 40% FC, while in RI plants, SA increased POX activity in comparison with non-SA at 40% FC (Table 4). In non-AM and AM plants, SA increased GR activity compared with non-SA at 40% FC so that the greatest increment was observed in RI plants (Table 4). The interaction showed that the FM fungus had a negative response to SA, especially in drought conditions, while RI fungus had a positive response to SA in comparison with FM due to the increase in the CAT, POX, and GR activities in the application of SA. Hence lower reduction of the DTI in RI plants with SA treatment could be due to the positive response of RI fungus to SA and the increase in the CAT, POX, and GR activities.

The results of the principal component analysis showed that the 12 studied traits were reduced to four components and the four components together account for 78.74% of the total data changes. The first component, the second component, the third component, and the fourth component explained 40.09%, 17.24%, 11.93%, and 9.48% of the total data changes, respectively (Table 5). In the first component, the traits of MC, HW, VD, GI, seed yield, and DTI had a positive factor coefficient, and POX activity and electrolyte leakage had a negative factor coefficient; therefore, the first

| М  | FC% | Electrolyte leakage (%)    | APX ( $\Delta A_{290}$ min <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> <sub>protein</sub> ) | GI                      | VD (µm)                       | MC (%)                         |
|----|-----|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| NM | 100 | $16.9 \pm 0.51^{e}$        | $2 \pm 0.45^{\circ}$   | $33.3 \pm 0.91^{a}$     | $0\pm0^{\rm c}$               | $0\pm 0^{e}$                   |
| NM | 70  | $32.6 \pm 1.12^{\circ}$    | $2.9 \pm 0.66^{\rm bc}$  | $23.6 \pm 0.93^{\circ}$ | $0 \pm 0^{c}$                 | $0\pm 0^{\rm e}$               |
| NM | 40  | $68.7 \pm 1.75^{a}$        | $5.2 \pm 1.02^{ab}$  | $16.9 \pm 2.12^{d}$     | $0 \pm 0^{c}$                 | $0\pm 0^{e}$                   |
| FM | 100 | $13.4 \pm 1.02^{f}$        | $4.7 \pm 1.14^{ab}$  | $29.4 \pm 1.23^{b}$     | $29.93 \pm 1.74^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $39.43 \pm 5.83^{d}$           |
| FM | 70  | $24.4 \pm 1.07^{d}$        | $6.4 \pm 1.67^{a}$   | $33 \pm 2.45^{a}$       | $31.6 \pm 3.58^{b}$           | $58.34 \pm 2.78^{a}$           |
| FM | 40  | $43.2 \pm 1.57^{b}$        | $4.1 \pm 0.98^{\rm abc}$   | $29 \pm 2.17^{b}$       | $47.61 \pm 2.6^{a}$           | $44.44 \pm 2.61$ <sup>cd</sup> |
| RI | 100 | $10.7 \pm 0.63^{\text{g}}$ | $1.98 \pm 0.39^{\circ}$  | $34.2 \pm 1.42^{a}$     | $30.3 \pm 2.17^{b}$           | $49.88 \pm 5.22^{bc}$          |
| RI | 70  | $25.2 \pm 1.15^{d}$        | $4.7 \pm 0.5^{ab}$   | $33.5 \pm 1.13^{a}$     | $33.9 \pm 2.92^{b}$           | $51.9 \pm 1.88^{abc}$          |
| RI | 40  | $41.4 \pm 1.03^{b}$        | $2.7 \pm 0.19^{bc}$  | $28.9\pm0.77^{\rm b}$   | $33.86 \pm 0.62^{b}$          | $54.1 \pm 6.14^{ab}$           |

Table 2 Mean comparison for the interaction of AM and drought stress on investigated parameters of linseed plants in the open-field conditions

M Mycorrhiza, NM Non-mycorrhizal plants, FM Funneliformis mosseae, RI Rhizoglomus intraradices, FC Field capacity, APX Ascorbate peroxidase, GI Greenness index, DTI Drought tolerance index, MC Mycorrhizal colonization, VD Vesicle diameter

The results are represented as the mean  $(n=6)\pm$  standard error. For each parameter, means with the same letter are not significantly different (Duncan's test p < 0.05)

component can be named as the component of drought tolerance and yield potential. Given that high values of MC, HW, VD, GI, seed yield, and DTI and low values of electrolyte leakage and POX activity are desirable, if the amount of the first component is high, treatments are selected that have less electrolyte leakage and POX activity and induce higher MC, HW, VD, GI, seed yield, and DTI (Table 5). The traits of APX activity, SOD activity, and electrolyte leakage had a positive effect on the second component; therefore, this component can be named as the drought stress sensitivity component. If the amount of the second component is high, treatment is selected that has high electrolyte leakage, APX activity, and SOD activity, in other words, induces drought sensitivity. Therefore, the lower value of this component will lead to the selection of treatments that induce drought tolerance and high yield under stress conditions (Table 5). In the third component, CAT, POX, and APX activities had a positive factor coefficient. The trait of GR activity had a positive effect on the fourth component (Table 5). The biplot diagram (Fig. 4) showed that the treatments 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, and 16 are located in the area with the high value of the first component and the medium to the low value of the second component. The treatments 11, 12, 17, and 18 are located in the area with the medium first component and medium to high second component. The treatments 1, 2, and 8 are placed in an area with the medium first component and the low second component. The treatments 3 and 4 are located in an area with the medium to the low first component and the medium second component (Fig. 4). The treatments 5 and 6 are placed in an area with the low first component and the high second component. Due to the fact that the high value of the first component and the low value of the second component are important in choosing the effective treatment in this experiment, so treatment 7 (inoculation with FM without SA treatment at 100% FC) is the best choice and after that, treatment 14 (inoculation with RI and SA treatment at 100% FC) and then treatment 13 (inoculation with RI without SA treatment at 100% FC) is better (Fig. 4).

## Discussion

In our study, drought enhanced oxidative stress by increasing electrolyte leakage and increased antioxidant enzymes in leaves of linseed considerably, which was confirmed by the increments in SOD, APX, and POX activities in linseed. Increased electrolyte leakage and activity of SOD, APX, and POX in stress conditions has been reported in other studies in maize, soybean, barley, and rice (Porcel and Ruiz-Lozano 2004; Abdel Latef and Chaoxing 2011; Yaghoubian et al. 2014; Harb et al. 2015; Quiroga et al. 2017; Kamarudin et al. 2018; Kim et al. 2018). Water deficit can increase the superoxide radical and SOD, as the first defense enzyme, can convert this radical to H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> to activate other defense mechanisms such as POX, APX, and CAT enzymes which can convert  $H_2O_2$  to  $H_2O$  and  $O_2$  (Kim et al. 2018). Catalase is less efficient compared to POX in H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> scavenging because of its low-substrate affinity, so as long as the stress is not too strong for the plant defense capacity (Shi et al. 2009), which was in agreement with our results about the CAT and POX under FC levels. Glutathione reductase and ascorbate are able to regenerate antioxidants. These enzymes are components of the ascorbate-glutathione pathway responsible for the removal of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in cellular compartments (Marulanda et al. 2007; Sofo et al. 2015). The decrease in seed yield under drought in this study was consistent with the results of Aghdam et al. (2016) who reported that drought stress (50% FC) resulted in a 48.1% reduction on seed yield of Linum usitatissimum (cv. Olajonzon). Water deficit just prior and during the early flowering stage can decrease the



RI

-----RI

bc

d

40

219



**Fig. 1** Mean comparison for the superoxide dismutase (SOD) activity **a**, seed yield **b** and drought tolerance index (DTI) **c** in *Linum usitatissimum* L. when affected by drought (FC, field capacity) levels and mycorrhizal fungi in the open-field conditions. Non-mycorrhizal

plants (NM), *Funneliformis mosseae* (FM), and *Rhizoglomus intraradices* (RI). *Vertical T bars* indicate standard error. For each parameter, data with the same letter are not significantly different (Duncan multiple range test p < 0.05)

number of fertile flowers, leading to reduced final seed yield production. The decline could also be associated with the reduction of leaf area, chlorophyll density, photosynthetic rate, and less nutrient absorption (Kamarudin et al. 2018). In this regard, there was a positive and higher correlation of seed yield with GI (r=0.68, p=0.001) which confirms the decrease in seed yield due to the reduction of chlorophyll density. Under drought conditions (especially 40% FC), VD increased in both mycorrhizal fungi (especially in FM species). The increase in the VD and HW under drought stress was consistent with the increase in the VD under lead stress studied by Alvarado-López et al. (2019) which reported that vesicle area increases under lead stress in *Glomus intraradices* when inoculated with *Daucus carota* L. plants.

The ameliorative effects of mycorrhiza on drought stress observed in this study are consistent with the results of Porcel and Ruiz-Lozano (2004), Ceccarelli et al. (2010), and He et al. (2017). The dissimilar behavior of AM fungi in relation to several plant enzymatic activities has been often reported (Porcel and Ruiz-Lozano 2004; He et al. 2017). It seems that

| M  | SA      | Electrolyte leakage (%)       | SOD (unit mg <sup>-1</sup> FW) | GI                      | Seed yield (mg plant <sup>-1</sup> ) | MC (%)               |
|----|---------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| NM | non-SA  | $40.7 \pm 7.99^{a}$           | $0.3673 \pm 0.00285^{\circ}$   | $23.4 \pm 2.83^{\circ}$ | $18.4 \pm 5.17^{\circ}$              | $0\pm0^{c}$          |
| NM | with SA | $38.1 \pm 7.45^{b}$           | $0.3761 \pm 0.00327^{b}$       | $25.8 \pm 2.34^{bc}$    | $25.4 \pm 7.04^{\circ}$              | $0\pm0^{\rm c}$      |
| FM | non-SA  | $26.3 \pm 4.29$ <sup>cd</sup> | $0.385 \pm 0.0059^{a}$         | $33.7 \pm 1.58^{a}$     | $50.2 \pm 6.75^{a}$                  | $49.52 \pm 2.27^{b}$ |
| FM | with SA | $27.7 \pm 4.61^{\circ}$       | $0.381 \pm 0.0042^{ab}$        | $27.2 \pm 0.87^{b}$     | $41 \pm 3.89^{ab}$                   | $45.28 \pm 5.47^{b}$ |
| RI | non-SA  | $26.7 \pm 4.42$ <sup>cd</sup> | $0.3808 \pm 0.00342^{ab}$      | $32.1 \pm 1.33^{a}$     | $44.8 \pm 5.13^{ab}$                 | $47.89 \pm 2.51^{b}$ |
| RI | with SA | $24.9 \pm 4.56^{d}$           | $0.3775 \pm 0.00148^{ab}$      | $32.4 \pm 1.12^{a}$     | $39 \pm 6.24^{b}$                    | $56.04 \pm 4.34^{a}$ |

Table 3 Mean comparison for the interaction of AM and SA on investigated parameters of linseed plants in the open-field conditions

M Mycorrhiza, SA Salicylic acid, NM Non-mycorrhizal plants, FM Funneliformis mosseae, RI Rhizoglomus intraradices, SOD Superoxide dismutase, GI Greenness index, MC Mycorrhizal colonization

The results are represented as the mean  $(n=9)\pm$  standard error. For each parameter, means with the same letter are not significantly different (Duncan's test p < 0.05)

specific antioxidant mechanisms (CAT, POX, APX, SOD, and GR activities) according to the fungus involved in the symbiotic association are indicative of drought tolerance in inoculated linseed plants. In our previous study, we showed that the roots of linseed were well colonized by AM species in growth chamber conditions (Ansari et al. 2016), and RI species (with 85.5%) showed higher colonization in comparison with FM species (with 72.4%). In this study, the application of both RI and FM increased MC in the open-field conditions, but RI with 52% was more efficacious which was in agreement with results of Ceccarelli et al. (2010) and Ansari et al. (2016). The difference in the amount of colonization in these two studies could be due to differences in environmental conditions between the two locations (growth chamber and open-field). Increased APX activity in FM plants has been reported by Abdel Latef and Chaoxing (2011) and Yaghoubian et al. (2014). The obtained results of SOD and GR activities in AM plants were concordant with the results of the Wu et al. (2006) and He et al. (2017). Both AM fungi, especially FM species under 40% FC increased seed yield and DTI in linseed plants through the increase in the GI and the decrease of the membrane electrolyte leakage, which these were concordant with the results of Rabie and Almadini (2005), Quiroga et al. (2017), and Hashem et al. (2018). Positive and higher correlations of MC with GI (r=0.5, p=0.001), SOD (r=0.43, p=0.01), GR (r=0.25, p=0.01), p=0.05), DTI (r=0.58, p=0.001), and seed yield (r=0.42, p = 0.01) were recorded in this study which indicating that MC has direct and positive effects on these traits. Majidi et al. (2015) reported that increasing chlorophyll content can increase DTI. Positive and higher correlations of DTI with GI (r=0.6, p=0.001), HW (r=0.63, p=0.001), and VD (r=0.56, p=0.001) observed in this study, which confirms that any factor (such as AM fungi) that increases GI can increase DTI. Thompson (1996) and Rahimzadeh and Pirzad (2017) demonstrated that AM fungi are responsible for increasing growth and seed yield of linseed, which was concordant with our results about seed yield in AM plants.

Also in our previous study, it was demonstrated that AM fungi, especially FM fungi improved dry weight accumulation of linseed (Ansari et al. 2016). Improved dry weight accumulation by AM fungi was reported by Ma et al. (2019) and Ozgonen et al. (2001) in cowpea and tomato, respectively. Improvement of dry matter leads to an increase in seed yield of plants under stressful and non-stressful conditions. An increment in the uptake and transfer of water and nutrients, especially P, which leads to better osmoregulation, improved antioxidant system, protection of photosynthesis, and increase in seed yield by AM fungi. Improvements in these traits may be due to enhanced water uptake in AM plants which is due to the presence of extra-radical hyphae (Hashem et al. 2018).

Porcel and Ruiz-Lozano (2004) and He et al. (2017) expressed that drought stress increased SOD, POX, and APX activities in both AM and non-AM plants compared with well-watered treatments. Also, Porcel and Ruiz-Lozano (2004) represented that APX activity was higher in the non-AM plant compared with AM plant which was in agreement with our results at 40% FC but was not similar to the other water regime (100% and 70% FC). On the other hand, FM caused an increment in APX activity in comparison with non-AM plants when the plants were exposed to well-watered (100% FC) and drought-stressed (70% FC) conditions, which was in agreement with results of Wu et al. (2006). In this study, AM effect on GI, especially by RI, was in agreement with the results of Baslam and Goicoechea (2012) and Nasaruddin and Ridwan (2018) who expressed that GI increased in AM plants. Both AM fungi, especially RI, assisted to stabilize the membranes of the cells and decrease electrolyte leakage in both drought and well-watered conditions, which was in agreement with the results of Quiroga et al. (2017) who reported that the higher stability of cell membrane is mostly related to lower malondialdehyde contents in AM plants. Cekic et al. (2012) reported that the response of antioxidant enzymes can be



**Fig.2** Mean comparison for the drought tolerance index (DTI) of *Linum usitatissimum* L. **a** vesicle diameter (VD) **b** and hyphal width (HW) **c** of mycorrhizal fungi (M) when affected by salicylic acid (SA) in the open-field conditions. Non-mycorrhizal plants (NM),

*Funneliformis mosseae* (FM), and *Rhizoglomus intraradices* (RI). *Vertical T bars* indicate standard error. For each parameter, data with the same letter are not significantly different (Duncan multiple range test p < 0.05)

altered according to the plants, AM fungi and drought conditions. It seems that the increase in antioxidant enzyme activities and improved seed yield of AM plants in drought may be attributed to the contribution of fungal hyphae in diffusing nutrient ions which serve as a co-factor for these enzymes like Zn and Cu (Subramanian et al. 2011). Herein, AM fungi might increase nutrients and water uptake by the improvement of root conductivity to water flow and/or via extra-radical mycelium being able to transport nutrients and water to the AM roots (Marulanda et al. 2007; Rahimzadeh and Pirzad 2017). Our results showed that the RI species were more effective compared with the FM on seed yield and



**Fig. 3** Mean comparison for the interaction of drought (FC, field capacity) and salicylic acid (SA) on mycorrhizal colonization (MC) of linseed plants in the open-field conditions. Non-mycorrhizal plants

(NM), Funneliformis mosseae (FM), and Rhizoglomus intraradices (RI). Vertical bars indicate standard error. Bars with the same letter are not significantly different (Duncan's test p < 0.05)

| М  | FC% | SA      | CAT<br>$(\Delta A_{240} min^{-1} mg^{-1}_{protein})$ | POX<br>$(\Delta A_{470} \text{min}^{-1} \text{mg}^{-1}_{\text{protein}})$ | $GR (\Delta A_{340} min^{-1} mg^{-1}_{protein})$ |
|----|-----|---------|--|---|--|
| NM | 100 | non-SA  | $49.6 \pm 15.69^{a}$                                 | $93.1 \pm 14.43^{ab}$   | $0.087 \pm 0.0072^{b}$                           |
| NM | 100 | with SA | $12.8 \pm 6.84^{b}$                                  | $14.8 \pm 7.79^{\text{ef}}$   | $0.071 \pm 0.0089^{b}$                           |
| NM | 70  | non-SA  | $22.6 \pm 2.5^{b}$                                   | $85.2 \pm 30.76^{ab}$   | $0.068 \pm 0.0036^{b}$                           |
| NM | 70  | with SA | $15.1 \pm 8.43^{b}$                                  | $38 \pm 17.37^{cde}$  | $0.18 \pm 0.0394^{b}$                            |
| NM | 40  | non-SA  | $15.2 \pm 1.67^{b}$                                  | $101.1 \pm 1.05^{a}$  | $0.078 \pm 0.0089^{b}$                           |
| NM | 40  | with SA | $18.1 \pm 1.67^{b}$                                  | $97.8 \pm 29.29^{ab}$   | $0.087 \pm 0.0036^{b}$                           |
| FM | 100 | non-SA  | $13.5 \pm 1.12^{b}$                                  | $13.2 \pm 0.52^{\text{ef}}$   | $0.081 \pm 0^{b}$                                |
| FM | 100 | with SA | $24.4 \pm 0.68^{b}$                                  | $24.9 \pm 8.92^{\rm def}$   | $0.18 \pm 0.0251^{b}$                            |
| FM | 70  | non-SA  | $24.1 \pm 5.36^{b}$                                  | $64.2 \pm 11.86^{abc}$  | $0.087 \pm 0.0072^{b}$                           |
| FM | 70  | with SA | $17.8 \pm 4.39^{b}$                                  | $10.9 \pm 0^{\text{ef}}$  | $0.043 \pm 0.0072^{b}$                           |
| FM | 40  | non-SA  | $23.2 \pm 2.51^{b}$                                  | $97.1 \pm 0.42^{ab}$  | $0.081 \pm 0^{b}$                                |
| FM | 40  | with SA | $12.7 \pm 6.89^{b}$                                  | $17.2 \pm 4.27^{\text{def}}$  | $0.115 \pm 0.0197^{b}$                           |
| RI | 100 | non-SA  | $10.8 \pm 2.33^{b}$                                  | $47 \pm 5.82^{bcd}$   | $0.102 \pm 0.0197^{b}$                           |
| RI | 100 | with SA | $7.5 \pm 3.61^{b}$                                   | $4.1 \pm 0.99^{f}$  | $0.198 \pm 0.0716^{b}$                           |
| RI | 70  | non-SA  | $13.6 \pm 0.5^{b}$                                   | $67.1 \pm 7.7^{abc}$  | $0.189 \pm 0.0734^{b}$                           |
| RI | 70  | with SA | $12.3 \pm 2.09^{b}$                                  | $36.2 \pm 15.48^{cde}$  | $0.127 \pm 0.0018^{b}$                           |
| RI | 40  | non-SA  | $8.1 \pm 4.51^{b}$                                   | $15.2 \pm 7.14^{\text{ef}}$   | $0.146 \pm 0.0662^{b}$                           |
| RI | 40  | with SA | $19.8 \pm 4.05^{b}$                                  | $47.1 \pm 9.64^{bcd}$   | $0.589 \pm 0.2935^{a}$                           |

*M* Mycorrhiza, SA Salicylic acid, *NM* Non-mycorrhizal plants, *FM Funneliformis mosseae*, *RI Rhizo*glomus intraradices, *FC* Field capacity, *CAT* Catalase, *POX* Peroxidase, *GR* Glutathione reductase. The results are represented as the mean  $(n=3)\pm$ standard error. For each parameter, means with the same letter are not significantly different (Duncan's test p < 0.05)

Table 4Mean comparisonfor the interaction of AMand drought stress and SA oninvestigated parameters oflinseed plants in the open-fieldconditions

 
 Table 5
 Results of principal components analysis for studied traits in mycorrhizal inoculated linseed and treated with salicylic acid under drought stress

| Traits                              | Compon | ent    |        |        |
|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                                     | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      |
| Mycorrhizal colonization            | 0.863  | 0.339  | -0.101 | 0.131  |
| Hyphal width                        | 0.901  | 0.308  | -0.067 | 0.086  |
| Vesicle diameter                    | 0.831  | 0.353  | -0.034 | 0.111  |
| Greenness index                     | 0.749  | -0.313 | 0.209  | 0.240  |
| Catalase activity                   | -0.231 | -0.251 | 0.667  | 0.427  |
| Peroxidase activity                 | -0.528 | 0.180  | 0.502  | 0.399  |
| Ascorbate peroxidase activity       | 0.113  | 0.504  | 0.559  | -0.168 |
| Glutathione reductase activ-<br>ity | 0.086  | 0.170  | -0.449 | 0.790  |
| Superoxide dismutase activ-<br>ity  | 0.309  | 0.731  | 0.156  | -0.155 |
| Seed yield                          | 0.750  | -0.491 | 0.085  | -0.133 |
| Drought tolerance index             | 0.769  | -0.111 | 0.358  | -0.083 |
| Electrolyte leakage                 | -0.634 | 0.686  | -0.042 | -0.015 |
| Relative variance                   | 40.090 | 17.240 | 11.930 | 9.480  |
| Cumulative variance                 | 40.090 | 57.340 | 69.260 | 78.740 |

antioxidant mechanisms and reduced electrolyte leakage in drought. Also, RI species had more colonization compared with FM that's about it, we represented high colonization of RI species with the roots of the linseed under drought stress and non-stress conditions (Ansari et al. 2016).

Irrespective of AM status, SA can mitigate oxidative stress in severe drought as evidenced by an increase in GR activity at 40% FC (Table 4) that was according to the study of Ahmad et al. (2018). In non-AM plants and RI plants, SA increased CAT activity at 40% FC while decreased it at 100% FC which was in agreement with the results of Kim et al. (2018) especially at 100% and 70% FC. Uzunova and Popova (2000) indicated that exogenous application of SA to plant exerts diverse physiological effects, such as the internal destruction of the plastids, inhibition of dry weight accumulation, and alterations in leaf expansion and anatomy. Shi et al. (2009) expressed that SA do not alter photosynthetic pigments in hemp plants which was in agreement with our results about the GI.

We hypothesized that reducing the VD and HW under SA treatment could have a negative effect on AM fungi and their function in plants. Salicylic acid caused a significant reduction on MC, HW and VD in FM species, but increased them in RI species which indicating the negative effect of SA on FM. Salicylic acid decreased colonization percentage in FM plants while increased it in RI plants (Ansari et al. 2016). Therefore, a mycorrhizal fungus and its colonization percentage were affected by SA treatment. Positive and higher correlations of MC with HW (r=0.92, p=0.001) and VD (r=0.84, p=0.001) were recorded in this study. Hence our investigation demonstrated that SA can affect MC via altering HW and VD that the type of change (decrease or increase) depends on the species of mycorrhizal fungus and its ability and genome. In this regard, Garg and Bharti (2018) reported that SA enhances the root colonization by significantly increasing the number of arbuscules and vesicles under salt stress which was in agreement with our results about the RI fungus. Also, Medina et al. (2003) expressed that SA may delay root colonization by AM fungi. Ozgonen et al. (2001) represented that SA and related compounds have a negative effect on pathogens and also on AM fungi. Also, Bhat et al. (2017) reported that SA functions as negative regulators in AM symbiosis. Temporary increases in CAT and POX activities in AM tobacco roots occur at the same time as the temporary increase of free SA (Blilou et al. 2000). In this study, CAT and GR activities were increased in RI plants with SA. Interaction between AM and drought and SA showed that RI plants with SA had higher CAT and POX activities in severe drought indicating the positive and synergistic effect between SA and RI species, while FM plants with SA had less CAT activity in severe drought indicating a negative effect between SA and FM species. Li et al. (2010) and Soltani Kazemi et al. (2018) showed that AM with SA increased CAT and POX activities in response to NO<sub>2</sub> exposure and salinity, respectively, which this was in agreement with our results about the CAT and POX activities in RI plants with SA. Garg and Bharti (2018) demonstrated that the combination of SA and AM fungus (Rhizoglomus intraradices) strengthens the plasma membrane and decreases electrolyte leakage under salt stress which was in agreement with our results about the RI fungus. Increasing the concentration of calcium ions in plants treated with both SA and AM fungus can reduce electrolyte leakage and favor AM symbiosis (Garg and Bharti 2018) because higher concentrations of calcium ion increase the sporulation and colonization of AM fungi (Jarstfer et al. 1998). Ozgonen et al. (2001) indicated that the deterrent effect of SA on the progress of Fusarium oxysporum f.sp. lycopersici enhances linearly with increasing SA concentration.

It is clear that SA altered beneficial effects of AM fungi in growth and yield of AM plants and AM symbiosis. Salicylic acid can have negative or positive effects on AM fungi which may be related to the SA effect on fungal hyphae and vesicle, and on root colonization of linseed by AM fungi. Li et al. (2010) represented that colonization by FM with SA can increase *Avena nuda* plant tolerance to increased NO<sub>2</sub> exposure. In our study, RI fungus had a positive response to SA through the lower reduction of seed yield, DTI and SOD, increasing GI and POX, CAT, and GR activities, and decreasing electrolyte leakage. Salicylic acid decreased the ability of linseed to AM symbiosis via decreasing HW and VD; hence the beneficial effects of AM reduced on the growth and yield of AM linseed plants. In general



**Fig. 4** Biplot of principal component analysis for the studied traits of linseed inoculated with mycorrhizal fungi and treated with salicylic acid under drought stress based on the first and second components.1: NM+100% FC+non-SA, 2: NM+100% FC+with SA, 3: NM+70% FC+non-SA, 4: NM+70% FC+with SA, 5: NM+40% FC+non-SA, 6: NM+40% FC+with SA, 7: FM+100% FC+non-SA, 8: FM+100% FC+with SA, 9: FM+70% FC+non-SA, 10:

SA reduced fungal HW (Table 1). However, SA increased VD and HW in RI, but decreased them in FM which demonstrated that FM is the most sensitive species to SA and RI had a synergistic response to SA. Medina et al. (2003) reported that changed SA in plants have an effect on FM during the establishment of the fungus, but do not affect the rate of final root colonization; they also represented that the status was not observed in RI and suggested that this might be due to the different root colonization pattern with this fungus in their experiments. Based on the results of principal component analysis, FM-linseed without SA at 100% FC, and RI-linseed treated with SA at 100% FC (with the highest amount of the first component and the low second component) had the lowest electrolyte leakage and POX activity and the highest DTI, GI, seed yield, and MC. This also showed that FM species did not have a synergistic effect with SA. On the other hand, RI-linseed without SA at 40% FC (with the medium first component and the medium second component) is the best choice under severe drought conditions.

FM+70% FC+with SA, 11: FM+40% FC+non-SA, 12: FM+40% FC+with SA, 13: RI+100% FC+non-SA, 14: RI+100% FC+with SA, 15: RI+70% FC+non-SA, 16: RI+70% FC+with SA, 17: RI+40% FC+non-SA, 18: RI+40% FC+with SA. Salicylic acid (SA), Non-mycorrhizal plants (NM), *Funneliformis mosseae* (FM), *Rhizoglomus intraradices* (RI), and Field capacity (FC)

# **Conclusion for future biology**

Linseed plants subjected to drought stress showed a significant reduction in growth, seed yield and DTI and a significant increment in oxidative damage. However, seed treatment with SA singly can ameliorate the antioxidant system, GI, seed yield, and DTI, while decrease electrolyte leakage that can be applied as a beneficial approach for elevating the drought tolerance of linseed in the future. The combination of SA and RI strengthens plant growth and performance compared with the non-AM and non-SA by decreasing electrolyte leakage, the stimulation of antioxidant system, the higher MC, VD, and HW followed by the better uptake of ions and water, and the higher chlorophyll density followed by more photosynthesis rate, which are responsible for drought tolerance. This can be significant to increase linseed production under drought conditions in the future, however, the use of RI and FM species singly can be more effective in the future linseed production under drought conditions compared to the combination of RI and SA. Also, these results would be the main step in other dry agro-ecological regions wherein cost-effective AM products and SA treatment could be applied for sustainable production of plants growing in that specific region. In addition, these findings encourage researchers to evaluate plant growth and yield as well as AM features (e.g., HW and VD) in terms of genes involved in the interaction pathway of SA with AM fungi.

**Acknowledgements** The authors would like to thank all people who assisted us in the performance of the experiments.

Author contributions AA contributed to conceptualization, investigation, experimental work, collected samples, methodology, data curation, statistical analysis, and writing-original draft preparation. JR was involved in supervision, resources, and methodology. MZ contributed to conceptualization, methodology, validation, and writing-reviewing. HK was involved in conceptualization. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

**Data accessibility** The data generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the authors on reasonable request.

## **Compliance with ethical standards**

**Conflict of interest** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## References

- Abdel Latef AAH, Chaoxing H (2011) Effect of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi on growth, mineral nutrition, antioxidant enzymes activity and fruit yield of tomato grown under salinity stress. Sci Hortic 127:228–233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2010.09.020
- Aghdam MTB, Mohammadi H, Ghorbanpour M (2016) Effects of nanoparticulate anatase titanium dioxide on physiological and biochemical performance of *Linum usitatissimum* (Linaceae) under well-watered and drought stress conditions. Braz J Bot 39:139–146. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40415-015-0227-x
- Ahmad P, Alyemeni MN, Ahanger MA, Egamberdieva D, Wijaya L, Alam P (2018) Salicylic acid (SA) induced alterations in growth, biochemical attributes and antioxidant enzyme activity in faba bean (Vicia faba L) seedlings under NaCl toxicity. Russ J Plant Physl. 65(1):104–114. https://doi.org/10.1134/S10214437180101 32
- Alvarado-López CJ, Dasgupta-Schubert N, Ambriz JE, Arteaga-Velazquez JC, Villegas JA (2019) Lead uptake by the symbiotic *Daucus carota* L.-*Glomus intraradices* system and its effect on the morphology of extra- and intraradical fungal microstructures. Environ Sci Pollut Res 26:381–391. https://doi.org/10.1007/s1135 6-018-3569-7
- Ansari A, Razmjoo J, Karimmojeni H (2016) Mycorrhizal colonization and seed treatment with salicylic acid to improve physiological traits and tolerance of flaxseed (*Linum usitatissimum* L) plants grown under drought stress. Acta Physiol Plant. 38(2):34. https:// doi.org/10.1007/s11738-015-2054-x
- Armada E, Azcon R, Lopez-Castillo OM, Calvo-Polanco M, Ruiz-Lozano JM (2015) Autochthonous arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and *Bacillus thuringiensis* from a degraded Mediterranean area can be used to improve physiological traits and performance of a plant of agronomic interest under drought conditions. Plant

Physiol Biochem 90:64–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plaph y.2015.03.004

- Baltruschat H, Santosb VM, da Silvac DKA, Schellenberga I, Deubeld A, Sieverdinge E, Oehl F (2019) Unexpectedly high diversity of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in fertile Chernozem croplands in Central Europe. CATENA 182:104135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. catena.2019.104135
- Baslam M, Goicoechea N (2012) Water deficit improved the capacity of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) for inducing the accumulation of antioxidant compounds in lettuce leaves. Mycorrhiza 22:347–359. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00572-011-0408-9
- Beauchamp C, Fridovich I (1971) Superoxide dismutase: improved assays and an assay applicable to acrylamide gels. Anal Biochem 44:276–287. https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-2697(71)90370-8
- Bergmeyer N (1970) Methods of enzymatic analysis. Academy Publisher, Berlin
- Berruti A, Lumini E, Balestrini R, Bianciotto V (2016) Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi as natural biofertlizers: let's benefit from past successes. Front Microbiol 6:1559. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb .2015.01559
- Bhat RA, Dervash MA, Mehmood MA, Skinder BM, Rashid A, Bhat JIA, Singh DV, Lone R (2017) Mycorrhizae: A sustainable industry for plant and soil environment. In: Varma A, Prasad R, Tuteja N (eds) Mycorrhiza - Nutrient uptake, biocontrol, ecorestoration. Springer, Cham, pp 473–502. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-68867-1\_25
- Blilou I, Bueno P, Ocampo JA, Garcia-Garrido JM (2000) Induction of catalase and ascorbate peroxidase activities in tobaccco roots inoculated with the arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus *Glomus mosseae*. Mycol Res 104:722–725. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0953 75629900204x
- Bradford MM (1976) A rapid and sensitive method for the quantitation of microgram quantities of protein utilizing the principle of protein-dye binding. Anal Biochem 72:248–254. https://doi. org/10.1016/0003-2697(76)90527-3
- Ceccarelli N, Curadi M, Martelloni L, Sbrana C, Picciarelli P, Giovannetti M (2010) Mycorrhizal colonization impacts on phenolic content and antioxidant properties of artichoke leaves and flower heads two years after field transplant. Plant Soil 335:311–323. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-010-0417-z
- Cekic OF, Unyayar S, Ortas I (2012) Effects of arbuscular mycorrhizal inoculation on biochemical parameters in *Capsicum annuum* L. (pepper) grown under long term salt stress. Turk J Bot 36:1–10. https://doi.org/10.3906/bot-1008-32
- Chemikosova SB, Pavlencheva NV, Guryanov OP, Gorshkova TA (2006) The effect of soil drought on the phloem fiber development in long-fiber flax. Russ J Plant Physiol. 53(5):656–662. https://doi.org/10.1134/S1021443706050098
- Dempsey DA, Klessig DF (2017) How does the multifaceted plant hormone salicylic acid combat disease in plants and are similar mechanisms utilized in humans? BMC Biol 15:23. https://doi. org/10.1186/s12915-017-0364-8
- Ditommaso A, nurse RE, (2004) Impact of sodium hypochlorite concentration and exposure period on germination and radicle elongation of three annual weed species. Seed Sci Technol. 32:377–391. https://doi.org/10.15258/sst.2004.32.2.10
- Fila G, Bagatta M, Maestrini C, Potenza E, Matteo R (2018) Linseed as a dual-purpose crop: evaluation of cultivar suitability and analysis of yield determinants. J Agr Sci 156:162–176. https:// doi.org/10.1017/S0021859618000114
- Garg N, Bharti A (2018) Salicylic acid improves arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis, and chickpea growth and yield by modulating carbohydrate metabolism under salt stress. Mycorrhiza 28(8):727– 746. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00572-018-0856-6
- Hara M, Furukawa J, Sato A, Mizoguchi T, Miura K (2012) Abiotic stress and role of salicylic acid in plants. In: Ahmad P, Prasad M

Deringer

226

(eds) Abiotic stress responses in plants. Springer, NY, pp 235-251. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-0634-1\_13

- Harb A, Awad D, Samarah N (2015) Gene expression and activity of antioxidant enzymes in barley (Hordeum vulgare L) under controlled severe drought. J Plant Interac. 10(1):109-116. https://doi. org/10.1080/17429145.2015.1033023
- Hashem A, Abd Allah EF, Alqarawi AA, Egamberdieva D (2018) Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and plant stress tolerance. In: Egamberdieva D, Ahmad P (eds) Plant microbiome Stress response Microorganism for sustainability 5. Springer, Singapore, pp 81-103. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5514-0 4
- He F, Sheng M, Tang M (2017) Effects of Rhizophagus irregularis on photosynthesis and antioxidative enzymatic system in Robinia pseudoacacia L under drought stress. Front Plant Sci 8:183. https ://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.00183
- Herzog V, Fahimi H (1973) A new sensitive colorimetric assay for peroxidase using 3,3'-diaminobenzidine as hydrogen donor. Anal Biochem 55:554-562. https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-2697(73)90144-9
- Jarstfer AG, Farmer P, Sylvia DM (1998) Tissue magnesium and calcium affect arbuscular mycorrhizal development and fungal reproduction. Mycorrhiza 7:237-242. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s00572-018-0856-6
- Kamarudin ZS, Yusop MR, Muda Mohamed MT, Ismail MR, Harun R (2018) Growth performance and antioxidant enzyme activities of advanced mutant rice genotypes under drought stress condition. Agronomy 8(12):279. https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy8120279
- Kim Y, Mun B-G, Khan AL, Waqas M, Kim H-H, Shahzad R, Imran M, Yun B-W, Lee I-J (2018) Regulation of reactive oxygen and nitrogen species by salicylic acid in rice plants under salinity stress conditions. PLoS ONE 13(3):e0192650. https://doi. org/10.1371/journal.pone.0192650
- La VH, Lee BR, Zhang Q, Park SH, Islam MdT, Kim TH (2019) Salicylic acid improves drought-stress tolerance by regulating the redox status and proline metabolism in Brassica rapa. Hortic Environ Biotechnol 60:31-40. https://doi.org/10.1007/s1358 0-018-0099-7
- Li R, Jiang Y, Xu J, Zhou B, Ma C, Liu C, Yang C, Xiao Y, Xu Q, Hao L (2010) Synergistic action of exogenous salicylic acid and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus colonization in Avena nuda seedlings in response to NO2 exposure. Bull Environ Contam Toxicol 84:96-100. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00128-009-9895-1
- Lutts S, Kinet JM, Bouharmont J (1996) NaCl-induced senescene in leaves of rice (Oryza sativa L.) cultivars differing in salinity resistance. Ann Bot 78:389-398. https://doi.org/10.1006/ anbo.1996.0134
- Ma Y, Látr A, Rocha I, Freitas H, Vosátka M, Oliveira RS (2019) Delivery of inoculum of Rhizophagus irregularis via seed coating in combination with Pseudomonas libanensis for cowpea production. Agronomy 9(1):33. https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy90 10033
- Majidi MM, Rashidi F, Sharafi Y (2015) Physiological traits related to drought tolerance in Brassica. Int J Plant Prod 9(4):541-559. https://doi.org/10.22069/ijpp.2015.2462
- Marulanda A, Porcel R, Barea JM, Azcon R (2007) Drought tolerance and antioxidant activities in lavender plants colonized by native drought-tolerant or drought-sensitive Glomus Species. Microb Ecol 54:543-552. https://doi.org/10.1007/s0024 8-007-9237-v
- McGonigle TP, Miller MH, Evans DG, Fairchild GL, Swan JA (1990) A new method which gives an objective measure of colonization of roots by vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. New Phytol 115(3):495-501. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.1990.tb004
- Medina MJH, Gagnon H, Piche Y, Ocampo JA, Garrido JMG, Vierheilig H (2003) Root colonization by arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi

is affected by the salicylic acid content of the plant. Plant Sci 164:993-998. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0168-9452(03)00083-9

- Müller A, Ngwene B, Peiter E, George E (2017) Quantity and distribution of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal storage organs within dead roots. Mycorrhiza 27:201-210. https://doi.org/10.1007/s0057 2-016-0741-0
- Nakano Y, Asada K (1981) Hydrogen peroxide is scavenged by ascorbate-specific peroxidase in spinach chloroplasts. Plant Cell Physiol 22:867-880. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.pcp. a076232
- Nasaruddin RI (2018) Photosynthetic apparatus of soybean exposed to drought due to application of arbuscular mycorrhiza. Asian J Plant Sci 17:37-46. https://doi.org/10.3923/ajps.2018.37.46
- Ozgonen H, Bicici M, Erkilic A (2001) The effect of salicylic acid and endomycorrhizal fungus Glomus etunicatum on plant development of tomatoes and fusarium wilt caused by Fusarium oxysporum f.sp lycopersici. Turk J Agr For 25:25-29
- Page AL, Miller HR, Keeney RD (1982) Methods of soil analysis, part 2: chemical and microbiological properties, 2nd edn. American Society of Agronomy, Madison, WI
- Porcel R, Ruiz-Lozano JM (2004) Arbuscular mycorrhizal influence on leaf water potential, solute accumulation, and oxidative stress in soybean plants subjected to drought stress. J Exp Bot 55:1743-1750. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erh188
- Quiroga G, Erice G, Aroca R, Zamarreño ÁM, García-Mina JM, Ruiz-Lozano JM (2018) Arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis and salicylic acid regulate aquaporins and root hydraulic properties in maize plants subjected to drought. Agr Water Manage 202:271-284. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2017.12.012
- Quiroga G, Erice G, Aroca R, Chaumont F, Ruiz-Lozano JM (2017) Enhanced drought stress tolerance by the arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis in a drought-sensitive maize cultivar is related to a broader and differential regulation of host plant aquaporins than in a drought-tolerant cultivar. Front Plant Sci 8:1-15. https://doi. org/10.3389/fpls.2017.01056
- Rabie GH, Almadini AM (2005) Role of bioinoculants in development of salt-tolerance of Vicia faba plants under salinity stress. Afr J Biotechnol 4:210-222
- Rahimzadeh S, Pirzad AR (2017) Microorganisms (AMF and PSB) interaction on linseed productivity under water-deficit condition. Int J Plant Prod. 11(2):259-274. https://doi.org/10.22069/ ijpp.2017.3423
- Rui-hong Y, Run-jin L, Cheng-lian L, Yong-zhang W, Pei-huan L, Yong-bing Y (2009) Effects of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and salicylic acid on salt tolerance of strawberry (Fragaria×ananassa Duch) plants. Sci Agr Sinica 42:1590-1594. https://doi. org/10.3864/j.issn.0578-1752.2009.05.011
- SAS Institute Inc (2009) SAS/STAT ® 9.2 User's Guide, Second Edition. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc
- Sauer DB, Burroughs R (1986) Disinfection of seed surfaces with sodium hypochlorite. Phytopathology 76:745-749. https://doi. org/10.1094/phyto-76-745
- Shi GR, Cai QS, Liu QQ, Wu L (2009) Salicylic acid-mediated alleviation of cadmium toxicity in hemp plants in relation to cadmium uptake, photosynthesis, and antioxidant enzymes. Acta Physiol Plant 31:969-977. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11738-009-0312-5
- Shivaraj SM, Dhakate P, Sonah H, Vuong T, Nguyen HT, Deshmukh R (2019) Progress toward development of climate-smart flax: A perspective on omics-assisted breeding. In: Kole C (ed) Genomic designing of climate-smart oilseed crops. Springer, Cham, pp 239-274. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93536-2\_5
- Sofo A, Scopa A, Maria N, Vitti A (2015) Ascorbate peroxidase and catalase activities and their genetic regulation in plants subjected to drought and salinity stresses. Int J Mol Sci 16:13561-13578. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms160613561

- Soltani Kazemi J, Aboutalebian MA, Hamzei J, Meskarbashee M (2018) Mycorrhiza and seed priming effect to improve the balance of sodium and potassium and some changes in antioxidants in the leaves of maize (*Zea mays* L.) under soil salinity. J Agron 17:18–27. https://doi.org/10.3923/ja.2018.18.27
- Stacey G, Bickley McAlvin C, Kim S, Olivares J, Soto MJ (2006) Effects of endogenous salicylic acid on nodulation in the model legumes *Lotus japonicus* and *Medicago truncatula*. Plant Physiol 141:1473–1481. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.106.080986
- Subramanian KS, Virgine Tenshia JS, Jayalakshmi K, Ramachandran V (2011) Antioxidant enzyme activities in arbuscular mycorrhizal (*Glomus intraradices*) fungus inoculated and non-inoculated maize plants under zinc deficiency. Indian J Microbiol 51(1):37– 43. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12088-011-0078-5
- Thompson JP (1996) Correction of dual phosphorus and zinc deficiencies of linseed (*Linum usitatissimum* L.) with cultures of vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. Soil Biol Biochem 28:941–951. https://doi.org/10.1016/0038-0717(95)00185-9
- Uzunova AN, Popova LP (2000) Effect of salicylic acid on leaf anatomy and chloroplast ultrastructure of barley plants. Photosynthetica 38:243–250. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1007226116925
- Wu QS, Xia RX, Zou YN (2006) Reactive oxygen metabolism in mycorrhizal and non-mycorrhizal citrus (*Poncirus trifoliata*) seedlings subjected to water stress. J Plant Physiol 163:1101–1110. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.jplph.2005.09.001

- Yaghoubian Y, Mohammadi Goltapeh E, Pirdashti H, Esfandiari E, Feiziasl V, Kari Dolatabadi H, Varma A, Haryani Hassim M (2014) Effect of *Glomus mosseae* and *Piriformospora indica* on growth and antioxidant defense responses of wheat plants under drought stress. Agric Res 3(3):239–245. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s40003-014-0114-x
- Zarei M, Hempel S, Wubet T, Schafer T, Savaghebi G, Salehi-Jouzani G, Khayam Nekouei M, Buscot F (2010) Molecular diversity of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in relation to soil chemical properties and heavy metal contamination. Environ Pollut 158:2757– 2765. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2010.04.017
- Zarei M, Konig S, Hempel S, Nekouei MK, Savaghebi G, Buscot F (2008a) Community structure of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi associated to Veronica rechingeriat the Anguran zinc and lead mining region. Environ Pollut 156:1277–1283. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.envpol.2008.03.006
- Zarei M, Saleh-Rastin N, Salehi Jouzani GH, Savaghebi GH, Buscot F (2008b) Arbuscular mycorrhizal abundance in contaminated soils around a zinc and lead deposit. Eur J Soil Biol 44:381–391. https ://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejsobi.2008.06.004
- Zhang YC, Zou YN, Liu LP, Wu QS (2019) Common mycorrhizal networks activate salicylic acid defense responses of trifoliate orange (*Poncirus trifoliata*). J integr plant biol 61(10):1099–1111. https ://doi.org/10.1111/jipb.12743