Abstract

Soil salinity threatens agricultural production worldwide by constraining plant growth and final crop yield. The early stages are most sensitive to salinity, in response to which salicylic acid (SA) has demonstrated beneficial effects in various plant species. Based on this, a maize (Zea mays L.) pot experiment was set up combining three levels of soil salinity (0, 6 and 12 dS m⁻¹), obtained through NaCl addition, with three levels of SA (0, 300 and 600 mM), applied by leaf spraying 20 days after seedling emergence. Fifteen days later, the following traits were assessed: morphology (plant height, leaf number), growth (root and shoot dry weight), leaf water status [relative water content (RWC), electrolyte leakage (EL)], pigments (chlorophyll a and b, carotenoids, anthocyanin), antioxidant enzymes (peroxidase, catalase, ascorbate peroxidase, vitamin C), oxidative stress markers (H₂O₂, malondialdehyde), osmo-regulating compounds (free amino acids, soluble proteins and sugars, proline), hormones [indole-3-acetic acid, gibberellic acid (GA), abscisic acid (ABA), ethylene], element (Na, K, Ca, Mg and Cl) concentration and content in roots, stem and leaves. Salinity severely affected maize growth (−26% total dry weight), impaired leaf water status (−31% RWC), reduced photosynthetic pigments, enhanced all antioxidant enzymes and oxidative stress markers, two osmo-regulating compounds (soluble sugars and proline) out of four, and all hormones except GA. SA was shown effective in containing most of the stress effects, while supporting plant defences by upgrading antioxidant activities (reduced oxidative stress markers), increasing cell membrane stability (−24% EL) and leaf water status (+20% RWC), and reducing plant stress signalling (−10% ABA and −20% ethylene). Above all, SA contrasted the massive entry of noxious ions (Na⁺ and Cl⁻), in favour of K⁺, Ca²⁺ and Mg²⁺ accumulation. Lastly, salicylic acid was shown beneficial for maize growth and physiology also under non-saline conditions.

Highlights

- Foliar applied salicylic acid alleviated salinity effects on maize growth at early plant stage.
- Salicylic acid improved leaf water status, chlorophyll content, and strengthened anti-oxidant enzymes under salinity.
- Salicylic acid reduced oxidative stress markers while enhancing osmo-regulating and hormonal responses to salinity.
- Salicylic acid hampered Na and Cl entry and translocation to above ground organs, preserving leaf cell membrane integrity.
- Salicylic acid was shown beneficial for maize growth and physiology also under non-saline conditions.
saline soils predominantly in the arid and semi-arid world areas (Cassaniti et al., 2013). Lastly, at a global scale and on a yearly basis, salinity stress causes a 12 billion US dollars reduction in agricultural production (Qadir et al., 2014), and puts 1.5 m ha out of cultivation (Munns and Tester, 2008).

Salinity causes ionic, oxidative, and osmotic stress to plants; all of them can have devastating impacts on diverse physiological and metabolic processes (Flower and Colmer, 2008). Plant responses to these changes often result in various alterations including the reduction in leaf area, internode length, and leaf necrosis and final abscission (Parida and Das, 2005). The response of plants and their ability to tolerate the salinity stress varies significantly among species (Flower and Colmer, 2008). Salinity stress disturbs the normal photosynthetic and respiration processes, as well as starch metabolism (Sudhir and Murthi, 2004). Additionally, it significantly reduces the amount of the photosynthetic pigments (Juan et al., 2005), and affects the production and accumulation of different hormones in plants. Ethylene is considered the most important hormone, as it influences several physiological processes, root growth, stem elongation, fruit ripening and grain development (Hussain et al., 2019). Ethylene production significantly increases under salt stress, which leads to a substantial reduction in growth and physiological processes (Hussain et al., 2020a). Thus, it is of primary importance for the plant to maintain low ethylene accumulation under salt stress in order to ensure better growth.

The uptake of large amounts of ions results in increased osmotic pressure at cellular level. Therefore, plants maintain cell homeostasis by sequestering salt ions in the vacuoles or by accumulating variable organic osmolytes (Munns, 2002). Moreover, in different plant species, various osmolytes such as proline or soluble sugars are produced, which protect plant cells from the damaging effects of salinity stress. Higher proline accumulation is often linked with salt tolerance (Hokmabadi et al., 2005). Therefore, plant ability to accumulate proline is often suggested as criteria to select salt tolerant genotypes (Asraf and Harris, 2004). The Na and K homeostasis plays an indispensable role in plant growth owing to the fact that the interaction between the two cations is mostly responsible for K deficiency (Parida and Das, 2005; Rahneshan et al., 2018). Potassium is fundamental for various physiological processes including enzymatic activation, maintenance of osmotic pressure and turgor potential, and stomatal opening (Golldack et al., 2003). Therefore, a higher K:Na ratio results in higher salt tolerance (Raza et al., 2007). Moreover, Ca also plays a relevant role in salt tolerance, as it controls Na influx by non-selective ionic channels, and therefore, alleviates salinity toxic effects (Melgar et al., 2006).

Plants produce diverse signalling molecules under salt stress, which diminish the negative effects and improve plant resilience facing this stress. Salicylic acid (SA) is one of the most important signalling molecules: its role in increasing plant adaptation to salt stress is well documented (Dempsey and Klessig, 2017; Kudla et al., 2018). In fact, SA influences a vast array of plant processes from seed germination to growth, and improves the salt tolerance by increasing the endogenous SA level (El-Mergawi and El-Wahed, 2010). SA also reduces the lipid peroxidation and production of reactive oxygen species, and interacts with different hormones to increase plant tolerance to salinity (Jayakannan et al., 2015; Husen et al., 2018). Likewise, SA application increases the synthesis of indole-3-acetic acid (IAA) and gibberellic acid (GA), two hormones also contributing to plant growth under salt stress (Shaki et al., 2019). Therefore, all these characteristics make SA a key substance to improve plant tolerance to salinity.

Maize (Zea mays L.) is the second largest cereal crop at world level (FAO, 2019), and is a species quite sensitive to salinity (Rhoades et al., 1992). Owing to this, it is expected that maize could remarkably benefit from treatment with SA. In contrast to this, there is a paucity of knowledge related to the effects of SA on maize early growth, physiological attributes, anti-oxidant activity, osmolyte accumulation, ionic homeostasis, and SA mediated hormonal cross talk under salinity.

Materials and methods

Experiment set up

A pot experiment was conducted at the University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan. The soil was collected from the Agronomy experimental farm (31.8° N, 73.8° E, 184 m a.s.l.), air-dried, mixed, sieved, and subjected to determination of the principal soil properties: the soil was a clay loam with pH 7.65, organic matter 6.5 mg g⁻¹, Kjeldahl N 0.38 mg g⁻¹, C:N 9.9, available P 13 mg kg⁻¹, and exchangeable K 171 mg kg⁻¹. Twenty-seven pots were filled each with 8 kg of soil. Maize seeds were sterilized for 1 minute with 70% ethanol followed by sodium hypochlorite for 5 minutes; at the end, seeds were washed with distilled water (dH₂O) five times and dried. Thereafter, 10 seeds per pot were sown at 1.5 cm depth. The study was conducted from 1st March to 15th April 2018 under a transparent rain shelter. During this period, the average minimum and maximum daily temperature was 17.4°C and 32.4°C, respectively. Air humidity varied between 43% and 73%. The pots were regularly watered according to need.

Experimental treatments

Nine treatments were set up resulting from the cross combination of three soil salinity levels, control, 6 dS m⁻¹ and 12 dS m⁻¹, and three SA levels, control, 300 mM and 600 mM. Table salt (NaCl) was applied during soil mixing and pot filling, at the concentrations given by the following formula, in order to obtain the above referred levels of salinity:

\[
\text{NaCl required (g kg}^{-1}\text{)} = \frac{\text{TSS} \times 8.5 \times \text{Saturation} (\%)}{100 \times 1000} \tag{1}
\]

TSS=total soluble salts which were measured as: TSS = (EC₂;EC₁) × 10; EC₁ was required electrical conductivity, and EC₂ was the EC in control soil. For the determination of saturation (%), soil paste was prepared by the addition of distilled water, mixed and left for 2h to reach equilibrium. The extract was obtained by filtering the saturated soil with filter paper; saturation was calculated by the following formula:
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Saturation (%) = \frac{\text{Loss in soil weight on drying}}{\text{Weight of soil after drying}} \times 100 \quad (2)

For plant nutrition, N, P, and K were applied as di-ammonium phosphate (1.87 g kg⁻¹ soil) and potash sulphate (5.58 g kg⁻¹) prior to sowing. After 20 days from emergence, SA was foliar applied according to different treatments. Leaves were sprayed with a manual pump on both sides, using a constant volume on all pots; control pots were sprayed with water.

Fifteen days after SA treatments, plants were harvested and the following morphological, growth, physiological, enzymatic, hormonal and chemical traits were determined.

**Morphological and growth traits**

Three plants were selected from each pot to record their height, leaf number, root and shoot fresh weight and, following oven drying (70°C), dry weight (DW).

**Leaf water status and pigments**

Relative water content (RWC) was determined according to Mostofa and Fujita (2013). The second top leaf was collected, weighed (FW), and then submerged in dH₂O for 24 h in the dark. After excessive water was removed from the leaf sample, turgid weight (TW) was taken. Then, the samples were dried at 70°C to record DW. Based on these data, RWC was determined with the following equation:

\[
RWC (%) = \frac{FW - DW}{TW - DW} \times 100 \quad (3)
\]

Electrolyte leakage (EL) was determined by the method of Lutts et al. (1996). Fresh leaves were collected and washed with dH₂O to remove any contamination. The leaf samples were placed in stoppered vials having 10 mL dH₂O at 25°C on a rotary shaker. First electrical conductivity (E₁) was recorded after 24 h; then the leaf samples were placed for 20 m in a water bath at 120°C, cooled down to room temperature and second electrical conductivity (E₂) was measured. The final EL was calculated as:

\[
EL = \frac{E_2}{E_1} \times 100 \quad (4)
\]

Chlorophyll a, b and carotenoids were determined according to Arnon (1949). One g leaf samples were homogenized in 80% acetone; the extract was centrifuged, and the supernatant was used for recording the absorbance at 663, 645, 470 nm with a spectrophotometer (Hitachi U-2001, Tokyo, Japan), for the three respective pigments. Phycoyanin was assessed by the method of Kubo et al. (1999); 0.5 g plant sample was homogenized into 5 mL potassium phosphate buffer using pestle and mortar. The extract was centrifuged for 15 min and the absorbance was recorded at 535 nm. A set of three replicates was used to determine the parameters related to leaf water status and photosynthetic pigments.

**Antioxidant enzymes and oxidative stress markers**

The catalase (CAT) content was determined according to Fu et al. (2017). Test tubes were prepared containing 100 μL of H₂O₂ (5.9 mM) + 1000 μL buffer and 100 μL of plant extract. Absorbance was recorded at 240 nm with the aforementioned spectrophotometer, using an extinction coefficient of 39.4 mM⁻¹ cm⁻¹.

The peroxidase (POD) content was measured according to Guan et al. (2009). The combination of reagents containing 100 μL extract enzyme + 2700 μL of 50 mM potassium buffer + 100 μL guaiacol and 100 μL H₂O₂ was used. A 0.5 g plant sample was homogenized with 5 mL potassium phosphate buffer (50 mM) having pH 7.0 under ice-cold conditions and centrifuged at 15,000 rpm. Thereafter, the absorbance was recorded at 470 nm using the aforementioned spectrophotometer.

The ascorbate peroxidase (APX) contents were determined by the methods of Nakano and Asada (1981). A mixture was prepared containing 100 μL enzyme extracts, 100 μL ascorbate (7.5 mM), 100 μL H₂O₂ (300 mM), and 2.7 mL potassium buffer (25 mM). Thereafter, the absorbance was recorded at 290 nm with the aforementioned spectrophotometer, using an extinction coefficient of 2.8 mM⁻¹ cm⁻¹.

Ascorbic acid was determined according to Mukherjee and Chouduri (1983). Leaf samples (0.5 g) were standardized with 5 mL of 10% trichloroacetic acid solution, and centrifuged for 10 min at 8000 rpm. After centrifugation, 0.5 mL of dithiocarbamate reagent was added to 2 mL supernatant, incubated for 3 h at 37°C, cooled rapidly by ice-cooling for about 10 minutes, and then 2 mL sulfuric acid was added dropwise and shaken lightly. The mixture was kept for 30 min at 30°C, then absorption was recorded at 520 nm with the aforementioned spectrophotometer, determining ascorbic acid content based on standard curves produced from samples with known concentrations.

The H₂O₂ content was assessed according to Velikova et al. (2000). A 0.5 g plant sample was ground in 5 mL of trichloroacetic acid and centrifuged. Afterward, 1 mL extract was placed in a test tube with 166 mg of 1 M potassium iodide and 100 μL potassium phosphate buffer for 30 minutes. The absorbance was then read at 390 nm with the aforementioned spectrophotometer, using an extinction coefficient of 0.28 μM⁻¹ cm⁻¹.

Malondialdehyde (MDA) was determined according to Rao and Sresty (2000). Plant samples (0.5 g) were ground with 5 mL trichloroacetic acid, and samples were centrifuged for 15 min at 12,000 rpm at 4°C. The mixture containing 1 mL plant sample and 1 mL of thiobarbituric acid was heated for 30 minutes at 100°C, and cooled rapidly in ice bath at 4°C. The MDA concentration was determined at 532 nm and 600 nm with the aforementioned spectrophotometer, using an extinction coefficient of 1.53 mM⁻¹ cm⁻¹. The mean value of aforementioned parameters was calculated from a set of three replicates.

**Osmo-regulating compounds and hormones**

Free amino acids were assessed through the procedure of Hamilton and Ván Slyke (1943). Leaf samples (0.5 g) were ground with 5 mL phosphate buffer (pH 7.8) and centrifuged at 15,000 rpm for 15 minutes. One mL extract was placed in a test tube containing 1 mL of ninhydrin and pyridine and left in a water bath for 30 minutes at 90°C. Then, dH₂O was added to a volume of 25 mL, and absorbance was read at 570 nm with the aforementioned spectrophotometer, determining free amino acid content based on standard curves produced from samples with known concentrations.

Total soluble proteins were determined with the Bradford (1976) method. Leaf samples (0.5 g) were ground in 5 mL phosphate buffer (pH 7.8) and centrifuged for 15 minutes at 15,000 rpm at 4°C. Thereafter, 1 mL extract was transferred into test tubes, 3 mL Bradford reagent was added and the mixture was left at room temperature for 15 minutes prior to reading the absorbance at 595 nm using the aforementioned spectrophotometer. The concentration of total soluble proteins was determined using standard curves derived from samples with known concentrations.

Total soluble sugars were measured by placing 1-2 drops of
supernatant on the prism of a digital refractometer, reading the Brix percent value.

The proline content was measured by the procedures of Bates et al. (1973). Plant samples (0.5 g) were extracted with 10 ml of 3% sulpho-saliclyc acid and centrifuged for 10 minutes at 10,000 rpm. The supernatant was supplied with acid-ninhydrin and placed in a water bath for 30 minutes at 90°C. Then, absorbance was read at 250 nm with the aforementioned spectrophotometer, determining proline content based on standard curves produced from samples with known concentrations.

Plant hormones, IAA and ABA were determined on 0.5 g samples ground in 2 mL 80% methanol with 40 mg butylated hydroxytoluene. Samples were incubated for 48 h at 4°C, and were centrifuged for 15 minutes at 1900×g. Afterwards, the C18 Sep-Pak cartridges were used to pass the supernatant followed by the use of 10 mL pure ethanol, and then 10 mL of ether to determine hormonal fractions which were Ni-dried at 20°C. The extract was subsequently dissolved in 0.1% gelatin (pH 7.5), and 0.1 Tween-20 containing 2 mL of phosphate-buffered saline. Lastly, the IAA and ABA concentrations were determined following the protocols of Well et al. (1981).

The GA concentration was determined following the protocols of Berrios et al. (2004). The extraction of plant samples (0.1 g) was done by using 3 mL 96% ethanol. Extract absorbance was read at 254 nm with the aforementioned spectrophotometer, and GA contents were determined with a linear regression equation.

The ethylene evolution was measured using the protocols of Sun et al. (2007 and 2010). Samples were excised from the plant, and were placed in vials for 30 minutes before sealing. Then samples were incubated for 2 h at room temperature, and 1 mL of gas sample was taken with a syringe from the headspace. The concentration of ethylene was measured using a gas chromatograph fitted with flame ionization detector and a capillary column (Porapak Q 80-100). The mean value of each osmo-regulating compound and hormone was determined by using three replications.

### Ion accumulation

Samples of the three plant organs (roots, stem and leaves) were collected, washed with dH2O, dried at 65°C, and milled to make powder. The powdered samples (0.5 g) were digested with 1:2 HCl and HNO3, for 10 minutes at 180°C, filtered and diluted with dH2O (Hsu and Kao, 2003). The acid mixture containing dH2O was used to measure the element (Na+, K+, Ca2+ and Mg2+) concentration in plant organs by flame photometer (Jena/Kyow PFP-7, Burlington, NJ, USA). For Cl− determination, samples of the three organs were extracted in distilled water and Cl− concentration was determined by a chloride analyser (model 926, Sherwood Scientific, Cambridge, UK). A set of three replicates was used to determine the mean value of each ion.

### Experimental design and data analysis

The experiment was arranged in a completely randomized factorial design with three replicates. Data from all traits were submitted to a two-way ANOVA for salinity, SA and their interaction. Tukey’s HSD test at P≤0.05 was used to separate levels in significant ANOVA sources. Four of the nine treatments resulting from the salinity x SA combination, excluding the intermediate level of salinity (300 mM) and SA (6 dS m−1), were more specifically focused in this work (Table 1), and submitted to one-way ANOVA for specific traits (element concentrations, contents and TIs). Data from all treatments and the complete two-way ANOVA are reported as Supplementary Materials in the online Appendix.

A principal component analysis (PCA) was performed on data of all traits from the four selected treatments. In the PCA, the principal components (PCs) were obtained from centred and scaled quantitative variables, through diagonalization of the correlation matrix and extraction of the associated eigenvectors and eigenvalues. In the PCA, the main traits (shoot DW, root DW, R:S, RWC, EL, total chlorophyll, carotenoids, anthocyanin, POD, CAT, APX, vitamin C, H2O2, MDA, free amino acids, soluble proteins, soluble sugars, proline, IAA, GA, ABA, ethylene, Na, K, Ca, Mg and Cl concentration in the whole plant) were set as active quantitative variables, while the selected Salinity levels (0 and 12 dS m−1) and SA levels (0 and 600 mM) were used as supplementary categorical variables.

Statistics was performed with the R 6.3.6 statistical software, using the Car (Fox et al., 2018) and Emmeans (Lenth et al., 2020) packages for the ANOVA and post-hoc test, and the FactoMineR package (Lê et al., 2008) for PCA. Charts were created with the ggplot2 (Wickham, 2009) R package.

### Results

#### Morphological and growth traits

Soil salinity determined a relevant reduction in maize growth and DW. Under no SA addition (Figure 1), the strongest salinity (Sal.12/SA0) resulted in approximately –20% plant height and leaf number, –35% leaf DW, –25% stem DW, –30% shoot DW, –15% root DW and +15% R:S, with respect to the control (Sal.0/SA0). Addition of SA determined a slight improvement of all growth traits under no salinity (Sal.0/SA600 vs Sal.0/SA0), and a stronger improvement under salinity (Sal.12/SA600 vs Sal.12/SA0). In the latter case, shoot DW attained approximately –15% compared to the control; i.e., it closed about half of the gap determined by salinity without SA addition. In the complete data set (Table S1 in the Supplementary Materials), salinity and SA exhibited significant interactions in plant height, stem DW and shoot DW. In these interactions, SA always mitigated salinity negative effects, in agreement with the two single factors’ effects.

#### Leaf water status and pigments

Salinity altered leaf water status, as shown by ca. –30% RWC and +40% EL with Sal.12/SA600 vs the control (Figure 2). The four pigments were curbed by salinity (Figure 2), staging variations in chlorophyll a to almost –60% (chlorophyll b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment no.</th>
<th>Salinity (dS m−1)</th>
<th>Salicylic acid (mM)</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sal.0/SA0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Sal.0/SA600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sal.12/SA0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Sal.12/SA600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Scheme of the nine treatments resulting from the combination of three levels of soil salinity with three levels of salicylic acid supplied to maize. Shaded rows indicate the four treatments more closely addressed in this paper; they are abbreviated as it appears in the subsequent tables and figures.
Addition of SA determined a slight improvement of all traits under no salinity (Sal.0/SA600 vs Sal.0/SA0), and a noticeable recovery under salinity (Sal.12/SA600 vs Sal.12/SA0). In the complete data set (Table S2 in the Supplementary Materials), significant salinity × SA interactions were observed in RWC, EL and anthocyanin. In these interactions, SA still tended to mitigate salinity negative effects. It is perceived, across the six traits reported in Table S2, that the high dosage of SA (600 mM) was able to offset the negative effects of the intermediate level of salinity (6 dS m⁻¹); not those of the highest salinity (12 dS m⁻¹).

**Antioxidant enzymes and oxidative stress markers**

The four antioxidant enzymes (POD, CAT, APX and vitamin C) and the two oxidative stress markers (H₂O₂ and MDA) responded to salinity (Sal.12/SA0) with increases from a minimum of ca. +10% (MDA) to a maximum of +140% (APX) vs the control (Figure 3). Under no salinity with addition of SA, two antioxidant enzymes (POD and vitamin C) were remarkably increased; the other two antioxidant enzymes (CAT and APX) were less strongly increased, while the two oxidative stress markers were slightly reduced. Under salinity, addition of SA determined further increases in the four antioxidant enzymes (Sal.12/SA600 vs Sal.12/SA0), whereas the two oxidative stress markers were slightly reduced. In the complete data set (Table S3 in the Supplementary Materials), all traits except H₂O₂ staged significant salinity × SA interactions. As a result, the four antioxidant enzymes were doubly enhanced by salinity and SA; thus, the low initial values under control conditions increased in parallel with salinity and SA levels. Conversely, in the case of the two oxidative stress markers, SA mitigated salinity effects. As a result, the high SA level under intermediate salinity (Sal.6/SA600) was able to restore H₂O₂ and MDA values similar to the control (Sal.0/SA0).

**Osmo-regulating compounds and hormones**

Salinity determined variable effects on osmo-regulating compounds and hormones (Figure 4): free amino-acids, soluble proteins and GA were reduced (variations between ca. –20% and –40%), while soluble sugars, proline, IAA, ABA and ethylene were increased (from approximately +20% to +140%). Under no salinity, SA addition increased to a variable extent all traits except ABA and ethylene that were decreased. Under salinity, addition of SA determined stronger variation in soluble sugars, proline and IAA (Sal.12/SA600 vs Sal.12/SA0), while in the other five traits milder variations were observed. In the complete data set (Table S4 in the Supplementary Materials), all traits except H₂O₂ staged significant salinity × SA interactions. As a result, the four antioxidant enzymes were doubly enhanced by salinity and SA; thus, the low initial values under control conditions increased in parallel with salinity and SA levels. Conversely, in the case of the two oxidative stress markers, SA mitigated salinity effects. As a result, the high SA level under intermediate salinity (Sal.6/SA600) was able to restore H₂O₂ and MDA values similar to the control (Sal.0/SA0).
Supplementary Materials), free amino-acids, soluble proteins, soluble sugars and ethylene exhibited significant salinity × SA interactions. SA mitigated salinity effects in free amino-acids, soluble proteins, GA, ABA and ethylene; in the first four traits, high SA level under intermediate salinity (Sal.6/SA600) was able to restore values quite similar to the control (Sal.0/SA0), whereas in the last trait (ethylene) this effect was far from being achieved.

Element accumulation and translocation to plant organs

The concentration of the four investigated cations (Na, K, Ca and Mg) and the anion (Cl) in plant organs is reported in the Tables S5 and S6 in the Supplementary Materials. The element concentration and content in the whole plant, referred to the four selected treatments (Table 2), indicate that salinity determined sharp increases in Na and Cl concentration, in exchange for decreases in K, Ca and Mg. This reflected in strong increases in Na and Cl content under salinity, despite plant DW reduction. Conversely, K, Ca and Mg content decreased under salinity, as the combined effect of lower element concentrations and lower plant DW.

With SA addition, Na and Cl concentration and content were reduced under both no salinity and salinity, while K, Ca and Mg concentration and content were enhanced under both no salinity and SA addition (Table 2). The allocation of the above described element contents across the three plant organs is expressed by the TI (Figure 5). In the case of Na (Figure 5A), a higher proportion of the element remained in the roots or was translocated to the stem under salinity (Sal.12/SA0 and Sal.12/SA600). Conversely, SA determined the allocation of a higher proportion of Na to leaves under no salinity (Sal.0/SA600).

In the case of K (Figure 5B), a higher proportion of the element was withheld at root level under salinity (Sal.12/SA0 and Sal.12/SA600), whereas a higher proportion was translocated to the stem under no salinity (Sal.0/SA0 and Sal.0/SA600). In both cases, SA addition did not play a significant role in the allocation to different organs.

In the case of Ca (Figure 5C), a higher proportion of the element was withheld at root level under salinity (Sal.12/SA0 and Sal.12/SA600), whereas a higher proportion was translocated to the leaves under no salinity (Sal.0/SA0 and Sal.0/SA600). SA addition did not play a significant role in the allocation to different organs for Ca.

In the case of Mg (Figure 5D), salinity and SA addition did not affect the element allocation to roots and stem. At the leaf level, instead, a slightly higher element translocation was observed under salinity (Sal.12/SA0) vs no salinity and SA addition (Sal.0/SA600).

Lastly (Figure 5D), a higher proportion of Cl was withheld at root level under salinity (Sal.12/SA0 and Sal.12/SA600), as for the cations Na, K and Ca. Under no salinity (Sal.0/SA0 and Sal.0/SA600), a higher proportion was translocated to the stem. SA

![Figure 5. Translocation Index (TI) of (A) sodium, (B) potassium, (C) calcium, (D) magnesium and (E) chloride to plant organs. Salinity and salicylic acid (SA) treatments are fully described in Table 1. Vertical bars, ± SE (n=3). Different letters indicate significant differences for the same organ (Tukey test at P≤0.05).](image)

Table 2. Element concentration and content in the whole plant of maize at different levels of salinity and salicylic acid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Na (mg g⁻¹ DW)</th>
<th>K (g plant⁻¹)</th>
<th>Ca (mg plant⁻¹)</th>
<th>Mg (mg plant⁻¹)</th>
<th>Cl (mg plant⁻¹)</th>
<th>Plant DW (g plant⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sal.0/SA0</td>
<td>3.2a</td>
<td>24.5b</td>
<td>77.4b</td>
<td>62.2b</td>
<td>4.1c</td>
<td>6.36b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal.0/SA600</td>
<td>2.1c</td>
<td>27.2a</td>
<td>85.5a</td>
<td>70.9a</td>
<td>2.5e</td>
<td>6.94a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal.12/SA0</td>
<td>20.5b</td>
<td>13.5d</td>
<td>51.9d</td>
<td>41.6c</td>
<td>35.9d</td>
<td>6.71d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal.12/SA600</td>
<td>17.1p</td>
<td>17.6c</td>
<td>66.5c</td>
<td>50.1c</td>
<td>30.1c</td>
<td>5.55c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salinity and salicylic acid (SA) treatments are fully described in Table 1. DW, dry weight; n.s. and ** indicate non-significant and significant at P<0.01, respectively. Different letters indicate statistical differences (Tukey test at P=0.05).
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addition appears to have favoured Cl allocation to leaves under no salinity (Sal.0/SA600); to have contrasted it under salinity (Sal.12/SA600).

Principal component analysis

The first two PCs were retained for PCA interpretation; they explained 82.3% and 15.6% of the total variance, respectively, and featured the respective eigenvalues of 22.23 and 4.22. The correlation coefficients between the quantitative (plant traits) and qualitative (salinity and SA levels) variables, on one side, and the first two PCs, on the other side, are reported in Table 3, and graphically represented in the Supplementary Materials (Figure S1).

In the biplot of quantitative and qualitative variables (Figure 6), the quantitative variables (green circles) whose values increased under salinity were grouped on the positive side of PC1, i.e., they were shown to be positively related to PC1 (Table 3). They included total Na and Cl concentration, antioxidant enzymes (vitamin C, APX, CAT, POD), oxidative stress markers (MDA and H₂O₂), some osmo-regulating compounds (proline and free sugars), and some hormones as ABA, IAA and ethylene. Not surprisingly, the root to shoot ratio was also placed on this side of PC1.

In exchange for this, the quantitative variables whose values decreased under salinity were grouped on the negative side of PC1, i.e., they were shown to be negatively related to PC1. They included shoot and root dry weight, total Ca, K and Mg concentration, all pigments (chlorophyll a + b, carotenoids, anthocyanin), leaf RWC, soluble proteins, free amino acids, and GA.

The few quantitative variables positively related to PC2 (Table 3) were IAA, POD, proline and vitamin C, which were, therefore, grouped on the positive side of PC2 (Figure 6). No quantitative variable was negatively related to PC2, meaning that none of the

---

**Table 3. Correlation coefficients between quantitative and qualitative variables, and the first two principal components.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>PC1</th>
<th>PC2</th>
<th>PC1</th>
<th>PC2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABA</td>
<td>0.93**</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
<td>K_T</td>
<td>-0.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antocyanin</td>
<td>-0.58**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>MDA</td>
<td>0.85**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APX</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>Mg_T</td>
<td>-0.97**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca_T</td>
<td>-0.93**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>Na_T</td>
<td>1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carotenoids</td>
<td>-0.55**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>POD</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td>0.40ns</td>
<td>Proline</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chl_T</td>
<td>-0.54**</td>
<td>0.32ns</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl_T</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.08**</td>
<td>RDW</td>
<td>-0.88**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>-0.46**</td>
<td>RWC</td>
<td>-0.97**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylene</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>-0.05**</td>
<td>SDW</td>
<td>-0.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free a.a.</td>
<td>-0.58**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>-1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>-0.99**</td>
<td>0.06**</td>
<td>Sugars</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O₂</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>-0.07**</td>
<td>Vit. C</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>0.96**</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.94**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Categorical variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>PC1</th>
<th>PC2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>0.96**</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.94**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 6.** PCA biplot of variables. Green circles indicate the barycenters of the measured traits, blue triangles indicate the barycenters of the salicylic acid treatments (SA; 0 and 600 mM), red squares indicate the barycenters of the salinity treatments (Sal.; 0 and 12 dS m⁻¹). ABA, abscisic acid; Ant., antocyan; APX, ascorbate peroxidase; Ca_T, total (i.e., whole plant) Ca concentration; Chl, chlorophyll; Chl_T, total (i.e., a + b) chlorophyll content; Cl_T, total Cl concentration; EL, electrolyte leakage; Free a.a., free amino acids; GA, gibberellic acid; IAA, indole-3-acetic acid; K_T, total K concentration; Mg_T, total Mg concentration; MDA, malondialdehyde; Na_T, total Na concentration; POD, peroxidase; R:S, root to shoot; RDW, root dry weight; RWC, relative water content; SDW, shoot dry weight; SP, soluble proteins.
surveyed traits was significantly affected by SA.

Of the two qualitative, alias categorical, variables, salinity (red squares) was strongly aligned with PC1 (Figure 6): the high level (Sal. 12 dS m⁻¹) was far away on the positive side mirroring the null level (Sal. 0) far away on the negative side. Conversely, SA (cyan triangles) was strongly aligned with PC2 (Figure 6): the high level (SA 600 mM) was far away on the positive side mirroring the untreated (SA 0) on the negative side.

Hence, it can be inferred that the first PC represents the salinity effects, while the second PC the SA effects.

**Discussion**

Salt stress diminishes plant growth since the early stages, due to oxidative damage, ionic and osmotic stress, and hormonal imbalances (Sarkar et al., 2018). Plant response to salinity depends on the degree of specific tolerance and phenotypic plasticity to environmental features (Al-Whaibi et al., 2012). Exogenous SA application has proved able to improve plant adaptation to salinity and reduce its impact on growth (Kudla et al., 2018; Waqas et al., 2019). Our results are consistent with the above findings reported in the literature, and provide further clues to the interpretation of plant behaviour under the contrasting influence of a stressor as salinity, and a mitigating agent as SA.

The beneficial effects of exogenous SA application at the seedling/early growth stages have already been reported in various plant species (Shakirova et al., 2003; Li et al., 2014; Ahmed et al., 2020), including maize (Hussein et al., 2007; Fahad and Bano, 2012). It is generally agreed that initial plant stages are those most sensitive to salt stress (Rhoades et al., 1992; Munns, 2002; Parida and Das, 2005), resulting in growth impairments and physiological damages that can hardly be recovered in the rest of plant life.

The improvement of leaf pigments, namely chlorophyll a and b, through foliar applied SA (Figure 2) is the premise for sustained photosynthesis under adverse conditions (Li et al., 2014).

The RWC reduction incurred by salinity is also well documented in the literature (Parida and Das, 2005; Karlidag et al., 2009). Supplying SA can mitigate this effect to a large extent (Figure 2), as documented in maize (Escobar et al., 2010) and other plants as barley and cucumber (El-Tayeb, 2005; Yildirim et al., 2008), where SA benefit is attributed to lower transpiration rates associated with higher leaf diffusible resistance.

The EL determined by damaged cellular membrane under salinity was also mitigated by SA (Figure 2), in agreement with previous studies (Parida and Das, 2005; Yildirim et al., 2008). Maintenance of membrane integrity plays a major role against salt stress (Stevens et al., 2006). The EL reduction obtained with SA supply is due to enhanced activity of anti-oxidant enzymes and increased Ca uptake, leading to higher membrane integrity (El-Tayeb, 2005; Fahad and Bano, 2012).

The anti-oxidant enzymes augmenting under stress conditions, were further enhanced by SA (Figure 3). It is evidenced that SA application acts as cell protectant alleviating the effects of the oxidative stress by increasing cell anti-oxidant activity (Sharma, 2013; Khan et al., 2012), which is responsible for scavenging the reactive oxygen species (ROS) created by the oxidative stress, and for reducing the EL determined by loss of membrane integrity (Faried et al., 2017). Therefore, the decrease of the two oxidative stress markers (H₂O₂ and MDA), is consistent with the increase of the investigated anti-oxidant enzymes (i.e., POD, CAT, APX and vitamin C) (Figure 3). Additionally, SA has a binding affinity with CAT, the anti-oxidant enzyme involved in ROS metabolism and redox homeostasis, resulting in increased salt tolerance (Hayat et al., 2008; Fahad and Bano, 2012; Sharma, 2013).

Salinity exerted a variable effect on osmo-regulating compounds: free amino acids and soluble proteins were depressed, while soluble sugars and proline were enhanced (Figure 4). However, they were all enhanced by SA under both saline and non-saline conditions. The increase in free amino acids with SA supply is consistent with previous findings in wheat (Hamid et al., 2010). In general, a higher level of free amino acids creates a gradient of osmotic potential facilitating the inward movement of water to prevent the effect of salt stress (El-Saidi, 1997).

The increase in soluble proteins is possibly due to SA induced protein kinase synthesis and higher nitrate reductase activity. This is associated with a better regulation of various metabolic processes including cell division and differentiation, thanks to enhanced anti-oxidant activities (El-Tayab, 2005; Fahad and Bano, 2012).

Increased synthesis of soluble sugars, as way to improve salt tolerance in maize (Fahad and Bano, 2012), in our experiment appeared to be triggered both by salinity and SA application (Figure 4).

Proline, a non-polar amino acid, was also enhanced both by salinity and SA supply (Figure 4). SA favours the metabolic pathways and transduction signalling that up-regulate the biosynthesis of proline, which is necessary to maintain ionic homeostasis and low cytosolic potential (Faried et al., 2017). Therefore, the increase in proline by SA application improves the osmotic adjustment and plant defences by activating membrane stability, osmotic regulation, ROS scavenging, protein and enzymatic activities (Fahad and Bano, 2012), which all result in improved photosynthesis and overall plant production (Eraslan et al., 2007).

In our experiment, plant hormones were variably influenced by salinity and SA (Figure 4). The role of IAA in salinity tolerance is ambiguous in the literature, and changes in IAA synthesis and metabolism under salinity need to be better elucidated. However, the IAA increase under salinity is consistent with previous studies (Fahad and Bano, 2012; Shaki et al., 2019). Additionally, since IAA improves cell wall extensibility, the role of SA may be to sustain cell growth under reduced hydration determined by salinity (Shaki et al., 2019).

The support provided by SA to GA concentration in our experiment has been associated with better seed germination in *Arabidopsis thaliana* under salinity (Alonso-Ramirez et al., 2009). This suggests that GA biosynthesis and activity may be facilitated by SA, indicating another connection in the complex mechanism of hormonal interactions.

Abscisic acid is a major stress hormone acting in the internal signalling, enabling plants to survive under adverse conditions (Keskin et al., 2010). ABA is also associated with regulation of plant RWC, stomata guard cell activity, and promotion of gene induction (Zhu, 2002). SA and ABA have the same roles in stomata closing through diverse pools of ROS; based on this, SA and ABA may have positive or negative interactions depending on specific conditions (Jayanannan et al., 2015). In *A. thaliana*, the higher endogenous SA reduced stomata aperture and increased salinity tolerance, demonstrating a beneficial SA role in response to salt stress (Miura et al., 2013). In our experiment, SA reduced ABA accumulation, which is consistent with previous studies on maize (Fahad and Bano, 2012) and *A. thaliana* (Asensi-Fabado and Munns-Bosch, 2011; Miura et al., 2011): higher SA concentration increased salinity tolerance by suppressing the ABA signalling triggered by salinity.

Ethylene plays a major role in seed germination, growth, yield, and various physiological processes (Hussain et al., 2019; Ahmed et al., 2020), including root elongation and root hair formation in association with IAA (Muday et al., 2012). Salinity strongly increased ethylene production (Figure 4), resulting in depressed
plant growth, increased ROS production and adverse physiological consequences (Steffens, 2014; Hussain et al., 2020b). Conversely, SA application considerably reduced ethylene production (Figure 4), resulting in significant improvement in growth and physiological traits. It is evinced, therefore, that the tight control of ethylene production is crucial for plant survival under salt stress, to which aim SA plays a beneficial role.

Ion uptake and translocation is highly influenced by salinity, in strong interaction with SA (Table 2 and Figure 5): SA counters Na and Cl accumulation while enhancing Ca, K and Mg accumulation, as means to contrast the former two elements’ noxious effects (Gunes et al., 2007; Fahad and Bano, 2012). Salinity tolerance is often associated with plant attitude to exclude Na in favour of K uptake, thus maintaining optimum K/Na ratio (Malekzadeh, 2015). The analogous exclusion of Cl determined by SA suggests that a similar process might involve anions.

Excessive Na accumulation in cell cytosol increases ROS production, in turn affecting membrane stability by increased MDA content, EL, and protein degradation (Gao et al., 2015). Additionally, excessive Na affects cytosolic activities by physiological and bio-chemical changes (Flowers and Flowers, 2003), resulting in reduced carbon assimilation and premature leaf senescence (Suzuki et al., 2014). Salt stress increases EL owing to increased K efflux from the cells under osmotic stress. To contrast it, SA application reduces EL (Jayakannan et al., 2013) and helps the plant to retain a larger share of K to counter-balance Na excess.

Overall, the maintenance of cytosolic ion homeostasis is fundamental for plant survival under salt stress. SA application increases the defence system activities by reducing cytosolic Na content, while enhancing gene expression responsible for Na sequestration into the vacuole (Shaki et al., 2019). SA also modulates Na transport activities. Therefore, the reduction in Na concentration with SA application (Table 2) could be due, beside K enhancement, to Ca-mediated increase in the activity of H+-ATPase, which provides the energy to remove the excessive Na from cells (Hoang et al., 2020).

The comprehensive effect of SA under salinity may be evinced from the PCA (Figure 6). Although the first PC that represents salinity owns a higher amount of explained variance (82.3%), the second PC that represents SA ability to enhance an array of compounds as a hormone (IAA), two antioxidant enzymes (POD and vitamin C), and an osmo-regulating compound (proline) (Table 4), which are prompted to face salinity.

Conclusions

Salinity, quite expectedly caused serious constraints to maize early growth, in association with impairments in plant physiological machinery. Exogenous application of salicylic acid was able to offset to a good extent these negative effects, by triggering mitigation mechanisms as well as improving anti-oxidant, osmo-regulating and hormonal responses. Antagonism to Na and Cl entry into the plant and translocation to aboveground organs is another remarkable feature exerted by salicylic acid under salinity.

Additional studies are, nevertheless, needed to more deeply investigate the mechanisms involved in salicylic acid effects, namely salicylic acid relationship with hormones and genes involved in Na transport, plus ABA and ethylene reduction.

Lastly, salicylic acid was shown beneficial for plant growth also under non-saline condition, which makes salicylic acid useful and applicable under field conditions, provided that a consistent protocol for seed/seedling treatment is established.
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