B E F
D

Ashenafi Worku*, Bethel Nekir, Lemma Mamo and Teshome Bekele
EIAR, Werer Agricultural Research Center P. O. Box-2003, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
**Corresponding author E-mail: ashuw21@gmail.com*

Salinity is a soil degradation process that significantly reduces plant diversity and agricultural yield, land productivity and value in arid and semi-arid climate regions. High ground water, wrong irrigation practices, low irrigation water quality and topographic of the land are particularly important among the factors that cause salinization of soils (Munns and Tester, 2008; Munns, 2011). The increase in salinity in these regions is adversely affecting crop productivity and in some cases making portions of farms unprofitable or waste land (Setter *et al.*, 2004; Farifteh *et al.*, 2006; Rasool *et al.*, 2007; Elgharably *et al.*,2010; Al-Dakheel and Hussain, 2016). In addition to this, it's estimated that salinization of irrigated lands causes annual global income loss of about US$ 12 billion (Ghassemi *et al.*, 1995), impacting aggregate national incomes in countries affected by degradation of salt-affected land and saline water resources (Qureshi, 2017).Most large-scale irrigated farms in Ethiopia were established without preliminary soil survey; land preparation, proper structures for the delivery of irrigation water and provision of drainage facilities for the safe disposal of excess water (Heluf 1985; Ashenafi and Bobe, 2016). As a result secondary salinization becomes a challenge affecting productivity of substantial areas of farms.

Two approaches have been followed to cope with soil salinity (FAO, 1988; FAO, 1994). The first and most common approach is to modify the saline soil conditions to suit the crop plant, such as engineering approach drained through a suitable system of drainage. However, engineering approach of reclamation is impractical due to economic and technical reasons (Siyal *et al.*, 2002; Hanay *et al.*, 2004). The second approach is to exploit the genetic potential of plants for their adaptability to adverse soil conditions. Growing of salt-tolerant plants is a sustainable approach to biological amelioration of saline wastelands (Haynes and Francis, 1993; Chang *et al.*, 1994; Kushiev *et al.*, 2005). Salt-affected lands can be effectively used and ameliorated through judicious use of various plant species (Chang *et al.*, 1994; Singh *et al.*, 2002; Kushiev *et al.*, 2005).

Moreover, identified salt tolerant forage grass species and uses for bioremediation is very useful as it requires low initial investments, improve the soil quality and the produced crops can be used as animal feedlots. The aim of this study was to evaluate some selected forage grasses for their salt tolerance, ameliorative effect and biomass yield under salt affected soils.

B

The experiment was conducted at Werer agricultural research centre is located at 278 km to the east of Addis Ababa at an altitude of 740 masl and located at 9°12’8”N latitude and 40°15’21” E longitude. The topography of the study area reflects the recent geomorphic history of the Middle Awash valley, through which deposits from the Awash River formed on extensive alluvial plain (AVA, 1960). Slope gradients are generally very low, and predominantly lying in the range between 1 and 2%. The predominant soil types are Vertisols and Fluvisols having alluvial origin deposited from Awash River. The soil structure is generally weekly developed. Vertisols are silty clay to clay while Fluvisols are sandy loam to silty loam in texture (Heluf, 1985; Wondimagegne and Abere, 2012). Fluvisols are constituents of muscovite/illite clay minerals and Vertisols are dominated by montmorillonite clay minerals (Wondimagegne and Abere, 2012). According to the result obtained from Ashenafi and Bobe (2016), the study area is characterized by bimodal rainfall pattern. The mean annual rainfall is 571.3 mm and the mean minimum and maximum temperature are 19.6°C and 34.4°C, respectively. The mean annual free water evaporation by the Class A pan and relative humidity recorded are 2803.7 mm, and 50 %, respectively. The area has five times higher annual free water evaporation than annual mean rainfall, which could be one of the causes for the formation of salt affected soils and nutrient imbalance for plant growth (Ashenafi and Bobe, 2016).

A D E

Four improved forage grasses (*Cinchrus ciliaris, Panicum antidotale, Sorghum sudanese* and *Chloris gayana*) were evaluated for their ameliorating effect and forage yield performance; from 2012 to 2014 at WARC under salt affected soil condition. Treatments were laid out in randomized complete block design (RCBD) with three replications in a plot size of 70 m^2. Forage grasses were established during the month of June, 2012. Agronomic practices recommended in the area were followed. After attaining optimum harvesting time, nine cuts were made at 45 day interval till January 2014. Plant height and total fresh biomass yield of each harvest was measured and recorded. From each harvest 300 gm sample of each grass species were taken, oven dried at 65^0C for 72 hours, then weighted and dry matter yield estimated gravimetrically. Mean plant height, biomass yield, and also relativity reduction in plant height and biomass yield to that under normal soil condition was assessed.

Treatment wise soil samples were collected before planting and after last harvest of experimental period at a soil depth of 0-30 and 30-60 cm and analyzed for selected soil physico-chemical properties. Soil particle size distribution was determined by the Boycouos hydrometer method (Bouyoucos, 1962). According to Blake (1965) undisturbed soil samples were collected using core-sampler method to determine bulk density (BD). Soil reaction (pHe) and electrical conductivity (ECe) were determined from saturated paste extract following the methods described by FAO (1999). Caution exchange capacity (CEC) of the soil was determined by 1M ammonium acetate (NH_4OAc) saturated samples at pH 7 (Van Reeuwijk, 1992). Samples were analysed for exchangeable sodium, potassium, calcium and magnesium extracted in 1M ammonium acetate pH 7 (Van Reeuwijk, 1992). Exchangeable sodium percentage (ESP) was computed as the percentage of exchangeable Na divided to the CEC of the soil as follows:

$$ESP\ (\%) = \frac{\text{Exchangeable Sodium (Na)}}{CEC} * 100$$

Where, concentrations are in cmol $_{(+)}$ kg^{-1} of soil.

Ameliorative effect forage grasses on soil salinity, alkalinity and bulk density characters were assessed.

The collected mean data was used for descriptive statistics in the form of tables, graphs and charts. Analysis of mean was performed to assess the differences in soil and agronomic parameters between each treatment using the general linear model procedure of the statistical analysis system.

C

Selected physicochemical properties of surface and sub-surface soils of the study site were characterized based on the analytical results of the composite soil samples collected at depth of 0-30 and 30-60 cm from experimental site before planting salt tolerant forage grasses. The results indicated that texture of the soil of the experimental site was dominated by the clay at 0-30 cm and silty clay at 30-60 cm soil depth. On the basis of particle size distribution, the soil contained sand 6.48%, silt 34.00%, and clay 59.52% at surface soil. While sub-surface the soil contained sand 8.48 %, silt 46.00 %, and clay 45.52 %. According to the soil textural class determination triangle, soil of the experimental site was found to be from clay at surface soil to silt clay at sub-surface soil. The surface soil bulk density of the study site was ranged from1.31 g cm^{-3} to 1.35 g cm^{-3} (Table 1).

Table 1.!Fggfd! g gbdf!c mlef !b ! gmf df e!c !h h! gg bhf!h b f ! ef ! bmbgf d f e! mld e !

Treatments	Mean Bulk density (gm/cc-3)			
	BP	AFH	∆ Bulk density	% Reduction
D di !d mb	2 45!	2 29!	1 273!	23 1 !
b d n!b e bmh	2 44!	2 2 !	1 256!	21 1!
T hi n! eb f f!	2 42!	2 31!	1 226!	9 89!
Di m !hb b b	2 46!	2 28!	1 287!	24 15!

C ! !cf g f! mb h!BH ! !bgf !g bmib f h!

The analytical results (Table 2) indicated that the soil reaction of the saturated paste extract of study area at soil depths of 0-30 and 30-60 cm varied from 7.6 to 8.1 and 7.6 to 7.9, respectively. According to the rating of Jones (2003), soil reaction (pHe) from pest extracted of study area was rated from slightly alkaline to moderately alkaline. High pHe of the study area might be from excessive accumulation of exchangeable Na and $CaCO_3$ in the soil. Most of crops get nutrient from surface soil, as a result of this soil reaction of irrigated dry land with soluble salt highly affect the solubility and availability plant nutrient in root zone.

D E

As evidenced from changes in soil ECe, pHe, ESP and bulk density that attained after last harvest over initial values (before planting) remarkable improvement in soil quality indicators observed. Reduction in ECe varied between 52.60 and 74.81 % in the upper 0-30cm soil layer and 54.76 to 79.63 % in the lower 30-60cm (Table 2). Soil salinity in all experimental plots was observed to decrease; extent of reduction varied among forage grasses treatments. Reduction in surface soil salinity was higher in *Chloris gayana* and *Cinchrus ciliaris* in which a decline of about 74.81 and 70.55 % was taking place, respectively. Rhodes grass (*Chloris gayana*), and baffle grass (*Cinchrus ciliaris*) were reported as promising grasses for sodic soils (Maqsood and Imtiaz, 2004).

Table 2.! fb ! bmf ! glFDf!b e! f!b ! gmf df e!c !h h! dg bhf!h b f !

!

Grass Species	Soil depth (cm)	Mean ECe (dS/m)				Mean pHe			
		BP	AFH	Δ ECe	% Reduction	BP	AFH	Δ pHe	% Reduction
D di !d mb !	1! !41!	27 17!	5 84!	22 44!	81 66!	8 9!	8 7!	1 3!	3 7!
	41! !71!	25 43!	5 67!	87!	79 27!	8 8!	8 7!	1 2!	2 4!
b d n!b e bmh!	1! !41!	23 17!	5 16!	9 12!	77 53!	8 7!	8 6!	1 2!	2 4!
	41! !71!	9 93!	4 79!	6 25!	69 39!	8 7!	8 6!	1 2!	2 4!
T hi n! eb f f!	1! !41!	92!	5 76!	6 27!	63 71!	8 9!	8 7!	1 3!	3 7!
	41! !71!	8 78!	4 58!	5 31!	65 87!	8 9!	8 7!	1 3!	3 7!
Di m !hb b b!	1! !41!	29 17!	5 66!	29 62!	85 92!	9 2!	8 8!	1 5!	5 !
	41! !71!	28 93!	4 74!	25 2 !	8 74!	8 !	8 8!	1 3!	3 6!

C ! !cf g f! mb h!BH ! !bgf !g bmhb f h!

Planting of salt tolerant forage grasses markedly reduction on sodium hazard and soil reaction of over the initial soil ESP and soil reaction pHe values of soil. Reduction in ESP varied between 38.13 and 64.08 % in the upper 0-30cm soil layer and 44.11 to 70.19 % in the lower 30-60cm, (Table 3), whereas decline in pHe varied between 1.3 and 4.9 % in the upper 0-30cm soil layer and 1.3 to 2.6 % in the lower 30-60cm (Table 2).Though sodium hazard and soil reaction in all experimental plots was seen to decrease; extent of reduction varied among forage grasses treatments. Reduction in surface soil sodicity was higher in *Chloris gayana* and *Cinchrus ciliaris* in which a decline of about 64.08 and 59.27 % was taking place, respectively. While, the higher reduction in surface soil reaction (pHe) was recorded under *Chloris gayana* (4.9 %) and *Cinchrus ciliaris* (2.6 %). These forage grasses were strongly reclaimed sodicity of soil through bio-drainage as compared to other tested forage grasses species. These results agreed with those reported by Qureshi and Barrett (1998) and Maqsood and Imtiaz (2004).In general, the forage grass species is rated as a potential biotic material for soil amelioration (Kumar and Abrol, 1984; Qadiret al., 2008).

Table 3.! fb ! bmf ! gF di b hf bcrh! e n! f df bhf!b ! gmf df e!c !h h! gg bhf!h b f !
!

! Treatments!	Soil depth (cm)	Mean Exchangeable sodium percentage (%) BP	AFH	∆ ESP	% Reduction
	1.41!	36 25!	21 35!	25 !	6 38!
D di !d mb	41.71!	34 26!	21 49!	23 88!	66 27!
	1.41!	42 25!	25 79!	27 57!	63 97!
b d n!b e brh	41.71!	39 54!	27 12!	23 53!	54 7 !
	1.41!	32 25!	24 19!	9 17!	49 24!
T hi n! eb f f	41.71!	34 21!	23 2!	21 2 !	55 22!
	1.41!	38 25!	86!	28 4 !	75 19!
Di m !hb b b	41.71!	39 19!	9 48!	2 82!	81 2 !

C ! !cf g f! mb h!BH ! !bgf !g bmhi b f h!FT ! !F di b hf bcrh! e n! f df bhf!

Cultivation of salt-tolerant grass helps to restore soil structure and permeability through penetration of their roots and solublization of native-soil calcium carbonate and thus enhanced leaching of salts (Qadir *et al.*, 2007; Qadir et al., 2008). Decline in salinity due to cultivation of grass could be attributed to enhance leaching of salts from upper to lower soil layer due to improved soil physical conditions (Quirk, 2001; Qadir and Schubert, 2002). The result obtained from undisturbed soil sample showed that the highest percent reduction in surface soil bulk density (13.04 %) value was recorded under *Chloris gayana* grown area. Declining of bulk density might be from the cementing agent of organic matter that create aggregate to dispersed soil due to increasing soil organic matter as a result of cultivated grass species. Similar results were reported by (Qadir and Schubert, 2002; Qadir *et al.*, 2008).

E B F A

The mean values for soil plant height of forage grass species were highly affected by salinity and sodicity of the soil. The highest plant height was recorded from *Sorghum sudanese* grass followed by *Panicum antidotale* than that of *Chloris gayana* and *Cinchrus ciliaris* grasses species (Figure 1). However, the effect of salinity stress was less pronounced in *Chloris gayana* (24.72 %) and *Cinchrus ciliaris* (29.22 %) in which forage species plant height appeared comparable to that under normal soil condition. While relatively the highest reduction *Panicum antidotale* and *Sorghum sudanese* in plant height was recorded 35.78 and 30.37%, respectively (Figure 1). This could be due to salt tolerance and bio-drainage in a forage grass species there must be sufficient genetic variation within the species in response to salt, and this variation should be genetically controlled, to make selection and breeding possible for a target trait (Epstein and Norlyn, 1977; Shannon, 1978; Epstein *et al.*, 1980).In addition to this, due to the gradual decrease in plant height with increase in salt stress could an inhibitory effect of salt in shoot growth as compare to normal soil.This is in agreement with reports in intermediate spring wheat (Ashraf and McNeilly, 1988), pearl millet (Singh et al., 1999), perennial rye grass (Horst and Dunning, 1989), and sorghum (Marambe and Ando, 1995).

C

Dry matter yield of forage grasses was affected under salt affected soils as compared to normal soil. The highest dry matter yield were recorded under *Cinchrus ciliaris* (37.0 ton/ha/year) and *Chloris gayana* (36.0 ton/ha/year) than that of *Panicum antidotale* (30.0 ton/ha/year) and *Sorghum sudanese* (27.0 ton/ha/year). The salinity and sodicity problem was highly pronounced in Sorghum *Sudanese* (45 %) and *Panicum antidotale* (53 %) in which forage species dry matter yield appeared comparable to that under normal soil condition than other tested forage grasses (Figure 2). This could be due to leaf area index and plant height of forage grasses were decreased as salinity of soil increased. Decreases in leaf area index and plant height also resulted in a decrease of dry matter yields of forage grasses especially *Sorghum sudanese* and *Panicum antidotale* grasses. Several other researchers have also reported that a decrease in leaf area index and plant height leads to a decrease in the dry matter yields (de Luca *et al.,* 2001; Hay and Porter, 2006; Taleisnik *et al.,* 2009).



	Cinchrus Ciliaris	Panicum antidotale	Sorghum sudanese	Chloris gayana
PH (cm) saline soil	102.74	127.10	160.85	120.54
PH (cm) Normal soil	145.15	197.92	231.85	160.13
Relative reduction in PH (%)	29.22	35.78	30.37	24.72

Figure 1. Fggfd! g m !ifhi !g bhf!h b f ! ef ! bmf! md e !



	Cinchrus Ciliaris	Panicum antidotale	Sorghum sudanese	Chloris gayana
DMY (ton/ha/year) saline soil	37.00	30.00	27.00	36.00
DMY (ton/ha/year) Normal soil	40.00	65.00	49.00	42.00
Relative reduction in DMY (%)	9.00	53.00	45.00	15.00

Figure 2. Mean dry matter yield (DMY) of forage grasses under saline soil condition

In saline soils, plant spends more energy for taking water, therefore water intake from the soil decreases. This situation negatively affects dry matter yield and quality of the forage grasses.In this study, performance and yield parameters according to standard soil conditions of forage grasses which have different tolerance levels for salinity and alkalinity were compared. However, this may be explained by genetic differences by which each plant demonstrates different characteristics in taking nutritional elements from soil and collecting these elements. Hence, it has also been determined in several other studies that grass yield in saline soils is declined (Masters *et al.*, 2007; Qadir *et al.*, 2008; Kopittke *et al.*, 2009).

B E F
C

Even though the declining of plant height and dry matter with cutting were not constancy, generally when the number of cutting increased total dry matter and plant height of tested forage grass were decreased. The forage grasses varied considerably in their overall tolerance to salinity and numbers of cuts have a key role for determining forage grass biomass yield and qualities (Jensen *et al.*, 2011). Based on the result obtained from the field, the highest plant height was recorded at first cut of *Sorghum sudanese* whereas the lowest plant height was recorded at 9th cut of *Cinchrus ciliaris* grass specie (Figure 3). The consequence of relative reduction of plant height within 9th cut was less pronounced *Panicum antidotale* follow by *Chloris gayana*grass species appeared comparable to *Cinchrus ciliaris* and *Sorghum sudanese* grass species. This could be decrease in plant height as increase number of forage grass cuts for longer periods of physiological growth with reduced defoliation frequency stimulating stem growth at the expense of leaf production. These results showed in parallel with the results Qadir *et al.*, (2008) and Xie *et al.*, (2012).



	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th
Cinchrus ciliaris	109.73	118.33	113.53	94.80	103.60	95.00	100.20	112.80	76.67
Panicum antidotale	118.53	140.73	145.47	136.73	136.20	107.87	108.27	142.80	107.33
Sudan grass	216.13	212.13	179.67	135.00	123.60	107.67	162.83	188.27	122.33
Chloris gayana	124.20	119.13	126.27	124.47	114.33	81.80	96.80	118.53	89.33

Figure 3. i f!fggd! g mb !i f hi !) ! !eggf f !i b f h! bhf! dgg bhf!h b f ! ef ! bmf! md e !

Results indicated that investigated dry matter yield of forage grass were influenced by numbers of cuts. The highest dry matter yield was recorded at first cut of *Sorghum sudanese* grass species, whereas the lowest dry matter yield in percentage was recorded at 9th cut of *Sorghum sudanese* grass species (Figure 4).Dry matter yield of *Sorghum sudanese* grass specie was highly affected as number of cuts increase under saline soil condition as compared to other tested forage grass species. The relative reduction trend of dry matter yield in forage grass species showed that as increase numbers of cuts were highly pronounced in *Sorghum sudanese* follow by *Panicum antidotaleand Chloris gayana* grass species appeared comparable to *Cinchrus ciliaris* grass species. The decrease in dry matter yield with increase in number of cuts agrees with the reports of Smart *et al.*, (2004) and Tessema *et al.*, (2010) that dry matter yield with decrease in defoliation frequency.



	1st Harvesting	2nd Harvesting	3rd Harvesting	4th Harvesting	5th Harvesting	6th Harvesting	7th Harvesting	8th Harvesting	9th Harvesting
Cinchrus ciliaris	5.92	6.37	4.80	3.31	2.48	2.56	3.07	4.17	1.76
Panicum antidotale	3.15	5.40	4.58	3.72	2.80	2.10	2.10	3.12	1.62
Sudan grass	6.51	5.21	2.92	0.94	1.68	1.16	1.89	3.41	0.94
Chloris gayana	3.98	6.19	4.45	2.68	2.00	1.44	2.80	4.10	1.97

Figure 4. i f!f gg d! ge !n b f ! f nd!)E ! !e gg f !i b f h! bhf! gg bhf!h b f ! ef ! bmf! nd e !!

In general, the forage grasses varied dramatically in dry matter biomass accumulation potential under different number of cuts. *Cinchrus ciliaris* and *Chloris gayana*grasses species the most salt tolerant forage grass species and also a number of forage biomass harvested long period time with more biomass at the higher salinity. This suggests that the actual forage species preference in saline drainage water reuse systems will be dependent upon the salinity of the water being reused, as well as management practices that affect salinity in the crop root zone. The same result was reported by Robinson *et al.*, (2004) for salt tolerant forage species of California.

B

Biological reclamation of salt affected soil is more important from stabilization of soil quality and eco-restoration points of view. Under all treatments the soil maintained improvement in soil salinity, alkalinity and bulk density characters. Result clearly indicates the possibility of reclamation of salt affected soils through cultivating salt tolerant forage grass while obtaining reasonable forage yield. Both biomass and dry matter yield parameters of forage grass species tested were reasonably high enough and closely comparable to that under normal soil condition. Outcome obtained so far clearly indi9esalinity tolerac10(e)4(8-169(a)4(nd)-

E[reB( )] TJETBT1 0 0104.784191 654.5 T[([( )] TJET EMC /P <<MCIID 0/Lang (en-GB)>>BDC BT1 0 0

Epstein E and Norlyn JD. 1977. Sea-w ater based crop production: A feasibility study. Science 197:249-251.

Epstein E, Rush DW, Kingsbury RW, Kellery DB, Cunningham GA Worna AF. 1980. Saline culture of crops: A genetic approach. Science 210:399-404.

Farifteh J, Farshad A, George RJ. 2006. Assessing salt-affected soils using remote sensing, solute modeling and Geophysics. Geoderma 30(2):191-206.

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). 1988. Salt Affected Soils and Their Management. Soil Resources, Management and Conservation Service FAO Land and Water Development Division. FAO Soils Bulletin 39, Rome, Italy.

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (1994). Water quality for agriculture. FAO Irrigation and drainage paper 29 rev. Reprinted 1989, 1994. Rome, Italy

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). 1999. Soil Salinity Assessment: Methods and Interpretation of Electrical Conductivity Measurements. FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper 57, Rome, Italy.

Ghassemi F, Jakeman AJ, Nix HA. 1995. Salinisation of Land and Water Resources: Human Causes, Extent, Management and Case Studies. CABI Publishing: Wallingford.

Hanay A, Buyuksonmez F, Kiziloglu FM, Canpolat MY. 2004. Reclamation of saline-sodic soils w ith gypsum and msw compost. Compost Science & Utilization 12 (2):175-179.

Hay R and Porter J. 2006. The physiology of crop yield. Blackw ell Publishing, Singapore.

Haynes RJ and Francis GS. 1993. Changes in Microbial Biomass C, Soil Carbohydrate Composition and Aggregate Stability Induced by Grow the of Selected Crop and Forage Species under Field Conditions. Journal of Soil Science 44: 665-675.

Heluf G. 1985. Investigation on Salt-affected Soils and Irrigation Water Quality in Melka Sadi-Amibara Plain, Rift Valley Zone of Ethiopia. MSc. Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Horst GL, Dunning NB. 1989. Germination and seedling growth of perennial ryegrasses in soluble salts. J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci., 114(2):338-342.

Jensen E, Farrar K, Thomas- Jones S, Hastings A, Donnison I and Clifton- Brown J. 2011, Characterization of flowering time diversity in *Miscanthus* species. Global Change Biology Bioenergy, 3, 387–400.

Jones JB. 2003. Agronomic Hand Book: management of crops, soils and their fertility. CRC Press, Washington. Kandil AA, Sharif AE, Abido WAE, İbrahim MM (2012). Effect of salinity on seed germination and seedling characters of some forage sorghum cultivars. International Journal of Agriculture Sciences 4(7):306-311.

Kopittke PM, Kopittke RA and Menzies NW. 2009. Measurement and interpretation of salinity tolerance in four perennial grasses. Journal of Plant Nutrition 32:30-43.

Kumar A and Abrol IP. 1984. Studies on the reclaiming effect of Karnal grass and para-grass grow n in a highly sodic soil. Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences 54:189193.

Kushiev H, Noble AD, Abdullaev I and Toshbekov U. 2005. Remediation of Abandoned Saline Soils Using Glycyrrhiza glabra: A Study from the Hungry Steppes of Central Asia. International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability 3(2):102-113.

Maqsood A and Imtiaz Q. 2004. Rehabilitation and Productive Use of Salt Affected Land through Afforestation. Rangeland Research Programme, NARC, Islamabad. Quarterly science vision 9:1-2.

Marambe B and Ando T. 1995. Physiological Basis of Salinity Tolerance of Sorghum Seeds during Germination. J. Agronomy and Crop Science, 174:291-296.

Masters DG, Benesand SE and Norman HC. 2007. Biosaline Agriculture for Forage and Livestock Production. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 119:234-248.

Munns R and Tester M. 2008. Mechanisms of salinity tolerance. *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.* 59, 651–681.

Munns R. 2011. Plant adaptations to salt and water stress: differences and commonalities. *Adv. Bot. Res.* 57, 1–32.
Qadir I, Khan ZH, Majeed A, Yaqoob S, Khan RA and Anjum K. 2008. Effect of salinity on forage production of range grasses Pakistan journal of science 60(1-2): 59-63.
Qadir M and Schubert S. 2002. Degradation processes and nutrient constraints in sodic soils. Land Degradation and Development 13:275-294.
Qadir M, Sharma BR, Bruggeman A, Choukr-Allah R and Karajeh F. 2007. Non-conventional water resources and opportunities for water augmentation to achieve food security in water scarce countries. Agricultural Water Management 87:2-22.
Quirk JP. 2001. The significance of the threshold and turbidity concentrations in relation to sodicity and microstructure. Australian Journal of Soil Research 39:1185-1217.
Qureshi AS. 2017. Sustainable use of marginal lands to improve food security in the United Arab Emirates. Journal of Experimental Biology and Agricultural Sciences August-2017; Vol.–5 (Spl-1-SAFSAW). DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.18006/2017.5 (Spl-1-SAFSAW).S41.S49
Qureshi RH and Barrett-Lennard EG. 1998. Saline Agriculture for Irrigated Land in Pakistan: A handbook, ACIAR Monograph No. 50, Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research, Canberra, Pp: 142.
Rasool R, Kukal SS and Hira GS. 2007. Soil physical fertility and crop performance as affected by long term application of FYM and inorganic fertilizers in rice-w heat system. Journal of Soil and Tillage Research 96(1-2):64-72.
Robinson PH, Grattan SR Getachew G, Grieve CM, Poss JA, Suarez DL, and Benes SE. 2004. Biomass accumulation and potential nutritive value of some forages irrigated with saline-sodic drainage water.Animal Feed Science and Technology 111:175-189.
Setter TL, Waters I, Khabaz-Saberi H, McDonald G and Biddulph B. 2004. Screening for w ater logging tolerance of crop plants pp. 20-24. In„8th Conference of the International Society for Plant Anaerobiosis, 20–24 September 2004. International Society for Plant Anaerobiosis. Perth, WA.
Shannon MC. 1978. Testing salt tolerance variability among long wheat grass lines. Agronomy Journal 70:719-722.
Singh B, Tarawali S, Gupta S, Tabo R, Nokoe S and Odion E. 1999. Farmer participatory evaluation of improved strip intercropping system in Northern Nigeria. Agronomy Abstracts, Annual Meeting P 37.
Singh YP, Tomar OS, Minhas PS, Sharma VK and Gupta RK. 2002. Performance of 32 tree species and soil conditions in a plantation established with saline irrigation. Forest Ecology and Management177:333-346.
Siyal AA, Siyal AG and Abro ZA. 2002. Salt Affected Soils Their Identification and Reclamation. Pakistan Journal of Applied Science 2(5):537-40.
Smart AJ, Schacht WH, Moser LE and Volesky JD. 2004. Prediction of leaf/stem ratio using near-infrared reflectance spectroscopy (NIRS). Agronomy Journal 96(1):316-318.
Taleisnik E, Rodríguez AA, Bustos D, Erdei L, Ortega L and Senn ME. 2009. Leaf expansion in grasses under salt stress. Journal of Plant Physiology 166:1122-1140.
Tessema ZK, Mihret J and Solomon M. 2010. Effect of defoliation frequency and cutting height on grow th, dry-matter yield and nutritive value of Napier grass (Pennisetum purpureum (L.) Schumach). Grass and Forage Science 65:421-430. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2494.2010.00761.
Van Reeuwijk LP. 1992. Procedures for soil analysis (3rd Ed.). International Soil Reference Center, Wageningen, Netherlands.
Wondimagegne C and Abere M. 2012. Selected Physical and Chemical Characteristics of Soils of the Middle Awash Irrigated Farm. Ethiopian Journal of Agriculture Science 22:127-142.
Xie T, Su P, Shan L and Ma J. 2012. Yield, quality and irrigation w ater use efficiency of sweet sorghum [Sorghum bicolor (Linn.) Moench] under different land types in arid regions. Australian Journal of Crop Science 6:10-16.