

# Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry

Available online at www.phytojournal.com



E-ISSN: 2278-4136 P-ISSN: 2349-8234 JPP 2018; 7(5): 2948-2952 Received: 05-07-2018 Accepted: 25-08-2018

#### Rekha Sodani

Department of Plant Physiology, Institutes of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India **Current address**: College of Agriculture, Nagaur, Agriculture University, Jodhpur, Rajasthan, India

#### JP Srivastava

Department of Plant Physiology, Institutes of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India

#### **Uday Pratap Singh**

Department of Plant Physiology, Institutes of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India

Correspondence Rekha Sodani

Department of Plant Physiology, Institutes of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India **Current address:** College of Agriculture, Nagaur, Agriculture University, Jodhpur, Rajasthan, India

# Studies on the impact of elevated concentrations of fluoride in soil on morphological parameters of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.)

## Rekha Sodani, JP Srivastava and Uday Pratap Singh

#### Abstract

Effect of six levels of fluoride *viz*.0 (T<sub>1</sub>), 50 (T<sub>2</sub>), 100 (T<sub>3</sub>), 200 (T<sub>4</sub>), 250 (T<sub>5</sub>) and 300 (T<sub>6</sub>) mg fluoride kg<sup>-1</sup> soil on morphological parameter of wheat genotype HUW-234 was studied under pot culture during 2016-17 and 2017-18. Observations were recorded at 30 days interval. Elevated concentrations of fluoride significantly reduce shoot dry matter, leaf area, relative growth rate (RGR) and net assimilation rate (NAR) while plant height at 50 mg fluoride kg<sup>-1</sup> soil was marginal stimulated but at higher concentration it declined. It is concluded that elevated fluoride level in soil causes reduction in plant growth and development primarily by reducing photosynthetic area and NAR.

Keywords: Fluoride, morphology, leaf area, RGR, NAR

#### Introduction

Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) is an important staple cereal crop throughout the world. Wheat is the second most important cereal crop next to rice. In India, during 2016-17, wheat was grown over an area of 30.42 million hectare with production of 98.51 million tonnes (Anonymous 2018)<sup>[1]</sup>. Fluoride ( $F^-$ ) is the anion form of fluorine. Fluorine is an element of halogen family. Organic and inorganic fluorine compounds are sometimes called fluoride (Greenwood *et al.* 1997)<sup>[4]</sup>. It is reported that present of sodium fluoride in soil caused reduction in dry matter and leaf area pn wheat (Shadad *et al.* 1989)<sup>[8]</sup>. Rathore (1992)<sup>[7]</sup> found that various concentrations of sodium fluoride (5-500 ppm) cause significant reduction in leaf area, net assimilation rate and relative growth rate in *Hordeum vulgare* and *Zea mays*. both crop plants. *Hordeum vulgare* could not tolerate a fluoride application beyond 100 ppm while *Zea mays* tolerated up to 500 ppm. Sodium fluoride toxicity is also reported to reduce plant height and leaf area per plant in two varieties of barley *viz.* DL-69 and K-24 and in two varieties of wheat *viz.* HD-2009 and PBW-226 (Singh *et al.*2014)<sup>[10]</sup>.

#### Materials and methods

This experiment was conducted during *rabi* 2016-17 and 2017-18 in pots (diameter 25 and height 25 cm) filled with 7.50 kg pulverized dry soil collected from the field and mixed with FYM (4:1). Pots used in this experiment were without hole at bottom. Soil was supplemented with N, P and K @ 120:60:40 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. 50% N was applied as basal and rest in two equal split doses at 21 days after sowing (DAS) and at boot stage.

#### Imposing fluoride treatment and growing plants

Pots were divided into 6 sets and supplemented with 0 ( $T_1$ ), 50 ( $T_2$ ), 100( $T_3$ ), 200( $T_4$ ), 250( $T_5$ ) and 300 ( $T_6$ ) mg fluoride kg<sup>-1</sup> soil. NaF was used as a salt to supply fluoride. Amount of fluoride required to attain desired level of fluoride in each pot was calculated. It was dissolved in 1.5L water and full volume was applied to respective pot. Pots were left for 5 days to equilibrate and by that time soil moisture content was suitable for sowing. Sowing was done on November 23 and December 5 during 2016-17 and 2017 18, respectively. After 7 days of sowing, thinning was done to maintain 5 plants of uniform growth in each pot.

Fluoride treatments were again repeated at 25, 50, 75 and 100 days after sowing (DAS) by irrigating pots to saturation level with the solution of the same concentration of F. Observations were recorded at 30, 60, 90 days after sowing (DAS) and harvest stages.

#### **Morphological parameters**

Observations were recorded in three replications from three randomly selected pots. For each replication three plants from a pot were selected.

Mean value of such three plants was considered as one replication in each treatment at a particular stage.

### (a) Plant height (cm)

Height of the selected plants was measured from the surface of soil in pots up to the growing tip of the main stem with meter scale and expressed in cm. It was recorded at 30, 60, 90 DAS and harvesting stage.

#### (b) Dry weight (g plant<sup>-1</sup>)

Three plants from each replication were taken at an interval 30 days from 30 DAS till harvest and oven dried at  $105^{\circ}$ C for 1h followed by at  $65^{\circ}$ C till constant weight. Plant dry weight was expressed as g plant<sup>-1</sup>.

#### (c) Leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup>)

All leaves (lamina portion) from individual plants were excised. Their maximum lengths and breadths were measured. Leaf area of individual leaf was calculated as:

Leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>) = [Maximum length  $\times$  Maximum breadth]  $\times$  0.66

Areas of all leaves of a plant were summed to find out leaf area plant<sup>-1</sup>.

Factor 0.66 was derived by taking leaves of different sizes, determining their area by paper weighing method and finding out relationship between their [maximum length  $\times$  maximum breadth] and area.

#### (d) Relative growth rate (RGR)

It was calculated by using the formula given by Blackman (1919) and expressed as mg mg<sup>-1</sup> 30 days<sup>-1</sup>. It was measured between 0-30, 30-60 and 60-90 DAS.

$$RGR = \frac{Log_e W_2 - Log_e W_1}{T_2 - T_1}$$

Where,

 $W_1$  = Dry weight of the plant (mg) at time  $T_1$ 

 $W_2$ = Dry weight of the plant (mg) at time  $T_2$ 

#### (e) Net assimilation rate (NAR)

It is rate of dry matter increase per unit of leaf area per unit time (Radford, 1967) and expressed as mg cm<sup>-2</sup> 30 days<sup>-1</sup> and calculated as follows:

$$NAR = \frac{(W_2 - W_1)}{(T_2 - T_1)} \times \frac{(Log_eA_2 - Log_eA_1)}{(A_2 - A_1)}$$

Where,

 $A_1$  and  $W_1$ = Leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>) and dry weight of the plant (mg), respectively, at time  $T_1$ 

 $A_2$  and  $W_2$ = Leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>) and dry weight of the plant (mg), respectively, at time  $T_2$ 

Individual plant weight and leaf area plant<sup>-1</sup> was used to calculated this parameter. It was measured between 0-30, 30-60 and 60-90 DAS.

#### Result

#### 1. Plant height (cm plant<sup>-1</sup>)

Height of plants grown in pots at elevated concentration of fluoride in soil was measured at 30, 60, 90 days after sowing and at harvest during 2016-17 and 2017-18. Differences were found to be significant with respect to stage (S), treatment (T) and  $S \times T$  (Table 1). During 2016-17, as expected, with advancement in days after sowing (DAS) plant height increased. The increment was relatively higher between 60-90 DAS. When mean values for different treatments were compared; it decreased with increased level of fluoride in the root zone. Mean plant height did not differ significantly between  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  treatments, but with further increase in fluoride level in soil; it decreased significantly at all stages. When  $S \times T$  interactions were examined, at a particular stage, with increased fluoride level plant height under  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ treatment did not differ significantly. However, as compared to T<sub>1</sub>, plants under other treatments had significantly lower plant height. Similar trend was observed during 2017-18.

 Table 1: Effect of different concentrations of fluoride on plant height (cm plant<sup>-1</sup>) in wheat genotype HUW-234 at 30, 60, 90 and at harvest during *rabi* 2016-17 and 2017-18

	T		Year									
S No				2016-17								
<b>5.</b> INO.	1 reatments*	Stage (days after sowing)				Mean	5	owing)	Mean			
		30	60	90	At harvest		30	60	90	At harvest		
1.	<b>T</b> 1	33.00	58.67	68.33	73.00	53.33	36.33	60.33	70.00	74.67	55.56	
2.	T2	33.67	59.00	70.67	73.67	54.44	37.00	61.00	72.67	75.67	56.89	
3.	T3	32.00	47.67	66.00	65.33	48.56	34.00	49.67	68.00	67.33	50.56	
4.	<b>T</b> 4	31.67	41.00	61.33	63.00	44.67	33.67	43.00	63.33	65.33	46.67	
5.	T5	29.33	39.33	55.00	62.33	41.22	31.33	41.33	57.00	64.33	43.22	
6.	T <sub>6</sub>	28.33	38.33	48.00	54.67	38.22	30.33	40.33	50.00	58.00	40.22	
	Mean	31.33	47.33	61.56	65.33		33.78	49.28	63.50	67.56		
			$SEm\pm$	CD (5%)				$SEm\pm$	CD (5%)			
	Stage (S)		0.37	1.04				0.38	1.08			
	Treatment (T)		0.45	1.28				0.46	1.32			
	$\mathbf{S}  imes \mathbf{T}$		0.90	2.55				0.93	2.64			

\*T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>5</sub>, and T<sub>6</sub> represent 0, 50, 100, 200, 250 and 300 mg fluoride kg<sup>-1</sup> soil, respectively.

#### 2. Shoot dry matter (g plant<sup>-1</sup>)

Shoot dry weight was quantified at 30, 60, 90 days after sowing and at harvest during 2016-17 and 2017-18. Differences were significant with respect to stage (S), treatment (T) and S  $\times$  T (Table 2). During 2016-17, with advancement in days after sowing (DAS) mean values for dry matter plant<sup>-1</sup> increased. Mean treatment values decreased with increased level of fluoride in the root zone. At all stages of observation; the maximum dry matter was recorded in plants under  $T_1$  (control) treatment, i. e., 0.36, 2.14, 4.08 and 3.50 g plant<sup>-1</sup> at 30, 60, 90 DAS and harvest stages, respectively. It was evident that as compared to 90 DAS shoot dry weight plant<sup>-1</sup> decreased at harvest stage. Similar pattern was found in during 2017-18.

Table 2: Effect of different concentrations of fluoride on shoot dry matter (g plant <sup>-1</sup> ) in wheat genotype HUW-234 at 30, 60, 90 and 120	0 days
after sowing during rabi 2016-17 and 2017-18	

	Treatments*	Year										
S No												
5. INU.		Stage (days after sowing)				Mean		sowing)	Mean			
		30	60	90	At harvest		30	60	90	At harvest		
1.	$T_1$	0.36	2.14	4.08	3.50	2.20	0.37	2.21	4.26	3.71	2.28	
2.	$T_2$	0.33	2.04	3.68	2.89	2.02	0.34	2.06	4.05	3.48	2.15	
3.	T3	0.29	1.84	3.46	2.77	1.86	0.29	1.89	3.75	2.93	1.98	
4.	$T_4$	0.28	1.77	3.36	2.60	1.80	0.28	1.86	3.64	2.77	1.92	
5.	<b>T</b> 5	0.24	1.75	3.04	2.27	1.68	0.25	1.75	3.47	2.47	1.82	
6.	<b>T</b> <sub>6</sub>	0.15	1.35	2.74	1.92	1.41	0.16	1.43	3.02	2.01	1.54	
	Mean	0.27	1.82	3.39	2.66		0.28	1.87	3.70	2.89		
			SEm±	CD (5%)				SEm±	CD (5%)			
Stage (S)		0.02	0.05				0.02	0.06				
Treatment (T)		0.02	0.06				0.03	0.07				
	$\mathbf{S}  imes \mathbf{T}$		0.04	0.11				0.05	0.15			

<sup>\*</sup>T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>5</sub>, and T<sub>6</sub> represent 0, 50, 100, 200, 250 and 300 mg fluoride kg<sup>-1</sup> soil, respectively.

#### 3. Leaf area (cm<sup>-2</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup>)

Leaf area was measured at 30, 60, 90 days after sowing during 2016-17 and 2017-18. Differences were significant with respect to stage (S), treatment (T) and S  $\times$  T (Table 3). During 2016-17, at 30, 60 and 90 DAS the mean value of leaf area plant<sup>-1</sup> was the maximum in plants under T<sub>1</sub> (control) treatment, i. e., 68.02, 188.33 and 225 cm<sup>-2</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup>,

respectively, which at different stages gradually declined with increase in fluoride concentration in soil. As compared to 30 and 60 days stages leaf area was the maximum at 90 DAS in plants under respective treatments. Almost similar trend was recorded in 2017-18 and the mean differences were analogous.

Table 3: Effect of different concentrations of fluoride on leaf area (cm <sup>-2</sup> plant <sup>-1</sup> ) in wheat genotype HUW-234 at 30, 60 and 90 days after sowing
during rabi 2016-17 and 2017-18

Treatment*	Year										
				Mean							
	Stage	Mean	Sta								
	30	60	90		30	60	90				
$T_1$	68.02	188.33	225.00	160.45	69.18	192.00	230.00	163.73			
$T_2$	66.18	182.00	214.67	154.28	66.68	186.33	218.00	157.00			
<b>T</b> 3	62.16	175.33	193.67	143.72	62.76	176.67	196.00	145.14			
$T_4$	55.57	162.00	182.67	133.41	56.69	164.00	184.00	134.90			
T <sub>5</sub>	50.51	150.00	175.00	125.17	51.45	152.00	176.33	126.59			
T <sub>6</sub>	45.66	142.67	163.00	117.11	46.91	143.67	163.00	117.86			
Mean	58.02	166.72	192.33		58.94	169.11	194.56				
		SEm±	CD (5%)			SEm±	CD (5%)				
Stag	ge (S)	0.69	1.98			0.49	1.41				
Treatm	nent (T)	0.97	2.80			0.70	2.00				
S	×T	1.69	4.84			1.21	3.46				
	$\begin{tabular}{c} $T$ reatment* \\ \hline $T_1$ \\ $T_2$ \\ $T_3$ \\ $T_4$ \\ $T_5$ \\ $T_6$ \\ $Mean$ \\ \hline $Stag$ \\ $Treatn$ \\ $Stag$ \\ $Stag$ \\ $Treatn$ \\ $Stag$ \\ $	Treatment*         Stage $30$ $30$ T1         68.02           T2         66.18           T3         62.16           T4         55.57           T5         50.51           T6         45.66           Mean         58.02           Stage (S)           Treatment (T)           S × T	2016-17           Stage (days after sowi           30         60           T1         68.02         188.33           T2         66.18         182.00           T3         62.16         175.33           T4         55.57         162.00           T5         50.51         150.00           T6         45.66         142.67           Mean         58.02         166.72           SEm±           Stage (S)         0.69           Treatment (T)         0.97           S × T         1.69	Year           Treatment*         Year           2016-17           Stage (days after sowing)           30         60         90           T1         66.02         188.33         225.00           T2         66.18         182.00         214.67           T3         62.16         175.33         193.67           T4         55.57         162.00         182.67           T5         50.51         150.00         175.00           T6         45.66         142.67         163.00           Mean         58.02         166.72         192.33           Stage (S)         0.69         1.98           Treatment (T)         0.97         2.80           S $\times T$ 1.69         4.84         T	Year           Treatment*         Mean $30$ 60         Mean $30$ 60         Mean           T1         66.02         188.33         225.00         160.45           T2         66.18         188.33         225.00         160.45           T2         66.18         188.03         225.00         160.45           T2         66.18         182.00         214.67         160.45           T4         55.57         162.00         182.67         133.41           T5         50.51         150.00         175.17           T6         45.66         142.67         163.00         117.11           Mean         58.02         166.72         192.33         17           Teatment (T)         0.97         2.80 <th <="" colspan="2" t<="" td=""><td><math display="block">\begin{array}{ c c c c c } \hline &amp; Year \\ \hline &amp; 2016-17 &amp; Mean \\ \hline &amp; Stage (days after sowing) &amp; Mean \\ \hline &amp; 30 \\ \hline &amp; 3</math></td><td><math display="block">\begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline Feat ment* &amp; \hline Vear &amp; \hline Vear \\ \hline \hline 2016-17 &amp; &amp; Mean \\ \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; Mean \\ \hline \hline 30 &amp; 60 &amp; 90 &amp; \hline 30 &amp; 60 \\ \hline \hline 30 &amp; 60 &amp; 90 &amp; \hline 30 &amp; 60 \\ \hline \hline 30 &amp; 60 &amp; 90 &amp; \hline 30 &amp; 60 \\ \hline \hline 11 &amp; 68.02 &amp; 188.33 &amp; 225.00 &amp; 160.45 &amp; 69.18 &amp; 192.00 \\ \hline T_2 &amp; 66.18 &amp; 182.00 &amp; 214.67 &amp; 154.28 &amp; 66.68 &amp; 186.33 \\ \hline T_3 &amp; 62.16 &amp; 175.33 &amp; 193.67 &amp; 143.72 &amp; 62.76 &amp; 176.67 \\ \hline T_4 &amp; 55.57 &amp; 162.00 &amp; 182.67 &amp; 133.41 &amp; 56.9 &amp; 164.00 \\ \hline T_5 &amp; 50.51 &amp; 150.00 &amp; 175.00 &amp; 125.17 &amp; 51.45 &amp; 152.00 \\ \hline T_6 &amp; 45.66 &amp; 142.67 &amp; 163.00 &amp; 117.11 &amp; 46.91 &amp; 143.67 \\ \hline Mean &amp; 58.02 &amp; 166.72 &amp; 192.33 &amp; 58.94 &amp; 169.11 \\ \hline Mean &amp; 58.02 &amp; 166.72 &amp; 192.33 &amp; 58.94 &amp; 169.11 \\ \hline SEm &amp; CD (5\%) &amp; I &amp; SEm \\ \hline Stage (S) &amp; 0.69 &amp; 1.98 &amp; I &amp; 0.49 \\ \hline Treatment (T) &amp; 0.97 &amp; 2.80 &amp; I &amp; 0.70 \\ \hline S \times T &amp; 1.69 &amp; 4.84 &amp; I &amp; 1.21 \\ \hline \end{array}</math></td><td><math display="block">\begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline Feat ment* &amp; \hline Feat ment* &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Stage (S) &amp; 0.69 &amp; 1.98 &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (S) &amp; \hline Mean &amp;</math></td></th>	<td><math display="block">\begin{array}{ c c c c c } \hline &amp; Year \\ \hline &amp; 2016-17 &amp; Mean \\ \hline &amp; Stage (days after sowing) &amp; Mean \\ \hline &amp; 30 \\ \hline &amp; 3</math></td> <td><math display="block">\begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline Feat ment* &amp; \hline Vear &amp; \hline Vear \\ \hline \hline 2016-17 &amp; &amp; Mean \\ \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; Mean \\ \hline \hline 30 &amp; 60 &amp; 90 &amp; \hline 30 &amp; 60 \\ \hline \hline 30 &amp; 60 &amp; 90 &amp; \hline 30 &amp; 60 \\ \hline \hline 30 &amp; 60 &amp; 90 &amp; \hline 30 &amp; 60 \\ \hline \hline 11 &amp; 68.02 &amp; 188.33 &amp; 225.00 &amp; 160.45 &amp; 69.18 &amp; 192.00 \\ \hline T_2 &amp; 66.18 &amp; 182.00 &amp; 214.67 &amp; 154.28 &amp; 66.68 &amp; 186.33 \\ \hline T_3 &amp; 62.16 &amp; 175.33 &amp; 193.67 &amp; 143.72 &amp; 62.76 &amp; 176.67 \\ \hline T_4 &amp; 55.57 &amp; 162.00 &amp; 182.67 &amp; 133.41 &amp; 56.9 &amp; 164.00 \\ \hline T_5 &amp; 50.51 &amp; 150.00 &amp; 175.00 &amp; 125.17 &amp; 51.45 &amp; 152.00 \\ \hline T_6 &amp; 45.66 &amp; 142.67 &amp; 163.00 &amp; 117.11 &amp; 46.91 &amp; 143.67 \\ \hline Mean &amp; 58.02 &amp; 166.72 &amp; 192.33 &amp; 58.94 &amp; 169.11 \\ \hline Mean &amp; 58.02 &amp; 166.72 &amp; 192.33 &amp; 58.94 &amp; 169.11 \\ \hline SEm &amp; CD (5\%) &amp; I &amp; SEm \\ \hline Stage (S) &amp; 0.69 &amp; 1.98 &amp; I &amp; 0.49 \\ \hline Treatment (T) &amp; 0.97 &amp; 2.80 &amp; I &amp; 0.70 \\ \hline S \times T &amp; 1.69 &amp; 4.84 &amp; I &amp; 1.21 \\ \hline \end{array}</math></td> <td><math display="block">\begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline Feat ment* &amp; \hline Feat ment* &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (days after sowing) &amp; \hline Stage (S) &amp; 0.69 &amp; 1.98 &amp; \hline Mean &amp; \hline Stage (S) &amp; \hline Mean &amp;</math></td>		$\begin{array}{ c c c c c } \hline & Year \\ \hline & 2016-17 & Mean \\ \hline & Stage (days after sowing) & Mean \\ \hline & 30 \\ \hline & 3$	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline Feat ment* & \hline Vear & \hline Vear \\ \hline \hline 2016-17 & & Mean \\ \hline Stage (days after sowing) & Mean \\ \hline \hline 30 & 60 & 90 & \hline 30 & 60 \\ \hline \hline 30 & 60 & 90 & \hline 30 & 60 \\ \hline \hline 30 & 60 & 90 & \hline 30 & 60 \\ \hline \hline 11 & 68.02 & 188.33 & 225.00 & 160.45 & 69.18 & 192.00 \\ \hline T_2 & 66.18 & 182.00 & 214.67 & 154.28 & 66.68 & 186.33 \\ \hline T_3 & 62.16 & 175.33 & 193.67 & 143.72 & 62.76 & 176.67 \\ \hline T_4 & 55.57 & 162.00 & 182.67 & 133.41 & 56.9 & 164.00 \\ \hline T_5 & 50.51 & 150.00 & 175.00 & 125.17 & 51.45 & 152.00 \\ \hline T_6 & 45.66 & 142.67 & 163.00 & 117.11 & 46.91 & 143.67 \\ \hline Mean & 58.02 & 166.72 & 192.33 & 58.94 & 169.11 \\ \hline Mean & 58.02 & 166.72 & 192.33 & 58.94 & 169.11 \\ \hline SEm & CD (5\%) & I & SEm \\ \hline Stage (S) & 0.69 & 1.98 & I & 0.49 \\ \hline Treatment (T) & 0.97 & 2.80 & I & 0.70 \\ \hline S \times T & 1.69 & 4.84 & I & 1.21 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline Feat ment* & \hline Feat ment* & \hline Stage (days after sowing) & \hline Mean & \hline Stage (days after sowing) & \hline Mean & \hline Stage (days after sowing) & \hline Mean & \hline Stage (days after sowing) & \hline Mean & \hline Stage (days after sowing) & \hline Mean & \hline Stage (days after sowing) & \hline Mean & \hline Stage (days after sowing) & \hline Mean & \hline Stage (days after sowing) & \hline Mean & \hline Stage (days after sowing) & \hline Mean & \hline Stage (days after sowing) & \hline Mean & \hline Stage (days after sowing) & \hline Mean & \hline Stage (days after sowing) & \hline Mean & \hline Stage (days after sowing) & \hline Stage (S) & 0.69 & 1.98 & \hline Mean & \hline Stage (S) & \hline Mean &$	

 $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ ,  $T_3$ ,  $T_4$ ,  $T_5$ , and  $T_6$  represent 0, 50, 100, 200, 250 and 300 mg fluoride kg<sup>-1</sup> soil, respectively.

#### 4. Relative growth rate (mg mg<sup>-1</sup> 30 days<sup>-1</sup>)

Relative growth rate (RGR) was calculated between 0-30, 30-60 and 60-90 days after sowing (DAS) during 2016-17 and 2017-18 and presented in Table 4 differences were found to be significant with respect to stage (S), treatment (T) and S × T. During 2016-17, as compared to 0-30 DAS, mean value for RGR decreased markedly between 30-60 and 60-90 DAS. Mean RGR for T<sub>1</sub> was 2.77mg mg<sup>-1</sup>30 days<sup>-1</sup>, which declined successively with increased fluoride concentration in soil to 2.74, 2.72, 2.71, 2.67 and 2.64 mg mg<sup>-1</sup> 30 days<sup>-1</sup>under T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>6</sub> treatments, respectively. Between 0-30 day stages, as compared to T<sub>1</sub>, RGR decreased progressively up to T<sub>6</sub> treatment, while between 30-60 day stages it increased up to T<sub>6</sub> treatment. Between 60-90 day stages it decreased up to T<sub>5</sub> treatment level then increased. Experiment conducted during second year also showed similar trend but between 30-60 and 60-90 day stages, as compared to T<sub>1</sub>, RGR increased progressively up to T<sub>6</sub> treatment (Table 4).

Table 4: Effect of different concentrations of fluoride on relative growth rate (mg mg<sup>-1</sup> 30 days<sup>-1</sup>) in wheat genotype HUW-234 between 0-30,<br/>30-60 and 60-90 days after sowing during *Rabi* 2016-17 and 2017-18

S. No.	Treatment*	Year									
			2016-	-17	Mean		Mean				
		Stag	ge (days af	ter sowing)		Stag					
		0-30	30-60	60-90		0-30	30-60	60-90			
1.	$T_1$	5.89	1.78	0.65	2.77	5.91	1.79	0.66	2.79		
2.	$T_2$	5.80	1.82	0.59	2.74	5.81	1.82	0.67	2.77		
3.	T <sub>3</sub>	5.66	1.86	0.63	2.72	5.67	1.87	0.69	2.74		
4.	$T_4$	5.62	1.86	0.64	2.71	5.64	1.89	0.67	2.73		

T5	5.49	1.98	0.55	2.67	5.51	1.95	0.69	2.72
$T_6$	4.99	2.22	0.71	2.64	5.04	2.22	0.75	2.67
Mean	5.57	1.92	0.63		5.59	1.92	0.69	
		SEm±	CD (5%)			SEm±	CD (5%)	
Stage (S)		0.01	0.01			0.01	0.01	
Treatment (T)			0.02			0.01	0.02	
S  imes T			0.03			0.01	0.03	
	$\begin{array}{c} T_5 \\ T_6 \\ Mean \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ Stage (S) \\ \hline \\ Treatment (T) \\ S \times T \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ccc} T_5 & 5.49 \\ T_6 & 4.99 \\ \hline Mean & 5.57 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ Stage (S) \\ \hline \\ Treatment (T) \\ \hline \\ S \times T \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c cccc} T_5 & 5.49 & 1.98 \\ \hline T_6 & 4.99 & 2.22 \\ \hline Mean & 5.57 & 1.92 \\ \hline Stage (S) & 0.01 \\ \hline Treatment (T) & 0.01 \\ \hline S \times T & 0.01 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c cccc} T_5 & 5.49 & 1.98 & 0.55 \\ \hline T_6 & 4.99 & 2.22 & 0.71 \\ \hline Mean & 5.57 & 1.92 & 0.63 \\ \hline & & SEm \pm & CD (5\%) \\ \hline Stage (S) & 0.01 & 0.01 \\ \hline Treatment (T) & 0.01 & 0.02 \\ \hline S \times T & 0.01 & 0.03 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c ccccc} T_5 & 5.49 & 1.98 & 0.55 & 2.67 \\ \hline T_6 & 4.99 & 2.22 & 0.71 & 2.64 \\ \hline Mean & 5.57 & 1.92 & 0.63 & \\ \hline & SEm\pm & CD (5\%) & \\ \hline Stage (S) & 0.01 & 0.01 & \\ \hline Treatment (T) & 0.01 & 0.02 & \\ \hline S \times T & 0.01 & 0.03 & \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

\*T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>5</sub>, and T<sub>6</sub> represent 0, 50, 100, 200, 250 and 300 mg fluoride kg<sup>-1</sup> soil, respectively.

#### 5. Net assimilation rate (mg cm<sup>-2</sup>30 days<sup>-1</sup>)

Net assimilation rate (NAR) was studied between 0-30, 30-60 and 60-90 days after sowing (DAS) during 2016-17 and 2017-18 and presented in (Fig. 1; 2). Differences were found to be significant with respect to stage (S), treatment (T) and S  $\times$  T. During 2016-17, mean NAR was significantly higher between 0-30 DAS which decreased sharply and progressively between30-60 and 60-90 DAS. Treatment means also declined with increased fluoride level in root zone. T<sub>6</sub> level appeared to be vary deleterious than other fluoride treatments.

Between 0-30 days stage NAR decreased with increased fluoride concentration while between 30-60 days stage NAR decreased up to  $T_4$  treatment than increased at  $T_5$  treatment and further declined at  $T_6$  treatment. Between 60-90 DAS; with increased fluoride level NAR declined but no definite pattern was observed. Almost similar pattern was found during 2017-18 but during this year between 60-90 days stage NAR increased with fluoride concentration up to  $T_5$  treatment and then declined at  $T_6$  treatment.



**Fig 1:** Effect of different concentrations of fluoride on net assimilation rate (mg cm<sup>-2</sup> 30 days<sup>-1</sup>) in wheat genotype HUW-234 between 0-30, 30-60 and 60-90 days after sowing during *rabi* 2016-17. Vertical bars on graph represent standard error ( $p \le 0.05$ ). \*T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>5</sub>, and T<sub>6</sub> represent 0, 50, 100, 200, 250 and 300 mg fluoride kg<sup>-1</sup> soil, respectively



**Fig 2:** Effect of different concentrations of fluoride on net assimilation rate (mg cm<sup>-2</sup> 30 days<sup>-1</sup>) in wheat genotype HUW-234 between 0-30, 30-60 and 60-90 days after sowing during *rabi* 2017-18. Vertical bars on graph represent standard error ( $p \le 0.05$ ). T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>5</sub>, and T<sub>6</sub> represent 0, 50, 100, 200, 250 and 300 mg fluoride kg<sup>-1</sup> soil, respectively

#### Discussion

Fluoride toxicity is reported to reduce plant height in wheat (Singh *et al.* 2001) <sup>[9]</sup>. At 50 mg fluoride kg<sup>-1</sup> soil had marginal stimulatory effect on plant height (Table 1).There is

a report indicating that fluoride may have stimulatory effect on plant growth at very low concentration (Gao *et al.* 2012) <sup>[3]</sup>. However, dry matter plant<sup>-1</sup> (Table 2) and leaf area plant<sup>-1</sup> (Table 3) decreased concomitantly as the level of fluoride increased in soil. Even 50 mg fluoride kg-1 soil had significantly retarding effect on these parameters and 300 mg fluoride kg<sup>-1</sup> soil was highly toxic. Reports are available to indicate that higher concentrations of sodium fluoride significantly reduced leaf area, net assimilation rate and relative growth rate in maize and barley (Shadad et al. 1989, Rathore 1992)<sup>[7, 8]</sup>. Leaves are the major photosynthetic organ in wheat; therefore, reduction in leaf area is reflected in terms of reduction in rate of dry matter accumulation per unit of time (RGR). In the present study increased fluoride level decreased RGR (Table 4) at all stages of observation, proving that fluoride has deleterious effects on RGR of wheat. As the concentration of fluoride increased then mean NAR declined (Fig. 1: 2). It is reported that increased fluoride level causes reduction in net photosynthetic rate (Yamauchi et al. 1983) <sup>[12]</sup>. By affecting photosynthetic area as well as photosynthetic pigments (Justyna et al. 2017, Singh et al. 2017)<sup>[5, 11]</sup>. In another experiment it was observed that photosynthetic pigments level declined under fluoride toxicity. It is concluded that elevated fluoride level in soil causes reduction in plant growth and development primarily by reducing photosynthetic area and NAR.

#### Conclusion

It is concluded that the elevated concentrations of fluoride on wheat genotype HUW-234 significantly reduce shoot dry matter, leaf area, relative growth rate and net assimilation rate at various growth stages but plant height increased at 50 mg fluoride kg<sup>-1</sup> soil than declined. Significant effects were obtained at 5% CD values. Control plants demonstrate best performance than plants subjected to 250-300 mg fluoride kg<sup>-1</sup> soil.

#### References

- 1. Anonymous 2018 Times of India.com govt-pegs-wheatoutput-to-be-1-42-lower-at-97-11-in-/articleshow/63098314.cms 2017-18.
- 2. Blackman VH. The compound interest law and plant growth, Ann. Bot. 1919; 33:353-360,
- Gao H, Zhang Z, Wan X. Influences of charcoal and bamboo charcoal amendment on soil-fluoride fractions and bioaccumulation of fluoride in tea plants. Environmental Geochemistry and Health 2012; 34(5):551-562. doi: 10.1007/s10653-012-9459-x
- 4. Greenwood Norman N. Earnshaw A. Chemistry of the Elements. 2nd Edition, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 997; 1340:1.
- Justyna PELC, Beata SMOLIK, Marcelina KRUPA-Małkiewicz. Effect of sodium fluoride on some morphological and physiological parameters of 10 days old seedlings of various plant species, Folia Pomer. Univ. Technol. Stetin., Agric., Aliment. Pisc., Zootech. 2017; 338(44)4:151-158.
- 6. Radford PJ. Growth analysis formulae their use and abuse. Crop Science, Madison, 1967; 7:171-175.
- 7. Rathore S. Effect of fluoride toxicity on leaf area, net assimilation rate and relative growth rate of *Hordeumvulgare* and Zea mays, Fluoride Research report. 1992; 25(4):175-182.
- 8. Shadad MA, Radi FA, El-Enany AE. Seed germination transpiration rate, and growth criteria as affected by various concentrations of CdCl2, NaF and 2, 4-DNP, Journal of Islamic Academy of Sciences. 1989; 2(1):7-12.

- 9. Singh J, Singh D, Chauhan VS. Effect of sodium fluoride on growth and yield in wheat *(Triticumaestivum)*, Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2001; 71(I):41-3.
- Singh N, Kumar D, Kishore GR, Arya KPS. Effect of fluoride toxicity on the growth and yield of barley (*HordeumvulagareL.*) and Wheat (*Triticumestivum L.*), International J Plant Sci. 2014; 9(1):223-226
- 11. Singh UP, Yashu BR, Sodani R, Srivastava JP. Effect of elevated fluoride levels on morph-physiological parameters of wheat and barley, Journal of Pharma cognosy and Phyto chemistry 2017; 6(6):2245-2248.
- Yamauchi M, Choi WK, Yamada Y. Fluoride inhibition of photosynthesis in certain crop plants, Soil Sci Plant Nutr. 1983; 29(4):549-53.