Interaction of Water Salinity and Different Irrigation Levels on Physiological Growth of Olive (*Olea europaea* L.)
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**ABSTRACT**

During the last few years, due to inadequate rainfall, Iran has faced water scarcity. This made the fertile zones including the Fars Province and especially the Marvdasht District to face many problems. Salt concentrations increase and the groundwater resources reduction in the central part of this district are currently occurring. Recently, the farmers have attempted to change the cultivation pattern by cultivation of salt-resistant plants including olive and pistachio. Therefore, in this study, interaction between salinity of the irrigation water and the water deficit on physiological growth of the olive plant (*Olea europaea* L.) was investigated. The experiment was conducted as a completely randomized block design for three years (2013–2015) in a 7-years-old olive grove (Roghani-Fishomi cultivar) grown in a sandy soil with planting density of 5.5×5.5 meters. Treatments included five Irrigation levels (I₁ = 25%, I₂ = 50%, I₃ = 75%, I₄ = 100%, and I₅ = 125 percent of olive water requirements) and three Salinity levels of 2.2 to 7.7 dS m⁻¹ (S₁), incorporation of 50% well water with 50% drinking water from the local region (S₂), and pure drinking water from the region (S₃ = Salinity of 0.4 to 0.85 dS m⁻¹) of irrigation water. Treatments were applied in a factorial arrangement, with three replications. Daily irrigation of trees was performed by drip irrigation. The results showed that in all of the three consecutive years, the highest Intrinsic Water Use Efficiency (IWUE) values were obtained in I₃S₁ (131.94, 114.14 and 96.95 by years, respectively). Also, the highest transpiration efficiency was achieved in I₃S₃ (1.24, 1.06 and 0.88 respectively). In high salinity, due to the stress applied to the olive trees, leaf water potential decreased and, consequently, the water in the leaves could not meet the existing VPDₗ.a (saturation Vapor Pressure Deficit near leaf area), thus causing stomatal closure and reduction in stomatal conductance (gs). Generally, for I₁ to I₄ irrigation levels, the highest salinity effect on Transpiration Efficiency (TE) happened in S₃ salinity level.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Olive tree has moderate resistance to salinity (Connor and Fereres 2005). Hence, it can be irrigated using saline water (Simkeshzadeh et al., 2015). Resistance of olive trees to salinity is not the same in different varieties. Depending on the salinity level of the irrigation water, the yield and the plant growth are affected differently and, in some cases, due to the high salinity level, the plant confronts the risk of dying. Olive plant’s resistance to salinity depends highly on the salt excretion mechanism around the roots (Melgar et al., 2012). High salinity reduces pollination, fruit size (Ben-Gal, 2011) and thus reduces fruit crop yields of the olive
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tree, but it will have no effects on the amount of the fruit oil (Ben-Ahmed et al. 2009). On the other hand, it increases the ratio of linoleic to linolenic acids and decreases the ratio of oleic acid to linolenic acid (Cresti et al., 1994). It also decreases the concentration of phenols in the olive fruit oils (Ben-Ahmed et al., 2009) and significantly causes a reduction in the growth of the shoots, leaf area, and the dry weight of the chlorophyll (Alaei et al., 2015). Moreover, olive is a drought-resistant plant, which is able to grow in shallow soils with minimal supplemental irrigation and with winter rainwater. Based on table olive production, fruit production and its economical return do not depend solely on its durability, but the fruit size, yield, oil yield and quality are important factors that determine whether olive production is economical or not (University of California, 2014). By applying deficit irrigation in some circumstances, the quality of the produced oil is increased. The best deficit irrigation range for a high oil quality is between 33 and 40% of water requirement, and for optimal olive oil production, it is between 70 and 75% of water requirement. By reducing irrigation up to 30 percent of the water requirement, not only fruit production is reduced heavily, but also the oil percentage and its quality are reduced, as well. By an increase in the percentage of the consumed water, the fruit yield increased by a reduction in oil production (Vossen et al., 2008; Grattan et al., 2006).

Asik et al. (2014) showed that irrigation scheduling using deficit irrigation allowed considerable water savings in Memecik olive trees (Olea europaea L.), with minimal effects on yield. Different irrigation levels had no significant effect on the yield, while significant differences between treatments were detected in some morphological features such as shoot length, shoot diameter, canopy volume, and fruit set ratio. Results indicated that irrigation of Memecik olive trees should be scheduled based on the amount of water equivalent to 25% (S0.25) of the five-day cumulative evaporation from a Class A pan. Kaya et al. (2017) demonstrated that an increase in the amount of irrigation water applied to an olive orchard was accompanied by a fall in ripeness index values, a rise in moisture content, and a reduction in the oil content of the fruit.

The most efficient olive fruit production has been reported at the irrigation level of 100% (Talozi and Al Waked 2016). Salt resistance in plants depends on the interaction between salinity and other environmental parameters including dryness (Jouyban, 2012). Not many cases of researches exist on the interaction between different levels of irrigation and salinity in garden plants so far. Lots studies have generally referred to crop yield. (Melgar et al., 2012). For instance, in the interaction between three salinity levels (0.5, 5, and 10 dS m⁻¹) and three irrigation levels, it was demonstrated that the water salinity had no substantial effects on the fruit size, fruit mantle, and olive fruit core; but the amount of oil available in the fruit was increased linearly by an increase in the salinity (Serrano Castillo et al., 2008).

The aim of this study was to investigate the interaction between the salinity of the irrigation water and the water deficit on physiological growth (by examining the relationship between photosynthesis and transpiration) of the olive plant in the Marvdasht District, Fars Province, Iran.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The study area is located in the central part of the Marvdasht District with longitude of longitude of 52° 59' 43" E, latitude of 29° 50' 22" N, and altitude of 1,620 m (Figure 1).

The experiment was conducted for three years (2013 to 2015) in a 7-years-old olive garden planted (Roghani-Fishomi variety) at a cultivation density of 5.5x5.5 meters. Treatments included different irrigation levels (I₁, I₂, I₃, I₄ and I₅ for 25, 50, 75, 100, and 125% of water requirements). Three
replications were used in the form of a factorial layout within a completely randomized blocks design. Plant water requirement was calculated by FAO Penman-Monteith method modified for the Kooshkak Area of the Marvdasht County (Razzaghi and Sepaskhah, 2012) and meteorological data of the Persepolis synoptic station. The irrigation water salinity levels were salinity of 2.2 to 7.7 dS m$^{-1}$ ($S_1$), incorporation of 50% well water ($S_1$) with 50% drinking water from the local region ($S_2$), and finally pure drinking water from the region ($S_3$ = salinity of 0.4 to 0.85 dS m$^{-1}$). Different levels of applied irrigation were maintained from the beginning of the treatments until the end of the experiment. The method of irrigation was loop drip irrigation and eight emitters with discharge of 4 liters per hour for each tree. Irrigation was done on daily basis and by three electronic pumps.

To assess the interaction of water salinity and different irrigation levels on physiological growth of olive, the relationship between stomatal conductance ($g_s$, mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$), saturation Capor Pressure Deficit near leaf area ($VPD_{l.a}$, kPa), stem water potential ($\psi_{stem}$), and photosynthesis rate ($A$, µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$), was investigated. Parameters of $g_s$, $VPD_{l.a}$, $A$, and Transpiration ($Tr$, mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) were extracted through the data recorded by the photosynthesis meter device (ADC BioScientific LCi Analyser Serial No. 30784). The measurement was conducted on sunny days and between 11 to 14 o’clock. In addition, $\psi_{stem}$ was measured using pressure bomb (model 5100A, Santa Barbara, CA, USA).

In this study, using the relevant information, the Intrinsic Water Use Efficiency (IWUE) (Equation 1) (Farquhar et al., 2001; Jones, 2004) and Transpiration Efficiency (TE) (Equation 2) (Jones, 2004) were calculated:
To study the effect of different salinity and irrigation levels on the intrinsic water use efficiency (IWUE), various salinity (S1, S2, and S3) and irrigation (I1, I2, I3, I4, and I5) levels were investigated. Intrinsic Water Use Efficiency (IWUE) was calculated as:

\[ \text{IWUE} = \frac{A}{g_s} \]  

(1)

TE = \frac{A}{Tr}  

(2)

In addition, the linear regression analysis was performed for all treatments.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Intrinsic Water Use Efficiency (IWUE)

Figure 2. Relationship between photosynthesis (A, µmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)) and stomatal conductance (gs, mmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)) (Slope of each line= Intrinsic Water Use Efficiency, IWUE) at various Salinity (S1, S2, and S3) and Irrigation (I1, I2, I3, I4, and I5) levels, based on measurements in five different times (June to November) in 2013, 2014, and 2015 (n= 5, P ≤0.05)
efficiency in olive, the changes of photosynthesis (A) versus the stomatal conductance (gs) were drawn (Figure 2) separately for the study years (2013, 2014 and 2015). The two parameters of photosynthesis (A) and stomatal conductance (gs) are under the direct influence of sunlight, air temperature, and relative humidity and these changes were more tangible in the October; therefore, A and gs data were used in drawing the diagram from June to November in 2013 and from April to October for the years of 2014 and 2015. For the purpose of statistical analysis of the salinity and irrigation levels effect, linear regression (P≤ 0.05) with five points (n=5) were fitted and the slope of the fitted lines were used in this analysis. The charts on the left side of Figure 2 show the effect of different salinity levels on IWUE (excluding irrigation levels). In 2013, the greatest IWUE was observed in S1 (80.34) and the least in S2 (64.40). In 2014, S2 had the greatest IWUE (75.61) and the least was in S3 (65.53), and in 2015, the greatest effect was for S3 (62.74) and the least effect for S1 (56.03). Slope difference in the salinity level of S3 (69.9) was almost identical with S1 and S2 in 2014, and salinity levels of S1 and S2 (61.81) in 2015.

With respect to the effect of different irrigation levels on IWUE (regardless of salinity levels) (charts on the right side of Figure 2), the greatest and the least IWUE in 2013 were in I4 (101.5) and I1 (57.85), respectively. In this year, the highest IWUE was obtained at low salinity levels and average levels of irrigation. In 2014, the highest and the least IWUE were those of I3 (90.97) and I5 (53.14), respectively. The slope of the fitted lines was almost equal in irrigation levels of I1 and I5 (90.10), which were almost identical in terms of the effect on the IWUE. The slope difference of the fitted lines in irrigation levels of I4 (58.36) and I5 was not high. However, the slope difference of the fitted lines in irrigation level of I3 (76.05) was high compared with other irrigation levels and acted independently in terms of the effect on IWUE. In 2014, the highest IWUE was obtained in S2 salinity level and low to moderate irrigation levels. In 2015, the greatest and the least effect was that of irrigation levels of I2 (80.60) and I1 (46.38), respectively. The slope difference of the fitted lines in irrigation levels of I3 (65.53) and I1 was insignificant. The slope difference of the fitted lines in irrigation levels of I4 and I3 was high in comparison with other irrigation levels, which acted independently in terms of effect on IWUE. Generally, in 2015, the highest IWUE value was obtained in irrigation levels of S1 and the low to moderate irrigation levels (like the year 2014).

Analyzing the effects of the different levels of salinity on IWUE (Figure 3) in 2013, and at irrigation level of I4, the least IWUE was that of the S1 (the slope of the regression line of 56.7) and the greatest IWUE was that of the S3 (slope of 59.3). But, the slope difference of the fitted lines was significant (P< 0.05) between salinity levels of S1 (56.7) and S3 (59.3). In other words, the effect of different salinity levels on the IWUE was not equal in S1 and S3. However, there was no significant difference between salinity level of S1 with S2 (58) and S2 with S3. In the I2 irrigation level, the most IWUE was observed in salinity level of S2 (85.92) and the least in S1 (68.02). The differences between the slopes of the fitted lines were significant in all three levels of salinity. In I3, the highest IWUE was observed in salinity level of S1 (131.94) and the least in S3 (86.64). The difference between the slope of the fitted lines in salinity levels of S2 (89.9) with S3 (86.6) was not high. In other words, the effect of these salinity levels on IWUE was equal in this irrigation level. In I5, the highest IWUE was observed in salinity level of S1 (63.13) and the least one in S3 (51). The differences between the slopes of the fitted lines in all salinity levels in this irrigation level were similar. In other words, the difference of levels’ effect on IWUE was not significant in this irrigation treatment. In the irrigation level of I6, the maximum IWUE was observed in the salinity
Figure 3. Relationship between photosynthesis (A, µmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)) and stomatal conductance (gs, mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)) (Slope of each line= Intrinsic Water Use Efficiency, IWUE) in various Salinity and Irrigation levels (S\(_1\), S\(_2\), S\(_3\) and I\(_1\), I\(_2\), I\(_3\), I\(_4\), I\(_5\)), based on measurements in five different times in: a: 2013, b: 2014, and c: 2015 (n= 5, P≤ 0.05)
level of $S_1$ (67.2) and the least at the salinity level of $S_1$ (56.42). The difference between the slope of the fitted lines was almost equal in salinity level of $S_2$ (56.14) and $S_3$. In other words, the effect of $S_2$ and $S_1$ levels on IWUE was not significant in this irrigation level. Generally, in 2013, the highest and the least IWUE were obtained in $I_S1$ (131.94) and $I_S2$ (46.66), respectively.

In 2014, in irrigation level of $I_1$, the greatest IWUE was that of $S_1$ (the slope of the regression line being 99.15) and the least was that of $S_3$ (with a slope of 85.63). But due to the difference of the fitted lines slope, the difference at 5% level was different between the $S_2$ salinity level (85.6) and other levels. In other words, the difference between $S_1$ and $S_3$ salinity levels with $S_3$ salinity level in this irrigation level was significant on IWUE. In the $I_2$ irrigation level, the most IWUE was observed in $S_1$ (79.97) and the least IWUE in $S_3$ (70.87). The difference between the slope of the fitted lines in $S_1$ (78.14) and $S_3$ (79.97) was not significant and were almost equal in terms of the effect on the IWUE. In the $I_3$ irrigation level, the most IWUE was observed in $S_1$ (114.14) and the least at the salinity level of $S_3$ (80.57). The difference between the slope of the fitted lines was not high at $S_1$ (83.31) compared with $S_3$. In other words, the effect of these salinity levels on IWUE was equal in this irrigation level. In the $I_4$, the most IWUE was observed in $S_2$ (62.35) and the least in the $S_1$ (54.97). The difference between the slopes of the fitted lines was not significant in $S_1$ (56.4) and $S_3$ in comparison with $S_2$. In the $I_4$ irrigation level, the most IWUE was observed in $S_2$ (58.41) and the least IWUE in $S_1$ (38.3). The difference between the slopes of the fitted lines in the $S_3$ (48.56) was almost equal with $S_1$ and $S_3$. In other words, the effect of salinity levels in this irrigation level was significant on IWUE. In general, the most and the least IWUE in 2014, were obtained in $I_S1$ (114.14) and $I_S3$ (38.29) treatments, respectively.

In 2015, Figure 3 (right), in $I_1$ the most effect was that of $S_1$ (the slope of the regression line being 92.44) and the least was that of $S_2$ (slope of 75.24). The difference in the slope of the fitted lines in $S_2$ and $S_3$ (77.59) was low and not significant in terms of the effect of the different salinity levels on IWUE. In the $I_2$, the most and the least IWUE were observed in salinity levels of $S_1$ (83.16) and $S_3$ (63.17), respectively. The difference between the slopes of the fitted lines was significant in different levels of salinity and in terms of the impact on IWUE. In $I_3$, the highest IWUE was obtained in $S_2$ salinity level (96.95) and the least IWUE in $S_3$ salinity level (65.83). Like the $I_2$ irrigation level, the difference between the slopes of the fitted lines at different salinity levels was also significant in this irrigation level. In $I_4$, the highest and the least IWUE were observed in $S_2$ (52.88) and $S_3$ (46.14). The difference between the slopes of the fitted lines in different levels of salinity was not significant. In $I_4$, the most and the least IWUE were observed in $S_2$ (46.97) and $S_1$ (33.10), respectively. The difference between the slope of the fitted lines was low in salinity levels of $S_3$ (35.05) and $S_1$. In other words, the effect of the $S_3$ (35.05) and $S_1$ salinity levels on IWUE was not significant. In general, the highest and the least IWUE in 2015 were observed in $I_S1$ (96.95) and $I_S3$ (33.10) treatments, respectively. The effect of different levels of salinity in different irrigation levels in two consecutive years of 2014 and 2015 were similar. Note that in each of the three study years, the $I_S1$ treatment had the highest effect on IWUE.

**Relationship between Water Potential of Olive Stem or Leaf with Stomatal Conductance**

As the soil around the plants roots dries out, the plant restricts water transfer from inside the stomata to outside i.e. plant reduces the stomatal conductance (Kang and Zhang, 2004; Liu et al., 2006). Therefore, in this research, the relationship between $\psi_{stem}$ and $g_s$ ($R^2=0.57$, $P \leq 0.05$) (Figure 4) showed that the plant reaction to salinity tension and irrigation (reducing water potential of leaves on branches) was to close stomata and thus reduce stomatal
conductance (gs). This conclusion is consistent with the results of Sperlinga et al. (2014).

**Relationship between Saturation Vapor Pressure Deficit Near Leaf Surface (VPD\textsubscript{la}) with Stomatal Conductance (gs)**

Climatic conditions including relative humidity surrounding the olive trees can cause signals from plant to the leaves, which result in stomata closure in leaf surface. Therefore, in areas with dry climate (study area) Vapor Pressure Deficit (VPD) can affect stomatal conductance. Thus, in this study, we tried to examine the relationship between stomatal conductance and VPD (Figure 5). Thus, to establish a relationship between vapor pressure deficit near leaf surface (VPD\textsubscript{la}, kPa) and stomatal conductance (gs, mol m\textsuperscript{-2} s\textsuperscript{-1}), the three-year measurements data were used. This means that, in 2013, the measurements of late September, December, and March were used. In 2014, the data of June, August, and early October, and in 2015, the measurements of the early October, November, and December were used. The results of this research showed that there was a relationship between VPD\textsubscript{la} and gs. In Figure 5, by increasing the VPD\textsubscript{la}, the amount of gs is reduced at first with a negative and steep slope, then, in the range of VPD\textsubscript{la} = 2.7 to 2.8 kPa, the slope is moderated and reaches zero. Finally, slope increases from VPD\textsubscript{la} = 2.8 kPa (R\textsuperscript{2} = 0.39, P≤ 0.05). It should be noted that this finding was consistent with the results of Olyae et al. (2015) and Moriana et al. (2002).

In Figures 6 (a-b), the relationship between stomatal conductance (gs) and saturation vapor pressure deficit near leaf surface is shown for different irrigation levels (regardless of salinity levels) and at different salinity levels (regardless of irrigation levels), respectively. As shown, gs varied between 0.01 to 0.045 mol m\textsuperscript{-2} s\textsuperscript{-1} and VPD\textsubscript{la} varied between 1.2 to 3.6 kPa. For the statistical analysis of the process of the changes and impact of the different irrigation levels on gs, their linear regression was drawn. Despite low R\textsuperscript{2}, the impact of different irrigation levels on gs and its relationship with VPD\textsubscript{la} can be seen clearly. According to Figure 6, in all irrigation levels, gs decreases by an increase in the VPD\textsubscript{la}. By increasing irrigation levels from I\textsubscript{1} to I\textsubscript{5}, the slope of curves decreased. This process continued to the VPD\textsubscript{la} = 2.5-2.7 kPa range and then increased. Increasing or decreasing of slope in the irrigation level was different such that the maximum slope was related to I\textsubscript{1} and the minimum slope was related to I\textsubscript{3} and I\textsubscript{4} (this result was consistent...
with the results of Moriana et al., (2002).

In Figure 6-b, the effect of salinity level on $gs$ and VPD$_{l.a}$ is shown. In all $S_1$ and $S_2$ salinity levels, by increasing VPD$_{l.a}$, the $gs$ decreased at first such that, in both levels, the lowest $gs$ was observed in VPD$_{l.a}$ = 2.1 kPas. Therefore, by increasing VPD$_{l.a}$ the $gs$ increased almost with an equal slope in both of the salinity levels. In $S_1$ by increasing VPD$_{l.a}$, the $gs$ decreased. In high salinity, due to the stress applied to the olive tree, leaf water potential decreased and, consequently, the water in the leaves could not meet the existing VPD$_{l.a}$, thus causing stomatal closure and reduction in $gs$.

Transpiration Efficiency

Transpiration Efficiency (TE) is an index that shows the photosynthesis rate per unit of transpiration. This index is positively correlated with photosynthesis (Shadan et al., 2013). The two parameters of photosynthesis ($A$) and Transpiration ($Tr$) are under direct influence of sunlight, air temperature, relative humidity, and carbon dioxide levels. In the study area, the changes were more tangible until October. Therefore, the data pertaining to the mentioned month was used for statistical analysis of the TE. In this study, effect of the salinity and irrigation levels were linearly fitted ($P \leq 0.05$) with five points and the statistical analysis was performed by the slope of the fitted lines. According to Figure 7 (a), in 2013, the most effect was related to $S_3$ salinity level (1.08) and the least was that of $S_2$ (0.56). Due to the slope of the linear regression, the difference between $S_1$ (0.59) and $S_2$ was not significant. In other words, the effect of $S_1$ and $S_2$ levels on TE was similar. However, the differences between $S_1$ and $S_3$ levels were significant in comparison to $S_1$ salinity level. In 2014, concerning the effect of different salinity levels on TE (Figure 8 (b)), the most effect was that of $S_3$ (0.86) and the least belonged to $S_4$ (0.54). The slope of the linear regression in $S_3$ (0.82) and $S_1$ levels had little difference with that of $S_1$ salinity level. In other words, the effect of $S_2$ and $S_3$ levels on TE was almost identical. In 2015, (Figure 7 (c)), $S_4$ (0.68) and $S_1$ (0.42) salinity levels were observed to have the most and the least effect on TE, respectively. The difference between $S_1$, $S_2$ (0.62) and $S_3$ salinity levels was significant. In other words, each of the salinity levels independently affected TE. As from $S_1$ to $S_3$ the impact was greater. In the case of the effect of different irrigation levels (regardless of salinity) (Figure 7 (d)) on TE in 2013, the most and the least were for $I_4$ (1.04) and $I_5$ (0.54), respectively. The
difference between the slope of the linear regression in $I_1$ (0.86), $I_2$ (0.63), $I_3$ (0.92), $I_4$ and $I_5$ showed that their effects was not equal on $TE$ or in other words, The difference between the slope of the linear regression in $I_1$ (0.86), $I_2$ (0.63), $I_3$ (0.92), $I_4$ and $I_5$ showed that their effects were not equal on $TE$ or in other words, the effect of different irrigation levels on $TE$ is different but the effect of normal irrigation ($I_0$) was the highest (1.044), but among the different levels of salinity, the effect of $S_3$ salinity level on $TE$ was high. In 2014, (Figure 7 (e)), the most and the least effect of the irrigation level on $TE$ was related to $I_1$ (0.92) and $I_3$ (0.55), respectively. The difference of the slope of the linear regression showed that the effect of the $I_2$ and $I_4$ irrigation levels on $TE$ was equal or in other words, their difference was not significant. However, in other levels of irrigation, the differences were significant. In 2015, Figure 8 (f), like the year 2014, the irrigation levels of $I_1$ (0.77) and $I_3$ (0.28) had the highest and lowest effect on $TE$, respectively. The difference between slopes of the linear regression was significant for all levels of irrigation. The effect of $I_2$ (0.61) and $I_3$ (0.63) irrigation levels on $TE$ was
Figure 8. Relationship between photosynthesis (A) and Transpiration (Tr) (n=5, P≤ 0.05) in various salinity and irrigation levels (S₁, S₂, S₃ and I₁, I₂, I₃, I₄, I₅), based on measurements in five different times in: a: 2013, b: 2014 and c: 2015.
similar, but the effect of other irrigation levels was not similar. Analyzing the effect of different salinity levels on TE in the irrigation level of $I_1$, in 2013 (Figure 8), the least effect was that of $S_2$ salinity level (with the slope of the regression line equal to 0.68) and the most belonged to $S_3$ (with a slope of 1.02). However, due to the difference in the fitted lines slopes, the difference in the effect on TE was significant ($P< 0.05$) between $S_1$ (0.79), $S_2$ and $S_3$ salinity levels. In other words, the effect of different salinity levels on TE was not equal in these two salinity levels. In the $I_2$ irrigation level, the most and the least TE were observed in $S_3$ (1.04) and $S_2$ (0.25) irrigation levels, respectively. The differences between the slopes of the fitted lines in all three salinity levels were significant and meaningful. In $I_3$ irrigation level, the most and the least TE were observed in $S_1$ (1.24) and $S_1$ (0.37), respectively. The difference between the slope of the fitted lines in $S_1$ (0.77), $S_2$ and $S_3$ salinity levels was high and the effect of different levels on TE in this irrigation level was not equal. The most and the least TE in $I_4$ were observed in $S_3$ (1.04) and $S_1$ (0.84) salinity levels, respectively. The difference between the slope of the fitted lines in the salinity level of $S_3$ (0.9) was almost equal with the $S_1$ and the difference in the effect of the salinity levels on TE was not significant. In $I_2$ irrigation level, the most and the least TE were observed in $S_2$ (0.96) and $S_1$ (0.05), respectively. The difference between the slopes of the fitted lines was almost high and significant in all salinity levels. As was observed, the most effect on TE happened in $S_3$ salinity level at all irrigation levels. The most and the least TE in 2013 were obtained in $I_5 S_3$ (1.24) and $I_2 S_1$ (0.05) treatments, respectively.

According to Figure 8, the irrigation level of $I_1$ had the least effect with $S_2$ salinity level (with 0.65 slope of the regression line), but due to the slopes of the fitted regression lines in $S_1$ and $S_2$ levels of salinity (both having 0.72), they were the most effective on TE. Nonetheless, their differences with $S_1$ were insignificant. In $I_2$ irrigation level, the most TE was observed in $S_3$ salinity level (0.73) and the least in $S_1$ (0.58), and the difference between the slope of the fitted lines was significant and meaningful. In $I_3$, the highest TE was observed in $S_1$ salinity level (1.06) and the least in $S_1$ (0.43). The difference between the slope of the fitted lines in $S_2$ (0.79), $S_1$ and $S_3$ was high, and the effect of the different levels on TE was not equal in this irrigation level. In $I_4$ irrigation level, the highest TE was observed in $S_1$ salinity level (0.79) and the least in $S_1$ (0.50). The difference between the slopes of the fitted lines in $S_2$ salinity level (0.70) compared with the other two levels was high and the impact difference of the salinity level on TE was significant. In $I_5$, the most TE was observed in $S_3$ salinity level (0.58) and the least in $S_2$ (0.44). The slopes of the fitted lines in $S_1$ (0.57) and $S_3$ salinity levels was almost equal, and the impact of these salinity levels on TE was not significant in $I_5$. As was observed, from $I_1$ to $I_4$ irrigation levels, the highest effect on TE happened in $S_3$ salinity level. In 2014, the most and the least TE were obtained in $I_3 S_3$ (1.06) and $I_5 S_1$ (0.43) treatments, respectively.

In 2015, like the year 2014, in $I_1$ irrigation level, the effect of $S_1$ and $S_3$ (0.62) on TE was equal, with insignificant difference. The most and the least TE were observed in $S_2$ (0.67) and $S_1$ (0.54) salinity levels, and the difference between the slope of the fitted lines was significant. Like the year 2014, in $I_3$, the highest TE was observed in salinity level of $S_3$ (0.88) and the least in $S_1$ (0.35). The difference between the slope of the fitted lines in $S_2$ (0.64), $S_1$ and $S_3$ salinity levels was high, and the impact of the different levels on TE was not equal in $I_3$. In $I_4$ and $I_5$ irrigation levels, like the $I_5$, the difference between the slope of the fitted lines in different salinity levels was high and their impact on TE was not equal.

As was observed, from $I_1$ to $I_4$ irrigation level, the most effect happened on TE in $S_3$ salinity level. The highest and the least TE in 2015 were obtained in $I_3 S_1$ (0.88) and $I_5 S_2$ (0.18) treatments, respectively.
CONCLUSIONS

Photosynthesis is one of the first plant processes affected by water stress and salinity. In this process, the sunlight energy is converted by plants and some of the bacteria into the chemical energy stored in nutrients. Under moderate to high salinity conditions, the accumulation of sodium in the olive leaf cause decrease photosynthesis. Low concentration of CO$_2$ in the chlorophyll of olive leaves in salinity condition is due to the low concentration of CO$_2$ in stomata and mesophyll and will be one of the factors limiting photosynthesis. In the present research, we investigated the interaction between salinity of the irrigation water and water deficit on physiological growth of the olive plant during three years (2013-2015) in a 7-years-old olive grove (Roghani-Fishomi cultivar). The relationship between water potential of olive stem ($\psi_{stem}$) and stomatal conductance ($g_s$) showed that the plant reaction to salinity stress and deficit irrigation was due to stomatal closure and, thus, $g_s$ reduction. Our findings showed that in all three years of study, $I_3S_1$ had the most effect of salinity and deficit irrigation interaction on Intrinsic Water Use Efficiency (IWUE), while the low water salinity level and the average irrigation level had the highest IWUE. Furthermore, in all three years of study, the strongest interaction of salinity and deficit irrigation on transpiration efficiency was observed in $I_3S_1$ treatment. The $I_1$ irrigation level had the best IWUE and TE performance. Generally, for $I_1$ to $I_4$ irrigation levels, the highest salinity effect on Transpiration Efficiency (TE) happened in $S_3$ salinity level.
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