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Figure 4. : Effect of salt treatment on protein levels in leaves of *S.portulacastrum*. CBB G-250 stained 10 % SDS-PAGE gel showed differently expressed proteins after treatment with different concentration of NaCl.; lane 1: protein marker; lane 2: wild plant (*S. portulacastrum*); lane 3: control plant grown in distilled water in garden soil; lane 4: plant treated with distilled water in shore soil; lane 5 to 8: Salt treatment (50mM, 150mM, 250mM, 350mM).

Figure 5. Effect of salt treatment on protein expression in roots of *S. portulacastrum*. CBB G-250 stained 10 % SDS-PAGE gel showed differently expressed proteins after treatment with different concentration of NaCl; lane 1: protein marker; lane 2: wild plant; lane 3: control plant (distilled water + normal soil); lane 4: plants treated with distilled water in shore soil; lane 5-7: salt treatment (50mM, 150mM & 250mM).

Figure 6. Effect of salt treatment on protein levels in stems of *S. portulacastrum*. CBB G-250 stained 10 % SDS-PAGE gel showed differently expressed proteins after treatment with different concentration of NaCl; lane 1: protein marker; lane 2: wild plant; lane 3: control plant (distilled water + normal soil); lane 4: plants treated with distilled water in shore soil; lane 5-7: salt treatment (50mM,150mM & 250mM).
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Figure 9: Effect of salt treatment on protein levels in Stems of *S. portulacastrum*. CBB G-250 stained 10 % SDS-PAGE gel showed differently expressed proteins after treatment with different concentration of NaCl. lane M: protein marker; lane 1-7: 300mM salt treatment at different time intervals (4hr - 72hr); lane 8 - 10: direct salt treatment (300mM NaCl) for 4hr to 8 hr; lane C10: control plant grown in ½ MS media.

Figure 10. Effect of salt treatment on protein levels in leaves of *S. portulacastrum*. CBB G-250 stained 10 % SDS-PAGE gel showed differently expressed proteins after treatment with different concentration of NaCl; lane M: protein marker; lane C1: control plant grown in ½ MS media; lane C2: control plant grown in vermiculated soil; lane 1, 3, 5: 0.5 and 1M NaCl treatment at different time point (3hr-9hr)
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Figure 14. A representative CBB stained 2D gel of the *S. portulacastrum* leaf proteome. Differentially expressed protein spots were numerically marked and the number of expressed proteins. The arrows indicate the protein spots subjected for MS identification.

Figure 15: Identification of proteins from *S. portulacastrum* via MALDI TOF/MS. The protein Spot 1 was excised and digested with trypsin and then collected peptides were analysed using a Bruker MALDI/TOF/ mass spectrometer. The annotated PMF spectral peaks showed the intensities of different peptide. Database searching with Mascot software against NCBI nr database identified as a Hsp70, which corresponds to that in Table 2.

Figure 16. Comparison of deduced amino acid sequence with the homologues of hsp70 obtained from MALDI/TOF/TOF Mascot software for *S. portulacastrum*

Figure 17: Identification of proteins from *S. portulacastrum* via MALDI TOF/MS. The protein spots 2 was excised and digested with trypsin and then collected peptides were analyzed using a Bruker MALDI/TOF/ mass spectrometer. The annotated PMF spectral peaks showed the intensities of different peptide. Database searching with Mascot software against NCBI nr database identified as a T complex protein, which corresponds to that in Table 2.

**Statistical tool:**

Methods used –SPSS 20.00 version