Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Segmental Morphology of Perennial Ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* L.): A Study of Functional Implications of Plant Architecture

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Plant Science

Institute of Natural Resources College of Sciences Massey University Palmerston North, New Zealand



MASSEY UNIVERSITY

Arif Hasan Khan Robin 2011

Abstract

This thesis investigated the structural and functional implications of segmental organisation of two hydroponically grown perennial ryegrass (Lolium perenne L.) cultivars, Alto and Aberdart in spring and autumn, for around 90 days in each season. The objectives included describing tiller axis morphology, studying leaf and root turnover pattern in a phyllochron (leaf appearance interval) time scale, and studying root-shoot and tiller-tiller functional relations. In the Spring experiment a total of 15 - 16 segments or phytomers developed, 10 -11 of which bore roots. In the Autumn experiment, a total of 22 - 23 phytomers developed, 17 - 18 of which bore roots. New leaves appeared more frequently in autumn and achieved significantly greater final leaf length, dry weight and lamina area through a significantly faster rate of leaf extension, though with significantly shorter elongation duration compared to spring leaves. However, autumn leaves had significantly longer life span and lower specific leaf area. The individual leaves achieved maximum photosynthetic capacity between 12.5 and 14.8 days after appearance. The individual root-bearing phytomers in autumn bore a significantly higher number of roots (2.4) than in spring (1.7). At successively more developed phytomers root main axis length, root dry weight, root length including branches, surface area and volume increased linearly up to phytomer 6 - 7 for both of the cultivars in both seasons whereas dry matter deposition rate per phytomer per day and mean root diameter decreased gradually. Branching to quaternary order was observed during root development. Principal component analysis of root morphology data detected statistically significant morphological variation between genotypes of each cultivar but the basis for differentiation was not visually evident. Roots older than 10 leaf appearance intervals in autumn decreased gradually in volume while still increasing in total branch length. This was interpreted as evidence of root death in some branches while the remainder continued elongation. Tiller root:shoot ratio varied seasonally, possibly mediated by faster leaf than root appearance rate at successive phytomers in spring, and vice-versa in autumn. Excision of adult daughter tillers significantly reduced number of root-bearing phytomers of the main tiller which indicated slower new root appearance rate at the main tiller. A significant proportion of root derived N and assimilated C from daughter tillers was translocated to the main tillers and this may explain why daughter tillers remain smaller in size than their parent tillers. Evidence for a proposed oscillation of N concentration within the tiller axis of *Hordeum vulgare* L. linked to N uptake by successive developing leaves was also examined. A weak N concentration oscillation was detected, with the highest concentration just prior to each leaf appearance event. Evaluation of ryegrass root morphology from a segmental perspective, though logistically challenging, has provided previously unavailable information on the time course of root mass accumulation and of root branching. This methodology could be used in future to further explore the carbon economy of the root system and the factors that limit final root size.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my chief supervisor, Associate Professor Cory Matthew for his continuous support, enthusiastic guidance, encouragement and warm interest throughout the doctoral study. Without his generous help it was impossible to complete this thesis. I gratefully acknowledge the contribution of my co-supervisors Professor Peter Kemp and Dr. Louis Irving for their constructive suggestions and guidance. I specially acknowledge the contribution of Professor John Hodgson for his kind, valuable editorial comments and suggestions throughout the thesis.

I acknowledge the contribution of the staff of Massey University Plant Growth Unit Steven Ray, Lindsay Silva, Lesley Taylor and Scott Avery for helping in number of ways during the experiments. Special thanks to Lindsay Silva for constructing the C labelling equipment and Scott Avery for help isolating the roots of main tiller and daughter tillers. Thanks are also due to Mark Osborne for providing seedlings, and to Chris Rawlingson for assisting with photosynthesis measurements.

My sincere thanks go to Dr. Jim Crush for allowing use of WinRhizo root scanning facilities at the AgResearch in Hamilton. I am indebted to Lily Ouyang for her guidance in using the root scanner. Ian Furkert and Bob Toes helped me analyzing barley plant samples to determine total N using the microkjeldahl method, thanks are due to them also.

I would like to sincerely thank Professor Hans Schnyder for providing the opportunity to use the isotope ratio mass-spectrometer as a guest researcher at the Lehrstuhl für Grünlandlehre, Technische Universität München, Germany. My sincere thanks also go to the other research colleagues of Professor Schnyder, especially Dr. Rudi Schäufele, Dr. Fernando Lattanzi, Dr. Christoph Lehmeier, Inga Schleip and Max Wittmer for their help in a number of different ways.

My gratitude also goes to the course teachers Dr. Siva Ganesh (Multivariate Analysis for Researchers) and Dr. Gillan Norris, Dr. Andrew Sutherland Smith and Professor Michael Hardman (Protein Structure and Function) for their willingness to answer my questions.

Sincere thanks go to Dr. Alasdair Noble (Postgraduate Student Statistics Consultant, Massey University) for checking the statistical models used in this thesis.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to my colleague, Dr. Edith Khaembah for her consultation during my research and thesis writing. Thanks also go to my other colleague, Sajjad Hossain for his help in seedling transplantation at the hydroponic unit. I would like to thank Md. Shahjahan Kabir for his friendly support in root isolation and sample processing during when I was particularly busy.

I would like to thank Massey University for the award of a Vice-Chancellor's Doctoral Scholarship for three years funding to carry out my PhD studies. I am also grateful to the Ellett Agricultural Research Trust, and to the Massey University Scholarships committee for award of a John Hodgson Pastoral Science Scholarship, Sports Turf Bursary, and Helen E Akers PhD Scholarship for additional support. Special thanks to the German Academic Exchange Scholarship (DAAD) and Institute of Natural Resources for supporting travel grants and living expenses for a six week research visit to Germany.

I would like to thank Bangladesh Agricultural University for granting study leave to pursue my doctoral study in New Zealand. Finally, I wish to thank my mother Ferdousi Begum, my wife Rawnak Laila, brother Munir Zaman Khan, sister Tasnim Khanom, and other relations and friends for their interest and inspiration during the study period. Dedication

I dedicate this thesis to my beloved mother

Ferdousi Begum

Table of Contents

Abstracti
Acknowledgmentsii
Table of Contents
List of Tablesxiv
List of Figuresxxii
List of Appendicesxxxv
Glossary of Abbreviationsxlii
Chapter 1: Introduction
1.1 Background1
1.2 Objectives
1.3 Experimental sequence
1.4 Thesis structure
Chapter 2: Literature Review
2.1 Grassland in a global context7
2.2 The role of and need for component studies
2.3 Emergence of understanding of segmental morphology in grasses
2.4 Segmental organisation as an integrating principle for component processes of
grass tiller form and function14
2.4.1 Unit of grass growth: the phytomer14
2.4.2 The developmental sequence of a phytomer16
2.4.2.1 Leaf growth
2.4.2.2 Apical meristem to leaf primordium16
2.4.2.3 Leaf ligule formation
2.4.2.4 Leaf appearance
2.4.2.5 Leaf elongation and extension

2.4.2.6 Tillering	23
2.4.2.7 Root formation and development	23
2.4.2.7.1 Root production in field swards	24
2.4.2.7.2 Root production at the phytomer level	25
2.4.2.7.3 Root life span	26
2.4.2.7.4 Genetic variations in root characteristics	27
2.4.2.7.5 Fine roots and root hairs	28
2.4.3 Factors affecting patterns of growth and development	28
2.4.3.1 Effects on shoot growth and development	28
2.4.3.1.1 Temperature	29
2.4.3.1.2 Light	29
2.4.3.1.3 N Supply	31
2.4.3.1.4 Photosynthesis in relation to leaf age	32
2.4.3.2 Factors affecting root growth	32
2.4.3.2.1 Temperature	32
2.4.3.2.2 Light	33
2.4.3.2.3 Moisture status	34
2.4.3.3 Factors affecting root function	35
2.4.3.3.1 Root responses affecting nutrient uptake	35
2.4.4.2.2 Root responses affecting water uptake	36
2.4.4 Intra-plant competition	37
2.4.4.1 Root-shoot relations	37
2.4.4.2 Main tiller-daughter tiller exchange of C and N	40
2.4.4.3 N cycling between organs	42
2.4.4.4 C recycling within the root system	43
2.5 Questions relevant to further component research	43
Chapter 3: Tiller Morphology	46

3.1 Introduction	46
3.2 Materials and Methods	46
3.3 Results	48
3.3.1 Schematic description of the tiller axis	48
3.3.2 Leaf appearance rate	49
3.3.3 Root development	50
3.3.4 Variation in leaf and root size at successive phytomer positions	51
3.3.5 Comparison of main and daughter tillers	52
3.4 Discussion	54
3.5 Summary	57
Chapter 4: Leaf Turnover and Photosynthesis	58
4.1 Introduction and Overview	58
4.2 Objectives	59
4.3 Experimental	59
	50
4.3.1 Experimental site	
4.3.1 Experimental site	
4.3.1 Experimental site4.3.2 Seasonal timing of experiments4.3.3 Weather data	
 4.3.1 Experimental site 4.3.2 Seasonal timing of experiments 4.3.3 Weather data 4.3.4 Plant materials 	
 4.3.1 Experimental site 4.3.2 Seasonal timing of experiments 4.3.3 Weather data 4.3.4 Plant materials 4.3.5 Experimental design 	
 4.3.1 Experimental site 4.3.2 Seasonal timing of experiments 4.3.3 Weather data 4.3.4 Plant materials 4.3.5 Experimental design 4.3.6 Hydroponic culture system 	
 4.3.1 Experimental site 4.3.2 Seasonal timing of experiments. 4.3.3 Weather data 4.3.4 Plant materials 4.3.5 Experimental design 4.3.6 Hydroponic culture system 4.3.7 Growth measurements 	
 4.3.1 Experimental site 4.3.2 Seasonal timing of experiments 4.3.3 Weather data 4.3.4 Plant materials 4.3.5 Experimental design 4.3.6 Hydroponic culture system 4.3.7 Growth measurements 4.3.8 Photosynthesis measurement 	
 4.3.1 Experimental site 4.3.2 Seasonal timing of experiments 4.3.3 Weather data 4.3.4 Plant materials 4.3.5 Experimental design 4.3.6 Hydroponic culture system 4.3.7 Growth measurements 4.3.8 Photosynthesis measurement 4.3.9 Destructive harvest 	
 4.3.1 Experimental site 4.3.2 Seasonal timing of experiments 4.3.3 Weather data 4.3.4 Plant materials 4.3.5 Experimental design 4.3.6 Hydroponic culture system 4.3.7 Growth measurements 4.3.8 Photosynthesis measurement 4.3.9 Destructive harvest 4.3.10 Phytomer (P) nomenclature 	
 4.3.1 Experimental site 4.3.2 Seasonal timing of experiments. 4.3.3 Weather data 4.3.4 Plant materials 4.3.5 Experimental design 4.3.6 Hydroponic culture system 4.3.6 Hydroponic culture system 4.3.7 Growth measurements 4.3.8 Photosynthesis measurement 4.3.9 Destructive harvest 4.3.10 Phytomer (P) nomenclature 4.3.11 Leaf data collection. 	

4.3.13 Correlation analysis and principal component analysis (PCA) for the	e leaf
traits	70
4.4 Results	70
4.4.1 Phyllochron duration	70
4.4.2 Age of phytomer positions	74
4.4.3 Leaf elongation duration (LED)	74
4.4.4 Leaf elongation rate (LER)	76
4.4.5 Number of elongating leaves (NEL)	78
4.4.6 Final leaf lamina length (FLL)	79
4.4.7 Leaf lamina width (LW)	
4.4.8 Leaf lamina dry weight (LDW)	81
4.4.9 Leaf area (LA)	
4.4.10 Specific leaf area (SLA)	
4.4.11 Leaf life span (LLS) and number of live leaves per tiller (NLL)	
4.4.12 Net photosynthetic rate	
4.4.13 Association among the leaf traits	
4.4.13.1 Correlation Analysis	
4.4.13.2 Principal component analysis	
4.5 Discussion	90
4.5.1 Methodology	90
4.5.2 Phyllochron responses in changing day length	92
4.5.3 A_{lf} and LER as the determinants of plant growth in changing day leng	th95
4.5.4 Leaf photosynthetic capacity and its association with leaf traits	96
4.6 Summary	97
Chapter 5: Tiller Axis Dynamics of Root Production	99
5.1 Introduction and Overview	99
5.2 Objectives	

5.3 Materials and Methods10)0
5.3.1 Root-bearing phytomer (Pr) nomenclature)0
5.3.2 Age determination for the roots at root-bearing phytomers)0
5.3.3 Root harvest)1
5.3.4 Root measurements10)2
5.3.5 Root preservation and processing10)3
5.3.6 Root length determination by the grid intersect method10)3
5.3.7 Root scanning using WinRHIZO [®] software10)3
5.3.8 Sample structure for WinRHIZO [®] scanning10)4
5.3.9 Dry weight estimation for roots preserved in alcohol10)6
5.3.10 Root data derivation)6
5.3.11 Visual scoring for root branching10)9
5.3.12 Statistical analysis10)9
5.4 Results	0
5.4.1 Tiller axis description	0
5.4.1.1 Number of leaf and root-bearing phytomers on the tiller axis	0
5.4.1.2 Seasonal variation on age of roots at successive Pr11	1
5.4.1.3 Number of roots per phytomer position (R_p) in the Spring and Autumn	
experiments11	2
5.4.2 Progression of root development at successive phytomers	4
5.4.2.1 Root dimensions at successive phytomers	.4
5.4.2.2 Root branching orders and root branching pattern	29
5.4.2.3 Root development at successive phytomers	35
5.4.3 Detailed examination of selected root-bearing phytomers	36
5.4.3.1 Measured variables	36
5.4.3.2 Derived variables	37
5.4.3.3 Distribution of total root length, surface area and volume among root	
diameter classes	38

5.4.3.4 Principal component analysis	. 143
5.5 Discussion	. 145
5.5.1 Co-ordination between phyllochron and rhizochron	.145
5.5.2 R_p and its association with other root physical traits	
5.5.3 Root development progression at successively developing phytomers	.147
5.5.3.1 Main axis development	.147
5.5.3.2 Root development curve	.148
5.5.4 C expenditure and dynamics of root branching	.151
5.5.5 Evidence of root death	.154
5.5.6 Seasonal variation in root dimensions	.156
5.5.7 Significance of studying root turnover: Increase in nutrient and water	
absorption area	.157
5.6 Summary	. 158
Chapter 6: Root-shoot interrelations and seasonal morphogenetic variations	.160
6.1 Introduction and Overview	.160
6.2 Objectives	.161
6.3 Methodology	.161
6.3.1 Investigation of root-shoot relations	.161
6.3.2 Effect of increasing or decreasing day length on root:shoot ratio	.161
6.3.3 Effect of daughter tiller removal on main tiller morphology	. 162
6.3.3.1 Short term effects of adult daughter tiller removal	.164
6.3.3.2 Longer term effects of juvenile daughter tiller removal	.164
6.3.4 Statistical analysis	. 165
6.4 Results	.166
6.4.1 Root: shoot morphogenetic relations	.166
6.4.1.1 Correlation analysis	.167
6.4.1.2 Principal component analysis (PCA)	168

6.4.2 'Architectural Signal' determining seasonal change in root:shoot ratio
hypothesized by Matthew et al. (1998)170
6.4.3 Main tiller-daughter tiller morphological relations
6.4.3.1 Effects on the main tiller of the excision of adult daughter tillers
6.4.3.2 Effects of preventing daughter tiller formation
6.4.3.2.1 Effect on tiller morphological traits
6.4.3.2.2 Root development in plants with or without daughter tillers
6.4.3.2.3 Effect of daughter tiller removal on adjacent root-bearing
phytomers179
6.5 Discussion
6.5.1 Seasonal variation in root:shoot ratio
6.5.2 Contribution of daughter tillers to main tiller development
6.5.2.1 Adult daughter tillers fed older roots of the main tiller
6.5.2.2 DT's shoot has a homeostatic relation with MT's root
6.5.2.3 Effects of preventing any daughter tiller formation for longer duration183
6.5.2.4 Effect of DT removal on root:shoot ratio in the Autumn experiment
6.6 Summary
Chapter 7: Functional Implications of Segmental Organisation
7.1 Introduction and Overview186
7.2 Objectives
7.3 Materials and Methods
7.3.1 Plant material
7.3.2 C labelling system
7.3.3 Calibration and testing of the C labelling system
7.3.3.1 Estimating C required per day191
7.3.3.2 Checking the air tank for leaks and diffusion gains
7.3.3.3 Modifying and calibrating the air pumps192
7.3.3.4 Calculating the CO_2 dilution due to leakage

7.3.3.5 Measuring flow rate and collecting gas samples	193
7.3.4 C and N labelling in Experiment 6.2	193
7.3.5 Analysis of isotope ratios for C and N	194
7.3.6 Estimation of new N received by the individual plant parts	196
7.3.7 Statistical analysis	196
7.4 Results	198
7.4.1 C exchange between main tiller and daughter tiller	198
7.4.2 Differential new N acquisition by the main tiller and the daughter tiller labelled plants and by individual tillers	200
7.4.3 Differential new N acquisition by the shoot components of main tiller and	
daughter tiller labelled plants	201
7.4.4 Differential new N acquired by roots of varying ages of the labelled tillers	
and their attached tillers	202
7.4.5 Inter-segmental C-N relations	205
7.4.5.1 C-N relations among shoot, tiller axis and roots	205
7.4.5.2 N isotope ratio in shoot and root dissection categories	207
7.4.5.3 C isotope ratio in the shoot and the roots	208
7.4.5.4 PCA for the inter-segmental C-N relations	208
7.5 Discussion	210
7.5.1 C exchange between main tiller and daughter tiller	210
7.5.2 N exchange pattern between the main tiller and the daughter tiller	212
7.5.3 Inter-segmental C-N relations	212
7.6 Summary	213
Chapter 8: Evidence of N Concentration Oscillation: Pattern and Possible Causes of	
N Flux in Barley Shoots	214
8.1 Introduction and Overview	214
8.2 Initial concept	215
8.3 Experimental	217

8.3.1 Experiment 1	217
8.3.2 Experiment 2	219
8.3.3 Statistical analysis	219
8.4 Results	220
8.4.1 Evaluation of N concentration oscillation in the tiller axis	220
8.4.2 Evaluation of N concentration oscillation in leaf laminae and sheath	
segments	222
8.4.3 Evaluation of effect of perturbation of photosynthetic area on N flux	224
8.5 Discussion	226
8.5.1 Evidence of N flux and N oscillation	226
8.5.2 Evaluation of leaf shading effects on the pattern of N oscillation	226
8.6 Summary	227
Chapter 9: Overview and Conclusions	229
9.1 Review of thesis objectives and synthesis of results	229
9.1.1 Tiller axis morphology and co-ordination between leaf and root	
appearance	229
9.1.2 Leaf turnover pattern and photosynthetic efficiency associated with leaf	
turnover	229
9.1.3 Dynamics of root production	230
9.1.4 Plant architectural signal	232
9.1.5 Economics of daughter tiller production	233
9.1.6 N oscillation in the tiller axis	233
9.2 Conclusions	234
9.3 Recommendations and further research	235
References	237
Appendices	263

List of Tables

Table 1.1 Chapter structure of the thesis	.6
Table 3.1 Leaf appearance interval at different phytomer positions for Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars during a 90 d growth period in spring. The youngest leaf was used as the reference point and was designated as P1. Note that P2 is the most recent and P11 of Alto and P13 of Aberdart the first observed leaf appearance event. Appearance interval for roots on successive phytomers at positions P6-P13 is assumed to equal leaf appearance interval at	
those same phytomers	50
Table 3.2 Root-bearing phytomer appearance rate (Pr d ⁻¹ , assumed to be the same as for the leaf at that position) and number of roots per phytomer (R _p) at different phytomer positions for Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars during the 90 d growth period. The phytomer bearing the youngest root was designated as Pr1	51
Table 3.3 Variation in shoot and root morphological traits between main tillers (MT)and daughter tillers (DT) averaged across Alto and Aberdart perennialryegrass cultivars. DT2 is typically one phyllochron younger than DT1 andthey were therefore located on adjacent phytomers, and opposite on the tilleraxis. R_p , number of roots per phytomer; DW, dry weight; DM, dry matter; Pr,root-bearing phytomer positions. Data presented are the average \pm SE of fourtillers from two cultivars.	54
Table 4.1 Mean values for variation in daily temperature and light intensity during	
the Spring 2008 (Experiment 4) and Autumn 2009 (Experiment 5) experiments	61
Table 4.2 Allocation of plant material to hydroponic culture trays. Each hydroponic tray contained 6 Alto and 6 Aberdart tillers as of particular genotypes as indicated. 'A' denotes cultivar Alto and 'B' denotes cultivar Aberdart. 1-10 are the individual genotypes of each cultivar. The hydroponic unit contained 10 trays in all with the same layout duplicated. Trays were moved weekly to a new position, and their orientation rotated 180° at the same time.	61
new position, and then offentation forated foor at the same time	J 4

Table	4.3 Chemical composition of the nutrient solution used in the hydroponic
	culture system. Quantities shown in the right hand column are the amount
	required to make 250 L of nutrient solution
Table	4.4 Leaf data structure for conducting analysis of variance (ANOVA)69
Table	4.5 The estimated age (days from leaf appearance \pm SE) at the final harvest, of
	the successive phytomer positions of Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass
	cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments74
Table	4.6 Curve parameters for the log-normal fit of net photosynthetic rate (NPR)
	and leaf age for Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in the Spring
	and Autumn experiments (Experiments 4 & 5, respectively). d: the highest
	NPR (μ mol CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹); g: leaf age when d occurs (days); f: a measure of
	curve width (log days)
Table	4.7 Leaf area (LA), leaf dry weight (LDW), estimated total photosynthesis of
	all leaf laminae (NPR tiller ⁻¹) and ratio between NPR and LA per tiller for
	Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in the Spring and Autumn
	experiments (Experiments 4 & 5, respectively) for 64 tillers for which
	photosynthesis measurements were carried out
Table	4.8 Co-efficients of correlation within perennial ryegrass cultivars in the
	Spring and Autumn experiments (Experiments 4 & 5, respectively) for 11
	leaf traits assessed for 16 tillers each of Alto and Aberdart from each
	Experiment. A _{lf} , leaf appearance interval; LED, leaf elongation duration; LER,
	leaf elongation rate; NLL, number of elongating leaves; NPR, net
	photosynthetic rate; FLL, leaf lamina length; LDW, leaf dry weight; LW, leaf
	lamina width; LA, leaf area; SLA, specific leaf area; LLS, leaf life span; NLL,
	number of live leaves. The cells contain Pearson correlation coefficients
Table	4.9 Major principal components and their coefficients from principal
	component analysis of tiller morpho-physiological traits of Alto and Aberdart
	perennial ryegrass cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments
	(Experiments 4 & 5, respectively) Abbreviations are: A _{lf} , leaf appearance
	interval (d); LED, leaf elongation duration; LER, leaf elongation rate (cm d ⁻¹);
	NEL, number of elongating leaves at a time; NPR, net photosynthetic rate
	(µmol CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹); FLL, leaf lamina length (cm); LDW, leaf lamina dry

- **Table 5.3** ANOVA structure for the root data of Alto and Aberdart perennialryegrass cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments to test statisticalsignificance of experiment, cultivar, experiment × cultivar, genotype withincultivar effects and effect of phytomer of each cultivar within experiment.109

- **Table 5.6** Statistical probability values for effect of experiment, cultivar, experimentx cultivar interaction, genotype within cultivar, phytomer of each cultivar andexperiment x phytomer interaction on various root dimensions of Alto andAberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars for the Spring and Autumn experiments....118

- Table 5.11 Whole root statistics for roots of Pr5 and Pr7 in the Spring experiment and Pr11 in the Autumn experiment. The aim was to compare immature and mature roots in the Spring experiment and roots of a similar developmental stage in the Autumn experiment and in the spring experiment. Pr, root-bearing phytomers; R_p, number of roots per phytomer; RDW_i, individual root dry weight (mg); RAL, root main axis length (cm); RL_i, root length (cm); RSA_i, root surface area (cm²); RV_i, root volume (cm³); RD_i, root diameter (mm), and RT_i, number of tips per root for Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars at the Pr5 and Pr7 in the Spring experiment and Pr11 in the Autumn experiment.
- **Table 5.12** Derived measures for comparing root morphology: Pr, root-bearing phytomers; SRL, specific root length (cm mg⁻¹); SRSA, specific root surface area (cm² mg⁻¹); SRV, Specific root volume (mm³ mg⁻¹ DW); TD, tissue

density (mg cm⁻³); RL/RV, root length per unit root volume (cm cm⁻³) and RL/RV^{1/3}, dimension corrected root length per unit root volume^{1/3}; RSA/RV, surface area per unit volume (cm²cm⁻³); RSA/RV^{2/3}, dimension corrected surface area/volume^{2/3} for Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars at the Pr5 and Pr7 in the Spring experiment and Pr11 in the Autumn experiment....138

- Table 5.13 PCA of root morphological traits for Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars of Pr5 and Pr7 in the Spring experiment and Pr11 in the Autumn experiment. R_p, number of roots at the phytomer position; RDW, dry weight of the individual root; RAL, length of the main root axis; RL, root length; RSA, root surface area; RD, root diameter; RV, root volume; RT, number of tips per root; SRL, specific root length, SRSA, specific root surface area; SRV, specific root volume; TD, tissue density; RL/RV, root length per root volume; $DRL/RV^{1/3}$, dimension corrected total root length per unit root volume; RSA/RV, surface area per unit root volume; DSA/RV^{2/3}, dimension corrected surface area per unit root volume; %variation, percentage variation explained; p, probability of statistical variation in nonorthogonal contrast $(F_{1.81})$; p (Pr5 v Pr7) and p (Pr7 v Pr11) respectively denote probability of statistical variation between Pr5 versus Pr7 of the Spring experiment and Pr7 of the Spring experiment versus Pr11 of the Autumn experiment; PC, principal component, SE, standard error.
- Table 5.14 Main root axis length (RAL), RL (total root length): RAL ratio and %
 diameter reduction at the first eight root-bearing phytomers (Pr) of

 progressive development.
 148

- Table 5.16 Mean root dry weight (RDW), surface area (RSA), volume (RV) at the Pr12 and Pr14 for Alto and Pr12 and Pr16 for Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivar in autumn, and the root length (RL) at those phytomers distributed along four different diameter classes.
- Table 6.2 Coefficients of correlation within perennial ryegrass cultivars in Spring and Autumn experiments and across combined data of independently measured leaf and root traits assessed in 89 tillers of Alto and Aberdart. LDW_t, leaf lamina dry weight tiller⁻¹; LA_t, leaf area per tiller; RDW_t, root dry weight; NLL number of live leaves tiller⁻¹; NPr, number of live root-bearing phytomers tiller⁻¹; NR_t, total number of live roots tiller⁻¹. A single cell contains the Pearson correlation coefficient.
- Table 6.3 Principal component analysis of tiller root and shoot morphological traits of Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in Spring and Autumn experiments. LDW_t, leaf lamina dry weight tiller⁻¹ (mg); LA_t, leaf area tiller⁻¹ (cm²); NLL, number of live leaves tiller⁻¹; NPr, number of live root-bearing phytomers tiller⁻¹; NR_t, total number of live roots tiller⁻¹, RDW_t, root dry weight tiller⁻¹ (mg); RL_t, total root length tiller⁻¹ (m); NR_t, total number of live roots tiller⁻¹; NSA_t, root surface area tiller⁻¹ (cm²). PC, principal component. 169
- **Table 6.4** Analysis of variance (ANOVA) of scores for the first two principal components (PCs) based on the shoot and root data of Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in Spring and Autumn experiments. SE, standard

- Table 7.1 Dissection categories for isotopically labelled root and shoot of Alto

 (Experiment 6.1) and Aberdart (Experiment 6.2) perennial ryegrass cultivars,

in order to determine isotope distribution within the plant. EL, elongating leaf;
Pr, root-bearing phytomer195
Table 7.2 Mean C isotope ratio (δ^{13} C (∞)) of different plant parts for different tillercategories of Alto perennial ryegrass in Experiment 6.1 for MTL-MT, maintillers of main tiller labelled plants; MTL-DT, daughter tillers of main tillerlabelled plants; DTL-MT, main tillers of daughter tiller labelled plants; andDTL-DT; daughter tillers of daughter tiller labelled plants
Table 7.3 Statistical significance of difference in ¹⁵ N uptake (mg g ⁻¹ tiller DW) forthe various tiller dissection categories for Aberdart perennial ryegrass inExperiment 6.2, as tested by orthogonal linear contrast between labelled andunlabelled tillers (MTL-MT and DTL-DT versus MTL-DT and DTL-MT);unlabelled tillers (MTL-DT versus DTL-MT) and labelled tillers (MTL-MTversus DTL-DT). The data for which statistical information is presented here
are reported in Fig. 7.11 to 7.13 above
Table 7.4 %C, %N and C:N ratio for shoot, tiller axis and roots of Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in Experiment 6
Table 7.5 Principal component analysis (PCA) coefficients for C and N traits of shoot, tiller axis and root dissection categories of Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars. C:N, carbon:nitrogen ratio; δ^{15} N, isotopic mass ratio between ¹⁵ N and ¹⁴ N; δ^{13} C, isotopic mass ratio between ¹³ C and ¹² C
Table 7.6 Mean PC scores of PCA in Table 7.5 for C and N traits of shoot, tiller axis
and root dissection categories of Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars and statistical significance determined by ANOVA. PC, principal component; SE, standard error of mean; p, statistical probability
Table 8.1 Nutrient composition used for growing barley plants in Experiment 1
Table 8.2 N concentration (%) of leaf 4 lamina (L4) and daughter tiller 1 (DT1) at different sampling dates after transplanting under three different treatments – control, excision of the oldest leaf, shading of the oldest leaf. Treatments ware imposed on Day 22 225
word imposed on Day 22

List of Figures

- Fig. 2.4 Interrelationship between morphological and growth traits including among others leaf elongation rate (LER), leaf elongation duration (LED), leaf appearance rate (LAR), tiller appearance and leaf area index (LAI) (from Bahmani et al., 2000).

Fig. 3.2 Variation between phytomer positions for (a) leaf length, (b) leaf dry weight,
(c) root length and (d) root dry weight of Alto and Aberdart - perennial
ryegrass cultivars. Vertical bars indicate standard error at each phytomer
position. For leaf data the emerging leaf (P1) is the reference point and for the
roots the youngest root-bearing position (Pr1) is the reference point
Fig. 3.3 Variation between main tiller and daughter tillers at successive phytomer
positions for (a) leaf length, (b) leaf dry weight, (c) root length and (d) root
dry weight averaged accross Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars.
Vertical bars indicate standard error at each phytomer position. For leaf data
the emerging leaf is the reference point (P1) and for root data the youngest
root-bearing phytomer position (Pr1) is the reference point
Fig. 4.1 Positioning of the Spring and Autumn experiments within the seasonal cycle
of day length change60
Fig. 4.2 Daily average temperature during the Spring (1 July to 28 September) and
Autumn (3 March to 31 May) experiments
Fig 4.3 Variation in daily thermal time (growing degree days (GDD) $^{\circ}$ C d) during
the Spring 2008 (1 July to 28 September) and Autumn 2009 (3 March to 31
the spring 2000 (1 bury to 20 september) and Matanin 2009 (5 Match to 51
May) experiments
May) experiments
May) experiments
 May) experiments
 May) experiments
May) experiments
 May) experiments

experiments (Experiments 4 & 5, respectively) for the two perennial ryegrass cultivars Alto and Aberdart. Phytomer position 1 is the youngest leaf.

Vertical bars show standard error of means at each phytomer for each cultivar	
in each experiment. Note that the time sequence reads from right (older	
phytomers) to left (younger phytomers)	.72
Fig. 4.7 Time course of phytomer accumulation expressed in cumulative days for Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments (Experiments 4 & 5, respectively). Phytomer position 1 is the youngest leaf.	.73
Fig. 4.8 Time course of phytomer accumulation expressed in cumulative thermal time (°C d) for Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments (Experiments 4 & 5, respectively). Phytomer position 1 is the youngest leaf	73
	.75
Fig. 4.9 Leaf elongation duration (LED) of Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments (Experiments 4 & 5, respectively). Vertical bars show standard error of means at each phytomer for each cultivar in each experiment. Phytomer position 1 is the youngest leaf.	
	.75
Fig. 4.10 Leaf elongation rate (LER) at different phytomer positions over a 90 d	
growing period for Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in the	
Spring and Autumn experiments (Experiments 4 & 5, respectively). Vertical	
bars show standard error of means at each phytomer for each cultivar in each experiment. Phytomer position 1 indicates the youngest leaf	.76
Fig. 4.11 Leaf elongation rate (LER) expressed in thermal time (mm °C ⁻¹ d ⁻¹) at	
different phytomer positions for Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments (Experiments 4 & 5, respectively). Phytomer position 1 is the youngest leaf. Vertical bars show standard error of means at each phytomer for each cultivar in each	77
experiment	. / /
Fig. 4.12 Number of elongating leaves for Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments (Experiments 4 & 5, respectively). Phytomer position 1 is the youngest leaf. Vertical bars show	
standard error of means at each phytomer for each cultivar in each	70
CAPCIIIICII	. 70

Fig. 4.13 Final leaf length (FLL) at the different phytomer positions for Alto and	
Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments	
(Experiments 4 & 5, respectively). Vertical bars show standard error of	
means at each phytomer for each cultivar in each experiment. Phytomer	
position 1 denotes the youngest leaf	79
Fig. 4.14 Leaf width at different phytomer positions of Alto and Aberdart perennial	
ryegrass cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments (Experiments 4 & 5,	
respectively). Vertical bars show standard error of means at each phytomer	
for each cultivar in each experiment. Phytomer position 1 denotes the	
youngest leaf.	.80
Fig. 4.15 Leaf dry weight (LDW) at different phytomer positions for Alto and	
Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments	
(Experiments 4 & 5, respectively). Vertical bars show standard error of	
means at each phytomer for each cultivar in each experiment. Phytomer	
position 1 denotes the youngest leaf	.81
Fig. 4.16 Leaf area (cm ²) at different phytomers for Alto and Aberdart perennial	
ryegrass cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments (Experiment 4 and 5,	
respectively). Vertical bars show standard error of means at each phytomer	
for each cultivar in each experiment. Phytomer position 1 denotes the	
youngest leaf.	.82
Fig. 4.17 Specific leaf area $(cm^2 \sigma^{-1})$ at different phytomers for Alto and Aberdart	
perennial ryegrass cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments	
(Experiments 4 & 5 respectively) Vertical bars show standard error of	
means at each phytomer for each cultivar in each experiment. Phytomer	
position 1 denotes the voungest leaf.	.83
Fig. 4.18 Loof life span (LLS) and number of live leaves per tiller (NLL) for Alte	
and Abordert perceptial magness cultivers in the Spring and Autumn	
and Aberdart pereinnar Tyegrass curtivals in the Spring and Autumn avpariments (Experiment 4 & 5 respectively) Vertical bars indicate standard	
experiments (Experiment 4 & 3, respectivery). Ventical bars mulcale standard	Q /I
	04

Fig. 4.19 Net photosynthetic rate (NPR) for five selected leaf positions of Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments

- **Fig. 5.2** Root scanner and WinRHIZO[®] software facilities at AgResearch Ruakura laboratories, Hamilton. The author is scanning the individual roots of different phytomers in order to estimate the rate of root development for the two perennial ryegrass cultivars Alto and Aberdart from Experiments 4 & 5. 104

- **Fig. 5.9** Specific root length (cm mg⁻¹) of Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments. Time scale gives age of Aberdart phytomers. For Alto phytomers add approximately 10% (spring) or 5% (autumn) to the number of days on the time scale. Root-bearing phytomers are counted from the youngest phytomer with roots. The standard errors are derived from those of the log transformed data in for the

- Fig. 5.13 Root branching orders at different phytomer positions of same genotype (a) main axis elongation at phytomer 2, (b) primary root branching at phytomer 3, (c) secondary branching at phytomer 5, (d) tertiary branching at phytomer 11. ... 131
- Fig. 5.14 Visual scores for individual scanned roots at different order of root branching for different phytomer positions of Alto (A) and Aberdart (B) perennial ryegrass cultivars in Spring and Autumn experiments. To obtain the score-sheet root-bearing phytomers are numbered in X-axis and the orders of root branching are scored on Y-axis.

- Fig. 5.15 Developmental stages of phytomers in a vegetative grass tiller from the apical meristem to quaternary level of root branching in a stylised diagram. AM, apical meristem; LP, leaf primordium; ELS, elongating leaf inside the pseudostem; EL, elongating visible leaf; FEL, fully elongated leaf; ML, mature leaf; SL, senescing leaf; AB, axillary bud; DT, daughter tiller; TA, tiller axis; MAE, main root axis elongation for the youngest adventitious roots; 1°, 2°, 3° and 4° branching: primary, secondary, tertiary and quaternary level of root branching. For the root branching phases only the alternate root-bearing phytomers are partly drawn. Leaf developmental stages have been drawn taking data from Yang *et al.* (1998). The diagram has been drawn following Matthew et al. (2001).

- Fig. 5.18 Percentage distribution of root length among different root diameter class (mm) for roots of Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars at phytomer (Pr) 5 and Pr7 in the Spring experiment and Pr11 in the Autumn experiment......140

- Fig. 5.20 Percentage distribution of root volume among different root diameter class (mm) for roots of Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars at phytomer (Pr) 5 and Pr7 in the Spring experiment and Pr11 in the Autumn experiment......142

- Fig. 6.4 Total root dry weight per tiller (RDW_t), RDW of the first eight phytomers (Pr1–Pr8), and RDW of the oldest five phytomers for perennial ryegrass cultivar Alto in the Spring experiment. Vertical bars indicate standard error of mean for each treatment. Data are for plants with two daughter tillers (DT+)

and plants with daughter tillers excised (DT-) harvested $12 - 20$ d after DT
excision174
Fig. 6.5 Specific leaf area (SLA) at the different leaf positions of Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivar for the plants with two daughter tillers (DT+) and
plants without daughter tillers (D1-) for the 93 d growth period. Vertical bars
show standard error at each phytomer position. Phytomer position 1 denotes the emerging leaf
Fig. 6.6 Ratio of root dry weight per phytomer position (RDW _p): leaf lamina dry
weight per tiller (LDW_t) for perennial ryegrass cultivar Alto in the Autumn
experiment for DT+ and DT- plants. Vertical bars indicate standard error of
mean for all data for each treartment. The trend line is represented by a
quadratic curve. Stdev, standard deviation
Fig. 6.7 Ratio of root dry weight per phytomer position (RDW _p): leaf lamina dry
weight per tiller (LDW_t) for Aberdart perennial ryegrass in the Autumn
experiment for plants with (DT+) and without daughter tillers (DT-). Vertical
bars indicate standard error of mean for all data for each treartment. The trend
line is represented by a quadratic curve for DT- plants and a cubic curve for DT+ plants. Stdev, standard deviation
Fig. 6.8 Root:shoot ratio expressed as root dry weight per phytomer position (RDW _p)
divided by total leaf dry weight (LDW_t) per tiller for perennial ryegrass
cultivar Alto in the Autumn experiment (Experiment 5) at the oldest three
phytomer positions in DT+ and DT- Plants. Vertical bars indicate standard
error of mean for each treatment
Fig. 7.1 Flow chart showing key components of the system set up for feeding individual tillers with ¹² C-enriched CO ₂
Fig. 7.2 Soda-lime CO_2 scrubber (a) and soda-lime dust trap (b) to remove
atmospheric CO ₂ supplied from the air compressor (c)
Fig. 7.3 The mylar air tank (>3m ³). Tank contains an internal mixing fan. Black tube
supplies air to pump manifold. Taps allow Licor 6200 connection to monitor
CO ₂ concentration in the air tank

Fig. 8.4 N concentration (%) in the tiller axis at successive destructive harvests in
Experiment 2 of barley plants growing in soil
Fig. 8.5 N concentration (%) of different shoot segments of barley plants growing in
hydroponic culture for successive harvest dates for the control plants in
Experiment 1223
Fig. 8.6 N concentration (%) in the different shoot segments of barley plants at
different harvest dates for the plants growing in soil in Experiment 2224
Fig. 8.7 N concentration fluctuation in Leaf 3 Lamina of barley plants during
vegetative growth under Control, Excision, and Shading treatments imposed
at Day 22. Alf, leaf appearance interval. For Excision and Shading treatments
the oldest leaf (Leaf 1) was either excised or shaded, respectively225
Fig. 9.1 C cost for root construction, root respiration and estimated photo-assimilate
supply at different Pr of (a) Alto and (b) Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars
in the Autumn experiment. The assimilate supply curve assumes 30% of
available photo-assimilate consumed at each successive Pr

List of Appendices

Appendix 1 Irving and Matthew submitted manuscript to Annals of Botany journal 263

Appendix	5.1a	Phyllochron	expressed	in	days	for	Alto	perennial	ryegrass	
cultivar in t	the Au	ıtumn experin	nent (Exper	im	ent 5).					

Appendix 5.1b Phyllochron (Alf), leaf age, rhizochron and estimated root age at
different phytomers. de, delay between leaf and root appearance at a particular
phytomer for cultivar Alto in the Autumn experiment (Experiment 5)
Appendix 5.2 Number of leaves appeared since transplanting (NLA), root-bearing
phytomers (NPr) and length of individual roots at particular phytomers at Day
16, Day 22 and Day 27 after transplanting for 6 tillers of Alto (A) and
Aberdart (B) perennial ryegrass. Phytomer positions are as at Day 27 and
observations in the same column show the development over time of roots at
that phytomer position
Appendix 5.3 Comparison between root length at the different phytomer positions of
Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in the Spring experiment
(Experiment 4) obtained from modified Newman Method and WinRhizo
Method. SRL, specific root length; WL, WinRhizo length; NL, Newman
Length271
Appendix 5.3a Alto perennial ryegrass cultivar in spring
Appendix 5.3b Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivar in spring
Appendix 5.4 Quadratic curves for estimating the root dry matter deposition rate at
different phytomer (DMD _p) positions of Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass
cultivars in the Spring and Autumn experiments
Appendix 5.4a Alto in the Spring experiment
Appendix 5.4b Aberdart in the Spring experiment
Appendix 5.4c Alto in the Autumn experiment
Appendix 5.4d Aberdart in the Autumn experiment
Appendix 5.5 Estimation of specific root length, specific root surface area and
specific root volume for Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars in
Spring and Autumn experiments (Experiment 4 & 5, respectively)274
Appendix 5.5a Estimation of specific root length at the phytomer positions of
unknown root length274
Appendix 5.5b Estimation of specific root surface area at the phytomer
positions of unknown surface area

Appendix 5.5c Estimation of specific root volume at the different phytomer
positions of unknown root volume
Appendix 5.6 ANOVA for estimating experiment × phytomer interaction (RL, root
length as an example). Exp, experiment; Cul, cultivar; Geno, Genotypes;
ClonalRep, clonal replicates; Pr, phytomers277
Appendix 5.7 ANOVA for estimating variation between two experiments, Spring
and Autumn experiments; two cultivars, Alto and Aberdart; genotypes of
each cultivar for different root dimensions at different root-bearing phytomers
(SRL, specific root length as an example)277
Appendix 5.8 Non-orthogonal linear contrast: SAS code used for non-orthogonal
linear contrast
Appendix 5.9 Derived measures for new root dry weight (RDW), root length (RL),
root surface area (RSA), root volume (RV), root diameter at each root-
bearing phytomer position (Pr) considering root growth at each phytomer
position in steady-state and derived root diameter of the all roots at each
phytomer position for two perennial ryegrass cultivars, Alto and Aberdart in
two different experiements, the Spring and Autumn experiements. The new
root growth at each position was calculated from a quadratic equation. Pr1
refers the youngest root-bearing phytomer278
Appendix 5.9a Alto in the Spring experiment
Appendix 5.9b Aberdart in the Spring experiment
Appendix 5.9c Alto in the Autumn experiment
Appendix 5.9d Aberdart in the Autumn experiment
Appendix 5.10 PC scores for different measured and derived root dimensions of
phytomer (Pr) 5 and Pr 7 of Spring experiment, Pr 11 of Autumn experiment
for Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivars
Appendix 6.1 ANOVA commands for testing statistical significance of effects of
experiment, cultivar, the experiment x cultivar interaction, and genotypes
within experiment and cultivar for tillers of Alto and Aberdart perennial
ryegrass in the Spring and Autumn experiments. LDW_t , leaf dry weight per
tiller

Appendix 6.2	PC scores for root-shoot morphological traits of Alto a	and Aberdart
perennia	al ryegrass cultivars in Spring and Autumn experiments (Experiments
4 & 5, r	respectively)	

Appendix 6.4 A comparison for the morphological traits at the individual tiller level of the main tiller and the two daughter tillers of two perennial ryegrass cultivars Alto and Aberdart in the Spring and Autumn experiments (Experiment 4 & 5, respectively). LDW, leaf lamina dry weight per tiller (mg); LA, leaf area of the live leaves per tiller (cm²); SLA, specific leaf area (cm² g⁻¹); NLL, number of live leaves; NPr, number of live root-bearing phytomers; NR_t, number of roots per tiller; RDW, root dry weight per tiller;

Appendix 6.5 A comparison between DT+ and DT- plants for main tiller morphological development at the successive phytomers after the daughter tiller excision treatment in perennial ryegrass cultivar cv. (a) Alto and (b) Aberdart in the Spring experiment (Experiment 4). Tillers were excised 98 days after transplantation and harvested between 12 and 20 d later. FLL, final leaf length (cm); LDW, Leaf dry weight (mg), LA, leaf area (cm²); SLA, specific leaf area (cm² g⁻¹); R_p number of roots per phytomer, RDW_i root dry weight of the individual roots at each phytomer (mg). Net RDW, change in RDW per phytomer at the treatment period. SE, standard error of mean; Appendix 6.6 Tiller axis shoot and root traits for daughter tiller excised (DT-) plants of Alto and Aberdart (Aber) perennial ryegrass cultivars at the destructive harvest after 93 d growth in the Autumn experiment (Experiment 5). FLL, final leaf length (cm); LW, leaf width (mm); LDW, leaf dry weight (mg); LA, leaf area (cm²); SLA, specific leaf area (cm² g⁻¹); R_p, number of roots per phytomer, RDW_p, root dry weight per phytomer; RDW_i, root dry weight per root of the individual roots at each phytomer; RDW_i/LDW_t, RDW at each phytomer position standardized against leaf dry weight per tiller; SE, standard error of mean; where given as % is for log transformed data; p, probability of Appendix 7.2 C isotope ratio in the labelling samples as read by isotope ratio mass spectrometer. Samples were collected in 10 mL vacutainers from the air tank using a double-ended needle. The gas samples were carried from Palmerston North to Freising, Germany in a luggage for measuring C isotope mass ratio......293

Appendix 7.4 CO ₂ concentration (ppm) recorded at the outlet of the bags feeding the
tillers at different times of the day (CO ₂ concentration inside the air tank was
420 ppm in Experiment 6.1 and 430 ppm in Experiment 6.2)
Appendix 7.5 Estiamtion of change in C isotope mass ratio due to leakage within
labelling system
Appendix 7.5a Calibration of the labelling system: change in C isotope mass
ratio at the outlets of the pumps due to leakage within the system
Appendix 7.5b Calculation of the estimated change in C isotope ratio of the
supplied CO ₂ mixture due to measured leakage into the system
Appendix 7.6 Calculation for (¹⁵ NH4) ₂ SO ₄ required to prepare 1 atom% solution296
Appendix 7.7 Standard curve for estimating the natural abundance of ¹⁵ N
Appendix 7.8 ANOVA structure for the C labelled plants to estimate the statistical variation between labelled and unlabelled tillers after GLM procedure: root and shoot, and different shoot and root dissection categories. (1. MTL-MT, main tiller of the main tiller labelled plant; 2. MTL-DT, daughter tiller of the main tiller labelled plant; 3. DTL-MT, main tiller of the daughter tiller labelled plant; 4. DTL-DT; daughter tiller of the daughter tiller labelled plant; 207
plant.)
Appendix 7.9 ¹⁵ N uptake (mg g ⁻¹ Dissection category) by different dissection categories of main tiller and daughter tiller of Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivar plants for the labelled plants with ¹⁵ (NH ₄) ₂ SO ₄ for 5 days. (MTL, main tiller labelled; DTL, daughter tiller labelled, (asterisks indicates significant relations). Data for some of the selected dissection categories are also presented in Fig. 7.12 and 7.13
Appendix 7.10 %C. % N. C:N ratio. δ^{15} N (‰) and δ^{13} C (‰) at different root and
shoot dissection categorires of Alto and Aberdart perennial ryegrass cultivar at destructive harvest in Experiment 6.1 & 6.2 (Aberdart root positions are in
parenunesis)
Appendix 7.10a %C, % N and C:N ratio
Appendix 7.10b δ^{15} N and δ^{13} C isotope mass ratio (‰)
Appendix 7.11 C mass isotope ratio inside the bag (Farquhar et al., 1989)

Appendix 8.1 Ca	lculation for % 1	N concentration	

Glossary of Abbreviations

A _{lf}	Leaf appearance interval/phyllochron
A _{lg}	Ligule appearance interval
ANOVA	Analysis of variance
A _{rt}	Root appearance interval/rhizochron
С	Carbon
C:N	Carbon-nitrogen ratio
CER	CO ₂ exchange rate
CRD	Completely randomized design
d	Day(s)
d	Maximum net photosynthetic rate
de	Delay between leaf and root appearance at the same phytomer (node)
DM	Dry matter
DMD _p	Dry matter deposition rate per phytomer
$RL/RV^{1/3}$	Dimension corrected root length:root volume ratio
RSA/RV ^{2/3}	Dimension corrected root surface area:root volume ratio
DT	Daughter tiller
DT-	Daughter tiller excised plants
DT+	Plants with two oldest daughter tillers
DTL	Daughter tiller labelled plant (refers to stable isotope labelling)
DW	Dry weight
EL	Elongating/emerging leaf
Exp	Experiment
f	A measure of curve-width of the log-normal curve in log-days
FLL	Final leaf lamina length
g	Leaf age when maximum net photosynthetic rate occurs
GDD	Growing degree days
Geno	Genotype
GLM	Generalized linear model
IGER	Institute for Grassland and Environmental Research
L	Leaf
LA	Leaf area
LA _i	Leaf area of the individual leaves
LA _t	Leaf area per tiller
LAR	Leaf appearance rate

LDW	Leaf dry weight	
LDW _i	Leaf dry weight of the individual leaves	
LDW _t	Leaf dry weight per tiller	
LDW _{DT}	Leaf dry weight of the two daughter tillers	
LED	Leaf elongation duration	
LER	Leaf elongation rate	
LLS	Leaf life span	
LW	Leaf lamina width	
MES	2-(N-morpholino) ethanesulfonic acid, a pH stabilizer	
MT	Main tiller	
MTL	Main tiller labelled plant	
Ν	Nitrogen	
NEL	Number of visible elongating leaves per tiller	
NLA	Number of leaf appearance events	
NLL	Number of live leaves per tiller	
NP	Number of phytomers per tiller	
NPr	Number of root-bearing phytomers per tiller	
NPR	Net photosynthetic rate	
NR _t	Number of roots per tiller	
р	Probability value	
P (numeral)	Phytomer position using the emerging leaf as the reference point	
PAR	Photosynthetically active radiation	
PC	Principal component	
PCA	Principal component analysis	
PPFD	Photosynthetic photon flux density	
Pr	Root-bearing phytomer using the youngest root as a reference point	
PrAR	Root-bearing phytomer appearance rate	
PVC	Polyvinyl chloride	
R	Root	
RA	Root axis	
RAL	Root main axis length	
RCBD	Randomized complete block design	
RD	Root diameter	
RDW	Root dry weight	
RDW _i	Root dry weight of the individual roots	
RDW _P	Root dry weight per phytomer	
RDW _t	Root dry weight per tiller	

RL	Root length
RL _i	Individual root length
RL_P	Root length per phytomer
RL _t	Root length per tiller
R _P	Number of roots per phytomer
RSA	Root surface area
RSA _i	Root surface area of the individual roots
RSA _P	Root surface area per phytomer
RSA _t	Root surface area per tiller
RT	Root tips
RT_i	Number of root tips of individual roots
RT _P	Number of root tips per phytomer
RV	Root volume
RV_i	Root volume of the individual roots
RV _P	Root volume per phytomer
$\mathbf{SDW}_{\mathrm{t}}$	Dry weight of leaf sheaths per tiller
SE	Standard error
SEM	Standard error of mean
SL	Senescing leaves
SLA	Specific leaf area
SRL	Specific root length
SRSA	Specific root surface area
SRV	Specific root volume
TADW	Tiller axis dry weight
TAR	Tiller appearance rate
T _{base}	Base temperature for GDD calculations
TD	Tissue density
TPAt	Total photosynthetic assimilation per tiller
T_{max}	Maximum temperature
T_{min}	Minimum temperature
Treat	Treatment
YR	Young roots
$\delta^{13}C$	Carbon isotope mass ratio $({}^{13}C; {}^{12}C)$ per mill (‰)
$\delta^{15}N$	Nitrogen isotope mass ratio (¹⁵ N: ¹⁴ N)