

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.

ASPECTS OF WATER DEFICIT AND VEGETATIVE
GROWTH IN SELECTED PASTURE AND
FORAGE GRASSES

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment
of the requirement for the
degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
at

Massey University
Palmerston North
New Zealand

ALEXANDER CHEONG PING CHU

1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgements	i
List of Figures	iii
List of Tables	vii
List of Appendices	x
 Abstract	 1
 Chapter I: <u>Introduction and Objectives</u>	 5
1.1 Introduction	5
1.2 Objectives	7
 Chapter II: <u>Review of Literature</u>	 10
2.1 Introduction	10
2.1.1 Terminology	10
2.2 Development of plant water deficit	13
2.3 Plant responses to water deficit	14
2.4 The effects of water deficit on leaf growth	
in pasture grasses	17
2.4.1 Leaf extension in grasses	17
2.4.2 The effects of water deficit on leaf	
extension	18
2.5 The effects of water deficit on vegetative	
yields in pasture grasses	20
2.6 Reactions of plants to water deficit following	
drought hardening pre-treatments	24
2.7 The interactive effects of temperature and	
water deficit on plant growth	27
2.7.1 The effects of temperature on leaf	
growth	27

	<u>Page</u>
2.7.2 The interactive effects of temperature and water deficit on plant growth	28
Chapter III: <u>Sensitivity of leaf extension to plant water deficit</u>	31
3.1 Introduction	31
3.2 <u>Experiment 1</u> - Leaf water potential and leaf extension in a sudax crop	34
3.2.1 Abstract	34
3.2.2 Introduction	34
3.2.3 Materials and Methods	35
3.2.4 Results and Discussion	37
3.2.4.1 Diurnal changes in leaf water potential within the canopy	37
3.2.4.2 Changes in leaf water potential of basal tillers after removal of canopy	38
3.2.4.3 Leaf extension rate and leaf water potential	39
3.3 <u>Experiment 2</u> - Sensitivity to water deficit of leaf extension in prairie grass	41
3.3.1 Abstract	41
3.3.2 Introduction	42
3.3.3 Materials and Methods	42
3.3.4 Results and Discussion	44
3.3.4.1 Diurnal trends in leaf water potential and leaf extension during the drying cycle	44
3.3.4.2 Relationship between leaf water potential and leaf extension rate	45

	<u>Page</u>
3.4 <u>Experiment 3 - Sensitivity to water deficit of</u>	
leaf extension in two ryegrass cultivars	
under different temperature regimes	50
3.4.1 Abstract	50
3.4.2 Introduction	50
3.4.3 Materials and Methods	51
3.4.4 Results and Discussion	53
3.4.4.1 Diurnal pattern of leaf extension	
rate and leaf water potential	53
3.4.4.2 Mean daily leaf extension rate	55
3.4.4.3 The relationship between leaf	
water potential and leaf	
extension rate	56
Chapter IV: <u>The effects of water deficit on subsequent recovery</u>	
<u>growth in pasture grasses</u>	59
4.1 Introduction	59
4.2 <u>Experiment 4 - Recovery growth following water</u>	
deficits of different duration in prairie	
grass	61
4.2.1 Abstract	61
4.2.2 Introduction	62
4.2.3 Materials and Methods	62
4.2.4 Results and Discussion	65
4.2.4.1 Rate of leaf emergence	65
4.2.4.2 Rate of leaf extension	66
4.2.4.3 Rate of increase in growth	
components	71

		Page
4.3	<u>Experiment 5 - Recovery growth following different levels of water deficit in two cultivars of ryegrass under two different temperature regimes</u>	76
4.3.1	Abstract	76
4.3.2	Introduction	77
4.3.3	Materials and Methods	79
4.3.4	Results and Discussion	83
	4.3.4.1 Rate of leaf emergence	83
	4.3.4.2 Rate of leaf extension	85
	4.3.4.3 Growth data from the destructive harvests	88
	4.3.4.3.1 Responses during the desiccation phase	89
	4.3.4.3.2 Responses during the recovery phase	91
	4.3.4.4 The rate of increase in growth parameters	99
Chapter V:	<u>The reactions of plants to water deficit following atmospheric pre-conditioning</u>	105
5.1	<u>Experiment 6 - The reaction of prairie grass to water deficit following atmospheric pre-conditioning</u>	105
5.1.1	Abstract	105
5.1.2	Introduction	106
5.1.3	Materials and Methods	108
5.1.4	Results and Discussion	111

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter VI: <u>Overview and Conclusion</u>	121
6.1 The sensitivity of leaf extension to plant water deficit	121
6.2 The effects of water deficit on subsequent plant recovery growth	125
6.2.1 The relative sensitivity of different growth parameters to water deficit	125
6.2.2 The effects of water deficit on subsequent recovery of different growth parameters	129
6.3 Comparative responses of Nui and Ruanui to water deficit and during subsequent recovery	135
6.4 The relationship between leaf extension rate and plant growth rate	139
6.5 Reaction of plants to water deficit following "drought hardening" pretreatments	143
Appendices	145
References	177

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a great pleasure to acknowledge the stimulation and wise counsel of my supervisors, Professor B.R. Watkin of the Agronomy Department, Massey University and Dr H.G. McPherson of Plant Physiology Division, (P.P.D), Department of Scientific and Industrial Research (D.S.I.R.) in all facets of this study. In particular I am grateful to Dr H.G. McPherson for his sincere and critical guidance throughout the study. To me, this has been an invaluable educational experience, any errors remaining in this thesis, are entirely mine.

I acknowledge the assistance given to me by the following:-

Dr J.P. Kerr, Director of P.P.D. for permission to use the facilities which made this study possible. Also for his cooperation and guidance in the sudax experiment reported in this study.

Mr G. Halligan, D.S.I.R., for his capable technical assistance in the Climate Room experiments and for his careful preparation of the Figures in this thesis.

Mrs R. Tillman, Massey University for technical assistance and computer card punching.

Mr P.L. Rollinson, D.S.I.R., for taking the stomatal resistance measurements.

Dr C.R. Slack, D.S.I.R., for teaching me the freeze drying technique.

Mr D.H. Hopcroft, D.S.I.R., for the electron microscopic work reported in this thesis.

Dr. W. Rumball and Mr I. Ritchie for the plant materials used in this study.

Mrs J. Humphries, Massey University for the careful typing of this thesis.

To all these people I wish to extend my thanks.

I would also like to thank the following groups of people too many to name individually:-

Staff of P.P.D., in particular those in the Climate Room Services,

Nursery Support Unit and Technical Service team whose standard of assistance

have ensured the smooth running of the experiments

The staff of Massey Library and D.S.I.R. Library for prompt and efficient service.

Members of the Agronomy Department, Massey University and members of P.P.D. and Grasslands, D.S.I.R., for discussion and comments.

Staff of Massey Computer Centre for their cooperation.

Finally to my wife, Jenny, and my sons Simon and Michael, for their patience and understanding in allowing me to pursue this study in tranquillity.

Financial assistance from the following are gratefully acknowledged:-

D.S.I.R. research contract SIR 38/10/4/22.

IBM Research Grant for Investigation on Summer Pasture Productivity (held jointly with Mr C. Korte of Agronomy Department Massey University)

Agricultural and Horticultural Faculty Research Fund 1973/1974.

LIST OF FIGURESPage

Figure 3.1

Leaf water potentials (ψ_1) measured at three heights in the canopy of field-grown sudax and net radiation taken over an adjacent plot of paspalum (26 Jan 1974).

37/i

Figure 3.2

Diurnal courses of air temperature, leaf water potential (ψ_1) and leaf extension rate in a stand of field grown sudax (13-14 Feb 1974).

39/i

Figure 3.3

Timing of measurements of leaf extension rate (A to D) and ψ_1 (a to d) relative to diurnal changes in temperature and air vapour pressure deficit. The leaf length measurements used to compute extension rates were taken at each end of the periods indicated. Leaf water potential measurements were taken during the periods indicated by arrows.

44/i

Figure 3.4

Diurnal time course of ψ_1 and leaf extension rate for prairie grass during several days of a drying cycle. Statistical significance of differences between treatments are shown for each time period (*P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01).

44/ii

Figure 3.5

Daily maximum and minimum ψ_1 (a) and daily leaf extension rate (b) for prairie grass during a drying cycle. Arrows indicate time of rewatering.

46/i

Figure 3.6

Relationship between leaf extension rate and ψ_1 at four different times of day during a drying cycle in prairie grass. Curves were fitted using $Y = a + b \log_e X$.

46/ii

Figure 3.7

Normalised relationships with rates of leaf extension for each time of day expressed relative to the well watered control plants measured at the same time, and with ψ_1 expressed as a difference from the ψ_1 of the control plants measured at the same time of day

47/i

Figure 3.8

Diurnal time course of leaf extension rate (LER) for Ruanui and Nui ryegrasses during several days of a drying cycle.

(a) under high temperature regimes ($27.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}$) 53/i

(b) under low temperature regimes ($17.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}$ C). 53/ii

Figure 3.9

Diurnal time course of leaf water potential for Ruanui and Nui ryegrass during several days of a drying cycle. (a) under high temperature regimes ($27.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}$ C) (b) under low temperature regime ($17.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}$ C).

54/i

Figure 3.10

Mean daily extension rates for Ruanui and Nui ryegrass during a drying cycle. (a) under high temperature ($27.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}$ C) (b) under low temperature ($17.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}$ C).

55/i

Figure 3.11

Mean daily leaf extension rate of Nui expressed relative to Ruanui (1.0) during a drying cycle. (a) under high temperature ($27.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}$ C) (b) under low temperature ($17.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}$ C).

55/i

Figure 3.12

Normalised relationships with rates of leaf extension for each time of day expressed relative to the well watered control plants measured at the same time, and with ψ_1 expressed as a difference from the ψ_1 of the control plants at the same time of day, for Ruanui (O) and Nui (●). (a) under high temperature regime ($27.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}$ C) (b) under low temperature regime ($17.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}$ C).

55/i

Figure 3.13

The relationship between leaf water potential (ψ_l) and leaf extension rate (LER) measured at time C for Ruanui (O) and Nui (●) ryegrass during a drying cycle. (a) under high temperature regime ($27.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}\text{C}$) (b) under low temperature regime ($17.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}\text{C}$).

58/i

Figure 4.1

Time course of main tiller leaf emergence in prairie grass after water deficits of different duration

65/i

Figure 4.2

Leaf extension rate of prairie grass after water deficits of different duration. Four-daily means are shown.

66/i

Figure 4.3

Pattern of recovery of growth components in prairie grass after water deficits of different duration (a) tiller number per plant, (b) leaf number per plant, (c) leaf area per plant, (d) shoot dry weight per plant.

71/i

Figure 4.4

Growth component data from Figure 4.3 expressed as a function of "non-drought" days. (a) tiller number per plant, (b) leaf number per plant, (c) leaf area per plant, (d) shoot dry weight per plant.

72/i

Figure 4.5

Time course of leaf extension rate in Ruanui (R) and Nui (N) for well-watered control (C), stress 1 (S1) and stress 2 (S2) plants: (a) under H temperature regime and (b) under L temperature regime.

85/i

Figure 4.6

Changes in plant growth parameters during the desiccation period. (a) Tiller numbers per plant (mature and immature tillers). (b) leaf number per plant (mature, immature and

dead leaves). (c) leaf area per plant (mature and immature leaves). (d) dry weight components (root, sheath, lamina and dead matter).

89/i

Figure 4.7

Nui and Ruanui dry weight per plant for Control, Stress 1 and Stress 2 during the recovery phase. The means were averaged across the two temperature regimes (mg/plant).

97/i

Figure 5.1

Relationships between leaf water potential and relative leaf water content of the 4 different environments (a) LL, (b) HL, (c) HH and (d) LH.

117/i

Figure A.1

Stomatal conductance for Nui and Ruanui during desiccation. (a) under H temperature regime ($27.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}\text{C}$) (b) under L temperature regime ($17.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}\text{C}$)

145/i

Figure A.2

Transpiration rate for Nui and Ruanui during desiccation. (a) under H temperature regime ($27.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}\text{C}$) (b) under L temperature regime ($17.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}\text{C}$)

146/i

Figure A.3

Relationship between leaf water potential and relative leaf water content for Nui and Ruanui under two temperature regimes. (a) under H temperature regime ($27.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}\text{C}$) (b) under L temperature regime ($17.5^{\circ}/12.5^{\circ}\text{C}$).

148/i

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 3.1	Comparison of regressions between leaf water potential and leaf extension rate for two ryegrass cultivars under different temperature regimes.
	57
Table 4.1	Mean leaf extension rate for each leaf insertion level on the main stem measured from its appearance until the appearance of the next leaf (mm/day).
	67
Table 4.2	Linear regression analysis for growth components during the recovery phase in prairie grass.
	73
Table 4.3	Mean intervals (days) between appearance of successive leaves in well-watered control plants of Ruanui and Nui ryegrass under 2 temperature regimes.
	84
Table 4.4	Mean intervals (days) between appearance of leaves 8 and 9 (i.e., leaf 9) in Ruanui and Nui during the recovery phase for control, Stress 1 and Stress 2 plants under 2 temperature regimes.
	84
Table 4.5	Comparison of the rates of leaf extension (mm/day) between well-watered Ruanui and Nui ryegrass under 2 temperature regimes.
	86
Table 4.6	Growth parameter comparisons between Nui and Ruanui ryegrass at the end of the desiccation phase
	90
Table 4.7	Influence of previous water deficit treatments on plant growth parameters during the period of recovery
	93
Table 4.8	The effects of temperature on plant growth parameters during the recovery phase.
	95
Table 4.9	The difference between ryegrass cultivars during the period of recovery (R = Ruanui, N = Nui).
	98

Table 4.10	Regression coefficients (b) and coefficient of determination (R^2) for the rate of increase in the 4 major growth components.	100
Table 4.11	Comparisons of regression coefficients from Table 4.10.	101
Table 5.1	Effects of different evaporative demands on plant dry weight and lamina area of well-watered control plants. (a) Dry weight and leaf area per plant (b) Mature lamina area of individual leaves at final harvest.	112
Table 5.2	Effects of different evaporative demands on plant dry weight and lamina area of desiccated plants. (a) Dry weight and leaf area per plant at first harvest. (b) Mature lamina area of individual leaves at final harvest.	114
Table 5.3	Linear regression equation ($Y = a + bX$), fitted through the data sets in Figure 5.1.	116
Table 5.4	Effects of different evaporative demands on the transpiration rates of well-watered control plants ($\mu\text{g H}_2\text{O}/\text{cm}^2/\text{s}$).	116
Table 5.5	Effects of different evaporative demands on stomatal density and epidermal cell numbers of well-watered control plants, using scanning electron microscopy.	119
Table 6.1	Ratio of mature to immature leaf components at the end of the desiccation periods.	128
Table 6.2	Summary of linear regression information between (i) the rate of dry weight increase (R_w) as the dependent variable with leaf extension rate (LER) as the independent variable.	

	(ii) the rate of leaf area increase (R_L) as the dependent variable with LER as the independent variable.	140
Table A.1	Regression equation for the relationship between the leaf water potential and relative leaf water content for Nui and Ruanui under 2 temperature regimes.	148
Table A.2	Regression information for the leaf area and leaf length x leaf width relationship.	172
Table A.3	Comparison between plants with their secondary tillers removed and those with their secondary tillers intact.	175.

LIST OF APPENDICES

App. 3.1	Time course of stomatal resistance in 2 cultivars of ryegrass under 2 temperature regimes	145
App. 3.2	Time course of transpiration rates in 2 cultivars of ryegrass under 2 temperature regimes.	146
App. 3.3	Relationship between leaf water potential and relative leaf water content for Ruanui and Nui ryegrass under 2 temperature regimes.	148
App. 4.1	Statistical methods and procedures.	149
App. 4.2a	Analysis of variance for leaf emergence rate in well-watered control plants.	151
App. 4.2b	Analysis of variance for leaf emergence rate between control, Stress 1 and Stress 2 plants for leaf 9.	152
App. 4.3	Means for temperature x water deficit interaction during the period of desiccation.	152
App. 4.4	Analysis of variance for the rate of leaf extension between well-watered Ruanui and Nui ryegrass under different temperature regimes.	152
App. 4.5	Summary of F ratios and F tests on plant parameters during the desiccation period.	153
App. 4.6	Summary of F ratios and F tests for plant parameters during the recovery phase.	154
	(A) Tiller number data	154
	(B) Leaf number data	156
	(C) Leaf area data	158
	(D) Plant dry weight data	161
App. 4.7a	Influence of previous water deficit treatments on plant growth parameters during the period of recovery.	164

		<u>Page</u>
App. 4.7b	Influence of temperature on plant growth parameters during the period of recovery.	167
App. 4.7c	The difference between ryegrass cultivars during the period of recovery after removal of water deficit	169
App. 4.8a	Temperature x water deficit interaction means. Leaf area per plant (cm ²).	171
App. 4.8b	Temperature x water deficit interaction means. Dry weight per plant (mg).	171
App. 5.1	Estimation of leaf area from leaf length and leaf width measurements.	172
App. 5.2	The effects of removing the secondary tillers on the performance of the main tiller in prairie grass.	173
App. 6.1	Origins of plant materials used in the present study.	176

ASPECTS OF WATER DEFICIT AND VEGETATIVE GROWTH IN SELECTED PASTURE AND
FORAGE GRASSES

ABSTRACT

In this study, the sensitivity of leaf extension to plant water status, the ability of the plant to recover after different periods of water deficit and the plant's reaction to atmospheric pre-conditioning were examined using different pasture and forage grasses.

The sensitivity of leaf extension to plant water status was studied in 3 separate experiments using sudax (SX-6, a forage sorghum hybrid, *Sorghum bicolor* (L) Moench x *S. sudanese* (piper) Staff), prairie grass (*Bromus catharticus* Vahl. cv. Grasslands Matua) and 2 cultivars of perennial ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* L. c.v. Grasslands Nui and Grasslands Ruanui). The sudax experiment was conducted in the field, whereas the prairie grass and ryegrass experiments were conducted in the Climate Laboratory, D.S.I.R. The day/night temperatures used in the prairie grass experiment was 22.5°/12.5°C. For the ryegrass, 2 contrasting temperature regimes were used; these were high (H), 27.5°/12.5°C, and low (L) 17.5°/12.5°C day/night temperatures.

It was found that leaf extension was very sensitive to small changes in leaf water potential during the initial stages of desiccation, but the response became less sensitive with increasing levels of desiccation. However, the relationship between leaf water potential and leaf extension rate was not unique. It varied according to the environmental conditions. The true relationship between leaf water potential and leaf extension rate can only be established when the leaf water potential at the site of measurement can be related unequivocally to the leaf water potential at the site of elongation.

The rates of recovery in leaf extension, leaf emergence, tiller

number, green leaf number, leaf area and dry weight per plant were followed after different water deficit treatments in one experiment with prairie grass and in another experiment with 2 cultivars of perennial ryegrass under 2 contrasting temperature regimes. The environmental conditions for these experiments were the same as those used in the leaf extension experiments.

In prairie grass, upon relief of water deficit, the previously desiccated plants showed an "accelerated" rate of leaf extension up to 20% higher than those of the well-watered control plants of the same physiological age. The "accelerated" rate lasted for over 28 days after rewatering during which time 4 to 5 new leaves emerged. However no such "accelerated" rates were observed in the ryegrasses. The "accelerated" response following rewatering in prairie grass would be consistent with a differential sensitivity of cell division and cell elongation to water deficit. The desiccation treatment was more severe in the ryegrass experiment where both cell division and cell elongation could be suppressed, and this could account for the absence of a similar response in the ryegrasses.

Under well-watered conditions, the mean leaf emergence rate was 4.1 days per leaf for the prairie grass. The corresponding mean leaf emergence rates for Nui and Ruanui were 5.7 and 6.3 days/leaf under the H and 6.6 and 6.6 days/leaf under the L temperature regimes respectively. Within the grass species, post-desiccation leaf emergence rates between the previously desiccated and the well-watered plants were similar.

During desiccation, tiller number was the least sensitive parameter to water deficit, followed by dry weight and leaf number. Leaf area was the parameter most sensitive to desiccation. Amongst the dry weight components, lamina component was the most sensitive followed

by the root component with the sheath component the least sensitive to desiccation.

The pattern of recovery from desiccation was examined to see if positive or negative carryover effects occurred. To enable valid comparison of desiccated and control plants, physiological age was adjusted by removing a number of "drought" days from the chronological age. It was found that when the desiccation was mild e.g., in the prairie grass experiment, reductions in plant dry weights were proportional to the number of "drought" days. On the other hand, under a more severe level of desiccation, e.g., as in the ryegrass experiments, using the same method of adjustment, it was found that the dry weights of the previously desiccated plants were substantially lower than those of the well-watered control plants of the same physiological age. The reduction in dry weight was more pronounced under the H than under the L temperature regime.

After rewatering, in both prairie grass and ryegrass, the relative rates^{of} increase of leaf area were higher in the previously desiccated plants than the well-watered control plants. In contrast to this, the relative rates of increase in dry weight, tiller number and leaf number in the previously desiccated plants were either similar to, or slightly less than those of the well-watered control plants.

Although the pattern of recovery in the leaf extension rates was different between the two experiments, this had no apparent positive or negative carryover effects on the relative rates of recovery in the growth parameters measured (e.g., tiller number, green leaf number, leaf area and dry weight per plant).

The reaction of prairie grass to desiccation following either a "dry"

or a "wet" atmospheric pre-conditioning was compared with those plants that were grown continuously under either the "dry" or the "wet" vapour pressure environments.

Plants with a previously "dry" history were able to grow longer into the desiccation period than those with the "wet" history as well as those under the continuous "wet" or "dry" conditions. This apparent "adaptation" was due to a more efficient rate of water use per unit leaf area by the "hardened" plants. But the mechanism that enabled these plants to use water more efficiently was not known.

Nui had been reported to outyield Ruanui under the summer and autumn conditions in New Zealand. Because of the importance of perennial ryegrass to New Zealand, a comparison of these 2 cultivars was also made in this study. Between the two cultivars of ryegrass, Nui had a higher leaf extension rate (+20%) under the H temperature regime, it also had a heavier mean tiller dry weight (+28%), a larger mean area per leaf (+24%), but a lower tiller number (-24%) and a lower green leaf number (-18%) per plant than Ruanui. All the other parameters measured, including total leaf area and total dry weight per plant, top to root ratio, specific leaf area, leaf area ratio, stomatal resistance and transpiration rates were similar between the two ryegrass cultivars. Some of the possible reasons for the lack of difference on a per plant basis are discussed.

The possibility of using leaf extension rate to predict plant dry weight changes in water deficit studies is also discussed.