PHYSIOLOGICAL AND METABOLIC RESPONSES OF THELLUNGIELLA SALSUGINEA TO OSMOTIC STRESS

PHYSIOLOGICAL AND METABOLIC RESPONSES OF THELLUNGIELLA SALSUGINEA TO OSMOTIC STRESS

By

DAVID ROLANDO GUEVARA, Hon. B. Sc.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

© Copyright by David R. Guevara, February 2010

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (2010)

McMaster University (Biology)

Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE:Physiological and Metabolic Responses of Thellungiellasalsuginea to Osmotic Stress

AUTHOR:David R. Guevara, Hon. B.Sc. (McMaster University)SUPERVISOR:Professor E.A. Weretilnyk, Ph. D

NUMBER OF PAGES: xv, 188

ABSTRACT

Abiotic stresses such as extreme temperatures, drought and high salinity severely compromise plant productivity, and have placed selective pressure for the acquisition of traits enabling plants to adjust to and recover from these unfavorable environmental conditions. Thellungiella salsuginea is a plant that is native to highly saline and semiarid environments and exhibits an exceptional ability to tolerate abiotic stress. In this thesis, I report on laboratory and field studies aimed at identifying traits that allow Thellungiella to tolerate harsh environmental conditions. It was found that Thellungiella accumulates organic solutes in response to abiotic stress. Transcript and metabolite profiling approaches were used to identify metabolic pathways important for the accumulation of compatible organic solutes in Thellungiella in response to sub-optimal environmental conditions. The relative abundance of transcripts encoding enzymes associated with the biosynthesis of compatible organic solutes such as proline or galactinol showed stress-responsive increases in cabinet-grown material and these metabolites were accumulated in salt or drought treated plants, respectively. However, proline and galactinol were found to be of low relative abundance in leaves of field plants. In contrast, several carbohydrates including sucrose, glucose, and fructose made a greater relative contribution to the field plant profiles suggesting that carbohydrates play an important role in plant abiotic stress tolerance during growth under field conditions. The identification of stress-specific metabolic changes can be used to identify important biochemical traits underlying environmental stress tolerance in *Thellungiella*. This

information can be used to improve the tolerance of stress – sensitive crops (including a related crucifer species, canola) that are grown in areas where persistent droughts, saline soils and early or late frosts frequently occur.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Elizabeth Weretilnyk for her financial support and guidance throughout my studies. Her constant challenges and criticisms about my work helped me develop the skills to ask the right questions, to critically analyze my findings and relate them to the "bigger picture". I think I will eventually write a book on her quotes, one of the lab favorites: "Plants don't read textbooks". This statement emphasizes an important point; plants have evolved unique ways on how to survive and thus this statement is a constant reminder which has helped me think "outside the box" in the quest for an understanding of the mechanism underlying the vast metabolic flexibility exhibited by plants. She also helped me develop my presentation skills and gave me advice on many topics outside the lab that I greatly appreciate.

I am grateful to Susan Dudley who spurred my interest in plant evolution. I enjoyed (and miss) the conversations we had over coffee about plant research, and I will cherish her scientific advice as well as advice beyond the lab. I am indebted to Brian McCarry who inspired me to pursue my quest to study the chemical diversity and complexity that exists in nature. I thank Brian Golding and Jon Stone for their help in bioinformatical analysis which greatly helped me analyze my work and has opened up a different way of thinking about data analysis.

I thank Peter Summers for his suggestions about the finer details in plant biochemistry, advice throughout my work in the lab, and critically reading of our manuscripts. While in the lab, I had the pleasure of working with Mike BeGora, Jeff Dedrick, Martina Drebenstedt, Amber Gleason, Karen Haines, Chris Wang and thank them for their help and encouragement.

My interest in plants all started when I was a toddler roaming in the maize fields of rural El Salvador where my grandfather, Papa Tino, taught me about his farm and the importance this crop has played for the economy and throughout civilization. I thank my parents, Jose and Ana, who left everything behind for us to pursue our dreams and I am fortunate to have found mine; the love of my life, Rovena, and plant science. I thank my brothers Nestor and Herb, and sister Carolyn for their love and encouragement throughout my journey. It's actually difficult to put in words the gratitude I have for the unconditional love and encouragement that Rovena provided to me throughout my studies. Her patience, love and support throughout my studies motivated me to step up to the challenges.

This work is dedicated to our families who depend on agriculture for a living and I have made it my personal mission to improve crop yields during a time when we are more than ever dependant on plant products due to explosive growth in the world population, but are most vulnerable as a result of the unpredictability in climatic conditions which compromises our food resources.

OVERVIEW

This sandwich thesis contains five chapters: Chapter One (Literature review); Chapter Two (Materials and Methods); Chapters Three and Four (Enclosed as separate manuscripts to be submitted); and Chapter Five (General discussion). My contributions and the contribution from the co-authors will be described in a preamble to chapters three and four. The final chapter will include a general discussion and future directions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page	i
Descriptive note	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Overview	vii
Table of contents	viii
List of figures	xi
List of tables	xiii
List of abbreviations used	xiv

Chapter One: Literature Review
1.1 Abiotic stress decreases plant growth and productivity 1
1.2 Plant responses to osmotic stress
1.3 Using genomics approaches to search for osmotic stress tolerance mechanisms10
1.4 Field studies14
1.5 <i>Thellungiella</i> : A valuable model for the study of abiotic stress tolerance15
1.6 Research objectives17
1.7 References

Chapter	Two: Materials and Methods	29
2.1	Yukon field site location and plants	29
2.2	Controlled environment plant growth conditions	29
2.3	Stress treatments	30
2.4	Water status and physiological response measurements	31
2.5	Metabolite analysis of Yukon Thellungiella	33
2.6	Criteria for the identification of metabolites	45
2.7	Biological variability of metabolite profiles	47
2.8	References	49

Chapter Three: Physiological and metabolic responses of the halophytic plant,

Thellungiella salsuginea to salinity	59
3.0 Preface	59
3.1 Abstract	63
3.2 Introduction	64
3.3 Materials and Methods	66
3.4 Results	70
3.5 Discussion	75
3.6 Conclusions	80
3.7 References	81

Chapter Four: Transcriptomic and metabolomic analysis of Yukon Thellun	<i>giella</i> plants
growing under cabinet and field conditions shows overlapping and distinct	responses to
environmental conditions	
4.0 Preface	
4.1 Abstract	107
4.2 Introduction	
4.3 Materials and methods	
4.4 Results	
4.5 Discussion	
4.6 References	

Chapter Five:	General Discussion	
---------------	--------------------	--

LIST OF FIGURES

Chapter Two:

Figure 1 Natural distribution of *Thellungiella* in the Yukon Territory.

Figure 2 Metabolomic analysis of *Thellungiella*.

Figure 3 Peak deconvolution from complex GC/MS chromatograms.

Figure 4 Strategy for data mining of metabolomic data to identify metabolic traits associated with abiotic stress tolerance.

Chapter Three:

Figure 1. Effect of salinization on the root growth of *Thellungiella* seedlings.

Figure 2. Performance of *Thellungiella* plants subjected to salt treatments.

Figure 3. Water relations of Yukon Thellungiella exposed to NaCl.

Figure 4. PCA of MST data for Yukon *Thellungiella* plants show grouping as a function of salt exposure.

Figure 5. Hierarchical cluster analysis of salt-responsive MSTs.

Figure 6. Leaf proline content of Yukon *Thellungiella* subjected to NaCl treatments and their respective, unsalinized control plants.

Figure S1. PCA of the 58 statistically significant MSTs.

Figure S2. Analysis of the contribution of MSTs with highest absolute PC loadings on metabolic grouping patterns observed using 58 statistically significant MSTs.

Chapter Four:

Figure 1 Phenotype of *Thellungiella* grown in controlled environments and at the Yukon field site

Figure 2 Meteorological conditions near Yukon field site

Figure 3 Gene ontology classification of transcripts differentially expressed in *Thellungiella* growing at the Yukon field site.

Figure 4 Hierarchical cluster analysis of genes differentially expressed in *Thellungiella* harvested from the Yukon field site in 2003 and 2005 and *Thellungiella* exposed to abiotic stresses in growth cabinets.

Figure 5 Hierarchical cluster analysis of metabolites in *Thellungiella* harvested from the Yukon field site in 2003 and 2005 and chamber grown plants exposed to abiotic stresses.

Figure 6 Hierarchical cluster analysis of metabolites present at different levels

throughout the day in *Thellungiella* harvested from the Yukon field site.

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 4

Supplemental Table S1. Soil properties and mineral composition of Yukon

Thellungiella harvested from the experimental field site near Whitehorse, YT, and from growth chamber grown plants.

Supplemental Table S2. Transcripts differentially expressed in Yukon *Thellungiella* harvested from the field in 2003 and 2005.

Supplemental Table S3. Metabolites present at statistically significantly different levels in Yukon *Thellungiella* harvested from the field in 2003 and 2005.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED

ABA	Abscisic acid
AMDIS	Automated Mass Spectral Deconvolution Information System
d	Day
ELIP	Early light induced protein
FW	Fresh weight
GASP	Gas chromatography/Mass spectrometry Analysis Software Package
GC/MS	Gas chromatography/Mass spectrometry
HSP	Heat shock protein
LEA	Late embryogenesis abundant
LTP	Lipid transfer protein
m/z	mass-to-charge ratio
MSTFA	N-methyl-N-trimethylsilyl-trifluoroacetamide
MST	Mass spectral tags
MPa	Megapascal
NaCl	Sodium chloride
HCA	Hierarchical cluster analysis
ANOVA	Analysis of variance
PCA	Principal component analysis
ROS	Reactive oxygen species
Ψ_{W}	Water potential

Ψs	Solute potential
ψ_{P}	Pressure/Turgor potential
RI	Retention index
RT	Retention time
RWC	Relative water content
TIC	Total ion chromatogram
TMS	Trimethylsilyl

Chapter One

Literature Review

1.1 Abiotic stress decreases plant growth and productivity

Plants growing in their native habitats are confronted with ever-changing environmental factors that may limit their growth and productivity. Some of these factors include prolonged periods of water deficit (drought), excessively high or low temperatures, or high soil salinity. These conditions reduce the quantity of water that can be taken up from the soil by plant roots and so represent factors contributing to osmotic stresses. Unfortunately, most major crop species are poorly adapted and vulnerable to osmotic stress (Boyer, 1982). It is estimated that osmotic stresses are responsible for decreasing major crop yields by about 69%, depending on the crop (Boyer, 1982; Bray et al, 2000). To some extent, the impact of water deficit can be partially offset through irrigation of crops to produce higher yields in agricultural areas prone to recurrent drought episodes during the growing season. However, irrigation of agricultural lands with poorly drained soils can lead to the buildup of salts in the soil to levels that can be toxic to plants (Schoups et al., 2005). The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has predicted an increased incidence of more intense and longer drought in the future as a result of increased soil drying due to higher temperatures and decreased land precipitation patterns (IPCC, 2008). Consequently, drought effects on crop yield will

become more severe and lead to reduced food production. The current position held by many plant scientists is that we must enhance the tolerance of stress-sensitive crops so that they achieve higher yields despite exposure to sub-optimal environmental conditions (Flowers and Yeo, 1995). This is especially important since higher yields will be required to meet the increased demand for plant products to sustain the growing human population (Flowers and Yeo, 1995; Trewavas, 2001). However, in order to improve the productivity of crops grown under sub-optimal environmental conditions we must develop a more complete understanding of the mechanisms underlying osmotic stress tolerance in plants (Flowers and Yeo, 1995; Tester and Bacic, 2005).

1.2 Plant responses to osmotic stress

1.2.1 Water status

Plant cell growth generally occurs within a narrow range of water content (Hsiao et al., 1976). There are two parameters that are widely used to determine the water status of a plant: the relative water content and the water potential.

1.2.1.1 Relative water content

The relative water content (RWC) refers to the amount of water in the tissue relative to the amount the tissue can hold when fully turgid. A leaf from a well-watered

plant will have a RWC in the range of 85-95 %, and decreases when plants are exposed to osmotic stress (Hsiao, 1973). Although the RWC is a useful parameter to describe the effect water deficits have on cell volume and water status of a plant (Sinclair and Ludlow, 1985), one short-coming is that it does not provide information on water movement (Kramer, 1988). A more suitable parameter to help describe water movement in the cell is the water potential.

1.2.1.2 Water potential

Plant water status can be monitored by measuring the free energy state of water molecules inside cells or tissues, a parameter that is estimated by plant physiologists using the term water potential (Ψ_w). Ψ_w is comprised of two major components: the solute (or osmotic) potential (Ψ_s) which represents the effect of dissolved solutes on Ψ_w , and the pressure (or turgor) potential (Ψ_p) which describes the effect of pressure on the energy status of water. The presence of solutes reduces the free energy of water, and thus decreases Ψ_w , whereas a positive Ψ_P increases the Ψ_w . Pure water has the highest capacity to do work and is frequently represented by a Ψ_w of zero megapascal (MPa). In biological systems, water has less potential energy than pure water due to the effect of dissolved solutes that are inevitably present in a cell and thus Ψ_w values are always negative. Well hydrated plants maintain a leaf Ψ_w of – 0.85 to – 1.0 MPa (Flowers and Ludlow, 1986). Plants can take up water from their environment through the roots only when their root Ψ_w is lower than the surrounding soil Ψ_w .

1.2.1.3 Impact of osmotic stress on water relations

When plants are subjected to soil water deficits water lost by transpiration can exceed uptake by roots. Under these conditions, plant Ψ_W decreases with the passive accumulation of solutes (Acevedo et al., 1979; Flower and Ludlow, 1986). The decrease in root Ψ_w must be sufficient to maintain a $\Delta\Psi w$ gradient between the root Ψ_w and soil Ψ_w to ensure continued water uptake by the root. If this gradient is not established, plant growth ceases as a first consequence of water deficit (Nonami and Boyer, 1989) with turgor loss (or wilting) when the Ψ_p reaches 0 Mpa.

Drought, extreme temperatures, or high soil salinity affect plant water status in different ways, but all of these environmental conditions can ultimately lead to cellular dehydration. In the field, drought and high temperature stress significantly reduce water content in the soil as a result of evaporation leading to decreased water uptake by plants and reduced water content of plant tissues (Ristic et al., 1991). Soil salinity, on the other hand, need not be accompanied by a shortage of water. Water moves down a Ψ_W gradient from high (less negative) to low Ψ_W . As such, the presence of high salts can impede the ability of a plant to take up water unless the plant can overcome the reduction in soil Ψ_W caused by the presence of high levels of dissolved solutes in the soil (Yeo et al., 1991). Chilling temperature (5°C) leads to lower water content in plant tissues as a result of decreased water absorption by the roots and water transport to the shoot (Burchett et al., 2006). Finally, freezing temperatures (<0°C) lead to the formation of ice in the intercellular spaces and the resulting movement of water out of the cell during extracellular freezing causes cellular dehydration (Yelenowsky and Guy, 1989).

Inadequate water supply to plant tissues during osmotic stress triggers physiological responses aimed at minimizing transpirational water loss, an objective achieved by stomatal closure (Ackerson and Krieg, 1977) when the leaf RWC decreases to 70 to 75% (Chaves et al., 2002) . However, stomatal closure during water deficits leads to lower CO₂ intake for photosynthesis (Meyer and Genty, 1999). Drought-induced reduction of photosynthesis limits plant growth and development because fewer resources are available to support cell expansion. Therefore, in general, water deficits produce plants of decreased stature and this reduction in plant size can severely compromise yield potential (Blum and Sullivan, 1997).

1.2 2 Osmotic adjustment

Some plants have the ability to maintain full turgor of the leaves during water deficits by actively accumulating non-toxic (compatible) organic solutes. It has been proposed that compatible organic solute accumulation serves to decrease the plant Ψ_s in order to establish a $\Delta \Psi w$ gradient between the plant and drying or saline soil that promotes water uptake (Hsiao et al., 1976). Plants exposed to saline environments passively accumulate the Na⁺ ions dissolved in the water absorbed by their tissues. To offset the deleterious effects of high Na⁺ concentrations on metabolic processes, plants sequester potentially perturbing ions in the vacuole (Matoh et al., 1987). However, this

5

response can lead to an osmotic imbalance within the cell (Matoh et al., 1987; Binzel et al., 1988). Thus, it is generally accepted that the balance in the osmotic pressure between the cytoplasm and the vacuole is achieved primarily via the accumulation of compatible solutes in the cytoplasm (Binzel et al., 1988). This active net accumulation of solutes by plants in response to water deficit or salinity helps them remain turgid under water deficits and the response is called osmotic adjustment. Osmotic adjustment has been proposed to be an important adaptive process conferring osmotic stress tolerance in plants (Flowers and Ludlow, 1986). This is believed to be the case because plants that can osmotically adjust are better able to acclimate to adverse environmental conditions (Acevedo et al., 1979; Nonami and Boyer, 1989) than plants that close their stomata during exposure to soils with low ψ_W (Turner, 1974).

Two extreme examples of highly desiccation and salt tolerant plants include the 'resurrection plant' *Craterostigma plantagenium* and the 'common ice plant' *Mesembryanthemum crystallinum. C. plantagenium* is capable of recovering from complete vegetative tissue dehydration (Bianchi et al., 1991) whereas *M. crystallinum* can grow in the presence of sea-water strength salinity (Paul and Cockburn, 1989). *C. plantagenium* and *M. crystallinum* are able to thrive under osmotic stress due, at least in part, to their ability to osmotically adjust in response to exposure to extreme environmental conditions. *C. plantagenium* accumulates sucrose in response to prolonged periods of desiccation (Bianchi et al., 1991) while the pinitol content of *M. crystallinum* increases when exposed to sea-level strength salinity (Paul and Cockburn, 1989). The capacity for osmotic adjustment is not restricted to 'extremophile' plants but is believed to be a process that many organisms including many plant species undergo when experiencing osmotic stress (Yancey 2005; Yancey et al., 1982).

The compatible organic solutes involved in osmotic adjustment are chemically diverse but essentially fall into five main classes of compounds: 1) sugars, including trehalose (Garg et al., 2002) and sucrose, (Bianchi et al., 1991; Rizhsky et al., 2004), 2) sugar alcohols, like galactinol, inositol, mannitol, sorbitol, and pinitol,(Paul and Cockburn, 1989; Popp and Smirnoff, 1995; Pattanagul and Madore, 1999, Taji et al., 2002), 3) N-containing solutes such as the amino acid proline (Kishor et al., 1995), or quaternary ammonium species like proline betaine, β -alanine betaine and glycine betaine (Hanson et al., 1991), 4) tertiary sulfonium compounds including 3-dimethylsulfoniopropionate and choline-O-sulfate (Trossat et al., 1998). The capacity to accumulate these compatible solutes differs between plant species. For example, stress-responsive increases in proline content occurs broadly among plant species (Delauney and Verma, 1991) whereas other classes of compatible solutes such as glycine betaine are accumulated in plants of select families such the Chenopodiaceae and Poaceae (Storey and Jones, 1977).

Many crop plants lack the ability to synthesize and accumulate compatible solutes that are found in osmotic stress tolerant native plants. Therefore, genes encoding enzymes involved in the synthesis of compatible solutes have been introduced into nonaccumulating species in an effort to genetically engineer crop plants that are more stress tolerant. For example, transgenic tobacco plants engineered to over-express a gene encoding the *M. crystallinum* myo-inositol *O*-methyltransferase were more drought and

salt tolerant than wild-type tobacco plants (Sheveleva et al., 1997). These transgenic tobacco plants were found to contain higher levels of ononitol compared to wild-type tobacco plants, an observation that led the authors to conclude that ononitol plays a role in osmotic adjustment. This approach of metabolic engineering to increase compatible solute biosynthesis by plants has contributed towards increased stress tolerance in nonaccumulating, stress-sensitive crops such as rice (Zhu et al., 1998; Garg et al., 2002), tobacco (Kishor et al., 1995; Sheveleva et al., 1997), and wheat (Abebe et al., 2003). However, despite these successes, frequently the observed levels of compatible solutes accumulated by the transgenic plants were not high enough to explain their protective role through their contribution towards osmotic adjustment. This observation is consistent with the conclusion that compatible solutes may increase the tolerance of plants through protective mechanisms other than simply osmotic adjustment. Flowers (2004) has also raised the concern that most of these studies were performed under artificial, controlled environmental conditions and it is uncertain whether transgenic plants with an increased capacity for compatible solute biosynthesis have an increased tolerance to abiotic stress under field conditions.

An example of the difficulty in associating stress tolerance with solute accumulation is given by sucrose. The accumulation of sucrose in many plants experiencing water deficits is widespread and found among osmotic stress tolerant and sensitive species. However, the significance of sucrose accumulation during osmotic adjustment is uncertain due to the difficulty in demonstrating conclusively that sucrose accumulated in response to stress actually contributes towards osmotic adjustment (Munns and Weir, 1981). In fact, accumulation of organic solutes like sucrose may represent the outcome of impairments in metabolism and thus may be indicators of cell damage as opposed to providing protective functions (Paul and Cockburn, 1989). More recently the adaptive value of organic solute accumulation and their contribution to osmotic adjustment for abiotic tolerance in plants has been challenged. A comprehensive analysis of solute accumulation in Limonium latifolium subjected to NaCl treatments shows that the major contributors to osmolarity were inorganic solutes, while organic solutes such as sucrose, hexoses, β -alanine betaine, and glycine betaine only accounted for approximately 25% of the osmolarity (Gagneul et al., 2007). Interestingly, compartmental analysis of proline and β -alanine betaine in salt-shocked L. latifolium found that both of these compatible solutes were localized in the vacuoles rather than the cytosol raising questions as to whether these metabolites are involved in osmotic adjustment in this species (Gagneul et al., 2007). Therefore, future work must be directed towards delineating the significance of compatible organic solute accumulation during exposure to osmotic stress conditions if this trait is to be used in long-term selection strategies to develop crops showing greater tolerance to osmotic stress.

The failure to genetically engineer plants with greater osmotic stress tolerance through an increased capacity to produce a given organic solute reveals that the manipulation of a single gene involved in compatible solute synthesis is likely insufficient to yield a more stress tolerant crop (Ramanjulu and Bartels, 2002). This may be due to the multigenic nature of osmotic stress tolerance in plants with an innate ability to thrive under sub-optimal environmental conditions (Ramanjulu and Bartels, 2002). As

9

a consequence, current efforts are focused on gaining an appreciation for higher order controls that serve to coordinate cellular functions at multiple levels using genomic approaches. Approaches that afford a better appreciation of global regulatory networks include technologies that allow the unbiased detection of many simultaneous changes among gene products that may occur in response to an abiotic challenge. These approaches include quantifying products at the transcript, protein and metabolite level. Changes occurring at each of these levels in response to abiotic stress compared to unstressed conditions should include those that are essential for enabling plants to adjust to and recover from exposure to sub-optimal environmental conditions. Recent technological advancements in genomics approaches now permit the correlation of physiological responses in plants subjected to osmotic stress with multiple, concurrent changes among specific gene products allowing for the development of deeper insights into the cellular processes associated with osmotic stress tolerance.

1.3 Using genomics approaches to search for osmotic stress tolerance mechanisms

The availability of the full genome sequence of the genetic model plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* (hereafter referred to as *Arabidopsis*) has led to the development of tools and resources that can be used to gain insights into the genetic basis of plant abiotic stress tolerance (Somerville and Somerville, 1999; The *Arabidopsis* Genome Initiative, 2000). One noteworthy technological advance in identifying the molecular basis underlying plant abiotic stress tolerance has been the development of genome wide

10

expression profiling methods (Somerville and Somerville, 1999). The high-throughput analysis of gene expression (transcriptomics) using DNA microarrays has greatly helped in the large-scale identification of genes that are stress-responsive.

Transcriptomics is performed using DNA microarrays containing 1,000 to 10,000 cDNA sequences per square centimeter deposited onto a solid surface (a glass slide). These arrayed sequences are hybridized with fluorescently labeled probes derived from mRNA samples of different tissue types (Wisman and Ohlrogge, 2000) allowing the simultaneous analysis of thousands of genes in a single microarray experiment. For some plant species including *Arabidopsis* and rice (*Oryza sativa*), whole genome DNA microarray chips are commercially available (www.affymetrix.com). A recent advance in transcript profiling methodologies is RNA sequencing (RNA-Seq). RNA-Seq approaches enable the analysis of the entire transcriptome in a high-throughput manner with greater sensitivity and a higher level of reproducibility compared with DNA microarrays (Wang et al., 2009). The use of RNA-Seq methodologies will enable the accurate quantification of transcriptional responses to abiotic stress in many non-model plants including halophytes, as no prior knowledge on genome sequence is required to quantify gene expression levels in an unbiased fashion (Wang et al., 2009).

Plant responses to water deficits are modulated by altered gene expression that is triggered by sub-optimal environmental conditions. As such, transcriptomics has been used to elucidate the molecular mechanisms underlying osmotic stress tolerance. For example, transcriptomics has been used to monitor the gene expression patterns exhibited by *Arabidopsis* exposed to osmotic stress (Seki et al., 2002; Kreps et al., 2002). These

studies showed that hundreds of genes were differentially expressed in Arabidopsis upon short-term exposure to abiotic stress conditions by studying 1, 2 up to 24 h time-points following stress exposure (Seki et al., 2002; Kreps et al., 2002). Among the genes showing increased transcript abundance following exposure to abiotic stresses were those encoding proteins associated with: the synthesis of compatible solutes or phytohormones, the protection against ROS, dehydrin proteins, HSP proteins, LEA proteins, LTP proteins, transcription factors, carbohydrate metabolism, and others of unknown function. The precise role for many of these gene products remains elusive, and this is particularly true for the comparatively well studied dehydrins, LEAs and LTPs that over many years have been well documented to increase in a stress-responsive manner (Seki et al., 2002). However, the over-expression of LEA (Xu et al., 1996) in stress-sensitive crops, for example, has led to enhanced tolerance confirming their role for abiotic stress tolerance. Interestingly, transcriptomics results show that different sets of genes are involved in the response to cold, drought, or salinity stress (Seki et al., 2002). This observation provides evidence that responses to a given stress are specific at the molecular level (Seki et al., 2002). This specificity offers targets for a narrower range of products to test *in planta*. For example, associating survival during long-term exposure to abiotic stress under natural conditions in the field with the presence or absence of a given gene product would provide compelling evidence for the role of a specific gene in abiotic stress tolerance.

The information afforded by transcriptome profiling is extremely useful in associating metabolic pathways that are altered in plants subjected to sub-optimal environments. However, transcriptome data alone cannot establish whether the increased abundance of transcripts encoding a given enzyme actually leads to more enzyme and enzyme activity in the cell (Fiehn et al., 2000). Consequently, large-scale analysis of metabolites present in an organism should be used to help establish or define the metabolic phenotype that results from the altered expression of genes in response to adverse environmental conditions.

The metabolome is the entire metabolite complement of a biological organism and as such, is complex. For the plant kingdom it is estimated that over 200,000 chemically diverse metabolites exist (Weckwerth, 2003) with an estimated number of about 5,000 metabolites in a single plant cell (Krishnan et al., 2005). Current methodologies permit the simultaneous analysis of over 300 metabolites using gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC/MS) (Fiehn et al., 2000) and up to 5,200 putative metabolites using Fourier transform ion cyclotron mass spectrometry (FTMS) (Aharoni et al., 2002). Of these technologies, the GC/MS approach has been the preferred metabolomics method due to its amenability for high-throughput analysis (methodologies reviewed by Allwood et al., 2008). To date no technology has been developed that allows one to study the complete metabolome of an organism. Studying the complete metabolome remains a challenge because no single approach suitably handles the wide dynamic range in metabolite abundance in tissues where, without enrichment, a large proportion of metabolites are present at levels below the current limit of detection. No instrumentation exists that can simultaneously resolve and detect all of the chemical components that are found in the plant kingdom (Sumner et al., 2003). Despite these inherent shortcomings, metabolomic approaches have been used to identify stress-induced changes in the metabolism of plants including Arabidopsis subjected to drought or heat (Rizhsky et al., 2004), cold temperatures (Kaplan et al., 2004; Cook et al., 2004; Gray and Heath, 2005) and salinity (Kim et al., 2007). In these studies distinct metabolic phenotypes could be associated using the profiles of chemical components extracted from Arabidopsis cell cultures or plants subjected to stress-treatments when compared to profiles from unstressed controls. For example, Arabidopsis subjected to cold temperatures undergoes a substantive re-organization of the metabolome compared to unstressed controls (Kaplan et al., 2004; Cook et al., 2004, Gray and Heath, 2005). Arabidopsis exposure to cold temperatures leads to the accumulation of sugars and proline, and unexpectedly, other metabolites including putrescine, ornithine, and citrulline that implicate polyamines as contributing towards improved stress tolerance upon exposure to low temperatures (Cook et al., 2004). Rizhsky et al. (2004) reported that Arabidopsis exposed to drought accumulates proline, whereas exposure to a combination of drought and heat stress resulted in the accumulation of sucrose instead of proline. Arabidopsis cell cultures exposed to 100 mM NaCl over a period of 72 h showed that salt treatment leads to the co-induction of glycolysis and sucrose metabolism suggesting that sucrose accumulation may serve to promote water uptake and a potential source of energy to sustain cellular metabolism during exposure to salinity stress (Kim et al., 2007). Current metabolomics methodologies may not be unbiased or comprehensive but they are sufficient to uncover novel changes among metabolites across multiple metabolic pathways. Improvements in this technology could increase our capacity to detect changes among chemical components in plants subjected to abiotic stress and will

no doubt increase our capacity to define essential cellular networks needed by plants to respond to and recover from sub-optimal environmental conditions.

1.4 Field studies

The advent of genomic tools has offered important insights into identifying gene products associated with plant response to cold temperature, drought or salinity. In general, these environmental conditions induce the expression of many different genes or different members of gene families. Although these studies have identified traits associated with abiotic stress tolerance, the adaptive value and contribution of these traits to long-term acclimation of plants experiencing sub-optimal environments remains difficult to judge (Kulheim et al., 2002; Rizhsky et al., 2004). This difficulty may be due to the relatively low number of studies focusing on traits expressed in plants exposed to abiotic stress conditions in their natural environment. In fact, most studies aimed at identifying stress-specific responses have been performed using plants subjected to artificial calibrated treatments imposed in controlled environmental growth chambers. Extrapolating plant responses in the laboratory to their response in the field is difficult given that growth chambers cannot mimic the complexity of a natural environment where traits that are important for long-term survival and productivity under challenging conditions are needed. Comparative studies reporting on plants subjected to abiotic stress under controlled environments and under field conditions have been published (Miyazaki et al., 2004; Dhanaraj et al., 2006). Although overlap is found between transcripts

15

expressed in plants subjected to stress in growth chambers and those in the field, major differences were also found. Key to this latter observation is that caution should be exercised when extrapolating results based on laboratory experiments alone to form predictions or expectations of plant responses in the field (Dhanaraj et al., 2007).

1.5 Thellungiella: a valuable model for the study of abiotic stress tolerance

The adoption of *Arabidopsis* as a model organism has greatly improved our understanding of the genetic mechanisms that control plant growth and development (Bevan and Walsh, 2005). While much progress has been made in identifying mechanisms by which plants respond and adapt to cold temperatures, high salinity, drought, and other stresses, our understanding of the molecular basis of abiotic stress tolerance has been impeded, in part, by the lack of an appropriate genetic model with an innate ability to withstand stress. Arabidopsis displays little to no inherent tolerance to abiotic stress (Bressan et al., 2001). However, a close relative of Arabidopsis, Thellungiella salsuginea (also known as Thellungiella halophila or salt-lick mustard, hereafter referred to as *Thellungiella*) is native to areas with highly saline soils. Thellungiella has been reported as a suitable genetic model plant to study stress tolerance due to its ability to complete its life cycle under harsh environmental conditions (Zhu 2001; Xiong and Zhu, 2002; Inan et al., 2004, Taji et al., 2004, Wong et al., 2005, 2006; Griffith et al., 2007). Thellungiella shares many traits of Arabidopsis including a small size, short life cycle, copious seed production, a relatively small genome and it can be

genetically transformed (Bressan et al., 2001). *Thellungiella* coding DNA also has a high degree of sequence similarity to homologous *Arabidopsis* genes (90 – 95%); a feature that facilitates gene identification in this species. This similarity in genome content enables one to apply the abundant genetic resources developed for the study of *Arabidopsis* to the study *Thellungiella*'s response to abiotic stress.

Several natural accessions of *Thellungiella* have been identified that are specialized for diverse habitats worldwide (Scoggan, 1978). In Canada, *Thellungiella*'s distribution extends from south western Yukon and northern British Columbia to the Prairie Provinces, regions with semi-arid conditions (Scoggan, 1978). *Thellungiella* is also found in the western United States, Maritime China, Russia (Scoggan, 1978). Thus, unlike *Arabidopsis*, *Thellungiella* natural distribution exemplifies a species that has had to adapt to areas featuring cold including freezing temperatures, high salinity, and prolonged periods of water deficit. The molecular basis conferring the capacity of extremophiles like *Thellungiella* to withstand harsh environments is poorly understood and provides an exciting research opportunity to gain insights into the evolution of adaptive abiotic stress tolerance traits in plants using readily available approaches and methodologies.

1.6 Research objectives

Identifying metabolic pathways needed by plants stressed under field conditions will provide information that can be used to produce more stress tolerant crops. To date, no studies have compared traits expressed in extremophiles, such as *Thellungiella* plants, exposed to stress under controlled environmental conditions and in their natural habitat. In this thesis, I report comparisons of transcript and metabolite profiles of *Thellungiella* plants grown in the laboratory and at a Yukon field site. The objective of this comparative study is identifying abiotic stress tolerance traits in the Yukon ecotype of *Thellungiella*. During my studies, I addressed the following questions:

- Is there evidence for osmotic adjustment in Yukon *Thellungiella* subjected to abiotic stress treatments in growth chambers and plants in the field?
- 2) Is there overlap among transcripts or metabolites that accumulate in Yukon *Thellungiella* growing at the Yukon field site and plants subjected to calibrated stress treatments in controlled growth chambers?
- 3) Can comparisons between transcript and metabolite profiles of plants exposed to field and growth cabinet conditions identify biochemical traits needed for survival and growth under abiotic stress?

My hypothesis is that a critical trait(s) needed for survival under osmotic stress should be expressed by the plant regardless of whether the plant experiencing stress is growing in the cabinet or a remote field site.

1.7 References:

- Abebe T, Guenzi AC, Martin B, Cushman JC (2003) Tolerance of mannitolaccumulating transgenic wheat to water stress and salinity. Plant Physiol 131: 1748-1755
- Acevedo E, Fereres E, Hsiao TC, Henderson DW (1979) Diurnal growth trends, water potential, and osmotic adjustment of maize and sorghum leaves in the field. Plant Physiol 64: 476-480
- Ackerson RC, Krieg DR (1977) Stomatal and nonstomatal regulation of water use in cotton, corn, and sorghum. Plant Physiol 60: 850-853
- Aharoni A, Ric de Vos CH, Verhoeve HA, Maliepaard CA, Kruppa G, Bino R,
 Goodenowe D (2002) Nontargeted metabolome analysis by use of Fourier
 transform ion cyclotron mass spectrometry. OMICS 6: 217-234
- Allwood JW, Ellis DI, Goodacre R (2008) Metabolomic technologies and their application to the study of plants and plant-host interactions. Physiol Plant 132: 117-135
- Bevan M, Walsh S (2005) The *Arabidopsis* genome: A foundation for plant research. Genome Res 15: 1632-1642
- Bianchi G, Gamba A, Murelli C, Salamini F, Bartels D (1991) Novel carbohydrate metabolism in the resurrection plant *Craterostigma plantagineum*. Plant J 1: 355-359

Binzel ML, Dana Hess F, Bressan RA, Hasegawa PM (1988) Intracellular compartmentation of ions in salt adapted tobacco cells. Plant Physiol 86: 607-614

Blum A, Sullivan CY (1997) The effect of plant size on wheat response to agents of drought stress. I. Root drying. Aust J Plant Physiol 24: 35-41

Boyer JS (1982) Plant productivity and environment. Science 218: 443-448

- Bray EA, Bailey-Serres J, Weretilnyk EA (2000) Responses to abiotic stresses. In B Buchanan, W Gruissem, R Jones, eds, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology of Plants. Amer Soc Plant Physiol, Rockville, MD, pp 1158-1203
- Bressan RA, Zhang C, Zhang H, Hasegawa PM, Bohnert HJ, Zhu J-K (2001) Learning from the Arabidopsis experience. The next gene search paradigm. Plant Physiol 127: 1354-1360
- Burchett S, Niven S, Fuller MP (2006) The effect of cold acclimation on the water relations and freezing tolerance of *Hordeum vulgare* L. Cryo Letters 27: 295-303
- Chaves MM, Pereira JS, Maroco JP, Rodrigues ML, Ricardo CPP, Osorio ML, Carvalho I, Faria T, Pinheiro C (2002) How plants cope with water stress in the field: photosynthesis and growth. Ann Bot 89: 907-916
- Cook D, Fowler S, Fiehn O, Thomashow MF (2004) A prominent role for the CBF cold response pathway in configuring the low-temperature metabolome of *Arabidopsis*. Proc Nat Acad Sci USA **101**: 15243-15248
- Delauney A, Verma D (1993) Proline biosynthesis and osmoregulation in plants. Plant J4: 215-223
Dhanaraj AL, Alkharouf NW, Beard HS, Chouikha IB, Matthews BF, Wei H, Arora R, Rowland LJ (2007) Major differences observed in transcript profiles of blueberry during cold acclimation under field and cold room conditions. Planta 225: 735-751

Fiehn O, Kopka J, Trethewey RN, Willmitzer L (2000) Identification of uncommon plant metabolites based on calculation of elemental compositions using gas chromatography and quadrupole mass spectrometry. Anal Chem **72:** 3573-3580

Flowers TJ (2004) Improving crop salt tolerance. J Exp Bot 55: 307-319

- Flowers TJ, Yeo AR (1995) Breeding for salinity resistance in crop plants: Where next? Aust J Plant Physiol 22: 875-884
- Flowers TJ, Ludlow MM (1986) Contribution of osmotic adjustment to the dehydration tolerance of water-stressed pigeonpea (*Cajanus cajan* (L.) millsp.) leaves. Plant Cell Environ 9: 33-40
- Gagneul D, Ainouche A, Duhaze C, Lugan R, Larher F, Bouchereau A (2007) A reassessment of the function of the so-called compatible solutes in the halophytic Plumbaginaceae *Limonium latifolium*. Plant Physiol **144**: 1598-1611
- Garg AK, Kim J-K, Owens TG, Ranwala AP, Choi YD, Kochian LV, Wu RJ (2002) Trehalose accumulation in rice plants confers high tolerance levels to different abiotic stresses. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **99:** 15898-15903
- Gray GR, Heath D (2005) A global reorganization of the metabolome in *Arabidopsis* during cold acclimation is revealed by metabolic fingerprinting. Physiol Plant 124: 236-248

- Griffith M, Timonin M, Wong CE, Gray G, Akhter SR, Saldanha M, Rogers MA,
 Weretilnyk EA, Moffatt BA (2007) *Thellungiella*: an *Arabidopsis*-related model
 plant adapted to cold temperatures. Plant Cell Environ 30: 529-538
- Hanson AD, Rathinasabapathi B, Chamberlin B, Gage DA (1991) Comparative physiological evidence that β-alanine betaine and choline-o-sulfate act as compatible osmolytes in halophytic *Limonium* species. Plant Physiol 97: 1199-1205
- Hsiao TC, Acevedo E, Fereres E, Henderson DW (1976) Water stress, growth and osmotic adjustment. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci 273: 479-500

Hsiao TC (1973) Plant responses to water stress. Annu Rev Plant Physiol 24: 519-570

- Inan G, Zhang Q, Li PH, Wang ZL, Cao ZY, Zhang H, Zhang CQ, Quist TM,
 Goodwin SM, Zhu JH, Shi HH, Damsz B, Charbaji T, Gong QQ, Ma SS,
 Fredricksen M, Galbraith DW, Jenks MA, Rhodes D, Hasegawa PM,
 Bohnert HJ, Joly RJ, Bressan RA, Zhu J-K (2004) Salt cress. A halophyte and
 cryophyte *Arabidopsis* relative model system and its applicability to molecular
 genetic analyses of growth and development of extremophiles. Plant Physiol 135:
 1718-1737
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2008) <u>http://ipcc.ch</u>. Accessed August 2009.
- Kaplan F, Kopka J, Haskell DW, Zhao W, Schiller KC, Gatzke N, Sung DY, Guy
 CL (2004) Exploring the temperature-stress metabolome of *Arabidopsis*. Plant
 Physiol 136: 4159-4168

Kim JK, Bamba T, Harada K, Fukusaki E, Kobayashi A (2007) Time-course metabolic profiling of *Arabidopsis thaliana* cell cultures after salt stress treatment. J Exp Bot **58:** 415-424

- Kishor PBK, Hong Z, Miao CH, Hu CAA, Verma DPS (1995) Overexpression of Δ^1 pyrroline-5-carboxylate synthetase increases proline production and confers osmotolerance in transgenic plants. Plant Physiol **108**: 1387-1394
- Kramer PJ (1988) Changing concepts regarding plant water relations. Plant Cell Environ 11: 565-568
- Kreps JA, Wu Y, Chang HS, Zhu T, Wang X, Harper JF (2002) Transcriptome changes for *Arabidopsis* in response to salt, osmotic, and cold stress. Plant Physiol 130: 2129-2141
- Krishnan P, Kruger NJ, Ratcliffe RG (2005) Metabolite fingerprinting and profiling in plants using NMR. J Exp Bot 56: 255-265
- Kulheim C, Agren J, Jansson S (2002) Rapid regulation of light harvesting and plant fitness in the field. Science 297: 91-93
- Matoh T, Watanabe J, Takahashi E (1987) Sodium, potassium, chloride, and betaine concentrations in isolated vacuoles from salt-grown Atriplex gmelini leaves. Plant Physiol 84: 173-177
- Meyer S, Genty B (1999) Heterogeneous inhibition of photosynthesis over the leaf surface of *Rosa rubiginosa* L. during water stress and abscisic acid treatment: induction of a metabolic component by limitation of CO₂ diffusion. Planta 210: 126-131

Miyazaki S, Fredricksen M, Hollis KC, Poroyko V, Shepley D, Galbraith DW, Long SP, Bohnert HJ (2004) Transcript expression profiles of *Arabidopsis thaliana* grown under controlled conditions and open-air elevated concentrations of CO₂ and of O₃. Field Crops Res **90:** 47-59

- Munns R, Weir R (1981) Contribution of sugars to osmotic adjustments in elongating and expanded zones of wheat leaves during moderate water deficit at two light levels. Aust J Plant Physiol 8: 94-105
- Nonami H, Boyer JS (1989) Turgor and growth at low water potentials. Plant Physiol **89:** 798-804
- Pattanagul W, Madore MA (1999) Water deficit effects on raffinose family oligosaccharide metabolism in Coleus. Plant Physiol **121**: 987-993
- Paul MJ, Cockburn W (1989) Pinitol, a compatible solute in *Mesembryanthemum* crystallinum L. J Exp Bot 40: 1093-1098
- Popp M, Smirnoff N (1995) Polyol accumulation and metabolism during water deficit. In N Smirnoff, ed, Environment and Plant Metabolism. BIOS Scientific Publishers Limited, Oxford, U.K., pp 199 – 215
- Ramanjulu S, Bartels D (2002) Drought- and dessication-induced modulation of gene expression in plants. Plant Cell Environ 25: 141-151
- **Ristic Z, Gifford DJ, Cass DD** (1991) Heat shock proteins in two lines of *Zea mays* L. that differ in drought and heat resistance. Plant Physiol **97:** 1430-1434

Rizhsky L, Liang H, Shuman J, Shulaev V, Davletova S, Mittler R (2004) When defense pathways collide. The response of Arabidopsis to a combination of drought and heat stress. Plant Physiol **134**: 1683-1696

Schoups G, Hopmans JW, Young CA, Vrugt JA, Wallender WW, Tanji KK,

Panday S (2005) Sustainability of irrigated agriculture in the San Joaquin Valley,California. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 102: 15352-15356

- Scoggan HJ (1978) Part 3 Dicotyledoneae (Saururaceae to Violaceae), In: The Flora of Canada, National Museums of Canada, Ottawa, pp. 790-791.
- Seki M, Narusaka M, Ishida J, Nanjo T, Fujita M, Oono Y, Kamiya A, Nakajima M, Enju A, Sakurai T, Satou M, Akiyama K, Taji T, Yamaguchi-Shinozaki K, Carninci P, Kawai J, Hayashizaki Y, Shinozaki K (2002) Monitoring the expression profiles of 7000 Arabidopsis genes under drought, cold and highsalinity stresses using a full-length cDNA microarray. Plant J 31: 279-292
- Sheveleva E, Chmara W, Bohnert HJ, Jensen RG (1997) Increased salt and drought tolerance by *D*-ononitol production in transgenic *Nicotiana tabacum* L. Plant Physiol 115: 1211-1219
- Sinclair TR, Ludlow MM (1985) Who taught plants thermodynamics? The unfulfilled potential of plant water potential. Aust J Plant Physiol 12: 213-217.

Somerville C, Somerville S (1999) Plant functional genomics. Science 285: 380-383

Storey R, Jones RGW (1977) Quaternary ammonium compounds in plants in relation to salt resistance. Phytochemistry 16: 447-453 Sumner LW, Mendes P, Dixon RA (2003) Plant metabolomics: large-scale phytochemistry in the functional genomics era. Phytochemistry 62: 817-836

- Taji T, Seki M, Satou M, Sakurai T, Kobayashi M, Ishiyama K, Narusaka Y, Narusaka M, Zhu JK, Shinozaki K (2004) Comparative genomics in salt tolerance between Arabidopsis and Arabidopsis-related halophyte salt cress using Arabidopsis microarray. Plant Physiol 135: 1697-1709
- Taji T, Ohsumi C, Iuchi S, Seki M, Kasuga M, Kobayashi M, Yamaguchi-Shinozaki
 K, Shinozaki K (2002) Important roles of drought- and cold-inducible genes for
 galactinol synthase in stress tolerance in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Plant J 29: 417426
- **Tester M, Bacic A** (2005) Abiotic stress tolerance in grasses. From model plants to crop plants. Plant Physiol **137:** 791-793
- The Arabidopsis Genome Initiative (2000) Analysis of the genome sequence of the flowering plant Arabidopsis thaliana. Nature **408**: 796-815
- **Trewavas AJ** (2001) The population/biodiversity paradox. Agricultural efficiency to save wilderness. Plant Physiol **125:** 174-179
- Trossat C, Rathinasabapathi B, Weretilnyk EA, Shen T-L, Huang Z-H, Gage DA,
 Hanson AD (1998) Salinity promotes accumulation of 3 dimethylsulfoniopropionate and its precursor S-methylmethionine in chloroplasts.
 Plant Physiol 116: 165-171
- **Turner NC** (1974) Stomatal behavior and water status of maize, sorghum, and tobacco under field conditions. II. At low soil water potential. Plant Physiol **53**: 360-365

Wang Z, Gerstein M, Snyder M (2009) RNA-Seq: a revolutionary tool for transcriptomics. Nat Rev Genet 10: 57-63

- Weckwerth W (2003) Metabolomics in systems biology. Annu Rev Plant Biol **54:** 669-689
- Wisman E, Ohlrogge J (2000) Arabidopsis microarray service facilities. Plant Physiol124: 1468-1471
- Wong CE, Li Y, Labbe A, Guevara D, Nuin P, Whitty B, Diaz C, Golding GB, Gray GR, Weretilnyk EA, Griffith M, Moffatt BA (2006) Transcriptional profiling implicates novel interactions between abiotic stress and hormonal responses in *Thellungiella*, a close relative of Arabidopsis. Plant Physiol 140: 1437-1450
- Wong CE, Li Y, Whitty BR, Diaz-Camino C, Akhter SR, Brandle JE, Golding GB, Weretilnyk EA, Moffatt BA, Griffith M (2005) Expressed sequence tags from the Yukon ecotype of *Thellungiella* reveal that gene expression in response to cold, drought and salinity shows little overlap. Plant Mol Biol 58: 561-574
- Xiong L, Zhu JK (2002) Molecular and genetic aspects of plant responses to osmotic stress. Plant Cell Environ 25: 131-139
- Xu D, Duan X, Wang B, Hong B, Ho T, Wu R (1996) Expression of a late
 embryogenesis abundant protein gene, *HVA1*, from barley confers tolerance to
 water deficit and salt stress in transgenic rice. Plant Physiol 110: 249-257
- Yancey PH (2005) Organic osmolytes as compatible, metabolic and counteracting cytoprotectants in high osmolarity and other stresses. J Exp Biol 208: 2819-2830

Yancey PH, Clark ME, Hand SC, Bowlus RD, Somero GN (1982) Living with water stress: evolution of osmolyte systems. Science 217: 1214-1222

- Yelenosky G, Guy CL (1989) Freezing tolerance of citrus, spinach, and petunia leaf tissue. Plant Physiol 89: 444-451
- Yeo AR, Lee K-S, Izard P, Boursier PJ, Flowers TJ (1991) Short- and long-term effects of salinity on leaf growth in rice (*Oryza sativa L*.). J Exp Bot 42: 881-889
- Zhu B, Su J, Chang MC, Verma DPS, Fan YL, Wu R (1998) Overexpression of a pyrroline-5-carboxylate synthetase gene and analysis of tolerance to water and salt stress in transgenic rice. Plant Sci 139: 41-48

Zhu JK (2001) Plant salt tolerance. Trends Plant Sci 6: 66-71

Chapter Two

Methods and Materials

2.1 Yukon field site location and plants

In 2002, 2003 and 2005, cauline leaf tissue was harvested from mature, flowering Yukon *Thellungiella* at a field site near Whitehorse, Yukon (location: 60° 55.928'N, 135° 10.249' W; elevation = 647m), located 20 km north of Whitehorse (Fig. 1). Soil samples were collected from the top 18 cm depth at the field site where Yukon *Thellungiella* was harvested. Soil pH, electrical conductivity, and chemical content were determined and the elemental composition of soil samples, field and chamber leaf tissues were analyzed (Ping et al., 1998). Five to six cauline leaves, weighing approximately 200 mg FW were harvested from at least ten different plants 7 h from sunrise in the Yukon, and then tissue was transferred quickly to individual 2-mL Nalgene cryovials. The cryovials containing the samples were immediately flash frozen in liquid nitrogen (Jacob's Industries Limited, Whitehorse, YT), and then transferred to a charged MVE XC20/3V vapour shipper (Jencons Scientific Inc., Bridgeville, PA) where samples were kept frozen at -150°C for transport. Vials were transferred to -80°C for storage pending analysis.

2.2 Controlled environment plant growth conditions

Seeds of Yukon *Thellungiella* were sterilized using a vapour-phase gas technique (Clough and Bent, 1998) and then mixed with 0.1% (w/v) Phytagel (Sigma, Oakville, ON) and pipetted onto a moistened soil mixture containing six parts Promix BX (Premier Horticulture, Rivière-du-Loup, PQ) and one part Turface (Profile Products LLC, Buffalo, NY) in individual 5 x 5 x 7 cm pots. The pots containing seeds were stratified for 2 d at 4°C before transfer to growth chambers (AC 60 Enconair, Winnipeg, MB) set with a 21h/3h day/night cycle (light intensity of 250 μ mol m⁻²s⁻¹) and 22°C/10°C day/night temperature regime. Plants were watered daily with de-ionized distilled water prepared using Barnstead NANO Pure II system (Barnstead International, Dubuque, IA) and fertilized once per week with 1 g L⁻¹ 20-20-20 (N-P-K) fertilizer.

Cauline leaves from mature, flowering, 12-week-old Yukon *Thellungiella* plants grown in Enconair chambers served as control, unstressed tissue in microarray and metabolite profiling experiments in comparisons involving the cauline leaves from fieldgrown plants (Prepared by Mr. Yong Li under the supervision of Dr. Barbara Moffatt, University of Waterloo). Basal rosette leaves of unstressed control plants served as the basis of comparison for metabolite profiles in the case of cold, drought, drought/rewatered and saline plant samples.

2.3 Stress treatments

For drought experiments, 4-week-old Yukon *Thellungiella* plants were randomly divided into two groups: a control group that was well-watered and a drought group where water was withheld until plants were visibly wilted. Approximately one-half of

the wilted plants in the drought treatment were re-watered by watering the soil. The rewatered plants were allowed to recover and regain turgor for 48 h prior to harvest. To impose salinity stress, 4-week-old Yukon *Thellungiella* plants were salinized with 50 mM NaCl for three days and the salinity level increased in increments of 50 mM NaCl every three days to a final concentration ranging from 100 to as high as 500 mM NaCl. Plants were irrigated with the final NaCl concentration for 3 d prior to harvest. Leaf tissue was harvested and flash-frozen with liquid nitrogen and then stored at -80°C for subsequent GC/MS analysis. Cold temperature experiments were performed by Dr. Marilyn Griffith's lab at the University of Waterloo. Four-week-old Yukon *Thellungiella* plants grown at 22°C were randomly divided into two groups: a control group that was grown at 22°C and a group that was shifted to 5/4°C for 3-weeks. Upon completion of the stress treatments a portion of the leaf tissue was flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80°C until it was processed for transcript or metabolite profiling

2.4 Water status and physiological response measurements

Relative water content (RWC)

For RWC measurements, 6 mm diameter discs were removed from leaves using a cork borer and weighed to obtain their FW and then allowed to float on 2 mL of deionized, distilled water in covered transparent Falcon® plastic wells (Becton Dickinson Labware, Franklin Lakes, NJ) for 24 h. The discs were blotted dry and weighed to obtain the turgid weight. The dry weight was then obtained after by taking the leaf discs and drying them in an oven set at 70°C for 24 h in pre-weighed 1.5 mL microfuge tubes. The RWC was determined using the following equation:

RWC (%) = [(Fresh weight – Dry weight)/(Turgid weight – Dry weight)]

Dewpoint psychrometry

Leaf water potential was measured using a HR 33 T psychrometer (Wescor Inc. Logan, UT). A disc was excised from a fully expanded leaf using a 6 mm diameter cork borer and then was placed in a C52 leaf chamber. Discs were allowed to come to equilibrium with the air in the chamber for 20 min. Leaf solute potential was determined by submerging the leaf disc in liquid nitrogen for a few seconds. The frozen leaf disc was allowed to thaw and come to equilibrium for 20 min with the air in a C52 leaf chamber. Leaf turgor pressure was estimated as the difference between the water potential and osmotic potential (Nonami and Boyer, 1989). A calibration standard curve was performed using NaCl concentrations in the range of 0 to 1000 μ M before taking leaf ψ_W measurements.

Infrared gas analysis

A CIRAS-1 infrared gas analyzer (IRGA) (PP Systems, Haverhill, MA) was used to determine rates of photosynthesis, transpiration, and stomatal conductance using excised leaves. The leaves were left to equilibrate in the leaf chamber for 60 s before taking a measurement. The leaf boundary-layer resistance was determined by following the operator's manual (CIRAS-1 Version 2). A calibration curve estimating resistance as a function of leaf area was determined and used to calculate rates of photosynthesis and stomatal conductance. Given that the leaves were typically less than 2.5 cm² and so did not cover the area in the leaf chamber of the instrument, it was necessary to correct rates using leaf areas. Leaf areas were determined using an AM100 leaf area meter (Analytical Development Company Ltd., Herts, UK). For photosynthesis rate measurements the light intensity was set to 300 μmol m⁻²s⁻¹ and the CO₂ concentration was maintained at 450 ppm. The instrument data was imported to a statistical analysis software (SAS) Version 7 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC) and rates of photosynthesis, transpiration and stomatal conductance were calculated with the corrected leaf area using PS_EQN_CIRAS equation (Appendix 1), which is saved in the SAS program (the PS_EQN_CIRAS equation was created by Jon Sleeman, former M.Sc. student of Dr. S. Dudley).

2.5 Metabolite analysis of Yukon Thellungiella

Polar metabolite extraction of Yukon Thellungiella leaf tissue

At harvest, 200 mg of leaf tissue was weighed and then flash frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored in a -80°C freezer until samples were processed. For processing, the tissue was crushed to a powder with a mortar and pestle that was chilled with liquid nitrogen prior to grinding. The leaves were ground to a powder in liquid nitrogen and after the nitrogen evaporated 1.4 mL of 100% HPLC grade methanol was added (Caledon Laboratories Limited, Georgetown, ON). 50 μ L of 2 mg mL⁻¹ ribitol (Sigma) was added

as an internal recovery standard and 58 µL of 1 M NaCl was added to improve the polar/non-polar phase separation of the slurry. This slurry was transferred to a 15 mL Corex[©] tube. The Corex[©] tube containing the brei was covered with aluminum foil with a punctured hole and was placed in a 70°C water bath and shaken for 15 min. The tubes were then centrifuged for 3 min at 14000 g at 4°C using a Beckman Coulter Avanti J-25 Centrifuge equipped with a JA-20 rotor (Fullerton, CA). The supernatant was removed and transferred to a 16 x 100 mm test tube (VWR) and 1.4 mL of de-ionized, distilled H₂O was added. To the remaining pellet in the Corex© tube, 750 µL of chloroform were added, the tube was shaken for 5 min at room temperature and then centrifuged for 3 min at 14000 g as above. The supernatant was removed and combined with the methanol water phase in the 16 x 100 mm test tube and the pooled mixture was vortexed and centrifuged for 15 min (International Clinical Centrifuge Model CL, Needham, MA) at the step 5 speed setting. The polar (upper) phase was transferred to a new 16 x 100 mm test tube and vortexed again. After vortexing, $250 \,\mu$ L of polar extract was removed and transferred to a 1 mL reaction vial (Wheaton, Millville, NJ). This polar fraction was dried down with nitrogen gas using an N-evap (Meyer N-evap organomation model no. 111 Berlin, MA) with an airflow pressure of 20 psi and the bottom of the tubes were suspended in a water bath set at 40°C. A 250 µL aliquot of the polar phase was combined with 250 µL of de-ionized distilled water in a microfuge tube with 1 mm holes in the lids. These tubes were then flash frozen in liquid nitrogen and lyophilized using a freeze dry system (Labconco Freezone Plus 6, Kansas City, MO) overnight and then the tubes were stored in desiccant at -20°C.

Oxime derivatization

Direct trimethylsilyl derivatization of reducing sugars leads to different peaks related to cyclic and linear forms for the same compound (Fiehn et al., 2000b). One way to prevent the formation of the cyclic conformation of sugars is to treat them with methoxyamine in order to reduce and stabilize the carbonyl moiety (Roessner et al., 2000). Therefore, 50 μ L of 20 mg mL⁻¹ methoxyamine hydrochloride (Sigma) dissolved in biotech grade \geq 99.9% pyridine (Sigma) was added to the dried leaf extract and the mixture was incubated at 30°C in a Baxter temperature block heater (Lab-line instruments, Inc. Melrose Park, IL) for 90 min prior to trimethylsilyl derivatization.

Trimethysilyl derivatization

After methoxymation, the polar metabolites were converted into volatile trimethylsilyl derivatives by using the derivatization agent N-methyl-N-(trimethylsilyl)trifluoroacetamide (MSTFA). MSTFA (Chromatographic Specialties Inc. Brockville, ON) is the preferred trimethylsilyl reagent due to its ability to derivatize a broad range of chemical compound classes (Fiehn et al., 2000a; Roessner et al., 2000). The samples were derivatized with 80 μ L of 100% MSTFA at 37°C for 30 min. After incubation, the derivatized samples were placed in a desiccator jar containing anhydrous calcium sulphate (Drierite) for at least 2 h prior to analysis by GC/MS.

GC/MS analysis

Derivatized plant extracts were analyzed using a Trace DSQ GC-MS system (Thermo Finnigan, Austin, TX) operated in the positive ion electron impact (EI⁺) full scan mode. Samples were diluted 25-fold using HPLC-grade hexane and then $1-\mu L$ was injected into the Trace DSQ GC-MS system using the MPS 2 autosampler (Gerstel GmbH & Co., Mülheim, Germany). Chromatography was performed using a Restek Rtx-5MS integra column (crossbond 5% diphenyl – 95% dimethyl polysiloxane; Cat.#12623 -127, Chromatographic Specialties Inc.) with a length of 30 m, a column ID of 0.25mm and a film thickness of $0.25\mu m$. The column was fused with a 10 m guard column that had the same composition as the column. The injection temperature was 230°C, and the ion source was kept at 200°C. The carrier gas was high purity (>99.999%) helium (VitalAire, Hamilton, ON) at a constant flow rate of 1 mL min⁻¹. The oven temperature program was initially set at 50°C isocratic for 2.5 min, the temperature was increased first at 7.5°C min⁻¹ to 70°C, and then followed by a 5°C min⁻¹ ramp to a final temperature of 310°C that was isocratic for 6 min. The system was allowed to return to 50°C for 5 min before the next injection. Mass spectra were recorded at three scans s^{-1} with an m/z 50 – 650 scanning range.

Criteria used to monitor GC column performance

GC column performance was monitored by injecting a polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) calibration standard solution mix #5 (Restek Co., Bellefonte, PA). This standard solution contained the benzofluoranthenes, a group of PAHs with identical mass spectrum that can only be resolved chromatographically. Therefore, GC column performance was monitored by ensuring that the peaks for benzofluoranthene (b) and (k) were successfully resolved. If these PAHs were not resolved, the removal of 50 to 70 cm of the retention gap would restore the GC column performance that was checked by re-running the PAH calibration standard solution prior to metabolite profiling of plant extracts.

GC/MS data analysis

GC/MS chromatograms or metabolite profiles are quite complex revealing the presence of several hundred peaks. Figure 2 shows representative GC/MS chromatograms generated for polar extracts prepared from Yukon *Thellungiella* subjected to different stress treatments or from plants harvested from the field site near Whitehorse, YT. The metabolite profiles show the presence of major and minor peaks. The enlarged portion of Figure 2 shows a comparison between the metabolite profiles generated for cold-treated Yukon *Thellungiella* plants and a plant that was grown under unstressed conditions. While a number of peaks are not different between Yukon *Thellungiella* plants treated with cold temperatures relative to an unstressed plants (a), a number of peak are higher (b) or lower (c) in the metabolite profiles from treated Yukon *Thellungiella* relative to the unstressed control plant. The main objective from these metabolite profiling studies was to identify metabolites undergoing statistically significant differences in abundance in *Thellungiella* subjected to stress treatments compared with respective controls. Therefore, it is necessary to extract information on

37

the areas of peaks present in the metabolite profiles of control and treated *Thellungiella* plants in a reproducible and efficient fashion.

Deconvolution of mass spectral components

High-throughput approaches require efficient and reproducible extraction of data. As such, visual peak-by-peak comparison between multiple GC/MS analyses was not feasible. Although the majority of peaks could be resolved by peak area integration using the X calibur software, some peaks co-eluted posing a challenge for precise peak abundance determination. For example, Figure 3 shows a sample raw chromatogram (a) with panel (b) showing irregularities in peak shape due to the presence of more than one peak component. Upon careful examination, two peaks were found to have different mass spectra within this major peak, as shown in panels c and d. Therefore, it was necessary to extract the pure mass spectra to distinguish between closely eluting peaks along with their accurate peak abundance information. The automated mass spectral deconvolution of identification system (AMDIS) was used to extract peak abundance and pure mass spectral component information from the complex chromatograms generated for leaf metabolite profiles. With AMDIS it is possible to separate the mass spectra of overlapping, co-eluting peaks rapidly, a process commonly referred to as deconvolution (Stein, 1999). AMDIS creates an eluent file (*.elu) in a tab-delimited format that contains information on peak abundance and mass spectrum of an individual component. Unfortunately, the absolute retention times (RTs) for identical peaks from multiple successive GC/MS analyses were not identical making direct comparisons for these peaks

difficult. An additional step is necessary to align identical peaks from multiple GC/MS analyses prior to statistical analysis.

Peak alignment using the GC/MS data analysis software package (GASP)

The eluent tab-delimited data files generated from GC/MS using AMDIS are complex and difficult to compare. Variation is found in the absolute RTs of identical peaks in chromatograms from multiple analyses done on different days or even different times on the same day. Correcting for shifting RTs was not possible due to the nonlinearity of changes across the chromatogram. To correct for shifting RTs, Roessner et al. (2000) added fatty acid standards of different molecular weights (non-branched) to each sample prior to derivatization and GC/MS analysis. In this approach, a retention index (RI) value for a peak can be calculated that describes peak position relative to the two flanking fatty acid standard peaks in the chromatogram (Roessner et al., 2000). Thus all peaks are designated by their RI and peaks from multiple runs that share the same RI can then be aligned.

I used the exact method by Roessner et al. (2000) to calculate the RIs for peaks from GC/MS runs. In order to calculate the RI for peaks, a fatty acid standard mix was added to extracts. The fatty acid standard mix was prepared by adding 9 fatty acid standards that had variable lengths in hydrocarbon chain (C_7 , C_9 , C_{11} , C_{13} , C_{15} , C_{19} , C_{23} , C_{27} , C_{31}) dissolved in tetrahydrofuran in a Kimble vial and expressed as a % v/v: heptanoic acid 3.7%, nonanoic acid 3.7%, undecanoic acid 3.7%, tridecanoic acid 3.7%, pentadecanoic acid 3.7%, nonadecanoic acid 7.4%, tricosanoic acid 7.4%, heptacosanoic

39

acid 22.2% and hentriacontanoic acid 55.5% (Sigma). The fatty acid standards were dissolved in tetrahydrofuran to a final concentration of 10 μ g μ L⁻¹. To the dried leaf extract, 25 μ L of a 10 μ g μ L⁻¹ fatty acid standard mix dissolved in tetrahydrofuran was added and the mixture was dried down using nitrogen gas prior to methoxymation and derivatization.

All the peaks present in the GC/MS files were deconvoluted using AMDIS to create the tab-delimited eluent file. This eluent file was then converted into a GC/MS universal (*.gmu) file format using the GC/MS data analysis software package (GASP) (Nuin et al., 2004). The GC/MS universal file contains all the peak abundance information as well as the associated RT and mass spectrum information for an individual component. In order to calculate the RI, the exact RT for each fatty acid standard needs to be entered into GASP (available at: <u>www.flintbox.com</u>) and then the RIs for all the peaks present in the GC/MS universal file are calculated using the following equation:

 $\mathbf{RI}_{x} = [(100)x(\mathbf{C}_{n}) + (((100)x(\mathbf{C}_{n+1}) - (100)x(\mathbf{C}_{n}))x((\mathbf{RT}_{x} - \mathbf{RT}_{\mathbf{Cx}-1})/(\mathbf{RT}_{\mathbf{Cx}+1} - \mathbf{RT}_{\mathbf{Cx}-1})))]$

 C_n represents the number of carbons present in the fatty acid that elutes before the compound x

 C_{n+1} represents the number of carbons present in the fatty acid that elutes after the compound x

 RT_x denotes the RT of compound x

 RT_{X+1} denotes the RT of fatty acid standard that elutes after compound x

 RT_{X-1} denotes the RT of fatty acid standard that elutes before compound x

In addition to creating a RI for each peak present in the GC/MS universal file, the peak area is divided by the peak area of the internal recovery standard, ribitol, and hence only this normalized peak area is compared between multiple analyses. Once the RI and normalized peak areas have been determined for each GC/MS analysis, peaks sharing the same RI from multiple GC/MS universal files from multiple analyses are aligned using GASP, and a GC/MS alignment format (*.gma) file is created. This GC/MS alignment format file will contain three columns: a column containing the normalized peak area, a column containing the original RT and a column containing the calculated RI. This file can be subjected to a variety of statistical test that are available within GASP as this software interfaces with the statistical package "R" (<u>www.r-project.org</u>) or it can be exported to Excel or any other software package for data mining.

Data mining

The strategy for data mining of metabolomic data is outlined in Figure 4. After peak deconvolution using AMDIS and alignment using GASP, the data was subjected to at least three different statistical methods routinely used for metabolomic data mining. This included using a combination of unsupervised methods such as principal component analysis (PCA) and hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA), and more stringent methods such as analysis of variance. These methods are designed to visualize and differentiate between large datasets obtained from metabolite profiles (Sumner et al., 2003; Fiehn, 2002).

Principal component analysis

One of the first questions to answer during the exploration of metabolomic data is whether or not the data acquired groups into distinct groups based on differences in metabolite concentrations (Fiehn, 2002). For example, if distinct metabolite profile groups (also referred to as metabolic phenotypes, Fiehn et al., 2000a) emerge when comparing the entire dataset generated for wild-type and mutant or treated and control samples, this would signify that differences exist in their metabolite composition. PCA is an important multivariate technique used to determine whether groups exist among metabolite profiles. PCA transforms the large dataset (hundreds of peaks from multiple GC/MS analyses) into a smaller set of uncorrelated variables, called principal components that are determined by linear combinations using the peak abundance data (Fiehn et al., 2000a; Taylor et al., 2002). The contribution of each peak on this principal component (referred to as a principal component loading) is used to determine whether it plays an important role in the observed grouping patterns. Normally, the top three principal components are plotted against one another to determine whether distinct groups are evident in the overall dataset (Sumner et al., 2003). Once the existence of distinct groups are established, classical statistical methods such as Student's *t*-tests or analysis of variance (ANOVA) can be used to identify metabolites whose levels are statistically significantly different between the groups (Fiehn, 2002).

PCA analysis of metabolite profiles obtained for leaf polar extracts prepared from *Thellungiella* plants was done using the STATISTICA Version 6.0 software package (StatSoft, Inc., Tulsa, OK). The peak abundance data was log₁₀ transformed due to the observed dynamic range of concentrations in metabolite abundance. This transformation allows a better comparison of large and small numbers (Roessner et al., 2001). A covariance matrix was used to determine the principal components from the dataset.

Analysis of variance

One-way ANOVA was used to identify peaks that were present at statistically significantly different levels in *Thellungiella* plants subjected to stress treatments relative to respective controls. This approach enabled the comparison of the means of two or more independent groups with the assumption that the means follow a normal distribution with equal variances (Sokal and Rohlf, 1995). The null hypothesis that the means of all groups are equal, was rejected when a threshold for significance of P<0.05 was obtained as determined using STATISTICA Version 6.0 software package (StatSoft, Inc., Tulsa, OK) or GASP (Nuin et al., 2004). At a P<0.05, at least one pair of means was found to be different during multiple means comparisons. Given that several hundred variables were compared between groups, the expected number of incorrect null hypotheses rejections was 15 (false positives). However, ANOVA yielded considerably more peaks undergoing statistically significant differences between treatment and control (58 for the "salt" data) or field and chamber (109 for "field") comparisons than the expected number of false positives. Means of statistically significantly different peaks between groups

43

were further explored using hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA) (described in the next section). This was performed to group peaks undergoing similar expression patterns in response to stress treatments. These results were then related to the literature for biological interpretation instead of applying multiple test corrections such as the Bonferroni correction to decrease the false discovery rate, as the Bonferroni correction is generally too conservative (Sokal and Rohlf, 1995).

Hierarchical cluster analysis

HCA methods are used to assess the similarity between metabolite profiles (Fiehn, 2002). The most commonly used distance metric for metabolomic data analysis is the Euclidean distance (Taylor et al., 2002). The result of HCA is visualized as a dendrogram or a tree where the branch lengths are proportional to the distances between groups (Sumner et al., 2003). HCA can also be used to group peaks undergoing similar expression patterns. The first step was to identify statistically significantly different peaks between *Thellungiella* plants subjected to abiotic stress treatments compared with their respective controls. The next step was to express the mean peak abundance as a fold-ratio of the mean for treated and control samples. These fold-ratios were log₁₀ transformed and then subjected to HCA to group peaks undergoing similar expression patterns. Peaks that were not detected in either treated or control samples were assigned a threshold for detection value of 0.00005 since their true value is between zero and the detection limit. A Euclidean distance was used to calculate the matrix of all the log₁₀ transformed peak fold ratios and the average-linkage method was used to perform the

HCA either using STATISTICA Version 6.0 software package or the Gene Cluster software program (available at <u>http://rana.lbl.gov</u>, Eisen et al., 1999) to construct heatmaps. The output of the Gene Cluster software program is a *.cdt file that can be opened with the Java Treeview program (available at: <u>http://jtreeview.sourceforge.net</u>, Saldanha, 2004) to construct heatmaps. On the heatmap white indicates no change, and red or blue indicates a peak that is present at higher or lower levels, respectively, for data of *Thellungiella* subjected to calibrated stress treatments imposed in growth cabinets relative to respective controls or field grown relative to chamber grown controls.

In summary, using a combination of PCA, HCA and ANOVA, peaks that help distinguish between metabolic phenotypes can be identified. The next step is to identify the chemical structure for these peaks in order to relate them to metabolic pathways and, in doing so, gain insights into the biochemical changes associated with response to abiotic stress.

2.6 Criteria for identification of metabolites

Mass spectral library

A mass spectral library created by Dr. Chris Wang using authentic standards has been prepared using the same methodology and instrumentation as that used for the leaf samples. The first step to identify peak components was to find the closest matching mass spectrum in the library for a given peak of interest. The next step was to compare the RI for the unknown peak to that of an associated mass spectrum. Therefore, all peaks

45

that were positively identified had an identical mass spectrum and RI to that obtained for an authentic standard present in the library.

Co-injection using authentic standards

Wherever possible, further confirmation for the identity of an unknown component was obtained by co-injection. In this approach, addition of a known amount of authentic standard to the extract helps identify whether the peak height associated with the target unknown increases as a result of the addition of the authentic standard. The first step is to estimate the relative amount of the peak so that the addition of the authentic standard to the extract does not overwhelm the initial peak amplitude. Ideally, the peak amplitude of the extract should double (at most) upon addition of the authentic standard. The response of the authentic standard was determined by injecting an equivalent of 5 ng and diluting appropriately prior to its addition to the extract. This approach is only feasible if the authentic standard is commercially available and there is some certainty as to its chemical identity.

Galactosidase/glucosidase hydrolysis of complex sugars

Peaks with mass spectra that resembled disaccharides (presence of m/z 361) were assayed to determine whether they had specific linkage bonds connecting monomers. A β -glucosidase (E.C 3.2.1.21; Sigma) purified from almonds was used to cleave β -glucose linkages from complex sugars present in the polar extracts. The protocol used to perform the β -glucosidase hydrolysis reaction was developed by Mr. David Guevara and Dr. Peter Summers in conjunction with Mr. Jeff Malins. In total, only MST 2137 classified as a C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide was demonstrated to undergo hydrolysis by β -glucosidase using this approach.

Briefly, to a 1 mL microfuge tube that contains the re-suspended polar extract in 125 μ L of de-ionized distilled water at a concentration of 7.2 mg FW equivalent mL⁻¹, 25 μ L of 0.05 Units μ L⁻¹ of the β -glucosidase enzyme was added and the reaction was allowed to proceed for 4 h in a water bath set to 37°C. To stop the reaction, 50 μ L of the extract subjected to β -glucosidase hydrolysis was transferred into a new microfuge tube on ice, then 350 μ L of cold 100% HPLC grade methanol was added and the mixture vortexed. To remove the enzyme, 407.5 μ L of de-ionized distilled water and 188 μ L of chloroform were added to this microfuge tube. This microfuge tube was vortexed and centrifuged for 1 min at 3000 *g* at room temperature. The polar (upper) phase was placed into a new microfuge tube and an aliquot of 467 μ L was transferred into a 1 mL Wheaton reaction vial. This polar fraction was dried down with 20 psi of N₂ (g) using an N-evap. The bottoms of the tubes were suspended in a water bath set at 40°C. The dried extract was then derivatized and analyzed by GC/MS using the same methods described previously.

2.7 Biological variability of metabolite profiles

The initial challenge was to determine whether reproducible metabolite profiles could be obtained using an experimental size of 5 plants per treatment. A sample size of five is a manageable size since samples can be harvested rapidly to avoid changes due to time effects. With larger sample sizes manipulations can take more time thereby risking the degradation of samples or the possible formation of artifacts. This was an important step since baseline variability in metabolite profiles needed to be established before further treatment comparisons could be made since Yukon *Thellungiella* seeds used for experiments were not from single seed descent.

Ten individual plants grown together under identical conditions in a growth chamber were analyzed. A Student's *t*-test was performed to determine whether the peak areas of the first 5 samples run were the same as the component areas from the subsequent 5 samples. Out of 275 peak components detected using AMDIS, only 10 were different at a significance of P<0.05, a number that is lower than the 14 expected incorrect null hypotheses rejections (false positives) for this dataset. This indicates that the metabolite profiles between the two groups representing 10 individual plants were similar. Furthermore, only 3 of the 10 significantly different peaks were present at levels 2-fold higher or lower between these groups. One reason to explain the variability in these 3 peaks is that these peaks represent chemicals whose abundance was low and near the detection limit for the detector. However, metabolites can be expected to exhibit variations in their levels between different plants since biochemical networks are not static due to oscillations that are part of maintaining plant cellular homeostasis (Weckwerth, 2003). These findings are in keeping with other studies that have found metabolite profiles to be highly reproducible, with a small number of metabolites that exhibit higher variations in their levels even though plants are grown under the same conditions (Fiehn et al., 2000b; Roessner et al., 2000). Based on these results, we

determined that N=5 is a suitable number of replicates to detect changes between metabolite profiles at a significance cut-off of P<0.05.

•

2.8 References

- **Clough SJ, Bent AF** (1998) Floral dip: a simplified method for *Agrobacterium*mediated transformation of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Plant J **16**: 735-743
- Eisen MB, Spellman PT, Brown PO, Botstein D (1998) Cluster analysis and display of genome-wide expression patterns. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 95: 14863-14868
- Fiehn O, Kopka J, Dormann P, Altmann T, Trethewey RN, Willmitzer L (2000a) Metabolite profiling for plant functional genomics. Nat Biotechnol 18: 1157-1161
- Fiehn O, Kopka J, Trethewey RN, Willmitzer L (2000b) Identification of uncommon plant metabolites based on calculation of elemental compositions using gas chromatography and quadrupole mass spectrometry. Anal Chem 72: 3573-3580
- Fiehn O (2002) Metabolomics the link between genotypes and phenotypes. Plant Mol Biol 48: 155-171
- Nuin PAS, Weretilnyk EA, Summers PS, Guevara DR, Golding GB (2004) GASP: GC/MS data analysis software package (Unpublished)
- Ping CL, Bockheim JG, Kimble JM, Michaelson GJ, Walker DA (1998) Characteristics of cryogenic soils along a latitudinal transect in Arctic Alaska. J Geophys Res Atmosph 103: 28917-28928
- Roessner U, Wagner C, Kopka J, Trethewey RN, Willmitzer L (2000) Simultaneous analysis of metabolites in potato tuber by gas chromatography/mass spectrometry. Plant J 23: 131-142

Saldanha AJ (2004) Java Treeview – extensible visualization of microarray data. Bioinformatics 20: 3246-3248

- Scoggan HJ (1978) Part 3 Dicotyledoneae (Saururaceae to Violaceae), In: The Flora of Canada, National Museums of Canada, Ottawa, pp. 790-791
- Sokal RR, Rohlf FJ (1995) Single-classification analysis of variance. In Biometry: The principles and practice of statistics in biological research third edition. W. H. Freeman and Company, NY, pp. 207-260
- Stein SE (1999) An integrated method for spectrum extraction and compound identification from gas chromatography/mass spectrometry. J Am Soc Mass Spec
 10: 770-781
- Sumner LW, Mendes P, Dixon RA (2003) Plant metabolomics: large-scale phytochemistry in the functional genomics era. Phytochemistry 62: 817-836
- Taylor J, King RD, Altmann T, Fiehn O (2002) Application of metabolomics to plant genotype discrimination using statistics and machine learning. Bioinformatics 18: S241-S248
- Weckwerth W (2003) Metabolomics in systems biology. Annu Rev Plant Biol **54:** 669-689

Figure 1. Natural distribution of *Thellungiella* in the Yukon Territory.

Red dot denotes locations where Yukon *Thellungiella* populations were found by our research group. The purple asterisk indicates the field site location referred to as Dillabough's grazing lease, where tissue was harvested from Yukon *Thellungiella* growing on the field in the years 2002, 2003 and 2005. The Yukon Territory map was accessed from <u>http://www.yukoncommunities.yk.ca/communities</u>. MapQuest and the MapQuest logo are registered trademarks of MapQuest, Inc. Map content © 2007 by MapQuest, Inc. and its respective copyright holder. Used with permission #KMM1957870V75342L8234KM.



Figure 2. Metabolomic analysis of Thellungiella.

A) Representative total ion chromatogram of the polar phase of leaf extracts prepared from *Thellungiella* plants subjected to various abiotic stress treatments in growth cabinets or harvested from a salt flat near Whitehorse, YT. The metabolite profiles are complex and show the presence of several hundred peaks.

B) Inset shows differences between peaks of treatment and controls; a = no change, b = higher in treated, c = lower in treated.



Figure 3. Peak deconvolution from complex GC/MS chromatograms.

A) Chromatogram of a polar extract prepared from *Thellungiella* leaves.

B) Co-eluting peaks can be separated (deconvoluted) using AMDIS to show unique mass spectral components with unique ion traces such as m/z 319 (blue) and m/z 173 (red).
Mass spectra for co-eluting peaks i & ii are given in C & D, respectively. Mass spectral information as well as RIs calculated for mass spectral components were used to align peaks from multiple chromatograms.


Figure 4. Strategy for data mining of metabolomic data to identify metabolic traits associated with abiotic stress responses.

McMaster - Biology



Chapter Three

"Physiological and metabolic responses of the halophytic plant, *Thellungiella* salsuginea, to salinity."

3.0 PREFACE: Author contributions and acknowledgements for manuscript to be submitted for publication.

<u>David Guevara:</u> Performed salinity stress experiments (water status & physiology, metabolomic analysis and statistical analysis); compiled figures; wrote first draft of the manuscript.

Dr. Sajjad Akhter: Performed seed germination and root growth experiments.

Dr. Brian McCarry: Provided suggestions for metabolomic analysis.

<u>Dr. Susan Dudley:</u> Provided CIRAS-1 equipment and suggestions for stomatal conduction and photosynthesis analysis.

Dr. Peter Summers: Critical reading and revision of the manuscript.

<u>Dr. Elizabeth Weretilnyk:</u> Supervised the project and oversaw revisions of this and all the drafts.

RUNNING HEAD: Yukon Thellungiella response to salinity

Corresponding author:	Dr. Elizabeth Weretilnyk
	Department of Biology,
	McMaster University
	1280 Main St. West, Hamilton, ON
	L8S 4K1, Canada
	Tel: (905) 525-9140, Ext 24573
	Fax: (905) 522-6066
	e-mail: weretil@mcmaster.ca

Research category

Environmental Stress and Adaptation

TITLE:

Physiological and metabolic responses of the halophytic plant, *Thellungiella* salsuginea, to salinity.

AUTHORS:

David Guevara¹, Sajjad Akhter³, Brian McCarry², Peter Summers¹, Susan Dudley¹, Elizabeth Weretilnyk^{1*}

 ¹ Departments of Biology and ²Chemistry, McMaster University, 1280 Main St. West, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, L8S 4K1
 ³ Department of Biology, University of Waterloo, 200 University Avenue West, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, N2L 3G1 FOOTNOTES:

1 This work was supported by a Discovery Grant by the Natural Sciences and

Engineering Research Council of Canada to E.A.W.

* Corresponding Author; E-mail weretil@mcmaster.ca

3.1 ABSTRACT

Thellungiella salsuginea Yukon ecotype is a subarctic crucifer native to habitats with highly saline soils and displays an exceptional ability to tolerate sea-strength salinity. Yukon Thellungiella plants were subjected to NaCl treatments to identify traits associated with salinity tolerance. Yukon Thellungiella seeds can germinate on agar media supplemented with up to 100 mM NaCl and once germinated seedlings maintain 60% the root elongation rates of seedlings grown in the absence of NaCl. Plants salinized gradually to 300 mM NaCl on soil showed rates of stomatal conductance and photosynthesis that were 48% and 64%, respectively, of rates for well-watered, unsalinized, control plants. Leaf water and solute potential measurements from Yukon Thellungiella irrigated with NaCl show that leaf solute content increases in a saltresponsive manner. Polar solutes from leaves were profiled using gas chromatography/mass spectrometry. Of the 300 mass spectral tags (MSTs) detected in metabolite profiles, 25, 27 and 48 MSTs were found to be significantly different in Yukon Thellungiella subjected to 100 mM, 300 mM or 500 mM NaCl, respectively, relative to unsalinized controls. Among the metabolites consistently more abundant in Yukon Thellungiella subjected to 300 mM NaCl and 500 mM NaCl were glucose, proline, pyroglutamic acid, sucrose, valine, and six sugar-like compounds. Our results suggest that part of the mechanism enabling Yukon Thellungiella to tolerate salinity involves the accumulation of proline and carbohydrates.

3.2 INTRODUCTION

Soil salinity negatively impacts plant growth and productivity. Unfortunately, the accumulation of salt in arable lands as a result of poor irrigation poses serious threats to agriculture (Shani et al., 2005). Therefore, it will be necessary to improve the salinity tolerance of crops in order to meet the demands for food production. The family Brassicaceae includes a number of agronomically important species that are negatively affected by high salinity (Ashraf and McNeilly, 2004), while at least thirty of its members are halophytes (Flowers et al., 1986). Among these halophytic species is *Thellungiella* salsuginea (also known as salt cress, Thellungiella halophila, hereafter referred to as *Thellungiella*) which is capable of completing its lifecycle when grown under sea-water strength salinity (Zhu 2001; Gong et al., 2005; Kant et al., 2006). Thellungiella's close similarity to Arabidopsis thaliana (>90% nucleotide identity; Zhu, 2001) permits the use of the genetic resources and tools amassed for the study of Arabidopsis to unravel the molecular mechanism(s) underlying salinity tolerance of *Thellungiella* (Bressan et al., 2001; Zhu 2001). The use of Thellungiella as a genetic model species for the study of salinity tolerance will provide invaluable information that can be used to develop crops that have a greater ability to tolerate saline soils.

Plants growing on saline soil have a reduced ability to take up water due to the high concentrations of dissolved salts in the soil water that lowers the soil water potential (ψ_W) relative to that of the roots (Rodriguez et al., 1997). Some plants are able to lower their root ψ_W by accumulating non-toxic "compatible" solutes such as amino acids,

sugars and straight chain or cyclic polyols in order to create a ψ_W gradient that allows for water uptake from saline soils (Jefferies et al., 1979). Natural accessions of *Thellungiella* native to maritime China (Shandong Province) and sub-arctic Canada (Yukon Territory) grow on highly saline soils (Inan et al., 2004; Guevara et al., 2009) and it has been shown that they accumulate solutes in response to abiotic stress (Inan et al., 2004; Wong et al., 2006). Shandong *Thellungiella* plants exposed to 250 mM NaCl for 24 h were shown to accumulate sugars such as galactinol, glucose, inositol, trehalose, and a trehalose-like sugar and the amino acids glutamate and proline (Gong et al., 2005). The observation that Shandong Thellungiella accumulates a number of carbohydrates and amino acids in response to salinity suggests that this plant uses chemically diverse compatible solutes to promote water uptake during exposure to saline conditions. This interpretation finds further support in the reports that transcripts encoding enzymes involved in the synthesis of sugars and amino acids are enriched in both the Shandong and Yukon ecotypes of Thellungiella exposed to abiotic stress (Inan et al., 2004; Taji et al., 2004; Gong et al., 2005; Wong et al., 2006).

Proline accumulation, a response associated with stress tolerance in many plant species (Delauney and Verma, 1993), has been proposed to be an important trait for salinity tolerance in Shandong *Thellungiella* (Gong et al., 2005; Inan et al., 2004; Kant et al., 2006). However, the roles organic solutes such as sugars or sugar-like metabolites play in salinity tolerance in *Thellungiella* subjected to saline environments is unknown. In this study, Yukon *Thellungiella* plants were subjected to a step-wise increase in salt to identify physiological and metabolic traits that are present during plant acclimation to NaCl. The role of proline and soluble sugars in promoting water uptake in Yukon *Thellungiella* exposed to saline environments is discussed.

3.3 MATERIALS AND METHODS

Plant growth and stress treatments

For seed germination and primary root growth studies, *Thellungiella* seeds were surface sterilized in 0.6% (v/v) sodium hypochlorite for 10 min, rinsed twice with 95% ethanol and then rinsed extensively with sterile, distilled water. Sterile seeds were sown on 0.7% (w/v) agar or media supplemented with NaCl. The seeds were stratified for 2 d in the dark at 4°C, and then the plates were transferred to 20°C under continuous light (50 μ mol m⁻²s⁻¹) for 10 d. The emergence of a 2 mm radicle from the seed coat defined the time of germination and primary root length measurements were recorded daily.

Thellungiella seeds of the Yukon ecotype were sown on a moistened soil mixture containing six parts Promix BX (Premier Horticulture, Rivière-du-Loup, PQ) and one part Turface (Profile Products LLC, Buffalo, NY) in individual 5 x 5 x 7 cm pots, as described in Wong et al. (2006). The seeds were stratified for 2 d at 4°C and then the pots were transferred to growth chambers (AC60 Enconair, Winnipeg, MB) set for a 21-h/22°C d with an irradiance of 250 μ mol m⁻²s⁻¹ and a nighttime temperature of 10°C. For salinity treatments, four-week-old plants were watered with 50 mM NaCl for 3 d and the salinity level of the irrigating solution was increased in increments of 50 mM NaCl every

3 d to final concentrations of 100mM, 300 mM, and 500 mM NaCl. Plants were watered for 3 d at their final salinity level prior to physiological analysis and harvest of salinized and respective unsalinized controls at each salt step.

Water potential measurements

Leaf water (ψ_W) and solute (ψ_S) potential measurements were performed using a HR33T psychrometer fitted with a C52 chamber (Wescor Inc., Logan, UT) using a 6 mm diameter disc excised from a mature fully expanded leaf (Wong et al., 2006). Leaf turgor (ψ_P) pressure was estimated as the difference between the water and solute potential measurements (Nonami and Boyer, 1989).

Photosynthesis measurements

A CIRAS-1 infrared gas analyzer (IRGA) (PP Systems, Haverhill, MA, USA) was used to measure rates of photosynthesis and stomatal conductance. Excised leaves were quickly placed in the leaf chamber and left to equilibrate for 60 s before taking a measurement. The light intensity was set to 300 μ mol m⁻²s⁻¹ and the CO₂ concentration was 450 ppm. A calibration curve plotting resistance as a function of leaf area was performed to determine the leaf boundary-layer resistance, as outlined in the CIRAS-1 Version 2 operator's manual to correct rates of photosynthesis and stomatal conductance for leaf area was measured using an AM100 leaf area meter (Analytical Development Company Ltd., Hoddesdon,UK).

Metabolite analysis

The procedure followed for polar metabolite extraction and analysis by gas chromatography/mass spectrometry was essentially that described by Fiehn et al. (2000). A 200-mg sample of leaf tissue to which 50 μ L of the internal standard ribitol (2 mg mL⁻¹) was added was ground and the polar metabolites were extracted using 1.4 mL of methanol, 1.4 mL of de-ionized distilled water and 0.75 mL of chloroform. The methanol/water fraction containing the polar metabolites was dried under a stream of N₂ (g), a 25 μ L aliquot of RT standard mixture containing odd-chained fatty acids (Roessner et al., 2000) was added and the mixture dried as before. To the residue 50 μ L of methoxyamine (20 mg mL⁻¹ in pyridine) was added and the contents incubated at 30°C for 90 min. Samples were derivatized with 80 μ L of N-methyl-N-trimethylsilyl trifluoroacetamide and incubated at 37°C for 30 min.

The samples were diluted 25-fold in hexane and then 1 μ L was injected using a MPS 2 autosampler (Gerstel GmbH & Co., Mülheim, Germany) into a Trace DSQ GC/MS system (Thermo Finnnigan, Austin TX) operated in the positive ion electron impact (Ef⁺) full scan mode. Chromatography was performed using a 30 m x 0.25 mm I.D. and 0.25 μ m film thickness Restek Rtx-5MS integra column (Chromatographic Specialties Inc., Brockville, ON) equipped with a 10 m guard column of the same composition. The injection temperature was 230°C, and the ion source was kept at 200°C. The carrier gas was helium at a flow rate of 1 mL min⁻¹. The temperature was initially set at 50°C for 2.5 min then 7.5°C min⁻¹ to 70°C followed by 5°C min⁻¹ to a final

temperature of 310°C where it was maintained for 6 min. Mass spectra were recorded at 3 scans s⁻¹ with a mass-to-charge (m/z) scanning range of 50 to 650.

The automated mass spectral deconvolution and identification system (AMDIS) was used to extract peak abundance and mass spectral information for each trimethylsilyl (TMS) derivative component. This information was imported into the GC/MS Data Analysis Software Package (GASP; Available at: <u>www.flintbox.com</u>, Nuin et al., 2004) where peak area was normalized to that of the internal standard ribitol, and the RI calculated according to Roessner et al. (2000). Each TMS component was labeled with a RI. The RI and mass spectrum (MS) are used to distinguish different mass spectral tags (MSTs) as defined by Kopka (2006). The putative chemical identity for MSTs was obtained by querying a library generated using authentic standards that were analyzed using the same instrument.

Data analysis

Principal component analysis (PCA) and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were performed using the STATISTICA software package Version 6 (StatSoft Inc., Tulsa, OK) with the abundance information for each MST deconvoluted using AMDIS. For PCA, the abundance data was log₁₀ transformed and then a co-variance matrix was used to calculate the principal components. The abundance information of MSTs that were significantly different between treated and control tissue at a P<0.05 as determined by ANOVA were expressed as a log₁₀ transformed fold-ratio of the means between treated and control groups. This fold-ratio was then subjected to hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA) to group metabolites according to their similarity in pattern of expression at each salt step. Euclidean distance was used to calculate the distance matrix using the Cluster program (<u>http://rana.lbl.gov</u>, Eisen et al., 1998). The complete-linkage method was used for data clustering and heatmaps were constructed using the JavaTreeview program (Saldanha, 2004).

3.4 RESULTS

Thellungiella growth on NaCl

The germination efficiency of Yukon *Thellungiella* seeds on agar media was not affected by exposure to 50 or 100 mM NaCl. However, Figure 1 shows that seedlings exposed to the agar medium containing 50 mM or 100 mM NaCl resulted in a reduced root growth relative to unstressed controls. After 10 d, roots of seedlings on 50 mM and 100 mM NaCl were 17% and 26% shorter, respectively, than roots of unsalinized controls. The germination efficiency of seeds on media supplemented with 150 mM NaCl was reduced to 80% and was only 30% when seeds were exposed to 200 mM NaCl (data not shown).

Yukon *Thellungiella* plants were grown on soil and watered with a solution containing increasing concentrations of NaCl. Figure 2A shows representative Yukon *Thellungiella* plants watered with a solution lacking added NaCl and plants watered with 100 and 300 mM NaCl. All plants eventually flowered and set seed. *Thellungiella* plants watered with a final concentration of 100 mM NaCl showed rates of stomatal conductance and photosynthesis that were not significantly different from rates observed for unsalinized control plants (Fig. 2B). However, *Thellungiella* plants salinized to 200 mM NaCl or 300 mM NaCl showed 60% and 48% the rates of stomatal conductance observed in unsalinized controls, respectively. Plants exposed to 300 mM showed 64% of the rates of photosynthesis recorded for the corresponding controls (Fig. 2B).

Thellungiella plants accumulate solutes in response to NaCl

Unstressed Yukon *Thellungiella* plants have a leaf ψ_W of – 0.9 MPa and leaf ψ_W decreases with exposure to successively higher concentrations of NaCl (Fig. 3). Similarly, the leaf ψ_S of plants decreases in a salt-responsive manner. Leaf ψ_S decreased by 36% upon exposure to 100 mM NaCl, and up to a 300% decrease in leaf ψ_S was observed when plants were subjected to 500 mM NaCl compared to an unsalinized plant (Fig. 3). However, even when leaf ψ_S values were found to be as low as – 4.0 MPa the leaves showed a positive ψ_P . Therefore, the drop in leaf ψ_S shows that solute content of *Thellungiella* leaves increased as a function of exposure to higher concentrations of NaCl.

Metabolite profiling of Yukon Thellungiella subjected to salt treatments

The polar organic solutes contributing to the drop in leaf ψ_s were profiled by GC/MS analysis of leaves from plants exposed to 100 mM NaCl ("low"salt), 300 mM

NaCl ("medium"salt) or 500 mM NaCl ("high"salt). All metabolite profiling included comparisons made with control, unsalinized plants of the same age grown under identical conditions. The metabolite profiles derived using GC/MS were complex and were composed of several hundred TMS derivatives including amino acids, amines, organic acids, sugars, and polyols.

Principal component analysis (PCA) was used to investigate differences between the metabolite profiles of Yukon Thellungiella plants irrigated with salt and their respective controls. PCA is an unsupervised multivariate data analysis approach used to determine whether groups exist in metabolomic data through visual interpretation (Fiehn, 2002). PCA can also be used to calculate the relative contribution of an individual metabolite towards the observed grouping pattern through the examination of the principal component (PC) loadings. We performed PCA using the complete data comprised of 30 metabolite profiles representing 300 MSTs. Of the total metabolite variance detected, 63% can be accounted for by the first three PCs (PC1 = 41\%, PC2= 12%, PC3= 9%). Figure 4A shows PC1 and PC2 plotted against each other giving rise to separate groups for the metabolite profiles of polar extracts prepared from leaves of Yukon Thellungiella plants watered with NaCl or not. Four main groups are shown by the treatments and these distinguish three groups representing treatments for metabolite profiles of plants exposed to 100 mM, 300 mM or 500 mM NaCl and the treatment for all of the controls grouped as a fourth group (Fig. 4A). PC loading analysis revealed that the variables citrate, galactose, glucose, malate, proline, and sucrose all contribute to the observed grouping (Fig 4B).

An ANOVA performed using the same data shows 58 MSTs to differ significantly with respect to relative abundance (P<0.05) among the different treatments. PCA was performed using the abundance of these MSTs only. Of the total metabolite variance detected, 90% can be accounted for by the first three PCs (PC1 = 58%, PC2= 17%, PC3= 15%). The main groups observed were comparable to those observed using the entire data (Fig. S1A). The variables galactose, glucose, malate, proline, and sucrose were also found to exert the greatest influence in the observed grouping patterns (Fig. S1B). To determine the relative influence of each of these variables on the overall grouping pattern observed for all 58 MSTs, MST relative abundance for galactose, glucose, malate, proline or sucrose were removed from the data in turn and PCA analysis was carried out on the remaining data representing the remaining 57 MSTs. It was found that only malate (Fig. S2E) and proline (Fig. S2F) led to a change in the grouping pattern observed for the analysis performed using the abundance of the 58 statistically significant MSTs. By contrast, the removal of glucose (Fig. S2B), galactose (Fig. S2C), or sucrose (Fig S2D) from the dataset did not change the overall grouping pattern. This provides evidence for malate and proline as playing prominent roles in generating the grouping patterns observed in the PC1 and PC2 biplots. Therefore, the formation of distinct groups from by distinct treatments provides evidence that differences among metabolite abundance and/or composition distinguishes samples prepared from Yukon Thellungiella subjected to saline conditions compared to unsalinized controls.

The mean abundance for each of the 58 statistically different MST was expressed as a ratio between salt-treated and unsalinized control, the ratio was log₁₀ transformed,

then subjected to hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA) (Fig. 5). Of these MSTs, 23 were identified by comparison of their RI and MS to those of authentic standards analyzed using the same GC/MS instrument while 15 MSTs could only be categorized according to their chemical class based on their MS pattern (i.e., sugar, sugar alcohol, phosphorylated sugar). A total of 20 MSTs could not be classified to their chemical class and are labeled as "unknown". A total of 25, 27 and 48 MSTs were found to be significantly different in Yukon Thellungiella subjected to 100 mM, 300 mM or 500 mM NaCl, respectively, relative to unsalinized controls (Fig. 5). Only 5 of the 25 MSTs (20%) were present at higher levels in Yukon Thellungiella plants irrigated with 100mM NaCl compared to unsalinized controls and they were asparagine, fumaric acid, proline, pyroglutamate and serine (Fig. 5). By contrast, for plants salinized to 300 mM NaCl or 500 mM NaCl almost 80% of the MSTs showing statistically significant differences were ones that underwent increases in abundance relative to controls (Fig. 5). Among the metabolites consistently more abundant in *Thellungiella* subjected to 300 mM NaCl and 500 mM NaCl were glucose, proline, pyroglutamic acid, sucrose, valine, six sugar-like compounds and six MSTs labeled as unknowns (Fig. 5). Some MSTs did not show a consistent pattern of increase with salt exposure. For example, glucose, sucrose, and several other sugar-like MSTs were lower in leaves of Thellungiella exposed to 100 mM NaCl as compared to control plants of the same age. Only proline was found to consistently increase in abundance with successively higher exposure of plants to saline conditions (Fig. 5, 6). MSTs that underwent only an increase in abundance in leaves of Thellungiella subjected to 500 mM NaCl were ascorbic acid, galactose, glutamine, quinic

acid, and three sugar-like compounds. Figure 5 shows that the organic acids ascorbate, citramalate, fumarate and quinate are more abundant in samples from salt-stressed plants while citrate, malate, maleate, succinate and threonate are present in lower abundance.

3.5 DISCUSSION

The salt level of soils in Yukon Thellungiella's natural habitat is estimated to be roughly equivalent to 160 mM NaCl (Guevara et al., 2009). Under these conditions, our in vitro germination trial suggests that Yukon Thellungiella seeds should germinate at about 80% efficiency if there is little to no dilution of salts by spring run-off or precipitation. Neither the Shandong nor Yukon ecotypes show any decreased capacity to germinate when media is not supplemented by NaCl so there is no apparent need for salt to promote germination (Inan et al., 2004). However, Inan et al (2004) show that Shandong *Thellungiella* seeds fail to germinate on any MS agar media supplemented with NaCl as low as 100 mM. This response has been observed in other halophytes presumably as a means to prevent NaCl induced injury to the seedling (Flowers et al., 1986). Figure 1 shows that root growth of Yukon *Thellungiella* seedlings on agar containing NaCl is slower than for seedlings without added salt. However, at 100 mM the rate of root elongation after 6 d exposure to salt is 1.4 mm d^{-1} which is 60% of the rate determined for plants on NaCl-free media. This observation suggests that Yukon Thellungiella can germinate and grow, albeit more slowly than controls, under the levels of NaCl that approximate those found at Yukon field sites.

Stomatal conductance of Yukon Thellungiella decreases in response to salinity but rates of photosynthesis were not reduced to the same extent (Fig. 2B). Shandong Thellungiella undergoes a decrease in stomatal transpiration during exposure to saline conditions (Volkov et al., 2003; Inan et al., 2004). This decrease in stomatal transpiration, however, was not specific to Na⁺, but also occurred during treatments with elevated K⁺ concentrations (Volkov et al., 2003). Flowers et al. (1986) states that transpiration rates expressed on the basis of fresh weight generally show a decline with salt exposure but cautions that interpretation of these data may be confounded by other factors including the basis used for their expression. Our data, corrected for leaf area, suggests that Na⁺ ion influx into the shoot via the transpiration stream is ongoing in Thellungiella but decreased stomatal conductance should reduce the salt accumulated in the mature, fully expanded leaves of the salinized plants used for our measurements. Control of transpiration and mechanisms impacting water uptake by Thellungiella requires further work to delineate the mechanism(s) underlying salt-induced stomatal closure and to determine its significance for salinity tolerance in this plant.

Yukon *Thellungiella* shows a decrease in leaf ψ_S with increasing external salt showing that this plant accumulates solutes in a salt-responsive manner (Fig. 3). The estimated leaf ψ_p remains positive, an outcome consistent with a plant able to actively accumulate solutes in order to take up water from potting media that is undergoing increasing salinization. Shandong *Thellungiella* (Inan et al., 2004) plants also undergo a decrease in leaf ψ_S and both accessions show decreases to as low as -4.0 MPa when exposed to 500 m M NaCl. Thus, a general mechanism for the halophile *Thellungiella* appears to be an ability to accumulate solutes in order to establish a ψ_W gradient to promote water uptake under saline conditions (Inan et al., 2004).

We compared leaf metabolite profiles of Yukon Thellungiella plants subjected to saline conditions in order to identify organic solutes undergoing changes in abundance with increasing salt exposure. The 58 statistically significant changes among MSTs led to distinct grouping of treatments representing Yukon *Thellungiella* plants exposed to different NaCl concentrations (Fig. S1A). Fewer metabolites underwent an increase in abundance in leaves of Yukon Thellungiella plants exposed to 100 mM NaCl (Fig. 5). Among the metabolites showing a higher content in Yukon *Thellungiella* irrigated with 100 mM NaCl was proline and pyroglutamate (Fig. 5). The increase in proline content for this accession is salt-responsive, a finding that is consistent with that reported for Shandong Thellungiella (Inan et al., 2004; Gong et al., 2005; Kant et al., 2006). Positively correlated changes among MST relative abundance with increasing salt are noteworthy as so few MSTs showed this pattern. For example, only proline was found to undergo an increased abundance that correlated positively with increasing salinity (Fig. 5 and 6). Proline serves diverse roles in plant stress tolerance including osmotic adjustment, a N-storage molecule, scavenging ROS, maintaining NADP⁺/NADPH ratios during stress, all of which can contribute towards important strategies for abiotic stress tolerance (For a review, see Kishor et al., 2005).

Although proline accumulated in a manner that was positively correlated with increasing salinity at all salt-levels tested, proportionately more compounds were present at higher levels in Yukon *Thellungiella* salinized to 300 mM or 500 mM compared with

100 mM NaCl treated plants, relative to their respective, unsalinized controls. For example, we found 13 MSTs (5 unknown, 7 sugars, and valine) to be present at lower abundance in leaves of Yukon Thellungiella plants watered with 100 mM NaCl relative to controls and the converse to be true for plants stressed to 500 mM NaCl (Fig. 5). For a halophyte like *Thellungiella*, lowering of ψ_W at a salt level of 100 mM NaCl or even higher could be accomplished simply by accumulating inorganic solutes such as Na⁺ and Cl⁻. In support of this suggestion, Na⁺ and Cl⁻ concentrations can be accumulated to ca 100 mM in the cytoplasm of cells adapted to 428 mM NaCl (Binzel et al., 1988). For example, the halophytic plant Limonium latifolium accumulates proline, sucrose, cyclitols and inorganic ions in response to salinity (Gagneul et al., 2007). The contribution of organic solutes towards ψ_S was estimated to be only about 25% while inorganic ions were a major contributor, accounting for 75% towards ψ_{s} (Gagneul et al., 2007). The accumulation of readily available inorganic ions to lower the ψ_W during exposure to low concentrations of salt may provide an energetically less expensive means to promote water uptake (Gagneul et al., 2007).

The redirection of carbon towards accumulated sugars represents a redirection of photosynthate away from growth and maintenance metabolism. Nonetheless, significant increases in the total soluble sugars have been reported for Shandong *Thellungiella* plants subjected to saline conditions compared to unsalinized controls (Inan et al., 2004). We also observed an accumulation of sugars and sugar-like MSTs when Yukon *Thellungiella* plants were exposure to 300 or 500 mM NaCl (Fig. 5). We also found that content of several organic acids were lower in Yukon *Thellungiella* exposed to saline conditions

relative to the unsalinized control plants. Decreases in citrate, malate, and succinate content were observed in leaves of plants subjected to 300 or 500 mM NaCl treatments (Fig. 5). Sanchez et al. (2008b) propose that organic acids contribute to salt tolerance by restoring ion balance under stress and by contributing to nitrogen assimilation for amino acids and the synthesis of compatible solutes. All of these roles could redirect organic acids and reduce their total content in leaves and conceivably other organs. The decreases that we find for the leaf content of several organic acids is consistent with the roles proposed by Sanchez et al (2008b) in directing carbon into amino acids and sugars for Yukon Thellungiella exposed to saline conditions. Some exceptions to the observed depletion of organic acids in plants exposed to saline conditions included quinic acid and ascorbic acid, both of which were found to be more abundant in Yukon Thellungiella exposed to 500 mM NaCl relative to unsalinized controls (Fig. 5). These metabolites may be involved in the protection against oxidative damage that can occur in plants exposed to high salinity, and may not directly contribute towards the synthesis of organic solutes (Apel and Hirt, 2004). For example, quinic acid is an important precursor for the synthesis of antioxidants (Niggeweg et al., 2004) that are implicated in protection against oxidative stress (Apel and Hirt, 2004) and ascorbic acid is capable of scavenging reactive oxygen species (Conklin et al., 1996; Apel and Hirt, 2004).

3.6 CONCLUSION

The ability of *Thellungiella* to thrive under saline soils is likely due, in part, to its ability to osmotically adjust (Inan et al., 2004). In this study, we found that Yukon *Thellungiella* plants accumulate proline and sugars in response to salinity. The higher of amino acid and sugar content in Yukon *Thellungiella* subjected to saline conditions relative to unsalinized controls was accompanied by lower levels of organic acids. This suggests that organic acids provide a potential carbon source to support the increased synthesis of compatible organic solutes that are accumulated in Yukon *Thellungiella* in response to salinity. For *Thellungiella*, proline has been proposed to be a major compatible solute when plants are salt-stressed (Inan et al., 2004). However, the salinity-induced increases in the abundance of sugars such as glucose and sucrose in Yukon *Thellungiella* strongly suggests that in addition to proline, carbohydrates also play a prominent role in lowering ψ_S to promote water uptake from sea-level salinity conditions. The role these metabolites play for *Thellungiella* adaptation to the highly saline soils typically found in its natural habitat in the Yukon requires further investigation.

3.7 REFERENCES

- **Apel K, Hirt H** (2004) Reactive oxygen species: metabolism, oxidative stress, and signal transduction. Annu Rev Plant Biol **55:** 373-399
- Ashraf M, McNeilly T (2004) Salinity tolerance in Brassica oilseeds. Crit Rev Plant Sci23: 157-174
- Binzel ML, Hess FD, Bressan RA, Hasegawa PM (1988) Intracellular compartmentation of ions in salt adapted tobacco cells. Plant Physiol 86: 607-614
- Conklin PL, Williams EH, Last RL (1996) Environmental stress sensitivity of an ascorbic acid-deficient *Arabidopsis* mutant. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 93: 9970-9974
- Delauney A, Verma D (1993) Proline biosynthesis and osmoregulation in plants. Plant J4: 215-223
- Eisen MB, Spellman PT, Brown PO, Botstein D (1998) Cluster analysis and display of genome-wide expression patterns. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 95: 14863-14868

Fiehn O, Kopka J, Trethewey RN, Willmitzer L (2000) Identification of uncommon plant metabolites based on calculation of elemental compositions using gas chromatography and quadrupole mass spectrometry. Anal Chem **72:** 3573-3580

Fiehn O (2002) Metabolomics – the link between genotypes and phenotypes. Plant Mol Biol 48: 155-171

Flowers T, Hajibagheri M, Clipson N (1986) Halophytes. Quart Rev Biol 61: 313-337

Gagneul D, Ainouche A, Duhaze C, Lugan R, Larher F, Bouchereau A (2007) A

reassessment of the function of the so-called compatible solutes in the halophytic Plumbaginaceae *Limonium latifolium*. Plant Physiol **144**: 1598-1611

Guevara D, Dedrick J, Wong A, Li Y, Labbe A, Ping L, Wang Y, Golding GB, Gray G, McCarry BE, Summers PS, Griffith M, Moffatt BA, Weretilnyk EA

(2009) Transcriptomic and metabolomic analysis of Yukon *Thellungiella* plants growing under cabinet and field conditions shows overlapping and distinct responses to environmental conditions

Gong QQ, Li PH, Ma SS, Rupassara SI, Bohnert HJ (2005) Salinity stress adaptation competence in the extremophile *Thellungiella halophila* in comparison with its relative *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Plant J **44**: 826-839

Inan G, Zhang Q, Li PH, Wang ZL, Cao ZY, Zhang H, Zhang CQ, Quist TM,
Goodwin SM, Zhu JH, Shi HH, Damsz B, Charbaji T, Gong QQ, Ma SS,
Fredricksen M, Galbraith DW, Jenks MA, Rhodes D, Hasegawa PM,
Bohnert HJ, Joly RJ, Bressan RA, Zhu J-K (2004) Salt cress. A halophyte and
cryophyte *Arabidopsis* relative model system and its applicability to molecular
genetic analyses of growth and development of extremophiles. Plant Physiol 135:
1718-1737

Kant S, Kant P, Raveh E, Barak S (2006) Evidence that differential gene expression between the halophyte, *Thellungiella halophila*, and *Arabidopsis thaliana* is responsible for higher levels of the compatible osmolyte proline and tight control of Na+ uptake in T-halophila. Plant Cell Environ 29: 1220-1234

Kishor PBK, Sangam S, Amrutha RN, Sri Laxmi P, Naidu KR, Rao KRSS, Rao S,
Reddy KJ, Theriappan P, Sreenivasulu N (2005) Regulation of proline
biosynthesis, degradation, uptake and transport in higher plants: Its implications
in plant growth and abiotic stress tolerance. Curr Sci 88: 424-438

- Kopka J (2006) Current challenges and development in GC/MS based metabolite profiling technology. J Biotech 124: 312-322
- Munns R (2005) Genes and salt tolerance: bringing them together. New Phytol 167: 645-663
- Niggeweg R, Michael AJ, Martin C (2004) Engineering plants with increased levels of the antioxidant chlorogenic acid. Nat Biotech 22: 746-754
- Nuin P, Weretilnyk EA, Summers PS, Guevara DR, Golding GB (2005) GASP: GC/MS Analysis Software Package

(http://www.flintbox.com/technology.asp?page=685).

- Rizhsky L, Liang H, Shuman J, Shulaev V, Davletova S, Mittler R (2004) When defense pathways collide. The response of *Arabidopsis* to a combination of drought and heat stress. Plant Physiol **134**: 1683-1696
- Rodriguez HG, Roberts JKM, Jordan WR, Drew MC (1997) Growth, water relations, and accumulation of organic and inorganic solutes in roots of maize seedlings during salt stress. Plant Physiol **113**: 881-893
- Roessner U, Wagner C, Kopka J, Trethewey RN, Willmitzer L (2000) Simultaneous analysis of metabolites in potato tuber by gas chromatography/mass spectrometry. Plant J 23: 131-142

Saldanha AJ (2004) Java Treeview--extensible visualization of microarray data.

Bioinformatics **20:** 3246-3248

- Sanchez DH, Lippold F, Redestig H, Hannah MA, Erban A, Kramer U, Kopka J, Udvardi MK (2008a) Integrative functional genomics of salt acclimation in the model legume *Lotus japonicus*. Plant J 53: 973-987
- Sanchez DH, Siahpoosh MR, Roessner U, Udvardi M, Kopka J (2008b) Plant metabolomics reveals conserved and divergent metabolic responses to salinity. Physiol Plant 132: 209-219
- Shani U, Ben-Gal A, Dudley LM (2005) Environmental implications of adopting a dominant factor approach to salinity management. J Environ Qual 34: 1455-1460
- Taji T, Seki M, Satou M, Sakurai T, Kobayashi M, Ishiyama K, Narusaka Y, Narusaka M, Zhu JK, Shinozaki K (2004) Comparative genomics in salt tolerance between Arabidopsis and Arabidopsis-related halophyte salt cress using Arabidopsis microarray. Plant Physiol 135: 1697-1709
- Volkov V, Wang B, Dominy PJ, Fricke W, Amtmann A (2003) Thellungiella halophila, a salt-tolerant relative of Arabidopsis thaliana, possesses effective mechanisms to discriminate between potassium and sodium. Plant Cell Environ 27: 1-14
- Volkov V, Amtmann A (2006) *Thellungiella halophila*, a salt-tolerant relative of *Arabidopsis thaliana* has specific root ion-channel features supporting K⁺/Na⁺ homeostasis under salinity stress. Plant J **48**: 342-353

Wong CE, Li Y, Labbe A, Guevara D, Nuin P, Whitty B, Diaz C, Golding GB, Gray GR, Weretilnyk EA, Griffith M, Moffatt BA (2006) Transcriptional profiling implicates novel interactions between abiotic stress and hormonal responses in *Thellungiella*, a close relative of *Arabidopsis*. Plant Physiol 140: 1437-1450
Yancey PH (2005) Organic osmolytes as compatible, metabolic and counteracting cytoprotectants in high osmolarity and other stresses. J Exp Biol 208: 2819-2830

Zhu JK (2001) Plant salt tolerance. Trends Plant Sci 6: 66-71

Figure 1. Effect of salinization on the root growth of *Thellungiella* seedlings.

Data represent the mean of ten seedlings at each time point for three independent

experiments \pm SEM.



Figure 2. Performance of *Thellungiella* plants subjected to salt treatments.

A) *Thellungiella* plants following treatment with 0 mM, 100mM or 300mM NaCl. The photograph was taken on the third day of exposure to NaCl treatment by Dr. Peter Summers. Bar = 1cm.

B) Stomatal conductance and photosynthetic rates of Yukon *Thellungiella* exposed to NaCl expressed as the % of rates for unsalinized, control plants at each salt step. Values are the mean determination of rates for mature fully expanded leaves from six individual plants \pm SEM. Stomatal conductance for control plants were 84 \pm 6.5, 102 \pm 3.5, and 89 \pm 5.4 mmol m⁻² s⁻¹ at 100, 200, or 300 mM NaCl treatments, respectively. Photosynthetic rates for control plants were 7.1 \pm 0.5, 6.9 \pm 0.8, and 3.6 \pm 1.6 μ mol m⁻² s⁻¹ at 100, 200, or 300 mM NaCl treatments (*) denotes that values of salt-treated plants are significantly different from controls at P<0.05; Student's *t* test.





Figure 3. Water relations of Yukon Thellungiella exposed to NaCl.

Plants were salinized step-wise by increasing the concentration of NaCl in water by 50 mM increments. Leaf ψ_W and ψ_S potential measurements were taken after 3 d of acclimation to each salt concentration. The ψ_P was estimated as the difference between ψ_W and ψ_S . Values are means of six individual plants ± SEM from two different experiments.


Figure 4. PCA of MST data for Yukon *Thellungiella* plants show grouping as a function of salt exposure.

A) The PC1 and PC2 were plotted against each other giving rise to distinct groups. Each letter represents the entire complement of 300 MSTs present in leaves from an individual Yukon *Thellungiella* plant that either received no salt (Controls for each salt-step: "100mM NaCl"=CL; "300mM NaCl"=CM; "500mM NaCl"=CH) or varying concentrations of salt: 100 mM=L, 300 mM=M and 500 mM=H. The metabolite profiles from five individual plants were determined at each salt step as well as for five corresponding unsalinized control plants.

B) PC loading plot for PC1 and PC2. MSTs with highest absolute PC loadings were identified and are labeled: Cit, citrate, Gal, galactose, Glc, glucose, Mal, malate, Pro, proline, Suc, sucrose.



Figure 5. Hierarchical cluster analysis of salt-responsive MSTs.

Heat map showing MSTs found to be statistically significantly different in abundance in leaves of Yukon *Thellungiella* subjected to 100 mM, 300 mM or 500 mM NaCl. White indicates no difference in MST ratio between treatment and respective control while red or blue indicates that MST abundance was higher (positive number) or lower (negative number), respectively, relative to control. Data shown is reported as relative to MST content in their respective controls that received no NaCl. Wherever possible, each MST was labeled with the RI number. Chemical structure of putative matches were made by comparing MS patterns to those of authentic standards analyzed using the same instrument. Proline and glucose were identified by co-injection. Data are based on MST levels from five individual plants at each salt treatment as well as respective unsalinized controls.

PhD Thesis – David Guevara

McMaster - Biology

+ 58

1

- 24





Figure 6. Leaf proline content of Yukon *Thellungiella* subjected to NaCl treatments and their respective, unsalinized control plants.

The absolute concentration of leaf proline levels were determined by using an eight-point calibration standard curve prepared from known quantities of proline (156 pg μ L⁻¹ to 20 ng μ L⁻¹, correlation coefficient, R²=0.994). Numbers on the x-axis denote NaCl concentration (mM). Open bars, unsalinized controls; solid bars, salinized plants. Values are means ± SE from five individual plants.



Figure S1. PCA of the 58 statistically significant MSTs.

A) The PC1 and PC2 were plotted against each other giving rise to distinct groups. Each letter represents the 58 MSTs present in leaves from an individual Yukon *Thellungiella* plant that either received no salt (Controls for each salt-step: "100mM NaCl"=CL; "300mM NaCl"=CM; "500mM NaCl"=CH) or varying concentrations of salt: 100 mM=L, 300 mM=M and 500 mM=H. The metabolite profiles from five individual plants were determined at each salt step as well as for five corresponding unsalinized control plants.

B) PC loading plot for PC1 and PC2. MSTs with highest absolute PC loadings were identified and are labeled: Cit, citrate, Gal, galactose, Glc, glucose, Mal, malate, Pro, proline, Suc, sucrose.



Figure S2. Analysis of the contribution of MSTs with highest absolute PC loadingson metabolite grouping patterns observed using 58 statistically significant MSTs.A) The PC1 and PC2 were plotted against each other giving rise to distinct groups using

MST abundance for the 58 statistically significant MSTs. Glucose (B), Galactose (C), Sucrose (D), Malate (E) and Proline (F) were individually removed from the dataset and performed PCA on the remaining 57 MSTs to determine the effect of removal on the original grouping pattern.



Chapter Four

"Transcriptomic and metabolomic analysis of Yukon *Thellungiella* plants growing under cabinet and field conditions shows overlapping and distinct responses to environmental conditions"

4.0 PREFACE: Author contributions and acknowledgements for manuscript to submitted for publication.

<u>David Guevara:</u> Performed metabolomic analysis of Yukon *Thellungiella* subjected to cold, drought and salinity treatments in growth cabinets and of plants harvested in 2003 from the Yukon; performed all statistical analysis of metabolome data and meta-analysis of transcriptome data from "growth chamber" and "field" microarray experiments; compiled figures 3 to 6 and supplemental tables; wrote the first draft of the manuscript. <u>Jeff Dedrick:</u> Compiled Figure 2; Performed metabolomic analysis of Yukon *Thellungiella* harvested from the Yukon in 2005.

<u>Dr. Annie Wong & Yong Li:</u> Performed microarray experiments for Yukon *Thellungiella* harvested from field sites in the Yukon in 2003 & 2005.

Dr. Aurelie Labbe: Performed statistical analysis of microarray experiments.

Dr. Chien-Lu Ping: Performed Yukon soil analysis

Dr. Chris Wang: Created the library of TMS-metabolite derivatives database

<u>Dr. Brian Golding</u>: Designed platform for storage and retrieval of microarray experiments.

Dr. Brian McCarry: Provided suggestions for metabolomic analysis.

Dr. Peter Summers: Critical reading and revision of the manuscript.

Dr. Barbara Moffatt: Supervised microarray experiments.

<u>Dr. Elizabeth Weretilnyk:</u> Supervised the project, compiled Figure 1, wrote final version of the discussion, and oversaw the revisions of the first draft and all subsequent drafts.

RUNNING HEAD: Transcriptome and metabolite analysis of Yukon Thellungiella

Corresponding author:	Dr. Elizabeth Weretilnyk
	Department of Biology,
	McMaster University
	1280 Main St. West, Hamilton, ON
	L8S 4K1, Canada
	Tel: (905) 525-9140, Ext 24573
	Fax: (905) 522-6066
	e-mail: weretil@mcmaster.ca

TITLE:

Transcriptomic and metabolomic analysis of Yukon *Thellungiella* plants growing under cabinet and field conditions shows overlapping and distinct responses to environmental conditions

AUTHORS:

David R. Guevara, Jeff Dedrick, Chui E. Wong², Yong Li, Aurelie Labbe³, Chien-Lu Ping, Yanxiang Wang, G. Brian Golding, Brian E. McCarry, Peter S. Summers, Barbara A. Moffatt, Elizabeth A. Weretilnyk^{*}

Departments of Biology (D.R.G., J.D., Y.W., G.B.G., P.S.S., E.A.W.) and Chemistry (B.E.M.), McMaster University, 1280 Main St. West, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, L8S 4K1

Department of Biology, University of Waterloo, 200 University Ave. West, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, N2L 3G1 (C.E.W., Y.L., B.A.M.)

Palmer Research, Agricultural and Forestry Research Station, University of Alaska-Fairbanks, 533 East Fireweed Ave., Palmer, Alaska, USA, 99645 (C.P.)

FOOTNOTES:

¹ This work was supported by a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) Discovery Grant to EAW; AAFC-NSERC-CRD (Performance Plants Inc.) grant to BAM, EAW, INAC Northern Scientific Training Program grants to DRG, JD and the Ontario Research Development Challenge Fund.

² Present address: Melbourne School of Land and Environment, University of Melbourne Parkville, Victoria 3010, Australia

³ Present address: Département de mathématiques et de statistique, Pavillon Alexandre-Vachon Université Laval, Québec, Canada, G1K 7P4

* Corresponding Author; E-mail weretil@mcmaster.ca

The author responsible for distribution of materials integral to the findings presented in this article in accordance with the policy described in the Instructions for Authors (<u>www.plantphysiol.org</u>) is: Elizabeth Weretilnyk (weretil@mcmaster.ca).

4.1 ABSTRACT:

Thellungiella salsuginea has a high natural tolerance to abiotic stresses including salt, cold and water deficits. Microarray studies have shown that this extremophile plant when grown under controlled environment conditions undergoes many stress-responsive changes in transcript abundance. However, cabinet-grown plants have prominent rosettes with few cauline leaves while the opposite is true for plants found in the field. To determine whether stress-responsive changes in cabinet-grown plants are also found in field plants we analyzed leaf transcript and metabolite profiles of *Thellungiella* found at its native Yukon habitat during two years with contrasting meteorological conditions. Of 673 genes showing differential expression between field and chamber-grown plants, 27% are categorized as stress-associated by GO Biological Process with several more highly expressed in the year with below average precipitation. We found 63 differentially expressed genes in field-grown plants whose patterns of expression were different in plants stressed in growth cabinets. In general, the relative abundance of metabolites in leaves of field plants was lower than plants in chambers. The relative abundance of serine, proline, galactinol and raffinose showed stress-responsive increases in cabinetgrown material but they were found to be of low relative abundance in leaves of field plants. In contrast, several carbohydrates including sucrose, glucose, galactose and fructose made a greater relative contribution to the field plant profiles than to plants in growth cabinets. Comparisons between plants responding to stress in cabinets and the field implicates the involvement of many common products but site-specific differences

may offer important targets for improving crops that must respond appropriately to multiple, concurrent stresses.

4.2 INTRODUCTION

Abiotic stresses such as drought, extreme temperatures, and high salinity decrease plant growth and productivity and are responsible for major losses in crop yield (Boyer, 1982). Thellungiella salsuginea (also known as salt-lick mustard, saltwater cress, Thellungiella halophila, herein referred to as Thellungiella) is an emerging physiological and genetic model for the study of abiotic stress tolerance in plants. An important factor underlying this development is *Thellungiella*'s significant natural ability to tolerate adverse environmental conditions including, water deficits, freezing temperatures, and high salinity (Inan et al., 2004; Taji et al., 2004; Wong et al., 2005; 2006; Griffith et al., 2007). Of additional importance is the close relationship between Thellungiella and Arabidopsis (Al-Shehbaz et al., 2006). This relatedness between the two species allows one to apply the knowledge and genetic tools already developed for the study of Arabidopsis towards increasing our understanding of molecular mechanisms underlying stress tolerance in Thellungiella (Bressan et al., 2001). Thellungiella shares some advantageous properties with Arabidopsis including a comparatively small genome size (approximately two-fold the genome size of Arabidopsis), small stature, prolific seed production and a relatively short life cycle of six to eight weeks (Inan et al., 2004). In many respects, Thellungiella is ideally suited to studies designed to identify traits underlying stress tolerance of plants with an objective to improving the productivity of stress-sensitive crops.

Transcript profiling was used to study stress-induced changes in gene expression for *Thellungiella* genotypes originating in Shandong Province, China and Yukon Territory, Canada. The gene expression pattern shown by Shandong *Thellungiella* subjected to salinity stress treatments in controlled environments has been studied using *Arabidopsis* microarray slides (Inan et al., 2004; Taji et al., 2004; Gong et al., 2005). Microarrays showed six genes undergoing salt-responsive changes in expression in Shandong *Thellungiella* compared to 40 genes in *Arabidopsis* plants exposed to the same salt stress conditions (Taji et al., 2004). Interestingly, among the genes identified as stress-responsive in *Arabidopsis* were genes associated with higher constitutive expression in unstressed *Thellungiella* (Taji et al., 2004). Together these observations suggest that many genes associated with salinity are constitutively expressed in *Thellungiella* producing a plant with a heightened innate resilience towards stress.

Gene expression patterns following response to cold, drought or salinity in Yukon *Thellungiella* was assessed using a microarray derived from cDNA libraries enriched for genes associated with stress (Wong et al., 2006). Exposure to salt stress resulted in the differential expression of 22 genes, a number that is low compared to cold stress (76 genes) or drought stress (101 genes). However, little overlap was found among the genes whose expression changed with exposure to cold, drought or salinity leading to the conclusion that *Thellungiella* has rather specific responses to these stresses (Wong et al., 2006).

Metabolite profiling has been used to describe plant phenotype as a function of genotype or genotype and environment interaction (Messerli et al., 2007; Li et al., 2008).

Since metabolite profiling provides an overview of the complement of metabolites present in an organism at a set time-point, this data complements transcript profiling and offers a means to link the potential for a plant to express a stress-specific response to an actual metabolic phenotype. In this way, comparisons made between unstressed plants and plants experiencing sub-optimal environmental conditions can provide valuable insights into traits conferring tolerance (Rizhsky et al., 2004). One such study combines transcript and metabolite profiling methodologies to monitor Shandong *Thellungiella*'s response to salinity under controlled environmental conditions (Gong et al., 2005). Shandong *Thellungiella* was shown to have higher levels of proline, and sugar alcohols, in plants subjected to salinity stress relative to unsalinized controls and this outcome was associated with the enhanced expression of transcripts encoding enzymes involved in their synthesis (Gong et al., 2005).

The study of plant responses to stress frequently uses plants grown under controlled environments in cabinets and the application of treatments intended to simulate adverse field conditions. This approach has been used successfully in identifying stress responses and genes whose products are involved in stress tolerance (for a review see Bartels and Sunkar, 2005). However, it is impossible to faithfully reproduce the complexities of a natural environment in a growth cabinet. Several studies using microarrays have highlighted this important consideration by comparing phenotypes observed in controlled conditions to those expressed in the field (Dhanaraj et al., 2007; Miyazaki et al., 2004). In these comparisons, the association and value of traits observed in controlled environment studies and stress tolerance can find support or be questioned depending on their expression under field conditions.

In this study we harvested leaves from Yukon *Thellungiella* plants growing on salt flats near Whitehorse, YT, Canada. Microarray and metabolite profiling was completed using leaves harvested during two years of contrasting meteorological conditions. In 2003, the Yukon experienced below average precipitation and in 2005 the rainfall was above average. Analysis of Yukon Thellungiella during the different sampling years allowed us to compare the profile of transcripts and metabolites for field plants with comparable profiles prepared from plants grown and stressed under growth cabinet conditions. In our study we found many drought-responsive changes in the expression of gene products identified in simulated drought experiments in growth cabinets to be also represented among transcripts showing differential expression in plants harvested in 2003, a dry year. However, some changes were field or cabinet specific, raising questions about the essential nature of various gene products for stress protection. As such, comparative genomic analysis involving field studies can offer an important companion strategy to the study of chamber-grown plants in the identification of critical traits underlying abiotic stress tolerance.

4.3 MATERIALS AND METHODS

Yukon field site location and plants

In 2002, 2003 and 2005 cauline leaf tissue was harvested from mature, flowering Yukon *Thellungiella* at a field site near Whitehorse, Yukon (location: 60° 55.928'N, 135° 10.249' W; elevation = 647m). Leaf tissue was transferred quickly to 2-mL Nalgene cryovials, immediately flash frozen in liquid nitrogen, and then transferred to a charged MVE XC20/3V vapour shipper (Jencons Scientific Inc , Bridgeville, PA) where samples were kept frozen at -150°C for transport. Vials were transferred to -80°C for storage pending analysis.

Controlled environment plant growth conditions and stress treatments

Seeds of the Yukon genotype were sterilized using a vapour-phase gas technique (Clough and Bent, 1998) and then mixed with 0.1% (w/v) Phytagel (Sigma) and pipetted onto a moistened soil mixture containing six parts Promix BX (Premier Horticulture, Rivière-du-Loup, PQ) and one part Turface (Profile Products LLC, Buffalo, NY) in individual 5 x 5 x 7 cm pots. The pots containing seeds were stratified for 2 d at 4°C before transfer to growth chambers (AC 60 Enconair, Winnipeg, MB) set with a 21-h d and irradiance of 250 μ mol m⁻²s⁻¹ and 22°C/10°C day/night temperature regime. Plants were watered daily as needed and fertilized one time per week with 1 g L⁻¹ 20-20-20 (N-P-K) fertilizer.

Cauline leaves obtained from mature, flowering, 12-week-old *Thellungiella* plants grown in controlled environment chambers served as the source of control, unstressed tissue in microarray and metabolite profiling experiments in comparisons involving the cauline leaves from field-grown plants. Basal rosette leaves of unstressed control plants served as the basis of comparison for metabolite profiles in the case of cold, drought, drought/re-watered and saline plant samples (Wong et al., 2006). The growth conditions, stress treatments and nature of tissue harvested were as described by Wong et al. (2006). Upon completion of the stress treatments a portion of the leaf tissue was flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80°C until it was processed for metabolite profiling.

Soil and plant analysis

Soil samples were collected from the top 18 cm depth at the field site where Yukon *Thellungiella* was harvested. Soil pH, electrical conductivity, and chemical content were determined and the elemental composition of soil samples, field and chamber leaf tissues were analyzed (Ping et al., 1998).

Solute potential measurements

Leaf solute potential measurements were made using a HR33T psychrometer (Wescor Inc., Logan, UT). A frozen leaf disc 6 mm in diameter was allowed to thaw and come to equilibrium with the air in the chamber for 20 min in a C52 leaf chamber.

Microarray analysis

Total RNA extraction and microarray hybridization conditions were as reported by Wong et al. (2006) except the mRNA was first amplified using the Ambion MessageAmp aRNA Amplification kit (Applied Biosystems) and the cDNA was primed with a random primer mix (Invitrogen). The cDNA microarrays were hybridized with Cy3 and Cy5 fluorescently labeled probe pairs prepared using RNA extracted from untreated cauline leaves of chamber grown *Thellungiella* and cauline leaves of *Thellungiella* harvested at the Yukon field site. Three biological replicates with dye swap as a technical replicate were used for leaf tissue harvested from the field in 2003 and 2005 and statistical analysis was based on a total of six replicates per field year (three biological replicates plus three technical replicates). ScanArray confocal scanning system and QuantArray data acquisition software (Perkin-Elmer) were used to obtain data, and after normalization, differentially expressed genes between growth chamber and field-grown Yukon *Thellungiella* were detected using a Bayesian model as previously described (Wong et al., 2006). Transcripts in leaves of field plants showing differential expression relative to those in chamber-grown plants were annotated and classified using the TAIR9 gene ontology functional categorization tool (http://www.arabidopsis.org/tools/bulk/sequences/index.jsp).

Metabolite analysis

Polar metabolites for profiling by gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (GC/MS) were obtained from frozen leaf tissue (200 mg) to which 50 μ L of ribitol (2 mg mL⁻¹) was added and then ground together to a fine powder in liquid nitrogen. The protocol followed for metabolite extraction using methanol and chloroform was as described by Fiehn et al. (2000) and the fraction in the methanol phase containing polar metabolites was retained for this study. The final steps of preparation included the addition of a mixture of fatty acid standards so that RTs could be converted to RIs

(Roessner et al., 2000). Methoxymation and derivatization were as reported by Roessner et al. (2000).

Samples were analyzed using a Trace DSQ GC-MS system (Thermo Finnigan, Austin, TX) operated in the positive ion electron impact (EI⁺) full scan mode. Samples were diluted 25-fold with hexane and then 1- μ L was injected using a MPS 2 autosampler (Gerstel GmbH & Co., Mülheim, Germany). Chromatography was performed on a 30 m long, 0.25 mm ID and 0.25 μ m film thickness Restek Rtx-5MS integra column (crossbond 5% diphenyl – 95% dimethyl polysiloxane; Chromatographic Specialties Inc., Brockville, ON) fused with a 10 m guard column of the same composition. The injection temperature was 230°C, and the ion source was kept at 200°C. The carrier gas was helium (>99.999% purity; VitalAire, Hamilton, ON) delivered at a constant flow rate of 1 mL min⁻¹. The temperature program was initially set at 50°C for 2.5 min then temperature was first increased at a rate of 7.5°C min⁻¹ to 70°C followed by 5°C min⁻¹ ramp to a final temperature of 310°C where it remained for 6 min. Mass spectra were recorded at three scans per second with a scanning range of 50 to 650 mass-to-charge (m/z) ratio.

The automated mass spectral deconvolution and identification system (AMDIS) software was used to extract peak abundance and mass spectral (MS) information for each trimethylsilyl derivative resolved in GC/MS chromatograms (Stein, 1999). This information was imported in tab-delimited format to the GC/MS Analysis Software Package (GASP) (available at: <u>www.flintbox.com</u>, Nuin et al., 2004) where the RI was calculated as described by Roessner et al. (2000) and the relative abundance for each

component was adjusted to reflect the estimated recovery of the internal standard ribitol. The term mass spectral tag (MST) refers to an individual trimethylsilyl derivative identified by a characteristic RI and MS (Kopka, 2006). Identical MSTs from multiple GC/MS analyses were aligned with GASP and subjected to statistical tests to identify those associated with specific samples and/or treatments. An arbitrary threshold detection limit for relative response factors associated with MSTs of 0.00005 was used in determining abundance and fold-differences among chemical components from different samples.

The chemical identity of an MST was determined by comparing its RI and MS parameters to those obtained for authentic standards analyzed using the same instrument and experimental conditions. MSTs that shared m/z ratios with authentic standards that had different RIs were classified according to predicted chemical classes such as sugars or sugar phosphates.

Statistical analysis of data

Transcripts found differentially expressed in the field relative to cabinet-grown plants were compared to those showing stress-related changes in abundance reported previously by Wong et al. (2006). The Wong et al. (2006) dataset is comprised of 147 transcripts showing statistically significant stress-responsive changes in leaves of Yukon *Thellungiella* plants grown in cabinets and subjected to cold, drought, salinity and drought followed by re-watering treatments. Transcripts showing a 1.5-fold or greater difference in expression in *Thellungiella* harvested from the field compared to growth chamber grown plants (P<0.01) were subjected to multivariate analysis. MSTs whose abundance was significantly different (P<0.05) between treated and control or field and control plants were expressed as a ratio, and were then log_{10} transformed before being subjected to multivariate analysis. Euclidean distance was used to calculate the distance matrix and a complete linkage method was used for hierarchical clustering MSTs and genes using the program, Cluster (Eisen et al., 1998). Heat maps were constructed using the Java Treeview program (<u>http://jtreeview.sourceforge.net</u>, Saldanha, 2004) where white indicates no difference between transcript or MST abundance between the sample and its respective control while red or blue indicates a gene or MST is detected at higher or lower levels, respectively, relative to a control.

4.4 RESULTS

Yukon field site conditions

The season for plant growth in the Yukon is typically short and for *Thellungiella* this extends from early May to late July (Bruce Bennett, personal communication). We visited the field site over one to two week periods in late May 2002, early July 2003 and late June 2005. Sampling in 2002 was largely carried out to select a suitable field location and establish a sampling protocol suitable for preserving the RNA and metabolite content of specimens during transport from the remote Yukon location.

Specimens harvested in 2003 and 2005 were subjected to both transcript and metabolite profiling.

At the field site we selected *Thellungiella* plants growing on soil encrusted by salt deposits. Soil at the site is composed of an upper mineral-organic layer of approximately 20 cm that overlays clay. Chemical analysis of the upper layer (Supplemental Table S1) shows the soil to be highly alkaline with a pH of 8.3 and saline (soil electrical conductivity of 15.7 dS m⁻¹ is roughly equivalent to 157 mM NaCl; Munns, 2005). This soil is high in magnesium, sodium and sulfates, a feature shared by other saline soils in the area (Day, 1962). With respect to other nutrients, the soil has adequate levels of potassium and phosphorus (236 and 26 mg kg⁻¹, respectively), whereas the total nitrogen content is very low (0.26%; Martens and Lindsay, 1990). The Ca/Mg ratio is less than one while a typical soil usually has a Ca/Mg ratio exceeding one (Brady et al., 2005).

For the Whitehorse, Yukon area, the average temperature for the 2003 and 2005 growing seasons was approximately 20° C (Fig. 2). In 2003, average high and low temperatures for the ten-day period prior to harvest were 22°C and 15°C, respectively. At the field site on the day of harvest, soil temperature was 17°C, the air temperature was 24°C, and the light intensity was 1500 μ moles m⁻² s⁻¹. In 2005, the average high and low temperatures for the ten-day period before harvest was, 18°C and 7°C, respectively. At the field where plants were collected in 2005, the soil temperature was 18°C, the daytime air temperature was 24°C, and the light intensity was 1433 μ moles m⁻² s⁻¹.

The average cumulative rainfall for this region is 84.1 mm during the growing season for *Thellungiella* (May through July) classifying this area as semi-arid

(Environment Canada climate normals 1971 – 2000;

http://www.climate.weatheroffice.ec.gc.ca/climate_normals). In 2003, however, total precipitation was 28% lower than the long-term norms and, as such, can be considered a drought year even for a semi-arid region (Fig. 2, Hogg and Wein, 2005). In a ten day period leading up to our visit to the field site in 2003 only 1.8 mm of rainfall was recorded for the area.

Thellungiella growing in the field and in growth chambers have different phenotypes

The natural accession of *Thellungiella* found in the Yukon displays a variable phenotype under different growth conditions. A prominent difference in a mature, flowering plant is the distribution of leaves between the basal rosette and aerial stems bearing flowers. In growth cabinets set to mimic the temperature range and summer daylength of the Yukon, plants develop multiple (60 to 80 by 8 weeks) basal rosette leaves (Fig. 1A) with flowers first appearing at about 4 to 5 weeks as a small cluster within the rosette. Plants usually bolt at about six weeks after germination and flowers are borne on a main stem. At about 8 weeks, auxiliary stems bearing flowers appear and cauline leaves develop on the main and auxiliary stems with the basal rosette leaves remaining a prominent feature. In contrast, *Thellungiella* at field sites have prominent cauline leaves that clasp around the main and auxiliary flowering stems and either lack or have only a few, diminutive rosette leaves (Fig. 1B, C, and D). The chemical analysis of leaf tissue show N, Ca⁺⁺, and Mg⁺⁺ contents to be similar for cabinet and field-grown plants, but the

121

Na⁺ content of leaves harvested in the field is over six-times higher than that of the cabinet-grown control plants (Supplemental Table S1).

The plants collected in 2003 had experienced below-average precipitation (32.4 mm) in a 60 d period before harvest, in the same timeframe the plants collected in 2005 had experienced more frequent episodes of rainfall leading to above-average cumulative precipitation (92.2 mm). The contrasting precipitation patterns allowed us to compare the field plants exposed to water deficits in 2003 with those experiencing above-normal cumulative precipitation in 2005. Figure 1C shows the grass surrounding *Thellungiella* to be brown and either dead or dying in 2003. The *Thellungiella* plants were small (8 to 18 cm tall) but green and either flowering or setting seed. In contrast, at the same site in 2005 the above-average precipitation patterns contributed to an abundance of green vegetation around the *Thellungiella* plants who were themselves almost 2 to 3-fold larger than the plants found in 2003 (Fig. 1B and D). The transcript and metabolite composition of these plants were then compared to plants subjected to more calibrated stress treatments in controlled environment chambers so as to identify shared and site-specific stress-responsive traits.

Transcript profiling of Thellungiella growing under field conditions

We used a cDNA microarray containing 3628 unique sequences derived from libraries of stress-induced cDNAs as described in Wong et al. (2006) to profile transcripts present in the leaves of plants obtained from the Yukon field site. Of the gene products represented on the microarray, 673 (19%) were found to be differentially expressed in cauline leaves of *Thellungiella* growing in the field (Supplemental Table S2). In 2003, transcripts associated with 216 cDNAs were differentially expressed with 132 and 84 being present at higher or lower levels, respectively, relative to control cauline leaves from cabinet-grown plants. For 2005, transcripts associated with 548 genes were found to be differentially expressed with 301 and 247 being present at higher or lower levels, respectively, relative to cauline leaf controls. Of the 673 genes differentially expressed in field samples, only 7% were expressed at higher levels over controls in both years and 6% were expressed to a lesser extent in both field years relative to cabinet-grown controls. Only two gene products were found to be up-regulated in one year and down-regulated in the other year sampled.

We classified the genes showing differential expression between 2003 and 2005 by the biological processes and molecular functions encoded by their products according to the Gene Ontology (GO) annotations (<u>www.arabidopsis.org</u>) and summarized this analysis in pie charts (Fig. 3). The GO Biological Process categorizes 180 of the 673 (~27%) genes showing differential expression in the field plants relative to chamber plants as being associated with stress (Fig. 3A; Supplemental Table S2). Few stressassociated genes were detected in both years with only twelve found to be more highly expressed and fourteen repressed in both 2003 and 2005. Gene products classified as stress-responsive by GO comprised a two-fold greater proportion of the transcripts showing enhanced expression in 2003 as compared to 2005 (Fig. 3A).

The GO Slim analysis by molecular function (Fig. 3B) shows that 20% of the genes expressed at higher levels in 2003 encode products of unknown function compared

to 11% in 2005. Interestingly, proteins with kinase activity contribute <1% towards the complement of products with increased expression in 2003 whereas 8% are repressed that year. In contrast, products encoding protein kinases have expression levels that are similar in control tissue and in leaves harvested in 2005.

We compared the transcripts showing differential expression in field plants with those previously reported as undergoing changes in abundance in rosette leaves of *Thellungiella* subjected to cold, drought, drought recovery or salinity treatments in growth cabinets (Wong et al., 2006). From this meta-analysis we found 63 genes that were differentially expressed in leaves of field-grown plants that were not changed in expression in leaves of plants stressed in growth cabinets. An additional 85 genes show differential expression in the field and in response to at least one growth cabinet stress condition. The fold-differences associated with these 148 gene products were then compared using HCA (Fig. 4). The HCA comparison does not include genes whose transcripts were identified as undergoing differential expression in leaves of field plants from only one year (2003 or 2005) unless the gene product was also reported to undergo stress-associated changes following treatments in the growth cabinet. All of the genes whose products showed a change in relative abundance in 2003 and/or 2005 are listed in Supplemental Table S2.

HCA groups the two field datasets into a single cluster that has greater similarity to the data for cold and drought treated cabinet-grown plants than data obtained from plants subjected to salt stress or recovering from drought (Fig. 4). From the HCA heat map, some generalizations can be made about differences among transcript abundance with respect to sample source. The top half of the figure includes genes whose transcripts are down-regulated in the field relative to control, cauline leaves of cabinet-grown plants while the bottom half includes genes found to be more highly expressed in the field. Differential expression for some genes was only observed in leaf samples obtained from the field site. In total there were 28 genes showing higher expression and 30 genes showing lower expression in leaves of 2003 and 2005 field plants relative to cauline controls and for which no differential expression was observed in leaves of stressed plants from cabinets.

Of the genes shown in the HCA comparison (Fig. 4) about 60% are associated with a stress-responsive change in expression previously reported for cabinet grown plants subjected to cold, salinity, drought, or drought followed by re-watering treatments (Wong et al., 2006). For example, the first six genes at the top of the figure show comparatively strong stress-responsive expression in growth cabinets with exposure to cold or drought treatments but none were detected at higher abundance in the field for either year sampled. This contrasting pattern of gene expression makes it difficult to conclude whether these genes play a role in plant stress response under field conditions. Other genes show changes in expression that supports a role in stress acclimation in field and cabinet grown plants. By way of example, a cluster of seven genes at the base of the HCA heat map showed increased expression in 2005 and in leaves of plants re-watered following drought treatment in cabinets but they showed no increased expression in 2003 or following drought, cold or salinity treatments in cabinets. This group would appear to be comprised of genes whose expression is down-regulated with stress irrespective of

125

where the plants are growing and are more likely associated with plants recovering from stress or growing under more optimal field conditions such as those of 2005.

Patterns of differential expression associated with a number of the genes in the heat map are strongly suggestive of a stress-responsive role that is not influenced by where the plants are growing. For example, transcripts associated with 15 genes showed higher abundance in 2003 plant samples and in plants that had undergone a drought treatment in growth cabinets but their transcript abundance for 2005 was no different than for cauline leaves of well-watered controls in growth cabinets. Transcripts associated with five of the 15 genes (At4g16190, At5g66400, At1g20440, At1g20450 and At5g59310) also showed increased expression after a cold treatment in cabinet conditions. Enhanced expression with salinity is shown for a total of four genes, three of which are also up-regulated under field conditions. One of these salt-responsive products (At5g52300) shows higher transcript abundance in the field but more so for 2003. The broad stress responsive behaviour for At5g52300 (annotated as Responsive to Desiccation 29B) in cabinet grown plants and elevated transcript levels for field plants distinguishes this product from others in the heat map. Nine genes showed decreased expression in 2003 field samples but no differential expression relative to controls in 2005. Of these genes, six are also repressed in drought-exposed chamber-grown plants with four (At4g02380, At2g06850, At3g01500 and At2g10940) also showing increased expression in drought-stressed plants that are re-watered and recovering from stress.

Of the gene products showing differential expression in the heat map (Fig. 4), only 49 were categorized by GO-Slim analysis to be associated with stress. Among gene products showing enhanced expression following stress treatments in cabinets and in field plants, 13 genes have transcripts that increase in response to drought imposed on plants in cabinets and six of these are more abundant in leaf samples from plants harvested in 2003. Interestingly, the six genes associated with these drought-responsive transcripts are not categorized by GO Biological Functions as responsive to stress (including abiotic or biotic stress). The genes associated with these transcripts are At3g09390, At4g33550, At5g42050, At5g42800, At5g53870, and At5g60360. Indeed, two from this list (At5g42050 and At5g53870) were not among the products used to compile the GO Biological Process shown in Figure 3A.

Two genes encoding expressed proteins of unknown function (At5g66860 and At2g15890) showed no apparent stress-responsive pattern in plants exposed to cold, salt or drought stress in cabinets but were found to show higher expression in the field in 2003, the year of prolonged water deficits at the field site. Furthermore the expression levels for these products were repressed in 2005 field plants, a year of adequate rainfall.

Metabolite profiling of *Thellungiella* growing under field conditions

The GO annotation analysis of Figure 3 shows that transcripts associated with metabolism comprise one of the largest categories of differentially regulated genes in *Thellungiella* field plants. In order to gain greater insight into the biochemical activities of these plants we extracted and profiled polar metabolites present in samples of the same leaf tissues used for microarray experiments. Using this approach, it was possible to simultaneously monitor over 300 MSTs corresponding to chemically diverse compounds.

We found 109 MSTs in leaf extracts prepared from plants collected in both 2003 and 2005 that showed statistically significant differences in abundance relative to extracts from cauline leaf controls (Supplemental Table S3). Of these components, the majority of MSTs showed reduced levels in the field (62) or showed a difference in abundance for only one year (48) compared to controls. Only two MSTs, (RI 1320 and RI 1377) showed differential abundance between the two years with higher content in 2003 samples.

In parallel to the transcript HCA, we compared MSTs found to undergo changes in abundance in 2003 and 2005 field plants (Supplemental Table S3) with those undergoing stress-responsive changes in abundance in cabinet-grown plants subjected to stress. This HCA (Fig. 5) includes MSTs showing a change in relative abundance in field material for both 2003 and 2005. Also included were 15 MSTs found at a level different from controls in one year (either 2003 or 2005) and in at least one cabinet stress treatment. The most striking impression given by HCA is that most components are less abundant in leaves of field plants than cauline leaves from a growth cabinet control plant. Leaves harvested from *Thellungiella* growing on saline field sites in 2003 and 2005 had a higher content of citrate, unknown RI 1429, succinate, ethanolamine, Gly, citramalate, sucrose and fructose compared to cauline leaf controls. None of the laboratory stress conditions led to an increased relative abundance of the first four MSTs in this list. Carbohydrates, including several sugars (sucrose, glucose, galactose and fructose) and sugar alcohols, also show increased abundance in field samples relative to well-watered cauline control leaves. Finally, a number of components were of low relative abundance

128
in the field samples but showed a significant change in content in leaves of plants stressed in growth cabinets. These MSTs include several amino acids (Ser, Glu, Pro, Ile, and Val), galactinol and, raffinose.

The content of plant metabolites can show diurnal changes in abundance (Gibon et al., 2006). We took two measures to address the impact of time of harvest on MST composition. In the first measure we grew laboratory plants under a Yukon day-length regime and synchronized leaf removal from cabinet-grown and field plants. Harvest time approximated the same number of hours (7 h) from sunrise in the Yukon or "lights on" in the growth cabinet. A second measure involved harvesting leaf tissue from field plants at three time-points corresponding to 2, 7 and 12 h after sunrise. Measurements of MST abundance at any given time point were expressed as an average fold-change of the three time points selected for tissue analysis and Figure 6 shows an HCA for the group of 29 MSTs that were found to undergo significant changes in abundance. The majority of the compounds that underwent changes in content showed maximum abundance in the samples obtained 7 h after sunrise. This group includes myo-inositol, raffinose, galactinol, quinic acid, fructose, sucrose, and 16 unidentified MSTs. A smaller group whose abundance was highest in early morning (2 h) samples included phosphate, citrate, Gly and unknown RI 1320 while one MST, unknown RI 966, was most abundant in the late time-point sample (12 h after sunrise). Given the difficulty of sampling at a remote field site and the pattern of highest abundance tending to be near midday, we selected a single time-point corresponding to 7 h after sunrise for routine sampling and synchronized this sampling time for comparisons with plants in growth cabinet material.

Our finding agrees with those reported by Gibon et al. (2006) who reported that metabolite abundance is relatively low early in the day and increases over the course of the day.

4.5 DISCUSSION

Many features distinguish a model organism and among them is their ease of propagation under laboratory conditions. While the study of model plants such as *Arabidopsis* under these conditions has provided an abundance of genetic and physiological information, applying this knowledge to plant performance under more complex, natural environmental conditions has lagged behind (Ungerer et al., 2008). In this study we have applied functional genomic approaches to the study of a related crucifer extremophile growing under laboratory conditions with a population of the same species found in its native Yukon habitat. The Yukon Territory of Canada offers a very challenging environment for plants. With a relatively short growing season, typically cold and frequently dry conditions, and a highly saline and alkaline soil medium, the field site we selected for our study is ideally suited for studying plants requiring traits needed for survival under adverse conditions.

Given the diversity of concurrent environmental stresses possible under Yukon field conditions, a highly plastic phenotype could be advantageous in developing a plant more suitably structured for a prevailing environment. In July 2003 the only green and flowering vegetation among dead and dying grass at the field site was *Thellungiella* (Fig. 1C). These plants were small in stature compared to those found in 2005 and aside from this morphological indication of stress, leaf solute potential (Ψ_s) measurements also distinguished these Yukon *Thellungiella* plants. A well-watered plant in the growth cabinet has a cauline leaf Ψ_s of -1.50 ± 0.05 MPa, a comparatively low value for an unstressed plant (Morgan, 1984). In comparison, visibly turgid cauline leaves from field plants were -2.07 ± 0.13 MPa and -1.63 ± 0.07 MPa in 2003 and 2005, respectively. These leaf Ψ_s values show the most solute-rich leaves as being from plants experiencing the 2003 drought. Solute accumulation by plants under water deficits is a beneficial physiological response that can improve water uptake to maintain or restore turgor (Hanson and Hitz, 1982; Shao et al., 2009).

Analysis of transcripts by biological process corroborates the extent of stress experienced by plants under field conditions. The theoretical expectation for transcripts classified by GO Biological Process for "Response to stress or biotic stimulus" and "Response to stress" given the coding potential for the *Arabidopsis* genome would be approximately 8.4% (TAIR; http://www.arabidopsis.org/tools/bulk/go/) and for the unigenes represented on our microarray chip about 8% (Wong et al., 2005). However, we found our observed and expected frequencies with respect to transcripts classified by these categories to diverge. The observed frequency of stress-associated transcripts was over two-fold higher at 19% for *Thellungiella* leaf tissue collected in 2005, a year of above-normal precipitation. In 2003 the corresponding value is just over 38% or almost four times as high as the theoretical expectation showing that stress-responsive gene expression made an even greater relative contribution towards the transcripts found in leaves of 2003 field plants. This observation suggests that gene products undergoing changes in relative abundance uniquely in this year could be associated with survival under extreme water deficit conditions.

The gene products found to undergo an increase in transcript abundance in leaves of field plants of 2003 but not 2005 are given in supplemental Table S2E. Of the 78 genes found to undergo a 2-fold or greater increase in expression, 14 (18 %) were reported to be stress responsive in growth cabinet treated plants by Wong et al. (2006) and the remaining 64 products only showed increased relative expression in tissue from 2003 field plants. Only half of the 64 gene products are categorized by GO Annotation to be associated with stress although their enrichment in this tissue source would suggest otherwise. With a focus on the 15 most highly expressed gene products in 2003, all but seven showed increased abundance in tissue subjected to stress, including simulated drought in cabinets. These seven transcripts encode genes for heat shock protein 17.6 kDa class II (At5g12020), a lipid transfer protein family member (At1g62510), heat shock protein 81-1 (At5g52640), beta-amylase 8 (BMY8, At4g17090), a putative lipocalin (At5g58070), ferretin 1 (At5g01600), and cold, circadian rhythm, and RNA binding 2 (At2g21660). The heat-shock products, putative lipocalin, BMY8 and lipid transfer protein share a common feature in that all have a reported association with exposure to high temperature (Chi et al., 2009; Kaplan and Guy, 2004; Rizhsky et al., 2004), consistent with the prevailing hot and dry weather conditions for 2003 (Fig. 2).

A combination of heat and drought stress in the field is not uncommon and usually leads to a more significant adverse impact on crop productivity than either stress alone (reviewed by Mittler, 2006). Plants subjected to heat stress and water deficits display characteristic physiological changes including a combination of high respiration and low photosynthesis and these responses are associated with stress-specific changes among gene products related to carbon metabolism (Rizhsky et al., 2004). Although light and circadian rhythms are two factors regulating starch metabolism, environmental conditions of temperature stress (heat or cold) and drought can also influence starch synthesis and degradation (reviewed in Lu and Sharkey, 2006). Among the highly expressed transcripts only found in 2003 leaves were those encoding two β -amylases namely BMY8 (At4g17090) which was one of the ten most highly expressed products, and BMY7 (At3g23920), and an α - amylase-like 2 product (At1g76130). The BMYs are of particular interest as they are believed to play a key role in starch catabolism, particularly under controlled environment conditions (Fulton et al., 2008). In Arabidopsis the expression of genes encoding BMYs are regulated by many factors including light, phytohormones and various stress conditions with BMYs 7 and 8 associated more specifically with heat and cold stress (Kaplan and Guy, 2004; Kaplan et al., 2006). BMY8 is considered the most important enzyme in the breakdown of leaf starch but a very specific functional overlap between BMYs 7 and 8 has been revealed through a particularly severe, starch-accumulation phenotype of a double mutant (Fulton et al., 2008). BMYs are involved in starch degradation and the maltose produced can protect photosynthetic proteins and membranes from stress-associated damage (Kaplan and Guy, 2004). This relief may be transitory until other compatible solutes including sugars can accumulate as part of a long-term stress acclimation strategy. In our case we

detected and verified the presence of maltose among our chemical components but found no evidence that the maltose content was significantly higher in leaf tissue from 2003 compared to cauline leaf controls produced in our growth cabinets or in comparison to field plants harvested in 2005. The lack of accumulated maltose would suggest that this organic solute is not used in long-term adjustment for drought and heat stress protection. Since levels of maltose are typically low during the day (Weise et al., 2005) and the field plants are exposed to a daylength in excess of 20 h during the summer, it is possible that maltose cannot accumulate in field plants under these conditions. The heightened capacity for starch degradation including the production of glucose, sucrose and fructose could explain the elevated levels of these sugars in 2003 leaf tissue (Fig. 5).

Of 2,806 drought and/or heat responsive changes among transcripts, Rhizsky et al. (2004) found over 770 (41%) that were unique to *Arabidopsis* plants exposed to a simultaneous heat and drought treatment. These unique changes extended to the metabolome where drought and heat-specific metabolites, particularly sugars, were found to accumulate with sucrose content increasing by almost 24-fold over unstressed controls (Rizhsky et al., 2004). In field plants where most metabolites were found at levels well below those found in plants grown in growth cabinets, we found statistically significant higher contents associated with sucrose and a number of other sugars. In our case, however, the highest fold-increase in sucrose was found in plants exposed to the more favorable 2005 conditions as opposed to the dry and hot 2003 season. In agreement with their study, however, we found other sugars including glucose, fructose and galactose to undergo significant increases in 2003 tissues as compared to plant tissues obtained in

2005. For these latter sugars in particular, levels frequently increased with other stress treatments in cabinets but in each case drought elicited the highest-fold accumulation.

Not all of the heat stress and drought-related changes represented a positive accumulation. Rather, the study by Rizhsky et al. (2004) reports proline levels to be increased by drought but suppressed under a combination of drought and heat stress, an observation that seems at variance with the purported stress-protective role of proline (Szekely et al., 2008 and reviewed by Verbruggen and Hermans, 2008). Our comparative study between the field and cabinet stress treatments also shows factors contributing to proline accumulation to be at least as complex for Yukon *Thellungiella* plants.

Proline accumulation under stress results from its increased synthesis and decreased turnover (Delauney and Verma, 1993) and a salt stress-responsive increase in proline content for Shandong *Thellungiella* plants has been well documented (Inan et al., 2004; Kant et al., 2006). Wong et al. (2006) reported that transcripts associated with *delta-1-pyrroline-5-carboxylate synthetase* (*P5CS A*, At2g39800 and *P5CS B*, At3g55610) were expressed at higher levels in drought and cold-treated plants relative to controls. Based upon these expression patterns we expected proline content to be higher in cold and drought-stressed chamber-grown plants. However, Figure 5 shows that proline content was highest in cold and salt-stressed plants and not in leaves of plants subjected to drought treatment, an observation showing poor agreement to predictions based upon the relative abundance of *P5CS* transcripts. For the field plants, the transcript profiles for leaves of 2003 plants show no enrichment for *P5CS A* or *B* transcripts and proline content was, at best, no different than the level found in a well-watered cauline

135

leaf found in the growth cabinet. Thus whether drought was simulated in a growth cabinet or in combination with salt and heat stress in the field as was the case in 2003, proline did not accumulate in Yukon *Thellungiella* under water deficits. Moreover, while a salt stress treatment imposed by irrigating plants in growth chambers with saline solutions led to increased proline content, plants growing under non-drought conditions that are exposed to salt in the field (2005) also had low levels of proline compared to a well-watered cabinet-grown plant. Together these observations suggest that Yukon *Thellungiella* plants show metabolic plasticity with respect to their capacity to accumulate proline. It may be that any benefits conferred by proline under a controlled, cabinet salt stress treatment are not realized during water deficits or when plants are subjected to the multiple, concurrent stresses experienced in the field. Our findings support the conclusions of Gagneul et al. (2007) who found proline levels in the halophyte *Limonium latifolium* to respond modestly but positively to salt up-shifts but did not display strong indications of a being an osmolyte in comparison to other solutes.

Galactinol was also present at higher relative abundance in *Thellungiella* leaves from plants subjected to drought conditions in growth cabinets but was found at lower levels in the leaf tissue of field plants compared to well-watered, chamber-grown *Thellungiella* (Fig. 5). Galactinol synthase catalyzes a key step in galactinol synthesis and the expression of the gene encoding this enzyme (At1g56600) was up-regulated in *Thellungiella* harvested from the field during both years relative to cabinet grown controls (Fig. 4). This observation suggests that the capacity for galactinol accumulation by these plants should not be limited by the absence of this enzyme. However, this data is based upon a static snapshot of metabolites, and it is possible that galactinol fails to accumulate because it is used in other synthetic or catabolic reactions although raffinose, one such end-product, also did not accumulate in field plants (Fig. 5). Galactinol content was found to change over the course of a day with the highest level found at the 7 h (midday) time-point (Fig. 6). This pattern of changing abundance is consistent with a role in carbohydrate transport and both galactinol and galactinol synthase have known roles in phloem loading in other plant species (McCaskill and Turgeon, 2007).

A genome-wide analysis of Arabidopsis revealed that 1310 out of 1969 (~67%) genes that were differentially expressed in Arabidopsis subjected to drought were also significantly up or down-regulated by exogenously applied abscisic acid (ABA) or an analog of ABA (Huang et al., 2007, 2008). Our study shows 15 genes whose transcript levels were higher in leaf tissue from 2003 and in plants subjected to drought treatments in cabinets. Expression of these genes was suppressed in plants recovering from drought treatment and showed no increased expression in 2005 plant tissue relative to wellwatered cabinet plants. With one exception (At5g60360), these genes were classified by Huang et al. (2007) as ABA-responsive. Among the 2003-specific changes, the gene product encoded by At2g46680 is an ABA-responsive homeodomain Leu zipper transcription factor (ATHB7) that has been reported to be upregulated by drought, salinity, and white light (Söderman et al., 1996; Henriksson et al., 2005). Transcripts associated with ATHB7 were over 3-fold more abundant in leaves of 2003 Thellungiella field plants relative to well-watered control plants and in a previous study were not found to be more abundant in drought-treated plants in growth cabinets (Wong et al., 2006).

Thus water deficits simulated in growth cabinets did not elicit the same response with respect to expression of *ATHB7* as a prolonged drought in the field.

The capacity of a plant to withstand an environmental extreme will probably not reside with one metabolite, protein or transcript but is more likely to be a combination of many control levels working in concert (Mazzucotelli et al., 2008). If this is true then it is likely that an extremophile may be an organism that can successfully orchestrate its response to maximize the advantages that various response pathways may confer. One dramatic albeit descriptive indication of *Thellungiella*'s capacity to show flexibility toward its environment is displayed by the contrasting field and cabinet phenotypes. It is perhaps not surprising that plants with such striking and distinct architectures should also have underlying differences in transcriptome and metabolome profiles. Nonetheless, we found many traits to be expressed by plants in the field and in growth cabinets. As such, some traits are expressed by plants experiencing stress regardless of where they are growing and it is tempting to propose that these will be the genes and gene products that offer the greatest potential for crop improvement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Bruce Bennett and Randy Mulder for their assistance at the Yukon field site.

4.6 REFERENCES

- Al-Shehbaz IA, Beilstein MA, Kellogg EA (2006) Systematics and phylogeny of the Brassicaceae (Cruciferae): an overview. Plant Syst Evol 259: 89-120
- Bartels D, Sunkar R (2005) Drought and salt tolerance in plants. Crit Rev Plant Sci 24: 23-58

Boyer JS (1982) Plant productivity and environment. Science 218: 443-448

- Brady KU, Kruckeberg AR, Bradshaw HD (2005) Evolutionary ecology of plant adaptation to serpentine soils. Annu Rev Ecol Evol System **36:** 243-266
- Bressan RA, Zhang C, Zhang H, Hasegawa PM, Bohnert HJ, Zhu J- (2001) Learning from the *Arabidopsis* experience. The next gene search paradigm. Plant Physiol 127: 1354-1360
- Chi W, Fung RM, Liu H, Hsu C, Charng Y (2009) Temperature-induced lipocalin is required for basal and acquired thermotolerance in *Arabidopsis*. Plant Cell Environ 32: 917-927
- **Clough SJ, Bent AF** (1998) Floral dip: a simplified method for Agrobacterium-mediated transformation of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Plant J **16:** 735-743
- **Day JH** (1962) Reconnaissance Soil Survey of the Takhini and Dezadeash Valleys in the Yukon Territory. Canada Dept. of Agriculture, Ottawa, ON

Delauney AJ, Verma DPS (1993) Proline biosynthesis and osmoregulation in plants. Plant J 4: 215-223

Dhanaraj AL, Alkharouf NW, Beard HS, Chouikha IB, Matthews BF, Wei H,
 Arora R, Rowland LJ (2007) Major differences observed in transcript profiles of
 blueberry during cold acclimation under field and cold room conditions. Planta
 225: 735-751

Eisen MB, Spellman PT, Brown PO, Botstein D (1998) Cluster analysis and display of genome-wide expression patterns. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 95: 14863-14868

Fiehn O, Kopka J, Trethewey RN, Willmitzer L (2000) Identification of uncommon plant metabolites based on calculation of elemental compositions using gas chromatography and quadrupole mass spectrometry. Anal Chem 72: 3573-3580

Fulton DC, Stettler M, Mettler T, Vaughan CK, Li J, Francisco P, Gil D, Reinhold H, Eicke S, Messerli G, Dorken G, Halliday K, Smith AM, Smith SM, Zeeman SC (2008) beta-AMYLASE4, a noncatalytic protein required for starch breakdown, acts upstream of three active beta-amylases in *Arabidopsis* chloroplasts. Plant Cell 20: 1040-1058

Gagneul D, Ainouche A, Duhaze C, Lugan R, Larher FR, Bouchereau A (2007) A reassessment of the function of the so-called compatible solutes in the halophytic Plumbaginaceae Limonium latifolium. Plant Physiol **144:** 1598-1611

Gibon Y, Usadel B, Blaesing OE, Kamlage B, Hoehne M, Trethewey R, Stitt M (2006) Integration of metabolite with transcript and enzyme activity profiling during diurnal cycles in *Arabidopsis* rosettes. Genome Biol **7:** 76

Gong QQ, Li PH, Ma SS, Rupassara SI, Bohnert HJ (2005) Salinity stress adaptation competence in the extremophile *Thellungiella halophila* in comparison with its relative *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Plant J. 44: 826-839

Griffith M, Timonin M, Wong AC, Gray GR, Akhter SR, Saldanha M, Rogers MA,
Weretilnyk EA, Moffatt B (2007) *Thellungiella*: an *Arabidopsis*-related model
plant adapted to cold temperatures. Plant Cell Environ 30: 529-538

Hanson AD, Hitz WD (1982) Metabolic responses of mesophytes to plant water deficits. Annu Rev Plant Physiol 33: 163-203

- Henriksson E, Olsson ASB, Johannesson H, Johansson H, Hanson J, Engstrom P,
 Soderman E (2005) Homeodomain leucine zipper class I genes in *Arabidopsis*.
 Expression patterns and phylogenetic relationships. Plant Physiol 139: 509-518
- Hogg EH, Wein RW (2005) Impacts of drought on forest growth and regeneration following fire in southwestern Yukon, Canada. Can J For Res 35: 2141-2150
- Huang D, Jaradat MR, Wu W, Ambrose SJ, Ross AR, Abrams SR, Cutler AJ (2007) Structural analogs of ABA reveal novel features of ABA perception and signaling in *Arabidopsis*. Plant J 50: 414-428

Huang D, Wu W, Abrams SR, Cutler AJ (2008) The relationship of drought-related gene expression in *Arabidopsis thaliana* to hormonal and environmental factors. J Exp Bot 59: 2991-3007

Inan G, Zhang Q, Li PH, Wang ZL, Cao ZY, Zhang H, Zhang CQ, Quist TM,
Goodwin SM, Zhu JH, Shi HH, Damsz B, Charbaji T, Gong QQ, Ma SS,
Fredricksen M, Galbraith DW, Jenks MA, Rhodes D, Hasegawa PM,
Bohnert HJ, Joly RJ, Bressan RA, Zhu JK (2004) Salt cress. A halophyte and
cryophyte *Arabidopsis* relative model system and its applicability to molecular
genetic analyses of growth and development of extremophiles. Plant Physiol 135:
1718-1737

- Kant S, Kant P, Raveh E, Barak S (2006) Evidence that differential gene expression between the halophyte, *Thellungiella halophila*, and *Arabidopsis thaliana* is responsible for higher levels of the compatible osmolyte proline and tight control of Na⁺ uptake in *T. halophila*. Plant Cell Environ **29:** 1220-1234
- **Kaplan F, Guy CL** (2004) β-Amylase induction and the protective role of maltose during temperature shock. Plant Physiol **135**: 1674-1684
- Kaplan F, Sung DY, Guy CL (2006) Roles of beta-amylase and starch breakdown during temperatures stress. Physiol Plant 126: 120-128
- **Kopka J** (2006) Current challenges and developments in GC-MS based metabolite profiling technology. J Biotechnol **124:** 312-322

Li P, Ainsworth EA, Leakey ADB, Ulanov A, Lozovaya V, Ort DR, Bohnert HJ (2008) *Arabidopsis* transcript and metabolite profiles: Ecotype-specific responses to open-air elevated [CO₂]. Plant Cell Environ **31:** 1673-1687

Lu Y, Sharkey TD (2006) The importance of maltose in transitory starch breakdown. Plant Cell Environ 29: 353-366

Martens DC, Lindsay WL (1990) Testing soils for copper, iron, manganese and zinc. In RL Westerman, ed, Soil Testing and Plant Analysis, Ed 3. Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI, pp 229-264

- Mazzucotelli E, Mastrangelo AA, Crosatti C, Guerra D, Stanca AM, Cattivelli L (2008) Abiotic stress response in plants: When post-transcriptional and posttranslational regulations control transcription. Plant Sci **174:** 420-431
- McCaskill A, Turgeon R (2007) Phloem loading in Verbascum phoeniceum L. depends on the synthesis of raffinose-family oligosaccharides. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 104: 19619-19624
- Messerli G, Nia VP, Trevisan M, Kolbe A, Schauer N, Geigenberger P, Chen JC, Davison AC, Fernie AR, Zeeman SC (2007) Rapid classification of phenotypic mutants of *Arabidopsis* via metabolite fingerprinting. Plant Physiol 143: 1484-1492

Mittler R (2006) Abiotic stress, the field environment and stress combination. Trends Plant Sci 11: 15-19

Miyazaki S, Fredricksen M, Hollis KC, Poroyko V, Shepley D, Galbraith DW, Long SP, Bohnert HJ (2004) Transcript expression profiles of *Arabidopsis thaliana* grown under controlled conditions and open-air elevated concentrations of CO₂ and of O₃. Field Crops Res **90:** 47-59

- Morgan JM (1984) Osmoregulation and water stress in higher plants. Annu Rev Plant Physiol 35: 299-319
- Munns R (2005) Genes and salt tolerance: bringing them together. New Phytol 167: 645-663
- Nuin P, Weretilnyk EA, Summers PS, Guevara DR, Golding GB (2005) GASP:

GC/MS analysis software package. Hamilton, ON

Ping CL, Bockheim JG, Kimble JM, Michaelson GJ, Walker DA (1998)

Characteristics of cryogenic soils along a latitudinal transect in Arctic Alaska. J Geophys Res Atmos **103**: 28917-28928

Rizhsky L, Liang H, Shuman J, Shulaev V, Davletova S, Mittler R (2004) When defense pathways collide. The response of *Arabidopsis* to a combination of drought and heat stress. Plant Physiol **134**: 1683-1696

- Roessner U, Wagner C, Kopka J, Trethewey RN, Willmitzer L (2000) Simultaneous analysis of metabolites in potato tuber by gas-chromatography-mass spectrometry. Plant J 23: 131-142
- Saldanha AJ (2004) Java Treeview--extensible visualization of microarray data. Bioinformatics 20: 3246-3248

Shao H, Chu L, Jaleel, CA, Manivannan P, Panneerselvam, Shao M (2009)

Understanding water defict stress-induced changes in the basic metabolism of higher plants – biotechnologically and sustainably improving agriculture and the ecoenvironment in arid regions of the globe. Crit Rev Biotechnol **29**: 131-151

- Soderman E, Mattsson J, Engstrom P (1996) The *Arabidopsis* homeobox gene ATHB-7 is induced by water deficit and by abscisic acid. Plant J **10:** 375-381
- Stein SE (1999) An integrated method for spectrum extraction and compound identification from gas chromatography. J Am Soc Mass Spectrom 10: 770-781
- Szekely G, Abraham E, Cseplo A, Rigo G, Zsigmond L, Csiszar J, Ayaydin F, Strizhov N, Jasik J, Schmelzer E, Koncz C, Szabados L (2008) Duplicated P5CS genes of *Arabidopsis* play distinct roles in stress regulation and developmental control of proline biosynthesis. Plant J 53: 11-28
- Taji T, Seki M, Satou M, Sakurai T, Kobayashi M, Ishiyama K, Narusaka Y, Narusaka M, Zhu JK, Shinozaki K (2004) Comparative genomics in salt

tolerance between *Arabidopsis* and *Arabidopsis*-related halophyte salt cress using *Arabidopsis* microarray. Plant Physiol **135**: 1697-1709

- **Ungerer MC, Johnson LC, Herman MA** (2008) Ecological genomics: understanding gene and genome function in the natural environment. Heredity **100:** 178-183
- Verbruggen N, Hermans C (2008) Proline accumulation in plants: a review. Amino Acids 35: 753-759
- Weise SE, Kim KS, Stewart RP, Sharkey TD (2005) Beta-Maltose is the metabolically active anomer of maltose during transitory starch degradation. Plant Physiol 137: 756-761

Wong CE, Li Y, Labbe A, Guevara D, Nuin P, Whitty B, Diaz C, Golding GB, Gray GR, Weretilnyk EA, Griffith M, Moffatt BA (2006) Transcriptional profiling implicates novel interactions between abiotic stress and hormonal responses in *Thellungiella*, a close relative of *Arabidopsis*. Plant Physiol 140: 1437-1450

Wong CE, Li Y, Whitty BR, Diaz-Camino C, Akhter SR, Brandle JE, Golding GB, Weretilnyk EA, Moffatt BA, Griffith M (2005) Expressed sequence tags from the Yukon ecotype of *Thellungiella* reveal that gene expression in response to cold, drought and salinity shows little overlap. Plant Mol Biol 58: 561-574

Figure 1. Phenotype of *Thellungiella* grown in controlled environments and at the Yukon field site

A) 9-week old *Thellungiella* grown in controlled environment cabinets showing seed-

bearing siliques and a prominent rosette (scale: white or black bar =2 cm).

B) *Thellungiella* found on salt flats have cauline leaves borne on multiple stems that terminate in flowers and siliques, but lack the prominent rosette observed in plants grown in growth cabinets. The inset shows an example of *Thellungiella* found on salt flats with one main stem.

C) Thellungiella growing on Yukon field site in 2003 amongst dried up vegetation.

D) Thellungiella growing on Yukon field site in 2005

PhD Thesis – David Guevara McMaster - Biology



Figure 2. Meteorological conditions near Yukon field site

Data were taken from Environment Canada for the Whitehorse site and the months of May to July for 2003 and 2005 (www.climate.weatheroffice.ec.gc.ca/climate_normals/). Asterisks denote dates on which tissue was harvested from *Thellungiella* plants growing in the field.



Figure 3. Gene ontology classification of transcripts differentially expressed in *Thellungiella* growing at the Yukon field site.

The transcripts enhanced or repressed in Yukon *Thellungiella* harvested from the field in 2003 and 2005 relative to growth chamber grown plants were classified into the (A) biological processes and (B) molecular function categories using the TAIR9 gene ontology categorization (<u>www.arabidopsis.org/tools/bulk/go/index.jsp</u>). The number of transcripts that are differentially expressed in Yukon *Thellungiella* harvested from the field in 2003 or 2005 relative to growth chamber grown plants are indicated in brackets.





Figure 4. Hierarchical cluster analysis of genes differentially expressed in *Thellungiella* harvested from the Yukon field site in 2003 and 2005 and *Thellungiella* exposed to abiotic stresses in growth cabinets

Transcript expression levels were converted to a ratio of the treatment over the appropriate control. Ratios greater or less than the controls by at least 1.5 fold were then log_{10} transformed before being subjected to HCA and illustrated as a heatmap. White indicates no difference in gene expression between the sample and its respective control while red or blue indicates that gene expression was higher (positive number) or lower (negative number), respectively, relative to a control. Values in legend are fold-differences compared to the appropriate control.



Figure 5. Hierarchical cluster analysis of metabolites in *Thellungiella* harvested from the Yukon field site in 2003 and 2005 and chamber grown plants exposed to abiotic stresses.

MSTs that were significantly (P<0.05) higher or lower in *Thellungiella* growing at the Yukon field site relative to unstressed growth cabinet-grown controls are compared to similar values for *Thellungiella* subjected to abiotic stress treatments imposed in growth cabinets. If an MST was only significantly higher or lower in one field year, it was not included in the analysis. The mean MST abundance was expressed as the fold ratio of treated or field over appropriate control levels. Those ratios that were higher or lower by a factor of 1.5-fold were then log_{10} transformed before being subjected to HCA and illustrated as a heatmap. White indicates no difference in MST abundance between the sample and its respective control while red or blue indicates that the MST is detected at higher (positive number) or lower (negative number) levels, respectively, relative to a control. The values in the legend are fold differences compared to the appropriate control.

McMaster - Biology



Figure 6. Hierarchical cluster analysis of metabolites present at different levels throughout the day in *Thellungiella* harvested from the Yukon field site.

The mean of measurements from five individual plants harvested at 2 h, 7 h and 12 h from the beginning of the light period were expressed as a ratio relative to the mean abundance for all three timepoints). The fold ratios were then log_{10} transformed subjected to HCA and illustrated as a heatmap. MSTs whose levels were significantly different (P<0.05) at any time-point from the average of the day are illustrated. White indicates no difference between the mean MST abundance at a given time point and the daily average while red or blue indicates that the MST is present at significantly higher (positive number) or lower (negative number) levels, respectively, compared to the daily average. The values in the legend are fold differences compared to the average.



Supplemental Table S1. Soil properties and mineral composition of Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the experimental field site near Whitehorse, YT, and from growth chamber grown plants.

	Soil Pr	operties	Thellungiella Mineral Composition			
Parameter	Field Site 1	Field Site 2	Field Site 1	Field Site 2	Chamber	
pH	8.3	8.3	- <u></u>		<u></u>	
E.C. $(dS m^{-1})$	15.68	15.47				
Concentration (ppm)						
NH4 ⁺	1	1				
NO ₃	10	60				
Total C	26100	100500				
Total N	2600	10700	31900	26500	42000	
Р	26	47	2800	2900	9200	
K	236	131	22300	22200	43700	
Ca	521	469	15800	14000	10400	
Na	2224	2076	13630	7100	2058	
Mg	1456	1583	6000	6100	4200	

Supplemental Table S2. Transcripts differentially expressed in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in 2003 and 2005.

Values represent fold-ratio between field (F) and chamber grown Yukon *Thellungiella*, where a positive or negative number represents an enhancement or repression of transcript expression in field-grown, respectively, compared to cabinet grown plants. Column E denotes whether annotated gene is associated with stress based on gene ontology categorization (Yes=stress associated). Column F denotes whether the annotated gene is associated with abscisic acid signaling (S) or metabolism (M), or responsive to abscisic acid stimulus (R) based on gene ontology categorization. Column G denotes whether the annotated gene is also stress-responsive (indicated with "1") based on experiments performed in growth chambers by our research group as reported in Table 2 in Wong et al. (2006).

Transcripts down-regulated (P<0.01) in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in 2003 and 2005

Α		C	D	E	F	G
<u> </u>		F 2003 /	F 2005 /			<u> </u>
AGI code	Annotation	Chamber	Chamber			
At2g43590	Chitinase. Putative	-23.7	-3.7			1
At3g57270	Beta-1.3-Glucanase 1	-18.6	-14.3			
At3957240	Beta-1 3-Glucanase 3	-14.7	-20.0	Yes		1
At1975040	Pathogenesis-Related Gene 5	-10.9	-5.3	Yes		$\frac{1}{1}$
At2g30520	Root Phototropism 2	-10.7	-4.0	Yes		<u> </u>
At3g51600	Lipid Transfer Protein 5	-10.3	-5.6		————	1
At5g21274	Calmodulin 6	-9.3	-10.0		<u> </u>	
At4g27440	Protochlorophyllide Oxidoreductase B	-9.0	-9.1			
At1g21100	O-Methyltransferase. Putative	-8.8	-7.7	·		<u>├</u> ───
At3g13560	Glycosyl Hydrolase Family 17 Protein	-8.2	-5.0			F
At3916530	Legume Lectin Family Protein	-8.0	-12.5			1
At2g02930	Glutathione S-Transferase 16	-7.6	-5.6		·····	<u> </u>
At4922690	Cytochrome P450 Family	-7.1	-9.5			<u> </u>
At2g39310	Iacalin Lectin Family Protein	-7.0	-7.1			1
At2g44490	Penetration 2 Glycosyl Hydrolase	-6.5	-8.3	Yes		$\frac{1}{1}$
At2g41180	SigA-Binding Protein-Related	-6.4	-4 5			<u> </u>
At2g29300	Tropinone Reductase Putative	-63	-83			<u>├</u> ──
At3g16370	GDSL-Motif Linase/Hydrolase	-6.0	-1.8			1
At1978830	Curculin-Like Lectin Family Protein	-5.2	-3.4			<u> </u>
At4g11650	Osmotin 34	-51	-21.4	Yes	·	1
At3g26210	Cytochrome P450, Family 71	-4.9	-5.0			
At3g01290	Band 7 Family Protein	-4.8	-5.6	<u> </u>		
At1951805	Leucine-Rich Repeat Protein Kinase	-4.7	-4.8			
At4938770	Proline-Rich Protein 4	-4.6	-1.8			<u> </u>
At3g11080	Disease Resistance Family Protein	-3.9	-5.6	Yes	-	<u> </u>
At1g09480	Cinnamyl-Alcohol Dehydrogenase	-3.8	-5.6		~	<u> </u>
At1g62380	ACC Oxidase 2	-3.8	-4.9	Yes		<u> </u>
At3g45640	Mitogen-Activated Protein Kinase 3	-3.7	-4.8	Yes	S	
At4g28780	GDSL-Motif Lipase/Hydrolase	-3.7	-1.7			
At4g21960	Peroxidase 42	-3.6	-3.2	Yes	·	1
At1949130	Zinc Finger Family Protein	-3.5	-4.3			
At3g32980	Peroxidase 32	-3.5	-6.7	Yes	-	<u> </u>
At4g01950	Giveerol-3-Phosphate Acyltransferase 3	-3.4	-2.7			
At1931580	Pathogen Inducible ECS1	-3.3	-3.1	Yes		1
At3g22440	Hydroxyproline-Rich Glycoprotein	-33	-2.2			<u> </u>
At3952500	Aspartyl Protease Family Protein	-3.2	-2.4			
At2g26190	Calmodulin-Binding Family Protein	-3.2	-2.5			<u> </u>
At1002140	Maternal Effect Embryo Arrest 63	-31	-2.6			t
At1976160	Sku5 Oxidoreductase	-3.0	-15			<u> </u>
At3g15450	Unknown Protein	-3.0	-7.0			<u>├──</u> ─
At1 v20620	Catalase 3	-29	-97	Yes		
At5g24240	Phosphatidylinositol 3- and 4-Kinase		_22	103		
At4g13850	Glycine-Rich RNA-Binding Protein 2	-2.9	-2.2	Ves		
111-813030	Gifene-Rich Ritz-Dinding Hotem 2	L -2.0	-2.2	103	1	1

At5g14120	Nodulin Family Protein	-2.8	-4.5		1
At4g19810	Glycosyl Hydrolase Family 18 Protein	-2.8	-7.7	T	
At1g28230	Purine Permease 1	-2.7	-3.3		
At1g65930	Isocitrate Dehydrogenase, Putative	-2.6	-2.2	Yes	
At2g20630	Protein Phosphatase 2C, Putative	-2.5	-5.0		

Transcripts up-regulated (P<0.01) in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in 2003 and 2005

A	В	С	D	Е	F	G
		F 2003 /	F 2005 /			
AGI Code	Annotation	Chamber	Chamber			1
At3g02150	Plastid Transcription Factor 1	1.6	1.9			
At4g27520	Plastocyanin-Like Protein	1.9	2.1			
At3g46970	Alpha-Glucan Phosphorylase 2	2.1	5.9	Yes		
At5g51040	Expressed Protein	2.1	2.2			
At4g37980	Elicitor-Activated Gene 3	2.2	4.6	Yes		
At4g35090	Catalase 2	2.3	3.7	Yes		
At5g57800	Eceriferum 3	2.3	5.5			
At2g39770	Cytokinesis Defective 1	2.4	2.2	Yes		
At1g06430	FtsH Protease 8	2.4	2.1			1
At1g15100	Zinc Ion Binding Protein	2.4	2.6		S	
At5g23750	Remorin Family Protein	2.5	3.0			1
At3g61220	Short-Chain Dehydrogenase/Reductase	2.5	2.9	Yes		
At1g67870	Glycine-Rich Protein	2.5	1.9			
At2g29630	Thiamine Biosynthesis Family Protein	2.6	3.8			1
At3g51730	Saposin B Domain-Containing Protein	2.6	2.6			
At3g21560	Sinapate 1-Glucosyltransferase	2.6	4.1			
At1g24580	Zinc Finger Family Protein	2.7	3.4			
At3g56290	Expressed Protein	2.7	3.6			
At1g29640	Expressed Protein	2.7	1.8			
At4g13250	Short-Chain Dehydrogenase/Reductase	2.7	3.1			1
At2g12190	Cytochrome P450, Putative	2.8	2.6			
At1g58280	Expressed Protein	2.8	3.5			
At5g61820	Expressed Protein	3.1	1.9			1
At1g17190	Glutathione S-Transferase	3.2	5.3	Yes		
At3g44300	Nitrilase 2	3.2	4.0	Yes		
At3g57020	Strictosidine Synthase Family Protein	3.3	2.4			1
At3g23400	Plastid-Lipid Associated Protein	3.5	1.8			
At1g56600	Galactinol Synthase 2	3.6	3.1			1
At4g37680	Heptahelical Protein 4	3.8	8.5			
At5g15970	Cold-Responsive 6.6	4.1	6.4	Yes	R	1
At4g26530	Fructose-Bisphosphate Aldolase	4.2	5.5			F
At5g52300	Responsive To Dessication 29B	4.4	2.7	Yes	S	1
At4g14690	Early Light-Inducible Protein 2	4.6	29.0	Yes		1
At5g07990	Flavonoid 3'-Monooxygenase	5.2	10.2	Yes		
At4g39800	Myo-Inositol-1-Phosphate Synthase	5.3	9.2			<u> </u>
At5g09570	Expressed Protein	5.3	2.5			
At3g19710	Methionine-Oxo-Acid Transaminase	5.8	4.0			
At5g13170	Nodulin Mtn3 Family Protein	5.9	5.3			1
At5g57785	Unknown Protein	6.1	3.7			
At3g57520	Seed Imbibition 2	8.2	3.9			1
At3g22840	Early Light-Inducible Protein 1	13.0	52.9	Yes		1

Transcripts up-regulated (P<0.01) in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in 2003, down-regulated (P<0.01) in 2005

A	В	C	D	E	F	G
		F 2003 /	F 2005 /			
AGI code	Annotation	Chamber	Chamber			
At2g15890	Maternal Effect Embryo Arrest 14	2.8	-2.4			
At5g66860	Expressed Protein	2.4	-1.6			

Transcripts down-regulated (P<0.01) in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in 2003 only

	В	C	D	Е	F	G
		F 2003 /	F 2005 /			
AGI code	Annotation	Chamber	Chamber			1
At1g72610	Germin-Like Protein 1	-20.5				1
At1g56340	Calreticulin 1	-11.2		Yes		
At2g10940	Lipid Transfer Protein Family Protein	-10.6				1
At3g16470	Jacalin Lectin Family Protein	-9.3		Yes		
At5g41750	Disease Resistance Protein	-8.9		Yes		
At5g22580	Expressed Protein	-7.5				
At1g74710	Isochorismate Synthase 1	-6.3		Yes		
At1g52400	Beta-Glucosidase Homolog 1	-5.0				1
At4g31500	Cytochrome P450 Monooxygenase	-4.9		Yes		
At1g71695	Peroxidase 12	-4.7		Yes		
At1g66980	Glycerophosphoryl Phosphodiesterase	-4.7				
At4g02380	Senescence-Associated Gene 21	-4.6		Yes		1
At1g80440	Kelch Repeat-Containing F-Box	-4.3				
At1g26770	Expansin A10	-4.2				
At2g45470	Arabinogalactan Protein 8	-4.2				
At2g21650	Maternal Effect Embryo Arrest 3	-4.1				
At3g25020	Disease Resistance Family Protein	-3.8		Yes		
At2g06850	Endoxyloglucan Transferase	-3.5		Yes		1
At5g14320	30S Ribosomal Protein S13	-3.4				
At3g27690	PS II Light Harvesting Complex	-3.3				1
At4g03210	Xyloglucan Endotransglucosylase	-3.3				
At2g05070	PS II Light Harvesting Complex	-3.2				
At2g28190	Copper/Zinc Superoxide Dismutase 2	-3.2		Yes		
At5g37600	Glutamate-Ammonia Ligase	-3.2				
At1g08450	Calreticulin 3	-3.2				
At3g01500	Carbonic Anhydrase 1	-3.1		Yes		1
At1g48300	Unknown Protein	-2.9				
At4g23190	Cysteine-Rich Rlk11 Kinase	-2.9		Yes		
At3g62630	Expressed Protein	-2.9				
At1g14870	Expressed Protein	-2.8		Yes		
At1g15820	PSII Chlorophyll Binding Protein	-2.8		Yes		1
At1g59870	Pleiotropic Drug Resistance 8 Protein	-2.7		Yes		
At3g22120	Plasma Membrane Linker Protein	-2.6				1
At1g44446	Chlorophyllide A Oxygenase	-2.6				
At5g40780	Lysine Histidine Transporter 1	-2.5				
At3g17390	S-Adenosylmethionine Synthase 3	-2.3		Yes		

Transcripts up-regulated (P<0.01) in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in 2003 only

A	В	C	D	Е	F	G
		F 2003 /	F 2005 /			
AGI code	Annotation	Chamber	Chamber			
At1g80130	Expressed Protein	1.5		Yes		1
At3g15310	Transposable Element Gene	16				1
At1g22370	UDP-Glucosyl Transferase 85A5	16				
At3g55/30	Beta-1 3-Glucanase Butative	1.0				
At5g42050	Linknown Brotain	1.6				1
AL3942030		1.0				
Atig2///0	Endemolecular (Energy land (Dhan hat an	1.7			D	
Alig47310	Endonuclease/Exonuclease/Phosphatase	1.7			К	
At2g34640	Plastid Transcriptionally Active 12	1.8				
Atig09070	Soybean Regulated by Cold 2	1.9				
At2g16890	UDP-Glucosyl Transferase	1.9				
At3g23920	Beta-Amylase I	2.0				ļ
At4g23600	Coronatine Induced 1, JA Responsive 2	2.1		Yes	R	
At1g64370	Unknown Protein	2.1				
At4g38740	Peptidyl-Prolyl Cis-Trans Isomerase	2.1				
At3g08510	Phospholipase C 2	2.1				
At5g09590	Heat Shock Protein 70	2.1		Yes		
At1g63810	Nrap Family Protein	2.1				
At2g33590	Cinnamoyl-CoA Reductase Family	2.2				
At3g56310	Alpha-Galactosidase/Melibiase, Putative	2.2				
At2g17695	Expressed Protein	2.3				
At3g10985	Wound-Induced Protein 12/SAG20	2.3		Yes		
At1980530	Nodulin Family Protein	2.3			-	
At5g48180	Kelch Repeat-Containing Protein	2.3				
At1g30360	Farly-Responsive To Dehydration 4	2.3				
At1g30300	NADPH Thioredoxin Peduatase 1	2.5				
At4g55400	Alpha Amulasa Lika 2	2.3				
At1g/0150	Aipita-Aitiyiase-Like 2	2.5				ł
At1g03340	Expressed Protein	2.5		Vaa		1
At1g13930	Expressed Protein	2.4		res		1
At1g29330	ER Lumen Retaining Receptor 2	2.4				
At2g43100	Aconitase Containing Protein	2.5				
Atlg21680	Expressed Protein	2.5				L
At2g01150	Zinc Ion Binding Protein	2.5				
At1g52030	Myrosinase-Binding Protein 2	2.5		Yes		1
At2g37220	RNA-Binding Protein Cp29, Putative	2.5		Yes		
At5g42980	Thioredoxin H-Type 3 Protein	2.5		Yes		
At4g34950	Nodulin Family Protein	2.5				
At1g31230	Aspartate Kinase	2.6				
At5g52310	Cold Regulated 78	2.6		Yes	R	
At5g60600	4-OH-3-Mebut-2-en-1-yl DiP Synthase	2.6		Yes		
At4g19230	Cytochrome P450	2.6		Yes	М	1
At1g17870	Yellow-Green 3	2.6		Yes		
At2g29450	Glutathione S-Transferase	2.6		Yes		
At5g53870	Plastocyanin-Like Protein	2.7				1
At1g68050	Flavin-Binding Kelch Domain Protein	2.7		Yes		
At1g78380	Glutathione Transferase 8	2.7		Yes		
At1g19570	Dehydroascorbate Reductase	2.7		- **		
At5g42800	Dihydroflavonol 4-Reductase	27				1
At4001610	Cathensin B-Like Cysteine Protease	2.7				
At5g16070	2-Alkenal Reductase	2.7		Yes		<u> </u>
At2g29220	Duridovina Riosunthasis 1.1	2.1		Vee		
AL2230230		2.0		105		
AU20000	FIORE S	2.8				
At3g02830	UDP-GIUCUTONIC ACID Decarboxylase 2	2.8				
At4g39/30	Lipid-Associated Family Protein	2.8				
At1g55490	Chaperonin 60 Beta	2.8		Yes		
At3g51780	Bcl-2-Associated Athanogene 4	2.8		Yes		
At3g09390	Metallothionein 2A	2.8				1

At1g01470	Late Embryogenesis Abundant 14	2.8	Yes		Τ
At5g60360	Aleurain-Like Protease	2.9			1
At2g34810	FAD-Binding Protein	2.9	Yes		
At1g66390	Production Of Anthocyanin Pigment 2	2.9			
At5g23010	2-Isopropylmalate Synthase 3	2.9			
At2g40300	Ferritin 4	2.9	Yes		
At1g09240	Nicotianamine Synthase, Putative	2.9			
At3g56090	Ferritin 3	3.0	Yes		
At2g17840	Early-Responsive To Dehydration 7	3.0	Yes		
At1g16410	Cytochrome P450	3.0			
At1g16850	Unknown Protein	3.1	Yes		
At3g17800	UV-B Responsive MEB5.2 Gene	3.2	Yes		
At2g46680	Homeobox 7 Transcription Factor	3.2	Yes	S	
At3g15840	Post-Illumination Chlorophyll Protein	3.3			
At3g48510	Expressed Protein	3.3			
At5g21100	L-Ascorbate Oxidase, Putative	3.3			
At4g16190	Cysteine Proteinase, Putative	3.4			1
At2g40080	Early Flowering 4	3.5	Yes		
At1g07040	Expressed Protein	3.6			
At2g21660	Cold, Circadian Rhythm Protein	3.6	Yes		
At1g62570	Flavin-Containing Monooxygenase	4.0			1
At5g01600	Ferretin 1	4.1	Yes		
At5g58070	Lipocalin, Putative	4.2	Yes		
At1g20440	Cold Regulated 47	4.3	Yes	R	1
At5g66400	Responsive To ABA 18	4.5	Yes	R	1
At4g17090	Beta-Amylase 3, Beta-Amylase 8	4.9	Yes		
At4g04020	Fibrillin	4.9	Yes	R	1
At5g52640	Heat Shock Protein 81-1	5.8	Yes		
At1g62510	Lipid Transfer Protein Family Protein	6.2			
At5g12020	17.6 kDa Class II Heat Shock Protein	6.3	Yes		
At5g59310	Lipid Transfer Protein 4	8.1		R	1
At4g33550	Lipid Transfer Protein Family Protein	8.4			1
At1g20450	Early Responsive To Dehydration 10	8.7	Yes	R	1

Transcripts down-regulated (P<0.01) in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in 2005 only

A	В	С	D	E	F	G
		F 2003 /	F 2005 /			
AGI code	Annotation	Chamber	Chamber			
At1g78850	Curculin-Like Lectin Family Protein		-13.3			
At1g21120	O-Methyltransferase, Putative		-11.1			1
At5g41550	Disease Resistance Protein		-8.3	Yes		1
At3g51000	Epoxide Hydrolase, Putative		-7.4			
At1g06650	2-OG-Dependent Dioxygenase, Putative		-5.9			1
At5g55450	Lipid Transfer Protein Family Protein		-5.9	Yes		
At5g61210	Synaptosomal-Associated Protein 33		-5.6	Yes		
At5g25980	Glucoside Glucohydrolase 2		-5.5			1
At4g16500	Cysteine Protease Inhibitor		-5.0			
At2g38530	Lipid Transfer Protein 2		-5.0			
At2g05530	Glycine-Rich Protein		-4.7			
At1g76790	O-Methyltransferase Family 2 Protein		-4.5			
At2g05520	Glycine-Rich Protein 3		-4.4	Yes	R	
At2g41430	Early Responsive To Dehydration 15		-4.3	Yes		
At5g20950	Glycosyl Hydrolase Family 3 Protein		-4.3			
At1g15670	Kelch Repeat Family Protein		-4.2			
At3g51920	Calmodulin 9		-4.0	Yes	R	
At5g20230	Blue-Copper-Binding Protein		-3.8	Yes		1
At2g20960	pEARLI4		-3.8			
At3g03870	Hypothetical Protein		-3.8			
				·	r	
-----------	---------------------------------------	------	------------	--------------	---------------	
At4g29190	Zinc Finger Family Protein					
At5g35525	Unknown Protein					
At5g39670	Calcium-Binding EFHand Protein	-3.3	L			
At3g14990	4-Me-5-OH-Me-Thiazole P Protein					
At2g05440	Glycine-Rich Protein	-3.3	l		1	
At2g39210	Nodulin Family Protein	-3.2				
At1g13260	ABI3/Vp1 1 Transcription Factor	-3.2			<u> </u>	
At2933830	Auxin Associated Family Protein	-3.1				
At5g48380	Leucine-Rich Repeat Family Protein	-31		·		
At5g61530	Small G Protein Family Protein	-3.1	<u> </u>		├ ────	
At3g01330	Enithiospecifier Medifier 1		Vac		1	
At5g14210	Aurice Arrestite d Eventile Destain		105			
At1g56220	Auxin Associated Family Protein	-3.0	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	
At3g11130	Clathrin Heavy Chain, Putative	-2.9			ļ	
At1g54030	GDSL-Motif Lipase, Putative	-2.9	<u> </u>			
At4g24190	Shepherd ATP Binding Protein	-2.9	Yes			
At5g21940	Unknown Protein	-2.9				
At5g11090	Serine-Rich Protein	-2.9				
At1g22710	Sucrose-Proton Symporter 2	-2.9				
At2g29320	Tropinone Reductase, Putative	-2.9				
At3g28930	AvrRpt2-Induced Gene 2	-2.8	Yes			
At5961020	Evolutionary Conserved C-Terminal 3	-2.8				
At4935480	Zinc Ion Binding Protein	-2.8			t	
At5g15650	Alpha-1 4-Glucan-Protein Synthase	-2.7	Yes			
At5g21090	Leucine-Rich Repeat Protein Putative	-2.7	105		<u>+</u>	
At/g05070	Unknown Protein				h	
A14g03070	Charachi Undralana Escuila 1 Dratain	-2.7	- Var			
Al5g24350	Glycosyl Hydrolase Pamily I Protein	-2.0	res			
At5g01750	Unknown Protein	-2.0		- <u>n</u> -		
At5g25610	Responsive to Dessication 22	-2.0	res	<u> </u>	- <u> </u>	
At3g14230	APETALA2 2 Transcription Factor	-2.6			L	
At5g18490	Unknown Protein	-2.6				
At2g30250	WRKY DNA-Binding Protein 25	-2.6	_Yes			
At3g10020	Unknown Protein	-2.5	Yes			
At4g10450	60S Ribosomal Protein L9	-2.5				
At2g47470	Maternal Effect Embryo Arrest 30	-2.5	İ			
At3g06500	Beta-Fructofuranosidase, Putative	-2.5				
At3g56510	TBP-Binding Protein, Putative	-2.5				
At5g20290	40S Ribosomal Protein S8	-2.4				
At4g26120	Ankyrin Repeat Family Protein	-2.4				
At5g58375	Unknown Protein	-2.4				
At5g44420	Low-Molecular-Weight Cys-Rich 77	-2.4	Yes		1	
At1g08380	Photosystem I Subunit O	-2.4			1	
At5g20010	Ras Related Nuclear Protein	-2.4	Yes			
At5957887	Unknown Protein	-2.4				
At/g19160	Unknown Protein	2.4				
At5a56000	Heat Shock Protein 81.4	-2.5	ł		<u> </u>	
At1a14710	HO-proline Rich Glycoprotein	-2.3			╀───┤	
Arig14710	20C Ex(II) Organaca Esmily Protein				┟╌───┤	
At2g17720	400 Pilessenal Protein S2 Putation	-2.3			<u>├</u>	
Alig58985	405 Ribosomai Protein 52, Putative	-2.3	<u> </u>		↓	
At5g27850	605 Ribosomal Protein L18 (Rp118C)	-2.3				
At1g6/9/0	Heat Shock Transcription Factor A8	-2.3				
At1g53280	DJ-1 Family Protein	-2.3				
At4g39670	Glycolipid Transporter	-2.3				
At3g48530	SNF1-Related Kinase	-2.3				
At4g19200	Proline-Rich Family Protein	-2.3	L	L		
At3g52800	Zinc Finger Family Protein	-2.3				
At1g67430	60S Ribosomal Protein L17	-2.2				
At3g47470	PS I Light Harvesting Complex	-2.2				
At4g14270	PAM2 Motif Containing Protein	-2.2				
At1g14790	RNA-Dependent RNA Polymerase 1	-2.2	Yes			
At4g10970	Unknown Protein	-2.2		<u> </u>	<u>├───</u>	
At4g34670	40S Ribosomal Protein S3A	-2.2		 	┼───┤	
At3g02230	Reversibly Glycosylated Polypeptide 1	-2.2	Yes			
At1g12240	Vacuolar Invertase	-2.1	- <u> </u>		┞───┤	
·						

				· · · · ·		r
At2g41530	S-Formylglutathione Hydrolase		-2.1			
At2g36160	40S Ribosomal Protein S14		-2.1			
At2g37190	60S Ribosomal Protein L12		-2.1	Yes		
At3g24830	60S Ribosomal Protein L13A		-2.1			
At3951840	Acvl-CoA Oxidase 4		-2.1	<u> </u>		
At3g25890	AP2 Transcription Factor Dutative		2.1	<u> </u>	·	<u> </u>
At2=14060	Lete Embruogenerie Abundant Destein				<u> </u>	ł
AL2944060	Late Embryogenesis Adundant Protein		-2.1	res		<u> </u>
At4g05150	Octicosapeptide/Phox/BemTP Protein		-2.1	<u> </u>		
At4g18630	Unknown Protein		-2.1			
At1g47540	Trypsin Inhibitor, Putative		-2.1	Yes		
At5g23860	Tubulin Beta-8		-2.1	Yes		
At1g50010	Tubulin Alpha-2 Chain		-2.1	Yes		
At5050900	Armadillo/B-Catenin Repeat Protein		-2.0			
At3g1/310	Pectin Methylesterase 3		2.0	Vec		
At1=02120	Demonstrate Te Abasis As 41D		-2.0	105		
Atiguzio	Responsive To Abscisic Acid 1B		-2.0			
At3g61460	Zine Ion Binding Protein		-2.0	[
At3g21140	FMN Binding Protein		-2.0			
At5g53460	NADH-Glutamate Synthase 1 Gene		-2.0			
At1g73680	Pathogen-Responsive a-Dioxygenase		-2.0	Yes		
At3g26090	Regulator Of G-Protein Signaling 1		-2.0	Yes	R	
At4g20890	Tubulin Beta-9 Chain		-2.0			
At3g17410	Sering/Threening Protein Kingsa		-2.0	<u> </u>		
A(3g17410			-2.0			
At4g29410	60S Ribosomal Protein L28		-2.0			
At1g21310	Extensin 3		-2.0			
At5g01530	Chlorophyll A-B Binding Protein CP29		-2.0			1
At3g45860	Receptor-Like Protein Kinase, Putative		-2.0	Yes		
At5g12250	Beta-6 Tubulin		-2.0	Yes		
At1961820	Beta-Glucosidase 46					
At1g30220	Elongation Easter 1 Bate/Ef 1 Bate		-2.0	·		
Alig30230	COS D'harren Detain Delate h		-2.0	— —		
At3g58660	ous Ribosomal Protein-Related		-1.9			
At5g60640	Protein Disulfide Isomerase-Like 1-4		-1.9	Yes		
At5g10360	40S ribosomal protein S6-2		-1.9			
At4g02350	Exocyst Complex Subunit Sec15-Like		-1.9	L		
At3g61470	PS I Light Harvesting Complex		-1.9			1
At2g17480	Mildew Resistance Locus O 8		-1.9	Yes		
At3g16640	Translation-Controlled Tumor Protein		-1.9	Yes		
At5g61190	Zinc Finger Related Protein		1.0			
At/g3/180	Cualase Family Protein			Var		
At4254160			-1.9	1es		
At4g13940	Adenosylhomocysteinase		-1.9			
At2g20780	Mannitol Transporter, Putative		1.9			
At5g09810	Actin 7		1.9	Yes		
At1g09690	60S Ribosomal Protein L21		-1.9			
At5g39590	Unknown Protein		-1.9			
At2g34420	PS II Light Harvesting Complex		-1.9			
At3944340	Clone Fighty-Four Transporter Protein		-1.8			
At3g17520	Late Empryogenesis Abundant Protain		1.0			
At3=11320	Late Entoryogenesis Abundant Frotein		-1.0			
A12941400			-1.8			
At5g24150	Squalene Monooxygenase I		-1.8			
At1g29920	Chlorophyll A/B-Binding Protein 2		-1.8			
At5g11740	Arabinogalactan Protein 15		-1.8			
At1g77460	Binding Protein		-1.8			
At3g54810	Blue-Micropylar Transcription Factor		-1.8			
At1g30580	GTP Binding Protein		-1.8			
At5010010	Unknown Protein			<u> </u>		
At/g22670	Heat Shock Protein 70	— {	-1.0			
A14g22070	DNA Dinding Details 45.4		-1.8			┢━━━━━━┫
At5g54900	KNA-Binding Protein 45A		-1.8			
At3g27740	Carbamoyl Phosphate Synthetase A		-1.8			
At5g02500	Heat Shock Cognate Protein 1		-1.8	Yes		
At3g54890	Chlorophyll Binding Protein		-1.8			1
At1g72150	Patellin 1		-1.8			
At1g01820	Peroxisomal Biogenesis Factor 11c		-1.8			
At4015030	Unknown Protein					
At1077997	Unknown Protein		1.0			
AU 822002			-1.8			

1.1.8 1.1.8 1.1.8 Al321700 Unknown Protein 1.1.8 1.1.8 Al3217050 Yellow Stripe Like 5 Transporter 1.1.7 1.1.8 Al3207700 DiGcorge Syndrome Related Protein 1.1.7 1.1.7 Al4201701 DiP-Glucosyndramsferase 1.1.7 1.1.7 Al4201701 DiP-Glucosyndramsferase 1.1.7 1.1.7 Al4292020 Phenylalanyl-HKNA Synthetase 1.1.7 1.1.7 Al4292030 Flengation Factor Hamily Protein 1.1.7 1.1.7 Al4292030 Sciel A Cytosolic Factor Flamily Protein 1.1.7 1.1.7 Al1254100 Scinder Theorin Protein Nitaso 1.1.7 1.1.7 Al1294000 Scinder Theorin Protein Nitase 1.1.7 1.1.7 Al2203740 Scinder Theorin Protein Nitase 1.1.7 1.1.6 Al220300 Scinder Theorin Protein Nitase 1.1.7 1.1.6 Al220340 Fetratricopeptide Repear Protein 1.1.6 1.1.6 Al2264430 Glycosyl Hydrodase Family Protein 1.1.6 1.1.6	At1g35780	Unknown Protein	-1.8	<u>г - т</u>		
Abs/17650 Yellow Strip Euke 5 Transporter 1.18 Ads(07790 DiGeorge Syndrome Related Protein 1.17 Ads(07790 DiGeorge Syndrome Related Protein 1.17 Ads(01790 DiGeorge Syndrome Related Protein 1.17 Ads(01070 UDP-Glucosyltransferase 1.17 Yes Att[55460 DNA. Binding Protein-Related 1.17 Image: Comparison Comparison Protein Related Att[27160 Sciel A Cynsoch Factor Family Protein 1.17 Yes Image: Comparison Relation Relation Protein Relation Rel	At3g27090	Unknown Protein	-1.8			
Abs/1000 Discorge Syndrome Related Protein 1.0 Alsg07700 Discorge Syndrome Related Protein 1.7 Alsg00300 Elongation Factor I - Alpha/EF-1-Alpha 1.7 Alsg01700 Discorge Syndrome Related 1.7 All g55460 DNA-Binding Protein Related 1.7 All g55460 DNA-Binding Protein Related 1.7 All g55460 Drenylatally-HRNA Synthetase 1.7 All g21600 Sci 14 Alpha-Subwini 2 -1.7 All g26301 Translation Initiation Factor 1.7 All g26303 Translation Initiation Factor 1.7 All g26304 Sci-Introcolly Aldehyde Dehydrogenase 1.7 All g26304 Sci-Introcolly Aldehyde Dehydrogenase 1.7 All g26304 Sci-Introcolly Aldehyde Dehydrogenase 1.7 All g263040 Sci-Introcolly Aldehyde Dehydrogenase 1.7 All g263040 Econouclease Family Protein -1.6 All g264450 Glycosyl Hydrolase Family 1 Protein -1.6 All g264450 Glycosyl Hydrolase Family 1 Protein -1.6 All g26304	At3g17650	Yellow Stripe Like 5 Transporter	-1.8			
Adsg0103 Elongation Factor 1-Alpha/EF-1-Alpha 1-7 1.7 Artg51030 Diongation Factor 1-Alpha/EF-1-Alpha 1-7 1.7 Artg53203 Phenylalanyl-tRNA Synthetase 1-7 1.7 Artg53203 Phenylalanyl-tRNA Synthetase 1-7 1.7 Artg53203 Franslation Initiation Factor 1-7 1.7 Artg25502 Translation Initiation Factor 1-7 Yes 1.7 Artg25502 Translation Initiation Factor 1-7 Yes 1.7 Artg25803 Translation Initiation Factor 1-7 Yes 1.7 Artg25804 Translation Initiation Factor 1-7 Yes 1.7 Artg25805 Translation Initiation Factor 1-7 Yes 1.7 Artg25806 Translation Initiation Factor 1-7 Yes 1.7 Artg26806 Exonuclease Family Protein 1-7 Yes 1.7 Artg25804 Exonuclease Family Protein 1-16 1.6 1.7 Artg252040 Galactoxytransferase Family Protein 1-16	At3g07790	DiGeorge Syndrome Related Protein	-1.0			
Adsg0000 UDP. Glucosyltransferase 1.7 Yes Atlg53460 DNA-Binding Protein Related -1.7 - Atlg53460 DNA-Binding Protein Related -1.7 - Atlg53250 Sec14 Cytosolic Factor Family Protein -1.7 - Atlg52550 Translation Initiation Factor -1.7 Yes - Atlg55401 3-Chloroallyl Aldehyde Dehydrogenase -1.7 Yes R 1 Atlg54030 3-Chloroallyl Aldehyde Dehydrogenase -1.7 Yes R 1 Atlg54051 Serine/Threonine Protein Kinase -1.7 Yes - - Atlg54030 Berine/Threonine Protein Kinase -1.7 Yes - - Atlg54040 Evonuclease Family Protein -1.6 -	At5c60390	Elongation Factor 1-Alpha/EE-1-Alpha	-1.7			
Artgr070 DNA-Binding Protein Related 1.7 1.7 Artgr2500 Phenylalanyl-tRNA Synthetase 1.7 1.7 Artgr2200 Phenylalanyl-tRNA Synthetase 1.7 1.7 Artgr2160 Sec14 Cytosofic Factor Family Protein 1.7 1.7 Artgr25602 Translation Initiation Factor 1.7 Yes Artgr25603 Translation Initiation Factor 1.7 Yes 1.7 Artgr25602 Translation Initiation Factor 1.7 Yes 1.7 Artgr25603 Integral Membrane Yip1 Family Protein 1.7 Yes 1.7 Artgr25040 Serine/Threonine Protein Kinase 1.7 Yes 1.7 Artgr25040 Galaciosyltransferase Family Protein 1.6 1.7 1.6 Artgr24450 Glycosyl Hydrolase Family Protein 1.6 1.6 1.7 Artgr2450 Galaciosyltransferase Family Protein 1.6 1.6 1.6 Artgr2450 Glycosyl Hydrolase Family Protein 1.6 1.6 1.6 Artgr24500 Galaciosyltransferase Family P	At/g01070	Liongation Lactor 1-Alpha Liongation Liongation Liongation	-1.7	Ves		
Arlg.2920 Drive Dranke, Trease 1.7 Arlg.2920 Drenylamy-IrRNA Synitetase 1.7 Arlg.27160 Sec14 Cytosolic Factor Family Protein 1.7 Arlg.27160 Sec14 Cytosolic Factor Family Protein 1.7 Arlg.25520 Translation Initiation Factor 1.7 Yes Arlg.25520 Translation Initiation Factor 1.7 Yes Arlg.25070 Translation Initiation Factor 1.7 Yes Arlg.250700 Serind/Theorine Protein Kinase 1.7 Yes Arlg.250700 Serind/Theorine Protein Kinase 1.7 Yes Arlg.250700 Galactosyltras/ferase Family Protein 1.6 1.6 Arlg.250200 Galactosyltras/ferase Family Protein 1.6 1.6 Arlg.250300 Orka-Binding Protein Kinase 19 1.6 1.6 Arlg.250300	At1g55460	DNA Binding Protein Related	-1.7	105		
Ardg.2233 Interplanify/Extra sprint data 1.7 Ardg.2233 File Flore 1.7 Ardg.25502 Translation Initiation Factor 1.7 Ardg.25020 Integral Membrane Yipi Family Protein -1.7 Ardg.250740 Serine/Threonine Protein Kinase -1.7 Ardg.25140 Herraricoperpide Repeat Protein -1.7 Ardg.25240 Galactosyltransferase Family Protein -1.6 Ardg.25240 Galactosyltransferase Family Protein -1.6 Ardg.25240 Galactosyltransferase Family Protein -1.6 Ardg.25200 Galactosyltransferase Family Protein -1.6 Ardg.25290 DNA-Binding Protein GT-1-Related -1.6 Ardg.252900<	At1g30280	Dhanylalanyl tRNA Synthetase	-1.7		<u> </u>	
Allg 2100 Bet PS Quarker Lakor Parking Protein -1.7 Yes Allg 25630 Translation Initiation Factor -1.7 Yes - Allg 25630 Translation Initiation Factor -1.7 Yes - Allg 25630 Translation Initiation Factor -1.7 Yes R 1 Allg 254100 3-Chirovallyl Aldehyde Dehydrogenase -1.7 Yes R 1 Alg 250740 Serine/Threonine Protein Kinase -1.7 - - - Alg 250740 Serine/Threonine Protein Kinase -1.7 Yes - </td <td>Attg39260</td> <td>Sool4 Cytosolic Easter Family Protein</td> <td>-1.7</td> <td>}</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Attg39260	Sool4 Cytosolic Easter Family Protein	-1.7	}		
Adsg5500 Finduator Law Protein 1.7 1cs Adsg55502 Translation Initiation Factor 1.7 Yes 1 Adlg54502 Translation Initiation Factor 1.7 Yes R 1 Adlg54100 3-Chloroally Aldehyde Dehydrogenase 1.7 Yes R 1 Adg52140 Serine/Threonine Protein Kinase 1.7 Yes R 1 Adg52140 Teranslation Exonuclease Family Protein 1.6 1 1 1 Adg52020 Galactosyltransferase Family Protein 1.6 1 <	Attg/2100	Flongation Factor 1B Alpha Subunit 2	-1.7	Vec		
Alsg.2020 Translation Initiation Factor 1.7 Yes Allg.26630 Translation Initiation Factor 1.7 Yes R 1 Allg.26300 Serine/Threonine Protein Kinase 1.7 Yes R 1 Alg.253005 Integral Membrane Yip1 Family Protein 1.7 Yes R 1 Alg.25140 Fertarticopeptide Repeat Protein 1.7 Yes R 1 Alg.252040 Exonuclease Family Protein 1.6 1.6 1	At2255620	Elongation Factor TB Alpha-Subunit 2	-1./	105		
Atig20030 Tainstatoli micro raction -1.7 Yes R 1 Atig25100 Schioroallyl Aldehyde Dehydrogenase -1.7 Yes R 1 At2g39705 Integral Membrane Yipi Family Protein -1.7 Yes R 1 At2g37240 Tetratricopeptide Repeat Protein -1.7 Yes R 1 At3g252140 Tetratricopeptide Repeat Protein -1.6 - - - At5g26200 Galactosyltransferase Family Protein -1.6 -	Al5g55020	Translation Initiation Factor	-1./	Vac		
All 294100 S-ChildGarly A diellyde Delydrogetase -1.7 Tes K 1 All 2g3803 Integral Membrane Yipi Family Protein -1.7 -1.7 -1.7 All 2g3803 Serine/Threonine Protein Kinase -1.7 -1.7 -1.7 All 2g1680 4-Coumarate CoA Ligase 1 -1.7 Yes -1.6 All 2g1680 4-Coumarate CoA Ligase 1 -1.7 Yes -1.6 All 2g1680 4-Coumarate CoA Ligase 1 -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 All 2g1680 Exonuclease Family Protein -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 All 2g10420 Proteasome Family Protein Kinase 19 -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 All 2g32800 Calcium-Dependent Protein Kinase 19 -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 All 2g32300 GPatch Domain-Containing Protein -1.6<	At1g20030	Chloroplyd Aldobydo Dobydrogonogo	-1./	Vac	D	1
Al2g39305 Integral Memorane Tipl raminy Protein -1.7 Al2g30740 Serine/Threonine Protein Kinase -1.7 Al1g51680 4-Coumarate CoA Ligase 1 -1.7 Al1g51680 4-Coumarate CoA Ligase 1 -1.7 Al5g26940 Exonuclease Family Protein -1.6 Al5g26202 Galactosyltransferase Family Protein -1.6 Al2g44450 Olycosyl Hydrolase Family Protein -1.6 Al2g0200 Proteasome Family Protein -1.6 Al2g02100 UTPAmoraia Ligase, Putative -1.6 Al4g02120 UTPAmoraia Ligase, Putative -1.6 Al4g02120 UTPAmoraia Ligase, Putative -1.6 Al4g0230590 DNA-Binding Protein GT-I-Related -1.6 Al4g232590 DNA-Binding Protein, Putative -1.6 Al4g232590 DNA-Binding Protein -1.6 Al2g32590 DNA-Binding Protein -1.6 Al2g32590 DNA-Binding Protein -1.6 Al2g32590 DNA-Binding Protein -1.6 Al2g12300 Disported Protein -1.6 Al2g1300 Disported Protein -1.6 <td< td=""><td>Alig34100</td><td>S-Chioroanyi Aldenyde Denydrogenase</td><td>-1./</td><td>ies</td><td><u> </u></td><td><u> </u></td></td<>	Alig34100	S-Chioroanyi Aldenyde Denydrogenase	-1./	ies	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Al2g30740 Serine Turbonine Protein Naise -1.7 Al2g52140 Tetratricopeptide Repeat Protein -1.7 Al1g51680 4-Coumarate CoA Ligase 1 -1.7 Al5g6240 Exonuclease Family Protein -1.6 Al5g6250 Galactosyltransferase Family Protein -1.6 Al5g6260 Galactosyltransferase Family Protein -1.6 Al5g0240 Calcium-Dependent Protein Kinase 19 -1.6 Al4g02120 UPr-Ammonia Ligase, Putative -1.6 Al1g0380 G-Patch Domain-Containing Protein -1.6 Al1g0380 G-Patch Domain-Containing Protein -1.6 Al2g243250 Embryo Defective 1290/Kinase -1.6 Al1g0380 G-Patch Domain-Containing Protein, Putative -1.6 Al1g0380 Chirinase -1.6	At2g39803	Series (Theorem Protein Kings)	-1./	_		
Atbg2140 Tetratrocpeptide Repeat Protein -1.7 Yes Atbg21680 4-Coumarate CoA Ligase 1 -1.7 Yes Atbg20200 Galactosyltransferase Family Protein -1.6 -1.6 Atbg20200 Proteasome Family Protein -1.6 -1.6 Atbg20200 Proteasome Family Protein -1.6 -1.6 Atbg1210 UTPAmmonia Ligase, Putative -1.6 -1.6 Atbg23200 DVetasome Family Protein -1.6 -1.6 Atbg2120 UTPAmmonia Ligase, Putative -1.6 -1.6 Atbg23250 Embryo Defective 1200Kinase -1.6 -1.6 Atbg23250 Embryo Defective 1200Kinase -1.6 -1.6 Atlg13160 SDA1 Family Protein -1.6 -1.6 Atlg13160 Unknown Protein -1.6 -1.6 Atlg13180 Unknown Protein -1.6 -1.6 At2g14300 Unknown Prot	At2g30740	Serine/Infeorine Protein Kinase	-1./	├ ───┤		
Atlg 21680 4-Countrate CoA Ligase 1 -1.7 Yes AtSg26940 Exonuclease Family Protein -1.6 -1.6 AtSg26200 Galactosyltransferase Family Protein -1.6 -1.6 AtSg26200 Proteasome Family Protein -1.6 -1.6 AtSg20200 Proteasome Family Protein -1.6 -1.6 AtSg10200 Protenome Family Protein -1.6 -1.6 AtLg03200 OP-Ammonia Ligase, Putative -1.6 -1.6 AtLg03200 G-Patch Domain-Containing Protein -1.6 -1.6 AtLg03200 DNA-Binding Protein OT-1-Related -1.6 -1.6 AtLg103080 Chitinase -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 AtLg103080 Chitinase -1.6 Yes -1.6 -1.6 AtLg10300 SDA1 Family Protein -1.6	At3g52140	Tetratricopeptide Repeat Protein	-1./			
Abg262040 Exonuclease Family Protein -1.6 Atfg26220 Galactoxyltransferase Family Protein -1.6 Atfg20200 Proteasome Family Protein -1.6 Atfg19450 Calcium-Dependent Protein Kinase 19 -1.6 Atfg02120 UTPAmmonia Ligase, Putative -1.6 Atfg03980 C-Patch Domain-Containing Protein -1.6 Atfg03980 G-Patch Domain-Containing Protein -1.6 Atfg2320 DNA-Binding Protein GT-1-Related -1.6 Atfg2320 Embryo Defective 1290/Kinase -1.6 Atfg2320 Chitinase -1.6 Atfg20100 Oligouridylate-Binding Protein, Putative -1.6 Atfg20590 Homolog 2B/Transcription Factor -1.6 Atfg21600 Pro-Rich Splicesome-Associated -1.6 Atfg21300 Coatomer Protein Complex, Putative -1.6 Atfg21300	At1g51680	4-Coumarate CoA Ligase 1	-1./	Yes		
Abg26420 Galactosyltransterase ramily Protein -1.6 At2g44450 Glycosyl Hydrolase Family 1 Protein -1.6 At3g02200 Proteasome Family 1 Protein -1.6 At3g02200 Proteasome Family 1 Protein -1.6 At3g02200 UTPAmmonia Ligase, Putative -1.6 At4g02120 UTP-Ammonia Ligase, Putative -1.6 At1g63980 G-Patch Domain-Containing Protein -1.6 At1g02202 Embryo Defective 1290(Kinase -1.6 At4g221250 Embryo Defective 1290(Kinase -1.6 At1g05850 Chitinase -1.6 At1g13160 SDA1 Family Protein -1.6 At1g13160 SDA1 Family Protein -1.6 At1g21660 Pro-Rich Spliceosome-Associated -1.6 At3g11500 Unknown Protein -1.6 At1g181500 Unknown Protein -1.6 At1g18250 Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family -1.6 At1g18250 Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family -1.6 At1g18250 Bagy-Related Kinase 11 -1.6 At1g26400 Bell1-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 At1g2	At5g26940	Exonuclease Family Protein	-1.6			
Adg24430 Glycosyl Hydrolase Family Protein -1.6 At3g02200 Proteasome Family Protein -1.6 At4g02120 UTPAmmonia Ligase, Putative -1.6 At1g0380 G-Patch Domain-Containing Protein -1.6 At1g03980 G-Patch Domain-Containing Protein -1.6 At1g03980 G-Patch Domain-Containing Protein -1.6 At3g2230 Embryo Defective 1290/Kinase -1.6 At1g03850 Chitinase -1.6 At1g03850 Chitinase -1.6 At1g13160 SDA1 Family Protein -1.6 At1g13160 SDA1 Family Protein -1.6 At4g21650 Hronolog 2B/Transcription Factor -1.6 At4g21500 Unknown Protein -1.6 At2g21390 Coatomer Protein Complex, Putative -1.6 At2g15100 Unknown Protein -1.6 - At2g2130 Coatomer Protein Complex, Putative -1.6 - At2g16400 Bell1-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 - At2g16400 Bell1-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 - At2g16800 S/ZIP28 Transcription Factor	At5g62620	Galactosyltransferase Family Protein	-1.6			
At5g12200 Proteasome ramily Protein -1.6 At5g19450 Calcium-Dependent Protein Kinase 19 -1.6 At4g02120 UTPAmmonia Ligase, Putative -1.6 At4g02120 UTPAmmonia Ligase, Putative -1.6 At4g02120 UTPAmmonia Ligase, Putative -1.6 At4g023900 DNA-Binding Protein GT-1-Related -1.6 At4g23250 Embryo Defective 1290/Kinase -1.6 At4g03580 Chitinase -1.6 At1g13160 SDA1 Family Protein -1.6 At1g13160 SDA1 Family Protein -1.6 At2g05690 Homolog 2B/Transcription Factor -1.6 At2g1500 Unknown Protein -1.6 At2g1390 Coatomer Protein Complex, Putative -1.6 At2g1400 Bell-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 At2g1400 Bell-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 At2g1400 Bell-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 <	At2g44450	Glycosyl Hydrolase Family I Protein	-1.6			
Atg19450 Calcium-Dependent Protein Kinase 19 -1.6 At4g02120 UTP-Ammonia Ligase, Putative -1.6 At1g63980 G-Patch Domain-Containing Protein -1.6 At1g25990 DNA-Binding Protein GT-1-Related -1.6 At4g2250 Embryo Defective 1290/Kinase -1.6 At1g100 Oligouridylate-Binding Protein, Putative -1.6 At1g100 Oligouridylate-Binding Protein, Putative -1.6 At1g105850 Chitinase -1.6 At1g105850 Chitinase -1.6 At1g205809 Homolog 2B/Transcription Factor -1.6 At4g21660 Pro-Rich Spliceosome-Associated -1.6 At2g11500 Unknown Protein -1.6 At2g12190 Coatomer Protein Complex, Putative -1.6 At2g12300 Coatomer Protein Complex, Putative -1.6 At1g18850 Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family -1.6 At2g16400 Bell1-Like Homecodomain 7 -1.6 </td <td>At3g02200</td> <td>Proteasome Family Protein</td> <td>-1.6</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	At3g02200	Proteasome Family Protein	-1.6			
At4g02120 UTPAmmonia Ligase, Putative -1.6 At1g63980 G-Patch Domain-Containing Protein -1.6 At3g2590 DNA-Binding Protein GT-1-Related -1.6 At4g23250 Embryo Defective 1290/Kinase -1.6 At4g23250 Embryo Defective 1290/Kinase -1.6 At4g23250 Chitinase -1.6 At1g03850 Chitinase -1.6 At1g03550 Chitinase -1.6 At1g035690 Homolog 2B/Transcription Factor -1.6 At4g21600 Pro-Rich Spliceosome-Associated -1.6 At5g1500 Unknown Protein -1.6 At5g1500 Unknown Protein -1.6 At1g1850 Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family -1.6 At1g18950 Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family -1.6 At5g26751 Shaggy-Related Kinase 11 -1.6 At5g1900 bZIP28 Transcription Factor -1.6 At5g39450 F-Box Family Protein -1.6 At1g18160 bEll1-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 At2g17400 RNA Recognition Motif Protein -1.6 At5g39450 F-Box Family Prot	At5g19450	Calcium-Dependent Protein Kinase 19	-1.6			
Att g63980G-Patch Domain-Containing Protein-1.6At3g25990DNA-Binding Protein GT-1-Related-1.6At4g23250Embryo Defective 1290/Kinase-1.6At4g23500Chitinase-1.6At1g05850Chitinase-1.6At1g05850SDA1 Family Protein-1.6At1g13160SDA1 Family Protein-1.6At4g21600Pro-Rich Spliceosome-Associated-1.6At4g21600Pro-Rich Spliceosome-Associated-1.6At3g05690Unknown Protein-1.6At3g1500Unknown Protein-1.6At3g1500Unknown Protein-1.6At1g1890Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family-1.6At1g18950Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family-1.6At1g18950Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family-1.6At1g16400Bell1-Like Homeodomain 7-1.6At1g261300bZIP28 Transcription Factor-1.6At3g27700RNA Recognition Motif Protein-1.6At1g0170Synaptobrevin-Related Family Protein-1.6At1g04190Tetratricopeptide Repeat Protein-1.6At1g24101Synaptobrevin-Related Family Protein-1.5At1g28304Chaperonin, Putative-1.5At1g28430Chaperonin, Putative-1.5At1g26400Reprensin Family Protein-1.5At1g26400Reperonin, Putative-1.5At1g26400Reperonin, Putative-1.5At1g264300Chaperonin, Putative-1.5At1g264300Riperonin Protein-1.5	At4g02120	UTPAmmonia Ligase, Putative	-1.6			
A1325990 DNA-Binding Protein GT-1-Related -1.6 At4g23250 Embryo Defective 1290/Kinase -1.6 At1g1400 Oligouridylate-Binding Protein, Putative -1.6 At1g05850 Chitinase -1.6 At1g05850 Chitinase -1.6 At1g05850 Chitinase -1.6 At1g05850 Chitinase -1.6 At1g05690 Homolog 2B/Transcription Factor -1.6 At4g21600 Pro-Rich Spliceosome-Associated -1.6 At4g21500 Unknown Protein -1.6 At2g21390 Coatomer Protein Complex, Putative -1.6 At1g1850 Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family -1.6 At5g26751 Shaggy-Related Kinase 11 -1.6 At5g26751 Shaggy-Related Kinase 11 -1.6 At5g39450 F-Box Family Protein -1.6 At5g39450 F-Box Family Protein -1.6 At5g39450 F-Box Family Protein -1.6 At1g0170 Synaptobrevin-Related Family Protein -1.6 At1g04190 Tetratricopeptide Repeat Protein -1.5 At2g26710 Glutamate-tRNA Liga	At1g63980	G-Patch Domain-Containing Protein				
At4g23250 Embryo Defective 1290/Kinase -1.6 At3g14100 Oligouridylate-Binding Protein, Putative -1.6 At1g0550 Chitinase -1.6 At1g05590 Homolog 2B/Transcription Factor -1.6 At3g05690 Homolog 2B/Transcription Factor -1.6 At3g05690 Homolog 2B/Transcription Factor -1.6 At3g1890 Unknown Protein -1.6 At3g1890 Unknown Protein -1.6 At2g21390 Coatomer Protein Complex, Putative -1.6 At2g16400 Bell-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 At2g16400 Bell-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 At2g194501 F-Box Family Protein <t< td=""><td>At3g25990</td><td>DNA-Binding Protein GT-1-Related</td><td>-1.6</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	At3g25990	DNA-Binding Protein GT-1-Related	-1.6			
At3g14100Oligouridylate-Binding Protein, Putative-1.6At1g03850Chitinase-1.6At1g03850Chitinase-1.6At1g01310SDA1 Family Protein-1.6At3g05690Homolog 2B/Transcription Factor-1.6At4g21660Pro-Rich Spliceosome-Associated-1.6At3g05890Unknown Protein-1.6At3g1300Unknown ProteinAt2g1390Coatomer Protein Complex, PutativeAt1g18950Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family-1.6	At4g23250	Embryo Defective 1290/Kinase	1.6			
A11g05850 Chitinase -1.6 Yes A11g13160 SDA1 Family Protein -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 A13g05690 Homolog 2B/Transcription Factor -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 A14g21660 Pro-Rich Spliceosome-Associated -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 A13g51890 Unknown Protein -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 A12g21300 Coatomer Protein Complex, Putative -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 A11g18950 Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 A11g18950 Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 A11g18950 Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 A12g16400 Bell1-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 A12g16400 Bell1-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 A13g10800 bZIP28 Transcription Factor -1.6 Yes -1.6 A13g27700 RNA Recognition Motif Protein -1.6 -1.6 -1.6 A13g211830 Chaperonin, Putative -1.5 -1.5 -1.4 <	At3g14100	Oligouridylate-Binding Protein, Putative	-1.6			
At1g13160 SDA1 Family Protein -1.6 -1.6 At3g05690 Homolog 2B/Transcription Factor -1.6 -1.6 At4g21660 Pro-Rich Spliceosome-Associated -1.6 -1.6 At3g51890 Unknown Protein -1.6 -1.6 At3g51890 Unknown Protein -1.6 -1.6 At2g21390 Coatomer Protein Complex, Putative -1.6 -1.6 At1g18950 Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family -1.6 -1.6 At2g26751 Shaggy-Related Kinase 11 -1.6 -1.6 At2g16400 Bell1-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 -1.6 At3g10800 bZIP28 Transcription Factor -1.6 Yes At3g27700 RNA Recognition Motif Protein -1.6 -1.6 At3g11800 Chaperonin, Patative -1.6 -1.6 At3g21700 RNA Recognition Motif Protein -1.6 -1.6 At3g11830 Chaperonin, Patative -1.5 -1.6 At3g11830 Chaperonin, Patative -1.5 -1.5 At1g28400 Extensin Family Protein -1.5 -1.5 At1g284320 <	At1g05850	Chitinase	-1.6	Yes		
At3g05690Homolog 2B/Transcription Factor-1.6-1.6At4g21660Pro-Rich Spliceosome-Associated-1.6	At1g13160	SDA1 Family Protein	-1.6			
At4g21660 Pro-Rich Spliceosome-Associated -1.6 At3g51890 Unknown Protein -1.6 At5g11500 Unknown Protein -1.6 At2g21390 Coatomer Protein Complex, Putative -1.6 At1g18950 Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family -1.6 At1g18950 Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family -1.6 At5g26751 Shaggy-Related Kinase 11 -1.6 At2g16400 Bell1-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 <td>At3g05690</td> <td>Homolog 2B/Transcription Factor</td> <td>-1.6</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	At3g05690	Homolog 2B/Transcription Factor	-1.6			
At3g51890 Unknown Protein -1.6 At5g11500 Unknown Protein -1.6 At2g21390 Coatomer Protein Complex, Putative -1.6 At1g18950 Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family -1.6 At1g18950 Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family -1.6 At2g26400 Bell1-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 At3g10800 bZIP28 Transcription Factor -1.6 At3g29450 F-Box Family Protein -1.6 At3g29450 F-Box Family Protein -1.6 At3g27700 RNA Recognition Motif Protein -1.6 At4g10170 Synaptobrevin-Related Family Protein -1.6 At1g04190 Tetratricopeptide Repeat Protein -1.5 At1g78040 Extensin Family Protein -1.5 At1g266730 Zinc Finger Family Protein -1.5 At1g284320 Unknown Protein -1.5 At1g28040 Extensin Family Protein -1.5 At2g43320<	At4g21660	Pro-Rich Spliceosome-Associated	-1.6			
At5g11500 Unknown Protein -1.6 At2g21390 Coatomer Protein Complex, Putative -1.6 At1g18950 Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family -1.6 At1g18950 Shaggy-Related Kinase 11 -1.6 At2g16400 Bell1-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 At3g10800 bZIP28 Transcription Factor -1.6 At5g39450 F-Box Family Protein -1.6 At3g10700 RNA Recognition Motif Protein -1.6 At4g10170 Synaptobrevin-Related Family Protein -1.6 At1g04190 Tetratricopeptide Repeat Protein -1.6 At3g1830 Chaperonin, Putative -1.5 At1g78040 Extensin Family Protein -1.5	At3g51890	Unknown Protein	-1.6			
At2g21390Coatomer Protein Complex, Putative-1.6At1g18950Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family-1.6At5g26751Shaggy-Related Kinase 11-1.6At2g16400Bell1-Like Homeodomain 7-1.6At3g10800bZIP28 Transcription Factor-1.6At5g39450F-Box Family Protein-1.6At3g10800bZIP28 Transcription Factor-1.6At5g39450F-Box Family Protein-1.6At3g27700RNA Recognition Motif Protein-1.6At4g10170Synaptobrevin-Related Family Protein-1.6At1g04190Tetratricopeptide Repeat Protein-1.6At5g26710Glutamate-tRNA Ligase, Putative-1.5At1g78040Extensin Family Protein-1.5At1g06960Ribonucleoprotein Spliceosomal Protein-1.5At1g06960Ribonucleoprotein Spliceosomal Protein-1.5At5g57630Cbl-Interacting Protein Kinase 21-1.5At4g28510Prohibitin 1-1.5YesAt5g43010Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A-1.5Yes	At5g11500	Unknown Protein	-1.6			
At1g18950Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family-1.6-1.6At5g26751Shaggy-Related Kinase 11-1.6-1.6At2g16400Bell1-Like Homeodomain 7-1.6-1.6At3g10800bZIP28 Transcription Factor-1.6YesAt5g39450F-Box Family Protein-1.6YesAt3g27700RNA Recognition Motif Protein-1.6Image: Comparison of the synthesis of the synth	At2g21390	Coatomer Protein Complex, Putative	-1.6			
At5g26751Shaggy-Related Kinase 11-1.6-1.6At2g16400Bell1-Like Homeodomain 7-1.6-1.6At3g10800bZIP28 Transcription Factor-1.6YesAt5g39450F-Box Family Protein-1.6YesAt3g27700RNA Recognition Motif Protein-1.6Image: Comparison of the second	At1g18950	Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Family	-1.6			
At2g16400 Bell1-Like Homeodomain 7 -1.6 -1.6 At3g10800 bZIP28 Transcription Factor -1.6 Yes At5g39450 F-Box Family Protein -1.6 Yes At3g27700 RNA Recognition Motif Protein -1.6 Image: Comparison of the second secon	At5g26751	Shaggy-Related Kinase 11	-1.6			
At3g10800bZIP28 Transcription Factor-1.6YesAt5g39450F-Box Family Protein-1.6-1.6At3g27700RNA Recognition Motif Protein-1.6-1.6At4g10170Synaptobrevin-Related Family Protein-1.6-1.6At1g04190Tetratricopeptide Repeat Protein-1.6-1.6At3g11830Chaperonin, Putative-1.5-1.6At3g27700Glutamate-tRNA Ligase, Putative-1.5-1.5At1g78040Extensin Family Protein-1.5-1.5At1g243320Unknown Protein-1.5-1.5At1g0690Ribonucleoprotein Spliceosomal Protein-1.5-1.5At5g57630Zinc Finger Family Protein-1.5-1.5At5g28510Prohibitin 1-1.5-1.5At4g28510Prohibitin 1-1.5-1.5At5g43010Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A-1.5-1.5	At2g16400	Bell1-Like Homeodomain 7	-1.6			
At5g39450F-Box Family Protein-1.6At3g27700RNA Recognition Motif Protein-1.6At4g10170Synaptobrevin-Related Family Protein-1.6At1g04190Tetratricopeptide Repeat Protein-1.6At3g11830Chaperonin, Putative-1.5At3g27700Glutamate-tRNA Ligase, Putative-1.5At1g78040Extensin Family Protein-1.5At2g43320Unknown Protein-1.5At1g06900Ribonucleoprotein Spliceosomal Protein-1.5At5g6730Zinc Finger Family Protein-1.5At5g257630Cbl-Interacting Protein Kinase 21-1.5At5g43010Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A-1.5	At3g10800	bZIP28 Transcription Factor	-1.6	Yes		
At3g27700RNA Recognition Motif Protein-1.6At4g10170Synaptobrevin-Related Family Protein-1.6At1g04190Tetratricopeptide Repeat Protein-1.6At3g11830Chaperonin, Putative-1.5At5g26710Glutamate-tRNA Ligase, Putative-1.5At1g78040Extensin Family Protein-1.5At2g43320Unknown Protein-1.5At1g06960Ribonucleoprotein Spliceosomal Protein-1.5At5g6730Zinc Finger Family Protein-1.5At5g57630Cbl-Interacting Protein Kinase 21-1.5At5g43010Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A-1.5	At5g39450	F-Box Family Protein	-1.6			
At4g10170Synaptobrevin-Related Family Protein-1.6At1g04190Tetratricopeptide Repeat Protein-1.6At3g11830Chaperonin, Putative-1.5At5g26710Glutamate-tRNA Ligase, Putative-1.5At1g78040Extensin Family Protein-1.5At2g43320Unknown Protein-1.5At1g06960Ribonucleoprotein Spliceosomal Protein-1.5At5g6730Zinc Finger Family Protein-1.5At5g57630Cbl-Interacting Protein Kinase 21-1.5At4g28510Prohibitin 1-1.5YesAt5g43010Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A-1.5	At3g27700	RNA Recognition Motif Protein	-1.6			
At1g04190Tetratricopeptide Repeat Protein-1.6At3g11830Chaperonin, Putative-1.5At5g26710Glutamate-tRNA Ligase, Putative-1.5At1g78040Extensin Family Protein-1.5At2g43320Unknown Protein-1.5At1g06960Ribonucleoprotein Spliceosomal Protein-1.5At5g66730Zinc Finger Family Protein-1.5At5g57630Cbl-Interacting Protein Kinase 21-1.5At4g28510Prohibitin 1-1.5YesAt5g43010Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A-1.5	At4g10170	Synaptobrevin-Related Family Protein	-1.6			
At3g11830Chaperonin, Putative-1.5At5g26710Glutamate-tRNA Ligase, Putative-1.5At1g78040Extensin Family Protein-1.5At2g43320Unknown Protein-1.5At1g06960Ribonucleoprotein Spliceosomal Protein-1.5At5g66730Zinc Finger Family Protein-1.5At5g57630Cbl-Interacting Protein Kinase 21-1.5At4g28510Prohibitin 1-1.5YesAt5g43010Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A-1.5	At1g04190	Tetratricopeptide Repeat Protein	-1.6			
At5g26710Glutamate-tRNA Ligase, Putative-1.5At1g78040Extensin Family Protein-1.5At2g43320Unknown Protein-1.5At1g06960Ribonucleoprotein Spliceosomal Protein-1.5At5g66730Zinc Finger Family Protein-1.5At5g57630Cbl-Interacting Protein Kinase 21-1.5At4g28510Prohibitin 1-1.5YesAt5g43010Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A-1.5	At3g11830	Chaperonin, Putative	-1.5			
At1g78040Extensin Family Protein-1.5At2g43320Unknown Protein-1.5At1g06960Ribonucleoprotein Spliceosomal Protein-1.5At5g66730Zinc Finger Family Protein-1.5At5g57630Cbl-Interacting Protein Kinase 21-1.5At4g28510Prohibitin 1-1.5At5g43010Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A-1.5	At5g26710	Glutamate-tRNA Ligase, Putative	-1.5			
At2g43320Unknown Protein-1.5At1g06960Ribonucleoprotein Spliceosomal Protein-1.5At5g66730Zinc Finger Family Protein-1.5At5g57630Cbl-Interacting Protein Kinase 21-1.5At4g28510Prohibitin 1-1.5YesAt5g43010Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A-1.5	At1g78040	Extensin Family Protein	-1.5			
At1g06960Ribonucleoprotein Spliceosomal Protein-1.5At5g66730Zinc Finger Family Protein-1.5At5g57630Cbl-Interacting Protein Kinase 21-1.5At4g28510Prohibitin 1-1.5YesAt5g43010Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A-1.5	At2g43320	Unknown Protein	-1.5			
At5g66730Zinc Finger Family Protein-1.5At5g57630Cbl-Interacting Protein Kinase 21-1.5At4g28510Prohibitin 1-1.5YesAt5g43010Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A-1.5	At1g06960	Ribonucleoprotein Spliceosomal Protein	-1.5			
At5g57630 Cbl-Interacting Protein Kinase 21 -1.5 At4g28510 Prohibitin 1 -1.5 Yes At5g43010 Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A -1.5	At5g66730	Zinc Finger Family Protein	-1.5			
At4g28510 Prohibitin 1 -1.5 Yes At5g43010 Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A -1.5	At5g57630	Cbl-Interacting Protein Kinase 21	-1.5			
At5g43010 Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A -1.5	At4g28510	Prohibitin 1	-1.5	Yes		
	At5g43010	Regulatory Particle Triple-A 4A	-1.5			

Transcripts up-regulated (P<0.01) in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in 2005 only

A	В	C	D	Е	F	G
		F 2003 /	F 2005 /			
AGI code	Annotation	Chamber	Chamber			
At3g62910	Translation Release Factor		1.5			
At5g08410	Thioredoxin Reductase Subunit A		1.5			
At5944650	Unknown Protein		1.5			
At3e60690	Auxin-Responsive Family Protein		1.5			
At2g18915	Ibiquitin-Protein Ligase		1.5			
At5g03420	Dentin Sialaphosphoprotein		1.5			
At1g60000	Aminomethyltransferase		1.5			
At1200330	ATD Synthese Femily		1.5	Vec		
At4g32200	Chloroplast Unusual Desitioning 1		1.5	103		
Al3g23090	A/D Fold Formily Dratein/Ludroloop		1.5			— —
Al5g38520	A/B Fold Family Protein/Hydrolase		1.5			
At1g33720			1.5			
At4g26500	I ranscription Regulator		1.5			
At3g46690	UDP-Glucosyl Transferase		1.6			
At5g13690	Alpha-N-Acetylglucosaminidase		1.6			
At3g25530	Phosphogluconate Dehydrogenase		1.6	Yes		
At1g03680	Thioredoxin M-Type 1		1.6	Yes		
At5g27380	Glutathione Synthetase 2		1.6	L		
At2g31040	ATP Synthase Protein I -Related	ļ	1.6			
At1g49970	Endopeptidase CLP		1.6			
At1g14920	GA Insensitive/Transcription Factor		1.6	Yes	R	L
At3g44680	Histone Deacetylase 9		1.6			
At5g58950	Protein Kinase Family Protein		1.6			
At1g60600	1,4-OH-2-Naphthoateprenyltransferase		1.6			
At3g08730	P70 Ribosomal S6 Kinase		1.6	Yes		
At4g18010	Inositol PolyP 5-Phosphatase II		1.6		R	
At5g63330	DNA-Binding Protein		1.6			
At4g13220	Unknown Protein		1.6			
At1g49880	Erv1/Alr Family Protein		1.6			
At4g04640	ATP Synthase Gamma Chain 1		1.6			
At5957360	Zeitlupe Ubiquitin-Protein Ligase		1.7	Yes		
At1e67090	Ribulose-Bisphosphate Carboxylase		1.7	Yes		
At3g21690	Mate Efflux Family Protein		1.7	100		
At2001570	Repressor Of GA Transcription Factor		1.7	Yes	R	
At2g40480	Unknown Protein		17	103		
At1g76520	Auxin Efflux Carrier Family Protein		17			<u> </u>
At2g32950	Constitutive Photomorphogenic 1		1.7	Ves		<u>├───</u> ──
At5g54080	Homogentisate 1.2 Dioxygenase		1.7	103		
At2g20860	Lippic Acid Synthese 1		1.7			
At2g20800	Ribosomal Protoin L1 Family Protoin	·	1.7			
At1g10925	Unknown Protein		$\frac{1.7}{1.7}$		· · · · · · ·	
At5667520	Deptidul Prolul Cie, Trans Jeomeraca		1.7			
At2g/7500	Dependent of the light Recenter 2		1.7			
AL284/390	FIDIOLYASE/DIUE-LIGHT RECEPTOR 2		1./	V		
At4g34190	Stress Ennanced Protein I		1.7	1 es		
At1g20225	Unknown Protein		1./			
At1g21065	Unknown Protein	ļ	1.7			
At2g38270	Protein Disulfide Oxidoreductase		1.7			
At3g27300	Glucose-6-Phosphate Dehydrogenase 5		1.7			
At4g37510	Ribonuclease III Family Protein		1.7		ļ	
At3g27570	Unknown Protein		1.7			
At1g44920	Unknown Protein		1.7			
At1g16240	Syntaxin Of Plants 51		1.7			
At1g52510	Hydrolase, A/B Fold Family Protein		1.7		L	
At1g61660	Basic Helix-Loop-Helix Family Protein		1.7			1
At4g09680	Unknown Protein		1.7			
At3g04870	Zeta-Carotene Desaturase		1.7		M	
At3g24170	Glutathione-Disulfide Reductase		1.7			
					and a second sec	

		·	,		
At5g22640	Embryo Defective 1211	1.8			
At4001310	Ribosomal Protein L 5 Family Protein	18			
A 45 - 49200	ADD Churren Durenhaanhaardaan	1.0	Vac	<u> </u>	
AI5g48500	ADP Glucose Pyrophosphorylase	1.8	105	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
At2g27680	Aldo/Keto Reductase Family Protein				<u> </u>
At1g55920	Serine Acetyltransferase 1	1.8	Yes		
At5g50920	Heat Shock Protein 93-V	18			
ALJ200920		1.0			
At3g02170	Longitolia 2	1.8			
At1g50020	Unknown Protein	1.8]	
A+2a31370	h7IP Transcription Factor	18			
A12g31370		1.0			
At5g54960	Pyruvate Decarboxylase-2	1.8	Yes		
At1g74730	Unknown Protein	1.8	ſ	í	1
At5003880	Unknown Protein	1.8			1
11050000				├ ────	
At5g40500	Unknown Protein	1.8			
At5g67030	ABA Deficient 1/Zeaxanthin Epoxidase	1.8	Yes	M	
At4935010	Beta-Galactosidase 11	18			1
A+1 = 64070	Commo Toponharol Mathyltronaforaça	1.0			<u> </u>
Al1g04970	Gamma-Tocopheror Methyluansierase				
At5g06260	Nucleolar Protein-Related	1.8			
At1g16880	Uridvlyltransferase-Related Protein	1.8	Yes		
At3g22370	Alternative Oxidase 1A	18	Vec	(f
AU3222070		1.0	103	<u> </u>	
At1g68830	Stt/ Homolog Stn//Protein Kinase	1.8		L	
At1g11650	RNA Binding Protein	1.8	1		
At4934350	4-HO-3-Mebut-2-En-1-DiP Reductase	1.8			
A.5-07270	La sitel Delughander Kinger (Allele	1.0		┟────	
Al3g0/3/0	mositor Poryphosphate Kinase 2 Alpha	1.8			└── ─
At5g52200	Protein Phosphatase Inhibitor	1.8			
At1g64150	Unknown Protein	18			
A+3 ~ 26095	A mino Torminal Brotonco	1.0		<u> </u>	
A13g20085	Annno Terminal Protease				
At5g58060	Unknown Protein	1.8			
At4g13430	Aconitase Family Protein	1.8			
A+4g11600	Clutathiana Paravidasa 6		Var		
A14g11000	Olulaulione Feloxidase o	1.0	Tes		
At1g78960	Lupeol Synthase 2	1.8			
At3g13180	Nol1/Nop2/Sun Family Protein	1.9]	
At1g22600	Unknown Protein	19			r
Alig22000	Pit Lee Distante Calant				
At5g38410	Ribulose Bisphosphate Carboxylase	1.9			
At1g44575	Nonphotochemical Quenching	1.9	Yes	[[
At2g42130	Plastid-Linid-Associated Protein 13	19			
A+2-11560	Lista Elpid / Bootnice Trotein 15	1.5			
ALSGIISOU		1.9		L	
At3g07220	Transcriptional Activator, Putative	1.9			
At4g00895	ATP Synthase Delta Chain-Related	1.9			
At/g11175	Translation Initiation Easter IF 1	1.0			
A(4g11175					L
At4g20360	Translation Elongation Factor				
At4g13010	Zinc-Binding Dehvdrogenase	1.9]	
At3952230	Linknown Protein	1.0			f1
A:2 51190					<u> </u>
At3g51180	Zinc Finger Family Protein	1.9			
At5g26570	Phosphoglucan Water Dikinase	1.9		1	[]
At5g54870	Unknown Protein	19			
At2a46000	Unknown Protein	1.5		<u> </u>	
A12840900					↓
At4g32770	Vitamin E Deficient 1	1.9	Yes		
At1g43670	Fructose-1,6-Bisphosphatase, Putative	1.9			
At4g20060	Embryo Defective 1895/Binding	10		<u> </u>	<u>├───</u> ┤
A10-20000			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	├
At2g28900	P-P-Hydrolysis-Driven Transporter	1.9	Yes		
At1g28140	Unknown Protein	1.9			
At1g53520	Chalcone-Flavanone Isomerase	19			t1
A+5a57040	Chevelace I Family Brotein		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	┼───┤
A13g37040				L	
At3g47570	Leucine-Rich RepeatKinase, Putative	1.9		L	<u> </u>
At2g37770	Aldo/Keto Reductase Family Protein	2.0			
At1g15600	Vacualar Type H+-Pyrophosphotose	20	Vac	<u> </u>	<u>├</u>
A:1 27020	vacuorar-1 ype 11++ r yrophosphatase		res		┟
At4g37930	Serine Hydroxymethyltransferase 1	2.0	Yes		
At5g05200	ABC1 Family Protein	2.0			
At4913310	Cytochrome P450	20	— <u> </u>		;
A+2-22020	Couplero Enovidere 2		<u> </u>		┝━━─┤
At2g22830	Squalene Epoxidase 2	2.0		L	
At3g12780	Phosphoglycerate Kinase 1	2.0	Yes		
At4g35250	Vestitone Reductase-Related	20			
A+1 a24140	A satul Coonguma A Carbourter 1				┝───┤
	ACCIVITUDEITZVIIIE A CALIDOXVIASE I	1 2.0			

L 11 64050					
At1g64850	Calcium-Binding Family Protein	2.0			
At5g16540	Zinc Finger Protein 3	2.0	4		
At2g18710	P-P-Bond-Hydrolysis-Driven Protein	2.1			
At1g64860	Sigma Factor A Transcription Factor	2.1			
At2g46910	Fibrillin Family Protein	2.1			
At4g09650	ATP Synthase Delta Chain	2.1	Yes		
At5g52420	Unnknown Protein	2.1			
At2g03390	uvrB/uvrC Motif-Containing Protein	2.1	1	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
At3g03250	LIDP-Glucose Pyrophosphorylase	21	Yes		<u> </u>
At5g14970	Amine Oxidase	21	1		
At1g12090	Extensin-Like Protein/Linid Binding	2.1	+		
At1g12090	Assolution Coll Death 2	2.1	Vac	<u> </u>	
At+2=20500	Accelerated Cell Deallin 2				1
At5g29390	Distribution Orden la contra la cont	2.1		<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Atig/0/30	Phosphoglucomutase, Cytoplasmic	2.1			
At3g1/930	Unknown Protein				ļ
At5g55990	Calcineurin B-Like Protein 2	2.2			
At1g79270	Evolutionarily Conserved C-Terminal 8				
At3g46610	Pentatricopeptide Repeat-Protein	2.2		L	
At5g65720	Cysteine Desulfurase/Transaminase	2.2		<u> </u>	
At1g22850	Unknown Protein	2.2			
At3g63410	Albino Or Pale Green Mutant 1	2.2			
At4g09750	Short-Chain Dehydrogenase	2.2	T —		
At5g26820	Ferroportin-Related Protein	2.2			
At5g56860	N-/C-Metabolism-Transcription Factor	2.2			
At2g24090	Ribosomal Protein L35 Family Protein	2.2	+	t	
At2g33250	Unknown Protein	22			
At2g13360	Alapine: Glyoxylate Aminotransferase	2.2			┝───┤
At1g22070	TGA1A Pelated Transcription Factor	2.2	Vac		
At1g22070	Indexe Protein				<u> </u>
Al5g55620	Unknown Protein	2.2			┝───┤
Atig05190	Embryo Defective 2394	2.2			┣────┤
At4g39970	Haloacid Dehalogenase	2.2		<u> </u>	\vdash
At2g37540	Short-Chain Dehydrogenase	2.2			
At1g48030	Dihydrolipoamide Dehydrogenase 1	2.2	Yes		
At1g80380	Phosphoribulokinase	2.3			
At5g58040	RNA Binding Protein	2.3			
At5g28840	GDP-D-Mannose 3',5'-Epimerase	2.3			
At1g44000	Unknown Protein	2.3			
At5g04140	Fd-Dependent Glutamate Synthase 1	2.3	Yes		
At1g09340	Chloroplast RNA Binding Protein	2.3	Yes		
At5g20280	Sucrose Phosphate Synthase 1F	2.3	-		
At4932190	Centromeric Protein-Related	23	+	t	
At1e68570	Oligopentide Transport Family Protein	23			
At4g36390	Radical SAM Protein	2.3			
At4g17560	Ribosomal Protein I 10 Family Protain	2.3		 _	
At2g16250	Forradovin Palatad Protein		-+		┝───┤
At1252970	Perevisemel Membrane Protein Palatad				
Aug328/0	Linknown Destain				
AL3201000	Ulikilowii Piteliii				┞
At3g10180	Ninesin Motor Protein-Related			ļ	
At4g25170	Unknown Protein	2.4			ļ
At4g11570	Haloacid Dehalogenase	2.4		I	ļ
At3g59300	Unknown Protein	2.4	<u> </u>		
At1g79600	ABC1 Family Protein	2.4			
At4g13770	Cytochrome P450 83A1	2.4	Yes		
At1g48350	Ribosomal Protein L18 Family Protein	2.4			
At1g05560	UDP-Glucosyl Transferase 75B1	2.4		M	
At5g20380	Transporter-Related Protein	2.4			
At5g42270	ATP-Dependent Metallopeptidase	2.4			
At2g04520	Translation Initiation Factor 1A	2.4			j]
At1g27370	Squamosa Promoter-Binding Protein	2.4	1		
At4g01080	Unknown Protein	2.4			
At3g55120	Chalcone Isomerase	25	Vec		
At3g23700	S1 RNA-Binding Protein	- 2.5	Vec		
At5g30510	RNA Binding Ribosomal Protein S1		103		
		2.5	1	1	. 1

				T	
At2g37240	Antioxidant Oxidoreductase	2.5		ļ	
At1g57770	Amine Oxidase Family	2.5			
At3g16910	Acetate-coA Ligase	2.5	_	Į	
At4g34135	UDP-Glucosyltransferase	2.5	Yes		
At5g34850	Purple Acid Phosphatase 26	2.6		1	
At4917610	tRNA/rRNA Methyltransferase	2.6			<u> </u>
At/g3/2/0	3 Chloroallyl Aldehyde Dehydrogenase	2.0	Vec	P	<u>├</u>
At7-07020	Sterentural Constituent Of Dilyurogenase	2.0	105		
At3g27830	Structural Constituent Of Ribosome	2.0		l	<u> </u>
At1g52590	DCC Family Protein Precursor	2.6			<u> </u>
At1g66330	Senescence-Associated Family Protein	2.6			
At1g29390	Cold Regulated 314	2.6	Yes		
At1g60950	Ferredoxin 2	2.6	Yes		
At4g04770	Nucleosome Assembly Protein 1	2.7	Yes	1	
At3063140	mRNA-Binding Protein Putative	27		1	
At/g1/0/0	Embruo Sac Development Arrest 28	2.7			
At4g14040	Emoryo Sac Development Arrest 58	2.7		[<u> </u>
At3g14770	Nodulin Milins Family Protein	2.7		<u> </u>	<u> </u>
At2g24280	Serine Carboxypeptidase S28	2.7			1
At4g13930	Serine Hydroxymethyltransferase 4	2.8			
At1g73990	Signal Peptide Peptidase	2.8	Yes		
At3g63520	Carotenoid Cleavage Dioxygenase 1	2.8	Yes	M	
At5g13650	Elongation Factor Family Protein	2.8	-		
At1g50250	EtsH Protease 1 Metallopentidase	28			
At1250250	Zing Einger Dratain 1	2.8		1	
Al5g02850		2.8		·	<u> </u>
At4g04350	Aminoacyl-tRNA Ligase	2.9			
At1g64680	Unknown Protein	2.9			
At5g17170	Enhancer Of SOS3-1	2.9			
At5g67360	Subtilase	2.9			
At5g15410	Rectifier Potassium Channel	2.9	Yes	1	<u> </u>
At2948070	Unknown Protein	29	Yes		<u> </u>
At2g30490	Cinnamate 4. Hydroxylase	3.0	Vec		<u> </u>
A12g30490	Mandhana Pastein Duteting	3.0	105	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
At1g32080	Memorane Protein, Putative			· · · · · ·	<u> </u>
At1g62780	Unknown Protein				
At3g53260	Phenylalanine Ammonia-Lyase 2	3.0	Yes		
At4g12320	Cytochrome P450	3.0			
At1g04350	2-OG-Dependent Dioxygenase, Putative	3.0			
At5g24460	Hydrolase	3.0		1	
At2038740	Haloacid Dehalogenase	31			<u> </u>
At/g33010	Glycine Decarboxylase P Protein 1	3.1			<u> </u>
A14255010	Orychie Decarboxylase F-Floteni I	3.1			<u> </u>
At2g35840	Sucrose-Phosphatase 1	3.2			
At2g42810	Protein Ser/Thr Phosphatase 5	3.2	Yes		
_At5g60540	Pyridoxine Biosynthesis 2	3.2			
At5g10170	Inositol-3-P Synthase, Putative	3.2			
At1g67360	Rubber Elongation Factor Protein	3.2			1
At3g25410	Bile Acid:Na Symporter Family Protein	3.3			
At1916080	Unknown Protein	33	-		<u> </u>
At1078070	WD-40 Repeat Family Protein	31			
At/021070	Clutathione Derovidase 7	2 /	Var		<u>+</u>
A(4g31870		3.4	<u>Ies</u>		
At5g20070	INUGIX HYDROIASE HOMOIOg 19	3.4			<u> </u>
At5g53970	Aminotransferase, Putative	3.5		<u> </u>	
At4g36530	Hydrolase, A/B Fold Family Protein	3.5			
At1g78510	Solanesyl Diphosphate Synthase 1	3.5			
At5g52250	WD-40 Repeat Family Protein	3.5	Yes		F
At5005580	Omega-3 Eatty Acid Desaturase	36	Ves		<u> </u>
At2g17200	Calcium-Dependent Protein Kinase 6	27	103	c	<u> </u>
At1~45020	Defactive Chloroplaste Drotein Delet-3	3./		<u> </u>	
A11845250	Chains Developments Protein-Kelated				
A12g26080	Glycine Decarboxylase P-Protein 2	3./			L
At5g46800	A Bout De Souffle Binding Protein	3.7		ļ	
At1g62750	Translation Elongation Factor	3.7			
At5g24120	RNA Polymerase Sigma Subunit E	3.8	Yes		
At3g21890	Zinc Finger Family Protein	3.8	Yes		
At3g21250	Multidrug Resistance-Associated 6	3.0		<u> </u>	
At1g17100	SOUL Heme-Binding Family Protein	4.2			1
At4a15520	Burguisto Orthophosphoto Dilinere	4.2	L		
A14813330	ryiuvate Orthophosphate Dikinase	[4.4		1	1

At2g04039	Unknown Protein	4.5		
At4g15480	Sinapate 1-Glucosyltransferase	5.0	Yes	
At4g37990	Elicitor-Activated Gene 3	5.1	Yes	
At1g02205	Eceriferum 1	5.2		
At5g20630	Germin-Like Protein 3	5.5	Yes	1
At5g13930	Naringenin-Chalcone Synthase	6.0	Yes	1
At3g21670	Nitrate Transporter (NTP3)	6.4		1
At2g38240	20G-Fe(II) Oxygenase Family Protein	6.5		
At2g42530	Cold-Regulated 15B Protein	6.7	Yes	1
At5g05270	Chalcone-Flavanone Isomerase	7.1		1
At3g44990	Xyloglucan:Xyloglucosyl Transferase 8	7.1		
At2g37040	Phenylalanine Ammonia-Lyase	7.6	Yes	
At2g18230	Pyrophosphorylase 2	7.7		
At4g26850	Vitamin C Defective 2	9.4	Yes	
At1g62710	Vacuolar Processing Enzyme	10.5		

Supplemental Table S3. Metabolites present at statistically significantly different levels in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in 2003 and 2005.

Values represent fold-ratio between field and growth chamber grown Thellungiella, where a positive or negative number represents a metabolite present at higher or lower level in field-grown plants, respectively, relative to cabinet grown plants.

Metabolites present at significantly lower levels (P<0.05) in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in 2003 and 2005

	Field 2003 / Chamber	Field 2005 / Chamber
1076_aspartic acid	-12326.0	-880.4
1346_glutamine	-10508.4	-10508.4
2206_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-1686.8	-1405.7
2803_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-1179.0	-471.6
1312_unknown	-1025.2	-28.2
984_unknown	-978.8	-978.8
1564_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-858.0	-3.5
2683_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-580.4	-580.4
2997_raffinose	-366.0	-1683.7
2666_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-316.5	-46.4
1599_unknown	-278.4	-696.0
2649_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-220.0	-27.5
1770_unknown	-196.0	-78.4
1854_unknown	-175.5	-280.8
2371_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-138.0	-115.0
1368_unknown	-123.2	-123.2
2472_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-95.2	-95.2
1477_lysine	-91.2	-91.2
1894_unknown	-68.0	-68.0
2731_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-64.9	-7.3
1774_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-64.2	-19.0
1786_phosphorylated sugar	-55.2	-286.8
1555_unknown	-50.3	-201.2
1956_unknown	-45.2	-45.2
821_phosphate	-24.3	-120.8
2616_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-22.7	-16.0
2423_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-22.7	-254.0
1964_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-17.4	-48.8
2000_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-16.3	-130.0
2254_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-16.2	-368.8
891_fumaric acid	-15.8	-120.4
1845_cinnamic acid	-15.6	-7.0
1916_glucose-6-phosphate	-12.7	-56.0
1710_C6 sugar alcohol	-8.3	-675.2
2548_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-7.6	-21.8
1426_quinic acid	-6.2	-2.6
1096_pyroglutamic acid	-5.6	-951.2
2269_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-5.6	-9.8
810_unknown	-4.8	-137.0
1026_unknown	4.7	-166.8
1158_unknown	-4.2	-7.7

1166_unknown	-3.8	-25.6
931_threonine	-3.7	-104.8
2137_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-3.0	-37.3
749_valine	-2.8	-19.5
2598_galactinol	-2.5	-5.4
903_serine	-2.5	-845.0
1147_unknown	-2.3	-123.2
833_isoleucine	-2.1	-188.8
1179_glutamic acid	-1.8	-5747.3
1044_malic acid		-1.6

Metabolites present at higher levels (P<0.05) in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in 2003 and 2005

ID	Field 2003 / Chamber	Field 2005 / Chamber
2236_sucrose	2.2	3.5
1389_citric acid	5.3	4.8
1429_unknown	6.1	9.6
1440_fructose	8.7	4.5
844_glycine	46.2	36.2
1024_citramalic acid	69,9	44.7
859_succinic acid	863.6	276.6
794_ethanolamine	1118.0	688.0

Metabolites present at higher levels (P<0.05) in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in 2003, and lower levels (P<0.05) in 2005

D	Field 2003 / Chamber	Field 2005 / Chamber
1320_unknown	5.3	-42.3
1377_unknown	6.1	-6.6

Metabolites present at higher levels (P<0.05) in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in 2003 only

ID	Field 2003 / Chamber
1664_myo-inositol	1.5
1118_threonic acid	1.7
1466_glucose	2.4
874_unknown	2.6
1062_unknown	21.3
1141_unknown	27.0
1042_unknown	45.7
1462_galactose	49.5
1415_unknown	100.8
1559_C6 sugar alcohol	114.4
1553_unknown	120.8
1079_gamma amino butyric acid (GABA)	218.9
1364_unknown	260.8

1727_C6 sugar alcohol	313.6
1315_unknown	468.4
1344_unknown	611.3
1443_unknown	638.4
815_glycerol	743.2
1495_pentose	892.4
1565_unknown	1549.6
1778_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	1568.4

Metabolites present at lower levels (P<0.05) in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in 2005 only

D	Field 2005 / Chamber
1522_C6 sugar alcohol	-1189.6
1569_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-730.4
1241_asparagine	-609.0
794_unknown	-338.8
1979_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	-285.2
1260_unknown	-97.2
839_proline	-43.4
1221_unknown	-37.5
611_alanine	-28.6
1942_unknown	-14.0
1193_phenylalanine	-3.5

Metabolites present at higher levels (P<0.05) in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in 2005 only

D	Field 2005 / Chamber
1410_unknown	3.1
1734_C6 sugar alcohol	7.2
1306_unknown	17.5
1574_unknown	22.6
929_unknown	64.0
2205_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	73.6
1913_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	107.2
1978_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	107.9
1383_unknown	113.0
2240_unknown	130.0
1543_unknown	221.0
1774_C6 sugar alcohol	343.2
2141_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	445.6
1330_unknown	542.0
1108_unknown	1183.2
1975_C12 sugar alcohol/disaccharide	1206.8

Chapter Five

General Discussion

In the field, the soil water content can vary within a single day and throughout the growing season (Acevedo et al., 1979; Hanson and Hitz, 1982). Plants must therefore constantly 'fine-tune' physiological processes to ensure continued growth and development under fluctuating water availability (Hanson and Hitz, 1982). However, prolonged exposure to water deficits severely compromises plant growth and productivity and consequently, a lack of water is the single most important factor limiting crop production (Boyer, 1982). A better understanding of the molecular basis of plants that are naturally tolerant to abiotic stress holds great promise for improving the tolerance of stress-sensitive crops using genetic engineering approaches (Bressan et al., 2001). However, to date, the genes enabling naturally stress tolerant plants to thrive in their harsh habitats are unknown.

The identification of traits associated with abiotic stress tolerance has typically been performed by subjecting plants to calibrated stress treatments imposed under controlled growth chamber conditions. Under field conditions, however, plants are exposed to multiple stresses simultaneously leading to altered physiological responses that are not necessarily predicted based on experiments performed in artificial laboratory conditions (Rizhsky et al., 2004). Comparisons made between traits expressed by plants subjected to abiotic stress in their natural habitats and those exposed to growth chamber experiments could identify critical mechanisms enabling plants to acclimate to abiotic stress.

Thellungiella is exceptionally tolerant to cold temperatures, drought and salinity and is therefore an emerging genetic model for the study of abiotic stress tolerance mechanisms (Inan et al., 2004; Taji et al., 2004; Gong et al., 2005; Griffith et al., 2007; Wong et al., 2006). The highly saline soils in the Yukon where *Thellungiella* populations were sampled combined with the prevailing precipitation patterns during the periods plants were harvested enabled us to compare the traits expressed in *Thellungiella* experiencing drought and relatively well-watered conditions in the field (Guevara et al., 2009b). Our research group has demonstrated that Yukon Thellungiella accumulates organic solutes in response to drought and salinity treatments imposed in controlled environmental chambers (Wong et al., 2006, Guevara et al., 2009a) and in plants experiencing water deficits in the field (Guevara et al., 2009b), relative to unstressed chamber grown plants. Compatible organic solute accumulation in response to drought or salinity has been observed in other naturally tolerant plants (Bianchi et al., 1991; Paul and Cockburn, 1989), although the precise role compatible organic solute accumulation plays for stress tolerance is still under debate (Gagneul et al., 2007). Therefore, it will be an important objective to demonstrate the importance for organic solute accumulation for stress tolerance in Thellungiella grown under field conditions.

Proline has been proposed to be a major compatible solute in Shandong *Thellungiella* subjected to saline environments (Inan et al., 2004; Kant et al., 2006). Proline levels were similar between Yukon *Thellungiella* harvested from the field during drought and growth chamber grown controls (Guevara et al., 2009). Moreover, we found no evidence for altered expression of genes encoding enzymes involved in proline biosynthesis or degradation in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from salt flats in the Yukon (Guevara et al., 2009b). This outcome was not anticipated as we previously reported on genes encoding enzymes associated with proline metabolism such as delta-1-pyrroline-5carboxylate synthetase (P5CS1, At2g39800; P5CS2, At3g55610) which were enriched in Thellungiella subjected to drought or cold stress treatments imposed in growth cabinets, relative to unstressed controls (Wong et al., 2006). The lack of proline accumulation in Yukon Thellungiella plants growing under highly saline environments in the field exposed to drought conditions raises important questions about the role of this solute in abiotic stress tolerance. One possible explanation for the lack of proline accumulation in Thellungiella subjected to abiotic stress in the field may be the result of the low nitrogen (N) content in the soil at the Yukon field site (Supplemental Table S1 in Chapter 4). Insufficient N in the soil leads to plant N-deficiency (Kant et al., 2008), and this could limit the amount of N that can be diverted towards the synthesis of N-containing compatible solutes, including proline (Stewart and Lee, 1974). For example, Yukon Thellungiella experiencing water deficits under N limitation may accumulate polyols or sugars rather than N-containing metabolites such as proline, to ensure sufficient N pools are present for the synthesis of macromolecules such as chlorophyll, nucleotides and proteins (Tattersall, 2009). It will also be important to determine the effects light and temperature have on Yukon Thellungiella's ability to accumulate proline during growth under field conditions, as these environmental conditions can be quite variable during the

day. Further work will be required to demonstrate whether glucose and sucrose accumulation trutly contributes towards stress tolerance in Yukon *Thellungiella* growing in its naturally harsh habitat. For example, a recent study revealed that these two sugars can accumulate in *Arabidopsis* in response to potassium deficiency (Armengaud et al., 2009). The authors concluded that shoot glucose and sucrose accumulation is caused by impaired sugar metabolism in roots of potassium deficient plants (Armengaud et al., 2009). Thus, it will be important to study Yukon *Thellungiella*'s response to abiotic stress under full nutrient and nutrient deficient conditions to distinguish between general stress symptoms and traits associated with stress tolerance.

One striking observation was the drastic difference in morphology exhibited by Yukon *Thellungiella* from field sites in the Yukon compared to plants grown under growth chambers. Yukon *Thellungiella* harvested from the field sites had prominent cauline leaves in lieu of larger rosette leaves typically observed in growth chamber grown plants (Guevara et al., 2009). It has been demonstrated that the investment in vegetative biomass in wild barley was plastic and sensitive across water and nutrient stress treatments (Volis et al., 2004). This plasticity enabled an enhancement in fitness as a result of early onset flowering during water deficits (Volis et al., 2004). The significance of the apparent morphological differences observed between field grown and growth chamber grown Yukon *Thellungiella* for abiotic stress tolerance is unknown. It is likely that the phenotypic plasticity exhibited by Yukon *Thellungiella* may represent an important strategy enabling this plant to thrive in a highly variable environment.

179

The validation of the importance of genes for survival under harsh environmental conditions will require the use of both forward and reverse genetic approaches to determine the effect of gene manipulation on stress tolerance. For example, a recent functional gene-mining approach where a cDNA expression library from Shandong Thellungiella was constructed and used to transform Arabidopsis, generating a transgenic seed library which was screened for salt-tolerant Arabidopsis lines (Du et al., 2008). Among the salt-tolerant lines isolated, it was conclusively demonstrated that the enhancement in tolerance to salinity for the line ST6-66 was as a result of an unknown gene (At1g13930), that at the amino acid level was 67% similar to the Arabidopsis homologue with an as of yet, unknown function (Du et al., 2008). Intriguingly, this transcript was also elevated in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the salt flats in 2003, the year when plants experienced drought conditions and in Yukon *Thellungiella* exposed to drought treatments in growth chambers. The next task would be to test the effect overexpression of this gene has for plant abiotic stress tolerance in stress-sensitive crops such as canola in highly saline environments in the field.

The response of *Arabidopsis* and *Thellungiella* to calibrated stress treatments imposed in controlled environmental conditions has been compared (Inan et al., 2004; Taji et al., 2004; Gong et al., 2005; Kant et al., 2006), and this work has led to several hypotheses regarding the special attributes responsible for conferring *Thellungiella*'s superior ability to tolerate harsh environments. For example, *Thellungiella*'s innate ability to tolerate sub-optimal environments to a greater extent than *Arabidopsis* may be due to: **1**) novel genes (Inan et al., 2004); **2**) the expansion of gene complement in

Thellungiella through gene or partial genome duplications which may have led to the evolution of paralogous genes that encode more active forms of enzymes (Inan et al., 2004; Gong et al., 2005; Kant et al., 2006); 3) divergent promoter structures in Thellungiella compared to Arabidopsis that permit diverse patterns of gene expression giving rise to halophytic characteristics (Inan et al., 2004); 4) an altered sensitivity to external factors or internal hormonal signals (Gong et al., 2005). A comparison between Arabidopsis, Brassica and Thellungiella responses to abiotic stress should help identify traits giving rise to Thellungiella's 'extremophile'-like characteristics that distinguish it from its less tolerant close relatives. The entire genome sequence of Arabidopsis thaliana is already available and whole genome sequencing efforts are currently underway or planned for other crucifers such as Arabidopsis lyrata, Capsella rubella, Brassica rapa, and Shandong Thellungiella (Schranz et al., 2007). Thus, through comparative genomics between Arabidopsis and Thellungiella whole genome sequence, it will be possible to identify changes within the genome structure, discover novel genes, and reveal modifications in the sequence of homologous genes, as well as the identification of differences in promoter structures between these halophyte and glycophyte species.

CONCLUSION

The combination of transcript and metabolite profiling of Yukon *Thellungiella* harvested from its harsh habitat enabled us to identify metabolic pathways associated

with abiotic stress tolerance under field conditions. This study revealed that the enrichment in sugar levels of field-grown Yukon Thellungiella experiencing drought conditions compared to unstressed controls is brought about by the higher level of expression of genes encoding enzymes associated with carbohydrate metabolism. This was in contrast to amino acids levels which were present at significantly lower levels in leaf tissues from Yukon Thellungiella harvested from salt flats in the Yukon, compared to unstressed growth chamber grown plants. Interestingly, proline, and its precursor glutamate, did not accumulate in Yukon Thellungiella harvested from the field in either year or in plants subjected to water deficit in growth chambers raising questions regarding proline's importance for stress tolerance in Yukon Thellungiella when grown under field conditions. The altered gene expression in Yukon Thellungiella subjected to drought in the field compared to unstressed, chamber grown plants is likely regulated by both ABA and the drought-responsive transcription factor AtHB7. It will be important to manipulate the expression of AtHB7 in order to determine its importance for abiotic stress tolerance in extremophile plants such as Thellungiella grown under field conditions. This information can then be used for improving the tolerance of stress-sensitive crops plants using biotechnological approaches.

References

- Acevedo E, Fereres E, Hsiao TC, Henderson DW (1979) Diurnal growth trends, water potential, and osmotic adjustment of maize and sorghum leaves in the field. Plant Physiol 64: 476-480
- Armengaud P, Sulpice R, Miller AJ, Stitt M, Amtmann A, Gibon Y (2009) Multilevel analysis of primary metabolism provides new insights into the role of potassium nutrition for glycolysis and nitrogen assimilation in *Arabidopsis* roots. Plant Physiol 150: 772-785
- Bianchi G, Gamba A, Murelli C, Salamini F, Bartels D (1991) Novel carbohydrate metabolism in the resurrection plant *Craterostigma plantagineum*. Plant J 1: 355-359
- Dhanaraj AL, Alkharouf NW, Beard HS, Chouikha IB, Matthews BF, Wei H,

Arora R, Rowland LJ (2007) Major differences observed in transcript profiles of
blueberry during cold acclimation under field and cold room conditions. Planta
225: 735-751

- Du J, Huang Y-P, Xi J, Cao M-J, Ni W-S, Chen X, Zhu J-K, Oliver DJ, Xiang C-B (2008) Functional gene-mining for salt tolerance genes with the power of *Arabidopsis*. Plant J **56**: 653-664
- Gagneul D, Ainouche A, Duhaze C, Lugan R, Larher F, Bouchereau A (2007) A reassessment of the function of the so-called compatible solutes in the halophytic Plumbaginaceae *Limonium latifolium*. Plant Physiol 144: 1598-1611

Gong QQ, Li PH, Ma SS, Rupassara SI, Bohnert HJ (2005) Salinity stress adaptation competence in the extremophile *Thellungiella halophila* in comparison with its relative *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Plant J **44:** 826-839

Guevara D, Akhter S, McCarry BE, Summers PS, Dudley SA, Griffith M,

Weretilnyk E A (2009a) Physiological and metabolic responses of the halophytic plant, *Thellungiella salsuginea*, to salinity,.

Guevara D, Dedrick J, Wong CE, Li Y, Labbe A, Ping C-L, Wang Y, Golding GB, Gray G, McCarry BE, Summers PS, Griffith M, Moffatt BA, Weretilnyk EA (2009b) Transcriptomic and metabolomic analysis of Yukon *Thellungiella* plants growing under cabinet and field conditions shows overlapping and distinct responses to environmental conditions

- Hanson AD, Hitz WD (1982) Metabolic responses of mesophytes to plant water deficits. Annu Rev Plant Physiol 33: 163-203
- Inan G, Zhang Q, Li PH, Wang ZL, Cao ZY, Zhang H, Zhang CQ, Quist TM,
 Goodwin SM, Zhu JH, Shi HH, Damsz B, Charbaji T, Gong QQ, Ma SS,
 Fredricksen M, Galbraith DW, Jenks MA, Rhodes D, Hasegawa PM,
 Bohnert HJ, Joly RJ, Bressan RA, Zhu J-K (2004) Salt cress. A halophyte and
 cryophyte *Arabidopsis* relative model system and its applicability to molecular
 genetic analyses of growth and development of extremophiles. Plant Physiol 135:
 1718-1737
- Kant S, Kant P, Raveh E, Barak S (2006) Evidence that differential gene expression between the halophyte, *Thellungiella halophila*, and *Arabidopsis thaliana* is

responsible for higher levels of the compatible osmolyte proline and tight control of Na+ uptake in *T-halophila*. Plant Cell Environ **29**: 1220-1234

- Kant S, Bi Y-M, Weretilnyk EA, Barak S, Rothstein SJ (2008) The Arabidopsis
 halophytic relative Thellungiella halophila tolerates nitrogen-limiting conditions
 by maintaining growth, nitrogen uptake, and assimilation. Plant Physiol 147:
 1168-1180
- Miyazaki S, Fredricksen M, Hollis KC, Poroyko V, Shepley D, Galbraith DW, Long SP, Bohnert HJ (2004) Transcript expression profiles of *Arabidopsis thaliana* grown under controlled conditions and open-air elevated concentrations of CO2 and of O3. Field Crops Res **90:** 47-59
- Paul MJ, Cockburn W (1989) Pinitol, a compatible solute in *Mesembryanthemum* crystallinum L. J Exp Bot 40: 1093-1098
- Rizhsky L, Liang H, Shuman J, Shulaev V, Davletova S, Mittler R (2004) When defense pathways collide. The response of *Arabidopsis* to a combination of drought and heat stress. Plant Physiol **134**: 1683-1696
- Schranz ME, Song B-H, Windsor AJ, Mitchell-Olds T (2007) Comparative genomics in the Brassicaceae: a family-wide perspective. Curr Opin Plant Biol 10: 168-175
- Stewart GR, Lee JA (1974) The role of proline accumulation in halophytes. Planta 120: 279-289
- **Tattersall A** (2009) The effects of nitrogen concentration on compatible solutes during salinity stress in *Thellungiella salsuginea*. MSc Thesis, McMaster University.

Taji T, Seki M, Satou M, Sakurai T, Kobayashi M, Ishiyama K, Narusaka Y, Narusaka M, Zhu JK, Shinozaki K (2004) Comparative genomics in salt tolerance between Arabidopsis and Arabidopsis-related halophyte salt cress using Arabidopsis microarray. Plant Physiol 135: 1697-1709

Volis S, Verhoeven KJF., Mendlinger S, Ward D (2004) Phenotypic selection and regulation of reproduction in different environments in wild barley. J Evol Biology 17: 1121-1131

Wong CE, Li Y, Labbe A, Guevara D, Nuin P, Whitty B, Diaz C, Golding GB, Gray GR, Weretilnyk EA, Griffith M, Moffatt BA (2006) Transcriptional profiling implicates novel interactions between abiotic stress and hormonal responses in *Thellungiella*, a close relative of *Arabidopsis*. Plant Physiol 140: 1437-1450

APPENDIX

CIRAS-1 Equation to Correct for Leaf Area to Calculate Stomatal Conductance

and Photosynthesis Rate Measurements of Yukon Thellungiella

PROC IMPORT OUT= WORK.photosyn DATAFILE= "C:\Users\Dave\ps\irgacom1.xls" DBMS=EXCEL97 REPLACE; GETNAMES=YES; RUN;

Proc sort data=photosyn; by date; Run;

----Procedures to calc PS and SC-----; data ps; set photosyn;

--Sec 4-----

vapor pressure at saturation(es) and in the cuvette(eo) measured in bars (may not need) {in bars} *-----*-

MBRa=MBR/1000; rha=rh/1000;

es=(6.13753e-3)*(EXP((CAT*(18.564-(CAT/254.4)))/(CAT+255.57)));

eo=(MBRa+rha);

correction of co2 readings for the broadening of the bands by water vapor -assumes dry air before air is passed over leaf (MBRa is zero). {in ppm = micromol/mol} *------*:

cout=(CO2rf+diff);

estimation of boundary layer resistance from a regression of boundary layer resistance on filter paper 'leaves' of differing sizes. The regression may be linear or quadratic. Change to fit your leaves {in m2 s/mol?} rb=0.20-> set on CIRAS IRGA OLD rb~0.36=1/(5.94871+(-2.32984*LAR)+(0.508707*LAR*LAR)+(-).037207*LAR*LAR*LAR)) if lfincuv then LAR=lfincuv: rb=((0.102*lfincuv)+0.218);625 *_____* {GOOD} conversion of mass flow rate (mls/min) to molar flow rate per unit leaf area (mols/m2/s) (manual lacks 1/60 minute/second conversion) $\{in mols/m2/s\}$ *_____* W = (FLOW/1000) * (1/22.41) * (273/293) * (1/60) * (1/1.013) * (10000/lfincuv);*_____* {GOOD} calculation of transpiration rate (Ea) Manual uses mmol/m2/s *_____*: $Ea=(W^{(eo-MBRa)}/(1.013-eo))^{1000};$ *_____* {GOOD} calculation of leaf temperature from energy balance equation PARM is micromol/m2/s. Manual uses W/m2 -> divide PAR by 1.895? *_____* deltan=((PARM*0.16)-((Ea/1000)*(45064.3-(CAT*42.9)))); $deltad = (((0.93 \times 28.97 \times 1.012)/rb) + (4.639 + (0.0583 \times CAT)));$ delta=deltan/deltad: lftemp=CAT+delta; *--Sec 4-----* calculation of leaf vapor pressure from leaf temp {in bars} *_____* el=6.13753e-3*EXP((lftemp*(18.564-(lftemp/254.4)))/(lftemp+255.57));

_____ calculation of leaf stomatal conductance Manual uses mmol/m2/s *_____*

Ga=(1/(((el-eo)/((Ea/1000)*1.013))-rb))*1000;

calculation of photosynthetic rate Manual uses micromol/m2/s *-----*;

Aa=-(W*(cout-CO2rf)+(cout*(Ea/1000)));

proc print; var date TLTL lftemp EVAP Ea GSGS Ga PNN Aa; run;