What do I need references for?

* Temperature responses

**What is explained by leaf N?**

**“Estimation of photosynthesis traits from leaf reflectance spectra: Correlation to nitrogen content as the dominant mechanism”**

Good paper to reference ‘measuring leaf N from space’…

Both Vcmax and Jmax are strongly correlated to leaf N (as measured remotely in this study – could do with some more refs), we can infer that Vcmax and Jmax are a function of the amounts of protein involved in these processes – that is, carboxylation and ‘electron transport’. Well yeah sure… we get nowhere if we don’t have good gas exchange data though…

“It is well known that the Rubisco content in the leaf is closely related to Vcmax,25 (Jacob et al., 1995; Makino et al., 1994; Onoda, 2005) and that cytochrome f content has a strong linear relationship to Jmax,25 (Onoda, 2005; Sudo et al., 2003; Terashima and Evans, 1988).”

So the correlations between leaf N, Rubisco and cytochrome b6f might be useful?

Calvin cycle vs leaf N, R2 = 0.7652

Cytochrome b6f vs leaf N, R2 = 0.5916

Photosystems vs leaf N, R2 = 0.5445

Adding in leafrad\_mean and tavg (respectively) helps the models for (adjR2 = 0.64) photosystems and cytochrome b6f (adjR2 = 0.70), but straight leaf N is the best predictor of calvin cycle protein abundance.

This could be cool to add to the end of the results? Why is it better than just adding other variables to multiple regressions (which try to estimate Vcmax and Jmax from reflectances / leaf N) anyway?

Discussion fodder: we’ve put boundaries on how closely protein amounts can be linked to leaf N. The correlations are pretty strong for Calvin cycle proteins (give rubisco specifically as well) but

*Above is all for aggregated data. If we use unaggregated data to try and predict protein amounts from leaf N, we really don’t get much above 0.5 (calv = 0.5148, cyt = 0.4817, phot = 0.412) and adding envvars/LMA doesn’t get us much further.*

*This would be good for supplementary.*

**Allocation of leaf N**

**From: “Optimal allocation of leaf-level nitrogen: implications for covariation of Vcmax and Jmax and photosynthetic downregulation”**

*There is no parameter in Evans 1989 equations (or later updates) to account for for Photosystems – we show that Photosystems are a really substantial component of leaf N and should be directly accounted for. (need to do some further reading on this to confirm)*

2.2. Nitrogen and Photosynthetic Capacity Nitrogenis critical fordevelopmentandmaintenanceof all componentsof thephotosynthetic system[Poorter et al., 1995] and is allocated to its various components as follows [Evans, 1989]

Norg = NP + NE + NR + NS + NO, (4)

where NP is the nitrogen invested in pigment proteins such as chlorophyll a and b, NE is nitrogen allocated to the electron transport system including cytochrome f and coupling factor, NR is the nitrogen allocated to RuBisCO, NS is nitrogen in soluble proteins other than RuBisCO, and NO is additional organic leaf nitrogen not invested in photosynthetic functions such as in cell walls (all terms in equation (4) are in units ofmmolNm−2).

**Evans & Poorter 2001 \*\* this paper is essential to understanding photosynthetic capacity in terms of allocation light harvesting**

 “plants grown in low light partitioned a larger fraction of leaf nitrogen into light harvesting.”

By combining Pf and SLA into the same equation, we have been able to assess the relative importance of both param- eters. Whereas previous studies have shown that changes to f due to acclimation to growth irradiance improve photo-Psynthesis per unit leaf nitrogen, we have shown that changes in SLA have a greater impact under both low- and high-light conditions. Niinemets & Tenhunen (1997) took a different approach, combining data from different experi- ments and linking all of the parameters to leaf dry mass per unit area via empirical regressions through data collected on leaves at different canopy positions. They concluded that in low light, nitrogen re-allocation within the leaf was at least as important as changes to SLA. By contrast, we sug- gest that under low light, changes to P increased relative daily photosynthesis per unit leaf dry mass by only 2% in comparison with a 29% increase by changing SLA (Fig. 8). *It was under high light that re-allocation of nitrogen had a greater impact, enabling a 10% increase compared to a 22% increase by changing SLA (Fig. 8,9).*

The reason for this is that light capture by a leaf is very efficient at low chlorophyll contents and to increase absorp- tance requires a lot of additional pigment-protein com- plexes (Fig. 3a). More light can be captured by spreading a given amount of pigment-protein complexes over a greater area than by concentrating it in a given area. Under high light, increasing daily photosynthesis requires greater amounts amounts of nitrogen allocated to electron transport capac- ity and the soluble proteins. Nitrogen per unit leaf area is increased by decreasing SLA. As none of the additional nitrogen needs to be allocated to pigment-protein to main- tain absorptance, all of the additional nitrogen can be allo- cated towards increasing Jmax. Thus under high light, the two parameters interact and daily photosynthesis increases by more if the increase in 1/SLA is accompanied by a decrease in f.

“In previous papers, it has been shown that nitrogen partitioning within leaves changes with growth irradiance in such a way that it almost maximizes photosynthesis (Evans 1989b, 1989c, 1993a, 1993b; Hikosaka & Terashima 1996; Hikosaka et al . 1998; Niinemets, Kull & Tenhunen 1998).”

“These data were evaluated in a model that revealed a far greater sensitivity of daily photosynthesis per unit leaf dry mass to changes in SLA than to nitrogen par- titioning.”

“the data of Niinemets et al. (1998) that was collected on four deciduous tree species, in which allocation of nitro- gen to Rubisco and bioenergetics was relatively indepen- dent of the light environment of the leaf, whereas allocation to pigment-protein complexes was dramatically higher in leaves collected from low irradiance sites.”

**What are the literature numbers on what proportion of protein each category comprises?**

**Evans & Seeman 1989 - The allocation of protein nitrogen in the photosynthetic apparatus: costs, consequences, and control**

Light reactions (thylakoid membrane bound proteins associated with light harvesting, electron transport and photophosphorylation), represent ~25% of leaf protein

Photosynthetic carbon reduction cycle (Calvin cycle), includes soluble proteins involved in CO2 assimilation, photorespiration, RuBP regeneration and starch & sucrose synthesis. Also represents ~1/4 of leaf nitrogen (what sort of plants are we talking about here?)



**What are the ‘proxies’ for protein amounts?**

‘Pigment associated protein’ is calculated from chlorophyll measurements, using a stock average ratio of chlorophyll-‘soluble N’.

Rubisco content was assessed using a 14CABP binding method (Mate et al 1993)

‘Rubisco’ is calculated from ‘soluble protein’ (measured using Coomassie Plus assay with BSA as the standard). Steve said this is probably pretty good. But only for 10 species grown in the glasshouse.

In Hikosaka 1998, Rubisco is calculated by:

“For determination of RuBPCase content, the frozen leaf was homogenized in a 100 mM Na-phosphate buffer (pH 7·5) containing 0·4 M sorbitol, 10 mM NaCl, 2 mM MgCl2, 5 mM iodine acetate, 1 mM phenylmethyl sulfonyl fluoride, 5 mM dithiothreitol and 2% (w/v) polyvinylpyrrolidon. After filtration through 20 μm mesh, concentration of chl in the filtrate was determined with 80% acetone (Porra et al. 1989). Then, the filtrate was applied to SDS-PAGE. The gel was stained with Coomassie Brilliant Blue R-250 (CBB). The band of the large subunit of RuBPCase was extracted with formamide for spectrophotometric determination of the RuBPCase content (Makino, Mae & Ohira 1986). Calibration curves were made with the RuBPCase purified from Spinacia oleracea L. and the protein concentration was determined using the method of Lowry et al. (1951). The RuBPCase content per unit leaf area was calculated as a product of the RuBPCase/chl ratio and chl content per unit leaf area.”

How do I want to frame the intro?

- we have had estimates for the sizes of different functional pools of protein in leaves since the 80's - achieved using classical biochemical wizardry (Evans & Seeman 1989). These estimates were made using domesticated plants like spinach from which it was relatively straight forward to extract protein.

- roughly 1/4 light harvesting, 1/4 carbon assimilation, 10% respiration (including protein synthesis / degradation etc.))

- talk about allocation equations and where the numbers have typically come from (Evans 1989 a/b, see that 2016 review paper for an overview

- we know there are some fundamental relationships between N allocation and major environmental variables - temperature, water, light

- Responses of major protein groups to these env vars have been investigated extensively as a means to understanding the fundamentals of how the photosynthetic apparatus is optimised to its environment

  - light response (Evans & Poorter 2001 would do, Niinemets too)

  - temperature response (look up)

  - precip response (Wright paper, forget which one)

  - Evans & Poorter 2001, ref Niinemets and a few others, have directly determined Rubisco content and electron transport proteins in wild plants, but the species coverage remains limited and generally to glasshouse grown plants.

  - 'Pigment associated proteins' aren't usually quantified directly - measurements are made by measuring chlorophyll and then multiplying by a stock 'N per chlorophyll' number derived from Evans work (1989, paper with pie chart and tables?)

- Now using cutting edge mass spectrometric methods we can accurately and rapidly measure amounts of protein at any level of functional organisation, from high level functional categories down to individual protein subunits. We've done this for 32 Eucalypt species spanning broad ranges of environmental conditions across half the Australian continent.

- We provide an updated, completed quantification of protein allocation to all major leaf protein functional categories.

- It is possible to test a vast range of environment-function relationships using this dataset. In this initial analysis, we have opted to address the main drivers of variation in the abundance of photosynthesis proteins, questions/issues/ which are of longstanding interest across multiple disciplines in the plant sciences.

-By combining of comparative field ecology and a novel quantitative proteomics approach, we describe drivers of variation in photosynthesis protein abundances with unprecedented accuracy, at the continental scale.