DISCUSSION

We found inconsistent effects of atmospheric CO2 concentration and waterlogging status on gas exchange, growth and functional traits between species of riparian tree seedlings.

While photosynthesis is the primary means by which plants accumulate biomass, increases in leaf-level photosynthesis may not necessarily translate to biomass gains (REF). Metabolically costly responses to waterlogging tolerance, such as anaerobic catabolism (), detoxification of reactive oxygen species and toxic ions, and morphological adaptations such as formation of adventitious roots may act as energetic sinks. Species-specific relationships between photosynthetic rate and biomass responses to waterlogging and CO2 level treatments were apparent in this study.

Of the three species studied here, only growth of C. cunninghamiana was interactively affected by CO2 concentration and waterlogging status. Biomass of shoot, total root and fine root components was significantly higher under eCO2 for control C. cunninghamiana plants, but not plants which were recovering from waterlogging, despite increased rates of CO2 assimilation. No significant interaction effect on root mass fraction was found, but visual inspection of the data (Fig X) indicates that eCO2 stimulation of RMF was present in control and recovering, but not waterlogged plants. Re-establishment of pre-waterlogging biomass allocation appears to have occurred despite absent differences in total biomass. Photosynthesis remained higher in recovering plants under eCO2, indicating that their ability to convert the extra photosynthate produced under eCO2 into biomass was impaired by waterlogging.

No increase in biomass attended increased photosynthetic rate under eCO2 for either A. floribunda or E. camaldulensis. A. floribunda underwent substantial root mortality in response to waterlogging, although the presence of spongy white aerenchymous adventitious roots indicated a degree of morphological adaptation to anoxia (Evans 2004). Stomatal conductance was also reduced by waterlogging in A. floribunda. Conversely, waterlogging stimulated fine root growth in E. camaldulensis. A proliferation of fine aerenchymous roots both below and above the water line was observed in waterlogged and recovered plants, corresponding to increased fine root mass compared with control plants. No significant effect of waterlogging on shoot biomass was observed in A. floribunda or E. camaldulensis. The strong morphological response of E. camaldulensis root systems combined with higher photosynthetic rate in recovering than control plants, and higher stomatal conductance in waterlogged plants than control or recovering plants, indicates that E. camaldulensis responded favourably to waterlogging in this study. This growth response concurs with the results of previous studies (Sena-Gomes & Kozlowski 1980; Marcar 1993), although see Kogawara, Yamanoshita, Norisada, Masumori, & Kojima, (2006); Sena-Gomes & Kozlowski (1980) also reported reduction in shoot biomass of E. camaldulensis following waterlogging.

We suggested earlier that higher water use efficiency under eCO2 might facilitate photosynthesis where waterlogging had caused stomatal closure. WUE was altered by waterlogging only in A. floribunda, and by CO2 level only in E. camaldulensis. WUE was interactively dependent on waterlogging status and CO2 level in C. cunninghamiana, being higher at eCO2 than aCO2 for waterlogged plants only. The lack of stomatal response to waterlogging indicates that higher WUE under eCO2 is not the mechanism maintaining photosynthetic rate under waterlogging, however.

1. Summary
   1. Summarise ‘answers’ to research questions (few interactions, variable main effects, species specific)
   2. Was CO2 or waterlogging stronger as a main effect?
2. Biomass accumulation
   1. Acacia and euc unaffected by eCO2 (precedent?) but casuarina had the most interesting interaction effect in the study
   2. Roots? Both fine and total decreased in AF, stayed constant (although interaction) in CC, and fine but not total increased for EC (spongy white aerenchymous roots)!
   3. Flooding didn’t do much to shoots (except CC interaction).
3. Relationships between gas exchange parameters and biomass accumulation
   1. Did higher photosynthesis translate to higher biomass? (“It is important to note that A per unit leaf area is not the most important factor for predicting overall plant growth (Korner 1991). The combination of carbohydrate produc- tion, which is determined by photosynthetic rate and leaf area, and the consumption of carbohydrates for growth, respiration, storage, and root exudation, account for most of the overall growth enhancement under conditions of eCO2 (Morison and Lawlor 1999).” – (Wang *et al.* 2012)
   2. Did stomatal closing occur in response to flooding?
   3. Talk about WUE.
   4. Acacias didn’t have lower stomatal conductance under flooding, and photosynthesis stayed the same, but they used water more efficiently.
   5. No similar patterns between PR and gs for casuarina, and eCO2 effect on photosynth only found for WUE of waterlogged plants
   6. Euc photosynthesis improved under recovery, associated with increased stomatal conductance. WUE stayed constant between treatments and eCO2 plants maintained their advantage.
4. Traits and economic spectra
   1. Species-specific effects, no clear pattern.
   2. AF flooding shifted traits > conservative
   3. CC CO2 shifted traits > conservative
   4. EC flooding reduced fine root DMC (more aerenchymous roots), reduced SLA (starch storage?)
5. What happened during recovery? Did plants recover?
6. Elaborate on the Casuarina interaction
   1. Is there anything we already know about CC and CO2 / flooding?
7. Evidence for anoxic drought / stomatal closure vs starch storage hypotheses

**eCO2 effect for E. camaldulensis**

<http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/variation-in-gas-exchange-characteristics-in-clones-of-eucalyptus-s-amaldulensis-under-varying-conditions-of-co-2>

some evidence for eCO2 stimulation of photosynthesis

**flooding (root hypoxia) effect on E. camaldulensis**

<http://treephys.oxfordjournals.org/content/26/11/1413.short>

“ Root hypoxia caused decreases in whole-plant biomass, photosynthetic rate and stomatal conductance in E. camaldulensis, but not in M. cajuputi. “

<http://www.publish.csiro.au/?paper=PP9960497>

clonal lines of E. camaldulensis “Stomatal conductance, net gas exchange and leaf nutrient allocation did not differ greatly among the clonal lines.”

**Flooding effect on Causarina:**

Melaleuca cuticularis and C. obesa survived all treatments, and generally maintainedhigh rates of net photosynthesis. Banksia attenuata tolerated neither waterloggingnor salinity

* “Variable tolerance of wetland tree species to combined salinity and waterlogging is related to regulation of ion uptake and production of organic solutes”

Frankia requires aeration to colonise Casuarina – therefore Frankia might have been subsidising N in control treatment but died or was impaired following waterlogging.

<http://link.springer.com.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/article/10.1007/BF02232785>

eCO2 effects on Casuarina

* None known? Ask Mel…