

## BRIEF COMMUNICATION

## Effect of growth regulators on photosynthesis, transpiration and related parameters in water stressed cotton

B. KUMAR, D.M. PANDEY, C.L. GOSWAMI and S. JAIN

*Department of Botany and Plant Physiology, CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar-125 004, Haryana, India*

### Abstract

Gas exchange in *Gossypium hirsutum* L. cv. H-777 as affected by water deficit and growth regulators (IAA, GA<sub>3</sub>, BAP, ABA, ethrel) was examined. Sixty days after sowing, growth regulators in concentration 50 µM were applied as foliar spray and irrigation was withheld to get desired (moderate and severe) water deficit. All the parameters were measured on the third leaf from the top between 10:00 and 11:00. Net photosynthetic rate (P<sub>N</sub>), transpiration rate (E), stomatal conductance (g<sub>s</sub>), carboxylation efficiency (CE), and water potential (ψ<sub>w</sub>) decreased significantly with the increasing water stress, however, water use efficiency (WUE) was unaffected. Foliar spray with IAA, GA<sub>3</sub> and BAP partially counteracted the effect of water deficit on the above parameters except ψ<sub>w</sub>, which became more negative. ABA and up to some extent ethrel increased WUE and maintained higher ψ<sub>w</sub>, however, caused further decrease in P<sub>N</sub>, E, and g<sub>s</sub>.

*Additional key words:* *Gossypium hirsutum*, water deficit, water potential, water use efficiency.

Cotton is an important crop grown throughout the world. Water deficit severely limits the photosynthesis and crop productivity (Lawlor and Uprety 1993, Kumar *et al.* 1994). Both stomatal and non-stomatal factors contribute to the effects of water deficit on photosynthesis and water use efficiency (Matthews and Boyer 1984, Bunce 1988, Martin and Ruiz-Torres 1992, Dubey 1997).

Various factors are thought to be involved in decline of plant productivity under water stress, and content of endogenous phytohormones is important one (Cornish 1988). Exogenous application of plant growth regulators (PGRs) has been employed in order to alleviate the harmful effects of water deficit. Although some encouraging results are available in the literature (Gadallah 1995, Cadena and Cothren 1996, Coskuncelbi *et al.* 1997, Zhao *et al.* 1997, Pospíšilová *et al.* 2000), yet, information available regarding role of PGRs under water deficit is inconclusive. So, present study was conducted to see the effects of PGRs on photosynthesis, water use

efficiency and related parameters and to see the correlation of these parameters with leaf water potential.

Experiment was conducted in screenhouse in earthen pots during 1998 at CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, India, using dune sand and Hoagland's nutrient solution. Water stress was imposed at 60 days after sowing (DAS) by withholding irrigation in order to achieve desired stress level: field capacity [soil moisture content (SMC) = 10 ± 0.5 %], moderate stress (SMC = 5 ± 0.5 %), severe stress (SMC = 3 ± 0.5 %). Foliar spray of indoleacetic acid (IAA), gibberellic acid (GA<sub>3</sub>), benzylaminopurine (BAP), abscisic acid (ABA), and ethrel in the concentration 50 µM was applied just before withholding the irrigation while distilled water was sprayed on control plants. Water potential was measured using pressure chamber (*Model 3005, Soil Moisture Equipment Corporation, Santa Barbara, USA*). Gas exchange parameters were measured using infrared gas analyser (*Ciras-1, P.P. Systems Inc., Hitchin, U.K.*)

Received 5 September 2000, accepted 28 January 2001.

*Abbreviations:* ABA - abscisic acid, BAP - benzylaminopurine, CE - carboxylation efficiency, DAS - days after sowing, E - transpiration rate, GA<sub>3</sub> - gibberellic acid, g<sub>s</sub> - stomatal conductance, IAA - indoleacetic acid, P<sub>N</sub> - net photosynthetic rate, SMC - soil moisture content, ψ<sub>w</sub> - water potential, WUE - water use efficiency.

*Acknowledgements:* This research was funded by ICAR, New Delhi (India) in terms of a research project.

Fax: (+91) 1662 34952, e-mail: bhumeshkumar@usa.net

under natural daylight ( $1000 - 1100 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ), temperature ( $32 \pm 0.5 \%$ ), air humidity ( $60 \pm 5 \%$ ) and  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration ( $354 \pm 5 \text{ cm}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$ ). Carboxylation efficiency (CE) and water use efficiency (WUE) were calculated using following relationships:

$$\text{CE} [\%] = (P_N/c_i) \times 100$$

$$\text{WUE} = P_N/E$$

Where,  $P_N$ ,  $c_i$  and  $E$  represent net photosynthetic rate, internal carbon dioxide concentration, and transpiration rate, respectively.

All the observations were measured on third leaf from top on main axis between 10:00 to 11:00 in triplicate and data were analysed using factorial CRD.

Net photosynthetic rate ( $P_N$ ), transpiration rate ( $E$ ) and stomatal conductance ( $g_s$ ) were significantly decreased under water deficit (Table 1). Decline in  $P_N$  in cotton was observed also by Zhao *et al.* (1991), Ephrath *et al.* (1993), Cadena and Cothren (1996), Faver *et al.* (1996). Drought induced reduction in the rate of transpiration was noted in cotton by Leidi *et al.* (1993), Cadena and

Cothren (1996), Van Iersel and Oosterhuis (1996) while decline in stomatal conductance was reported in cotton by Zakaria *et al.* (1993) and Iersel *et al.* (1996). Reduction in CE under water deficit was reported in cotton by Leidi *et al.* (1999). Water use efficiency (WUE) did not change significantly under water deficit because  $P_N$  and  $E$  decreased proportionately (Table 1). However, Van Rensburg and Krüger (1993) reported that WUE declined significantly in tobacco under drought. At moderate and severe stress,  $\psi_w$  of the leaves was  $-1.37$  and  $-1.70$  MPa, respectively, while at field capacity it was  $-0.98$  MPa (Table 1). Reduction in  $\psi_w$  of cotton leaves was reported by Ephrath *et al.* (1993) under soil moisture stress.

Foliar spray of IAA,  $\text{GA}_3$  and BAP resulted in an increase in  $P_N$ ,  $E$  and  $g_s$  at moderate and severe stress as compared to that of control plants at similar stress level (Table 1). Application of ABA did not show any considerable effect at moderate stress but at severe stress it caused a further decrease in  $P_N$  (25 %); ethrel was not found effective at either stress level (Table 1). On the other hand, ABA and ethrel caused a significant decrease in  $E$  and  $g_s$  at moderate and severe stresses.

Table 1. Effect of growth regulators (50  $\mu\text{M}$ ) on net photosynthetic rate, transpiration rate, stomatal conductance, carboxylation efficiency, water use efficiency and water potential in cotton under water deficit.

PGR/stress	H <sub>2</sub> O	IAA	GA <sub>3</sub>	BAP	ABA	Ethrel	LSD <sub>0.05</sub>
Net photosynthetic rate [ $\mu\text{mol}(\text{CO}_2) \text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ]							
Field capacity	7.00	7.13	7.27	6.57	5.83	6.36	PGR 0.44
Moderate stress	4.43	5.93	5.93	5.50	4.30	4.63	stress 0.31
Severe stress	3.03	3.77	3.47	3.70	2.27	3.00	PGR $\times$ stress NS
Transpiration rate [ $\text{mmol}(\text{H}_2\text{O}) \text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ]							
Field capacity	4.41	4.96	5.10	4.56	3.92	4.10	PGR 0.28
Moderate stress	3.03	4.13	4.08	3.83	2.62	2.73	stress 0.20
Severe stress	2.09	2.68	2.75	2.63	1.01	1.80	PGR $\times$ stress NS
Stomatal conductance [ $\text{mmol}(\text{H}_2\text{O}) \text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ]							
Field capacity	431	486	498	455	403	411	PGR 18.0
Moderate stress	306	378	367	350	280	287	stress 12.7
Severe stress	258	288	302	295	172	239	PGR $\times$ stress 31.2
Carboxylation efficiency [%]							
Field capacity	3.27	3.26	3.55	3.15	2.55	3.02	PGR 0.34
Moderate stress	1.69	2.40	2.85	2.25	1.28	1.57	stress 0.24
Severe stress	0.94	1.37	1.23	1.24	0.60	0.91	PGR $\times$ stress NS
Water use efficiency [ $\mu\text{mol}(\text{CO}_2) \text{mmol}^{-1}(\text{H}_2\text{O})$ ]							
Field capacity	1.59	1.44	1.43	1.44	1.49	1.55	PGR 0.17
Moderate stress	1.46	1.43	1.45	1.43	1.64	1.70	stress NS
Severe stress	1.45	1.41	1.26	1.41	2.25	1.66	PGR $\times$ stress 0.30
Leaf water potential [-MPa]							
Field capacity	0.98	0.96	0.97	0.98	0.93	0.97	PGR 0.06
Moderate stress	1.36	1.44	1.45	1.38	1.24	1.32	stress 0.04
Severe stress	1.70	1.81	1.83	1.73	1.56	1.66	PGR $\times$ stress NS

Carboxylation efficiency (CE) was improved in response to IAA, GA<sub>3</sub> and BAP but decreased with ABA, and was unaffected with ethrel at moderate stress (Table 1). At severe stress, only IAA was able to improve CE while ABA further declined it as compared to control plants. WUE was not affected by the application of IAA and BAP at either stress level but GA<sub>3</sub> at severe stress caused 13 % decrease in WUE. However, significant increase was observed with ABA and ethrel at moderate as well as severe stress (Table 1). Water potential ( $\psi_w$ ) of leaves became more negative by application of IAA and GA<sub>3</sub>, unaffected by BAP and ethrel, but significantly improved by ABA at both the stress levels (Table 1).

Zhao *et al.* (1997) reported that cotton plants treated with PGR-IV (GA<sub>3</sub>, IBA and propriety fermentation broth) showed an increase in  $P_N$  and  $g_s$  under water deficit. Foliar spray of ABA on cotton plants was found to be beneficial in order to minimize water loss under water deficit condition (Gadallah 1995). Similarly, Goswami and Srivastava (1985) argued that application of ABA resulted in lesser lowering of  $\psi_w$  of leaves, and

decrease in  $g_s$ , E and  $P_N$  in sunflower under water deficit. Higher WUE with ABA under water deficit may be ascribed to the role of ABA in stomatal closure (Nilsen and Orcutte 1996) and the fact that E was lowered up to greater extent than  $P_N$  with ABA under water deficit (Table 1).

All the parameters ( $P_N$ , E,  $g_s$ , CE, WUE) showed strong positive correlation with leaves  $\psi_w$  in control, IAA and GA<sub>3</sub> treated plants. This is also true in case of BAP and ethrel treated plants except WUE, which showed negative correlation with  $\psi_w$ . However, under ABA treatment, WUE showed very strong negative correlation because  $\psi_w$  decreased while WUE increased in ABA treated plants.

Results of this experiment led us to interpret that under water deficit, spray of ABA resulted in higher WUE which seems to be a desirable trait under drought condition and such an affect might be due to reduction in stomatal conductance and transpiration rate that ultimately led to maintain better water status of leaves under stress conditions.

## References

- Bunce, J.A.: Non-stomatal inhibition of photosynthesis by water stress. Reduction in photosynthesis at high transpiration rate without stomatal closure in field-grown tomato. - *Photosynth. Res.* **18**: 357-362, 1988.
- Cadena, J., Cothren, J.T.: Carbon balance for PGR-IV treated cotton plants grown under two irrigation regimes. - In: Dugger, P., Richter, D. (ed.): *Proceedings of Beltwide Cotton Prod. Res. Conference*. Pp. 1225-1232. National Cotton Council of America, Nashville 1996.
- Cornish, K.: Why does photosynthesis decline with age? - In: Brown, J.M. (ed.): *Proceedings of Beltwide Cotton Prod. Res. Conference*. Pp. 50-55. National Cotton Council of America, New Orleans 1988.
- Coskuncelbi, K., Aliyev, R.T., Beyazoglu, O.: Effect of gibberellic acid on the alterations caused by drought stress in the genome of cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) seedling. - *Turkish J. Biol.* **21**: 175-179, 1997.
- Dubey, R.S.: Photosynthesis in plants under stressful conditions. - In: Pessarakli, M. (ed.): *Handbook of Photosynthesis*. Pp. 859-875. Marcel Dekker, New York 1997.
- Ephrath, J.E., Marani, A., Bravdo, A.B.: Photosynthetic rate, stomatal resistance and leaf water potential in cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) as affected by soil moisture and irradiance. - *Photosynthetica* **29**: 63-71, 1993.
- Faver, K.L., Gerik, T.J., Thaxton, P.M.: Late season water stress in cotton. II. Leaf gas exchange and assimilation capacity. - *Crop Sci.* **36**: 922-928, 1996.
- Gadallah, M.A.A.: Effect of water stress, abscisic acid and proline on cotton plants. - *J. Arid Environ.* **30**: 315-325, 1995.
- Goswami, B.K., Srivastava, G.C.: Effect of ascorbic acid and zeation on water stress induced photosynthesis and respiration in sunflower leaves. - *Indian J. Plant Physiol.* **28**: 350-357, 1985.
- Kumar, A., Singh, D.P., Singh, P.: Influence of water stress on photosynthesis, transpiration and water use efficiency and yield of *Brassica juncea* L. - *Field Crops Res.* **37**: 95-101, 1994.
- Lawlor, D.W., Upreti, D.C.: Effects of water stress on photosynthesis of crops and biochemical mechanism. - In: Abrol, Y.P., Mohanty, P., Govindjee (ed.): *Photosynthesis: Photoreactions to Plant Productivity*. Pp. 419-449. Oxford and IBH Publ. Co., New Delhi 1993.
- Leidi, E.O., Lopez, J.M., Lopez, M., Gutierrez, J.C.L.: Searching for tolerance to water stress in cotton genotypes: Photosynthesis, respiration, stomatal conductance and transpiration. - *Photosynthetica* **28**: 383-390, 1993.
- Leidi, E.O., Lopez, M., Gorham, J., Gutierrez, J.C.L.: Variation in carbon isotope discrimination and other traits related to drought tolerance in upland cotton cultivar under dryland conditions. - *Field Crops Res.* **61**: 109-123, 1999.
- Martin, B., Ruiz-Torres, N.A.: Effects of water deficit stress on photosynthesis, its components and component limitations, and on water use efficiency in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). - *Plant Physiol.* **100**: 733-739, 1992.
- Matthews, M.A., Boyer J.S.: Acclimation of photosynthesis to low leaf water potential. - *Plant Physiol.* **74**: 161-166, 1984.
- Nilsen, E.T., Orcutte, D.M.: Phytohormones and plant responses to stress. - In: Nilsen, E.T., Orcutte, D.M. (ed.): *Physiology of Plant under Stress: Abiotic Factor*. Pp. 183-198. John Wiley and Sons Inc., New York 1996.
- Pospišilová, J., Synková, H., Rulcová, J.: Cytokinins and water stress. - *Biol. Plant.* **43**: 321-328, 2000.
- Van Iersel, M.W., Oosterhuis, D.M.: Drought effect on water relations of cotton fruits, bracts and leaves during ontogeny. - *Environ. exp. Bot.* **36**: 51-59, 1996.
- Van Rensburg, L.V., Krüger, G.H.J.: Comparative analysis of differential drought stress-induced suppression of and recovery in carbon dioxide fixation: stomatal and non-

- stomatal limitation in *Nicotiana tabaccum*. - J. Plant Physiol. **142**: 296-306, 1993.
- Zakaria, M.I., Mulchi, C.L., Lee, E.H.: Effect of soil moisture, atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> and air quality on photorespiration, stomatal conductance and transpiration rate in cotton. - In: Brown, J.M. (ed.): Proceedings of Beltville Cotton Prod. res. Conference. Pp. 1252-1255. National Cotton Council of America, New Orleans 1988.
- Zhao, D.L., Xu, Y.Z., Wang, Y.F., Xu, X.: Effect of water stress on the content of C and N in cotton during flowering and boll setting. - Plant Physiol. Commun. **273**: 194-196, 1991.
- Zhao, D., Oosterhuis, D.M., Zhao, D.L.: Physiological responses of growth chamber grown cotton plants to the plant growth regulator PGR-IV under water deficit stress. - Environ. exp. Bot. **38**: 7-14, 1997.