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1. PhD project description

PHD SUPERVISORS

Karen Koefoed Petersen   (Principal supervisor) - Aarhus University, Denmark
Rex Brennan (Co-supervisor) – The James Hutton Institute, Scotland
Hanne L. Kristensen- Aarhus University, Denmark
Lillie Andersen- Aarhus University, Denmark

This PhD is part of the ClimaFruit project (European Regional Development Funded project). It will provide underpinning knowledge for growers to be able to sustain both productivity and quality when climatic conditions become limiting. The project will evaluate the ability of elite North region (Scandinavia and United Kingdom) blackcurrant cultivars to cope with water stress during flower induction or flowering and to recover after a period of drought stress by looking at plant water relations, flowering and root growth, and will also look at gene expression in stress conditions.

Introduction

Changing climatic conditions are becoming a limiting factor in the sustainable production of blackcurrants from existing commercial cultivars in Denmark. The overall aim of this project is to identify elite cultivars that have adaptive and phenotypic plasticity and are therefore more likely to remain productive during unfavourable weather conditions. This will be achieved by identifying specific traits such as an ability to maintain productivity and quality, and increase water use efficiency during and after drought stress.

Background – state of the art

In Denmark blackcurrants are commercially produced in the field. During the last 5 growing seasons more extreme weather conditions have had a negative impact on the productivity and sustainability of the crop. Weather conditions that currently threaten the production of blackcurrants in Denmark are extended periods of droughts, or heavy rain during the production season and/or lack of winter chilling (1). There is a large diversity in the genetic material available in blackcurrants; many different cultivars are grown in different countries to fit the global production (2). Traditionally selections are chosen based on productivity and disease resistance (3). However, with changing climatic conditions and reduced productivity, breeding material needs to be re-evaluated for increased adaptive and phenotypic plasticity (4, 5). The term plasticity reflects the ability of a plant to alter its phenotype under changing conditions, plasticity in plant growth also reflects the genotype by environment interaction (6). Therefore, as climatic conditions become unpredictable it is
important to grow plant material that has plastic or adaptive traits so that they can cope with extreme drought and retain and maintain a commercial crop. These traits will become important given the increased frequency of extreme weather events. Exploitation of germplasm to identify the genetic diversity in response to extreme climatic conditions (drought stress) has not been investigated in blackcurrants. There is significant potential to select cultivars with an increased ability to respond to and recover from stressful conditions (7). Cultivars with an ability to modify root systems as visualised by root distribution and root density are therefore likely to adjust to water and nutrient uptake (8, 9).

**Short project description with hypothesis and aim**

The overall aim of this project is to identify elite cultivars that have adaptive and phenotypic plasticity and therefore are more likely to remain productive during unfavourable weather conditions. This will be achieved by identifying specific traits such as an ability to maintain productivity and quality during and after drought stress. The project will more specifically investigate root and shoot growth as well as flowering in different elite selections of blackcurrants, grown under limited/irregular water availability under protected culture. The response of plant material will be evaluated from a physiological and genetic perspective. Drought conditions may result in differences between cultivars in evapotranspiration, stomatal conductance and stomatal limitation, reduction in leaf water potential and changes in osmotic potential and turgor. Water deficit may result in reduced biomass production and therefore a reduced leaf area, fresh and dry weight, water use efficiency and finally, a reduction in production. Differences in root growth under and during recovery from reduced water availability can be measured using root window observations for quantification of root growth, WinRHIZO for estimation of total root length and root diameter classes and $^{15}$N application for estimation of root N uptake activity. The difference in gene expression between the stressed and unstressed samples will be evaluated using Agilent microarrays, and should enable the identification of some of the key genes involved in water stress tolerance.

More specific hypotheses are:

- Water use efficiency is expected to increase under drought stress but to different degrees dependent on blackcurrant cultivar.

- Blackcurrant genotypes respond differently to reduced water availability with regard to plant water status and gene expression.

- Root density, regrowth ability and root uptake activity of elite blackcurrant cultivars are phenotypic traits that are significantly correlated to growth plasticity during conditions of drought or water stress.

- Plant water relations are related to phenotypic and genotypic growth plasticity during water stress.
Industrial interests in the project

- The industry will gain basic knowledge on the potential to breed new cultivars more suited to climate extremes (drought stress) thereby ensuring a sustainable production of blackcurrants in future.

- Increased knowledge about the effects of drought stress on blackcurrant production and how to maintain a high productivity, uniformity and quality.

- Knowledge from the project will increase our overall understanding of how plants respond to and recover from drought conditions. More specifically the impact of restricted water availability during flowering and after the harvest period during flower induction on productivity will be determined.

References:

2. Progress so far and plan for remaining PhD period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL WORK</th>
<th>OFFICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug-Dec 2010</td>
<td><strong>Pre-trial</strong> to estimate flowering time, evapotranspiration ($ET_c$), stomata conductance ($g_s$) data analyses from pre-trial experiment</td>
<td>Literature study, PhD courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Feb 2011</td>
<td><strong>Experiment I</strong> to determine drought stress during flowering, water status, growth, flower abortion and root and top regrowth $ET_c$, $g_s$, $^{15}$N uptake, basal and stem shoot growth</td>
<td>Literature study, PhD courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-Apr 2011</td>
<td>Preparing minirhizotron tubes for field trial, washing roots and preparing for WinRHIZO from experiment I</td>
<td>Data analyses of $g_s$ from experiment I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-Aug 2011</td>
<td>Preparing samples C and $^{15}$N</td>
<td>PhD courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-Oct 2011</td>
<td>Preparing samples C and $^{15}$N</td>
<td>Data analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-Dec 2011</td>
<td>osmotic potential WinRHIZO</td>
<td>PhD course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Mar 2012</td>
<td>osmotic potential</td>
<td>Data analyses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deviations from original PhD plan

In the original PhD plan three experiments were planned: one in greenhouse, one outdoors in pots to follow the plants from the greenhouse experiment and one field experiment. A greenhouse experiment (exp. 1), modified compared to the original plan to be manageable for one PhD-student, has been performed during the spring 2011 and one lot of plants were further evaluated after transfer to outdoor conditions. A field experiment was established (2011) with minirhizotron tubes and tubes for measuring soil moisture content. But, due to heavy precipitation during most of the 2011 growing season, no differences in growth can be expected so far. Therefore a second greenhouse experiment is planned to run during the autumn 2012, in order to have enough data to publish within the timeframe of the PhD period.

Milestones for remaining $1^{1/2}$ year PhD plan is presented in a table on the page 6.
### Activity Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1 - Result section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed plan exp. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start exp. 2, no treatments until later</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1 - Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1 - results and M&amp;M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA extraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1 - Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1 - Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1 - whole manuscript</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1 - Prepare figure for submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1 - Final revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1 - submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare experiment 2*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2 - running</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 2 - M&amp;M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis - First section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2 - ABA and osmotic potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 2 - M&amp;M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 2 - Results and data analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 2 - Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 3 - Data analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 3 - M&amp;M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 3 - Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 3 - Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment 2 - final data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 3 - results Introduction, M&amp;M, Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 3 - discussion, Figures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 3 - Final revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 3 - submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 2 - Introduction, M&amp;M, Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 2 - Discussion, Figures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 2 - Final revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 2 - submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis - Second section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand in thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes test of measurements (water potential, RWC etc.), preparation of excel sheets for data collection etc.
3. Preliminary results

Effects of water stress during flowering of two pot grown blackcurrant (*Ribes nigrum* L.) cultivars

*Abstract*

Two cultivars of blackcurrant (*Ribes nigrum* L.), ‘Narve Viking’ and ‘Ben Gairn’, were studied to evaluate growth responses to drought stress during flowering and during a recovery phase to identify if there is any significant difference in physiological responses between the cultivars. Plants were selected based on growth vigor and differences in genetic background and grown in 3 l pots sandy loam soil mixture until the beginning of flowering where irrigation treatments were started. Plants were either hand irrigated with a volume replacing the previous day’s evapotranspiration (FI) or not irrigated (NI) for 12 days. Hereafter irrigation was continued of all plants to allow for 17 days of recovery.

Water limitation severely decreased the evapotranspiration and leaf anatomy. Stomatal conductance was highly influenced with drought stress, but also with daily temperature and VPD, time of measurements and cultivar difference. Plant water status was highly influenced by the day of measurement. Leaf water potential and osmotic potential significantly decreased during a twelve days of withholding water. Turgor remains positive, except the day 12, when leaves for both cultivar lost turgor and wilt.

Aboveground plant growth was evaluated by leaf area and fresh and dry weight of flowers, leaves and stems at the end of the drought treatment and after one and two weeks of recovery. Basal and stem shoot growth were recorder during drought stress period.

Roots were quantified at the vertical soil surface, feeding a stable isotope $^{15}$N to the roots showed root nitrogen uptake activity, then extracted from the soil to estimate total root length and distribution in diameter classes by WinRHIZO analysis.

The results indicate that ‘Ben Gairn’ was more tolerant to drought stress than ‘Narve Viking’ due to a faster recovery of root growth and less reduction in growth of aerial parts during the drought treatment.

*Keywords*: *Ribes nigrum*; Water stress; Evapotranspiration; Plant water status; Root recovery

*Introduction*

Drought is one of the most important abiotic stresses that cause significant reduction in crop yield. The response of plants to water deficit varies with species. Plants have three main defences against drought stress: the first defence is a leaf area reduction, which results in reduced transpiration. The second is deeper root growth; which can allow water uptake from deeper soil zones that still have moisture. Stomata closure is third defence which serves to reduce
evaporation from the already existing leaf area (Taiz and Zeiger, 2002). Levitt in 1972 classified such mechanisms of plant response to drought stress as drought tolerance and drought avoidance which have long been considered to be important strategies in drought adaptation (Chaves et al., 2003, Blum 2011). In the concept of drought avoidance, plants use mechanisms like leaf movement, stomata closure and large root system in order to maximize water acquisition and reduce transpiration to be able to maintain higher water potential under water deficit condition. Drought tolerance use mechanisms such as osmotic adjustment and cell membrane stability that allow metabolism to function under low water potential (Blum 2011).

Drought conditions may results in difference between cultivars in evapotranspiration, stomata conductance and stomata limitation, reduction in leaf water potential and changes in osmotic potential and turgor. Water deficit results in foliage area biomass resulting reduce in leaf area, fresh and dry weight, water use efficiency and finally, a reduction in production (Asraf and O Leary, 1996; Chartzoulakis et al., 2002: Liu et al., 2006; Guerfel et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2009: Álvarez et al., 2011; Mahdidi et al., 2011)

Weather conditions that currently threaten the production of blackcurrants in Denmark are extended periods of droughts, or heavy rain during the production season and/or lack of winter chilling (1) have had a negative impact on the productivity and sustainability of the crop. Therefore, as climatic conditions become unpredictable it is important to grow plant material that has plastic or adaptive traits so that they can cope with extreme weather conditions and maintain a commercial crop. Specific traits for blackcurrants will become increasingly important given the increased frequency of extreme weather events (Heide and Sonsteby, 2010; Sonsteby et al., 2011).

In future, episodes of drought stress may be more frequent during the flowering period of blackcurrants due to climate change, but little is known about how different blackcurrant cultivars recover during growth after drought (Wilson and Jones, 1980; Cosmulescu et al., 2008). Therefore, the aim of this study is to investigate the effect of stress response in a twelve days and recovery phases of two weeks in a several anatomical and physiological parameters of the two important Scandinavian and UK cultivar, 'Ben Gairn' and 'Narve Viking'. Specifically, we study these two cultivars to identify adaptive and phenotypic adaptations that reduce water loss and are therefore more likely to remain productive during unfavourable weather conditions.

Material and methods

Plant material and growing conditions

A pot experiment was conducted in a greenhouse conditions at The Department of Food Science, Faculty of Science and Technology, Aarslev, Aarhus University, Denmark in April 2011 under optimal temperature, light, wind and nutrient conditions. Two blackcurrant (Ribes nigrum L.) cultivars 'Ben Gairn' and 'Narve Viking' were selected based on growth vigor and differences in genetic background. One year old cold stored plants propagated from cuttings were grown in 3 l pots in a sandy loam soil mixture from 13th of January until the beginning of flowering where irrigation treatments were started (6th of April).

Evaluations of blackcurrant cultivars focussed on phases of drought response of the plants during a 12 day period and seventeen days of recovery phase.
Experimental design

A split plot design was used with drought levels as the main treatments, cultivars as sub treatments, and four replications. On the beginning of the experiment, each cultivar was placed on separately table and mixed them randomize inside each of this table. According to the days of drought stress, we have inside of each table 6 blocks randomized. In a one block at day 0 we had 4 plants, while in other 5 blocks we have 8 plants, 4 fully irrigated and 4 non irrigated. Every time after finishing a day of drought treatment, we placed the pots on the free table completely randomized and irrigated in order to recovery.

Evapotranspiration and water treatment

Irrigation for plants in recovery phases was managed once per day. From the day of potting all plants were irrigated on a daily basis in order to maintain 100% water holding capacity. During the period of treatment (flowering time) two different water availabilities were established: 1. full irrigated (FI) and 2. non irrigated (NI) for 0, 2, 5, 7, 9 and 12 days followed by recovery at full irrigation.

Evapotranspiration, as well irrigation for control plants, and drying out was recorded on a daily basis with an electronic weighing scale, for each pot individually. Full irrigated plants were given water individually every day in the late afternoon according to the weight loss that we maintained at pot water holding capacity. For the plants that were exposed to drought (non irrigated treatment), we recorded the water loss every day.

Plant water relations

Stomata conductance of four plant per treatment was measured on the days of drought treatment (0, 2, 5, 7, 9 and 12) with a portable porometer (steady state porometer PMR-2, PP-Systems, UK) in the morning between 9-10 am (m) and afternoon - midday between 12:30-13:30 pm (a) and a second fully expanded upper canopy leaf were used per pot recording a three times. Midday leaf water potential ($\Psi_l$) and osmotic potential ($\Psi_o$) were measured on the same leaf using a pressure chamber and dew point microvoltmeter, respectively. After stomatal conductance and leaf water potential measurements each leaf was immediately wrapped in aluminum foil, frozen in liquid nitrogen, and transferred to a -80°C freezer for subsequent leaf osmotic potential determination. Turgor potential ($\Psi_T$) was determined by the difference $\Psi_T = \Psi_o - \Psi_l$.

“Root window” method for quantification of roots at the vertical soil surface

Counting is performed at the end of drought treatment, one week of recovery and end of experiment (two weeks of recovery). A window is cut at a random place of the pot wall with minimal damage of roots by cutting the upper vertical edge and tearing the window downwards. The grid (4 x 4 cm cross) on transparent plastic is attached, 4 cm from the pot bottom. Roots touching the horizontal and vertical lines are counted. At the opposite side of the pot a similar
window is cut, grid attached and roots counted. Grids are removed and windows closed by tape until next counting.

\textit{15N experiment at the end of experiment for estimation of root N uptake activity}

1 day before destructive sampling of plant shoots, 10 ml of solution of Ca\(^{(15}\text{NO}_3)\)\(_2\) enriched 98% with \(^{15}\text{N}\) is injected into 10 cm depth in each pot in 4 holes. After e.g. 48 hours (exactly same period after injection for each pot), the shoot is harvested and dried at maximally 80°C for 24 hours and weighed for dry matter. Then store in plastic bags. One non enriched background sample per each cultivar was used. Later the samples are grinded, packed in tin capsules making a replicate samples and sent for \(^{15}\text{N}\) analysis at the US Davis facility.

\textit{Estimation of total root length and diameter classes by root extraction and WinRHIZO analysis}

After harvesting shoot samples in the \(^{15}\text{N}\) experiment, the pots are stored cold. Within a few days, the roots from each pot are extracted by washing and collecting all roots on a sieve with 250 µm mesh size in the setup in the vegetable working room. The root samples are stored cold in water, coloured (solution) and then analyzed for total root length and diameter classes by use of the WinRHIZO software. The root samples are then dried and weighed for total root biomass. The root countings at the end of the experiment from the “root window method” are compared with the total root length and biomass measurements from the WinRHIZO.

\textit{Measurement of plants biomass after drought stress and recovery phases}

The plants were harvested on 18\textsuperscript{th} April and 5\textsuperscript{th} of May after drought stress period and after \(^{15}\text{N}\) experiment, respectively. During harvest each plant organ was divided and flower, leaf, stem and root (only from recovery phases) and drying in an oven at 70°C for 48h to constant weight. The leaf area (LA) was measured after the twelve days of drought stress using leaf area meter.

\textit{Data analyses and statistic}

A general linear model test was used to examine influence of the cultivar and irrigation treatments on two blackcurrant cultivars (SAS 8.02, Cary, NC, USA). In the case of stomatal conductance logarithm of \(g_s\) data (log \(g_s\)) was used to examine cultivar, time of measurements and day of measurements and water availability treatment effects on stomatal conductance. Standard errors of the means (SE) were calculated. Tukey’s Studentised Range (HSD) Test was applied to separate measured parameters of the plants exposed to different irrigation regimes.
Results

Evapotranspiration

Water limitation for a period of 12 days during flowering and unfolding of leaves severely decreased the evapotranspiration and leaf area in blackcurrants (Fig.1, Table 1). After 3 to 5 days, the evapotranspiration for non-irrigated plants decreased as plants attempted to conserve water and closed stomata (Fig.2).

When grown at full irrigation (FI) the evapotranspiration from 'Narve Viking' was for the experimental period of twelve days an average of 2237.80 g plant\(^{-1}\), but for 'Ben Gairn' only 1864.85 g plant\(^{-1}\) (Fig.1) partly due to a smaller leaf area of 1385.02 cm\(^2\) for 'Ben Gairn' compared with 1733.81 cm\(^2\) for 'Narve Viking'. If irrigation was withheld for twelve days (NI) the evapotranspiration was almost the same in the two cultivars 683.70 g plant\(^{-1}\) and 696.84 g plant\(^{-1}\) for 'Narve Viking' and 'Ben Gairn' respectively. This indicates that almost no plant available water was left in the soil after 12 days of NI.

**Figure 1**: Accumulated evapotranspiration (ET\(_c\)) of fully irrigated (FI) and non-irrigated (NI) plants, of 'Narve Viking' (NI) and 'Ben Gairn' (BG) over a 12 day period.
The leaf area, leaf dry weight and water content determined at the end of the drought stress period of 12 days were significantly lower for NI plants compared with FI plants of both cultivars whereas differences between cultivars were not significant (Table 1 and 2). In none irrigated ‘Narve Viking’ the specific leaf area showed a significant decrease but the highest water use efficiency (Table 1). The WUE in ‘Ben Gairn’ also tended to increase for NI plants.

**Table 1.** Effects of full irrigation (FI) or no irrigation (NO) on total leaf area, leaf water content, specific leaf area and water use efficiency (WUE) in two blackcurrant cultivars ‘Ben Gairn’ (BG) and ‘Narve Viking’ (NV) after 12 days of treatment. Values with the same letters within a column are not significantly different at P <0.05 according to Tukey’s test (n=4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultivar/treatment</th>
<th>Total leaf area (cm²)</th>
<th>Leaf water content (g g⁻¹ DW)</th>
<th>Specific leaf area (cm² g⁻¹ DW)</th>
<th>WUE (g g⁻¹ DW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BGFI</td>
<td>1385.02ᵃ</td>
<td>3.06ᵃ</td>
<td>225.18ᵇᵃ</td>
<td>0.77ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGNI</td>
<td>623.87ᵇ</td>
<td>2.41ᵇ</td>
<td>217.20ᵇᵃ</td>
<td>1.31ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVFI</td>
<td>1733.81ᵃ</td>
<td>3.45ᵃ</td>
<td>256.90ᵃ</td>
<td>0.94ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVNI</td>
<td>576.43ᵇ</td>
<td>2.04ᵇ</td>
<td>195.62ᵇ</td>
<td>2.33ᵃ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drought stress significantly decreased dry mass production after twelve days of withholding water and ‘Ben Gairn’ showed better leaf, stem and root recovery after seventeen days of recovery, when plants were fully irrigated, while flowers for both cultivars were severely damaged. The root dry weight, as well as the root length, after recovery were significantly higher for FI plants of ‘Narve Viking’ compared with NI plants (Table 2 and 6). In ‘Ben Gairn’ root dry weight and root length were not significantly affected in NI plants. Drought stress significantly reduced and influenced a total plant dry weight for ‘Narve Viking’ (Table 2 and 6).

**Table 2.** Dry mass distribution between different organs of blackcurrant cultivars ‘Ben Gairn’ (BG) and ‘Narve Viking’ (NV) (flower, leaf and stem) after 12 days of no (NI) or full irrigation (FI) and after seventeen days of recovery at FI (flower, leaf and stem, root). Different letters within the same column indicate significant differences according to Tukey’s Test at P < 0.05 (n=4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultivar/treatment</th>
<th>12 days of drought stress</th>
<th>Dry mass (g plant⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flower</td>
<td>Leaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGFI</td>
<td>0.33ᵃᵇ</td>
<td>6.14ᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGNI</td>
<td>0.09ᵇ</td>
<td>2.88ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVFI</td>
<td>0.56ᵃ</td>
<td>6.76ᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVNI</td>
<td>0.14ᵇ</td>
<td>3.01ᵇ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultivar/treatment</th>
<th>17 days of recovery - full irrigation</th>
<th>Dry mass (g plant⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Root</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGFI</td>
<td>11.94ᵇ</td>
<td>34.30ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGNI</td>
<td>9.64ᵇ</td>
<td>26.37ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVFI</td>
<td>19.33ᵃ</td>
<td>57.98ᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVNI</td>
<td>11.90ᵇ</td>
<td>26.59ᵇ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Stomatal conductance**

For stomatal conductance \((g_s)\) four way interaction between cultivar, time of measurement, irrigation treatment and day of measurement was seen (Table 3).

**Table 3.** F values and significance level of general linear model test using logarithmic transformed data \((\log g_s)\) for stomatal conductance data in two blackcurrant cultivars grown in the greenhouse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main factors</th>
<th>Cultivar</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivar</td>
<td>34.0711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>210.8431</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>18.1364</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>2047.5480</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two way interaction</th>
<th>Cultivar:Day</th>
<th>Day:Time</th>
<th>Cultivar:Time</th>
<th>Day:Treatment</th>
<th>Time:Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivar:Day</td>
<td>7.0822</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2.5038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivar:Time</td>
<td>5.4956 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.8349 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day:Time</td>
<td>2.5038 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivar:Treatment</td>
<td>52.8349 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>256.1789 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day:Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.2089 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.2089 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F value</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivar:Day:Time</td>
<td>5.4849 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivar:Day:Treatment</td>
<td>6.8980 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivar:Time:Treatment</td>
<td>13.7054 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day:Time:Treatment</td>
<td>17.4757 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four way interaction</th>
<th>Cultivar:Day:Time:Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5809 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fully irrigated plants differences in \(g_s\) between days of measurement were seen due to differences in temperature and VPD (Table 3; Fig.2). Drought stress highly influenced stomatal conductance and for ‘Narve Viking’ \(g_s\) was significantly reduced from day 5, both in the morning and afternoon measurements, while ‘Ben Gairn’ showed reduced \(g_s\) from day 7 in the morning and day 5 in the afternoon measurements. In NI plants differences between the two cultivars were only visible on day 7 for the morning measurements, and day 5 for the afternoon measurements. Stomatal conductance did not differ between cultivars for FI plants. ‘Narve Viking’ FI morning measurement were significantly higher on the day 10 and 12, while ‘Narve Viking’ NI only at day 12. ‘Ben Gairn’ FI were significantly higher on the day 12, while ‘Ben Gairn’ NI was significantly higher at day 7.
Figure 2. Stomatal conductance measured between 9-10 am (m) and between 12:30-13:30 pm (a) for blackcurrant cultivars 'Narve Viking’ and ‘Ben Gairn’ grown at full irrigation (FI) or no irrigation (NI) for 0, 2, 5, 7, 9 and 12 days. Letters indicate differences between days of treatment, within each cultivar, irrigation treatment and time of measurement.
Plant water status (leaf water potential, osmotic potential and turgor)

Transpiration and changing in daily temperature (increasing of mean temperature) associated with drought stress reduce leaf water potential ($\Psi_l$) which become more negative for both cultivars, while turgor become more positive (Figure 3). Water potential and turgor ($\Psi_T$) of fully irrigated plants for both cultivars ranked from -0.54 MPa and 0.86 MPa on days where the set point temperature was kept on 17.61 °C (day 7) and -1.51 MPa and 0.02 MPa on days with high temperature of (23.46 °C) on day 5, respectively. Osmotic adjustment ($\Psi_m$) as a mechanism of drought adaptation wasn’t influenced by daily temperature and ranked -1.33 MPa on day 7 and -1.58 MPa on the day 5. For fully irrigated plants no difference was seen in $\Psi_l$, $\Psi_m$ and $\Psi_T$ between the cultivars, whereas $\Psi_l$ and $\Psi_T$ for non-irrigated ‘Narve Viking’ was lower than for ‘Ben Gairn’ on day 7. When irrigation was withheld $\Psi_l$ was significantly decreased in both cultivars from day 5 for ‘Narve Viking’ and day 7 for ‘Ben Gairn’. The results measured on different days showing a highly influence by daily temperature and VPD.

![Figure 3](image-url)

**Figure 3.** Water potential, osmotic potential and turgor of fully irrigated (FI) and non-irrigated (NI) plants, of ‘Narve Viking’ (A, B, C) and ‘Ben Gairn’ (D, E, F) over a 12 day period where data are presented as averages $n = 4$ with standard error bars

It is possible that due to smaller plant and through osmotic adjustment ‘Ben Gairn’ maintains cell water contents by increasing the osmotic force and thus increasing water uptake. With grater $\Psi_l$
more water is held in leaf cells resulting in higher $\Psi_n$ comparing with Narve Viking. On day 12 NI plants of both cultivars lost turgor and wilted. On day 12 measurement of osmotic potential was really difficult which resulted in negative $\Psi_n$.

**Table 4.** F values and significance of general linear model for water potential ($\Psi_l$), osmotic potential ($\Psi_p$) and turgor ($\Psi_T$) in two blackcurrant cultivars grown in the greenhouse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cul</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Irri</th>
<th>Cul*Day</th>
<th>Cul*Irr</th>
<th>Day*Irr</th>
<th>Cul<em>Day</em>Irr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Psi_l$ (MPa)</td>
<td>14.53***</td>
<td>184.56***</td>
<td>63.11***</td>
<td>8.51***</td>
<td>8.97***</td>
<td>18.96***</td>
<td>1.55ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Psi_p$ (MPa)</td>
<td>0.10ns</td>
<td>115.19***</td>
<td>67.06***</td>
<td>5.65***</td>
<td>12.92***</td>
<td>6.20***</td>
<td>2.08ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Psi_T$ (MPa)</td>
<td>16.54**</td>
<td>41.11***</td>
<td>18.60***</td>
<td>4.20**</td>
<td>4.51**</td>
<td>8.56***</td>
<td>1.32ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Root recovery measurements*

In future, episodes of drought stress may be more frequent during the flowering period of blackcurrants due to climate change, but little is known about how different blackcurrant cultivars recover during growth after drought.

For root recovery measurements two way interactions between cultivars and irrigation, day and irrigation was seen (Table 5). The recovery of blackcurrant cultivars was significantly dependent with the time of recovery, increasing with the time of full irrigation. ‘Ben Gairn’ indicating a faster recovery and thereby a better drought tolerance.

**Table 5.** F values and significance of general linear model for root recovery data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cultivar</th>
<th>Day 20.72***</th>
<th>Irrigation 94.81***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two ways interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivar:Day</td>
<td>0.77ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivar:Irrigation</td>
<td>5.64*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day:Irrigation</td>
<td>3.26*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivar:Day:Irrigation</td>
<td>1.24ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Root window method for quantification of roots at the vertical soil surface during recovery phases in ‘Narve Viking’ and ‘Ben Gairn’ has been done during the two weeks after the treatment finished. The ability of root recovery was determined by evaluating the number of roots day 0, 7 and 14 after end of drought treatment. ‘Ben Gairn’ had a 52 % regrowth of roots in the non-irrigated relative to the full irrigated treatment at the 3. observation compared to only 10 % in ‘Narve Viking’. (Fig. 4).
**Figure 4.** Ability of root recovery after drought treatment as determined by the number of roots counted in a given area for ‘Narve Viking’ (NV) and ‘Ben Gairn’ (BG) blackcurrant cultivars. 1. obsv: 0 days of recovery, 2. obsv: 7 days of recovery, 3. obsv: 14 days of recovery. Bars represent average (n=4), with standard error bars.

Total root length showed that ‘Ben Gairn’ had a better root recovery than ‘Narve Viking’, which had only half the length of roots after drought treatment and recovery phase compared to after full irrigation. For fully irrigated plants ‘Narve Viking’ showed a significantly higher root length compared with ‘Ben Gairn’. There was no statistical difference in root length for ‘Ben Gairn’ between the treatments in comparison with ‘Narve Viking’. The length of the main root system clearly indicated that fully irrigated plants had a more branched main root system compared with plants that were exposed to drought stress treatment. Specific root length didn’t show any difference within cultivar or treatments (Table 6).
Table 6. Effects of drought treatment after the recovery phases on root length, length of main root and specific root length in two blackcurrant cultivars grown in the greenhouse. Data are means of 4 plants. Values with the same letters within a column are not significantly different at P <0.05 according to Tukey’s test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultivar/treatment</th>
<th>Root length (m)</th>
<th>Length of main root (m)</th>
<th>Specific root length (m g⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BGFI</td>
<td>7.14ᵇ</td>
<td>0.18ᵃ</td>
<td>8.55ᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGNI</td>
<td>5.74ᵇ</td>
<td>0.11ᵇ</td>
<td>5.93ᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVFI</td>
<td>12.68ᵃ</td>
<td>0.18ᵃ</td>
<td>7.23ᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVNI</td>
<td>6.26ᵇ</td>
<td>0.13ᵇ</td>
<td>5.47ᵃ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
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<tr>
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<td>Nutrient use efficiency</td>
<td>8.11.2010.</td>
<td>2</td>
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</tr>
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<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>14-19.08.2011.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual display of quantitative information in applied plant science</td>
<td>29.11-01.12.2011.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
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Plasticity of blackcurrants in a changing climate: focus on water efficiency
5. Dissemination and teaching activities


June 10, 2011 - Friday seminar held at the Department of Food presenting a PhD thesis and preliminary results from first experiment.

January 2011 – Poster presentation PhD presentation and relation of my project to breeding in climate change, NOVA PhD course participant – Iceland.

June 7, 2011 - Poster presentation at the 8.th International Horticulture, Technology & Machinery Exhibition in Aarslev „Plasticity of blackcurrant in a changing climate; focus on water efficiency„.

June 22 to 26, 2011 - Zlatibor, Serbia, two posters presentation „Effect of water stress on the ability of blackcurrant cultivars to grow under potted conditions„, and „Plasticity of blackcurrant in a changing climate; focus on water efficiency„.

September, 21 – 22, 2011.ClimaFruit 2 year planning and reporting meeting, held in Bioforsk, Apelsvoll, Norway. Presentation of preliminary results and talk for the Clima Fruit web site describing the project.

October, 3-4, 2011.Folum and Aarlev, Integration day, workshop.


26-29 June 2012 Dundee, Scotland, poster presentation „Root recovery in two blackcurrant cultivars after a period of drying out„.
6. Conferences, seminars and events

June 22 to 26, 2011 - Zlatibor, Serbia

10 International Rubus and Ribes Symposium, International Society for Horticultural Science (ISHS)

Two posters presentation „Effect of water stress on the ability of blackcurrant cultivars to grow under potted conditions„, and „Plasticity of blackcurrant in a changing climate; focus on water efficiency."

26-29 June 2012 Dundee, Scotland

The eighth symposium of the International Society of Root Research (ISRR)

Poster presentation „Root recovery in two blackcurrant cultivars after a period of drying out„.
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8. Paper 1

Working title: Effects of water stress during flowering of two pot grown blackcurrant (*Ribes nigrum* L.) cultivars

The work has been discussed in details with my supervisor Karen Koefoed Petersen, Hanne Lindhard and Hanne L. Kristensen. The first draft of introduction, material and methods and results and discussion part and conclusions are in process.

**Hypothesis of the article**

Water stress during flowering will induce changes in growth, dry matter distribution and reduce the potential fruit yield, but to which degree depend of the capacity to adjust physiologically during water stress.

Dry soil conditions will reduce the amount of fine root growth relative to full irrigation and this will affect the root’s ability for regrowth.

Root nitrogen uptake activity differs between stressed and non-stressed plants. Nitrogen uptake will be increased after 12 days of drought stress and 14 days of recovery due to shoot growth.

**Abstract**

**Introduction**

**Materials and methods**

*Treatments*  
- Two blackcurrant cultivars (‘Ben Gairn’ and ‘Narve Viking’)  
- Fully irrigated and none irrigated plants.

**Experimental outline of experiment 1.**

*Measurements and calculations*

Daily evapotranspiration  
Stomatal conductance  
Leaf water potential  
Leaf water potential  
Turgor  
Leaf area after 12 days of drought  
FW and DW of leaves, flowers and stems after drought and recovery
Shoot length before and after 12 days of drought  
Root window observations during recovery  
$^{15}$N and the end of the recovery period  
WinRHIZO analyses of roots after recovery (root length, distribution between root classes and dry weight of the roots)  
Specific leaf area  

**Results**  
Figure 1 - Accumulated evapotranspiration  
Figure 2 - Stomatal conductance  
Figure 3 - Water potential, osmotic potential and turgor  
Figure 4 - Root regrowth after 0, 7 and 14 days  
Figure 5 - $^{15}$N uptake over 14 days of recovery  
Table 1. Leaf area, leaf water content, specific leaf area and WUE  
Table 2. DM distribution between plant parts after 12 days of drought and 17 days of recovery  
Table 3. Stomatal conductance - statistic  
Table 4. Water potential, osmotic potential and turgor - statistic  
Table 5. Root recovery measurements – statistic  
Table 6. Root length, length of main root and specific root length  

**Discussion**  
Evapotranspiration and water relations during drought stress to blackcurrant  
Plant growth and dry matter distribution after drought and recovery  
Root activity ($^{15}$N) and root re-growth  
Cultivar differences in response to drought stress during flowering  

**Conclusions**
9. Paper 2

Working title: Influence of drought stress during flower induction in two cultivars of blackcurrant

The plan is going to be discussed in details with my supervisors Karen Koefoed Petersen, Lillie Andersen and Hanne Kristensen (Aarhus University, Denmark) and Rex Brennan (James Hutton Institute)

The plan is that in April 2012 top cuttings of cultivars ‘Ben Hope’ and ‘Titania’ will be rooted and grown under optimal water and nutrient conditions in greenhouse. Plants will be trimmed to only one shoot until the period of harvest in late July. Plants will be kept in the vegetative stage by long day (>18 hours). One period of deficit irrigation (50% of fully irrigated) are going to be investigated during the initial stages of flower induction which will be induced by transfer to short day conditions (10 h). During water stress and the following recovery period evapotranspiration, stomatal conductance, plant water status, leaf ABA content and top and root growth and flower initiation will be studied. The following year a monitoring of bud burst and flowering are going to be investigated.

Hypothesis

Water stress during flower induction will reduce the number of flower strigs and number of flowers per strig the following year and thereby reduce yield but to which degree depend on cultivar and the ability to adjust physiologically during and after water deficit.

Root growth is generally thought to occur in two peaks, one around flowering and a second after harvest. Therefore we expect root growth to be reduced during, immediately after and also the following spring when plants are subjected to drought stress during flower initiation.

Abstract

Introduction

Materials and methods

Treatments

- Two blackcurrant cultivars (‘Ben Hope’ and ‘Titania’)  
- Fully irrigated and deficit irrigated plants.  
- Days of deficit irrigation before recovery (0, 3, 5, 7 and 10 days)
Measurements during deficit irrigation July/August 2012

- \( E_{T_c} \) and \( E_{T_o} \) manually weighting
- stomatal conductance
- Leaf water potential,
- Leaf osmotic potential
- ABA
- Eelative water content
- Leaf growth (individual leaves)
- Root window observations

Measurements during recovery March 2013-

- Root window observation
- First flower open
- Number of strigs
- Flower per strigs
- Length of new shoot growth, one shoot per plant
- Fresh and dry weight of flowers, leaves and stems

Results

Figure 1 - Daily evapotranspiration, reference evapotranspiration, crop coefficient
Figure 2 - Stomatal conductance during drought and recovery
Figure 3 - Water potential, osmotic potential and turgor
Figure 4 - ABA
Figure 5 - Root regrowth after 0, 7 and 14 days and after overwintering
Figure 6 - DM distribution between plant parts after overwintering
Figure 7- Bud burst, flowering and fruiting performance
Table 1 - Extension growth, no of flower striges per bush and per strig, date of first flower opening in the following year

Discussion

Water relations during drought stress in the flower induction period and during the following recovery phase
DM distribution after drought and recovery
Changes in root growth as affected by period of deficit irrigation during flower initiation
Extension growth, bud burst and flowering

Conclusions
10. Paper 3
Working title: Differential regulation of genes in two blackcurrant cultivars subjected to drought stress during flowering using microarray technology

The plan is going to be discussed in details with my supervisors Karen Koefoed Petersen (Aarhus University, Denmark) and Rex Brennan (James Hutton Institute, Scotland).

Most physiological processes are affected from the experiment I (evapotranspiration, stomatal conductance, water potential, osmotic potential and turgor, etc). The knowledge of environment is crucial for planning any breeding study. From the first greenhouse study, two cultivars were chosen due to days of drought stress in order to see the differences in gene expression between the stressed and unstressed samples, and identify some of the key genes that show differential expression. A very large number of genes are up- or down- regulated by drought stress, but is going to be a challenge to identify and screen the key genes or groups of genes.

Hypothesis of the article

1. Sensing and signalling of water deficit will activate or deactivate genes which can be identified by microarray analyses of total RNA.
2. Depending on drought tolerance blackcurrant cultivars will show differences in gene expression when irrigation is withheld.

Abstract

Introduction

Materials and methods

*Treatments (samples from exp. 1)*
- Two blackcurrant cultivars (‘Ben Gairn’ and ‘Narve Viking’)
- Fully irrigated and non irrigated plants.
- Three time points (3, 5, 7 days)
- Four biological replicates

*Measurements*
- Total RNA extraction according to Hedley et al., 2010 (May-July in Aarslev).
- Prepare, run and interpret microarrays (November, Dundee) and identification of candidates genes
- RT-PCR to verify up and down regulation of candidates genes
Results

Figure 1 – Overview of gene expression profiling for two blackcurrant cultivars.  
Figure 2 - Microarray expression data based upon days of drought stress  
Figure 3 - Frequency of significant differentially expressed genes between sample time points, days of sampling and number of differentially expressed genes (up-regulated and down-regulated)  
Figure 4 - Validation of microarray expression profiles for selected Ribes gene by RT-PCR.

Discussion

Insight of genetic components associated with drought stress during flowering  
The differences in gene expression between stressed and unstressed plants  
Candidate genes that show differential expression.  
Insight into the genetic control of drought stress during a flowering time in two North Region blackcurrant cultivars.  
The potential development and use of genetic markers for drought stress for future breeding  
The use of microarrays over a time course leading up to drought stress key changes in gene expression at flowering time.

Conclusions