

Unconsidered environmental stresses may cause overestimates of the CO₂-fertilization effect

EL Fiscus¹, FL Booker¹, CD Reid², JE Miller¹

¹United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, 3908 Inwood Road, Raleigh, NC, 27603, U.S.A. edfiscus01@sprynet.com, fbooker@mindspring.com

²Department of Biology, Duke University, Durham, NC, U.S.A. chantal@duke.edu

Keywords: CO₂-fertilization, environmental stress, crop productivity, air pollutants, elevated CO₂

Introduction

Both atmospheric CO₂ and background concentrations of tropospheric O₃ are rising, although the latter at a much lower rate. While elevated CO₂ is thought to be beneficial to plant growth, current levels of O₃ are already at highly phytotoxic levels in some areas. O₃ is a natural component of the atmosphere and originates primarily from photochemical reactions of nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and hydrocarbons with O₂. However, background levels are increasing as a result of anthropogenic emissions of these precursors, which may travel for hundreds of miles before reacting to form O₃. Thus, O₃ pollution is not confined to highly polluted source areas. Agricultural soils are thought to contribute significant quantities of O₃ precursors in rural areas as well and so some of the most productive agricultural areas in the United States are subjected to potentially phytotoxic O₃ levels.

Atmospheric CO₂ affects plants and ecosystems because it is a substrate for photosynthesis and elevated CO₂ stimulates photosynthesis, growth and sometimes crop yield. Kimball (1983) has shown that the magnitude of the response to elevated CO₂ is highly variable, not only across but within species and cultivars. Although there appears to be a major genetic component to this variability, much of it may be due to environmental stresses that occurred during plant growth. It is not surprising that there are significant physiological interactions between CO₂ and O₃. The most relevant interaction for present purposes involves the reduction of leaf conductance at elevated levels of atmospheric CO₂ that has the effect of preventing reductions of photosynthesis, growth and yield in many crops grown in the presence of toxic levels of O₃ (Fiscus *et al.*, 1997; Fiscus *et al.*, 2001). Similar interactions are known to occur between water stress and elevated CO₂ with the same effect that the elevated CO₂ reduces photosynthetic, growth and yield losses which might have occurred at ambient CO₂ levels. Conversely, if plants are grown in elevated CO₂ in the presence of any stress that might reduce photosynthesis, growth and yield but is unrecognized or unmonitored, the beneficial effects of the elevated CO₂ (CO₂-fertilization) may appear exaggerated. Using such studies to estimate world food supplies in future atmospheres may result in overly optimistic projections. Analysis of published and unpublished data from our field site at Raleigh, NC, U.S.A. provides a means to analyze this situation. Using phytotoxic levels of ozone as the primary stressor, we can examine the relationship between the magnitude of the CO₂-fertilization effect on photosynthesis, vegetative biomass production and yield and the level of plant stress.

Materials and methods

Plants in all of the experiments discussed here were grown in open-top chambers (Heagle *et al.*, 1973) and subjected to reciprocal CO₂ X O₃ treatments. The CO₂ treatments consisted of current ambient concentrations (A) and a nominally double ambient concentration, designated CO₂. O₃ treatments always consisted of at least charcoal-filtered air (CF) and a CF or NF (non-filtered) treatment to which O₃ was added (NF+) to bring the air to a concentration approximately 50% higher than background levels. Occasionally there was an NF treatment as well in which the plants were exposed to existing ambient levels of O₃. Averaged across all experiments the ambient and elevated CO₂ concentrations were 372 µL L⁻¹ and 706 µL L⁻¹ while the CF, NF and NF+ O₃ concentrations averaged 25 nL L⁻¹, 50 nL L⁻¹ and 80 nL L⁻¹, respectively. In all instances discussed here, except for one experiment, plants were grown in 15L or 21 L pots which were fertilized, watered, treated for pests and harvested as reviewed by Fiscus *et al.* (2001). Crop economic yields were obtained in the usual manner but discussions of vegetative biomass in this paper will be confined to the above-ground plant parts exclusive of reproductive structures. Both yield and biomass values were regressed against O₃ concentrations according to $Y = a + b(\ln[O_3])^2$. Over a period of 8 years, 4 species (cotton, rice, soybean and wheat), including 7 different cultivars, were grown under the reciprocal gas treatments as well as with planting density (rice) and soil nitrogen levels (cotton) as variables. The plant data will be discussed in terms of “cultivar years” (CVY), where each CVY represents one cultivar grown for a single season in the complete set of reciprocal gas treatments. Any additional treatments imposed on an entire CO₂ X O₃ block such as soil N or planting densities are counted as additional CVYs. For example, in 1997 and 1998 rice (one cultivar) was grown under the reciprocal gas treatments with five planting densities as subplots. In those particular experiments each density would count as a separate CVY. Thus the experiments discussed here consisted of a total of 31 CVYs.

Results

Typical interactive effects of elevated CO₂ and O₃ on net photosynthetic rates are shown in




Fig.1. Ratios of net assimilation rates of soybean plants grown in reciprocal mixtures of CO₂ and O₃ during 1994. Drawn from data of Reid and Fiscus (1998).

Figure 1 where it can be seen that elevated CO₂ increases NAR in the presence and absence of damaging O₃. At ambient CO₂, O₃ reduced NAR throughout the season but its effect,

relative to clean air (CFA), increased after flowering. In elevated CO₂ this decline was delayed for another 20 days but throughout most of the season NAR was increased by 30% to 60% by elevated CO₂. However, as table 1 illustrates, the increased photosynthetic rates did not always result in increased economic yield either in soybean or the other crops examined in the paper. The first significant point to be derived from Table 1 is the high degree of variability in the CO₂-fertilization effect, ranging in soybean for example from a yield decrease of 11 % to an increase of 39% in clean air (CF). The other crops, cultivars and O₃ treatments exhibited similarly high variability both within seasons and across multiple seasons. Secondly, the magnitude of the CO₂-fertilization effect is highly dependent on the level of O₃ stress present during growth. Again, variability was high but the trends for each crop are clear and characterized by the mean value for all crops which showed a small effect in clean air and larger effects as the level of stress increased.

Table 1. Percentage change in seed yield resulting from a doubled CO₂ concentration in the presence of 3 levels of O₃. Table is condensed and updated from Fiscus *et al.* (2001).

Species and Data Source	Parameter	CF	NF	NF+
<i>Glycine max</i>	Mean	11.8	35.0	57.4
Fiscus <i>et al.</i> (1997) 3 CVY	Maximum	39	84	94
Heagle <i>et al.</i> (1998) 3 CVY	Minimum	-11	7	9
Booker (Unpublished Data) 5 CVY	Median	8	24.5	58
<i>Gossypium hirsutum</i>	Mean	5.3	36.0	89.7
Heagle <i>et al.</i> (1999) 6 CVY	Maximum	23	50	141
	Minimum	-16	11	31
	Median	7.0	47.0	97.0
<i>Oryza sativa</i>	Mean	-5.1		13.9
Reid (Unpublished Data) 10 CVY	Maximum	13		28
	Minimum	-26		-2
	Median	-2.0		14.5
<i>Triticum aestivum</i>	Mean	-0.8	2.0	38.0
Heagle <i>et al.</i> (2000) 4 CVY	Maximum	17	39	79
	Minimum	-14	-20	13
	Median	-3.0	-5.0	30.0
Mean for all crops (31 CVY)		2.8	24.3	49.8

Above-ground vegetative biomass also showed large data variability but the mean across all crops in CF air was substantial at a little over 30%. A comparison of vegetative biomass and yield is shown in Figure 2. Like yield, vegetative biomass increased with increasing O₃ stress to a mean value approaching 80% in the presence of relatively high levels of O₃.




Fig.2. Effect of doubling the CO₂ concentration on vegetative biomass and eventual yield of crops grown in different levels of pollutant O₃. Bars are $\pm$ one standard error. For biomass and yield respectively, $a = -20.50$ and -53.58 ; $b = 5.116$ and 5.299 .

Nonetheless, the point is clear that even the 30% increase in vegetative biomass in the CFA treatment ultimately resulted, on average, in a yield increase of less than 3%.

Average yield losses due to O₃ and the effect of elevated CO₂ in ameliorating those losses are shown in Table 2. Both biomass and yield are reduced by the same amount at current CO₂

Table 2. Mean ($\pm$ se) reduction and amelioration of yield and biomass losses due to O₃ stress for all crops.

	% Reduction by O ₃ in Ambient CO ₂	% Reduction by O ₃ in Doubled CO ₂	Amelioration Ratio (2A/NF+) : (A/CF)
Biomass	26.8 $\pm$ 1.8	4.1 $\pm$ 2.1	1.254 $\pm$ 0.062
Yield	28.0 $\pm$ 2.7	0.4 $\pm$ 1.9	1.031 $\pm$ 0.026
n	31	31	31

levels but that reduction virtually disappeared at double ambient CO₂ concentrations with only a 4% increase in biomass and less than 1% for yield. In addition, the amelioration ratio indicates that even at high levels of O₃ stress, biomass was still increased about 25% by elevated CO₂ above what it was in CF air at ambient levels. However, yield was only restored to the same level observed in CFA air.

Discussion

The data examined in this paper clearly illustrate that the relationship between crop yields, biomass production, elevated CO₂ and co-occurring stresses presents a complex picture and may confound efforts to estimate future world food supplies based on changing gaseous environments. The data strongly suggest that plants in which the vegetative portion is consumed could benefit substantially from CO₂ increases but for those which are grown for their reproductive structures the picture is less clear. Even in non-domesticated species there

often can occur a similar lack of positive relationship between vegetative and reproductive biomass with elevated CO₂. The increased vegetative biomass is not translated into increased reproductive biomass for *Arabidopsis thaliana* (Ward and Strain, 1997), *Bromus madritensis* (Huxman, *et al.*, 1999), *Casia obtusifolia* (Thomas *et al.*, 1999), *Heterotheca subaxillaris* (Johnson and Lincoln, 2000), *Poa annua* and *Senecio vulgaris* (Leishman *et al.*, 1999) and *Raphanus raphanistrum* (Curtis *et al.*, 1994; Jablonski, 1997). Farnsworth and Bazzaz (1995) suggested that the vegetative response to CO₂ was not a good indicator of reproductive output as they observed different trends among and within genera of 9 annual species representing 3 genera. Similarly, several genotypes of *Abutilon theophrasti* showed lower reproduction with elevated CO₂ while others showed no change or a positive enhancement (Thomas *et al.*, 1999). Curtis *et al.* (1994) also reported a range of reproductive responses for *Raphanus raphanistrum*. Changes in the balance between C and N resources within a plant and the inability of some plants to adjust this balance has been suggested to explain the lack of a CO₂ effect on reproduction.

Competition for limiting resources may also play a role in limiting the reproductive response to CO₂. Bazzaz *et al.* (1992) reported decreased reproductive output per unit soil surface area with an increase in planting density of *Abutilon theophrasti* and no productivity enhancement due to elevated CO₂. Thomas *et al.* (1999) found that more genotypes of *Abutilon theophrasti* responded with a decrease in reproductive to vegetative biomass with elevated CO₂ when grown in stand than when grown individually. The decrease in reproductive biomass was larger than the increase in vegetative biomass. Microcosm studies of two grassland species *Pascopyrum smithii* (C₃) and *Bouteloua gracilis* (C₄) grown in pure stands, have shown a 19% increase in total biomass after two years of growth in elevated CO₂ but no CO₂ effect on seed head production for *Bouteloua* and smaller reproductive heads for *Pascopyrum* at both CO₂ levels (Hunt *et al.*, 1996). Likewise, for old-field Mediterranean microcosms, Navas *et al.* (1997) reported that total biomass significantly increased in 4 of the 19 species represented while reproductive biomass was decreased by elevated CO₂ in 13 of the 19 species with 4 showing significant changes. Although the majority of these studies were conducted in controlled environment chambers, similar results have been found in field studies. *Avena barbata* grown in open-top field chambers (OTC) at elevated CO₂ showed an increase from ca. 5 to 7 seeds per plant associated with a reduction in seedling density, indicating a reduction in yield per unit ground area (Jackson, *et al.*, 1994). A rare calcareous grassland species, *Gentianella germanica*, significantly increased its total biomass with elevated CO₂ but its seed mass was decreased because of a 79% decrease in seed set (Fischer *et al.*, 1997). These studies suggest that resources become limiting as plants compete with their neighbors and that this competition for resources has a direct effect on reproductive yields at elevated CO₂. These studies are consistent with fertilization studies suggesting that N limits the stimulatory effect of CO₂, e.g., *Hordeum spontaneum* (Gr 2000) and *Bromus mollis* (Larigauderie *et al.*, 1988). In addition, the study on cotton seed production conducted by Heagle *et al.*, (1999) clearly showed that the N fertilization effect dwarfs the effect of doubled CO₂. The N effect taken across CO₂ in CF air averaged 150% and in NF+ air 154% while the CO₂ effect averaged across N was 5% in CF air. The unpublished planting density data of Reid for rice, cited in table 1, is also consistent with the concept that the effect of elevated CO₂ may be limited by availability of resources other than CO₂. Finally, an analysis of historical wheat yield data led Amthor (1998) to conclude that productivity increases due to elevated CO₂ will be small compared to those due to future advances in technology. Thus, the certitude of crop productivity increases due to higher atmospheric CO₂ concentrations is diminishing while the costs and methodologies necessary to take advantage of the situation are still somewhat obscure.

References

- Ackerly DD, Bazzaz FA (1995) *Global Change Biology* **1**, 199-207.
- Amthor JS (1998) *Field Crops Research* **58**, 109-127.
- Bazzaz FA, Ackerly DD, Woodward FI, Rochefort L (1992) *Journal of Ecology* **180**, 643-651.
- Curtis PS, Snow AA, Miller AS (1994) *Oecologia* **97**, 100-105.
- Farnsworth EJ, Bazzaz FA (1995) *Oecologia* **104**, 454-466.
- Fischer M, Matthies D, Schmid B (1997) *Journal of Ecology* **85**, 681-691.
- Fiscus EL, Reid CD, Miller JE, Heagle AS (1997) *Journal of Experimental Botany* **48**, 307-313.
- Grünzweig JM, Körner Ch. (2000) *Global Change Biology* **6**, 631-638.
- Heagle AS, Body DE, Heck WW (1973) *Journal of Environmental Quality* **2**, 365-368.
- Heagle AS, Miller JE, Booker, FL (1998) *Crop Science* **38**, 128-134.
- Heagle AS, Miller JE, Booker FL, Pursley WA (1999) *Crop Science* **39**, 731-741.
- Heagle AS, Miller JE, Pursley WA (2000) *Crop Science* **40**, 1656-1664.
- Hunt HW, Elliot ET, Detling JK, Morgan JA, Chen D-X (1996) *Global Change Biology* **2**, 35-47
- Huxman TE, Hamerlynck EP, Smith SD (1999) *Functional Ecology* **13**, 769-777.
- Jablonski LM (1997) *Canadian Journal of Botany* **75**, 533-545.
- Jackson RB, Sala OE, Field CB, Mooney HA (1994) *Oecologia* **98**, 257-262.
- Johnson SL, Lincoln DE (2000) *Global Change Biology* **6**, 767-778.
- Kimball BA (1983) *Agronomy Journal* **75**, 779-788.
- Larigauderie A, Hilbert DW, Oechel WC (1988) *Oecologia* **77**, 544-549.
- Leishman MR, Sanbrooke KJ, Woofin RM (1999) *New Phytologist* **144**, 455-462.
- Navas M-L, Sonie L, Richarte J, Roy J (1997) *Global Change Biology* **3**, 523-530.
- Potvin C, Tousignant D (1996) *Oecologia* **108**, 683-693.
- Reid CD, Fiscus EL (1988) *Journal of Experimental Botany* **49**, 885-895.
- Thomas SC, Jasienski M, Bazzaz FA (1999) *Ecology* **80**, 1552-1567.