

Comparative adaptation of canola (*Brassica napus*) and Indian mustard (*B. juncea*) to soil water deficits

by

Philip R. Wright
B.Sc.Agr. (Syd), M.Sc.Agr. (Syd)

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy of the
University of New England

Department of Agronomy and Soil Science
University of New England
Armidale, NSW, 2351
Australia

September 1995

*"It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven
Upon the place beneath: it is twice bless'd"*

-The Merchant of Venice, William Shakespeare

Preface

I certify that the substance of this thesis has not already been submitted for any degree and is not currently being submitted for any other degree.

I certify that any help received in preparing this thesis, and all sources used, have been acknowledged in this thesis.



Philip Richard Wright

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank my supervisors, Dr Jim Morgan, Assoc. Prof. Robin Jessop and Dr Alf Cass for their guidance, support and encouragement.

I would also like to thank Dr Annette Cowie and other friends and colleagues for many valuable and enjoyable conversations, both relevant and totally irrelevant to this work. Thanks must also go to my father, W.A. Wright, for many hours of proof reading and his patience with his son's eccentricities of grammar and spelling.

I also gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the then Oilseeds Research Council.

Finally I thank Therese, my wife, for uncomplainingly putting up with the long labour of this thesis.

Abstract

Canola (*Brassica napus*) has become an increasingly important crop in Australia, although it is poorly adapted to dry environments. Indian mustard (*B. juncea*) is reputed to be better adapted to these environments and may be a suitable alternative crop in these areas. However, very little is known about the comparative performance of these crops or the basis for differences in adaptation. The work reported in this thesis set out to examine these questions and to provide at least a preliminary understanding of any observed differences.

Five experiments were conducted comparing growth, yield, water use and plant water relations, chiefly under field conditions in northern NSW. At least three genotypes of each species were used in the field experiments and all were matched for phasic development and height in the main experiments.

Mustard produced more above ground dry matter than canola (between 9 and 120%) with the biggest relative difference occurring at the greatest soil water deficit. Mustard yielded more than twice as much seed as canola under these conditions while there were no yield differences at low deficits. Components of yield differed between the two species with mustard having more pods per plant but fewer seeds per pod and a lower harvest index. Differences in these factors could not explain mustard's yield advantage, which was due to its greater dry matter production.

The advantage in dry matter production was related to greater early vigour and an ability to maintain longer leaf area durations under water deficits. Differences in early vigour were associated with a greater rate of leaf expansion which arose from differences in leaf morphology, with mustard having smaller specific leaf weights. Water use efficiencies for seed and dry matter production were higher in mustard. Some evidence of higher transpiration efficiency in mustard was also found, both at a leaf and canopy level. Neither leaf stomatal density nor epidermal conductance could explain differences in transpirational efficiency, these differences were concluded to result from a greater photosynthetic rates per unit leaf area.

Leaves of mustard were found to have higher turgor than those of canola particularly under water deficit conditions. Turgor maintenance in mustard was shown to be related to a greater capacity to accumulate solutes under these conditions. Differences in turgor were related to differences in dry matter production and may also be related to differences in water use efficiency. The results of these studies are consistent with osmoregulation being an important trait in mustard's greater adaptation to water deficits. It is recommended that work be continued on developing mustard as a crop in its own right for Australian conditions.

Table of Contents

<i>Preface</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Aknowlegements</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>Abstract</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Table of Contents</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>x</i>
CHAPTER 1, INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2, LITERATURE REVIEW	4
CHAPTER 3, MATERIALS AND METHODS	26
3.1. Introduction	27
3.2. Genetic material	27
3.3. Experiments	27
3.3.1. Experiment 1. (Armidale field trial 1988/89).....	27
3.3.2. Experiment 2. (Glasshouse experiment 1989)	29
3.3.3. Experiment 3. (Tamworth field trial 1990).....	31
3.3.4. Experiment 4. (Tamworth rain exclusion experiment 1990)	32
3.3.5. Experiment 5. (Tamworth field trial 1991).....	32
3.4. Measurements	34
3.4.1. Growth and developm nt.....	34
3.4.2. Psychrometry.....	34
3.4.3. Leaf conductance	35
3.4.4. Relative water content	36
3.4.5. Epidermal conductance.....	36
3.4.6. Pressure volume curves.....	37
3.4.7. Soil moisture	38
3.4.8. Leaf gas exchange	39
3.4.9. Stomatal frequency	39
3.5. Statistical analysis.....	39

CHAPTER 4, GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT	40
4.1. Introduction	41
4.2. Results	42
4.2.1. Development	42
4.2.2. Growth	42
Experiment 1	42
Experiment 2	42
Experiment 3	43
Experiment 4	43
Experiment 5: Dry matter accumulation	44
Experiment 5: leaf characteristics	48
4.3. Discussion	55
4.4. Conclusion	58
CHAPTER 5, YIELD AND YIELD COMPONENTS	59
5.1 Introduction	60
5.2 Results	60
5.2.1. Experiment 1	60
5.2.2. Experiment 2	60
5.2.3. Experiment 3	61
5.2.4. Experiment 4	63
5.2.5. Experiment 5	63
5.2.6. Relationships across experiments	65
5.3 Discussion	70
5.4 Conclusion	74
CHAPTER 6, WATER USE AND WATER USE EFFICIENCY	76
6.1. Introduction	77
6.2. Results	77
6.2.1. Water use	77
6.2.2. Transpiration efficiency of dry matter production (Td)	78
6.2.3. Water use efficiency of dry matter production (Wd)	78
6.2.4. Transpiration efficiency of seed production (Ts)	78
6.2.5. Water use efficiency of seed production (Ws)	81
6.2.6. Relationships across experiments	81
6.2.7. Transpiration efficiency on a gas exchange basis (TI)	82
6.2.8. Leaf conductance	84
6.2.9. Epidermal conductance	84
6.2.10. Stomatal frequency	85
6.3. Discussion	86

6.4. Conclusion	92
CHAPTER 7, PLANT WATER RELATIONS	93
7.1. Introduction	94
7.2. Results	94
7.2.1. Leaf water potential	94
7.3.2. Leaf turgor pressure.....	97
7.3.3. Relative water content	97
7.3.4. Interrelations	99
7.3.5. Solute accumulation ..	105
7.4. Discussion.....	108
7.5. Conclusion	113
CHAPTER 8, GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	114
8.1. Introduction	115
8.2 Discussion.....	115
8.2.1. Osmoregulation and adaptation.....	115
8.2.2. Water use efficiency and adaptation	119
8.2.3. Osmoregulation and water use efficiency	120
8.3. Conclusions and Recommendations	122
REFERENCES	124
APPENDICES.....	147

List of Tables

Table 2.1. Generalised sensitivity to water stress of plant processes or parameters.....	9
Table 3.1. List of genotypes used in the five experiments and a brief summary of the origin and pedigree of each genotype where available.....	28
Table 3.2. Monthly weather data for the 1988/89, 1990 and 1991 growing seasons.....	30
Table 4.1. Dry matter, leaf area index and specific leaf weight at peak flowering (growth stage 4.3) for plants from Experiment 3; data has been pooled across the two different watering treatments as these treatments were not applied at this stage.....	43
Table 4.2. Dry matter, leaf area index and specific leaf weight at peak flowering (growth stage 4.3) for plants from Experiment 4.....	44
Table 4.3. Leaf weight ratio (LWR) of canola and mustard for early growth (up until inflorescence visible, 3.1).....	51
Table 4.4. Total leaf area duration and leaf area durations for various stages of growth of plants grown at the low and high soil water deficit sites in Experiment 5 (units days).....	54
Table 5.1. Above ground dry matter (AGDM), seed yield (SY), harvest index (HI), number of pods per plant (PN), number of seeds per plant (SN), number of seeds per pod (SN/PN) and seed weight (SW) for Experiment 2 (glasshouse experiment).....	61
Table 5.2. Yield and yield components Experiment 3.....	62
Table 5.3. Yield and yield components Experiment 4.....	62
Table 5.4. Yield and yield components Experiment 5.....	64

Table 6.1. Total water use (mm) for glasshouse experiment (Experiment 2).....	79
Table 6.2. Total water use (mm) for field experiments.....	79
Table 6.3. Water use (mm) for different periods of growth in Experiment 5.....	79
Table 6.4. Transpiration efficiency of dry matter production ($\text{kg ha}^{-1} \text{mm}^{-1}$) for glasshouse experiment (Experiment 2)	80
Table 6.5. Water use efficiency ($\text{kg ha}^{-1} \text{mm}^{-1}$) for field experiments	80
Table 6.6. Water use efficiency ($\text{kg ha}^{-1} \text{mm}^{-1}$) for different periods of growth in Experiment 5	80
Table 6.7. Transpiration efficiency of seed production ($\text{kg ha}^{-1} \text{mm}^{-1}$) for the glasshouse experiment.....	81
Table 6.8. Water use efficiency of seed production ($\text{kg ha}^{-1} \text{mm}^{-1}$) for field experiments	81
Table 6.9. Field measurements of transpiration efficiency (T_t) on a gas exchange basis, photosynthesis (P_n), stomatal conductance (g_s) and sub stomatal CO_2 concentration (C_i)	83
Table 6.10. Epidermal conductance (g_e , mm s^{-1}) of canola and mustard plants grown at different levels of water deficit under glasshouse conditions of Experiment 2.....	84
Table 6.11. Stomatal frequency (number mm^{-2}) sampled for adaxial and abaxial leaf surfaces of mustard and canola in Experiment 2	85
Table 7.1. Water potential (ψ), turgor pressure (P_t) and relative water contents (ζ) of leaves of canola and mustard sampled early in the morning (EM) or at midday (MD) in Experiments 3 and 4.....	96

Table 7.2. Osmotic potential at full turgor (π_t) the change in osmotic potential with change in water potential (b), water potential at zero turgor (ψ_0), and the coefficient of determination for relationships established at each sampling date for three experiments.....	102
Table 7.3. Water potential at zero turgor (ψ_0), osmotic potential at full turgor (π_t) and the bulk modulus of elasticity (ϵ) under low or high soil water deficits in Experiment 2	104
Table 7.4. Rate of solute accumulation (z) and the coefficient of determination for straight line fits of the form given in equation 7.2.....	106
Table A4.1. Dry matter, leaf area index (LAI) and specific leaf weight (SLW) at peak flowering (growth stage 4.3) for plants from Experiment 1.....	148
Table A4.2. Dry matter, yield, harvest index and individual seed weights at maturity (growth stage 5.5) for plants from Experiment 1	149
Table A6.1. Analysis of variance for stomatal frequency	162

List of Figures

Figure 3.1. Change in potential, as measured by psychrometry, with different equilibrium times (-0.7 MPa estimated as the true equilibrium potential)	35
Figure 3.2. Loss of fresh weight with elapsed time since excision in a canola leaf under controlled conditions	37
Figure 4.1. Relationship between total dry matter at maturity and days to maturity in Experiment 1.....	42
Figure 4.2. Changes in average canola and mustard dry matter accumulation (Experiment 5) with time for a) total, b) leaf, c) stem and d) pod dry matter under low soil moisture deficit conditions and e) total, f) leaf, g) stem and h) pod dry matter under high soil moisture deficits	45
Figure 4.3. Average change in pod numbers with time for canola and mustard under (a) low soil water deficit and (b) high soil water deficit	47
Figure 4.4. Average change in crop growth rate with time for canola and mustard under (a) low soil water deficit and (b) high soil water deficit.....	48
Figure 4.5. Average change in canola and mustard leaf characteristics with time, a) leaf number, b) leaf area index c) percentage inactive leaf dry matter and d) specific leaf weight under low deficit conditions and e) leaf number, f) leaf area index g) percentage inactive leaf dry matter and h) specific leaf weight under high soil moisture deficits.....	50
Figure 4.6. The relationship between leaf area index and specific leaf weight a) 50 days after sowing and b) 64 days after sowing.....	51
Figure 4.7. Relationship between a) total dry matter accumulation and leaf area duration over the season b) dry matter accumulation to growth stage 3.1 and leaf area duration over the same period c) dry	

matter accumulation and leaf area duration between 3.1 and 4.4 and	
d) dry matter accumulation and leaf area duration between 4.4 and	
5.5.....	53
Figure 4.8. Relationship between total dry matter at maturity and	
leaf area index at stage 4.3 for data from Experiments 3, 4 and 5	55
Figure 4.9. Change in the relative dry matter accumulation of	
mustard compared to canola (mustard/canola) with time under low	
and high deficit conditions in Experiment 5.....	56
Figure 5.1. Relative performance of mustard compared to canola	
(mustard/canola) for different experiments and components of yield	
(a) dry matter, (b) seed yield, (c) harvest index, (d) pod number, (e)	
seed number, (f) seed number per pod, (g) seed weight, (h) oil	
concentration, (i) protein concentration and (j) oil yield.....	67
Figure 5.2. Relationship between a stress index (soil water plus	
rainfall divided by class A pan evaporation for the growing season)	
and site mean dry matter.....	68
Figure 5.3. Relationship between seed number and yield under field	
conditions across low-deficit and high deficit treatments	68
Figure 5.4. Relationship between crop dry weight at peak flowering	
(4.3) and yield for low deficit treatments and high deficit treatments.....	69
Figure 5.5. Relationship between assimilate supply (crop dry weight	
at peak flowering divided by pod number at maturity) and number of	
seeds per pod for low deficit treatments and high deficit treatments.....	69
Figure 5.6. Relationship between dry matter at final harvest and a)	
pod number, b) number of seeds per pod and c) seed number.....	72
Figure 6.1. Relative water use efficiency (mustard/canola) of dry	
matter production and seed production for different experiments.....	82

Figure 6.2. Change in stomatal conductance with time for a) adaxial and b) abaxial leaf surfaces.....	84
Figure 6.3. Effect of water deficit on epidermal conductance	85
Figure 6.4. Relationship between water use efficiency on a dry matter basis for the vegetative phase with the leaf area index at the end of the phase	87
Figure 6.5. Relative water use efficiency (mustard/canola) of dry matter production for vegetative growth, open symbols and reproductive growth, closed symbols, for different sites of Experiment 5.....	88
Figure 6.6. Relationship between transpiration efficiency on a gas exchange basis and specific leaf weight a) 57 days after sowing in Experiment 4 and b) 110 days after sowing for the irrigated site of Experiment 5.....	90
Figure 6.7. Association between water use efficiency of dry matter production and harvest index across three different sites.....	91
Figure 7.1. Changes in leaf water potential with time in Experiment 5 under low deficit conditions a) early morning and c) midday and under high deficit conditions b) early morning and d) midday	95
Figure 7.2. Changes in leaf turgor pressure with time in Experiment 5 under low deficit conditions a) early morning and c) midday and under high deficit conditions b) early morning and d) midday	98
Figure 7.3. Changes in relative water content of leaves with time in Experiment 5 under low deficit conditions a) early morning and c) midday and under high deficit conditions b) early morning and d) midday.....	99
Figure 7.4. Relationship between leaf water potential and osmotic potential at different stages of ontogeny for canola and mustard.....	101

Figure 7.5. Change in relative water content with change in water potential.....	103
Figure 7.6. Change in relative water content with change in osmotic potential.....	103
Figure 7.7. Change in relative water content with change in xylem water potential for canola and mustard under high soil water deficit.....	105
Figure 7.8. Change in solute accumulation with water potential at different stages of phenology for canola and mustard.....	107
Figure 7.9. Relative difference in midday leaf turgor of mustard compared to canola (mustard/canola) in Experiment 5.....	108
Figure 7.10. Change in water potential at which turgor reaches zero with time for canola and mustard in Experiment 5.....	109
Figure 7.11. Change in the osmotic potential at full turgor with time for canola and mustard	110
Figure 7.12. Calculated change in solute accumulation with declining water potential for leaves of canola and mustard from Experiment 5.....	112
Figure 8.1. Relationship of total above ground dry matter production with average leaf turgor pressure for Experiment 3, 4 and 5	118
Figure 8.2. Relationship of crop growth rate for phases of growth with the average turgor pressure for each phase of growth in Experiment 5.....	118
Figure 8.3. Relationship of leaf area duration and turgor pressure for experiment 5 for different growth phases a) total 0-5.5, b) early 0-3.1, c) mid 3.1-4.4, and d) late 4.4-5.5 ..	119
Figure 8.4. Relationship of stomatal conductance with leaf water potential (left hand column) or leaf turgor pressure (right hand column) on three different occasions in Experiment 5.....	121

Figure A4.1. Relationship between seed yield and days to maturity in Experiment 1.....	148
Figure A8.1. Relationship between leaf photosynthesis and a) leaf water potential and b) leaf turgor pressure.....	163