*Chapter* **9**

Photosynthesis: Physiological and Ecological Considerations

THE CONVERSION OF SOLAR ENERGY to the chemical energy of organic compounds is a complex process that includes electron transport and photosynthetic carbon metabolism (see Chapters 7 and 8). Earlier discussions of the photochemical and biochemical reactions of photosynthesis should not overshadow the fact that, under natural conditions, the photosynthetic process takes place in intact organisms that are continuously responding to internal and external changes. This chapter addresses some of the photosynthetic responses of the intact leaf to its environment. Additional photosynthetic responses to different types of stress are covered in Chapter 26.

The impact of the environment on photosynthesis is of interest to plant physiologists, ecologists, and agronomists. From a physiological standpoint, we wish to understand how photosynthetic rate responds directly to environmental factors such as light, ambient CO_2 concentrations, and temperature, or indirectly, through the effects of stomatal control, to environmental factors such as humidity and soil moisture. The dependence of photosynthetic processes on environment is also important to agronomists because plant productivity, and hence crop yield, depend strongly on prevailing photosynthetic rates in a dynamic environment. To the ecologist, the fact that photosynthetic rates and capacities show differences in different environments is of great interest in terms of adaptation.

In studying the environmental dependence of photosynthesis, a central question arises: How many environmental

(A)   Epidermis   Palisade cells   (B)

Spongy
mesophyll

Epidermis

Leaf grown in sun

Leaf grown in shade

100 μm

FIGURE 9.1   Scanning electron micrographs of the leaf anatomy from a legume (*Thermopsis montana*) grown in different light environments. Note that the sun leaf (A) is much thicker than the shade leaf (B) and that the palisade (columnlike) cells are much longer in the leaves grown in sunlight. Layers of spongy mesophyll cells can be seen below the palisade cells. (Micrographs courtesy of T. Vogelmann.)

factors can limit photosynthesis at one time? The British plant physiologist F. F. Blackman hypothesized in 1905 that, under any particular conditions, the rate of photosynthesis is limited by the slowest step, the so-called *limiting factor*.

The implication of this hypothesis is that at any given time, photosynthesis can be limited either by light or by CO_2 concentration, for instance, but not by both factors. This hypothesis has had a marked influence on the approach used by plant physiologists to study photosynthesis—that is, varying one factor and keeping all other environmental conditions constant. In the intact leaf, three major metabolic steps have been identified as important for optimal photosynthetic performance:

- Rubisco activity
- Regeneration of ribulose bisphosphate (RuBP)
- Metabolism of the triose phosphates

The first two steps are the most important under natural conditions.

Farquhar and Sharkey (1982) added a new dimension to our understanding of photosynthesis by pointing out that we should think of the controls over photosynthetic rate in leaves through "supply" and "demand" functions. The biochemical activities referred to above take place in the palisade cells and spongy mesophyll of the leaf (Figure 9.1); they describe the "demand" by photosynthetic metabolism in the cells for CO_2 as a substrate. However, the actual rate of CO_2 "supply" to these cells is controlled by stomatal guard cells located on the epidermal portions of the leaf. These supply and demand functions associated with photosynthesis take place in different cells. It is the coordinated actions of "demand" by photosynthetic cells and "supply" by guard cells that determine the leaf photosynthetic rate.

In the following sections, we will focus on how naturally occurring variations in light and temperature influence photosynthesis in leaves and how leaves in turn adjust or acclimate to variations in light and temperature. In addition, we will consider the impacts of atmospheric carbon dioxide, a major factor that influences photosynthesis and one that is rapidly increasing in concentration as humans continue to burn fossil fuels for energy uses.

Light, Leaves, and Photosynthesis

Scaling up from the chloroplast (the focus of Chapters 7 and 8) to the leaf adds new levels of complexity to photosynthesis. At the same time, the structural and functional properties of the leaf make possible other levels of regulation.

We will start by examining how leaf anatomy and leaf orientation control the absorption of light for photosynthesis. Then we will describe how chloroplasts and leaves acclimate to their light environment. We will see that the photosynthetic response of leaves grown under different light conditions also reflects an acclimation capacity to growth under a different light environment. We will also see that there are limits in the extent to which photosynthesis in a species can acclimate to very different light environments.

It will become clear that multiple environmental factors can influence photosynthesis. For example, consider that both the amount of light and the amount of CO_2 determine the photosynthetic response of leaves. In some situations involving these two factors, photosynthesis is limited by an inadequate supply of light or CO_2. In other situations, absorption of too much light can cause severe problems, and special mechanisms protect the photosynthetic system from excessive light. While plants have multiple levels of acclimation control over photosynthesis that allow them to grow successfully in constantly changing

environments, there are ultimately limits to possible acclimations to sun versus shade, high temperature versus low temperature, and high water stress versus low water stress environments.

Units in the Measurement of Light

Think of the different ways in which leaves are exposed to different spectra and quantities of light that result in photosynthesis. Plants grown outdoors are exposed to sunlight, and the spectrum of that sunlight will depend on whether it is measured in full sunlight or under the shade of a canopy. Plants grown indoors may receive either incandescent or fluorescent lighting, each of which is different from sunlight. To account for these differences in spectral quality and quantity, we need uniformity in how we measure and express the light that impacts photosynthesis.

Three light parameters are especially important in the measurement of light: (1) spectral quality, (2) amount, and (3) direction. Spectral quality was discussed in Chapter 7 (see Figures 7.2 and 7.3, and **Web Topic 7.1**). A discussion of the amount and direction of light reaching the plant requires consideration of the geometry of the part of the plant that receives the light: Is the plant organ flat or cylindrical?

Flat, or planar, light sensors are best suited for flat leaves. The light reaching the plant can be measured as energy, and the amount of energy that falls on a flat sensor of known area per unit time is quantified as **irradiance** (see Table 9.1). Units can be expressed in terms of energy, such as watts per square meter (W m^{-2}). Time (seconds) is contained within the term watt: 1 W = 1 joule (J) s^{-1}.

Light can also be measured as the number of incident **quanta** (singular *quantum*). In this case, units can be expressed in moles per square meter per second (mol m^{-2} s^{-1}), where *moles* refers to the number of photons (1 mol of light = 6.02×10^{23} photons, Avogadro's number). This measure is called **photon irradiance**. Quanta and energy units can be interconverted relatively easily, provided that the wavelength of the light, λ is known. The energy of a photon is related to its wavelength as follows:

$$E = \frac{hc}{\lambda}$$

where c is the speed of light (3×10^8 m s^{-1}), h is Planck's constant (6.63×10^{-34} J s), and λ is the wavelength of light, usually expressed in nm (1 nm = 10^{-9} m). From this equation it can be shown that a photon at 400 nm has twice the energy of a photon at 800 nm (see **Web Topic 9.1**).

Now let's turn our attention to the direction of light. Light can strike a flat surface directly from above or obliquely. When light deviates from perpendicular, irradi-

	Energy measurements (W m^{-2})	**Photon measurements (mol m^{-2}s^{-1})**
TABLE 9.1 **Concepts and units for the quantification of light**		
Flat light sensor	Irradiance	Photon irradiance
	Photosynthetically active radiation (PAR, 400-700 nm, energy units)	PAR (quantum units)
	—	Photosynthetic photon flux density (PPFD)
Spherical light sensor	Fluence rate (energy units)	Fluence rate (quantum units)
	Scalar irradiance	Quantum scalar irradiance

ance is proportional to the cosine of the angle at which the light rays hit the sensor (Figure 9.2).

There are many examples in nature in which the light-intercepting object is not flat (e.g., complex shoots, whole plants, chloroplasts). In addition, in some situations light

FIGURE 9.2 Flat and spherical light sensors. Equivalent amounts of collimated light strike a flat irradiance–type sensor (A) and a spherical sensor (B) that measure fluence rate. With collimated light, A and B will give the same light readings. When the light direction is changed 45°, the spherical sensor (D) will measure the same quantity as in B. In contrast, the flat irradiance sensor (C) will measure an amount equivalent to the irradiance in A multiplied by the cosine of the angle α in C. (After Björn and Vogelmann 1994.)

can come from many directions simultaneously (e.g., direct light from the sun plus the light that is reflected upward from sand, soil, or snow). In these situations it makes more sense to measure light with a spherical sensor that takes measurements omnidirectionally (from all directions).

The term for this omnidirectional measurement is **fluence rate** (see Table 9.1) (Rupert and Letarjet 1978), and this quantity can be expressed in watts per square meter (W m^{-2}) or moles per square meter per second (mol m^{-2} s^{-1}). The units clearly indicate whether light is being measured as energy (W) or as photons (mol).

In contrast to a flat sensor's sensitivity, the sensitivity to light of a spherical sensor is independent of direction (see Figure 9.2). Depending on whether the light is collimated (rays are parallel) or diffuse (rays travel in random directions), values for fluence rate versus irradiance measured with a flat or a spherical sensor can provide different values (for a detailed discussion, see Björn and Vogelmann [1994]).

Photosynthetically active radiation (**PAR**, 400–700 nm) may also be expressed in terms of energy (W m^{-2}) or quanta (mol m^{-2} s^{-1}) (McCree 1981). Note that PAR is an irradiance-type measurement. In research on photosynthesis, when PAR is expressed on a quantum basis, it is given the special term **photosynthetic photon flux density** (**PPFD**). However, it has been suggested that the term *density* be discontinued, because within the International System of Units (SI units, where *SI* stands for *Système International*), *density* can mean area or volume.

In summary, when choosing how to quantify light, it is important to match sensor geometry and spectral response with that of the plant. Flat, cosine-corrected sensors are ideally suited to measure the amount of light that strikes the surface of a leaf; spherical sensors are more appropriate in other situations, such as in studies of a chloroplast suspension or a branch from a tree (see Table 9.1).

How much light is there on a sunny day? What is the relationship between PAR irradiance and PAR fluence rate? Under direct sunlight, PAR irradiance and fluence rate are both about 2000 μmol m^{-2} s^{-1}, although higher values can be measured at high altitudes. The corresponding value in energy units is about 400 W m^{-2}.

Leaf anatomy maximizes light absorption

Roughly 1.3 kW m^{-2} of radiant energy from the sun reaches Earth, but only about 5% of this energy can be converted into carbohydrates by a photosynthesizing leaf (Figure 9.3). The reason this percentage is so low is that a major fraction of the incident light is of a wavelength either too short or too long to be absorbed by the photosynthetic pigments (see Figure 7.3). Of the absorbed light energy, a significant fraction is lost as heat, and a smaller amount is lost as fluorescence (see Chapter 7).

Recall from Chapter 7 that radiant energy from the sun consists of many different wavelengths of light. Only pho-


FIGURE 9.3 Conversion of solar energy into carbohydrates by a leaf. Of the total incident energy, only 5% is converted into carbohydrates.

tons of wavelengths from 400 to 700 nm are utilized in photosynthesis, and about 85 to 90% of this PAR is absorbed by the leaf; the remainder is either reflected at the leaf surface or transmitted through the leaf (see Figure 9.4). Because chlorophyll absorbs very strongly in the blue and the red regions of the spectrum (see Figure 7.3), the transmitted and reflected light are vastly enriched in green—hence the green color of vegetation.

The anatomy of the leaf is highly specialized for light absorption (Terashima and Hikosaka 1995). The outermost cell layer, the epidermis, is typically transparent to visible light, and the individual cells are often convex. Convex epidermal cells can act as lenses and focus light so that the amount reaching some of the chloroplasts can be many times greater than the amount of ambient light (Vogelmann et al. 1996). Epidermal focusing is common among herbaceous plants and is especially prominent among tropical plants that grow in the forest understory, where light levels are very low.

Below the epidermis, the top layers of photosynthetic cells are called **palisade cells**; they are shaped like pillars that stand in parallel columns one to three layers deep (see

Figure 9.4 Optical properties of a bean leaf. Shown here are the percentages of light absorbed, reflected, and transmitted, as a function of wavelength. The transmitted and reflected green light in the wave band at 500 to 600 nm gives leaves their green color. Note that most of the light above 700 nm is not absorbed by the leaf. (After Smith 1986.)

Figure 9.1). Some leaves have several layers of columnar palisade cells, and we may wonder how efficient it is for a plant to invest energy in the development of multiple cell layers when the high chlorophyll content of the first layer would appear to allow little transmission of the incident light to the leaf interior. In fact, more light than might be expected penetrates the first layer of palisade cells because of the sieve effect and light channeling.

The **sieve effect** is due to the fact that chlorophyll is not uniformly distributed throughout cells but instead is confined to the chloroplasts. This packaging of chlorophyll results in shading between the chlorophyll molecules and creates gaps between the chloroplasts, where light is not absorbed—hence the reference to a sieve. Because of the sieve effect, the total absorption of light by a given amount of chlorophyll in a palisade cell is less than the light absorbed by the same amount of chlorophyll in a solution.

Light channeling occurs when some of the incident light is propagated through the central vacuole of the palisade cells and through the air spaces between the cells, an arrangement that facilitates the transmission of light into the leaf interior (Vogelmann 1993).

Below the palisade layers is the **spongy mesophyll**, where the cells are very irregular in shape and are surrounded by large air spaces (see Figure 9.1). The large air spaces generate many interfaces between air and water that

reflect and refract the light, thereby randomizing its direction of travel. This phenomenon is called *light scattering*.

Light scattering is especially important in leaves because the multiple reflections between cell–air interfaces greatly increase the length of the path over which photons travel, thereby increasing the probability for absorption. In fact, photon path lengths within leaves are commonly four times or more longer than the thickness of the leaf (Richter and Fukshansky 1996). Thus the palisade cell properties that allow light to pass through, and the spongy mesophyll cell properties that are conducive to light scattering, result in more uniform light absorption throughout the leaf.

Some environments, such as deserts, have so much light that it is potentially harmful to leaves. In these environments leaves often have special anatomic features, such as hairs, salt glands, and epicuticular wax that increase the reflection of light from the leaf surface, thereby reducing light absorption (Ehleringer et al. 1976). Such adaptations can decrease light absorption by as much as 40%, minimizing heating and other problems associated with the absorption of too much light.

Plants compete for sunlight

Plants normally compete for sunlight. Held upright by stems and trunks, leaves configure a canopy that absorbs light and influences photosynthetic rates and growth beneath them.

As we will see, leaves that are shaded by other leaves experience lower light levels and have much lower photosynthetic rates. Some plants have very thick leaves that transmit little, if any, light. Other plants, such as those of the dandelion (*Taraxacum* sp.), have a rosette growth habit, in which leaves grow radially very close to each other on a very short stem, thus preventing the growth of any leaves below them.

Trees with their leaves high above the ground surface represent an outstanding adaptation for light interception. The elaborate branching structure of trees vastly increases the interception of sunlight. Very little PAR penetrates the canopy of many forests; almost all of it is absorbed by leaves (Figure 9.5).

Another feature of the shady habitat is **sunflecks**, patches of sunlight that pass through small gaps in the leaf canopy and move across shaded leaves as the sun moves. In a dense forest, sunflecks can change the photon flux impinging on a leaf in the forest floor more than tenfold within seconds. For some of these leaves, sunflecks contain nearly 50% of the total light energy available during the day, but this critical energy is available for only a few minutes now and then in a very high dose.

Sunflecks also play a role in the carbon metabolism of lower leaves in dense crops that are shaded by the upper leaves of the plant. Rapid responses of both the photosynthetic apparatus and the stomata to sunflecks have been of

FIGURE 9.5 The spectral distribution of sunlight at the top of a canopy and under the canopy. For unfiltered sunlight, the total irradiance was 1900 µmol m^{-2} s^{-1}; for shade, 17.7 µmol m^{-2} s^{-1}. Most of the photosynthetically active radiation was absorbed by leaves in the canopy. (After Smith 1994.)

substantial interest to plant physiologists and ecologists (Pearcy et al. 1997), because they represent unique physiological responses specialized in the capture of short bursts of sunlight.

Leaf angle and leaf movement can control light absorption

How do leaves influence the light levels within a canopy? The angle of the leaf relative to the sun will determine the amount of sunlight incident upon it in a manner identical to that shown for the flat light sensor in Figure 9.2. If the sun is directly overhead, a horizontal leaf (such as the flat sensor in Figure 9.2A) will receive much more sunlight than a leaf at a steeper angle. Under natural conditions, leaves exposed to full sunlight at the top of the canopy tend to have steep leaf angles so that less than the maximum amount of sunlight is incident on the leaf blade; this allows more sunlight to penetrate into the canopy. It is common to see that the angle of different leaves within a canopy decrease (become more horizontal) with increasing depth into a canopy.

Leaves have the highest light absorption when the leaf blade, or lamina, is perpendicular to the incident light. Some plants control light absorption by **solar tracking** (Koller 2000); that is, their leaves continuously adjust the orientation of their laminae such that they remain perpendicular to the sun's rays (Figure 9.6). Many crop and wild species have leaves capable of solar tracking, including alfalfa, cotton, soybean, bean, and lupine.

Solar-tracking leaves keep a nearly vertical position at sunrise, facing the eastern horizon, where the sun will rise. The leaf blades then lock on to the rising sun and follow its movement across the sky with an accuracy of ±15° until sunset, when the laminae are nearly vertical, facing the west, where the sun will set. During the night the leaf takes a horizontal position and reorients just before dawn so that it faces the eastern horizon in anticipation of another sunrise. Leaves track the sun only on clear days, and they stop when a cloud obscures the sun. In the case of intermittent cloud cover, some leaves can reorient as rapidly as 90° per hour and thus can catch up to the new solar position when the sun emerges from behind a cloud (Koller 1990).

Solar tracking is a blue-light response (see Chapter 18), and the sensing of blue light in solar-tracking leaves occurs in specialized regions. In species of *Lavatera* (Malvaceae), the photosensitive region is located in or near the major leaf veins (Koller 1990). In lupines (*Lupinus*, Fabaceae), leaves consist of five or more leaflets, and the photosensi-

FIGURE 9.6 Leaf movement in sun-tracking plants. (A) Initial leaf orientation in the lupine *Lupinus succulentus*. (B) Leaf orientation 4 hours after exposure to oblique light. The direction of the light beam is indicated by the arrows. Movement is generated by asymmetric swelling of a pulvi-

nus, found at the junction between the lamina and the petiole. In natural conditions, the leaves track the sun's trajectory in the sky. (From Vogelmann and Björn 1983, courtesy of T. Vogelmann.)

tive region is the pulvinus and is located in the basal part of each leaflet lamina (see Figure 9.6).

In many cases, leaf orientation is controlled by a specialized organ called the **pulvinus** (plural *pulvini*), found at the junction between the blade and petiole. The pulvinus contains motor cells that change their osmotic potential and generate mechanical forces that determine laminar orientation. In other plants, leaf orientation is controlled by small mechanical changes along the length of the petiole and by movements of the younger parts of the stem.

Some solar-tracking plants can also move their leaves such that they avoid full exposure to sunlight, thus minimizing heating and water loss. Building on the term **heliotropism** (bending toward the sun), which is often used to describe sun-induced leaf movements, these sun-avoiding leaves are called *paraheliotropic*, and leaves that maximize light interception by solar tracking are called *diaheliotropic*. Some plant species have leaves that can display diaheliotropic movements when they are well watered and paraheliotropic movements when they experience water stress.

Since full sunlight usually exceeds the amount of light that can be utilized for photosynthesis, what advantage is gained by solar tracking? By keeping leaves perpendicular to the sun, solar-tracking plants are able to maintain maximum photosynthetic rates throughout the day, including early morning and late afternoon. Moreover, air temperature is lower during the early morning and late afternoon, so that water stress is lower. Solar tracking therefore gives an advantage to plants with short growing periods, as in rain-fed crops such as pinto beans. Diaheliotropic solar tracking appears to be a feature common to wild plants that are short lived and must complete their life cycle before the onset of drought (Ehleringer and Forseth 1980). Similarly, paraheliotropic leaves are able to regulate the amount of sunlight incident on the leaf to a nearly constant value, although the amount of incident sunlight is often only one-half to two-thirds of full sunlight.

Plants acclimate and adapt to sun and shade

Shady habitats can receive less than 20% of the PAR available in an exposed habitat; deep shade habitats receive less than 1% of the PAR at the top of the canopy. Some plants have enough developmental plasticity to respond to a range of light regimes, growing as sun plants in sunny areas and as shade plants in shady habitats. We call this **acclimation**, a process whereby the newly produced leaf has a set of biochemical and morphological characteristics that are best suited for a particular environment.

In some plant species, individual leaves that develop under very sunny or very shady environments are often unable to persist when transferred in the other type of habitat (see Figure 9.5). In this case, the mature leaf will be abscised and a new leaf develop better suited for the new environment. For example, what happens when you take

a plant that has developed indoors and transfer it outdoors? After some time, if it's the right type of plant, it develops a new set of leaves better suited to high sunlight. However, other species of plants are not able to acclimate when transferred from sunny to shade environments, but instead they are **adapted** to a sunny environment or to a shade environment. For example, when plants adapted to deep shade conditions are transferred into full sunlight, the leaves experience chronic photoinhibition and leaf bleaching, and they eventually die, as will be discussed later in this chapter.

Sun and shade leaves have some contrasting biochemical characteristics:

- Shade leaves have more total chlorophyll per reaction center, have a higher ratio of chlorophyll b to chlorophyll a, and are usually thinner than sun leaves.
- Sun leaves have more rubisco and a larger pool of xanthophyll cycle components than shade leaves (see Chapter 7).

Contrasting anatomic characteristics can also be found in leaves of the same plant that are exposed to different light regimes. Figure 9.1 shows some anatomic differences between a leaf grown in the sun and a leaf grown in the shade. Sun-grown leaves are thicker and have longer palisade cells than leaves grown in the shade. Even different parts of a single leaf show adaptations to their light microenvironment (Terashima 1992).

These morphological and biochemical modifications are associated with specific functions. Far-red light is absorbed primarily by PSI, and altering the ratio of PSI to PSII or changing the light-harvesting antennae associated with the photosystems makes it possible to maintain a better balance of energy flow through the two photosystems (Melis 1996). These adaptations are found in nature; some shade plants show a 3:1 ratio of photosystem II to photosystem I reaction centers, compared with the 2:1 ratio found in sun plants (Anderson 1986). Other shade plants, rather than altering the ratio of PSI to PSII, add more antenna chlorophyll to PSII. These adaptations appear to enhance light absorption and energy transfer in shady environments, where far-red light is more abundant.

Sun and shade plants also differ in their dark respiration rates, and these differences alter the relationship between respiration and photosynthesis, as we'll see a little later in this chapter.

Photosynthetic Responses to Light by the Intact Leaf

Light is a critical resource for plants that can limit growth and reproduction. The photosynthetic properties of the leaf provide valuable information about plant adaptations to their light environment. In this section we describe typical photosynthetic responses to light as measured in light-

FIGURE 9.7   Response of photosynthesis to light in a C_3 plant. In darkness, respiration causes a net efflux of CO_2 from the plant. The light compensation point is reached when photosynthetic CO_2 assimilation equals the amount of CO_2 evolved by respiration. Increasing light above the light compensation point proportionally increases photosynthesis, indicating that photosynthesis is limited by the rate of electron transport, which in turn is limited by the amount of available light. This portion of the curve is referred to as light-limited. Further increases in photosynthesis are eventually limited by the carboxylation capacity of rubisco or the metabolism of triose phosphates. This part of the curve is referred to as CO_2-limited.

response curves. We also consider how an important feature of light-response curves, the light compensation point, explains contrasting physiological properties of sun and shade plants. The section then continues with descriptions of how leaves respond to excess light.

### Light-response curves reveal photosynthetic properties

Measuring net CO_2 fixation in intact leaves at increasing photon flux allows us to construct light-response curves (Figure 9.7) that provide useful information about the photosynthetic properties of leaves. In the dark there is no photosynthetic carbon assimilation, and instead CO_2 is given off by the plant because of mitochondrial respiration (see Chapter 11). By convention, CO_2 assimilation is negative in this part of the light-response curve. As the photon flux increases, photosynthetic CO_2 assimilation increases linearly until it equals CO_2 release by mitochondrial respiration. The point at which photosynthetic CO_2 uptake exactly balances CO_2 release is called the **light compensation point**.

The photon flux at which different leaves reach the light compensation point varies with species and developmental conditions. One of the more interesting differences is found between plants grown in full sunlight and those grown in the shade (Figure 9.8). Light compensation points of sun plants range from 10 to 20 µmol m^{-2} s^{-1}; corresponding values for shade plants are 1 to 5 µmol m^{-2} s^{-1}.

The values for shade plants are lower because respiration rates in shade plants are very low, so little net photosynthesis suffices to bring the net rates of CO_2 exchange to zero. Low respiratory rates represent a basic response that allows shade plants to survive in light-limited environments through their ability to achieve positive CO_2 uptake rates at lower values of PAR than sun plants.

Increasing photon flux above the light compensation point results in a proportional increase in photosynthetic rate (see Figure 9.7), yielding a linear relationship between photon flux and photosynthetic rate. Such a linear relationship comes about because photosynthesis is light limited at those levels of incident light, so more light stimulates proportionately more photosynthesis.

In this linear portion of the curve, the slope of the line reveals the **maximum quantum yield** of photosynthesis for

FIGURE 9.8   Light-response curves of photosynthetic carbon fixation in sun and shade plants. Triangle orache (*Atriplex triangularis*) is a sun plant, and a wild ginger (*Asarum caudatum*) is a shade plant. Typically, shade plants have a low light compensation point and have lower maximal photosynthetic rates than sun plants. The dashed line has been extrapolated from the measured part of the curve. (After Harvey 1979.)

FIGURE 9.9 The quantum yield of photosynthetic carbon fixation in a C$_3$ plant and in a C$_4$ plant as a function of leaf temperature. In normal air, photorespiration increases with temperature in C$_3$ plants, and the energy cost of net CO$_2$ fixation increases accordingly. This higher energy cost is expressed in lower quantum yields at higher temperatures. Because of the CO$_2$-concentrating mechanisms of C$_4$ plants, photorespiration is low in these plants, and the quantum yield does not show a temperature dependence. Note that at lower temperatures the quantum yield of C$_3$ plants is higher than that of C$_4$ plants, indicating that photosynthesis in C$_3$ plants is more efficient at lower temperatures. (After Ehleringer and Björkman 1977.)

the leaf. Recall that quantum yield is the ratio of a given light-dependent product (in this case, CO$_2$ assimilation) to the number of absorbed photons (see Equation 7.5).

Photosynthetic quantum yield can be expressed on either a CO$_2$ or O$_2$ basis. Recall from Chapter 7 that the quantum yield of photochemistry is about 0.95. However, the photosynthetic quantum yield of an integrated process such as photosynthesis is lower whether it is measured in chloroplasts (organelles) or whole leaves. Based on the biochemistry discussed in Chapter 8, we expect the maximum quantum yield for photosynthesis to be 0.125 for C$_3$ plants (one CO$_2$ molecule fixed per eight photons absorbed).

Under today's atmospheric conditions (380 ppm CO$_2$, 21% O$_2$), the quantum yields for CO$_2$ of C$_3$ and C$_4$ leaves are similar and vary between 0.04 and 0.06 mole of CO$_2$ per mole of photons. In C$_3$ plants the reduction from the theoretical maximum is primarily caused by energy loss through photorespiration. In C$_4$ plants the reduction is caused by the energy requirements of the CO$_2$-concentrating mechanism. If C$_3$ leaves are exposed to low O$_2$ concentrations, photorespiration is inhibited and the quantum yield increases to about 0.09 mole of CO$_2$ per mole of photons. If C$_4$ leaves are exposed to low O$_2$ concentrations, the quantum yields for CO$_2$ fixation remain constant at about

0.05 mole of CO$_2$ per mole of photons, irrespective of whether leaves are exposed to a current (21%) or low O$_2$ concentration. This is because the carbon-concentrating mechanism in C$_4$ photosynthesis effectively eliminates CO$_2$ evolution via photorespiration.

Quantum yield varies with temperature and CO$_2$ concentration because of their effect on the ratio of the carboxylase and oxygenase reactions of rubisco (see Chapter 8). Below 30°C in today's environment, quantum yields of C$_3$ plants are generally higher than those of C$_4$ plants; above 30°C, the situation is usually reversed (see Figure 9.9). Despite their different growth habitats, sun and shade plants show very similar quantum yields, because the basic biochemical processes that determine quantum yield are the same for these two types of plants.

At higher photon fluxes, the photosynthetic response to light starts to level off (see Figure 9.10) and eventually reaches *saturation*. Once the saturation point is reached, further increases in photon flux no longer affect photosynthetic rates, indicating that factors other than incident light, such as electron transport rate, rubisco activity, or the metabolism of triose phosphates, have become limiting to photosynthesis.

FIGURE 9.10 Light-response of photosynthesis of a sun plant grown under sun or shade conditions. The upper curve represents an *A. triangularis* leaf grown at an irradiance ten times higher than that of the lower curve. In the leaf grown at the lower light levels, photosynthesis saturates at a substantially lower irradiance, indicating that the photosynthetic properties of a leaf depend on its growing conditions. The dashed red line has been extrapolated from the measured part of the curve. (After Björkman 1981.)

After the saturation point, photosynthesis is commonly referred to as *CO₂ limited* (see Figure 9.8), reflecting the inability of the Calvin cycle enzymes to keep pace with the absorbed light energy that is producing ATP and NADPH. Light saturation levels for shade plants are substantially lower than those for sun plants. These levels usually reflect the maximum photon flux to which the leaf was exposed during growth.

The light-response curve of most leaves saturates between 500 and 1000 μmol m^{-2} s^{-1}—well below full sunlight (which is about 2000 μmol m^{-2} s^{-1}). Although individual leaves are rarely able to utilize full sunlight, whole plants usually consist of many leaves that shade each other, so only a small fraction of a tree's leaves are exposed to full sun at any given time of the day. The rest of the leaves receive subsaturating photon fluxes in the form of small patches of light that pass through gaps in the leaf canopy or in the form of light transmitted through other leaves. Because the photosynthetic response of the intact plant is the sum of the photosynthetic activity of all the leaves, only rarely is photosynthesis saturated with light at the level of the whole plant.

Light-response curves of individual trees and of the forest canopy show that photosynthetic rate increases with photon flux and photosynthesis usually does not saturate, even in full sunlight (Figure 9.11). Along these lines, crop productivity is related to the total amount of light received during the growing season, and given enough water and nutrients, the more light a crop receives, the higher the biomass (Ort and Baker 1988).

Leaves must dissipate excess light energy

When exposed to excess light, leaves must dissipate the surplus absorbed light energy so that it does not harm the photosynthetic apparatus (Figure 9.12). There are several routes for energy dissipation involving *nonphotochemical quenching* (see Chapter 7), which is the quenching of chlorophyll fluorescence by mechanisms other than photochemistry. The most important example involves the transfer of absorbed light energy away from electron transport toward heat production. Although the molecular mechanisms are not yet fully understood, the xanthophyll cycle appears to be an important avenue for dissipation of excess light energy (see **Web Essay 9.1**).

THE XANTHOPHYLL CYCLE Recall from Chapter 7 that the xanthophyll cycle, which comprises the three carotenoids violaxanthin, antheraxanthin, and zeaxanthin, is involved in the dissipation of excess light energy in the leaf (see Figure 7.36). Under high light, violaxanthin is converted to antheraxanthin and then to zeaxanthin. Note that the two aromatic rings of violaxanthin have a bound oxygen atom in them, antheraxanthin has one, and zeaxanthin has none (again, see Figure 7.36). Experiments have shown that zeaxanthin is the most effective of the three xanthophylls in heat dissipation, and antheraxanthin is only half as effective.


FIGURE 9.11   Changes in photosynthesis (expressed on a per-square-meter basis) in individual needles, a complex shoot, and a forest canopy of Sitka spruce (*Picea sitchensis*) as a function of irradiance. Complex shoots consist of groupings of needles that often shade each other, similar to the situation in a canopy where branches often shade other branches. As a result of shading, much higher irradiance levels are needed to saturate photosynthesis. The dashed portion of the forest canopy trace has been extrapolated from the measured part of the curve. (After Jarvis and Leverenz 1983.)

Whereas the levels of antheraxanthin remain relatively constant throughout the day, the zeaxanthin content increases at high irradiances and decreases at low irradiances.

In leaves growing under full sunlight, zeaxanthin and antheraxanthin can make up 60% of the total xanthophyll cycle pool at maximal irradiance levels attained at midday (Figure 9.13). In these conditions a substantial amount of excess light energy absorbed by the thylakoid membranes can be dissipated as heat, thus preventing damage to the photosynthetic machinery of the chloroplast (see Chapter 7). The fraction of light energy that is dissipated depends on irradiance, species, growth conditions, nutrient status, and ambient temperature (Demmig-Adams and Adams 1996).

THE XANTHOPHYLL CYCLE IN SUN AND SHADE Leaves that grow in full sunlight contain a substantially larger xanthophyll pool than do shade leaves, so they can dissipate higher amounts of excess light energy. Nevertheless, the xanthophyll cycle also operates in plants that grow in the low light of the forest understory, where they are only occasion-

FIGURE 9.12   Excess light energy in relation to a light-response curve of photosynthetic evolution. The broken line shows theoretical oxygen evolution in the absence of any rate limitation to photosynthesis. At levels of photon flux up to 150 μmol m^{-2} s^{-1}, a shade plant is able to utilize the absorbed light. Above 150 μmol m^{-2} s^{-1}, however, photosynthesis saturates, and an increasingly larger amount of the absorbed light energy must be dissipated. At higher irradiances there is a large difference between the fraction of light used by photosynthesis versus that which must be dissipated (excess light energy). The differences are much greater in a shade plant than in a sun plant. (After Osmond 1994.)


FIGURE 9.13   Diurnal changes in xanthophyll content as a function of irradiance in sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*). As the amount of light incident to a leaf increases, a greater proportion of violaxanthin is converted to antheraxanthin and zeaxanthin, thereby dissipating excess excitation energy and protecting the photosynthetic apparatus. (After Demmig-Adams and Adams 1996.)

ally exposed to high light when sunlight passes through gaps in the overlying leaf canopy, forming sunflecks (described earlier in the chapter). Exposure to one sunfleck results in the conversion of much of the violaxanthin in the leaf to zeaxanthin. In contrast to typical leaves, in which violaxanthin levels increase again when irradiances drop, the zeaxanthin formed in shade leaves of the forest understory is retained and protects the leaf against exposure to subsequent sunflecks.

The xanthophyll cycle is also found in species such as conifers, the leaves of which remain green during winter, when photosynthetic rates are very low yet light absorption remains high. Contrary to the diurnal cycling of the xanthophyll pool observed in the summer, zeaxanthin levels remain high all day during the winter. Presumably this mechanism maximizes dissipation of light energy, thereby protecting the leaves against photooxidation during winter (Adams et al. 2001).

In addition to protecting the photosynthetic system against high light, the xanthophyll cycle may help protect against high temperatures. Chloroplasts are more tolerant of heat when they accumulate zeaxanthin (Havaux et al. 1996). Thus, plants may employ more than one biochemical mechanism to guard against the deleterious effect of excess heat.

CHLOROPLAST MOVEMENTS   An alternative means of reducing excess light energy is to move the chloroplasts so that they are no longer exposed to high light. Chloroplast movement is widespread among algae, mosses, and leaves of higher plants (Haupt and Scheuerlein 1990). If chloroplast orientation and location are controlled, leaves can regulate how much of the incident light is absorbed. Under low light (Figure 9.14B), chloroplasts gather at the cell surfaces parallel to the plane of the leaf so that they are aligned perpendicularly to the incident light—a position that maximizes absorption of light.

Under high light (Figure 9.14C), the chloroplasts move to the cell surfaces that are parallel to the incident light, thus avoiding excess absorption of light. Such chloroplast rearrangement can decrease the amount of light absorbed by the leaf by about 15% (Gorton et al. 1999). Chloroplast movement in leaves is a typical blue-light response (see Chapter 18). Blue light also controls chloroplast orientation in many of the lower plants, but in some algae, chloroplast movement is controlled by phytochrome (Haupt and Scheuerlein 1990). In leaves, chloroplasts move along actin microfilaments in the cytoplasm, and calcium regulates their movement (Tlalka and Fricker 1999).

LEAF MOVEMENTS   Plants have evolved structural features that reduce the excess light load on leaves during high sunlight periods, especially when transpiration and its cooling

(A) Darkness

(B) Weak blue light

(C) Strong blue light

FIGURE 9.14 Chloroplast distribution in photosynthesizing cells of the duckweed *Lemna*. These surface views show the same cells under three conditions: (A) darkness, (B) weak blue light, and (C) strong blue light. In A and B, chloroplasts are positioned near the upper surface of the cells, where they can absorb maximum amounts of light. When the cells are irradiated with strong blue light (C), the chloroplasts move to the side walls, where they shade each other, thus minimizing the absorption of excess light. (Micrographs courtesy of M. Tlalka and M. D. Fricker.)

effects are reduced because of water stress. These features often involve changes in the leaf orientation relative to the incoming sunlight. For example, paraheliotropic leaves track the sun but at the same time can reduce incident light levels by folding leaflets together so that the leaf lamina become nearly parallel to the sun's rays. Another common feature is wilting, whereby a leaf droops to a vertical orientation, again effectively reducing the incident heat load and reducing transpiration and incident light levels.

Absorption of too much light can lead to photoinhibition

Recall from Chapter 7 that when leaves are exposed to more light than they can utilize (see Figure 9.12), the reaction center of PSII is inactivated and often damaged in a phenomenon called **photoinhibition**. The characteristics of photoinhibition in the intact leaf depend on the amount of light to which the plant is exposed (Figure 9.15). The two types of photoinhibition are dynamic photoinhibition and chronic photoinhibition (Osmond 1994).

Under moderate excess light, **dynamic photoinhibition** is observed. Quantum efficiency decreases (contrast the slopes of the curves in Figure 9.15), but the maximum photosynthetic rate remains unchanged. Dynamic photoinhibition is caused by the diversion of absorbed light energy toward heat dissipation—hence the decrease in quantum efficiency. This decrease is often temporary, and quantum efficiency can return to its initial higher value when photon flux decreases below saturation levels.

Chronic photoinhibition results from exposure to high levels of excess light that damage the photosynthetic system and decrease both quantum efficiency and maximum

FIGURE 9.15 Changes in the light-response curves of photosynthesis caused by photoinhibition. Exposure to moderate levels of excess light can decrease quantum efficiency (reduced slope of curve) without reducing maximum photosynthetic rate, a condition called dynamic photoinhibition. Exposure to high levels of excess light leads to chronic photoinhibition, where damage to the chloroplast decreases both quantum efficiency and maximum photosynthetic rate. (After Osmond 1994.)

photosynthetic rate (see Figure 9.15). Chronic photoinhibition is associated with damage and replacement of the D1 protein from the reaction center of PSII (see Chapter 7). In contrast to dynamic photoinhibition, these effects are relatively long-lasting, persisting for weeks or months.

Early researchers of photoinhibition interpreted all decreases in quantum efficiency as damage to the photosynthetic apparatus. It is now recognized that short-term decreases in quantum efficiency seem to reflect protective mechanisms (see Chapter 7), whereas chronic photoinhibition represents actual damage to the chloroplast resulting from excess light or a failure of the protective mechanisms.

How significant is photoinhibition in nature? Dynamic photoinhibition appears to occur normally at midday, when leaves are exposed to maximum amounts of light and there is a corresponding reduction in carbon fixation. Photoinhibition is more pronounced at low temperatures, and it becomes chronic under more extreme climatic conditions.

Studies of natural willow populations, and of crops such as oilseed rape (*Brassica napus*) and maize (*Zea mays*), have shown that the cumulative effects of a daily depression in photosynthetic rates caused by photoinhibition decrease biomass by 10% at the end of the growing season (Long et al. 1994). This may not seem a particularly large effect at any one moment in time, but compounded daily or over an entire growing season, it could be significant in natural plant populations competing for limited resources—conditions under which any reduction in carbon allocated to reproduction can adversely affect survival and reproductive success.

Photosynthetic Responses to Temperature

Photosynthesis (CO_2 uptake) and transpiration (H_2O loss) share a common pathway. That is, CO_2 diffuses into the leaf, and H_2O diffuses out, through the stomatal opening regulated by the guard cells. While these are independent processes, vast quantities of water are lost during photosynthetic periods, with the molar ratio of H_2O loss to CO_2 uptake often reaching 250 to 500. This high water loss rate also removes heat from leaves and keeps them relatively cool under full sunlight conditions. Since photosynthesis is a temperature-dependent process, it is important to remember this linkage between two processes influenced by the degree of stomatal opening. As we will see, stomatal opening influences both leaf temperature and the extent of transpiration water loss.

Leaves must dissipate vast quantities of heat

The heat load on a leaf exposed to full sunlight is very high. In fact, a leaf with an effective thickness of water of 300 μm would warm up to a very high temperature if all available solar energy were absorbed and no heat were lost. However, this does not occur because leaves absorb only about 50% of the total solar energy (300–3,000 nm), with most of the absorption occurring in the visible portion of the spectrum (see Figure 9.4). Yet the amount of the sun's

Energy input   **Heat dissipation**

FIGURE 9.16 The absorption and dissipation of energy from sunlight by the leaf. The imposed heat load must be dissipated in order to avoid damage to the leaf. The heat load is dissipated by emission of long-wavelength radiation, by sensible heat loss to the air surrounding the leaf, and by the evaporative cooling caused by transpiration.

energy absorbed by leaves is still enormous, and this heat load is dissipated by the emission of long-wave radiation (at about 10,000 nm), by sensible (i.e., perceptible) heat loss, and by evaporative (or latent) heat loss (Figure 9.16):

- Radiative heat loss: All objects emit radiation in proportion to their temperature. However, the maximum wavelength is inversely proportional to its temperature, and leaf temperatures are low enough that the wavelengths emitted are not visible to the human eye.

- Sensible heat loss: Air circulation around the leaf removes heat from the leaf surfaces if the temperature of the leaf is higher than that of the air; the heat is convected from the leaf to the air.

- Latent heat loss: Evaporative heat loss occurs because the evaporation of water requires energy. Thus, as water evaporates from a leaf (transpiration), it withdraws large amounts of heat from the leaf and cools it. The human body is cooled by the same principle, through perspiration.

Sensible heat loss and evaporative heat loss are the most important processes in the regulation of leaf temperature, and the ratio of the two is called the **Bowen ratio** (Campbell 1977):

$$\text{Bowen ratio} = \frac{\text{Sensible heat loss}}{\text{Evaporative heat loss}}$$

In well-watered crops, transpiration (see Chapter 4), and hence water evaporation from the leaf, are high, so the Bowen ratio is low (see **Web Topic 9.2**). Conversely, when evaporative cooling is limited, the Bowen ratio is large. For example, in a water-stressed crop, partial stomatal closure reduces evaporative cooling and the Bowen ratio is increased. The amount of evaporative heat loss (and thus the Bowen ratio) is influenced by the degree to which stomata remain open.

Plants with very high Bowen ratios conserve water, but also endure very high leaf temperatures. However, the high temperature difference between the leaf and air does increase the amount of sensible heat loss. Reduced growth is usually correlated with these high Bowen ratios, because a high Bowen ratio is indicative of at least partial stomatal closure.

Photosynthesis is temperature sensitive

When photosynthetic rate is plotted as a function of temperature in a leaf with C_3 photosynthesis under ambient CO_2 concentrations, the curve has a characteristic bell shape (Figure 9.17A). The ascending arm of the curve represents a temperature-dependent stimulation of enzymatic activities; the flat top portion of the curve represents a temperature range over which temperature is optimum for photosynthesis; the descending arm is associated with temperature-sensitive deleterious effects, some of which are reversible while others are not.

Temperature affects all biochemical reactions of photosynthesis as well as membrane integrity in chloroplasts, so it is not surprising that the responses to temperature are complex. We can gain insight into the underlying mechanisms by comparing photosynthetic rates of C_3 leaves in air at normal and at high CO_2 concentrations. At high CO_2 (see Figure 9.17B), there is an ample supply of CO_2 at the carboxylation sites, and the rate of photosynthesis is limited primarily by biochemical reactions connected with electron transport (see Chapter 7). In these conditions, temperature changes have large effects on fixation rates.

At ambient CO_2 concentrations (see Figure 9.17A), photosynthesis is limited by the activity of rubisco, and the response reflects two conflicting processes: an increase in carboxylation rate as the temperature rises and a decrease in the affinity of rubisco for CO_2 (see Chapter 8). There is also evidence that rubisco activity decreases at high temperatures because of temperature effects on rubisco activase (see Chapter 8). These opposing effects dampen the temperature response of photosynthesis at ambient CO_2 concentrations.

By contrast, when photosynthetic rate is plotted as a function of temperature in a leaf with C_4 photosynthesis, the curves have a bell shape in both cases (see Figure 9.17), since photosynthesis is CO_2-saturated (as was discussed in Chapter 8). This is one of the reasons that leaves of C_4 plants tend to have a higher photosynthetic temperature optimum than do leaves of C_3 plants when grown under common conditions.

At low temperatures, photosynthesis can also be limited by other factors such as phosphate availability at the chloroplast (Sage and Sharkey 1987). When triose phosphates are exported from the chloroplast to the cytosol, an equimolar amount of inorganic phosphate is taken up via translocators in the chloroplast membrane.

If the rate of triose phosphate utilization in the cytosol decreases, phosphate uptake into the chloroplast is inhibited and photosynthesis becomes phosphate limited (Geiger and Servaites 1994). Starch synthesis and sucrose synthesis decrease rapidly with temperature, reducing the demand for triose phosphates and causing the phosphate limitation observed at low temperatures.

The highest photosynthetic rates seen in temperature responses represent the so-called *optimal temperature response*. When these temperatures are exceeded, photosynthetic rates decrease again. It has been argued that this optimal temperature is the point at which the capacities of the various steps of photosynthesis are optimally balanced, with some of the steps becoming limiting as the temperature decreases or increases. What factors are associated

FIGURE 9.17 Changes in photosynthesis as a function of temperature at normal atmospheric CO_2 concentrations (A) and at high CO_2 concentrations, which saturate photosynthetic CO_2 assimilation (B). Photosynthesis depends strongly on temperature at saturating CO_2 concentrations. Note the significantly higher photosynthetic rates at saturating CO_2 concentrations. (After Berry and Björkman 1980).

FIGURE 9.18   The relative rates of photosynthetic carbon gain predicted for identical C_3 and C_4 grass canopies as a function of latitude across the Great Plains of North America (After Ehleringer 1978).

with the decline in photosynthesis beyond the temperature optimum? Respiration rates increase as a function of temperature, but they are not the primary reason for the sharp decrease in net photosynthesis at high temperatures. Rather, membrane-bound electron transport processes become unstable at high temperatures, cutting off the supply of reducing power and leading to a sharp overall decrease in photosynthesis.

Optimal temperatures have strong genetic (adaptation) and environmental (acclimation) components. Plants of different species growing in habitats with different temperatures have different optimal temperatures for photosynthesis, and plants of the same species, grown at different temperatures and then tested for their photosynthetic responses, show temperature optima that correlate with the temperature at which they were grown. Plants growing at low temperatures maintain higher photosynthetic rates at low temperatures than plants grown at high temperatures.

These changes in photosynthetic properties in response to temperature play an important role in plant adaptations to different environments. Plants are remarkably plastic in their adaptations to temperature. In the lower temperature range, plants growing in alpine areas are capable of net CO_2 uptake at temperatures close to 0°C; at the other extreme, plants living in Death Valley, California, have optimal rates of photosynthesis at temperatures approaching 50°C.

Figure 9.9 shows changes in quantum yield as a function of temperature in a C_3 plant and in a C_4 plant. In the C_4 plant the quantum yield or light-use efficiency remains constant with temperature, reflecting typical low rates of photorespiration. In the C_3 plant the quantum yield decreases with temperature, reflecting a stimulation of photorespiration by temperature and an ensuing higher energy demand per net CO_2 fixed. While quantum yield effects are most expressed under light-limited conditions, a similar pattern is reflected in photorespiration rates under high light as a function of temperature. The combination of reduced quantum yield and increased photorespiration leads to expected differences in the photosynthetic capacities of C_3 and C_4 plants in habitats with different temperatures. The predicted relative rates of primary productivity of C_3 and C_4 grasses along a latitudinal transect in the Great Plains of North America from southern Texas in the USA to Manitoba in Canada (Ehleringer 1978) are shown in Figure 9.18. This decline in C_3 relative to C_4 productivity moving southward very closely parallels the actual abundances of plants with these pathways in the Great Plains: C_3 species are more common above 45°N, and C_4 species dominate below 40°N (Figure 9.18) (**Web Topic 9.3**).

# Photosynthetic Responses to Carbon Dioxide

We have discussed how plant growth and leaf anatomy are influenced by light and temperature. Now we turn our attention to how CO_2 concentration affects photosynthesis. CO_2 diffuses from the atmosphere into leaves—first through stomata, then through the intercellular air spaces, and ultimately into cells and chloroplasts. In the presence of adequate amounts of light, higher CO_2 concentrations support higher photosynthetic rates. The reverse is also true: Low CO_2 concentrations can limit the amount of photosynthesis.

In this section we will discuss the concentration of atmospheric CO_2 in recent history, and its availability for carbon-fixing processes. Then we'll consider the limitations that CO_2 places on photosynthesis and the impact of the CO_2-concentrating mechanisms of C_4 plants.

Atmospheric CO_2 concentration keeps rising

Carbon dioxide is a trace gas in the atmosphere, presently accounting for about 0.038%, or 380 parts per million (ppm), of air. The partial pressure of ambient CO_2 (c_a) varies with atmospheric pressure and is approximately 38 pascals (Pa) at sea level (see **Web Topic 9.4**). Water vapor usually accounts for up to 2% of the atmosphere and O_2 for about 21%. The bulk of the atmosphere is nitrogen, at 77%.

The current atmospheric concentration of CO_2 is almost twice the concentration that has prevailed during most of the last 420,000 years, as measured from air bubbles trapped in glacial ice in Antarctica (Figure 9.19A). Today's atmospheric CO_2 is likely higher than Earth has experienced in the last 2 million years. Except for the last 200 years, atmospheric CO_2 concentrations during the recent geological past are thought to have been low, meaning that the plants in the world today evolved in a low-CO_2 world. The available evidence indicates that high CO_2 concentra-

FIGURE 9.19   Concentration of atmospheric CO_2 from 420,000 years ago to the present. (A) Past atmospheric CO_2 concentrations, determined from bubbles trapped in glacial ice in Antarctica, were much lower than current levels. (B) In the last 1000 years, the rise in CO_2 concentration coincides with the Industrial Revolution and the increased burning of fossil fuels. (C) Current atmospheric concentrations of CO_2 measured at Mauna Loa, Hawaii, continue to rise. The wavy nature of the trace is caused by change in atmospheric CO_2 concentrations associated with the growth of agricultural crops. Each year the highest CO_2 concentration is observed in May, just before the Northern Hemisphere growing season, and the lowest concentration is observed in October. (After Barnola et al. 1994, Keeling and Whorf 1994, Neftel et al. 1994, and Keeling et al. 1995.)

tions greater than 1,000 ppm have not existed on Earth since the warm Cretaceous, over 70 million years ago. Thus, until the dawn of the Industrial Revolution, the geological trend over the past 50 to 70 million years had been one of decreasing atmospheric CO_2 concentrations (**Web Topic 9.5**).

The current CO_2 concentration of the atmosphere is increasing by about 1 to 3 ppm each year, primarily because of the burning of fossil fuels such as coal, oil, and natural gas (see Figure 9.19C). Since 1958, when C. David Keeling began systematic measurements of CO_2 in the clean air at Mauna Loa, Hawaii, atmospheric CO_2 concentrations have increased by more than 20% (Keeling et al. 1995). By 2100 the atmospheric CO_2 concentration could reach 600 to 750 ppm unless fossil fuel emissions are controlled (**Web Topic 9.6**).

THE GREENHOUSE EFFECT   The consequences of this increase in atmospheric CO_2 are under intense scrutiny by scientists and government agencies, particularly because of predictions that the **greenhouse effect** is altering the world's climate. The term *greenhouse effect* refers to the resulting warming of Earth's climate, which is caused by the trapping of long-wavelength radiation by the atmosphere.

A greenhouse roof transmits visible light, which is absorbed by plants and other surfaces inside the greenhouse. The absorbed light energy is converted to heat, and part of it is re-emitted as long-wavelength radiation. Because glass transmits long-wavelength radiation very poorly, this radiation cannot leave the greenhouse through the glass roof, and the greenhouse heats up.

Certain gases in the atmosphere, particularly CO_2 and methane, play a role similar to that of the glass roof in a greenhouse. The increased CO_2 concentration and temperature associated with the greenhouse effect can influence photosynthesis. At current atmospheric CO_2 concentrations, photosynthesis in C_3 plants is CO_2 limited (as we will discuss later in the chapter), but this situation could change as atmospheric CO_2 concentrations continue to rise. Under laboratory conditions, most C_3 plants grow 30 to 60% faster when CO_2 concentration is doubled (to 600–750 ppm), and the growth rate changes depend on nutrient status (Bowes 1993).

CO_2 diffusion to the chloroplast is essential to photosynthesis

For photosynthesis to occur, carbon dioxide must diffuse from the atmosphere into the leaf and into the carboxylation site of rubisco. Because diffusion rates depend on concentration gradients in leaves (see Chapters 3 and 6), appropriate gradients are needed to ensure adequate diffusion of CO_2 from the leaf surface to the chloroplast.

The cuticle that covers the leaf is nearly impermeable to CO_2, so the main port of entry of CO_2 into the leaf is the stomatal pore. The same path is traveled in the reverse

Figure 9.20 Points of resistance to the diffusion of CO_2 from outside the leaf to the chloroplasts. The stomatal pore is the major point of resistance to CO_2 diffusion.

direction by H_2O. CO_2 diffuses through the pore into the substomatal cavity and into the intercellular air spaces between the mesophyll cells. This portion of the diffusion path of CO_2 into the chloroplast is a gaseous phase. The remainder of the diffusion path to the chloroplast is a liquid phase, which begins at the water layer that wets the walls of the mesophyll cells and continues through the plasma membrane, the cytosol, and the chloroplast. (For the properties of CO_2 in solution, see **Web Topic 8.6.**)

Each portion of this diffusion pathway imposes a resistance to CO_2 diffusion, so the supply of CO_2 for photosynthesis meets a series of different points of resistance (Figure 9.20). An evaluation of the magnitude of each point of resistance is helpful for understanding CO_2 limitations to photosynthesis.

The sharing of the stomatal entry pathway by CO_2 and water presents the plant with a functional dilemma. In air of high relative humidity, the diffusion gradient that drives water loss is about 50 times larger than the gradient that drives CO_2 uptake. In drier air, this difference can be even larger. Therefore, a decrease in stomatal resistance through the opening of stomata facilitates higher CO_2 uptake but is unavoidably accompanied by substantial water loss.

Recall from Chapter 4 that the gas phase of CO_2 diffusion into the leaf can be divided into three components—the boundary layer, the stomata, and the intercellular spaces of the leaf—each of which imposes a resistance to CO_2 diffusion (see Figure 9.20).

The boundary layer consists of relatively unstirred air at the leaf surface, and its resistance to diffusion is called the **boundary layer resistance**. The magnitude of the boundary layer resistance decreases with leaf size and wind speed. The boundary layer resistance to water and CO_2 diffusion is physically related to the boundary layer resistance to sensible heat loss discussed earlier.

Smaller leaves have a lower boundary layer resistance to CO_2 and water diffusion, and to sensible heat loss. Leaves of desert plants are usually small, facilitating sensible heat loss. The large leaves often found in the shade of the humid Tropics can have large boundary layer resistances, but these leaves can dissipate the radiation heat load by evaporative cooling made possible by the abundant water supply in these habitats.

After diffusing through the boundary layer, CO_2 enters the leaf through the stomatal pores, which impose the next type of resistance in the diffusion pathway, the **stomatal resistance**. Under most conditions in nature, in which the air around a leaf is seldom completely still, the boundary layer resistance is much smaller than the stomatal resistance, and the main limitation to CO_2 diffusion is imposed by the stomatal resistance.

There is also a resistance to CO_2 diffusion in the air spaces that separate the substomatal cavity from the walls of the mesophyll cells, called the **intercellular air space resistance**. This resistance is also usually small—causing a drop of 0.5 Pa or less in partial pressure of CO_2, compared with the 38 Pa outside the leaf.

The resistance to CO_2 diffusion of the liquid phase in C_3 leaves—the **liquid phase resistance**, also called **mesophyll resistance**—encompasses diffusion from the intercellular leaf spaces to the carboxylation sites in the chloroplast. This point of resistance to CO_2 diffusion has been calculated as approximately one-tenth of the combined boundary layer resistance and stomatal resistance when the stomata are fully open. This low resistance value can be attributed to the localization of chloroplasts near the cell periphery, which minimizes the distance that CO_2 must diffuse through liquid to reach carboxylation sites within the chloroplast.

Because the stomatal pores usually impose the largest resistance to CO_2 uptake and water loss in the diffusion pathway, this single point of regulation provides the plant with an effective way to control gas exchange between the leaf and the atmosphere. In experimental measurements of gas exchange from leaves, the boundary layer resistance and the intercellular air space resistance are often ignored, and the stomatal resistance is used as the single parameter describing the gas phase resistance to CO_2 (see **Web Topic 9.7**).

Patterns of light absorption generate gradients of CO_2 fixation

We have discussed how leaf anatomy is specialized for capturing light and how it also facilitates the internal diffusion

FIGURE 9.21   Distribution of absorbed light in spinach sun leaves. Irradiation with blue, green or red light results in different profiles of absorbed light in the leaf. The micrograph above the graph shows a cross section of a spinach leaf, with rows of palisade cells occupying nearly half of the leaf thickness. The shapes of the curves are in part a result of the unequal distribution of chlorophyll within the leaf tissues. (After Nishio et al. 1993 and Vogelmann and Han 2000; micrograph courtesy of T. Vogelmann.)

of CO_2, but where inside an individual leaf do maximum rates of photosynthesis occur? In most leaves, light is preferentially absorbed at the upper surface, whereas CO_2 enters through the lower surface. Given that light and CO_2 enter from opposing sides of the leaf, does photosynthesis occur uniformly within the leaf tissues, or is there a gradient in photosynthesis across the leaf?

For most leaves, once CO_2 has diffused through the stomata, internal CO_2 diffusion is rapid, so limitations on photosynthetic performance within the leaf are imposed by factors other than internal CO_2 supply. When white light enters the upper surface of a leaf, blue and red photons are preferentially absorbed by chloroplasts near the irradiated surface (Figure 9.21), owing to the strong absorption bands of chlorophyll in the blue and red regions of the spectrum (see Figure 7.5). Green light, on the other hand, penetrates deeper into the leaf. Compared to blue and red, chlorophyll

absorbs poorly in the green (again, see Figure 7.5), yet green light is very effective in supplying energy for photosynthesis in the tissues within the leaf depleted of blue and red photons.

The capacity of the leaf tissue for photosynthetic CO_2 assimilation depends to a large extent on its rubisco content. In spinach (*Spinacea oleracea*) and fava bean (*Vicia faba*), rubisco content starts out low at the top of the leaf, increases toward the middle, and then decreases again toward the bottom, similar to the distribution of chlorophyll in a leaf as shown in Figure 9.21. As a result, the distribution of photosynthetic carbon fixation within the leaf is bell-shaped.

CO_2 imposes limitations on photosynthesis

For many crops, such as tomatoes, lettuce, cucumbers, and roses growing in greenhouses under optimal water and nutrient nutrition, the carbon dioxide enrichment in the greenhouse environment above natural atmospheric levels results in increased productivity. Expressing photosynthetic rate as a function of the partial pressure of CO_2 in the intercellular air space (c_i) within the leaf (see **Web Topic 9.7**) makes it possible to evaluate limitations to photosynthesis imposed by CO_2 supply. At very low intercellular CO_2 concentrations, photosynthesis is strongly limited by the low CO_2.

Increasing intercellular CO_2 to the concentration at which these two processes balance each other defines the **CO_2 compensation point**, at which the net efflux of CO_2 from the leaf is zero (Figure 9.22). This concept is analogous to that of the light compensation point discussed earlier in

FIGURE 9.22   Changes in photosynthesis as a function of intercellular CO_2 concentrations in Arizona honeysweet (*Tidestromia oblongifolia*), a C_4 plant, and creosote bush (*Larrea divaricata*), a C_3 plant. Photosynthetic rate is plotted against calculated intercellular partial pressure of CO_2 inside the leaf (see Equation 5 in **Web Topic 9.4**). The partial pressure at which CO_2 assimilation is zero defines the CO_2 compensation point. (After Berry and Downton 1982.)

the chapter: *The CO_2 compensation point reflects the balance between photosynthesis and respiration as a function of CO_2 concentration, and the light compensation point reflects that balance as a function of photon flux under constant O_2 concentration.*

In C_3 plants, increasing atmospheric CO_2 above the compensation point stimulates photosynthesis over a wide concentration range (see Figure 9.22). At low to intermediate CO_2 concentrations, photosynthesis is limited by the carboxylation capacity of rubisco. At high CO_2 concentrations, photosynthesis becomes limited by the capacity of the Calvin cycle to regenerate the acceptor molecule ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate, which depends on electron transport rates. However, photosynthesis continues to increase with CO_2 because carboxylation replace oxygenation on rubisco. By regulating stomatal conductance, most leaves appear to regulate their c_i (internal partial pressure for CO_2) such that it is at an intermediate concentration between limitations imposed by carboxylation capacity and limits in the capacity to regenerate ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate.

A plot of CO_2 assimilation as a function intercellular partial pressures of CO_2 tells us how photosynthesis is regulated by CO_2, independent of the functioning of stomata (see Figure 9.22). Inspection of such a plot for C_3 and C_4 plants reveals interesting differences between the two pathways of carbon metabolism:

- In C_4 plants, photosynthetic rates saturate at c_i values of about 15 Pa, reflecting the effective CO_2-concentrating mechanisms operating in these plants (see Chapter 8).

- In C_3 plants, increasing c_i levels continue to stimulate photosynthesis over a much broader CO_2 range.

- In C_4 plants, the CO_2 compensation is zero or nearly zero, reflecting their very low levels of photorespiration (see Chapter 8).

- In C_3 plants, the CO_2 compensation point is about 10 Pa, reflecting CO_2 production because of photorespiration (see Chapter 8).

These responses indicate that C_3 plants may benefit more from ongoing increases in today's atmospheric CO_2 concentrations (see Figure 9.19). In contrast, photosynthesis in C_4 plants is CO_2-saturated at low concentrations, and as a result C_4 plants do not benefit much from increases in atmospheric CO_2 concentrations. In fact, the ancestral photosynthetic pathway is C_3 photosynthesis, and C_4 photosynthesis is a derived pathway. During geologically historical time periods when atmospheric CO_2 concentrations were very much higher than they are today, CO_2 diffusion through stomata into C_3 leaves would have resulted in higher c_i values and therefore higher photosynthetic rates. While C_3 photosynthesis is typically CO_2-diffusion limited today, C_3 plants still account for nearly 70% of the world's primary productivity. The evolution of C_4 photosynthesis is one biochemical adaptation to overcome a CO_2-limited

FIGURE 9.23 The combination of atmospheric carbon dioxide levels and daytime growing season temperatures that are predicted to favor C_3 versus C_4 grasses. At any point in time, the Earth is at a single atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration, resulting in the expectation that C_4 plants would be most common in the hottest growing–season habitats. (After Ehleringer et al. 1997.)

atmosphere. Our current understanding is that C_4 photosynthesis may have evolved recently, some 10 to 15 million years ago.

If the ancestral Earth more than 50 million years ago was one of elevated atmospheric CO_2 concentrations that were well above current atmospheric conditions, under what atmospheric conditions might we have expected that C_4 photosynthesis should become a major photosynthetic pathway found in the Earth's ecosystems? Ehleringer et al. (1997) suggest that C_4 photosynthesis first became a prominent component of terrestrial ecosystems in the warmest growing regions of the Earth when global CO_2 concentrations decreased below some critical and as-yet unknown threshold CO_2 concentration (Figure 9.23). That is, the negative impacts of high photorespiration and CO_2 limitation on C_3 photosynthesis would be greatest under warm to hot growing conditions, especially when atmospheric CO_2 is reduced. The C_4-favorable growing areas would have been located in those geographic regions with the warmest temperatures. C_4 plants would have been most favored during periods of the Earth's history when CO_2 levels were lowest. In today's world, these regions are the subtropical grasslands and savannas. There are now extensive data to indicate that C_4 photosynthesis was more prominent during the glacial periods when atmospheric CO_2 levels were below 200 ppm than it is today (see Figure 9.19). Other factors may have contributed to the expansion of C_4 plants, but certainly low atmospheric CO_2 was one important factor favoring their geographic expansion.

Because of the CO_2-concentrating mechanisms in C_4 plants, CO_2 concentration at the carboxylation sites within C_4 chloroplasts is often saturating for rubisco activity. As a

result, plants with C_4 metabolism need less rubisco than C_3 plants to achieve a given rate of photosynthesis, and require less nitrogen to grow (von Caemmerer 2000).

In addition, the CO_2-concentrating mechanism allows the leaf to maintain high photosynthetic rates at lower c_i values, which require lower rates of stomatal conductance for a given rate of photosynthesis. Thus, C_4 plants can use water and nitrogen more efficiently than C_3 plants can. On the other hand, the additional energy cost of the concentrating mechanism (see Chapter 8) makes C_4 plants less efficient in their utilization of light. This is probably one of the reasons that most shade-adapted plants in temperate regions are C_3 plants.

Crassulacean Acid Metabolism

Many cacti, orchids, bromeliads, and other succulent plants with crassulacean acid metabolism (CAM) have stomatal activity patterns that contrast with those found in C_3 and C_4 plants. CAM plants open their stomata at night and close them during the day, exactly the opposite of the pattern observed in guard cells in leaves of C_3 and C_4 plants (Figure 9.24). At night, atmospheric CO_2 diffuses into CAM plants where it is combined with phosphoenolpyruvate and fixed into malate (see Chapter 8).

The ratio of water loss to CO_2 uptake is much lower in CAM plants than it is in either C_3 or C_4 plants. This is because stomata are open only at night when temperatures are lower and humidities higher than daytime conditions, both of which contribute to a lower transpiration rate.

The main photosynthetic constraint on CAM metabolism is that the capacity to store malic acid is limited, and this limitation restricts the total amount of CO_2 uptake. However, some CAM plants are able to enhance total photosynthesis during wet conditions by fixing CO_2 via the Calvin cycle at the end of the day, when temperature gradients are less extreme. In water-limited conditions, stomata then only open at night.

Cladodes (flattened stems) of cacti can survive after detachment from the plant for several months without water. Their stomata are closed all the time, and the CO_2 released by respiration is refixed into malate. This process, which has been called *CAM idling*, also allows the intact plant to survive for prolonged drought periods while losing remarkably little water.

Carbon isotope ratio variations reveal different photosynthetic pathways

We can learn more about the different photosynthetic pathways in plants by measuring their chemical composition. That is, the stable isotopes of carbon atoms in a leaf contain useful information about photosynthesis. The two stable isotopes of carbon are ^{12}C and ^{13}C, differing only in composition by the addition of an additional neutron in ^{13}C.

FIGURE 9.24 Photosynthetic carbon assimilation, evaporation, and stomatal conductance of a CAM plant, the cactus *Opuntia ficus-indica*, during a 24-hour period. The whole plant was kept in a gas exchange chamber in the laboratory. The dark period is indicated by shaded areas. Three parameters were measured over the study period: (A) photosynthetic rate, (B) water loss, and (C) stomatal conductance. In contrast to plants with C_3 or C_4 metabolism, CAM plants open their stomata and fix CO_2 at night. (After Gibson and Nobel 1986.)

How do we measure the carbon isotopes of plants?

Atmospheric CO_2 contains the naturally occurring stable carbon isotopes ^{12}C and ^{13}C in the proportions 98.9% and 1.1%, respectively. $^{14}CO_2$ is radioactive and is present in small quantities (10^{-10}%). The chemical properties of $^{13}CO_2$ are identical to those of $^{12}CO_2$, but plants assimilate less $^{13}CO_2$ than $^{12}CO_2$. In other words, leaves discriminate against the heavier isotope of carbon during photosynthe-

sis, and therefore they have smaller $^{13}C/^{12}C$ ratios than are found in atmospheric CO_2.

The $^{13}C/^{12}C$ isotope composition is measured by use of a mass spectrometer, which yields the following ratio:

$$R = \frac{^{13}CO_2}{^{12}CO_2} \qquad (9.1)$$

The **carbon isotope ratio** of plants, $\delta^{13}C$, is quantified on a per mil (‰) basis:

$$\delta^{13}C\ ^0/_{00} = \left(\frac{R_{sample}}{R_{standard}} - 1\right) \times 1000 \qquad (9.2)$$

where the standard represents the carbon isotopes contained in a fossil belemnite from the Pee Dee limestone formation of South Carolina. The $\delta^{13}C$ of atmospheric CO_2 has a value of −8‰, meaning that there is less ^{13}C in atmospheric CO_2 than is found in the carbonate of the belemnite standard.

What are some typical values for carbon isotope ratios of plants? C_3 plants have a $\delta^{13}C$ value of about −28‰; C_4 plants have an average value of −14‰ (Farquhar et al. 1989). Both C_3 and C_4 plants have less ^{13}C than does CO_2 in the atmosphere, which means that they discriminate against ^{13}C during the photosynthetic process. Cerling et al. (1997) provided $\delta^{13}C$ data for a large number of C_3 and C_4 plants from around the world (Figure 9.25). What becomes clear from this figure is that there is a wide spread of $\delta^{13}C$ values in C_3 and C_4 plants values from averages of −28‰ and −14‰, respectively. These $\delta^{13}C$ variations actually reflect the consequences of small variations in physiology associated with changes in stomatal conductance in

FIGURE 9.25 Frequency histograms for the observed carbon isotope ratios in C_3 and C_4 taxa from around the world. (After Cerling et al. 1997.)

different environmental conditions. Thus, $\delta^{13}C$ values can be used both to distinguish between C_3 and C_4 photosynthesis and then to further reveal details about stomatal conditions for plants grown in different environmental conditions (such as the tropics versus deserts).

Differences in carbon isotope ratio are easily detectable with mass spectrometers that allow for very precise measurements of the abundance of ^{12}C and ^{13}C in either different molecules or different tissues. Many of our foods are products of C_3 plants, such as wheat (*Triticum aestivum*), rice (*Oryza sativa*), potatoes (*Solanum tuberosum*), and beans (*Phaseolus* spp.). Yet many of our most productive crops are C_4 plants, such as corn (maize; *Zea mays*), sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum*), and sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor*). Carbohydrates extracted from each of these foods may be chemically identical, but they are C_3–C_4 distinguishable on the basis of their $\delta^{13}C$ values. For example, measuring the $\delta^{13}C$ values of table sugar (sucrose) makes it possible to determine if the sucrose came from sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris*; a C_3 plant) or sugarcane (a C_4 plant) (see **Web Topic 9.8**).

Why are there carbon isotope ratio variations in plants?

What is the physiological basis for ^{13}C depletion in plants relative to CO_2 in the atmosphere? It turns out that both the diffusion of CO_2 into the leaf and the carboxylation selectivity for $^{12}CO_2$ play a role.

CO_2 diffuses from air outside of the leaf to the carboxylation sites within leaves in both C_3 and C_4 plants. Because $^{12}CO_2$ is lighter than $^{13}CO_2$, it diffuses slightly faster toward the carboxylation site, creating an effective diffusion fractionation factor of −4.4‰. Thus, we would expect leaves to have a more negative $\delta^{13}C$ value simply because of this diffusion effect. Yet this factor alone is not sufficient to explain the $\delta^{13}C$ values of C_3 plants as shown in Figure 9.25.

The initial carboxylation event is a determining factor in the carbon isotope ratio of plants. Rubisco represents the first carboxylation reaction in C_3 photosynthesis and has an intrinsic discrimination value against ^{13}C of −30‰. By contrast, PEP carboxylase, the primary CO_2 fixation enzyme of C_4 plants, has a much smaller isotope discrimination effect—about −2‰. Thus, the inherent difference between the two carboxylating enzymes contributes to the different isotope ratio differences observed in C_3 and C_4 plants (Farquhar et al. 1989).

Other physiological characteristics of plants affect its carbon isotope ratio. One primary factor is the partial pressure of CO_2 in the intercellular air spaces of leaves (c_i). In C_3 plants the potential isotope discrimination by rubisco of −30‰ is not fully expressed during photosynthesis because the availability of CO_2 at the carboxylation site becomes a limiting factor restricting the discrimination by rubisco. Greater discrimination against $^{13}CO_2$ occurs when c_i is high, as when stomata are open. Yet open stomata also

facilitate water loss. Thus, lower ratios of photosynthesis to transpiration are correlated with greater discrimination against ^{13}C (Ehleringer et al. 1993). When leaves are exposed to water stress, stomata tend to close, reducing c_i values. As a consequence, C_3 plants grown under water stress conditions tend to have more positive carbon isotope ratios.

Measuring $\delta^{13}C$ in fossil, carbonate-containing soils and fossil teeth makes it possible to reconstruct the photosynthetic pathways present at times in the ancient past. These approaches have been used to determine that C_4 photosynthesis developed and became prevalent about 6 million years ago and to reconstruct the diets of ancient and modern animals (see **Web Topic 9.9**).

CAM plants can have $\delta^{13}C$ values that are very near those of C_4 plants. In CAM plants that fix CO_2 at night via PEP carboxylase, $\delta^{13}C$ is expected to be similar to that of C_4 plants. However, when some CAM plants are well watered, they can switch to C_3 mode by opening their stomata and fixing CO_2 during the day via rubisco. Under these conditions the isotope composition shifts more toward that of C_3 plants. Thus the $\delta^{13}C$ values of CAM plants reflect how much carbon is fixed via the C_3 pathway versus the C_4 pathway.

Summary

Photosynthetic activity in the intact leaf is an integral process that depends on many biochemical reactions. Different environmental factors can limit photosynthetic rates.

Leaf anatomy is highly specialized for light absorption, and the properties of palisade and mesophyll cells ensure light absorption throughout the leaf. In addition to the anatomic features of the leaf, chloroplast movements within cells and solar tracking by the leaf blade help maximize light absorption. Light transmitted through upper leaves is absorbed by leaves growing beneath them.

Many properties of the photosynthetic apparatus change as a function of the available light, including the light compensation point, which is higher in sun leaves than in shade leaves. The linear portion of the light-response curve for photosynthesis provides a measure of the quantum yield of photosynthesis in the intact leaf. In temperate areas, quantum yields of C_3 plants are generally higher than those of C_4 plants.

Sunlight imposes on the leaf a substantial heat load, which is dissipated back into the air by long-wavelength radiation, by sensible heat loss, or by evaporative heat loss. Increasing CO_2 concentrations in the atmosphere are increasing the heat load on the biosphere. This process could cause damaging changes in the world's climate, but it could also reduce the CO_2 limitations on photosynthesis. At high photon flux, photosynthesis in most plants is CO_2 limited, but the limitation is substantially lower in C_4 and CAM plants because of their CO_2-concentrating mechanisms.

Diffusion of CO_2 into the leaf is constrained by a series of different points of resistance. The largest resistance is usually that imposed by the stomata, so modulation of stomatal apertures provides the plant with an effective means of controlling water loss and CO_2 uptake. Both stomatal and nonstomatal factors affect CO_2 limitations on photosynthesis.

Temperature responses of photosynthesis reflect the temperature sensitivity of the biochemical reactions of photosynthesis and are most pronounced at high CO_2 concentrations. Because of the role of photorespiration, the quantum yield is strongly dependent on temperature in C_3 plants but is nearly independent of temperature in C_4 plants.

Leaves growing in cold climates can maintain higher photosynthetic rates at low temperatures than leaves growing in warmer climates. Leaves grown at high temperatures perform better at high temperatures than leaves grown at low temperatures do. Functional changes in the photosynthetic apparatus in response to prevailing temperatures in the environment have an important effect on the ability of plants to live in diverse habitats.

The carbon isotope ratios of leaves can be used to distinguish photosynthetic pathway differences among different plant species. Within each photosynthetic pathway, variations in the carbon isotope ratios reveal information about environmental factors such as water stress.

Web Material

Web Topics

9.1   Working with Light
Amount, direction, and spectral quality are important parameters for the measurement of light.

9.2   Heat Dissipation from Leaves: The Bowen Ratio
Sensible heat loss and evaporative heat loss are the most important processes in the regulation of leaf temperature.

9.3   The Geographic Distributions of C_3 and C_4 Plants
The geographic distribution of C_3 and C_4 plants corresponds closely with growing season temperature in today's world.

9.4   Calculating Important Parameters in Leaf Gas Exchange
Gas exchange methods allow us to measure photosynthesis and stomatal conductance in the intact leaf.

9.5 Prehistoric Changes in Atmospheric CO$_2$

Over the past 800,000 years, atmospheric CO$_2$ levels changed between 180 ppm (glacial periods) and 280 ppm (interglacial periods) as Earth moved between ice ages.

9.6 Projected Future Increases in Atmospheric CO$_2$

In 2005 atmospheric CO$_2$ reached 379 ppm and is expected to reach 400 ppm by 2015.

9.7 Calculating Important Parameters in Leaf Gas Exchange

Gas exchange methods allow us to measure photosynthesis and stomatal conductance in the intact leaf.

9.8 Using Carbon Isotopes to Detect Adulteration in Foods

Carbon isotopes are frequently used to detect the substitution of C$_4$ sugars into C$_3$ food products, such as the introduction of sugar cane into honey to increase yield.

9.9 Reconstruction of the Expansion of C$_4$ Taxa

The $\delta^{13}C$ of animal teeth faithfully record the carbon isotope ratios of food sources and can be used to reconstruct the abundances of C$_3$ and C$_4$ plants eaten by mammalian grazers.

Web Essay

9.1 The Xanthophyll Cycle

Molecular and biophysical studies are revealing the role of the xanthophyll cycle on the photoprotection of leaves.

Chapter References

Adams, W. W., Demmig-Adams, B., Rosenstiel, T. N., and Ebbert, V. (2001) Dependence of photosynthesis and energy dissipation activity upon growth form and light environment during the winter. *Photosynth. Res*. 67: 51–62.

Anderson, J. M. (1986) Photoregulation of the composition, function, and structure of thylakoid membranes. *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol*. 37: 93–136.

Barnola, J. M., Raynaud, D., Lorius, C., and Korothevich, Y. S. (1994) Historical CO$_2$ record from the Vostok ice core. In *Trends '93: A Compendium of Data on Global Change* (ORNL/CDIAC-65), T. A. Boden, D. P. Kaiser, R. J. Sepanski, and F. W. Stoss, eds., Carbon Dioxide Information Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN, pp. 7–10.

Berry, J., and Björkman, O. (1980) Photosynthetic response and adaptation to temperature in higher plants. *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol*. 31: 491–543.

Berry, J. A., and Downton, J. S. (1982) Environmental regulation of photosynthesis. In *Photosynthesis: Development, Carbon Metabolism and Plant Productivity*, Vol. II, Govindjee, ed., Academic Press, New York, pp. 263–343.

Björkman, O. (1981) Responses to different quantum flux densities. In *Encyclopedia of Plant Physiology*, New Series, Vol. 12 A, O. L. Lange, P. S. Nobel, C. B. Osmond, and H. Zeigler, eds., Springer, Berlin, pp. 57–107.

Björn, L. O., and Vogelmann, T. C. (1994) Quantification of light. In *Photomorphogenesis in Plants*, 2nd ed., R. E. Kendrick and G. H. M. Kronenberg, eds., Kluwer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp. 17–25.

Bowes, G. (1993) Facing the inevitable: Plants and increasing atmospheric CO$_2$. *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Biol.* 44: 309–332.

Campbell, G. S. (1977) *An Introduction to Environmental Biophysics*. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Cerling, T. E., Harris, J. M., MacFadden, B. J., Leakey, M. G., Quade, J., Eisenmann, V., and Ehleringer, J. R. (1997) Global vegetation change through the Miocene–Pliocene boundary. *Nature* 389: 153–158.

Demmig-Adams, B., and Adams, W. (1996) The role of xanthophyll cycle carotenoids in the protection of photosynthesis. *Trends Plant Sci.* 1: 21–26.

Ehleringer, J. R. (1978) Implications of quantum yield differences on the distributions of C$_3$ and C$_4$ grasses. *Oecologia* 31: 255–267.

Ehleringer, J. R., and Björkman, O. (1977) Quantum yields for CO$_2$ uptake in C$_3$ and C$_4$ plants. *Plant Physiol.* 59: 86–90.

Ehleringer, J. R., and Forseth, I. (1980) Solar tracking by plants. *Science* 210: 1094–1098.

Ehleringer, J. R., Björkman, O., and Mooney, H. A. (1976) Leaf pubescence: Effects on absorptance and photosynthesis in a desert shrub. *Science* 192: 376–377.

Ehleringer, J. R., Sage, R. F., Flanagan, L. B., and Pearcy, R. W. (1991) Climate change and the evolution of C$_4$ photosynthesis. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 6: 95–99.

Ehleringer, J. R., Hall, A. E., and Farquhar, G. D. (eds.) (1993) *Stable Isotopes and Plant Carbon-Water Relations*. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Ehleringer, J. R., Cerling, T. E., and Helliker, B. R. (1997) C$_4$ photosynthesis, atmospheric CO$_2$, and climate. *Oecologia* 112: 285–299.

Farquhar, G. D., and Sharkey, T. D. (1982) Stomatal conductance and photosynthesis. *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol*. 33: 317–345.

Farquhar, G. D., Ehleringer, J. R., and Hubick, K. T. (1989) Carbon isotope discrimination and photosynthesis. *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Biol.* 40: 503–538.

Geiger, D. R., and Servaites, J. C. (1994) Diurnal regulation of photosynthetic carbon metabolism in C$_3$ plants. *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Biol.* 45: 235–256.

Gibson, A. C., and Nobel, P. S. (1986) *The Cactus Primer*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Gorton, H. L., Williams, W. E., and Vogelmann, T. C. (1999) Chloroplast movement in *Alocasia macrorrhiza*. *Physiol. Plant.* 106: 421–428.

Harvey, G. W. (1979) Photosynthetic performance of isolated leaf cells from sun and shade plants. *Carnegie Inst. Washington Yearbook* 79: 161–164.

Haupt, W., and Scheuerlein, R. (1990) Chloroplast movement. *Plant Cell Environ.* 13: 595–614.

Havaux, M., Tardy, F., Ravenel, J., Chanu, D., and Parot, P. (1996) Thylakoid membrane stability to heat stress studied by flash spectroscopic measurements of the electrochromic shift in intact potato leaves: Influence of the xanthophyll content. *Plant Cell Environ.* 19: 1359–1368.

Jarvis, P. G., and Leverenz, J. W. (1983) Productivity of temperate, deciduous and evergreen forests. In *Encyclopedia of Plant Physiology*, New Series, Vol. 12D, O. L. Lange, P. S. Nobel, C. B. Osmond, and H. Zeigler, eds., Springer, Berlin, pp. 233–280.

Keeling, C. D., and Whorf, T. P. (1994) Atmospheric CO$_2$ records from sites in the SIO air sampling network. In *Trends '93: A Compendium of Data on Global Change* (ORNL/CDIAC-65), T. A. Boden, D. P. Kaiser, R. J. Sepanski, and F. W. Stoss, eds., Carbon Dioxide Information Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN, pp. 16–26.

Keeling, C. D., Whorf, T. P., Wahlen, M., and Van der Plicht, J. (1995) Interannual extremes in the rate of rise of atmospheric carbon dioxide since 1980. *Nature* 375: 666–670.

Koller, D. (1990) Light-driven leaf movements. *Plant Cell Environ.* 13: 615–632.

Koller, D. (2000) Plants in search of sunlight. *Adv. Bot. Res*. 33: 35–131.

Long, S. P., Humphries, S., and Falkowski, P. G. (1994) Photoinhibition of photosynthesis in nature. *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Biol.* 45: 633–662.

McCree, K. J. (1981) Photosynthetically active radiation. In *Encyclopedia of Plant Physiology*, New Series, Vol. 12A, O. L. Lange, P. S. Nobel, C. B. Osmond, and H. Zeigler, eds., Springer, Berlin, pp. 41–55.

Melis, A. (1996) Excitation energy transfer: Functional and dynamic aspects of Lhc (cab) proteins. In *Oxygenic Photosynthesis: The Light Reactions*, D. R. Ort and C. F. Yocum, eds., Kluwer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp. 523–538.

Neftel, A., Friedle, H., Moor, E., Lötscher, H., Oeschger, H., Siegenthaler, U., and Stauffer, B. (1994) Historical CO_2 record from the Siple Station ice core. In *Trends '93: A Compendium of Data on Global Change* (ORNL/CDIAC-65), T. A. Boden, D. P. Kaiser, R. J. Sepanski, and F. W. Stoss, eds., Carbon Dioxide Information Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN, pp. 11–15.

Nishio, J. N., Sun, J., and Vogelmann, T. C. (1993) Carbon fixation gradients across spinach leaves do not follow internal light gradient. *Plant Cell* 5: 953–961.

Ort, D. R., and Baker, N. R. (1988) Consideration of photosynthetic efficiency at low light as a major determinant of crop photosynthetic performance. *Plant Physiol. Biochem.* 26: 555–565.

Osmond, C. B. (1994) What is photoinhibition? Some insights from comparisons of shade and sun plants. In *Photoinhibition of Photosynthesis: From Molecular Mechanisms to the Field*. N. R. Baker and J. R. Bowyer, eds., BIOS Scientific, Oxford, pp. 1–24.

Pearcy, R. W., Gross, L. J., and He, D. (1997) An improved dynamic model of photosynthesis for estimation of carbon gain in sunfleck light regimes. *Plant Cell Environ*. 20: 411–424.

Richter, T., and Fukshansky, L. (1996) Optics of a bifacial leaf: 2. Light regime as affected by leaf structure and the light source. *Photochem. Photobiol.* 63: 517–527.

Rupert, C. S., and Letarjet, R. (1978) Toward a nomenclature and dosimetric scheme applicable to all radiations. *Photochem. Photobiol.* 28: 3–5.

Sage, R. F., and Sharkey, T. D. (1987) The effect of temperature on the occurrence of O_2 and CO_2 insensitive photosynthesis in field grown plants. *Plant Physiol.* 84: 658–664.

. 125: 2001–2006.

Smith, H. (1986). The perception of light quality. In *Photomorphogenesis in Plants*, R. E. Kendrick and G. H. M. Kronenberg, eds., Nijhoff, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp. 187–217.

Smith, H. (1994). Sensing the light environment: The functions of the phytochrome family. In *Photomorphogenesis in Plants*, 2nd ed., R. E. Kendrick and G. H. M. Kronenberg, eds., Nijhoff, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp. 377–416.

Terashima, I. (1992) Anatomy of non-uniform leaf photosynthesis. *Photosynth. Res.* 31: 195–212.

Terashima, I., and Hikosaka, K. (1995) Comparative ecophysiology of leaf and canopy photosynthesis. *Plant Cell Environ.* 18: 1111–1128.

Tlalka, M., and Fricker, M. (1999) The role of calcium in blue-light-dependent chloroplast movement in *Lemna trisulca* L. *Plant J.* 20: 461–473.

Vogelmann, T. C. (1993) Plant tissue optics. *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Biol.* 44: 231–251.

Vogelmann, T. C., and Björn, L. O. (1983) Response to directional light by leaves of a sun-tracking lupine (*Lupinus succulentus*). *Physiol. Plant.* 59: 533–538.

Vogelmann, T. C., and Han, T. (2000) Measurement of gradients of absorbed light in spinach leaves from chlorophyll fluorescence profiles. *Plant Cell Environ.* 23: 1303–1311.

Vogelmann, T. C., Bornman, J. F., and Yates, D. J. (1996) Focusing of light by leaf epidermal cells. *Physiol. Plant.* 98: 43–56.

von Caemmerer, S. (2000) *Biochemical Models of Leaf Photosynthesis*. CSIRO, Melbourne, Australia.