



Photosynthetic Light Response of Tanzania Grass under Four Levels of Leaf Temperature

A. C. L. de Mello

Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

P. M. Santos

Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

Carlos G. S. Pedreira

Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

M. Corsi

Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

C. T. dos S. Dias

Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uknowledge.uky.edu/igc>



Part of the [Plant Sciences Commons](#), and the [Soil Science Commons](#)

This document is available at <https://uknowledge.uky.edu/igc/19/1/28>

This collection is currently under construction.

The XIX International Grassland Congress took place in São Pedro, São Paulo, Brazil from February 11 through February 21, 2001.

Proceedings published by Fundacao de Estudos Agrarios Luiz de Queiroz

PHOTOSYNTHETIC LIGHT RESPONSE OF TANZANIA GRASS UNDER FOUR LEVELS OF LEAF TEMPERATURE

A.C.L. de Mello¹, P.M. Santos¹, C. G. S. Pedreira¹, M. Corsi¹ and C.T. dos S. Dias²

¹ Department of Animal Production, ESALQ - USP, Av. Pádua Dias, 11, Piracicaba – SP, Brasil

² Department of Exact Sciences, ESALQ - USP, Av. Pádua Dias, 11, Piracicaba – SP, Brasil

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to establish photosynthetic light response curves for Tanzania grass (*Panicum maximum* Jacq.) under four leaf temperature levels. Photosynthetic rate was measured as a response to levels of photosynthetic photon flux density (PPFD) on the youngest fully expanded leaves of 12 representative tillers with an infra red gas analyzer. The effect of PPFD was tested for each leaf temperature level in a randomized complete block design. Photosynthetic light response curves were adjusted for each leaf temperature using a non-linear hyperbolic model. The maximum photosynthetic response was 25,59; 31,43; 34,57 and 27,53 $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for 25, 30, 35 and 40 °C of leaf temperature, respectively. Although light saturation was not attained, response to light increments declined with light levels higher than 1000 – 2000 $\mu\text{mol photon m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, and the response curve approximated saturation slowly. Photosynthetic rates of Tanzania grass depend on light and temperature level and these must be considered when modelling crop yield potential.

Keywords: Photosynthesis, photosynthetic photon flux density

Introduction

Pasture-based livestock production depends on soil, plant, animal, and environmental factors. Simulation models are useful tools to integrate all these information and help on decision analysis, but require information on plant responses to environment.

Dynamic simulation models for livestock production on temperate pastures have been developed, but much information is lacking on most tropical forages. This characterizes a gap in international literature on adequate information related to tropical forages and their physiological responses to management. According to Boote & Tollenaar (1994), photosynthesis is one of the characteristics that must be considered when modelling crop yield potential.

The purpose of this work was to describe photosynthetic light response curves for Tanzânia grass under four leaf temperature levels.

Material and Methods

The experiment was carried out on an irrigated Tanzania grass pasture at Piracicaba, SP, Brazil (Lat. 22°42'30''S, Long. 47°38'30''W) on February 2000. The soil was previously fertilized with P, K, Ca Mg and micronutrients to ensure adequate nutrient availability. The pasture was rotationally grazed (3 days grazing and 33 days rest) and 80 kg N ha⁻¹ was supplied after each grazing.

Net photosynthetic rate (AP) was measured at twelve levels of photosynthetic photon flux density (PPFD, $\mu\text{mol photon m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$) under four leaf temperature levels, on the youngest fully expanded leaves of 12 representative tillers (3 per temperature level) with a model LI-6400 infra-red gas analyzer (LI-COR, Inc). Leaf temperature was set at the gas analyzer main console and monitored automatically inside the leaf chamber.

For initial determination of light responses, a steady-state rate of photosynthesis was obtained at the desired temperature (25, 30, 35 or 40 °C) and 3000 $\mu\text{mol photon m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$. Measurements were then made at 12 PPFD levels ranging from high (3000 $\mu\text{mol photon m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$) to low (250 $\mu\text{mol photon.m}^{-2}.\text{s}^{-1}$) at 250 $\mu\text{mol photon.m}^{-2}.\text{s}^{-1}$ intervals.

The effect of PPFD was tested for each leaf temperature level in a randomized complete block design with 12 treatments (PPFD levels) and three replications (3 leaves). Analysis of variance was conducted and a photosynthetic light response curve was adjusted for each leaf temperature with a non-linear hyperbolic model using the SAS system (SAS, 1989).

Results and Discussion

The following photosynthetic light response curves were adjusted (AP is expressed in $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and PPFD in $\mu\text{mol photon m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$):

- T 25 °C \Rightarrow AP = (25,59 * PPFD) / (448,48 + PPFD); $R^2 = 0,97$
- T 30 °C \Rightarrow AP = (31,43 * PPFD) / (383,21 + PPFD); $R^2 = 0,96$
- T 35 °C \Rightarrow AP = (34,57 * PPFD) / (449,54 + PPFD); $R^2 = 0,95$
- T 40 °C \Rightarrow AP = (27,53 * PPFD) / (663,70 + PPFD); $R^2 = 0,83$

The maximum photosynthetic responses predicted by the model were 25,59; 31,43; 34,57; and 27,53 $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for 25, 30, 35 and 40 °C of leaf temperature, respectively. Ziska et al. (1999) observed that the photosynthetic rate of *Panicum maximum* at 25 °C, ambient $[\text{CO}_2]$ and saturating PPFD levels (2100 $\mu\text{mol photon m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) were 44,7 $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. This response was higher than that obtained in the present experiment (21,0 $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for 25 °C and 2100 $\mu\text{mol photon m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$), probably due to genetic differences between cultivars or to the controlled conditions used by Ziska et al. (1999) for grass growth.

Light saturation was not attained at 25 or 35 °C (Fig. 1) even under the highest PPFD level (3000 $\mu\text{mol photon m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$). Veenendaal et al. (1993) working with a number C_4 grasses observed that photosynthesis of leaves grown under full sun light showed signs of light saturation above 1100 $\mu\text{mol photon m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$, reaching photosynthesis levels between 25 and 42 $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$. According to Ziska et al. (1999), light saturation point of *Panicum maximum* was near 1600 $\mu\text{mol photon m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$. Although light saturation was not reached in the present work, photosynthetic responses to light were progressively smaller under light levels higher than 1000 – 2000 $\mu\text{mol photon m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$, and light photosynthetic response curve approximated saturation slowly.

It was impossible to compare leaf temperature effects on photosynthesis due to the confounding effect (leaf x temperature effect), but at 40 °C the response was more variable ($R^2 = 0,83$) and maximum photosynthesis tended to be lower (27,53 $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$). The light response curve at 40 °C was not as well defined as for the other temperature levels, probably due to temperature stress. As temperature rises above optimum, photosynthesis begins to decline, at first gradually and reversibly, and then steeply and irreversibly as it rises above a critical value (Powles, 1984). Oberhuber and Edwards (1993) observed that the optimum temperature for *Panicum maximum* was 35 °C.

Photosynthetic rates of Tanzania grass respond to light and temperature levels, and this should be considered when modelling the yield potential of this forage crop. Information on plant physiological responses that have an impact on crop agronomic performance, under varying temperature and light environment, may be valuable in assessing yield potential and decision-making in year-round planning of foraging and feeding strategies in pasture-based livestock systems in the tropics.

Acknowledgements

Financial support from FAPESP is gratefully acknowledged.

References

- Boote, K.J. and Tollenaar M.** (1994) Modelling genetic yield potential. In: Boote, K.J., Bennett J.M., Sinclair T.R. and Paulsen G.M. (eds) *Physiology and Determination of Crop Yield*. Madison, American Society of Agronomy. pp. 533-566.
- Oberhuber, W. and Edwards G.E.** (1993) Temperature dependence of linkage of quantum yield of photosystem II to CO₂ fixation in C₄ and C₃ plants. *Plant Physiology*, **101**: 507-512.
- Powles, S.B.** (1984) Photoinhibition of photosynthesis induced by visible light. *Annual Reviews of Plant Physiology*, **35**: 15-44.
- SAS.** Institute, Inc. **SAS user's guide:** statistics. Cary: Statistical Analysis System Institute, 1989. 846 p.
- Veenendaal, E.M., Shushu D.D. and Scurlock J.M.O.** (1993) Responses to shading of seedlings of savanna grasses (with different C₄ photosynthetic pathways) in Bostwana. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **9**: 213-229.

Ziska, L.H., Sicher R.C. and Bunce J.A. (1999) The impact of elevated carbon dioxide on the growth and gas exchange of three C₄ species differing in CO₂ leak rates. *Physiologia Plantarum*, **105**: 74-80




Figure 1 – Photosynthetic light response curves for Tanzania grass leaves under 25, 30, 35 and 40 °C.