Author's Proof

Chapter 12 1 **Nitrogen and Stress** ²

Annie P. Jangam and N. Raghuram ³

[AU1] Nitrogen is an important macroelement for plant growth. However, plant can't use 4 atmospheric nitrogen as such and depend on its availability in more reactive forms ⁵ such as urea, nitrate, ammonium, amino acids, etc. Even legumes depend on symbi- $_6$ otic N-fixing bacteria to convert N_2 into ammonium ions to meet their N requirements. Therefore, the term nitrogen (N) is used in this review to represent a broad 8 range of reactive species of N compounds. In agricultural soils, N compounds and 9 other nutrients have to be constantly replenished as fertilizers/manures to enable ¹⁰ repetitive cropping. As N fertilizers are expensive, N-use efficiency becomes an ¹¹ important determinant of crop productivity. 12

Since precision farming techniques to balance the plant nutrient demand with fer- ¹³ tilizer supply are not accessible/affordable to farmers in developing countries, the $_{14}$ actual availability of N to the crop plant varies from N-deficient state to N-excess 15 state, depending on prevailing fertilizing practices. Both these states can cause nutri- ¹⁶ ent stress to the plant. In addition, loss of reactive N species from the soil-plant system causes widespread environmental stresses, not only through N pollution of $_{18}$ ground water and surface water bodies affecting health, biodiversity, and ecosystem ¹⁹ services but also through air pollution and climate change (Sutton and Bleeker 2013). 20 [AU2] In fact, N₂O as a greenhouse gas is 300 times more potent than $CO₂$ (Galloway et al. 21) 2008), though carbon dominates the entire climate change discussion. Climate change ²² itself causes/exacerbates abiotic stresses to the plant and its N status (Fig. 12.1). $_{23}$

> Nitrogen-use efficiency is therefore not only an economic problem of optimizing 24 input costs to the farmer but also an environmental problem of preventing accumula- ²⁵ tion of reactive N species outside the agroecosystem. Accordingly, the relationship $_{26}$ between plant, nitrogen, and stress is twofold: nutritional stress in terms of plant 27 growth/development/productivity due to variation in N availability or climate and ²⁸

G.K. Pandey (ed.), *Elucidation of Abiotic Stress Signaling in*

Plants, DOI 10.1007/978-1-4939-2540-7_12

A.P. Jangam \cdot N. Raghuram (\boxtimes)

School of Biotechnology, Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Sector 16C, Dwarka, New Delhi, Delhi, India e-mail: [raghuram98@hotmail.com](mailto:%20raghuram98@hotmail.com)

[©] Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2015

A.P. Jangam and N. Raghuram

Fig. 12.1 Relationship between nutrient stress, abiotic stress, and resourceuse efficiency

- N-induced environmental stress (and climate change that in turn affects the plant),
- which can be exacerbated due to N-inefficient cultivars and/or practices. The primary focus of this book chapter is nutritional stress, but N-use efficiency is a common
- concern that links both nutritional and environmental aspects of reactive nitrogen.
-

12.1 Nitrogen Nutrition and N-Use Efficiency

 Nitrogen-use efficiency has been defined in many different ways by agronomists, physiologists, and others (Good et al. 2004; Pathak et al. 2008; Hirose 2011). The simplest among them is total biomass or grain yield per unit N fertilizer added (or N available in the soil). Improvement in NUE is possible to some extent by non- plant interventions such as the choice of fertilizer and method/timing of its applica- tion and other crop management practices. But only biological avenues for crop improvement are the main focus of this article, whether in relation to NUE or stress resistance. Plants show improved NUE in N-limiting conditions (Kant et al. 2011). In other words, a plant that gives the same or higher agronomic output with lesser N input is considered more N-use efficient than the plant that needs higher N input. [AU3]⁴⁴ But what constitutes yield varies from crop to crop, such as grains in cereals or leaves/fruits/tubers in vegetables, and accordingly what constitutes NUE and how to improve it in each case (see Chardon et al. 2012 for a recent review). This is also often true for stress resistance, if it is measured in terms of the impact of stress on yield, keeping in view the multiplicity of stresses involved. Unfortunately, many of the high-yielding and/or upmarket varieties of the green revolution era were neither designed for N-use efficiency nor stress resistance, whereas the farmers selected traditional cultivars that were more robust to such factors, even if they yielded less. This means that crop improvement strategies for NUE and stress resistance cannot be limited to the narrow germplasm of high-yielding varieties and have to include the wild/traditional varieties. It is well known that NUE is an inherited, multigenic, quantitative trait. A study of natural variation of N uptake and metabolism in 18 accessions of Arabidopsis under high- and low-N conditions showed that while plants may vary in the way they respond to high- or low-N conditions, their NUE remained similar, indicating that NUE as a trait is exclusively genetically determined (Chardon et al. 2010,

2012). However, the multiplicity of the definitions of NUE, combined with its poor

12 Nitrogen and Stress Author's Proof

biological characterization at the phenotypic or genotypic level makes it difficult to 61 study the impact of stress on NUE. Nevertheless, any discussion on nitrogen and 62 stress has to be understood in terms of the impact of abiotic or nutritional stress on 63 NUE. For example, elevated $CO₂$ could enhance NUE in some cases (Shimono and $_{64}$) Bunce 2009), while heat or water stress could adversely impact NUE (Harrigan ⁶⁵ et al. 2009), as does wasteful use of N fertilizer. Understanding the various mecha- ⁶⁶ nisms underlying these complex interactions will equip us with the means to main- ⁶⁷ tain crop productivity in a changing climate. 68

12.1.1 Nitrogen Uptake and Metabolism 69

Plant nitrogen (N) nutrition is a complex and dynamic process, as the plant has to be 70 able to assimilate various forms/amounts of nitrogen in fluctuating micro- and mac- ⁷¹ roenvironments. This can happen even in fertilized soils, depending on the soil N 72 status, nature of the fertilizer used (organic/inorganic), the frequency of their appli- ⁷³ cation, and the action of nitrifying bacteria in the soil. Organic N sources (manures 74 urea) are broken down by nitrifying bacteria to inorganic compounds such as nitrates ⁷⁵ and ammonium salts, which are the preferred forms of N uptake for most plants, $\frac{76}{6}$ though amino acids can be used under extremely N-poor and cold conditions. ⁷⁷

Plants uptake nitrate primarily through the high-/low-affinity transport systems $\frac{78}{6}$ (HATS/LATS) in the roots and are mostly inducible by nitrate and regulated by its ⁷⁹ downstream metabolites, hormones, stress, etc., except the constitutive HATS (Tsay 80 et al. 2007). The signaling mechanisms involved in the nitrate regulation of NO_3 81 transporter genes need to be elucidated fully, although few genes in Arabidopsis ⁸² (NRT1.1, NLP7, and CIPK8) have been suggested to play a crucial role (Castaings 83 et al. 2009). NRT1.1 is termed "transceptor" since it is both a transporter as well as $_{84}$ [AU4] a receptor for N signal (Gojon et al. 2011). There are also transporters for ammo- ⁸⁵ nium and urea, but their relative contribution to the overall external N acquisition by $_{86}$ plants and their regulation are far less understood, despite the growing interest (Vert 87) and Chory 2009; Näsholm et al. 2009; Bouguyon et al. 2012; Wang et al. 2012). ⁸⁸ Some aspects of N transport under situations of stress have been mentioned later in $_{89}$ this chapter, but one can expect a lot more activity in this area in the coming years. ₉₀

The N compounds taken up by the roots are distributed throughout the plant, 91 where they enter the cellular nitrate assimilatory pathway. Nitrate is reduced in the $_{92}$ cytosol by the enzyme nitrate reductase to nitrite, which is transported to the chlo- ⁹³ roplast, where it is further reduced to ammonium ions by nitrite reductase. The ⁹⁴ ammonium ions are incorporated into organic acids to form amino acids, through ⁹⁵ [AU5] the glutamine synthase and glutamate synthetase (GS-GOGAT cycle) and various ⁹⁶ transaminases. This is the primary N metabolic pathway in plants, but secondary N_{97} remobilization can occur during senescence, in which cytosolic isoforms of GS and ⁹⁸ GOGAT also play important roles (Xu et al. 2012). Secondary N remobilization to $_{99}$ recycle nutrients from senescing leaves could be of critical importance for grain 100 filling and yield in cereal crops (Kichey et al. 2007). Signaling mechanisms play a 101 key role in N metabolic regulation to optimize the N budget under varying situa- ¹⁰² tions of plant N demand and supply. 103

A.P. Jangam and N. Raghuram

Fig. 12.2 Overlap between N stress, hormones, and N sensing, uptake, and assimilation

12.1.2 Signaling in N Metabolic Regulation

 Nitrate is not only a nutrient but also a signal for plant metabolic regulation, growth, and development (Stitt 1999). Other forms of N such as ammonium and glutamine have also been shown to have signaling roles, but nitrate remains the best-studied form of N signal, both at the local and systemic levels. Locally, it affects root growth, seed dormancy, and flowering time, but also has systemic effects on an organism-wide basis (Ho and Tsay 2010). For example, nitrate has been shown to induce genome- wide changes in gene expression in model plants such as Arabidopsis (Wang et al. 2003; Scheible et al. 2004), rice (Lian et al. 2006; Cai et al. 2012), maize (Trevisan et al. 2011), and tomato (Wang et al. 2001), involving hundreds, if not thousands, of genes. They include various nitrate transporters, enzymes of nitrate assimilation, car- bon and redox metabolism, several protein kinases, cytochrome families, transcription factors, etc. The search for nitrate response elements (NREs) in the upstream sequences of a few nitrate-responsive genes has not yet produced a universally accepted consen- sus sequence that accounts for most, if not all nitrate-responsive genes found to date (Das et al. 2007; Konishi and Yanagisawa 2010, 2011; Pathak et al. 2011; Krapp et al. 2014). Similarly, several transcription factors are implicated in mediating nitrate response, such as ANR1, DOF1/2, LDB37/38/39, NLP6/7, and SPL9 (reviewed in 122 Krapp et al. 2014), and further research is needed to narrow them down. It is believed that the combinatorial action of local and systemic signaling deter-

 mines the ability of a plant to adapt to fluctuating environments (Krouk et al. 2011; Alvarez et al. 2012; Huang et al. 2012). However, the mechanism of nitrate signal- ing continues to evade scientists for several decades. Signaling is also involved in stress response, whether due to N deficiency/excess or due to other abiotic stresses, impinging on N metabolic regulation. The pathways for stress and nutrient signaling may either be separate or shared, depending on the specific stress in question, which will further define whether manipulation of one will impact the response to the other (Fig. 12.2). This is an issue of crucial agronomic relevance, which can only be addressed when the signaling mechanisms connecting N metabolic regulation and stress are better elucidated. Some developments in this regard are elaborated below.

12 Nitrogen and Stress **12.2 12.2 Nitrogen and Stress** 134

Nitrogen stress is caused by extreme fluctuations in the soil N level or due to the 135 formation of nitroso compounds in the plant as a consequence of other stresses. The ¹³⁶ normal intracellular nitrate concentration is in the micromolar range and soil N concentration up to multi-millimolar range fall within the nutritional range (and there- ¹³⁸ fore also the tolerance range) of most plants. N-limitation or N-deficiency stress 139 occurs when soil N levels fall below the sub-millimolar range, eventually leading to ¹⁴⁰ N starvation. N-excess conditions require N levels to increase beyond 40 mM , 141 though the precise threshold varies depending on the plant, duration of exposure, ¹⁴² soil type, organic content, microbial activity, cropping practices, and climate. 143

Plants respond in many different ways to changes in N provision (Krouk et al. ¹⁴⁴ 2010; Kraiser et al. 2011; Kant et al. 2011). Their responsiveness to N availability ¹⁴⁵ depends on both genotype and the interaction of genotype with N fertilization level ¹⁴⁶ (Gallais and Hirel 2004; Chardon et al. 2010). They can adjust their molecular ¹⁴⁷ machinery in accordance with N nutritional status or abiotic stress, often rapidly 148 and sometimes indefinitely (Krapp and Kaiser 2010). For example, plants respond 149 to N starvation or deficiency by changes such as increase in the root to shoot ratio 150 by enhancing lateral root growth or suppressing shoot growth or early senescence of 151 leaves (Marschner 1995). Characterization of the machinery responsible for N 152 homeostasis in stress helps to identify appropriate sites of intervention for crop improvement. This machinery includes, but is not limited to, the affinity-based N_{154} transport systems such as LATS and HATS, which can be reprogrammed to achieve 155 N homeostasis at the local or whole plant level. Several studies have shown that the 156 root uptake capacities for nitrate, ammonia, and urea are strongly downregulated 157 under conditions of N excess and upregulated during N starvation or N limitation 158 (Tsay et al. 2007; Nacry et al. 2013). However, going beyond transporters, it seems ¹⁵⁹ that the limiting steps in plant N metabolism are different under high and low N $_{160}$ levels (Coque and Gallais 2006). Moreover, while studies that report "high" N often 161 do not make clear distinction between N sufficiency and N excess, studies that 162 report "low" N either deal with N limitation or N starvation but not both, making it $_{163}$ necessary to discuss them in their own separate context. 164

12.2.1 Nitrogen Starvation/Limitation ¹⁶⁵

[AU6] Nitrogen-starved plants show shunted growth; chlorosis; poor yield; poor pigmenta- 166 tion due to carbohydrate accumulation, anthocyanin induction, and phenylpropanoid 167 biosynthesis; and decreased photosynthesis, leaf number, and overall plant develop- 168 **ment.** Studies in which nitrate was supplied to nitrate-starved plants like Arabidopsis 169 and rice (Wang et al. 2000, 2003; Scheible et al. 2004; Lian et al. 2006; Cai et al. ¹⁷⁰ 2012) showed the involvement of genes from N/C metabolism, redox metabolism, ¹⁷¹ hormonal response, etc. Many gene families such as cytochrome, protein kinases, 172

and hormone/nutrient transporter were differentially regulated by nitrate in both rice 173

174 and Arabidopsis (Cai et al. 2012). Various N transporters such as NRT2.1 and NRT2.2 for nitrate; AMT1.1, AMT1.2, and AMT1.3 for ammonia (Tsay et al. 2007); and DUR3 for urea (Kojima et al. 2007) were differentially regulated by N source/avail- ability/concentration. The expression of GLN and GDH genes (Masclaux-Daubresse et al. 2005) were also altered during N starvation. The possible role of NLP7 as a key regulator in N-starved conditions has been suggested recently (Marchive et al. 2013). Studies in Arabidopsis and maize have shown that chronic N limitation elicits a genome-wide response and the genes involved are far more differentially regulated than genes supplied with sufficient N (Bi et al. 2007; Wu et al. 2011).

 In the low concentration range such as 1 μM, high-affinity transport systems (HATS) are able to scavenge ions from the soil. During N starvation or limitation, NRT1.1 represses lateral root in Arabidopsis by remobilizing auxin, mimicking the role of an auxin transporter (Krouk et al. 2010). Low concentrations of ammonia have also been known to strongly regulate nitrate transport systems. NRT1.1 mutant studies have shown that a protein kinase CIPK23 phosphorylates NRT1.1 during nitrate limitation, thereby influencing primary nitrate response (Ho et al. 2009). The rate of N uptake in roots is determined by ionic concentration (Tsay et al. 2007), which is influenced by various stress conditions (Segonzac et al. 2007). Recently, it was reported that in maize, N-deficiency stress resembled the response of plants to a number of other biotic and abiotic stresses, in terms of transcript, protein, and metabolite accumulation (Amiour et al. 2012). In rice, two proteins, fibrillin and hairpin-binding protein, have been identified previously as N-deficiency stress-responsive proteins (Song et al. 2011; Amiour et al. 2012).

12.2.2 Nitrogen Excess

 In natural and in well-managed agricultural soils, excess N concentrations are rarely found for long, due to microbial conversions, surface runoff, volatilization, or leach- ing, apart from plant uptake. For example, although urea application in excess of 100 kg/ha is very common in intensively cultivated areas, its effective concentra- tions are often <70 mM in agricultural soils (Wang et al. 2008). Reaching far higher concentrations that contribute to nonspecific osmotic stress effects is only possible when other solutes are also high, such as in saline soils. This is also true for the con- version products of urea, viz., nitrate/nitrite/ammonium, whose ionic effects saturate in the millimolar range, and they rarely reach 100-fold levels needed to have any osmotic effect on their own. However, they can influence the pH of the soil tempo- rarily, though the extent and duration of that influence on the soil as well as on the plant depend on the soil type/conditions and the plant itself. In any case, the ionic/ pH/osmotic effects are indirect and generic effects that are not specific to N and therefore cannot be strictly considered as N stress. Terms such as N "sufficiency" or "excess" or "high N" have to be understood in this context, as they are often used interconvertibly, mainly to contrast with N limitation/starvation (Fig. 12.3). Genes from transporter families have shown altered gene expression during chronic N stress probably because plants need to adjust to the varying levels of N

12 Nitrogen and Stress

Fig. 12.3 Nitrogen stress caused by nitrogen starvation/ excess and nitrosative stress

available to plants. In the high concentration range, the activity of low-affinity ²¹⁶ transport systems (LATS) from the large family of transporters for nitrate (NRT1) 217 and peptides (PTR) plays a major role (Tsay et al. 2007). Unlike with the HATS, the 218 LATS-mediated nitrate or ammonia uptake (or influx) does not saturate and shows 219 a generally linear increase with increasing external concentration (Touraine and ²²⁰ Class 1997; Nacry et al. 2013). But they could accumulate in plant cells, unless their ²²¹ assimilation can match the uptake. This necessitates a mechanism to regulate 222 cytosolic nitrate concentration, which is provided by a nitrate-inducible efflux sys- ²²³ tem that prevents excessive accumulation of nitrate in the cell (Miller et al. 2007). ²²⁴ An efflux transporter, NAXT1, was recently identified belonging to the NRT1/PTR 225 family of transporters (Segonzac et al. 2007; Chapman and Miller 2011). ²²⁶

Plants also have a capacity to store N in vacuoles as a way of balancing between 227 uptake, assimilation, and translocation to other parts of the plant and minimize ²²⁸ losses through efflux/volatilization. Some vegetables grown under excess N condi- ²²⁹ tions have a tendency to accumulate N (Chen et al. 2004 ; Anjana et al. 2007) that 230 enters our food chain. There is a growing attention toward the adverse health effects ²³¹ of excessive dietary exposure to nitrate and other forms of reactive N, including ²³² methemoglobinemia, gastric cancer, respiratory ailments, cardiac disease, etc. ²³³ (Townsend et al. 2003; Anjana and Iqbal 2007). ²³⁴

12.2.3 Nitrosative Stress ²³⁵

Reactive nitrogen species (RNS) include NO and related molecules such as ²³⁶ *S*-nitrosothiols (SNOs), *S*-nitrosoglutathione (GSNO), peroxynitrite (ONOO[−]), ²³⁷ dinitrogen trioxide (N_2O_3) , and nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) . During adverse environmental conditions, these molecules can cause stress to plants, which is designated 239 as nitrosative stress (Fig. 12.3). This can combine with the stress caused by reactive ²⁴⁰

 oxygen species (ROS) to form nitro-oxidative stress in plants. Like ROS, the role of RNS signaling has been implicated in many abiotic stresses such as salinity, water stress, temperature stress, and UV radiation. Evidence for RNS signaling in certain abiotic stresses like salinity and heat stress was strictly species or treatment specific, and the literature is inconclusive, if not contradictory (Corpas et al. 2011). In other stresses such as UV-radiation and ozone stress, there is a marked increase in the 247 activity of RNS species, which leads to cell death (Corpas et al. 2011). The role of RNS signaling needs to be studied further to understand the changes in plant physi-ology under stress.

²⁵⁰ **12.3 Nitrogen in Abiotic Stresses**

 Nitrogen availability depends on plant–soil–microbe interactions, whereas nitrogen acquisition is basically driven by transpiration, which is in turn affected by tempera- ture and levels of CO2. Climate change models predict that elevated levels of green 254 house gases (GHGs) like $CO₂$, CH₄, and N₂O cause increased variability in tempera- ture, humidity, precipitation, wind velocity, and photosynthetically active radiation, all leading to major abiotic stresses such as drought, heat/cold stress, waterlogging, etc. (IPCC 2007; Bloom et al. 2010). All these stresses affect plant phenology and also alter nitrogen availability and its uptake/retention (Fig. 12.4). For example, Borner et al. (2008) observed that the snow depth in tundra regions affect N mineral- ization directly. Volatilization of reactive N from the plant further contributes to GHG accumulation, completing the vicious cycle. The role of reactive N in plant stress can be understood in the context of specific stresses as given below or integrated into a network of multiple interacting stresses, as elaborated later in this chapter.

12 Nitrogen and Stress *12.3.1 N in Elevated CO² and NO²* ²⁶⁴

Continuous exposure to elevated atmospheric $CO₂$ may result in stomatal closure, $_{265}$ adversely affecting the rate of transpiration and therefore nutrient uptake of the ²⁶⁶ plants, leading to nutrient N deficiency stress. Decrease in activities of assimilatory ²⁶⁷ enzymes such as nitrate reductase (Ferrario-Méry et al. 1997) and RuBisCO (Bloom 268 et al. 2010) was also observed. However, brief exposure to elevated $CO₂$ showed γ_{69} enhanced activities of NR and GSA in cucumber and sunflower leaves (Aguera et al. 270 2006). Inhibition of photorespiration-dependent nitrate assimilation (Rachmilevitch 271 et al. 2004) is also observed at higher levels of $CO₂$. Elevated $CO₂$ is known to 272 enhance photosynthesis in C3 plants and improve NUE (Shimono and Bunce 2009). ²⁷³ The form of N used under various $CO₂$ concentrations affect the nutrients and their $_{274}$ distribution in the plant (Natali et al. 2009). For example, wheat plants supplied with 275 ammonium salts as a source of N were more N responsive under elevated $CO₂$ concentrations, in terms of nutrient accumulation, yield, and yield components, as com- 277 pared to those supplied with nitrate (Carlisle et al. 2012 and references therein). 278

Nitrogen dioxide can be absorbed and utilized by the plants in small quantities 279 for assimilation (Mokhele et al. 2012) and therefore elevated $NO₂$ causes some 280 increase in intracellular nitrate concentration (Qiao and Murray 1998). On the other 281 hand, reduction of ambient $NO₂$ level has no effect on the organic N content of the $_{282}$ plants or on the amount or rate of N uptake in the plants. ²⁸³

12.3.2 N in Water and Salt Stress

Drought stress alone is projected to double in future, which will lead to loss of yield 285 (IPCC 2007). While photosynthesis can be maintained under fluctuations of water 286 supply (Lightfoot et al. 2007), water deficit can alter the C and N transformations by $_{287}$ bringing about changes in the soil–microbe interactions such as reducing the activ- ²⁸⁸ ity of nitrifying bacteria (StClair and Lynch 2010 and references therein). This is ²⁸⁹ evident from the inhibition of nitrogen fixation in legume crops during C and N $_{290}$ fluxes under drought (Ladrera et al. 2007; Rogers et al. 2009). ²⁹¹

The effect of drought on leaf N status remains uncertain, as it was reported to 292 increase in *Malus domestica* (Jie et al. 2010), decrease in *Prunus persica* (Dichio ²⁹³ [AU7] et al. 2007), and be unaffected in *Querus* (Li et al. 2013). However, a recent tran- ²⁹⁴ scriptome study suggests the interactive effects on the genome-wide impact of 295 drought and N limitation in maize (Humbert et al. 2013). It studied 30 conditions ²⁹⁶ involving three major parameters such as organ (leaf, root, or stem), nitrogen supply 297 (optimal or chronic limitation), and water supply (optimal supply, mild water stress ²⁹⁸ by withdrawal for 3 days, severe water stress by withdrawal for 5 days, and recovery 299 from severe stress by rewatering for 2 h or 5 h). The impact of severe stress was 300 more extensive in root and stem than in leaf, in terms of the number of spots/genes 301 affected. The pathways most affected were sucrose and starch metabolism, Calvin ³⁰² cycle, proline, and asparagine biosynthesis. Both photosynthetic assimilation and ³⁰³

 nitrate assimilation were shown to be downregulated. The effect of water withdrawal and nitrogen limitation on ammonium assimilation was tissue specific; the tran- scripts for glutamine and glutamate synthases were more in leaf as compared to stem and root. This study also shows that while nitrogen limitation has very little impact on the transcriptome on its own (0.2 % of the spots), even mild water stress makes the plant more vulnerable to N limitation, affecting the expression of a much larger number of genes (Humbert et al. 2013). These observations need to be validated in other plants before wider generalizations could be made. However, studying such interactive effects could be useful to optimize NUE along with water-use efficiency (WUE) (Di Paolo and Rinaldi 2008). On the other hand, heavy use of N fertilizers regardless of the water regime can be detrimental on grain filling and drought toler-ance (Humbert et al. 2013 and references therein).

 Drought tolerance genes contribute to greater NUE because they improve bio- mass production over an extended range of soil moisture availability and weather conditions (Harrigan et al. 2009). The traits for drought stress include yield poten- tial, WUE, harvest index (HI), improved transpiration efficiency, and deep root pen-etration (to access water and nutrients), all of which are relevant to NUE as well.

 Flooding is another form of water stress that is expected to increase due to climate change. Waterlogging affects \sim 10 % of the global land area and an esti- mated 10 million hectares of land in developing countries. It can cause a wide vari- ety of symptoms that can affect yield either directly or indirectly, through affecting leaf senescence, tiller number, and reduced plant height. While N availability could increase under situations in which floods bring silt and nutrients along, it could also decrease in situations where topsoil and fertilizer N are lost or diluted out. Other parameters such as temperature could also result in interactive effects.

 Salinity is one of the major abiotic stresses that lower the yield and usually is accompanied by water stress. The impact of salt stress is dependent on the cultivar/ organ/developmental stage and the degree of salt stress. Salinity is known to alter the activities of various enzymes from the N assimilatory pathway like nitrate reductase in leaves than in roots (Mokhele et al. 2012).

12.3.3 N in Heat and Cold Stress

 Accumulation of greenhouse gases (carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide) in 336 the earth's atmosphere is expected to warm up the earth's surface by $1.8-4$ °C by the 337 end of this century (IPCC 2007). Rising temperatures of both soil and air could alter the rate of water and nitrogen uptake due to their effect on rate of transpiration and soil moisture respectively (Dong et al. 2001). Elevated temperatures also alter N allocation, reduce foliar N concentration and carbohydrate content (Tjoelker et al. 1999), damage photosynthetic membranes and cause chlorophyll loss decreasing leaf photosynthetic rate, increase embryo abortion, lower grain number, and

decrease grain-filling duration and rates resulting in lower grain yield.

12 Nitrogen and Stress thor's Prool

Globally, leaf N concentrations have been found to vary along altitudinal and 344 latitudinal temperature gradients across plant species or functional groups (Reich 345 and Oleksyn 2004). Foliar N content increases from the tropics to the cooler and ³⁴⁶ drier midlatitudes due to "temperature-related plant physiological stoichiometry 347 and biogeographical gradients in soil substrate age, as well as cold temperature ³⁴⁸ effects on biogeochemistry at high latitudes" (Reich and Oleksyn 2004). 349

Cold stress can produce undesirable responses to nitrogen fertilizers that are often 350 applied in high concentrations to increase yield. For example, high nitrogen supply 351 before/during pollen development aggravates the effect of pollen sterility in rice in 352 extreme cold conditions (Gunawardena et al. 2003). Low temperatures are also 353 known to inactivate RuBisCO carboxylase by *S*-nitrosylation (Corpas et al. 2011). 354

12.3.4 N in UV and Other Stresses 355

Enhanced exposure to UV is one of the consequences of climate change. Plant N $_{356}$ uptake and assimilation are significantly inhibited at high levels of UV-B radiation. ³⁵⁷ Excessive UV light along with nutrient deficiencies can lead to photooxidative 358 stress, which is worsened further in other environmental stresses such as metal tox- ³⁵⁹ icity (Lynch and StClair 2004 and the references therein). There is a significant 360 increase in the activity of RNS species under UV-radiation stress as well as under 361 ozone stress, which could lead to cell death (Corpas et al. 2011). ³⁶²

12.3.5 N in Multiple Interacting Stresses 363

Most of the plant stress studies were done changing or observing a single variable 364 factor, i.e., changing $CO₂$, temperature, or water concentrations, but very few stud- 365 ies considered the combinatorial effect of these stresses. Studies show increased ³⁶⁶ concentrations of $CO₂$ can increase the demand for nutrient, but increase in tem- 367 peratures can influence the length of growing season and in turn reduce the demand ³⁶⁸ for nutrients (Nord and Lynch 2009; Mittler and Blumwald 2010). Rice plants 369 exposed to increases levels of $CO₂$ have shown increased sensitivity to cold stress 370 (Shimono and Bunce 2009). Both drought and heat stresses together affect N avail- ³⁷¹ ability storage and remobilization in pine trees (Rennenberg et al. 2009; Huang 372 et al. 2012). The activity of many nitrate-regulated genes is hypothesized to be regu- ³⁷³ lated by light, and evidence shows that both NRT2 and NR activity is dependent on 374 light as well as nitrogen (Lillo 2004, 2008; Chapman and Miller 2011). Thus, 375 mounting evidence suggests that the effect of various abiotic stresses can lead to 376 unanticipated changes in plant growth and development. ³⁷⁷

12.4 Conclusions and Prospects

 There is a growing demand for developing crops with resilience to climate change, abiotic stress, and N-use efficiency for global food security and environmental sus- tainability. While studies on individual stresses and the signaling mechanisms involved in the plant's response to them have made impressive progress, integrative studies are needed that can model the complex interactions between various abiotic stresses and the signaling and/or regulatory events involved in them. Similarly, in the area of N-response and N-use efficiency, integration of crop genetics and func- tional genomics approaches have begun to make rapid strides, but the links between nitrogen and stress remain peripheral, especially at the level of signaling and regula- tory interface of stress and N, except in the area of nitrosative stress. This calls for new synergies to be forged between research on abiotic stress and resource-use efficiency in general and N-use efficiency in particular, to identify some common signaling aspects or regulatory targets for developing not only stress-resistant and climate-resilient crops but also N-use-efficient or resource-use-efficient crops.

 Crop improvement through QTL mapping and marker-assisted selection/breeding seems to be a promising route in this regard. Extensive studies in various plants have lead to the mapping of many agronomic traits such NUE, yield, biomass, N uptake, and remobilization (Habash et al. 2007; Fontaine et al. 2009). The possibility of co- localization of multiple agronomically important QTLs is an increasingly attractive avenue to explore in this regard. For example, in tropical maize, QTLs for grain yield and secondary traits were identified under varying N and water supply, some of 400 which were found to be co-localized (Ribaut et al.). More efforts in this direc- tion can be enabled by suitable national policies and intergovernmental cooperation for germplasm exchange and collaboration. The role of public sector may prove to be at least as crucial as that of the private sector in facilitating affordable access to such technologies for the farmers, breeders, and consumers alike.

[AU8]⁴⁰⁵ **References**

- health implications—a review. Agron Sustain Dev 27:45–57
- Anjana SU, Iqbal M, Abrol YP (2007) Are nitrate concentrations in leafy vegetables within safe limits? Curr Sci 92:355–360

12 Nitrogen and Stress

12 Nitrogen and Stress
Author's Proof

A.P. Jangam and N. Raghuram

Author Queries

Chapter No.: 12 0002476867

