

Journal of Experimental Botany, Vol. 72, No. 11 pp. 3971–3986, 2021 doi:10.1093/jxb/erab144 Advance Access Publication 29 March 2021



## **REVIEW PAPER**

# Cell wall thickness and composition are involved in photosynthetic limitation

Jaume Flexas<sup>1,\*,1,®</sup>, María J. Clemente-Moreno<sup>1,†</sup>, Josefina Bota<sup>1</sup>, Tim J. Brodribb<sup>2</sup>, Jorge Gago<sup>1</sup>, Yusuke Mizokami<sup>3,®</sup>, Miquel Nadal<sup>1,®</sup>, Alicia V. Perera-Castro<sup>1,®</sup>, Margalida Roig-Oliver<sup>1</sup>, Daisuke Sugiura<sup>4,®</sup>, Dongliang Xiong<sup>5,®</sup> and Marc Carriquí<sup>2,†,®</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Group on Plant Biology under Mediterranean Conditions, Institut d'Investigacions Agroambientals i d'Economia de l'Aigua (INAGEA) – Universitat de les Illes Balears (UIB), Ctra Valldemossa Km 7.5., 07122, Palma, Illes Balears, Spain

<sup>2</sup> School of Biological Sciences, University of Tasmania, Hobart, TAS 7001, Australia

<sup>3</sup> Laboratory of Applied Ecology, Tokyo University of Pharmacy and Life Sciences, 1432-1 Horinouchi, Hachioji-shi, Tokyo, 192-0392, Japan

<sup>4</sup> Laboratory of Crop Science, Department of Plant Production Sciences, Graduate School of Bioagricultural Sciences, Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, Aichi, 464-8601, Japan

<sup>5</sup> National Key Laboratory of Crop Genetic Improvement, MOA Key Laboratory of Crop Ecophysiology and Farming System in the Middle Reaches of the Yangtze River, College of Plant Science and Technology, Huazhong Agricultural University, Wuhan, Hubei 430070, China

<sup>†</sup> These authors contributed equally to this work.

\* Correspondence: Jaume.flexas@uib.es

Received 10 February 2021; Editorial decision 24 March 2021; Accepted 25 March 2021

Editor: Pablo Manavella, Instituto de Agrobiotecnología del Litoral, Argentina

# Abstract

The key role of cell walls in setting mesophyll conductance to  $CO_2(g_m)$  and, consequently, photosynthesis is reviewed. First, the theoretical properties of cell walls that can affect  $g_m$  are presented. Then, we focus on cell wall thickness  $(T_{cw})$  reviewing empirical evidence showing that  $T_{cw}$  varies strongly among species and phylogenetic groups in a way that correlates with  $g_m$  and photosynthesis; that is, the thicker the mesophyll cell walls, the lower the  $g_m$  and photosynthesis. Potential interplays of  $g_m$ ,  $T_{cw}$ , dehydration tolerance, and hydraulic properties of leaves are also discussed. Dynamic variations of  $T_{cw}$  in response to the environment and their implications in the regulation of photosynthesis are discussed, and recent evidence suggesting an influence of cell wall composition on  $g_m$  is presented. We then propose a hypothetical mechanism for the influence of cell walls on photosynthesis, combining the effects of thickness and composition, particularly pectins. Finally, we discuss the prospects for using biotechnology for enhancing photosynthesis by altering cell wall-related genes.

**Keywords:** Cell wall composition, cell wall thickness, cellulose, CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion, hemicellulose, land plants, leaf anatomy, mesophyll conductance, pectin.

© The Author(s) 2021. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Society for Experimental Biology. All rights reserved.

For permissions, please email: journals.permissions@oup.com

Abbreviations:  $A_n$ , net assimilation rate; CW, cell wall; D, diffusivity; DT, desiccation tolerance;  $\Delta L$ , apparent diffusion path length;  $\varepsilon$ , bulk modulus of elasticity;  $g_{cw}$ , cell wall conductance to CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion;  $g_m$ , mesophyll conductance to CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion;  $g_s$ , stomatal conductance to CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion; p, cell wall porosity;  $p/\tau$ , effective porosity; PME, pectin methylesterase; PRE, pectin-remodelling enzyme;  $r_{cw}$ , cell wall resistance to CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion;  $S_c/S$ , chloroplast surface area exposed to intercellular air spaces per unit of leaf area;  $T_{cw}$ , mesophyll cell wall thickness;  $\tau$ , tortuosity.

## Introduction

Cell walls (CWs) have a well recognized importance in plant physiology and biotechnology. As such, they are intensively studied from different perspectives. A reflection of their importance is that different aspects of CW biology have been repeatedly reviewed and updated over the last 70 years, for example in the Annual Review series (Frey-Wyssling, 1950; Albersheim et al., 1969; Cleland, 1971; Northcote, 1972; Cassab and Varner, 1988; Popper et al., 2011; Wolf et al., 2012; Anderson and Kieber, 2020) as well as in many other journals, including the Journal of Experimental Botany (e.g. Sarkar et al., 2009; Carpita and McCann, 2015; Sorek and Turner, 2016). Interestingly, among all these reviews, the word 'photosynthesis' is only mentioned by Sarkar et al. (2009), to say that photosynthesis influences CWs, which contrasts with the more recent view that CWs can be crucial in regulating photosynthesis. Hence, the global aim of this review is to highlight the CW as a mechanistic limitation on photosynthesis.

Photosynthesis is an essential plant process, and improving crop photosynthesis is a major goal (Zhu et al., 2010; Ray et al., 2013; Ort et al., 2015) that up to now has been addressed mostly by attempting to modify either stomata (Drake et al., 2013; de Boer et al., 2016; Lawson and Vialet-Chabrand, 2019; de Sousa et al., 2020), Rubisco and Calvin cycle enzymes (Price et al., 2013; Schlüter and Weber, 2016; South et al., 2019), or dynamic sun-shade aspects (Kromdijk et al., 2016). These attempts reflect a long-standing view of the scientific community in which photosynthesis is mainly limited by either stomatal closure or restricted biochemical and photochemical activity. However, it is now widely recognized that mesophyll conductance  $(g_m)$ —the ease of diffusion of CO<sub>2</sub> from substomatal cavities to Rubisco active sites inside chloroplast stroma-plays a similarly important role to those of stomata and photo-biochemistry (Gago et al., 2020a). Indeed, gm often shows the most consistent limitation of photosynthesis across the terrestrial plant phylogeny (Gago et al., 2019; Flexas and Carriquí, 2020).

Mesophyll conductance limits photosynthesis to an extent similar to that exerted by the well-known stomatal and biochemical limitations, which results in a globally significant correlation between net photosynthesis  $(A_n)$  and  $g_m$  (Fig. 1). Because of this, based on standard photosynthesis modelling (Farquhar et al., 1980), it has been estimated that only small improvements (typically 10-30%) in photosynthesis can be expected from alleviating a single limitation alone. Larger improvements require two or more limitations to be alleviated simultaneously (Flexas, 2016; Gago et al., 2019). The optimal combination would improve mesophyll conductance and photo-biochemistry without altering stomatal limitations, achieving simultaneous increases in photosynthesis and photosynthetic water use efficiency (Flexas, 2016; Flexas et al., 2016). Consequently,  $g_m$  is a significant target—alone or in combination with other components of photosynthesis-for



**Fig. 1.** Relationship between net assimilation rate  $(A_n)$  and mesophyll conductance to  $CO_2$  diffusion  $(g_m)$  in  $C_3$  plants. The line represents an exponential standardized major axis (SMA) fit (*y*=42.103  $x^{0.5796}$ ) of the pooled data across all phylogenetic groups (412 entries from 271 species). SMA fittings were performed using the function sma() in the 'smatr' R package. Data and references are available at Dataset S1 at Dryad. Gymnosperm species from Veromann-Jürgenson *et al.* (2020) are also included.

enhancing crop photosynthesis using biotechnological approaches (Flexas *et al.*, 2016; Bailey-Serres *et al.*, 2019).

Although the role of  $g_m$  in determining  $A_n$  is now widely recognized within the scientific community, limitations arise from lack of knowledge of the mechanistic basis of  $g_m$ . Mesophyll conductance is a composite conductance of an intercellular gas phase ( $g_{ias}$ ) and a liquid phase ( $g_{liq}$ ):

$$g_{\rm m} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{g_{\rm iss}} + \frac{RT_{\rm k}}{H \times g_{\rm liq}}}} \tag{1}$$

where  $H/(RT_k)$  is the dimensionless form of Henry's law constant, needed to convert  $g_{liq}$  to a gas phase equivalent conductance, as  $g_m$  is defined as a gas-phase conductance (Niinemets and Reichstein, 2003; Tosens *et al.*, 2012*a*). At the same time,  $g_{liq}$  is a composite conductance of the apoplastic and cellular components of the CO<sub>2</sub> pathway comprised from the mesophyll CW surface to the carboxylation site in the chloroplast. Thus,  $g_{liq}$  can be expressed on a leaf projected surface area basis by scaling it by the chloroplast surface area exposed to intercellular airspaces per unit of leaf area ( $S_c/S$ ):

$$g_{\rm liq} = \frac{S_{\rm c}}{S} \times \frac{1}{r_{\rm cw} + r_{\rm pl} + r_{\rm cyt} + r_{\rm en} + r_{\rm st}}$$
(2)

where  $g_{cw}$ ,  $g_{pl}$ ,  $g_{cyt}$ ,  $g_{en}$ , and  $g_{st}$  account for the CW, plasma membrane, cytosol membrane, chloroplast membrane, and stroma conductances, respectively. Concomitantly, each partial conductance is determined by several anatomical properties and/or biochemical properties. While biochemical components, probably explaining the observed rapid variations in response to varying environment (Flexas *et al.*, 2007; Vrábl *et al.*, 2009; Douthe *et al.*, 2012), are still a matter of debate (Gu and Sun, 2014; Théroux-Rancourt and Gilbert, 2017; Carriquí *et al.*, 2019*a*; Shrestha *et al.*, 2019; Evans, 2021), there is ample

agreement that leaf anatomical properties are important drivers of  $g_{\rm m}$  variability, at least at the interspecific level (Evans *et al.*, 2009; Terashima et al., 2011; Tomás et al., 2013; Peguero-Pina et al., 2017; Veromann-Jürgenson et al., 2017, 2020; Carriquí et al., 2019b; Gago et al., 2019). Previous studies have highlighted the importance of anatomical properties, such as mesophyll porosity (Earles et al., 2018; Lundgren et al., 2019; Baillie and Fleming, 2020) or the chloroplast distribution, in particular the  $S_c/S$  (Ren et al., 2019), in determining  $g_m$ . Although not negligible, the contribution of mesophyll air space porosity to the overall  $g_{\rm m}$  has been shown to be much lower than that of  $S_{\rm c}/S$ (Han et al., 2018; Carriquí et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020), except perhaps in succulent leaves (Earles et al., 2018). Still, mesophyll porosity may have indirect important effects as apparently it determines the formation of functional stomata during leaf development (Lundgren et al., 2019; Baillie and Fleming, 2020). Besides CW thickness  $(T_{cw})$  and associated traits [e.g. porosity (p) or tortuosity ( $\tau$ )],  $S_c/S$  has been generally suggested to be the most limiting anatomical factor for  $g_m$  (Tosens *et al.*, 2016; Peguero-Pina et al., 2017; Carriquí et al., 2019b; Ren et al., 2019; Veromann-Jurgenson et al., 2020). However, a dominant role for  $T_{cw}$  in  $g_m$  has also been described, and the anatomical limitation analysis of  $g_m$  introduced by Tomás et al. (2013) has shown that, in fact, CW limitations are frequently equal to or greater than  $S_c/S$  and that together these constitute the primary anatomical factors for setting the maximum  $g_m$  that a species can achieve (Tomás et al., 2013; Tosens et al., 2016; Carriquí et al., 2019a, b; Veromann-Jurgenson et al., 2020). In addition to thickness, recent evidence points to an effect of CW composition on photosynthesis (Weraduwage et al., 2016, 2018; Ellsworth et al., 2018; Clemente-Moreno et al., 2019; Carriquí et al., 2020; Roig-Oliver et al., 2020b, c; Evans, 2021).

The aim of this review is to focus on CWs, highlighting their importance in setting  $g_m$  and, hence, photosynthesis. For this, we first conceptualize which are the CW properties expected to affect  $g_{\rm m}$ . Then, we review the available empirical evidence of  $T_{cw}$  and CW composition effects on  $g_m$  both within and between species. Afterwards, we propose a hypothetical mechanism for the influence of CWs on  $g_m$  and photosynthesis, and we speculate on potential CW-mediated trade-offs between photosynthesis, leaf water relations, and hydraulics. Based on all the evidence, we briefly discuss prospects for improving photosynthesis by CW manipulation. It is important to highlight that all concepts reviewed here account mostly for  $C_3$ plants. Until very recently, it was technically difficult to estimate  $g_m$  in C<sub>4</sub> plants, limiting an understanding of the role of CWs and other anatomical components in this group (Tosens et al., 2016; Cousins et al., 2020; Pathare et al., 2020).

#### Cell wall properties affecting $g_{\rm m}$

The plant CW is a complex biological structure with multiple functions, including maintaining cell structural integrity, providing flexibility for cell division and expansion, and acting as a barrier for pathogens and protecting cells from the environment (Anderson and Kieber, 2020). Depending on the plant group, cell type, and developmental stage, the CW exhibits variable composition and structural complexity (Sarkar *et al.*, 2009; Popper *et al.*, 2011; Maron, 2019; Yokoyama, 2020). In particular, photosynthetic cells possess a primary CW mainly composed of a variable proportion and content of cellulose, hemicellulose, pectin, structural proteins, and some additional components (Cosgrove, 2005; Sarkar *et al.*, 2009; Cosgrove and Jarvis, 2012). The universal presence of the CW of photosynthetic cells of all species constitutes a barrier that hinders CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion (Evans *et al.*, 2009; Terashima *et al.*, 2011; Tholen and Zhu, 2011).

In the journey of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> molecules through the photosynthetic organs to the carboxylation sites inside chloroplast stroma, CWs are the first resistance in unistratose organs (e.g. most moss phyllids and filmy fern fronds), and the second in multistratose organs with intercellular air spaces, that CO<sub>2</sub> molecules must face (Hanson et al., 2014; Flexas et al., 2018; Carriquí et al., 2019b). However, the role of CWs in limiting photosynthesis has often been neglected (e.g. Sims and Pearcy, 1989; Ellsworth and Reich, 1993; Niinemets, 1999) for several reasons. For instance, the CW represents only a tiny fraction of the apparent CO<sub>2</sub> pathway length of most photosynthetic organs since its thickness ranges between 0.1 µm and 4 µm in land plants (Han et al., 2016; Carriquí et al., 2019b; Coe et al., 2019; Sugiura et al., 2020), while the mesophyll can be up to several millimetres or even centimetres thick (Earles et al., 2018; Carriquí et al., 2020; Herrera, 2020). Moreover, CW pore size, ranging between 30 Å and 50 Å (3–5 nm), is sufficient to allow the free crossing of CO<sub>2</sub> molecules, which have a kinetic diameter of only 3.3 Å (Carpita et al., 1979). Additionally, CW properties were considered to be quite static concerning their influence on photosynthesis (Evans et al., 2009). However, there is now broad consensus that the physicochemical properties of the CW constitute a key determinant of  $A_n$  and  $g_m$ (Flexas et al., 2018; Gago et al., 2020a, b; Sugiura et al., 2020; Evans, 2021).

 $g_{\rm cw}$ , the inverse of CW resistance  $(r_{\rm cw})$ , is determined, as in the other components of the CO<sub>2</sub> pathway, by four main physicochemical properties: diffusivity  $(D, 1.79 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ at}$ 25 °C), porosity  $(p, \text{ expressed in m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3})$ , apparent diffusion path length ( $\Delta L$ , expressed in m), and tortuosity ( $\tau$ , expressed in m m<sup>-1</sup>), which are inter-related as follows (Evans *et al.*, 2009; Terashima *et al.*, 2011):

$$g_{cw} = \frac{1}{r_{cw}} = \frac{D \times p}{\Delta L \times \tau}$$
(3)

Diffusion of CO<sub>2</sub> in CW occurs in the liquid phase (Rondeau-Mouro *et al.*, 2008), for which *D* is at least  $10^4$  times lower than in the intercellular gas phase (Terashima *et al.*, 2011). In turn, *D* is also determined by the atmospheric pressure, Henry's law

constant (which accounts for the equilibrium air–water partition coefficient), and the combination of pH and  $[CO_2]$ , which modifies the diffusion coefficient by influencing the fraction of  $CO_2$  that crosses the CW in the form of bicarbonate. However, considering the slightly acidic pH in the apoplast, the influence of the conversion of  $CO_2$  to bicarbonate on  $CO_2$  diffusivity might be small (Niinemets and Reichstein, 2003; Terashima *et al.*, 2011; Tholen and Zhu, 2011; Xiao and Zhu, 2017). Finally, *D* is perhaps also affected by carbonic anhydrases, as their presence has been reported by Chen *et al.* (2009) in the CW apoplast of rice calli. Certainly, further studies about the effects of pH and the presence of carbonic anhydrases are still required.

The other three properties determining  $g_{cw}$  largely depend on the amount, structure, organization, and interaction between CW components. Very briefly, CWs are composed of cellulose microfibrils to which hemicellulosic polysaccharides link, and all of this is embedded in a pectin matrix, forming a tangled web (Cosgrove, 2005; Anderson and Kieber, 2020; Yokoyama, 2020). As the CW assembly determines several properties, such as *p* and  $\tau$ , at the same time, it influences  $g_{cw}$  in a very complex (as further discussed in the following sections) and dynamic way, given the constant remodelling and reconstruction to which the wall is subjected (Sarkar *et al.*, 2009; Bellincampi *et al.*, 2014; Houston *et al.*, 2016; Clemente-Moreno *et al.*, 2019; Maron, 2019; Zhang *et al.*, 2019).

 $\Delta L$  is equivalent to  $T_{cw}$  (Evans et al., 2009; Tosens et al., 2012*b*;Tomás *et al.*, 2013), and  $g_m$  has been reported to be lower at larger  $T_{cw}$ , and therefore  $\Delta L$  (Evans *et al.*, 2009; Carriquí et al., 2015; Peguero-Pina et al., 2017; Sugiura et al., 2020). This has been further confirmed by the analytical models based on anatomical traits (Tosens et al., 2012b; Tomás et al., 2013; Xiao and Zhu, 2017), that—although also based on several assumptions that are debatable, such as the actual value for wall porosity—predict g<sub>m</sub> quite accurately (Tosens and Laanisto, 2018; Flexas and Carriquí, 2020) and emphasize the importance of  $T_{cw}$  to  $g_m$  limitation (Veromann-Jürgenson *et al.*, 2017, 2020; Han et al., 2018; Carriquí et al., 2019b). For its ease of measurement,  $\Delta L$  is the most characterized CW property, with hundreds of measurements in different species and conditions. Although never proved experimentally, potentially  $\Delta L$  could be assocaited with CW composition.

*p* is determined by the quantity of wall pores of sufficient size for the passage of CO<sub>2</sub>. On the other hand,  $\tau$  is related to path lengthening due to non-linearity in the diffusion path that CO<sub>2</sub> molecules must face due to the cellulose and hemicellulose microfibril entanglement (Burgert and Dunlop, 2011). These two properties are the least known and the most difficult parameters to determine due to their close intercorrelation. In fact, there are still no direct measurements for these properties and, in most approximations of CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion through walls, both are usually combined as a single parameter,  $p/\tau$  (i.e. effective porosity) (Nobel, 2004; Terashima *et al.*, 2006; Evans *et al.*, 2009; Tosens *et al.*, 2012*b*; Tomás *et al.*, 2013). Based on

simple physicochemical estimations, it was traditionally considered that effective porosity was large enough for  $g_{cw}$  not limiting  $g_m$  and photosynthesis (Nobel, 2004). Later, Terashima et al. (2006), considering also the relationship between  $g_m$  and the mesophyll anatomical traits, and studies on wall permeability to water on algae (Gutknecht, 1967) with extremely thick walls (Okuda et al., 1997), suggested that  $p/\tau$  might be actually limiting  $g_m$  and inversely proportional to  $T_{cw}$ . Evans et al. (2009), based on microscopy images showing pore size in onion (McCann et al., 1990), also suggested the possibility that  $p/\tau$  may be limiting  $g_m$  under certain conditions. Evans (2021) proposed that the important variability of  $g_m/S_c/S$  for a given  $T_{cw}$  (see Fig. 2E) could be largely explained by differences in  $p/\tau$  and membrane permeability. Thus, most analytical models of  $g_m$  have considered a variable  $p/\tau$  closely related to T<sub>cw</sub> (Tosens et al., 2012b, 2016; Tomás et al., 2013; Veromann-Jürgenson et al., 2017, 2020), although Carriquí et al. (2020) proposed that this might not be the case in species with large  $T_{\rm cw}$ . The underlying problem is that the assumption of one porosity or another can radically change the conclusions of the study (Evans, 2021). Nowadays, despite advances in tools to quantify  $p/\tau$  (Liu *et al.*, 2019), complicated interactions among CW basic components and physical microenvironments such as polysaccharides, wall proteins, and apoplastic pH, a precise understanding of how these parameters interact and affect  $CO_2$  diffusion (see 'Effects of cell wall composition on  $A_n$  and  $g_{\rm m}$ ' for further details) remains elusive.

# Relationships among mesophyll conductance, cell wall thickness, and leaf water relations and hydraulics across species and phylogenetic groups

Historically, studies linking photosynthesis,  $g_{\rm m}$ , and  $T_{\rm cw}$  have been mostly dedicated to angiosperms (Flexas et al., 2012). However, in recent years, measurements of a significant number of previously understudied gymnosperms (Veromann-Jürgenson et al., 2017, 2020; Carriquí et al., 2020) ferns and fern allies (Carriquí et al., 2015; Tosens et al., 2016), and mosses and liverworts (Carriquí et al., 2019b; Coe et al., 2019) have allowed the exploration of the relationships between  $A_{\rm n}$ ,  $g_{\rm m}$ , and its anatomical drivers from a phylogenetic and evolutionary perspective. Photosynthetic capacity,  $A_n$ , and its underlying parameters [stomatal conductance  $(g_s)$ ,  $g_m$ , and biochemical capacity] display a progressive phylogenetic increase from bryophytes to angiosperms (Gago et al., 2019). A similar increasing tendency is observed for  $S_c/S$ , while a decreasing tendency is observed for  $T_{cw}$  (Gago *et al.*, 2019). When all plant groups are pooled together,  $T_{cw}$  strongly correlates with  $g_m$  and  $A_n$  (P<0.001 Fig. 2A, B). On the other hand, a weaker but equally significant correlation between  $g_{\rm m}$  and  $S_{\rm c}/S$  is observed (Fig. 2C), despite the correlation between  $S_c/S$  and  $T_{cw}$  (Fig. 2D). In addition, the  $g_{\rm m}/S_{\rm c}$  is significantly decreased with increasing  $T_{\rm cw}$ 



**Fig. 2.** Relationships among photosynthesis and anatomical traits in C<sub>3</sub> plants. Lines represent linear SMA fittings (*y*=*a x*+*b*) on data pooled across all phylogenetic groups. (A, *y*=4.110 *x*-4.504) Net assimilation rate (*A*<sub>n</sub>) and cell wall thickness (*T*<sub>cw</sub>) (303 entries from 204 species). (B, *y* = 0.067 *x*-0.140) Mesophyll conductance to CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion (*g*<sub>m</sub>) and *T*<sub>cw</sub> (280 entries from 183 species). (C, *y* = 0.026 *x*-0.148) *g*<sub>m</sub> and chloroplast surface area exposed to intercellular air spaces per leaf area (*S*<sub>c</sub>/*S*) (327 entries from 201 species). (D, *y*=3.032 *x*-0.750) *S*<sub>c</sub>/*S* and *T*<sub>cw</sub> (293 entries from 195 species). (E, 0.005 *x*-0.008) Mesophyll conductance expressed on a chloroplast surface area basis (*g*<sub>m</sub> *S*/*S*<sub>c</sub>) and *T*<sub>cw</sub> (273 entries from 178 species). SMA fittings were performed using the function sma() in the 'smatr' R package. Data and references are available at Dataset S1 at Dryad.

(Fig. 2E) (Terashima *et al.*, 2011; Tomás *et al.*, 2013). While the correlations showed here may not necessarily implicate causality, they agree with the observations based on mechanistic  $g_m$  limitation analysis showing that  $S_c/S$  and  $T_{cw}$  are indeed the two strongest anatomical limitations to the maximum  $g_m$  achievable by a given species or genotype (Tomás *et al.*, 2013; Tosens *et al.*, 2016; Carriquí *et al.*, 2019*a*, *b*; Gago *et al.*, 2019; Veromann-Jurgenson *et al.*, 2020).  $T_{cw}$  and  $S_c/S$  may vary independently and compensate for each other to achieve substantial  $g_m$  in some cases, as described for Mediterranean *Quercus* 

species (Peguero-Pina et al., 2017) and, to an extreme extent, in resurrection plants (Fernández-Marín et al., 2020; Nadal et al., 2021). These hardy species have been found to achieve similar or greater photosynthesis than their non-resurrection counterparts by breaking the often-reported trade-off between  $S_c/S$ and  $T_{\rm cw}$ , so that they have a much larger  $S_{\rm c}/S$  concomitant with larger  $T_{cw}$  than non-resurrection species. However, it has to be considered that, while  $T_{cw}$  can be easily determined from TEM images as a 2D trait, the 3D estimation of  $S_c/S$  is critical (Théroux-Rancourt et al., 2017; Earles et al., 2019; Harwood et al., 2020). Indeed, the  $S_c/S$  values Dataset S1 available at the Dryad Digital Repository, https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad. qbzkh18gs) were derived from 2D images with broad assumptions regarding cell and chloroplast shapes. In this sense, the methodological issues in estimating  $S_c/S$  could perhaps partly contribute to the variation of  $g_m - S_c/S$  relationship between and within groups.

There is strong support for the concept that an increased photosynthetic rate was likely to be an important adaptive process contributing to the successful angiosperm radiation (Brodribb and Feild, 2010). The observed trajectory of increasing  $g_{\rm m}$  due largely to decreasing  $T_{\rm cw}$  (Gago *et al.*, 2019) fits well into this broader narrative, possibly explaining one of the primary limitations that delayed a transition from an ancestral low photosynthetic poikilohydric state (observed in most extant bryophytes), to a derived homeohydric high photosynthetic condition in the vascular plant lineage. Among the diverse morphological innovations that occurred during land plant diversification, such as stomata development, the hydrophobic cuticle, and the hydraulic system (Kenrick and Crane, 1997), evolution in  $T_{cw}$  has received little attention. This allows us to hypothesize and speculate about some evolutionary aspects that may deserve future experimental attention.

Concerning the general decline of  $T_{cw}$  along the phylogeny, from bryophytes to angiosperms, one interesting possibility is that a large  $T_{cw}$  may have been a fundamental constraint on the evolution of high  $A_n$ , and that  $T_{cw}$  could not be reduced until homeohydric features such as stomatal regulation of gas exchange and efficient vasculature had evolved. An explanation for this may be that desiccation tolerance (DT) requires thick CWs to prevent tissue damage during dehydration. DT is a prerequisite for terrestrial species with low vascular efficiency to carry out photosynthesis at humidities below 100% (Brodribb et al., 2020). These plants can survive dehydration to <30% relative water content or water potentials < -100 MPa for extended periods (Alpert and Oliver, 2002; Gaff and Oliver, 2013). Bryophytes constitute the group of land plants with the highest percentage of studied desiccation-tolerant species, although desiccation-tolerant ferns and lycophytes are also common (Oliver et al., 2005; Vitt et al., 2014; Fernández-Marín et al., 2016). There is evidence that species exposed to frequent changes in cell volume appear to require thick CWs with high elasticity preventing damaging leaf deformation upon dehydration/rehydration (Balsamo et al., 2003). The occurrence of thick CWs in angiosperms that have recently evolved DT (as a homoplasy with DT in bryophytes) provides strong support for the idea that thick CWs are a prerequisite for DT (Perera-Castro *et al.*, 2020). If this is the case, it may be that a transition from DT and poikilohydry was a critical step to developing high  $A_n$  because the thin CWs required for high  $A_n$  are only effective where cell hydration is maintained within narrow limits. Assuming that this connection between  $T_{cw}$  and DT is constitutive, it is easy to envisage an evolutionary sequence in land plants whereby evolution in water relations (stomatal regulation of transpiration and efficient water transport) enabled a shift away from DT, enabling a decline in  $T_{cw}$  and an increase in  $g_m$  and  $A_n$ .

Homeohydry in most seed plants may enable cell  $T_{cw}$  to be much lower (and  $g_m$  to be much higher) than in early branching land plant clades, but it also adds an important water transport limitation on  $A_n$ . Evidence of this is clearly seen in the coordination between hydraulic conductance  $(K_{leaf})$  and An among land plants (Brodribb et al., 2007; Flexas et al., 2013; Xiong et al., 2017; Lu et al., 2019; Xiong and Nadal, 2020), since water loss and CO<sub>2</sub> uptake share a common path at the leaf surface. The observed coordination between water supply and  $A_n$  across land plants broadly agrees well with the theoretical resource allocation in leaves based on optimality theory (Deans et al., 2020), and can be observed in patterns of leaf vein evolution across the land plant phylogeny (Boyce et al., 2009; Brodribb and Feild, 2010). Efficient water supply to leaves can enable high rates of water and CO<sub>2</sub> exchange across the epidermis enabling high  $A_n$ , but this could only happen with a parallel evolution of stomata on the leaf surface (Brodribb et al., 2017). Early vascular plants are characterized by large relatively immobile guard cells, but evolution in guard cell size and shape occurred in parallel with leaf vascular systems such that modern angiosperms possess very dense arrays of small, highly mobile stomata (Franks and Beerling, 2009; de Boer et al., 2012) and very dense leaf venation (Roddy, 2019), which together provide sufficient  $g_s$  to enable angiosperm leaves to profit from the high  $g_{\rm m}$  that is allowed by low  $T_{\rm cw}$ .

# Dynamic changes in cell wall thickness and their effects on mesophyll conductance and photosynthesis

Photosynthetic CW thickness has been considered as a relatively static parameter with only interspecific variations (Evans *et al.*, 2009). However, recent studies demonstrate that  $T_{cw}$ changes very dynamically even in mature leaves (Table S1 at Dryad). The responses of  $g_m$  during acclimation to environmental changes can be explained by the variation of anatomical traits (e.g.  $T_{cw}$  and/or  $S_c/S$ ), although physiological factors such as aquaporins and carbonic anhydrases can also be involved (Flexas *et al.*, 2006; Perez-Martin *et al.*, 2014; Groszmann *et al.*, 2017; Momayyezi *et al.*, 2020; Evans, 2021). In general,  $g_m$  variation in response to internal and external factors is not so tightly coupled with either  $T_{cw}$  or  $S_c/S$  as are the differences in the maximum  $g_m$  among species, seen in the previous section.

 $T_{\rm cw}$  has been reported to change during leaf development (Niinemets et al., 2012). After leaf emergence, T<sub>cw</sub> increases, even after full expansion (Miyazawa and Terashima, 2001; Miyazawa et al., 2003; Tosens et al., 2012a; Borniego et al., 2020; Carriquí et al., 2021), and then it may remain stable or decrease with ageing in some species (Hanba et al., 2001; Saito et al., 2006). Effects of the age-dependent changes in  $T_{cw}$  on  $g_{\rm m}$  and  $A_{\rm n}$  vary greatly depending on growth environment, leaf life span, and plant species. In some trees, gm increases regardless of the increase in  $T_{cw}$  possibly because  $S_c/S$  also increases during ontogeny (Hanba et al., 2001; Miyazawa and Terashima, 2001; Tosens et al., 2012a). On the other hand, some herbaceous plants show a marked decrease in  $g_{\rm m}$  during ontogeny. For example, in tomato and soybean,  $T_{cw}$  increases by ~40-80% in leaves 10–14 d after full expansion, while  $S_c/S$  remains virtually unchanged, and g<sub>m</sub> decreases (Berghuijs et al., 2015; Sugiura *et al.*, 2020). An observed decrease in  $g_m$  in bean during leaf ontogeny (Miyazawa et al., 2003) was due more to the decrease in  $S_c/S$  than to any change in  $T_{cw}$  (Sugiura *et al.*, 2020).

 $T_{\rm cw}$  can also change according to light environment (Syvertsen et al., 1995; Oguchi et al., 2003; Gratani et al., 2006; Fini et al., 2016), although this might depend on speciesspecific light requirements. Generally, plants grown under high light conditions tend to show higher  $g_{\rm m}$  without changing  $T_{\rm cw}$ , which could be explained by an increase in  $S_c/S$  (Syvertsen et al., 1995; Hanba et al., 2002; Tosens et al., 2012a; Peguero-Pina et al., 2016). However, Fini et al. (2016) reported that three woody species of the Oleaceae family with different light requirements changed  $g_m$  and  $T_{cw}$  in a different manner when grown under 30% or 100% of full sunlight. While sunrequiring species increased  $g_m$  despite an increase in  $T_{cw}$ , shadetolerant species decreased  $g_{\rm m}$  despite unchanged  $T_{\rm cw}$  and  $S_{\rm c}/S$ . Whether light requirement is involved in the predominance of anatomical or biochemical components of  $g_m$  needs further confirmation.

The effect of  $CO_2$  concentration during growth in leaf anatomy and g<sub>m</sub> has been less frequently assessed. Teng et al. (2006) reported an increase in  $T_{cw}$ , cellulose, and pectin in Arabidopsis plants grown at elevated CO<sub>2</sub>. Unfortunately, gm was not determined in that study. However, Mizokami et al. (2019) did not observe a significative variation of  $g_{\rm m}$  despite the increase of  $T_{cw}$  in response to high  $[CO_2]$  in this species. Using free-air CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment (FACE) technology, rice developed leaves with thicker CWs and decreased  $g_{\rm m}$ , while in wheat higher  $[CO_2]$  resulted in unchanged  $T_{cw}$  and  $g_m$  (Zhu et al., 2012). Another factor affecting  $T_{cw}$  is the sink-source balance, which varies interspecifically and depends greatly on environmental conditions. Sugiura et al. (2017) showed that the amount of CW materials accumulated in leaves was higher for radish plants grown under lower nitrogen and higher CO<sub>2</sub> conditions (i.e. lower sink), while it was lower in radish with larger hypocotyls (i.e. higher sink activity). Furthermore, soybean and bean showed coordinated increases in  $T_{cw}$  and decreases in  $g_m$  and  $A_n$  after a substantial decrease in sink activity by defoliation, which supports the idea that photosynthesis may be down-regulated by anatomical changes in response to changes in the sink–source ratio (Sugiura *et al.*, 2020).

In some studies,  $g_m$  decreases in response to long-term drought together with a general decrease in  $S_c/S$  and a slight increase in  $T_{cw}$  (Miyazawa *et al.*, 2008; Tosens *et al.*, 2012*a*; Galmés *et al.*, 2013; Tomás *et al.*, 2014; Han *et al.*, 2016; Ouyang *et al.*, 2017; Du *et al.*, 2019). However, intercultivar and interspecific differences in the response of  $S_c/S$  and  $T_{cw}$  to water stress have been observed. Ouyang *et al.* (2017) reported that many cultivars of rice showed drought-induced increases in  $T_{cw}$  and decreases in  $g_m$  without changes in  $S_c/S$ . Instead, wheat showed an increase in  $S_c/S$  under drought conditions (Ouyang *et al.*, 2017).

# Effects of cell wall composition on $g_m$ and $A_n$

Changes in CW components and their biochemical properties can modify CW thickness, conformation, and complexity, which could affect the CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion by physicochemical interactions through the CW (Le Gall et al., 2015; Houston et al., 2016; Clemente-Moreno et al., 2019). Only recently, researchers have begun to study the role of CW composition on  $g_{\rm m}$  using genetic approaches. Although some studies testing mutants with changes in their CW composition have reported reductions in the photosynthetic rate (Zhang et al., 2020) and/or anatomical changes that alter mesophyll architecture and, potentially, leaf  $CO_2$  diffusion (Weraduwage *et al.*, 2016), to the best of our knowledge only two studies have directly addressed the effect of CW composition on  $g_m$ . Firstly, Ellsworth et al. (2018) described a strong  $g_{\rm m}$  reduction (83%) in mutants with disrupted synthesis and accumulation of the hemicelluloses (1,3)- and (1,4)-linked  $\beta$ -glucosyl polysaccharides, implying photosynthesis rate reductions of  $\sim$ 30–40%. This allowed them to propose that CW mixed-linkage glucans content improves  $p/\tau$  in rice. However, a significant part of the  $g_m$  reduction with the mutation was due to pleiotropic effects affecting other anatomical traits (Evans, 2021), since at least 23% of the  $g_{\rm m}$  constraint was caused by a reduction of  $S_c/S$ . However, other reduced parameters such as lower leaf mass area (LMA), leaf thickness, and  $T_{cw}$  could facilitate higher  $g_m$ , implying that  $g_m$  was at least partially constrained by altered CW composition. More recently, Roig-Oliver et al. (2020c) reported a gm reduction related to diminished galacturonic acid amounts in Arabidopsis mutants with alterations in pectin acetyl- and methylesterases, although whether these mutations affected other key anatomical traits determining  $g_{\rm m}$  was not assessed.

Besides genetic approaches, interspecific comparisons may also help in disentangling the role of CW components on gm. Recently, Carriquí et al. (2020) performed an interspecific study in which seven conifer species were evaluated under non-stress conditions. The advantage of using conifers is that they lie on the quasi-flat region of the  $g_m$ to  $T_{\rm cw}$  exponential decay, where variations of  $g_{\rm m}$  are less dependent on variations of  $T_{cw}$  (Fig. 2). Although no significant correlation between CW components and  $A_n$  was found, probably because g<sub>m</sub> was not the main limitation to photosynthesis in these species, hemicellulose and cellulose contents were negatively correlated with gm. Also, while pectin content itself was not related to  $g_m$ , the pectin to cellulose and hemicellulose ratio strongly correlated with  $g_{\rm m}$ . In another rercent study in rice (Ye et al., 2020), genotypes with higher LMA also presented greater leaf thickness and  $T_{\rm cw}$ , and lower  $g_{\rm m}$ . In this study, the amount of celluloses, hemicelluloses, and pectins also scaled positively with LMA and  $T_{cw}$ , while the pectin to cellulose and hemicellulose ratio declined (Ye et al., 2020). Hence, in rice, co-variation of  $T_{cw}$  and CW composition makes it difficult to establish whether variation in  $g_m$  is due only to  $T_{cw}$ , composition, or an interaction of both.

Additional evidence for a possible effect of CW composition on  $g_m$  and  $A_n$  arises from studies of photosynthesis response to abiotic stress. In tobacco exposed to salinity and drought, pectins showed a significant negative relationship with both  $A_n$  and  $g_m$ , whilst the hemicellulose/pectin ratio correlated positively with both  $g_m$  and  $A_n$ , in contrast to the cellulose/hemicellulose ratio, which correlated negatively with  $g_{\rm m}$ . Interestingly, these changes were associated with the activity of antioxidant apoplastic enzymes linked to CW alterations as well as with specific CW primary metabolites such as galactose, glucosamine, and hydroxycinnamate, which were exclusively correlated with  $g_{\rm m}$  and not with other photosynthetic traits (Clemente-Moreno et al., 2019). In grapevines subjected to stresses including high and low temperature and water stress, it was observed that stress-induced variations in cellulose concentrations were negatively related to changes in  $g_{\rm m}$  and  $A_{\rm n}$ (Roig-Oliver et al., 2020b). In sunflower plants acclimated to different water availability conditions, lignin accumulation was significantly associated with  $g_m$  reductions (Roig-Oliver *et al.*, 2020a). Interestingly, the same study showed that the proportion between cellulose and hemicelluloses to pectins was positively correlated with changes in  $T_{cw}$ . Altogether, these results indicate that abiotic stresses provoke species-dependent changes in CW composition. These affect the different main CW compounds, so that the relative proportions between them varies, probably altering the physicochemical CW environment and affecting CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion. In addition, minor CW compounds have also been suggested to affect photosynthesis. For instance, in Triticale, increased amounts of CW-bound phenolics, especially ferulic acid, resulted in increased photosynthesis (Hura et al., 2009, 2012), whilst in sunflower coumarate content in CWs was negatively correlated with  $g_m$  (Roig-Oliver *et al.*, 2020a).

# Hypothetical mechanism for the influence of cell walls on photosynthesis

As discussed in the previous sections, both  $T_{cw}$  and chemical composition (which in turn also potentially determines  $T_{cw}$ ) appear to be involved in setting and perhaps regulating  $g_{\rm m}$ . However, the empirical evidence concerning both factors is limited. The correlation between  $g_{\rm m}$  and  $T_{\rm cw}$  is strong regardless of the phylogenetic groups considered (Fig. 2A), as might be expected due to the central position of  $T_{cw}$  in the theoretical equation for gm. For CW composition, instead, data are still scarce and discrepancies appear between studies. These apparent discrepancies are likely to reflect, on one hand, the different and complementary roles of thickness and composition in setting  $g_{\rm m}$ , and, on the other, that the system is complicated and some CW components (e.g. pectins) play a variety of roles in the physicochemical properties defining diffusive conductance of the CW ( $g_{cw}$ , a major component of  $g_m$ ). As a result, these may potentially act in opposite directions and/or have pleiotropic effects.

What is the position of CW components in the equation of  $g_{cw}$ ? We suggest that CW composition—with a major role for pectins and/or the proportion between pectins and other compounds—determines p and, very probably,  $\tau$ , yet in a complex manner (Fig. 3). If so, CW composition (even a single compound) may have effects on both the numerator and the denominator of the  $g_m$  equation, and in a nonproportional way, meaning that strong simple correlations between  $g_m$  and the concentration of any single CW component is unlikely.

Among principal CW compounds, pectins are often considered the master regulators of p (Ochoa-Villareal et al., 2012; Bidhendi and Geitmann, 2016; Cosgrove, 2016; Novakovic et al., 2018). While the general view is that pectins decrease porosity, we argue that  $p/\tau$  could instead be positively related to an increased fraction of pectins, based on experiments in which pectin degradation results in larger molecules capable of traversing the wall (Baron-Epel et al., 1988; Fleischer et al., 1999). This is because pectins exhibit hydrocolloid properties and can bind several times their own volume of water (Panchev et al., 2010; Schiraldi et al., 2012). Because CO<sub>2</sub> is a very small molecule as compared with average CW pore sizes (Carpita et al., 1979), slight reductions of p may not affect its diffusion significantly. However, as CO<sub>2</sub> diffuses in solution, it might be the hydrophilic fraction of the pore which affects its diffusion. In this sense, pectins may increase what could be called the 'effective porosity to water and CO<sub>2</sub>'. Regardless of these speculative thoughts about the effect of pectin abundance on *p*, there is no doubt that increased pectin content modifies p due to interactions with other molecules (Fig. 3).



**Fig. 3.** Summary of the hypothetical mechanisms for the effects of cell wall properties on cell wall conductance. The relationship between the four properties determining cell wall conductance ( $g_{cw}$ ) is displayed at the top of the diagram. Below the equation, the physicochemical factors that determine (black) or potentially determine (grey) each cell wall property are detailed. Arrows indicate the known or suggested direction of influence of each factor.

The action of pectin-remodelling enzymes (PREs) promotes changes in pectin physicochemical properties, which modify the pectin matrix status as well as pectin interaction with other CW components, thus determining CW characteristics (Pelloux et al., 2007; de Souza and Pauly, 2015). In particular, the degree of pectin methylesterification is also an important feature that affects p. However, paradoxically, de-esterification has been related to both increased and decreased p and CW stiffness (Bidhendi and Geitmann, 2016). Apparently, the effect depends on how pectin de-esterification occurs. Basically, there are two mechanisms of de-esterification, blockwise and non-blockwise. Blockwise de-esterification results in a continuous region of de-esterified pectin, which allows better cross-linking of pectins with Ca<sup>2+</sup> bonds, resulting in gelation, which increases wall stiffness and, presumably, decreases p. On the contrary, non-blockwise de-esterification pectin methylesterases (PMEs) act discontinuously, resulting in reduced cross-linking of pectins with Ca<sup>2+</sup> and also facilitating pectin degradation by polygalacturonases, hence resulting in wall softening and increased porosity (Bidhendi and Geitmann, 2016). The occurrence of blockwise or non-blockwise de-esterification depends on which specific PMEs are involved, which in turn depends on pH, initial stage of methylesterification, and cation concentration (Osorio et al., 2008). This implies that p may not even be constant through the  $T_{cw}$ , since all these parameters can change from one side to another in the apoplast. For instance, a pH gradient may occur from slightly acidic apoplast to weakly alkaline symplast, thus through the CW pathway  $HCO_3^{-}$  will tend to increase in concentration assuming that there is an equilibrium between  $CO_2$  aqueous and HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> (Evans et al., 2009). Apoplast redox status and the activity of several antioxidant apoplast enzymes such as peroxidases (POXs) varies depending on stress conditions (O'Brien et al., 2012; Tenhaken, 2015). Under stress, apoplast water pH tends to alkalinize (Geilfus, 2017), reducing the pH gradient with the symplast, and at equilibrium [HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>  $]/[CO_{2aq}]$ , the anion  $HCO_3^-$  will increase in concentration relative to  $CO_2$  along the apoplast and CW.

Besides methylesterification, other factors have been related to p. For instance, interaction of pectins with ion metals such as aluminium or copper is known to reduce p and affect the hydraulic conductivity of the pectic matrix, and pectin dimerization and branching have also been suggested to affect p somehow (Bidhendi and Geitmann, 2016). In addition, the apoplast redox status will be modified by the role of reactive oxygen species (ROS) and antioxidant apoplastic enzymes, which are also involved in modifying CW chemistry, especially, in response to stress (Tenhaken, 2015). Apoplastic ROS and their related enzymes are linked to different CW modification processes such as cell elongation, lignin and suberin formation, and cross-linking of CW components directly influencing the cell stiffening/loosening properties (Schmidt *et al.*, 2016). The large complexity of mechanisms potentially involved in pectin-dependent regulation of p may explain why correlations with  $g_{\rm m}$  are not as clear as those observed between  $g_{\rm m}$  and  $T_{\rm cw}$ , but a hypothetical understanding of the action of these compounds will help in elucidating the precise mechanisms in future studies.

Concerning  $\tau$ , this might be mostly related to the specific arrangement of cellulose and hemicellulose fibrils, which may strongly depend on hemicelluloses and pectins because these bind covalently among them (Burgert and Dunlop, 2011). It may also depend on phenolic compounds and lignins, because these also form covalent bounds with hemicelluloses (Burgert and Dunlop, 2011; Anderson and Kieber, 2020) and increase CW hydrophobicity (Niklas et al., 2017), which might be relevant as CO<sub>2</sub> diffuses dissolved in water. Indeed, lignins have been shown to negatively correlate with  $g_m$  in one study (Roig-Oliver et al., 2020a). Additionally, the role of structural proteins can also be an extra factor to be evaluated as, depending on species, they can range from 1% to 10% of the total CW, modifying CW properties in response to abiotic and biotic stress (Olmos et al., 2017) which may also affect CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion through the CW.

It is worth saying that the physical equation and terms that we use in this section (conductance, porosity, and tortuosity) rely on the assumption that CO<sub>2</sub> moves across CWs in a simple, non-facilitated diffusion manner-following Fick's first law. However, this may not necessarily be the case, and chemical interactions between CO<sub>2</sub> molecules—or water molecules where  $CO_2$  is dissolved—and wall components may eventually occur inside the CW pores (Terashima et al., 2011). If so, the actual  $\tau$  would be a combination of the 'physical'  $\tau$  (i.e. the twisting of the path length due to the non-linear position of the pores across the fibre matrix) and the 'chemical'  $\tau$  (i.e. any kind of chemical interactions between CO<sub>2</sub> and CW compounds that could slow CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion). Rondeau-Mouro et al. (2008) reported that the aqueous phase diffusion in Arabidopsis CW residues (i.e. CWs in which pectins, proteins, and starch have been removed mechanically) approximates that in free water. For this reason, for several years, chemical  $\tau$ , also referred as  $r_{\rm f}$  [i.e. a dimensionless factor that accounts for the reduction of D compared with free water (Weisiger, 1998)], has been considered negligible in studies in which mesophyll conductance was modelled (Tosens et al., 2012a, 2016; Tomás et al., 2013; Carriquí et al., 2019b). However, phenolic compounds, one of the potential components of this chemical  $\tau$ , have been shown to negatively correlate with  $g_m$  in Roig-Oliver *et al.* (2020a) and with  $A_n$  in a multispecies comparison (Sumbele et al., 2012), and, in general, any other compound capable of establishing molecular interactions such as transient van der Waals bonds with diffusing water and/or  $CO_2$  itself may significantly reduce chemical  $\tau$ ; that is, increase  $r_{\rm f}$ .

Such potential chemical interactions between water,  $CO_2$ , and CW composition have not been investigated *in vivo* in plants, but they are known and used in industrial procedures related to phenol transformation, cellulose-derived materials,

etc. (Luo *et al.*, 2016; Gunnarsson *et al.*, 2017, 2018). Local conditions across the apoplast would also determine the chemical  $\tau$  because, as CO<sub>2</sub> diffuses in water, the temperature determines its solubility and the pH determines its chemical form as carbon dioxide or bicarbonate (Terashima *et al.*, 2011). We suggest that studying these interactions *in planta* deserves future research as they are potentially key, but unknown, regulators of CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion across CWs.

# Prospects for improving photosynthesis by cell wall manipulation

Up until recently, most of the attempts to improve photosynthesis through anatomical changes have been focused on stomatal traits such as size, shape, and density (Gago *et al.* 2020*b*, and references therein), mesophyll cell density, distribution, and cell to cell contact (Masle *et al.*, 2005; Takai *et al.*, 2013; Lehmeier *et al.*, 2017), and  $S_c/S$  (Tholen *et al.*, 2008; Li *et al.*, 2013; He *et al.*, 2017). This topic has been reviewed by Tholen *et al.* (2012) and Ren *et al.* (2019). However, biotechnological attempts to specifically study the relationship between CW composition and  $g_m$  (and, thus,  $A_n$ ) have been scarce.

Based on the evidence discussed in the sections above, the most obvious ways to increase  $g_{cw}$  would be achieving lower  $T_{\rm cw}$  and increasing  $p/\tau$ . Unfortunately, the genes regulating these properties are unknown, and changing a single gene can have important pleiotropic consequences. The genes regulating the metabolic pathways of the major CW compounds and enzymatic activities related to their synthesis and degradation would directly affect leaf expansion, growth, cell density, and cell to cell contact (Tenhaken, 2015). However, knowledge of how those alterations could also affect CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion through differential physicochemical interactions in the CW matrix remains unclear (Clemente-Moreno et al., 2019). Molecular strategies focused on altering any of these components could have huge consequences on the highly coordinated network to sustain CW functionality. For instance, virus-induced gene silencing (VIGS) of CESA1 and CESA2 (genes encoding enzymes catalysing cellulose synthesis) in Nicotiana benthamiana showed strong reductions of cellulose, but this alteration promoted PME gene regulation, avoiding CW weakness by a reduction in the PME degree accompanied by an increase in Ca<sup>2+</sup> crosslinkages (Burton et al., 2000; Weraduwage et al., 2018).

Because of the pivotal role of the cell in plant physiology, any alteration in CW genetics would have dramatic effects on the plant's anatomy and performance (Weraduwage *et al.*, 2018), making it more difficult to use CW mutants to establish specific cause–effect relationships between cell composition affecting  $g_{cw}$ . So, the question emerges: how can we disentangle the CW changes that affect general plant physiological status (and also their photosynthetical capacity) from those specific-ally altering CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion?

 $p, \tau$ , and intrinsic physicochemical properties interacting with the CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion will mostly depend on the matrix network developed by the major polysaccharide compounds, glycoproteins, and phenolic compounds, defining both the final CW conformation and general leaf anatomy (thus, affecting  $g_m$ ) (Ren *et al.*, 2019). Reductions in cellulose content will drive strong effects in the CW and weaken it. In order to strengthen the weakened CW, increased levels of pectins (esterified and unesterified, with increased Ca<sup>2+</sup>-mediated cross-linkage with xyloglucan and extensins), reduced levels of arabinogalactan proteins (AGPs), and changes in extensins have been observed (Burton *et al.*, 2000; Mélida *et al.*, 2009, and references therein). Additionally, these changes in CW profile can be accompanied by general mesophyll rearrangements— $T_{cw}$  and cell elongation—as observed in the cellulose-defective mutants AtCesA7 in Arabidopsis (Zhong *et al.*, 2003), that could also affect  $g_m$ (Evans *et al.*, 2009; Evans, 2021).

Despite the key role in CW modifications described for pectins (Tenhaken, 2015), just a few studies focused on how altering PREs, including PMEs and pectin acetylesterases, could affect photosynthesis. Weraduwage *et al.* (2016) showed that Arabidopsis mutants with reduced and overexpressed levels of PME showed minor differences in their  $A_n$ . Contrarily, Roig-Oliver *et al.* (2020c) tested other Arabidopsis mutants with alterations in pectin acetyl and methylesterases, and showed that reductions in both  $A_n$  and  $g_m$  were paralleled by a diminished pectin amount.

In summary, the CW is a highly coordinated molecular and physiological network that performs an essential role in cells, and any change in its composition dynamically activates a response to compensate and sustain their main functionality from genes to enzymatic activity (Burton *et al.*, 2000; Weraduwage *et al.*, 2018). These changes will affect not just its intrinsic composition, but also a general rearrangement of leaf anatomy that will also affect leaf gas exchange and plant growth (Weraduwage *et al.*, 2016, 2018). Indeed, most studies show that relationships with  $g_m$  are significantly stronger when considerd as ratios among all the major compounds rather than with any single compound, indicating a complex interaction that could affect  $p/\tau$  (Clemente-Moreno *et al.*, 2019; Carriquí *et al.*, 2020; Roig-Oliver *et al.*, 2020*b*, *c*).

Before altering CW CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion properties using biotechnological approaches becomes feasible, further efforts are required to elucidate how the different interactions between CW compounds, including structural proteins, can affect  $g_{cw}$ . Unfortunately, CW mutants often display strong phenotypes due to the essential role of the CW in plant physiology. Specific CW-inducible transformants become highly desirable to avoid dramatic phenotypes that can alter the whole-plant functioning, complicating specific examination of the effect of CW composition on  $g_m$  and  $A_n$ . In parallel, additional technologies should be employed to further characterize CW properties, including immunolocation assays to determine the position and distribution of their main components, precise CW characterization from its main monomers to its principal components and their conformations, and ultrastructural  $\boldsymbol{p}$  determination, among others, in combination with gas exchange measurements.

### **Concluding remarks**

In addition to their multiple and recognized functions in plant cells, there is now ample evidence for a role for CWs in  $g_m$  and photosynthesis. It has been shown that a phylogenetic trend exists from thick CWs and low photosynthetic capacities in bryophytes to thin walls and high photosynthesis in angiosperms. Besides thickness, an emerging role of CW composition in  $g_m$  is highlighted. While the role of thickness is well understood, further studies are required to better understand the mechanisms by which changes in composition may affect CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion. We hypothesize that these effects might be multiple and complex, complicating efforts to disentangle the particular role of each compound. Yet with current perspectives, we can hypothesize a major role for pectins and/or the pectin to cellulose plus hemicellulose ratio. More genetic approaches are needed to investigate the possibility of improving crop photosynthesis by means of CW manipulation. While already presenting thin CWs, which may preclude improvement, the possibility of improving crop photosynthesis by manipulating CW composition has yet to be evaluated. In addition, such studies should also evaluate the possibility that CW-related improvement of photosynthesis could have detrimental effects on plant water relations, plant tolerance to water stress, and/or any of the other fundamental functions that CWs have in plant cells.

#### Acknowledgements

JF is grateful for the financial support from project PGC2018-093824-B-C41 from the Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades (Spain) an the ERDF (FEDER). MN was supported by the Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad (MINECO, Spain) and the European Social Fund (pre-doctoral fellowship BES-2015-072578). The Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte (MECD, Spain) supported a pre-doctoral fellowship (FPU-02054) awarded to AP-C.

#### **Author contributions**

JF and MC: conceptualization; MC, AVP-C, MJC-M: data compilation; MC and MN: data analysis. JF and MJC-M: homogenization of language and style between the sections; JF, MJC-M, JB, TJB, JG, YM, MN, AVP-C, MR-O, DS, DX, and MC: writing, revision, and approval of the final manuscript.

#### Data availability

Dataset included in the figures of this review are available at the Dryad Data Repository: https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.qbzkh18gs (Flexas *et al.*, 2021). Dataset S1. Photosynthetic and anatomical data compilation from previously published papers.

#### References

Albersheim P, Jones TM, English PD. 1969. Biochemistry of the cell wall in relation to infective processes. Annual Review of Phytopathology 7, 171–194.

Alpert P, Oliver MJ. 2002. Drying without dying. In: Black M, Pritchard HW, eds. Desiccation and survival in plants. Drying without dying. Wallingford, UK: CABI Publishing, 3–43.

Anderson CT, Kieber JJ. 2020. Dynamic construction, perception, and remodeling of plant cell walls. Annual Review of Plant Biology **71**, 39–69.

Bailey-Serres J, Parker JE, Ainsworth EA, Oldroyd GED, Schroeder JI.
2019. Genetic strategies for improving crop yields. Nature 575, 109–118.
Baillie AL, Fleming AJ. 2020. The developmental relationship between

stomata and mesophyll airspace. New Phytologist **225**, 1120–1126.

Balsamo RA, Bauer AM, Davis SD, Rice BM. 2003. Leaf biomechanics, morphology, and anatomy of the deciduous mesophyte *Prunus serrulata* (Rosaceae) and the evergreen sclerophyllous shrub *Heteromeles arbutifolia* (Rosaceae). American Journal of Botany **90**, 72–77.

Baron-Epel O, Gharyal PK, Schindler M. 1988. Pectins as mediators of wall porosity in soybean cells. Planta 175, 389–395.

Bellincampi D, Cervone F, Lionetti V. 2014. Plant cell wall dynamics and wall-related susceptibility in plant–pathogen interactions. Frontiers in Plant Science 5, 228.

**Berghuijs HN, Yin X, Ho QT, van der Putten PE, Verboven P, Retta MA, Nicolaï BM, Struik PC.** 2015. Modelling the relationship between CO<sub>2</sub> assimilation and leaf anatomical properties in tomato leaves. Plant Science **238**, 297–311.

**Bidhendi AJ, Geitmann A.** 2016. Relating the mechanics of the primary plant cell wall to morphogenesis. Journal of Experimental Botany **67**, 449–461.

Borniego ML, Molina MC, Guiamét JJ, Martinez DE. 2020. Physiological and proteomic changes in the apoplast accompany leaf senescence in Arabidopsis. Frontiers in Plant Science **10**, 1635.

**Boyce CK, Brodribb TJ, Feild TS, Zwieniecki MA.** 2009. Angiosperm leaf vein evolution was physiologically and environmentally transformative. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences **276**, 1771–1776.

**Brodribb TJ, Carriquí M, Delzon S, McAdam SAM, Holbrook NM.** 2020. Advanced vascular function discovered in a widespread moss. Nature Plants **6**, 273–279.

**Brodribb TJ, Feild TS.** 2010. Leaf hydraulic evolution led a surge in leaf photosynthetic capacity during early angiosperm diversification. Ecology Letters **13**, 175–183.

**Brodribb TJ, Feild TS, Jordan GJ.** 2007. Leaf maximum photosynthetic rate and venation are linked by hydraulics. Plant Physiology **144**, 1890–1898.

Brodribb TJ, McAdam SA, Carins Murphy MR. 2017. Xylem and stomata, coordinated through time and space. Plant, Cell & Environment 40, 872–880.

**Burgert I, Dunlop JWC.** 2011. Micromechanics of cell walls. In: Wojtaszek P, ed. Mechanical integration of plant cells and plants. Heidelberg: Springer, 27–52.

Burton RA, Gibeaut DM, Bacic A, Findlay K, Roberts K, Hamilton A, Baulcombe DC, Fincher GB. 2000. Virus-induced silencing of a plant cellulose synthase gene. The Plant Cell **12**, 691–706.

Carpita NC, McCann MC. 2015. Characterizing visible and invisible cell wall mutant phenotypes. Journal of Experimental Botany **66**, 4145–4163.

Carpita N, Sabularse D, Montezinos D, Delmer DP. 1979. Determination of the pore size of cell walls of living plant cells. Science **205**, 1144–1147.

**Carriquí M, Cabrera HM, Conesa MÀ, et al.** 2015. Diffusional limitations explain the lower photosynthetic capacity of ferns as compared with angiosperms in a common garden study. Plant, Cell & Environment **38**, 448–460.

**Carriquí M, Douthe C, Molins A, Flexas J.** 2019*a*. Leaf anatomy does not explain apparent short-term responses of mesophyll conductance to light and  $CO_2$  in tobacco. Physiologia Plantarum **165**, 604–618.

#### **3982** | Flexas *et al.*

Carriquí M, Nadal M, Clemente-Moreno MJ, Gago J, Miedes E, Flexas J. 2020. Cell wall compposition strongly influences mesophyll conductance in gymnosperms. The Plant Journal **103**, 1372–1385.

**Carriquí M, Nadal M, Flexas J.** 2021. Acclimation of mesophyll conductance and anatomy to light during leaf ageing in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Physiologia Plantarum doi: 10.1111/ppl.13398.

**Carriquí M, Roig-Oliver M, Brodribb TJ, et al.** 2019b. Anatomical constraints to nonstomatal diffusion conductance and photosynthesis in lycophytes and bryophytes. New Phytologist **222**, 1256–1270.

Cassab GI, Varner JE. 1988. Cell wall proteins. Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology **39**, 321–353.

Chen XY, Kim ST, Cho WK, Rim Y, Kim S, Kim SW, Kang KY, Park ZY, Kim JY. 2009. Proteomics of weakly bound cell wall proteins in rice calli. Journal of Plant Physiology **166**, 675–685.

Cleland R. 1971. Cell wall extension. Annual Review of Plant Physiology 22, 197–222.

Clemente-Moreno MJ, Gago J, Díaz-Vivancos P, Bernal A, Miedes E, Bresta P, Liakopoulos G, Fernie AR, Hernández JA, Flexas J. 2019. The apoplastic antioxidant system and altered cell wall dynamics influence mesophyll conductance and the rate of photosynthesis. The Plant Journal **99**, 1031–1046.

**Coe KK, Howard NB, Slate ML, Bowker MA, Mishler BD, Butler R, Greenwood J, Stark LR.** 2019. Morphological and physiological traits in relation to carbon balance in a diverse clade of dryland mosses. Plant, Cell & Environment **42**, 3140–3151.

**Cosgrove DJ.** 2005. Growth of the plant cell wall. Nature Reviews. Molecular Cell Biology **6**, 850–861.

**Cosgrove DJ.** 2016. Plant cell wall extensibility: connecting plant cell growth with cell wall structure, mechanics, and the action of wall-modifying enzymes. Journal of Experimental Botany **67**, 463–476.

Cosgrove DJ, Jarvis MC. 2012. Comparative structure and biomechanics of plant primary and secondary cell walls. Frontiers in Plant Science 3, 204.

Cousins AB, Mullendore DL, Sonawane BV. 2020. Recent developments in mesophyll conductancce in  $C_3$ ,  $C_4$ , and crassulacean acid metabolism plants. The Plant Journal **101**, 816–830.

**Deans RM, Brodribb TJ, Busch FA, Farquhar GD.** 2020. Optimization can provide the fundamental link between leaf photosynthesis, gas exchange and water relations. Nature Plants **6**, 1116–1125.

**de Boer HJ, Eppinga MB, Wassen MJ, Dekker SC.** 2012. A critical transition in leaf evolution facilitated the Cretaceous angiosperm revolution. Nature Communications **3**, 1221.

de Boer HJ, Price CA, Wagner-Cremer F, Dekker SC, Franks PJ, Veneklaas EJ. 2016. Optimal allocation of leaf epidermal area for gas exchange. New Phytologist **210**, 1219–1228.

de Sousa LF, de Menezes-Silva PE, Lourenço LL, et al. 2020. Improving water use efficiency by changing hydraulic and stomatal characteristics in soybean exposed to drought: the involvement of nitric oxide. Physiologia Plantarum **168**, 576–589.

de Souza AJ, Pauly M. 2015. Comparative genomics of pectinacetylesterases: insight on function and biology. Plant Signaling & Behavior 10, e1055434.

**Douthe C, Dreyer E, Brendel O, Warren CR.** 2012. Is mesophyll conductance to  $CO_2$  in leaves of three Eucalyptus species sensitive to short-term changes of irradiance under ambient as well as low  $O_2$ ? Functional Plant Biology **39**, 435–448.

**Drake PL, Froend RH, Franks PJ.** 2013. Smaller, faster stomata: scaling of stomatal size, rate of response, and stomatal conductance. Journal of Experimental Botany **64**, 495–505.

**Du Q, Liu T, Jiao X, Song X, Zhang J, Li J.** 2019. Leaf anatomical adaptations have central roles in photosynthetic acclimation to humidity. Journal of Experimental Botany **70**, 4949–4962.

Earles JM, Buckley TN, Brodersen CR, et al. 2019. Embracing 3D complexity in leaf carbon–water exchange. Trends in Plant Science 24, 15–24.

Earles JM, Theroux-Rancourt G, Roddy AB, Gilbert ME, McElrone AJ, Brodersen CR. 2018. Beyond porosity: 3D leaf intercellular airspace traits that impact mesophyll conductance. Plant Physiology **178**, 148–162.

**Ellsworth DS, Reich PB.** 1993. Canopy structure and vertical patterns of photosynthesis and related leaf traits in a deciduous forest. Oecologia **96**, 169–178.

**Ellsworth PV, Ellsworth PZ, Koteyeva NK, Cousins AB.** 2018. Cell wall properties in *Oryza sativa* influence mesophyll CO<sub>2</sub> conductance. New Phytologist **219**, 66–76.

**Evans JR.** 2021. Mesophyll conductance: walls, membranes and spatial complexity. New Phytologist **229**, 1864–1876.

**Evans JR, Kaldenhoff R, Genty B, Terashima I.** 2009. Resistances along the CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion pathway inside leaves. Journal of Experimental Botany **60**, 2235–2248.

**Farquhar GD, von Caemmerer S, Berry JA.** 1980. A biochemical model of photosynthetic  $CO_2$  assimilation in leaves of  $C_3$  species. Planta **149**, 78–90.

**Fernández-Marín B, Holzinger A, García-Plazaola JI.** 2016. Photosynthesis strategies of desiccation-tolerant organisms. In: Pessarakli M, ed. Handbook of photosynthesis. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 663–681.

Fernández-Marín B, Nadal M, Gago J, Fernie AR, López-Pozo M, Artetxe U, García-Plazaola JI, Verhoeven A. 2020. Born to revive: molecular and physiological mechanisms of double tolerance in a paleotropical and resurrection plant. New Phytologist **226**, 741–759.

Fini A, Loreto F, Tattini M, Giordano C, Ferrini F, Brunetti C, Centritto M. 2016. Mesophyll conductance plays a central role in leaf functioning of Oleaceae species exposed to contrasting sunlight irradiance. Physiologia Plantarum **157**, 54–68.

Fleischer A, O'Neill MA, Ehwald R. 1999. The pore size of nongraminaceous plant cell walls is rapidly decreased by borate ester crosslinking of the pectic polysaccharide rhamnogalacturonan II. Plant Physiology **121**, 829–838.

**Flexas J.** 2016. Genetic improvement of leaf photosynthesis and intrinsic water use efficiency in  $C_3$  plants: why so much little success? Plant Science **251**, 155–161.

**Flexas J, Barbour MM, Brendel O, et al**. 2012. Mesophyll diffusion conductance to  $CO_2$ : an unappreciated central player in photosynthesis. Plant Science **196**, 31.

Flexas J, Cano FJ, Carriquí M, Coopman RE, Mizokami Y, Tholen D, Xiong D. 2018.  $CO_2$  diffusion inside photosynthetic organs. In: Adams W III, Terashima I, eds. The leaf: a platform for performing photosynthesis. Cham: Springer, 163–208.

Flexas J, Carriquí M. 2020. Photosynthesis and photosynthetic efficiencies along the terrestrial plant's phylogeny: lessons for improving crop photosynthesis. The Plant Journal **101**, 964–978.

Flexas J, Clemente-Moreno MJ, Bota J, et al. 2021. Data from: Cell wall thickness and composition are involved in photosynthetic limitation. Dryad Digital Repository. doi:10.5061/dryad.qbzkh18gs

**Flexas J, Díaz-Espejo A, Conesa MA,** *et al.* 2016. Mesophyll conductance to  $CO_2$  and Rubisco as targets for improving intrinsic water use efficiency in  $C_3$  plants. Plant, Cell & Environment **39**, 965–982.

**Flexas J, Diaz-Espejo A, Galmés J, Kaldenhoff R, Medrano H, Ribas-Carbo M.** 2007. Rapid variations of mesophyll conductance in response to changes in CO<sub>2</sub> concentration around leaves. Plant, Cell & Environment **30**, 1284–1298.

**Flexas J, Niinemets U, Gallé A,** *et al.* 2013. Diffusional conductances to  $CO_2$  as a target for increasing photosynthesis and photosynthetic water-use efficiency. Photosynthesis Research **117**, 45–59.

Flexas J, Ribas-Carbó M, Hanson DT, Bota J, Otto B, Cifre J, McDowell N, Medrano H, Kaldenhoff R. 2006. Tobacco aquaporin NtAQP1 is involved in mesophyll conductance to  $CO_2$  *in vivo*. The Plant Journal **48**, 427–439.

**Franks PJ, Beerling DJ.** 2009. Maximum leaf conductance driven by  $CO_2$  effects on stomatal size and density over geologic time. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA **106**, 10343–10347.

Frey-Wyssling A. 1950. Physiology of cell wall growth. Annual Review of Plant Physiology 1, 169–182.

**Gaff DF, Oliver M.** 2013. The evolution of desiccation tolerance in angiosperm plants: a rare yet common phenomenon. Functional Plant Biology **40**, 315–328.

Gago J, Carriquí M, Nadal M, Clemente-Moreno MJ, Coopman RE, Fernie AR, Flexas J. 2019. Photosynthesis optimized across land plant phylogeny. Trends in Plant Science **24**, 947–958.

Gago J, Daloso DM, Carriquí M, Nadal M, Morales M, Araújo WL, Nunes-Nesi A, Flexas J. 2020a. Mesophyll conductance: the leaf corridors for photosynthesis. Biochemical Society Transactions 48, 429–439.

Gago J, Daloso DM, Carriquí M, Nadal M, Morales M, Araújo WL, Nunes-Nesi A, Perera-Castro AV, Clemente-Moreno MJ, Flexas J. 2020b. The photosynthesis game is in the 'inter-play': mechanisms underlying  $CO_2$  diffusion in leaves. Environmental and Experimental Botany **178**, 104174.

Galmés J, Ochogavía JM, Gago J, Roldán EJ, Cifre J, Conesa MÀ. 2013. Leaf responses to drought stress in Mediterranean accessions of *Solanum lycopersicum*: anatomical adaptations in relation to gas exchange parameters. Plant, Cell & Environment **36**, 920–935.

**Geilfus CM.** 2017. The pH of the apoplast: dynamic factor with functional impact under stress. Molecular plant **10**, 1371–1386.

Gratani L, Covone F, Larcher W. 2006. Leaf plasticity in response to light of three evergreen species of the Mediterranean maquis. Trees **20**, 549–558.

Groszmann M, Osborn HL, Evans JR. 2017. Carbon dioxide and water transport through plant aquaporins. Plant, Cell & Environment 40, 938–961.

**Gu L, Sun Y.** 2014. Artefactual responses of mesophyll conductance to  $CO_2$  and irradiance estimated with the variable J and online isotope discrimination methods. Plant, Cell & Environment **37**, 1231–1249.

**Gunnarsson M, Bernin D, Östlund Å, Hasani M.** 2018. The CO<sub>2</sub> capturing ability of cellulose dissolved in NaOH(aq) at low temperature. Green Chemistry **20**, 3279–3286.

**Gunnarsson M, Theliander H, Hasani M.** 2017. Chemisorption of air CO<sub>2</sub> on cellulose: an overlooked feature of the cellulose/NaOH(aq) dissolution system. Cellulose **24**, 2427–2436.

Gutknecht J. 1967. Membranes of Valonia ventricosa: apparent absence of water-filled pores. Science 158, 787–788.

Han J, Lei Z, Flexas J, Zhang Y, Carriquí M, Zhang W, Zhang Y. 2018. Mesophyll conductance in cotton bracts: anatomically determined internal CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion constraints on photosynthesis. Journal of Experimental Botany **69**, 5433–5443.

Han JM, Meng HF, Wang SY, Jiang CD, Liu F, Zhang WF, Zhang YL. 2016. Variability of mesophyll conductance and its relationship with water use efficiency in cotton leaves under drought pretreatment. Journal of Plant Physiology **194**, 61–71.

Hanba YT, Kogami H, Terashima I. 2002. The effect of growth irradiance on leaf anatomy and photosynthesis in *Acer* species differing in light demand. Plant, Cell & Environment **25**, 1021–1030.

Hanba YT, Miyazawa SI, Kogami H, Terashima I. 2001. Effects of leaf age on internal  $CO_2$  transfer conductance and photosynthesis in tree species having different types of shoot phenology. Australian Journal of Plant Physiology **28**, 1075–1084.

**Hanson DT, Renzaglia K, Villarreal JC.** 2014. Diffusion limitation and CO<sub>2</sub> concentrating mechanisms in bryophytes. In: Hanson DT, Rice SK, eds. Photosynthesis in bryophytes and early land plants. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer, 95–112.

Harwood R, Goodman E, Gudmundsdottir M, Huynh M, Musulin Q, Song M, Barbour MM. 2020. Cell and chloroplast anatomical features are poorly estimated from 2D cross-sections. New Phytologist **225**, 2567–2578.

**He W, Adachi S, Sage RF, Ookawa T, Hirasawa T.** 2017. Leaf photosynthetic rate and mesophyll cell anatomy changes during ontogenesis in backcrossed *indica×japonica* rice inbred lines. Photosynthesis Research **134**, 27–38.

Herrera A. 2020. Are thick leaves, large mesophyll cells and small intercellular air spaces requisites for CAM? Annals of Botany **125**, 859–868. Houston K, Tucker MR, Chowdhury J, Shirley N, Little A. 2016. The plant cell wall: a complex and dynamic structure as revealed by the responses of genes under stress conditions. Frontiers in Plant Science 7, 984.

Hu W, Lu Z, Meng F, Li X, Cong R, Ren T, Sharkey TD, Lu J. 2020. The reduction in leaf area precedes that in photosynthesis under potassium deficiency: the importance of leaf anatomy. New Phytologist **227**, 1749–1763.

Hura T, Hura K, Dziurka K, Ostrowska A, Bączek-Kwinta R, Grzesiak M. 2012. An increase in the content of cell wall-bound phenolics correlates with the productivity of triticale under soil drought. Journal of Plant Physiology **169**, 1728–1736.

Hura T, Hura K, Grzesiak S. 2009. Possible contribution of cell-wallbound ferulic acid in drought resistance and recovery in triticale seedlings. Journal of Plant Physiology **166**, 1720–1733.

Kenrick P, Crane PR. 1997. The origin and early evolution of plants on land. Nature **389**, 33–39.

Kromdijk J, Głowacka K, Leonelli L, Gabilly ST, Iwai M, Niyogi KK, Long SP. 2016. Improving photosynthesis and crop productivity by accelerating recovery from photoprotection. Science **354**, 857–861.

Lawson T, Vialet-Chabrand S. 2019. Speedy stomata, photosynthesis and plant water use efficiency. New Phytologist **221**, 93–98.

Le Gall H, Philippe F, Domon JM, Gillet F, Pelloux J, Rayon C. 2015. Cell wall metabolism in response to abiotic stress. Plants 4, 112–166.

Lehmeier C, Pajor R, Lundgren MR, et al. 2017. Cell density and airspace patterning in the leaf can be manipulated to increase leaf photosynthetic capacity. The Plant Journal 92, 981–994.

Li Y, Ren B, Ding L, Shen Q, Peng S, Guo S. 2013. Does chloroplast size influence photosynthetic nitrogen use efficiency? PLoS One 8, e62036.

Liu X, Li J, Zhao H, Liu B, Günther-Pomorski T, Chen S, Liesche J. 2019. Novel tool to quantify cell wall porosity relates wall structure to cell growth and drug uptake. Journal of Cell Biology **218**, 1408–1421.

Lu Z, Xie K, Pan Y, Ren T, Lu J, Wang M, Shen Q, Guo S. 2019. Potassium mediates coordination of leaf photosynthesis and hydraulic conductance by modifications of leaf anatomy. Plant, Cell & Environment 42, 2231–2244.

Lundgren MR, Mathers A, Baillie AL, et al. 2019. Mesophyll porosity is modulated by the presence of functional stomata. Nature Communications **10**, 2825.

**Luo J, Preciado S, Xie P, Larrosa I.** 2016. Carboxylation of phenols with  $CO_2$  at atmospheric pressure. Chemistry **22**, 6798–6802.

Maron L. 2019. Rethinking our models of the plant cell wall. The Plant Journal 100, 1099-1100.

Masle J, Gilmore SR, Farquhar GD. 2005. The ERECTA gene regulates plant transpiration efficiency in Arabidopsis. Nature **436**, 866–870.

McCann MC, Wells B, Roberts K. 1990. Direct visualization of cross-links in the primary plant-cell wall. Journal of Cell Science **96**, 323–334.

Mélida H, García-Angulo P, Alonso-Simón A, Encina A, Alvarez J, Acebes JL. 2009. Novel type II cell wall architecture in dichlobenilhabituated maize calluses. Planta **229**, 617–631.

**Miyazawa SI, Makino A, Terashima I.** 2003. Changes in mesophyll anatomy and sink-source relationships during leaf development in *Quercus glauca*, an evergreen tree showing delayed leaf greening. Plant, Cell & Environment **26**, 745–755.

**Miyazawa SI, Terashima I.** 2001. Slow development of leaf photosynthesis in an evergreen broad-leaved tree, *Castanopsis sieboldii*: relationships between leaf anatomical characteristics and photosynthetic rate. Plant, Cell & Environment **24**, 279–291.

**Miyazawa SI, Yoshimura S, Shinzaki Y, Maeshima M, Miyake C.** 2008. Deactivation of aquaporins decreases internal conductance to  $CO_2$  diffusion in tobacco leaves grown under long-term drought. Functional Plant Biology **35**, 553–564.

**Mizokami Y, Noguchi K, Kojima M, Sakakibara H, Terashima I.** 2019. Effects of instantaneous and growth  $CO_2$  levels and abscisic acid on stomatal and mesophyll conductances. Plant, Cell & Environment **42**, 1257–1269.

#### **3984** | Flexas *et al.*

**Momayyezi M, McKown AD, Bell SCS, Guy RD.** 2020. Emerging roles for carbonic anhydrase in mesophyll conductance and photosynthesis. The Plant Journal **101**, 831–844.

Nadal M, Perera-Castro AV, Gulias J, Farrant JM, Flexas J. 2021. Resurrection plants optimize photosynthesis despite very thick cell walls by means of chloroplast distribution. Journal of Experimental Botany **72**, 2600–2610.

Niinemets U. 1999. Components of leaf dry mass per area—thickness and density—alter leaf photosynthetic capacity in reverse directions in woody plants. New Phytologist **144**, 35–47.

**Niinemets Ü, García-Plazaola JI, Tosens T.** 2012. Photosynthesis during leaf development and ageing. In: Flexas J, Medrano H, Loreto F, eds. Terrestrial photosynthesis in a changing environment: a molecular, physiological, and ecological approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 353–372.

Niinemets U, Reichstein M. 2003. Controls on the emission of plant volatiles through stomata: differential sensitivity of emission rates to stomatal closure explained. Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres **108**, 4208.

Niklas KJ, Cobb ED, Matas AJ. 2017. The evolution of hydrophobic cell wall biopolymers: from algae to angiosperms. Journal of Experimental Botany **68**, 5261–5269.

**Nobel PS.** 2004. Physicochemical and environmental plant physiology. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.

Northcote DH. 1972. Chemistry of the plant cell wall. Annual Review of Plant Physiology 23, 113–132.

**Novakovic L, Guo T, Bacic A, Sampathkumar A, Johnson KL.** 2018. Hitting the wall—sensing and signaling pathways involved in plant cell wall remodeling in response to abiotic stress. Plants **7**, 89.

**O'Brien JA, Daudi A, Butt VS, Bolwell GP.** 2012. Reactive oxygen species and their role in plant defence and cell wall metabolism. Planta **236**, 765–779.

**Ochoa-Villareal M, Aispuro-Hernández E, Vargas-Aispuro I, Martínez-Téllez MÁ.** 2012. Plant cell wall polymers: function, structure and biological activity of their derivatives. In: Gomes DS, ed. Polymerization. Rijeka: InTech.

**Oguchi R, Hikosaka K, Hirose T.** 2003. Does the photosynthetic lightacclimation need change in leaf anatomy? Plant, Cell & Environment **26**, 505–512.

**Okuda K, Ueno S, Mine I.** 1997. Cytomorphogenesis in coenocytic green algae. IV. The construction of cortical microtubules during lenticular cell formation in *Valonia ulticularis*. Memoir of the Faculty of Science, Kochi University, Series D **18**, 17–25.

**Oliver MJ, Velten J, Mishler BD.** 2005. Desiccation tolerance in bryophytes: a reflection of the primitive strategy for plant survival in dehydrating habitats? Integrative and Comparative Biology **45**, 788–799.

**Olmos E, García De La Garma J, Gomez-Jimenez MC, Fernandez-Garcia N.** 2017. Arabinogalactan proteins are involved in salt-adaptation and vesicle trafficking in tobacco By-2 cell cultures. Frontiers in Plant Science **8**, 1092.

**Ort DR, Merchant SS, Alric J, et al**. 2015. Redesigning photosynthesis to sustainably meet global food and bioenergy demand. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA **112**, 8529–8536.

**Osorio S, Castillejo C, Quesada MA, Medina-Escobar N, Brownsey GJ, Suau R, Heredia A, Botella MA, Valpuesta V.** 2008. Partial demethylation of oligogalacturonides by pectin methyl esterase 1 is required for eliciting defence responses in wild strawberry (*Fragaria vesca*). The Plant Journal **54**, 43–55.

**Ouyang W, Struik PC, Yin X, Yang J.** 2017. Stomatal conductance, mesophyll conductance, and transpiration efficiency in relation to leaf anatomy in rice and wheat genotypes under drought. Journal of Experimental Botany **68**, 5191–5205. Panchev IN, Slavov A, Nikolova K, Kovacheva D. 2010. On the watersorption properties of pectin. Food Hydrocolloids 24, 763–769.

Pathare VS, Sonawane BV, Koteyeva N, Cousins AB. 2020. C<sub>4</sub> grasses adapted to low precipitation habitats show traits related to greater meso-phyll conductance and lower leaf hydraulic conductance. Plant, Cell & Environment **43**, 1897–1910.

**Peguero-Pina JJ, Sancho-Knapik D, Flexas J, Galmés J, Niinemets Ü, Gil-Pelegrín E.** 2016. Light acclimation of photosynthesis in two closely related firs (*Abies pinsapo* Boiss. and *Abies alba* Mill.): the role of leaf anatomy and mesophyll conductance to CO<sub>2</sub>. Tree Physiology **36**, 300–310.

Peguero-Pina JJ, Sisó S, Flexas J, Galmés J, García-Nogales A, Niinemets Ü, Sancho-Knapik D, Saz MÁ, Gil-Pelegrín E. 2017. Celllevel anatomical characteristics explain high mesophyll conductance and photosynthetic capacity in sclerophyllous Mediterranean oaks. New Phytologist **214**, 585–596.

Pelloux J, Rustérucci C, Mellerowicz EJ. 2007. New insights into pectin methylesterase structure and function. Trends in Plant Science 12, 267–277.

**Perera-Castro AV, Nadal M, Flexas J.** 2020. What drives photosynthesis during desiccation? Mosses and other outliers from the photosynthesis-elasticity trade-off. Journal of Experimental Botany **71**, 6460–6470.

Perez-Martin A, Michelazzo C, Torres-Ruiz JM, Flexas J, Fernández JE, Sebastiani L, Diaz-Espejo A. 2014. Regulation of photosynthesis and stomatal and mesophyll conductance under water stress and recovery in olive trees: correlation with gene expression of carbonic anhydrase and aquaporins. Journal of Experimental Botany **65**, 3143–3156.

Popper ZA, Michel G, Hervé C, Domozych DS, Willats WG, Tuohy MG, Kloareg B, Stengel DB. 2011. Evolution and diversity of plant cell walls: from algae to flowering plants. Annual Review of Plant Biology **62**, 567–590.

**Price GD, Pengelly JJ, Forster B, Du J, Whitney SM, von Caemmerer S, Badger MR, Howitt SM, Evans JR.** 2013. The cyanobacterial CCM as a source of genes for improving photosynthetic CO<sub>2</sub> fixation in crop species. Journal of Experimental Botany **64**, 753–768.

**Ray DK, Mueller ND, West PC, Foley JA.** 2013. Yield trends are insufficient to double global crop production by 2050. PLoS One **8**, e66428.

**Ren T, Weraduwage SM, Sharkey TD.** 2019. Prospects for enhancing leaf photosynthetic capacity by manipulating mesophyll cell morphology. Journal of Experimental Botany **70**, 1153–1165.

Roddy AB. 2019. Testing the benefits of early vessel evolution. Journal of Experimental Botany 70, 3024–3027.

**Roig-Oliver M, Bresta P, Nadal M, Liakopoulos G, Nikolopoulos D, Karabourniotis G, Bota J, Flexas J.** 2020a. Cell wall composition and thickness affect mesophyll conductance to CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion in *Helianthus annuus* under water deprivation. Journal of Experimental Botany **71**, 7198–7209.

**Roig-Oliver M, Nadal M, Clemente-Moreno MJ, Bota J, Flexas J.** 2020*b*. Cell wall components regulate photosynthesis and leaf water relations of *Vitis vinifera* cv. Grenache acclimated to contrasting environmental conditions. Journal of Plant Physiology **244**, 153084.

**Roig-Oliver M, Rayon C, Roulard R, Fournet F, Bota J, Flexas J.** 2020c. Reduced photosynthesis in *Arabidopsis thaliana atpme17.2* and *atpae11.1* mutants is associated to altered cell wall composition. Physiologia Plantarum doi: 10.1111/ppl.13186.

**Rondeau-Mouro C, Defer D, Leboeuf E, Lahaye M.** 2008. Assessment of cell wall porosity in *Arabidopsis thaliana* by NMR spectroscopy. International Journal of Biological Macromolecules **42**, 83–92.

**Saito T, Soga K, Hoson T, Terashima I.** 2006. The bulk elastic modulus and the reversible properties of cell walls in developing *Quercus* leaves. Plant & Cell Physiology **47**, 715–725.

**Sarkar P, Bosneaga E, Auer M.** 2009. Plant cell walls throughout evolution: towards a molecular understanding of their design principles. Journal of Experimental Botany **60**, 3615–3635.

Schiraldi A, Fessas D, Signorelli M. 2012. Water activity in biological systems – a review. Polish Journal of Food and Nutrition Sciences 62, 5–13.

Schlüter U, Weber AP. 2016. The road to C4 photosynthesis: evolution of a complex trait via intermediary states. Plant & Cell Physiology 57, 881–889.

Schmidt R, Kunkowska AB, Schippers JH. 2016. Role of reactive oxygen species during cell expansion in leaves. Plant Physiology **172**, 2098–2106.

**Shrestha A, Song X, Barbour MM.** 2019. The temperature response of mesophyll conductance, and its component conductances, varies between species and genotypes. Photosynthesis Research **141**, 65–82.

**Sims DA, Pearcy RW.** 1989. Photosynthetic characteristics of a tropical forest understory herb, *Alocasia macrorrhiza*, and a related crop species, *Colocasia esculenta* grown in contrasting light environments. Oecologia **79**, 53–59.

**Sorek N, Turner S.** 2016. From the nucleus to the apoplast: building the plant's cell wall. Journal of Experimental Botany **67**, 445–447.

South PF, Cavanagh AP, Liu HW, Ort DR. 2019. Synthetic glycolate metabolism pathways stimulate crop growth and productivity in the field. Science **363**, eaat9077.

Sugiura D, Terashima I, Evans JR. 2020. A decrease in mesophyll conductance by cell-wall thickening contributes to photosynthetic downregulation. Plant Physiology **183**, 1600–1611.

**Sugiura D, Watanabe CKA, Betsuyaku E, Terashima I.** 2017. Sink–source balance and down-regulation of photosynthesis in *Raphanus sativus*: effects of grafting, N and CO<sub>2</sub>. Plant & Cell Physiology **58**, 2043–2056.

Sumbele S, Fotelli MN, Nikolopoulos D, Tooulakou G, Liakoura V, Liakopoulos G, Bresta P, Dotsika E, Adams MA, Karabourniotis G. 2012. Photosynthetic capacity is negatively correlated with the concentration of leaf phenolic compounds across a range of different species. AoB Plants **2012**, pls025.

Syvertsen JP, Lloyd J, Mcconchie C, Kriedemann PE, Farquhar GD. 1995. On the relationship between leaf anatomy and  $CO_2$  diffusion through the mesophyll of hypostomatous leaves. Plant, Cell & Environment **18**, 149–157.

Takai T, Adachi S, Taguchi-Shiobara F, et al. 2013. A natural variant of NAL1, selected in high-yield rice breeding programs, pleiotropically increases photosynthesis rate. Scientific Reports **3**, 2149.

**Teng N, Wang J, Chen T, Wu X, Wang Y, Lin J.** 2006. Elevated CO<sub>2</sub> induces physiological, biochemical and structural changes in leaves of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. New Phytologist **172**, 92–103.

Tenhaken R. 2015. Cell wall remodeling under abiotic stress. Frontiers in Plant Science 5, 771.

**Terashima I, Hanba YT, Tazoe Y, Vyas P, Yano S.** 2006. Irradiance and phenotype: comparative eco-development of sun and shade leaves in relation to photosynthetic  $CO_2$  diffusion. Journal of Experimental Botany **57**, 343–354.

**Terashima I, Hanba YT, Tholen D, Niinemets Ü.** 2011. Leaf functional anatomy in relation to photosynthesis. Plant Physiology **155**, 108–116.

Théroux-Rancourt G, Earles JM, Gilbert ME, Zwieniecki MA, Boyce CK, McElrone AJ, Brodersen CR. 2017. The bias of a twodimensional view: comparing two-dimensional and three-dimensional mesophyll surface area estimates using noninvasive imaging. New Phytologist **215**, 1609–1622.

Théroux-Rancourt G, Gilbert ME. 2017. The light response of mesophyll conductance is controlled by structure across leaf profiles. Plant, Cell & Environment 40, 726–740.

Tholen D, Boom C, Noguchi K, Ueda S, Katase T, Terashima I. 2008. The chloroplast avoidance response decreases internal conductance to  $CO_2$  diffusion in *Arabidopsis thaliana* leaves. Plant, Cell & Environment **31**, 1688–1700.

Tholen D, Ethier G, Genty B, Pepin S, Zhu XG. 2012. Variable mesophyll conductance revisited: theoretical background and experimental implications. Plant, Cell & Environment **35**, 2087–2103.

**Tholen D, Zhu XG.** 2011. The mechanistic basis of internal conductance: a theoretical analysis of mesophyll cell photosynthesis and  $CO_2$  diffusion. Plant Physiology **156**, 90–105.

Tomás M, Flexas J, Copolovici L, Galmés J, Hallik L, Medrano H, Ribas-Carbó M, Tosens T, Vislap V, Niinemets Ü. 2013. Importance

of leaf anatomy in determining mesophyll diffusion conductance to  $CO_2$  across species: quantitative limitations and scaling up by models. Journal of Experimental Botany **64**, 2269–2281.

Tomás M, Medrano H, Brugnoli E, Escalona JM, Martorell S, Pou A, Ribas-Carbó M, Flexas J. 2014. Variability of mesophyll conductance in grapevine cultivars under water stress conditions in relation to leaf anatomy and water use efficiency. Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research **20**, 272–280.

**Tosens T, Laanisto L.** 2018. Mesophyll conductance and accurate photosynthetic carbon gain calculations. Journal of Experimental Botany **69**, 5315–5318.

**Tosens T, Niinemets U, Vislap V, Eichelmann H, Castro Díez P.** 2012*a*. Developmental changes in mesophyll diffusion conductance and photosynthetic capacity under different light and water availabilities in *Populus tremula*: how structure constrains function. Plant, Cell & Environment **35**, 839–856.

**Tosens T, Niinemets Ü, Westoby M, Wright IJ.** 2012*b*. Anatomical basis of variation in mesophyll resistance in eastern Australian sclerophylls: news of a long and winding path. Journal of Experimental Botany **63**, 5105–5119.

**Tosens T, Nishida K, Gago J, et al.** 2016. The photosynthetic capacity in 35 ferns and fern allies: mesophyll CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion as a key trait. New Phytologist **209**, 1576–1590.

**Veromann-Jürgenson LL, Brodribb TJ, Niinemets Ü, Tosens T.** 2020. Variability in the chloroplast area lining the intercellular airspace and cell walls drives mesophyll conductance in gymnosperms. Journal of Experimental Botany **71**, 4958–4971.

Veromann-Jürgenson LL, Tosens T, Laanisto L, Niinemets Ü. 2017. Extremely thick cell walls and low mesophyll conductance: welcome to the world of ancient living! Journal of Experimental Botany **68**, 1639–1653.

Vitt DH, Crandall-Stotler B, Wood A. 2014. Bryophytes: survival in a dry world through tolerance and avoidance. In: Rajakaruna N, Boyd RS, Harris TB, eds. Plant ecology and evolution in harsh environments. New York: Nova Science, 267–295.

Vrábl D, Vasková M, Hronková M, Flexas J, Santrucek J. 2009. Mesophyll conductance to  $CO_2$  transport estimated by two independent methods: effect of variable  $CO_2$  concentration and abscisic acid. Journal of Experimental Botany **60**, 2315–2323.

Weisiger RA. 1998. Impact of extracellular and intracellular diffusion barriers on transport. In: Bassingthwaighte JB, Goresky CA, Linehan JH, eds. Whole organ approaches to cellular metabolism. New York: Springer, 389–423.

Weraduwage SM, Campos ML, Yoshida Y, et al. 2018. Molecular mechanisms affecting cell wall properties and leaf architecture. In: Adams W III, Terashima I, eds. The leaf: a platform for performing photosynthesis. Advances in photosynthesis and respiration (including bioenergy and related processes), vol 44. Cham: Springer, 209–253.

Weraduwage SM, Kim SJ, Renna L, C Anozie F, D Sharkey T, Brandizzi F. 2016. pectin methylesterification impacts the relationship between photosynthesis and plant growth. Plant Physiology **171**, 833–848.

Wolf S, Hématy K, Höfte H. 2012. Growth control and cell wall signaling in plants. Annual Review of Plant Biology **63**, 381–407.

Xiao Y, Zhu XG. 2017. Components of mesophyll resistance and their environmental responses: a theoretical modelling analysis. Plant, Cell & Environment 40, 2729–2742.

Xiong D, Flexas J, Yu T, Peng S, Huang J. 2017. Leaf anatomy mediates coordination of leaf hydraulic conductance and mesophyll conductance to  $CO_2$  in *Oryza*. New Phytologist **213**, 572–583.

Xiong D, Nadal M. 2020. Linking water relations and hydraulics with photosynthesis. The Plant Journal **101**, 800–815.

Ye M, Zhang Z, Huang G, Xiong Z, Peng S, Li Y. 2020. High leaf mass per area (LMA) *Oryza* genotypes invest more leaf mass to cell wall and possess a low mesophyll conductance. AoB Plants **12**, plaa028.

Yokoyama R. 2020. A genomic perspective on the evolutionary diversity of the plant cell wall. Plants 9, 1195.

#### **3986** | Flexas *et al.*

Zhang R, Hu H, Wang Y, et al. 2020. A novel rice fragile culm 24 mutant encodes a UDP-glucose epimerase that affects cell wall properties and photosynthesis. Journal of Experimental Botany **71**, 2956–2969.

Zhang T, Tang H, Vavylonis D, Cosgrove DJ. 2019. Disentangling loosening from softening: insights into primary cell wall structure. The Plant Journal **100**, 1101–1117.

Zhong R, Morrison WH 3rd, Freshour GD, Hahn MG, Ye ZH. 2003. Expression of a mutant form of cellulose synthase AtCesA7 causes dominant negative effect on cellulose biosynthesis. Plant Physiology 132, 786-795.

Zhu C, Ziska L, Zhu J, Zeng Q, Xie Z, Tang H, Jia X, Hasegawa T. 2012. The temporal and species dynamics of photosynthetic acclimation in flag leaves of rice (*Oryza sativa*) and wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) under elevated carbon dioxide. Physiologia Plantarum **145**, 395–405.

Zhu XG, Long SP, Ort DR. 2010. Improving photosynthetic efficiency for greater yield. Annual Review of Plant Biology **61**, 235–261.