Comparative effects of two alkali stresses, Na$_2$CO$_3$ and NaHCO$_3$ on cell ionic balance, osmotic adjustment, pH, photosynthetic pigments and growth in oat (Avena sativa L.)
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Abstract

This study examines the comparative effects of NaHCO$_3$ and Na$_2$CO$_3$ on young oat (Avena sativa L.) plants to elucidate the species’ physiological adaptive mechanisms to alkali stress. Factors considered are the intracellular influx and efflux of ions, ionic balance, osmotic adjustment, pH homeostasis, photosynthetic pigments and growth. Results show that, Na$_2$CO$_3$ had stronger effects than NaHCO$_3$, and that with increasing concentrations of both stresses the plant showed rising Na$^+$ influxes into the shoot resulting in Na$^+$ ion toxicity. This is tolerated by Na$^+$ sequestration in the vacuole; the accumulation mainly of Cl$^-$, SO$_4^{2-}$ and the synthesis of high concentrations of organic anions to maintain vacuolar ionic balance and, lastly by the synthesis of proline in the cytoplasm to avoid dehydration. Moreover, Na$_2$CO$_3$ stress inhibits growth more strongly, compared to NaHCO$_3$, because of the higher energy costs associated with Na$^+$ exclusion and compartmentalisation. The syntheses of organic anions, the syntheses of proline in the cytoplasm, reduced photosynthetic capacity and increased membrane permeability. Compared to the shoot, although the root had a similar response to both stresses, it showed a higher tolerance because high Na$_2$CO$_3$ stresses (>48 mmol L$^{-1}$) resulted in significant increases in root tissue pH, but did not affect the pH homeostasis of the shoot. Additionally, while both stresses decreased root dry weight, they did not significantly affect root extension growth. This indicates that oat adopts an opportunistic guerrilla strategy by which it avoids resource-poor patches of soil (e.g. high alkali) while preferentially exploiting more favorable habitats by maintaining root extension.
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Introduction

Alkali stress has been demonstrated in a number of reports (Kawanabe and Zhu, 1991; El-Samad and Shaddad, 1996; Campbell and Nishio, 2000; Hartung et al., 2002; Rao et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2011; Ma et al., 2011). Previous studies have suggested that alkali stress results mainly from levels of the alkaline salts NaHCO$_3$ and Na$_2$CO$_3$ (Shi and Yin, 1993; Shi and Sheng, 2005; Yang et al., 2010; Liu et al., 2010). In some areas, soil alkalinisation is a severe problem. For example, approximately 7% (6.7×10$^3$ hm$^{-2}$) of the cultivated land in northeast China has alkaline soils with only a few alkali-tolerant halophytes being able to survive there (Kawanabe and Zhu, 1991). Alkali stress usually involves a combination of stresses, osmotic, ion-induced injury and high pH (Munns, 2002; yang et al., 2008a; Chen et al., 2011). The high-pH environment that surrounds the roots can greatly affect the absorption of cations and inorganic anions and can also disrupt the ionic balance and pH homeostasis of the tissues (Yang et al., 2007, 2008b; Guo et al., 2010). The results are a decrease in photosynthesis, damage to the membrane system and finally a reduction in growth. Although the effects of various mixed alkali stresses have been studied extensively in a few plants (Shi and Yin, 1993; Hartung et al., 2002; Shi and Wang, 2005; Yan et al., 2006; Guo et al., 2010; Radi et al., 2012), these studies do not differentiate between the effects of NaHCO$_3$ and of Na$_2$CO$_3$ in isolation. Although these studies provide a better understanding of the adaptive responses of plants under mixed alkaline stress, analysis of the stresses caused by the single alkali have not been adequately researched. Examination of the effects of NaHCO$_3$ alone, or of Na$_2$CO$_3$ alone, would seem to be a logical starting point for resolving the demographic mechanisms underlying these complex responses. Therefore, stress effects associated with NaHCO$_3$ on its own or with Na$_2$CO$_3$ on its own should be investigated as thoroughly as those of mixed alkali stress, especially, in regard to the responses of the major plant organs, the shoot and root. The present study was conducted in an experimental area of Northeast Normal University during the 2008 season. We compare the separate effects of alkali stresses, NaHCO$_3$ stress and Na$_2$CO$_3$ stress on water potential, photosynthetic pigments, ionic balance and tissue pH and growth in the shoot and root of young oat seedlings, to enhance our understanding of the mechanisms of alkali stress damage to plants and also those by which they adapt to such alkali stress.

Results

**Tissue pH and ELR analysis of shoot and root**

Shoot tissue pH did not show significant differences between NaHCO$_3$ and Na$_2$CO$_3$ stresses but root tissue pH and electrolyte leakage rate (ELR) were significantly higher under Na$_2$CO$_3$ stress than under NaHCO$_3$ stress (Table 1). The shoot
tissue pH under both stresses was closely similar to the controls (Fig. 1A, B) suggesting that these stress intensities did not affect the aboveground tissue pH. However, the root pH showed a different behaviour. While NaHCO₃ stress did not affect root pH with increasing stress, middle and high Na₂CO₃ contents (≥72mmol L⁻¹) did cause significant increases. Both stresses increased the ELR but the extent of the increment under Na₂CO₃ stress was much greater than under NaHCO₃ stress (Fig. 1C). All the plants treated with 120 and 144 mmol L⁻¹ of Na₂CO₃ died so their pH values were not recorded.

**Growth indices analysis of oat**

With increasing alkalai stress, the shoot survival rate, number of tillers per plant, root length, plant height, shoot dry weight and root dry weight all decreased (Fig. 2A-F), but the extents of the reductions were different. The effect on root length was especially slight with the effect of NaHCO₃ being not significant and only the most concentrated Na₂CO₃ (144mmol L⁻¹) caused a significant decrease (Fig. 2C; table 1). Furthermore, the reductions under Na₂CO₃ stress were much greater than those under NaHCO₃ stress (table 1).

**Photosynthetic pigments analysis of leaves**

All photosynthetic pigments were significantly lower under Na₂CO₃ than under NaHCO₃ (Table 1). The effects of NaHCO₃ stress on Chl a, Chl b and carotenoid were similar with all three parameters decreasing but the extents of the reductions under Na₂CO₃ stress were greater than those under NaHCO₃. When Na₂CO₃ stress was ≥ 120 mmol L⁻¹ the plants died and the contents of Chla, Chlb and Carotenoid were not recorded. The same concentrations of NaHCO₃ did not result in plant death (Fig. 3).

**Cations analysis of shoot and root**

Each of the cations showed significant differences between the NaHCO₃ and Na₂CO₃ stresses (Table 1). In both the shoots and the roots, the concentration ratios of Na⁺ and Na⁺/K⁺ in the Na₂CO₃ stressed plants compared to the NaHCO₃ stressed plants were significantly higher, while for K⁺ and Ca²⁺ the concentration ratios were significantly lower (Table 1). Both shoots and roots showed similar trends for these cations (Fig. 4A, B, C, D, G, H). With increasing stress, both the NaHCO₃ and Na₂CO₃ stresses resulted in increased Na⁺ contents and a decreased K⁺ contents, and finally in an increased Na⁺/K⁺ ratio (Fig. 4A, B, C, D, G, H). When NaHCO₃ and Na₂CO₃ stresses were compared, the extents not only of the increases in Na⁺ but also of the reductions in K⁺ were much greater under Na₂CO₃ stress than under NaHCO₃ stress (Fig. 4A, B, C, D, G, H). In both shoot and root, although the Ca²⁺ content range was far less than for either Na⁺ or K⁺, it showed a similar trend for decrease compared to K⁺ with increasing alkalai stress, also, the extent of the Ca²⁺ decrease for Na₂CO₃ stress was greater than for the NaHCO₃ stress (Fig. 4E, F).

**Anions analysis of shoot and root**

All the anions showed significant differences between the NaHCO₃ and Na₂CO₃ stresses (Table 1). In both shoot and root, compared to the NaHCO₃ stress, the Na₂CO₃ stress showed significantly higher concentrations of SO₄²⁻ and organic acids, while the Cl⁻, NO₃⁻ and H₂PO₄⁻ concentrations were significantly lower (Table 1). In both shoot and root Cl⁻ and SO₄²⁻ increased with increasing stress intensity for both stressors but compared with the NaHCO₃ stress, the extent of increase in Cl⁻ in the Na₂CO₃ was higher than in SO₄²⁻ (Fig. 5A, B, C, D). Both NO₃⁻ and H₂PO₄⁻ decreased with increasing stress but the reductions with Na₂CO₃ were much greater than with NaHCO₃ (Fig. 5E, F, G, H). With increasing stress, both low NaHCO₃ (≤72mmol L⁻¹) stresses and all the Na₂CO₃ stresses caused increases in organic acid. However, when the NaHCO₃ stresses were higher than 72 mmol L⁻¹, OA showed decreases (Fig. 5I, J).

**Water and proline contents analysis of shoot and root**

In both shoot and root, proline concentrations were significantly higher under Na₂CO₃ stress than under NaHCO₃ stress while water contents were significantly lower (Table 1). Both NaHCO₃ and Na₂CO₃ stress decreased the water contents of shoots and roots (Fig. 6A, B) but the extent of the reductions with increasing Na₂CO₃ stress were greater than with increasing NaHCO₃ stress. For shoot and roots, the changes in water content were in opposite directions with proline being increased by strong alkaline stress (>120mmol L⁻¹ NaHCO₃ and ≥96 mmol L⁻¹ Na₂CO₃) (Fig. 6C, D).

**Discussion**

**Tissue pH**

Regardless of environmental pH, to maintain normal metabolism it is important that plants can stabilise their tissue pH (Yang et al., 2007). Our observations that shoot tissue pH was similar to the control values under both alkalai stresses and that stress intensity increases did not have significant effects on tissue pH suggests that oat is able to maintain a stable cell pH (Fig.1A, B). However, it is surprising that when the stress level rose above certain threshold values (48 mmol L⁻¹ with Na₂CO₃; 72 mmol L⁻¹ with NaHCO₃), root pH was affected by increasing levels of stress. This may be explained as that at above 48 mmol L⁻¹ in Na₂CO₃ (or 72 mmol L⁻¹ in NaHCO₃) the harmful effects of high pH were opposed by pH adjustments outside the roots (by extrusion of H⁺, OA, amino acids or CO₂ produced by root respiration) with the intracellular environment being unaffected. However, when the stress intensity exceeded the capacity for root adjustment (>48 mmol L⁻¹ in Na₂CO₃ or >72 mmol L⁻¹ in NaHCO₃), the result was a reduction in photosynthetic pigment content (Fig. 5), and a sharp increase in ELR (Fig. 1C). This suggests that the stress may have weakened the controls, leading to increases in pH. Meanwhile, compared to the shoot, it was found that the effects of both alkali stresses on root growth (i.e. root length and biomass) was reduced, indicating that the root has a higher tolerance of elevated pH. This deserves further investigation.

**Growth indices**

Our results show that the injurious effects of Na₂CO₃ on growth were greater than those of NaHCO₃ for the same alkali control (Fig. 2), and this is consistent with previous reports (Shi and Yin, 1993; Yang et al., 2007). The injurious effects of alkali are commonly thought to be due to a combination of low water potential, ion toxicity, and, in particular, to high-pH stress (Munns, 2002). Firstly, the greater alkali stress due to Na₂CO₃ compared with NaHCO₃ leads to severer reductions in photosynthetic pigment content (Fig. 3) and a sharp increase in ELR (Fig. 1C). These results indicate that high pH from Na₂CO₃ stress may damage root cell structure and function affecting such processes as the absorption of ions, damaging photosynthetic pigments and membrane systems (e.g. increases in ELR). This may be why growth under NaHCO₃ stress was
Ion toxicity and ion imbalance

Under high concentrations of either alkali, the first effect on the plant is likely to be in the root due to high concentrations of Na⁺ in the soil. The Na⁺ enters the roots passively via voltage independent nonspecific cation channels and possibly via other Na⁺ transporters such as some members of the high-affinity K⁺ transporter (HKT) family (Munns and Tester, 2008), resulting in Na⁺ ion toxicity in shoot. The similar radii of the hydrated ions of Na⁺ and K⁺ makes them difficult to discriminate, and this is the basis of Na⁺ toxicity (Blumwald, 2000). Under both alkali stresses, Na⁺ competes with K⁺ for uptake into the roots (Munns, 2002; Munns and Tester, 2008). Compared to the same stress concentrations of NaHCO₃ and Na₂CO₃, the latter has the higher concentration of Na⁺ resulting in increased Na⁺ accumulation (associated with decreased K⁺ accumulation) (Fig. 4ABCD). Also, the increased Na⁺ in the stressed plant may induce a decrease in Na⁺ exclusion, which normally enables the plant to avoid or defer ion toxicity problems. Many plant species have a Na⁺ exclusion mechanism that depends on Na⁺/H⁺ antiport, such as salt overly sensitive 1

Table 1. Results of a two-way ANOVA of plant characteristics by stress category, and by stress gradient and their interaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Stress category</th>
<th>Stress gradient</th>
<th>Category×Gradient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) ions and organic acid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoot Na⁺ content</td>
<td>2053.806***</td>
<td>441.723***</td>
<td>194.087***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root Na⁺ content</td>
<td>1962.682***</td>
<td>448.914***</td>
<td>185.606***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoot K⁺ content</td>
<td>594.499***</td>
<td>144.279***</td>
<td>32.183***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root K⁺ content</td>
<td>617.148***</td>
<td>151.240***</td>
<td>33.286***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoot Ca²⁺ content</td>
<td>237.577***</td>
<td>75.229***</td>
<td>10.253***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root Ca²⁺ content</td>
<td>92.747***</td>
<td>135.584***</td>
<td>10.522***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoot Na⁺/K⁺ ratio</td>
<td>6103.667***</td>
<td>1186.216***</td>
<td>693.524***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root Na⁺/K⁺ ratio</td>
<td>5843.242***</td>
<td>1178.227***</td>
<td>663.099***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoot Cl⁻ content</td>
<td>8730.910***</td>
<td>2111.533***</td>
<td>1501.335***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root Cl⁻ content</td>
<td>130.938***</td>
<td>186.921***</td>
<td>7.554***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoot SO₄²⁻ content</td>
<td>252.528***</td>
<td>155.270***</td>
<td>14.193***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root SO₄²⁻ content</td>
<td>88.950***</td>
<td>73.563***</td>
<td>5.714***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoot NO₃⁻ content</td>
<td>5849.245***</td>
<td>510.064***</td>
<td>121.803***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root NO₃⁻ content</td>
<td>5066.797***</td>
<td>1204.266***</td>
<td>206.504***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoot H₂PO₄⁻ content</td>
<td>216.028***</td>
<td>23.991***</td>
<td>10.599***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root H₂PO₄⁻ content</td>
<td>174.224***</td>
<td>45.478***</td>
<td>7.879***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoot organic acid content</td>
<td>1201.624***</td>
<td>73.181***</td>
<td>129.200***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root organic acid content</td>
<td>140.200***</td>
<td>26.039***</td>
<td>10.502***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) water and proline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoot water content</td>
<td>29.525***</td>
<td>12.718***</td>
<td>2.522 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root water content</td>
<td>16.613***</td>
<td>4.594***</td>
<td>1.929 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoot proline content</td>
<td>15.242**</td>
<td>62.169***</td>
<td>3.025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root proline content</td>
<td>25.284***</td>
<td>142.933***</td>
<td>5.750**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) tissue pH, ELR, Chl, Car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoot tissue pH</td>
<td>0.410 n.s.</td>
<td>0.105 n.s.</td>
<td>0.164 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root tissue pH</td>
<td>112.706***</td>
<td>22.139***</td>
<td>19.165***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electrolyte leakage rate (ELR)</td>
<td>72.665***</td>
<td>71.086***</td>
<td>4.010***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chlorophyll (Chl) a</td>
<td>84.845***</td>
<td>23.822***</td>
<td>8.851***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chlorophyll (Chl) b</td>
<td>86.057***</td>
<td>34.020***</td>
<td>8.783***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carotenoid (Car)</td>
<td>140.607***</td>
<td>43.361***</td>
<td>21.962***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) growth index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survival rate</td>
<td>1768.559***</td>
<td>303.930***</td>
<td>215.895***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of tillers per plant</td>
<td>24.523***</td>
<td>12.629***</td>
<td>3.669***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root length</td>
<td>3.679 n.s.</td>
<td>2.230 n.s.</td>
<td>0.315 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plant height</td>
<td>46.796***</td>
<td>30.127***</td>
<td>1.948 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root dry weight</td>
<td>13.669**</td>
<td>13.946***</td>
<td>0.839 n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers represent F values: * P ≤ 0.1; ** P ≤ 0.01; *** P ≤ 0.001; n.s., no significant.
**Fig 1.** Effects of NaHCO$_3$ and Na$_2$CO$_3$ stress on (A) shoot tissue pH, (B) root tissue pH, (C) ELR (electrolyte leakage rate) in oat shoots. The 4-week-old oat seedlings were treated with NaHCO$_3$ stress (pH 8.03-8.26) and Na$_2$CO$_3$ stress (pH 9.91-11.27) for 9 days. In each column, the data markers identified with the same letters are not significantly different (P < 0.05) according to a Duncan test. The error bars represent ± standard error (n = 3) of three replicates. Shoot represents aboveground part of plant.

**Fig 2.** Effects of NaHCO$_3$ and Na$_2$CO$_3$ stress on (A) survival rate, (B) number of tillers per plant, (C) root length, (D) plant height, (E) shoot dry weight, (F) root dry weight in oat. The 4-week-old oat seedlings were treated with NaHCO$_3$ stress (pH 8.03-8.26) and Na$_2$CO$_3$ stress (pH 9.91-11.27) for 9 days. In each column, the data markers identified with the same letters are not significantly different (P < 0.05) according to a Duncan test. The error bars represent ± standard error (n = 3) of three replicates. DW, dry weight; Shoot represents aboveground part of plant.
(SOS1), which exchanges cytoplasmic Na\(^+\) with external H\(^+\) (Zhu, 2003; Munns and Tester, 2008). The exchange activity relies on the transmembrane proton gradient achieved by H\(^+\)-ATPase (Zhu, 2003). Compared to NaHCO\(_3\), the same concentration of Na\(_2\)CO\(_3\) has a higher pH, and its relatively lack of external protons may weaken the exchange activity of the Na\(^+\)/H\(^+\) antiport on the root plasma membrane (Munns and Tester, 2008), possibly reducing the exclusion of Na\(^+\) from the rhizosphere and enhancing plant accumulation of Na\(^+\) (Fig. 4). In addition, compared to Na\(^+\) and K\(^+\), other ions, especially Ca\(^{2+}\), can also be influenced by both alkali stresses each of which exhibits decreasing trends with increasing concentrations. However, the extent of this effect is significantly higher in Na\(_2\)CO\(_3\) than in NaHCO\(_3\). This is firstly because, higher Na\(^+\) in the shoot is influenced by Na\(_2\)CO\(_3\) replacement of more intra-cellular Ca\(^{2+}\) which results in substantial Ca\(^{2+}\) loss (Fig. 4E); secondly, the high-pH environment of the roots with Na\(_2\)CO\(_3\) can cause some ions, such as Ca\(^{2+}\), to precipitate directly (Shi and Zhao, 1997); thirdly, Ca\(^{2+}\) can be influenced in the plant by higher contents of organic acid (mainly oxalic acid) (Fig. 5I) through the formation of calcium oxalate (an insoluble crystal) from oxalic acid and Ca\(^{2+}\). In the root, the high concentration of Na\(^+\) causes this ion to move in the xylem across the endodermis where it is released from the stelar cells to the stelar apoplasm, from where it moves through the xylem in the transpiration stream, finally reaching the shoot where the Na\(^+\) toxicity occurs (Munns and Tester, 2008). The main site of Na\(^+\) toxicity for most plants is in the leaf blade. Here, it can be tolerated by anatomical adaptations and by intracellular partitioning with the Na\(^+\) remaining in the cell being sequestered in the vacuoles to avoid Na\(^+\) toxicity in the cytosol (Serrano and Rodriguez-Navarro, 2001; Munns, 2002; Zhu, 2003).  

**Ion balance**

When compartmentalisation of Na\(^+\) in the vacuoles takes place, plants usually accumulate inorganic anions, such as Cl\(^-\), and SO\(_4^{2-}\), or they synthesise organic anions to maintain theionic balance (Yang et al., 2007). This fits with our study (Fig. 5) where the concentrations of inorganic anions under NaHCO\(_3\) stress were significantly lower than those under Na\(_2\)CO\(_3\) stress of the same intensity. This suggests that the relatively high pH caused by Na\(_2\)CO\(_3\) stress may inhibit the uptake of anions such as NO\(_3^-\) and H\(_2\)PO\(_4^-\) (Fig. 5EGF). Meanwhile, Cl\(^-\) and SO\(_4^{2-}\) in relatively high concentrations in both alkalis make higher contributions to the ion balance. Additionally, we find that, with stress concentration increases in the plant, OA is strongly increased only with Na\(_2\)CO\(_3\) whereas with NaHCO\(_3\) it is decreased. This suggests that under Na\(_2\)CO\(_3\) stress, OA is the dominant ion in the maintenance of equilibrium. This may be an alkali resistance mechanism involving two components, intracellular pH adjustment and extracellular pH adjustment (also possibly, pH adjustment in the root-external microenvironment). The OA synthesised might also be transported to roots for pH regulation. The process of pH adjustment may occur outside the root or in the root apoplasm, or both. Therefore, the type of cells involved in pH adjustment may be epidermal, cortical or xylem parenchyma cells. The mechanism of pH adjustment may involve the exudation of a buffer compound, such as H\(^+\), OA, amino acids or even CO\(_2\) produced by root respiration, or other factors not considered above.

**Osmotic adjustment**

When plants compartmentalise Na\(^+\) into the vacuoles to avoid Na\(^+\) toxicity in the cytosol (Serrano and Rodriguez-Navarro, 2001; Zhu, 2003) and accumulate inorganic anions and synthesise organic anions to maintain vacuolar ionic balance (Yang et al., 2007), they may also synthesise compatible low molecular weight organic solutes (compatible solutes) in the cytoplasm to maintain osmotic equilibrium and so prevent dehydration and protect biomacromolecules (Parida and Das, 2005). The amino acid proline is one of the most widely distributed compatible solutes occurring in many organisms from bacteria to higher plants (Flowers et al., 1977). In many halophytes, proline occurs at sufficiently high concentrations in their leaves (over 40 mM on a tissue water basis) to contribute significantly (over 0.1 MPa) to cell osmotic potential (Fricke, 2004). Thus, in our study it is clear that Na\(^+\) concentration increases in the vacuoles (which also accumulate inorganic and organic anions to maintain ionic balance) and as alkali stress increases, proline concentration increases to prevent cytoplasmic dehydration (Fig. 6). Furthermore, for the same intensity of the two alkali stresses the especially high concentrations of Na\(^+\) with Na\(_2\)CO\(_3\) lead to relatively high concentrations of proline (Fig. 6). In particular, the induction of proline synthesis is also related to the high pH value associated with alkalinity. The involvement of proline accumulation in the damage caused by alkali stress is another aspect that requires further investigation. Apart from the above-mentioned osmotic adjustment which comes with an energy cost, a quick and energetically economical way of reducing cell water potential to avoid osmotic stress is to allow decreases in water content (Fig. 6AB). In summary, the key features pertaining to osmotic adjustment are an ability to accumulate Na\(^+\) and organic acids in the vacuoles and to accumulate large amounts of proline in the cytoplasm.

**Materials and methods**

**Plant materials**

Oat (Avena sativa L.) is an annual, graminaceous plant which is very tolerant of drought, cold, saline and alkali stress and mineral deficiency. The oat cultivar No.2 baiyanmai (numbered species is B7046-2-4-1-6 in Baicheng City Academy of Agriculture Sciences, China) was used. This cultivar is characterised by early maturation, high salt and alkali tolerance, and high disease resistance (Wei et al., 2007). It has a high grain yield which rises to over 2300 kg/hm\(^2\). Its protein and fat contents are 16.6% and 5.6%, respectively (Wei et al., 2007). The plant can mature in live culms and provides both grain and straw.

**Cultivation**

Seeds were sown in 20-cm diameter plastic pots containing 3 kg of washed sand. The pots were watered daily with sufficient Hoagland nutrient solution. Each pot contained 25 seedlings. All pots were placed outdoors and protected from the rain. The experiment was carried out in an experimental area of the Northeast Normal University during the 2008 growth season.

**Design of the simulated alkaline conditions**

Two alkaline salts, NaHCO\(_3\) and Na\(_2\)CO\(_3\) were applied separately to create two stress groups. Within each group, six concentrations were used: 0, 48, 72, 96, 120 and 144 mmol L\(^{-1}\). Treatments in the NaHCO\(_3\) stress group were labeled A\(_1\)–A\(_6\) and those in the Na\(_2\)CO\(_3\) stress group were labeled B\(_1\)–B\(_6\). A\(_1\) and B\(_1\) were the controls. There were three replicates per treatment.
Fig 3. Effects of NaHCO$_3$ and Na$_2$CO$_3$ stress on the (A) chlorophyll (Chl) a, (B) chlorophyll (Chl) b in oat. The 4-week-old oat seedlings were treated with NaHCO$_3$ stress (pH 8.03-8.26) and Na$_2$CO$_3$ stress (pH 9.91-11.27) for 9 days. In each column, the data markers identified with the same letters are not significantly different (P < 0.05) according to a Duncan test. The error bars represent ± standard error (n = 3) of three replicates. FW, fresh weight; Shoot represent aboveground part of plant.

**Stress treatments**

The stress treatments were applied when the seedlings were four weeks old. Thirty-six pots of uniform seedlings were divided randomly into 12 sets of 3 pots. Two sets were used for the controls and the remaining 10 sets were used for the stress treatments giving three replicate pots per treatment. The treated pots were watered daily between 16.00–18.00 h with excess of a nutrient solution that contained the appropriate stress salts. The control plants were watered with nutrient solution at the same time. The duration of stress treatment was nine days.

**Physiological indices measurements**

**Measurement of tissue pH**

To determine tissue pH, fresh shoots and roots were washed thoroughly three times with neutral deionised water, followed by surface-drying with filter paper. They were then crushed and the pH of the expressed sap measured with a digital pH meter PHS-3C; Shanghai precision & scientific instruments, Shanghai, China.

**Measurement of the electrical conductivity of the leaves**

Membrane permeability is reflected in a ‘relative electrical conductivity’, which is defined as the ratio of the electrical conductivity of leaves with intact membranes to those with membranes destroyed by a boiling water treatment. Electrolyte leakage rate (ELR) was determined as described by Lutts et al., (1996).

**Measurement of chlorophyll**

After 9 days of stress treatment, fresh healthy leaves were cut into small segments to determine the concentrations of chlorophyll a and carotenoid b according to Arnon (1949).

**Measurement of growth indices**

All plants were harvested in the morning after the final treatment. The number of tillers per plant was recorded. The plants were first washed with tap water and then with distilled water. For each plant, the roots and shoots were separated and their fresh weights (FW) and the lengths of their shoots and the total root length per plant were determined. The samples were then oven-dried at 105 °C for 15 min before being vacuum-dried at 80°C to constant weight. The shoot and root dry weights (DW) were recorded. The water content (WC) of both parts was calculated using the formula WC= (FW-DW) / FW. Survival rate (SR) was expressed using the formula: SR= n / N where n is the number of plants surviving from the total of N plants.

**Measurement of ions**

Dry samples (0.1 g) of shoot and root were treated with 20 mL of deionised water at 100°C for 1 h and the resultant extract was used to determine the contents of inorganic ions and organic acids (OA). The contents of NO$_3$-, Cl$^-$, SO$_4^{2-}$, H$_2$PO$_4$ were determined by ion chromatography using a DX-300 ion chromatographic system with an AS-A-SC ion-exchange column and a CDM-II electrical conductivity detector (mobile
The levels of the organic acids were also determined by ion chromatography using an DX-300 ion chromatographic system with an ICE-AS6 ion-exclusion column, CDM-II electrical conductivity detector and an AMMS-ICE II MicroMembrane suppressor (mobile phase: 0.4 mmol L⁻¹ heptafluorobutyric acid; DIONEX). An atomic absorption spectrophotometer (TAS-990; Purkinje General, Beijing, China) was used to determine the levels of Na⁺, K⁺ and Ca²⁺.

**Measurement of proline**

The dried samples were homogenised to determine free proline contents which was assayed using the acid-ninhydrin method (Zhu et al. 1983).
Fig 6. Effects of NaHCO₃ and Na₂CO₃ stress on the (A) shoot water content, (B) root water content, (C) shoot proline content, (D) root proline content in oat. The 4-week-old oat seedlings were treated with NaHCO₃ stress (pH 8.03-8.26) and Na₂CO₃ stress (pH 9.91-11.27) for 9 days. In each column, the data markers identified with the same letters are not significantly different (P < 0.05) according to a Duncan test. The error bars represent ± standard error (n = 3) of three replicates. Shoot represent aboveground part of plant.

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis of the data was performed using the statistical program SPSS 13.0 (SPSS, Chicago, USA). All data are represented by an average of three replicates and their standard errors (SE). Data were analysed by one-way and two-way ANOVA. The treatment mean values were compared by post-hoc Duncan tests. The term significant indicates differences at P < 0.05.
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