



**HAL**  
open science

## Blue light effects on rose photosynthesis and photomorphogenesis

Farouk Abidi, Tiffanie Girault, O. Douillet, G. Guillemain, G. Sintès, M. Laffaire, H. Ben Ahmed, S. Smiti, Lydie Huché-Thélier, Nathalie Leduc

### ► To cite this version:

Farouk Abidi, Tiffanie Girault, O. Douillet, G. Guillemain, G. Sintès, et al.. Blue light effects on rose photosynthesis and photomorphogenesis. *Plant Biology*, 2013, 15 (1), pp.67-74. 10.1111/j.1438-8677.2012.00603.x . hal-01168899

**HAL Id: hal-01168899**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01168899v1>**

Submitted on 9 Aug 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Blue light effects on rose photosynthesis and photomorphogenesis

F. Abidi<sup>1,2,4</sup>, T. Girault<sup>2</sup>, O. Douillet<sup>1</sup>, G. Guillemain<sup>1</sup>, G. Sintès<sup>1</sup>, M. Laffaire<sup>3</sup>, H. Ben Ahmed<sup>4</sup>,  
S. Smiti<sup>4</sup>, L. Huché-Thélier<sup>1</sup> & N. Leduc<sup>2</sup>

1 - INRA, Institut de Recherche en Horticulture et Semences, (INRA, Agrocampus-Ovest, Université d'Angers), SFR 4207 QUASAV, F-49071 Beaucouzé, France

2 - LUNAM Université d'Angers, Institut de Recherche en Horticulture et Semences (Université d'Angers, Agrocampus-Ovest, INRA), SFR 4207 QUASAV, UFR Sciences, 2bd Lavoisier, F-49045, Angers, France

3 - Agrocampus-Ovest, Institut de Recherche en Horticulture et Semences (Agrocampus-Ovest, Université d'Angers, INRA), SFR 4207 QUASAV, F-49045, Angers, France

4 - Université de Tunis, Campus Universitaire-Université de Tunis El Manar, Tunis, Tunisie

Through its impact on photosynthesis and morphogenesis, light is the environmental factor that most affects plant architecture. Using light rather than chemicals to manage plant architecture could reduce the impact on the environment. However, the understanding of how light modulates plant architecture is still poor and further research is needed. To address this question, we examined the development of two rose cultivars, *Rosa hybrida* 'Radrazz' and *Rosa chinensis* 'Old Blush', cultivated under two light qualities. Plants were grown from one-node cuttings for 6 weeks under white or blue light at equal photosynthetic efficiencies. While plant development was totally inhibited in darkness, blue light could sustain full development from bud burst until flowering. Blue light reduced the net CO<sub>2</sub> assimilation rate of fully expanded leaves in both cultivars, despite increasing stomatal conductance and intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. In 'Radrazz', the reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> assimilation under blue light was related to a decrease in photosynthetic pigment content, while in both cultivars, the chl *a/b* ratio increased. Surprisingly, blue light could induce the same organogenetic activity of the shoot apical meristem, growth of the meta-mers and flower development as white light. The normal development of rose plants under blue light reveals the strong adaptive properties of rose plants to their light environment. It also indicates that photomorphogenetic processes can all be triggered by blue wavelengths and that despite a lower assimilation rate, blue light can provide sufficient energy *via* photosynthesis to sustain normal growth and development in roses.

## INTRODUCTION

Light is one of the key environmental factors that have a major impact on plant architecture. In terms of light quality, both red and blue light have been shown to alter plant architectural development. Plant response to blue light is less constant than that to red light (Rajapakse & Kelly 1995; Khattak *et al.* 2004) and depends on the species. For example, under blue light, bud burst is stimulated in *Triticum aestivum* (Barnes & Bugbee 1992) and *Prunus cerasifera* (Muleo *et al.* 2001), whereas it is reduced in *Solanum tuberosum* (Wilson *et al.* 1993). Similarly, shoot elongation is increased under blue light in pepper (Brown *et al.* 1995) and cucumber (Piszczek & Glowacka 2008), whereas it is repressed in *Pinus* (Sarala *et al.* 2007) and in *S. tuberosum* (Wilson *et al.* 1993). Even within a single species, plant response to blue light can differ among varieties, as shown in tomato (Glowacka 2006). As an ornamental plant, the rose could benefit from light treatments that could modify its architecture. This could con-

tribute to the production of new plant shapes and improved aesthetic quality (Boumaza *et al.* 2009) or to better control of plant diseases (Gontijo *et al.* 2010). This reasoning has already been applied to other ornamental species such as *Antirrhinum*, *Zinnia* and *Dendranthema* (Rajapakse *et al.* 1992; Cremer *et al.* 1998; McMahon *et al.* 1991; Cerny *et al.* 2003). So far, very few attempts have been made to modulate rose architecture through qualitative light treatments. In the miniature rose (*Rosa hybrida*), assays to reduce plant height using far-red light-absorbing filters failed (Cerny *et al.* 2003), while some success was achieved in increasing stem length and dry weight of *Rosa hybrida* 'Mercedes' shoots by reducing the amount of blue light in the white fluorescent light (Maas & Bakx 1995).

The effects of light on plant architecture can be mediated either through photomorphogenic responses or through the direct impact of light on plant photosynthesis. However, the respective contribution of each process to the elaboration of plant architecture is poorly understood. In photomorphogenic

responses, light can affect meristem activity, organ differentiation and growth through control of genetic activities other than those involved in photosynthesis (McIntyre 1987; Benson & Kelly 1990; Brown *et al.* 1995; Li *et al.* 2000; Parks *et al.* 2001; Fukuda *et al.* 2008). In rose, where we showed that bud burst and shoot meristem organogenic activity are totally inhibited in the absence of light, we demonstrated that blue light was able to induce both of these processes (Girault *et al.* 2008) and stimulated the transcription of an acid vacuolar invertase gene, required for hexose supply during bud burst (Girault *et al.* 2010). To date, apart from the above-mentioned studies, no other close examination of the effect of blue light on the components of vegetative and floral developments of rose has been reported.

Concerning photosynthesis, blue light is known to have both positive and negative effects, depending on the dose and duration of the treatment. For example, blue light stimulates photosynthesis by inducing stomatal opening (Sharkey & Raschke 1981; Zeiger & Zhu 1998; Kinoshita *et al.* 2001), increasing stomatal conductance and intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations (Karlsson & Assmann 1990), or increases leaf mass area (LMA), nitrogen and chlorophyll content (Hogewoning *et al.* 2010). Under very high blue irradiance, photosynthetic efficiency can however be reduced through a decrease in mesophyll conductance (Loreto *et al.* 2009) or by a chloroplast avoidance response that preserves the photosynthetic apparatus from photodamage (Brugnoli & Bjorkman 1992; Wada *et al.* 2003). Little is known of the mechanisms that allow the adjustment of rose photosynthetic activity to qualitative light conditions. Most research have so far focused on the impact of white light irradiance on rose assimilation rate and plant production (Zieslin & Mor 1990; Maas *et al.* 1995b; Bredmose 1997). In roses, the photosynthetic rate has been reported as being mainly influenced by PAR (Pasian & Lieth 1994) and modulated by temperature (Ueda *et al.* 2000; Ushio *et al.* 2008) and atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> level (Urban *et al.* 2002).

In order to understand the respective contribution of photosynthesis and photomorphogenesis on the elaboration of rose architecture, we monitored the effect of blue light throughout the development of plants derived from single node cuttings until the flowering stage in two rose cultivars, *Rosa hybrida* 'Radrazz' and *R. chinensis* 'Old Blush'. Photomorphogenic responses to blue light were studied by measuring the main components of vegetative and floral developments of the first- and second-order axes. Photosynthesis during light treatment was assessed through measurement of CO<sub>2</sub> assimilation rate, stomatal conductance, intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentration and pigment content.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

### Plant material

Metamers (comprising a node bearing a leaf with five or seven leaflets, its axillary bud and the underlying internode) from *Rosa hybrida* 'Radrazz' (Knock out®) and *R. chinensis* 'Old Blush' were harvested from the medial part of mother plant stems and used as single-node cuttings. Cuttings were inserted into FERTISS peat plugs (FERTIL, Le Syndicat, France) and rooting was achieved after 4–5 weeks of culture under high humidity. Well-rooted cuttings were transferred

into 500-ml pots containing a 70/20/10 mixture (v/v/v) of neutral peat, coco fibre and perlite, and grown in a greenhouse at 25 ± 5 °C. Extra lighting was supplied with high-pressure sodium-vapour lamps below 200 W·m<sup>-2</sup>. After 4 days of acclimation in the greenhouse, well-rooted cuttings were transferred to growth chambers for the light treatments. Plants were grown until all secondary axes, derived from the first wave of bud burst (Huché-Théliér *et al.* 2011), had reached the flowering stage 'petal colour visible' (PCV) or stopped their growth without flowering. On primary axes, three flowering stages were considered: (i) the 'flower bud visible' stage (FBV) corresponding to the time at which the floral bud can be seen but the peduncle is not yet fully elongated; (ii) the PCV corresponding to the moment at which the sepals begin to open, revealing the colour of the petals (red for 'Radrazz', pink for 'Old Blush'); and (iii) the 'open flower' (OF) stage corresponding to the time at which stamens are visible.

### Climate conditions in growth chambers

Plants were grown in growth chambers under constant conditions (temperature: 25 ± 3 °C; relative humidity: 80 ± 5%; photoperiod: 16-h light/8-h dark) and irrigated with a nutrient solution prepared from fertilizer Peter Exel (1 g·l<sup>-1</sup>; pH 5.6; EC: 1.77 ms·cm<sup>-1</sup>). Plants were subjected to white or blue light treatments. White light was produced from white neon tubes (Mastec 36 W, white/33 cool), while blue light was produced with blue neon tubes (Philips TL-D 36 W/18 blue) (Fig. 1). The photosynthetic photon flux density (PPFD) and yield photon flux (YPF) were calculated using the formula of Sager *et al.* (1988) from the light spectrum measured with a calibrated spectrometer (AvaSpec-2048-6-RM). The photosynthetic efficiency was adjusted to 110 μmol·m<sup>-2</sup>·s<sup>-1</sup>, by changing the distance between the plant apex and the light source, and was similar in the two light treatments. The height of the neon tubes was adjusted once every 2 weeks to maintain a constant PPFD at the plant apex level. The characteristics of light treatments are presented in the inset of Fig. 1.

### Photosynthetic parameters

#### Gas exchange measurements

Gas exchange measurements were performed using a portable infrared gas analyser (IRGA; LI-6400; Li-Cor Inc., Lincoln, NE, USA) within a narrow leaf chamber (236 cm<sup>2</sup>; LI-6400-11). Stomatal conductance (gs), net CO<sub>2</sub> assimilation (A) and intercellular concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> (Ci) were then monitored under the two light conditions: on plants at the end of the flowering period of the primary axis (OF stage) and in the fully expanded last five-leaflet leaf of this axis.

#### Pigment analysis

Chlorophyll (*a* and *b*) and carotenoid contents were determined spectrophotometrically. Fresh leaf tissue (0.2 g) was extracted in 5 ml 80% acetone at 4 °C for 72 h, as described in Torrecillas *et al.* (1984). The absorbance of the extract was measured using a UV-visible spectrophotometer (Cary 100 scan) at 470.0, 646.8 and 663.2 nm. Pigment content was calculated according to the equations of Torrecillas *et al.* (1984):




Fig. 1. Distribution of spectral photon fluence rate of the white and blue light treatments.

$$\text{Chl } a \text{ (mg g}^{-1}\text{FW)} = (12.25 * \text{OD}_{663.2}) - (2.79 * \text{OD}_{646.8})$$

$$\text{Chl } b \text{ (mg g}^{-1}\text{FW)} = (21.5 * \text{OD}_{646.8}) - (5.1 * \text{OD}_{663.2})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Carotenoids (mg g}^{-1}\text{FW)} &= 1000 * \text{OD}_{470.0} - (1.82 * \text{Chl } a) \\ &\quad - (85.02 * \text{Chl } b) / 198 \end{aligned}$$

### Organogenic activity and bursting of axillary buds

#### Evaluation of shoot apical meristem (SAM) organogenesis

The number of leaf-like organs (scales, young preformed leaves and leaf primordia) in the buds of the single-node cuttings was evaluated in the two genotypes: on the day of harvest from the mother shoots (T0), upon rooting (T1), just before transfer to light treatment (T2), and at the FBV stage, when the first axes produced after the burst of the single node cutting buds had reached their final length and entered flowering (T3). Buds were dissected under a stereomicroscope and leaf-like organs were removed and counted until only the SAM remained, as described previously (Girault *et al.* 2008).

#### Evaluation and cartography of bud burst

An axillary bud was considered as burst when its length was at least 1 cm and when at least the tip of the first leaf was visible outside the scales (Girault *et al.* 2008). For each cultivar, bud burst on the primary axis was recorded three times a week from the stage where the FBV at the apex of the primary axis until the first wave of secondary axes had flowered.

For cartography, since the two genotypes of rose showed very pronounced leaf polymorphism along the stem, the primary axis could be easily divided into three distinct zones: (i) the basal zone extending from the base of the stem to the first node bearing the first five-leaflet leaf, (ii) the apical zone extending from the node bearing the last apical five-leaflet leaf to the floral bud (not included), (iii) the medial zone including all the metamers located between the basal and the apical zone. In this medial zone, the leaves had between five

and seven leaflets. The percentage bud burst was determined for each zone.

### Morphological characterisation of primary and secondary axes

#### Length and diameter

At the end of the experiments, the number of secondary axes with at least three internodes was determined. The length of primary and secondary axes and their stem diameter at 1 cm from the basis of the axis were measured. The leaf sequences (succession of nodes and number of leaflets per leaf) were also recorded.

#### Mass production and water content (WC)

Fresh (FW) and dry (DW) weight of stems was determined at the end of the experiments. Dry mass was determined after drying for 72 h in a drying oven (60 °C). Linear mass (LM) was calculated using the formula: LM = DW/length of axis. Water content (WC) was calculated using the formula: WC = (FW – DW/FW) \* 100.

#### Leaf area (LA) and leaf mass area (LMA)

Total leaf area and leaf dry mass were measured on each plant at the end of the experiments. Leaf area was determined using ImageJ software (National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA) and leaf dry mass was determined after drying for 72 h in an oven (60 °C). Leaf mass area (LMA) was determined using the formula: LMA = leaf dry mass/leaf area.

### Statistical analysis

Experiments were replicated at least three times. The number of treated plants in each experiment is stated in the figures. Statistical analyses were carried out using StatBox 6.6 software (Grimmersoft, France). Analyses focused on a comparison using Student's *t*-test between means measured under blue light and white light. Asterisks (\*), (\*\*), and (\*\*\*) indicate significant differences between light treatments at the 0.05, 0.01 and 0.001 levels, respectively.

**Table 1.** Effect of light quality on photosynthetic parameters and pigment content in leaves of *Rosa hybrida* 'Radrazz' and *R. chinensis* 'Old Blush' after 6 weeks of culture under white light (WL: 110  $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ) or blue light (BL: 110  $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ).

genotype	'Radrazz'		'Old Blush'	
	WL	BL	WL	BL
photosynthetic parameters				
CO <sub>2</sub> assimilation rate ( $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ )	1.71 ( $\pm 0.45$ )	1.27 ( $\pm 0.35$ )*	2.87 ( $\pm 0.89$ )	1.20 ( $\pm 0.59$ )**
stomatal conductance ( $\text{mmol}\cdot\text{H}_2\text{O}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ )	115 ( $\pm 25$ )	166 (31)**	105 ( $\pm 37$ )	178 ( $\pm 20$ )**
intercellular CO <sub>2</sub> concentration ( $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{CO}_2\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$ )	383 ( $\pm 30$ )	398 ( $\pm 10$ )	342 ( $\pm 25$ )	392 ( $\pm 10$ )***
pigment content ( $\text{mg g}^{-1}$ )				
chlorophyll a	229 ( $\pm 32$ )	194 ( $\pm 25$ )*	199 ( $\pm 53$ )	210 ( $\pm 51$ )
chlorophyll b	99 ( $\pm 15$ )	67 ( $\pm 10$ )**	89 ( $\pm 18$ )	80 ( $\pm 31$ )
chlorophyll a/b	2.6 ( $\pm 0.1$ )	2.9 ( $\pm 0.2$ )***	2.2 ( $\pm 0.5$ )	2.7 ( $\pm 0.3$ )*
carotenoids	32 ( $\pm 7$ )	19 ( $\pm 4$ )***	43 ( $\pm 8$ )	41 ( $\pm 8$ )

Values in brackets represent SE with 20 plants. \*, \*\* and \*\*\* significant differences between white and blue light treatments at 0.05, 0.01 and 0.001 levels, respectively.

## RESULTS

### Effect of blue light on photosynthesis in *Rosa*

Under white light, CO<sub>2</sub> assimilation (A) of mature leaves from 6-week-old plants of cv. 'Radrazz' and cv. 'Old Blush' was, respectively, 1.71 and 2.87  $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{CO}_2\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ . When plants were grown under blue light, A dropped significantly to, respectively, 1.27 and 1.20  $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{CO}_2\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  (Table 1). This was concomitant with a reduction in photosynthetic pigment (chl *a* and *b* and carotenoids) content in 'Radrazz' and with an increase of the chl *a/b* ratio in both cultivars (Table 1). Blue light also increased the stomatal conductance (gs) of leaves of both cultivars (Table 1), as well as the intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> content of leaves of 'Old Blush' (Table 1).

### Effect of blue light on rose development

#### Morphological characteristics of the primary axes

While the organogenic activity of SAM in cutting buds was totally inhibited in darkness (data not shown) and as previously demonstrated in beheaded rose plants (Girault *et al.* 2008), white light induced organogenesis in cuttings buds (Table 2). Interestingly, when cuttings were grown under blue light, the same amount of organogenic activity was produced in both cultivars, as shown by the number of foliar organs and internodes on first axes upon growth arrest and flowering (Tables 2 and 3). Growth of these axes was as efficiently stimulated by blue as by white light, since no significant difference was observed in any of the six studied morphological characteristics (diameter and length, number and average length of internodes, linear mass and water content). Blue light also induced the same morphogenetic pattern of development in leaf primordia as similar compound leaves were obtained under both this light quality and under white light, and there was no difference in total leaf area (Table 3) or pattern of leaflet distribution (Fig. 2) compared to white light. The single significant difference was an increase in LMA under blue light in 'Radrazz' (Table 3).

**Table 2.** Mean number of leaf-like organs (primordia, young leaves and scales) within cutting buds on the day of stem severing (T0), in rooted cuttings (T1), at the beginning of the light treatment (T2) and average number of leaves and scales on the primary axis at the 'floral bud visible' stage (T3) under white light (WL: 110  $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ) or blue light (BL: 110  $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ) in *Rosa hybrida* 'Radrazz' and *R. chinensis* 'Old Blush'.


stage	T0	T1	T2	T3	
	WL	WL	WL	WL	BL
Cv. 'Radrazz'	8.2 ( $\pm 0.8$ )	9.4 ( $\pm 0.7$ )	10.5 ( $\pm 0.8$ )	11.4 ( $\pm 0.8$ )	11.8 ( $\pm 0.9$ )
Cv. 'Old Blush'	8.1 ( $\pm 0.8$ )	8.2 ( $\pm 0.8$ )	9.3 ( $\pm 0.9$ )	10.1 ( $\pm 0.7$ )	10.2 ( $\pm 0.8$ )

Values in brackets represent SE with  $n = 40$  plants.


**Table 3.** Effect of light quality on morphological characteristics of the primary axes of *Rosa hybrida* 'Radrazz' and *Rosa chinensis* 'Old Blush' after 6 weeks of culture under white light (WL: 110  $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ) or blue light (BL: 110  $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ).

genotype	'Radrazz'		'Old Blush'	
	WL	BL	WL	BL
axis diameter (mm)	3.2 ( $\pm 0.4$ )	3.2 ( $\pm 0.2$ )	2.8 ( $\pm 0.2$ )	2.5 ( $\pm 0.4$ )
axis length (mm)	186 ( $\pm 53$ )	179 ( $\pm 75$ )	176 ( $\pm 87$ )	168 ( $\pm 71$ )
average number of internodes	11.4 ( $\pm 0.8$ )	11.9 ( $\pm 1.8$ )	10.0 ( $\pm 1.6$ )	10.2 ( $\pm 1.4$ )
average length of internodes (mm)	16.0 ( $\pm 3.4$ )	14.7 ( $\pm 4.2$ )	17.0 ( $\pm 6.0$ )	15.8 ( $\pm 4.7$ )
linear mass of primary stem ( $\text{mg}\cdot\text{cm}^{-1}$ )	17.6 ( $\pm 4.0$ )	18.0 ( $\pm 4.8$ )	12.5 ( $\pm 2.4$ )	11.6 ( $\pm 2.9$ )
water content (%)	70 ( $\pm 3$ )	68 ( $\pm 2$ )	71 ( $\pm 3$ )	70 ( $\pm 1$ )
leaf area ( $\text{cm}^2$ )	251 ( $\pm 52$ )	215 ( $\pm 45$ )	118 ( $\pm 37$ )	122 ( $\pm 35$ )
leaf mass area ( $\text{mg}\cdot\text{cm}^{-2}$ )	3.6 ( $\pm 0.6$ )***	4.5 ( $\pm 0.5$ )	3.6 ( $\pm 0.5$ )	3.5 ( $\pm 0.6$ )

Values in brackets represent SE with 40 plants. \*\*\*Significant difference between white and blue light treatments at 0.001 level.



**Fig. 2.** Effect of light quality on the number of leaflets per leaf along the primary axis of *Rosa hybrida* 'Radrazz' (A) and *R. chinensis* 'Old Blush' (B) after 6 weeks of culture under white light ( $110 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ) or blue light ( $110 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ). Only nodes bearing at least one leaflet leaf were considered for the identification of internode rank. Error bars represent SE with  $n = 40$  plants. No significant difference was noted between white and blue light treatments.



**Fig. 3.** Bud burst per zone along the primary axis of cultivars *Rosa hybrida* 'Radrazz' (A) and *R. chinensis* 'Old Blush' (B) after 6 weeks of culture under white or blue light. nm = number of buds per zone. Error bars represent SE with  $n = 40$  plants. No significant difference was noted between white and blue light treatments.

#### Growth and development of secondary axes

Blue light induced the same amount of bud burst on primary axes of 'Radrazz' and 'Old Blush' ( $24 \pm 13\%$ ,  $46 \pm 18\%$ , respectively) as white light ( $27 \pm 9\%$ ,  $59 \pm 18\%$ , respectively), with no change in the cartography of bud burst along the primary axes (Fig. 3). The strong acrotonic bud burst pattern characterising 'Radrazz' under white light was similarly expressed under blue light (Fig. 3). Under blue light, the secondary axes derived from the burst buds were as long and composed of as many internodes as those produced under white light (Table 4).

#### Flower development

As well as vegetative development, blue light could sustain full reproductive development in both rose cultivars and as efficiently as white light. Hence, there was a similar percentage of flowering axes under both light conditions (Table 5) and normal development of floral organs was observed under blue light in both cultivars (Fig. 4). Only flower peduncles

**Table 4.** Effect of light quality on morphological characteristics of the secondary axes of *Rosa hybrida* 'Radrazz' and *Rosa chinensis* 'Old Blush' after 6 weeks of culture under white light (WL:  $110 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ) or blue light (BL:  $110 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ).


genotype	'Radrazz'		'Old Blush'	
	WL	BL	WL	BL
light treatment				
average number of axes	3.0 ( $\pm 0.5$ )	2.9 ( $\pm 0.5$ )	5.0 ( $\pm 0.4$ )	4.6 ( $\pm 0.9$ )
axis length (mm)	107 ( $\pm 10$ )	104 ( $\pm 11$ )	107 ( $\pm 24$ )	122 ( $\pm 5$ )
average number of internodes	8.3 ( $\pm 0.3$ )	8.0 ( $\pm 0.6$ )	7.4 ( $\pm 0.8$ )	8.5 ( $\pm 0.5$ )
average length of internodes (mm)	13.0 ( $\pm 0.8$ )	13.0 ( $\pm 0.2$ )	14.1 ( $\pm 1.6$ )	14.2 ( $\pm 1.3$ )

Values in brackets represent SE with 40 plants. No significant difference was noted between white and blue light treatments.

**Table 5.** Effect of light quality on percentage flowering of primary axes and on flower characteristics in *Rosa hybrida* ‘Radrazz’ and *R. chinensis* ‘Old Blush’.

genotype	‘Radrazz’		‘Old Blush’	
	WL	BL	WL	BL
percentage flowering of primary axes	90.8 (±2.3)	90.7 (±6.4)	80.8 (±6.3)	78.6 (±4.6)
flower diameter (mm)	83 (±10)	80 (±8)	57 (±8)	61 (±8)
petal number	9.1 (±1.3)	9.9 (±2.3)	24.3 (±5.7)	27.3 (±8.8)
peduncle length (mm)	49 (±5)***	35 (±5)	70 (±8)***	58 (±7)

Values in brackets represent SE with n = 20 plants. \*\*\*Significant difference between white light (WL: 110  $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ) and blue light (BL: 110  $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ) treatments at 0.001 level.



**Fig. 4.** Open flowers produced by *Rosa hybrida* ‘Radrazz’ (A) and *R. chinensis* ‘Old Blush’ (B) plants after 6 weeks of culture under white light (110  $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ) or blue light (110  $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ).


appeared shorter under blue light (Table 5). Under blue light, and in both cultivars, the rate of floral development was slower by 3 days (Fig. 5).

## DISCUSSION

The objective of this study was to measure the effects of blue light on both the photosynthetic activity and morphogenesis of two rose cultivars, *R. hybrida* ‘Radrazz’ and *R. chinensis* ‘Old

Blush’, and to evaluate whether such light treatment could modify plant architecture. Unlike most studies published to date on the impact of blue light on plants (Wilson *et al.* 1993; Maas *et al.* 1995a; Sarala *et al.* 2007), we examined the effects of blue light throughout the full development of the plants, starting from one single bud through to the entire vegetative development of second order axes and their flowering. This allowed precise evaluation of the impact of blue light on the most important morphogenetic events (SAM organogenesis, metamer and leaf growth and development, flower induction and organogenesis). We demonstrated that under blue light, the two rose genotypes had normal and similar vegetative and floral development to those observed under white light. In fact, blue light did not affect organogenetic activity of the SAM or growth capacity of the metamers. Nevertheless, photosynthesis was affected by blue light treatment.

Our measurements indeed revealed a strong reduction (–25% in ‘Radrazz’ and –58% in ‘Old Blush’) in leaf  $\text{CO}_2$  assimilation in both cultivars under blue light. Since plants were grown under same photosynthetic efficiency (110  $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ) in both light treatments, the observed reduction in  $\text{CO}_2$  assimilation rate under blue light could not be explained by the reduced photosynthetic quantum yield of blue photons (McCree 1972), nor by a decrease in LMA, stomatal conductance or intercellular  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations under blue light. LMA, which is known to correlate positively with the photosynthetic capacity of leaves (Oguchi *et al.* 2003), was at least similar (‘Old Blush’) or higher (‘Radrazz’) under blue light as under white light. Similarly, blue light stimulated stomatal conductance in both cultivars, as well as intercellular  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations in ‘Old Blush’, thus reducing stomatal limitation to photosynthesis (Lawson *et al.* 2008). The increased values of these two parameters (stomatal conductance and intracellular  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration) in roses are in accordance with the reported effect of blue light on stomatal opening in other plants (Karlsson & Assmann 1990; Hogewoning *et al.* 2010). In contrast, the reduction in photosynthetic pigment content (chl *a* and *b*, as well as carotenoids) in leaves of ‘Radrazz’ under blue light could contribute to a decrease in  $\text{CO}_2$  assimilation, as found in bean (Barreiro *et al.* 1992). However, since no such reduction was observed in



**Fig. 5.** Thermal time required for the primary axis of *Rosa hybrida* ‘Radrazz’ and *R. chinensis* ‘Old Blush’ cultivated under white or blue light to reach different flower stages. Error bars represent SE with n = 20 plants. \*P = 0.05 and \*\*P = 0.01 indicate significant differences between white and blue light treatments.



'Old Blush', other mechanisms, such as a reduction in mesophyll conductance (Brugnoli & Bjorkman 1992; Flexas *et al.* 2008; Loreto *et al.* 2009) or a change in chloroplast distribution (Wada *et al.* 2003) probably regulated carbon assimilation under blue light in rose.

The reduced CO<sub>2</sub> assimilation rates under blue light had surprisingly little impact on the growth of the two rose cultivars. Features such as shoot or internode length, diameter, dry weights of primary and secondary axes and leaf area were identical under both light treatments. The rate of development was only slowed by 3 days under blue light. Such a lack of effect of reduced assimilation rate on plant growth and biomass has also been reported in *Lindera melissifolia* under increasing irradiance (Aleric & Kirkman 2005). This may reflect modified carbon partitioning between roots and aerial organs (Aleric & Kirkman 2005), although no obvious difference in root system development was observed under either light regime in our rose genotypes (data not shown). Alternatively, it may reflect the impact of other environmental factors affecting our culture system.

The only effect of blue light on growth was observed in 'Radrazz', with an increase in LMA. Such an increase, together with a higher chl *a/b* ratio observed under blue light, may contribute to plant acclimation, as reported for other species under various blue light treatments (Rajapakse & Kelly 1993; Hogewoning *et al.* 2010; Macedo *et al.* 2011). The absence of a change in LMA in 'Old Blush' may reflect different strategies of adaptation to this particular light environment and could partly explain the difference in intensity of the impact of blue light on CO<sub>2</sub> assimilation between the two cultivars.

Concerning rose photomorphogenesis, while the absence of light completely abolished morphogenesis and bud burst in rose (Girault *et al.* 2008), our experiments demonstrate that blue light is able to induce full, normal vegetative and floral development in these same buds. More precisely, our morphometric data show that neither organogenetic activity of the apical shoot and axillary meristems nor the growth capacity of the metamers is affected by blue light. As such, there was a non-significant difference in number of internodes produced by the SAM on the first- and second-order shoots when grown under white or blue light. While most of the first-order shoot internodes were already formed within the cutting bud upon initiation of the light treatments (Table 2), it is striking that a reduced light spectrum, lacking important morphogenetically active wavelengths (MAR; Varlet-Grancher *et al.* 1993) such as red and far-red light, had no impact on differentiation of the axillary buds on the primary axis, nor on their capacity to produce normal metamers in similar numbers to those under white light. Moreover, the branching

pattern along the first-order shoots was not modified by blue light treatment. Observation of the leaves that developed on the axes of both ranks revealed no difference in leaf shape between the two light conditions, and no change in the distribution of the three-, five- and seven-foliolate leaves along the axis. Similarly, the SAMs were as efficiently induced to flower and were able to differentiate normal and as many floral organs under blue light as under white light. Even though flower initiation is an autonomous process in *Rosa* (Bredmose & Hansen 1996), which does not require a specific light regime, it is well known that in this plant, unfavourable light conditions such as too low irradiance (Nell & Rasmussen 1979; Maas *et al.* 1995b) can cause the arrest or abortion of flower buds, leading to blind shoots (Dambre *et al.* 2000).

Overall, the results indicate that unlike numerous other plants, the development of which is affected by blue light (Mortensen & Stromme 1987; Rajapakse & Kelly 1993; Brown *et al.* 1995; Li *et al.* 2000), *Rosa* is capable of quantitatively and qualitatively adjusting the mechanisms that sustain its growth under a modified light spectrum. This reflects the strong adaptive properties of this plant to its light environment. At the molecular level, this suggests that in rose, blue light can trigger all of the photomorphogenic processes induced by white light. For example, sink activity of rose shoot apices, which was shown to be modulated by red light (Mor *et al.* 1980), was likely induced by blue light in our experiments, since plant development, which requires strong control of sink/source allocations, was identical under both white and blue light conditions. This highlights the redundancy of the light signalling pathways involved in photomorphogenic responses in rose, as previously suggested for bud burst (Girault *et al.* 2008, 2010), and our results converge well with recent observations on the quintuple phytochrome mutant of *Arabidopsis thaliana*, where exposure to blue light could bypass several developmental arrests related to the lack of red light photomorphogenic signals (Strasser *et al.* 2010).

Our work thus confirms that blue light photoreceptors, mainly cryptochromes, phytochromes and phototropins (Whitelam & Halliday 2007) play important roles in the regulation of morphogenetic responses to light quality in rose. Their respective roles should be studied further.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported in part by INRA Département Environnement-Agronomie and by the Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur de Tunisie, through a grant to F. Abidi. C. Bouffard, S. Chalain, B. Dubuc and A. Lebec are thanked for their help in plant propagation.

## REFERENCES

- Aleric K.M., Kirkman L.K. (2005) Growth and photosynthetic responses of the federally endangered shrub, *Lindera melissifolia* (Lauraceae), to varied light environments. *American Journal of Botany*, **92**, 682–689.
- Barnes C., Bugbee B. (1992) Morphological responses of wheat to blue light. *Journal of Plant Physiology*, **139**, 339–342.
- Barreiro R., Guaiamet J.J., Beltrano J., Montaldi E.R. (1992) Regulation of the photosynthetic capacity of primary bean leaves by the red:far-red ratio and photosynthetic photon flux density of incident light. *Journal of Plant Physiology*, **85**, 97–101.
- Benson J., Kelly J. (1990) Effect of copper sulphate filters on growth of bedding plants. *Scientia Horticulturae*, **25**, 1144–1153.
- Boumazza R., Demotes-Mainard S., Huché-Thélier L., Guérin V. (2009) Visual characterization of the esthetic quality of the rose bush. *Journal of Sensory Studies*, **24**, 774–796.
- Bredmose N. (1997) Chronology of three physiological development phases of single-stemmed rose (*Rosa hybrida* L.) plants in response to increment in light quantum integral. *Scientia Horticulturae*, **69**, 107–115.
- Bredmose N., Hansen J. (1996) Topophysis affects the potential of axillary bud growth, fresh biomass accumulation and specific fresh weight in single-stem roses (*Rosa hybrida* L.). *Annals of Botany*, **78**, 215–222.
- Brown C.S., Schuerge A.C., Sager J.C. (1995) Growth and photomorphogenesis of pepper plants under red light-emitting diodes with supplemental blue or far-red lighting. *Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science*, **120**, 571–577.



- Brugnoli E., Bjorkman O. (1992) Chloroplast movements in leaves: influence on chlorophyll fluorescence and measurements of light-induced absorbance changes related to pH and zeaxanthin formation. *Photosynthesis Research*, **32**, 23–35.
- Cerny T.A., Faust J.E., Layne D.R., Rajapakse N.C. (2003) Influence of photosensitive film and growing season on stem growth and flowering of six plant species. *Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science*, **128**, 486–491.
- Cremer F.A., Havelange H., Saedler A., Huijser P. (1998) Environmental control of flowering time in *Antirrhinum majus*. *Journal of Plant Physiology*, **104**, 345–350.
- Dambre P., Blindeman L., Van Labeke M.C. (2000) Effect of planting density and harvesting method on rose flower production. *Acta Horticulturae*, **513**, 129–135.
- Flexas J., Ribas-Carbo M., Diaz-Espejo A., Galme S.J., Medrano H. (2008) Mesophyll conductance to CO<sub>2</sub>: current knowledge and future prospects. *Plant, Cell and Environment*, **31**, 602–621.
- Fukuda N., Fujita M., Ohta Y., Sase S., Nishimura S., Ezura H. (2008) Directional blue light irradiation triggers epidermal cell elongation of abaxial side resulting in inhibition of leaf epinasty in geranium under red light condition. *Scientia Horticulturae*, **115**, 176–182.
- Girault T., Bergougnoux V., Combes D., Viemont J.D., Leduc N. (2008) Light controls shoot meristem organogenic activity and leaf primordia growth during bud burst in *Rosa* sp. *Plant, Cell and Environment*, **31**, 1534–1544.
- Girault T., Abidi F., Sigogne M., Pelleschi-Travier S., Boumaza R., Sakr S., Leduc N. (2010) Sugars are under light control during bud burst in *Rosa* sp. *Plant, Cell and Environment*, **33**, 1339–1350.
- Glowacka B. (2006) Response of the tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.) transplant to the daylight supplemented with blue spectrum. *Folia Horticulturae Supplement*, **4**, 145–149.
- Gontijo L.M., Margolies D.C., Nechols J.R., Cloyd R.A. (2010) Plant architecture, prey distribution and predator release strategy interact to affect foraging efficiency of the predatory mite *Phytoseiulus persimilis* (Acari: Phytoseiidae) on cucumber. *Biological Control*, **53**, 136–141.
- Hogewoning S.W., Trouwborst G., Maljaars H., Poorter H., Van leperen W., Harbinson J. (2010) Blue light dose–response of leaf photosynthesis, morphology, and chemical composition of *Cucumis sativus* grown under different combinations of red and blue light. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, **61**, 1–11.
- Huché-Théliér L., Boumaza R., Demotes-Mainard S., Canet A., Symoneaux R., Douillet O., Guerin V. (2011) Nitrogen deficiency increases basal branching and modifies the visual quality of rose bushes. *Scientia Horticulturae*, **130**, 325–334.
- Karlsson P.E., Assmann S.M. (1990) Rapid and specific modulation of stomatal conductance by blue-light in ivy (*Hedera helix*): an approach to assess the stomatal limitation of carbon assimilation. *Journal of Plant Physiology*, **94**, 440–447.
- Khattak A.M., Pearson S., Johnson C.B. (2004) The effects of far red spectral filters and plant density on the growth and development of chrysanthemum. *Scientia Horticulturae*, **102**, 335–341.
- Kinoshita T., Doi M., Suetsugu N., Kagawa T., Wada M., Shimazaki K. (2001) Phot1 and phot2 mediate blue light regulation of stomatal opening. *Nature*, **414**, 656–660.
- Lawson T., Lefebvre S., Baker N.R., Morison J.I.L., Raines C. (2008) Reductions in mesophyll and guard cell photosynthesis impact on the control of stomatal responses to light and CO<sub>2</sub>. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, **59**, 3609–3619.
- Li S., Rajapakse N.C., Young R.E., Oi R. (2000) Growth responses of chrysanthemum and bell pepper transplants to photosensitive plastic films. *Scientia Horticulturae*, **84**, 215–225.
- Loreto F., Tsonev T., Centritto M. (2009) The impact of blue light on leaf mesophyll conductance. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, **60**, 2283–2290.
- Maas F.M., Bakx E.J. (1995) Effects of light on growth and flowering of *Rosa hybrida* ‘Mercedes’. *Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science*, **120**, 571–576.
- Maas F.M., Bakx E.J., Morris D.A. (1995a) Photocontrol of stem elongation and dry weight partitioning in *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. by the blue light content of photosynthetic photon flux. *Journal of Plant Physiology*, **146**, 665–671.
- Maas F.M., Hofman-Eijer L.B., Hulsteyn K. (1995b) Flower morphogenesis in *Rosa hybrida* ‘Mercedes’ as studied by cryo-scanning electron and light microscopy. Effects of light and shoot position on a branch. *Annals of Botany*, **75**, 199–205.
- Macedo A.F., Leal-Costab M.V., Tavares E.T., Lagec C.L., Esquibel M.A. (2011) The effect of light quality on leaf production and development of in vitro-cultured plants of *Alternanthera brasiliana* Kuntze. *Environmental and Experimental Botany*, **70**, 43–50.
- McCree K.J. (1972) Action spectrum, absorbance and quantum yield of photosynthesis in crop plants. *Agricultural Meteorology*, **9**, 191–216.
- McIntyre G.I. (1987) The role of water in the regulation of plant development. *Canadian Journal of Botany*, **65**, 1287–1298.
- McMahon M.J., Kelly J.W., Decoteau D.R. (1991) Growth of *Dendranthema grandiflorum* (Ramat.) Kitamura under various spectral filters. *Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science*, **116**, 950–954.
- Mor Y., Halevy A.H., Porath D. (1980) Characterization of the light reaction in promoting the mobilizing ability of rose shoot tips. *Journal of Plant Physiology*, **66**, 996–1000.
- Mortensen L.M., Stromme E. (1987) Effects of light quality on some greenhouse crops. *Scientia Horticulturae*, **33**, 27–36.
- Muleo R., Morini S., Casano S. (2001) Photoregulation of growth and branching of plum shoots: physiological action of two photosystems. *In vitro Cellular and Development Biology*, **37**, 609–617.
- Nell T.A., Rasmussen H.P. (1979) Blindness in roses: effect of high intensity light and blind shoots prediction techniques. *Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science*, **104**, 21–25.
- Oguchi R., Hikosaka K., Hirose T.F. (2003) Does the photosynthetic light-acclimation need change in leaf anatomy? *Plant, Cell and Environment*, **26**, 505–512.
- Parks B.M., Hoecker U., Spalding E.P. (2001) Light-induced growth promotion by SPA1 counteracts phytochrome-mediated growth inhibition during de-etiolation. *Journal of Plant Physiology*, **126**, 1291–1298.
- Pasian C.C., Lieth J.H. (1994) Prediction of flowering rose shoot development based on air temperature and thermal units. *Scientia Horticulturae*, **59**, 131–145.
- Piszczek P., Glowacka B. (2008) Effects of the colour of light on cucumber (*Cucumis sativus* L.). *Seedling Vegetable Crops Research Bulletin*, **68**, 71–80.
- Rajapakse N.C., Kelly J.W. (1993) Spectral filters influence transpirational water loss in Chrysanthemum. *Scientia Horticulturae*, **28**, 999–1001.
- Rajapakse N.C., Kelly J.W. (1995) Spectral filters and growing season influence growth and carbohydrate status of chrysanthemum. *Journal of the American Society of Horticultural Science*, **120**, 78–83.
- Rajapakse N.C., Pollock R.K., McMahon M.J., Kelly J.W., Young R.E. (1992) Interpretation of light quality measurements and plant response in spectral filter research. *Scientia Horticulturae*, **27**, 1208–1211.
- Sager J.C., Smith W.O., Edwards J.L., Cyr K.L. (1988) Photosynthetic efficiency and phytochrome photoequilibria determination using spectral data. *Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers*, **316**, 1882–1889.
- Sarala M., Taulavuori K., Taulavuori E., Karhu J., Laine K. (2007) Elongation of Scots pine seedlings under blue light depletion is independent of etiolation. *Environmental and Experimental Botany*, **60**, 340–343.
- Sharkey T.D., Raschke K. (1981) Effect of light quality on stomatal opening in leaves of *Xanthium strumarium* L. *Journal of Plant Physiology*, **68**, 1170–1174.
- Strasser B., Sánchez-Lamas M., Yanovsky M.J., Casal J.J., Cerdán P.D. (2010) *Arabidopsis thaliana* life without phytochromes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, **107**, 4776–4781.
- Torrecillas A., León A., Del Amor F., Martínez-Mompéan M.C. (1984) Determinación rápida de clorofila en discos foliares de limonero. *Fruits*, **38**, 55–60.
- Ueda Y., Ishihara S., Tomita H., Oda Y. (2000) Photosynthetic response of Japanese rose species *Rosa bracteata* and *Rosa rugosa* to temperature and light. *Scientia Horticulturae*, **84**, 365–371.
- Urban L., Six S., Barthelemy L., Bearez P. (2002) Effect of elevated CO<sub>2</sub> on leaf water relations, water balance and senescence of cut roses. *Journal of Plant Physiology*, **159**, 717–723.
- Ushio A., Mae T., Makino A. (2008) Effects of temperature on photosynthesis and plant growth in the assimilation shoots of a rose. *Soil Science and Plant Nutrition*, **54**, 253–258.
- Varlet-Grancher C., Moulia B., Sinoquet H., Russell G. (1993) Spectral modification of light within plant canopies: how to quantify its effects on the architecture of the plant stand. In: Varlet-Grancher C., Moulia B., Sinoquet H. (Eds), *Crop structure and light microclimate characterization and applications*. INRA, Versailles, pp 427–451.
- Wada M., Kagawa T., Sato Y. (2003) Chloroplast movement. *Annual Review of Plant Biology*, **54**, 455–468.
- Whitelam G., Halliday K. (2007) *Light and plant development*. Blackwell, Oxford, UK, Vol. **30**, 325 pp.
- Wilson D.A., Weigel R.C., Wheeler R.M., Sager J.C. (1993) Light spectral quality effects on the growth of potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) nodal cuttings in vitro. *In Vitro Cellular and Development Biology*, **29**, 5–8.
- Zeiger E., Zhu J. (1998) Role of zeaxanthin in blue light photoreception and the modulation of light–CO<sub>2</sub> interactions in guard cells. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, **49**, 433–442.
- Zieslin N., Mor Y. (1990) Light on roses. A review. *Scientia Horticulturae*, **43**, 1–14.