

# **Micromechanics of root development in soil**

Lx Dupuy, M Mimault, D Patko, Vincent Ladmiral, B. Ameduri, M P Macdonald, M Ptashnyk

### **To cite this version:**

Lx Dupuy, M Mimault, D Patko, Vincent Ladmiral, B. Ameduri, et al.. Micromechanics of root development in soil. Current Opinion in Genetics and Development, 2018, 51, pp.18 - 25. 10.1016/j.gde.2018.03.007. hal-01898743

## **HAL Id: hal-01898743 <https://hal.science/hal-01898743v1>**

Submitted on 25 Apr 2019

**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.



 formidable expansion of imaging technologies enables live observations of the rhizosphere micro-pore architecture at unprecedented resolution. Granular matter physics provides ways to understand the microscopic fluctuations of forces in soils, and the increasing knowledge of plant mechanobiology may shed new lights on how roots perceive soil heterogeneity. This opinion paper exposes how recent scientific achievements may contribute to design a new theory for root growth in heterogeneous environments.

#### Main text

22 Current knowledge of the biomechanics of plant root growth in soil is largely based on the extensive 23 work of plant biophysicists from the second half of the 20th century [1-3]. The view was that both  roots and soil must be considered as continua so that the description of root soil interactions can be achieved with continuous mathematical functions of macroscopic variables such as Young's modulus 26 of root tissue, soil penetration stress, and pore water pressure [4]. Classical concepts from mechanics 27 and physiology then provide a suitable framework to understand factors controlling tissue growth in its natural environment. The energy required to deform the root and surrounding soil, which originates from the photosynthetic chemical energy accumulated within the tissues, is converted into turgor pressure and mechanical energy [5]. Turgor pressure then overcome the resistance from cell wall to stretching, the resistance to movement of water across membranes, and the resistance to the displacement of the soil around the root [6].

 This classical view of root-soil biomechanics has been central to identify the biophysical factors limiting growth in soil, but it is now challenged to predict morphologies and developmental patterns observed in natural conditions (Figure 1). If roots were to experience homogeneous mechanical stress from the soil, one would expect turgor pressure and Lockhart equation [1] to predict accurately growth arrest in soil. This is not the case and large discrepancies remain between measured turgor pressure (in the order of 1MPa [7]) and the levels of mechanical stresses at which growth is arrested (>5MPa [8]). Classical mechanics of continua is ill-equipped to explain the links between soil heterogeneity and stochasticity of plant development. The root tissue itself is heterogeneous and cell types have different roles in facilitating growth and penetration. Anchoring the base of the root for example, is necessary for cell elongation to produce apical movement and deformation of the soil [9]. The root cap and its associated border cells have also a fundamental role in reducing friction from the bulk soil. It was shown recently that wheat genotypes with sharper root tips are more efficient at soil penetration [10].

 To establish a biomechanical framework that accountsfor the complexity of root interactions with the granular medium, one must capture the microscopic nature of particle forces and the collective action they have on root tissues (Figure 1A). Kolb, et al. [11] proposed to categorise the nature of root mechanical responses to soil based on the scale of the soil heterogeneities. When the medium is

 composed of small particles, individual variations in the force required to move them are not perceived by the root. The behaviour of roots and soil can be homogenised, and classical continuum mechanics usually applies (Box 1A) [12]. Soils also contain objects that are too large and or too rigid for a root to deform and displace, for example when roots grow in contact with stones, in cracks or pores [13,14]. Growth forces cannot displace the obstacle and the root usually combines tropic responses and mechanical buckling to avoid the obstacle (Box 1B) [15]. The behaviour of roots growing in soils with particles of intermediate sizes is more challenging to understand. A root can displace individual particles from the soil, but the forces exerted by each of the particles can also influence the course of root development (Box 1C). Although such growth environments are common for fine roots or due to the presence of aggregate and sand particles, growth patterns in such conditions are not well understood. How frequently does a root deflect from their growth trajectory? What are the magnitude of deflections? How does the distribution of particle forces modify the growth trajectory? Understanding the forces acting on a root during the elongation requires detailed knowledge of the physics of granular media. Granular media are assemblages of particles held by frictional and repulsive forces from adjacent particles. The forces holding particles together form chain-like networks that propagate at the contact points between neighbouring particles[16]. Because particles are disordered or have various sizes and shapes, large variations in magnitude and direction of particle forces arise [16,17]. Early theoretical work based on dry and static monodisperse particles showed that distribution of contact forces vary greatly and the overall force distribution follows an exponential decline [18,19]. Particles dynamics is better understood too. Contact forces in granular media propagate through complex waves [20] with appearance of macroscopic phenomenon such as clogging and arching, where particles spontaneously organise as vaults [21]. Solid, liquid and even gaseous phases may be observed in granular media depending on the external forces applied upon them [22]. Indeed, powerful techniques and hardware are available to examine theories in conditions that are nearly identical to experiments. 3D templates of the pore geometry together with description of the root and anatomical details can be obtained [23,24], and there are efficient computational  techniques that exploit the power of Graphical Processing Unit to simulate roots and soil at the particle and cell resolution. Discrete Element Modelling (DEM) for example uses Newton's second law to describe the motion of millions of interacting particles [25,26]. The models reproduce closely experimental observations, even in the case of biologically complex systems with detailed quantification of the force distribution surrounding growing roots [27,28].

 Despite recent experimental and theoretical breakthroughs, granular matter physics has not 82 transformed our understanding of the mechanics of root growth. Many current limitations are due to 83 our lack of understanding of how roots respond to complex mechanical signals, and particularly how competition between multiple mechanical stimuli affects root responses. Cellular mechanisms involved in the response to physical obstacles have not been fully characterised, but a growing number of studies are now revealing the signalling and regulatory mechanisms involved in plant responses to mechanical force. Research in animal sciences have identified a multitude of proteins which binding domains are modified by mechanical forces [29] and their discovery in plants may follow. Large families of mechanosensitive ion channels have been identify in plants [30], with for example MCA calcium mechanosensitive channels being linked to growth response to hard gel layers [31]. Adaptation to mechanical forces are also well characterised, including the changes in cell division patterns, growth direction, cell differentiation and gene expression [32]

 A main difficulty, however, is to understand the nature of the mechanical signals perceived from the soil particles surrounding plant roots. It is central to develop capabilities to study not only the forces and displacement produced in the root soil system, but also the biological responses due to mechanical interactions with soil particles. Unfortunately, experimenting with natural soils is challenging because of its opacity. Rhizotron systems have been an extremely powerful tool to study root growth [33,34], glass interfaces introduce strong border effects and observations of biomechanical processes are often biased. X-ray imaging allows visualisation of interactions between 100 roots and soil particles in situ in high resolution [35]. The technique allows time-lapse imaging for several weeks of growth. Improved images can be obtained with the application of contrasting agents.

 For example, iodine perfused into plant leaves revealed the vascular structures of the roots and rhizobial nodules [36]. Root hairs can be resolved using synchrotron sources with resolution of up to 5μm and at temporal resolution sufficient for tracking particle movement due to root growth [37]. However, X-ray is an ionising radiation that affects biological processes especially meristematic regions where high cell division rates occurs [38], and despite the increase in resolutions, details of the inner cellular processes and biochemical activity have remained invisible [39].

 Optics and microscopy in the visible range have thus remained the preferred approach to make observation of the biology and mechanics of the root. Confocal Laser Scanning Microscopes (CLSM) have provided the first live images of root-particle interaction in high resolution with details available on contact with particle surface, anatomical features at cell resolution and gene expression [40-42]. FRET imaging now allows tension sensors to record molecular forces at the piconewton scale [43]. However, CLSM has proved limited for long observations due to photo toxicity and photo bleaching. Because of the confined environment of the microscope, it has also remained limited to small plant samples. The field is now turning to different types of microscopes. Light Sheet Microscopy (LSM), in particular, has drastically reduced the light doses to the samples [44]. Illumination of the sample is planar and achieved orthogonal to the detection so that 2D images are generated instantaneously often using the new generation of scientific-CMOS cameras. By taking a whole 2D section in one "shot", volume scanning is accelerated, enabling small and fast developmental events to be tracked during development. The technique has considerably advanced our ability to observe living organisms 121 both live and in situ with, for example, the ability to track cell growth, movement and divisions of entire embryos [45] or capturing the beating of a living heart [46]. Because axial resolution in light sheet systems is not dependent upon high numerical aperture imaging objectives, they allow larger fields of view and can easily accommodate microcosms and instruments for maintaining healthy growth conditions [47]. Details of the morphology and anatomy of tissues can be obtained without the use of markers [48,49] and recently dynamic light scattering (biospeckle) has been used to  enhance image contrast [50]. Light sheet imaging has also been used in granular matter physics for a long time, although its application to root and soil is just emerging [50-52].

 Optics and microscopy also provides many ways to control and measure mechanical forces. Laser ablation for example, has long been used to understand the distribution of forces within a tissue [53], whilst optical trapping has been used to apply small localised forces [54]. Photoelastic materials have been central to establishing the nature of the chains of forces and how they propagate within a granular medium [55]. Kolb, et al. [56] used photoelasticity to characterise the forces created by root growth within a pore, and Wendell, et al. [57] have successfully created a granular medium using a photo elastic media where maximum growth forces and avoidance mechanisms could be observed (Figure 1B). New cantilever-based optical sensors [58,59] have also been developed to measure simultaneously growth forces generated by a root and three-dimensional strain rate in responses to changes in external forces applied to the root. Bizet, et al. [59] for example, obtained stereoscopic data to decompose root response to axial mechanical forces into different phases (Figure 1C). Hydrogels can also be combined with fluorescent dyes and light sheet imaging to reconstruct interparticle forces within the granular medium [60].

 Techniques for mimicking soil physical conditions under a microscope are also emerging rapidly. Transparent artificial media based on fluoropolymers that can mimic soil properties have been developed [42]. The media reproduces the physical and chemical properties of soil through control of the distribution of sizes and surface chemistry of the particles (Figure 1D). Because the particles are made of fluoropolymers that have refractive index close to water, only small adjustment of refractive indices, usually by adding a colloid to the nutrient solution, allows light to travel without refraction through the substrate. Microfluidics techniques have also progressed significantly and are becoming suitable to live and high resolution microscopy of roots and microbes [61,62]. Microfluidics allows precise and repeatable control of liquids and this could be used, for example, to control water tension and particle cohesion in soil during live experiments. The range of materials and fabrication techniques has been considerably expanded with the use of 3D printing [63], photo lithography [64], etching

 technics [65] and the use of optically controlled fluidics [66,67]. It has been possible, for example, to produce chambers with physical heterogeneity, physical barriers and chemical gradients, with direct applications to root and soil studies [62,64,68] .

 The scientific community is better equipped than ever to make observations on the micromechanics of root development in soil. Experimental systems provide soil-like growth conditions and allow for observations, measurements and data generation with precision, accuracy and resolution. How then to transform the amount of information available to us into scientific breakthrough? The complexity of the root-particle interactions is a major challenge. At each growth step, a root is in contact with a new arrangement of particlesthat apply forces of varying magnitudes and orientations. Because there are countless numbers of possible arrangements, the forces applied on roots cannot be 163 experimentally controlled. Measurements of granular forces in situ is required (Figure 2.1), and granular media physicist have achieved such measurements. There are now great opportunities to combine current knowledge of soil micromechanics with mechanobiology and propose a mechanistic framework that account for sensing and response to micro-scale heterogeneity (Figure 2.2). New theories must be developed to embrace stochasticity and explain responses to multiple mechanical stimuli (Figure 2.3-4). Major challenges remain, but a recent look at the literature indicates our thinking is evolving in the right way.



 Figure 1: Growing roots interact mechanically with soil particles during growth. These interactions influence the morphology of the root, and the dynamics of development of the root system. A) Irregular growth of cortex cells is observed in hard or compacted soil [left, 69]. Resistance from the soil particles causes root diameter to increase and the root tip to buckle and bend towards the path of least resistance (middle, lentils roots grown at 2MPa confining pressure). At the scale of the root 177 system, interactions causes growth trajectories to be stochastic as observed here on Anthyllis 178 vulneraria grown on landslide soils (image courtesy Loïc Pagès). Technological developments now allow precise characterisation of mechanical interactions between a root and the growth substrate. These include for example, B) photoelastic discs for measurement of growth forces in soil pores [56] (images courtesy Evelyne Kolb), C) root growing on a cantilever sensor for measuring growth forces [59], D) transparent soil substrates that provide the physical structure of soil with the ability to carry out 3D live imaging [50], E) Dual flow microfluidic systems with microscale both physical and nutrient heterogeneity [68] and F) discrete element modelling for testing root responses to interactions with granular media [28] (image courtesy Mahmoud Fakih).





189 Box 1: Root primary growth is a local process where elongation of tissues is taking place at the root tip. Soil heterogeneity influences strongly how the tissue elongates and deforms (top), and local interactions taking place at the tip can have drastic effects on the morphology and development of 192 the whole root system, and the resources available to the plant (bottom). Mathematical modelling provides a useful framework to explain how heterogeneity can affect the morphology of the root system.

 (A) When roots grow in soil particles which representative volume is small compared to the diameter 196 of the roots, the action of the particles can be averaged (top). In such conditions, it is unlikely for a 197 plant to perceive the fluctuations of forces from individual particles. If the mechanical resistance of

198 the soil is not limiting, root trajectories follow smooth streamlines (bottom). Mathematically, this 199 phenomenon has been described as the convection of root tips (density  $\rho$ ) [70]. The growth velocity 200  $E$  (cm.d<sup>1</sup>) and the rate of change in root angle due to gravitropism  $g$  (d<sup>1</sup>) define the growth of the root 201 system:

$$
\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{F} + \partial_\theta g \rho = 0,
$$

203 with  $F = \rho E(\cos(\theta) + \sin(\theta))$  is the spatial flux of root tips and gp is the angular flux of roots. In this 204 case, growth and resource acquisition is optimal.

205 (B) When soil elements cannot be displaced, in the case of stones and rock for example, the root 206 adopts avoidance behaviours. Optimal growth is not affected and remains similar to (A), until the 207 obstacle is reached. Heterogeneities in this case define the boundaries within which convective 208 growth is taking place. Using the same mathematical framework, presence of such boundaries can be 209 modelled through boundary conditions, for example

$$
\partial_n \rho = 0.
$$

211 Large scale soil heterogeneities can be problematic because they may restrain access to pools of 212 resources, e.g. deep water, even though the root growth in most parts of the soil domain is unaffected. 213 They may also forms paths of least growth resistance, for example in the case of pores and cracks.

214 (C) Intermediate cases are more problematic to analyse. Roots are in contact with particles which 215 apply forces of varying magnitudes and orientation. Although the root may overcome these forces, a 216 single particle may be able to deflect the growth trajectory. Since particles have inhomogeneous 217 distribution, root deflection occurs is stochastic. Mathematically, the phenomenon can be described 218 by a convection, where the growth velocity e<E (cm.d<sup>-1</sup>) and the rate of change in root angle due to 219 gravitropism  $g$  (d<sup>1</sup>) and random fluctuations define the dynamics:

$$
\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{F} + \partial_\theta (g\rho + D\partial_\theta \rho) = 0,
$$

 $221$  gp +  $D\partial_{\theta}$  the angular flux of roots. The parameter D is the angular diffusion coefficient. Because D 222 relates to the probability of roots to be deflected by a particle, and the magnitude of such deflection, 223 there is a direct link between micro-mechanics of root particle interactions and the morphology of the 224 root system. Diffusive growth makes root trajectories irregular, and limits the expansion of the root 225 system, even when the elongation rate is not affected. Mathematical analysis of equation 3 reveals 226 the conditions for which transitions from convective growth to diffusive growth occur, i.e. for Peclet number  $P_e = \frac{g}{R}$ 227 *number*  $P_e = \frac{9}{D}$  < 1.

228

229



 Figure 2: Dissecting the complexity of root particles mechanical interactions requires an elaborate research strategy. (1) First step is to better understand the nature of the forces applied to a root. This can be achieved, using photo elastic beads, imaging, or developing artificial roots equipped with sensors [71], but also by revisiting older techniques, for example by analysing micro penetrometer 236 test and exploit force fluctuations [72]. (2) In the second step, it is essential to characterise how these forces (orange arrows) are perceived by plant roots. This could be achieved using e.g. modern LSM microscopes, artificial soils, calcium or FRET tension sensors to inform on the perception of forces induced by heterogeneous media [73]. (3) Finally, the mechanism of response to complex distribution 240 of forces must be characterised. In this case, responses can be studied on simplified systems where position and magnitude of forces can be controlled accurately, using lab-on-chip device and more traditional developmental biology approaches. Experiments and data can then be used to formulate and test new concepts and biomechanical theories (black arrows). Computational models can test

- biomechanical theories in most realistic conditions using latest technologies, e.g. particle based
- simulations and computer hardware (4) and influence the design of new experiments (grey arrows).

### Acknowledgements

- This work was supported by the consolidator fellowship from the European Research Council ERC
- SENSOILS-647857. We also thank the colleagues from the RoSoM project for inspiring discussions on
- root biomechanics and discrete element modelling (Agropolis Fondation ID 1202-073; LabexAgro:
- ANR-10-LABX- 001-01).

#### 254 References

- 255 1. Lockhart JA: An analysis of irreversible plant cell elongation. Journal of Theoretical Biology 1965, 256 8:264-275.
- 257 2. Barley K, Greacen E: Mechanical resistance as a soil factor influencing the growth of roots and
- 258 underground shoots. Advances in agronomy 1967, 19:1-43.
- 259 3. Silk WK, Erickson RO: Kinematics of plant growth. Journal of Theoretical Biology 1979, 76:481-501.
- 260 4. Abdalla A, Hettiaratchi D, Reece A: The mechanics of root growth in granular media. Journal of
- 261 Agricultural Engineering Research 1969, 14:236-248.
- 262 5. Silk WK, Wagner K: Growth-sustaining water potential distributions in the primary corn root. a non
- 263 compartmented continuum model. Plant Physiology 1980, 66:859-863.
- 264 6. Dexter A: Mechanics of root growth. Plant and soil 1987, 98:303-312.
- 265 7. Clark L, Whalley W, Dexter A, Barraclough P, Leigh R: Complete mechanical impedance increases
- 266 the turgor of cells in the apex of pea roots. Plant, Cell & Environment 1996, 19:1099-1102.
- 267 8. Bengough A, Mullins C: Penetrometer resistance, root penetration resistance and root elongation
- 268 rate in two sandy loam soils. Plant and Soil 1991, 131:59-66.
- 269 9. Bengough AG, Loades K, McKenzie BM: Root hairs aid soil penetration by anchoring the root
- 270 surface to pore walls. Journal of Experimental Botany 2016, 67:1071-1078.
- 271 10. Colombi T, Kirchgessner N, Walter A, Keller T: Root tip shape governs root elongation rate under
- 272 increased soil strength. Plant Physiology 2017, 174:2289-2301.
- 273 11. Kolb E, Legue V, Bogeat-Triboulot M-B: Physical root-soil interactions. Physical Biology 2017,
- 274 14:065004.
- 275 12. Faure A: Stress field developed by root growth: theoretical approach. Journal of Agricultural
- 276 Engineering Research 1994, 58:53-67.
- 277 13. Jackson R, Moore L, Hoffmann W, Pockman W, Linder C: Ecosystem rooting depth determined
- 278 with caves and DNA. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States
- 279 of America 1999, 96:11387-11392.
- 280 14. White RG, Kirkegaard JA: The distribution and abundance of wheat roots in a dense, structured
- 281 subsoil–implications for water uptake. Plant, Cell & Environment 2010, 33:133-148.
- 282 15. Monshausen GB, Gilroy S: The exploring root—root growth responses to local environmental

283 conditions. Current opinion in plant biology 2009, 12:766-772.

- 284 16. Mueth DM, Jaeger HM, Nagel SR: Force distribution in a granular medium. Physical Review E
- 285 1998, 57:3164-3169.
- 286 17. Liu C, Nagel SR, Schecter D, Coppersmith S, Majumdar S: Force fluctuations in bead packs. Science 287 1995, 269:513-515.
- 288 18. Coppersmith S, Liu C-h, Majumdar S, Narayan O, Witten T: Model for force fluctuations in bead 289 packs. Physical Review E 1996, 53:4673-4685.
- 290 19. Hurley R, Hall S, Andrade J, Wright J: Quantifying interparticle forces and heterogeneity in 3D

291 granular materials. Physical Review Letters 2016, 117:098005.

- 292 20. Zhang L, Lambert S, Nicot F: Discrete dynamic modelling of the mechanical behaviour of a granular 293 soil. *International Journal of Impact Engineering* 2017, 103:76-89.
- 294 21. Aranson IS, Tsimring LS: Patterns and collective behavior in granular media: Theoretical concepts.
- 295 Reviews of Modern Physics 2006, 78:641-692.
- 296 22. Gnoli A, Lasanta A, Sarracino A, Puglisi A: Unified rheology of vibro-fluidized dry granular media:
- 297 From slow dense flows to fast gas-like regimes. Scientific Reports 2016, 6:38604.
- 298 23. Richard P, Philippe P, Barbe F, Bourlès S, Thibault X, Bideau D: Analysis by x-ray microtomography

299 of a granular packing undergoing compaction. *Physical Review E* 2003, 68:020301-020301.

- 300 24. Vlahinić I, Andò E, Viggiani G, Andrade JE: Towards a more accurate characterization of granular
- 301 media: extracting quantitative descriptors from tomographic images. *Granular Matter* 2013,
- 302 16:9-21.
- 303 25. Guo Y, Curtis JS: Discrete Element Method Simulations for Complex Granular Flows. Annual
- 304 Review of Fluid Mechanics 2015, 47:21-46.
- 305 26. Nicot F, Xiong H, Wautier A, Lerbet J, Darve F: Force chain collapse as grain column buckling in
- 306 granular materials. Granular Matter 2017, 19:18.
- 307 27. Bourrier F, Kneib F, Chareyre B, Fourcaud T: Discrete modeling of granular soils reinforcement by 308 plant roots. Ecological Engineering 2013, 61:646-657.
- 309 28. Fakih M, Delenne JY, Radjai F, Fourcaud T: Modeling root growth in granular soils: effects of root
- 310 stiffness and packing fraction. In *EPJ Web of Conferences*: EDP Sciences: 2017:14013.
- 311 29. Iskratsch T, Wolfenson H, Sheetz MP: Appreciating force and shape—the rise of
- 312 mechanotransduction in cell biology. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology 2014, 15:825.
- 313 30. Hamilton ES, Schlegel AM, Haswell ES: United in diversity: mechanosensitive ion channels in
- 314 plants. Annual Review of Plant Biology 2015, 66:113-137.
- 315 31. Nakagawa Y, Katagiri T, Shinozaki K, Qi Z, Tatsumi H, Furuichi T, Kishigami A, Sokabe M, Kojima I,
- 316 Sato S: Arabidopsis plasma membrane protein crucial for Ca2+ influx and touch sensing in 317 roots. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 2007, 104:3639-3644.
- 318 32. Mirabet V, Das P, Boudaoud A, Hamant O: The role of mechanical forces in plant morphogenesis.
- 319 Annual review of plant biology 2011, 62:365-385.
- 320 33. Nagel KA, Putz A, Gilmer F, Heinz K, Fischbach A, Pfeifer J, Faget M, Blossfeld S, Ernst M, Dimaki
- 321 C: GROWSCREEN-Rhizo is a novel phenotyping robot enabling simultaneous measurements of
- 322 root and shoot growth for plants grown in soil-filled rhizotrons. Functional Plant Biology 2012,
- 323 39:891-904.
- 324 34. Rellán-Álvarez R, Lobet G, Lindner H, Pradier P-L, Sebastian J, Yee M-C, Geng Y, Trontin C, LaRue
- 325 T, Schrager-Lavelle A: GLO-Roots: an imaging platform enabling multidimensional
- 326 characterization of soil-grown root systems. Elife 2015, 4.
- 327 35. Mooney SJ, Pridmore TP, Helliwell J, Bennett MJ: Developing X-ray computed tomography to non-
- 328 invasively image 3-D root systems architecture in soil. Plant and soil 2012, 352:1-22.
- 329 36. Keyes SD, Gostling NJ, Cheung JH, Roose T, Sinclair I, Marchant A: The Application of Contrast
- 330 Media for In Vivo Feature Enhancement in X-Ray Computed Tomography of Soil-Grown Plant 331 Roots. Microscopy and Microanalysis 2017, 23:538-552.
- 332 37. Keyes S, Cooper L, Duncan S, Koebernick N, Fletcher DM, Scotson C, Van Veelen A, Sinclair I,
- 333 Roose T: Measurement of micro-scale soil deformation around roots using four-dimensional
- 334 synchrotron tomography and image correlation. Journal of The Royal Society Interface 2017,
- 335 14:20170560.
- 336 38. De Micco V, Arena C, Pignalosa D, Durante M: Effects of sparsely and densely ionizing radiation on 337 **plants**. Radiation and Environmental Biophysics 2011, 50:1-19.
- 338 39. Koebernick N, Daly KR, Keyes SD, George TS, Brown LK, Raffan A, Cooper LJ, Naveed M,
- 339 Bengough AG, Sinclair I, et al.: High-resolution synchrotron imaging shows that root hairs
- 340 influence rhizosphere soil structure formation. New Phytologist 2017, 216:124-135.
- 341 40. Schloter M, Borlinghaus R, Bode W, Hartmann A: Direct identification, and localization of
- 342 Azospirillum in the rhizosphere of wheat using fluorescence‐labelled monoclonal antibodies
- 343 and confocal scanning laser microscopy. Journal of Microscopy 1993, 171:173-177.
- 344 41. Assmus B, Hutzler P, Kirchhof G, Amann R, Lawrence JR, Hartmann A: In situ localization of
- 345 Azospirillum brasilense in the rhizosphere of wheat with fluorescently labeled, rRNA-targeted
- 346 oligonucleotide probes and scanning confocal laser microscopy. Applied and Environmental
- 347 Microbiology 1995, 61:1013-1019.
- 348 42. Downie H, Holden N, Otten W, Spiers AJ, Valentine TA, Dupuy LX: Transparent soil for imaging the 349 rhizosphere. *PLoS One* 2012, 7:e44276.
- 350 43. Cost A-L, Ringer P, Chrostek-Grashoff A, Grashoff C: How to measure molecular forces in cells: a
- 351 guide to evaluating genetically-encoded FRET-based tension sensors. Cellular and molecular
- 352 bioengineering 2015, 8:96-105.
- 353 44. Reynaud EG, Krzic U, Greger K, Stelzer EH: Light sheet-based fluorescence microscopy: more
- 354 dimensions, more photons, and less photodamage. HFSP Journal 2008, 2:266-275.
- 355 45. Rozbicki E, Chuai M, Karjalainen AI, Song F, Sang HM, Martin R, Knölker H-J, MacDonald MP,
- 356 Weijer CJ: Myosin II-mediated cell shape changes and cell intercalation contribute to primitive 357 streak formation. Nature Cell Biology 2015, 17:397.
- 358 46. Mickoleit M, Schmid B, Weber M, Fahrbach FO, Hombach S, Reischauer S, Huisken J: High-
- 359 resolution reconstruction of the beating zebrafish heart. Nature Methods 2014, 11:919-922.
- 360 47. Reynaud EG, Peychl J, Huisken J, Tomancak P: Guide to light-sheet microscopy for adventurous
- 361 biologists. Nature Methods 2015, 12:30-34.
- 362 48. Reidt SL, O'Brien DJ, Wood K, MacDonald MP: Polarised light sheet tomography. Opt Express 363 2016, 24:11239-11249.
- 364 49. Wilding D, Pozzi P, Soloviev O, Vdovin G, Sheppard CJ, Verhaegen M: Pupil filters for extending
- 365 the field-of-view in light-sheet microscopy. Optics Letters 2016, 41:1205-1208.
- 366 50. O'Callaghan FE, Braga RA, Neilson R, MacFarlane SA, Dupuy LX: New live screening of plant-

367 **nematode interactions in the rhizosphere**. *Scientific Reports* 2018, 8:1440.

368 51. Yang Z, Downie H, Rozbicki E, Dupuy LX, MacDonald MP: Light Sheet Tomography (LST) for in situ

369 imaging of plant roots. Optics Express 2013, 21:16239-16247.

- 370 52. Silverberg JL, Noar RD, Packer MS, Harrison MJ, Henley CL, Cohen I, Gerbode SJ: 3D imaging and
- 371 mechanical modeling of helical buckling in Medicago truncatula plant roots. Proc Natl Acad Sci
- 372 *U S A* 2012, **109**:16794-16799.
- 373 53. Sampathkumar A, Krupinski P, Wightman R, Milani P, Berquand A, Boudaoud A, Hamant O,

374 Jönsson H, Meyerowitz EM: Subcellular and supracellular mechanical stress prescribes

- 375 cytoskeleton behavior in Arabidopsis cotyledon pavement cells. *Elife* 2014, 3:e01967.
- 376 54. Mártonfalvi Z, Bianco P, Naftz K, Ferenczy GG, Kellermayer M: Force generation by titin folding.
- 377 Protein Science 2017.
- 378 55. Tordesillas A, Steer CAH, Walker DM: Force chain and contact cycle evolution in a dense granular
- 379 material under shallow penetration. Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics 2014, 21:505-519.
- 380 56. Kolb E, Hartmann C, Genet P: Radial force development during root growth measured by
- 381 **photoelasticity**. *Plant and Soil* 2012, 360:19-35.
- 382 57. Wendell DM, Luginbuhl K, Guerrero J, Hosoi AE: Experimental Investigation of Plant Root Growth

383 Through Granular Substrates. Experimental Mechanics 2011, 52:945-949.

- 384 58. Ozoe K, Hida H, Kanno I, Higashiyama T, Notaguchi M: Early characterization method of plant root
- 385 adaptability to soil environments. In Micro Electro Mechanical Systems (MEMS), 2015 28th

386 IEEE International Conference on 18-22 Jan: IEEE: 2015:702-705.

- 387 59. Bizet F, Bengough AG, Hummel I, Bogeat-Triboulot MB, Dupuy LX: 3D deformation field in
- 388 growing plant roots reveals both mechanical and biological responses to axial mechanical
- 389 forces. Journal of Experimental Botany 2016, 67:5605-5614.
- 390 60. Brodu N, Dijksman JA, Behringer RP: Spanning the scales of granular materials through

391 microscopic force imaging. Nature Communication 2015, 6:6361.

- 392 61. Massalha H, Korenblum E, Malitsky S, Shapiro OH, Aharoni A: Live imaging of root-bacteria
- 393 interactions in a microfluidics setup. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the
- 394 United States of America 2017, 114:4549-4554.
- 395 62. Stanley CE, Grossmann G, Solvas XC, DeMello AJ: Soil-on-a-Chip: microfluidic platforms for
- 396 environmental organismal studies. Lab on a Chip 2016, 16:228-241.
- 397 63. Kitson PJ, Rosnes MH, Sans V, Dragone V, Cronin L: Configurable 3D-Printed millifluidic and
- 398 microfluidic 'lab on a chip'reactionware devices. *Lab on a Chip* 2012, 12:3267-3271.
- 399 64. Yanagisawa N, Sugimoto N, Arata H, Higashiyama T, Sato Y: Capability of tip-growing plant cells to

400 **penetrate into extremely narrow gaps**. *Scientific Reports* 2017, 7:1403.

- 401 65. Anderson JR, Chiu DT, Wu H, Schueller O, Whitesides GM: Fabrication of microfluidic systems in
- 402 poly (dimethylsiloxane). Electrophoresis 2000, 21:27-40.
- 403 66. Neale SL, MacDonald MP, Dholakia K, Krauss TF: All-optical control of microfluidic components
- 404 using form birefringence. Nature Materials 2005, 4:530-533.
- 67. Baret J-C, Miller OJ, Taly V, Ryckelynck M, El-Harrak A, Frenz L, Rick C, Samuels ML, Hutchison JB,
- Agresti JJ: Fluorescence-activated droplet sorting (FADS): efficient microfluidic cell sorting based on enzymatic activity. Lab on a Chip 2009, 9:1850-1858.
- 408 68. Stanley CE, Shrivastava J, Brugman R, Heinzelmann E, Swaay D, Grossmann G: Dual-flow-RootChip
- reveals local adaptations of roots towards environmental asymmetry at the physiological and
- 410 genetic levels. New Phytologist 2018, 217:1357-1369.
- 411 69. Lipiec J, Horn R, Pietrusiewicz J, Siczek A: Effects of soil compaction on root elongation and
- 412 anatomy of different cereal plant species. Soil and Tillage Research 2012, 121:74-81.
- 70. Kalogiros DI, Adu MO, White PJ, Broadley MR, Draye X, Ptashnyk M, Bengough AG, Dupuy LX:
- 414 Analysis of root growth from a phenotyping data set using a density-based model. Journal of
- Experimental Botany 2016, 67:1045-1058.
- 71. Sadeghi A, Mondini A, Del Dottore E, Mattoli V, Beccai L, Taccola S, Lucarotti C, Totaro M,
- 417 Mazzolai B: A plant-inspired robot with soft differential bending capabilities. *Bioinspiration &* biomimetics 2016, 12:015001.
- 72. Perfect E, Groenevelt P, Kay B, Grant C: Spatial variability of soil penetrometer measurements at
- **the mesoscopic scale**. Soil and Tillage Research 1990, 16:257-271.
- 421 73. Monshausen GB: Visualizing Ca 2+ signatures in plants. Current Opinion in Plant Biology 2012,
- 15:677-682.
-