



HAL
open science

Potential involvement of proline and flavonols in plant responses to ozone

Fanny Boublin, Cécile Cabassa-Hourton, Juliette Leymarie, Luis Leitao

► **To cite this version:**

Fanny Boublin, Cécile Cabassa-Hourton, Juliette Leymarie, Luis Leitao. Potential involvement of proline and flavonols in plant responses to ozone. *Environmental Research*, 2022, 207, pp.112214. 10.1016/j.envres.2021.112214 . hal-03832573

HAL Id: hal-03832573

<https://hal.u-pec.fr/hal-03832573v1>

Submitted on 22 Jul 2024

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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 Potential involvement of proline and flavonols in plant responses to ozone.

2 Fanny Boublin¹, Cécile Cabassa-Hourton², Juliette Leymarie¹, Luis Leita¹

3 ¹Univ Paris Est Creteil, CNRS, INRAE, IRD, Sorbonne Université, Université de Paris, Institut d'Ecologie
4 et des Sciences de l'Environnement de Paris, IEES-Paris, F-94010 Creteil, France

5
6 ²Sorbonne Université, UPEC, CNRS, IRD, INRA, Institut d'Ecologie et des Sciences de l'Environnement
7 de Paris, IEES, Paris, F-75005 Paris, France

8 9 Abstract

10 Ozone is considered to be a major phytotoxic pollutant. It is an oxidizing molecule with harmful effects
11 that can affect human health and vegetation. Due to its phytotoxicity, it constitutes a threat to food
12 security in a context of climate change. Proline accumulation is induced in response to numerous
13 stresses and is assumed to be involved in plant antioxidant defense. We therefore addressed the
14 question of the putative involvement of proline in plant ozone responses by analyzing the responses
15 of two *Arabidopsis* mutants (obtained in the Col-0 genetic background) altered in proline metabolism
16 and different ecotypes with various ozone sensitivity, to controlled ozone treatments. Among the
17 mutants, the *p5cs1* mutant plants accumulated less proline than the double *prodh1xprodh2* (*p1p2*)
18 mutants. Ozone treatments did not induce accumulation of proline in Col-0 nor in the mutant plants.
19 However, the variation of the photosynthetic parameter Fv/Fm in the *p1p2* mutant suggests a positive
20 effect of proline. Proline accumulation induced by ozone was only observed in the most ozone-
21 sensitive ecotypes, Cvi-0 and Ler. Contrary to our expectations, proline accumulation could not be
22 correlated with variations in protein oxidation (carbonylation). On the other hand, flavonols content,
23 measured here, using non-destructive methods, reflected exactly the genotypes ranking according to
24 ozone sensitivity.

25 26 Keywords

27 ozone, proline metabolism, oxidative stress, flavonols, *Arabidopsis thaliana* (L.) Heynh, protein
28 carbonylation

29 30 1. Introduction

31 Plants are subjected to many environmental constraints such as low or high temperatures, drought,
32 ultraviolet (UV) radiation and gaseous pollutants like tropospheric ozone (O₃). Tropospheric ozone is a
33 secondary pollutant formed by photochemical reactions of anthropogenic precursors, mainly nitrogen
34 oxides (NO_x) and volatile organic compounds (including the non-anthropogenic plant-emitted volatile
35 organic compounds). Tropospheric ozone concentrations have increased considerably over the past
36 century (Parrish et al., 2012) and predictions show that they will remain high for several decades
37 (Sicard et al., 2017). In addition, ozone is considered as a highly phytotoxic air pollutant (Tiwari and
38 Agrawal, 2018).

39 The extent of damage to plants induced by ozone is a function of the intensity and duration of the
40 exposure to the pollutant, in other words, of the ozone dose (Mills et al., 2011). Acute exposure, that
41 is, exposure to high concentrations of ozone for short periods of time, can trigger hypersensitivity

1 responses characterized by the appearance of necrotic lesions on leaf surfaces (Kangasjarvi et al.,
2 2005). In *Arabidopsis thaliana* (L.) Heynh, 93 ecotypes have been ranked according to their sensitivity
3 to ozone, based on such leaf symptoms (Brosché et al., 2010). Plants chronically exposed to current
4 ozone concentrations (Sicard et al., 2017) may not develop necrotic leaf symptoms. Rather,
5 photosynthesis reduction, inhibition of plant growth and, over time, premature senescence may be
6 observed (Gandin et al., 2021; Jolivet et al., 2016). Indeed, current tropospheric ozone concentrations
7 are sufficiently high to reduce yield in many plant species in several regions of the world (Emberson et
8 al., 2018). In poplar, Holm oak, wheat or common bean, as much as 10% in leaf, root, seed and/or total
9 biomass can be lost to ozone (Hayes et al., 2020), even if the impact of ozone varies between species
10 and between cultivars. For example, wheat and bean are considered as sensitive to ozone whereas
11 barley is classified as resistant (Mills et al., 2007).

12 Ozone is absorbed by plants through stomata, which can lead to a decrease in stomatal conductance.
13 Once in the stomatal cavity, ozone is dissolved in the apoplasm and this results in the formation of
14 reactive oxygen species (ROS) (Kangasjarvi et al., 2005). If the plant's antioxidant systems become
15 overwhelmed by ozone-induced ROS, damage to major cellular biomolecules occurs (proteins, lipids,
16 nucleic acids and chlorophylls) (Foyer and Noctor, 2005). Decrease in leaves chlorophylls has been
17 repeatedly observed, for example in *Arabidopsis* (Miller et al., 1999), bean (Leitao et al., 2008) or trees
18 (Jolivet et al., 2016) exposed to ozone. Furthermore, changes in chlorophyll fluorescence indicate that
19 the efficiency of the photochemical reaction is negatively affected as a consequence of the inactivation
20 of some proteins associated with photosystem II (Feng et al., 2018). Carbon fixing reactions are also
21 affected since up to 30% of the activity of ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase / oxygenase
22 (RuBisCO) was lost in the leaves of plants (bean, wheat, maize or poplar) exposed to ozone (Bagard et
23 al., 2015; Leitao et al., 2008).

24 ROS formed from O₃ degradation can oxidize the proteins and protein carbonylation is the most
25 common modification induced by ROS. Carbonylation involves the incorporation of an aldehyde or
26 ketone onto an amino acid side chain (Coffey and Gronert, 2016). Protein carbonylation is usually used
27 as a good indicator of stress because, among all cellular oxidative stress markers, it has the advantage
28 of being irreversible. Compared to other markers such as glutathionylated proteins or malondialdehyde,
29 carbonylated proteins are more stable (Dalle-Donne et al., 2003). For all these reasons, level of
30 carbonylated proteins is considered as a good indicator of oxidative stress and is commonly used as a
31 marker of the level of protein oxidation in humans (Mannaa and Hanisch, 2020) as well as in plants
32 (Anjum et al., 2015).

33 In plants, the amino acid proline is known to participate in the biosynthesis of primary metabolism
34 components, and to play a role during the growth and development (Verbruggen and Hermans, 2008),
35 notably as a component of cell wall proteins (Kavi Kishor et al., 2015). Moreover, proline is known to
36 accumulate in plant tissues in response to many environmental stresses such as drought, high salinity,
37 high temperature, freezing, UV radiation, heavy metals and ozone (Calzone et al., 2019; Szabados and
38 Savouré, 2010; Verbruggen and Hermans, 2008). Under conditions of osmotic stress, proline can act
39 as an osmoprotectant, specifically in halophyte plants, as a molecular chaperone, a stabilizer of cellular
40 structures, a scavenger of free radicals and an energy sink (Szabados and Savouré, 2010). Accumulation
41 of proline confers stress tolerance by maintaining cell turgor or osmotic balance, by stabilizing
42 membranes (thus preventing electrolyte leakage) and by maintaining physiological ROS concentrations
43 (thus preventing/limiting oxidative stress) (Hayat et al., 2012; Smirnoff and Cumbes, 1989). Indeed,
44 proline has been shown to be responsible for the scavenging ROS and other free radicals (Ben Rejeb
45 et al., 2014; Szabados and Savouré, 2010) although its role in the direct scavenging of singlet oxygen
46 could be discussed (Signorelli et al., 2014). Its role in plants response to ozone needs further studying

1 and directed alteration of proline metabolism could be an appropriate approach. In plants, proline
2 metabolism is compartmentalized and is distributed between cytosol, mitochondria and possibly
3 chloroplasts under stress conditions (Szabados and Savaouré, 2010). Proline is mainly synthesized in the
4 cytosol from glutamate that is transformed into Δ^1 -pyrroline-5-carboxylate (P5C) by Δ^1 -pyrroline-5-
5 carboxylate synthetase (P5CS) (Funck et al., 2008; Verbruggen and Hermans, 2008). P5C is then
6 reduced to proline by the pyrroline-5-carboxylate reductase (P5CR) enzyme. The catabolism of proline
7 occurs in mitochondria and under the command of the proline dehydrogenase (ProDH) that oxidizes
8 proline in P5C, which is then converted to glutamate by the pyrroline-5-carboxylate deshydrogenase
9 (P5CDH) enzyme (Hayat et al., 2012). Proline content can be regulated by both biosynthetic and
10 catabolic pathways. P5CS activity was shown to be the rate-limiting step of proline biosynthesis in
11 plants (Kavi Kishor et al., 2015). This enzyme is encoded by two genes in Arabidopsis, *P5CS1* and *P5CS2*.
12 Study of knockout *p5cs1* mutants indicated that this isoform is mainly involved in proline accumulation
13 during osmotic or salt-stress while P5CS2 is required for embryogenesis, during the late stages of seed
14 development (Székely et al., 2008). On the opposite, proline catabolism is mainly induced after stress
15 recovery and senescence, ProDH enzymes being the rate-limiting steps (Cabassa-Hourton et al., 2016;
16 Launay et al., 2019). In Arabidopsis, PROD H is encoded by two genes, *PROD H1* and *PROD H2*, both being
17 involved in abiotic stress responses (Cabassa-Hourton et al., 2016). Both the single *p5cs1* and double
18 *prodh1xprodh2* (*p1p2*) mutants were shown to differentially accumulate proline compared to wild
19 type, in response to abiotic stresses like salt stress (for *p5cs1* mutant) and dark induced senescence
20 (for *prodh1xprodh2* mutant) (Cabassa-Hourton et al., 2016; Launay et al., 2019).

21 In order to test if proline metabolism is linked to ozone stress perception and response, we conducted
22 two experiments, the first one using mutants altered in proline content and the second one using
23 different *Arabidopsis thaliana* ecotypes with variable ozone sensitivity. In line with proline's putative
24 antioxidant properties, we hypothesized that proline accumulation in response to controlled ozone
25 treatments would result in enhanced tolerance to oxidative stress in Arabidopsis plants. As a result,
26 several parameters were analyzed to characterize plant growth and leaf protein oxidation level in
27 relation with the plants ability to accumulate proline.

28

29 **2. Materials and Methods**

30 **2.1. Plant materials**

31 Four ecotypes of *Arabidopsis thaliana* (L.) Heynh were used: Col-0, Ts-1, *Ler*, Cvi-0 kindly provided by
32 Dr Verslues. Two mutants in the Col-0 background, affected in proline metabolism were used: *p5cs1*
33 (*salk_063517*) and *p1p2* (*prodh1-4* and *prodh2-2* double-mutant (Cabassa-Hourton et al., 2016).

34 In a first experiment, seeds of Col-0, *p5cs1* and *p1p2* were sown in small pots (7.5 cm in diameter) filled
35 with potting soil/peat (Klashmann-Dailmann, TS3). In a second experiment, seeds of Col-0, Ts-1, *Ler*
36 and Cvi-0 were sown on Jiffy-7[®] peat pellets (Jiffy International, Kristiansand, Norway) placed in smaller
37 pots (4.5 cm in diameter).

38 In both experiments, after sowing, the pots were placed at 4°C, in darkness for two days (stratification).
39 Plants were thereafter grown for 5 weeks in phytotronic chambers (Adaptis 1000, Conviron)
40 maintained at 20°C/22°C (night/day), 60% of relative humidity, with 8 hours of photoperiod (200
41 $\mu\text{mol.m}^{-2}.\text{s}^{-1}$) from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm. Plants were regularly watered by sub-irrigation and fertilized
42 weekly with 5 mL of fertilizer (Algoflash) per pot.

43

2.2. Ozone exposure and collection of plant material

Ozone generation and regulation in the growth chamber involved an ozone generator (C-Lasky, AirTree Ozone Technology Co. Ltd.), an ozone monitor (106-L, 2B Technologies) coupled to a continuous recorder of ozone concentrations (midi logger GL220, Graphtec). To evaluate plant exposure to ozone, the AOT40 index was calculated. The AOT40 (Accumulated Ozone exposure over a Threshold of 40 ppb; ppb h) was determined as the sum of the differences between hourly ozone concentrations and 40 ppb for each hour when the concentration exceeds 40 ppb over the fumigation period (Fuhrer et al., 1997).

In the first experiment, five-week-old plants (n = 14) were exposed to 240 ppb of ozone during six hours, for 16 consecutive days. Ozone was applied in the middle of the photoperiod, between 9:30 am and 3:30 pm. In parallel, control plants (n = 14) were cultivated under ambient ozone conditions in a similar phytotronic chamber. At the end of the ozone treatment, eight ozonated plants and eight control plants were randomly selected; six mature leaves (leaf ranks 10 to 16; the numbering of leaves was performed from the oldest to the youngest) were collected per plant and per genotype, weighed and immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen for biochemical analyzes. The other six plants (per treatment and per genotype) were used for ecophysiological analyzes.

In the second experiment, five-week-old plants (n = 14) were exposed to 240 ppb of ozone during six hours, for 10 consecutive days. As described previously, ozone was applied between 9:30 am and 3:30 pm. Control plants (n = 14) were cultivated under ambient ozone conditions. After 10 days of ozone treatment, nine ozonated plants and nine control plants were randomly selected; six mature leaves (leaf ranks 10 to 16) were collected and weighed. From these 9 plants, leaves of 3 different plants were pooled and frozen in liquid nitrogen in order to have enough material for biochemical analyzes.

2.3. Estimation of leaf area and biomass

At the end of the experiments, plants were photographed with a Samsung ST73 camera, screwed to a camera stand, at fixed height and angle. The projected areas, determined using the Image J software, were considered as the estimated total leaf areas. The aboveground biomass was determined by weighing each rosette immediately after sampling (fresh biomass) and after drying at 60 °C for 48 hours (dry biomass).

2.4. Determination of the total chlorophyll content and flavonol index

Leaf total chlorophyll and flavonol index were non-destructively measured, using the DUALEX® device (Force-A, Orsay, France; Cerovic et al., 2012). This device is a leafclip optical sensor which estimates chlorophyll and flavonol contents of plant leaves, based on absorbance and transmittance of specific wavelengths of visible and near infrared light. For each plant, five measurements were made on the 12th fully-developed leaf (counting from the oldest one). Thus, the total chlorophyll content and flavonol index values are the means of these five measurements.

2.5. Measurement of chlorophyll fluorescence parameters

In the first experiment, parameters derived from chlorophyll fluorescence were measured, using a Pulse Amplitude Modulation Fluorescence Monitoring System 1 (FMS1, Hansatech Instruments,

1 Norfolk, UK) (n = 6). After 30 minutes of dark adaptation, F_0 (minimum fluorescence yield) and the
2 F_v/F_m ratio (maximum quantum yield of photosystem II) were quantified on the 12th leaf, by
3 application of a short flash of saturated light ($12000 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ for 0.3 s). Following these
4 measurements, the leaves were exposed to a continuous actinic light source ($240 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$) for 15
5 minutes. The parameters Φ PSII (quantum yield of photosystem II), qP (photochemical quenching) and
6 qNP (non-photochemical quenching) were quantified after application of a short flash of saturated
7 light ($12000 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ for 0.3 s).

8 In the second experiment, F_0 (after 30 minutes of dark adaptation) and the F_v/F_m ratio (after
9 application of a short flash of saturated light at $3000 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ for 0.3 s) were measured on the 12th
10 plant leaf, using a HandyPEA (Hansatech Instruments Ltd) (n = 10). Measurements on ozonated Cvi-0
11 plants were impossible because ozone-induced leaf damage was too important.

12

13 **2.6. Proline assay**

14 Proline content was spectrophotometrically determined at 520 nm according to Bates' method, using
15 30 to 40 mg of frozen leaf tissue (Bates et al., 1973).

16

17 **2.7. Quantification of carbonylated proteins according to the fluorescein-5-thiosemicarbazide** 18 **(FTC) method**

19 Total soluble leaf protein extraction was carried out in lysis buffer (50 mM Tris, 1 mM EDTA, 1.5% PVPP
20 (w/v), pH 7.5, extemporaneously supplemented with protease inhibitors: 20 μM E-64, 1 mM Pefabloc
21 SC, 1 mM 1,10-phenantroline). After homogenization, samples were centrifuged twice at 21500 g for
22 10 minutes at 4° C. The supernatants were collected and stored on ice.

23 The Bradford method was used to quantify protein content (Bradford, 1976). Removal of residual
24 nucleic acids and FTC derivatization of proteins were performed according to Havé et al. (2015) with
25 the following modifications: final FTC concentration was 4 mM and the resuspension buffer contained
26 8 M urea, 1 mM EDTA, 150 mM NaCl, 100 mM Tris, pH 8.0, 20 μM E-64, 1 mM Pefabloc SC and 1 mM
27 1,10-phenantroline.

28 Ten μg of FTC-derivatized proteins were separated by SDS-PAGE in 20% acrylamide gels (mini-Criterion,
29 Bio-Rad) using TGS running buffer (Tris/glycine/SDS, pH 8.3 buffer, Bio-Rad). After separation of the
30 proteins, the in-gel capture of the FTC signal was achieved, using an EZ Imager (Bio-Rad) with $\lambda_{em} =$
31 516 nm and $\lambda_{ex} = 492$ nm. The gel was then stained with colloidal Coomassie blue according to the
32 protocol of Dyballa and Metzger (2009) and total protein signal acquisition was made with the EZ
33 Imager.

34 FTC and Coomassie blue signal analyses were performed by densitometry, using the Image Lab™
35 software (Bio-Rad). FTC signals were normalized to Coomassie blue signals and expressed as arbitrary
36 units.

37

38 **2.8. Statistical analyses**

39 Statistical analyses were performed using the R software v 3.6.1 (R Core Team, 2020). In order to
40 determine any differences between the ecotypes, treatments and interactions between these two
41 factors, 2-way ANOVA followed by multiple comparison tests were performed if residuals were

1 normally distributed (Shapiro test) and variances were homogeneous (Bartlett test). When the number
2 of replicates was homogeneous, a type I 2-way ANOVA was performed, followed by a Tukey HSD test
3 whereas when it was not homogeneous, a type II 2-way ANOVA was performed (using the car package)
4 followed by a Pairwise T-test with a Bonferroni correction. If residuals were not normally distributed
5 or variances were not homogeneous, a non-parametric test was performed (Kruskal-Wallis test
6 followed by a Pairwise Wilcoxon test with a Bonferroni correction). Only the significant differences due
7 to ozone treatment were mentioned on the figures and results of p-values are reported in table S2.
8 Results are considered significant at p-value < 0.05 (threshold = 5%).

9

10 **3. Results and Discussion**

11 **3.1. Ozone exposure**

12 The ozone concentrations actually experienced by the plants were recorded throughout the
13 experiments. The means of the daily ozone concentrations were calculated from the hourly ozone
14 averages measured during the fumigation periods (Fig. S1 A and C). It was thus possible to determine
15 the hourly average ozone concentrations, at which the plants were exposed daily during the 6 hours
16 of fumigation. Overall, during the first experiment, the average ozone concentration was 239.4 ppb ±
17 17.6 ppb and the AOT40 was 21.9 ppm.h after 16 days (Fig. S1 A-B). For the second experiment, the
18 average ozone concentration was 237.9 ppb ± 6.2 ppb and the AOT40 was 11.7 ppm.h after 10 days
19 (Fig. S1 C-D). For this second experiment, ten days into the ozone treatment, the Cvi-0 ecotype showed
20 severe leaf injuries. As a result, the experiment was stopped. Daily variations in hourly ozone
21 concentration are reported in Fig. S1 E and F for experiment 1 and 2 respectively.

22 Ozone treatments in both experiments were severe. Indeed, the average daily ozone concentrations
23 in Europe does not exceed 35 ppb (Sicard et al., 2020). Moreover, the AOT40 critical level for a
24 reduction of wheat yield is of 3 ppm.h after 3 months (Mills et al., 2007).

25

26 **3.2. Effects of ozone exposure on Arabidopsis proline-metabolism mutants**


27 **3.2.1. Effects of ozone on leaf morphology and biomass**

28 At the end of the ozone treatment (240 ppb over 16 days), no leaf necrosis/chlorosis was visible,
29 regardless of the genotype (Col-0, *p5cs* and *p1p2*). However, all ozonated plants of the three genotypes
30 simultaneously developed leaf curling (Fig. 1A). Average rosette projected areas were between 86 cm²
31 and 105 cm² (Fig. 1B). Average rosette fresh weights were between 4.08 g and 5.09 g and dry weights
32 between 0.31 g and 0.38 g (Fig. 1C and 1D). No significant difference was observed between genotypes
33 for rosette area, fresh weight and dry weight (Fig. 1B-D), or between control and ozonated plants
34 regardless of the genotype (2-way ANOVA (type I), p-values > 0.05).

35 **3.2.2 Effect of ozone on the fluorescence parameters of chlorophyll**

36 All fluorescence parameters of chlorophyll measured showed similar values for Col-0 and *p5cs*
37 genotypes regardless of the treatment. In the *p1p2* mutant, the ozone treatment had a significant
38 impact (Fig. 1E-F): ozonated *p1p2* plants showed lower F_0 values (≈ -25%) than control plants (Fig. 1E)
39 (Tukey HSD test, p-value = 0.006), and they had a slightly higher maximum quantum yield of
40 photosystem II Fv/Fm ratio (+3%) (Fig. 1F) (Pairwise Wilcoxon test, p-value = 0.032). Regarding Φ PS2,
41 qP and qNP parameters, no significant difference was observed (for Φ PS2, pairwise Wilcoxon test, p-
42 values > 0.05, for qP and qNP, Tukey HSD test, p-values > 0.05; data not shown), regardless of
43 genotypes and treatments.

1



2

3 **Figure 1:** Impacts of ozone (239.4 ppb ± 17.6 ppb over 16 days) on qualitative and quantitative morphological
 4 traits (ozonated plants, black bars; control plants, white bars). Col-0: wild-type; *p5cs*: Col-0 mutant affected in
 5 the P5CS enzyme (*p5cs1*); *p1p2*: Col-0 mutant affected in the two isoforms of the proline dehydrogenase (*prodh1*
 6 *prodh2*).

7 Pictures of representative plants (A); Projected rosette area (cm²) (B); rosettes fresh (C) and dry (D) weight (g)
 8 (n = 14). F_o (Minimum fluorescence yield, AU (E) and F_v/F_m ratio (maximum quantum yield of photosystem II) (F)
 9 (n = 6). Values represented are means ± SD. * represents a significant effect of ozone compared to control
 10 (Rosette area, rosette fresh and dry weight, F_o: Tukey HSD test; F_v/F_m: Pairwise Wilcoxon test; threshold = 5%).
 11 For ANOVA or Kruskal-Wallis results, see table S2.

12

13

3.2.3 Effects of ozone on leaf pigments, soluble protein content, protein carbonylation level and proline content

Total chlorophyll contents and flavonol indexes measured on the 12th leaves were between 24.2 and 27.2 µg/cm² (Fig. 2A) and between 0.16 and 0.19 µg/cm² respectively (Fig. 2B). No significant difference was observed between ozonated and control plants, nor between genotypes for the same treatment, for both parameters (Tukey HSD test, p-values > 0.05). The soluble leaf protein contents were between 9.11 and 10.5 µg/mg of fresh weight (FW) and were statistically equivalent between treatments and genotypes (Fig. 2C) (2-way ANOVA (type I), p-values > 0.05). Protein carbonylation index, quantified using FTC method, was weak for all the genotypes and treatments (Fig. 2D). Furthermore, no significant difference in the carbonylation index was observed between treatments and genotypes (2-way ANOVA (type I), p-values > 0.05).

Wild-type Col-0 plants (both ozonated and controls) had leaf proline contents (2.36 µmol/g FW) intermediate between those of *p5cs* plants (1.52 µmol/g FW) and those of *p1p2* plants (above 3 µmol/g of FW) (Fig. 2E). The proline contents in *p5cs* were significantly lower than those in *p1p2* plants (Tukey HSD test, p-value < 0.003). The ozone treatment did not alter the proline contents in either of the genotypes (2-way Anova, p-values > 0.05; Tukey HSD test, p-values > 0.05).

3.2.4 Discussion of the first experiment with proline-metabolism mutants


These results, obtained after a severe ozone stress (240 ppb), did not show any effects on growth or biochemical parameters in the wild-type Col-0. The lack of ozone effect on aerial biomass agrees with the results of Brosché et al. (2010) where Col-0 was used as a reference genotype for ozone tolerance and did not develop any leaf necrosis. Sharma & Davis (1994), using either 150 or 300 ppb of ozone for durations similar to ours, observed small pinhead-sized dry lesions on leaves, for the 300 ppb treatment only. This can be related to the absence of necrosis observed in our case at 240 ppb (Fig. 1). Nevertheless, in this study, a decrease in the Col-0 ecotype biomass was observed (Sharma and Davis, 1994). High ozone tolerance in the Col-0 ecotype was confirmed by the absence of accumulation of carbonylated proteins, a parameter that is considered as a biomarker of oxidative stress (Dalle-Donne et al., 2003).

Our results of rosette areas agree with those of other studies carried out on poplar and maize, where the ozone treatment did not modify leaf surface (Bagard et al., 2008; Leitao et al., 2007a). However, another study, carried out on the *Ler* ecotype of *Arabidopsis thaliana*, showed a decrease in the development of the rosette leaves, thus leading to a decrease in the surface of the rosettes (Miller et al., 1999).

Leaf curling has previously been observed in the Col-0 ecotype of *Arabidopsis* in response to different ozone concentrations. Indeed, Sharma and Davis (1994) observed the apparition of leaf curling after 3 days of treatment at 150 ppb or 300 ppb of ozone. These authors suggested that ethylene could be involved in leaf curling. This is in agreement with the fact that ethylene production corresponds to an early response to ozone in numerous species (reviewed in Langebartels et al., 2002; Vainonen and Kangasjärvi, 2015).

Our results about total chlorophyll contents between ozonated plants and control plants are not in agreement with the results generally observed in the literature for different plant models. Indeed, studies carried out on the *Ler* ecotype of *Arabidopsis* (Miller et al., 1999), poplar (Bagard et al., 2008), bean (Leitao et al., 2008) and maize (Leitao et al., 2007) showed a decrease in total chlorophyll content in the leaves, in response to ozone. However, it was also shown that a mild dose of ozone can lead to

1 an increase in chlorophyll content in maize leaves (Leitao et al., 2007b), a phenomenon probably linked
 2 to hormesis (Agathokleous et al., 2019).
 3



4
 5 **Figure 2:** Impacts of ozone (239.4 ppb \pm 17.6 ppb over 16 days) on biochemical parameters (ozonated plants,
 6 black bars; control plants, white bars). Col-0: wild-type; *p5cs*: Col-0 mutant affected in the P5CS enzyme (*p5cs1*);
 7 *p1p2*: Col-0 mutant affected in the two isoforms of the proline dehydrogenase (*prodh1 prodh2*).
 8 Total chlorophyll contents ($\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$, A) and flavonol index (AU, B) measured on the 12th expanded leaf with
 9 Dualex[®]; total protein content ($\mu\text{g}/\text{g}$ of FW, C); carbonylation of proteins revealed by FTC signal (AU, D); and
 10 proline content ($\mu\text{mol}/\text{g}$ of FW, E). Values represented means \pm SD (n = 14 for total chlorophyll content and
 11 flavonol index and n = 8 for the other parameters). The letters represent the significant differences between
 12 genotypes and treatment (Total chlorophyll content, flavonol index, protein content and proline content:
 13 Tukey HSD test; carbonylation index: Pairwise Wilcoxon test; threshold = 5%). For ANOVA or Kruskal-Wallis results, see
 14 table S2.

15

1 Concerning proline, our results confirmed that the mutations in *P5CS* gene or in the two *ProDH* genes
2 respectively induced lower (-36%) or higher proline (+27%) contents, compared to the wild type,
3 although the difference was only statistically significant between the *p5cs* and *p1p2* genotypes. This is
4 in agreement with previous results obtained by Székely et al. (2008) and Launay et al. (2019) on well-
5 watered plants. Proline is known to accumulate in response to different environmental stresses (Hayat
6 et al., 2012; Zegaoui et al., 2017) and *p5cs* mutants were more sensitive to salt stress (Székely et al.,
7 2008). In our study, no difference in proline content was observed between ozonated and control
8 *Arabidopsis* plants regardless of genotype.

9 Since ozone did not impact the proline content of Col-0 and mutant plants, its involvement in tolerance
10 to ozone could be questioned. However, the *p1p2* mutant characterized by the highest proline content
11 also showed the lowest F_0 values and the highest Fv/Fm ratio. Low F_0 was indicative of a physical
12 dissociation between photosystem II reaction centers and light harvesting complexes that is difficult
13 to interpret in the absence of chlorophyll degradation. On the other hand, the high Fv/Fm ratio in this
14 genotype concurrent with high proline contents suggested that proline could nevertheless play a
15 protective role as stresses inducing damage of PSII usually result in reductions in Fv/Fm (Murchie and
16 Lawson, 2013).

17 Since we concluded to the elevated tolerance to ozone in Col-0, the putative link between ozone and
18 proline had to be further analyzed in other *Arabidopsis* ecotypes. Thus, a second ozone exposure
19 experiment was conducted, using the natural variability in ozone tolerance amongst *Arabidopsis*
20 ecotypes, as previously established by Brosché et al., 2010.

21 **3.3. Effects of ozone exposure on different *Arabidopsis* ecotypes**


22 **3.3.1. Effects of ozone on leaf morphology and biomass**

23 In response to the second ozone treatment (237.9 ppb \pm 6.2 ppb over 10 days), Ts-1 and Col-0 ecotypes
24 showed no foliar symptoms except leaf curling for Col-0 (Fig. 3A). The *Ler* and *Cvi-0* ecotypes both
25 showed leaf necrosis and early senescence symptoms, such as chlorosis (Fig. 3A). Average rosette
26 projected areas were between 12 and 42 cm² (Fig. 3B). For all genotypes, rosette fresh weights were
27 between 0.2 g and 0.84 g (Fig. 3C) and the dry weights between 0.03 g and 0.07 g (Fig. 3D). For rosettes
28 areas and fresh weights, no significant difference was observed between control and ozonated plants
29 for Col-0, Ts-1 and *Ler* (Pairwise T-test, p-values > 0.05). However, ozonated *Cvi-0* plants showed the
30 smallest rosettes areas (-68%) and fresh weight (-71%) (Pairwise T-test, p-values < 0.05). Concerning
31 rosette dry weight, no significant difference was observed between control and ozonated plants
32 regardless of the ecotype (Fig. 3D) (2-way ANOVA (type II), p-value = 0.67).

33 **3.3.2. Effects of ozone on the fluorescence parameters of chlorophyll**

34 F_0 (Fig. 3E) and Fv/Fm (Fig. 3F) were not affected by ozone treatment in Ts-1 and Col-0 plants (Pairwise
35 Wilcoxon test and Pairwise T-test, p-values > 0.05). However, *Ler* showed a significant decrease in F_0 (-
36 22%) (Pairwise T-test, p-value = $1.90 \cdot 10^{-12}$) and Fv/Fm (-5.5%) (Pairwise Wilcoxon test, p-value =
37 0.0257) as a response to the ozone treatment. Unfortunately, it was not possible to measure these
38 parameters on ozonated *Cvi-0* plants as the leaves selected for analysis were completely dry by the
39 10th day.

40



1

2 **Figure 3:** Impacts of ozone (237.9 ppb ± 6.2 ppb over 10 days) on qualitative and quantitative morphological
 3 traits (ozonated plants, black bars; control plants, white bars) of different *Arabidopsis* ecotypes (Ts-1, Col-0, *Ler*
 4 and Cvi-0).


5 Pictures of representative plants (A); Projected rosette areas (cm²) (B) (n = 14), rosette fresh (C) (n = 14) and dry
 6 (D) (n = 5) weight (g); F₀ (minimum fluorescence yield) (AU) (E) (n = 10) and F_v/F_m ratio (maximum quantum yield
 7 of photosystem II) (F) (n = 10). Values represented means ± SD. * represents a significant effect of ozone
 8 compared to control (Rosette area, rosette fresh and dry weight and F₀: Pairwise T-test; F_v/F_m: pairwise
 9 Wilcoxon test; threshold = 5%). For ANOVA or Kruskal-Wallis results, see table S2

10 3.3.3. Effects of ozone on leaf pigments, soluble protein content, protein carbonylation level
 11 and proline content

12 Overall, leaf total chlorophyll contents and flavonol indexes were between 4.8 and 19.3 μg/cm² (Fig.
 13 4A) and between 0.10 and 0.41 (Fig. 4B) respectively. In Col-0 and *Ler*, ozone had no significant impact
 14 on the total chlorophyll contents (Fig. 4A) (Pairwise Wilcoxon test, p-values > 0.05). Ozonated Ts-1
 15 plants accumulated 26% more chlorophylls than the corresponding control plants (Pairwise Wilcoxon

1 test, p -value = 9.4×10^{-5}) whereas ozonated Cvi-0 plants had far less chlorophylls than their control (-
 2 67%) (Pairwise Wilcoxon test p -value = 6.9×10^{-5}). Flavonol index increased in response to ozone: Ts-1
 3 (+13%), Col-0 (+30%), *Ler* (+60%) and Cvi-0 (+173%) (Fig. 4B, Pairwise Wilcoxon test, p -value < 0.0023).
 4 Overall, leaf soluble protein contents were between 7.1 and 11.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mg}$ of fresh weight and were not
 5 significantly influenced by the ozone treatment (Fig. 4C, 2-way ANOVA (type I), p -value = 0.18). It
 6 should be noted that under control conditions, *Ler* plants presented a significantly higher protein
 7 content than Cvi-0 plants (Tukey HSD test, p -value = 0.0132). In ozonated plants, Cvi-0 had a
 8 significantly lower protein content than *Ler* and Col-0 (Tukey HSD test, p -values < 0.05).

9



10

11 **Figure 4:** Impacts of ozone (237.9 ± 6.2 ppb over 10 days) on biochemical responses of Ts-1, Col-0, *Ler* and Cvi-0
 12 *Arabidopsis* ecotypes (ozonated plants, black bars; control plants, white bars).
 13 Total chlorophyll contents ($\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$, A) and flavonol index (AU, B) measured on the 12th expanded leaf with
 14 Dualex®; total protein content ($\mu\text{g}/\text{g}$ of FW, C); carbonylation of proteins revealed by FTC signal (AU, D); and
 15 proline content ($\mu\text{mol}/\text{g}$ of FW, E). Values represented means \pm SD ($n = 14$ for total chlorophyll content and
 16 flavonol index and $n = 3$ for the other parameters). * represents a significant effect of ozone compared to control
 17 (Total chlorophyll content, flavonol index and proline content: pairwise Wilcoxon test; protein content and
 18 carbonylation index: Tukey HSD test threshold = 5%). For ANOVA or Kruskal-Wallis results, see table S2.

1 In all four ecotypes, there was no significant effect of ozone on leaf protein carbonylation level (Fig.
2 4D, 2-way ANOVA (type I), p-value = 0.53). Comparison with control plants indicated no significant
3 difference amongst the different ecotypes (Tukey HSD test, p-values > 0.05). However, ozone treated
4 *Ler* plants had a significantly lower carbonylation signal than ozonated Ts-1 plants (Tukey HSD test, p-
5 value = 0.0067).

6 Overall, average proline contents varied from 1.25 to 10.35 $\mu\text{mol/g}$ of fresh weight (Fig. 4E). Col-0
7 showed proline content similar to those measured the first experiment (Fig. 4E). For control plants,
8 the average proline content was equivalent in all ecotypes (around 2 $\mu\text{mol/g}$ fresh weight). Ozone had
9 a significant impact on leaf proline contents only in *Ler* and *Cvi-0* (+380% and +280% respectively;
10 Pairwise Wilcoxon test, p-values < 0.05; for Ts-1 and Col-0, Pairwise Wilcoxon test, p-values = 1).

11

12 3.3.4. Discussion of the second experiment on Arabidopsis ecotypes

13

14 The two ecotypes that presented leaf macroscopic symptoms (necrosis and chlorosis) in response to
15 the second ozone treatment, i.e., *Ler* and *Cvi-0*, accumulated proline in their leaves, while the ozone
16 treatment did not change the proline contents in the Col-0 and Ts-1 ecotypes. *Cvi-0*, particularly
17 appeared to be the most sensitive ecotype to ozone of the four ecotypes, according to the severe and
18 significant decreases in leaf area, biomass and chlorophyll content. Other experiments confirmed
19 these results (data not shown). Furthermore, they agree with the ozone tolerance classification made
20 by Brosché et al. (2010) who ranked Ts-1, Col-0, *Ler* and *Cvi-0* in decreasing order of tolerance to ozone,
21 according to macroscopic symptoms. It should be noted that the flavonol index, related to the leaf
22 content in flavonols, also increased with the ozone sensitivity of the four ecotypes. Flavonols
23 accumulation in response to several abiotic stresses, including ozone, has been reported previously
24 (Gandin et al., 2019; Ghosh et al., 2020; Pellegrini et al., 2018; Yamaji et al., 2003) and has been
25 attributed to the antioxidant potential of these compounds (Chapman et al., 2019). However, all plant
26 species and genotypes do not rely on these “low-cost antioxidants” to the same extent, since other
27 systems, such as the ascorbic acid or glutathione antioxidant systems can be favored (Yamaji et al.,
28 2003).

29 This second experiment clearly showed that proline accumulation occurred in response to ozone only
30 in the two sensitive ecotypes. This explains the lack of differences observed in the mutants derived
31 from the tolerant ecotype Col-0. However, the amounts of accumulated proline did not correlate with
32 the sensitivity of the ecotypes to ozone, suggesting that proline accumulation was a general stress
33 response linked to its role in oxidative stress detoxification. This response is shared by numerous
34 organisms (Ben Rejeb et al., 2014) but not all, as a reduction in proline content after ozone exposure
35 has recently been reported observed in the biofueling bacteria *Cobetia marina* (Li et al., 2020). Ueno
36 et al. (2021) showed that the pattern of variation in proline concentrations in endophytic-symbiotic
37 plants was inverse to that observed for TBARS (thiobarbituric acid reactive substances, an indicator of
38 lipid peroxidation and oxidative stress). It could be recalled that changes in proline contents in
39 response to ozone varies between species and experiments (Cotrozzi et al., 2017); an increase in
40 proline content was detected in poplar (Podda et al., 2019), wheat (Li et al., 2016; Zheng et al., 2011),
41 *Vigna unguiculata* (Malaiyandi and Natarajan, 2014) or *Lolium multiflorum* (Ueno et al., 2021) whereas
42 it was not observed in pepper (Colunje et al., 2021), oak trees (Cotrozzi et al., 2017) or *Ischaemum*
43 *rugosum* (Dolker and Agrawal, 2019). El-Khatib (2003) have shown that, in *Medicago sativa*, an ozone
44 sensitive plant species, the proline content strongly correlated with foliar injury, while proline content
45 was not altered in several other species, shown to be tolerant to ozone. Moreover, the response of
46 proline metabolism can vary with the developmental stage, as was observed in winter wheat (Liu et

1 al., 2015). However, we can assume that the absence of carbonylated proteins in the sensitive ecotypes
2 could be partly related to an increase in protective proline and flavonol content, while the absence of
3 carbonylated proteins in tolerant ecotypes would result from the development of other ROS
4 detoxification mechanisms.

5
6
7

8 **Conclusion**

9 In these experiments, ozone had a negative impact on *Ler* and *Cvi-0* ecotypes that was not observed
10 in other ecotypes or mutants, results that concur with the classification made by Brosché et al. (2010)
11 from others physiological parameters. Using mutants or natural variability, the results presented here
12 show that proline does not appear to be a major determinant of ozone tolerance but could be a signal
13 induced in sensitive plants when the oxidative stress becomes too high. The slight effect observed for
14 the *p1p2* mutant in response to ozone, characterized by higher proline contents, also suggests a
15 protective role of proline on the photosynthetic apparatus. Literature data show that the effect of
16 ozone on proline accumulation strongly depends on the species and the experiments considered. Even
17 though our results did not allow to correlate the levels of protein carbonylation and proline, an
18 antioxidant role for proline cannot be ruled out. Flavonol index appears particularly interesting in
19 *Arabidopsis* as it confirmed the ranking of ecotypes according to their sensitivity to ozone, obtained in
20 different experiments. Analysis of the different antioxidant mechanisms (ascorbate, glutathione and
21 enzymatic processes) should help deciphering the roles played by proline and flavonols in ozone
22 responses.

23

24 **Acknowledgements**

25 We acknowledge Ruben Puga Freitas for his support in fluorescence measurements and Anne Repellin
26 for her help in English writing.

27

28 **References**

- 29 Agathokleous, E., Araminiene, V., Belz, R.G., Calatayud, V., De Marco, A., Domingos, M.,
30 Feng, Z., Hoshika, Y., Kitao, M., Koike, T., Paoletti, E., Saitanis, C.J., Sicard, P.,
31 Calabrese, E.J., 2019b. A quantitative assessment of hormetic responses of plants to
32 ozone. *Environ. Res.* 176, 108527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2019.108527>
- 33 Anjum, N.A., Sofu, A., Scopa, A., Roychoudhury, A., Gill, S.S., Iqbal, M., Lukatkin, A.S., Pereira,
34 E., Duarte, A.C., Ahmad, I., 2015. Lipids and proteins—major targets of oxidative
35 modifications in abiotic stressed plants. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* 22, 4099–4121.
36 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-014-3917-1>
- 37 Bagard, M., Jolivet, Y., Hasenfratz-Sauder, M.-P., Gérard, J., Dizengremel, P., Le Thiec, D.,
38 2015. Ozone exposure and flux-based response functions for photosynthetic traits in
39 wheat, maize and poplar. *Environ. Pollut.* 206, 411–420.
40 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2015.07.046>
- 41 Bagard, M., Le Thiec, D., Delacote, E., Hasenfratz-Sauder, M.-P., Banvoy, J., Gérard, J.,
42 Dizengremel, P., Jolivet, Y., 2008. Ozone-induced changes in photosynthesis and

1 photorespiration of hybrid poplar in relation to the developmental stage of the
2 leaves. *Physiol. Plant.* 134, 559–574. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-3054.2008.01160.x)
3 3054.2008.01160.x

4 Bates, L.S., Waldren, R.P., Teare, I.D., 1973. Rapid determination of free proline for water-
5 stress studies. *Plant Soil* 39, 205–207. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00018060>

6 Ben Rejeb, K., Abdelly, C., Saviouré, A., 2014. How reactive oxygen species and proline face
7 stress together. *Plant Physiol. Biochem.* 80, 278–284.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plaphy.2014.04.007>

9 Bradford, M.M., 1976. A rapid and sensitive method for the quantitation of microgram
10 quantities of protein utilizing the principle of protein-dye binding. *Anal. Biochem.* 72,
11 248–254. <https://doi.org/10.1006/abio.1976.9999>

12 Brosché, M., Merilo, E., Mayer, F., Pechter, P., Puzörjova, I., Brader, G., Kangasjärvi, J., Kollist,
13 H., 2010. Natural variation in ozone sensitivity among *Arabidopsis thaliana* accessions
14 and its relation to stomatal conductance: Natural variation of *Arabidopsis* ozone
15 sensitivity. *Plant Cell Environ.* 33, 914–925. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.2010.02116.x)
16 3040.2010.02116.x

17 Cabassa-Hourton, C., Schertl, P., Bordenave-Jacquemin, M., Saadallah, K., Guivarc’h, A.,
18 Lebreton, S., Planchais, S., Klodmann, J., Eubel, H., Crilat, E., Lefebvre-De Vos, D.,
19 Ghelis, T., Richard, L., Abdelly, C., Carol, P., Braun, H.-P., Saviouré, A., 2016. Proteomic
20 and functional analysis of proline dehydrogenase 1 link proline catabolism to
21 mitochondrial electron transport in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Biochem. J.* 473, 2623–
22 2634. <https://doi.org/10.1042/BCJ20160314>

23 Calzone, A., Podda, A., Lorenzini, G., Maserti, B.E., Carrari, E., Deleanu, E., Hoshika, Y.,
24 Haworth, M., Nali, C., Badea, O., Pellegrini, E., Fares, S., Paoletti, E., 2019. Cross-talk
25 between physiological and biochemical adjustments by *Punica granatum* cv. Dente di
26 cavallo mitigates the effects of salinity and ozone stress. *Sci. Total Environ.* 656, 589–
27 597. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.11.402>

28 Cerovic, Z.G., Masdoumier, G., Ghozlen, N.B., Latouche, G., 2012. A new optical leaf-clip
29 meter for simultaneous non-destructive assessment of leaf chlorophyll and
30 epidermal flavonoids. *Physiol. Plant.* 146, 251–260. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-3054.2012.01639.x)
31 3054.2012.01639.x

32 Chapman, J.M., Muhlemann, J.K., Gayomba, S.R., Muday, G.K., 2019. RBOH-Dependent ROS
33 Synthesis and ROS Scavenging by Plant Specialized Metabolites To Modulate Plant
34 Development and Stress Responses. *Chem. Res. Toxicol.* 32, 370–396.
35 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrestox.9b00028>

36 Coffey, C.M., Gronert, S., 2016. A cleavable biotin tagging reagent that enables the
37 enrichment and identification of carbonylation sites in proteins. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.*
38 408, 865–874. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-015-9176-2>

39 Colunje, J., Garcia-Caparros, P., Moreira, J.F., Lao, M.T., 2021. Effect of Ozonated Fertigation
40 in Pepper Cultivation under Greenhouse Conditions. *Agronomy* 11, 544.
41 <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy11030544>

42 Cotrozzi, L., Remorini, D., Pellegrini, E., Guidi, L., Lorenzini, G., Massai, R., Nali, C., Landi, M.,
43 2017. Cross-Talk between Physiological and Metabolic Adjustments Adopted by
44 *Quercus cerris* to Mitigate the Effects of Severe Drought and Realistic Future Ozone
45 Concentrations. *Forests* 8, 148. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f8050148>

- 1 Dalle-Donne, I., Rossi, R., Giustarini, D., Milzani, A., Colombo, R., 2003. Protein carbonyl
2 groups as biomarkers of oxidative stress. *Clin. Chim. Acta* 329, 23–38.
3 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0009-8981\(03\)00003-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0009-8981(03)00003-2)
- 4 Dolker, T., Agrawal, M., 2019. Negative impacts of elevated ozone on dominant species of
5 semi-natural grassland vegetation in Indo-Gangetic plain. *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.*
6 182, 109404. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2019.109404>
- 7 Dyballa, N., Metzger, S., 2009. Fast and Sensitive Colloidal Coomassie G-250 Staining for
8 Proteins in Polyacrylamide Gels. *J. Vis. Exp.* 1431. <https://doi.org/10.3791/1431>
- 9 El-Khatib, A.A., 2003. The response of some common Egyptian plants to ozone and their use
10 as biomonitors. *Environ. Pollut.* 124, 419–428. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0269-7491\(03\)00045-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0269-7491(03)00045-9)
- 11
- 12 Emberson, L.D., Pleijel, H., Ainsworth, E.A., van den Berg, M., Ren, W., Osborne, S., Mills, G.,
13 Pandey, D., Dentener, F., B ker, P., Ewert, F., Koeble, R., Van Dingenen, R., 2018.
14 Ozone effects on crops and consideration in crop models. *Eur. J. Agron.* 100, 19–34.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2018.06.002>
- 16 Feng, Z., Calatayud, V., Zhu, J., Kobayashi, K., 2018. Ozone exposure- and flux-based
17 response relationships with photosynthesis of winter wheat under fully open air
18 condition. *Sci. Total Environ.* 619–620, 1538–1544.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.10.089>
- 20 Foyer, C.H., Noctor, G., 2005. Redox Homeostasis and Antioxidant Signaling: A Metabolic
21 Interface between Stress Perception and Physiological Responses. *Plant Cell* 17,
22 1866–1875. <https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.105.033589>
- 23 Fuhrer, J., Sk rby, L., Ashmore, M.R., 1997. Critical levels for ozone effects on vegetation in
24 Europe. *Environ. Pollut.* 97, 91–106. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0269-7491\(97\)00067-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0269-7491(97)00067-5)
- 25 Funck, D., Stadelhofer, B., Koch, W., 2008. Ornithine- δ -aminotransferase is essential for
26 Arginine Catabolism but not for Proline Biosynthesis. *BMC Plant Biol.* 8, 40.
27 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2229-8-40>
- 28 Gandin, A., Davrinche, A., Jolivet, Y., 2019. Deciphering the main determinants of O₃
29 tolerance in Euramerican poplar genotypes. *Sci. Total Environ.* 656, 681–690.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.11.307>
- 31 Gandin, A., Dizengremel, P., Jolivet, Y., 2021. Integrative role of plant mitochondria facing
32 oxidative stress: The case of ozone. *Plant Physiol. Biochem.* 159, 202–210.
33 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plaphy.2020.12.019>
- 34 Ghosh, A., Pandey, B., Agrawal, M., Agrawal, S.B., 2020. Interactive effects and competitive
35 shift between *Triticum aestivum* L. (wheat) and *Chenopodium album* L. (fat-hen)
36 under ambient and elevated ozone. *Environ. Pollut.* 265, 114764.
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.114764>
- 38 Hav , M., Leitao, L., Bagard, M., Castell, J.-F., Repellin, A., 2015. Protein carbonylation during
39 natural leaf senescence in winter wheat, as probed by fluorescein-5-
40 thiosemicarbazide. *Plant Biol.* 17, 973–979. <https://doi.org/10.1111/plb.12315>
- 41 Hayat, S., Hayat, Q., Alyemeni, M.N., Wani, A.S., Pichtel, J., Ahmad, A., 2012. Role of proline
42 under changing environments: A review. *Plant Signal. Behav.* 7, 1456–1466.
43 <https://doi.org/10.4161/psb.21949>
- 44 Hayes, F., Sharps, K., Harmens, H., Roberts, I., Mills, G., 2020. Tropospheric ozone pollution
45 reduces the yield of African crops. *J. Agron. Crop Sci.* 206, 214–228.
46 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jac.12376>

- 1 Jolivet, Y., Bagard, M., Cabané, M., Vaultier, M.-N., Gandin, A., Afif, D., Dizengremel, P., Le
2 Thiec, D., 2016. Deciphering the ozone-induced changes in cellular processes: a
3 prerequisite for ozone risk assessment at the tree and forest levels. *Ann. For. Sci.* 73,
4 923–943. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13595-016-0580-3>
- 5 Kangasjarvi, J., Jaspers, P., Kollist, H., 2005. Signalling and cell death in ozone-exposed plants.
6 *Plant Cell Environ.* 28, 1021–1036. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-
7 3040.2005.01325.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.2005.01325.x)
- 8 Kavi Kishor, P.B., Hima Kumari, P., Sunita, M.S.L., Sreenivasulu, N., 2015. Role of proline in
9 cell wall synthesis and plant development and its implications in plant ontogeny.
10 *Front. Plant Sci.* 6, 544. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2015.00544>
- 11 Langebartels, C., Wohlgemuth, H., Kschieschan, S., Grün, S., Sandermann, H., 2002. Oxidative
12 burst and cell death in ozone-exposed plants. *Plant Physiol. Biochem.* 40, 567–575.
13 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0981-9428\(02\)01416-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0981-9428(02)01416-X)
- 14 Launay, A., Cabassa-Hourton, C., Eubel, H., Maldiney, R., Guivarc’h, A., Crilat, E., Planchais, S.,
15 Lacoste, J., Bordenave-Jacquemin, M., Clément, G., Richard, L., Carol, P., Braun, H.-P.,
16 Lebreton, S., Saviouré, A., 2019. Proline oxidation fuels mitochondrial respiration
17 during dark-induced leaf senescence in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *J. Exp. Bot.* 70, 6203–
18 6214. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erz351>
- 19 Leitao, L., Bethenod, O., Biolley, J.-P., 2007a. The Impact of Ozone on Juvenile Maize (*Zea*
20 *mays* L.) Plant Photosynthesis: Effects on Vegetative Biomass, Pigmentation, and
21 Carboxylases (PEPc and Rubisco). *Plant Biol.* 9, 478–488. [https://doi.org/10.1055/s-
22 2007-964942](https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2007-964942)
- 23 Leitao, L., Delacôte, E., Dizengremel, P., Le Thiec, D., Biolley, J.-P., 2007b. Assessment of the
24 impact of increasing concentrations of ozone on photosynthetic components of
25 maize (*Zea mays* L.), a C4 plant. *Environ. Pollut.* 146, 5–8.
26 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2006.05.019>
- 27 Leitao, L., Dizengremel, P., Biolley, J.-P., 2008. Foliar CO₂ fixation in bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris*
28 L.) submitted to elevated ozone: Distinct changes in Rubisco and PEPc activities in
29 relation to pigment content. *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.* 69, 531–540.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2006.10.010>
- 31 Li, C., Meng, J., Guo, L., Jiang, G., 2016. Effects of ozone pollution on yield and quality of
32 winter wheat under flaxweed competition. *Environ. Exp. Bot.* 129, 77–84.
33 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2015.11.011>
- 34 Li, J., Rumancev, C., Lutze, H.V., Schmidt, T.C., Rosenhahn, A., Schmitz, O.J., 2020. Effect of
35 ozone stress on the intracellular metabolites from *Cobetia marina*. *Anal. Bioanal.*
36 *Chem.* 412, 5853–5861. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-020-02810-6>
- 37 Liu, X., Sui, L., Huang, Y., Geng, C., Yin, B., 2015. Physiological and visible injury responses in
38 different growth stages of winter wheat to ozone stress and the protection of
39 spermidine. *Atmospheric Pollut. Res.* 6, 596–604.
40 <https://doi.org/10.5094/APR.2015.067>
- 41 Malaiyandi, M., Natarajan, M., 2014. Impact of Ozone on Morphological, Physiological, and
42 Biochemical Changes in Cow Pea (*Vigna unguiculata* [L.] Walp.). *Ozone Sci. Eng.* 36,
43 36–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01919512.2013.824817>
- 44 Manna, A., Hanisch, F.-G., 2020. Redox Proteomes in Human Physiology and Disease
45 Mechanisms. *J. Proteome Res.* 19, 1–17.
46 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jproteome.9b00586>

1 Miller, J.D., Arteca, R.N., Pell, E.J., 1999. Senescence-Associated Gene Expression during
2 Ozone-Induced Leaf Senescence in Arabidopsis. *Plant Physiol.* 120, 1015–1024.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.120.4.1015>

4 Mills, G., Buse, A., Gimeno, B., Bermejo, V., Holland, M., Emberson, L., Pleijel, H., 2007. A
5 synthesis of AOT40-based response functions and critical levels of ozone for
6 agricultural and horticultural crops. *Atmos. Environ.* 41, 2630–2643.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2006.11.016>

8 Mills, G., Hayes, F., Simpson, D., Emberson, L., Norris, D., Harmens, H., Büker, P., 2011.
9 Evidence of widespread effects of ozone on crops and (semi-)natural vegetation in
10 Europe (1990-2006) in relation to AOT40- and flux-based risk maps. *Glob. Change
11 Biol.* 17, 592–613. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02217.x>

12 Murchie, E.H., Lawson, T., 2013. Chlorophyll fluorescence analysis: a guide to good practice
13 and understanding some new applications. *J. Exp. Bot.* 64, 3983–3998.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/ert208>

15 Parrish, D.D., Law, K.S., Staehelin, J., Derwent, R., Cooper, O.R., Tanimoto, H., Volz-Thomas,
16 A., Gilge, S., 2012. Long-term changes in lower tropospheric baseline ozone
17 concentrations at northern mid-latitudes. *Atmos Chem Phys* 21.

18 Pellegrini, E., Campanella, A., Cotrozzi, L., Tonelli, M., Nali, C., Lorenzini, G., 2018. Ozone
19 primes changes in phytochemical parameters in the medicinal herb *Hypericum
20 perforatum* (St. John's wort). *Ind. Crops Prod.* 126, 119–128.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2018.10.002>

22 Podda, A., Pisuttu, C., Hoshika, Y., Pellegrini, E., Carrari, E., Lorenzini, G., Nali, C., Cotrozzi, L.,
23 Zhang, L., Baraldi, R., Neri, L., Paoletti, E., 2019. Can nutrient fertilization mitigate the
24 effects of ozone exposure on an ozone-sensitive poplar clone? *Sci. Total Environ.* 657,
25 340–350. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.11.459>

26 R Core Team. 2020. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna,
27 Austria: <https://www.r-project.org/>, n.d.

28 Sharma, Y.K., Davis, K.R., 1994. Ozone-Induced Expression of Stress-Related Genes in
29 *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Plant Physiol.* 105, 1089–1096.

30 Sicard, P., Anav, A., De Marco, A., Paoletti, E., 2017. Projected global ground-level ozone
31 impacts on vegetation under different emission and climate scenarios. *Atmospheric
32 Chem. Phys.* 17, 12177–12196. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-12177-2017>

33 Sicard, P., Paoletti, E., Agathokleous, E., Araminienè, V., Proietti, C., Coulibaly, F., De Marco,
34 A., 2020. Ozone weekend effect in cities: Deep insights for urban air pollution
35 control. *Environ. Res.* 191, 110193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2020.110193>

36 Signorelli, S., Coitiño, E.L., Borsani, O., Monza, J., 2014. Molecular Mechanisms for the
37 Reaction Between •OH Radicals and Proline: Insights on the Role as Reactive Oxygen
38 Species Scavenger in Plant Stress. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 118, 37–47.
39 <https://doi.org/10.1021/jp407773u>

40 Smirnoff, N., Cumbes, Q.J., 1989. Hydroxyl radical scavenging activity of compatible solutes.
41 *Phytochemistry* 28, 1057–1060. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9422\(89\)80182-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9422(89)80182-7)

42 Szabados, L., Saviouré, A., 2010. Proline: a multifunctional amino acid. *Trends Plant Sci.* 15,
43 89–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2009.11.009>

44 Székely, G., Abraham, E., Cseplo, A., Rigo, G., Zsigmond, L., Csiszar, J., Ayaydin, F., Strizhov,
45 N., Jasik, J., Schmelzer, E., Koncz, C., Szabados, L., 2008. Duplicated *P5CS* genes of
46 *Arabidopsis* play distinct roles in stress regulation and developmental control of

1 proline biosynthesis. *Plant J.* 53, 11–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365->
2 313X.2007.03318.x

3 Tiwari, S., Agrawal, M., 2018. *Tropospheric Ozone and its Impacts on Crop Plants*. Springer
4 International Publishing, Cham. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71873-6>

5 Ueno, A.C., Gundel, P.E., Molina-Montenegro, M.A., Ramos, P., Ghera, C.M., Martínez-
6 Ghera, M.A., 2021. Getting ready for the ozone battle: Vertically transmitted fungal
7 endophytes have transgenerational positive effects in plants. *Plant Cell Environ.*
8 pce.14047. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.14047>

9 Vainonen, J.P., Kangasjärvi, J., 2015. Plant signalling in acute ozone exposure: Ozone action
10 on plants. *Plant Cell Environ.* 38, 240–252. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.12273>

11 Verbruggen, N., Hermans, C., 2008. Proline accumulation in plants: a review. *Amino Acids* 35,
12 753–759. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00726-008-0061-6>

13 Yamaji, K., Julkunen-Tiitto, R., Rousi, M., Freiwald, V., Oksanen, E., 2003. Ozone exposure
14 over two growing seasons alters root-to-shoot ratio and chemical composition of
15 birch (*Betula pendula* Roth): Ozone alters chemical composition of birch. *Glob.*
16 *Change Biol.* 9, 1363–1377. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2486.2003.00669.x>

17 Zegaoui, Z., Planchais, S., Cabassa, C., Djebbar, R., Belbachir, O.A., Carol, P., 2017. Variation
18 in relative water content, proline accumulation and stress gene expression in two
19 cowpea landraces under drought. *J. Plant Physiol.* 218, 26–34.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jplph.2017.07.009>

21 Zheng, Y.H., Li, Y.G., Xia, W.R., Xu, H., Su, B.Y., Jiang, G.M., Ning, T.Y., 2011. Responses of gas
22 exchange, cellular membrane integrity, and antioxidant enzymes activities of salinity-
23 stressed winter wheat to ozone pollution. *Photosynthetica* 49.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11099-011-0047-6>
25
26
27
28
29