

Understanding the contribution of root traits for phosphorus responsiveness of wheat

Kamrun Nahar

B. Sc. (Hons)

M. Sc. (Botany)

A thesis submitted to the University of Adelaide, South Australia

in the fulfilment of the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

School of Agriculture, Food and Wine

Faculty of Science

The University of Adelaide

May 2017

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
List of Figures.....	viii
List of Appendices	xii
List of abbreviations	xiii
Abstract.....	xiv
Declaration.....	xvii
Acknowledgement	xviii
Chapter 1 : General Introduction	1
References	5
Chapter 2 : Literature review	8
Introduction	8
Phosphorus in soil	9
Organic P	10
Inorganic P.....	11
Phosphorus uptake and translocation by plants	12
Deficiency symptoms	13
Phosphorus use in Australian agriculture.....	14
Phosphorus efficiency	17
Adaptive mechanisms	20
Root architecture.....	22
Root biomass and root: shoot ratio.....	30
Root exudates	31
Organic acids/ carboxylates	31
Phosphatases and other exudates	34
Aerenchyma formation.....	35
Mycorrhizal colonization	36
Remobilization / internal utilization of P	41
Summary	42
Aim and objective	43

References	44
Chapter 3 : Root angle, total root length and root hair length: combined contribution for phosphorus responsiveness of wheat	62
Abstract	64
Introduction	65
Materials and methods	69
Soil and plant materials	69
Growth conditions and measurements	71
Data analysis	74
Results	75
Root angle	75
Root hair length	81
Rhizosheath size	81
Dry matter production.....	85
Total shoot P uptake	88
Heritability and correlation of root traits and shoot P uptake.....	88
Discussion	92
Correlation of root angle towards varietal P responsiveness.....	92
Root morphology and P responsiveness	93
Root hair length and rhizosheath size for varietal P responsiveness and P uptake	95
Conclusion.....	99
Acknowledgements	99
References	99
Chapter 4 : Contribution of mycorrhizal colonization in growth, phosphorus uptake and varietal difference of wheat	105
Abstract	107
Introduction	108
Methods and materials	110
Selection of varieties.....	110
Experimental details	111
Measurements	114
Data analysis.....	115

Results	116
Experiment 1: Preliminary experiment.....	116
Experiment 2a: Root box	117
Experiment 2b: Field assessment.....	126
Experiment 3: Pot trial.....	127
Discussion	136
Acknowledgement.....	140
References	140
 Chapter 5 : Genetic variation of root traits and exudation of citric and malic acid in wheat varieties	
Abstract	144
Introduction	144
Materials and methods	148
Soil and plant materials	148
Growth conditions and measurements.....	148
Data analysis.....	152
Results	152
Rhizosheath pH.....	152
Rhizosheath size, root length and root hair length	153
Dry matter production.....	156
Malate and citric acid measurement	157
Correlation among root traits.....	160
Discussion	162
References	166
 Chapter 6 : Assessing the relative importance of root traits towards varietal responsiveness to phosphorus	
Introduction	172
Methods.....	173
Source of data	173
Statistical methods for data analysis.....	173
Results and discussion.....	174
The importance of root traits	175
Cluster analysis	182

Conclusion.....	186
References	187
Chapter 7 : QTL mapping for root hair length and rhizosheath size of a double haploid mapping population of wheat	191
Introduction	191
Materials and methods	193
Plant material.....	193
Rhizosheath screening	193
Statistical design and analysis	194
QTL analysis.....	195
Results	195
Phenotypic variation	195
QTL detection.....	199
Discussion	204
References	209
Chapter 8 : General discussion	212
Introduction	212
Trait dissection for P responsiveness	212
Selection of varieties	213
Key findings	216
The importance of root hair length	216
Rhizosheath size	217
Seminal and crown root angle	219
Total root length	220
AMF colonization.....	220
Organic acid exudation by roots	221
Conclusion.....	222
Future direction	223
References	224
Chapter 9 Appendices.....	228

List of Tables

Table 2.1. Some common definitions and terms used to describe phosphorus efficiency (adapted from Bovill et al 2013)	19
Table 3.1. Total root length and average root diameter of ten wheat varieties in Experiment 3 and 4. Means for Experiment 3 are the averages of the two P rates as there was no significant effect of P treatment or significant variety × P rate interaction. Mean values for the P-responsive and non-responsive varieties are shown as mean± standard error of mean. The levels of significance are: * P<0.05; ** P<0.01 and *** P<0.001; NS -non significant	80
Table 3.2. Shoot dry weight (SDW) and root dry weight (RDW) of ten wheat varieties in Experiment 3 and 4. Mean values for the P-responsive and non-responsive varieties are shown as mean ± standard error of mean. The levels of significance are: * P<0.05; **, P<0.01 and ***, P<0.001; NS –non significant	84
Table 3.3. Root to shoot ratio of ten wheat varieties in Experiments 3 and 4 (± standard error of mean). (* P<0.05; ** P<0.01 and *** P<0.001 NS means non-significant).....	86
Table 3.4. Broad sense heritability of five root traits, shoot and root dry weight and shoot P uptake of ten wheat varieties	90
Table 3.5. Correlation among all the traits when grown in two different P levels. Correlations below the diagonal are for the low P treatment and above the diagonal for the high P treatment (* P<0.05; ** P<0.01 and *** P<0.001)	91
Table 3.6. Correlation among all the traits when grown on two different soil types. Correlations below the diagonal are for the Halidon soil and above the diagonal for the Mallala soil (* P<0.05; ** P<0.01 and *** P<0.001)	91
Table 4.1. Summary ANOVA of Experiment 2a, showing mean squares (m.s.) and degree of freedom (df).Significance is shown as: * - P<0.05; ** - P<0.01; *** P <0.001	119
Table 4.2. Experiment 2: Shoot dry weight and root dry weight of seedling of ten wheat varieties grown at three rates of P. The varieties were either considered to be non-responsive or responsive to P fertiliser based on yield responses in the field. Means for each group are shown as mean ± standard error of mean. (* P<0.05; ** P<0.01 and *** P<0.001, NS= non-significant).....	121
Table 4.3. Experiment 2: Shoot P concentration and P uptake of seedling of ten wheat varieties grown at three rates of P. The varieties were either considered to be non-responsive or responsive to P fertiliser based on yield responses in the field. Means for each group are shown as mean ± standard error of mean. (* P<0.05; ** P<0.01 and *** P<0.001, NS= non-significant)	124

Table 4.4. Correlations among AMF colonization and other root traits in Experiment 2 at three different P treatments P (* P<0.05; ** P<0.01 and *** P<0.001)...	125
Table 4.5. Summary ANOVA of experiment 3 showing mean squares (m.s.) and degree of freedom (df).Significance is shown as: * - P<0.05; ** - P<0.01; *** P <0.001	129
Table 4.6. Correlation among AM colonization and other root trait for Experiment 3. Below the diagonal is correlation at nil P treatment and above the diagonal is the correlation at high P (* P<0.05; ** P<0.01 and *** P<0.001).	135
Table 5.1. Total root length of ten wheat varieties grown in Halidon soil. Mean values for the P-responsive and non-responsive varieties are shown as mean ± standard error of mean (n = 3). The levels of significance are: * P<0.05; ** P<0.01 and *** P<0.001	154
Table 5.2. Shoot dry weight (SDW) and root dry weight (RDW) of ten wheat varieties grown in Halidon soil. Mean values for the P-responsive and non-responsive varieties are shown as mean ± standard error of mean. The levels of significance are: * P<0.05; **, P<0.01 and ***; P<0.001	157
Table 5.3. Correlations among root traits and malic and citric acid concentration. Below the diagonal shows the correlation coefficients at nil P treatment and above the diagonal shows the correlation coefficients at high P treatment. The levels of significance are: * P<0.05; **, P<0.01 and ***; P<0.001 (n=29)	161
Table 6.1. Ranking of varieties according to the values of various root traits from all the experiments, showing difference in P treatment (P0: 0 kg P/ha or P30: 30 kg P/ha) and also in soil types (Hal – Halidon; Mal – Mallala). The grand mean for each experiment is also shown. Ranking are fromfrom the smallest to the largest values.....	178
Table 6.2. Rank correlation among all the root trait studied. Data for the rank correlation was taken from Table 1). Abbreviations in the table are: SRA1-first pair seminal root angle, SRA2-second pair seminal root angle, CRAplus-crown root angle , TRL-total root length, RV-rhizosheath size, RHL-root hair length, CA-citric acid, MA-malic acid, nil-0 kg P/ha, plus-30 kg P/ha, Hal-Halidon soil and Mal-Mallala soil (* P<0.05; ** P<0.01 and *** P<0.001).	179
Table 6.3. Mean value of different root traits of each cluster group.....	185
Table 7.1. Phenotype of the parent and the DH population.....	196
Table 7.2. Correlation of rhizosheath size and root hair length and other traits for all double haploid lines (The levels of significance are: * P<0.05; **, P<0.01 and ***; P<0.001).....	198
Table 7.3. List of all the QTLs and peak marker detected for this study. LRS = likelihood ratio statistic. A positive additive effect indicates that an RAC875	

allele is increasing trait values, whereas a negative additive effect indicates that a Kukri allele is increasing trait values 200

Table 8.1. Mean shoot dry weight (mg/plant) at 0 kg P/ha showing four different cluster group (data was taken from some previous experiment conducted for this thesis) 216

List of Figures

Figure 2.1. Phosphorus cycle in soil (adapted from Moody and Boland 1999).	10
Figure 2.2. Total P from different forms of P fertilizers applied in Australia from 2005 to 2014. SSP: single super-phosphate; TSP: triple super phosphate MAP: mono-ammonium phosphate; DAP: di-ammonium phosphate; NPK-P: NPK compound fertilisers (source International Fertilizer Association).	16
Figure 2.3. Plant traits and mechanisms for improving P uptake efficiency. P-efficient genotypes integrate different traits and mechanisms that contribute to adaptation to low P availability and are therefore more tolerant to P deficiency as compared to P-inefficient genotypes. Adaptations to low P availability include: (1) more and longer adventitious roots, (2) more horizontally oriented basal roots, (3) more taproot laterals, (4) more dispersed higher order laterals, (5) increased root hair density and length (together with increased organic acid exudation and more high-affinity P transporters), (6) greater association with mycorrhizae, and (7) greater formation of aerenchyma. Consequently, the soil volume explored by P-efficient genotypes is much larger compared to P-inefficient genotypes (adapted from Ramaekers et al 2010).	21
Figure 2.4. Effects of carboxylates (and other exudates) on inorganic (Pi) and organic (Po) mobilization in soil. Carboxylates are thought to be released via an anion channel. The exact way which phosphatases are released is not known. Carboxylates mobilize both inorganic and organic phosphorus. Phosphatases hydrolyse organic phosphorus compounds, once these have been mobilized by carboxylates. Carboxylates will also mobilize some of the cations that bind P. some of these cations (especially Fe) move to the root surface for uptake by roots. Sourced from Lambers et al 2006.	33
Figure 2.5. The two pathways of AM plants for P uptake (taken from Smith et al 2011).	38
Figure 3.1. The Best Linear Unbiased Predictions (BLUPs) for (a) the grain yield with no applied P and (b) the response to 30 kgP/ha for 10 wheat varieties based on a meta-analysis of a series of P response trials involving 50 genotypes of wheat. A negative yield indicates the variety's yield is lower than average. A negative response to P is lower than the average and the variety is considered relatively non-responsive to P and a positive response indicates a variety is more responsive than average and is considered to be relatively responsive to P. Mallala has an alkaline calcareous soil, Tumby Bay is a relatively acidic soil (pH~6). (Adapted from Mc Donald et al. 2015)	70
Figure 3.2. Experiment 1: (a) First and second pair of seminal root angle of ten wheat varieties. (b) first and second pair of seminal root angle of two groups of wheat varieties grown on germination paper. Root angle is the internal angle	

subtending the roots. The responsive group represents the mean of three varieties and nonresponsive group represents mean of seven varieties. Error bar represents standard error of mean.	76
Figure 3.3. Experiment 2: (a) Crown root angle of ten wheat varieties. (b) Crown root angle at three P treatment of two groups of wheat varieties grown on Halidon soil. Responsive group represents the mean of three varieties and nonresponsive group represents mean of seven varieties. Error bar represents lsd for Figure 3a and standard error of mean for the two group of varieties for Figure 3b.	78
Figure 3.4. Experiment 4: (a) Root hair length (mm) of ten wheat varieties. (b) Root hair length (mm) of two groups of wheat varieties in two soil types. Responsive group represents mean of three varieties and nonresponsive group represents mean of three varieties and nonresponsive group represents mean of seven varieties. Error bar represents lsd for Figure 3.4a and standard error of mean for Figure 3.4b.	82
Figure 3.5. (a) Experiment 3: Rhizosheath size (g/m) of two groups of wheat varieties (see Fig 3.2) and the effect of two different P treatments grown in Halidon soil. (b) Experiment 4: Rhizosheath size (g/m) of two representative groups of wheat varieties in two soil types.	83
Figure 3.6. Experiment 4: (a) Shoot P concentration ($\mu\text{g P/g DM}$) and (b) total P uptake by shoot ($\mu\text{g P/plant}$) of two groups of wheat varieties (see Fig. 3.2) in two soil types. Responsive group represents mean of three varieties each and nonresponsive group represents mean of seven varieties. Error bar represents standard error of mean for the group of variety.	87
Figure 3.7. Correlation between total shoot P uptake and (a) total root length and (b) root hair length in Halidon soil. Each data point represents the mean of five replication of ten wheat varieties (\blacklozenge represents responsive group and \blacklozenge represents nonresponsive group).	89
Figure 3.8. Correlation between root hair length and P uptake of ten wheat varieties grown in Halidon and Mallala soil. Each data point represents mean of five replications (\blacklozenge represents responsive group and \blacklozenge represents nonresponsive group).	97
Figure 4.1. (a) Arbuscular mycorrhizal AMF colonization of two wheat varieties at three different P treatments. Error bar represents LSD value. (b) Shoot dry weight (five plants) of two wheat varieties and at three different P treatments. Error bar represents LSD for genotypes and for P treatment.	117
Figure 4.2. Mycorrhizal colonization of non-responsive and responsive wheat varieties from experiment 2a at three different P treatments. Error bar represents LSD value.	120

Figure 4.3. Experiment 2a: (a) Number of tillers of ten wheat varieties at harvest time from Experiment 2 at three different P treatments and (b) Crown root number per plant of ten wheat varieties at three P treatments from experiment 2. Error bar represents LSD value (P=0.05).	122
Figure 4.4. Mycorrhizal colonization of seven wheat varieties at two different P treatments from field. Error bar represents LSD value.	126
Figure 4.5. (a) Mycorrhizal colonization of ten wheat varieties at two different P treatments from experiment 4. Error bar represents the LSD value. (b) The difference of mycorrhizal colonization between the two groups of wheat varieties. Error bar represents the standard error of mean.	128
Figure 4.6. (a) Shoot dry weight of ten wheat varieties at two different P treatments from experiment 4. Error bar represents standard error of mean. (b) Shoot dry weight at two different inoculation treatments. Error bar represents LSD value. (c) Root dry weight of ten wheat varieties at two different P treatments from experiment 4. Error bar represents LSD value. (d) Root dry weight at two different inoculation treatments. Error bar represents LSD value.	130
Figure 4.7. (a) Number of tillers of two groups of wheat varieties at two different P treatments. Error bar represents standard error of mean. (b) Number of tillers at two inoculation treatments. Error bar represents LSD value. (c) Number of crown root of two groups of wheat varieties at two different P treatments. Error bar represents standard error of mean. (d) Number of crown root at two inoculation treatments. Error bar represents LSD value.	132
Figure 4.8. (a) Total shoot P uptake (mg P/plant) of ten wheat varieties at two different P treatments from experiment 4. Error bar represents LSD value. (b) The difference between two groups of wheat varieties in their total P uptake. Error bar represent represents standard error of mean. (c) Shoot phosphorus concentration of two groups of wheat varieties and at two different P treatments. Error bar represents standard error of mean for the group and LSD value for the P treatment.....	133
Figure 5.1. (a) Difference in rhizosheath pH of ten wheat varieties. The pH of the bulk soil was 7.93 (0 kg P/ha) and 7.85 (30 kg P/ha); (b) Difference in pH between the bulk soil and the rhizosheath soil in ten wheat varieties grown in Halidon soil that show differences in grain yield response to P. The error bar is the LSD (P=0.05) for the Variety × Phosphorus interaction.....	153
Figure 5.2. Rhizosheath size of nonresponsive and responsive wheat varieties grown at two P level. Error bars are the standard error of mean (n=3) for the varieties and lsd for the P treatment.....	155

Figure 5.3. Root hair length of two groups of wheat varieties grown in Halidon soil. Responsive group represents mean of three varieties and nonresponsive group represents mean of seven varieties.	156
Figure 5.4. Malic acid concentration in rhizosheath soil of two wheat varieties at two different P treatment grown in Halidon soil. Error bar represents the LSD (P=0.05) for the variety x P treatment.....	158
Figure 5.5. (a) Malic acid concentration in rhizosheath soil of ten wheat varieties at two different P treatment grown in Halidon soil. (b) Citric acid concentration in rhizosheath soil of ten wheat varieties grown in Halidon soil. Error bar represents the LSD (P=0.05) for the variety × phosphorus treatment.....	159
Figure 6.1. Varietal categorisation based on all the root traits studied (values were taken from plants grown at 0 kg P/ha and from Halidon and Mallala soil from Table 6.1).	182
Figure 7.1. Histograms of frequency distribution of root traits. Data are the means of 200 lines (K= the parent Kukri and R= the parent RAC875)	197
Figure 7.2. QTL detected for rhizosheath size (RhizoVol), root hair length (RHL), root dry weight (RDW), root fresh weight (RFW), rhizosheath dry weight (RhizoDW), shoot dry weight (SDW), total root length (TRL) and average diameter (AvgDiam) of RAC875× Kukri population. Peak markers for each of the traits are highlighted, bold and underlined.	201
Figure 8.1. Clustering of varieties according to their shoot dry weight at 0 kg P/ha and also from two different soil type (values were taken from Experiment 3 & 4 from Chapter 3; Experiment 2a from Chapter 4 and from Chapter 5).....	215

List of Appendices

Appendix 1. Summary ANOVA of experiment 1a.....	228
Appendix 2. Summary ANOVA of Experiment 2.....	228
Appendix 3. Summary ANOVA of Experiment 3.....	229
Appendix 4. Total root length Experiment 3	230
Appendix 5. Summary ANOVA of Experiment 4.....	231
Appendix 6. Root hair length of ten wheat varieties grown in Halidon and Mallala soil	232
Appendix 7. Correlation of AMF colonization between controlled environment experiment (Experiment 2a) and field study (Experiment 2b) grown with two different P treatments.	233
Appendix 8. Root hair length of ten wheat varieties.	234
Appendix 9. Pedigree analysis of wheat varieties showing the coefficient of parentage matrix	235

List of abbreviations

Al	Aluminum
AMF	Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
ATP	Adenosine tri-phosphate
BLUEs	Best Linear Unbiased Estimates
BLUPs	Best Linear Unbiased Predictions
C	Carbon
Ca	Calcium
Cu	Copper
DAP	Di Ammonium Phosphate
DCP	Di Calcium Phosphate
D-LDH	D-Lactate Dehydrogenase
DH	Double Haploid
DM	Dry Matter
Fe	Iron
HAP	Hydroxyapatite
L-MDH	L-Malate Dehydrogenase
LOD	Logarithm of Odds
LR	Lateral Root
LRS	Likelihood Ratio Statistic
LSD	Least Significant Difference
MAP	Mono Ammonium Phosphate
MDH	Malate Dehydrogenase
Mg	Magnesium
N	Nitrogen
NADH	Nicotinamide Adenine Dinucleotide
NPK	Nitrogen Phosphorus Potassium
P	Phosphorus
PAE	Phosphorus Acquisition Efficiency
PUE	Phosphorus Uptake Efficiency
PR	Primary Root
QTL	Quantitative Trait Loci
RDW	Root Dry Weight
RO	Reverse Osmosis
RHL	Root Hair Length
S	Sulphur
SDW	Shoot Dry Weight
SNP	Single Nucleotide Polymorphism
SRA	Specific Root Area
SRL	Specific Root Length
SSP	Single Super Phosphate
TRL	Total Root Length
TSP	Triple Super Phosphate
Zn	Zinc

Abstract

Wheat is a major and widely-grown cereal crop around the world. Phosphorus (P) is a crucial element for plant growth and development, but the availability of soil P is very low. The low availability of soil P poses a serious nutritional constraint for plant growth. To combat the large difference between the P requirement for plant growth and the available soil P, plants have developed a number of root-based adaptive strategies to cope in low P environments. Crop improvement to increase P uptake efficiency will depend on exploiting one or more of these adaptive strategies.

To understand the contribution of a number of adaptive mechanisms of wheat varieties under P deficiency, a series of controlled environment experiments and some field studies were conducted. Ten bread wheat varieties were selected which have shown differential responses to applied P in a previous series of field trials over different sites and seasons. According to their response to P, varieties were categorised as non-responsive or responsive varieties. Non-responsiveness to applied P is indicative of high phosphorus use efficiency (PUE) which was considered to be the preferred trait. The study compared several root traits, which have been demonstrated to contribute to plant growth under P deficient conditions: seminal and crown root angle, root hair length, rhizosheath size, arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) colonization and organic acid releasing capacity. Based on the results of these experiments, a further study was done to identify quantitative trait loci (QTL) for rhizosheath size and root hair length.

The findings of these experiments suggests that wide crown root angle, rather than seminal root angle, was associated with the non-P responsive varieties. These varieties benefit from shallow crown roots at later stages of their growth cycle when the demand for P increases. The non-responsive varieties also had longer root hairs regardless of

soil type or P treatments, and this was associated with a greater rhizosphere size. From these experiments, it was concluded that longer root hair length, greater rhizosphere size and shallow crown root are traits that contributed to the better performance in the field of the non-responsive varieties. Multivariate analysis for all the traits also support this as most of the non-responsive varieties clustered together. Cluster analysis for shoot dry weight at nil P treatment and from two different soils in these experiments demonstrated that the ranking of varieties were similar to the ranking of varieties from the field based on the yield response.

QTL analysis was performed using a double haploid wheat population to understand the relation between root hair length and rhizosphere size. Despite the weak phenotypic correlation between root hair length and rhizosphere characteristics, co-located QTL were detected on chromosome 7A, a result consistent with reports from the literature supported. Four novel QTLs were detected for rhizosphere size from this study. Co-localization of other QTLs on chromosome 2A, 4B and 5A was also observed and information from available literature suggests that those chromosomal regions are important for yield and yield related components.

A significant difference among varieties was observed for AMF colonization, but it was not possible to relate this variation with the varietal P responsiveness. Varietal difference was also observed for the citric and malic acid concentration in the rhizosphere soil, but it was also not possible to relate that difference with the observed difference in varietal P responsiveness from field.

This study suggested that selection of varieties with more than one adaptive mechanisms to grow well under P deficient conditions is possible. Selection based on greater root hair length, greater rhizosphere size and wide crown root angle appears to

be most crucial adaptive mechanisms for growth and yield under P deficiency. Selection of varieties with more than one mechanisms will allow the variety to grow well under wide range of environmental conditions without compromising yield. The chromosomal region identified from this study can be selected for gaining further understanding on the genetic control of those traits and could be targeted for marker aided selection to improve wheat varieties. Future work should consider the genetic control and inheritance of these root traits to develop new varieties with less P dependency and greater capacity to acquire of soil P.

Declaration

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name, in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in future, be used in a submission in my name, for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

I acknowledge the support I have received for my research through the provision of an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship.

Kamrun Nahar.....

Date.....

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my supervisors Associate Professor Glenn K. McDonald and Dr. William Bovill for their supervision and support during this study. Especially I owe my principal supervisor Associate Professor Glenn K. McDonald for his excellent supervision, constructive criticism and endless support during this study. I am sincerely thankful to my co-supervisor Dr. William Bovill for his support, friendly advice and help during the data analysis. My special thanks goes to my independent advisor Dr. Maria Manjarrez for her help during this work, constructive advice during experimental setup and friendly attitude.

I would like to acknowledge the financial support of the Australian Government for providing me the Australian Postgraduate Award (APA). I also would like to acknowledge the academic and technical support of the University of Adelaide and its staff. I express my thanks to all staff and friends from the Agronomy Lab of the University of Adelaide for their help and friendship. Special thanks to Mr. Willie Shoobridge for his technical support during collecting plant samples from field.

I also wish to express my sincere gratitude to my husband, Md Samsul Haque and my children Tahmid and Tasmia for their endless support, patience and sacrifice during this whole journey. Finally I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my mother Tahmida Yasmin and my father Md Kamal Uddin for their encouragement and moral support and it is your prayer which bring me this far.