

Effects of different concentration of Ca (NO₃)₂ on quinoa-treated with salinityHong Yan ^{1,2} and Fulai Liu ¹¹ Faculty of Science, Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Højbakkegaard Allé 13, 2630 Taastrup, Denmark² School of Life Sciences, Northeast Normal University, Changchun 130024, China**ABSTRACT**

Salinity has some adverse effects on the morphology and physiology in many crops. To alleviate the damages of salinity, the applications of calcium nitrate on quinoa-treated NaCl (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.) were investigated under the supported-hydroponic environment. The plants were exposed to 200mM NaCl with 20mM and 150mM Ca (NO₃)₂ (EC 18.61~37.85 ds·m⁻¹ and osmotic potential -0.89~-1.71MPa), and sampled for measurements of osmotic potential, stomatal characteristics, and root characteristics. The presence of 200 mM NaCl alone decreased the relative parameters in different degrees. In all treatments, the indexes on stomatal characteristic were decreased with increasing electrical conductivity (EC) levels except for stomatal density. Stomatal conductance decreased more markedly when osmotic potential reached -0.89Mpa. Increasing in stomatal density observed in higher Ca(NO₃)₂ level (150mM) might be caused by the inhibition of cell division in the epidermis, which was also due to reduction of osmotic potential of the solutions. A similar trend was observed for osmotic potentials in the same tissue, which were decreased with increasing EC of the solutions. Although no significant differences in the all treatments were observed for the average diameter of roots, the beneficial effect of Ca(NO₃)₂ application at the concentration of 20 mM was significant in projected area, surface area, and volume. The phenomenon showed that moderate reduction in osmotic potential was favorable to cell extension due to maintaining cell turgor pressure. Much lower osmotic potential possibly inhibited cell division of root apical meristem. From the above results, it might be concluded that the effects of Ca(NO₃)₂ applications depended on the concentration, while the significant differences between the stomata and root morphology represented the tissue-specific as well.

Subject Agricultural Science, Plant Science**Key words** Quinoa, Salinity, Calcium nitrate, Stomatal characteristic, Osmotic potential, Root characteristic**INTRODUCTION**

Salinity is one of the most vital environmental stresses affecting seed germination (Lovato, Filho & Martins, 1999), seedling growth, development, and crop productivity. More than 800 million ha of land is salt-affected, which is over 6% of the world's land area (Rengasamy, 2006). Approximately 20% of the world's arable land and 40% of the irrigated land are subjected to salinity erosion at different degrees (Sahi et al., 2006). It is estimated that 50% of all arable lands may become saline by the year 2050 (Seki et al., 2007). As a consequence, enhancing salinity tolerance by some means would be an important strategy to improve the crop productivity (Khan et al., 2010).

In general, the effects of salt on plants are attributed to the decrease in water uptake, and toxicity of specific ions (Alam, 1994), leading to membrane disorganization, increase in reactive

42 oxygen species (ROS) levels and metabolic toxicity (Hasegawa et al., 2000). For many
43 conditions, water status and ion effect are inextricably linked. The initial and primary effects of
44 salt, especially at moderate concentrations, are due to osmotic stress (Munns & Termaat, 1986).
45 Even in well-watered soils by decreasing the osmotic potential of soil solutes, it is difficult for
46 roots to extract water from their surrounding media (Sankar et al., 2007). In such case, the plants
47 should adapt to the environmental variation through the stomatal aperture for maintaining the
48 water balance. Resistance for CO₂ diffusion and decreases in transpiration rates reduce carbon
49 assimilation, which inhibits the photosynthesis and crop productivity. Consequently, the stomatal
50 characteristics should be regarded as one of important physiological parameters. In addition, ion
51 toxicity or nutrition imbalance is increased owing to passive absorption and accumulation of
52 some specific ions. Sodium and chlorine are generally the dominant ions in saline environments
53 (Tester & Davenport, 2003), and directly affect nutrient uptake, such as Na⁺ reducing Ca²⁺ uptake
54 or Cl⁻ reducing NO₃⁻ uptake (Grattan & Grieve, 1999). Most plants are very sensitive to Na⁺
55 which can disturb intracellular ion homeostasis (Rengel, 1992), membrane dysfunction (Ghoulam,
56 Foursy & Fares, 2002), and disorder of metabolic processes (Manaa et al., 2011). Accordingly,
57 two cost-effective strategies of increasing crop yield are breeding tolerant genotypes, and
58 application of chemical substances.

59 Quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.), an ancient crop of the Amaranthaceae family, has been
60 cultivated in the Andean region for thousands of years (Jacobsen, Mujica & Jensen, 2003). It is a
61 tetraploid species, a close relative of beets and amaranth (Maughan et al., 2006). As reported in
62 previous literatures, quinoa is a highly nutritious seed crop which is rich in amino acid (lysine),
63 unsaturated fatty acids (linolenic acid, linoleic acid), mineral composition as cofactors in
64 antioxidant enzymes (calcium, magnesium, iron, copper, and zinc), tocopherols (vitamin E),
65 saponins and phenolic compound with antioxidant power (Rengasamy, 2006; Vega-G'alvez et al.,
66 2010). As a kind of grain crop, quinoa has an excellent stability under freezing and retrogradation
67 due to carbohydrate accumulation. Another critical characteristic is that quinoa may give seed
68 yield of 1.721 t ha⁻¹ of remarkable quality in typical agro-climatic conditions of South Eastern
69 Europe (Stikic et al., 2012). For these reasons, FAO has suggested it as one of the crops that
70 should be used for food security in the next century (Izquierdo et al., 2003; FAO, 1998). Quinoa
71 is also regarded as a crop with a high level of resistance to several of the predominant adverse
72 factors, such as drought, salinity, frost, hail and poor soil fertility (Jacobsen, Mujica & Jensen,
73 2003). In the field, most of plants known as glycophytes are not capable of dealing with salt
74 concentrations of EC > 4 dS·m⁻¹. For example, rice will die during vegetable stage when the
75 salinity rises to 10 dS·m⁻¹ (Munns, James & Läuchli, 2006). As a moderately salt-tolerant crop,
76 most of quinoa species may grow, develop and fruit under the mild saline conditions (10–20
77 dS·m⁻¹). It is worthwhile to note that quinoa can also survive even at 400 mM NaCl (40 dS·m⁻¹),
78 which amounts to the seawater (Razzaghi et al., 2011). The special characteristics and higher
79 nutrient values have received much attention from worldwide, and led to lots of research on the
80 development of new food products in recent years.

81 Salt tolerance is concerned not only plant species but also the exogenous application of
82 chemical substances (Jaleel et al., 2007). Exogenous application of nutrient elements is one of

83 efficient strategies minimizing the effects of salinity on plant productivity, such as N (Wu et al.,
84 2008), K (Chartzoulakis et al., 2006), Si (Liang, 1999), Ca and Mg (Asaeda et al., 2014). It is
85 well known that calcium is a very important macroelement for plant metabolism, and the
86 hypothesis of Ca^{2+} being a second messenger has been advanced for environmental stress.
87 Several practices have showed that calcium is involved in many processes, including cell division
88 and elongation (Kader & Lindberg, 2010), competition to Na^+ uptake (Epstein, 1962), lipid
89 peroxidation of cell membranes (Kaya et al., 2002; Marinos, 1962), antioxidant enzyme activities,
90 and the plant hormone metabolism (Manaa et al., 2014). Under abiotic stresses, application of
91 moderate amount of exogenous Ca^{2+} can increase stomatal conductance, improve plant
92 photosynthesis through calmodulin (CaM) and Ca^{2+} -dependent protein kinases (Zhang et al.,
93 2014). However, there are some disagreements about Ca^{2+} evaluation. Sohan, Jasoni & Zajicek
94 (1999) indicated that calcium supplements of 10 mM were not able to ameliorate the adverse
95 effects of NaCl on the plant-water relations of sunflower. Navarro, Martinez & Carvajal (2000)
96 reported that the growth-reductions and physiological effects induced by Na^+ (60 mM) were
97 partially prevented by additional Ca^{2+} in the hydroponics solution. Note that these plant
98 characteristics may not be affected until a critical threshold level of Ca^{2+} has been reached. It
99 means that crop biomass may not decrease until a given threshold concentration of Ca^{2+} is
100 reached, below which there is no significant influence in the total output. The beneficial effect of
101 Ca^{2+} did not persist once Ca^{2+} supply exceeded the critical level because further Ca^{2+} supply
102 increased soil salinity (Vaghela et al., 2010). Even as a kind of benefit macronutrient, higher
103 concentration of Ca^{2+} lead to water stress and inhibition of enzyme activity. Reviewing the past
104 literatures, most attention has focused on alleviating adverse effects of Ca^{2+} on salinity, less
105 attention has been given to the critical toxic level of Ca^{2+} . The influence of Ca^{2+} is largely
106 relevant to the relative concentration of Na^+ to Ca^{2+} as well as the absolute concentration of
107 calcium.

108 Transpiration, water uptake, and CO_2 entrance are partially controlled by the plant via its
109 regulation of stomatal opening. So the effects of initial water deficit on photosynthesis may be
110 observed directly by diffusion limitations through the stomata under salt stress condition. As for
111 the root systems, it not only plays an important role in water and nutrient uptake, but also
112 interacts directly with the biotic and abiotic components of the rhizosphere. Under stress
113 condition, adjustment to the root systems might alleviate the effect of the stress on the
114 intracellular environment. Thus, it is critical for the growth and survival of the plants to adjust
115 morphology and physiology of stomata and root system under salt stress. The focus of this study
116 was to provide additional information on the optimal concentration of calcium nitrate. The
117 relative physiological indexes of quinoa were investigated in terms of osmotic potential of
118 different parts, stomatal characteristic and root characteristic, and the possible role played by
119 calcium nitrate in regulating salinity-induced variations in these parameters.

120 MATERIALS AND METHODS

121 Plant culture

122 The experiment was carried out from 30th May to 10th July 2013 in the greenhouse located in the
123 Faculty of Science, University of Copenhagen. Plant material, a Danish bred cultivar (Titicaca)

124 more adapted to Mediterranean condition, was provided by Prof. Jacobsen SE of the University
125 of Copenhagen.

126 Seeds were sown in vermiculite-filled plastic trays in the greenhouse. The environmental
127 conditions were as follows: average day/night temperatures of 22 ± 2 °C / 18 ± 2 °C, 16 h light /
128 8h dark with a photosynthetic photon flux density (PPFD) of $600 \text{ mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, and a relative
129 humidity of $60 \pm 5\%$. Once seedlings emerged, they were watered with half-strength Hoagland's
130 nutrient solution (pH 6.8) every two days. After 2 weeks of culture, healthy and uniform
131 seedlings were transferred into 500 ml plastic pot (four seedlings per pot) containing full-strength
132 Hoagland's nutrient solution continuously aerated.

133 **Salt treatments**

134 When the seedlings were at the sixth leaf stage, the different treatments were initiated. The
135 different four treatments were applied as follow: (A) Hoagland's nutrient solution (control),
136 without the addition of NaCl or $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2$. (B) Hoagland's nutrient solution with 200mM NaCl;
137 (C) Hoagland's nutrient solution with 200mM NaCl + 20mM $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2$; (D) Hoagland's nutrient
138 solution with 200mM NaCl + 150mM $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2$. Each treatment included four replicates. NaCl
139 concentration was gradually elevated by 50 mM daily in order to avoid salt shock. The
140 concentration of $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2$ were designed on the basis of previous published experiments
141 (Vaghela et al., 2010). The solution was changed every other day until the end of the experiment,
142 and the pH of the solution was adjusted to 6.5 by adding 0.1M KOH. The plants were watered
143 twice every day in the early morning and the late afternoon according to the weight loss. At the
144 same time, the electronic conductivity (EC) and the osmotic potential (Ψ_π) of the respective
145 treatment solutions (Table 1) were determined by Conductivity Meter and Dew point
146 microvoltmeter (HR-33T, Wescor Inc., Logan, UT, USA), respectively.

147 **Table 1 The physical properties of the treatments.**

148 **The stomatal characteristics of quinoa under the stress conditons**

149 The stomatal conductance (g_s , $\text{mmol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$) was measured on the fourth fully expanded leaf
150 between 10:00- 12:00 AM with a leaf porometer (Model SC-1, Decagon, Pullman, WA, USA).
151 The result of the same leaf was repeated twice. The same leaf was used for the measurement of
152 stomatal morphology. According to the method of nail polish impressions (Shabala &
153 Volkenburgh, 2003), four leaves were taken from each of treatment. For each leaf, four
154 microscopic observations were analyzed at 400 magnifications. Stomatal morphology was
155 observed under a LEITZ DMRD microscope camera system (Leica Microscope and System
156 GmbH, D 35530, Wetzlar, Germany) equipped with a digital camera, and the images were
157 presented using image-editing software (Leica Microsystems, version 2.5.0, CMS GmbH
158 (Switzerland) Limited) on a computer screen. Stomatal length and stomatal density were
159 measured with the images using UTHSCSA ImageTool software (UTHSCSA ImageTool for
160 Windows version 3.00).

161 **The osmotic potential (Ψ_π) of different tissues in quinoa under the stress conditons**

162 The different parts of seedlings were frozen in liquid nitrogen for 20 min to disrupt cell
163 membranes, and then transferred to a refrigerator of -80°C for later osmotic potential
164 measurement. Before the osmotic potential was measured, the tissues should be equilibrated for

165 at least 20 min at 25°C. The sample was ground by the tissue grinder, and the osmotic potential of
166 the sap was measured with a Dewpoint Potential Microvoltmeter (HR- 33T, Wescor Inc., Logan,
167 UT, USA). The value was calculated on the basis of the standard curve determined previously.

168 **The root characteristics of quinoa under the stress conditons**

169 The root systems used for morphology measurements were spread out in a clear, water filled
170 plate, and were scanned to high definition (600 dpi) using the WinRHIZO analysis system
171 (WinRHIZO ver. 2004a, Regent Instruments Inc., Quebec, Canada). Total root length, projected
172 area, surface area, average diameter, root volume, length per volume were automatically analyzed
173 from the root images.

174 **Statistical analysis**

175 The experiment design was a randomized complete block with four replications. The data were
176 analyzed with SPSS version 10 (SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA), using the one-way analysis of
177 variance (ANOVA) followed by Least Significant Difference (LSD), p values ≤ 0.05 were
178 regarded as significant.

179 **RESULTS**

180 **The stomatal characteristics of quinoa**

181 Stomatal conductances, stomatal density, and length of stomatal pore were used to evaluate the
182 effects of salinity and supplementary $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2$ on the stomata characteristics. In most cases, the
183 relevant parameters of abaxial surface were higher than those of adaxial surface in different
184 degrees (Table 2). The presence of 200 mM NaCl alone decreased all the parameters on the
185 stomatal characteristics. As compared to the control, stomatal conductance, stomatal density, and
186 stomatal length of the adaxial surface decreased by 59.5%, 0.4% and 16.3 %, respectively.
187 Moreover, the above parameters of abaxial surface decreased by 59.3%, 20.2% and 14.9%,
188 respectively. In the identical NaCl level (200mM), the plants supplemented with different
189 concentrations of $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2$ exhibited reduction in stomatal conductance, and stomatal length of
190 both sides ($p < 0.05$) with increasing electrical conductivity (EC) levels except for stomatal density.
191 Stomatal conductance decreased more markedly when osmotic potential reached -0.89MPa. The
192 values of adaxial surface and abaxial surface in group C decreased by 81% and 87.3%,
193 respectively. The same parameters in group D decreased by 86.5% and 87.9%, respectively. In
194 the similar manner, stomatal length of adaxial surface and abaxial surface in group C decreased
195 by 29.4% and 8.2%, respectively. The same parameters in group D decreased by 32.3% and 34.5
196 %, respectively. In contrast to the above results, the maximum values of stomatal density in both
197 surfaces were recorded from group D. The related indexes in adaxial surface and abaxial surface
198 increased by 70% and 0.4 %, respectively.

199 **Table2 Effects of salt stress and calcium application on stomatal characteristics in quinoa** 200 **grown under greenhouse conditions.**

201 **The osmotic potential ($\Psi\pi$) of different tissues in quinoa**

202 The variations of osmotic potential in leaf, stem, and root of quinoa were shown in Table 3. The
203 highest values of osmotic potential in all treatments were found in the roots of the seedlings, and
204 the lowest values were found in the stems. The control treatment had less negative osmotic
205 potentials compared to the other treatments. In most cases, the osmotic potential in leaf, stem and

206 root of quinoa decreased gradually with decreasing osmotic potential of the different treatments.
207 At the same parts of the seedlings, decrease in osmotic potential was less pronounced among the
208 stress treatments ($p>0.05$). Compared with the control treatment, the osmotic potential of stress
209 solutions were 4.1-fold (B), 4.5-fold (C), and 7.8-fold (D), respectively (Table 1). In the quinoa
210 roots from different stress treatments, the osmotic potential was 7.6-fold (B), 8.1-fold (C), and
211 8.5-fold (D) higher than that of the control. In the quinoa stems of different stress treatments, the
212 osmotic potential was 2.6-fold (B), 3.1-fold (C), and 3.7-fold (D) higher than that of the control.
213 In the quinoa leaves of different stress treatments, the osmotic potential was 2.1-fold (B), 2.7-fold
214 (C), and 2.4-fold (D) higher than that of the control.

215 **Table 3 Effects of salt stress and calcium application on osmotic potential (Ψ_{π}) in quinoa**
216 **grown under greenhouse conditions.**

217 **The root characteristics of quinoa**

218 Root length, projected area, surface area, average diameter, and root volume were used to
219 evaluate the effects of NaCl and $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2$ on morphological variations of the root system (Table
220 4). The results showed that the presence of 200mM NaCl alone in growth medium decreased all
221 these parameters of root characteristics ($p>0.05$). Although no significant difference was
222 observed on the average diameter among all the treatments ($p>0.05$), the maximum values of the
223 root parameters were observed in group C.

224 **Table 4 Effects of salt stress and calcium application on root morphology of quinoa grown**
225 **under greenhouse conditions.**

226 **DISCUSSION**

227 As one of essential macronutrients, calcium makes the major contribution to signal transduction,
228 structural integrity and permeability to cellular membranes (Mengel & Kirkby, 1987), slowing
229 the degradation of cell wall (An et al., 2014), counteracting the harmful effects of Na^+ (Lahaye &
230 Epstein, 1971), availability and uptake of nutrients ((Pandolfi, Mancuso & Shabala, 2012), and so
231 on. High levels of salinity might disturb absorb of nutrients, such as Ca^{2+} deficiency. Exogenous
232 calcium should reduce the damage of Ca^{2+} deficiency. The conclusion has been confirmed by
233 Agarwal et al. (2005) suggested that Ca^{2+} might be responsible for the activation of transcription
234 factor associated with SOD, APOX and CAT under abiotic stress. Liu et al. (2014) also found
235 that CaCl_2 application increased stomatal conductance, and adjusted chloroplast structure in
236 LNT-stressed plants. Still other studies suggested that 3 or 10 mM Ca^{2+} supplements possibly
237 damaged the metabolism of the blueberry because of higher Ca^{2+} concentrations (Wright, Patten
238 & Drew, 1993). Plants differ in both the amounts of Ca^{2+} they require and their tolerance of Ca^{2+}
239 in the rhizosphere (White & Broadley, 2003). Therefore, such improvement in calcium
240 application was associated with the concentration of calcium.

241 **Effects of salt treatments on the stomatal characteristics of quinoa**

242 Under the salt stress condition, decreases in water potential of the environment resulted in the
243 limited uptake of water. Water deficit-induced stomatal closure has been regarded as the initial
244 response. In the current experiment, stomatal density did not show significant differences except
245 for the higher level treatment of $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2$ (150mM). The finding agreed with the previous report
246 (Jacobsen, Liu & Jensen, 2009) that leaf expansion is also sensitive to water deficit. The lower

247 osmotic potential in the leave may be significant in inhibition of cell division. While the division
248 of the epidermis was inhibited, the relative number of the stomata was increased at the same time.
249 This is the reason for the result that the highest value of stomatal density was observed in the
250 treatment of 150mM $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2$ and 200mM NaCl.

251 Compared with the variations of stomatal density and length of stomatal pore, stomatal
252 conductance was inhibited significant in previous conditions. Under low level of $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2$
253 (20mM), it may be suggested that reduction in gs is favorable to better water retention (Pandolfi,
254 Mancuso & Shabala, 2012). With increasing in the Ca^{2+} concentration, the effect on the stomata
255 aperture became more and more seriously. The results were consistent with reports of Montesano
256 and Van (2007), suggesting that reductions in stomatal indexes were probably attributed to
257 osmotic effects rather than Na^+ specifically, especially in the identical NaCl condition. In short
258 term, stomatal conductance may contribute to plant metabolism and growth. Thus, it is a more
259 practical approach to maintain the higher stomatal conductance, improve salt tolerance through
260 applying the optimal concentration of calcium.

261 **Effects of salt treatments on the osmotic potential ($\Psi\pi$) of different tissues in quinoa**

262 The presence of NaCl in the nutrient solution reduces the osmotic potential of the root
263 environment, and inhibits water absorption. Results presented in this study indicated that the
264 osmotic potential ($\Psi\pi$) of different tissues in quinoa was not influenced by the same way. There
265 were no proportional variations in the osmotic potential between the solutions and the different
266 tissues. This may be involved in employing internal exclusion (vacuolar sequestration) and
267 external (sequestration in EBC) exclusion for the cytosolic Na^+ (Bonales-Alatorre et al., 2013),
268 reducing the following accumulation in the cytoplasm of the shoot. And on the other hand,
269 osmotic potential of the same tissues became more negative with decreasing the osmotic potential
270 of all the treatments. Reduced values of osmotic potential may be due to externally supplied Ca^{2+}
271 under the identical NaCl concentration. The low osmotic potential in tissues was favorable to
272 maintain of the potential gradient for water uptake, delaying the physiological drought of the
273 seedlings in salt-stressed plants. Once the osmotic potential belows a threshold level,
274 physiological damages might occur. Therefore, it seemed that the beneficial effect of Ca^{2+} did not
275 persist when Ca^{2+} supply exceeded the critical level (Vaghela et al., 2010).

276 **Effects of salt treatments on the root characteristics of quinoa**

277 Environmental conditions affected root development processes in different ways. Root
278 architecture has been directly related to plant productivity (Lynch, 1995) under limiting edaphic
279 conditions. As expected, better root morphology meant more salt-tolerant (Ashraf et al., 2005). In
280 order to maintain the absorption function of root system, plant should adjust root morphology and
281 physiology. In current work, the NaCl treatment alone reduced all the parameters of the root
282 system ($p>0.05$) due to water-deficit and ion- excess effects. The results of $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2$ application
283 were consistent with the previous observation that maize - treated with low level of NaCl showed
284 the reduction in root elongation, and partly restored by the addition of Ca^{2+} (Cramer, Epstein &
285 Lauchli, 1988). Under the identical Na^+ concentration, low level of $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2$ (20mM)
286 maintained the optimal states of the root system. It indicated that the interaction between Na^+ and
287 Ca^{2+} was significant for the lengths, surface areas, projected areas and volumes of the roots. At

288 higher level (150 mM), serious effect of $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2$ application on the root length was detected.
289 The results also confirmed the hypothesis that the optimal concentration of calcium may be
290 significant in determining the rate and the extent of Na^+ - related inhibition of cell elongation
291 (Rengel, 1992).

292 CONCLUSION

293 In summary, it might be concluded that the synergic effects of NaCl and $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2$ on quinoa
294 seemed to depend on suitable calcium concentration level and the applied tissues. Even as a kind
295 of beneficial element, the optimal concentration of calcium varied with the sensitivity of different
296 tissues. The results of the present study may serve as a reference for future research on exogenous
297 application of chemicals.

298 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

299 Technical support from Faculty of Science, Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences,
300 University of Copenhagen is gratefully acknowledged. Many people provided assisted in carrying
301 out the experiment, including Aizheng Yang, Xiangnan Li.

302 REFERENCES

- 303 Agarwal S, Sairam RK, Srivastava GC, Tyagi A, Meena RC. 2005. Role of ABA, salicylic acid,
304 calcium and hydrogen peroxide on antioxidant enzymes induction in wheat seedlings. *Plant*
305 *Science*, 169(3): 559-570.
- 306 Alam SM. 1994. Nutrient uptake by plants under stress condition. In Handbook of plant and crop
307 stress, ed. M. Pessarakli, 227–246. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- 308 An P, Li XJ, Zheng YR, Egrinya E, InanagaShinobu. 2014. Calcium effects on root cell wall
309 composition and ion contents in two soybean cultivars under salinity stress. *Canadian Journal of*
310 *Plant Science*, 94:733-740.
- 311 Asaeda T, Senavirathna MDHJ, Kaneko Y, Rashid MH. 2014. Effect of calcium and magnesium
312 on the growth and calcite encrustation of *Chara fibrosa*. *Aquatic Botany*, 113: 100-106.
- 313 Ashraf MY, Akhtar K, Sarwar G, Ashraf M. 2005. Role of the rooting system in salt tolerance
314 potential of different guar accessions. *Agronomy for sustainable development*, 25:243–249
- 315 Bonales-Alatorre E, Shabala S, Chen ZH, Pottosin I. 2013. Reduced Tonoplast Fast-Activating
316 and Slow-Activating Channel Activity Is Essential for Conferring Salinity Tolerance in a
317 Facultative Halophyte, Quinoa. *Plant Physiology*, 162 (2): 940- 952.
- 318 Chartzoulakis K, Psarras G, Vemmos S, Loupassaki M, Bertaki M. 2006. Response of Two Olive
319 Cultivars to Salt Stress and Potassium Supplement. *Journal of Plant Nutrition*, 29: 2063-2078.
- 320 Cramer GR, Epstein E, Lauchli A. 1988. Kinetics of root elongation in maize in response to short
321 term exposure to NaCl and elevated calcium concentration. *Journal of Experimental Botany*,
322 208:1513–1522.
- 323 Epstein E. 1962. Mutual effects of ions on their absorption by plants. *Agrochimica*, 6: 293–322.
- 324 FAO. Under-Utilized Andean Food Crops. FAO, Rome, Italy; 1998.
- 325 Ghoulam C, Foursy A, Fares K. 2002. Effects of salt stress on growth, inorganic ions and proline
326 accumulation in relation to osmotic adjustment in five sugar beet cultivars. *Environmental and*
327 *Experimental Botany*, 47: 39–50.
- 328 Grattan SR, Grieve CM. 1999. Salinity - Mineral nutrient relations in horticultural crops. *Scientia*

- 329 *horticulturae*, 78: 127–157.
- 330 Lahaye PA, Epstein E. 1971. Calcium and salt tolerance by bean plants. *Plant Physiology*,
331 25:213-218.
- 332 Liang YC. 1999. Effects of silicon on enzyme activity and sodium, potassium and calcium
333 concentration in barley under salt stress. *Plant and Soil*, 209: 217-224.
- 334 Liu YF, Zhang GX, Qi MF, Li TL. 2014. Effects of calcium on photosynthesis, antioxidant
335 system, and chloroplast ultrastructure in tomato leaves under low night temperature stress.
336 *Journal of Plant Growth Regulation*, 34:263-273.
- 337 Lynch J. 1995. Root architecture and plant productivity. *Plant Physiology*, 109:7–13.
- 338 Hasegawa PM, Bressan RA, Zhu JK, Bohnert HJ. 2000. Plant cellular and molecular responses to
339 high salinity. *Annual Review Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology* 51: 463–499.
- 340 Izquierdo J, Mujicab A, Marathe'ec JP, Jacobsen SE. 2003. Horizontal, Technical Cooperation in
341 Research on Quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.). *Food Reviews International*, 19: 25–29.
- 342 Jacobsen SE, Mujica A, Jensen CR. 2003. The Resistance of Quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa*
343 Willd.) to Adverse Abiotic Factors. *Food Reviews International*, 19: 99–109.
- 344 Jacobsen SE, Liu F, Jensen CR. 2009. Does root-sourced aba play a role for regulation of stomata
345 under drought in quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.). *Scientia Horticulturae*, 122: 281–287.
- 346 Jaleel CA, Manivannan P, Sankar B, Kishorekumar A, Panneerselvam R. 2007. Calcium chloride
347 effects on salinity-induced oxidative stress, proline metabolism and indole alkaloid accumulation
348 in *Catharanthus roseus*. *Comptes Rendus Biologies*, 330: 674–683.
- 349 Kader MA, Lindberg S. 2010. Cytosolic calcium and pH signaling in plants under salinity stress.
350 *Plant Signaling & Behavior*, 5: 233–238.
- 351 Kaya C, Kirnak H, Higgs D, Saltali K. 2002. Supplementary calcium enhances plant growth and
352 fruit yield in strawberry cultivars grown at high (NaCl) salinity. *Scientia horticulturae*, 93:
353 65–74.
- 354 Khan MN, Siddiqui MH, Mohammad F, Naeem M, Khan MMA. 2010. Calcium chloride and
355 gibberellic acid protect linseed (*Linum usitatissimum* L.) from NaCl stress by inducing
356 antioxidative defence system and osmoprotectant accumulation. *Acta Physiologiae Plantarum*, 32:
357 121-132.
- 358 Lovato MB, Filho LDJP, Martins PS. 1999. Growth responses of *Stylosanthes humilis* (Fabaceae)
359 populations to saline stress. *Environmental and Experimental Botany*, 41: 145–153.
- 360 Manaa A, Ben Ahmed H, Valot B, Bouchet JP, Aschi-Smiti S, Causse M, Faurobert M. 2011.
361 Salt and genotype impact on plant physiology and root proteome variations in tomato. *Journal of*
362 *Experimental Botany*, 62: 2797–2813.
- 363 Manaa A, Gharbi E, Mimouni H, Wasti S, Aschi-Smiti S, Lutts S, Ben Ahmed H. 2014.
364 Simultaneous application of salicylic acid and calcium improves salt tolerance in two contrasting
365 tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*) cultivars. *South African Journal of Botany*, 95: 32–39.
- 366 Marinos NG. 1962. Studies on submicroscopic aspects of mineral deficiencies. I. Calcium
367 deficiency in the shoot apex of barley. *American Journal of Botany*, 49: 834–841.
- 368 Maughan PJ, Kolano BA, Maluszynska ND, Coles ND, Bonifacio A, Rojas J. 2006. Molecular
369 and cytological characterization of ribosomal RNA genes in *Chenopodium quinoa* and

- 370 *Chenopodium berlandieri*. *Genome*, 49:825–839.
- 371 Mengel K, Kirkby EA. 1987. Principle of Plant Nutrition. Bern, Switzerland: International Potash
372 Institute.
- 373 Montesano F, Van MW. 2007. Calcium can prevent toxic effects of Na⁺ on Tomato leaf
374 photosynthesis but does not restore growth. *Journal of the American Society for*
375 *Horticultural science*, 132(3):310-318.
- 376 Munns R, Termaat A. 1986. Whole-plant responses to salinity. *Australian Journal of Plant*
377 *Physiology*, 13:143–160.
- 378 Munns R, James RA, Läuchli A. 2006. Approaches to increasing the salt tolerance of wheat and
379 other cereals. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 57: 1025-1043.
- 380 Navarro JM, Martinez V, Carvajal M. 2000. Ammonium, bicarbonate and calcium effects on
381 tomato plants grown under saline conditions. *Plant Science*, 157:89–96.
- 382 Pandolfi C, Mancuso S, Shabala S. 2012. Physiology of acclimation to salinity stress in pea
383 (*Pisum sativum*). *Environmental and Experimental Botany*, 84: 44– 51.
- 384 Razzaghi F, Ahmadi SH, Adolf VI, Jensen CR, Jacobsen SE, Andersen MN. 2011. Water
385 relations and transpiration of quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.) under salinity and soil drying.
386 *Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science*, 197: 348-360.
- 387 Rengasamy P. 2006. World salinization with emphasis on Australia. *Journal of Experimental*
388 *Botany*, 57:1017–23.
- 389 Rengel Z. 1992. The role of calcium in salt toxicity. *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 15: 625–632.
- 390 Sahi C, Singh A, Blumwald E, Grover A. 2006. Beyond osmolytes and transporters: novel plant
391 salt-stress tolerance-related genes from transcriptional profiling data. *Physiologia Plantarum*,
392 127(1):1–9.
- 393 Sankar B, Jaleel CA, Manivannan P, Kishorekumar A, Somasundaram R, Panneerselvam R. 2007.
394 Drought induced biochemical modifications and proline metabolism in *Abelmoschus esculentus*
395 (L.) Moench. *Acta Botanica Croatica*, 66: 43–56.
- 396 Seki M, Umezawa T, Urano K, Shinozaki K. 2007. Regulatory metabolic networks in drought
397 stress responses. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*, 10: 296–302.
- 398 Shabala S, Shabala L, Volkenburgh EV. 2003. Effect of calcium on root development and root
399 ion fluxes in salinised barley seedlings. *Functional Plant Biology*, 30(5):507-514.
- 400 Sohan D, Jasoni R, Zajicek J. 1999. Plant–water relations of NaCl and calcium-treated sunflower
401 plants. *Environmental and Experimental Botany*, 42: 105–111.
- 402 Stikic R, Glamoclija D, Demin M, Vucelic-Radovic B, Jovanovic Z, Milojkovic-Opsenica D.
403 2012. Agronomical and nutritional evaluation of quinoa seeds (*chenopodium quinoa* Willd.) as an
404 ingredient in bread formulations. *Journal of cereal science*, 55: 2, 132–138.
- 405 Tester M, Davenport R. 2003. Na⁺ tolerance and Na⁺ transport in higher plants. *Annals of Botany*,
406 91: 503–527.
- 407 Vaghela PM, Patel AD, Pandey IB, Pandey AN. 2010. Implications of Calcium Nutrition on the
408 Response of *Salvadora persica* (Salvadoraceae) to Soil Salinity. *Communications in Soil Science*
409 *and Plant Analysis*, 41:2644–2660.
- 410 Vega-G´alvez A, Miranda M, Vergara J, Uribe E, Puentem L, AMart´inez E. 2010. Nutrition

- 411 facts and functional potential of quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.), an ancient Andean grain:
412 a review. *Journal of the science of food and agriculture*, 90: 2541–2547.
- 413 White PJ, Broadley MR. 2003. Calcium in plants. *Annals of Botany*, 92:487-511.
- 414 Wright GC, Patten KD, Drew MC.1993. Gas exchange and chlorophyll content of ‘Tifblue’
415 rabbiteye and ‘Sharpblue’ southern highbush blueberry exposed to salinity and supplemental
416 calcium. *Journal of the American Society for Horticulturalence*, 118: 456– 463.
- 417 Wu FZ, Bao WK, Li FL, Wu N. 2008. Effects of drought stress and N supply on the growth,
418 biomass partitioning and water-use efficiency of *Sophora davidii* seedlings. *Environmental and*
419 *Experimental Botany*, 63: 248-255.
- 420 Zhang GX, Liu YF, Ni Y, Meng ZJ, Lu T, Li TL. 2014. Exogenous Calcium Alleviates Low
421 Night Temperature Stress on the Photosynthetic Apparatus of Tomato Leaves. *Plos One*, 9:
422 97322.

423

Table 1 The physical properties of the treatments.

Treatment	Electrical conductivity ($\text{ds} \cdot \text{m}^{-1}$)	Osmotic potential (MPa)
A	1.87	-0.22
B	18.61	-0.89
C	22.65	-0.99
D	37.85	-1.71

424 Notes.

425 A, Hoagland's nutrient solution (control), without the addition of NaCl or Ca (NO₃)₂; B,
426 Hoagland's nutrient solution with 200mM NaCl; C, Hoagland's nutrient solution with 200mM
427 NaCl + 20mM Ca (NO₃)₂; D, Hoagland's nutrient solution with 200mM NaCl + 150mM Ca
428 (NO₃)₂.

429 **Table2 Effects of salt stress and calcium application on stomatal characteristics in quinoa**
 430 **grown under greenhouse conditions.**

Treatment	Stomatal conductance ($\text{mmol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\text{ s}^{-1}$)		Stomatal density ($\text{No}\cdot\text{mm}^{-2}$)		Length of stomatal pore ($\mu\text{ m}$)	
	Adaxial surface	Abaxial surface	Adaxial surface	Abaxial surface	Adaxial surface	Abaxial surface
A	475.68±76.94 a	684.80±62.57 a	138.00±9.50 b	165.33±12.51 a	90.21±4.00 a	96.89±1.54 a
B	192.52±31.96 b	278.88±46.23 b	137.33±18.58 b	132.00±12.48 ab	75.50±7.22 ab	82.48±2.55 bc
C	90.38±12.67 bc	87.24±11.27 c	112.00±8.86 bc	138.67±13.80 ab	63.68±8.07 b	89.00±2.66 b
D	64.20±8.94 c	83.15±13.92 c	234.67±17.24 a	166.00±9.60 a	61.10±4.33 bc	63.50±2.04 d

431 Notes.

432 A, Hoagland's nutrient solution (control), without the addition of NaCl or Ca (NO_3)₂; B,
 433 Hoagland's nutrient solution with 200mM NaCl; C, Hoagland's nutrient solution with 200mM
 434 NaCl + 20mM Ca (NO_3)₂; D, Hoagland's nutrient solution with 200mM NaCl + 150mM Ca
 435 (NO_3)₂.

436 Different letters indicate significant differences according to LSD at $p<0.05$. Data were
 437 presented as the mean ± standard error (SE, n=4).

438 **Table 3 Effects of salt stress and calcium application on osmotic potential (Ψ_{π}) in quinoa**
 439 **grown under greenhouse conditions.**

Treatment	Leaf (MPa)	Stem (MPa)	Root (MPa)
A	-0.79±0.11a	-0.71±0.05a	-0.18±0.05a
B	-1.63±0.19 b	-1.84 ±0.21 b	-1.37±0.32 b
C	-2.16±0.24 bc	-2.22±0.07 bc	-1.46±0.27 bc
D	-1.89±0.29 b	-2.62±0.10 c	-1.54±0.31 bc

440 Notes.

441 A, Hoagland's nutrient solution (control), without the addition of NaCl or Ca (NO₃)₂; B,
 442 Hoagland's nutrient solution with 200mM NaCl; C, Hoagland's nutrient solution with 200mM
 443 NaCl + 20mM Ca (NO₃)₂; D, Hoagland's nutrient solution with 200mM NaCl + 150mM Ca
 444 (NO₃)₂.

445 Different letters indicate significant differences according to LSD at $p<0.05$. Data were
 446 presented as the mean ± standard error (SE, n=4).

447 **Table 4 Effects of salt stress and calcium application on root morphology of quinoa grown**
 448 **under greenhouse conditions.**

Treatment	Root length (cm)	Projected Area (cm ²)	Surface Area (cm ²)	Average Diameter (mm)	Root Volume (cm ³)
A	4445.95 ab	112.75 b	354.21 b	0.68 a	2.27 b
B	3136.41 ab	90.77 bc	285.17 bc	0.56 a	2.19 bc
C	4648.39 a	161.80 a	508.33 a	0.70 a	4.44 a
D	2915.95 b	114.90 ab	360.98 ab	0.66 a	3.56 ab

449 Notes.

450 A, Hoagland's nutrient solution (control), without the addition of NaCl or Ca (NO₃)₂; B,
 451 Hoagland's nutrient solution with 200mM NaCl; C, Hoagland's nutrient solution with 200mM
 452 NaCl + 20mM Ca (NO₃)₂; D, Hoagland's nutrient solution with 200mM NaCl + 150mM Ca
 453 (NO₃)₂.

454 Different letters indicate significant differences according to LSD at $p < 0.05$. Data were
 455 presented as the mean (SE, n=4).