**Ginkgo biloba** and *Helianthus annuus* show different strategies to adjust photosynthesis, leaf water relations, and cell wall composition under water deficit stress
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Abstract

Cell wall thickness (*Tcw*) determines photosynthesis and leaf elasticity. However, only a few studies in angiosperms addressed cell wall composition implication in regulating photosynthesis and leaf water relations through mesophyll conductance (*gm*) and bulk modulus of elasticity (*ε*) adjustments, respectively. Thus, we compared the phylogenetically distant *Ginkgo biloba* L. and *Helianthus annuus* L. under control and water deprivation to study the relationship between changes in cell wall composition (cellulose, hemicelluloses, and pectins) with *gm* and *ε*. Although no changes were found for *Tcw*, both species differently modified cell wall composition, resulting in different physiological consequences. *H. annuus* increased cellulose, hemicelluloses, and pectins in a similar proportion, maintaining *ε*. Additionally, it reduced photosynthesis due to stomatal closure. *G. biloba* did not decrease photosynthesis and largely increased hemicelluloses, leaf mass area, and leaf density, enhancing *ε*. Nonetheless, no association between cell wall composition and *gm* was found in either of the two species.
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Introduction

Photosynthesis is a complex phenomenon that involves both diffusional and biochemical processes (Flexas et al. 2004, von Caemmerer et al. 2009). The diffusional process consists of the CO₂ pathway from the atmosphere to the substomatal cavity (stomatal conductance, *gm*) across the mesophyll tissue (mesophyll conductance, *gm*) until reaching its carboxylation sites at chloroplasts stroma, where biochemical processes occur (Flexas et al. 2004, Evans et al. 2009, von Caemmerer et al. 2009). Even though the mechanistic nature of *gm* is not yet fully understood (Evans et al. 2009, Flexas et al. 2012), some studies have evidenced that leaf anatomical traits, particularly cell wall thickness (*Tcw*) and chloroplasts surface area exposed to intercellular air spaces per leaf area (*S/S*), are crucial to determine *gm* across plants' phylogeny and in response to different environmental conditions (Terashima et al. 2001, Evans et al. 2009, Flexas et al. 2012, Tomás et al. 2013, Carriquí et al. 2015, 2019, 2020; Tosens et al. 2016, Onoda et al. 2017, Peguero-Pina et al. 2017, Veromann-Jürgenson et al. 2017). Hence, as thick cell walls limit *gm* and, simultaneously, potentially increase cells rigidity (enhanced bulk modulus of elasticity, *ε*) (Tyree and Jarvis 1982, Peguero-Pina et al. 2017), a trade-off between *gm* and net photosynthetic rate (*Pn*), with *ε* was demonstrated in a wide range of species under nonstress conditions (Nadal et al. 2018). Nonetheless, the mechanistic basis of *ε* and its intraspecific dynamics during plant's acclimation to changing environmental conditions are still poorly understood. Although Niinemets (2001) and Sack et al. (2003) proposed that leaf structure, particularly leaf mass
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CELL WALL COMPOSITION UNDER WATER DEFICIT STRESS

area (LMA) and leaf density (LD), was the main driver of $\varepsilon$, more recent studies suggested that cell wall composition and properties could be also relevant for determining $\varepsilon$ (Moore et al. 2008, Solecka et al. 2008, Álvarez-Arenas et al. 2018, Roig-Oliver et al. 2020).

The plant cell wall, a complex structure considered as a protective barrier to face those biotic and abiotic stresses occurring during plants' life, is mainly compounded by cellulose microfibrils (Carpita and Gibeaut 1993, Cosgrove 1997, 2005; Somerville et al. 2004, Sarkar et al. 2009, Tenhaken 2015, Houston et al. 2016, Rui and Dinnery 2019). Between those closely packed microfibrils, noncellulosic neutral sugars (hereafter 'hemicelluloses') are placed, conferring stability to the wall (Carpita and Gibeaut 1993, Cosgrove 1997, 2005; Somerville et al. 2004, Sarkar et al. 2009, Tenhaken 2015, Rui and Dinnery 2019). This cellulose–hemicelluloses network is embedded in a pectin matrix which has been proposed as a crucial structure to maintain an appropriate cell wall hydric status, especially during water deficit stress (Vicré et al. 2004, Cosgrove 2005, Leucci et al. 2008, Moore et al. 2008, 2013; Schiraldi et al. 2012, Le Gall et al. 2015, Houston et al. 2016). Additionally, the pectin matrix seems to be a key structure determining wall porosity and thickness (Somerville et al. 2004, Cosgrove 2005, Tenhaken 2015, Houston et al. 2016, Rui and Dinnery 2019), leading to the suggestion that it could influence CO$_2$ diffusion and, thus, photosynthesis. However, only a few studies directly focused on the relationship between modifications in cell wall components and $g_m$ (Ellsworth et al. 2018, Clemente-Moreno et al. 2019, Carriquí et al. 2020, Roig-Oliver et al. 2020). Particularly, Ellsworth et al. (2018) provided first evidence on how $g_m$ reductions could be attributed to anatomical alterations due to cell wall changes testing cs/l6 rice mutants. Then, Clemente-Moreno et al. (2019) specifically identified pectins and/or the ratio of hemicelluloses to pectins as main drivers of $g_m$ changes in Nicotiana sylvestris subjected to different environmental conditions. The relationship between modified cell wall composition and $g_m$ changes could not be exclusively attributed to pectins as Roig-Oliver et al. (2020) showed that only cellulose correlated with $g_m$ in Vitis vinifera cv. Grenache acclimated to contrasting conditions. Nonetheless, at an interspecific level and under nonstress conditions, the ratio of pectins to cellulose and hemicelluloses determined $g_m$ in conifers (Carriquí et al. 2020). Thus, it appears that the relationship between cell wall main composition and $g_m$ could be species-dependent (Roig-Oliver et al. 2020) and could be attributed to specific growing conditions.

Some studies have determined that cell wall composition differs among plants belonging to different phylogenetic groups (Popper and Fry 2004, Sørensen et al. 2010, Popper et al. 2011, Bartels and Classen 2017). Additionally, several studies have characterized cell wall composition changes in different monocot and dicot species under stressing conditions (see, for instance, Sweet et al. 1999, Vicré et al. 1999, 2004; Leucci et al. 2008, Moore et al. 2008, Solecka et al. 2008, Suwa et al. 2010, Carvalho et al. 2013, Baldwin et al. 2014, Zheng et al. 2014, Clemente-Moreno et al. 2019, Roig-Oliver et al. 2020). However, to our knowledge, no information is known regarding stress-induced changes in cell wall properties in other plant groups. Moreover, how these differences in cell wall composition in response to stress could be linked to differed strategies to regulate photosynthesis, leaf water relations and anatomical adjustments remain to be elucidated. In the current study, we compared the gymnosperm living fossil Ginkgo biloba L. (Ginkgoaceae) and the herbaceous angiosperm Helianthus annuus L. (Asteraceae) acclimated to two different experimental conditions (well-watered, i.e., control, and water deficit stress) to induce changes in cell wall composition that could influence photosynthesis, anatomical and/or leaf water relations responses.

Materials and methods

Plant material and growth conditions: One-year-old G. biloba plants were acquired from a garden center in horticultural alveolus. H. annuus seeds were individually sewed in horticultural alveolus using a mixture of 3:1 substrate:perlite for a growth chamber at 22°C with 12/12-h light/darkness daily fluctuation receiving PPFD of 200–300 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$. Water irrigation was assessed every two days to ensure plant growth. Three weeks later, when all plants had fully-developed leaves, they were transplanted to 3-L pots containing a mixture of 2:2 and 3:1 substrate:perlite for G. biloba and H. annuus, respectively. At this moment, six individual replicates per species were randomly subjected to two treatments: control (i.e., well-watered) and water deficit stress. Water-stressed plants were monitored every two days to maintain pots field capacity at 50% by replacing evaporated water and control plants were daily irrigated to keep field capacity at 100%. To identify the onset of new leaves during plants' acclimation to experimental conditions, already emerged ones were labeled. In both cases, treatments lasted 40 d. All measurements were performed in fully developed leaves developed under control or water-stressed conditions.

Gas-exchange and fluorescence measurements: At the end of the treatments, simultaneous measurements of gas exchange and chlorophyll $a$ fluorescence with an open infrared gas-exchange system coupled with a 2-cm$^2$ fluorescence chamber (Li-6400–40XT, Li-Cor Inc., Lincoln, NE, USA) were performed in one leaf per plant in each species and treatment. Measurements were performed at saturating PPFD (1,500 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ for H. annuus; 1,250 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ for G. biloba; 90/10% of red/blue light, respectively, in both cases), 25°C block temperature, and 300 μmol min$^{-1}$ flow rate. All gas-exchange measurements were corrected for CO$_2$ leakage in the leaf-gasket interface (Flexas et al. 2007). $F_{m}$, $F_{o}$, substomatal CO$_2$ concentration (C), and photochemical yield of PSII ($\Phi_{PSII}$) were recorded after steady-state conditions were reached (15–30 min) at ambient CO$_2$ concentration (C) of 400 μmol mol$^{-1}$. $F_{m}$–$F_{o}$ response curves were then performed by changing C in 14 steps (3–4 min), from 50 to 1,500 μmol(CO$_2$) mol$^{-1}$(air). Light curves under nonphotorespiratory conditions (1%
O₂) were performed to determine light respiration ($R_{\text{light}}$) and the PPFD fraction harvested by PSII ($s$) (Yin et al. 2009, 2011; Bellasio et al. 2016). From previous parameters, the electron transport rate (ETR) was calculated as described in Bellasio et al. (2016). The CO₂-compensation point in the absence of respiration ($f^*$) for $G. \text{biloba}$ and $H. \text{annuus}$ were obtained from comparing $P_n$-$C_i$ curves under ambient (21%) and low O₂ (1%) conditions as described in Bellasio et al. (2016). Finally, mesophyll conductance ($g_m$) was determined by the curve-fitting method (Sharkey 2016) using $R_{\text{light}}$ as an input and the Rubisco kinetics ($K_c$, $K_o$) from tobacco (Bernacchi et al. 2002). The mean $f^*$ value obtained for each species under well-watered conditions was used for water-stressed plants as in vivo methods are not reliable under stress (Galmés et al. 2006).

Anatomical measurements: A portion of the leaves used for gas-exchange measurements were cut in small pieces avoiding main foliar structures to be fixed under vacuum pressure using glutaraldehyde 4% and paraformaldehyde 2% prepared in 0.01 M phosphate buffer (pH 7.4). Samples were post-fixed in 2% buffered osmium tetroxide for two hours and dehydrated by a graded ethanol series. The obtained pieces were embedded in LR White resin (London Resin Company) and placed in an oven at 60°C for 48 h (Tomás et al. 2013).

Semi-fine (0.8 μm) and ultra-fine (90 nm) cross-sections were cut using an ultramicrotome (Leica UC6, Vienna, Austria). Semi-fine sections were dyed with 1% toluidine blue to be viewed in a bright field with an Olympus BX60 optic microscope. Pictures at 200× magnifications were taken with a digital camera (U-TV0.SXC, Olympus, Tokyo, Japan) to determine the fraction of mesophyll intercellular air spaces ($f_{\text{ia}}$). Ultra-fine sections for transmission electron microscopy (TEM H600, Hitachi, Tokyo, Japan) were contrasted with uranyl acetate and lead citrate to obtain pictures at 1,500× and 30,000× magnifications. The chloroplasts surface area exposed to intercellular air spaces per leaf area ($S_c/S$) and the cell wall thickness ($T_{cw}$) were measured from ultra-fine images at 1,500× and 30,000× magnifications, respectively. A cell curvature correction factor was determined according to Thain (1983) making an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/width ratio of five randomly selected cells from both palisade and spongy mesophyll types for an average length/with the ImageJ software (Wayne Rasband/NIH). Then, leaves were placed in an oven at 70°C for 72 h to obtain their dry mass. Leaf thickness was determined from six measurements per leaf avoiding main veins with a digital caliper. Thickness per area was used as a proxy to calculate LD.

Statistical analysis: Thompson test was performed to detect and eliminate outliers for all studied parameters. Two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and subsequent LSD test was assessed to determine significant ($P<0.05$) ‘species’ and ‘treatments’ effects and differences between groups, respectively. All analyses were performed using the R statistical software (ver. 3.2.2, R Core Team, Vienna, Austria).
Results

Physiological characterization: Under control conditions, *H. annuus* achieved the highest $P_N$ and $g_s$ [26.30 ± 2.27 µmol(CO$_2$) m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ and 0.40 ± 0.06 mol(CO$_2$) m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, respectively], which were largely reduced under water deficit stress (Fig. 1A,B). Contrarily, *G. biloba* showed much lower assimilation under control conditions [7.91 ± 0.43 µmol(CO$_2$) m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$], but neither $P_N$ nor $g_s$ experienced significant changes due to water deficit stress (Fig. 1A,B). Only *H. annuus* experienced an increase in WUEi under water deficit stress conditions (Fig. 1C). Additionally, water-stressed *H. annuus* also showed reductions of both $g_m$ (Fig. 1D) and ETR, the latter being also slightly reduced in *G. biloba* (Fig. 1E). Finally, $R_{light}$ only revealed differences at $P=0.053$ for the ‘treatments’ effect as it slightly decreased under water deficit stress (Fig. 1F).

Leaf water relations: No treatment effect was detected for both $Ψ_{tlp}$ and $π_o$ ($P=0.337$ and 0.139, respectively) (Fig. 2A,C). Although RWC$_{tlp}$ was maintained in *G. biloba*, it increased in water-stressed *H. annuus* in comparison to control (Fig. 2B). However, water-stressed *G. biloba* leaves were almost three-folds more rigid than control ones (61.17 ± 14.32 and 21.15 ± 2.36 MPa, respectively; Fig. 2D). Water deficit stress increased $a_t$ and $C*_{ft}$ in *H. annuus* [0.55 ± 0.03 and 1.96 ± 0.25 mol(H$_2$O) m$^{-2}$ MPa$^{-1}$, respectively], but no changes were detected in *G. biloba* (Fig. 2E,F).

Leaf structural and anatomical traits: Under water deficit stress conditions, *H. annuus* and *G. biloba* experienced an increase in both LMA and LD, being more marked in the latter species as they doubled control values (Table 1). An opposite pattern was found for LA, which decreased significantly under water deficit stress conditions, especially in *G. biloba* (Table 1). However, water deprivation did not significantly change anatomical parameters (i.e., $f_{fas}$, S/S, and Tcw) in none of the two species (Table 1), which were evaluated from similar pictures to those from Fig. 3.

Leaf cell wall composition: Water deficit stress induced different changes in cell wall composition in the two species. *G. biloba* significantly increased hemicelluloses while slightly decreasing cellulose, with no changes in the total AIR and pectins (Table 2). Instead, *H. annuus* significantly enhanced the total AIR with also increased amounts of cellulose, hemicelluloses, and pectins in a similar proportion (Table 2).

Discussion

A classic response to water deficit stress involves a reduction of $P_N$ associated to decreased leaf overall CO$_2$ diffusion (i.e., $g_s$ and $g_m$) (Chaves et al. 2002, 2008; Flexas et al. 2004, 2012; Nadal and Flexas 2019), which promotes enhanced WUEi due to larger descents in $g_s$ than in $g_m$ (Flexas et al. 2013). In the current study, this pattern was only observed in water-stressed *H. annuus* plants as $P_N$, $g_s$, and $g_m$ did not significantly decrease in *G. biloba*.

Fig. 1. (A) Net photosynthetic rate ($P_N$), (B) stomatal conductance ($g_s$), (C) intrinsic water-use efficiency (WUEi), (D) mesophyll conductance ($g_m$), (E) electron transport rate (ETR), and (F) light respiration ($R_{light}$) in Ginkgo biloba and Helianthus annuus across conditions (CL – control, WS – water deficit stress). Species (S) and treatments (T) effects were quantified by two-way ANOVA and differences between groups were addressed by LSD test. Different superscript letters indicate significant differences. Significance: ***$P<0.001$; ** $P<0.01$; * $P<0.05$; * $P<0.1$; ns $P>0.1$. Values are means ± SE ($n=5–6$).
Despite opposite patterns for photosynthesis regulation under water deficit stress, both species modified their foliage structure (i.e., increased LMA and LD, see Table 1) as previously reported by Niinemets et al. (2009). Additionally, water deficit stress strongly limited leaf development in both species as LA decreased significantly (Table 1), which has been described as a typical response to water deficit stress (Chaves et al. 2002). However, although Chartzoulakis et al. (2002) and Hafez et al. (2020) reported modifications in leaf, mesophyll, and epidermis thicknesses as well as in $f_{ia}$ testing avocado and barley, respectively, under water deprivation, Tomás et al. (2014) did not detect strong subcellular anatomical alterations in water-stressed grapevine cultivars. In fact, in the present study neither $T_{cw}$ nor other subcellular anatomical traits classically affecting $g_m$ were modified under water deficit stress (Table 1), suggesting that decreased $g_m$ in water-stressed H. annuus might be due to other nonstudied characteristics (e.g., aquaporins and/or carbonic anhydrases, see Pérez-Martín et al. 2014).

Poorer et al. (2009) proposed that LD could reflect, to some extent, the cell wall content per leaf. Nonetheless, AIR variations only followed the same pattern as LD in H. annuus, as the slight increase detected in G. biloba
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**Table 1.** Leaf structural and anatomical traits of Ginkgo biloba and Helianthus annuus across conditions (CL – control, WS – water deficit stress). Average values ± SE are shown for leaf mass area (LMA), leaf density (LD), leaf area (LA), fraction of mesophyll intercellular air spaces ($f_{ia}$), chloroplasts surface area exposed to intercellular air spaces per leaf area (S c/S) and cell wall thickness ($T_{cw}$). Species and treatments effects were quantified by two-way ANOVA and differences between groups were addressed by LSD test. Different superscript letters indicate significant differences. $n = 5–6$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species and treatments</th>
<th>LMA [g m$^{-2}$]</th>
<th>LD [g cm$^{-3}$]</th>
<th>LA [cm$^2$]</th>
<th>$f_{ia}$ [%]</th>
<th>S c/S [m$^2$ m$^{-2}$]</th>
<th>$T_{cw}$ [μm]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. biloba – CL</td>
<td>41.42 ± 1.22$^a$</td>
<td>0.15 ± 0.00$^a$</td>
<td>85.36 ± 8.34$^a$</td>
<td>30.87 ± 3.95$^b$</td>
<td>9.73 ± 1.28$^a$</td>
<td>0.39 ± 0.01$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. biloba – WS</td>
<td>89.52 ± 5.16$^a$</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.02$^a$</td>
<td>21.50 ± 9.61$^a$</td>
<td>25.13 ± 1.83$^b$</td>
<td>10.92 ± 1.13$^a$</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.03$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. annuus – CL</td>
<td>32.04 ± 0.71$^a$</td>
<td>0.16 ± 0.00$^a$</td>
<td>40.79 ± 6.03$^a$</td>
<td>45.50 ± 2.39$^b$</td>
<td>17.24 ± 1.48$^a$</td>
<td>0.18 ± 0.01$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. annuus – WS</td>
<td>48.18 ± 1.02$^b$</td>
<td>0.22 ± 0.00$^b$</td>
<td>21.37 ± 0.49$^b$</td>
<td>40.31 ± 0.58$^b$</td>
<td>18.74 ± 1.59$^b$</td>
<td>0.16 ± 0.01$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species:Treatments</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was not significant (Table 2). AIR enhancement due to water deficit stress was previously detected in *N. sylvestris* (Clemente-Moreno et al. 2019) and *V. vinifera* (Roig-Oliver et al. 2020). Concerning specific cell wall main composition, it has been reported that variations in cellulose content may depend, for instance, on species, specific plant tissues, plants’ age, and/or level of water deficit (Sweet et al. 1990, Zheng et al. 2014, Clemente-Moreno et al. 2019, Roig-Oliver et al. 2020). Thus, cellulose increased in *H. annuus* as previously shown for other species (Sweet et al. 1990, Clemente-Moreno et al. 2019, Roig-Oliver et al. 2020), but slightly decreased in *G. biloba* (Table 2). However, hemicelluloses have been found to either increase (Vicré et al. 1999), decrease (Sweet et al. 1990, Roig-Oliver et al. 2020), or stay constant (Clemente-Moreno et al. 2019) after exposure to water deficit stress. In our study, both species, especially *G. biloba*, presented increased amounts of hemicelluloses under water deficit stress (Table 2). Finally, pectins usually increase during water deficit because they play a key role in adjusting cell wall flexibility, thus, controlling cell wall hydric status (Sweet et al. 1990, Vicré et al. 1999, 2004; Cosgrove 2005, Leucci et al. 2008, Moore et al. 2008, 2013; Le Gall et al. 2015, Tenhaken 2015, Houston et al. 2016, Clemente-Moreno et al. 2019, Rui and Dinnery 2019, Roig-Oliver et al. 2020). However, in our study pectins were only enhanced in water-stressed *H. annuus* in a similar proportion to cellulose and hemicelluloses (Table 2). Additionally, the potential importance of pectins in determining ε adjustments has already been proposed (Moore et al. 2008, Solecka et al. 2008, Niinemets 2016) and Roig-Oliver et al. (2020) provided empirical evidence for this in grapevines. Surprisingly, *H. annuus* maintained ε under water deficit stress, while *G. biloba* – having kept pectins constant – drastically enhanced leaves rigidity once subjected to water deficit stress (Fig. 2D) as usually reported for other species (Bowman and Roberts 1985, Lo Gullo and Salleo 1988, Abrams 1990, Kloeppel et al. 1994). Although more experimental conditions should be tested to set concluding statements, our results suggest that ε adjustments in water-stressed *G. biloba* could be much more related to changes in leaf structure (i.e., decreased LA and enhanced LMA and LD) and hemicelluloses rather than to other cell wall components. However, while increased ε and LD have been proposed to involve reductions in *g*\(^m\) (Niinemets et al. 2009, Nadal et al. 2018), *G. biloba* was able to maintain *g*\(^m\) at control values under water deficit stress conditions. Oppositely, *H. annuus* differed from the previous strategy as leaf structure and cell wall composition changes were not reflected in ε modifications. Instead, increased AIR, cellulose, hemicelluloses, and pectins under water deficit stress were reflected as an increase in *a*\(_i\) and *C*\(^*n\) (Fig. 2E, F).

Table 2. Leaf cell wall composition of *Ginkgo biloba* and *Helianthus annuus* across conditions (CL – control, WS – water deficit stress). Average values ± SE are shown for alcohol insoluble residue (AIR), cellulose, hemicelluloses, and pectins contents. Species and treatments effects were quantified by two-way ANOVA and differences between groups were addressed by LSD test. Different superscript letters indicate significant differences. \(n = 5–6\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species and treatments</th>
<th>AIR [g g(^{-1}) (DM)]</th>
<th>Cellulose [mg g(^{-1}) (AIR)]</th>
<th>Hemicelluloses [mg g(^{-1}) (AIR)]</th>
<th>Pectins [mg g(^{-1}) (AIR)]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>G. biloba</em> – CL</td>
<td>0.16 ± 0.03(^a)</td>
<td>125.2 ± 12.9(^a)</td>
<td>176.5 ± 18.3(^a)</td>
<td>71.27 ± 6.52(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>G. biloba</em> – WS</td>
<td>0.19 ± 0.01(^a)</td>
<td>100.2 ± 11.6(^a)</td>
<td>261.4 ± 30.6(^a)</td>
<td>79.60 ± 4.16(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>H. annuus</em> – CL</td>
<td>0.09 ± 0.01(^b)</td>
<td>86.6 ± 8.8(^a)</td>
<td>79.7 ± 12.5(^a)</td>
<td>73.09 ± 12.09(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>H. annuus</em> – WS</td>
<td>0.15 ± 0.01(^a)</td>
<td>128.7 ± 5.2(^a)</td>
<td>156.2 ± 9.8(^b)</td>
<td>103.68 ± 3.45(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species:Treatments</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3. Representative micrographs from semi-fine (left) and ultra-fine (right) cross-sections taken at 200× and at 1,500× magnifications, respectively, for *Ginkgo biloba* (A,B) and *Helianthus annuus* (C,D) under control and water deficit stress conditions, respectively. Black scale bars = 100 µm. Detailed quantitative analyses of studied anatomical parameters are reported in Table 1.
To our knowledge, this study provides the first evidence on how changes in cell wall main composition may play a role in determining different strategies to face water deficit stress by adjustments in ε and/or \( g_s \) testing species from different phylogenetic groups. Contrary to Clemente-Moreno et al. (2019) and Roig-Oliver et al. (2020), in the two species studied here, water deficit stress induced changes in cell wall composition that did not affect \( g_s \) and photosynthesis, but differently modified water relations parameters. Thus, more detailed studies using a larger range of species and treatments are required for a better understanding of how cell wall composition – including other cell wall compounds such as lignins and cell wall-bound phenolics – can involve changes in leaf physiology and to what extent these responses are species-dependent and/or change across plants phylogeny.
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