ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Assessing drought tolerance in feld‑grown sunfower hybrids by chlorophyll fuorescence kinetics

Nuran Çiçek¹ • Veli Pekcan² • Özlem Arslan³ • Şeküre Çulha Erdal¹ • Ayşe Suna Balkan Nalçaiyi⁴ • Ayşe Nuran Çil⁵ • **Vakas Şahin5 · Yalçın Kaya6 · Yasemin Ekmekçi1**

Received: 15 January 2019 / Accepted: 4 May 2019 / Published online: 3 June 2019 © Botanical Society of Sao Paulo 2019

Abstract

Drought is one of the most damaging abiotic stress factors commonly experienced by plants, resulting in a signifcant loss of crop yield worldwide. The aim of the study was to assess drought tolerance of sunfower (*Helianthus annuus*) hybrids and fnd out potentially underlying photobiological traits. Experiment was conducted in the agricultural feld of Eastern Mediterranean Agricultural Research Institute in Adana. To evaluate the drought tolerance of twenty-six sunfower hybrids polyphasic chlorophyll fuorescence measurements were performed at the three growth stages named as vegetative, head formation and milky seed (stress 1, S1; stress 2, S2; stress 3, S3, respectively). The hybrids were classifed from drought tolerant to drought sensitive based on their drought factor index (DFI) values calculated from photosynthetic performance index. 9444 A X 9947 R and 9444 A X 8129 R were determined as the most tolerant hybrids, whereas 2453 A X 8129 R and 7751 A X TT 135 R were determined as the most sensitive hybrids. Severe drought stress (S2) inhibited severely both the donor and the acceptor sides of photosystem II in sensitive hybrids. Photosynthetic structures of drought-tolerant hybrids were less damaged by drought stress, consequently these hybrids could maintain their photosynthetic performances (minor changes in φ_{Po} , ψ_o , δ_{Ro} , specific and/or phenomenological energy fluxes) approximately control levels under severe drought condition. As a result, results, 9444 A X 9947 R and 9444 A X 8129 R hybrids could be recommended to be used in the breeding programs and further studies as genetic material and to be grown in drought-prone areas.

Keywords *Helianthus annuus* · JIP test · OJIP fuorescence transient · Photochemical activity · Water stress

 \boxtimes Yasemin Ekmekçi yase@hacettepe.edu.tr

- ¹ Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Hacettepe University, 06800 Beytepe, Ankara, Turkey
- ² Trakya Agricultural Research Institute, PO Box 16, 22100 Edirne, Turkey
- ³ Espiye Vocational School, Giresun University, Giresun, Turkey
- Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics, Faculty of Science, Necmettin Erbakan University, 42090 Meram, Konya, Turkey
- ⁵ Eastern Mediterranean Agricultural Research Institute, Karatas Yolu 17.km., Dogankent, Yuregir, PO Box 45, Adana, Turkey
- ⁶ Agricultural Research Institute, Trakya University, Edirne, Turkey

1 Introduction

Sunfower (*Helianthus annuus*) is one of the most important oilseed crops in the world. Seeds of sunfower have 40–50% oil and, 17–20% protein, which have a potential to close the gap between production and consumption of edible oil and animal feed around the world (Hussain et al. [2018\)](#page-9-0). It has been reported that approximately 47 million tons of sunfower seeds were produced in 2016 (FAOSTAT [2018](#page-9-1)). Sunfower, the second largest hybrid crop and the ffth largest oilseed crop, is grown globally and performs well in the most temperate climates (Seiler et al. [2017](#page-10-0)). Climate change and its impacts on life are among the most popular research topics. According to climate scenario, it is predicted that the crop production and yield will be limited and continue to decrease in the future (Hussain et al. [2018\)](#page-9-0).

Abiotic environmental stresses afect almost every aspect of plant physiology and metabolism. Drought stress is among the most detrimental abiotic stress factors commonly experienced by plants, resulting in a signifcant loss of crop yield worldwide. Therefore, the identifcation/selection of tolerant plant species to water shortage conditions is a primary requisite. Searching out the physiological mechanisms underlying the response of plants to drought stress and discovering the traits that are giving drought tolerance provide new and powerful tools in breeding programs (Farooq et al. [2009](#page-9-2); Osakabe et al. [2014;](#page-10-1) Fracasso et al. [2016](#page-9-3)).

Plants perceive the drought, one of the most detrimental environmental factors on plant growth and productivity, and generate some physiological, metabolic and molecular responses. These responses include decline in shoot elongation, decrease in photosynthetic activity, change in osmotic adjustment, carbohydrate status and antioxidant systems, accumulation of compatible solutes and, regulation in hormonal signaling (such as abscisic acid) and gene expression (Ekmekçi et al. [2005;](#page-9-4) Chaves et al. [2009;](#page-9-5) Pinheiro and Chaves [2011](#page-10-2)). The acclimation responses to drought stress are cultivar dependent and related to plant developmental stage (Flexas and Medrano [2002](#page-9-6); Zivcak et al. [2013](#page-11-0)). Acclimation responses are also related with severity and intensity of drought and exposure time to the stress (Chaves et al. [2009;](#page-9-5) Pinheiro and Chaves [2011](#page-10-2)). Efects of drought on photosynthetic activity of plants can be observed directly or indirectly (Zivcak et al. [2013](#page-11-0)). Drought causes stomata closure (direct effect) leading to decline in carbon assimilation and/or net photosynthetic rate (Reddy et al. [2004](#page-10-3); Sperdouli and Moustakas [2014\)](#page-10-4). Non-stomatal effects (indirect effect) infuence photosynthetic process by down-regulating electron transport, decreasing rubisco synthesis, inhibiting rubisco activity, reducing ATP synthesis, decreasing in Ribulose 1,5-bisphosphate (RuBP) regeneration and chlorophyll synthesis (Reddy et al. [2004](#page-10-3); Zivcak et al. [2013](#page-11-0)). Plants respond

diferently to the stress conditions depending on the adaptation mechanisms. The responses of plants to drought vary widely not only among species, but also among the genotypes of a given species. Genotypes grown under drought stress can be screened and classifed by measuring photosynthetic performance. Chlorophyll *a* fuorescence measurement is one of the methods for measuring photosynthetic efficiencies in stressed or non-stressed plants (Oukarroum et al. [2007;](#page-10-5) Goltsev et al. [2012](#page-9-7), [2016](#page-9-8); Kalaji et al. [2016a,](#page-9-9) [b](#page-9-10)) and has been used to investigate the efects of various abiotic stress factors, such as drought or excess amounts of water, salt stress, mineral nutrient defciency and toxicity and temperature stress (low or high). (Naumann et al. [2008;](#page-10-6) Ceppi et al. [2012;](#page-9-11) Öz et al. [2014](#page-10-7); Brestic et al. [2016](#page-9-12); Kan et al. [2017](#page-10-8); Askri et al. [2018;](#page-9-13) Çiçek et al. [2018;](#page-9-14) Kalaji et al. [2018a](#page-10-9), [b\)](#page-10-10). This rapid and nondestructive technique measures photosynthetic electron transport rate and gives insight into light energy utilization (Oukarroum et al. [2018;](#page-10-11) Stirbet et al. [2018](#page-10-12) and references therein). Illuminating dark-adapted photosynthetic samples exhibit polyphasic fuorescence transients (OJIP transient) which can be plotted on logarithmic scale. Besides, the shape of the OJIP fuorescence transient curves under diferent environmental conditions could change because of physiological situation of the sample. Strasser and Strasser ([1995\)](#page-10-13) introduced the JIP test to analyze the OJIP transients and it provides information related to structural and functional parameters that quantify the efficiency of photosynthetic apparatus (Yusuf et al. [2010](#page-10-14)). JIP test depends strongly on the assumption that $F_{\rm O}$ – $F_{\rm M}$ rise reflects the reduction in $Q_{\rm A}$ (Kalaji et al. [2014](#page-9-15)). The rise from F_{O} to F_{M} has several phases, like O–J–I–P, and these phases are related to the functionality of PSII acceptor and donor sides (Goltsev et al. [2016\)](#page-9-8). The O–J represents the reduction in the acceptor side of PSII (and also gives information on the connectivity between the PSII photosynthetic units), the J–I relates to the partial reduction in the PQ pool and the I–P refects the reduction in the acceptor side of PSI (Yusuf et al. [2010;](#page-10-14) Ripoll et al. [2016](#page-10-15)). Many parameters can be calculated from the data obtained by measurements: (1) efficiencies and quantum yields; i.e., maximum quantum yield of primary PSII photochemistry (F_V/F_M) , efficiency with which a PSII-trapped electron is transferred from Q^- to PQ (ψ _o), quantum yield for electron transport (φ _{Eo}) and the quantum yield for the reduction in PSI end electron acceptors per photon absorbed (φ_{R_0}) ; (2) specific fluxes; i.e., the absorption/antenna size (ABS/RC), maximum trapping (TRo/ RC), electrons transferred (ETo/RC) and dissipation (DIo/ RC) per active PSII. (3) Phenomenological energy fuxes; i.e., the absorption (ABS/CSo), maximum trapping (TRo/CSo), electron fuxes transferred (ETo/CSo) and amount of active PSII RCs (RC/CSo) per cross section. (4) The most sensitive JIP parameters, performance indexes (PI_{ABS} and PI_{Total}) (Strasser et al. [2000](#page-10-16), [2010;](#page-10-17) Hermans et al. [2003](#page-9-16); Oukarroum et al. [2007;](#page-10-5) Zivcak et al. [2008](#page-11-1); Boureima et al. [2012;](#page-9-17) Chen

et al. [2016](#page-9-18); Banks [2018;](#page-9-19) Kalaji et al. [2018b](#page-10-10)). In addition to that some JIP parameters give information about the PSII donor side; i.e., the fraction of the active OEC centers and, inactivation and damage of OEC (V_K/V_I) .

This study was a part of National Sunfower Hybrid Breeding Project carried out by Trakya Agriculture Research Institute (TARI, Republic of Turkey Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock), which is the only local supplier of the Turkey's sunfower. Firstly, ffty main and restorer lines were tested under drought conditions and drought-tolerant lines were determined (Pekcan et al. [2015](#page-10-18); Kaya et al. [2016\)](#page-10-19). Later, test hybrids were developed from drought-tolerant parent lines in 2015. Finally, this study was carried out in 2016. The purpose of the study was to investigate the drought tolerance of sunfower hybrids by polyphasic fuorescence kinetics, screen the hybrids and fnd out potential underlying mechanisms in terms of photosynthetic process.

2 Materials and methods

Experimental setup – Experiment was established in the agricultural feld of Eastern Mediterranean Agricultural Research Institute in Adana, Turkey. The soil properties of the experiment feld and some climatic characteristics during growth period in Adana are given in Tables [1](#page-2-0) and [2](#page-2-1), respectively. Twenty-six sunfower hybrids (*Helianthus annuus*) were used in the study (Table [3](#page-3-0)). Seeds of hybrids were sown on March 24, 2016, and plants were harvested on August 23, 2016, in the experimental plot. There were four rows in a plot which had 7.5 m long and, the distances in each row and between rows were 30×70 cm. Five seeds were sown in each row. The experiment was conducted under a randomized complete

block design with three replicates. Seedlings were separated into groups: control and drought stress treatments. When control plants were irrigated regularly and soil moisture was maintained approximately 404.49 mm, stressed plants were not irrigated and were left to natural conditions. Soil moisture was determined by gravimetric method (Delibaş [1994;](#page-9-20) Robock et al. [2000\)](#page-10-20). The values of soil moisture are given in Table [2](#page-2-1).

Measurements $-$ To ascertain the drought effects on the photochemical efficiency, chlorophyll a fluorescence measurements were performed. Polyphasic chlorophyll, a fuorescence measurement, was carried out on the fully developed leaves in each treatment by the Handy-PEA fluorimeter (Plant Efficiency Analyzer, Hansatech Instruments Ltd, Kings Lynn, UK) as described previously (Strasser and Strasser [1995](#page-10-13); Strasser et al. [2010;](#page-10-17) Oukarroum et al. [2015\)](#page-10-21). Measurements were made at three diferent growth stages; R-3 [vegetative, stress 1 (S1)], R5-1 [head formation, stress 2 (S2)] and R-6 [milky seed, stress 3 (S3)]. After at least 30 min adaptation to darkness, leaves were illuminated with three light emitting diodes providing a pulse of saturating light intensity of 3000 µmol m⁻² s⁻¹. Data, recorded between 10 µs and 1 s, were used to calculate some JIP test parameters. As mentioned before, JIP test is based on a proposed theory of energy fuxes in biomembranes (Strasser [1978](#page-10-22); Strasser et al. [2000\)](#page-10-16) and can be utilized to screen many samples quickly and to provide information about the structure, conformation and function of their photosynthetic apparatus (Strasser and Strasser [1995\)](#page-10-13). The equations and calculations for specifc energy fuxes (per reaction center, RC) and phenomenological energy fuxes (per excited cross section, CS), as well as for fux ratios or yields, are given in Table [4.](#page-4-0) In addition, the drought factor index (DFI) was calculated by utilizing photosynthetic performance index (PI_{ABS}) according to Oukarroum et al. [\(2007\)](#page-10-5) and Boureima et al. ([2012\)](#page-9-17) with minor modifcations.

Table 1 Soil properties of the feld which sunfower hybrids were grown

Table 2 Some climatic data during growth period in Adana and the moisture of feld soil which were left to natural conditions

Table 3 Sunfower hybrids were used in the study

Genotype number	Genotypes	DFI	Order
25	9444 $A \times 9947 R$	0.02	1
26	9444 $A \times 8129$ R	-0.02	$\overline{2}$
24	9444 $A \times TT$ 135 R	-0.49	3
23	9444 A \times CL 217 R	-0.75	$\overline{4}$
3	P 64 G 46	-0.76	5
20	9814 A \times CL 217 R	-0.77	6
$\mathbf{1}$	TUNCA	-0.83	7
18	7751 A×9947 R	-1.04	8
11	9209 $A \times TT$ 135 R	-1.07	9
2	BOSFORA	-1.08	10
19	9814 A \times TT 135 R	-1.32	11
10	2453 A \times CL 217 R	-1.59	12
13	$9209 A \times 8129 R$	-1.64	13
6	2453 A \times TT 135 R	-1.74	14
16	7751 A \times CL 217 R	-1.76	15
21	9814 A × 9947 R	-1.84	16
17	7751 A × 9979 R	-1.85	17
8	2453 A × 9979 R	-1.91	18
$\overline{4}$	LG 5485	-1.94	19
12	9209 $A \times 9947 R$	-2.02	20
15	7751 A × 8129 R	-2.03	21
5	CORAL	-2.03	22
22	$9814 A \times 9979 R$	-2.11	23
7	2453 A×9947 R	-2.20	24
9	2453 $A \times 8129$ R	-2.22	25
14	7751 $A \times TT$ 135 R	-2.98	26

Bold were selected the most tolerant and sensitive hybrids according to their drought factor indexes

Hybrids were screened and ranked according to their Drought Factor Indexes (DFI, its equation and calculation was explained in material and methods section)

$DFI = log A + 4 log B + 2 log C$

where A is the relative PI_{ABS} measured at the R-3 (vegetative stage-S1), *B* the relative PI_{ABS} measured at the R5-1 (head formation-S2) and *C* the relative PI_{ABS} measured at the R-6 (milky seed-S3). The relative PI_{ABS} for each treatment was calculated as PI_{ABS} drought stressed/ PI_{ABS} control. It has been seen that the minimum rainfalls were about in June– July, having looked at Table [2,](#page-2-1) and hybrids were exposed to severe drought stress during S2 period. Therefore, this is the reason why four factors for B are given in formulae. DFI is a reliable indicator used for evaluating and categorizing the drought tolerance of many plants, as well as sunfower (Boureima et al. [2012;](#page-9-17) Kaya et al. [2016\)](#page-10-19).

Statistical analysis – The study was conducted in a completely randomized block design with three replicates.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the data (five replicates of each measurement) was performed using SPSS 20.0 software (IBM SPSS Statistics), and the significance of differences between treatments and hybrids was compared with LSD's test at $P < 0.05$. The four rows plots were 7.5 m long with the 70×30 cm plant spacing.

3 Results and discussion

Photosynthesis is one of the primary processes for growth, development and biomass production of plants. The efficiency of this process depends on the environmental conditions, as well as plant's genetic code. Environmental stresses may infuence all the steps from light energy absorption to electron transfer to fnal acceptors (Ripoll et al. [2016](#page-10-15)) and, drought is the major stress factor that cause destructive efects on photosynthetic performance of plants. The sunflower, which is the most important source of edible oil, is a moderately drought-tolerant crop (Hussain et al. [2018](#page-9-0)). However, most of the hybrids examined in the present study have been negatively affected by drought (Fig. [1](#page-5-0)). The state of the photosynthetic processes in sunfower hybrids subjected to diferent drought conditions was analyzed by means of measuring chlorophyll a fuorescence and applying JIP test. Performance index (PI_{ABS}) of hybrids, an indicator of plant vitality and usually used to evaluate physiological state of the sample, was adversely afected from stress treatments, except 9444 A \times 9947 R (25) and 9444 A \times 8129 R (26) hybrids (Fig. [1](#page-5-0)). Strauss et al. ([2006](#page-10-23)) and Oukarroum et al. (2007) (2007) reported that the PI_{ABS} can be a sensitive parameter for assessing a large number of hybrids for stress tolerance. The hybrids were sorted from drought tolerant to drought sensitive based on their DFI values calculated from PI_{ARS} and, 9444 A \times 9947 R and 9444 A \times 8129 R hybrids exhibited better performance (highest DFI, 0.02 to −0.02) under drought conditions, whereas 2453 $A \times 8129$ R and 7751 A×TT 135 R hybrids exhibited lower performance (lowest DFI, -2.22 to -2.98) (Table [3\)](#page-3-0). Meanwhile, the relative deviation of PI_{ABS} values $[ΔPI_{ABS}=((PI_{ABS} - PI_{ABS})$ $\langle \text{stress} \rangle / \text{PI}_{\text{ABS control}}$ \rangle \times 100] for each genotype was examined to reveal the hybrids' responses to severe water defcit conditions (stress 2 period, Fig. [2](#page-6-0)). Two groups of hybrids can be seen in Fig. [2](#page-6-0): (1) ΔPI_{ABS} < 0, including 9444 A \times 9947 R and 9444 A×8129 R (-5.35 to -10.02 , tolerant hybrids), and (2) $\Delta PI_{\rm ABS} > 0$, 2453 A \times 8129 R and 7751 A \times TT 135 R (67.32–75.12, sensitive hybrids). According to Boureima et al. (2012) (2012) (2012) , if relative deviation of PI_{ABS} of sample is lower than zero (ΔPI_{ABS} < 0), hybrids perform better than control under stress condition, and if ΔPI_{ABS} of sample is higher than zero ($\Delta PI_{\rm ABS} > 0$), hybrids perform worse under stress condition.

Technical fluorescence parameters	Definition	
$F_{\rm o}$	Initial fluorescence intensity, when all PSII RCs are open	
F_{300}	Fluorescence intensity at $300 \mu s$	
$F_{\rm J}$	Fluorescence intensity at the J-step (at 2 ms)	
$F_{\rm I}$	Fluorescence intensity at the I-step (at 30 ms)	
$F_{\rm M}$	Maximal fluorescence intensity, when all PSII RCs are closed	
$V_{\rm J}$	$(F_{2ms} - F_o)/(F_M - F_o)$, relative variable fluorescence at the J-step (2 ms)	
$V_{\rm I}$	$(F_{30ms} - F_0)/(F_M - F_0)$, relative variable fluorescence at the I-step (30 ms)	
$V_{\rm K}$	$(F_{300us} - F_0)/(F_M - F_0)$, relative variable fluorescence at the K-step (300 µs)	
Mo or (dV/dt) o	$4(F_{300us} - F_0)/(F_M - F_0)$, initial slope (in ms ⁻¹) of the O-J fluorescence rise	
Sm	Area/ $(F_M - F_o)$, normalized area between the OJIP curve and the line $F = F_M$, which is a proxy of the number of electron carriers per electron transport chain	
OEC	$[1-(V_K/V_J)]_{\text{treated}}/[1-(V_K/V_J)]_{\text{control}}$, fraction of oxygen-evolving complexes (OEC)	
$V_{\rm K}/V_{\rm J}$	Limitation/inactivation and possibly damage of the oxygen-evolving complex	
Efficiencies and quantum yields		
$TRo/ABS = \varphi_{PQ}$	$F_{\rm V}/F_{\rm M}$, maximum quantum yield of primary PSII photochemistry	
$ETo/ABS = \varphi_{Eo}$	$\varphi_{\rm Po}$ × $\Psi_{\rm o}$, quantum yield for electron transport from $Q_{\rm A}$ to PQ	
$ETo/TRo = \Psi_0$	$1 - V_J$, efficiency with which a PSII-trapped electron is transferred from Q_A^- to PQ	
$\varphi_{\rm Do} = 1 - \varphi_{\rm Po}$	$F_{\rm o}/F_{\rm M}$, the quantum efficiency of energy dissipation	
$RE/ETo = \delta_{Ro}$	$(1 - V_1)/(1 - V_1)$, the efficiency with which an electron from PQH ₂ is transferred to final PSI acceptors	
$REo/ABS = \varphi_{Ro}$	$\varphi_{P_0} \times \Psi_0 \times \delta_{R_0}$, the quantum yield of electron transport from Q_A^- to the PSI end electron acceptors	
$RC/ABS = \gamma_{RC}/(1 - \gamma_{RC})$	Q_A reducing RCs per PSII antenna chlorophyll (reciprocal of ABS/RC)	
Specific fluxes (per active PSII)		
ABS/RC	$(Mo/VJ)/\varphi_{Po}$, apparent antenna size of an active PSII	
TRo/RC	Mo/VJ , maximum trapped exciton flux per active PSII	
${\rm ETo/RC}$	$(Mo/VJ) \times \Psi_o$, the flux of electrons transferred from QA to PQ per active PSII	
DI _o /RC	ABS/RC – TRo/RC, the flux of energy dissipated in processes other than trapping per active PSII	
Phenomenological energy fluxes (per CS)		
ABS/CSo $\approx F_{o}$	Absorbed photon flux per CS	
TRo/CSo	$(TRo/ABS) \times (ABS/CSo)$, maximum trapped exciton flux per CS	
ETo/CSo	$(ETo/ABS) \times (ABS/CSo)$, the flux of electrons from Q_A^- to PQ per CS	
RC/CS _o	$\varphi_{\rm Po} \times (V_{\rm J}/\rm Mo) \times F_{\rm o}$, amount of active PSII RCs per CS	
Performance indexes		
PI_{ABS}	$(RC/ABS) \times [\varphi_{PQ}(1-\varphi_{PQ})] \times [\Psi_{Q}(1-\Psi_{Q})]$	
SFI	$(RC/ABS) \times \varphi_{PQ} \times \Psi_Q$, an indicator of PSII 'structure and functioning'	
PI _{Total}	$(RC/ABS) \times (\varphi_{Po}/(1-\varphi_{Po})) \times (\Psi_o/(1-\Psi_o)) \times (\delta_{Ro}/(1-\delta_{Ro}))$, Performance index (potential) for energy conservation from photons absorbed by PSII to the reduction in PSI end acceptors	

Table 4 Defnitions, explanations and calculations of the JIP test parameters used in the present study (Tsimilli-Michael and Strasser [2008;](#page-10-24) Goltsev et al. [2016;](#page-9-8) Ripoll et al. [2016](#page-10-15); Stirbet et al. [2018](#page-10-12))

To clarify and evaluate the drought stress efect on sunfower plant, some JIP test parameters of four hybrids [with two lowest DFI values, 2453 $A \times 8129$ R and 7751 $A \times TT$ 135 R (sensitive) and two highest DFI values, 9444 A \times 9947 R and 9444 $A \times 8129$ R (tolerant)] suffered from severe drought condition were analyzed. The maximum quantum yield of PSII (F_V/F_M , φ_{Po}), one of the PI_{Total} components, significantly decreased in 2453 A \times 8129 R and 7751 A \times TT 135 R under severe drought condition (Fig. [3](#page-6-1)). While the efficiency with which a PSII-trapped electron is transferred from Q_A^- to PQ (ψ_0), another PI_{Total} component, similarly to F_V/F_M , decreased same hybrids; Q_A reducing RCs per

PSII antenna chlorophyll (RC/ABS), other component of the parameter, signifcantly increased under severe drought stress (Fig. 3). The efficiency with which an electron from PQH_2 is transferred to final PSI acceptors, (δ_{R_0}) final component of PI_{Total} , declined markedly in sensitive hybrids and increased significantly in 9444 $A \times 8129$ R (Fig. [3](#page-6-1)). As a result, PI_{ABS} and PI_{Total} , which provide valuable information about plant performance and vitality, decreased signifcantly in drought-stressed leaves in sensitive sunfower hybrids (2453 $A \times 8129$ R and 7751 $A \times TT$ 135 R), when those parameters in stressed conditions exhibited closer values to control levels in tolerant hybrids $(9444 A \times 9947)$

Fig. 1 Changes in the photosynthetic performance indexes (PI_{ABS}) of 26 sunflower hybrids exposed to drought stress. The inset: normalized values of PI_{ABS} and their mean (line) of hybrids at the three measurement times (i.e., drought stress periods). June–July received the lowest precipitation, and therefore, this period has been accepted as severe drought stress

R and 9444 $A \times 8129$ R). These results are consistent with previous studies' results, in which better performer plants under stress conditions have higher indexes values than others (Oukarroum et al. [2007](#page-10-5), [2009;](#page-10-25) Boureima et al. [2012](#page-9-17); Çiçek et al. [2015](#page-9-21); Umar and Siddiqui [2018\)](#page-10-26). Consequently, tolerant hybrids succeeded to sustain photosynthetic electron transport under drought compared to sensitive hybrids (Fig. [3\)](#page-6-1). These results are verifed with DFI results (Table [3](#page-3-0)).

Specific fluxes and parameters related to PSII donor side are presented in Fig. [4](#page-7-0). Specifc energy fux per RC for absorption (ABS/RC) exhibited an increase in sensitive sunfower hybrids, whereas tolerant hybrids maintained the absorption value at the control levels. According to Strasser et al. ([1999\)](#page-10-27), the change in the ABS/RC might indicate a change in the number of LHC complexes per PSII reaction center or could also be the result of changes in the relative amount of inactive RCs. The signifcant increase in sensitive hybrids might point out a decrease in the effective antenna size and could result from PSII inactivation. The fux of excitation energy trapped per RC (TRo/RC), the electron fux transferred per RC (ETo/RC) and the energy dissipation per RC (DIo/RC) also increased signifcantly in sensitive hybrids under severe stress condition (Fig. [4](#page-7-0)). Increase in energy dissipation implies the loss of absorbed excitation energy as heat and fuorescence and energy transfer to other systems rather than electron transport/photochemistry.

Moreover, an increase in the DIo/RC might also means the loss of connectivity between PSII units.

Amplitude of relative variable fluorescence of I–P, ΔV_{IP} (one of semiquantitative indicator for changes in the PSI content) and capacity of the intersystem pool to accept electron until full reduction in Q_A , Sm (the number of electron carriers), increased significantly in 9444 $A \times 8129$ R, while they decreased in other three hybrids (Fig. [4](#page-7-0)). On the contrary, the quantum efficiency of energy dissipation (φ_{Do}) significantly increased in 2453 A \times 8129 R and 7751 A \times TT 135 R hybrids under severe drought conditions (Fig. [4](#page-7-0)). Previous studies have demonstrated that the I–P amplitude of the OJIP transient is sensitive to stress treatments including drought (Oukarroum et al. [2009;](#page-10-25) Ceppi et al. [2012](#page-9-11); Çiçek et al. [2015](#page-9-21), [2018;](#page-9-14) Jedmowski et al. [2015\)](#page-9-22). Schansker et al. ([2005](#page-10-28)) observed that the I–P phase is a refection of electron transfer through PSI in the presence of an inactive PSI acceptor side. For drought stress, it was shown that a loss of I–P amplitude correlates with the maximum light inducible 820 nm change (Oukarroum et al. [2009;](#page-10-25) Ceppi et al. [2012\)](#page-9-11). However, since we did not do 820 measurements here, we cannot not exclude that the decreased I–P amplitude is not only due to a loss of PSI but could also be due to loss of ferredoxin or maybe even more likely, a combination of both. Some conditions have been described in which no correlation between I–P amplitude and PSI content was observed. Zivcak et al. ([2015\)](#page-11-2) gave ninety 300 ms

pulses of 15,000 µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹ spaced 10 s apart which caused damage to PSI (and as well to PSII) and did not observe an efect on VIP. In the case of severe salt stress

the relationship between the I–P and PSI content is also lost (Çiçek et al. [2018\)](#page-9-14). Higher energy dissipation and lower I–P amplitude in 2453 A \times 8129 R and 7751 A \times TT 135 R **Fig. 4** Some selected JIP test parameters quantifying the behavior of PSII in four sunfower hybrids exposed to severe drought (S2) condition

hybrids suggest that these hybrids did not adequately protect their photosynthetic apparatus from drought and did not sustain their photosynthetic capability, whereas other two hybrids had better performance under the same condition.

Drought stress inhibited the donor side of PSII (OEC, V_K/V_I , F_V/F_O), especially in sensitive hybrids (Fig. [4](#page-7-0)). V_K/V_I , associated with possible damage and inactivation of the oxygen-evolving complex, signifcantly increased in 2453 $A \times 8129$ R and 7751 $A \times TT$ 135 R under drought condition. OEC, fraction of oxygen-evolving complexes, also decreased in same hybrids (Fig. [4\)](#page-7-0). Results of V_K/V_I represent inactivation in OEC. Drought-tolerant 9444 $A \times 9947$ R and 9444 $A \times 8129$ R hybrids achieved to maintain the value near the control levels. Brestic et al. ([2012\)](#page-9-23) determined a signifcant increase in V_K/V_I in wheat under higher temperatures. Some other studies can be found in the literature showing increased values of V_K/V_J under various stresses. Lu and Zhang ([1999](#page-10-29)) and Oukarroum et al. ([2009](#page-10-25)) demonstrated that F_K/F_I , associated parameter with V_K/V_I , was increased by high temperature and drought. It has been supposed that an increase in F_K/F_J (in other words, the decrease in the ratio of J-step/K-step) is a quantitative indicator which refects the inactivation of PSII donor side (Oukarroum et al. [2009](#page-10-25)). A similar result was obtained from the study with UV-B and Scot pine, which UV-B treatment caused the increase in V_K/V_I of Scot pine (Çiçek N, Kalaji HM and Ekmekçi Y, under review). In contrast to V_K/V_J , F_V/F_O , characterized the changes in water-splitting complex in PSII, signifcantly decreased in sensitive sunfower hybrids. It has been considered that the water-splitting complex is a very sensitive part of the photosynthetic electron transport chain (Pereira et al. [2000;](#page-10-30) Goltsev et al. [2016](#page-9-8)). The last parameter of Fig. [4](#page-7-0) is structure–function indexes; SFI(abs), structural and functional information about the strength of the infuence of internal factors promoting the reactions in PSII, remained at their control levels in tolerant hybrids, while it signifcantly decreased in sensitive hybrids under severe drought stress (stress 2). Oukarroum et al. ([2015](#page-10-21)) stated that changes in electron transport reactions (both donor and acceptor sides of photosystems) induce an increase in ROS formation.

Figure [5](#page-8-0) demonstrates the energy pipeline leaf model of phenomenological fuxes (per cross section, CS) of drought sensitive and tolerant sunfower hybrids. Each relative value is expressed by the appropriate adjustment of the width of the corresponding arrow. Decrease in PSII efficiencies has been seen in sensitive hybrids under drought condition. They had somewhat high number of energy dissipation (DIo/CSo) and low electron transport (ETo/CSo), as well as high inactive reaction centers (the black points) compared to the corresponding controls. However, phenomenological energy fuxes per excited cross sections of the leaves of tolerant hybrids achieved to maintain the control levels (Fig. [5](#page-8-0)). Kalaji et al. ([2011\)](#page-9-24) suggested that the accumulation of inactive reaction centers might be associated with the increase in heat dissipation of excitation energy under salt stress. In the present study, drought stress also caused the inactivation of reaction centers in sensitive sunfower hybrids and thus the absorbed energy was dissipated as heat (higher values of φ_{Do} , DIo/RC, DIo/CSo). However, tolerant hybrids were

Fig. 5 Phenomenological leaf models based on calculations of parameters per excited leaf cross section (CSo) for control and severe drought (S2)-stressed sunfower hybrid leaves. Each relative value is drawn by the width of corresponding arrow, representing the value of a parameter. The value of absorbance (ABS/CSo), trapping fux (TR/CSo), electron transport (ET/CSo) or heat dissipation of excess light (DI/CSo), all expressed per leaf cross section. The black points represent the fraction of inactive reaction centers

able to actively direct the absorbed energy to the electron transport, therefore exhibited more efficient photosynthetic activity.

In nature, drought and high temperature are concurrent environmental factors which affect negatively plant metabolism. Psidova et al. ([2018](#page-10-31)) have determined a tolerance to drought and high temperature in *Fagus sylvatica* and suggested that this tolerance was related to employ the alternative electron sinks to decrease the excitation pressure on photosystems as a photoprotective mechanism. In addition to that, Sperdouli and Moustakas ([2012\)](#page-10-32) have suggested that *Arabidopsis* young leaves achieved a drought tolerance by dissipating the excess excitation energy, consequently these leaves could protect their photosynthetic apparatus from possible photodamage. The sensitive genotypes exhibited lower photosynthetic capacity (low PI_{Total} , PI_{AdB} , ψ_o , δ_{Ro} and ΔV_{IP} and high V_K/V_I , dissipations), the tolerant genotypes showed better performance under drought condition in this study. Tolerant sunfower genotypes might drive this type alternative pathway to maintain the photosynthetic apparatus and functionality.

Abiotic stress factors including drought induce the changes in structural and functional properties of the photosynthetic apparatus, afecting the electron transport and excitation energy utilization. In this study, the efects of drought stress on photosynthetic efficiency of sunflower hybrids were assessed using polyphasic chlorophyll a fuorescence and JIP test. Fluorescence results have indicated that drought caused a decrease in the number of electron carriers (lower Sm), dissociation of the OEC from PSII, and lower phenomenological energy fuxes in sensitive hybrids. However, tolerant hybrids exhibited minor changes in their photosynthetic structure, electron transport efficiency and energy utilization. Consequently, the drought-tolerant hybrids (9444 $A \times 9947$ R and 9444 $A \times 8129$ R) which were identifed in this study could be utilized in breeding programs/practices and can further our understanding of genetic mechanisms under this drought-tolerant phenotype. Chlorophyll a fuorescence measurement allows the assessment of photosynthetic efficiency which is one of the main metabolic processes of plant life. We believe this technique can be utilized in breeding programs along with molecular techniques, a large number of hybrids in the feld condition.

Acknowledgements This work was supported by the Scientifc and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK, Project Number: 1001- 113O926).

Authors' contributions VP and YK designed the study and ANÇ and VŞ carried out the feld experiment. ÖA, ŞÇE and ASBN performed the chlorophyll fuorescence measurements. NÇ and YE analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript. We attest to the fact that all authors listed on the title page have contributed signifcantly to the work, have read the manuscript, attest to the validity and legitimacy of the data and its interpretation and agree to its submission to Brazilian Journal of Botany.

References

- Askri H, Gharbi F, Rejeb S, Mliki A, Ghorbel A (2018) Diferential physiological responses of Tunisian wild grapevines (*Vitis vinifera* L. subsp. *sylvestris*) to NaCl salt stress. Braz J Plant Physiol 41:795–804
- Banks JM (2018) Chlorophyll fuorescence as a tool to identify drought stress in Acer genotypes. Environ Exp Bot 155:118–127
- Boureima S, Oukarroum A, Diouf M, Cisse N, Van Damme P (2012) Screening for drought tolerance in mutant germplasm of sesame (*Sesamum indicum*) probing by chlorophyll a fuorescence. Environ Exp Bot 81:37–43
- Brestic M, Zivcak M, Kalaji HM, Carpentier R, Allakhverdiev SI (2012) Photosystem II thermostability in situ: environmentally induced acclimation and genotype-specifc reactions in *Triticum aestivum* L. Plant Physiol Biochem 57:93–105
- Brestic M, Zivcak M, Kunderlikova K, Allakhverdiev SI (2016) High temperature specifcally afects the photoprotective responses of chlorophyll b-defcient wheat mutant lines. Photosynth Res 130:251–266
- Ceppi MG, Oukarroum A, Çiçek N, Strasser RJ, Schansker G (2012) The IP amplitude of the fuorescence rise OJIP is sensitive to changes in the photosystem I content of leaves: a study on plants exposed to magnesium and sulphate defciencies, drought stress and salt stress. Physiol Plant 144:277–288
- Chaves MM, Flexas J, Pinheiro C (2009) Photosynthesis under drought and salt stress: regulation mechanisms from whole plant to cell. Ann Bot 103:551–560
- Chen S, Yang J, Zhang M, Strasser RJ, Qiang S (2016) Classifcation and characteristics of heat tolerance in *Ageratina adenophora* populations using fast chlorophyll a fuorescence rise O-J-I-P. Environ Exp Bot 122:126–140
- Çiçek N, Arslan Ö, Çulha-Erdal Ş, Eyidoğan F, Ekmekçi Y (2015) Are the photosynthetic performance indexes and the drought factor index satisfactory selection criterion for stress? Fresenius Environ Bull 24:4190–4198
- Çiçek N, Oukarroum A, Strasser RJ, Schansker G (2018) Salt stress efects on the photosynthetic electron transport chain in two chickpea lines difering in their salt stress tolerance. Photosynth Res 136:291–301
- Delibaş L (1994) Irrigation. Publication No: 213, Faculty of Agriculture, Trakya University, Tekirdağ, p 199 **(in Turkish)**
- Ekmekçi Y, Bohms A, Thomson JA, Mundree SG (2005) Photochemical and antioxidant responses in the leaves of *Xerophyta viscosa* Baker and *Digitaria sanguinalis* L. under water deficit. Z Naturforschung C 60:435–443
- FAOSTAT (2018) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation (FAO) statistical databases. [http://www.fao.org.](http://www.fao.org) Accessed 15 Dec 2018
- Farooq M, Wahid A, Kobayashi N, Fujita D, Basra SMA (2009) Plant drought stress: effects, mechanisms and management. Agron Sustain Dev 29:185–212
- Flexas J, Medrano H (2002) Drought-inhibition of photosynthesis in C3 plants: stomatal and non-stomatal limitations revisited. Ann Bot 89:183–189
- Fracasso A, Trindade L, Amaducci S (2016) Drought tolerance strategies highlighted by two *Sorghum bicolor* races in a dry-down experiment. J Plant Physiol 190:1–14
- Goltsev V, Zaharieva I, Chernev P, Kouzmanova M, Kalaji HM, Yordanov I, Krasteva V, Alexandrov V, Stefanov D, Allakhverdiev SI, Strasser RJ (2012) Drought-induced modifcations of photosynthetic electron transport in intact leaves: analysis and use of neural networks as a tool for a rapid non-invasive estimation. Biochim Biophys Acta 1817:1490–1498
- Goltsev VN, Kalaji HM, Paunov M, Baba W, Horaczek T, Mojski J, Kociel H, Allakhverdiev SI (2016) Variable chlorophyll fuorescence and its use for assessing physiological condition of plant photosynthetic apparatus. Russ J Plant Physiol 63:869–893
- Hermans C, Smeyers M, Rodriguez RM, Eyletters M, Strasser RJ, Delhaye JP (2003) Quality assessment of urban trees: a comparative study of physiological characterisation, airborne imaging and on site fuorescence monitoring by the OJIP-test. J Plant Physiol 160:81–90
- Hussain M, Farooq S, Hasan W, Ul-Allahd S, Tanveere M, Farooq M, Nawaz A (2018) Drought stress in sunflower: physiological effects and its management through breeding and agronomic alternatives. Agric Water Manag 201:152–166
- Jedmowski C, Ashoub A, Momtaz O, Brüggemann W (2015) Impact of drought, heat, and their combination on chlorophyll fuorescence and yield of wild barley (*Hordeum spontaneum*). J Bot. [https://](https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/120868) doi.org/10.1155/2015/120868
- Kalaji HM, Govindjee Bosa K, Koscielniak J, Zuk-Golaszewska K (2011) Effects of salt stress on photosystem II efficiency and $CO₂$ assimilation of two Syrian barley landraces. Environ Exp Bot 73:64–72
- Kalaji HM, Schansker G, Ladle RJ, Goltsev V, Bosa K, Allakhverdiev SI, Brestic M, Bussotti F, Calatayud A, Dąbrowski P, Elsheery NI, Ferroni L, Guidi L, Hogewoning SW, Jajoo A, Misra AN, Nebauer SG, Pancaldi S, Penella C, Poli D, Pollastrini M, Romanowska-Duda ZB, Rutkowska B, Serôdio J, Suresh K, Szulc W, Tambussi E, Yanniccari M, Zivcak M (2014) Frequently asked questions about in vivo chlorophyll fuorescence: practical issues. Photosynth Res 122:121–158
- Kalaji HM, Jajoo A, Oukarroum A, Brestic M, Zivcak M, Samborska IA, Cetner MD, Lukasik I, Goltsev V, Ladle RJ (2016a) Chlorophyll a fuorescence as a tool to monitor physiological status of plants under abiotic stress conditions. Acta Physiol Plant 38:102
- Kalaji HM, Schansker G, Brestic M, Bussotti F, Calatayud A, Ferroni L, Goltsev V, Guidi L, Jajoo A, Li P, Losciale P, Mishra VK, Misra AN, Nebauer SG, Pancaldi S, Penella C, Pollastrini M, Suresh K, Tambussi E, Yanniccari M, Zivcak M, Cetner MD, Samborska IA, Stirbet A, Olsovska K, Kunderlikova K, Shelonzek H, Szymon Rusinowski S, Baba W (2016b) Frequently asked questions about chlorophyll fuorescence, the sequel. Photosynth Res 132:13–66
- Kalaji HM, Rackova L, Paganova V, Swoczyna T, Rusinowski S, Sitko K (2018a) Can chlorophyll-a fuorescence parameters be used as bio-indicators to distinguish between drought and salinity stress in *Tilia cordata* Mill? Environ Exp Bot 152:149–157. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2017.11.001) [org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2017.11.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2017.11.001)
- Kalaji HM, Rastogi A, Zivcak M, Brestic M, Daszkowska-Golec A, Sitko K, Alsharafa KY, Lotf R, Stypinski P, Samborska IA, Cetner MD (2018b) Prompt chlorophyll fuorescence as a tool for crop phenotyping: an example of barley landraces exposed to various abiotic stress factors. Photosynthetica 56:953–961
- Kan X, Ren J, Chen T, Cui M, Li C, Zhou R, Zhang Y, Liu H, Deng D, Yin Z (2017) Effects of salinity on photosynthesis in maize probed by prompt fuorescence, delayed fuorescence and P700 signals. Environ Exp Bot 140:56–64
- Kaya Y, Balkan Nalcaiyi AS, Culha Erdal Ş, Arslan Ö, Cicek N, Pekcan V, Yilmaz Mİ, Evci G, Ekmekci Y (2016) Evaluation of male inbred lines of sunfower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) for resistance to drought via chlorophyll fuorescence. Turk J Field Crops 21:162–173
- Lu C, Zhang J (1999) Effect of water stress on photosystem II photochemistry and its thermostability in wheat plants. J Exp Bot 336:1199–1206
- Naumann JC, Young DR, Anderson JE (2008) Leaf chlorophyll fuorescence, refectance, and physiological response to freshwater and saltwater fooding in the evergreen shrub, *Myrica cerifera*. Environ Exp Bot 63:402–409
- Osakabe Y, Osakabe K, Shinozaki K, Tran LSP (2014) Response of plants to water stress. Front Plant Sci 5:1–8. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2014.00086) [org/10.3389/fpls.2014.00086](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2014.00086)
- Oukarroum A, Madidi SE, Schansker G, Strasser RJ (2007) Probing the responses of barley cultivars (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) by chlorophyll a fuorescence OLKJIP under drought stress and re-watering. Environ Exp Bot 60:438–446
- Oukarroum A, Schansker G, Strasser RJ (2009) Drought stress efects on photosystem I content and photosystem II thermotolerance analyzed using Chl a fuorescence kinetics in barley varieties difering in their drought tolerance. Physiol Plant 137:188–199
- Oukarroum A, Bussotti F, Goltsev V, Kalaji HM (2015) Correlation between reactive oxygen species production and photochemistry of photosystems I and II in *Lemna gibba* L. plants under salt stress. Environ Exp Bot 109:80–88
- Oukarroum A, Lebrihi A, El Gharous M, Goltsev V, Strasser RJ (2018) Desiccation-induced changes of photosynthetic transport in *Parmelina tiliacea* (Hofm.) Ach. analysed by simultaneous measurements of the kinetics of prompt fuorescence, delayed fuorescence and modulated 820 nm refection. J Lumin 198:302–308
- Öz MT, Turan Ö, Kayıhan C, Eyidoğan F, Ekmekçi Y, Yücel M, Öktem HA (2014) Evaluation of photosynthetic performance of wheat cultivars exposed to boron toxicity by the JIP fuorescence test. Photosynthetica 52:555-563
- Pekcan V, Evci G, Yilmaz MI, Balkan Nalcaiyi AS, Çulha Erdal Ş, Cicek N, Ekmekci Y, Kaya Y (2015) Drought efects on yield traits of some sunfower inbred lines. Agric For 61:101–107
- Pereira WE, de Siqueira DL, Martínez CA, Puiatti M (2000) Gas exchange and chlorophyll fuorescence in four citrus rootstocks under aluminium stress. J Plant Physiol 157:513–520
- Pinheiro C, Chaves MM (2011) Photosynthesis and drought: can we make metabolic connections from available data? J Exp Bot 62:869–882
- Psidova E, Zivcak M, Stojnic S, Orlovic S, Gömöry D, Kucerova J, Ditmarova L, Strelcova K, Brestic M, Kalaji HM (2018) Altitude of origin infuences the responses of PSII photochemistry to heat waves in European beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.). Environ Exp Bot 152:97–106
- Reddy AR, Chaitanya KV, Vivekanandan M (2004) Drought-induced responses of photosynthesis and antioxidant metabolism in higher plants. J Plant Physiol 161:1189–1202
- Ripoll J, Bertin N, Bidel LPR, Urban L (2016) A user's view of the parameters derived from the induction curves of maximal chlorophyll a fuorescence: perspectives for analyzing stress. Front Plant Sci 7:1679.<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2016.01679>
- Robock A, Vinnikov KY, Srinivasan G, Entin JK, HoIIinger SE, Speranskaya NA, Liu S, Namkhai A (2000) The global soil moisture data bank. Bull Am Meteorol Soc 81:1281–1299
- Schansker G, Toth SZ, Strasser RJ (2005) Methylviologen and dibromothymoquinone treatments of pea leaves reveal the role of photosystem I in the Chl a fuorescence rise OJIP. Biochim Biophys Acta 1706:250–261
- Seiler GJ, Qi LL, Marek LF (2017) Utilization of sunfower crop wild relatives for cultivated sunfower improvement. Crop Sci 57:1083–1101
- Sperdouli I, Moustakas M (2012) Diferential response of photosystem II photochemistry in young and mature leaves of *Arabidopsis thaliana* to the onset of drought stress. Acta Physiol Plant 34:1267–1276
- Sperdouli I, Moustakas M (2014) Leaf developmental stage modulates metabolite accumulation and photosynthesis contributing to acclimation of *Arabidopsis thaliana* to water deficit. J Plant Res 127:481–489
- Stirbet A, Lazár D, Kromdijk J, Govindjee (2018) Chlorophyll a fuorescence induction: can just a one-second measurement be used to quantify abiotic stress responses? Photosynthetica 56:86–104
- Strasser RJ (1978) The grouping model of plant photosynthesis. In: Akoyunoglou G, Argyroudi-Akoyunoglou JH (eds) Chloroplast development. Elsevier Biomedical Press, North-Holland, pp 513–538
- Strasser BJ, Strasser RJ (1995) Measuring ast fuorescence transients to address environmental questions: the JIP test. In: Mathis P (ed) Photosynthesis: from light to biosphere. Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, pp 977–980
- Strasser BJ, Dau H, Heinze I, Senger H (1999) Comparison of light induced and cell cycle dependent changes in the photosynthetic apparatus: a fluorescence induction study on the green alga *Scenedesmus obliquus*. Photosynth Res 60:217–227
- Strasser RJ, Srivastava A, Tsimilli-Michael M (2000) The fuorescence transient as a tool to characterize and screen photosynthetic samples. In: Yunus M, Pathre U, Mohanty P (eds) Probing photosynthesis: mechanisms, regulation and adaptation. Taylor & Francis, London, pp 443–480
- Strasser RJ, Tsimilli-Michael M, Qiang S, Goltsev V (2010) Simultaneous in vivo recording of prompt and delayed fuorescence and 820-nm refection changes during drying and after rehydration of the resurrection plant *Haberlea rhodopensis*. Biochim Biophys Acta 1797:1313–1326
- Strauss AJ, Krüger GHJ, Strasser RJ, Van Heerden PDR (2006) Ranking of dark chilling tolerance in soybean genotypes probed by the chlorophyll a fuorescence transient O–J–I–P. Environ Exp Bot 56:147–157
- Tsimilli-Michael M, Strasser RJ (2008) In vivo assessment of stress impact on plants' vitality: applications in detecting and evaluating the benefcial role of mycorrhization on host plants. In: Varma A (ed) Mycorrhiza: state of the art. Genetics and molecular biology, eco-function, biotechnology, eco-physiology, structure and systematics, Springer, Berlin, pp 679–703
- Umar M, Siddiqui ZS (2018) Physiological performance of sunfower genotypes under combined salt and drought stress environment. Acta Bot Croat 77:36–44
- Yusuf MD, Kumar D, Rajwanshi R, Strasser RJ, Tsimilli-Michael M, Govindjee Sarin NB (2010) Overexpression of γ-tocopherol methyl transferase gene in transgenic *Brassica juncea* plants

alleviates abiotic stress: physiological and chlorophyll a fuorescence measurements. Biochim Biophys Acta 1797:1428–1438

- Zivcak M, Brestic M, Olsovska K, Slamka P (2008) Performance index as a sensitive indicator of water stress in *Triticum aestivum* L. Plant Soil Environ 54:133–139
- Zivcak M, Brestic M, Balatova Z, Drevenakova P, Olsovska K, Kalaji MH, Allakhverdiev SI (2013) Photosynthetic electron transport and specifc photoprotective responses in wheat leaves under drought stress. Photosynth Res 117:529–546
- Zivcak M, Brestic M, Kunderlikova K, Olsovska K, Allakhverdiev SI (2015) Efect of photosystem I inactivation on chlorophyll a fuorescence induction in wheat leaves: does activity of photosystem I play any role in OJIP rise? J Photochem Photobiol B 152:318–324

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.