

Cell type-specific transcriptional responses of plants to salinity

A dissertation submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of
Sciences at the University of Adelaide and Montpellier SupAgro

Thesis directors: Professor Mark Tester
Doctor Hervé Sentenac

AURELIE EVRARD

Biochimie and physiologie moléculaire des plantes, Montpellier
Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics, Adelaide

November 2012

Declaration

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

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

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

Aurelie EVRARD

November 2012

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my two principal supervisors, Prof Mark Tester and Dr Hervé Sentenac for their support and advice during the course of this study. I am particularly indebted to my co-supervisor Dr Ute Baumann for her support, encouragement, direction and patience from the first hour of the first day of this PhD. I also thank Dr Alexander Johnson for his support and for allowing me to undertake part of this project in New York.

The generous financial support from the Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics is gratefully acknowledged.

I wish to thank Dr. Ken Birnbaum for hosting me in his laboratory at New York University and Dr. Bastiaan Bargmann for his advice in the lab and both for their contributions to the current manuscript (and the future ones).

Many thanks to the Salt group members and Gwen in microscopy for their assistance, friendship and good sense of humor. Special thanks to the ACPFG admin team for their assistance with any paperwork and more generally of any kind. Thanks to the ACPFG members in general, The Plant Accelerator members for their support and their help. Thanks to the “Canaux” group members in France for your support, humor and advice during the months I spent in Montpellier.

I wish to thank my housemates Michael, Neka and Jon and my friends from Europe, thank you all to keep me sane, especially at the end. Thanks to Bec and Margaret Cargill for their assistance and advice in English writing. Special thanks are due for Julien, Nathan, Delphine, Ashley, Hanne, John, Julian, Melissa, Cecile, Ben, Carol Ann, Andrea, Darren, Jodie, Li and Mahima for your presence, support and smiles over the past few months, it means a lot to me.

Finally, my biggest thanks will go to my parents for their support and encouragements over these three long years and the last, but not the least, thanks to my sister who has always understood and encouraged me.

Table of contents

DECLARATIONI

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS II

TABLE OF CONTENTSIII

ABSTRACT.....IX

RESUME X

LIST OF FIGURES XII

LISTS OF TABLES..... XV

LISTS OF ABBREVIATIONS XVI

CHAPTER 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW..... 1

1.1 Salinity stress..... 1

 1.1.1 Soil salinity around the world and Australia 1

 1.1.2 Sodium toxicity in plants 2

 1.1.2.1 Plants vary in salinity tolerance 2

 1.1.2.2 The two phases of the salt response in plants: osmotic and ionic 3

 1.1.3 Salinity tolerance mechanisms 4

 1.1.3.1 Osmotic stress tolerance 4

 1.1.3.2 Tissue tolerance 9

 1.1.3.3 Sodium exclusion from shoots 10

 1.1.4 Importance of different cell types in salinity tolerance 12

 1.1.4.1 Root cells important for sodium accumulation in shoots 12

 1.1.4.2 Proof of concept: cell type-specific expression of key sodium transporters 13

1.2 The two model plants of this salinity study 15

 1.2.1 The Arabidopsis dicotyledon model 15

 1.2.1.1 Genetic model 15

 1.2.1.2 Root architecture 16

 1.2.2 The Oryza sativa monocotyledon model 17

 1.2.2.1 An important source of food and its world distribution 17

 1.2.2.2 Genetic model for cereals 18

 1.2.2.3 Root architecture 19

 1.2.3 Choice of the two root cell types in this study 22

1.3 Gene expression analysis	23
1.3.1 Affymetrix microarrays.....	23
1.3.2 Transcriptomic studies under salt stress.....	24
1.3.2.1 Whole plant or organ level	24
1.3.2.2 Appropriateness of the salinity treatment applied in transcriptomic studies	26
1.3.3 Cell type specific transcriptome studies.....	28
1.3.3.1 Isolation of the cells of interest	28
1.3.3.2 Root cell type transcription profiles for Arabidopsis and rice.....	30
1.3.3.3 Cell type-specific salt stress responses.....	32
1.4 Aim of the work in this thesis.....	33
 CHAPTER 2 GENERAL METHODS.....	 35
Fluorescence-activated cell sorting for analysis of cell type-specific responses to salinity stress in Arabidopsis and rice	35
 CHAPTER 3: TRANSCRIPTIONAL RESPONSES OF ARABIDOPSIS THALIANA PERICYCLE AND CORTICAL CELLS TO SALINITY.....	 49
3.1 Introduction.....	49
3.2 Materials & methods	50
3.2.1 Plant material and growth conditions	50
3.2.1.1 <i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i> GFP reporter lines used in microarrays experiments	50
3.2.1.2 Growth conditions for imaging	50
3.2.1.3 Quantitative PCR growth conditions	51
3.2.2 Microarray experiments	51
3.2.2.1 Protoplasts sorting using Fluorescently Activated Cells Sorting (FACS)	51
3.2.2.2 RNA extraction and cDNA amplification	51
3.2.2.3 Hybridization, washing and scanning.....	51
3.2.3 Validation of gene expression by quantitative PCR.....	52
3.2.3.1 RNA extraction, FACS and cDNA amplification	52
3.2.3.2 Quantitative PCR validation.....	52
3.2.4 Bioinformatic analysis of microarrays	54
3.2.4.1 Quality control and array data analysis	54
3.2.4.2 Bioinformatic software used for categorization and over-representation of responsive genes.....	55
3.3 Results.....	56
3.3.1 Microarray hybridisation and validation	56
3.3.1.1 Two GAL4 enhancer trap lines selected.....	56
3.3.1.2 Pre-processing of the microarrays data	57
3.3.2 Cell type transcription profiles.....	59

3.3.2.1 Phenylpropanoid/flavonoid pathway expressed in both cell types	60
3.3.2.2 Higher expression of photosynthesis light reaction genes in the inner root	63
3.3.2.3 Abundance of nitrate metabolism genes in cortical cells	65
3.3.2.4 Auxin transport: PIN transcripts more abundant in pericycle cells	66
3.3.3 Salt responsive genes	66
3.3.3.1 Trends and functional categories	66
3.3.3.2 Over-represented categories in each cell type	69
3.3.3.3 Unknown functional categories	70
3.3.3.4 Comparison with previous cell type studies	70
3.3.4 Pathways affected by salt stress	71
3.3.4.1 Regulation of transcription	71
3.3.4.2 Cell wall and secondary metabolism	72
3.3.4.3 Water transport	75
3.3.4.4 Changes in expression of a range of nutrient transport genes	76
3.3.4.5 Auxin transport: PIN family members	78
3.3.5 Validation of microarrays	78
3.4 Discussion	79
CHAPTER 4: FUNCTIONAL CHARACTERIZATION OF ARABIDOPSIS CELL TYPE-SPECIFIC SALT CANDIDATE GENES.....	85
4.1 Introduction.....	85
4.2 Materials and methods	85
4.2.1 Knock-out mutant lines and growing conditions.....	85
4.2.2.1.1 KO lines grown on solid media	86
4.2.2.1.2 KO lines bulked-up in artificial soil mix	86
4.2.2.2 Media for Relative Growth Rate (RGR) of roots	87
4.2.2.3 Media for membrane potential measurements.....	87
4.2.2.4 Hydroponic conditions	87
4.2.2 Over-expressing lines.....	88
4.2.3 Methods.....	88
4.2.3.1 Genotyping of plants	88
4.2.3.2 Relative growth rate measurements of roots	91
4.2.3.3 Shoot ion content measurements	92
4.2.3.4 Electrophysiology.....	93
4.3 Results.....	98
4.3.1 Identification of homozygous KO lines by PCR.....	98
4.3.2 Shoot ion accumulation in KO mutant lines	99
4.3.2.1 Shoot sodium accumulation decreased by 20% in three KO mutant lines in salt conditions	100

4.3.2.2 General trends of B, Mg, Mn, P, K, S and Ca in saline conditions	102
4.3.3 Effects of salt stress on relative growth rate of the roots.....	104
4.3.4 Functional characterisation of two “putative” transporters injected into oocytes	106
4.3.4.2 MATE transporter does not transport malate or citrate	108
4.3.4.3 No effect of different external solutions on the “putative” LIGAND transporter expressed in oocyte	109
4.3.6 Pattern of transcription of Ligand gene and other family members in Arabidopsis root	110
4.3.5 Less negative membrane potential in one KO line compared with the wild type	112
4.4 Discussion	113
CHAPTER 5: TRANSCRIPTIONAL SALT RESPONSES OF TWO ROOT CELL TYPES IN ORYZA SATIVA.....	117
5.1 Introduction.....	117
5.2 Material and methods.....	118
5.2.1 Plant material and growth conditions	118
5.2.1.1 Rice enhancer trap material	118
5.2.1.2 Growth conditions for imaging	118
5.2.1.3 Salinity treatments for microarrays	119
5.2.2 Microarray experiments	119
5.2.2.1 Protoplast sorting using Fluorescence-Activated Cell Sorter (FACS)	119
5.2.2.2 RNA extraction and cDNA amplification	119
5.2.2.3 Hybridisation, washing and scanning	119
5.2.3 Microarray data analysis	120
5.2.3.1 Data extraction	120
5.2.3.2 Differences in experimental conditions for microarray datasets	120
5.2.3.3 Quality control and selection of differentially expressed genes	121
5.2.3.4 Gene annotation.....	121
5.2.3.5 Analysis of salt responsive pathways	122
5.2.4 Validation of gene expression by quantitative PCR.....	122
5.2.4.1 RNA extraction and cDNA synthesis	122
5.2.4.2 Selection of salt responsive genes for q-PCR.....	122
5.2.4.3 Determination of transcript levels	123
5.3 Results.....	124
5.3.1 Microarray hybridisation and validation	124
5.3.1.1 Rice enhancer trap lines expressed GFP in specific cell types	124
5.3.1.2 Analysis of dataset microarrays identified salt responsive genes	126
5.3.2 Cell type transcription profiles	129
5.3.2.1 Stelar tissue displays higher gene expression	130
5.3.2.2 Transcription factors up-regulated in stelar tissue	130

5.3.2.3 Transporters up-regulated in cortical cells	131
5.3.3 Salt responsive genes	132
5.3.3.1 Large proportion of genes are down-regulated in cortical cells	132
5.3.3.2 Two functional categories are affected in cortical cells: protein metabolism and regulation of transcription	133
5.3.3.3 Salt responsive stelar genes belong to several biological functions	136
5.3.4 Q-PCR validated microarrays salt responsive genes	138
5.4 Discussion	140
CHAPTER 6 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TRANSCRIPTOMIC PATTERNS BETWEEN RICE AND ARABIDOPSIS IN CORTICAL AND STELAR TISSUE	145
6.1 Introduction	145
6.2 Methods.....	146
6.2.1 Homology search	146
6.2.2 Salt responsive genes analysis	146
6.2.3 Salt responsive pathways analysis	146
6.3 Results	147
6.3.1 Homologous Affymetrix probesets	147
6.3.1 Identification of homologous salt responsive genes.....	148
6.3.1.1 Inner tissue	148
6.3.1.2 Cortical tissue	150
6.3.2 Common and distinct salt responsive pathways	154
6.3.2.1 Inner part of the root.....	154
6.3.2.2 Cortical cells.....	154
6.4 Conclusion and discussion.....	155
CHAPTER 7: IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION OF HOMOZYGOUS RICE MUTANT LINES.....	158
7.1 Introduction.....	158
7.2 Materials and methods	158
7.2.1 Selection of candidate genes	158
7.2.1.1 Strategy used to identify rice candidate genes.....	158
7.2.1.2 Sourcing rice KO mutant lines	159
7.2.1.3 Growth conditions of rice mutants	160
7.2.1.4 Quarantine procedures to release KO mutant seeds	160
7.2.2 Genotyping of rice plants	161

7.2.2.1 Extraction of genomic DNA.....	161
7.2.2.2 PCR screening for T-DNA insertion	161
7.3 Results.....	162
7.3.1 Identification of rice KO mutant lines from transcriptomic data.....	162
7.3.2 Identification of homozygous KO mutant lines.....	163
7.3.3 Quarantine rice not released from quarantine status.....	166
7.4 Conclusions and perspectives.....	166
CHAPTER 8: GENERAL DISCUSSION	168
8.1 Advances in knowledge from this study	168
8.2 Future investigations and directions	170
CITED REFERENCES	174
APPENDICES.....	186

Abstract

Soil salinity reduces the growth of glycophytic plants such as *Arabidopsis thaliana* and rice. In vascular plants, roots are organized into concentric layers of cells and each layer has a specific biological function coordinated with other cell types in the root. Therefore, genes differentially expressed in response to a salt stress are also likely to be changing only in specific cell types, and thus may not be revealed at the organ level. In order to identify novel salt-responsive genes, cell-type specific transcriptomic approaches were undertaken in *Arabidopsis thaliana* and rice, with application of physiologically reasonable salt stress (50 mM) over 48 hours. Two cell-types from the root were chosen in both species for their potential role in salt storage and transport: cortical and pericycle/stelar cells respectively. Cell-types of interest expressing specifically Green Fluorescent Protein (GFP) were isolated from the rest of the root using fluorescence-activated cell sorting (FACS).

The outer layer of the root was found to be responding more than the inner part of the root after 48 hours of salt stress, with an overall down-regulation in both rice and *Arabidopsis*. *Arabidopsis* cortical cells responding to salt seem to regulate the cell wall biosynthesis, which may modulate the shape of the cells or alter the apoplastic movements of solutes in response to salt. Genes related to transport were affected by salt in *Arabidopsis*, with the crucial role of cortical cells in the movement of solutes being evident. Rice cortical cells respond to salt by showing a more extreme defense reaction in changing the protein metabolism and the regulation of transcription. The response of the inner part of the rice root to 48 hours of mild salt stress showed up-regulation of genes implicated in broader functional categories. The biological relevance of genes revealed using cell type-specific transcriptomics was demonstrated in a salt assay using knock-out (KO) lines of candidate genes from both cell-types in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Three KO mutant lines showed 20% reduction in shoot sodium after 5 weeks of salt stress and were also able to maintain a higher shoot dry weight.

These transcriptomic studies of isolated stelar and cortical cells in response to a mild salt stress have revealed salt responsive genes and pathways, indicating new areas for further study, and contributing to our understanding of the complex responses of plants to their environment at the cellular level.

Résumé

La salinité du sol affecte la croissance des plantes glycophytes telle que *Arabidopsis thaliana* et le riz. Chez les plantes vasculaires, les racines sont composées de divers types de cellules organisées en cercles concentriques. Chaque type de cellules racinaires possède une fonction biologique spécifique et coordonnée avec les autres cellules qui composent cette même racine. Il est probable que la réponse des gènes au stress salin soit spécifique du type cellulaire, ce qui ne peut être révélé par des études à l'échelle de l'organe entier. Afin d'étudier les réponses spécifiques, notre approche a été de générer des profils de transcriptome pour deux types de cellules racinaires chez les plantes modèles, *Arabidopsis* et riz. Les deux types de cellules étudiées ont été choisis en raison de leur rôle possible soit dans le stockage du sodium dans les cellules corticales, soit dans son transport dans les cellules du péricycle chez *Arabidopsis* ou du cylindre central chez le riz. Des plantes exprimant la protéine fluorescente verte (GF) spécifiquement dans un type de cellule racinaire furent utilisées pour cette analyse. Les cellules ont donc pu être isolées chez le riz et *Arabidopsis* grâce à la technique de cytométrie en flux.

L'analyse du transcriptome des cellules du péricycle et du cylindre central montrent que les cellules corticales sont plus réactives au stress salin et qu'une large majorité des gènes est sous-exprimée chez les deux plantes modèles. D'après les analyses d'expression des cellules du cortex d'*Arabidopsis*, trois voies métaboliques sont significativement sous-exprimées en réponse au stress salin: la voie de biosynthèse des phénylpropanoïdes, le transport de l'eau and le métabolisme secondaire. La régulation de gènes impliqués dans le transport de l'eau et des nutriments démontre l'importance des cellules corticales dans le mouvement des solutés. Chez le riz, les profils des deux types cellulaires étudiés révèlent une forte réaction de défense ; en effet le métabolisme protéique et la régulation de la transcription sont fortement sous-exprimés dans les cellules corticales alors que les cellules du cylindre central modifient et activent les gènes correspondant à divers catégories fonctionnelles telles que la réplication de l'ADN et le transport. Des gènes candidats ont été sélectionnés dans les deux types cellulaires d'*Arabidopsis*. Des lignées mutantes n'exprimant pas ces gènes ont été testées en stress salin dans des conditions hydroponiques. Les résultats ont révélé

un phénotype accumulant moins de sodium dans les parties aériennes (20% par rapport au génotype sauvage) pour certaines de ces lignées mutantes.

Ce travail est la première étude de transcriptome utilisant des types spécifiques de cellules racinaires chez le riz. L'identification de gènes et voies métaboliques répondant au stress salin dans le cortex et le cylindre central de la racine ouvre de nouveaux axes de recherche et va permettre d'élucider la complexité des processus biologiques d'adaptation au stress salin.

List of figures

Figure 1.1 Plant species vary in salinity tolerance.....	3
Figure 1.2 Vascular tissue and longitudinal zones of Arabidopsis.....	17
Figure 1.3 Parts of a young rice seedling germinated in the dark.....	20
Figure 3.1 Cell type-specific expression of GFP in roots of two GAL4-GFP Arabidopsis enhancer trap lines as visualized by confocal laser scanning microscopy.....	54
Figure 3.2 Pre-processing of the microarray data.....	55
Figure 3.3 Mapman representation of the biosynthesis pathway of lignin showing differences in transcript abundance between pericycle cells and cortex cells	57
Figure 3.4 Photosynthetic light reaction pathway and genes up-regulated in pericycle cells compare to cortex cells.....	60
Figure 3.5 Confocal images of four Arabidopsis demonstrating the presence of plastids in root tissue.....	60
Figure 3.6 Expression and description of several genes implicated in nitrate metabolism in cortex and pericycle cells.....	61
Figure 3.7 Number of genes up (↑) or down-regulated (↓) in pericycle and cortex cells in response to salt.....	63
Figure 3.8 Representation per functional category of genes up-regulated in response to salt in cortical cells and pericycle cells.....	64
Figure 3.9 Functional categories with more than 10 genes only are shown.....	65
Figure 3.10 Over representation of genes responsive to salt in each cell type classified per categories.....	66
Figure 3.11 Number and regulation trends of transcription factor families in response to salt treatment in pericycle and cortex cells.....	68
Figure 3.12 Selected metabolism overview (Mapman) of salt responsive genes in cortical cells.....	69
Figure 3.13 Number of genes implicated in cell wall biosynthesis down-regulated by salt in cortical and pericycle cells.....	70
Figure 3.14 Plant MetGenMAP pathway of the phenylpropanoid biosynthesis showing down-regulated transcripts in cortical cells in response to salt.....	71
Figure 3.15 Down-regulation of 17 water channels in response to salt in cortical cells and one water channel in pericycle	72
Figure 3.16 Gene expression changes in response to salt in cortical cells of genes tested in microarrays and q-PCR	74
Figure 3.17 Gene expression changes in response to salt in pericycle cells of genes tested in microarrays and q-PCR	75
Figure 4.1 Screening strategy for direct (A) or indirect (B) insertion of T-DNA in exons.....	86
Figure 4.2 Experimental set up for Arabidopsis root scanning over 3 weeks	88

Figure 4.3 Average sodium accumulation in the shoot in all KO mutant lines after 5 weeks growth in hydroponic solution.....	96
Figure 4.4 Shoot dry weight in salt conditions relative to control conditions.....	97
Figure 4.5 Average of the maximum root size in KO mutant lines.....	97
Figure 4.6 RGR of Col plants grown in control conditions (A) and salt conditions (B)	101
Figure 4.7 Estimation of transmembrane domains for <i>Ligand</i> gene (A) and <i>Mate</i> gene (B) using the TMHMM software.....	103
Figure 4.8 Mate and ligand cDNA cloned in the destination vector and their restriction pattern after digestion with HindIII and PvuII.....	104
Figure 4.9 Current-voltage relations for oocytes injected with water (black), mate RNA (blue) in solution1.....	105
Figure 4.10 Current-voltage relations for oocytes injected with water (black), ligand RNA (red) in solution1.....	106
Figure 4.11 Phylogenetic tree of the ‘Ligand’ family showing average distance between members.....	107
Figure 4.12 Average membrane potential measurements in Col-0 and the KO mutant line <i>ligand1</i> in control conditions.....	108
Figure 4.13 Average membrane potential measurements in Col-0 and the KO mutant line <i>ligand1</i> in 50mM salt.....	109
Figure 5.1: Cell type-specific expression of GFP in roots of the selected GAL4-GFP rice enhancer trap lines as visualized by confocal laser scanning microscopy.....	121
Figure 5.2: Pre-processing of the rice microarray data.....	123
Figure 5.3: Principal component analysis. [A] cortex RNA data; [B] stelar RNA data.....	125
Figure 5.4: Mapman representation of cell functions showing transcriptional level differences between stelar and cortex tissue in control conditions.....	126
Figure 5.5 Number and transcriptional changes of salt responsive genes in both root cell types of the rice.....	129
Figure 5.6 Salt responsive genes in cortical rice cells classified according to their Blastn results against Rice Genome Annotation Project (RGAP) annotation	130
Figure 5.7 Metabolic pathways of RNA and protein synthesis highlighted down-regulation of salt responsive genes in cortical cells	131
Figure 5.8 Salt responsive genes regulated in rice stelar tissue classified according to their Blastn results against Rice Genome Annotation Project (RGAP) annotation.....	133
Figure 5.9: Expression level of 11 cortical genes in response to salt in microarrays (Dataset A and B) and q-PCR.....	135
Figure 5.10: Expression level of 10 stelar genes in response to salt in microarrays (Dataset A and B) and q-PCR	136
Figure 6.1 Summary of the tblastx results.....	144

Figure 6.2 Common salt responsive genes in the inner part of the root.....	145
Figure 6.3 Common salt responsive genes in the outer part of the root.....	147
Figure 7.1 Genotyping of each KO mutant using PCR amplifications.....	161
Figure 8.1 Schematic representation of the adaptive processes in Arabidopsis and rice inner and outer root in response to a mild salt stress.....	166

Lists of tables

Table 1.1 Microarray experiments from whole organ/tissue in response to a strong salt stress.....	27
Table 1.2 Root cell type specific transcription profiles for rice and Arabidopsis.....	29
Table 3.1 Primer pairs of control genes (grey) and genes of interest used in Q-PCR with their locus and Affymetrix identifier.....	51
Table 3.2 Mean signal intensity (SI) for key enzymes implicated in lignin/phenylpropanoid pathway in pericycle and cortical cells.....	58
Table 3.3 Genes associated with the photosynthetic light reaction.....	59
Table 3.4: Genes significantly differentially expressed in response to salt per cell type annotated with a transport function.....	73
Table 4.1 Bath solution compositions used to measure voltage-current curves.....	93
Table 4.2 Average elemental composition of whole shoots for KO mutant lines and Col grown for 5 weeks in hydroponics without or with 50 mM NaCl and additional calcium.....	99
Table 4.3 Analysis of variance for the effect of conditions, genotype and their interactions on RGR at 192hours and 234hours after salt application.....	102
Table 4.4 Mean expression values of <i>Ligand</i> family members in cortex and pericycle in control and salt conditions.....	107
Table 5.1 Experimental differences between microarray datasets O, A, B and q-PCR sets.....	117
Table 5.2 Control genes used to normalise q-PCR data with their mean and standard deviation across 23 arrays.....	119
Table 5.3: Genes showing differences in expression between stelar and cortical cells are from two functional categories.....	127
Table 5.4: Pathways identified as significantly responsive to salt in cortical cells. The arrows indicated the directional regulation in response to salt	132
Table 5.5: Pathways identified as significantly responsive to salt in stelar tissue. The arrows indicated the directional regulation in response to salt.....	134
Table 6.1: Trends of Arabidopsis and rice salt-responsive genes in the inner part of the root.....	146
Table 6.2: Trends of Arabidopsis and rice salt-responsive genes in the outer part of the root.....	148
Table 6.3: Trends of the rice salt responsive genes in the outer part of the root.....	149
Table 6.4: Genes common between Arabidopsis and rice after an extended pathway comparison.....	150
Table 7.1: Number of salt responsive genes showing consistent trends across the three rice datasets depending on the fold-change cut off selected	159

Lists of abbreviations

%, percent
°C, degrees Celsius
ABA, abscisic acid
AKT, Arabidopsis potassium channel
Ath, *Arabidopsis thaliana*
AVP, vacuolar H⁺-pyrophosphatase
B, boron
Ca²⁺, calcium
CBL, calcineurin B-like proteins
cDNA, complementary DNA
cRNA, complementary RNA
CHX, cation/H⁺ exchangers
CIPK, CBL-interacting protein kinases
CSLD, cellulose synthase like D subfamily
DEPC, diethylpyrocarbonate
DNA, deoxyribonucleic acid
dNTPs, mixture of equal equivalents of dATP, dTTP, dCTP and dGTP
DRE, dehydration response element
EDTA, ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid
Fe, iron
FACS, fluorescently activated cell sorting
FDR, false rate discovery
GFP, green fluorescent protein
H⁺, proton
HKT, high affinity potassium transporter
ICP-OES, inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometry
IRGSP, international rice genome sequencing project
IVT, *in vitro* transcription
K, potassium
KAT, potassium Arabidopsis transporter
KO, knock-out
LB, luria and bertani medium
Mb, megabase
MES, 2-(*N*-morpholino)ethanesulfonic acid
Mg, magnesium
mM, millimolar
MM, mismatch
Mn, manganese
MS, Murashige and Skoog medium
Na⁺, sodium
NaCl, sodium chloride
NCBI, National Center for Biotechnology Information

NHX, Na⁺/H⁺ antiporter
Os, *Oryza sativa*
P, phosphate
PCA, principal component analysis
PCR, polymerase chain reaction
PM, perfect match
PVPP, polyvinylpyrrolidone
Q-PCR, quantitative real time polymerase chain reaction
RMA, robust multi-array average
RNA, ribonucleic acid
RGAP, rice annotation genome project
RGR, relative growth rate
RO, reverse osmosis
ROS, reactive oxygen species
S, sulfate
SDS, sodium dodecyl sulphate
SEM, standard error of the mean
SKOR, stelar K⁺ outward rectifier
SOS, salt overly sensitive
SUMO, small ubiquitin-like modifier proteins
TAE, Tris base, acetic acid and EDTA buffer
T-DNA, transfer DNA
UV, ultra violet
XTH, xyloglucan endotransglycosylase/hydrolase
Zn, Zinc