

鳥取大学研究成果リポジトリ

Tottori University research result repository

タイトル Title	Differential responses of roots for varying tolerance to salinity stress in wheat with special reference to elasticity
著者 Author(s)	Shao, Yang; An, Ping; Feng, Xiaohui; Muhammad, Irshad; Otie, Victoria; Li, Weiqiang; Zheng, Yuanrun; Qiman, Yunus
掲載誌・巻号・ページ Citation	PLANT GROWTH REGULATION , 94 : 183 - 193
刊行日 Issue Date	2021-06
資源タイプ Resource Type	学術雑誌論文 / Journal Article
版区分 Resource Version	著者版 / Author
権利 Rights	This version of the article has been accepted for publication, after peer review (when applicable) and is subject to Springer Nature' s AM terms of use, but is not the Version of Record and does not reflect post-acceptance improvements, or any corrections. The Version of Record is available online at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10725-021-00707-7
DOI	10.1007/s10725-021-00707-7
URL	https://repository.lib.tottori-u.ac.jp/11784

1 **Differential responses of roots for varying tolerance to**
2 **salinity stress in wheat with special reference to elasticity**

3
4 **Yang Shao¹, Ping An¹ *, Xiaohui Feng², Muhammad Irshad ³,Victoria Otie ⁴,**
5 **Weiqliang Li⁵, Yuanrun Zheng⁶, Yunus Qiman⁷**

6 ¹Arid Land Research Center, Tottori University, 1390 Hamasaka, Tottori city 680-
7 0001, Japan

8 ²Key Laboratory of Agricultural Water Resources, Center for Agricultural Resources
9 Research, Institute of Genetics and Developmental Biology, Chinese Academy of
10 Sciences, 286 Huaizhong Road, Shijiazhuang 050021, Hebei, China

11 ³Department of Environmental Sciences, COMSATS Institute of Information
12 Technology, University Road, Abbottabad, Pakistan

13 ⁴Department of Soil Science, Faculty of Agriculture, Forestry and Wildlife Resources
14 Management, University of Calabar, P.M.B. 1115, Calabar, Nigeria.

15 ⁵Signaling Pathway Research Unit, RIKEN Center for Sustainable Resource Science,
16 17-22, Suehiro-cho, Tsurumi, Yokohama 230-0045, Japan

17 ⁶Key Laboratory of Resource Plants, Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences,
18 20 Nanxincun, Xiangshan, Beijing 100093, China

19 ⁷College of Forestry and Horticulture, Xinjiang Agricultural University, 311
20 Nongdadong Road, Urumqi 830052, Xinjiang, China

21
22 *Corresponding author. E-mail: an.ping@tottori-u.ac.jp

23
24 **Acknowledgements**

25 This study is partially funded by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) of Japan
26 Society for the Promotion of Science, No. 26450020.

1 **Abstract**

2 Two salt-sensitive (Yongliang-15, GS-6058) and two salt-tolerant (JS-7, Xinchun-
3 31) wheat cultivars were used to investigate the extension, extensibility (viscoelastic
4 parameters), and chemical composition of the cell walls in their root elongation regions
5 (apical 10 mm-long root segments), under salinity stress. The elasticity of the root cell
6 wall, indicated by E_0 , significantly decreased in the salt-sensitive cultivars, whereas the
7 E_0 in the salt-tolerant cultivars was maintained at the same level as that in the non-saline
8 condition. Root extension and the differences among cultivars were largely dependent
9 on elastic extension, which accounts for one-half to two-thirds of the total extension.
10 Viscosity, indicated by η_0 , and the plastic extension of the root cell walls did not change
11 across the treatments and cultivars. The significant decrease in cell wall elasticity in the
12 root elongation region was one of the factors that depressed root growth in salt-sensitive
13 cultivars under the saline condition. The well-maintained elasticity of salt-tolerant
14 cultivars alleviated the depression of root growth by NaCl. Cell wall elasticity was
15 positively correlated with the relative pectin and hemicellulose I contents and
16 negatively correlated with the relative cellulose content. Under saline conditions, the
17 relative hemicellulose II content did not change in the salt-sensitive cultivars; however,
18 it decreased in the salt-tolerant ones. Thus, changes in chemical composition of the cell
19 wall were correspond with the cell wall extensibility and root growth in wheat cultivars
20 with different degrees of salt tolerance.

21 **Keywords:** Root elongation, Cell wall loosening, Apical root, Creep, Cultivar
22 difference, Salt stress

23

1 **Introduction**

2 Plant cell wall elasticity describes the elastic properties of the wall polymers.
3 When sustained force is applied to a cell wall, such as turgor pressure, the stretch in the
4 wall is partly elastic and partly plastic (Boudaoud, 2010; Monlia, 2013). These terms
5 refer to time-dependent extension. These extensions are results of the polymeric nature
6 of plant cell walls (Cosgrove, 2018).

7 Cell wall extension, composition, structure, and growth dynamics have been
8 extensively reviewed by Cosgrove (2018). The primary cell wall behaves like a
9 viscoelastic composite material that demonstrates a time-dependent extension under
10 load and time-dependent shrinkage after stretching (Boudaoud 2010; Cosgrove 2018).
11 Modules E_0 and η_0 are the most significant parameters that indicate the elastic and
12 viscous properties of the root-cell-wall, respectively.

13 Changes in the cell wall composition in relation to the cell wall extensibility have
14 been reported. Pectin and de-esterification of pectic homogalacturonan have been
15 associated with wall stiffening and growth cessation (Siedlecka et al. 2008; Hongo et
16 al. 2012; Wang et al. 2020). Decreases in the amount and molecular mass of
17 hemicellulose have been shown to increase the cell wall extensibility in the azuki bean
18 (Kaku et al. 2002), tea roots (Safari et al. 2018), tomato hypocotyls (Miedes et al. 2011),
19 and Arabidopsis (Xiao et al. 2016). A denser assembly of cellulose microfibrils induces
20 wall stiffness (Podgórska et al. 2017). A rice mutant with a defect in root elongation
21 showed a significantly low extensibility and high cellulose and hemicellulose II
22 contents in the root-cell-wall in the elongation zone (Inukai et al. 2012). Collectively,
23 these previous reports indicated that the chemical composition and extensibility of the
24 cell wall inherently interact and sensitively respond to the growth environment.

25 The effects of abiotic stresses on the root-cell-wall extension are fairly limited.

1 Water deficit has been shown to reduce the cell wall extensibility of the root elongation
2 zone in maize (Fan et al. 2006). Excessive aluminium (Al) in culture media depressed
3 cell wall extension in the root apical zone in wheat (Tabuchi and Matsumoto 2001; Ma
4 et al. 2004). Application of silicon (Si) increased the elastic extension and viscosity of
5 the apical root-cell-wall in sorghum under drought conditions (Hattori et al. 2003).
6 Compared to roots, the hypocotyl and leaves have been more extensively studied. Water
7 deficit reportedly decreased the cell wall extensibility in the hypocotyl of soybean (Wu
8 et al. 2005), and drought stress decreased the cell wall elasticity in rose leaves (Al-Yasi
9 et al. 2020). Si application was shown to increase the leaf cell wall extensibility in rice,
10 oat, and wheat seedlings (Hossain et al. 2002), and lead exposure reduced the leaf cell
11 wall extensibility in rice (Hossain et al. 2015). NH_4^+ -toxicity reportedly increases the
12 cell wall rigidity, which limits the expansion of leaf cells (Podgórska et al. 2017). Auxin
13 has recently been found to stimulate cell elongation by increasing the wall extensibility
14 (Barbez et al. 2017; Majda and Robert 2018). Abiotic stresses seem to generally depress
15 the cell wall extensibility; however, the effects of salinity (Na^+ ions) on root-cell-wall
16 extension and extensibility have not yet been reported.

17 Under saline conditions, higher proportions of pectin and lower proportions of
18 cellulose have been associated with cultivar differences in root growth in soybean (An
19 et al. 2014a). The widely reported elevation effect of calcium (Ca) application on root
20 growth under salinity stress was partially attributable to enhanced pectin levels (An et
21 al. 2014b). A lower proportion of wall cellulose in the hypocotyls of squash and
22 cultured tobacco cells ameliorated the inhibition in cell expansion and elongation under
23 salinity stress (Sakurai et al. 1987; Iraki et al. 1989). The structural arrangement of
24 cellulose microfibrils was altered by salt exposure in sorghum (Koyro 1997). The
25 amount of cellulose in the primary root was shown to decrease in response to salinity

1 stress in cotton (Zhong and Lauchli 1993) and soybean (An et al. 2014a). In *Artemisia*
2 *annua*, the main changes in the cell wall were found in the structure of pectin under salt
3 stress (Corrêa-Ferreira et al. 2019). Feng et al. (2018) reported that salinity damaged
4 the cell walls in *Arabidopsis* by disrupting pectin crosslinking. Wang et al. (2020)
5 reported that sodium induced pectin de-esterification, which reduced cell wall stiffness
6 in isolated onion epidermal cells. The extension coefficient of wheat leaves was
7 decreased even under short-term salinity exposure (Veselov et al. 2009). While the
8 genes encoding xyloglucan-related enzymes, which are functional in the enhancement
9 of root growth, were upregulated under long-term salinity exposure (Mahajan et al.
10 2020).

11 However, cultivar differences in root growth in relation to the cell wall
12 extensibility, extension, and compositions in crops have not been reported previously.
13 Therefore, the present study investigated the root-cell-wall extension parameters and
14 extension and chemical compositions in the elongation region of young wheat seedlings
15 under saline and non-saline conditions.

16 **Materials and methods**

17 **Cultivation of wheat seedlings**

18 Based on the growth and yield of the cultivars grown in saline soils in the
19 northwest of China (personal communication with local researchers), two salt-sensitive
20 (Yongliang-15, GS-6058) and two salt-tolerant (JS-7, Xinchun-31) wheat cultivars
21 were selected as the experimental materials. Seeds of the four cultivars were surface
22 sterilised in 5% sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl) for 5 min and then rinsed with distilled
23 water three times. Twenty seeds were placed in a line on a sheet of filter paper. Each
24 prepared sheet of filter paper (with the wheat seeds) were placed in a 24 × 34 cm plastic

1 zipper bag and moistened with distilled water. The plastic bags containing the seeds
2 were vertically placed in growth chambers (SANYO MLR-350 HT, Japan) set at 25 °C.
3 Two days later, when the roots and leaves had reached lengths of ~1.5 cm and 1 cm,
4 respectively, 80 mM NaCl (which gives distinct cultivar differences in root growth)
5 solutions with 1/12 fold of Hoagland solution were rinsed on roots everyday. The same
6 solution without NaCl was used as the control (non-saline treatment). Excess solutions
7 were drained. During the treatment period in the growth chambers, plants were exposed
8 to light (2000 lx) conditions of 16/8 h (light/dark) and temperatures of 23/18 °C
9 (day/night).

10 The lengths of all primary and seminal roots (usually three roots were generated
11 from one seed) in four randomly selected bags of each treatment were measured daily.
12 Since the primary and seminal roots had similar length so the average length of all roots
13 in one bag was taken as one replicate for root length measurement. Ten days after the
14 NaCl treatments, when there were significant differences in root length between the
15 sensitive and tolerant cultivars in the 80 mM NaCl treatment group, roots of the
16 seedlings were sampled for extension and chemical composition analysis.

17 **Measurement of root-cell-wall extension**

18 The extension of the apical root cell wall was determined following the method
19 developed by Tanimoto et al. (2000). For each treatment, 30–50 roots from 4–5 growth
20 bags were measured. Sections of the root region between 3 to 8 mm behind the root tip
21 (5 mm-long section) were subjected to the extension measurements using a Creep meter
22 (Yamaden RE2-3305C, Japan). A tensile force of 0.05 N was found to be optimal for
23 obtaining typical clean and stable creep extension curves for these wheat roots. Elastic
24 parameters (E_0 , E_1 , E_2 , E_3), the plastic parameter, the viscosity coefficient (η_0 , η_1 , η_2 ,
25 η_3), and the total, elastic, and plastic extension distances were determined by the

1 computer program, based on the Kelvin-Voigt-Burgers model (Tanimoto et al. 2000).

2 **Measurement of chemical compositions in the root-cell-wall**

3 Roots were taken out from growth bags and were rinsed with distilled water three
4 times, and then 10 mm-long apical segments were excised with a razor blade. Root
5 samples from 4–5 bags containing ~160 root segments represented one replicate and 4–
6 5 replicates were taken per treatment. The fresh weights of these segments were
7 recorded. Some segments were assigned for dry weight measurement, i.e. placed in an
8 oven set at 90 °C for 3 days prior to measurement. The water content of all cultivars
9 under the control and salinity treatments were calculated. Based on the water content,
10 the dry weights of the segments were calculated to determine the composition
11 measurements. Cell wall compositions were analysed using the procedure of Zhong and
12 Lauchli (1993) with minor modification. Specifically, root segments were homogenised
13 with ice-cold Tris-HCl buffer (pH 7.4) and Tris buffer-saturated phenol using a μ T-12
14 bead crusher (Taitec Corporation, Koshigaya, Japan). The homogenate was centrifuged
15 with 15 minutes, 5 000 g at 10 °C. The supernatant was discarded and the pellet
16 containing the cell walls was further purified by sequential incubation and
17 centrifugation in cold Tris-HCl, ethanol, acetone, a mixture of methanol: chloroform,
18 and again acetone and ethanol. Cell wall extracts were treated with pronase in
19 phosphate (pH 7.0). The walls were further treated with CDTA, 1 and 4 M KOH for
20 pectin, hemicellulose I, and II extraction. Residual insoluble sediments were designated
21 as the ‘cellulose fraction’. The amount of total sugar in each fraction was measured
22 using the phenol-sulphuric acid method (Dubois et al. 1951) and the meta-hydroxy
23 diphenyl method (Blumenkrantz and Asboe-Hansen 1973).

1 **Statistical analysis**

2 All data were analysed using an ANOVA and the means were compared using
3 Duncan's multiple range test at $P < 0.05$. Correlations among the compositions,
4 extension distances, elastic parameters, and plastic parameters of the root-cell-wall and
5 root growth were analysed by Pearson's correlations at $P < 0.05$. SPSS 21 software
6 (IBM SPSS, USA) was used for all statistical analyses.

7 **Results**

8 **Root growth**

9 Salinity severely depressed root growth in all cultivars (Image 1, Table 1). The
10 relative root growth in the sensitive cultivars (Yongliang-15, GS-6058) was lower than
11 that of the tolerant cultivars (JS-7, Xinchun-31). Compared with the control, the roots
12 became thicker under NaCl treatment, i.e., root diameters increased by ~10% and 40%,
13 and the area of the root cross sections increased by ~1.2 and ~1.9 times in the sensitive
14 and tolerant cultivars, respectively.

15 **Extension of the root-cell-wall**

16 The results of the elastic parameters and viscosity coefficients are shown in Table
17 2, wherein an increase in the E_0 value indicates a decrease in elasticity. The E_0 values
18 in the sensitive cultivars were significantly increased after the 80 mM NaCl treatment,
19 i.e. to almost double the values observed under the control treatment, However, no
20 significant changes were observed in the tolerant cultivars after NaCl treatment. Under
21 the non-saline condition, the E_0 values of the sensitive cultivars were significantly lower
22 compared with those of the tolerant cultivars. The elastic modules of E_1 , E_2 , and E_3
23 approximately ranged from 2.78×10^7 to 4.87×10^7 Pa in all treatments, i.e. were ~10
24 times higher than E_0 . No significant differences were observed among the E_1 , E_2 , and

1 E₃ modules between the 0 and 80 mM NaCl conditions for all cultivars, and no
2 significant differences were detected in the viscosity modules ($\eta_0, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3$) across
3 cultivars and treatments.

4 Typical root extension curves of all cultivars under both 0 and 80 mM NaCl
5 treatments were successfully obtained using the setting conditions. Representative
6 extension curves are shown in Fig. 1. As expected, salinity treatment depressed the root
7 extension and this depression was much more prominent in the salt-sensitive cultivars
8 than in the tolerant cultivars. Extension and viscoelastic parameters are simply
9 illustrated in Fig. 1. Further details regarding the extension curves have been described
10 by Tanimoto et al. (2000). The elastic, plastic, and total extensions are shown in Fig. 2.
11 The directly measured total extension distances of roots were decreased by about 40–
12 60% after 80 mM NaCl treatment in all cultivars (Fig. 2A). The elastic and plastic
13 extension distances were generally decreased by the salinity treatment in all cultivars
14 (Fig. 2A). The converted extension distances, which eliminated the effect of root
15 thickness on the salinity treatment, were all increased in the four cultivars because the
16 NaCl treatment caused the roots to thicken (Fig. 2B). However, a significant decrease
17 in the elastic and total extension in the sensitive cultivars was still observed after
18 treatment with 80 mM NaCl, compared with the control. While no significant
19 differences were detected in the elastic, plastic, and total extension results between the
20 0 and 80 mM NaCl treatments in the tolerant cultivars, elastic extension accounted for
21 approximately one-half to two-thirds of the total extension in all cultivars and
22 treatments, and plastic extension accounted for half or less than half of the total
23 extension.

24 **Chemical composition of the root-cell-wall**

25 The chemical compositions and their relative amounts are shown in Fig. 3. The

1 relative contents of the cell wall compositions were consistent with their absolute values.
2 Irrespective of the wheat cultivars, no significant differences were detected in the total
3 amounts of the root-cell-wall in the 10 mm-long apical root segments between the 0
4 and 80 mM NaCl treatments. However, the relative content of the four compositions
5 (pectin, hemicellulose I, hemicellulose II, and cellulose) differed greatly in response to
6 the NaCl treatment. The relative pectin content decreased, whereas the relative cellulose
7 content increased in all cultivars under the saline condition. The tolerant cultivars
8 showed significantly low relative hemicellulose I contents compared with the sensitive
9 cultivars. The sensitive cultivars showed no significant changes in the relative
10 hemicellulose II contents but the tolerant cultivars showed a significant decrease under
11 the saline condition. Notably, the total cell wall content in Xinchun-31 was only about
12 half that of the other cultivars. This may be due to differences in genetic background of
13 this cultivar. The Xinchun-31 is a Chinese-Mexican hybrid, while the other three
14 cultivars are of Chinese origin.

15 This may be due to the different genetic background of this cultivar. The maternal
16 origin of Xinchun-31 is Mexican, while the other three cultivars are Chinese origins.

17 Correlations among the root extension parameters and the cell wall compositions
18 are shown in Fig. 4. It is noteworthy that negative correlations were detected between
19 E_0 and relative pectin, E_0 and relative hemicellulose I, relative pectin and relative
20 cellulose, and relative hemicellulose I and η_0 ; and positive correlations were detected
21 between the root growth, the total and plastic extensions, and the relative pectin
22 contents. In addition, when using the calculated extensions, a positive correlation was
23 observed between the root growth and elastic extension.

1 **Discussion**

2 The tolerant cultivars (JS-7, Xinchun-31) showed higher relative root growth than
3 the sensitive cultivars (Yongliang-15, GS-6058), which is consistent with their growth
4 and production in real saline soils. Many previous reports have shown that the whole
5 wheat growth is consistent with root growth under saline conditions (Sadat Noori and
6 McNeilly 2000; Aslan et al. 2016; Mujeeb-Kazi et al. 2019). Therefore, we suggest that
7 relative root growth at the early seedling stage can be used as a reliable salinity
8 tolerance parameter for wheat cultivars. Hereafter, discussions regarding the salinity
9 tolerance are based on the observed root growth.

10 **Extension curve of the root-cell-wall**

11 Extensibility of the cell wall is an important factor that regulates cell elongation in
12 plant tissue (Sakurai 1991; Cosgrove 2018). Extension curves of the root-cell-wall
13 (subjected to measurement using a creep meter) have only previously been reported for
14 green peas, i.e. the first attempt using a creep meter to obtain the extension curve of the
15 root-cell-wall (Tanimoto et al. 2000). The extension curves of wheat roots under both
16 saline and non-saline conditions in this study showed similar shapes to that reported for
17 green peas (Fig. 1). This result confirmed that the mechanical properties of plant roots,
18 even thin wheat roots, follow the Kelvin-Voigt-Burgers viscoelastic model (Tanimoto
19 et al. 2000). In the present study, the extension curves intuitively illustrated the cultivar
20 differences in root-cell-wall extension and the effects of salinity on cell wall extension.
21 The largely depressed extension in the sensitive cultivars indicated that the mechanical
22 properties of the root-cell-wall of these cultivars were very sensitive to salinity stress.

23 **Elastic parameter E_0 in relation to root growth**

24 E_0 values have been reported for only three plants, i.e. green pea (Tanimoto et al.

1 2000), sorghum (Hattori et al. 2003), and Arabidopsis (Shigeyama et al. 2016). In the
2 present study, the E_0 of the elongation region of salt-sensitive cultivars under the non-
3 saline condition ranged from 1.6 to 1.8 10^6 Pa (Table 2). These values were similar to
4 those reported for green pea and sorghum roots (1.6–2.6 10^6 Pa) but were 10 times those
5 reported for Arabidopsis stems (1.8–3.2 10^5 Pa). The E_0 of the tolerant cultivars was
6 higher than that of the above-mentioned plants, i.e. $\sim 3.5 \cdot 10^6$ Pa. Salinity increased the
7 E_0 in the sensitive cultivars but had no effect on that in the tolerant cultivars (Table 2).
8 These results are very similar to those seen for Al stress, e.g. Al increased the E_0 in Al-
9 sensitive wheat cultivar but had no effect on the E_0 in the tolerant cultivar (Ma et al.
10 2004). This previous report suggested that Al binding with the cell wall resulted in the
11 deformation of the cell wall, which increased the E_0 but reduced the extensibility.
12 Sodium (Na^+) also directly binds with cell walls, and, the ion-binding was reportedly
13 much lower in tolerant cultivars compared with sensitive cultivars in barley and *Silene*
14 *paradoxa* (Flowers and Hajibagheri 2001; Colzi et al. 2012). Therefore, the increased
15 E_0 values in the sensitive cultivars may have been partially due to excessive Na-binding
16 with the cell walls, although the Na binding in the tolerant cultivars may have been
17 insufficient to cause cell wall deformation. In the present study, the significantly
18 increased E_0 values in the sensitive cultivars (Table 2) may represent one of the factors
19 that inhibited the root growth. In contrast, the unaffected E_0 of the tolerant cultivars
20 suggested that this parameter may not be a limiting factor for root growth in these
21 studied cultivars under saline conditions. In addition, these results suggested that the
22 mechanical properties of the root-cell-wall may be related to the cultivar differences in
23 root growth under salinity stress. The turgor pressure of cells, i.e. the driving force for
24 cell elongating, decreases under salinity stress (Ryggol and Zimmermann 1990; Ogawa
25 and Yamauchi 2006); therefore, the significance of cell wall elasticity on cell elongation

1 becomes very pronounced under saline conditions.

2 Root growth has been found to be associated with the extensibility of root-cell-
3 wall under drought (Hattori et al., 2003; Fan et al., 2006) and Al stress (Ma et al., 2004;
4 Safari et al. 2018) conditions. Collectively, these previous findings and the findings of
5 the present study indicate that the maintenance of the root-cell-wall extensibility is
6 important for root growth under abiotic stress conditions. Our findings revealed that the
7 E_0 was only about 1/10 of that of E_{1-3} and almost no significant differences were
8 detected among E_{1-3} across treatments and cultivars (Table 2).

9 **Cell wall extension and viscosity coefficient η in response to salinity** 10 **treatment**

11 Different elasticity traits of the cultivars resulted in different elastic and total
12 extension distance in this study (Fig. 2A). After accounting for the changes in root
13 thickness (which increased under salinity, Table 1), the extension distances of the
14 tolerant cultivars under the saline condition were almost consistent with those under the
15 control conditions (Fig. 2B). These findings suggested that the wall elastic property of
16 the tolerant cultivars favoured cell elongation under the saline condition. The elastic
17 extension accounted for approximately one-half to two-thirds of the total extension (Fig.
18 2), thus indicating that the elasticity of the cell wall mostly contributes to the cell
19 extension in wheat. On the other hand, plastic extension accounted for half or less than
20 half of the total extension (Fig. 2B) and η_0 , which represents the viscosity and
21 determines the plastic extension, was not affected by the salinity in all cultivars (Table
22 2, Fig. 2B). Therefore, we showed that the elastic properties of the root-cell-wall are
23 more prominent for root elongation than the plastic properties in wheat.

24 In the present study, the NaCl treatment had no effect on the viscosity (plastic
25 property) of the root-cell-wall in all cultivars (Table 2), except for a slightly high value

1 in Xinchun-31. Tanimoto et al. (2000) suggested that the decrease in viscosity is related
2 to expansin and the removal of other proteins and calcium ions from the cell wall.
3 Hattori et al. (2003) suggested that Si-hemicellulose and Si-pectin conjugates were
4 responsible for the observed changes in root viscosity. Ma et al. (2004) suggested that
5 interference in the binding of new wall materials with old materials increased the
6 viscosity and decreased plastic extension. Shigeyama et al. (2016) reported that the
7 accumulation of free xyloglucan oligosaccharides and the reduced molecular size of
8 xyloglucan in hemicellulose can decrease the viscosity parameters. However, in the
9 present study, the presence of Na⁺ did not affect the viscosity coefficient (Table 2) and
10 plastic extension in all cultivars (Fig. 2B). Since this property and other related plastic
11 extension parameters (e.g. irreversible extension) are also important factors that affect
12 cell elongation, further investigations are needed to clarify how wheat plants maintain
13 this wall property under saline conditions.

14 **Correlations between extension parameters and compositions**

15 The comparable total cell wall amounts under the saline and non-saline conditions
16 in all cultivars showed a stable allocation of carbon assimilation in the wheat cultivars,
17 despite the growing environment (Fig. 3). The general decrease in the pectin and
18 increase in the cellulose contents indicated a spatial-temporal change in cells under
19 saline conditions.

20 To our knowledge, this is the first study to assess the numeric correlations among
21 viscoelastic parameters and cell wall compositions. The negative correlations between
22 E₀ and the relative pectin and hemicellulose I contents demonstrated the great
23 contribution of these two compositions to cell elastic extension. Although the linkage
24 of pectin-cellulose (Wang et al. 2015) and pectin-xylan (Tan et al. 2013) were reported,
25 the load-bearing points are suggested to be hemicellulose II-cellulose conjunctions

1 (Cosgrove 2018). Therefore, higher amounts of pectin and hemicellulose I would be
2 expected to benefit cell elongation. A high positive correlation between E_0 and η_0
3 reveals interactions between the elastic and viscosity properties of the cell wall.
4 Previous reports, although not statistically supported, also showed a positive correlation
5 between these two parameters (Hattori et al. 2003; Ma et al. 2004). These results imply
6 that some wall constituents contribute to both elastic and viscous properties of cell wall.

7 The negative correlation between the relative pectin and cellulose contents and the
8 opposite correlations of these two compositions with the extension parameters (E_0 , total,
9 plastic, and elastic extension, Fig. 4) indicate that the deposition of cellulose to the
10 growing cell wall restricts the elongation of the cell while higher amounts of pectin
11 improves cell elongation. This notion is consistent with the report by An et al. (2014b),
12 who showed that an increase in the pectin content induced by Ca application enhanced
13 root growth in soybean. Contrasting effects of pectin and cellulose on cell wall
14 extension have been reported for white spruce (Renault and Zwiazek 1997). In the
15 present study, the final root growth under the saline condition was determined to be
16 positively correlated with the total, elastic, and plastic extensions, as well as the relative
17 pectin content (Fig. 4). These results revealed the significance of the root-cell-wall
18 properties and the special role that pectin plays in root growth under salinity stress.

19 Based on the growth processes and dynamics of the cell wall (Cosgrove 2018), our
20 results implied that the loosening of root cell wall under saline conditions (with reduced
21 turgor pressure) was largely depressed in the sensitive cultivars but maintained to some
22 extent in the tolerant cultivars. This wall loosening corresponded to the elastic
23 extension. When the root-cell-wall loosens, new wall materials fill in the space or bind
24 to the old wall. These materials improve the viscosity and their levels correspond with
25 the plastic nature, i.e. the final elongation, of the root region. Present study revealed the

1 regulation role of cell wall in root growth. Cultivar difference in salt tolerance may be
2 related with the property of root cell wall.

3 In conclusion, 1) Salinity decreased the root-cell-wall extension in salt-sensitive
4 cvs through an increased E0. However, there were no significant effects on the salt-
5 tolerant cultivars; 2) The elastic properties of root-cell-wall of wheat under salinity
6 were more pronounced in root elongation as compared with the plastic properties; 3)
7 Increment in pectin and hemicellulose-I better improved the elastic extension in the
8 root-cell-wall, relative to the deposition of cellulose. Further studies on the changes,
9 constitutions, and functions of the chemical compositions with regards to the cell wall
10 extension in various crops are needed to fully understand the role of cell walls in root
11 growth under abiotic stresses.

12

13 **Declarations**

14 **Funding:** This study is partially funded by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C)
15 of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, No. 26450020.

16 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

17 **Ethics approval**

18 Not applicable

19 **Consent to participate**

20 Not applicable

21 **Consent for publication**

22 Not applicable

23 **Availability of data and material**

24 All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article

25 **Code availability**

26 Not applicable

1 **Authors' contributions**

2 Yang Shao designed and carried out the experiments, analyzed the results. Yang Shao
3 and Ping An wrote the manuscript. Xiaohui Feng, Irshad Muhammad, Victoria Otie,
4 Weiqiang Li and Yuanrun Zheng provided scientific advice, and revised the manuscript.
5 Ping An conceived the research area and supervised the project.

6

1 **References:**

- 2 Al-Yasi H, Attia H, Alamer K, et al (2020) Impact of drought on growth, photosynthesis, osmotic
3 adjustment, and cell wall elasticity in Damask rose. *Plant Physiol Biochem* 150:133–139.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plaphy.2020.02.038>
- 5 An P, Li X, Zheng Y, et al (2014a) Effects of NaCl on root growth and cell wall composition of two
6 soya bean cultivars with contrasting salt tolerance. *J Agron Crop Sci* 200:212–218.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jac.12060>
- 8 An P, Li X, Zheng Y, et al (2014b) Calcium effects on root cell wall composition and ion contents in
9 two soybean cultivars under salinity stress. *Can J Plant Sci* 94:733–740.
10 <https://doi.org/10.4141/CJPS2013-291>
- 11 Aslan D, Zencircı N, Etöz M, et al (2016) Bread wheat responds salt stress better than einkorn wheat
12 does during germination. *Turkish J Agric For* 40:783–794. <https://doi.org/10.3906/tar-1604-59>
- 13 Barbez E, Dünser K, Gaidora A, et al (2017) Auxin steers root cell expansion via apoplastic pH
14 regulation in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 114:E4884–E4893.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1613499114>
- 16 Blumenkrantz N, Asboe-Hansen G (1973) New method for quantitative determination of uronic acids.
17 *Anal Biochem* 54:484–489. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-2697\(73\)90377-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-2697(73)90377-1)
- 18 Boudaoud A (2010) An introduction to the mechanics of morphogenesis for plant biologists. *Trends*
19 *Plant Sci* 15:353–360. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2010.04.002>
- 20 Chen C, Chen H, Zhang Y, et al (2020) TBtools - an integrative toolkit developed for interactive
21 analyses of big biological data. *Mol Plant* 13:1194–1202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molp.2020.06.009>
- 22 Colzi I, Arnetoli M, Gallo A, et al (2012) Copper tolerance strategies involving the root cell wall
23 pectins in *Silene paradoxa* L. *Environ Exp Bot* 78:91–98.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2011.12.028>
- 25 Corrêa-Ferreira ML, Viudes EB, de Magalhães PM, et al (2019) Changes in the composition and
26 structure of cell wall polysaccharides from *Artemisia annua* in response to salt stress. *Carbohydr Res*
27 483:107753. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.carres.2019.107753>
- 28 Cosgrove DJ (2018) Diffuse growth of plant cell walls. *Plant Physiol* 176:16–27.
29 <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.17.01541>
- 30 Dubois M, Gilles K, Hamilton JK, et al (1951) A colorimetric method for the determination of sugars.
31 *Nature* 168:167–167. <https://doi.org/10.1038/168167a0>
- 32 Fan L, Linker R, Gepstein S, et al (2006) Progressive inhibition by water deficit of cell wall
33 extensibility and growth along the elongation zone of maize roots is related to increased lignin
34 metabolism and progressive stelar accumulation of wall phenolics. *Plant Physiol* 140:603–612.
35 <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.105.073130>
- 36 Feng W, Kita D, Peaucelle A, et al (2018) The FERONIA receptor kinase maintains cell-wall integrity
37 during salt stress through Ca²⁺ Signaling. *Curr Biol* 28:666–675.e5.
38 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2018.01.023>
- 39 Flowers TJ, Hajibagheri MA (2001) Salinity tolerance in *Hordeum vulgare*: Ion concentrations in root
40 cells of cultivars differing in salt tolerance. *Plant Soil* 231:1–9.
41 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010372213938>
- 42 Fry SC (2011) Plant cell walls. From chemistry to biology. *Ann Bot* 108:viii–ix.
43 <https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcr128>
- 44 Hattori T, Inanaga S, Tanimoto E, et al (2003) Silicon-induced changes in viscoelastic properties of
45 sorghum root cell walls. *Plant Cell Physiol* 44:743–749. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pcp/pcg090>
- 46 Hongo S, Sato K, Yokoyama R, Nishitani K (2012) Demethylesterification of the primary wall by
47 PECTIN METHYLESTERASE35 provides mechanical support to the *Arabidopsis* stem. *Plant Cell*
48 24:2624–2634. <https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.112.099325>

- 1 Hossain MT, Mori R, Soga K, et al (2002) Growth promotion and an increase in cell wall extensibility
2 by silicon in rice and some other *Poaceae* seedlings. *J Plant Res* 115:23–27.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s102650200004>
- 4 Hossain MT, Soga K, Wakabayashi K, Hoson T (2015) Effects of lead toxicity on growth and cell wall
5 extensibility in rice seedlings. *Bangladesh J Bot* 44:333–336. <https://doi.org/10.3329/bjb.v44i2.38526>
- 6 Inukai Y, Sakamoto T, Morinaka Y, et al (2012) Root growth inhibiting, a rice endo-1, 4- β -D-
7 glucanase, regulates cell wall loosening and is essential for root elongation. *J Plant Growth Regul*
8 31:373–381. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00344-011-9247-3>
- 9 Iraki NM, Singh N, Bressan RA, Carpita NC (1989) Cell walls of tobacco cells and changes in
10 composition associated with reduced growth upon adaptation to water and saline stress. *Plant Physiol*
11 91:48–53. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.91.1.48>
- 12 Kaku T, Tabuchi A, Wakabayashi K, et al (2002) Action of xyloglucan hydrolase within the native cell
13 wall architecture and its effect on cell wall extensibility in azuki bean epicotyls. *Plant Cell Physiol*
14 43:21–26. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pcp/pcf004>
- 15 Koyro H-W (1997) Ultrastructural and physiological changes in root cells of sorghum plants (*Sorghum*
16 *bicolor* x *S. sudanensis* cv. Sweet Sioux) induced by NaCl. In: *J. Exp. Bot.*
17 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jxb/48.3.693>.
- 18 Ma JF, Shen R, Nagao S, Tanimoto E (2004) Aluminum targets elongating cells by reducing cell wall
19 extensibility in wheat roots. *Plant Cell Physiol* 45:583–589. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pcp/pch060>
- 20 Mahajan MM, Goyal E, Singh AK, et al (2020) Shedding light on response of *Triticum aestivum* cv.
21 Kharchia Local roots to long-term salinity stress through transcriptome profiling. *Plant Growth Regul*
22 90:369–381. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10725-019-00565-4>
- 23 Majda M, Robert S (2018) The role of auxin in cell wall expansion. *Int J Mol Sci* 19(951).
24 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms19040951>
- 25 Miedes E, Zarra I, Hoson T, et al (2011) Xyloglucan endotransglucosylase and cell wall extensibility. *J*
26 *Plant Physiol* 168:196–203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jplph.2010.06.029>
- 27 Mujeeb-Kazi A, Munns R, Rasheed A, et al (2019) Breeding strategies for structuring salinity tolerance
28 in wheat. In: *Advances in Agronomy*. Academic Press Inc., pp 121–187
- 29 Ogawa A, Yamauchi A (2006) Root osmotic adjustment under osmotic stress in maize seedlings 1.
30 Transient change of growth and water relations in roots in response to osmotic stress. *Plant Prod Sci*
31 9:27–38. <https://doi.org/10.1626/pps.9.27>
- 32 Park YB, Cosgrove DJ (2012) Changes in cell wall biomechanical properties in the xyloglucan-
33 deficient *xtt1/xtt2* mutant of *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Physiol* 158:465–475.
34 <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.111.189779>
- 35 Podgórska A, Burian M, Gieczewska K, et al (2017) Altered cell wall plasticity can restrict plant
36 growth under ammonium nutrition. *Front Plant Sci* 8(1344). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.01344>
- 37 Renault S, Zwiazek JJ (1997) Cell wall composition and elasticity of dormant and growing white
38 spruce (*Picea glauca*) seedlings. *Physiol Plant* 101:323–327. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-3054.1997.tb01003.x>
- 40 Rygol J, Zimmermann U (1990) Radial and axial turgor pressure measurements in individual root cells
41 of *Mesembryanthemum crystallinum* grown under various saline conditions. *Plant Cell Environ* 13:15–
42 26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.1990.tb01295.x>
- 43 Sadat Noori SA, McNeilly T (2000) Assessment of variability in salt tolerance based on seedling
44 growth in *Triticum durum* Desf. *Genet Resour Crop Evol* 47:285–291.
45 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008749312148>
- 46 Safari M, Ghanati F, Safarnejad MR, Chashmi NA (2018) The contribution of cell wall composition in
47 the expansion of *Camellia sinensis* seedlings roots in response to aluminum. *Planta* 247:381–392.
48 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00425-017-2792-7>
- 49 Sakurai N (1991) Cell wall functions in growth and development -a physical and chemical point of
50 view. *Bot Mag Tokyo* 104:235–251. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02489456>

- 1 Sakurai N, Tanaka S, Kuraishi S (1987) Changes in wall polysaccharides of squash (*Cucurbita maxima*
2 Duch.) hypocotyls under water stress condition: I. Wall sugar composition and growth as affected by
3 water stress. *Plant Cell Physiol* 28:1051–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.pcp.a077385>
- 4 Shigeyama T, Watanabe A, Tokuchi K, et al (2016) α -Xylosidase plays essential roles in xyloglucan
5 remodelling, maintenance of cell wall integrity, and seed germination in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *J Exp*
6 *Bot* 67:5615–5629. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erw321>
- 7 Siedlecka A, Wiklund S, Péronne MA, et al (2008) Pectin methyl esterase inhibits intrusive and
8 symplastic cell growth in developing wood cells of *Populus*. *Plant Physiol* 146:554–565.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.107.111963>
- 10 Tabuchi A, Matsumoto H (2001) Changes in cell-wall properties of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) roots
11 during aluminum-induced growth inhibition. *Physiol Plant* 112:353–358.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1399-3054.2001.1120308.x>
- 13 Tan L, Eberhard S, Pattathil S, et al (2013) An Arabidopsis cell wall proteoglycan consists of pectin
14 and arabinoxylan covalently linked to an arabinogalactan protein. *Plant Cell* 25:270–287.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.112.107334>
- 16 Tanimoto E, Fujii S, Yamamoto R, Inanaga S (2000) Measurement of viscoelastic properties of root
17 cell walls affected by low pH in lateral roots of *Pisum sativum* L. *Plant Soil* 226:21–28.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026460308158>
- 19 Veselov DS, Sharipova G V., Akhiyarova GR, Kudoyarova GR (2009) Fast growth responses of barley
20 and durum wheat plants to NaCl- and PEG-treatment: Resolving the relative contributions of water
21 deficiency and ion toxicity. *Plant Growth Regul* 58:125–129. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10725-009-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10725-009-9359-y)
22 [9359-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10725-009-9359-y)
- 23 Wang B, Sun Z, Yu Z (2020) Pectin degradation is an important determinant for alfalfa silage
24 fermentation through the rescheduling of the bacterial community. *Microorganisms* 8(488).
25 <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms8040488>
- 26 Wang T, Park YB, Cosgrove DJ, Hong M (2015) Cellulose-pectin spatial contacts are inherent to
27 never-dried Arabidopsis primary cell walls: evidence from solid-state nuclear magnetic resonance.
28 *Plant Physiol* 168:871–884. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.15.00665>
- 29 Wolf S, Greiner S (2012) Growth control by cell wall pectins. *Protoplasma* 249:169–175.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00709-011-0371-5>
- 31 Wu Y, Jeong BR, Fry SC, Boyer JS (2005) Change in XET activities, cell wall extensibility and
32 hypocotyl elongation of soybean seedlings at low water potential. *Planta* 220:593–601.
33 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00425-004-1369-4>
- 34 Xiao C, Zhang T, Zheng Y, et al (2016) Xyloglucan deficiency disrupts microtubule stability and
35 cellulose biosynthesis in Arabidopsis, altering cell growth and morphogenesis. *Plant Physiol* 170:234–
36 249. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.15.01395>
- 37 Zhang CB, Chen LH, Jiang J (2014) Why fine tree roots are stronger than thicker roots: The role of
38 cellulose and lignin in relation to slope stability. *Geomorphology* 206:196–202.
39 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2013.09.024>
- 40 Zhong H, Lauchli A (1993) Changes of cell wall composition and polymer size in primary roots of
41 cotton seedlings under high salinity. *J Exp Bot* 44:773–778. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/44.4.773>
42

1 **Tables**

2 **Table 1** Root growth, diameter, and cross-sectional area of four wheat cultivars under
 3 0 and 80 mM NaCl treatments

Cultivars	NaCl (mM)	Root length (cm)	Relative root growth (%)	Root diameter (mm)	Area of cross section (mm ²)	Increase in the cross-sectional area (%)
Yongliang-15	0	14.10 ± 0.58 a	100	0.524 ± 0.027 cd	0.216 ± 0.014 d	0
	80	5.15 ± 0.08 f	37	0.590 ± 0.005 b	0.273 ± 0.005 b	23
GS-6058	0	13.29 ± 0.92 a	100	0.531 ± 0.002 c	0.223 ± 0.003 cd	0
	80	3.77 ± 0.19 f	28	0.581 ± 0.005 b	0.264 ± 0.005 bc	18
JS-7	0	13.80 ± 0.14 a	100	0.426 ± 0.003 e	0.143 ± 0.002 e	0
	80	6.59 ± 0.33 e	49	0.590 ± 0.023 b	0.274 ± 0.023 b	93
Xinchun-31	0	15.84 ± 0.27 a	100	0.484 ± 0.001 d	0.184 ± 0.003 de	0
	80	8.98 ± 0.13 d	57	0.637 ± 0.027 a	0.320 ± 0.028 a	78

4 Values of root length, diameter and area of cross section represent means ± SEs (*n* = 4)

5

1 **Table 2** Distribution of elastic parameters and viscosity coefficients of root cell walls
 2 of four wheat cultivars under 0 and 80 mM NaCl treatments

Cultivars	NaCl (mM)	Elastic parameters				Viscosity coefficients			
		E_0 (10^6 Pa)	E_1 (10^7 Pa)	E_2 (10^7 Pa)	E_3 (10^7 Pa)	η_0 (10^{10} Pa s)	η_1 (10^9 Pa s)	η_2 (10^8 Pa s)	η_3 (10^7 Pa s)
Yongliang-15	0	1.65 ± 0.21c	3.12 ± 0.25ab	3.31 ± 0.93a	3.60 ± 0.20a	2.07 ± 0.25b	1.30 ± 0.09a	2.03 ± 0.07a	4.33 ± 0.42a
	80	3.33 ± 0.15ab	3.00 ± 0.25b	3.09 ± 0.47a	4.15 ± 0.39a	2.58 ± 0.26b	1.21 ± 0.12a	1.76 ± 0.23a	5.12 ± 0.71a
GS-6058	0	1.95 ± 0.14bc	3.73 ± 0.19ab	3.40 ± 0.92a	4.64 ± 0.05a	2.69 ± 0.30b	1.56 ± 0.12a	2.02 ± 0.08a	4.89 ± 0.37a
	80	3.64 ± 0.44a	3.49 ± 0.35ab	3.51 ± 0.13a	4.19 ± 0.40a	1.83 ± 0.21b	1.37 ± 0.14a	1.81 ± 0.08a	4.76 ± 0.44a
JS-7	0	3.71 ± 0.49a	3.82 ± 0.14ab	3.13 ± 0.18a	3.83 ± 0.38a	2.86 ± 0.47b	1.68 ± 0.04a	2.03 ± 0.08a	4.34 ± 0.35a
	80	3.37 ± 0.50ab	3.41 ± 0.40ab	2.86 ± 0.29a	3.59 ± 0.39a	2.53 ± 0.30b	1.43 ± 0.14a	1.66 ± 0.16a	4.23 ± 0.58a
Xinchun-31	0	3.40 ± 0.29ab	4.34 ± 0.69a	3.35 ± 0.81a	3.64 ± 0.92a	3.55 ± 0.65ab	1.72 ± 0.32a	1.85 ± 0.26a	4.52 ± 1.00a
	80	4.04 ± 0.91a	4.28 ± 0.51ab	3.98 ± 0.11a	4.89 ± 1.57a	5.31 ± 1.66a	1.60 ± 0.10a	1.79 ± 0.35a	3.75 ± 1.28a

3 Values represent means ± SEs ($n = 17-51$)

4 Means followed by the same letter in the same column are not significantly different ($P < 0.05$)

1 **Figure Legends**

2 **Fig. 1** Typical creep extension curves of root cell walls during the extension (5 min)
3 and shrinkage (5 min) of four wheat cultivars under 0 (black lines) and 80 (grey lines)
4 mM NaCl treatments. The total, elastic, and plastic extensions were determined by
5 reading the extensions at 5 and 10 min. The schematic illustration is based on the
6 extension curve of Yongliang-15. A Kelvin-Voigt-Burgers model with four elastic
7 (E_0, E_1, E_2, E_3) and four plastic ($\eta_0, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3$) parameters effectively analysed cell
8 wall extension and shrinkage in the creep-extension analysis (Tanimoto et al. 2000). E
9 and η describe the resistances of the material to the stretch force (P_0) in elastic and
10 plastic extending process, respectively. Footnotes of 0-3 indicate the different
11 extension stages.

12 P_0/E_0 : linear instantaneous deformation

13 $P_0/E_1 + P_0/E_2 + P_0/E_3$: non-linear deformation

14 P_0/η_0 : creep deformation

15

16

17

18 **Fig. 2** The elastic, plastic, and total extensions of the root cell wall of four wheat
19 cultivars under 0 and 80 mM NaCl treatments. A: Data were directly measured using
20 a creep meter. B: Converted data that account for changes in root thickness. The
21 converted extension = measured extension distance $\times (1 + (S_{80} - S_0)/S_0)$. Where S_{80} and
22 S_0 are areas of root cross section under 80 and 0 mM NaCl. Data represent means \pm
23 SEs ($n = 17-51$). Different upper- and lowercase letters indicate significant
24 differences ($P < 0.05$) in the elastic extension and plastic extension, respectively

25

1 **Fig. 3** Relative and absolute contents of pectin, hemicellulose I, hemicellulose II, and
2 cellulose in the root cell wall of four wheat cultivars under 0 and 80 mM NaCl
3 treatments. Values inside the bars indicate the relative values. Data represent means \pm
4 SEs ($n = 5$). Different letters within the same composition indicate significant
5 differences in the relative content ($P < 0.05$). ns: no significant difference in the total
6 cell wall content between 0 and 80 mM NaCl treatments within the same cultivar

7

8 **Fig. 4** Heat map showing the correlations of extension, viscoelastic parameters, and
9 composition of the root cell wall and root growth in wheats. HC I: Hemicellulose I; HC
10 II: Hemicellulose II. E_0 and η_0 indicate the elastic and viscous properties of the root-
11 cell-wall, respectively. Red and blue colour indicate positive and negative correlation,
12 respectively. Circle 大小? Significant correlations are indicated by asterisks ($*P < 0.05$,
13 $**P < 0.01$). This graph is depicted by TBtools (Chen et al. 2020)削除?

14

15 **Image 1** Roots of four wheat cultivars 10 days after 0 and 80 mM NaCl treatments.