

ACCEPTED VERSION

Timothy M. Bowles, Felipe H. Barrios-Masias, Eli A. Carlisle, Timothy R. Cavagnaro, Louise E. Jackson

Effects of arbuscular mycorrhizae on tomato yield, nutrient uptake, water relations, and soil carbon dynamics under deficit irrigation in field conditions

Science of the Total Environment, 2016; 566-567:1223-1234

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Final publication at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.05.178>

PERMISSIONS

<https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies/sharing>

Accepted Manuscript

Authors can share their [accepted manuscript](#):

24 Month Embargo

After the embargo period

- via non-commercial hosting platforms such as their institutional repository
- via commercial sites with which Elsevier has an agreement

In all cases [accepted manuscripts](#) should:

- link to the formal publication via its DOI
- bear a CC-BY-NC-ND license – this is easy to do
- if aggregated with other manuscripts, for example in a repository or other site, be shared in alignment with our [hosting policy](#)
- not be added to or enhanced in any way to appear more like, or to substitute for, the published journal article

4 August 2021

<http://hdl.handle.net/2440/102398>

1 Effects of arbuscular mycorrhizae on tomato yield, nutrient uptake, water relations, and soil
2 carbon dynamics under deficit irrigation in field conditions

3 Timothy M. Bowles*¹, Felipe H. Barrios-Macias², Eli A. Carlisle¹, Timothy R. Cavagnaro³, and
4 Louise E. Jackson¹

5 ¹Department of Land, Air and Water Resources, University of California Davis, Davis, CA
6 95616, USA

7 ²Department of Agriculture, Nutrition and Veterinary Sciences, University of Nevada, Reno,
8 Reno, NV 89557, USA

9 ³School of Agriculture, Food and Wine, University of Adelaide, Waite Campus, PMB 1 Glen
10 Osmond, SA, 5065, Australia.

11 *Corresponding author

12 Contact information for corresponding author: timothy.bowles@gmail.com

13

14

15 Abstract

16 Plant strategies to cope with future droughts may be enhanced by associations between roots and
17 soil microorganisms, including arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) fungi. But how AM fungi affect
18 crop growth and yield, together with plant physiology and soil carbon (C) dynamics, under
19 water stress in actual field conditions is not well understood. The well-characterized mycorrhizal
20 tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) genotype 76R (referred to as MYC+) and the mutant
21 nonmycorrhizal tomato genotype *rmc* were grown in an organic farm with a deficit irrigation
22 regime and control regime that replaced evapotranspiration. AM increased marketable tomato
23 yields by ~25% in both irrigation regimes but did not affect shoot biomass. In both irrigation
24 regimes, MYC+ plants had higher plant nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) concentrations (e.g. 5
25 and 24% higher N and P concentrations in leaves at fruit set, respectively), 8% higher stomatal
26 conductance (g_s), 7% higher photosynthetic rates (P_n), and greater fruit set. Stem water potential
27 and leaf relative water content were similar in both genotypes within each irrigation regime.
28 Three-fold higher rates of root exudation in detopped MYC+ plants suggest greater capacity for
29 water uptake through osmotic driven flow, especially in the deficit irrigation regime in which
30 root exudation in *rmc* was nearly absent. Soil with MYC+ plants also had slightly higher soil
31 extractable organic C and microbial biomass C at anthesis but no changes in soil CO₂ emissions,
32 although the latter were 23% lower under deficit irrigation. This study provides novel, field-
33 based evidence for how indigenous AM fungi increase crop yield and crop water use efficiency
34 during a season-long deficit irrigation and thus play an important role in coping with increasingly
35 limited water availability in the future.

36 **Keywords:** arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi, *Solanum lycopersicum* (tomato), water relations, water
37 stress, soil ecology, root hydraulics
38

39 **1. Introduction**

40 Increases in the intensity and frequency of droughts predicted with climate change (Trenberth et
41 al., 2014) will affect crop production (Hatfield et al., 2011), even in irrigated cropping systems as
42 freshwater supplies become increasingly limited (Elliott et al., 2014). Plant strategies to cope
43 with drought, such as avoiding water stress by stomatal regulation (Chaves et al., 2003), can be
44 enhanced by associations between roots and soil microorganisms (Bardgett and van der Putten,
45 2014; Mohan et al., 2014), including arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) fungi (Augé, 2001).

46 AM fungi affect a suite of interrelated plant processes, especially nutrient uptake and water
47 relations, that could affect growth under drought (Augé, 2001; Smith and Read, 2008). AM
48 plants often have higher stomatal conductance (g_s) at lower soil moisture (Augé et al., 2015) and
49 sometimes regulate stomatal closure differently (Duan et al., 1996; Lazcano et al., 2014) in ways
50 that may optimize responsiveness to variable soil moisture conditions. Higher g_s in AM plants
51 has been attributed to differences in plant size between AM and non-AM plants or higher leaf
52 phosphorus (P) concentrations, which can affect g_s (Augé et al., 2015). Since P diffusion is
53 severely limited in dry soil (Suriyagoda et al., 2014), AM contributions to plant P may be
54 especially important when soil moisture is low (Neumann and George, 2004). But differences in
55 g_s also occur when AM and non-AM plants have similar size and P levels (Augé et al., 2015).

56 AM fungi can change root hydraulic properties (Aroca et al., 2008; Bárzana et al., 2012;
57 Sánchez-Blanco et al., 2004) that increase water supply to shoots, which may be another
58 mechanism by which they affect g_s . AM plants can also have higher net photosynthetic rates (P_n)
59 under both well-watered and water-stressed conditions (Augé, 2001; Birhane et al., 2012; Huang
60 et al., 2011), which may be related to higher leaf N and/or higher C sink strength of the AM
61 association (Kaschuk et al., 2009).

62 But how AM fungi affect crop growth and yield under water stress in actual field conditions, and
63 the underlying physiological mechanisms, are not well-known, since most studies have occurred
64 in controlled environments (Augé et al., 2015; Jayne and Quigley, 2014; Worchel et al., 2013),
65 which differ substantially from field environments (Passioura, 2006; Suzuki et al., 2014). For
66 instance, since the much larger volume of soil available to field roots allows them to access more
67 water and nutrients compared to the restricted space in pots, the effect of AM fungi on water
68 relations and nutrient uptake may not be as great as in controlled environments during reduced
69 water availability. Conversely, greater light intensity in the field may allow plants to produce
70 more photosynthate and direct it to AM fungi and thereby increase benefits relative to costs
71 (Johnson et al., 1997). Field studies are thus essential to provide a more complete understanding
72 of AM vs. non-AM plant physiological, biogeochemical, and agronomic processes during an
73 entire crop life cycle in response to long dry spells that occur with reduced rainfall or deficit
74 irrigation (Suriyagoda et al., 2014).

75 Whole root system measurements are difficult in field studies and belowground processes like
76 soil C dynamics are challenging to measure directly, thus necessitating the use of indicators.
77 Root sap exudation may be a useful indicator of osmotic driven flow and root system size or
78 capacity to access soil water (Pickard, 2003). Indicators of soil C cycling, such as soil CO₂
79 efflux, which results from respiration of roots and soil microorganisms, and labile soil C pools
80 have been shown to increase in the presence of AM fungi (Cavagnaro et al., 2008; Peng et al.,
81 1993) and may reflect higher belowground C allocation in AM plants, although it is not clear
82 how they might change under water stress.

83 A major issue in field research on AM effects is achieving non-mycorrhizal controls. Typical
84 tactics to create non-mycorrhizal controls in the field, such as fumigation (Sylvia et al., 1993) or

85 use of soils severely depleted in AM spores (Douds et al., 2011; Subramanian et al., 2006) alter
86 non-target belowground communities and their ecological functions. A well-characterized
87 (Watts-Williams and Cavagnaro, 2014) tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) mutant with reduced
88 mycorrhizal colonization, named *rmc* (Barker et al., 1998) and its nearly isogenic (Larkan et al.,
89 2013) mycorrhizal wildtype progenitor (cv. 76R, referred to as MYC+) have similar growth and
90 nutrient uptake when not inoculated with AM fungi (Cavagnaro et al., 2004; Facelli et al., 2010),
91 thus serving as a model system for isolating the effects of AM fungi without other interventions
92 (Watts-Williams and Cavagnaro, 2015). Under field conditions on organic farms, AM
93 colonization of MYC+ roots is typically 10–25% and elicits pronounced changes in leaf P, N,
94 and Zn uptake (Cavagnaro et al., 2006), and on expression of root genes for P and N metabolism
95 (Ruzicka et al., 2011).

96 The main hypothesis of this field study was that the AM symbiosis would increase crop yield
97 under a deficit irrigation, and thus result in higher agronomic water use efficiency (yield per unit
98 of water applied). There were three specific hypotheses regarding plant physiological and
99 belowground effects: 1) Uptake of N and P would be higher in AM plants, especially P in the
100 deficit irrigation regime; 2) Rates of P_n and g_s would be higher and more responsive to soil
101 moisture availability in AM plants; and 3) Indicators of whole root system characteristics (root
102 sap exudation rates) and soil C cycling (soil CO₂ efflux and labile C pools) would be higher in
103 AM plants compared to non-AM plants, but reduced under deficit irrigation. To test these
104 hypotheses, the mycorrhizal tomato MYC+ and the mutant non-mycorrhizal tomato genotype
105 *rmc* were grown in an organic farm in the Sacramento Valley of California, with deficit and
106 well-watered irrigation regimes.

107 **2. Material and Methods**

108 *2.1 Field site, experimental design, and water regimes*

109 The experiment was conducted in a field under certified organic management at the University of
110 California Davis Student Farm in Davis, California, USA (38°32'29.49"N, 121°46'0.94"W)
111 during the 2014 growing season. During the winter fallow prior to the experiment, weeds ($2.4 \pm$
112 0.6 Mg ha^{-1} just before spring tillage), were mainly henbit (*Lamium amplexicuale*) and groundsel
113 (*Senecio vulgaris*), both of which are AM hosts (Ishii et al., 1998). Preparation of the 0.1 ha field
114 ($18.3 \text{ m} \times 55 \text{ m}$) included disking and bed formation (1.52 m wide from furrow to furrow)
115 followed by incorporation of 40 kg N ha^{-1} as feather meal (12-0-0) on 15 April 2014.

116 The soil series was mapped as a Reiff very fine sandy loam, a fine-silty, mixed, nonacid, thermic
117 Typic Xerorthents (Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2011). Available
118 P (Olsen) was $12.1 \mu\text{g P g}^{-1}$ and would be considered low for conventional tomato production in
119 California (Table 1). From 21 April to 7 August 2014 (transplanting and harvest, respectively),
120 mean temperatures were $30.9 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ (maximum) and $13.2 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ (minimum), with a maximum of 40.6
121 $^\circ\text{C}$ and a minimum of $5.3 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ (California Department of Water Resources 2014). The only
122 precipitation event $>1 \text{ mm}$ was on 25 April (8.4 mm).

123 The split plot, randomized complete block design had two blocks. Irrigation regime was the main
124 plot with two levels (control and 50% deficit, see below) and genotype was the sub-plot, also
125 with two levels (MYC+ and *rmc*, see below), replicated three times within each main plot. Thus,
126 there were six experimental units for each irrigation regime and genotype combination. To
127 minimize effects of adjacent irrigation treatments, one buffer bed on each side of an
128 experimental bed was planted but not sampled (3 beds total per main plot). Plots contained 20
129 plants at 30 cm spacing and each plot was separated by a 1 m buffer space with no plants.

130 Transplants of MYC+ and *rmc* were grown from surface sterilized seed provided to Westside
131 Transplant, LLC (Winters, CA). After 8 wk under certified organic management, seedlings were
132 transplanted on the bed center by hand on 21-22 April 2014, followed by 1.9 cm of water applied
133 via a single surface drip line in the center of each bed. Subsequently, subsurface irrigation
134 consisted of two drip lines (buried 10 cm deep, each 23 cm from the center of each bed)
135 pressurized from both ends to minimize time lags during irrigation events.

136 Irrigation scheduling in the control treatment used guidelines for California tomato production
137 under drip irrigation (Hartz et al., 1994; Johnstone et al., 2005). Daily reference
138 evapotranspiration (derived from a weather station ~1 km from the experimental site) and canopy
139 cover was used to calculate crop evapotranspiration. Canopy cover was measured 16, 28, 42, 58,
140 74, and 98 d after planting (DAP) using an infrared digital camera (ADCLite; Tetracam Inc.,
141 Chatsworth, CA, USA; Fig. 1c; Barrios-Masias *et al.*, 2013). The deficit irrigation treatment
142 began 29 DAP (Fig. 1a) and was achieved by providing 50% of the water as the control at each
143 irrigation event. The total water applied from transplanting until harvest was 32.7 cm (control)
144 and 18.7 cm (deficit irrigation), i.e. a 43% decrease.

145 *2.2 Aboveground biomass and nutrients*

146 Aboveground biomass was measured near tomato anthesis (52 DAP), fruit set (72 DAP), and
147 harvest when most fruit (>75%) were ripe (107 DAP) (Fig. 1a). These times correspond to the
148 BBCH growth stages of “flowering”, “development of fruit”, and “ripening of fruit” for tomato.
149 At anthesis and fruit set one and two plants in each plot, respectively, were cut at the base and
150 separated into leaves, stems, and fruit and then dried at 60 °C for 7 d. Leaves and stems were
151 weighed and then analyzed for total C and N by combustion on a ECS 4010 CHNSO analyzer

152 (Costech Analytical Technologies Inc., Valencia, CA, USA) and for P by nitric acid/hydrogen
153 peroxide digestion followed by colorimetric analysis of the digest using the molybdate-blue
154 method (Murphy and Riley, 1962). At harvest five adjacent plants from each plot were cut at the
155 base and red fruit (i.e. of harvestable quality) was separated from green and decayed fruit (i.e.
156 unharvestable), using criteria similar to that for commercially harvested tomatoes (Bowles et al.,
157 2015). Biomass of fruits and shoots were weighed in the field (fresh weight) and then
158 subsamples were dried at 60 °C and analyzed for total C, total N, and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ on a PDZ Europa
159 ANCA-GSL elemental analyser interfaced to a PDZ Europa 20–20 isotope ratio mass
160 spectrometer (Sercon Ltd, Cheshire, UK) at the UC Davis Stable Isotope Facility. Nutrients in
161 red fruit at harvest, including P, potassium (K), sulfur (S), boron (B), calcium (Ca), magnesium
162 (Mg), zinc (Zn), manganese (Mn), iron (Fe), and copper (Cu), were determined at the UC Davis
163 Analytical Laboratory by nitric acid/hydrogen peroxide microwave digestion and Inductively
164 Coupled Plasma Atomic Emission Spectrometry (ICP-AES). Total soluble solids (TSS) of ripe
165 fruit were measured using a refractometer.

166 *2.3 Leaf gas exchange and water status*

167 Leaf gas exchange measurements were taken on mature, fully expanded leaflets from the top of
168 the canopy with a field portable open flow infrared gas analyzer (model 6400, LI-COR Inc.,
169 Lincoln, NE, USA). Measurements were taken between 10:15 and 12:30 h with a 6-cm² leaf-
170 chamber, with the CO₂ reference set at 400 $\mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}$ and with a light intensity of 2000 μmol
171 $\text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ using a light-emitting diode source. During both the anthesis and fruit set samplings,
172 plots were sampled over five consecutive days (10 days total). Data from 48 and 50 DAP were
173 not used due to high wind and air temperature. Three leaflets per plot were collected on one day
174 in each sampling period for analysis of relative water content (RWC), total C, total N, $\delta^{13}\text{C}$,

175 specific leaf area (SLA), and specific leaf area nitrogen (SLAN). One leaflet had been used for
176 gas exchange measurements and was analyzed separately for photosynthetic N use efficiency
177 (PNUE), calculated as P_n divided by total N concentration. SLA was calculated as the hydrated
178 area divided by the dry mass. Leaf RWC was calculated according to:

$$179 \quad RWC (\%) = \left(\frac{FW - DW}{TW - DW} \right) \times 100$$

180 where FW is leaf fresh weight; DW is leaf dry weight after 48 h at 60 °C, and TW is leaf turgid
181 weight after submergence of the petiole in water overnight at 4 °C.

182 Stem water potential (Ψ_{stem}) was measured at mid-morning on one day each during the anthesis
183 and fruit set samplings. Shaded mature leaflets were covered for at least 15 min in plastic bags
184 wrapped in aluminum foil to prevent leaf transpiration, excised, and measured with a
185 Scholander-style pressure chamber (#3005; Soil Moisture Equipment Corp., Goleta, CA, USA)
186 (Choné et al., 2001).

187 *2.4 Root exudation and osmolality*

188 For root exudation rates, exuded sap was collected from one detopped plant per plot when Ψ_{stem}
189 was measured. Immediately after cutting plants for aboveground biomass at anthesis and fruit set
190 (see above), the stump was rinsed with ddH₂O and blotted with an absorbent tissue. PVC tubing
191 was fitted over the stump and sap was collected four times (~30 min intervals) in pre-weighed
192 vials for up to 2 h after ensuring there was no leakage. Collected sap was immediately frozen on
193 dry ice and then weighed in the lab. The osmolality of the exuded sap (excluding the first
194 collection to avoid contamination from cut cells) was determined using a vapor pressure
195 osmometer (VAPRO 5600; Wescor, Logan, Utah, USA). The osmotic potential of the exuded

196 sap was expressed in MPa, where $40.75 \text{ mOsmol kg}^{-1}$ corresponds to 0.1 MPa (Fricke et al.,
197 2014).

198 *2.5 Colonization of roots and soil sampling*

199 For determination of AM fungal colonization, roots were collected at 85 DAP 10 cm from the
200 plant row from a 6 cm dia. \times 10 cm deep core. After wet sieving of soil, roots were stained with
201 trypan blue (Cavagnaro et al., 2006) and colonization was determined using the gridline intersect
202 method (Giovannetti and Mosse, 1980).

203 Soil CO_2 fluxes were measured during the same 5-d runs as for leaf gas exchange using a LI-
204 COR 8100 soil respiration system (LI-COR, Lincoln, NE, USA). Measurements were made
205 between 1000 and 1200 h from a PVC collar, 20 cm in dia. \times 10 cm deep, inserted between two
206 plants 15 cm from plant row. Volumetric water content (VWC) was determined at the same time
207 using a time domain reflectance (TDR) probe (EC-5; Decagon Devices, Inc, Pullman,
208 Washington, USA) installed at 10 cm depth.

209 Soil was sampled just prior to starting deficit irrigation (21 DAP), and at anthesis (49 DAP), fruit
210 set (70 DAP), and harvest (108 DAP) samplings at four depths (0–15, 15–30, 30–60, and 60–100
211 cm; two 6.3 cm dia. cores composited per plot, 15 cm from plant row). Gravimetric water
212 content (GWC) was measured on all samples by drying a subsample at 105°C for 48 h.

213 Microbial biomass carbon (MBC) and 0.5 M K_2SO_4 -extractable organic C (EOC) were measured
214 at all but the harvest sampling in surface soil (0–15 cm) by chloroform fumigation-extraction
215 followed by UV-persulfate oxidation (Wu et al., 1990). No correction factors were used for
216 MBC. EOC was quantified in non-fumigated samples.

217 *2.6 Statistical analysis*

218 Mixed model analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed using the proc mixed procedure in
219 SAS v.9.4 (Cary, NC). Genotype and irrigation were treated as fixed effects while block and
220 block×irrigation were considered random effects to account for the split plot experimental
221 design. For leaf gas exchange data (i.e. g_s , P_n , and WUE_i), date was considered a repeated
222 measure. Degrees of freedom were adjusted as described by Kenward and Roger (1997).
223 Transformations were used as needed to meet assumptions of homoscedasticity and normality.
224 Principal components analysis (PCA) of fruit elemental concentrations and quantities was
225 performed using the *vegan* package in R (Oksanen et al., 2012). PCA was selected because these
226 data were normally distributed and the relationships were linear.

227 **3. Results**

228 *3.1 AM colonization, canopy cover, and soil moisture*

229 The mutant tomato genotype *rmc* had 6-fold lower root colonization by AM fungi than its
230 wildtype progenitor, MYC+ (2.1 vs. 12.3%, respectively, $F_{\text{geno},1,17}=33.7$, $p < 0.0001$).

231 Colonization was not affected by deficit irrigation.

232 Canopy cover reached a maximum of $60 \pm 2.7\%$ and $71 \pm 3.8\%$ in the deficit and control irrigation
233 regimes 98 DAP, respectively (Fig. 1). Canopy cover was similar across all treatments prior to
234 the beginning of deficit irrigation 29 DAP and then was significantly higher in the control
235 irrigation regime 42, 58, 74, and 98 DAP (Fig. 1). There were no significant differences in
236 canopy cover between the genotypes.

237 Gravimetric water content was similar at all depths prior to the onset of deficit irrigation (Fig.
238 1). Later changes in GWC were most pronounced at 0–15 cm depth, which was significantly

239 lower in the deficit irrigation regime at the anthesis, fruit set, and harvest samplings. There were
240 no differences in GWC in plots with MYC+ vs. *rmc* at any sampling time.

241 3.2 Aboveground biomass

242 At anthesis and fruit set samplings, aboveground dry biomass (leaves, stems, and fruit) was
243 similar for MYC+ and *rmc* and in both irrigation treatments (Fig. 2; Table S1), except for stem
244 biomass at the fruit set sampling, which was 12% higher in MYC+ compared to *rmc*.

245 At harvest, MYC+ had 25% higher red fruit dry biomass than *rmc* but similar shoot biomass
246 within each irrigation regime (Fig. 2; Table S1). Red fruit fresh biomass (i.e. yield) was 28% and
247 24% higher for MYC+ than *rmc* under control and deficit irrigation, respectively (Table 2). Total
248 fresh fruit biomass was also 19% higher in MYC+, since green and decayed fruit fresh biomass
249 was similar in both genotypes. In both tomato genotypes, red and green fruit fresh biomass were
250 11% ($p < 0.1$) and 30% ($p \leq 0.05$) lower under deficit irrigation, respectively. The fresh biomass of
251 individual red fruit was 67 ± 1.2 g and did not vary among water regime or genotype.

252 Irrespective of genotype, total aboveground dry biomass (fruit and shoots) at harvest was 12%
253 lower under deficit irrigation treatment, mostly due to lower shoot biomass (Fig. 2; Table S1).
254 Thus, the main effect of AM fungi on plant biomass was in fruit rather than shoots and did not
255 depend on water regime.

256 3.3 Plant N and P concentrations and contents

257 At anthesis, concentration of N in tomato leaves was similar across genotypes and water regimes.
258 But at fruit set, concentration of N in leaves was 5% higher in MYC+ than *rmc* (3.14 vs. 3.00%,
259 respectively) considering both water regimes together (Fig. 3; Table S2). Leaf N content was
260 similar across genotypes and water regimes at anthesis and fruit set (Table S2). At anthesis, stem

261 N concentration and content were 13% and 19% higher, respectively, in MYC+ than *rmc*, but
262 were similar at fruit set (Fig. 3; Table S2). At harvest, N concentration of red fruit was 8% higher
263 in *rmc* than MYC+ (Table S3). But the N content of red fruit was 19% higher in MYC+ than
264 *rmc*, resulting from higher red fruit biomass in MYC+ (Fig. 4; Table S3). There was a trend
265 toward higher total aboveground N content in MYC+ than *rmc* at harvest (Fig. 4; Table S3).
266 Considering both genotypes together, the deficit irrigation reduced N concentration in leaves at
267 fruit set by 5% and reduced total aboveground N content at harvest by 12%.

268 For the terminal leaflet on the most recently-expanded leaf at anthesis, N concentration was
269 slightly (5%) higher in MYC+ than *rmc* (4.9 vs. 4.7%), which resulted in 5% lower SLAN in
270 MYC+ than *rmc* (i.e. more N per unit leaf area), since SLA was similar in both genotypes (Table
271 2). Leaflet N concentration was not affected by the irrigation regime at either sampling, but SLA
272 and SLAN were 5% and 3% lower, respectively, under deficit irrigation at anthesis.

273 Phosphorus concentration and content in plants with AM fungi generally increased, especially
274 later in the growing season, but these effects were more pronounced under the control than the
275 deficit irrigation regime. At anthesis, concentration and content of P in leaves were similar in
276 MYC+ and *rmc*. But at fruit set, P concentration in the leaves was 24% higher in MYC+ than
277 *rmc* in the water control (0.19 vs. 0.15%, respectively) but with only slight differences between
278 genotypes under deficit irrigation (Fig. 3; Table S2). This corresponded to a lower leaf N:P ratio
279 for MYC+ in the water control at fruit set (Fig. 3; Table S1) indicating relatively more plant P
280 uptake than N uptake in these plants. Stem P concentration was higher in MYC+ vs. *rmc* at both
281 anthesis and fruit set (14% and 11%, respectively). Reduced P in leaves of plants under deficit
282 irrigation regime was apparent at anthesis with leaves having 18% lower P concentration, 25%

283 lower P content, and a 16% higher N:P ratio considering both genotypes together (Fig. 3; Table
284 S2). Stem P concentration and content were not affected by the water treatments.

285 Whereas red fruit P concentration at harvest was similar in MYC+ and *rmc* (Table S3), P content
286 of all red fruit was 28% higher in AM plants (Fig. 4; Table S3), again resulting from higher red
287 fruit biomass. Total aboveground P content at harvest was 25% higher in MYC+ than *rmc* and
288 was 17% lower under deficit irrigation when considering both genotypes together, but there was
289 a trend toward a stronger genotype effect under the control than the deficit irrigation regime. The
290 N:P ratio in shoots was 17% lower for MYC+ than *rmc* at harvest considering both water
291 regimes together. The N:P ratios in fruit and total biomass were also lower in MYC+, but mainly
292 in the water control (Fig. 4; Table S3).

293 *3.4 Fruit macro- and micronutrients and fruit quality*

294 Considering each nutrient individually, concentrations of K, Mg, Mn, and Cu were significantly
295 lower in red fruit of MYC+ than *rmc* (9, 11, 14, and 12% lower, respectively; Table S4). On the
296 basis of total content in red fruit per plant, all nutrients except Ca, Mn, Zn, and Fe were
297 significantly higher in MYC+ than *rmc* (Table S4). There were no effects of irrigation regime on
298 concentration or content of these nutrients in red fruit at harvest. The PCA of macro- and micro-
299 nutrients in red fruit at harvest showed that nutrient concentrations were strongly correlated with
300 one another and most tended to be lower in MYC+ vs. *rmc* (Fig. 5). Macro- and micro-nutrient
301 content, however, were higher in MYC+ than *rmc* (Fig. 5), reflecting higher red fruit biomass in
302 AM plants. The irrigation regimes did not significantly affect nutrient concentrations or contents
303 in red fruit (Table S4).

304 Total soluble solids in red fruit were similar in MYC+ and *rmc* but were 6% higher in the deficit
305 irrigation considering both genotypes together (Table S4). Fruit pH had a mean of 4.48 and was
306 similar in both genotypes and irrigation regimes.

307 *3.5 Plant water status*

308 Stem water potential (Ψ_{stem}) at mid-morning was similar in both genotypes and irrigation regimes
309 at anthesis, with a mean of -0.09 MPa (Table 2). But at fruit set, Ψ_{stem} reached -0.35 MPa in the
310 deficit irrigation regime, 29% lower than the control (-0.26 MPa), indicating slightly higher
311 water stress under deficit irrigation 43 days after the deficit began (72 DAP). A trend towards
312 less water stress in MYC+ at fruit set was indicated by less negative Ψ_{stem} than *rmc* but only in
313 the control irrigation (-0.22 vs. -0.30 MPa, respectively; $F_{\text{water} \times \text{geno}, 1, 19} = 3.9, p = 0.06$). Leaflet
314 RWC was similar in MYC+ and *rmc* and in both irrigation regimes at the anthesis and fruit set
315 samplings with a mean of 82% (Table 2).

316 *3.6 Leaf gas exchange and water use efficiency*

317 Considering all measurement dates together, P_n and g_s were 7 and 8% higher, respectively, in
318 MYC+ than *rmc* (P_n : $F_{\text{geno}, 1, 18} = 37.0, p < 0.0001$; g_s : $F_{\text{geno}, 1, 18} = 9.6, p = 0.006$) but were not affected
319 by the irrigation regimes. Mean P_n was 29.4 and 27.4 $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ and mean g_s was 0.81 and
320 0.74 $\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ in MYC+ and *rmc*, respectively. Since P_n and g_s both increased in MYC+, there
321 was no difference in intrinsic water use efficiency (WUE_i , i.e. the amount of CO_2 fixed per unit
322 of H_2O lost) between MYC+ and *rmc*, but WUE_i was 12% higher in the deficit irrigation regime
323 compared to the control at fruit set (Table 3), considering both genotypes together. There was
324 also no difference in leaflet $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ for MYC+ vs. *rmc* at either sampling time (Table 2).

325 Contrasting patterns of P_n and g_s occurred in MYC+ vs. *rmc* during the multi-day runs, and this
326 appears to be related to soil moisture availability and air temperature (Fig. 6). During the
327 anthesis sampling, P_n and g_s increased sharply for MYC+, but not *rmc*, in the deficit irrigation
328 regime at 51 DAP (Fig. 6a and 6b). Water had been applied shortly before gas exchange
329 measurements that day as indicated by an increase in surface soil VWC (Fig. 6d), after several
330 days of hot, windy weather. At fruit set, soil moisture was more consistent (Fig. 5d), but P_n
331 declined by 23% in *rmc* vs. only 10% in MYC+ between 69 and 70 DAP (i.e., 25.4 vs. 20.7
332 $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ in MYC+ vs. *rmc*). The maximum temperature on 70 DAP was 40.1 °C vs. 36.6 and
333 32.4 °C on 69 and 71 DAP, respectively Fig6c). At fruit set, similar leaflet N concentrations (see
334 above) but higher P_n contributed to 16% higher PNUE (i.e. $P_n \text{ N}^{-1}$) in MYC+ vs. *rmc* under
335 deficit irrigation, but not in the control (Table 2).

336 3.7 Root exudation rates and osmolality

337 Root exudation rates from detopped plants were similar in MYC+ and *rmc* at anthesis but were
338 3-fold lower in *rmc* than MYC+ at fruit set (Fig. 7a), when plants showed more water stress (see
339 Ψ_{stem} above), considering both irrigation regimes together. At fruit set, *rmc* plants in the deficit
340 irrigation treatment exuded virtually no sap. Root exudation rates were approximately 2-fold
341 lower in the deficit irrigation treatment compared to the control at anthesis and fruit set
342 considering both genotypes together. The osmotic potential of exuded sap was 36% higher under
343 deficit irrigation at anthesis but similar in both genotypes (Fig. 7b), whereas at fruit set it was
344 nearly 2-fold higher in *rmc* than MYC+, but unaffected by deficit irrigation.

345 3.8 Soil C dynamics

346 Early in the season before plants were present, mean soil EOC and MBC were 43.9 and 89.9 μg
347 C g^{-1} , respectively (data not shown). At anthesis, there was a trend toward slightly higher MBC
348 and EOC in soil with MYC+ plants compared to *rmc* plants (MBC: 98.7 vs. 91.1 $\mu\text{C g}^{-1}$ soil; and
349 EOC: 43.4 vs. 38.8 $\mu\text{C g}^{-1}$ soil in MYC+ and *rmc*, respectively) but at fruit set there were no
350 differences between genotypes (Table 4). Midday soil CO_2 emissions were similar in both
351 genotypes but 23% lower under deficit irrigation.

352 **4. Discussion**

353 This study provides field-based evidence that AM fungi can increase crop yield and crop water
354 use efficiency during season-long deficit irrigation, along with higher plant N and P uptake,
355 higher P_n and g_s , higher soil labile C pools, and possible changes in water uptake capacity.
356 Association with AM fungi increased tomato dry red fruit biomass and fresh red fruit biomass
357 (i.e. yield) by ~25% under field conditions in both the control and deficit irrigation regimes but
358 without other substantial changes in aboveground biomass. Greater fruit set likely occurred in
359 MYC+ plants. Higher rates of root sap exudation in MYC+ plants may reflect higher root
360 osmotic hydraulic conductance, a pathway for water uptake that may play an important role
361 under dry conditions (Barrios-Masias et al., 2015). Surprisingly, the substantial reduction in
362 irrigation (43% less water applied) was not severe enough to impact plant water status, based on
363 little change in Ψ_{stem} and leaf RWC, suggesting that roots could extract substantial water from
364 deep in the soil profile or that plants regulate daily leaf gas exchange to maximize C gain before
365 high vapor pressure deficits begin. These findings suggest that AM affect a suite of interrelated
366 plant drought responses that together enabled plants to produce higher yields.

367 *4.1 AM colonization, plant biomass and nutrient uptake*

368 The substantially lower root colonization of the tomato genotype *rmc* by AM fungi compared to
369 its wildtype progenitor MYC+ provided an effective non-AM control under field conditions. The
370 ratio of root colonization between MYC+ and *rmc* (6-fold higher in MYC+) was similar to that
371 of previous field experiments (Cavagnaro *et al.*, 2006; 2011) and a recent meta-analysis of
372 studies with these genotypes (Watts-Williams and Cavagnaro, 2014), but the rate of colonization
373 was lower (12% in this study vs. 20-25% in previous studies), though still within the range
374 typically found on field tomato roots (Cavagnaro and Martin, 2010; Ruzicka *et al.*, 2011). Winter
375 tillage and bare fallow in the experimental field were reflective of typical agricultural practices in
376 the study region but may have limited the colonization potential of the soil (Lekberg and Koide,
377 2005). Intense drying and rewetting cycling in surface soil where roots were sampled (0–10 cm)
378 may have also limited AM colonization. Identical growth and physiology (e.g. P uptake) of
379 MYC+ and near-isogenic *rmc* when grown without AM fungi present (Facelli *et al.*, 2010) mean
380 that the large genotypic differences shown here can be attributed to association with AM fungi,
381 and possibly also to changes in rhizosphere microbial communities induced by AM fungi, such
382 as hyphal-associated bacteria or plant-growth promoting bacteria (Scheublin *et al.*, 2010).
383 Previous work showing similar microbial communities in the soil around MYC+ and *rmc* roots
384 (via PLFA profiles) suggest that these changes may be relatively minor (Cavagnaro *et al.*, 2006),
385 but there is still a possibility that there are micro-scale fungal-bacterial interactions that affect
386 nutrient availability and uptake by the plant.

387 Greater fruit biomass in MYC+ plants and few differences in shoot biomass compared with *rmc*
388 through the season point to a specific effect of AM fungi on fruit rather than a general effect on
389 plant size. Since the size of individual fruits was similar in both genotypes and water regimes,
390 higher fruit biomass must have been a result of an increase in fruit number in MYC+ plants. AM

391 fungi can affect plant reproductive growth (Bryla and Koide, 1990; Poulton et al., 2002),
392 including increasing the total number of flowers in tomato (Subramanian et al., 2006), as well as
393 the number of flowers per truss, and the proportion of flowers setting fruit (Conversa et al.,
394 2013). High temperatures (>32 °C daytime) impair pollen and anther development in tomato at
395 anthesis and reduce fruit set (Peet et al., 1998). Such temperatures were exceeded in this study,
396 as typically occurs in the Mediterranean-type climates where tomatoes are widely grown. Higher
397 g_s in MYC+ plants could suggest higher transpiration rates, since canopy size was similar (Fig.
398 1), and thus cooler canopies (Fischer et al., 1998).

399 The higher P concentration of leaves and total plant P content in AM plants is typical for MYC+
400 plants grown in P-deficient soil (Watts-Williams and Cavagnaro, 2014), as in this study with
401 $12.1 \mu\text{g P g}^{-1}$ soil. But shoot P concentrations would still be considered low for tomatoes in this
402 region (Hartz et al., 1998). Similarly, N concentrations in shoots were close to the critical N
403 concentration (i.e. the minimum N concentration needed for maximal plant growth) for Roma-
404 type tomatoes (Tei et al., 2002; 3.35% and 2.80% measured aboveground N concentration at
405 anthesis and fruit set, respectively, vs. 3.49% and 2.77% critical N concentration at anthesis and
406 fruit set). But even the slight increases in plant N and P concentrations observed in AM plants
407 may have affected growth, especially fruit production (Tei et al., 2002), and physiology (e.g. root
408 hydraulics and leaf gas exchange, see below; Clarkson *et al.*, 2000; Cramer *et al.*, 2009).

409 The enhanced capacity to forage for P by AM fungi was expected to be more beneficial in drier
410 soil (Neumann and George, 2004; Smith et al., 2009), since fungal hyphae can access smaller
411 water-filled pores than roots (Nadian et al., 1998), but mycorrhizae increased P uptake more in the
412 control than the deficit irrigation treatment. AM contributions to plant P uptake, however, can be
413 substantial even when differences in total plant P are small or absent compared to a non-AM

414 control plant (Li et al., 2006), i.e. the AM contribution to P uptake can be “hidden” when direct
415 root uptake of P decreases but AM transfer of P to roots increases (Smith and Smith, 2011).
416 Increases in N and P uptake in MYC+ plants likely contributed to the large increase in fruit
417 biomass since fruit are a major nutrient sink (e.g. 43% and 65% of total aboveground N and P
418 uptake at harvest, respectively). For instance, the higher N and P content of MYC+ stems earlier
419 in the growing season could be translocated to the greater fruit load of these plants. The lower
420 concentrations of some nutrients (e.g. N, K, Mg, Mn, and Cu) in fruits of MYC+ vs. *rmc*
421 suggests that fruit elemental stoichiometry is flexible and that these nutrients were not limiting
422 fruit production.

423 *4.2 Water relations, photosynthesis, and soil C dynamics*

424 The magnitude of the increase in g_s in MYC+ plants, compared to *rmc*, was similar under both
425 control and deficit irrigation and is consistent with results from a meta-analysis of experiments,
426 conducted mainly in controlled settings, at similar levels of root colonization and when AM and
427 non-AM plants are similarly sized (Augé et al., 2015). AM fungi may have contributed directly
428 or indirectly to a higher g_s in MYC+ plants at a ψ_{stem} similar to *rmc* plants. Differences in g_s in
429 AM vs. non-AM control plants have been attributed to differences in plant size, leaf P nutrition,
430 as well as C dynamics (see below) of host leaves (Augé et al., 2015). Similar aboveground
431 biomass in MYC+ and *rmc* at anthesis and fruit set, and similar canopy cover over the whole
432 growing season (Fig. 1), rules out canopy size asymmetry as a driver of differences in water
433 relations.

434 The 3-fold higher root exudation rates in MYC+ plants than *rmc* at fruit set also highlights the
435 possibility for AM effects on root hydraulic properties, which has been observed in greenhouse

436 studies (Aroca et al., 2007; Bárzana et al., 2012) but not yet in the field. Is it possible that higher
437 root exudation rates indicate higher osmotic root hydraulic conductance in MYC+? Relative
438 differences in root hydraulic conductance between MYC+ and *rmc* would depend mainly on the
439 root hydraulic conductivity, the osmotic potential gradient between soil solution and the xylem
440 sap, and the size of the root system. The osmotic potential of the soil solution was likely similar
441 in MYC+ and *rmc* plots, since GWC was similar. Greenhouse studies have shown that MYC+
442 and *rmc* have similar root biomass (Watts-Williams and Cavagnaro, 2014), although this may
443 change under field conditions. Higher osmotic driven flow may be especially important during
444 periods of water stress when plants rely less on hydrostatic forces (i.e. lower g_s) for water uptake
445 (Aroca et al., 2012; Barrios-Masias et al., 2015).

446 Higher P_n in MYC+ plants allowed assimilation of enough C to support additional fruit biomass
447 and the C cost of the AM fungi while maintaining a similar canopy size to *rmc*. Building and
448 maintaining a larger canopy may not be advantageous when soil moisture is low due to higher
449 water loss through transpiration. Enhanced P_n in MYC+ plants may result from higher g_s ,
450 increased N and P nutrition, and/or higher C sink stimulation. Higher stomatal conductance
451 would increase CO₂ diffusion to sites of carboxylation and support higher P_n . Higher leaflet N
452 concentration and lower SLAN (i.e. more N per unit leaf area), as found in MYC+ plants at the
453 anthesis sampling, may indicate more photosynthetic machinery and a higher capacity for C
454 fixation (Evans, 1989). At fruit set, higher PNUE in MYC+ plants under water stress may be
455 related to differences in N partitioning in the leaf (Barrios-Masias et al., 2013) or evidence of C
456 sink stimulation of photosynthesis (Kaschuk et al., 2009).

457 Both above- and belowground C sink strengths of MYC+ plants were likely higher than *rmc*
458 since MYC+ plants had more fruit and AM fungal C demand can reach 5–20% of photosynthate

459 (Jakobsen and Rosendahl, 1990). Just a slight shift in plant belowground C allocation could
460 account for higher MBC in soil associated with MYC+ plants vs. *rmc* because the difference was
461 small (1.4 g MBC m⁻²), e.g. representing just ~0.6% of aboveground biomass C at anthesis (230
462 g C m⁻²). Higher belowground plant C allocation may also have stimulated slightly greater
463 organic matter turnover (Cheng, 2009), thus accounting for higher EOC. Variation in plant
464 allocation of C to AMF during development (Mortimer et al., 2005) may explain why these
465 effects were only apparent at anthesis; root allocation decreases after anthesis in field-grown
466 tomatoes (Jackson and Bloom, 1990). The lack of differences in soil CO₂ emissions between
467 MYC+ and *rmc* shows that total soil respiration was not affected by the AM associations, though
468 the relative contributions of roots, soil heterotrophs, and AMF may have changed (Cavagnaro et
469 al., 2008). Reductions in soil CO₂ emissions under deficit irrigation could reflect lower
470 respiration of soil microbes, since microbial activity decreases with lower soil moisture
471 (Manzoni et al., 2012).

472 Not only did AM plants have higher mean P_n and g_s, they also appeared to optimize responses to
473 environmental conditions in ways that would maximize growth. The large increase in P_n and g_s
474 in MYC+ but not *rmc* plants following irrigation after several days of hot, dry weather (51
475 DAP), agrees with studies in controlled environments that show AM plants to respond more
476 quickly than non-AM plants to changes in soil moisture (Duan et al., 1996; Lazcano et al., 2014).
477 This response occurred even in a field environment when changes to soil moisture would
478 inevitably occur more gradually than the rapid rewetting of a pot. Future work could also
479 examine whether AM fungi also affect how plants regulate diurnal patterns of leaf gas exchange,
480 for instance by maximizing C gain through increased stomatal conductance early in the day when
481 vapor pressure deficit is lower, followed by a reduction in g_s in the afternoon (Richards, 2000).

482 This could help explain the higher g_s we observed prior to late afternoon, when daily air
483 temperature peaks, and that despite a similar canopy size in MYC+ plants, soil water use was
484 similar in MYC+ and *rmc* plants.

485 Since P_n and g_s increased in parallel in MYC+ plants there was no increase in WUE_i compared to
486 *rmc*, as also reflected in similar leaflet $\delta^{13}C$ in the two genotypes. But since red fruit biomass was
487 higher in MYC+ than *rmc* but with the same amount of water applied, the crop water use
488 efficiency (i.e. yield cm^{-1} water applied) of MYC+ plants was ~30% higher: 2.46 and 3.72 Mg
489 $ha^{-1} cm^{-1}$ in MYC+ vs. 1.85 and 2.94 Mg $ha^{-1} cm^{-1}$ in *rmc* under control vs. deficit irrigation
490 regimes, respectively. Increasing yield per unit of water used will be increasingly important as
491 climate change affects water availability in both rainfed and irrigated agricultural systems.

492 *4.3 Conclusions*

493 The AM symbiosis increased ecosystem provisioning (i.e. yield) and regulating services, which
494 was associated with higher nutrient uptake, higher g_s and P_n at similar water availability, and
495 potentially greater root water uptake capacity. This shows that AM fungi play an important role
496 in plant responses to deficit irrigation in actual agroecosystem conditions. Strategies that boost
497 AM fungal populations like minimizing soil disturbance and fallow periods in agriculture may in
498 turn increase the services provided by mycorrhizal associations in a changing climate.

499 **Acknowledgements**

500 We thank the staff of the UC Davis Student Farm, especially Mark van Horn, for advice and
501 assistance with field operations. We also thank Hanna Casares, Malina Loehner, and Vi Truong
502 for invaluable assistance in the field and laboratory. This research was funded by the USDA
503 Specialty Crop Block Grant program through the California Department of Food and Agriculture

504 Award SCB 14036 to LEJ. TRC is supported in part by the Australian Research Council
 505 (FT120100463).

506 **References**

- 507 Aroca, R., Porcel, R., Ruiz-Lozano, J.M., 2007. How does arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis
 508 regulate root hydraulic properties and plasma membrane aquaporins in *Phaseolus vulgaris*
 509 under drought, cold or salinity stresses? *New Phytol.* 173, 808–816.
- 510 Aroca, R., Porcel, R., Ruiz-Lozano, J.M., 2012. Regulation of root water uptake under abiotic
 511 stress conditions. *J. Exp. Bot.* 63, 43–57.
- 512 Aroca, R., Vernieri, P., Ruiz-Lozano, J.M., 2008. Mycorrhizal and non-mycorrhizal *Lactuca*
 513 *sativa* plants exhibit contrasting responses to exogenous ABA during drought stress and
 514 recovery. *J. Exp. Bot.* 59, 2029–2041.
- 515 Augé, R., 2001. Water relations, drought and vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis.
 516 *Mycorrhiza* 11, 3–42.
- 517 Augé, R.M., Toler, H.D., Saxton, A.M., 2015. Arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis alters stomatal
 518 conductance of host plants more under drought than under amply watered conditions: A
 519 meta-analysis. *Mycorrhiza* 25, 13–24.
- 520 Bardgett, R.D., van der Putten, W.H., 2014. Belowground biodiversity and ecosystem
 521 functioning. *Nature* 515, 505–511.
- 522 Barker, S.J., Stummer, B., Gao, L., Dispain, I., O’Connor, P.J., Smith, S.E., 1998. A mutant in
 523 *Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill. with highly reduced VA mycorrhizal colonization: Isolation
 524 and preliminary characterisation. *Plant J.* 15, 791–797.
- 525 Barrios-Masias, F.H., Chetelat, R.T., Grulke, N.E., Jackson, L.E., 2013. Use of introgression
 526 lines to determine the ecophysiological basis for changes in water use efficiency and yield
 527 in California processing tomatoes. *Funct. Plant Biol.* 41, 119–135.
- 528 Barrios-Masias, F.H., Knipfer, T., McElrone, A., 2015. Differential responses of grapevine
 529 rootstocks to water stress are associated with adjustments in fine root hydraulic physiology
 530 and suberization. *J. Exp. Bot.* 66, 6069–6078.
- 531 Bárzana, G., Aroca, R., Paz, J.A., Chaumont, F., Martinez-Ballesta, M.C., Carvajal, M., Ruiz-
 532 Lozano, J.M., 2012. Arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis increases relative apoplastic water
 533 flow in roots of the host plant under both well-watered and drought stress conditions. *Ann.*
 534 *Bot.* 109, 1009–1017.
- 535 Birhane, E., Sterck, F.J., Fetene, M., Bongers, F., Kuyper, T.W., 2012. Arbuscular mycorrhizal
 536 fungi enhance photosynthesis, water use efficiency, and growth of frankincense seedlings
 537 under pulsed water availability conditions. *Oecologia* 169, 895–904.
- 538 Bowles, T.M., Hollander, A.D., Steenwerth, K., Jackson, L.E., 2015. Tightly-coupled plant-soil
 539 nitrogen cycling: Comparison of organic farms across an agricultural landscape. *PLoS One*

- 540 10, e0131888.
- 541 Bryla, D.R., Koide, R.T., 1990. Regulation of reproduction in wild and cultivated *Lycopersicon*
542 *esculentum* Mill. by vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizal infection. *Oecologia*.
- 543 Cavagnaro, T., Smith, F., Hay, G., Carne-Cavagnaro, V., Smith, S., 2004. Inoculum type does
544 not affect overall resistance of an arbuscular mycorrhiza defective tomato mutant to
545 colonisation but inoculation does change competitive interactions with wild-type tomato.
546 *New Phytol.* 161, 485–494.
- 547 Cavagnaro, T.R., Barrios-Masias, F.H., Jackson, L.E., 2011. Arbuscular mycorrhizas and their
548 role in plant growth, nitrogen interception and soil gas efflux in an organic production
549 system. *Plant Soil* 353, 181–194.
- 550 Cavagnaro, T.R., Jackson, L.E., Six, J., Ferris, H., Goyal, S., Asami, D., Scow, K.M., 2006.
551 Arbuscular mycorrhizas, microbial communities, nutrient availability, and soil aggregates in
552 organic tomato production. *Plant Soil* 282, 209–225.
- 553 Cavagnaro, T.R., Langley, A.J., Jackson, L.E., Smukler, S.M., Koch, G.W., 2008. Growth,
554 nutrition, and soil respiration of a mycorrhiza-defective tomato mutant and its mycorrhizal
555 wild-type progenitor. *Funct. Plant Biol.* 35, 228.
- 556 Cavagnaro, T.R., Martin, A.W., 2010. Arbuscular mycorrhizas in southeastern Australian
557 processing tomato farm soils. *Plant Soil* 340, 327–336.
- 558 Chaves, M.M., Maroco, J.P., Pereira, J.S., 2003. Understanding plant responses to drought: From
559 genes to the whole plant. *Funct. Plant Biol.* 30, 239–264.
- 560 Cheng, W., 2009. Rhizosphere priming effect: Its functional relationships with microbial
561 turnover, evapotranspiration, and C–N budgets. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 41, 1795–1801.
- 562 Choné, X., Leeuwen, C. Van, Dubourdieu, D., Gaudillère, J.-P., 2001. Stem water potential is a
563 sensitive indicator of grapevine water status. *Ann. Bot.* 87, 477–483.
- 564 Clarkson, D.T., Carvajal, M., Henzler, T., Waterhouse, R.N., Smyth, A.J., Cooke, D.T., Steudle,
565 E., 2000. Root hydraulic conductance: diurnal aquaporin expression and the effects of
566 nutrient stress. *J. Exp. Bot.* 51, 61–70.
- 567 Conversa, G., Lazzizzera, C., Bonasia, A., Elia, A., 2013. Yield and phosphorus uptake of a
568 processing tomato crop grown at different phosphorus levels in a calcareous soil as affected
569 by mycorrhizal inoculation under field conditions. *Biol. Fertil. Soils* 49, 691–703.
- 570 Cramer, M., Hawkins, H., Verboom, G., 2009. The importance of nutritional regulation of plant
571 water flux. *Oecologia* 161, 15–24.
- 572 Douds, D.D., Nagahashi, G., Wilson, D.O., Moyer, J., 2011. Monitoring the decline in AM
573 fungus populations and efficacy during a long term bare fallow. *Plant Soil* 342, 319–326.
- 574 Duan, X., Neuman, D., Reiber, J., Green, C., Saxton, A., Augé, R., 1996. Mycorrhizal influence
575 on hydraulic and hormonal factors implicated in the control of stomatal conductance during
576 drought. *J. Exp. Bot.* 47, 1541–1550.
- 577 Elliott, J., Deryng, D., Müller, C., Frieler, K., Konzmann, M., Gerten, D., Glotter, M., Flörke,

- 578 M., Wada, Y., Best, N., Eisner, S., Fekete, B.M., Folberth, C., Foster, I., Gosling, S.N.,
579 Haddeland, I., Khabarov, N., Ludwig, F., Masaki, Y., Olin, S., Rosenzweig, C., Ruane,
580 A.C., Satoh, Y., Schmid, E., Stacke, T., Tang, Q., Wisser, D., 2014. Constraints and
581 potentials of future irrigation water availability on agricultural production under climate
582 change. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 111, 3239–44.
- 583 Evans, J., 1989. Photosynthesis and nitrogen relationships in leaves of C3 plants. *Oecologia* 78,
584 9–19.
- 585 Facelli, E., Smith, S.E., Facelli, J.M., Christophersen, H.M., Smith, A.F., 2010. Underground
586 friends or enemies: Model plants help to unravel direct and indirect effects of arbuscular
587 mycorrhizal fungi on plant competition. *New Phytol.* 185, 1050–1061.
- 588 Fischer, R.A., Rees, D., Saire, K.D., Lu, Z.M., Condon, A.G., Larque Saavedra, A., 1998. Wheat
589 yield associated with higher stomatal conductance and photosynthetic rate, and cooler
590 canopies. *Crop Sci.* 38, 1467–1475.
- 591 Fricke, W., Bijanzadeh, E., Emam, Y., Knipfer, T., 2014. Root hydraulics in salt-stressed wheat.
592 *Funct. plant Biol.* 41, 366–378.
- 593 Hartz, T., LeStrange, M., May, D., 1994. Tomatoes respond to simple drip irrigation schedule
594 and moderate nitrogen inputs. *Calif. Agric.* 48, 28–31.
- 595 Hartz, T., Miyao, E., Valencia, J., 1998. DRIS evaluation of the nutritional status of processing
596 tomato. *HortScience* 33, 830–832.
- 597 Hatfield, J.L., Boote, K.J., Kimball, B. a, Ziska, L.H., Izaurrealde, R.C., Ort, D., Thomson, a M.,
598 Wolfe, D., 2011. Climate impacts on agriculture: Implications for crop production. *Agron.*
599 *J.* 103, 351–370.
- 600 Huang, Z., Zou, Z., He, C., He, Z., Zhang, Z., Li, J., 2011. Physiological and photosynthetic
601 responses of melon (*Cucumis melo* L.) seedlings to three *Glomus* species under water
602 deficit. *Plant Soil* 339, 391–399.
- 603 Ishii, T., Matsumoto, I., Shrestha, Y.H., Wamocho, L.S., Kadoya, K., 1998. Observation of
604 vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizal formation in the roots of some seasonal weeds proliferated
605 in citrus orchards. *J. Japanese Soc. Hortic. Sci.* 67, 556–558.
- 606 Jackson, L.E., Bloom, A.J., 1990. Root distribution in relation to soil nitrogen availability in
607 field-grown tomatoes. *Plant Soil* 128, 115–126.
- 608 Jakobsen, I., Rosendahl, L., 1990. Carbon flow into soil and external hyphae from roots of
609 mycorrhizal cucumber plants. *New Phytol.* 115, 77–83.
- 610 Jayne, B., Quigley, M., 2014. Influence of arbuscular mycorrhiza on growth and reproductive
611 response of plants under water deficit: A meta-analysis. *Mycorrhiza* 24, 109–19.
- 612 Johnson, N.C., Graham, J.H., Smith, F.A., 1997. Functioning of mycorrhizal associations along
613 the mutualism-parasitism continuum. *New Phytol.* 135, 575–586.
- 614 Johnstone, P., Hartz, T., LeStrange, M., Nunez, J., Miyao, E., 2005. Managing fruit soluble
615 solids with late-season deficit irrigation in drip-irrigated processing tomato production.
616 *HortScience* 40, 1857–1861.

- 617 Kaschuk, G., Kuyper, T.W., Leffelaar, P.A., Hungria, M., Giller, K.E., 2009. Are the rates of
618 photosynthesis stimulated by the carbon sink strength of rhizobial and arbuscular
619 mycorrhizal symbioses? *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 41, 1233–1244.
- 620 Kenward, M.G., Roger, J.H., 1997. Small sample inference for fixed effects from restricted
621 maximum likelihood. *Biometrics* 53, 983–997.
- 622 Larkan, N.J., Ruzicka, D.R., Edmonds-Tibbett, T., Durkin, J.M.H., Jackson, L.E., Smith, F.A.,
623 Schachtman, D.P., Smith, S.E., Barker, S.J., 2013. The reduced mycorrhizal colonisation
624 (*rmc*) mutation of tomato disrupts five gene sequences including the CYCLOPS/IPD3
625 homologue. *Mycorrhiza* 23, 573–84.
- 626 Lazcano, C., Barrios-Masias, F.H., Jackson, L.E., 2014. Arbuscular mycorrhizal effects on plant
627 water relations and soil greenhouse gas emissions under changing moisture regimes. *Soil*
628 *Biol. Biochem.* 74, 184–192.
- 629 Lekberg, Y., Koide, R.T., 2005. Is plant performance limited by abundance of arbuscular
630 mycorrhizal fungi? A meta-analysis of studies published between 1988 and 2003. *New*
631 *Phytol.* 168, 189–204.
- 632 Li, H., Smith, S.E., Holloway, R.E., Zhu, Y., Smith, F.A., 2006. Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi
633 contribute to phosphorus uptake by wheat grown in a phosphorus-fixing soil even in the
634 absence of positive growth responses. *New Phytol.* 172, 536–43.
- 635 Manzoni, S., Schimel, J.P., Porporato, A., 2012. Responses of soil microbial communities to
636 water stress: Results from a meta-analysis. *Ecology* 93, 930–8.
- 637 Mohan, J.E., Cowden, C.C., Baas, P., Dawadi, A., Frankson, P.T., Helmick, K., Hughes, E.,
638 Khan, S., Lang, A., Machmuller, M., Taylor, M., Witt, C.A., 2014. Mycorrhizal fungi
639 mediation of terrestrial ecosystem responses to global change: Mini-review. *Fungal Ecol.*
640 10, 3–19.
- 641 Mortimer, P.E., Archer, E., Valentine, A.J., 2005. Mycorrhizal C costs and nutritional benefits in
642 developing grapevines. *Mycorrhiza* 15, 159–165.
- 643 Murphy, J., Riley, J., 1962. A modified single solution method for the determination of
644 phosphate in natural waters. *Anal. Chim. Acta* 27, 31–36.
- 645 Nadian, H., Smith, S.E., Alston, A.M., Murray, R.S., Siebert, B.D., Osmond, G., 1998. Effects of
646 soil compaction on phosphorus uptake and growth of *Trifolium subterraneum* colonized by
647 four species of vesicular – arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *New Phytol.* 140, 155–165.
- 648 Neumann, E., George, E., 2004. Colonisation with the arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus *Glomus*
649 *mosseae* (Nicol. & Gerd.) enhanced phosphorus uptake from dry soil in *Sorghum bicolor*
650 (L.). *Plant Soil* 261, 245–255.
- 651 Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F.G., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., Minchin, P.R., O’Hara, R.B., Simpson,
652 G.L., Solymos, P., Stevens, M.H.H., Wagner, H., 2012. *vegan: Community Ecology*
653 *Package*.
- 654 Passioura, J.B., 2006. Viewpoint: The perils of pot experiments. *Funct. Plant Biol.* 33, 1075–
655 1079.

- 656 Peet, M.M., Sato, S., Gardner, R.G., 1998. Comparing heat stress effects on male-fertile and
657 male-sterile tomatoes. *Plant, Cell Environ.* 21, 225–231.
- 658 Peng, S., Eissenstat, D.M., Graham, J.H., Williams, K., Hodge, N.C., 1993. Growth depression
659 in mycorrhizal citrus at high-phosphorus supply. *Plant Physiol.* 101, 1063–1071.
- 660 Pickard, W.F., 2003. The riddle of root pressure. I. Putting Maxwell's demon to rest 121–134.
- 661 Poulton, J.L., Bryla, D., Koide, R.T., Stephenson, A.G., 2002. Mycorrhizal infection and high
662 soil phosphorus improve vegetative growth and the female and male functions in tomato.
663 *New Phytol.* 154, 255–264.
- 664 Richards, R.A., 2000. Selectable traits to increase crop photosynthesis and yield of grain crops. *J.*
665 *Exp. Bot.* 51, 447–458.
- 666 Ruzicka, D.R., Hausmann, N.T., Barrios-Masias, F.H., Jackson, L.E., Schachtman, D.P., 2011.
667 Transcriptomic and metabolic responses of mycorrhizal roots to nitrogen patches under
668 field conditions. *Plant Soil* 350, 145–162.
- 669 Sánchez-Blanco, M.J., Ferrández, T., Morales, M.A., Morte, A., Alarcón, J.J., 2004. Variations
670 in water status, gas exchange, and growth in *Rosmarinus officinalis* plants infected with
671 *Glomus deserticola* under drought conditions. *J. Plant Physiol.* 161, 675–682.
- 672 Scheublin, T.R., Sanders, I.R., Keel, C., van der Meer, J.R., 2010. Characterisation of microbial
673 communities colonising the hyphal surfaces of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *ISME J.* 4,
674 752–763.
- 675 Smith, S.E., Facelli, E., Pope, S., Smith, F., 2009. Plant performance in stressful environments:
676 Interpreting new and established knowledge of the roles of arbuscular mycorrhizas. *Plant*
677 *Soil* 326, 3–20.
- 678 Smith, S.E., Read, D.J., 2008. *Mycorrhizal Symbiosis*, 3rd ed. Academic Press, Cambridge, UK.
- 679 Smith, S.E., Smith, F.A., 2011. Roles of arbuscular mycorrhizas in plant nutrition and growth:
680 new paradigms from cellular to ecosystem scales. *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.* 62, 227–50.
- 681 Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S.D. of A., 2011. Soil Survey
682 Geographic (SSURGO) Database for Yolo Co., California. [WWW Document]. URL
683 <http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov>
- 684 Subramanian, K.S., Santhanakrishnan, P., Balasubramanian, P., 2006. Responses of field grown
685 tomato plants to arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal colonization under varying intensities of
686 drought stress. *Sci. Hortic. (Amsterdam)*. 107, 245–253.
- 687 Suriyagoda, L.D.B., Ryan, M.H., Renton, M., Lambers, H., 2014. Plant responses to limited
688 moisture and phosphorus availability: A meta-analysis. *Adv. Agron.* 124, 143–200.
- 689 Suzuki, N., Rivero, R.M., Shulaev, V., Blumwald, E., Mittler, R., 2014. Abiotic and biotic stress
690 combinations. *New Phytol.* 203, 32–43.
- 691 Sylvia, D.M., Hammond, L.C., Bennett, J.M., Haas, J.H., Linda, S.B., 1993. Field response of
692 maize to a VAM fungus and water management. *Agron. J.* 85, 193–198.
- 693 Tei, F., Benincasa, P., Guiducci, M., 2002. Critical nitrogen concentration in processing tomato.

- 694 Eur. J. Agron. 18, 45–55.
- 695 Trenberth, K.E., Dai, A., van der Schrier, G., Jones, P.D., Barichivich, J., Briffa, K.R., Sheffield,
696 J., 2014. Global warming and changes in drought. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* 4, 17–22.
- 697 Watts-Williams, S.J., Cavagnaro, T.R., 2014. Nutrient interactions and arbuscular mycorrhizas:
698 A meta-analysis of a mycorrhiza-defective mutant and wild-type tomato genotype pair.
699 *Plant Soil* 384, 79–92.
- 700 Watts-Williams, S.J., Cavagnaro, T.R., 2015. Using mycorrhiza-defective mutant genotypes of
701 non-legume plant species to study the formation and functioning of arbuscular mycorrhiza:
702 A review. *Mycorrhiza*.
- 703 Worchel, E.R., Giauque, H.E., Kivlin, S.N., 2013. Fungal symbionts alter plant drought
704 response. *Microb. Ecol.* 65, 671–678.
- 705 Wu, J., Joergensen, R.G., Pommerening, B., Chaussod, R., Brookes, P.C., 1990. Measurement of
706 soil microbial biomass C by fumigation-extraction: An automated procedure. *Soil Biol.*
707 *Biochem.* 22, 1167–1169.
- 708