Applying an empirical model of stomatal conductance to three C-4 grasses
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Abstract

An empirical equation for stomatal conductance has been developed. The equation is based on a linear index, which was modified to represent nonlinear independent effects of CO\textsubscript{2} flux and water vapor pressure deficit. The equation was applied to data from caucasian bluestem (\textit{Bothriochloa caucasia} (Trin.) C.E. Hubb.) and two accessions of Eastern gamagrass (\textit{Tripsacum dactyloides} (L.) L.), measuring responses of leaves of the three grasses to wide ranges of environmental conditions. The equation accurately predicts stomatal conductance in these C-4 grasses, but requires measured photosynthesis as an input variable. Dependence on only environmental inputs was achieved by including the equation as the conductance submodel in a complete leaf gas exchange model, along with a photosynthesis submodel derived from a biochemically based model. This simplified submodel also describes the data well, as does the integrated model. Comparisons of model results and derived parameter values indicate important differences among gas exchange properties of the three grasses. Implementation details of the model are discussed, along with approaches for adapting it for simulating interleaf variability, water stress effects, and patchy stomatal function.

1. Introduction

In arid and semiarid environments, the regulation of water loss is among the most important processes determining the success of plant species. Stomata are generally recognized as the principal regulators of water loss through leaves, but they also affect the exchange of carbon dioxide between the mesophyll and the atmosphere. Most simulation models of plant function that are intended to describe interactions between carbon fixation and transpiration use a stomatal component to calculate both transpiration and the supply of CO\textsubscript{2} within the leaf air space. However, the physiological mechanisms of stomatal movement are incompletely understood, and empirical models are still necessary to predict stomatal response to environmental
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variables (Collatz et al., 1991). Current empirical models differ in their formulation of stomatal responses to the environmental variables that also directly affect photosynthesis, namely, radiation, CO$_2$ and temperature. Several stomatal models include functional responses to these variables (Jarvis, 1976; Bakker, 1991), while others explicitly include a photosynthesis term and a correlation of stomatal conductance with photosynthesis (Farquhar and Wong, 1984; Collatz et al., 1991). The latter approach seems more valuable both in theory and application; it embodies the hypothesis that stomatal aperture is regulated by photosynthetic electron transport in the guard cells, and it allows a stomatal submodel to shift the burden of calculating the highly nonlinear effects of light, temperature and, to some extent, CO$_2$, to a separate photosynthesis submodel. This approach makes the simplifying assumption that guard cell electron transport and mesophyll carbon fixation respond similarly to similar conditions. While guard cell and mesophyll responses can be experimentally decoupled, for example with blue light (Karlsson and Assman, 1990), much evidence suggests parallel responses under most conditions (Wong et al., 1979; Bunce, 1987; Radin et al., 1988). The use of a photosynthesis submodel, calibrated for mesophyll responses, to represent guard electron transport thus allows a relatively simple model to describe this complex system.

In this paper, we test the empirical stomatal submodel of Ball (1988; Collatz et al., 1991) with gas exchange data for three C-4 grass varieties comprising two species. We extend the submodel to describe responses to conditions beyond those investigated in previous studies, and link it with an empirical photosynthesis submodel. We then test the integrated model with an independent data set for one of the grasses. The extended stomatal submodel, and the integrated model, provide the opportunity to compare gas exchange responses of several species by evaluating a small number of parameters.

2. Gas exchange data

We developed the stomatal submodel using gas exchange data for caucasian bluestem accession WW-765 (Bothriochloa caucasia (Trin.) C.E. Hubb) and two accessions of Eastern gamagrass (Tripsacum dactyloides (L.) L.): WW-1318, a relatively narrow leafed variety from Texas, and WW-1462, a wider leafed grass from Missouri. Results and analyses of caucasian bluestem and eastern gamagrass gas exchange experiments were published by Coyne and Bradford (1983, 1985). In the current study, these data were used to compare various stomatal submodel formulations, to identify differences in conductance responses among grass varieties, and to test the stomatal submodel in the context of a complete leaf gas exchange model. Model predictions for caucasian bluestem were then compared with measurements from data collected in a separate study (Coyne et al., 1982).
2.1. Plant culture

Plants were transplanted from the field into 18 dm$^3$ drained plastic buckets and grown in a greenhouse. Soil water was maintained at or near field capacity and fertility was optimized with periodic additions of nutrient solution. Supplemental lighting (400 W high pressure sodium lamps) was used to achieve a 14 h photoperiod. Photosynthetic flux density ($Q_p$; see Appendix 1 for list of symbols) in the absence of sunlight was about 700 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ at 1 m above the soil surface. Sunlight plus the supplemental lighting produced $Q_p$ levels higher than 2000 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ at midday. Daytime temperatures varied from 25 to 35°C and night-time temperatures averaged near 25°C.

2.2. Leaf gas exchange

The exchange of CO$_2$ and water vapor of individual leaves, representing the population of youngest, fully expanded lamina, was measured in a steady state, temperature controlled chamber. Response of gas exchange to light, temperature, ambient water vapor density gradient ($D_a$), and ambient CO$_2$ concentration ($c_a$) was determined by varying one and holding the other variables approximately constant. Discrete light levels were achieved by varying the height of a 1000 W multivapor lamp mounted in a parabolic reflector. The caucasian bluestem data used in the present study for model validation were measured at near-saturating irradiance only. Temperature was controlled by thermoelectric modules.

3. Stomatal submodel

3.1. Submodel development and application to caucasian bluestem and eastern gamagrass

The equation of Ball (1988; Collatz et al., 1991) uses a single empirical index that combines the influences of three variables on stomatal conductance to water vapor ($g_s$, mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$): net CO$_2$ assimilation ($A_n$, mol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$), leaf surface relative humidity ($h_s$, dimensionless fraction), and leaf surface CO$_2$ mole fraction ($c_s$, dimensionless fraction)

$$g_s = b_0 + b_1 \frac{A_n h_s}{c_s}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

The variables used in this and subsequent indices were chosen based both on their predictive utility and their general availability in most field and laboratory gas exchange measurements.

Leuning (1990) adjusted the value of $c_s$ in Eq. (1) by subtracting $\Gamma$(CO$_2$
compensation mole fraction); however, for the C-4 grasses considered here, \( \Gamma \) is too low (0–10, \( \mu \text{mol mol}^{-1} \)) for this adjustment to improve the predictive power of Eq. (1) or other stomatal equations developed in this paper.

Mott and Parkhurst (1991) and Aphalo and Jarvis (1991) argued that stomata respond not to \( h_s \), but to vapor pressure deficit. To evaluate whether the stomatal index could be improved by including such a response, we modified Eq. (1) to use vapor pressure deficit at the leaf surface, \( D_s \) (kPa)

\[
g_s = b_0 + b_1 \frac{A_n}{D_s c_s}
\]  

(2)

The empirical terms \( b_0 \) and \( b_1 \) in Eqs. (1) and (2) are determined for a given species by regression using leaf gas exchange measurements made under a number of conditions of light, \( \text{CO}_2 \) mole fraction, temperature and humidity. \( D_s \), \( h_s \) and \( c_s \) can be calculated from ambient and leaf internal conditions using standard gas exchange equations (Ball, 1987; Field et al., 1989).

We compared the measured conductances to values of the indices from Eqs. (1) and (2). Examination of the plots of \( g_s \) vs. these stomatal indices (Fig. 1) suggests several conclusions:

1. There is much scatter in the relationship between \( g_s \) and the stomatal index of Eq. (1) (Fig. 1(a)). The stomatal index based on vapor pressure deficit

Fig. 1. Stomatal conductance of caucasian bluestem, plotted against (a) the stomatal index of Eq. (1), based on relative humidity, and (b) the stomatal index of Eq. (2), based on vapor pressure deficit. Closed circles: observations within the ranges used by Collatz et al. (1991): \( T_l \) (leaf temperature) = 20–35°C, \( Q_p \) (Irradiance) > 0.0001 \( \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \), 0.45 < \( h_s \) < 0.90, and \( c_s \) > 0.0001 mol mol\(^{-1} \). Open circles: measurements at temperatures as low as 15°C and as high as 45°C, \( Q_p \) as low as 0 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \), and \( h_s \) as low as 0.14.
(Eq. (2)) shows a closer correspondence to measured conductance, but some scatter remains (Fig. 1(b)).

2. Within the ranges of environmental variables reported by Collatz et al. (1991), the relationships between \( g_S \) and the indices appear relatively linear, but the more extreme environmental conditions included here impart curvature to the relationships.

3. Cases where \( A_n < 0 \) because of very low \( Q_p \) result in small negative values of the stomatal indices, which still conform to the overall nonlinear relationships. This suggests the value of using an empirical stomatal equation for simulating night-time conductances.

To develop an empirical stomatal submodel applicable to a relatively wide range of conditions, we considered four nonlinear equations. Among the simplest forms are the power functions, employing either humidity or vapor pressure deficit

\[
g_S = b_0 \left[ \frac{A_n h_S}{c_S} \right]^{b_1}
\]

and

\[
g_S = b_0 \left[ \frac{A_n}{D_S c_S} \right]^{b_1}
\]

Equations (1)–(4) imply that the effects of \( A_n, c_S, \) and \( h_S \) or \( D_S \) on stomatal conductance are compensatory. For example, a 50% increase in \( A_n \) has the same effects in these equations as a 50% increase in \( h_S \) or a 33% decrease in \( D_S \) or \( c_S \). These compensatory relationships, while plausible for restricted ranges of environmental conditions, may not apply to the wide range of data considered here. We extended Eqs. (3) and (4) further by considering separate multiplicative terms for carbon and humidity

\[
g_S = b_0 \left[ \frac{A_n}{c_S} \right]^{b_1} h_S^{b_2}
\]

and

\[
g_S = b_0 \left[ \frac{A_n}{c_S} \right]^{b_1} \frac{1}{D_S^{b_2}}
\]

Other equations that included separate statistical terms for \( A_n \) and \( c_S \), while more complex than the above equations, did not provide improved fits to the data.

We evaluated Eqs. (1)–(6) using linear regression; variables in the nonlinear equations were first transformed to forms linear in the parameters (Draper and Smith, 1981). For numerical reasons, regression analyses did not include cases where \( A_n \leq 0 \). However, these cases were included in subsequent
Table 1
Coefficients of determination for six stomatal submodel formulations, applied to three grasses. Equation numbers correspond to those in the text. See Appendix 1 for definitions of terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Equation: ( g_s = )</th>
<th>( r^2 )</th>
<th>Caucasian Bluestem</th>
<th>Eastern Gamagrass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 692)</td>
<td>WW-1318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>( b_0 + b_1 \frac{A_n h_s}{c_s} )</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>( b_0 + b_1 \frac{A_n}{D_s c_s} )</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>( b_0 \left[ \frac{A_n h_s}{c_s} \right]^{b_1} )</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>( b_0 \left[ \frac{A_n}{D_s c_s} \right]^{b_1} )</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>( b_0 \left[ \frac{A_n}{c_s} \right]^{b_1} \frac{h_s}{D_s} )</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>( b_0 \left[ \frac{A_n}{c_s} \right]^{b_1} \frac{1}{D_s} )</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

applications of the integrated leaf gas exchange model, as explained later. We analyzed the six equations using measurements of leaf gas exchange for caucasian bluestem (Coyne and Bradford, 1983) and two accessions of eastern gamagrass (Coyne and Bradford, 1985). Data from all four manipulations (\( Q_p \times T_1, e_a \times T_1, c_a \times T_1 \) and \( T_1 \) alone) in these experiments were used in the submodel comparisons. To clarify the relative merits of \( D_s \) and \( h_s \) for predicting \( g_s \), we calculated additional regression analyses using only data from the \( e_a \times T_1 \) manipulations. Conformance of the various models to the data was evaluated using the coefficient of determination, \( r^2 \) (Table 1).

As proposed above, the nonlinear forms of the simple univariate equations fit the leaf gas exchange data better than did the linear forms (i.e. \( r^2 \) values for Eqs. (3) and (4) exceed those for Eqs. (1) and (2), respectively, see Table 1). Extending the simple nonlinear forms by separating effects of carbon flux and humidity also resulted in improved fit to the data. The findings of Aphalo and Jarvis (1991) are supported, in that each of the three equations that used \( D_s \) was better correlated with \( g_s \) than the analogous equation based on \( h_s \) (Table 1). Similar comparisons among regressions resulted from analyses restricted to data from the \( e_a \times T_1 \) experiments (results not shown).

We consider Eq. (6) to be the most appropriate empirical submodel for these three C-4 grasses. This equation explains more of the variation in stomatal conductance than the other equations.
3.2. Comparison of stomatal properties among grasses

Parameter values for Eq. (6) were determined for the three grasses using nonlinear regression. Parameter values show large differences among grasses (Table 2). The two gamagrass accessions differ significantly ($P < 0.05$) in all three parameters.

The empirical parameters $b_0$, $b_1$ and $b_2$ in Eq. (6) represent, respectively, a scaling factor, the coupling of stomatal conductance to carbon flux, and stomatal response to humidity. Differences among grasses in the parameter $b_0$ reflect differences in the overall stomatal response to changes in both carbon and humidity. Separate submodel analyses (not shown) in which $b_0$ was held to a constant value for all three grasses resulted in values of $b_1$ and $b_2$ that compare similarly to those in Table 2.

Differences among grasses in the parameter $b_1$ reflect differences in coupling of stomatal conductance to carbon assimilation. Calculations of estimated conductance at two values of $A_n$ for the three grasses show that high values of $b_1$ result in large declines in stomatal conductance as the ratio $A_n/c_S$ decreases (Table 2). Of the three grasses analyzed, the two eastern gamagrass accessions WW-1318 and WW-1462, respectively, showed the smallest and the largest degree of coupling of conductance to carbon flux (Table 2).

The parameter $b_2$ represents the degree of stomatal response to humidity. Calculations of estimated stomatal conductance at two humidity levels show that high values of $b_2$ result in large declines in conductance as $D_S$ increases (Table 2). According to these calculations, the two eastern gamagrass accessions display less of a stomatal response to humidity than does the bluestem.

The preceding analyses of the stomatal submodel are incomplete because they assume a stomatal response to $A_n$. However, stomata actually influence $A_n$ by regulating $c_i$. A more complete analysis of stomatal response to the

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>$b_0$</th>
<th>$b_1$</th>
<th>$b_2$</th>
<th>$\dot{g}_S$ ($A_n = 30$; $c_S = 320$; $D_S = 1$)</th>
<th>$\dot{g}_S$ ($A_n = 10$; $c_S = 320$; $D_S = 1$)</th>
<th>$\dot{g}_S$ ($A_n = 30$; $c_S = 320$; $D_S = 6$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian bluestem</td>
<td>1.18 a</td>
<td>0.618 a</td>
<td>0.339 a</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern gamagrass:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW-1318</td>
<td>1.17 a</td>
<td>0.541 b</td>
<td>0.298 a</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW-1462</td>
<td>1.45 b</td>
<td>0.663 a</td>
<td>0.235 b</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
environment requires the stomatal submodel to be integrated with a photosynthesis submodel.

4. Implementation in a leaf gas exchange model

4.1. Development of a photosynthesis submodel

We constructed an empirical submodel for C-4 photosynthesis by simplifying the C3 model of Farquhar et al. (1980). Several terms representing processes that are relatively unimportant in C-4 photosynthesis were removed. As in the model of Farquhar et al. (1980), $A_n$ was estimated as the minimum of two photosynthetic capacities, here termed $A_1$ and $A_2$. $A_1$ was limited by radiation and a maximum photosynthetic flux ($A_m$, mol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$), and was modeled with the nonrectangular hyperbola of Prioul and Chartier (1977)

$$A_1 = \frac{A_m + \alpha Q_p \sqrt{A_m^2 - 2A_m \alpha Q_p \cdot (2\theta - 1) + \alpha^2 Q_p^2}}{2\theta}$$

(7)

Here, $\alpha$ is an empirical parameter representing quantum efficiency (mol CO$_2$ mol$^{-1}$ incident photons) and $\theta$ is an empirical shape parameter determining the smoothness of the transition between limitation by $Q_p$ and by $A_m$ (Prioul and Chartier, 1977). Equation (7) is identical to the Farquhar et al. (1984) equation for light limited photosynthetic capacity, once the assumption is made that $\Gamma^*$ (CO$_2$ compensation concentration, ignoring mitochondrial respiration) is negligible.

$A_2$ was limited by $c_i$ and $A_m$, and is analogous to the rubisco limited photosynthesis of Farquhar et al. (1980), again assuming a negligible $\Gamma^*$

$$A_2 = A_m \frac{c_i}{c_i + Ec}$$

(8)

The parameter $Ec$ is a dimensionless, empirical index of the leaf’s CO$_2$ efficiency (Van Bavel, 1975). Net photosynthesis was modeled as a minimum of $A_1$ and $A_2$, less dark respiration ($R_d$, mol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)

$$A_n = \min(A_1, A_2) - R_d$$

(9)

Temperature dependence of maximum photosynthesis was simulated using an Arrhenius function (Feng et al., 1990)

$$A_m = \frac{\exp \left( \frac{K_a - E_a}{RT_k} \right)}{1 + \frac{E_a}{E_a \exp \left( \frac{dH}{RT_o} - \frac{dH}{RT_k} \right)}}$$

(10)
where $K_a$, $E_a$ and $dH$ are empirical parameters, $T_k$ is leaf temperature (K), $R$ is the gas constant, and $T_o$ is the temperature at which $A_m$ is maximized (K).

The photosynthesis submodel, complete with temperature dependency, has eight adjustable parameters, roughly half the number of more detailed models (e.g. Collatz et al., 1991). Inclusion of $\Gamma^*$, temperature dependencies of $R_d$, and smoothing of the minimum function in Eq. (9) resulted in no improvement of model performance. Our objective was to develop as simple a photosynthesis model as would adequately describe the data, in order to analyze further the stomatal submodel. Therefore, the simplified photosynthesis submodel was used for all subsequent analyses. Use of a more complex set of equations may be appropriate in certain situations, but would not be expected to change the results of the present analyses.

Parameter values were determined for caucasian bluestem and the two gamagrass accessions. We estimated $T_o$ from graphs of the data. The other seven parameters ($K_a$, $E_a$, $dH$, $\alpha$, $\theta$, $E_c$ and $R_d$) were estimated using nonlinear regression.

Large differences in parameter values were found among the three grasses (Table 3). Of the three, caucasian bluestem was found to have the lowest maximum photosynthetic rate and the smallest photon flux and CO$_2$ efficiencies. Of the gamagrasses, accession 1462 had the higher maximum photosynthetic rate and photon flux and CO$_2$ efficiencies.

### 4.2. Integration of stomatal and photosynthesis submodels

In order to simulate leaf responses to environmental variables, separate submodels for $g_s$ and $A_n$ must be solved simultaneously (Tenhunen and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Caucasian bluestem</th>
<th>Eastern gamagrass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WW-1318</td>
<td>WW-1462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_o$ (°C)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_a$</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_a$</td>
<td>61960</td>
<td>31040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$dH$</td>
<td>173300</td>
<td>288000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta$</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_c$</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_d$</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_m @ T_o$</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAME (%)</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Westin, 1979). We linked the submodels by using a diffusion equation for \( c_i \):

\[
c_i = c_S - 1.6 \frac{A_n}{g_S}
\]

where 1.6 is the ratio of the diffusivities of water vapor and CO\(_2\) in air. To implement the complete leaf gas exchange model, a numerical algorithm was used to determine values of \( c_i \) and \( g_S \) which satisfy Eqs. (6), (9), and (11). We tested this solution with wide ranges of environmental conditions. The algorithm found unique values of \( c_i \) and \( g_S \) for all conditions except extremely low levels of \( D_S \) or \( c_S \), and when \( A_n \leq 0 \) (i.e. net respiration). Keeping \( D_S \), \( c_S \), and \( g_S \) at or above the minimum values of 1 kPa, 50 \( \mu \)mol mol\(^{-1}\), and 0.01 mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\), respectively, allowed the algorithm to perform satisfactorily under all tested conditions.

### 4.3. Application of integrated gas exchange model to three grasses

We applied the integrated model to the leaf gas exchange data used to

![Graphs showing measured vs. modelled stomatal conductance for different datasets.](image)

Fig. 2. Measured (symbols) stomatal conductance, plotted against simulated values for four datasets: (a) caucasian bluestem calibration data; (b) caucasian bluestem independent dataset; (c) eastern gamagrass accession WW1318; (d) eastern gamagrass accession WW-1462. Lines represent the expected Observed = Simulated relationships.
Table 4
Relative Absolute Mean Errors for the integrated leaf gas exchange model and its component submodels. Conductance and photosynthesis submodels were calibrated for each of three grasses, and simulations were run first for the separate submodels and then for the integrated model. Simulations included runs using the data used to calibrate the submodels, as well as a single validation dataset for caucasian bluestem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>RAME (%)</th>
<th>Calibration data</th>
<th>Validation data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian bluestem</td>
<td>Eastern gamagrass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WW-1318</td>
<td>WW-1462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_s$ submodel</td>
<td>$g_s$</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_n$ submodel</td>
<td>$A_n$</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>$g_s$</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$A_n$</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

calibrate the submodels for the three grasses. An independent data set for caucasian bluestem was also used and is discussed in a later section. For each grass, we set the 12 adjustable parameters to the values determined for that grass. We then applied the model to the environmental variables ($Q_p$, $T_i$, $e_s$, and $c_a$) measured with each observation of leaf gas exchange for that grass. $A_n$ and $g_s$ were calculated as described above, and transpiration ($E$, mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) was calculated from the conductances and water vapor pressures (Pearcy et al., 1989). Calculated values of $A_n$, $g_s$, and $E$ were compared with measured values. Analyses included all measurements where $c_a > 20$ μmol mol$^{-1}$. Goodness of fit was evaluated using model residuals expressed as Relative Absolute Mean Errors (RAME; see Appendix 2).

Calculated photosynthesis rate, stomatal conductance and transpiration rate were close to the observed calibration values for the three accessions (Fig. 2(a), (c), (d)). Relative residuals calculated using calibration data for $A_n$, $g_s$ and $E$ using the integrated model were 13% or less (Table 4). Model performance with an independent data set (Fig. 2(b)) is discussed in a later section.

Performance of the integrated model can be evaluated with graphs of observed and simulated results against controlled environmental variables. Graphs were constructed showing these responses for one species, caucasian bluestem, using the dataset used to calibrate the model (Fig. 3). Measured and simulated $A_n$, $g_s$ and $E$ are in close agreement at all levels of the light and CO$_2$ experiments, and at temperatures up to 35°C in the temperature experiment. Discrepancies occur at higher temperatures, because model fitting was not greatly influenced by the small number of measurements above 35°C. Also,
Fig. 3. Observed (symbols) and simulated (lines) responses of photosynthesis, stomatal conductance, and transpiration to four environmental variables, for caucasian bluestem. Each column of scatter plots (except for the temperature experiment) shows results for experiments in which one environmental variable was varied at three temperatures. Leaf temperatures in those columns of scatterplots are indicated by symbols (circles: 15°C; triangles: 25°C; squares: 35°C). Each symbol represents the average values for 9–20 observations within a treatment group.

in the vapor pressure experiment, simulated $A_n$ and $g_S$ do not display the degree of responsiveness to $D_a$ seen in the observed data. Model analysis indicates that this is caused by the photosynthesis submodel's lack of a response to humidity, except indirectly through the effect on conductance. Generally, the integrated model produced fits better to the photosynthesis data, and worse to the conductance and transpiration data, than did the component submodels tested alone (Table 4). This may reflect a large degree of error in measurements of $c_i$ in the original data. Measured values of $c_i$ were used in testing the photosynthesis submodel, but $c_i$ was itself simulated in the integrated model.

4.4. Error analysis of integrated model

We carried out an error analysis on model results for caucasian bluestem, to evaluate the effects of experimental conditions on model performance. We
first calculated residuals from log-transformed observed and simulated values of \( g_S \) and \( A_n \). This reduced heterogeneity of the residuals’ variances across treatments; however, cases where \( A_n \leq 0 \) had to be excluded from this analysis. The residuals were tested with analysis of variance, using primary experimental treatment and leaf replicate as independent effects, and residuals for \( g_S \) and \( A_n \) as separate dependent variables. The analysis was repeated for each of the four experiments and each of the three temperatures, except when temperature itself was the primary experimental treatment. This reflects the design of the original experiments (Coyne and Bradford, 1983, 1985) where each leaf replicate was subjected to a range of a single environmental variable. Results of this analysis reveal that variation among individual leaves accounts for the greatest share of the model error: leaf replicate was significantly associated with errors in predicted \( g_S \) and \( A_n \) in all experiments and temperature levels \((P < 0.01)\). Primary treatment level was also significantly associated with model errors \((P < 0.01)\), except for the leaves measured at 15°C in the light and CO\(_2\) experiments. Model goodness-of-fit clearly varied across treatment gradients, as suggested by Fig. 3. However, the error analysis reveals that variability of model errors, probably resulting from physiological differences between leaves, are even greater than these treatment differences.

4.5. Application of integrated model to an independent data set

The model was applied to leaf gas exchange data for caucasian bluestem, collected in an independent study (Coyne et al., 1982). We used parameter values as calculated for caucasian bluestem in the analyses already discussed (Tables 2 and 3). The experiments used for validation differed from the ones in which parameters were calculated (i.e. calibration data) in the following aspects: (1) The validation study did not include manipulations of \( Q_p \); (2) leaves in the validation study were exposed to a relatively narrow range of \( c_a \) treatments; (3) the \( D_a \) and \( c_a \) experiments in the validation study did not include 15°C temperature treatments; (4) fewer leaves were measured \((n = 130)\).

Relative residuals from the validation data were higher than from the calibration data, and, as with the calibration simulations, the integrated model gave poorer fits to the conductance data and better fits to the photosynthesis data than did the standalone simulations with the submodels. Using the integrated model, the mean absolute residuals for conductance, transpiration and photosynthesis were within 16% of the average observed values (Table 4). The model showed a slight tendency to overestimate \( g_S \) in the validation dataset (Fig. 2(b)), an expected result, because observed fluxes in the validation data were also slightly lower than in the calibration data. The discrepancy in responses to \( D_a \), noted earlier for the calibration simulations, also appeared in the validation results. However, as with the calibration
Fig. 4. Stomatal conductance, photosynthesis and transpiration of three grasses calculated with the integrated leaf gas exchange model across ranges of light and temperature. Each set of curves was generated by solving the integrated conductance and photosynthesis model across a single varying condition, while all other conditions were assumed constant. Constant environmental variables were: \( Q_p \), 2000 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \); \( c_a \), 350 \( \mu \text{mol mol}^{-1} \); \( T_1 \), 35°C; \( D_a \), 1.3 kPa.
simulations, the greatest source of model error appeared to be leaf-to-leaf variation.

4.6. Comparing simulated gas exchange for three grasses

Figure 4 shows simulated $g_S$, $A_n$ and $E$ for the three grasses over ranges of $Q_p$ and $T_1$ similar to ranges in the calibration data. Simulated fluxes and conductance of eastern gamagrass accession 1462 exceed those of accession 1318; caucasian bluestem generally shows the lowest values. These curves reveal the effects of several important model parameters. Most obvious are the parameters $K_a$ and $E_a$, which reflect the differences in photosynthetic capacities among the three grasses, and largely cause the different magnitudes of responses just noted. In addition, the distinct plateaus in caucasian bluestem’s simulated responses to light are caused by the relatively high value of the $\theta$ parameter used for this grass. The effect of different optimal temperatures is seen in the temperature responses.

5. Discussion

5.1. Stomatal submodel

The application of the stomatal submodel of Ball (1988) and Collatz et al. (1991) to the data included in this study call into question that submodel’s assumptions of linearity and the compensatory effects of carbon flux and humidity. The revised stomatal submodel developed here, and tested with C-4 grass data in the context of a complete leaf gas exchange model, does not contain these assumptions. The generally good fit of the revised submodel to these data has several implications for an increased understanding of stomatal behavior. First, the nonlinear relationship between $g_S$ and $A_n$ suggests that stomata are more sensitive to changes in environmental conditions when $A_n$ is low than when $A_n$ is high. This nonlinearity may be the effect of differential response of stomatal photosynthetic electron transport with respect to that of the mesophyll. Further study, involving the application of stomatal submodels to data collected under wide ranges of conditions, is necessary to determine whether these nonlinear relationships occur among other species.

Ball (1988) acknowledged the poor linearity between $g_S$ and the stomatal index $A_v h_S/c_S$ at low photosynthesis and extreme humidities, and suggested the feasibility of constructing a nonlinear stomatal submodel. For his analyses, Ball (1988) considered the linear index to provide sufficient approximations of $g_S$, because of its simplicity and the fact that most of a plant’s transpiration and photosynthesis tend to occur under conditions where the
linear index is applicable. However, the importance of early morning periods for gas exchange is greater for grasses in semiarid environments than for well-watered crops. As in Ball's (1988) analysis, when we applied Eq. (1) to leaves with relatively low $A_n$, using parameter values derived from measurements at higher $A_n$, that equation tended to underestimate $g_S$ (see Fig. 1(a)). If a stomatal submodel based on Eq. (1) is used to simulate diurnal courses of gas exchange, the accumulated underestimation of $g_S$ and $E$ during periods of low light or high atmospheric water stress could lead to important errors in simulated water use.

The extended submodel, like the Ball (1988; Collatz et al., 1991) version, suggests that leaves 'sense', and respond to, CO$_2$ partial pressures and humidity within the leaf boundary layer, that is, at the leaf surface. Guard cells are thought to initiate these responses (Losch and Tenhunen, 1981). Recent work has challenged these assumptions. Mott (1988) suggested that stomata respond to $c_i$, rather than $c_S$. Other recent studies (Aphalo and Jarvis, 1991; Mott and Parkhurst, 1991) concluded that stomata respond to vapor pressure deficit, or the resulting transpiration stream, rather than relative humidity. The results of our study do not support a principal role of $c_i$ in determining stomatal behavior; its use in place of $c_S$ in the stomatal submodel did not improve the model's accuracy (results not shown). These results are not conclusive, being correlative rather than manipulative; also, estimates of $c_i$ are subject to more error than are the values of $c_S$. However, our results do support the utility of $c_S$ for predicting $g_S$. Regarding the choice of variables to account for the effect of humidity on $g_S$, our results indicate a greater utility of $D_S$ than $h_S$. Using $E$ in place of $D_S$ did not improve the stomatal submodel (results not shown).

5.2. Integrated model

When the stomatal submodel was integrated with the photosynthesis submodel, the goodness-of-fit for $g_S$ deteriorated for all three grasses. The opposite trend occurred with $A_n$ (Table 4). The photosynthesis submodel, in spite of its greater complexity, did not fit the data as well as the conductance submodel. Linking the stomatal submodel with a photosynthesis submodel does allow conductance to be simulated solely from environmental conditions, but simulations are subject to the same variability as simulated photosynthesis.

The greatest source of random error in the integrated model appears to be leaf-to-leaf variability, particularly in the photosynthesis submodel. The data used in model development included treatments on individual leaves. Error analyses on model residuals reveal that the leaf-to-leaf variation accounts for a greater portion of the residuals than any other factor considered. These results appear to be consistent with variation among leaves in photosynthetic capacity. It seems likely that much inter-leaf variability can be described with
Fig. 5. Net photosynthesis measured for caucasian bluestem, plotted against leaf internal CO₂ partial pressure. Observations were made at three temperatures in two separate experiments. The first experiment included manipulations of $c_a$ at constant $D_a$; in the second, $D_a$ was manipulated at constant $c_a$. Each point represents the average measurements of five to eight leaves; points connected by a line represent a single group of leaves exposed to either a $D_a$ or a $c_a$ treatment. Numbers at a point indicate the average $D_a$ for that group of leaves. Results indicate either a nonstomatal effect of humidity on photosynthesis, or systematic errors in estimation of $c_i$. Data are from Coyne and Bradford (1985).

the parameter pair $K_a$ and $E_a$ in the photosynthesis submodel, used to calculate $A_m$. Conceptually, these can be described as representing concentration of nitrogen or enzymes, which are known to limit photosynthetic rates (Boot and den Dubbelden, 1990).

5.3. Possible importance of heterogeneous stomatal closure

A further source of variability in the leaf model is revealed in the response of the integrated model to $D_a$ (Fig. 3), where simulated $A_n$ is relatively constant compared with the observed values, especially at low temperatures. The observed decreases in $A_n$ with increasing $D_a$ are not explained by any of the environmental variables included in the photosynthesis submodel: temperature and light were constant during this experiment, and observed $c_i$ decreased only slightly (Fig. 5). More complete photosynthesis submodels, e.g. Farquhar et al. (1980) and Collatz et al. (1991), use the same variables as in the model used here, and are also unable to fit these humidity effects.

One plausible explanation for the discrepancy in $A_n/c_i$ relationships
between the $c_a$ and the $D_a$ treatments (Fig. 5) is systematic error in the estimation of $c_i$ in the original experiments. Such systematic errors have recently been attributed to heterogeneous stomatal closure (Van Kraalingen, 1990; Terashima, 1992), as have apparently nonstomatal reductions in photosynthesis (Downton et al., 1988). Grass leaves seem likely to exhibit variable gas exchange across their width, because of the division of photosynthetic tissue into parallel 'pipes' separated by extensions of vascular tissue (Van Kraalingen, 1990; Terashima, 1992). During periods of high vapor pressure deficit and rapid transpiration, heterogeneous stomatal closure may develop in grass leaves as water stress increases in individual pipes served by relatively inefficient xylem veins. Local variations in boundary layer conductance (Nobel, 1991, p. 364) may contribute further to this phenomenon. When substantial portions of a leaf are inactive because of local stomatal closure, the leaf's average $c_i$ is likely to be overestimated (Downton et al., 1988).

Simple gas exchange models can be readily adapted to include effects of heterogeneous leaf activity, as demonstrated by Cheeseman (1991). However, the present model, which considers the effects of a leaf boundary layer on gas exchange, as well as the influence of $A_n$ on $g_S$, would be more difficult to adapt. The computational burden of considering interactions among leaf regions through boundary layer effects would be large. Adopting the assumption of homogenous concentrations of gases within a leaf's boundary layer would partially reduce this burden, but would still require multiple iterations of the integrated model, which itself contains iterative solutions. Cheeseman (1991) used Monte Carlo methods to generate distributions of stomatal activity; this required hundreds of randomly generated values of $g_S$ when the variance of $g_S$ was large. More efficient methods such as Gauss–Legendre quadrature (Press et al., 1989) could be used to solve the integrated model over a defined distribution of the parameter $b_0$ (Eq. 6), much as is commonly performed for individual leaves over irradiance distributions (e.g. Goudriaan, 1986). Besides the problems of implementation, conceptual difficulties remain: it is not clear just which environmental or physiological variables cause variability in stomatal activity. Although the current study suggests that atmospheric water vapor deficit may induce heterogeneous stomatal closure, whole leaf gas exchange experiments are insufficient for determining the causes of stomatal variability (Terashima 1992). Whole leaf experiments could be used to develop correlative relationships between environmental variables and some relative indicator of leaf patchiness, but this would require more highly factorial experimental designs than those used in the present study.

5.4. Incorporating effects of water stress

Our model was developed from data on well-watered plants. Leaf water
potentials, measured after treatment, were all above $-1.2$ MPa, and no strong relationship with $g_s$ or $A_n$ was displayed in this range. Effects of leaf water potential were therefore not included in the current model. Further development of the model for use in field situations will include an effect of water potential on $g_s$. Field measurements of gas exchange in caucasian bluestem indicate near-complete stomatal closure at xylem water potentials of approximately $-3.5$ MPa (unpublished data). Preliminary analyses suggest that an additional multiplicative term in Eq. (6), similar to Jarvis’ (1976) threshold equation, will adequately account for the effect of leaf water potential on both $g_s$ and $A_n$.

5.5. Conclusions

The conductance model developed in this paper is applicable to three C-4 grasses measured over a wide range of environmental conditions. The model is relatively simple and easily applied. The model is empirical and does not explain mechanics of stomatal response, but its development has identified important relationships among environmental and physiological variables that may contribute to explanatory models.

The integrated gas exchange model explains environmental responses of $g_s$, $E$ and $A_n$ quite well. It also applies, with moderate loss of accuracy, for a validation data set. Precision of the model would be enhanced by additional parameters that represent physiological causes of leaf-to-leaf variability in photosynthetic capacity.

The gas exchange model allows the comparison of responses of different grasses to numerous combinations of environmental variables, based on data collected at representative values of those conditions. Such an approach allows exploration of the differences among accessions that would be expected at combinations of environmental conditions not included in the original experiments. While such explorations should be performed cautiously, the success of the integrated model at fitting its calibration data suggests that its predictions outside the range of these observations can be regarded as useful hypotheses.
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**Appendix I. List of symbols, with definition, units and equation where defined or used in text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Units*</th>
<th>Equation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>photosynthetic capacity limited by light and Aₘ</td>
<td>mol m⁻² s⁻¹</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>photosynthetic capacity limited by cᵢ and Aₘ</td>
<td>mol m⁻² s⁻¹</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aₘ</td>
<td>maximum photosynthetic capacity</td>
<td>mol m⁻² s⁻¹</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aᵣ</td>
<td>net photosynthesis</td>
<td>mol m⁻² s⁻¹</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b₀, b₁, b₂</td>
<td>empirical parameters</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cₑ</td>
<td>ambient CO₂ mole fraction</td>
<td>mol mol⁻¹</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cᵢ</td>
<td>leaf internal CO₂ mole fraction</td>
<td>mol mol⁻¹</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cₛ</td>
<td>leaf surface CO₂ mole fraction</td>
<td>mol mol⁻¹</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dH</td>
<td>empirical parameter</td>
<td>J mol⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dₑ</td>
<td>ambient saturation deficit</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dₛ</td>
<td>leaf surface saturation deficit</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>transpiration</td>
<td>mol m⁻² s⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eₑ</td>
<td>empirical parameter</td>
<td>J mol⁻¹</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Except as specified after numbers or in figures.
Appendix 2. Goodness-of-fit statistics

The coefficient of determination \((r^2)\) is useful for evaluating the strength of the linear relationship between variables; we use it to compare alternative linear or linearized models (e.g. Table 1). However, \(r^2\) is less suitable for evaluating the fit of a fully specified model to data. For such purposes, we use the relative absolute mean error (RAME), defined as

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{|y_i - \hat{y}_i|}{n \cdot y} \times 100
\]  

(A1)

This statistic expresses the average absolute value of the residuals as a percent of the average observed value. Unlike \(r^2\), it measures the goodness of fit of a parameterized model. Unlike metrics such as mean square residuals, it allows comparison of models calculated from different units; because it uses absolute values instead of squared values, it does not emphasize the influence of a small number of outliers.