

IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON PLANTS, FRUITS AND GRAINS¹

CRISTHYAN ALEXANDRE CARCIA DE CARVALHO^{2*}, EBENÉZER DE OLIVEIRA SILVA³, MARLOS ALVES BEZERRA³

ABSTRACT - Over the past few years, the increased use of fossil fuels as well as the unsustainable use of land, through the reduction of native forests has increased the greenhouse gas emissions, contributing definitively to the rise in temperature on earth. In this scenario, two environmental factors, directly related to the physiology of crop production, are constantly being changed. The first change is the increase in the partial pressure of carbon dioxide (CO₂), which directly affects photosynthetic efficiency and the associated metabolic processes. The other change is the temperature increase which affects all the physiological and metabolic processes mediated by enzymes, especially photosynthesis and respiration. Therefore, this review aims to discuss the main effects caused by increased CO₂ pressure and the temperature rise in the physiology, productivity and post-harvest quality of plants with photosynthetic metabolism C3, C4 and CAM. Based on physiological evidence, the increased atmospheric CO₂ concentration will benefit net photosynthesis, stomatal conductance and the transpiration of C3 plants, however in hot, dry and saline environments, the C4 and CAM species present an advantage by having low photorespiration. Studies show controversial conclusions about the productivity of C3 and C4 plants, and the quality of their fruits or grains under different CO₂ concentrations or high temperatures. Thus, there is a need for more testing with C3 and C4 plants, besides of more researches with CAM plants, in view of the low number of experiments carried out in this type of plants.

Keywords: Carbon dioxide. Greenhouse gases. Photosynthetic metabolism. Plant physiology. Temperature.

IMPACTO DAS MUDANÇAS CLIMÁTICAS EM PLANTAS, FRUTOS E GRÃOS

RESUMO - Ao longo dos últimos anos, o aumento na utilização de combustíveis fósseis, bem como o uso não sustentável da terra, pela redução das florestas nativas, tem aumentado a emissão dos gases de efeito estufa, contribuindo de maneira definitiva para a elevação da temperatura na terra. Nesse cenário, dois fatores ambientais, diretamente ligados à fisiologia da produção vegetal, estão sendo constantemente alterados: a elevação na pressão parcial de dióxido de carbono (CO₂), que afeta diretamente a eficiência fotossintética e os processos metabólicos associados. A outra mudança é o aumento da temperatura, que afeta todos os processos fisiológicos e metabólicos mediados por enzimas, com destaque para a fotossíntese e a respiração. Diante disso, esta revisão teve como objetivo discutir os principais efeitos causados pelo aumento da concentração do CO₂ e elevação da temperatura na fisiologia, produtividade e qualidade pós-colheita das plantas com metabolismo fotossintético C3, C4 e CAM. Com base nas evidências fisiológicas o aumento da concentração de CO₂ atmosférico irá incrementar a fotossíntese líquida, a condutância estomática e a transpiração das plantas C3. Porém em ambientes quentes, secos e salinos, as espécies C4 e CAM apresentarão vantagem por possuir baixa fotorrespiração. Os estudos apresentam conclusões controversas sobre a produtividade das plantas C3 e C4, e a qualidade de seus frutos ou grãos submetidos a diferentes concentrações de CO₂ ou temperaturas elevadas. Assim, existe a necessidade de mais experimentação com plantas C3 e C4, além de mais pesquisas com plantas CAM, tendo em vista, o reduzido número de experimentos realizados com esse tipo de planta.

Palavras-chave: Dióxido de carbono. Gases de efeito estufa. Metabolismo fotossintético. Fisiologia de plantas. Temperatura.

*Autor para correspondência.

¹Recebido para publicação em 14/03/2014; aceito em 27/03/2014

²Universidade Federal Rural do Semi-árido, UFRSA, Programa de Pós-graduação em Fitotecnia, Av. Francisco Mota, 572, Bairro Costa e Silva, 59.625-900, Mossoró-RN. e-mail: cristhyanac@hotmail.com

³Embrapa Agroindústria Tropical, Rua: Dra Sara Mesquita, 2270, 60511-110, Fortaleza-CE. e-mail: ebenezer.silva@embrapa.br; marlos.bezerra@embrapa.br

INTRODUCTION

Today's agenda is the debates about global climate change. This approach is recent. It began in the 80's when the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) decided to monitor and simulate the changes climate occurring on our planet. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was created in order to gather information and indicate the causes and effects of these environmental impacts.

According to the IPCC (2007): the increased use of fossil fuels, inadequate agricultural practices and changes in the use of land are the human activities that contribute most to increasing the concentration of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the atmosphere, and creating as a result, global warming (SOLOMON et al., 2007).

The main greenhouse gases are water vapor, methane, ozone, nitrous oxide and carbon dioxide (CO₂), the latter being responsible for 70% of the potential of raising the temperature of the Earth (MARENCO, 2006; BRENNAN et al., 2007; PIMENTEL, 2011). Studies show that by the end of this century the concentration of CO₂ will go from the current 384ppm to 720ppm, and as a consequence, the Earth's average temperature could rise 1.8 to 4.0°C (IPCC, 2007; LEAKEY et al., 2009).

Based on this problem, researchers have been trying to figure out how plants will behave with the possible increase of CO₂ concentration and temperature in the future.

Thus, this review aims to discuss, based on research results, the physiological and productive performance of the C3, C4 and CAM plants as well as the quality of their fruits or grains.

EFFECTS OF CO₂ AND TEMPERATURE ON PLANT PHYSIOLOGY

In nature, there are three types of plants with different photosynthetic metabolism: C3, C4 and CAM. Each one presents unique characteristics in regard to absorption and assimilation of the carbon as well as to the adaptation to temperature variations.

These different types of plants show changes in physiology, morphology, anatomy, chemistry and gene expression profile when grown in elevated CO₂ concentrations and high temperatures (BRAGA et al., 2006; SOUZA et al., 2008). Pimentel (2004) argues that the physiological responses to different environmental conditions are variable and may be a function of genotype, the environment and the phenotype interaction.

According to Marin and Nassif (2013), the increase in the atmospheric CO₂ concentration increases the gradient that drives the diffusion of CO₂ from the atmosphere to the chloroplast. Therefore higher rates of photosynthesis for a given stomatal

conductance are expected. In addition, one has to maintain the same deficit in the stomata-atmosphere vapor pressure, so that a reduction in the transpiration rate will occur (TAIZ; ZAIGER 2013).

C3 photosynthetic metabolism plants in optimal temperature and humidity conditions will benefit the most from the increase in CO₂ concentration, but will suffer from stress if subjected to high temperatures due to a number of morphological, morpho-anatomical, physiological and biochemical changes, that affect their development and can result in drastic reduction in productivity (WAHID et al., 2007).

Contrary to the C3 plants, C4 and CAM photosynthetic metabolism plants in adverse conditions (high temperatures and low humidity) present less perspiration and a more efficient use of water and nutrients, especially nitrogen (STRECK, 2005; TAIZ; ZEIGER, 2013).

Barbosa et al. (2011) in an experiment with C3 photosynthetic metabolism plants, observed that the increase in CO₂ concentration (550ppm) in a growth chamber, decreased stomatal conductance in cowpea 'Marataoã' and 'Tapaihum' cultivars, 33.57% and 60.10%, respectively, compared to the control (360ppm). The transpiration rate reduced (26.82%) only in the Marataoã variety. The rate of net photosynthesis was not affected in either one of the cultivars. In sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris*), grown in an atmosphere rich in CO₂ (700ppm), Ignatova et al. (2005) noted an increase in net photosynthesis of 85%, 47% and 52% at days 3; 6 and 8 of analysis.

In an experiment with tropical tree species, Lloyd and Farquhar (2008) observed that the photosynthetic rates in the trees reduced when subjected to temperatures above 30°C. This condition caused an increase in respiration and transpiration and a reduction in stomatal conductance, due to the high leaf vapor pressure deficit. The same authors believe that the increase in CO₂ in the coming decades will compensate for any reduction in photosynthesis caused by increased temperature.

C3 photosynthetic mechanism land plants show positive responses (increase in net photosynthesis and decreased transpiration) when submitted in short term to an environment with high concentrations of CO₂. In the long term, this increase is compensated many times over by the down-regulation of photosynthetic capacity in the C3 species (LONG et al., 2004). According to Long et al. (2006) and Leakey et al. (2009), with the increase in the atmospheric CO₂ concentration, throughout the whole plant cycle, increased mitochondrial respiration occurs due to increased transcription and the activity of several glycolysis enzymes, the Krebs cycle, and the mitochondrial electron transportation chain.

In plants with C4 photosynthetic metabolism, the physiological responses can be variable. Vu et al. (2006) and Vu and Allen Jr (2009), working with sugar cane submitted to elevated CO₂ (720ppm) in a greenhouse, observed an increase of 17% and 26% in

net photosynthesis and a reduction of over 30% in stomatal conductance and transpiration. Souza et al. (2008) reached similar conclusions, a reduction of over 30% in stomatal conductance and transpiration and a 30% increase in net photosynthesis of sugar cane, grown in an open-top chamber with 720ppm of CO₂. High CO₂ concentrations in C₄ species, can improve the efficiency of water use, as it will reduce the periods of depletion of soil moisture, softening the period of stress during the dry season, decreased stomatal conductance and transpiration (MORGAN et al., 2011). Thus, the efficiency of water use per plant and per cultivated area would be greater (LEAKEY et al., 2009).

Long et al. (2006) observed reduction in stomatal conductance and water saving in corn growing in a high CO₂-concentration atmosphere (550ppm). However the CO₂ assimilation showed no significant increase. The cause of this is believed to be saturation, because the C₄ photosynthetic metabolism plants allow high rates of photosynthesis even in environments with little atmospheric CO₂ and low stomatal conductance (TAIZ; ZAIGER, 2013).

The result of stomata partial closure are decreased transpiration and xylem flow protection, which allow the stomata efficiency under conditions of low humidity in the atmosphere and soil (OSBORNE; SACK, 2012). Stomatal conductance plays a key role in the exchange of leaf gases, limiting both the water outlet and the inlet of CO₂ (BUCKLEY, 2005).

It is noteworthy, too, that the stomatal closure is generally observed when the concentration of CO₂ is high and may be associated with a lower loss of latent heat and a consequent increase in leaf temperature (KIMBALL; BERNACCHI, 2006). According to Taiz and Zeiger (2013), in conditions of stress, stomatal movement constitutes in an important mean of plant defense against excessive water loss and eventual death by desiccation. Moreover, the guard cells are considered sensitive to the levels of CO₂ (SAGE, 2002).

Several of the observed photosynthetic responses can be attributed to differences in experimental technologies, plant species used, age of the plant, type of soil in which the plant was grown, climate of the region, as well as the duration of the treatment and the phenological phases in which the treatment was applied (DAVEY et al., 2006; DAMATTA et al., 2010; POLLEY et al., 2011).

Therefore, the general expectation, based on physiological evidence is that the increase of atmospheric CO₂ benefits net photosynthesis, stomatal conductance and the transpiration of C₃ plants. However, in hot, dry and salty environments, C₄ and CAM species would have an advantage due to the fact that they show a very low photorespiration.

EFFECTS OF CO₂ AND TEMPERATURE ON THE PRODUCTIVITY OF PLANTS

With the increasing concentration of CO₂ on our Planet and the consequent global warming, several simulations of climate changes are being held. The main simulation model is based on CO₂ application in the atmosphere or soil, but controlled-environment studies are needed (GOMES et al., 2005), especially in growth or open-top chambers.

Studies under controlled conditions of temperature and humidity point to average increases of 30% in productivity in many C₃ crops submitted to the atmosphere at twice the current CO₂ concentration. In less controlled field conditions, the productivity gain was lower, between 10-28% (FUHRER, 2003; LIMA; ALVES, 2008).

Ainsworth and Long (2005) also observed an increase (10-20%) in the production of air biomass in pastures of C₃ plants. However in C₄ plants, the increase was between 0% and 10%. Therefore these values should be lower in commercially cultivated areas because of limiting factors such as pests, diseases, competition with weed, nutrient availability and stress caused by temperatures and drought (GHINI et al., 2012).

According to Dias Filho (2007), in Brazil, most established pastures are formed by plants with the C₄ photosynthetic pathway, which according to Fuhrer (2003), virtually do not present positive results at elevated CO₂ concentrations. However, the results are controversial. The sugar cane presents a high yield when grown in a high CO₂ concentration (SOUZA et al., 2008; VU; ALLEN Jr, 2009). On the other hand, well-fertilized and irrigated corn, does not respond positively to this factor (LEAKEY et al., 2006).

Experiments with other crops in a controlled environment, demonstrate positive responses when using the CO₂ enrichment method (FLORIDES; CHRISTODOULIDES, 2009; REDDY et al., 2010). Studies by Paula et al. (2011) with tabasco peppers, Kosobryukhov (2009) with cucumbers (*Cucumis sativus*) and Richter and Semenov (2005) with wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) reported an increase in productivity.

In protected environments, similar results were also observed by Frizzone et al. (2005a). They reported an increase in commercial productivity of yellow hybrid Bonus II melon fruits when doses of CO₂ combined with doses of potassium (K₂O) were applied through irrigation water, the optimal combination was 301.8 kg ha⁻¹ and 300 kg ha⁻¹, respectively.

Field experiments also show satisfactory results: Furlan et al. (2001), Pinto et al. (2006) and Branco et al. (2007) with lettuce, melon and tomato, respectively. Studies by Krishnan et al. (2007), Shimon et al. (2009) and Walter et al. (2010), using outdoor CO₂ enrichment with rice and Crous et al.

(2008), with pine trees, found positive results

Experiments with C3 tree species corroborate with the positive results obtained in other crops. Higher production of biomass was observed in species such as Guapinol (*Hymenaea courbari*), Sickie Pigeonwings (*Clitoria falcata*), *Piptadenia gonoacantha* (commonly known in Brazil as "Pau-Jacaré"), Guapuruvu (*Schizolobium parahyba*) and Brazilian Rosewood (*Dalbergia nigra*) when submitted to high concentrations of CO₂, due to higher rates of photosynthesis (BUCKERIDGE et al., 2007; BUCKERIDGE et al., 2008; GRANDIS et al., 2010). According to Tremblay et al. (2005), species used for reforestation can also be stimulated with the enrichment of CO₂, especially after the burning of a deforested area due to loss of soil carbon to the atmosphere.

Enrichment of CO₂ in a short time period, when the demand for carbohydrates is high, as in the early development of the organs of economic interest, is an alternative to increase the dry matter production of certain crops (PIMENTEL, 2004). However, the effects of using this technique should be tested for each crop and its stage of development, goal of cultivation and treatment duration (LONG et al., 2006).

The application of CO₂ should be performed at appropriate phenological stages. According to technical recommendations by Frizzzone et al. (2005b), the applications should occur in the determined period between the beginning of flowering, when 80% of the male flowers are open, and the beginning of the fruit stage, when 80% of the melon's fruit-set occurs.

Similar behavior was observed by D'Albuquerque Junior et al. (2007), who concluded that CO₂ applications at flowering and fruiting stages contributed to increase the melon production in 17% and 18%, respectively, when compared with the control (no application of CO₂). For the Guapinol species (commonly known in Brazil as "Jatobá") which also belongs to the C3 group, Grandis et al. (2010) claim that it is in the young stage where most CO₂ absorption occurs.

The enrichment of CO₂ combined with high temperatures may have both beneficial and non-beneficial effects in the crops with C3 and C4 photosynthetic pathways. According to Streck and Albert (2006) the increase of air temperature in 2; 3 and 6°C nullified the beneficial effects of increased CO₂ in the productive yield of corn, wheat and soybeans, respectively. Walter et al. 2010, corroborate with this information in rice crops.

On the other hand, Grandis et al. (2010) observed that in physiological terms it is possible that the effects of the increase of the CO₂ concentration combined with high temperatures positively join together, in a controlled environment, increasing crop yields, especially in fast-growing species.

The positive effect of the combination of factors (temperature + CO₂) were observed in alfalfa

(*Medicago sativa*) (ARANJUELO et al., 2005), cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*) (YOON et al., 2009), Mongolian oak (*Quercus mogolica*) (WANG et al., 2008) and wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) (LUO et al., 2005), in which a growth productivity were observed. Positive responses are mainly due to improved photosynthetic rates that are associated with increased biomass (LUO et al., 2005; RICHTER; SEMENOV, 2005; BATTIST; NAYLOR, 2009; FRIEND et al., 2009).

According to Taiz and Zaiger (2013), the higher concentration of CO₂ stimulates photosynthesis and reduces stomatal conductances. Other responses are secondary, such as: accelerated growth, decreased transpiration and decreased leaf nitrogen. This is all due to the increased supply of carbon and its interaction with water loss. The temperature affects all of the biological processes such as: photosynthesis, respiration, cell division, transport and phenology.

As stated above, this issue still has conflicting reports on the productivity of C3 and C4 plants under different CO₂ concentrations and / or high temperatures. Therefore, there is need for more experimentation with C3 and C4 plants, in addition to implementation of experiments with CAM plants, in view of the low number of experiments carried out in this type of plants.

EFFECTS OF CO₂ AND TEMPERATURE ON QUALITY OF FRUITS OR GRAINS

The increased concentration of CO₂ in the atmosphere also presents different effects on the postharvest quality of fruits and grains; it can be beneficial as well as harmful. In working with wheat, Hogy et al. (2009) found that the enrichment of CO₂ in the atmosphere has decreased the quality of the grain, because it modified the amino acid concentrations, reducing the amount of protein 7.4% compared to the control.

In melon, CO₂ application in irrigation water increased the pulp acidity, soluble solids, thickness and firmness (FRIZZONE et al., 2005a). Using the same method and culture, Pinto et al. (2006) found no influence to acidity, soluble solids and pH. D'Albuquerque Junior et al. (2007) also reached the same conclusion, disagreeing only on the acidity, which reduced.

Positive results were also obtained in a protected environment. Tomato plants with liquid CO₂ enrichment (700 to 900ppm) presented larger fruits, strong coloring, higher ascorbic acid and total sugar content compared to the control 250 to 400 ppm CO₂ (ISLAM et al., 1996). Experiments with Niitaka pears corroborate the efficacy of this treatment. The fruits subjected to elevated CO₂ condition (700ppm) had larger dimensions (size and diameter) and soluble solids when compared with control fruits (HAN et al., 2012).

However in an experiment with yellow pitaya (*Selenicereus megalanthus*) and red pitaya (*Hylocereus undatus*), two species of CAM photosynthetic metabolism, no significant differences in soluble solids and pulp percentage were observed when two CO₂ concentrations were used (380 and 1000ppm) in an open-top chamber housed in a greenhouse. However, an average increase of 52g of the fresh weight in the yellow pitaya fruit was verified when using 1000ppm of CO₂ when compared with control fruits. As far as the red pitaya fruits, there were no statistical differences (WEISS et al., 2010).

The results also show differences in the quality of the fruits and grains of the C3 and C4 plants when submitted to different CO₂ concentrations and / or high temperatures. Therefore, more experiments are needed with all kinds of plants, especially the CAM photosynthetic metabolism ones.

METHODS OF TESTING

As noted earlier, the experimental methods for the analysis of responses to climate change are being used in order to indicate the actual interference of abiotic factors in physiology and in the productivity of plants, besides the quality of fruits and grains. These environment simulation models demonstrate the importance of examining the isolated and combined effects of elevated atmospheric CO₂ concentration and global warming.

Currently some methods are being tested for environments with and without control, such as outdoor CO₂ enrichment (HOGY et al., 2009) and water irrigation (FRIZZONE et al., 2005a), CO₂ injection in an open top chamber (WEISS et al., 2010) and in a growth chamber (PAULA et al., 2011). However, these methods should be further studied with the aim of seeking information about which method is best suited for each condition (local and environmental conditions) given the need for objective and clear methods that obtain accurate responses that ensure reliability for the scientific community.

According to Norby and Luo (2004) outdoor experiments are difficult to conduct and interpret, since their results may be masked by interference from other factors not foreseen such as excessive rainfall, drought stress, wind speed, incidence of pests and diseases, among others. However, this method has the advantage of indicating the actual results, taking into account that plants may encounter these factors in the field.

The CO₂ enrichment experiments with irrigation water can be developed in the field, a greenhouse and a controlled environment. This method has some advantages such as increasing the amount of carbon in the soil, improving its chemical quality, increasing the availability of macro and micronutrients present in the soil, reducing the risk of the plant

suffering water stress, as they will be irrigated constantly.

The disadvantage is that it requires a large amount of CO₂ to be effective, which increases the production costs. According to Skok et al. (1962) and Stolwijk and Thimann (1957), cited by Storlie and Heckman (1996), fewer than 5% of CO₂ fixed by the plants is absorbed through the roots. So, the productivity increase as a result of CO₂ absorption by the root system, due the CO₂ application by irrigation water, should be quite unlikely.

Another method used in the field and in greenhouses is the injection of the CO₂ in an open-top chamber (WEISS et al., 2010). This method aims to inject CO₂ into the chamber, forming a type of microclimate; therefore it will increase the concentration of this gas, and still allowing gas exchanges, given the presence of a surface opening on the chamber.

The advantage of this methodology is that the plant can absorb both the CO₂ from the atmosphere as well as what is being injected artificially. The disadvantage is that loss of gas injected to the atmosphere without being tapped by the plant can occur and can burden the cost of experimentation.

Experiments in a controlled environment are also being conducted (BARBOSA et al., 2011). This method aims to control some abiotic factors (temperature, humidity, solar radiation, excess or deficit of water, etc.) that may influence the outcome of the experiments.

The advantage of this method is the possibility to test one or more factors in isolation without the risk of interference. The disadvantages are: high cost of system implementation and the uncertainty of obtaining the same environmental conditions when the crop is deployed in the planting areas.

CONCLUSION

The constant climate changes on our planet are the biggest concerns of the scientific community. It is unclear what will actually happen with the C3, C4 and CAM plants in the future. As shown in this review, the researchs showed conflicting results: while some species will be benefited, others will be harmed - which will depend mainly on the physiological metabolism of each type of plant.

This issue still has controversial conclusions about the productivity of C3 and C4 plants, and the quality of its fruits and grains under different CO₂ concentrations or high temperatures. Therefore, there is need for more experimentation with these three types of plants, particularly with CAM plants, in view of the low number of experiments carried out on this type of plant.

REFERENCES

- AINSWORTH, E. A.; LONG, S. P. What have we learned from 15 years of free air CO₂ enrichment (FACE)? a meta-analysis of the responses of photosynthesis, canopy properties and plant production of rising CO₂. **New Phytologist**, n. 165, p. 351-372, 2005.
- ARANJUELO, I. et al. The use of temperature gradient tunnels for studying the combined effect of CO₂, temperature and water availability in N₂ fixing alfalfa plants. **Annals of Applied Biology**, v. 146, p. 51-60, 2005.
- BARBOSA, L. G. et al. Comportamento Fisiológico de Feijão-Caupi sob diferentes concentrações de CO₂. In: SIMPÓSIO DE MUDANÇAS CLIMÁTICAS E DESERTIFICAÇÃO NO SEMIÁRIDO BRASILEIRO, 3., 2011, Juazeiro. **Anais...** Petrolina: Embrapa Semiárido, 2011. 1 CD-ROM.
- BATTIST, D. S.; NAYLOR, R. I. Historical warnings of future food insecurity with unprecedented seasonal heat. **Science**, Washington, v. 323, p. 240-244, 2009.
- BRAGA, M. R. et al. Effects of elevated CO₂ on the phytoalexin production of two soybean cultivars differing in the resistance to stem canker disease. **Environmental and Experimental Botany**, v. 58, p. 85-92, 2006.
- BRANCO, R. B. F. et al. Enxertia e água de irrigação carbonatada no transporte de ¹⁵N e na produção do tomateiro. **Revista Brasileira de Engenharia Agrícola e Ambiental**, v. 11, n. 4, p. 374-379, 2007.
- BRENNAN, W. J. et al. Our changing planet. The U.S. **Climate Change Science Program for Fiscal year 2007**. Washington: U. S. Global Change Research Program, 263 p. 2007.
- BUCKERIDGE, M. S., MORTARI, L. C.; MACHADO, M. R. Respostas fisiológicas de plantas às mudanças climáticas: alterações no balanço de carbono nas plantas podem afetar o ecossistema? In **Fenologia – Ferramenta para conservação e manejo de recursos vegetais arbóreos** (REGO, G. M.; NEGRELLE, R. R. B.; MORELLATO, L. P. C.). ed. Embrapa Florestas, Colombo, p. 1-13, 2007.
- BUCKERIDGE, M. S. et al. Respostas de plantas às mudanças climáticas globais. In **Biologia das mudanças climáticas no Brasil** (BUCKERIDGE, M. S. org.). ed. Rima, São Carlos, p.77-92, 2008.
- BUCKLEY, T. N. The control of stomata by water balance. **New Phytologist**, v. 168, p. 275-292, 2005.
- CROUS, K. Y.; WALTERS, M. B.; ELLSWORTH, D. S. Elevated CO₂ concentration affects leaf photosynthesis–nitrogen relationships in *Pinus taeda* over nine years in FACE. **Tree Physiology**, v. 28, p. 607-614, 2008.
- D' ALBUQUERQUE JUNIOR, B. S. et al. Qualidade física e química de frutos de meloeiro rendilhado cultivado sob diferentes épocas de aplicação de CO₂ via água de irrigação. **Irriga**, Botucatu, v. 12, n. 3, p. 273-280, jul./set. 2007.
- DAMATTA, F. M. et al. Impacts of climate changes on crop physiology and food quality. **Food Research International**, v. 43, p. 1814-1823, 2010.
- DAVEY, P. A. et al. Can fast growing trees escape biochemical down-regulation of photosynthesis when grown throughout their complete production cycle in the open air under elevated carbon dioxide? **Plant Cell Environment**, v. 29, p. 1235-1244, 2006.
- DIAS FILHO, M. B. **Degradação de pastagens: processos, causas e estratégias de recuperação**. 3. ed. Belém: Embrapa Amazônia Ocidental, 2007. 190p.
- FLORIDES, G. A.; CHRISTODOULIDES, P. Global warming and carbon dioxide through sciences. **Environment International**, v. 35, p. 390-401, 2009.
- FRIEND, A. D. et al. Photosynthesis in global scale models. In *Photosynthesis in silico* (eds LAISKA, A.; NEDBAL, L.; GOVINDJEE), **Springer**, The Netherlands, p. 465-497, 2009.
- FRIZZONE, J. A.; CARSOSSO, S. da S.; REZENDE, R. Produtividade e qualidade de frutos de meloeiro cultivado em ambiente protegido com aplicação de dióxido de carbono e de potássio via água de irrigação. **Acta Scientiarum Agronomy**, Maringá, v. 27, n. 4, p. 707-717, out./dez. 2005a.
- FRIZZONE, J. A.; D' ALBUQUERQUE JUNIOR, B. S.; REZENDE, R. Aplicação de dióxido de carbono via água de irrigação em diferentes fases fenológicas da cultura do meloeiro cultivado em ambiente protegido. **Acta Scientiarum Agronomy**, Maringá, v. 27, n. 4, p. 667-675, out./dez. 2005b.
- FUHRER, J. Agroecosystem responses to combinations of elevated CO₂, ozone, and global climate change. **Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment**, v. 97, p. 1-20, 2003.
- FURLAN, R. A. et al. Dióxido de carbono aplicado via água de irrigação na cultura da alface. **Horticultura Brasileira**, Brasília, v. 19, p. 25-29, 2001.
- GHINI, R. et al. Research approaches, adaptation

- strategies, and knowledge gaps concerning the impacts of climate change on plant diseases. **Tropical plant pathology**, Brasília, v. 37, n. 1, p. 5-24, jan./feb. 2012.
- GRANDIS, A.; GODOI, S.; BUCKERIDGE, M. S. Respostas fisiológicas de plantas amazônicas de regiões alagadas às mudanças climáticas globais. **Revista Brasileira de Botânica**, v. 33, n. 1, p. 1-12, jan./mar. 2010.
- GOMES, T. M. et al. Aplicação de doses de CO₂ via água de irrigação na cultura da alface. **Horticultura Brasileira**, v. 23, p. 316-319, 2005.
- HAN, J. H. et al. Effects of Elevated Carbon Dioxide and Temperature on Photosynthesis and Fruit Characteristics of 'Niitaka' Pear (*Pyrus pyrifolia* Nakai). **Horticulture Environment Biotechnology**, v. 53, n. 5, p. 357-361, 2012.
- HÖGY, P. et al. Effects of elevated CO₂ on grain yield and quality of wheat: results from a 3-year free-air CO₂ enrichment experiment. **Plant Biology**, v. 11, p. 60-69, may, 2009.
- IGNATOVA, L. K. et al. Growth, photosynthesis, and metabolism of sugar beet at an early stage of exposure to elevated CO₂. **Russian Journal Plant Physioly**, v. 52, p. 158-164, 2005.
- INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE IPCC. Climate Change 2007: **The Physical Science Basis**. Summary for Policy Makers, IPCC. Geneva, 2007.
- ISLAM S, MATSUI T, YOSHIDA Y. Effect of carbon dioxide enrichment on physico-chemical and enzymatic changes in tomato fruits at various stages of maturity. **Scientia Horticulturae**, v. 65, p. 137-149, 1996.
- KIMBALL, B. A.; BERNACCHI, C. J. Evapotranspiration, canopy temperature, and plant water relations. In... J. NÖSBERGER; S. P. LONG, R. J.; NORBY, M.; STITT, G. R.; HENDREY, H. BLUM (Eds.), *Managed ecosystems and CO₂*, p. 311-324, Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2006.
- KRISHNAN, P. et al. Impact of elevated CO₂ and temperature on rice yield and methods of adaptation as evaluated by crop simulation studies. **Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment**, v. 122, n. 2, p. 233-242, 2007.
- KOSOBRYUKHOV, A. A. Activity of the photosynthetic apparatus at periodic elevation of CO₂ concentration. **Russian Journal Plant Physioly**, v. 56, p. 8-16, 2009.
- LEAKEY, A. D. B. et al. Photosynthesis, productivity, and yield of maize are not affected by open-air elevation of CO₂ concentration in the absence of drought. **Plant Physiology**, v. 140, p. 779-790, 2006.
- LEAKEY, A. D. B. et al. Elevated CO₂ effects on plant carbon, nitrogen, and water relations: six important lessons from FACE. **Journal of Experimental Botany**, apr. 2009.
- LIMA, M. A. de.; ALVES, B. J. R. Vulnerabilidades, impactos e adaptação à mudança do clima no setor agropecuário e solos agrícolas. **Parcerias estratégicas**, Brasília, DF, n. 27, dez. 2008.
- LLOYD, J.; FARQUHAR, G. D. Effects of rising temperatures and [CO₂] on the physiology of tropical forest trees. **Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society**, v. 363, p. 1811-1817, 2008.
- LONG, S. P. et al. Rising atmospheric carbon dioxide: plants face the future. **Annual Review of Plant Biology**, v. 55, p. 591-628, 2004.
- LONG, S. P. et al. Food for thought: lower-than expected crop yield stimulation with rising CO₂ concentrations. **Science**, v. 312, p. 1918-1921, 2006.
- LUO, Q. et al. Potential impact of climate change on wheat yield in South Australian. **Agricultural and Forest Meteorology**, Amsterdam, v. 132, p. 273-285, 2005.
- MARENCO, J. A. Mudanças climáticas globais e seus efeitos sobre a biodiversidade: **caracterização do clima atual e definição das alterações climáticas para o território brasileiro ao longo do século XXI**. Brasília: Ministério do Meio Ambiente, 2006.
- MARIN, F.; NASSIF, D. S. P. Mudanças climáticas e a cana-de-açúcar no Brasil: fisiologia, conjuntura e cenário futuro. **Revista Brasileira Engenharia Agrícola Ambiental**, v. 17, n. 2, p. 232-239, 2013.
- MORGAN, J. A. et al. C4 grasses prosper as carbon dioxide eliminates desiccation in warmed semi-arid grassland. **Nature**, v. 476, p. 202-205, 2011.
- NORBY, R. J.; LUO, Y. Evaluating ecosystem responses to rising atmospheric CO₂ and global warming in a multi-factor world. **New Phytologist**, v. 162, p. 281-293, 2004.
- OSBORNE, C. P.; SACK, L. Evolution of C4 plants: a new hypothesis for an interaction of CO₂ and water relations mediated by plant hydraulics. **Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society**, B, n. 367, p. 583-600, 2012.

- PAULA, F. L. M. de. et al. Produção de pimenta tabasco com aplicação de CO₂, utilizando-se irrigação por gotejamento. **Acta Scientiarum. Agronomy**, Maringá, v. 33, n. 1, p. 133-138, 2011.
- PIMENTEL, C. A. **Relação da planta com a água**. Seropédica, RJ: EDUR, 2004. 192 p.
- PIMENTEL, C. Metabolismo de carbono de plantas cultivadas e o aumento de CO₂ e de O₃ atmosférico: situação e previsões. **Bragantia**, Campinas, v. 70, n. 1, p. 1-12, 2011.
- PINTO, J. M.; FARIA, C. M. B. de; FEITOSA FILHO, J. C. Produtividade e qualidade de frutos do meloeiro, em função de nitrogênio e de CO₂ aplicados via fertirrigação. **Irriga**, Botucatu, v. 11, n. 2, p. 198-207, abr./jun. 2006.
- POLLEY, H. W.; MORGAN, J. A.; FAY, P. A. Climate change and agriculture paper: application of a conceptual framework to interpret variability in rangeland responses to atmospheric CO₂ enrichment. **Journal of Agricultural Science**, v. 149, p. 1-14, 2011.
- REDDY, A. R.; RASINENI, G. K.; RAGHAVENDRA, A. S. The impact of global elevated CO₂ concentration on photosynthesis and plant productivity. **Current Science**, v. 99, n. 1, p. 46-57, jul. 2010.
- RICHTER, G. M.; SEMENOV, M. A. Modelling impacts of climate change on wheat yields in England and Wales: assessing drought risks. **Agricultural Systems**, Barking, v. 84, p. 77-97, 2005.
- SAGE, R. F. How terrestrial organism sense, signal, and response to carbon dioxide. **Integrative and Comparative Biology**, Mclean, v. 42, p. 469-480, 2002.
- SHIMONO, H. et al. Genotypic variation in rice yield enhancement by elevated CO₂ relates to growth before heading, and not to maturity group. **Journal of Experimental Botany**, v. 60, p. 523-532, 2009.
- SOLOMON, S. et al. IPCC, 2007. Climate Change 2007: **The Physical Science Basis**. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 996 p.
- SOUZA, A. P. et al. Elevated CO₂ increases photosynthesis, biomass and productivity, and modifies gene expression in sugarcane. **Plant Cell Environment**, v. 31, p. 1116-1127, 2008.
- STORLIE, C. A.; HECKMAN, J. R. Bell pepper yield response to carbonated irrigation water. **Journal of Plant Nutrition**, v. 19, p. 1477-1484, 1996.
- STRECK, N. A. Climate change and agroecosystems: the effect of elevated atmospheric CO₂ and temperature on crop growth, development, and yield. **Ciência Rural**, v. 35, 734-744, 2005.
- STRECK, N. A.; ALBERTO, C. M. Estudo numérico do impacto da mudança climática sobre o rendimento de trigo, soja e milho. **Pesquisa Agropecuária Brasileira**, Brasília, v. 41, n. 9, p. 1351-1359, set. 2006.
- TAIZ, L.; ZEIGER, E. **Fisiologia vegetal**. 5. ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2013. 918 p.
- TREMBLAY, A. et al. **Greenhouse gas emissions, fluxes and processes**: hydroelectric reservoirs and natural environments. Berlin, Springer, 2005.
- VU, J. C. V.; ALLEN JR., L. H.; GESCH, R. W. Up-regulation of photosynthesis and sucrose metabolism enzymes in young expanding leaves of sugarcane under elevated growth CO₂. **Plant Science**, v. 171, p. 123-131, 2006.
- VU, J. C. V.; ALLEN JR., L. H. Stem juice production of the C₄ sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum*) is enhanced by growth at double-ambient CO₂ and high temperature. **Journal of Plant Physiology**, v. 166, p. 1141-1151, 2009.
- YOON, S. T. et al. Growth and development of cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) in response to CO₂ enrichment under two different temperature regimes. **Environmental and Experimental Botany**, v. 67, p. 178-187, 2009.
- WAHID, A. et al. Heat tolerance in plants: an overview. **Environmental and Experimental Botany**, v. 61, p. 199-223, 2007.
- WALTER, L. C. et al. Mudança climática e seus efeitos na cultura do arroz. **Ciência Rural**, v. 40, n. 11, nov. 2010.
- WANG, X. W. et al. Combination of elevated CO₂ concentration and elevated temperature and elevated temperature only promote photosynthesis of *Quercus mongolica* seedlings. **Russian Journal of Plant Physiology**, v. 55, p. 1021-4437, 2008.
- WEISS, I.; MIZRAHI, Y.; RAVEH, E. Effect of elevated CO₂ on vegetative and reproductive growth characteristics of the CAM plants *Hylocereus undatus* and *Selenicereus megalanthus*. **Scientia Horticulturae**, v. 123, p. 531-536, 2010.