TOPOGRAPHIC CONTROLS ON STOMATAL AND MESOPHYLL LIMITATIONS TO PHOTOSYNTHESIS IN TWO SUBALPINE CONIFERS
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Premise of research. Leaf stomatal and mesophyll conductances limit photosynthesis and influence water use efficiency. Few studies have quantified the relative limitations imposed by these CO2 diffusion pathways on photosynthesis in mature conifer trees under natural conditions. Here, we report observations of stomatal and mesophyll conductance changes during seasonal drying across contrasting topographic positions in two Rocky Mountain conifers. We predicted that topographic controls on soil water availability and energy balance would determine limitations to photosynthesis by mesophyll conductance across conifer species with contrasting patterns of stomatal and hydraulic traits.

Methodology. Concurrent measurements of leaf gas exchange and carbon isotope discrimination were used to estimate stomatal \( g_s \) and mesophyll \( g_m \) conductance in branches of an isohydric species, lodgepole pine \( (Pinus contorta)\), and an anisohydric species, Engelmann spruce \( (Picea engelmannii)\), in the central Rocky Mountains. Quantitative limitation analysis of photosynthesis \( (A) \) was then performed using data from CO2 response curves.

Pivotal results. Stomatal conductance imposed greater limitations on photosynthesis (42%–67%) than mesophyll conductance (5%–17%), but no significant differences in \( g_m \) were observed between the two conifer species. At the mesic lower hillslope position, \( A, g_s \), and \( g_m \) increased during the growing season despite declines in soil moisture. In contrast, at the drier upper hillslope position, declines in soil moisture and increases in air temperature during the growing season are correlated with reductions in \( g_s \) but not with \( A \) or \( g_m \).

Conclusions. Adjustments in \( g_m \) played a potentially important role in sustaining photosynthesis and improving plant water use efficiency when stomatal conductance decreased with water limitation during the growing season at the research site. Sustained \( g_m \) with seasonal drought may be an important mechanism allowing conifers to survive and maintain competitive dominance in low-resource habitats.
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Introduction

Plants avoid desiccation and excessive xylem tensions by reducing stomatal conductance \( (g_s) \) and transpiration during periods of high evaporative demand and limited water supply from roots \( (Sperry 2000; Brodribb and Holbrook 2003; Sevanto et al. 2018) \). Reductions in \( g_s \) limit CO2 diffusion into intercellular air spaces, potentially lowering the photosynthetic rate \( (A) \) when CO2 is not saturating \( (Buckley 2005) \). Conductance of CO2 along the diffusion pathway inside leaves \( (g_m) \) colimits the supply of CO2 for photosynthesis but does not directly affect the transpiration rate at the leaf surface \( (Evans and von Caemmerer 1996; Flexas et al. 2012, 2013a, 2013b; Gago et al. 2019) \). Therefore, sustained or increased \( A \) and intrinsic water use efficiency \( iWUE; A/g_s \) could be achieved by reducing diffusion limitations imposed by mesophyll conductance \( (Grassi and Magnani 2005; Flexas et al. 2008, 2016; Tholen and Zhu 2011) \).

Covariation between \( g_s \) and \( g_m \) and their limitations on photosynthesis and influence on water use efficiency are poorly
documented under natural conditions (Flexas et al. 2016; Sevantö et al. 2018). Stomatal and mesophyll conductances are often similar in magnitude (Warren 2008b), and both have been observed to limit photosynthetic rate and influence leaf-level water use efficiency (Duan et al. 2011; Cano et al. 2013; Flexas et al. 2013a). However, the proportionality of these limitations likely varies across species (Peguero-Pina et al. 2012), and each conductance may have separate sensitivities to changes in the environment (Flexas et al. 2012).

Stomatal responses to leaf water supply and transpiration demand may have varying impacts on photosynthesis and water use efficiency depending on correlated responses of mesophyll conductance (Dewar et al. 2018). Isohydric species maintain relatively constant midday minimum water potentials to avoid drought-induced hydraulic damage by reducing stomatal conductance and transpiration as soil water availability declines. In these species where water limitations arise, strong coordinated changes in mesophyll conductance might offset stomatal limitations to CO₂ uptake. In contrast, anisohydric species sustain relatively high stomatal conductance as midday leaf water potential drops, allowing CO₂ fixation to continue to a certain degree but with greater risk of xylem cavitation (McDowell et al. 2008). In species that display a more anisohydric behavior, the overriding adjustments of mesophyll conductance might be important only for sustaining adequate supply of CO₂ to chloroplasts during drought since stomata remain relatively open. The conifer species chosen for the present study express isohydric (Pinus contorta) and anisohydric (Picea engelmannii) stomatal regulation.

Conifers, which display a wide range of hydraulic traits and stomatal behaviors, dominate forests at high northern latitudes and in cool and dry montane environments (Woodward 1995). In the Rocky Mountains of North America, conifers exist across contrasting topographic positions and over broad elevational ranges spanning habitats with highly variable and seasonally contrasting soil water availability. The magnitude of gₑ relative to gₛ in conifers and the proportional responses of gₑ to these contrasting patterns of water availability could have important implications for modeling photosynthesis at the global scale (Bonan 2019). Conifers are reported to have low gₑ caused by thick cell walls and the chloroplasts’ alignment against intercellular air space (Veromann-Jürgenson et al. 2017, 2020; Kooijmans et al. 2019), but only a few studies have quantified mesophyll conductance in mature conifer trees under natural conditions (Warren et al. 2003; Wingate et al. 2007; Bickford et al. 2010; Ubierna and Marshall 2011; Stangl et al. 2019), particularly over contrasting topographic positions where steep gradients of soil moisture availability, temperature, and vapor pressure deficit (VPD) develop. Most studies on gₑ responses to water limitation in conifers have been carried out on potted seedlings in controlled environments, which may not accurately represent responses of gₑ to water limitations in mature trees in the field. The relationship between temperature, VPD, and gₑ under natural conditions has yet to be investigated. In the current study we measured photosynthetic rate and stomatal and mesophyll conductances in branches of adult conifer trees of two species with contrasting patterns of stomatal regulation (lodgepole pine, P. contorta, and Engelmann spruce, P. engelmannii) in the Medicine Bow Range west of Laramie, Wyoming. We measured these traits in branches from trees at upper and lower positions on a south-facing hillslope where differences in soil depth, site energy balance, and drainage source area create potentially large contrasts in available soil moisture, especially late in the growing season.

We addressed the following questions. First, what is the magnitude of mesophyll conductance in P. contorta and P. engelmannii, and how does this trait respond to decreasing soil moisture under natural conditions? To what degree does the mesophyll conductance response differ between the more isohydric and more anisohydric conifer species studied? Second, what is the relative limitation to photosynthesis by gₑ compared with gₛ under different moisture conditions? And third, how do variations in stomatal and mesophyll conductances influence iWUE?

Material and Methods

Field Site Description

Twig samples were collected from mature Engelmann spruce (Picea engelmannii) and lodgepole pine (Pinus contorta) trees in the Medicine Bow Mountains of southeastern Wyoming. These two conifers, together with subalpine fir (Abies lasiocarpa), represent the dominant tree cover in subalpine forests over much of the central Rocky Mountains. We sampled at two field sites over the growing season (June–September) of 2015 in the No-Name Watershed (120-ha catchment, 3000 m asl, lat. 41°20′N, long. 106°20′W) along a south-facing hillslope gradient. The climate at our field sites is defined by long, cold winters and short, dry summers, with substantial winter snowfall (mid-October through May) followed by an extended dry growing season. Average annual precipitation at these field sites is about 1000 mm, with three-fourths of the precipitation occurring as snow, and mean annual air temperature is 1.5°C. The “upper hillslope” site is on the upper portion of a south-facing slope where the drainage source area is small and soils are shallow and rocky. The “lower hillslope” site is at the base of the south-facing slope fed by a larger drainage area, and the soils are generally deeper and store more water compared with the upper hillslope areas (Thayer et al. 2018). The upper and lower hillslope sites are approximately 300 m apart with 50 m of elevation difference.

Soil Moisture, Temperature, VPD, and Leaf Water Potential Measurements

Volumetric soil water content (θ) was continuously recorded in 2015 using CS625 soil moisture probes (Campbell Scientific) installed vertically at depths of 10 and 50 cm at each sample site. Soil water content data were recorded every 30 min using a CR1000 data logger (Campbell Scientific). Predawn and midday leaf water potentials (Ψpd, Ψmd) were determined using a Scholander pressure chamber (PMS Instrument) on twigs from the same trees and canopy positions used for the gas exchange and on-line 13C discrimination measurements described below. Meteorological data were obtained from a weather station at the field site. The mean temperature and VPD during the growing season were calculated and are shown in figure 1. Mean daily temperatures and daily maximum VPD over 7 d prior to each measurement were used as indexes of growth conditions to test their relationship with gₑ.
Gas Exchange and On-Line $^{13}$C Discrimination Measurements

Concurrent measurements of leaf gas exchange and photosynthetic carbon isotope discrimination provide one means to estimate $g_m$ under a range of conditions (Evans et al. 1986; Barbour et al. 2010, 2016; Ogée et al. 2018; Stangl et al. 2019). We sampled branches from the upper sunlit portion of the canopy for measurements each month from June to September in 2015. Branches from four P. contorta and four P. engelmannii trees were collected at each of the two sites from the same trees over every sampling campaign. We followed the sampling and handling procedures for branches reported in Monson et al. (2005). Branches were harvested before dawn and then transported (transit time of about 1 h) to the lab in an insulated cooler with wet paper towels in sealed plastic bags for measurement on the same day. Branch stems were recut underwater, and the freshly cut end was kept submerged during gas exchange measurements. The terminal section of a single twig on each branch was placed into a gas exchange chamber fitted to a photosynthesis analyzer (LI 6400XT IRGA and conifer chamber, LI-COR, Lincoln, NE). Needle leaf area was estimated with projected leaf area with a flatbed scanner and ImageJ software (http://rsb.info.nih.gov/ij/, US National Institutes of Health). Gas exchange measurements were made under saturating light with a red-green-blue LED light source, with equal intensities of each color light (PPFD $= 1500 \ \mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$; LI 6400-18 RGB Light Source). Sample CO2 concentration was set at 400 ppm. Flow rate was controlled between 200 and 400 $\mu$mol s$^{-1}$ to maintain a sufficient CO2 drawdown between the reference and sample gas streams. We assumed that the air surrounding the leaf was well mixed inside the chamber and that the boundary layer resistance was negligible, and therefore the default value was used for this study. For all the measurements, the CO2 drawdown was greater than 65 $\mu$mol mol$^{-1}$. Relative humidity was maintained between 50% and 75%, and chamber temperature was set at 25°C. We calibrated the IRGA in the morning of each measurement day and matched the reference and sample gas analyzers of the IRGA prior to each measurement cycle. After we placed twigs inside the chamber, we gave the needles 15 min to adjust to the chamber conditions before measurements. Measurements were recorded every 10 s for ~8 min.

The gas exchange system was coupled to an isotope ratio midinfrared spectrometer (Delta Ray, Thermo Fisher Scientific) to measure photosynthetic carbon isotope discrimination ($\Delta_{\text{obs}}$) under the conditions described above. Pure CO$_2$ with a known isotopic composition was supplied to the LI 6400 IRGA as source CO$_2$; the $\delta^{13}$C value of this gas was $-16.2 \pm 0.006\%$ (Vienna Pee Dee Belemnite [VPDB]) for measurements made in June and $-12.3 \pm 0.005\%$ for all other measurements, which were calibrated against a CO$_2$ standard gas (Oztech) on a dual inlet MAT 253 IRMS (Thermo Fisher Scientific) at the University of Utah’s Stable Isotope Ratio Facility for Environmental Research. The gas streams of the reference gas entering the leaf chamber and the sample gas leaving the chamber after exchange with leaves inside the chamber were routed into the Delta Ray using Teflon tubing with two Swagelok T fittings. After connecting the Delta Ray inlet tubes with the IRGA, we leak tested during the later period of the 15-min adjusting period by blowing high-CO$_2$ air (from human breath) gently around the chamber and switching connections along the flow paths. With no observable disruptions in CO$_2$ concentration and $\delta^{13}$C values recorded on the Delta Ray, we assumed that there was no leaking in the system (Bickford et al. 2009). The gas samples were dried with the instrument’s internal Nafion drier before they entered the laser measurement cell. The Delta Ray measured...
concentrations of the CO₂ isotopologues $^{13}$CO₂ and $^{12}$CO₂ in the reference and sample gases. Each measurement cycle lasted for ~8 min after a 45-s flushing with the incoming measurement gas stream. The 8-min measurement cycle consisted of alternating 1-min cycles recording the isotopic composition of calibration, reference, and sample gases from the LI 6400 portable photosynthesis system.

The laser of the Delta Ray scanned over absorption lines at 500 Hz, and then the signal was averaged for 1 s before the spectrum was fitted and isotope ratios were calculated from the spectrum fit from the Delta Ray software. Measured isotope ratios were referenced to the VPDB scale using a two-point calibration derived from calibrated CO₂ reference gases with high and low isotope ratio values. The two working standard gases used in our measurements were made by mixing the pure CO₂ with synthetic air in 116-L aluminum gas cylinders in the University of Wyoming Stable Isotope Facility. These gases were calibrated against a CO₂ standard gas (Oztech) on a dual inlet MAT 253 IRMS (Thermo Fisher Scientific) at the University of Utah’s Stable Isotope Ratio Facility for Environmental Research. The CO₂ concentrations for the two working standard gases were 414.05 ± 1.30 μmol mol⁻¹ and 418.52 μmol mol⁻¹, respectively ($n = 4$). The δ¹³C values were −10.74 ± 0.02‰ and −26.88 ± 0.20‰ ($n = 4$). The standard deviation of the δ¹³C values measured on “working standard gas” using the Delta Ray ranged from 0.07‰ to 0.10‰ over each measurement day. We evaluated the degree that the gas exchange instrument would cause isotope fractionations by measuring the reference and sample gases passing through an empty leaf chamber; the differences between reference and sample gases during these tests were <0.2‰. These small differences near the confidence limits for estimates of international reference materials for δ¹³C calibration were ignored in further calculations and corrections of our data.

**Calculations of ¹³C Discrimination and Mesophyll Conductance**

The instantaneous ¹³C discrimination occurring during gas exchange was calculated as (Evans et al. 1986)

$$\Delta_{\text{obs}} = \frac{\xi (\delta_d - \delta_o)}{1 + \delta_o - \xi (\delta_o - \xi_c)} \quad (1)$$

and

$$\xi = \frac{\delta_o}{\delta_c - \delta_o}, \quad (2)$$

where $\delta_c$ and $\delta_o$ are concentrations and δ¹³C values of CO₂ entering the leaf chamber and $\delta_c$ and $\delta_o$ are those for CO₂ leaving the leaf chamber after exchange with leaves inside (for a definition of terms, see the supplemental information, available online). We maximized the amount of leaf area inside the leaf gas exchange chamber and adjusted flow rates to maximize ¹³C discrimination and CO₂ drawdown to reduce uncertainty in our estimates of $g_{\text{m}}$. We excluded measurements from the data set for further analysis and calculations if the difference between $\delta_d$ and $\delta_o$ was less than 1‰, $\delta_o$ was less than 30 μmol mol⁻¹, or $\xi$ was greater than 10 (table 1; Bickford et al. 2010).

We estimated $g_{\text{m}}$ from the difference between calculated carbon isotope discrimination, assuming infinite $g_{\text{m}}$ (Δ, eq. [3]),

| Table 1 | Range and Mean (SD) of Measured Values Used for the Determination of Mesophyll Conductance Using the Instantaneous ¹³C Discrimination Technique after Filtering Data Not Meeting Quality Control Thresholds as Described by Bickford et al. (2010) |
|---------|--------------------------------------------------|
| $c_e - c_o$ (μmol mol⁻¹) | Min | Max | Mean (SD) |
| $\delta_o - \delta_i$ (%) | 1.20 | 3.5 | 2.44 (0.56) |
| $\xi$ | 2.88 | 8.50 | 4.80 (1.1) |

Note. Values are the difference in CO₂ concentration ($c_e - c_o$) and δ¹³C ($\delta_o - \delta_i$) between gas entering ($c_e$, $\delta_e$) and leaving ($c_o$, $\delta_o$) the leaf chamber, and $\xi$ is calculated from equation (2).

and that measured ($\Delta_{\text{obs}}$, eq. [1]; Barbour et al. 2010; Farquhar and Cernusak 2012)

$$\Delta = \frac{1}{1 - t} \left[ \frac{C_a - C_i}{C_o - C_i} + \alpha_r \frac{C_o - C_i}{C_o} \right] + \frac{1 + t}{1 - t} \left[ b \frac{C_o}{C_i} - \frac{\alpha_r' e'}{A + R_d} \frac{C_o - \Gamma^*}{C_o} - \frac{\alpha_i f}{C_o} \right] \quad (3)$$

where $C_a$, $C_o$, and $C_i$ are the ambient, leaf surface, and intercellular CO₂ concentrations (μmol mol⁻¹); $\alpha_r$ and $\alpha_i$ are the fractionations occurring during diffusion through the leaf boundary layer (2.9‰; Evans et al. 1986) and the stomata (4.4‰; Farquhar and Richards 1984); $b$ is the fractionation associated with Rubisco carboxylation (29‰; Roeske and O’Leary 1984); $f$ is the fractionation associated with photorespiration (16.2‰) was used for this study; Wingate et al. 2007; Evans and von Caemmerer 2013); and $e'$ is the fractionation associated with day respiration, taking into account the ¹³C disequilibrium between atmospheric and tank CO₂ (Tazoe et al. 2011). We assumed no fractionation by day respiration, and $e'$ was calculated as $\delta^{13}$C_{tank} – $\delta^{13}$C_{air}; $\delta^{13}$C_{tank} for this study was −16.2‰ (June) and −12.3‰ (other 3 mo). It was assumed that $\delta^{13}$C_{air} was −8‰, $\alpha_r$ is the fractionation factor for carboxylation $(1 + b)$, $\alpha_i$ is the fractionation factor for day respiration $(1 + e')$, $\alpha_r$ is the fractionation factor for photorespiration $(1 + f)$, and $R_d$ is the rate of day respiration and was assumed to be 0.9 (μmol m⁻² s⁻¹). The photosynthetic rate is $A$; $\Gamma^*$ is the compensation point in the absence of day respiration and was assumed to be 45 μmol mol⁻¹ (Bernacchi et al. 2002).

The ternary correction accounts for effects of transpiration on the rate of CO₂ fixation through stomata and is defined as (von Caemmerer and Farquhar 1981; Farquhar and Cernusak 2012)

$$t = \frac{\alpha_i a E}{2 g_{\text{m}}}, \quad (4)$$

where $E$ is the transpiration rate (mmol H₂O m⁻² s⁻¹), $g_{\text{m}}$ is the total conductance of CO₂ diffusion through the stomata and the boundary layer (μmol m⁻² s⁻¹), and $\alpha_i$ is the fractionation factor of CO₂ diffusion $(1 + a)$, where $a$ is the weighted fractionation attributable to diffusion through the leaf boundary layer and the stomata in series (Evans et al. 1986; Cernusak et al. 2013):
We then estimate \( g_m \) by the difference between predicted \( \Delta_i \) (where \( \Delta \) is the difference between chloroplast \( C_i \) and \( \Delta_{\text{obs}} \) as given by Farquhar and Cernusak (2012):

\[
1 + \frac{b - a_m - \frac{\alpha_m}{\alpha_i} R_d}{A + R_d} = \frac{\Delta_i}{\Delta_{\text{obs}}},
\]

where \( a_m \) (1.8%) is the discrimination from dissolution and diffusion of \( CO_2 \) from the intercellular air spaces to the sites of carboxylation in the chloroplasts.

We evaluated potential measurement artifacts associated with branch excision by comparing \( g_m \) relationships and \( g_m/g_s \), determined from our measurements with those from the literature conducted on intact and excised branches from mature conifer trees in the field (table S1 [tables S1, S2 are available online]; fig. S1 [figs. S1, S2 are available online]). We found little evidence of systematic differences in these relationships due to branch excision, indicating that measurement of photosynthetic gas exchange on excised branches using our approach had no evident impact on the photosynthetic parameters of interest.

**A-Ci Response Curves and Relative Limitations of \( g_m \) and \( g_{mn} \) on Photosynthesis**

We measured A-Ci response curves for the samples collected in July, August, and September 2015 as described in Monson et al. (2005). We started the measurement sequence with the chamber \( CO_2 \) concentration \( (C_i) \) of 400 \( \mu mol \) mol\(^{-1}\), then reduced \( C_i \) to 200 \( \mu mol \) mol\(^{-1}\) for 5 min to stimulate stomatal opening. The assimilation rate was recorded at this value before \( C_i \) was reduced to 75 \( \mu mol \) mol\(^{-1}\), followed by incremental increases and measurements at 150, 250, 350, 550, 700, 800, 900, 1200, and 2000 \( \mu mol \) mol\(^{-1}\). The data from the A-Ci responses were used for the limitation analyses.

**Quantitative Limitation Analysis**

Light-saturated photosynthesis is generally limited by substrate availability and can be expressed (Farquhar et al. 1980)

\[
A_c = \frac{V_{\text{max}}(C_i - 1)}{C_i + K_c(1 + O/K_o)} - R_d,
\]

where \( A_c \) is the photosynthetic rate at the Rubisco carboxylation-limited stage (\( \mu mol \) \( CO_2 \) m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)), \( V_{\text{max}} \) is the maximum rate of Rubisco carboxylation (\( \mu mol \) \( CO_2 \) m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)), and \( C_i \) (\( \mu mol \) mol\(^{-1}\)) and \( O \) (210 mmol mol\(^{-1}\)) are mole fractions of \( CO_2 \) and \( O_2 \) at the carboxylation site. Michaelis-Menten constants of Rubisco for \( CO_2 \) and \( O_2 \) are \( K_r \) and \( K_o \) respectively, and \( R_d \) is the day respiration rate (\( \mu mol \) \( CO_2 \) m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)). The relative changes in light-saturated assimilation rate can be expressed as (Grassi and Magnani 2005)

\[
\frac{dA_c}{A_c} = l_s \frac{dg_{sc}}{g_{sc}} + l_m \frac{dg_{sm}}{g_{sm}} + l_g \frac{dV_{\text{max}}}{V_{\text{max}}},
\]
between measurement months for a given species and site were evaluated using the least square means pairwise comparisons with the R lsmeans package (Lenth 2016). Linear relationships between related parameters were analyzed using least squares linear regression to evaluate possible correlation between leaf conductance and environmental factors such as soil water content, soil water potentials, leaf morphological traits, and water-use efficiency. All statistical analyses were conducted using R (ver. 3.4.3; R Development Core Team 2017).

Results

Soil Moisture, Temperature, VPD, and Leaf Water Potential

Soil moisture expressed as volumetric soil water content (m$^3$ m$^{-3}$) declined at the two hillslope sites from June after snowmelt to September (fig. 1). Soil moisture at a 50-cm depth dropped over this period from 0.32–0.35 to 0.14 m$^3$ m$^{-3}$ for the two sites. In June, the difference in soil water contents between the two hillslope positions was small. While from July to August the lower hillslope site had higher soil moisture content than the upper hillslope, in September soil moisture at the two hillslope locations converged to the low value of 0.14 m$^3$ m$^{-3}$ (fig. 1).

Daily temperature and VPD were higher at the upper hillslope than at the lower hillslope site over the season (fig. 1).

Average $\Psi_{pd}$ was similar at about $-1$ MPa for the two species independent of the hillslope position and was insensitive to changes in soil moisture ($P > 0.05$; fig. 2a, 2b). The $\Psi_{md}$ of Picea engelmannii was significantly lower than that of Pinus contorta at both hillslope sites in June, August, and September (all $P < 0.05$; fig. 2c, 2d); for example, in August at the upper hillslope, $\Psi_{md}$ was $-2.4 \pm 0.3$ MPa for P. engelmannii and $-1.4 \pm 0.1$ MPa for P. contorta. In July, however, the $\Psi_{md}$ values were similar for the two species at the hillslope sites (fig. 2c, 2d).

Leaf Carbon Isotope Composition, Mass per Area, and Nitrogen Content

We observed no differences in leaf carbon isotope ratios ($\delta^{13}$C) or LMA between the two species or among the four sampling times (mixed effects model, $P > 0.05$; table 2). The leaf nitrogen contents (N%) of P. contorta were significantly higher than those of P. engelmannii at both study sites and for each sampling time on both mass (N%) and nitrogen per leaf area (NLA) bases (all $P < 0.05$; table 2). But there were no significant differences in N% or NLA between the two study sites or among the four sampling times (all $P > 0.05$; table 2).

Fig. 2  Predawn and midday water potentials for twigs of the two conifer species at the upper and lower hillslope sites. Values represent the mean ± SE ($n = 3$).
was ~0.5 m\(^3\) m\(^{-2}\) as soil moisture decreased at both sites; however, the relationship was stronger between
P. contorta and P. engelmannii at the upper hillslope, \(g_s\) was 0.100 ± 0.009 and
0.081 ± 0.006 mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\), respectively, and was only 0.032 ± 0.006 and 0.014 ± 0.002 mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\), respectively, at the lower
hillslope (fig. 3c, 3d). While soil moisture decreased and air temperature increased over the season, \(g_m\) gradually increased at the lower
hillslope site and decreased at the upper hillslope location, which caused \(g_s\) to be significantly higher in August at the lower
hillslope compared with the upper hillslope site (fig. 3e, 3f).

Values of \(g_m\) did not differ between the two species (mixed model, \(P = 0.112\)), but hillslope position had a significant effect on \(g_m\) (mixed model, \(P = 0.006\); fig. 3e, 3f). Values of \(g_m\) did not differ between the two species at the upper hillslope site at any sampling time (mixed model, \(P > 0.05\)), while at the lower hillslope site, \(g_m\) was significantly higher in P. engelmannii than in P. contorta in September (Tukey test, \(P = 0.003\)). At both hillslope positions, \(g_m\) increased from June to September, and \(g_m\) was significantly higher (\(P < 0.05\)) in September than during the other 3 mo for P. engelmannii, but no significant
difference was detected from June to August for P. contorta (fig. 3e, 3f).

Values of \(A\) were positively correlated to both \(g_m\) and \(g_s\) for data pooled across species and hillslope sites (fig. 4a, 4b), but no correlation was found between \(g_m\) and \(g_m\) (fig. 4c). However, the relationship was stronger between \(A\) and \(g_s\) than between \(A\) and \(g_m\) with 76% of the variation in \(A\) explained by \(g_s\) compared with only 21% for \(g_m\).

Values of \(g_m\) were negatively correlated with soil moisture at 50-cm depths when the data from both species and two hillslope
sites were pooled (fig. 5a). However, there was no significant correlation between \(g_s\) and soil moisture at 50-cm depths when
the data were pooled. Yet there was a negative relationship between \(g_s\) and soil moisture content at the lower hillslope site
(fig. 5b), corresponding to the increase of \(g_s\) over the season despite decreasing soil moisture at the lower hillslope. No significant
correlation was found between VPD and \( g_m \) (fig. 5c), while \( g_m \) was positively correlated with ambient air temperature (fig. 5e). No relationship was found between \( g_s \), VPD, and air temperature (fig. 5d, 5f).

iWUE did not differ significantly between the upper and lower hillslope sites (fig. 6). iWUE did not change significantly at the lower hillslope over time because of the parallel upscaling of both \( A \) and \( g_s \). At the upper hillslope, iWUE increased significantly from June to July for both species because of the significant decrease of \( g_s/g_m \) from 0.78 to 0.30 and from 0.92 to 0.22 for \( P. \) contorta and \( P. \) engelmannii, respectively. If pooled together, \( A/g_s \) and \( g_m \) were also positively correlated (fig. 7).

**Limitation of Photosynthesis by \( g_s \), \( g_m \), and Biochemistry**

Estimation of the relative limitations of \( A \) by \( g_s \), \( g_m \), and biochemistry for the two species at the two hillslope positions from July, August, and September is presented in figure 8. In general, the limitation of photosynthesis caused by \( g_m \) was low, ranging from 7% to 18%, which was much less than that imposed by \( g_s \).
(l₁ of 42%–67%) and biochemistry (22%–50%; fig. 8). We did not observe any significant effect of hillslope position or species on l₁, l₂, or l₃.

**Discussion**

Low mesophyll conductance is believed to strongly limit CO₂ assimilation in conifers because, among other factors, needlelike leaves are dense, and their photosynthetic cells have thick cell walls that greatly restrict CO₂ diffusion to chloroplasts (Flexas et al. 2008; Veromann-Jürgenson et al. 2017). However, our measurements of mature field-grown individuals of *Pinus contorta* and *Picea engelmannii* showed that mesophyll conductance was proportionally high and much less of a constraint on CO₂ uptake compared with stomatal conductance. Further, structural investment in leaves, measured as LMA, which has been found to be associated with gₘ (Hassiotou et al. 2009), did not differ between the two species or the two hillslope positions, suggesting that structural constraints did not influence variation in gₘ for these two conifers. Our results also suggest that as stomatal conductance declined at the upper hillslope, where soil moisture was relatively low and transpiration demand was high from July to August, gₘ remained constant and the limitation to photosynthesis imposed by gₘ remained relatively stable. Overall, average gₘ/gₛ values in this study, an index of relative limitations, were all above 1 and increased as soil moisture declined toward the end of the growing season at the comparatively drier upper hillslope site.

Very few studies have reported field measurements of gₘ in mature conifer trees, and our estimates of gₘ compare well against available data reported by the few studies that used the same ¹³C discrimination technique (Warren et al. 2003; Bickford et al. 2010; Stangl et al. 2019). On the basis of the available studies of gₘ in conifers, the estimations of gₘ using the ¹³C discrimination method generally are higher than those reported in studies using the other methods (Stangl et al. 2019). Indeed, we found our estimates of gₘ in conifers to be similar to those reported in studies also using instantaneous ¹³C discrimination but higher than gₘ reported for conifers from studies using curve fitting or the chlorophyll fluorescence methods (table S2). In the current study, we relied on the ¹³C discrimination method, which may have uncertainties related to the quantities used for isotope fractionations in the model used to estimate gₘ (eqq. [3], [6]), such as the fractionations due to diffusion, carboxylation, dark respiration, and photorespiration, and uncertainty in the isotopic signature of the source carbohydrate for respiration (Ubierna and Farquhar 2014; Busch et al. 2020).

---

**Table 3**

ANOVA Table of the General Linear Mixed Effects Repeated Measures Models for Photosynthetic Rate (A), Stomatal Conductance (gₛ), and Mesophyll Conductance (gₘ) Measured at the Two Hillslope Positions for the Two Species, Lodgepole Pine (*Pinus contorta*) and Engelmann Spruce (*Picea engelmannii*)

|                     | A         | gₛ        | gₘ        | A/gₛ     |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
|                     | df F value | df F value | df F value | df F value |
| Month               | 3 15.53   | 1.54      | 1.54      | 1.54     |
| Site                | 1 6.95    | .01       | .01       | .01      |
| Species             | 1 .91     | .15       | .15       | .15      |
| Month × site        | 3 10.52   | <.0001    | <.0001    | <.0001   |
| Month × species     | 3 3.57    | <.0001    | <.0001    | <.0001   |
| Site × species      | 1 .86     | .36       | .36       | .36      |

---

**Fig. 4** Correlation between light-saturated photosynthetic rate (A) at an ambient intercellular CO₂ concentration (Cᵢ) of 400 μmol mol⁻¹ and mesophyll conductance (gₘ) and stomatal conductance (gₛ), as well as the relationship between gₘ and gₛ. The lines indicate significant least squares regression relationships for data pooled between species and hillslope sites.
The potential influence of branch excision on gas exchange characteristics imposes additional uncertainty on the estimates of mesophyll and stomatal conductances in our study. A number of studies have resorted to branch removal and rehydration in the lab to conduct gas exchange measurements on upper-canopy foliage of conifer trees (Monson et al. 2005; Woodruff et al. 2009; Potts et al. 2017), and studies that have directly tested artifacts of branch removal report virtually no impact on gas exchange traits for at least up to 48 h following sample collection from the field (Dang et al. 1997; Richardson and Berlyn 2002;
Our measurements of conifers relating to gs in excised branches compare favorably to measurements from other studies that include observations of excised and intact branches (fig. S1), and the modest differences reported across studies could easily be attributed to species’ physiological differences or differences in chamber measurement conditions. Thus, we are generally satisfied that any artifacts due to branch excision in our study were minimal.

Considering the caveats noted above, our estimates of gm and gs in P. contorta and P. engelmannii suggest that seasonal environmental changes had contrasting effects on photosynthesis across upper and lower hillslope positions. In the early growing season, the large difference in A and gs between the upper and lower hillslope sites was due to delayed seasonal recovery of photosynthetic activities at the lower site, which had lower air and soil temperatures. Low soil temperatures impede the rate of spring photosynthetic recovery in conifers (Ensminger et al. 2008; Wu et al. 2013). Reduced soil moisture at the upper hillslope site was associated with a large decline in gm from June to August but not with gs or A. We evaluated the relationships between gs, gm, soil moisture, daily maximum VPD, and daily air temperature recorded during the week prior to each sampling period. We found that gm was positively correlated with air temperature, while no relationship was found between gm and VPD (fig. 5), suggesting that soil moisture availability was likely an overriding factor affecting leaf gas exchange at the upper hillslope site from July to August. At the more mesic lower hillslope site, gs, gm, and A increased despite the seasonal decline in soil moisture content. Surprisingly, no relationship was found between gs and VPD when the data were pooled together from the two hillslope locations (fig. 5d). Further, reductions in gs, but not gm and A, demonstrate that maintenance of sufficient mesophyll conductance may have an important role in sustaining the photosynthetic rate independent of gs, which is supported further by the correlation between A and gs but the lack of correlation between gm and gs. The high A, gm, and gs values in September despite the continued decline in soil moisture content suggest that gas exchange may have been regulated by interactions among soil moisture, air temperature, and VPD. The evaporation demand was low in September, as indicated by VPD. The idea that changes in mesophyll conductance could potentially play an important independent role in controlling photosynthetic responses to soil water limitation has been recognized (Niinemets et al. 2009; Keenan et al. 2010; Gago et al. 2019). Previous studies, including experimental work on conifer seedlings, found that rapidly imposed reductions in soil water supply often led to

![Fig. 6 Intrinsic water use efficiency (photosynthetic rate [A]/stomatal conductance [gs]) for the two conifer species at the different hillslope sites. Values are means ± SE.](image)

![Fig. 7 Correlation between intrinsic water use efficiency (photosynthetic rate [A]/stomatal conductance [gs]) and leaf mesophyll conductance (gm). The lines indicate significant least squares regression relationships for data pooled between species and hillslope sites.](image)
reduced $g_{m}$ (Galmés et al. 2007; Duan et al. 2011). Conversely, the $g_{m}$ of black spruce seedlings did not respond to multiple cycles of drought, although $g_{s}$ was significantly reduced by drought treatments (Stewart et al. 1995). It is well known that stomatal conductance decreases with declines in soil water availability (Lawlor and Cornic 2002), but the responses of mesophyll conductance to long-term water deficits are still uncertain. In some species, stomatal closure played by far the main role in the decline of photosynthesis under moderate water stress (Chaves et al. 2009), but shifts in mesophyll conductance may also play a central role in some instances (Flexas et al. 2002; Galmés et al. 2007). In our study, we conclude that stomatal conductance was the main limitation to photosynthesis, suggesting that productivity was heavily constrained by stomatal closure in response to differences in water limitation or energy balance and temperatures across the hillslope positions, at least at the relatively xeric upper hillslope site. Similar results were found in a study where *Eucalyptus* acclimated to slowly induced long-term water stress, which led to reduced $g_{m}$ limitation (Cano et al. 2014). The central Rocky Mountain region is characterized by heavy winter and spring snowfall and dry summers, such that local plant communities often experience water stress late in the growing season, especially at sites on exposed south-facing slopes and where soil depth is shallow. Within such environments, sustaining proportionally high values of mesophyll conductance could potentially allow conifers to cope with prolonged water limitations during the growing season.

We observed little variation in predawn and midday leaf water potential despite 50% reductions in stomatal conductance at the upper hillslope site from July to August, suggesting that predawn and midday water potentials were not useful indicators of water limitation in these two species. Besides the soil water content differences, temperature and VPD differed between the upper and lower hillslope positions. Values of $g_{m}$ were positively correlated with temperature, which is consistent with previous studies that investigated the relationship between temperature and $g_{m}$ under controlled settings (Bernacchi et al. 2002; Scafaro et al. 2011; Evans and von Caemmerer 2013; von Caemmerer and Evans 2015). No relationship between VPD and $g_{m}$ was observed. A few other studies have also found that VPD had no significant impact on $g_{m}$ (Warren 2008a; Stangl et al. 2019). The negative correlation between $g_{m}$ and soil water content might not have direct causality, as temperature increased when soil moisture decreased. As such, it is difficult to untangle the roles of temperature and soil water content in adjustments in $g_{m}$, especially at the lower hillslope location. The results suggest that the interaction of air temperature and soil water availability drives differences in mesophyll conductance across the complex hillslope gradient within our study.

Adjustments in $g_{m}$ independent of $g_{s}$ also strongly influenced iWUE ($iWUE = A/g_{m}$) in the two conifers studied here, as indicated by a positive correlation between $A$ and $g_{m}$, and no correlation between $g_{s}$ and $g_{m}$. This confirms the prevailing assumption that enhancing $g_{m}$ will improve iWUE (Flexas et al. 2013a, 2016). A meta-analysis study of multiple species has also detected no relationship between $g_{m}$ and $g_{s}$ (Gago et al. 2016), which indicates possible decoupling of $g_{s}$ and $g_{m}$ in regulating iWUE under different environmental conditions. We did not measure or model in situ transpiration rates in the current study, but if leaf to air vapor pressure gradients were similar across the two species and hillslope environments, the positive correlation between $g_{m}$ and $A/g_{s}$ would also extend to a positive correlation between $g_{m}$ and $A/E$. We hypothesize, therefore, that seasonal enhancement of $g_{m}$ with decreasing soil moisture or increases in seasonal

![Fig. 8](image)

**Fig. 8** Relative limitations to the CO$_2$ assimilation rate ($A$) by stomatal conductance ($l_{s}$), mesophyll conductance ($l_{m}$), and biochemistry ($l_{b}$) for the two species at the upper and lower hillslopes. Data are presented as means ± SE.
temperature could increase plant productivity relative to water loss in Rocky Mountain conifers, at least at the leaf level.

Contrary to our expectation that the isohydric *P. contorta* and the anisohydric *P. engelmannii* would exhibit contrasting responses of mesophyll conductance to soil water limitation, the two species had similar $g_m$ values and responses over the growing season at the two hillslope sites (fig. 3; table 2). Tighter control of stomata in *P. contorta* was not accompanied by a higher mesophyll conductance to compensate for the early closure of stomata during water stress compared with *P. engelmannii*. At the upper hillslope site, stomatal conductance was reduced late in the season to maintain minimum midday leaf water potentials, while at the lower hillslope site, soil water availability was apparently high enough to support an increase of stomatal conductance for both species as temperatures warmed during the growing season. We speculate that in the conifers we studied, $g_m$ and $g_m$ might be influenced by different mechanisms. Given the coupled pathways for water and CO$_2$ exchange, $g_m$ might be more closely coordinated with leaf hydraulic conductance and photosynthetic capacity. Flexas et al. (2013b) found a strong correlation between $A$ and $g_m$ across diverse species and suggested that mesophyll structural and physiological traits that control $g_m$ also influence leaf hydraulics. We did not investigate relationships between leaf hydraulic properties and $g_m$ in our study but acknowledge the importance of functional integration between these traits, warranting further study.

To our surprise, $g_m$ did not impose the greatest limitation on photosynthesis in the two conifers. Despite some uncertainties involved with $g_m$ estimation, the limitation on photosynthesis imposed by mesophyll conductance in this study was less than one-third the limitation imposed by stomata (fig. 8). Maintaining a high $g_m$ is beneficial to plants that experience water shortage because it can increase photosynthesis without increasing transpiration (Flexas et al. 2008). This is consistent with the correlation between $g_m$ and $A$ and $A/g_m$. Few studies have investigated the $g_m$ limitation of $A$ in conifers, but of those, several have determined that $g_m$ was less limiting for $A$ than $g_s$ was (Warren et al. 2003; Peguero-Pina et al. 2012). In contrast, a few other available studies show that the limitation on $A$ imposed by $g_m$ was larger than that of $g_s$ (Stewart et al. 1995; De Lucia et al. 2003; Peguero-Pina et al. 2012). The divergence could be attributed to optimization differences across species. Veromann-Jürgenson et al. (2017) summarized all the available data on $g_m$ in 13 conifer species and found that variation in $g_m$ was high. One highlighted trait suggested to be a strong factor in determining $g_m$ is chloroplast surface area exposed to intercellular air space ($S/S_i$), which changes as environmental conditions change (Evans et al. 2009; Tomás et al. 2013; Evans 2021). In this study, we found that mesophyll conductance ($g_m$) overall imposed a small limitation on photosynthesis, but key adjustments in this trait played an important role in sustaining photosynthesis when stomatal conductance decreased with water limitation. To more broadly understand the role of $g_m$ in limiting $A$ in conifers, quantification of $g_m$ for many other conifer species under contrasting field conditions is required.
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