

1 **EFFECTS OF SUB-LETHAL SINGLE, SIMULTANEOUS, AND**
2 **SEQUENTIAL ABIOTIC STRESSES ON PHENOTYPIC TRAITS OF**
3 **ARABIDOPSIS THALIANA**

4 Morales, A.^{1,2,3,*}, de Boer, H. J.⁴, Douma, J. C.¹, Elsen, S.², Engels, S.², Glimmerveen, T.², Sajeev,
5 N.^{2,3}, Huber, M.³, Luimes, M.², Luitjens, E.², Raatjes, K.³, Hsieh, C.², Teapal, J.⁵, Wildenbeest, T.²,
6 Jiang, Z.^{2,3}, Pareek, A.⁶, Singla-Pareek, S. L.⁷, Yin, X.¹, Evers, J.B.¹, Anten, N.P.R.¹, van Zanten,
7 M.^{2,#}, Sasidharan, R.^{3,#}

8 ¹ Centre for Crop Systems Analysis, Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen, The
9 Netherlands

10 ² Molecular Plant Physiology, Institute of Environmental Biology, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The
11 Netherlands

12 ³ Plant Ecophysiology, Institute of Environmental Biology, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The
13 Netherlands

14 ⁴ Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

15 ⁵ Developmental Biology, Institute of Biodynamics and Biocomplexity, Utrecht University, The
16 Netherlands

17 ⁶ Stress Physiology and Molecular Biology Laboratory, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi,
18 India

19 ⁷ Plant Stress Biology, International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology, New
20 Delhi, India

21 * Contact author: alejandro.moralessierra@wur.nl

22 # Equal contribution

23 **ABSTRACT**

24 Plant responses to abiotic stresses are complex and dynamic, and involve changes in different traits,
25 either as the direct consequence of the stress, or as an active acclimatory response. Abiotic stresses
26 frequently occur simultaneously or in succession, rather than in isolation. Despite this, most studies
27 have focused on a single stress and single or few plant traits. To address this gap, our study
28 comprehensively and categorically quantified the individual and combined effects of three major
29 abiotic stresses associated with climate change (flooding, progressive drought and high
30 temperature) on 12 phenotypic traits related to morphology, development, growth and fitness, at
31 different developmental stages in four *Arabidopsis thaliana* accessions. Combined sub-lethal
32 stresses were applied either simultaneously (high temperature and drought) or sequentially
33 (flooding followed by drought). In total, we analyzed the phenotypic responses of 1782 individuals
34 across these stresses and different developmental stages.

35 Overall, abiotic stresses and their combinations resulted in distinct patterns of effects across the
36 traits analyzed, with both quantitative and qualitative differences across accessions. Stress
37 combinations had additive effects on some traits, whereas clear positive and negative interactions
38 were observed for other traits: 9 out of 12 traits for high temperature and drought, 6 out of 12 traits
39 for post-submergence and drought showed significant interactions. In many cases where the
40 stresses interacted, the strength of interactions varied across accessions. Hence, our results
41 indicated a general pattern of response in most phenotypic traits to the different stresses and stress
42 combinations, but it also indicated a natural genetic variation in the strength of these responses.

43 Overall, our study provides a rich characterization of trait responses of *Arabidopsis* plants to sub-
44 lethal abiotic stresses at the phenotypic level and can serve as starting point for further in-depth
45 physiological research and plant modelling efforts.

46 **Keywords:** *Arabidopsis thaliana*, abiotic stress, acclimation, flooding, drought, high
47 temperature, thermomorphogenesis, sequential stresses, simultaneous stresses

48 INTRODUCTION

49 Climate change has resulted in an overall increase in temperature and increased the likelihood of
50 extreme weather events such as floods, drought episodes, and heat waves (Stott, 2016, Schiermeier,
51 2011, Meehl et al., 2000). Such events often negatively affect the performance of plants and have
52 a significant impact on food production (Suzuki et al., 2014, Mittler et al., 2012). Extreme weather
53 events also occur simultaneously or sequentially, such as high temperature combined with drought
54 during summer heat waves, or sequential combinations of flooding and drought (Mittler, 2006,
55 Miao et al., 2009). Improvement of plant tolerance and/or ability to recover from these stresses is
56 critical to efforts towards safeguarding global food security in the foreseeable future (Fedoroff et
57 al., 2010).

58 In recent decades, knowledge on the effect of abiotic stresses on plant survival (tolerance) has
59 advanced significantly but is primarily based on studies focusing on a single stress often using
60 severe treatments such as submergence in darkness (Vashisht et al., 2011). Less is known about
61 the performance of plants under sub-lethal stresses, despite being common in the field, such as mild
62 supra-optimal temperatures, shallow submergence in the light or mild drought (Blum and Jordan,
63 1985, Chapin, 1991, Zanten et al., 2013). A comprehensive understanding of plant performance
64 under sub-lethal abiotic stresses requires analyzing coordinated changes in functional traits both
65 during the occurrence of stress and upon stress recovery, as opposed to one trait at a time (Thoen
66 et al., 2017, Pandey et al., 2017, Tardieu and Tuberosa, 2010).

67 In *Arabidopsis thaliana* (*Arabidopsis*), a mild increase in temperature is known to affect multiple
68 traits such as leaf angle, petiole length, leaf shape, specific leaf area or flowering time (Quint et al.,
69 2016, Zanten et al., 2013, Casal and Balasubramanian, 2019, Jagadish et al., 2016). Drought may
70 affect allocation of assimilates to roots, leaf relative water content and leaf expansion (Tardieu et
71 al., 2018, Chaves et al., 2003). Submergence also affects leaf angles and petiole elongation in some
72 rosette plant species (Voeselek and Bailey-Serres, 2015, van Veen et al., 2016, Sasidharan and
73 Voeselek, 2015). Also, hypoxia and energy impairment associated with submergence can severely
74 reduce growth in many species (Pierik et al., 2005, Sasidharan and Voeselek, 2015, Bailey-Serres
75 and Voeselek, 2008, Vashisht et al., 2011). The recovery phase following water recession presents
76 a different set of stressors for plants. The return to aerobic conditions can cause oxidative stress
77 accompanied by drought-like symptoms, a condition called ‘physiological drought’ (Yeung et al.,
78 2019, Yeung et al., 2018).

79 Regarding multiple abiotic stresses, studies in *Arabidopsis* have revealed distinct responses
80 matching specific stress combinations at the metabolic and molecular level. These responses to
81 multi-stress environments were not just a summation of the single stress responses (Mittler, 2006,
82 Rizhsky et al., 2004, Suzuki et al., 2014). Similarly, high temperature and mild drought had
83 interacting effects on some organ- and plant-level physiological and morphological traits in
84 *Arabidopsis* (Vile et al., 2012). Despite the studies mentioned above, significant gaps remain in
85 our knowledge on the effects of sub-lethal stresses and their combinations on phenotypic traits at
86 the plant level across different developmental stages.

87 The goals of the current study were to (i) categorically quantify the dynamic effects of several sub-
88 lethal abiotic stresses and their combinations on a wide range of phenotypic traits in *Arabidopsis*,
89 and (ii) analyze to what extent these effects are conserved/differ across a selection of different

90 natural accessions (Col-0, Bay-0, An-1 and Lp2-6). Three single sub-lethal abiotic stresses and two
91 sub-lethal combinations were used: (i) transient submergence followed by de-submergence, (ii)
92 continuous high temperature, (iii) progressive drought, (iv) progressive drought under continuous
93 high temperature and (v) transient submergence followed by de-submergence and progressive
94 drought.

95 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

96 For clarity of presentation, an overview of the different experiments in this study and how they are
97 interrelated is given in the next section. This is followed by a description of the plant growth
98 conditions, the experimental protocols, the measurement protocols with a description of every
99 phenotypic trait studied and a final section on the statistical analysis of the measured traits.

100 **Overview of experiments**

101 **Experiment I:** This experiment quantified the effects of high temperature, drought and their
102 combination on plant growth and a series of whole-plant developmental and morphological traits
103 of four natural accessions of Arabidopsis. Ten phenotypic traits were measured at three different
104 timepoints (Figure 1).

105 **Experiment II:** Similar to experiment I, but focused on the effects of submergence, drought, and
106 their sequential combination. The same traits as in experiment I were measured, but there were five
107 timepoints across sequential stresses involving submergence and drought (Figure 1). A separate
108 analysis was performed of the first three timepoints (i.e., when some of the plants were submerged,
109 “phase a” in Figure 1) and the last three timepoints (where none of the plants were submerged,
110 “phase b” in Figure 1).

111 **Experiment III:** This experiment was performed using the same growth conditions and abiotic
112 stress protocols as experiments I and II but focused on traits related to plant fitness measured at the
113 end of the plant's life cycle.

114 **Plant growth conditions**

115 For all experiments, seeds of natural *Arabidopsis thaliana* accessions Col-0 (N1092), Bay-0
116 (N954), An-1 (N944) and Lp2-6 (N22595) were used (Arabidopsis stock accession numbers
117 between brackets, from www.arabidopsis.info). Plants were sown on a moist soil:perlite mix 1:2
118 (Primasta BV, Asten, The Netherlands) and stratified in darkness at 4 °C for four days. After
119 stratification, pots were placed in a climate-controlled room at 21 °C (day and night), 70% relative
120 humidity, 120 $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ light intensity (PAR) at plant height provided by fluorescent tubes and
121 8 h photoperiod. When plants reached the two-leaf stage (ca. two weeks after sowing), the seedlings
122 were transplanted to Jiffy 7c coco pellets (Jiffy Products International BV, Zwijndrecht, The
123 Netherlands).

124 Prior to transfer of the seedlings, the pellets were soaked in lukewarm water and 50 mL of Hoagland
125 solution until saturation (soaked pellets reached a height of ca. 20 cm). Plants were then cultivated
126 at 21 °C in above-mentioned conditions or in a second climate-controlled room with the same
127 conditions except for a temperature of 27 °C (day and night). Additional Hoagland solution was
128 applied two, six and eight days after transplanting (10 mL, 20 mL, and 10 mL, respectively). Plants
129 were watered every two days except during the application of progressive drought or submergence.

130 **Experimental protocols**

131 **Experiment I**

132 As described above, the high-temperature treatment started at the two-leaf stage by moving the
133 plants to the climate-controlled room at 27 °C, while the plants remaining in the original room at
134 21 °C served as controls. When plants reached the 10-leaf stage, drought was imposed by
135 transferring plants to an empty tray and withholding watering for the duration of the treatment
136 (same procedure in both temperature regimes) under otherwise identical conditions as the well-
137 watered plants. Soil water content was estimated by monitoring the weight of the pellets in which
138 the plants were grown, expressed as pellet weight relative to control conditions. On average, 50%
139 relative pellet weight was reached at day 4 after stopping the watering, 25% at day 7 and 20 % at
140 day 9 (Figure S1).

141 Plants were harvested at three timepoints corresponding to the 10-leaf stage and 5 and 9 days after
142 the 10-leaf stage, respectively (Figure 1). At the first timepoint, only plants from the control and
143 high temperature groups were harvested as no drought was yet imposed, whereas at the second and
144 third timepoint, plants from the control, high temperature, drought and high temperature and
145 drought groups were harvested.

146 Typically, six biological replicates were randomly sampled at each combination of accession,
147 treatment and timepoint. However, this was not always possible (e.g., not enough plants might have
148 been available due to mortality), so the realized number of biological replicates was slightly lower
149 (see Table S1 for details). The experiment was executed in eight batches (each batch consisted of
150 one accession subject to all treatments, with two batches per accession).

151 **Experiment II**

152 Experiment II was performed entirely in the climate-control room set at 21 °C. When plants reached
153 the 10-leaf stage, randomly selected plants were subjected to complete submergence for five days
154 whereas others remained in control (non-flooded) conditions (Figure 1) under otherwise identical
155 conditions.

156 To submerge the plants, large containers (54 cm length × 27 cm width × 37 cm depth) were
157 prepared two days prior to the anticipated 10-leaf-stage timepoint. The containers were disinfected
158 with a chlorine tablet and lukewarm water and subsequently drained after at least two hours of
159 disinfection and rinsed thoroughly with water. The containers were then moved to the climate-
160 controlled rooms and filled with water a day before the experiments were started, to allow the water
161 to reach the temperature of the climate room. The submergence was restricted to five days to avoid
162 lethal effects or significant leaf senescence during post-submergence recovery. During
163 submergence, plants were exposed to the same light intensity and quality as in other treatments.

164 After five days, submerged plants were gently taken out of the water and excess water in the pellet
165 was drained by placing on absorbent paper, until the pellets reached the same weight as those of
166 the well-watered control plants. A subset of the de-submerged plants was then subjected to
167 progressive drought by withholding water (same protocol as in experiment I) while the others
168 received regular watering. A group of plants that had not been submerged were also subjected to
169 progressive drought. Altogether, experiment II thus had two phases:

- 170 - Phase a: Started at the 10-leaf stage and lasted for 5 days. This phase only contained control
171 plants and submerged plants. Plants were harvested at three timepoints: at the 10-leaf stage
172 (start of submergence), and two and five days after 10-leaf stage (Figure 1).

173 - Phase b: Started five days after the 10-leaf stage. There were four groups of plants: control,
174 drought, post-submergence and post-submergence drought. The first harvest timepoint of
175 this phase corresponds to the last timepoint of phase a, and it was followed by two
176 additional harvest timepoints, 9 and 12 days after the 10-leaf stage (Figure 1), which
177 corresponded to 4 and 7 days after the end of submergence, respectively.

178 Experiment II also aimed at six biological replicates in each combination of accession, treatment
179 and timepoint but the realized number of biological replicates was slightly lower (see Table S1 for
180 details). This experiment was also executed in eight batches (each batch consisted of one accession
181 subject to all treatments, with two batches per accession).

182 **Experiment III**

183 In experiment III, plants were grown as in experiment I and II and subjected to the same stress
184 treatments and duration. However, instead of harvesting them for phenotypic analysis, the plants
185 were labelled and allowed to develop further while being monitored until seed harvest. Plants that
186 were subjected to drought treatment (including those in which drought was combined with other
187 stresses) were returned to well-watered conditions after the drought period. In the case of high
188 temperature and high temperature and drought, plants were kept in the climate-controlled chamber
189 at 27 °C up to the seed harvest.

190 In all cases, as soon as plants bolted, an Aracon system (Betatech BVBA) was fitted around the
191 plant and kept until harvest. The base of the Aracon system collected the seeds from open siliques,
192 while the Aracon tube prevented contamination from – and dispersal to – neighboring plants. When
193 plants completely senesced, the inflorescence was cut at the base and all seeds attached to the plant
194 were removed and sieved (Retsch GmbH, mesh size: 425 µM), combined with the material in the
195 Aracon base and collected in a paper bag.

196 **Trait measurement protocols**

197 In the following, the measured traits are indicated in *italics*. For each harvested plant in experiment
198 I and II, a lateral picture was taken using a conventional photo camera of the first or second
199 youngest leaf with a petiole length larger than 1 cm at rosette base height, to determine the petiole
200 insertion angle with respect to the horizontal plane (*leaf angle*). The rosette was then directly
201 harvested using a forceps and razor blade, weighed to determined fresh weight, and dissected leaf-
202 by-leaf with a razor blade. The harvested leaves were laid out on a plastic overhead projector sheet
203 according to their developmental age and digitized with a flatbed scanner HP ScanJet G3110
204 (Hewlett-Packard, Palo Alto, CA, USA) at 600 dpi. The leaves were then oven-dried at 70 °C for
205 at least 72 h and weighed on a precision scale to determine the *rosette dry weight* and *relative water*
206 *content*. In addition, directly following the harvesting of above-ground parts, the primary roots
207 were retrieved from the growth substrate by rinsing the substrate off with tap water and the
208 maximum depth reached by the root system recorded (*root length*).

209 All the imaged true leaves were analyzed with ImageJ v. 1.52a (National Institutes of Health, USA)
210 to determine total plant area, number of rosette leaves (*early rosette leaf number*), average ratio
211 between blade width and length as an index of blade shape (*blade shape*) and average ratio between
212 petiole length and total leaf (i.e., petiole + blade) length (*petiole ratio*). From the plant area and
213 *early rosette leaf number*, the *leaf size* was derived and from the *rosette dry weight* and the plant
214 area, the average *specific leaf area* including petioles was calculated.

215 In experiment III, the total amount of seeds retrieved from each individual plant was weighed on a
216 precision scale to calculate the seed yield of each individual plant (*yield*) following a
217 sedimentation-based cleaning method described in Morales et al. (2020). In addition, the time to

218 opening of the first flower (*flowering time*) and the total number of rosette leaves produced at the
219 moment of flowering (*total rosette leaf number*) were recorded per plant.

220 **Statistical analysis**

221 A linear mixed model (random intercept and slopes) was fitted to each trait in experiments I and II
222 (separating phase a and b, Figure 1) using the lme function in the R package nlme (Pinheiro et al.,
223 2021). Either a logarithmic (for positive traits) or logit (for traits between 0 and 1) transformation
224 was used on each trait (Table S1). Each model assumed a linear response of the transformed trait
225 to time where the slope and intercepts were estimated as a function of treatment and accession
226 (fixed effects), and a random effect was used to account for variation across batches.

227 In each model, the time variable was set to zero at the first measurement timepoint. This means
228 that in experiment I and phase a of experiment II the intercepts of the models corresponded to trait
229 values at the 10-leaf stage, whereas for phase b of experiment II it corresponded to trait values five
230 days after the 10-leaf stage (Figure 1).

231 The six possible treatment groups (Figure 1) were encoded as the product of three binary variables
232 representing whether the plants were (i) grown under high temperature or not, (ii) subjected to
233 drought or not, (iii) subjected to submergence or not. The experimental design was not full factorial
234 as high temperature and submergence were not combined. The effect of accession was encoded as
235 a categorical variable representing the four possible accessions (An-1, Bay-0, Col-0 or Lp2-6). All
236 main effects and interactions were included in the models.

237 Once a model was fitted, F tests (significance level of 5%) were performed on each main effect
238 and interaction, using marginal sum of squares. In addition, the following post-hoc tests at 5%

239 significance level were performed with the *emmeans* R package (Lenth, 2021), using Tukey's
240 method:

241 (i) differences in mean values across treatments at the 10 leaf-stage of experiment I, tested
242 separately for each accession,

243 (ii) differences in slopes across all treatments, tested separately for each accession (in experiments
244 I and II, both phases). These slopes represent the rates of change over time of transformed valued
245 of the traits and hence capture the dynamic effects of transient treatments (drought, submergence
246 and combinations thereof).

247 The analysis described above emphasizes the trait responses to drought and submergence as a
248 function of time (slopes in the mixed effect models) rather than their effects on mean trait values
249 at the end of the experimental period. We do this because values of traits at the end of the treatment
250 are determined by the length of the treatment and the starting values of the traits (especially for
251 those traits associated to growth or development of the plants). Such analysis would thus not
252 generalize well, as they would be highly sensitive to the duration of the drought or submergence
253 treatment period and the developmental age of the plants at the beginning of the treatment.
254 However, the dynamic effects (i.e., rates of change, represented in this study by slopes) was
255 considered more useful as it would be more sensitive to the intensity of the stress imposed, the
256 physiological response of the plant and potential differences among accessions.

257 The analysis of experiment III also used linear mixed effect models on transformed trait values
258 (Table S1) to account for the effects and interactions of treatment and accession (fixed effects) and
259 experiment batch (random effect) but, unlike for experiments I and II, there was no time component
260 in this experiment and hence slopes were not computed. Differences in mean values across all

261 accessions and treatment combinations were tested using the same methodology described above
262 for experiment I.

263 **RESULTS**

264 Overall, abiotic stresses and their combinations resulted in distinct patterns of effects across the
265 traits analyzed, with both quantitative and qualitative differences across accessions. Stress
266 combinations had additive effects on some traits, whereas clear positive and negative interactions
267 were observed for other traits: 9 out of 12 traits for high temperature and drought, 6 out of 12 traits
268 for post-submergence and drought showed significant interactions. The detailed results of the
269 different experiments are described below trait-by-trait, in alphabetical order.

270 For conciseness, while all the results are shown in Figures 2 – 6, only those effects that were
271 statistically and physiologically significant are reported in the text unless it is pertinent to
272 emphasize a lack of effect. Whenever the statistical significance of the results was not consistent
273 (e.g., a significant effect of drought in experiment I but not in experiment II), the most stringent
274 result was chosen to avoid reporting excessive false positives. The individual measurements for all
275 the experiments and traits together with the fitted models are reported graphically in supplemental
276 Figures S2 – S28. The P values of the F tests for each fitted model are provided in Tables S2 – S5.

277 **Blade shape**

278 The *blade shape* corresponds to the average ratio between leaf blade width and length and
279 decreased over time under control conditions (Figures 3 – 5). High temperature (with or without
280 drought) accelerated this decrease in An-1 (Figures 3 and S2), although the value at the 10-leaf
281 stage was higher when compared to control conditions (Figures 2 and S2). On the other hand, Bay-

282 0 had systematically lower *blade shape* values under high temperature (Figure 2) but with the same
283 dynamics as in control conditions.

284 In experiment II, the leaf blades of Lp2-6 became more elongated when submerged (Figures 4 and
285 S3) with a strong recovery towards control values during post-submergence with or without
286 drought (Figure 5 and S4). Overall, no effect of drought was detected for *blade shape*.

287 **Flowering time**

288 High temperature (with or without drought) reduced the time to first flower opening (*flowering*
289 *time*) in all accessions except Lp2-6, while neither submergence nor drought had any effect on this
290 trait (Figure 6). The effect of high temperature varied across the affected accessions, with the
291 smallest effect on An-1 and the largest on Col-0 (Figure 6).

292 **Leaf angle**

293 The insertion angle of leaves with respect to the horizontal plane (*leaf angle*) was strongly
294 increased by high temperature (Figures 2 and S5), though no dynamic effect was observed (Figures
295 3 and S5). Drought did not affect the values of this trait but there was a strong positive interaction
296 with high temperature which led to further increases in *leaf angle* (Figures 3 and S5).

297 *Leaf angle* also increased during submergence (Figures 4 and S6) and did not decrease towards
298 control values during post-submergence, except when combined with drought for An-1 and Lp2-6
299 (Figure 5 and S7).

300 **Leaf size**

301 The average area of a rosette leaf (*leaf size*) of Bay-0 was increased by high temperature (Figures
302 2 and S8) but the dynamics were not affected (Figures 3 and S8). In contrast, drought always led

303 to smaller leaves in Bay-0 and the effect was enhanced when combined with high temperature
304 (Figure 3).

305 Submergence also led to smaller leaves in all accessions (Figures 4 and S9) and no recovery was
306 observed during post-submergence except for Lp2-6 (Figures 5 and S10). The application of
307 drought during post-submergence did not affect the dynamics of *leaf size* in Lp2-6 or An-1, but
308 strongly suppressed the trait values in Bay-0 and Col-0 (Figures 5 and S10).

309 **Petiole ratio**

310 The ratio between petiole length and leaf length (*petiole ratio*) was increased by high temperature
311 in all accessions (Figures 2 and S11) but the dynamics were not affected (Figures 3 and S11).
312 Submergence also led to an increase in *petiole ratio*, especially for An-1 and Lp2-6 (Figures 4 and
313 S12), though the post-submergence recovery phase did not differ from control conditions (Figures
314 5 and S13). Drought did not affect this trait except when combined with post-submergence where
315 it led to a strong decrease in *petiole ratio* in Lp2-6 (Figure 5).

316 **Relative water content**

317 The relative water content of leaves (*relative water content*) was not affected by high temperature
318 (Figures 2, 3 and S14), but it decreased with drought (Figures 3, 5, S14 and S16) and the effect of
319 drought was slightly enhanced by combining it with high temperature or post-submergence
320 (Figures 3, 5, S14 and S16). Submergence led to an increase in *relative water content* (Figures 4
321 and S15), but this was followed by a decrease during post-submergence, except in Lp2-6 (Figures
322 5 and S16).

323 **Root length**

324 The maximum depth reached by the root system (*root length*) did not differ between control and
325 high temperature at the 10-leaf stage (Figures 2 and S17), but the stress had a negative effect on
326 the growth of *root length* of Lp2-6 (Figures 3 and S17). *Root length* strongly decreased during
327 submergence, especially for Bay-0 and Col-0 (Figures 4 and S18) but there were no differences
328 noted in its dynamics between control and post-submergence (Figures 5 and S19). There were some
329 effects of drought on *root length* (on its own or when combined with post-submergence) for Bay-
330 0 and Lp2-6, though they were not always reproduced across the experiments (Figures 3, 5, S16
331 and S19).

332 **Rosette dry weight**

333 The effect of high temperature on rosette biomass (*rosette dry weight*) at the 10-leaf stage and its
334 rate of increase varied across accessions. Both An-1 and Col-0 had a lower *rosette dry weight* at
335 the 10-leaf stage under high temperature (Figures 2 and S20), but the stress accelerated the
336 accumulation of biomass in An-1, had no dynamic effect on Col-0 and slowed down growth in
337 Lp2-6 (Figures 3 and S20).

338 The *rosette dry weight* of all accessions decreased under submergence with Lp2-6 being the
339 accession least affected (Figures 4 and S21). However, no differences were detected between post-
340 submergence and control in the rate of *rosette dry weight* increase (Figures 5 and S22).

341 All accessions continued to accumulate *rosette dry weight* under drought and while this stress
342 reduced growth in Col-0 under experiment I (Figures 3 and S20) and An-1 under experiment II
343 (Figures 5 and S22), these results were not consistent across the two experiments. Drought
344 countered the dynamics effects of high temperature on *rosette dry weight* control (Figures 3 and

345 S20), whereas the rate of *rosette dry weight* increase was strongly suppressed by post-submergence
346 drought in Bay-0 and Col-0 (Figures 5 and S22).

347 **Rosette leaf number**

348 The number of rosette leaves at each harvest timepoint was counted in all the experiments in this
349 study. In experiment III, the rosette leaf number is referred to as *total rosette leaf number* and it
350 represents the total number of true leaves produced by the plants up to the moment of bolting (used
351 as a measure of fitness), whereas in experiments I and II, it is denoted as *early rosette leaf number*
352 and represents the number of true leaves present in a plant at harvest. The rate of change of the
353 transformed values of *early rosette leaf number* over time is denoted as “rate of leaf appearance”.

354 High temperature had a positive effect on the rate of leaf appearance of An-1 (Figures 3 and S23).
355 On the other hand, the rate of leaf appearance was decreased by high temperature in Bay-0 and
356 Col-0. The *total rosette leaf number* at bolting was also decreased by high temperature in all
357 accessions except Lp2-6 (Figure 6). The effect of high temperature on Bay-0 was so strong that
358 they bolted before the last harvest of experiment I (Figure S23).

359 The rate of leaf appearance decreased strongly during submergence in all accessions except Lp2-6
360 (Figures 4 and S24) but returned to the same rate as in control conditions during post-submergence,
361 except for Lp2-6 where it decreased during post-submergence (Figures 5 and S25). In all
362 accessions, the *total rosette leaf number* was lower in plants that had been submerged, although
363 the effect was much smaller than for high temperature (Figure 6).

364 Drought did not have any effect on *total rosette leaf number*, or the rate of leaf appearance and no
365 clear interactions were observed between high temperature or post-submergence and drought.

366 **Specific leaf area**

367 The average specific leaf area of the rosettes (*specific leaf area*) increased slightly for Bay-0 and
368 Col-0 at the 10-leaf stage (Figures 2 and S26). This trait decreased over time as adult leaves had
369 lower *specific leaf area* compared to juvenile leaves and high temperature accelerated this trend in
370 Bay-0 (Figures 3 and S26). A decrease in *specific leaf area* of Bay-0 was also observed for drought
371 (on its own or when combined with the other stresses).

372 Submergence increased *specific leaf area* in all accessions except for Lp2-6 where it decreased
373 (Figures 4 and S27). On the other hand, there were no differences between control and post-
374 submergence, except for Lp2-6 where a strong increase in *specific leaf area* was observed (Figures
375 5 and S28). No interactions with drought were observed except for Bay-0 (see above).

376 **Yield**

377 The seed yield per plant (*yield*) decreased under high temperature for all accessions, with Bay-0
378 being the most sensitive accession (Figure 6). Submergence also negatively affected the *yield* of
379 An-1 and Col-0, though the effect was smaller than for high temperature (Figure 6). Drought did
380 not have any effect on *yield* nor did it interact with other treatments.

381 **DISCUSSION**

382 **Effects of high temperature**

383 Our results confirm previous studies on thermomorphogenesis that reported significant increases
384 in *leaf angle*, *petiole ratio* and *specific leaf area* (Zanten et al., 2013, Quint et al., 2016, Ibañez et
385 al., 2017, Vile et al., 2012, Vasseur et al., 2011), though we observed a very weak effect on *specific*
386 *leaf area* compared to previous studies (Vile et al., 2012, Vasseur et al., 2011). The discrepancy on

387 *specific leaf area* may be due to these previous studies using a higher temperature difference (30 °C
388 – 20 °C) and different developmental stage (first silique shattered).

389 Less is known about the effects of high temperature on *root length* of Arabidopsis. Although Ibañez
390 et al. (2017) and Hanzawa et al. (2013) observed an increase in *root length* under high temperature,
391 these measurements were performed on young seedlings rather than established plants. On the other
392 hand, Vile et al. (2012) reported no effect of high temperature on biomass allocation of roots which
393 would be in agreement with our results.

394 Despite a relatively small impact on the dry weight of the young rosettes in experiment I (Figure
395 3), the high temperature treatment had a negative effect on *yield* and *total rosette leaf number*
396 (Figure 6). Such a reduction could not always be explained by a shorter vegetative cycle only, as
397 there was no effect of high temperature on the *flowering time* (measured in days) of Lp2-6 but still
398 *yield* was strongly affected in this accession (Figure 6).

399 Besides the expected high temperature phenotype, our measurements also revealed that high
400 temperature also reduces the rate of leaf appearance for some accessions (Figure 3), in
401 contradiction with previous experiments in Arabidopsis (Granier et al., 2002) and the thermal time
402 paradigm (Trudgill et al., 2005). Since the leaf appearance rate in Arabidopsis and other dicots is
403 known to be affected by the daily light integral when plants are grown at low light intensities
404 (Chenu et al., 2005, Savvides et al., 2014), we speculate that the temperature optimum for leaf
405 appearance may also depend on the light intensity or photoperiod, but this needs to be tested in
406 future experiments.

407 **Effects of submergence**

408 The present study provides an extensive documentation of the effect of submergence on a suite of
409 traits in *Arabidopsis*. The increase in leaf angle and petiole elongation under submergence has been
410 reported previously for flood-adapted species with aerenchyma-rich tissues, such as species from
411 the genus *Rumex* and *Rorippa* (Pierik et al., 2005, Sasidharan and Voesenek, 2015, Cox et al.,
412 2003) as well as in *Arabidopsis*, which lacks aerenchyma (van Veen et al., 2016). However, unlike
413 most previous submergence research on *Arabidopsis*, our submergence treatments were performed
414 in the light and the decline in internal oxygen concentrations might have been more gradual, as
415 light availability during submergence allows for some underwater photosynthesis and supports
416 oxygen production and carbon assimilation, making the stress milder than in the absence of light
417 (Vashisht et al., 2011). This may also explain why we do not see a strong evidence of a
418 physiological drought during the post-submergence phase in our experiments, in contrast to what
419 has been reported previously (Sasidharan and Voesenek, 2015, Tamang and Fukao, 2015, Yeung
420 et al., 2019, Fukao et al., 2011).

421 The significant negative effect of submergence on *yield* for An-1 and Col-0 and on *total rosette*
422 *leaf number* for all accessions was unexpected (Figure 6). Such an effect could not be explained
423 by the direct impact of submergence on *rosette dry weight* or *leaf initiation rate* (Figure 4), nor by
424 a post-submergence effect, as experiment II revealed no differences between control conditions
425 and the post-submergence recovery of *rosette dry weight* or *early rosette leaf number* (Fig. 4). This
426 implies that the negative effects of submergence on the growth and development of the plants were
427 either delayed (from the moment of de-submergence) or became stronger over time and hence
428 could not be detected during the first nine days of post-submergence that experiment II covered.

429 A decrease in *total rosette leaf number* but no effect on *flowering time* (as was the case for
430 submergence, Figure 6) is also not common in *Arabidopsis*. There are examples of experimental
431 manipulations that either increase flowering time and total number of leaves, such as the
432 application of nitric oxide (He et al., 2004) or sucrose (Ohto et al., 2001), or reduce flowering time
433 and total number of leaves, such as vernalization (Martinez-Zapater and Somerville, 1990) or
434 gibberellic acid (Bagnall, 1992). This correlation between *flowering time* and *total rosette leaf*
435 *number* is also observed across accessions of *Arabidopsis* and in mutants that affect either of the
436 processes (Méndez-Vigo et al., 2010), suggesting that the average rate of leaf appearance is highly
437 conserved. One example of decoupling the two traits is the application of nitrogen dioxide, which
438 reduces *flowering time* but does not affect *total rosette leaf number* (Takahashi and Morikawa,
439 2014). However, to our knowledge, such decoupling has not been reported before for an abiotic
440 stress in *Arabidopsis*.

441 In terms of *rosette dry weight* and *early rosette leaf number*, Lp2-6 appears to be more tolerant to
442 submergence stress than the other accessions (Figure 4). This is in accordance with previous studies
443 characterizing its relatively high survival and recovery following submergence in darkness
444 (Vashisht et al. 2011; Yeung et al., 2018). The minimal submergence effects on Lp2-6 biomass
445 coincided with a deviant effect (compared to other accessions) on many of the traits such as *blade*
446 *shape*, *leaf size* or *petiole ratio* (Figure 4), followed by a strong recovery towards control levels
447 during post-submergence (Figure 5). Since these traits were averaged at the plant level, these rapid
448 changes observed in Lp2-6 (Figures 4 and 5) reflect a strong contrast between the morphology of
449 leaves generated during submergence vs non-submerged conditions. Specifically, Lp2-6 grew
450 more elongated, thinner leaves with a longer petiole and a smaller blade, that would have reduced
451 the distance to the water surface, relative to the other accessions. This could result in more access

452 to light and oxygen and hence enable some growth and development under water. Interestingly,
453 Lp2-6 did not increase its *leaf angle* during submergence as much as other accessions. These results
454 suggest that *blade shape*, *leaf size* and *petiole ratio* are traits of interest when evaluating the
455 tolerance to submergence of Arabidopsis.

456 **Effects of drought and its interactions with high temperature and post-submergence**

457 Overall, drought tended to have weaker (or no) effect on the different traits in our study and had
458 no effect on yield (thus, plants were able to fully recover from the drought stress). Indeed, the
459 drought stress imposed was only mild, as dry weight accumulation during the drought was barely
460 affected in most cases, despite the gravimetric pellet water content decreasing by 75% after 9 days
461 of no watering (Figure S1). However, it is possible that the small transpiration rates of the young
462 Arabidopsis rosettes and the structure of the coconut fibers in the pellets allowed plants to maintain
463 a relatively favorable hydraulic status under such conditions.

464 Despite the overall weak effects of drought, we identified several instances where drought
465 interacted in a complex manner with high temperature or post-submergence, especially when
466 variation across accessions is considered. Specifically, there were statistically significant
467 interactions between drought and high temperature (for at least one accession) in 9 out of 12 traits
468 (Table S2) and between post-submergence and drought for half of the traits (Table S4). For
469 example, drought increased the effects of high temperature and post-submergence on *leaf angle* for
470 most accessions (Figure 3 and 5). Similarly, post-submergence drought led to small *leaf size* in
471 Bay-0 and Col-0 even though drought and post-submergence had little effect on their own (Figure
472 5). Vile et al. (2012) reported mostly additive effects of mild drought and high temperature
473 combinations for similar traits to the ones in our experiment, but they also identified some

474 interactions. Strong interactions have also been reported for molecular and metabolic traits in
475 response to combinations of stresses (Mittler, 2006, Rizhsky et al., 2004, Suzuki et al., 2014).

476 **Conclusions**

477 All tested sub-lethal abiotic stresses and their combinations affected a wide range of traits in
478 Arabidopsis. Moreover, each stress led to a different pattern of effects reflecting the distinct
479 challenges imposed by the different stresses, but there were differences among accessions for some
480 of the traits. Also, there were interactions between drought and other treatments and, when present,
481 the interactions tended to be accession specific.

482 This study contributes with a rich characterization of the response of Arabidopsis to sub-lethal
483 stresses at the level of organ and plant, providing a starting point for further in-depth physiological
484 research and mechanistic modelling efforts. Mechanistic plant models aid in understanding the
485 feedbacks and trade-offs acting on plant growth under different abiotic stresses, but only if they
486 are well calibrated and validated against a comprehensive quantitative description of plant
487 physiology, morphology and development such as the one provided in this study.

488 **FUNDING**

489 This research was funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) (Project
490 Numbers 867.15.030 AM, JBE, NA, XY; 867.15.031 AM, RS, MvZ; 016.Vidi.171.006 RS) under
491 joint Indo NWO bilateral cooperation program with DBT, India (AP and SLS-P).

492 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

493 We thank Ankie Ammerlaan, Jolanda Schuurmans and Evelien Stouten for their excellent technical
494 support during the experiments .

495 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

496 Figure 1: Schemes of experiments I and II showing treatments and harvest timepoints. Each row
497 represents a temporal overview of the treatment or control. Each star represents a harvest timepoint
498 (with days counted from the 10-leaf stage or 10LS). The same temporal schemes were used in
499 experiment III for applying the treatments, but plants were harvested at the time of seed maturity
500 instead, after rewatering to control conditions from respectively day 9 and 12 onwards in
501 experiments I and II.

502 Figure 2: Estimated average values of each trait in control and high temperature conditions at the
503 10-true leaf stage of experiment I (see text and Figure 1 for details) for each accession and treatment
504 as predicted by the linear mixed models fitted to the data on each trait. Within each panel and
505 accession, if two groups share the same letters it implies no significant difference at the 95%
506 confidence level (the significant tests were performed in the transformed scale, the means are
507 reported in the original scale, Tukey correction for multiple comparison was applied). Units of
508 measure are displayed in the heading of each panel if applicable. Whiskers indicate standard errors
509 of the means.

510 Figure 3: Estimated rate of change over time of each trait (after being transformed, see Table S1,
511 with units of 1/day) in experiment I (see text and Figure 1 for details) for each accession and
512 treatment (combination) as predicted by the linear mixed models fitted to the data on each trait.
513 Within each panel and accession, if two groups share the same letters it implies no significant
514 difference at the 95% confidence level (Tukey correction for multiple comparison was applied).
515 Whiskers indicate standard errors of the slopes.

516 Figure 4: Estimated rate of change over time of each trait (after being transformed, see Table S1,
517 with units of 1/day) in experiment II, phase a (see text and Figure 1 for details) for each accession

518 and treatment as predicted by the linear mixed models fitted to the data on each trait. Within each
519 panel and accession, if two groups share the same letters it implies no statistically significant
520 difference at the 95% confidence level (Tukey's HSD correction for multiple comparison was
521 applied). Whiskers indicate standard errors of the slopes.

522 Figure 5: Estimated rate of change over time of each trait (after being transformed, see Table S1,
523 with units of 1/day) in experiment II, phase b (see text and Figure 1 for details) for each accession
524 and treatment as predicted by the linear mixed models fitted to the data on each trait. Within each
525 panel and accession, if two groups share the same letters it implies no statistically significant
526 difference at the 95% confidence level (Tukey's correction for multiple comparison was applied).
527 Whiskers indicate standard errors of the slopes.

528 Figure 6: Estimated average values of each trait measured in experiment III for each accession and
529 treatment as predicted by the linear mixed models fitted to the data on each trait. Within each panel
530 and accession, if two groups share the same letters it implies no statistically significant difference
531 at the 95% confidence level (the significant tests were performed in the transformed scale, the
532 means are reported in the original scale, Tukey's correction for multiple comparison was applied).
533 Whiskers indicate standard errors of the means. Original data points each representing an individual
534 plant are shown as dots.

535 LITERATURE CITED

536 **Bagnall D. 1992.** Control of Flowering in *Arabidopsis thaliana* by Light, Vernalisation and
537 Gibberellins. *Functional Plant Biology*, **19**: 401-409.

538 **Bailey-Serres J, Voeselek LACJ. 2008.** Flooding Stress: Acclimations and Genetic Diversity.
539 *Annual Review of Plant Biology*, **59**: 313-339.

- 540 **Blum A, Jordan WR. 1985.** Breeding crop varieties for stress environments. *Critical Reviews in*
541 *Plant Sciences*, **2**: 199-238.
- 542 **Casal JJ, Balasubramanian S. 2019.** Thermomorphogenesis. *Annual Review of Plant Biology*,
543 **70**: 321-346.
- 544 **Chapin FS. 1991.** Integrated Responses of Plants to Stress. *BioScience*, **41**: 29-36.
- 545 **Chaves MM, Maroco JP, Pereira JS. 2003.** Understanding plant responses to drought—from
546 genes to the whole plant. *Functional Plant Biology*, **30**: 239-264.
- 547 **Chenu K, Franck N, Dauzat J, Barczy JF, Rey H, Lecoeur J. 2005.** Integrated responses of
548 rosette organogenesis, morphogenesis and architecture to reduced incident light in
549 *Arabidopsis thaliana* results in higher efficiency of light interception. *Functional Plant*
550 *Biology*, **32**: 1123-1134.
- 551 **Cox MCH, Millenaar FF, van Berkel YEMdJ, Peeters AJM, Voeselek LACJ. 2003.** Plant
552 Movement. Submergence-Induced Petiole Elongation in *Rumex palustris* Depends on
553 Hyponastic Growth. *Plant Physiology*, **132**: 282-291.
- 554 **Fedoroff NV, Battisti DS, Beachy RN, Cooper PJ, Fischhoff DA, Hodges C, Knauf VC, Lobell**
555 **D, Mazur BJ, Molden D. 2010.** Radically rethinking agriculture for the 21st century.
556 *Science*, **327**: 833-834.
- 557 **Fukao T, Yeung E, Bailey-Serres J. 2011.** The Submergence Tolerance Regulator SUB1A
558 Mediates Crosstalk between Submergence and Drought Tolerance in Rice. *The Plant Cell*,
559 **23**: 412-427.
- 560 **Granier C, Massonnet C, Turc O, Muller B, Chenu K, Tardieu F. 2002.** Individual leaf
561 development in *Arabidopsis thaliana*: a stable thermal-time-based programme. *Annals of*
562 *Botany*, **89**: 595-604.

- 563 **Hanzawa T, Shibasaki K, Numata T, Kawamura Y, Gaude T, Rahman A. 2013.** Cellular auxin
564 homeostasis under high temperature is regulated through a sorting NEXIN1-dependent
565 endosomal trafficking pathway. *Plant Cell*, **25**: 3424-33.
- 566 **He Y, Tang RH, Hao Y, Stevens RD, Cook CW, Ahn SM, Jing L, Yang Z, Chen L, Guo F,**
567 **Fiorani F, Jackson RB, Crawford NM, Pei ZM. 2004.** Nitric oxide represses the
568 *Arabidopsis* floral transition. *Science*, **305**: 1968-71.
- 569 **Ibañez C, Poeschl Y, Peterson T, Bellstädt J, Denk K, Gogol-Döring A, Quint M, Delker C.**
570 **2017.** Ambient temperature and genotype differentially affect developmental and
571 phenotypic plasticity in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *BMC Plant Biology*, **17**: 114.
- 572 **Jagadish SVK, Bahuguna RN, Djanaguiraman M, Gamuyao R, Prasad PVV, Craufurd PQ.**
573 **2016.** Implications of High Temperature and Elevated CO₂ on Flowering Time in Plants.
574 *Frontiers in Plant Science*, **7**.
- 575 **Lenth RV. 2021.** emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means.
- 576 **Martinez-Zapater JM, Somerville CR. 1990.** Effect of Light Quality and Vernalization on Late-
577 Flowering Mutants of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Plant Physiology*, **92**: 770-776.
- 578 **Meehl GA, Zwiers F, Evans J, Knutson T, Mearns L, Whetton P. 2000.** Trends in Extreme
579 Weather and Climate Events: Issues Related to Modeling Extremes in Projections of Future
580 Climate Change. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, **81**: 427-436.
- 581 **Méndez-Vigo B, de Andrés MT, Ramiro M, Martínez-Zapater JM, Alonso-Blanco C. 2010.**
582 Temporal analysis of natural variation for the rate of leaf production and its relationship
583 with flowering initiation in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, **61**:
584 1611-1623.
- 585 **Miao S, Zou CB, Breshears DD. 2009.** Vegetation responses to extreme hydrological events:
586 sequence matters. *The American Naturalist*, **173**: 113-118.

- 587 **Mittler R. 2006.** Abiotic stress, the field environment and stress combination. *Trends in Plant*
588 *Science*, **11**: 15-19.
- 589 **Mittler R, Finka A, Goloubinoff P. 2012.** How do plants feel the heat? *Trends in Biochemical*
590 *Sciences*, **37**: 118-125.
- 591 **Morales A, Teapal J, Ammerlaan JMH, Yin X, Evers JB, Anten NPR, Sasidharan R, van**
592 **Zanten M. 2020.** A high throughput method for quantifying number and size distribution
593 of Arabidopsis seeds using large particle flow cytometry. *Plant Methods*, **16**: 27.
- 594 **Ohto M, Onai K, Furukawa Y, Aoki E, Araki T, Nakamura K. 2001.** Effects of sugar on
595 vegetative development and floral transition in Arabidopsis. *Plant Physiology*, **127**: 252-
596 261.
- 597 **Pandey P, Irulappan V, Bagavathiannan MV, Senthil-Kumar M. 2017.** Impact of Combined
598 Abiotic and Biotic Stresses on Plant Growth and Avenues for Crop Improvement by
599 Exploiting Physio-morphological Traits. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, **8**: 537-537.
- 600 **Pierik R, Millenaar FF, Peeters AJM, Voesenek LACJ. 2005.** New perspectives in flooding
601 research: the use of shade avoidance and *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Annals of Botany*, **96**: 533-
602 540.
- 603 **Pinheiro J, Bates D, DebRoy S, Sarkar D. 2021.** nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects
604 Models.
- 605 **Quint M, Delker C, Franklin KA, Wigge PA, Halliday KJ, van Zanten M. 2016.** Molecular
606 and genetic control of plant thermomorphogenesis. *Nature Plants*, **2**: 15190.
- 607 **Rizhsky L, Liang H, Shuman J, Shulaev V, Davletova S, Mittler R. 2004.** When Defense
608 Pathways Collide. The Response of Arabidopsis to a Combination of Drought and Heat
609 Stress. *Plant Physiology*, **134**: 1683-1696.

- 610 **Sasidharan R, Voeselek LACJ. 2015.** Ethylene-Mediated Acclimations to Flooding Stress. *Plant*
611 *Physiology*, **169**: 3-12.
- 612 **Savvides A, Ntagkas N, van Ieperen W, Dieleman JA, Marcelis LFM. 2014.** Impact of light on
613 leaf initiation: a matter of photosynthate availability in the apical bud? *Functional Plant*
614 *Biology*, **41**: 547-556.
- 615 **Schiermeier Q. 2011.** Increased flood risk linked to global warming: likelihood of extreme rainfall
616 may have been doubled by rising greenhouse-gas levels. *Nature*, **470**: 316-317.
- 617 **Stott P. 2016.** How climate change affects extreme weather events. *Science*, **352**: 1517-1518.
- 618 **Suzuki N, Rivero RM, Shulaev V, Blumwald E, Mittler R. 2014.** Abiotic and biotic stress
619 combinations. *New Phytologist*, **203**: 32-43.
- 620 **Takahashi M, Morikawa H. 2014.** Nitrogen dioxide accelerates flowering without changing the
621 number of leaves at flowering in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Plant Signaling & Behavior*, **9**:
622 e970433.
- 623 **Tamang BG, Fukao T. 2015.** Plant Adaptation to Multiple Stresses during Submergence and
624 Following Desubmergence. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, **16**: 30164-
625 30180.
- 626 **Tardieu F, Simonneau T, Muller B. 2018.** The Physiological Basis of Drought Tolerance in Crop
627 Plants: A Scenario-Dependent Probabilistic Approach. *Annual Review of Plant Biology*, **69**:
628 733-759.
- 629 **Tardieu F, Tuberosa R. 2010.** Dissection and modelling of abiotic stress tolerance in plants.
630 *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*, **13**: 206-212.
- 631 **Thoen MP, Davila Olivas NH, Kloth KJ, Coolen S, Huang PP, Aarts MG, Bac-Molenaar JA,**
632 **Bakker J, Bouwmeester HJ, Broekgaarden C. 2017.** Genetic architecture of plant stress

- 633 resistance: multi-trait genome-wide association mapping. *New Phytologist*, **213**: 1346-
634 1362.
- 635 **Trudgill DL, Honek A, Li D, van Straalen NM. 2005.** Thermal time – concepts and utility.
636 *Annals of Applied Biology*, **146**: 1-14.
- 637 **van Veen H, Vashisht D, Akman M, Girke T, Mustroph A, Reinen E, Hartman S, Kooiker**
638 **M, van Tienderen P, Schranz ME, Bailey-Serres J, Voeselek LACJ, Sasidharan R.**
639 **2016.** Transcriptomes of Eight *Arabidopsis thaliana* Accessions Reveal Core Conserved,
640 Genotype- and Organ-Specific Responses to Flooding Stress. *Plant Physiology*, **172**: 668-
641 689.
- 642 **Vashisht D, Hesselink A, Pierik R, Ammerlaan JMH, Bailey-Serres J, Visser EJW, Pedersen**
643 **O, van Zanten M, Vreugdenhil D, Jamar DCL, Voeselek LACJ, Sasidharan R. 2011.**
644 Natural variation of submergence tolerance among *Arabidopsis thaliana* accessions. *New*
645 *Phytologist*, **190**: 299-310.
- 646 **Vasseur F, Pantin F, Vile D. 2011.** Changes in light intensity reveal a major role for carbon
647 balance in *Arabidopsis* responses to high temperature. *Plant Cell Environ*, **34**: 1563-76.
- 648 **Vile D, Pervent M, Belluau M, Vasseur F, Bresson J, Muller B, Granier C, Simonneau T.**
649 **2012.** *Arabidopsis* growth under prolonged high temperature and water deficit: independent
650 or interactive effects? *Plant, Cell & Environment*, **35**: 702-718.
- 651 **Voeselek LACJ, Bailey-Serres J. 2015.** Flood adaptive traits and processes: an overview. *New*
652 *Phytologist*, **206**: 57-73.
- 653 **Yeung E, Bailey-Serres J, Sasidharan R. 2019.** After The Deluge: Plant Revival Post-Flooding.
654 *Trends in Plant Science*, **24**: 443-454.
- 655 **Yeung E, van Veen H, Vashisht D, Sobral Paiva AL, Hummel M, Rankenberg T, Steffens B,**
656 **Steffen-Heins A, Sauter M, de Vries M, Schuurink RC, Bazin J, Bailey-Serres J,**


657 **Voesenek LACJ, Sasidharan R. 2018.** A stress recovery signaling network for enhanced
658 flooding tolerance in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
659 *Sciences of the United States of America*, **115**: E6085-E6094.

660 **Zanten Mv, Bours R, Pons TL, Proveniers MCG. 2013.** Plant acclimation and adaptation to
661 warm environments. In: Franklin KA, Wigge PA, eds. *Temperature and Plant*
662 *Development*.

663

664

Figures




665

666 **Figure 1:** Schemes of experiments I and II showing treatments and harvest timepoints. Each row represents a temporal
667 overview of the treatment or control. Each star represents a harvest timepoint (with days counted from the 10-leaf stage
668 or 10LS). The same temporal schemes were used in experiment III for applying the treatments, but plants were
669 harvested at the time of seed maturity instead, after rewatering to control conditions from respectively day 9 and 12
670 onwards in experiments I and II.

671


672




673
 674 **Figure 2:** Estimated average values of each trait in control and high temperature conditions at the 10-true leaf stage of
 675 experiment I (see text and Figure 1 for details) for each accession and treatment as predicted by the linear mixed models
 676 fitted to the data on each trait. Within each panel and accession, if two groups share the same letters it implies no
 677 significant difference at the 95% confidence level (the significant tests were performed in the transformed scale, the
 678 means are reported in the original scale, Tukey correction for multiple comparison was applied). Units of measure are
 679 displayed in the heading of each panel if applicable. Whiskers indicate standard errors of the means.

680

681




682
 683 **Figure 3:** Estimated rate of change over time of each trait (after being transformed, see Table S1, with units of 1/day)
 684 in experiment I (see text and Figure 1 for details) for each accession and treatment (combination) as predicted by the
 685 linear mixed models fitted to the data on each trait. Within each panel and accession, if two groups share the same
 686 letters it implies no significant difference at the 95% confidence level (Tukey correction for multiple comparison was
 687 applied). Whiskers indicate standard errors of the slopes.




688
 689 **Figure 4:** Estimated rate of change over time of each trait (after being transformed, see Table S1, with units of 1/day)
 690 in experiment II, phase a (see text and Figure 1 for details) for each accession and treatment as predicted by the linear
 691 mixed models fitted to the data on each trait. Within each panel and accession, if two groups share the same letters it
 692 implies no statistically significant difference at the 95% confidence level (Tukey's HSD correction for multiple
 693 comparison was applied). Whiskers indicate standard errors of the slopes.

694



695
 696 **Figure 5:** Estimated rate of change over time of each trait (after being transformed, see Table S1, with units of 1/day)
 697 in experiment II, phase b (see text and Figure 1 for details) for each accession and treatment as predicted by the linear
 698 mixed models fitted to the data on each trait. Within each panel and accession, if two groups share the same letters it
 699 implies no statistically significant difference at the 95% confidence level (Tukey's correction for multiple comparison
 700 was applied). Whiskers indicate standard errors of the slopes.

701



702
 703 **Figure 6:** Estimated average values of each trait measured in experiment III for each accession and treatment as
 704 predicted by the linear mixed models fitted to the data on each trait. Within each panel and accession, if two groups
 705 share the same letters it implies no statistically significant difference at the 95% confidence level (the significant tests
 706 were performed in the transformed scale, the means are reported in the original scale, Tukey's correction for multiple
 707 comparison was applied). Whiskers indicate standard errors of the means. Original data points each representing an
 708 individual plant are shown as dots.