

# Letters

# Community recommendations on terminology and procedures used in flooding and low oxygen stress research

#### Introduction

Apart from playing a key role in important biochemical reactions, molecular oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>) and its by-products also have crucial signaling roles in shaping plant developmental programs and environmental responses. Even under normal conditions, sharp O<sub>2</sub> gradients can occur within the plant when cellular O2 demand exceeds supply, especially in dense organs such as tubers, seeds and fruits. Spatial and temporal variations in O<sub>2</sub> concentrations are important cues for plants to modulate development (van Dongen & Licausi, 2015; Considine et al., 2016). Environmental conditions can also expand the low O2 regions within the plant. For example, excessive rainfall can lead to partial or complete plant submergence resulting in O2 deficiency in the root or the entire plant (Voesenek & Bailey-Serres, 2015). Climate changeassociated increases in precipitation events have made flooding a major abiotic stress threatening crop production and food sustainability. This increased flooding and associated crop losses highlight the urgency of understanding plant flooding responses and tolerance mechanisms.

Timely manifestation of physiological and morphological changes triggering developmental adjustments or flooding survival strategies requires accurate sensing of O2 levels. Despite progress in understanding how plants sense and respond to changes in intracellular O<sub>2</sub> concentrations (van Dongen & Licausi, 2015), several questions remain unanswered due to a lack of high resolution tools to accurately and noninvasively monitor (sub)cellular O2 concentrations. In the absence of such tools, it is therefore critical for researchers in the field to be aware of how experimental conditions can influence plant O2 levels, and thus on the importance of accurately reporting specific experimental details. This also requires a consensus on the definition of frequently used

At the 15<sup>th</sup> New Phytologist Workshop on Flooding stress (Voesenek et al., 2016), community members discussed and agreed on unified nomenclature and standard norms for low O2 and flooding stress research. This consensus on terminology and experimental guidelines is presented here. We expect that these norms will facilitate more effective interpretation, comparison and reproducibility of research in this field. We also highlight the current challenges in noninvasively monitoring and measuring O<sub>2</sub> concentrations in plant cells, outlining the technologies currently available, their strengths and drawbacks, and their suitability for use in flooding and low O2 research.

# **Terminology**

The inconsistent and sometimes inaccurate usage of flooding and low O2 stress-related terms together with incomplete details regarding experimental conditions have hindered the interpretation, reproducibility and comparison of independent studies in the field. Here, we define and clarify commonly used terms used in flooding and low-O<sub>2</sub> related experimental conditions.

#### Flooding

A general term referring to excessively wet conditions, that is where excess water replaces gas-spaces surrounding roots and/or shoots. Flooding encompasses the following terms that describe natural events or experiments.

- Waterlogging or soil flooding: only the root-zone is flooded (excessive water in the soil or other rooting media).
- Partial waterlogging or soil flooding: partial flooding of the rootzone. Details regarding depth and extent of soil flooding should be specified.
- Submergence: the entire plant (root and shoot) is under water.
- Partial submergence: the entire root system and part of aboveground organs are under water. Details regarding the submergence depth in relation to plant height or distance from soil surface should be specified.

#### Anaerobiosis

Literally means 'life without molecular O2'. Plants can only survive for a limited time without molecular O2. The term anaerobiosis frequently refers to the status of plants/organs exposed to a lack of O<sub>2</sub> for a short time, during which acclimation occurs through altered gene expression and metabolism.

#### Anaerobic metabolism

Describes cellular energy production from carbohydrates without the benefit of oxidative phosphorylation and engagement of cytochrome c oxidase as the final electron acceptor. Anaerobic metabolism occurs when O2 is absent and is usually associated with (but not limited to) ethanolic and/or lactate fermentation. In plants, it is also associated with accumulation of alanine and gamma-aminobutyric acid due to altered metabolite fluxes involving the tricarboxylic acid cycle among others (Narsai et al., 2011; van Dongen & Licausi, 2015; Voesenek & Bailey-Serres, 2015).

It can occur in cells within an 'anoxic core' in tissues/organs (e.g. vascular tissues of roots; Berry & Norris, 1949; Thomson & Greenway, 1991) even under externally aerobic conditions and in densely packed tissues or organs with a low surface to volume ratio (e.g. developing fruits, tubers, seeds, meristems; Geigenberger et al., 2000; Gibbs & Greenway, 2003; van Dongen & Licausi, 2015).

#### Defining -oxic conditions

The terms hypoxia and anoxia are often used interchangeably, which limits experimental reproducibility and can lead to misunderstanding of associated physiological, biochemical and molecular processes. When accurate quantification of the  $\rm O_2$  status of biological samples or their environment is not possible, use of oxic terms is valid, but care should be taken when inferring conclusions about  $\rm O_2$  availability from these experiments. As a guideline, we describe common -oxic words, highlighting their limitations.

- *Anoxia:* describes complete absence of O<sub>2</sub> in a system. This is not the same as an O2 concentration that is too small to measure because such a condition can be maintained when the diffusive flux of O<sub>2</sub> into the tissue is equal to the O<sub>2</sub> metabolism. True anoxic conditions are unlikely to occur in plant tissues where photosynthesis and respiration are key metabolic processes (Smith & Dukes, 2013). Thus, this term should be limited to describing the atmosphere applied to biological samples or the environment under investigation. Most cases applying anoxic conditions involve replacing the natural atmosphere with an inert gas such as argon or nitrogen (e.g. Loreti et al., 2005; Branco-Price et al., 2008). Some artificial flooding treatments have also been defined as anoxic, when water was degassed before submergence (Baud et al., 2004). In this case, however, the degassed water will not remain  $O_2$ free unless subsequently placed in an O<sub>2</sub>-free environment. Finally, true anoxic conditions require darkness, since the photosynthetic light reaction generates molecular O2.
- Normoxia: the reference normoxic condition is often the O<sub>2</sub> availability in air at sea level on today's Earth, that is 20.95%. However, O<sub>2</sub> concentrations within plant organs can be lower or higher under normoxic conditions (van Dongen & Licausi, 2015; Pedersen et al., 2016). Therefore, internal (organ/tissue/cellular) O<sub>2</sub> concentrations could deviate from the 'normoxic environment'. Under external normoxia, cells may be O<sub>2</sub>-limited due to high metabolic activity, as in meristems (Greve et al., 2003), vascular tissues of roots (Armstrong & Beckett, 1987) or due to limited diffusion in bulky tissues (Pedersen et al., 2006), or tubers (Geigenberger et al., 2000). The O<sub>2</sub> levels measured in these tissues over time in the experimental system is desirable.
- *Hypoxia:* describes O<sub>2</sub> concentrations below normoxic without necessarily implying any impact (i.e. hypoxic treatment refers to experiments in which a plant is exposed to lower O<sub>2</sub> conditions than air). Hypoxia is preferably used to selectively describe O<sub>2</sub> concentrations below which a specific process is affected (e.g. below the critical O<sub>2</sub> pressure (Armstrong *et al.*, 2009) for respiration) or a response is activated. This may imply the need for additional terms to indicate ranges of O<sub>2</sub> concentrations (e.g. in the field of

microbiology, micro-oxic often describes 0.5-5%  $O_2$ ; Pessi *et al.*, 2013). When authors use hypoxia or alternative terms to describe reduced  $O_2$  availability, provision of precise  $O_2$  tensions or ranges are valuable. This can include flow rates or turbulence, medium composition and temperatures for the external medium and the bulkiness, respiration rate and density of experimental tissue(s).

• Hyperoxia/superoxia: describe O<sub>2</sub> concentrations above normoxia. Hyperoxia/superoxia can result from, for instance, underwater photosynthesis and reduced outwards diffusion rate of O<sub>2</sub> from photosynthetic organs to the environment (Rich *et al.*, 2013; Pedersen *et al.*, 2016), or from water bodies to the atmosphere (Nikinmaa, 2014).

Although it is advisable that  $O_2$  concentrations be described for each experimental system, authors may prefer to use -oxic conditions best suited to the study, as long as the description enables experimental replication. Detailed description of the  $O_2$  levels assessed externally or internally (within the plant), or physical parameters that affect its availability, will improve the reproducibility of observations and help the design of models and meta-analyses.

## The challenge of monitoring oxygen levels in plants

Flooding is a compound stress imposing changes in O<sub>2</sub> availability (and thus respiratory ATP production), CO<sub>2</sub>, light, ethylene, mineral nutrients and reactive oxygen species (ROS; Voesenek & Sasidharan, 2013; Voesenek & Bailey-Serres, 2015). The severity of the stress and the response elicited depends upon genotype, developmental age of the plant, organ, tissue, and other factors including flooding depth and duration, light availability, temperature, humidity and the amount of carbohydrate storage (such as sugars, starch, lipids, protein) in cells and tissues.

It is not easy to predict what physiological changes occur in a spatial and dynamic fashion during flooding at the cellular level, especially with respect to O<sub>2</sub> concentration. The way in which a flooding treatment is performed will strongly influence how fast plant tissues experience low O<sub>2</sub> stress. Different factors, including light levels in the water, the temperature and the volume of the water used to submerge the plants, microbial activity in the submerged soil, and O<sub>2</sub> concentration of the water at the beginning of the experiment, will all influence how the O2 availability to the plant changes during the treatment. Therefore, careful monitoring and reporting of the O2 concentration around submerged plant tissue is required. Polarographic electrodes (such as the Clark-type electrode) are still most widely used for this. However, fiber-optic based sensor methods have become more popular during recent years (Rolletschek et al., 2009; Ast et al., 2012), since these are fast and selective. Moreover, optical sensors have the advantage that the same sensor can be used to measure molecular O2 concentrations in solution as well as in air, and the baseline of the measurement is more stable as compared with polarographic methods, which makes optical sensing more suited for long-term (days to weeks) measurements.

To avoid technical difficulties in controlling the  $O_2$  concentration around a plant by submergence, many studies use a chamber filled with  $O_2$ -free or  $O_2$ -poor air. This has the advantage that  $O_2$ 

concentrations can be changed much faster as compared to a submergence treatment, and that the actual external concentration can be controlled precisely. One should be aware, however, that a treatment with air containing little  $\rm O_2$  does not mimic submergence, but only changes one out of many parameters that are affected by submergence.

Apart from the importance of controlling the environmental O<sub>2</sub> concentration during experimental treatments, there is a strong need to obtain precise information about the plant internal-O2 concentration as well. To date, measurements of plant internal O<sub>2</sub> have only been accomplished via invasive means (Ast et al., 2012; Ast & Draaijer, 2014; van Dongen & Licausi, 2015). Most commonly, a small sensor needle is inserted into a plant organ and O<sub>2</sub> concentrations are measured at the tip of the needle. The smallest needle-type sensors that currently exist are based on the Clark-type sensor system (Revsbech, 1989) and commercially available sensors have a diameter of c. 4 µm. These sensors are extremely fragile. More robust glass-fiber-based optical sensors typically have a diameter of c. 50 µm. A disadvantage of needle-type sensors is that the tissue will be damaged upon insertion, which can lead to local changes in the rate of respiratory O2 consumption. Moreover, external O2 is likely to diffuse through the insertion wound into the interior of the tissue, which could lead to an overestimation of the actual in planta O2 concentration.

An alternative invasive method to determine local differences or changes in  $O_2$  concentration is by using  $O_2$ -sensitive reporter foil (Tschiersch *et al.*, 2012). Here, a special camera is used to determine  $O_2$  concentration-dependent light emission from a special coated sensor foil that is placed on the surface of the plant tissue (Jensen *et al.*, 2005). This method has been used to describe local differences in  $O_2$  concentration of plant organs, such as stems and seeds, that were cut in order to access the interior tissues with the sensor foil. By doing so, these measurements allowed detection of differential  $O_2$ -consumption patterns within the plant organ (Tschiersch *et al.*, 2012). More recently, nano particles coated with a fluorescent dye have been successfully used in rhizosphere studies (Koren *et al.*, 2015). These nano particles are possible future candidates for  $O_2$  studies at the cell level when working with large, transparent model cells such as cells of *Chara*.

To date, no method exists that enables noninvasive analysis of plant internal-O2 concentrations. The best alternative that is currently being applied makes use of reporter proteins (such as GUS, GFP or Luciferase) that are expressed under the control of low O<sub>2</sub>induced promotor sequences (Gasch et al., 2016). Interpretation of the expression pattern of the reporter protein allows conclusions about relative variation in the O<sub>2</sub> concentration between regions, or through time. It will not provide, however, an exact value for the actual local concentration of O2. Moreover, the reaction time of such reporter systems is relatively long, making it difficult to investigate rapid changes. Several other suggestions are being discussed to design alternative noninvasive molecular O2-reporter systems. Fluorescent resonance energy transfer (FRET)-based methods, in which the FRET efficiency is affected by O<sub>2</sub>-dependent protein maturation, have already been applied successfully in bacterial cell cultures (Potzkei et al., 2012), but there are no reports yet of the successful application of such O<sub>2</sub> sensors in plants.

In medical research, various noninvasive  $O_2$  monitoring techniques are being used, including positron emission tomography (PET) and nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) technology (Roussakis *et al.*, 2015). In plants, such methods have not yet been reported to determine  $O_2$  gradients, because of the poor resolution, and because homogenous application of the required radioisotopes or contrast agents (such as Fluorine-19 ( $^{19}$ F)-based probes) appears difficult in plants. Further research to develop methods to determine plant internal- $O_2$  concentrations will remain of utmost importance for the research field to advance further.

# **Experimental systems**

It is extremely important that researchers carefully detail the experimental imposition of flooding or low O<sub>2</sub> stress. We suggest that, in addition to details essential to any methods description, the following details specific to low O<sub>2</sub> and flooding studies are necessary:

#### Stress conditions

- ullet Type of flooding (waterlogging, partial or complete submergence) should include depth relative to shoot height. Investigators are encouraged to define terms used in their system, for example stagnant flooding. If hydroponics are used, information on aeration,  $O_2$  status, light and medium composition are needed.
- Flooding in a natural or artificial environment should include information on light, flow, turbidity, pH, inorganic carbon concentration and temperature of the water. It is beneficial to record the rate of decline of O<sub>2</sub> in the soil, air and water. Soil flooding can also be documented from soil redox potential.
- ullet Hypoxia experiments should provide details regarding the system used to achieve low  $O_2$  conditions (and state the  $O_2$  concentrations), including time taken to achieve the condition. Further information can include: chamber size, flow rate through the system, and details of application. The gas used to lower  $O_2$  levels must be stated.
- In experimental setups, determining  $O_2$  flux into roots from  $O_2$  containing bathing media, experimenters should be aware that when roots are attached to shoots, fluxes to the root can come not just from the media but also internally from the shoot (Armstrong & Armstrong, 2014).
- Recovery conditions (post-submergence or post-hypoxia) should be described, including light levels, temperature, humidity, and watering regime post-drainage. Rate of soil drainage (changes in soil water content) and changes in soil redox potential are also valuable.
- Zeitgeber time (hours after dawn) and illumination when experiments start and terminate should be mentioned.
- Plant density and orientation of growth on medium should be included.

#### Scoring survival

A recovery period following the removal of flooding/hypoxia/anoxia stress is essential for scoring survival (Striker, 2012). Plants should be photographed immediately before and after the treatment and at the

end of the recovery period. When scoring damage, quantitative rather than qualitative data are more reproducible and can be analyzed statistically (e.g. chlorophyll levels, biomass, green leaf area).

### **Conclusions**

Careful descriptions of growth and treatment conditions, especially factors that can influence both plant external- and internal- $O_2$  concentrations are essential for clarity, reproducibility and progress in research on plant responses to flooding and low  $O_2$ . Reporting on  $O_2$  concentrations, whenever possible, using the most suitable, currently available methods is recommended. Ultimately, the challenge is also to achieve an understanding of the spatial and temporal dynamics of the major flooding signals,  $O_2$ , ethylene, nitric oxide, ROS and low-energy, their interactions, and how signaling modulates response from the subcellular to the whole-plant level. Furthermore, the focus of many studies has been on short-term molecular signatures, often under severe conditions, whereas responses associated with long-term, less severe and more chronic  $O_2$  limitations that influence developmental plasticity, deserve greater attention.

Rashmi Sasidharan<sup>1\*</sup>, Julia Bailey-Serres<sup>1,2</sup>, Motoyuki Ashikari<sup>3</sup>, Brian J. Atwell<sup>4</sup>, Timothy D. Colmer<sup>5</sup>, Kurt Fagerstedt<sup>6</sup>, Takeshi Fukao<sup>7</sup>, Peter Geigenberger<sup>8</sup>, Kim H. Hebelstrup<sup>9</sup>, Robert D. Hill<sup>10</sup>, Michael J. Holdsworth<sup>11</sup>, Abdelbagi M. Ismail<sup>12</sup>, Francesco Licausi<sup>13</sup>, Angelika Mustroph<sup>14</sup>, Mikio Nakazono<sup>15</sup>, Ole Pedersen<sup>16</sup>, Pierdomenico Perata<sup>13</sup>, Margret Sauter<sup>17</sup>, Ming-Che Shih<sup>18</sup>, Brian K. Sorrell<sup>19</sup>, Gustavo G. Striker<sup>20</sup>, Joost T. van Dongen<sup>21</sup>, James Whelan<sup>22</sup>, Shi Xiao<sup>23</sup>, Eric J. W. Visser<sup>24</sup> and Laurentius A. C. J. Voesenek<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Environmental Biology, Utrecht University, Padualaan 8, Utrecht 3584CH, the Netherlands; <sup>2</sup>Center for Plant Cell Biology, Department of Botany and Plant Science, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521-0124, USA;

 <sup>3</sup>Bioscience and Biotechnology Center, Nagoya University, Chikusa, Nagoya, Aichi 464-8601, Japan;
 <sup>4</sup>Department of Biological Sciences, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW 2109, Australia;

<sup>5</sup>UWA School of Agriculture and Environment, The University of Western Australia, 35 Stirling Highway, Crawley, WA 6009, Australia;

<sup>6</sup>Department of Biosciences, Viikki Plant Science Center, Helsinki University, PO Box 65, Helsinki FI-00014, Finland; 
<sup>7</sup>Department of Crop and Soil Environmental Sciences, Translational Plant Science Program, Fralin Life Science Institute, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061, USA;

<sup>8</sup>Department of Biol 1, Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich, Grosshaderner Str 2-4, Martinsried, Planegg, Munich D-82152, Germany;

> <sup>9</sup>Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics, Aarhus University, Flakkebjerg, Slagelse 4200, Denmark;

<sup>10</sup>Department of Plant Science, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2, Canada; <sup>11</sup>Plant and Crop Sciences Division, School of Biosciences, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, LE12 5RD, UK; <sup>12</sup>International Rice Research Institute, Los Banos, Laguna 4031, Philippines; <sup>13</sup>PlantLab, Institute of Life Sciences, Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna, Via Mariscoglio 34, Pisa 56124, Italy; <sup>14</sup>Plant Physiology, University Bayreuth, Universitaetsstr. 30, Bayreuth 95440, Germany; <sup>15</sup>Graduate School of Bioagricultural Sciences, Nagoya University, Chikusa, Nagoya 464-8601, Japan; <sup>16</sup>Freshwater Biological Laboratory, Department of Biology, University of Copenhagen, Universitetsparken 4, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, Copenhagen 2100, Denmark; <sup>17</sup>Plant Developmental Biology and Plant Physiology, Kiel University, Kiel 24118, Germany; <sup>18</sup>Agricultural Biotechnology Research Center, Academia Sinica, 115, Taipei, Taiwan; <sup>19</sup>Department of Bioscience, Aarhus University, Aarhus 8000, Denmark; <sup>20</sup>IFEVA, Facultad de Agronomía, Universidad de Buenos Aires, CONICET, Av. San Martin 4453, Buenos Aires, Argentina; <sup>21</sup>Institute of Biology, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen 52074, Germany; <sup>22</sup>Department of Animal, Plant and Soil Science, School of Life Science, Australian Research Council Center of Excellence in Plant Energy Biology, La Trobe University, Bundoora, VIC 3086, Australia; <sup>23</sup>State Key Laboratory of Biocontrol and Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Plant Resources, School of Life Sciences, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510275, China; <sup>24</sup>Department of Experimental Plant Ecology, Institute for Water and Wetland Research, Radboud University, Heyendaalseweg 135, 6525 AJ Nijmegen, the Netherlands (\*Author for correspondence: tel +31 30 2536871; email r.sasidharan@uu.nl)

#### References

Armstrong W, Armstrong J. 2014. Plant internal oxygen transport (diffusion and convection) and measuring and modelling oxygen gradients. Low oxygen stress in plants: oxygen sensing and adaptive responses to hypoxia. *Plant Cell Monographs* 21: 267–298.

Armstrong W, Beckett PM. 1987. Internal aeration and the development of stelar anoxia in submerged roots. A multishelled mathematical model combining axial diffusion of oxygen in the cortex with radial losses to the stele, the wall layers and the rhizosphere. New Phytologist 105: 221–245.

Armstrong W, Webb T, Darwent M, Beckett PM. 2009. Measuring and interpreting respiratory critical oxygen pressures in roots. *Annals of Botany* 103: 281–293.

Ast C, Draaijer A. 2014. Methods and techniques to measure molecular oxygen in plants. Low oxygen stress in plants: oxygen sensing and adaptive responses to hypoxia. *Plant Cell Monographs* 21: 397–417.

Ast C, Schmälzlin E, Löhmannsröben HG, van Dongen JT. 2012. Optical oxygen micro- and nanosensors for plant applications. Sensors 12: 7015–7032.

Baud S, Vaultier MN, Rochat C. 2004. Structure and expression profile of the sucrose synthase multigene family in Arabidopsis. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 55: 397–409.

- Berry LJ, Norris WE. 1949. Studies of onion root respiration. II. The effect of temperature on the apparent diffusion coefficient in different segments of the root tip. *Biochemistry Biophysics Acta* 3: 607–614.
- Branco-Price C, Kaiser KA, Jang CJH, Larive CK, Bailey-Serres J. 2008. Selective mRNA translation coordinates energetic and metabolic adjustments to cellular oxygen deprivation and reoxygenation in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *The Plant Journal* 56: 743–755.
- Considine MJ, Diaz-Vivancos P, Kerchev P, Signorelli S, Agudelo-Romero P, Gibbs DJ, Foyer CH. 2016. Learning to breathe: developmental phase transitions in oxygen status. *Trends in Plant Science* 22: 140–153.
- van Dongen JT, Licausi F. 2015. Oxygen sensing and signaling. Annual Review of Plant Biology 66: 345–367.
- Gasch P, Fundinger M, Muller JT, Lee T, Bailey-Serres J, Mustroph A. 2016.
  Redundant ERF-VII transcription factors bind an evolutionarily-conserved cismotif to regulate hypoxia-responsive gene expression in Arabidopsis. The Plant Cell 28: 160–180.
- Geigenberger P, Fernie AR, Gibon Y, Christ M, Stitt M. 2000. Metabolic activity decreases as an adaptive response to low internal oxygen in growing potato tubers. *Biological Chemistry* 381: 723–740.
- Gibbs J, Greenway H. 2003. Mechanisms of anoxia tolerance in plants. I. Growth, survival and anaerobic catabolism. Functional Plant Biology 30: 1–47.
- Greve TM, Borum J, Pedersen O. 2003. Meristematic oxygen variability in eelgrass (*Zostera marina*). *Limnology and Oceanography* 48: 210–216.
- Jensen SI, Kühl M, Glud RN, Jørgensen LB, Priemé A. 2005. Oxic microzones and radial oxygen loss from roots of *Zostera marina*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 293: 49–58
- Koren K, Brodersen KE, Jakobsen SL, Kühl M. 2015. Optical sensor nanoparticles in artificial sediments a new tool to visualize O<sub>2</sub> dynamics around the rhizome and roots of seagrasses. *Environmental Science & Technology* 49: 2286–2292.
- Loreti E, Poggi A, Novi G, Alpi A, Perata P. 2005. A genome-wide analysis of the effects of sucrose on gene expression in Arabidopsis seedlings under anoxia. *Plant Physiology* 137: 1130–1138.
- Narsai R, Rocha M, Geigenberger P, Whelan J, van Dongen JT. 2011. Comparative analysis between plant species of transcriptional and metabolic responses to hypoxia. *New Phytologist* 190: 472–487.
- Nikinmaa M. 2014. An introduction to aquatic toxicology. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
  Pedersen O, Colmer TD, Borum J, Zavala-Perez A, Kendrick GA. 2016. Heat stress of two tropical seagrass species during low tides impact on underwater net photosynthesis, dark respiration and diel in situ internal aeration. New Phytologist. 210: 1207–1218.
- Pedersen O, Vos H, Colmer T. 2006. Oxygen dynamics during submergence in the halophytic stem succulent *Halosarcia pergranulata*. *Plant, Cell & Environment* 29: 1388–1399.

- Pessi G, Braunwalder R, Grunau A, Omasits U, Ahrens CH, Eberl L. 2013. Response of *Burkholderia cenocepacia* H111 to micro-oxia. *PLoS ONE* 8: e72939.
- Potzkei J, Kunze M, Drepper T, Gensch T, Jaeger K, Buchs J. 2012. Real-time determination of intracellular oxygen in bacteria using a genetically encoded FRET-based biosensor. BMC Biology 10: 28.
- Revsbech NP. 1989. An oxygen microelectrode with a guard cathode. *Limnology and Oceanography* 34: 474–478.
- Rich SM, Pedersen O, Ludwig M, Colmer TD. 2013. Shoot atmospheric contact is of little importance to aeration of deeper portions of the wetland plant *Meionectes brownii*: submerged organs mainly acquire O<sub>2</sub> from the water column or produce it endogenously in underwater photosynthesis. *Plant, Cell & Environment* 36: 213–223.
- Rolletschek H, Stangelmayer A, Borisjuk L. 2009. Methodology and significance of microsensor-based oxygen mapping in plant seeds an overview. *Sensors* 9: 3218–3227.
- Roussakis E, Li Z, Nichols AJ, Evans CL. 2015. Oxygen-sensing methods in biomedicine from the macroscale to the microscale. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition* 54: 8340–8362.
- Smith NG, Dukes JS. 2013. Plant respiration and photosynthesis in global-scale models: incorporating acclimation to temperature and CO<sub>2</sub>. Global Change Biology 19: 45–63.
- Striker GG. 2012. Time is on our side: the importance of considering a recovery period when assessing flooding tolerance in plants. *Ecological Research* 27: 983– 987.
- Thomson CJ, Greenway H. 1991. Metabolic evidence for stelar anoxia in maize roots exposed to low oxygen concentrations. *Plant Physiology* 96: 1294–1301.
- Tschiersch H, Liebsch G, Borisjuk L, Stangelmayer A, Rolletschek H. 2012. An imaging method for oxygen distribution, respiration and photosynthesis at a microscopic level of resolution. *New Phytologist* **196**: 926–936.
- Voesenek LACJ, Bailey-Serres J. 2015. Flood adaptive traits and processes: an overview. *New Phytologist* 206: 57–73.
- Voesenek LACJ, Sasidharan R. 2013. Ethylene and oxygen signalling drive plant survival during flooding. *Plant Biology* 15: 426–435.
- Voesenek LACJ, Sasidharan R, Visser EJW, Bailey-Serres J. 2016. Flooding stress signaling through perturbations in oxygen, ethylene, nitric oxide and light. *New Phytologist* 209: 39–43.

**Key words:** anoxia, flooding, hypoxia, low oxygen, plant anaerobiosis, reoxygenation, submergence, waterlogging.