THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

S-nitrosoglutathione spraying improves stomatal conductance, Rubisco activity and antioxidant defense in both leaves and roots of sugarcane plants under water deficit

Citation for published version:

Silveira, NM, Marcos, FCC, Frungillo, L, Moura, BB, Seabra, AB, Salgado, I, Machado, EC, Hancock, JT & Ribeiro, RV 2017, 'S-nitrosoglutathione spraying improves stomatal conductance, Rubisco activity and antioxidant defense in both leaves and roots of sugarcane plants under water deficit', *Physiologia plantarum*, vol. 160, no. 4, pp. 383-395. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ppl.2017.160.issue-4>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1111/ppl.2017.160.issue-4](https://doi.org/10.1111/ppl.2017.160.issue-4)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Physiologia plantarum

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Silveira, N.M., Marcos, F.C.C., Frungillo, L., Moura, B.B., Seabra, A.B., Salgado, I., Machado, E.C., Hancock, J.T. and Ribeiro, R.V. (2017), S-nitrosoglutathione spraying improves stomatal conductance, Rubisco activity and antioxidant defense in both leaves and roots of sugarcane plants under water deficit. *Physiol Plantarum*, 160: 383-395. doi:10.1111/ppl.12575, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/ppl.12575>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

***S*-nitrosoglutathione spraying improves stomatal conductance, Rubisco activity and antioxidant defense in both leaves and roots of sugarcane plants under water deficit**

Neidiquele M. Silveira^a, Fernanda C. C. Marcos^b, Lucas Frungillo^c, Bárbara B. Moura^b, Amedea B. Seabra^d, Ione Salgado^b, Eduardo C. Machado^a, John T. Hancock^e and Rafael V. Ribeiro^{b,*}

^aLaboratory of Plant Physiology “Coaracy M. Franco”, Center R&D in Ecophysiology and Biophysics, Agronomic Institute (IAC), Campinas SP, Brazil

^bDepartment of Plant Biology, Institute of Biology, University of Campinas (UNICAMP), Campinas SP, Brazil

^cSchool of Biological Sciences, Institute of Molecular Plant Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

^dCenter of Natural and Human Sciences, Federal University of ABC, Santo André, SP, Brazil

^eCentre for Research in Plant Science, University of the West of England (UWE), Bristol, UK

*Corresponding author, e-mail: rvr@unicamp.br

Abbreviations:

A, leaf CO₂ assimilation; ABA, abscisic acid; APX, ascorbate peroxidase; CAT, catalase; *C_i*, intercellular CO₂ concentration; DAB, 3,3'-diaminobenzidine; ETR, apparent electron transport rate; *g_s*, stomatal conductance; GSH, glutathione; GSNO, *S*-nitrosoglutathione; MDA, malondialdehyde; NO, nitric oxide; O₂⁻, superoxide anion; PEG, polyethylene glycol; PEP, phosphoenolpyruvate; PEPC, phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase; PPFD, photosynthetic photon flux density; PSII, photosystem II; ROS, reactive oxygen species; RuBP, ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate; Rubisco, ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase/oxygenase; RWC, relative water content; SOD, superoxide dismutase; WD, water deficit.

Abstract

Water deficit is a major environmental constraint on crop productivity and performance and nitric oxide (NO) is an important signaling molecule associated with many biochemical and physiological processes in plants under stressful conditions. This study aims to test the hypothesis that leaf spraying of *S*-nitrosoglutathione (GSNO), a NO donor, improves the antioxidant defense in both roots and leaves of sugarcane plants under water deficit, with positive consequences for photosynthesis. In addition, the role of key photosynthetic enzymes ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase/oxygenase (Rubisco) and phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase (PEPC) in maintaining CO₂ assimilation of GSNO-sprayed plants under water deficit were evaluated. Sugarcane plants were sprayed with water or GSNO 100 µM and subjected to water deficit, by adding polyethylene glycol (PEG-8000) to the nutrient solution. Sugarcane plants supplied with GSNO presented increases in the activity of antioxidant enzymes such as SOD in leaves and CAT in roots, indicating higher antioxidant capacity under water deficit. Such adjustments induced by GSNO were sufficient to prevent oxidative damage in both organs and were associated with better leaf water status. As consequences, GSNO spraying alleviated the negative impact of water deficit on stomatal conductance and photosynthetic rates, with plants also showing increases in Rubisco activity under water deficit.

Keywords: Antioxidant enzymes; Drought; Photosynthesis; Nitric oxide; *Saccharum*.

Introduction

Low water availability is the main abiotic stress affecting sugarcane metabolism and reducing crop yield and biomass production (Ribeiro et al. 2013, Sales et al. 2013). Sugarcane plants facing water deficit present reductions in CO₂ assimilation, transpiration, stomatal opening, and decreases in tillering and culm length (Machado et al. 2009, Silva et al. 2012). While stomatal closure reduces CO₂ diffusion into mesophyll and then limit sugarcane photosynthesis under mild water deficit, metabolic limitation of photosynthesis occurs under severe water deficit through decreases in the activity of key photosynthetic enzymes such as ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase/oxygenase (Rubisco) and phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase (PEPC) (Ghannoum 2009, Lopes et al. 2011). These responses may be associated with impairment of ATP and NADPH synthesis, reducing regeneration of both ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate (RuBP) and phosphoenolpyruvate (PEP) in C₄ plants (Lawlor 2002). In fact, photochemical impairment leading to low ATP and NADPH synthesis is found under drought and it is a result of reduced electron transport rate between PSII and PSI and damage to thylakoid membranes (Lawlor and Cornic 2002).

As biochemical reactions are more sensitive to drought than photochemical ones (Sales et al. 2015) and light energy continues to be absorbed by leaves, there is a change in the redox state of the cells. Thus, the over-reduction of the electron transport chain in chloroplasts and consequent increases in electron flow to O₂ will lead to the generation of reactive oxygen species (ROS). The increase in superoxide anion (O₂^{•-}) and hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂) concentrations in plant cells is one of the first symptoms of exposure to drought, often accompanied by lipid peroxidation in cell membranes (Yamamoto et al. 2002, Tian and Lei 2006). To prevent or reduce cell damage due to ROS, plants have an antioxidant system based

on enzymatic and non-enzymatic reactions. While the non-enzymatic reactions are mediated by ascorbate, glutathione, flavonoids, carotenoids and tocopherols, the enzymatic mechanism consists of several enzymes located in different cellular compartments such as superoxide dismutase (SOD), ascorbate peroxidase (APX) and catalase (CAT). During cell detoxification, $O_2^{\cdot -}$ produced in the mitochondria, chloroplasts and peroxisomes is dismuted to H_2O_2 by SOD, which is rapidly eliminated by the CAT and APX, producing H_2O and O_2 (Foyer and Noctor 2005, Wu et al. 2012, Huseynova 2012).

Some studies have reported nitric oxide (NO) action in plants under drought (Santisree et al. 2015, Farnese et al. 2015), with this molecule cooperating in ABA-induced stomatal closure (Neill et al. 2003) and also increasing drought tolerance in *Vicia faba* (Garcia-Mata and Lamattina 2001). In fact, NO is an important plant messenger mediating various physiological and biochemical processes, which can directly alter protein structure and activity (Cai et al. 2015). NO has a multifunctional role and its effects on plants can be beneficial or not, depending on its concentration and type of donor when supplied. The *S*-nitrosogluthathione (GSNO) is an important donor of NO, which is a *S*-nitrosated derivative of the most abundant cellular thiol, glutathione (GSH). GSNO has been considered an internal source of NO and as an essential component of NO-dependent signal transduction pathway (Broniowska et al. 2013). Recently, we found increases in root growth and maintenance of leaf water status in sugarcane plants under water deficit and supplied with NO. GSNO-sprayed plants exhibited increases in photosynthesis under water deficit, which was a consequence of high stomatal conductance and increased apparent carboxylation efficiency (Silveira et al. 2016).

While high *S*-nitrosothiols content in GSNO-sprayed sugarcane plants suggests a long-term role of NO-mediated responses to water deficit (Silveira et al. 2016), it is unclear

whether improved photosynthesis is related to the activity of key photosynthetic enzymes Rubisco and PEPC. Few studies have addressed the effects of NO on Rubisco and PEPC activities, which are likely dependent on plant species and NO donor. For instance, Kovacs (2013) showed that NO can *S*-nitrosated Rubisco in a dose-dependent manner, reducing its activity.

Alternatively, improved performance of NO-supplied plants under drought may be due to reduced oxidative damage. NO can prevent oxidative damage by activation of antioxidant mechanisms and maintenance of ROS homeostasis in two turfgrass species (Hatamzadeh et al. 2014), increasing ascorbate levels and activity of antioxidant enzymes (Zhang et al. 2008). Furthermore, $O_2^{\cdot -}$ can react with NO to form peroxynitrite (ONOO⁻) and therefore control ROS accumulation (Radi et al. 2002). The protective effect of exogenous application of NO donor molecules has been attributed to the elimination of $O_2^{\cdot -}$ and to increases in the activities of SOD, CAT and APX (Zhao et al. 2008). However, the consequences of such metabolic changes on photosynthetic metabolism remain unexplored. The activity of NADPH oxidase is also an important source of ROS under abiotic stress (Marino et al. 2012), with its activity reduced through *S*-nitrosylation mediated by NO (Yun et al. 2011).

While there is ample evidence of the involvement of NO in plant responses to drought, our knowledge about the underlying physiological processes leading to improved performance is still limited. In such context and using GSNO as a donor of NO, we hypothesized that leaf GSNO spraying improves the antioxidant defense of sugarcane plants under water deficit, with positive consequences for photosynthesis during and after such stressful condition. In addition, the role of key photosynthetic enzymes Rubisco and PEPC in maintaining CO₂ assimilation in GSNO-sprayed plants under water deficit was evaluated.

Material and methods

Plant material and experimental conditions

Sugarcane plants (*Saccharum* spp.) cv. IACSP94-2094 developed by ProCana Program (Agronomic Institute, IAC, Brazil) were propagated by placing mini-stalks from adult plants in trays containing commercial substrate composed of *Sphagnum*, rice straw and perlite in 7:2:1 ratio (Carolina Soil of Brazil, Vera Cruz RS, Brazil). Three-week-old plants with two to three leaves were transferred to modified Sarruge (1975) nutrient solution (15 mmol L⁻¹ N (7% as NH₄⁺); 4.8 mmol L⁻¹ K; 5.0 mmol L⁻¹ Ca; 2.0 mmol L⁻¹ Mg; 1.0 mmol L⁻¹ P; 1.2 mmol L⁻¹ S; 28.0 µmol L⁻¹ B; 54.0 µmol L⁻¹ Fe; 5.5 µmol L⁻¹ Mn; 2.1 µmol L⁻¹ Zn; 1.1 µmol L⁻¹ Cu and 0.01 µmol L⁻¹ Mo) and maintained hydroponically in a growth chamber (PGR15, Conviron, Winnipeg MB, Canada) at 30/20 °C (day/night), 80% relative humidity, 12 h photoperiod (7:00 to 19:00 h) and PPFD of 800 µmol m⁻² s⁻¹. This PPFD was the maximum intensity at plant level, inside growth chamber. Plants were grown under the above conditions for 30 days prior to water deficit and GSNO spraying.

Sugarcane plants were subjected to water deficit (WD) by adding polyethylene glycol (CarbowaxTM PEG-8000, Dow Chemical Comp, Midland MI, USA) to the nutrient solution. To prevent osmotic shock, PEG-8000 was added to the nutrient solution to cause a gradual decrease in its osmotic potential as follows: -0.25 MPa on the first day; -0.5 MPa on the second day; -0.6 MPa from the third to 5th day; and -0.75 MPa from the 6th to 12th day of treatment. From this point, the osmotic potential of the nutrient solution was monitored daily and corrected when necessary. After six days under water deficit (-0.75 MPa), plants were transferred to the original nutrient solution (-0.15 MPa) for rehydration for three days.

Sugarcane leaves were sprayed twice a day with freshly prepared GSNO solutions at 100 μ M. This concentration was based on a previous study in which significant increase of photosynthesis was found in sugarcane plants under water deficit (Silveira et al. 2016). Leaf sprays (20 mL per plant) were performed at the following days: when the osmotic potential of the nutrient solution reached -0.25, -0.5 and -0.6 MPa and the last spray was done three days after reaching -0.75 MPa, i.e., sprays were done on the first, second, third and 9th day (Suppl. Fig. S1). GSNO spraying was done outside the growth chamber to avoid undesirable interference with other treatments. Plants were then subjected to the following treatments: control, in which well-hydrated plants were sprayed with water; water deficit imposed by the osmotic potential of -0.75 MPa (WD) + water spray; and WD + GSNO spray (WDG). The physiological evaluations as leaf gas exchange, leaf relative water content (RWC) and chlorophyll content were performed at 0, 4, 12 and 15 days, which correspond to the osmotic potential of -0.15 MPa (well-hydrated), -0.6 MPa, -0.75 MPa (maximum stress, 12th day) and -0.15 MPa (recovery), respectively. For the enzymatic analyses, leaf and root sampling was done at the maximum water deficit (12th day) and also at the recovery period (15th day). Samples were collected, immediately immersed in liquid nitrogen and then stored at -80°C.

Synthesis of *S*-nitrosoglutathione (GSNO)

GSNO was synthesized and characterized as previously described (Silveira et al. 2016). Briefly, the reduced glutathione (GSH) was reacted with equimolar sodium nitrite in acidified aqueous solution, acetone was added, and the solution was washed with cold water, filtered and the obtained GSNO was freeze-dried for 24 h.

Leaf gas exchange and photochemical activity

Gas exchange of the first fully expanded leaf with visible ligule was measured daily using an infrared gas analyzer (Li-6400, Licor, Lincoln NE, USA) attached to a modulated fluorometer (6400-40 LCF, Licor, Lincoln NE, USA). Leaf CO₂ assimilation (A), stomatal conductance (g_s) and intercellular CO₂ concentration (C_i) were measured under PPFD of 2000 $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ and air CO₂ concentration of 400 $\mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}$. The measurements were performed between 11:00 and 13:00 h, as done by Silveira et al. (2016). The vapor pressure difference between leaf and air (VPDL) was 2.2 ± 0.3 kPa and leaf temperature was 29 ± 1 °C during the evaluations.

Chlorophyll fluorescence was evaluated simultaneously to the leaf gas exchange and the apparent electron transport rate (ETR) was estimated as $\text{ETR} = \phi_{\text{PSII}} \times \text{PPFD} \times 0.85 \times 0.4$, in which ϕ_{PSII} is the effective quantum efficiency of photosystem II (PSII), 0.85 is the light absorption and 0.4 is the fraction of light energy partitioned to PSII (Edwards and Baker 1993, Baker 2008). The non-photochemical quenching was calculated as $\text{NPQ} = (F_M - F_M')/F_M'$. The relative energy excess at PSII level was calculated as $\text{EXC} = [(F_V/F_M) - \phi_{\text{PSII}}]/(F_V/F_M)$, in which F_V/F_M is the potential quantum efficiency of photosystem II (Bilger et al. 1995). A chlorophyllmeter (CFL 1030, Falker, Porto Alegre RS, Brazil) was used to evaluate chlorophyll a and b and the relative content of chlorophyll (Chl) was calculated as chlorophyll $a + b$.

Measurements were taken at the beginning of the experiment (before reducing the osmotic potential of nutrient solution), when the osmotic potential of nutrient solution reached -0.75 MPa, at the maximum water deficit, and three days after returning plants to the control condition (recovery period).

Relative water content

The relative water content (RWC) was calculated in leaf discs according to Jamaux et al. (1997): $RWC = 100 * [(FW - DW) / (TW - DW)]$, in which FW, TW and DW are the fresh, turgid and dry weights, respectively.

Activity of photosynthetic enzymes

Ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase/oxygenase (Rubisco, EC 4.1.1.39)

Approximately 100 mg of leaves were macerated and homogenized with 0.5 mL of 100 mM bicine-NaOH buffer (pH 7.8), 1 mM ethylenediaminetetraacetic (EDTA), 5 mM MgCl₂, 5 mM dithiothreitol (DTT), 1 mM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride (PMSF) and 10 µM leupeptin. The resulting solution was centrifuged at 14000 g for 5 min at 4 °C. The initial activity of Rubisco was measured using as medium 100 mM bicine-NaOH (pH 8.0) containing 10 mM NaHCO₃, 20 mM MgCl₂, 3.5 mM ATP, 5 mM phosphocreatine, 0.25 mM NADH, 80 nkat glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase, 80 nkat 3-phosphoglyceric phosphokinase and 80 nkat creatine phosphokinase, incubated at 25 °C. The oxidation of NADH was initiated by adding 0.5 mM ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate (RuBP). A similar aliquot of clarified leaf extract was incubated with the reaction medium for 10 min at 25 °C and total Rubisco activity was measured after adding RuBP. The reduction of absorbance at 340 nm was monitored for 3 min (Sage et al. 1988, Reid et al. 1997). The activation state of Rubisco

was calculated as the ratio between the initial and total activities and the main panel shows the initial activity of the Rubisco.

Phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase (PEPC, EC 4.1.1.31)

Approximately 100 mg of leaves were macerated and homogenized with 0.5 mL of 100 mM potassium phosphate buffer (pH 7.5), 1 mM EDTA and 1 mM PMSF and centrifuged at 14000 g for 25 min at 4 °C and the supernatant collected. The reaction medium for PEPC activity contained 50 mM Tris-HCl buffer (pH 7.8), 5 mM MgCl₂, 5 mM glucose 6-phosphate, 10 mM NaHCO₃, 33 nkat malic dehydrogenase and 0.3 mM NADH. The reaction was initiated by adding 4 mM phosphoenolpyruvate and incubated at 30 °C. The oxidation of NADH was monitored for 1 min (Degl'innocenti et al. 2002).

Reactive oxygen species

The quantification of hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂) in plant material was performed following the method of Alexieva et al. (2001). Homogenates were obtained from 0.1 g of fresh tissue ground in liquid nitrogen with the addition of polyvinylpolypyrrolidone (PVPP) and 0.1% of trichloroacetic acid (TCA) solution (w/v). The extract was centrifuged at 10000 g and 4 °C for 15 min. The reaction medium consisted of 1.2 mL of 1 mM KI, 0.1 M potassium phosphate buffer (pH 7.5) and crude extract. The microtubes were incubated on ice under dark for 1 h. After this period, the absorbance was read at 390 nm. A standard curve was obtained with H₂O₂ and the results were expressed as μmol H₂O₂ g⁻¹ FW.

To determine the concentration of the superoxide anion ($O_2^{\cdot-}$), 50 mg of samples were incubated in an extraction medium consisting of 100 μ M EDTA, 20 μ M NADH, and 20 mM sodium phosphate buffer, pH 7.8 (Kuo and Kao 2003). The reaction was initiated by adding 100 μ L of 25.2 mM epinephrine in 0.1 N HCl. The samples were incubated at 28 °C under stirring for 5 min and the absorbance was read at 480 nm for 5 min. Superoxide anion production was assessed by the accumulation of adrenochrome using a molar absorption coefficient of $4.0 \times 10^3 \text{ M}^{-1}$ (Gay and Gebicki 2000).

Lipid peroxidation

The concentration of malondialdehyde (MDA) was measured and used as a proxy of lipid peroxidation. One hundred fifty mg of plant tissue were macerated in 2 mL of 0.1% TCA (w/v) and centrifuged at 10000 g for 15 min. The supernatant was added to 1.0 mL of 0.5 % thiobarbituric acid (w/v) in 20% TCA (w/v), and the mixture was incubated at 95 °C. Two hours after the reaction, the absorbance was measured at 532 and 600 nm. The absorbance at 600 nm was subtracted from the absorbance at 532 nm and the MDA concentration was calculated using an extinction coefficient of $155 \text{ mM}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1}$ (Heath and Packer 1968).

Protein extraction and antioxidant activity

Plant extracts were obtained from the macerate of 0.1 g of fresh tissue (roots or leaves) with liquid nitrogen, 1% PVPP and 2 mL of extraction medium containing 0.1 M potassium phosphate buffer (pH 6.8), 0.1 mM EDTA and 1 mM PMSF. After centrifugation of the

homogenates at 15000 g for 15 min and 4 °C, supernatants (crude extracts) were collected and preserved on ice. The protein levels of the enzymatic extracts were determined by the Bradford method (Bradford 1976) using bovine serum albumin (BSA) as the standard.

Catalase (CAT, EC 1.11.1.6) activity was quantified following the procedure described in Havir and McHale (1987). The reaction medium consisted of 3 mL of 100 mM potassium phosphate buffer (pH 6.8), deionized water, 125 mM H₂O₂ and crude extract. The reaction was carried out in a water bath at 25 °C for 2 min and activity assessed by the decrease in absorbance at 240 nm. The CAT activity was calculated using the molar extinction coefficient of 36 M⁻¹ cm⁻¹ and expressed as nmol min⁻¹ mg⁻¹ of protein.

Ascorbate peroxidase (APX, EC 1.11.1.11) activity was evaluated as described by Nakano and Asada (1981). The reaction medium was composed by 3 mL of 100 mM potassium phosphate buffer (pH 6.0), deionized water, 10 mM ascorbic acid, 10 mM H₂O₂ and crude extract. The reaction was carried out in a water bath at 25 °C for 2 min and activity monitored by the decrease in absorbance at 290 nm, using the molar extinction coefficient of 2.8 M⁻¹ cm⁻¹ to measure the APX activity, which was expressed as μmol min⁻¹ mg⁻¹ of protein.

Superoxide dismutase (SOD, EC 1.15.1.1) activity was determined according to Giannopolitis and Ries (1977). The reaction medium consisted of 3 mL of 100 mM sodium phosphate buffer (pH 7.8), 50 mM methionine, 5 mM EDTA, deionized water, crude extract, 100 μM riboflavin and 1 mM nitro blue tetrazolium chloride (NBT). A group of tubes was exposed to light (fluorescent lamp of 30 W) for 8 min, and another group remained in darkness. The absorbance was measured at 560 nm and one unit of SOD is the amount of enzyme required to inhibit the NBT photoreduction in 50%, being expressed as U min⁻¹ mg⁻¹ of protein.

Superoxide dismutase zymogram

In order to check the cellular compartment in which the first line of enzymatic defense against oxidative damage was active, the identification of SOD isoforms was performed by native-PAGE electrophoresis in polyacrylamide gel (12.5%) at 4 °C under constant current of 40 mA in Tris-HCl (pH 8.3) and glycine buffer. The protein extract was obtained after maceration of a composite leaf sample (0.4 g, composed by ~0.1 g per replicate) (Ferreira et al. 2002). SOD isoforms were identified through specific inhibition by H₂O₂ and KCN, with isoforms being classified as Mn-SOD (resistant to both inhibitors), Fe-SOD (resistant only to KCN) and Cu/Zn-SOD (inhibited by both inhibitors) (Azevedo et al. 1998).

Histochemical analysis

Samples of three leaves per plant (1 cm²) in three plants per treatment were cut and immediately immersed in a solution of 1 mg mL⁻¹ of DAB-HCl, adjusted to pH 5.6 with NaOH and incubated in dark for 8 h. Samples were taken at the maximum water deficit and they were cleared in 96% ethanol (Faoro and Iriti 2005) before transversal hand cuts. Samples were examined with a light microscope Olympus BX41 (Tokyo, Japan) fitted with a digital camera (Media Cybernetics PL-A624, Bethesda MD, USA). H₂O₂ was visualized as a reddish-brown coloration. As a negative control, DAB solution was supplemented with 10 mM ascorbic acid (Faoro et al. 2001).

Data analysis

The experimental design was completely randomized and data were subjected to the ANOVA procedure. The Scott-Knott test was used to compare treatments when significance was found ($P < 0.05$). The results presented are the mean $\pm$ SD and the number of replicates is stated in each figure caption.

Results

GSNO improves leaf water status and chlorophyll content under water deficit

As compared to well-hydrated plants, water deficit caused significant reduction in relative water content (RWC) of sugarcane plants at the maximum water deficit. Such reduction in RWC was alleviated when plants were sprayed with GSNO (Fig. 1A). Low water availability also reduced the chlorophyll content of sugarcane plants at the maximum water deficit and recovery period. Again, GSNO spraying alleviated the decreases in chlorophyll content caused by water deficit (Fig. 1B).

GSNO improves leaf gas exchange, photochemistry and increases Rubisco activity under water deficit

The water deficit induced a large reduction in leaf CO_2 assimilation of sugarcane plants from the 4th day of treatment, with GSNO treatment improving leaf CO_2 assimilation during the water deficit (Fig. 2A). The stomatal conductance was affected by water deficit and GSNO supplying in a similar way as compared to leaf CO_2 assimilation (Fig. 2B). There was

a significant increase in intercellular CO₂ concentration (C_i) at the maximum water deficit when plants were not supplied with GSNO and subjected to water deficit (Fig. 2C). The apparent electron transport rate (ETR) was reduced due to water deficit. However, such negative effect of water deficit was nulled by GSNO only at the beginning of water deficit treatment (Fig. 2D). The consumption of electrons per CO₂ assimilated (ETR/*A*) was increased in plants under water deficit conditions. However, plants sprayed with GSNO presented lower ETR/*A* than plants under low water availability and without GSNO supplying, mainly at the maximum water deficit (Fig. 2E). Leaf GSNO spraying caused the lowest non-photochemical quenching at the maximum water deficit (Fig. 2F). While water deficit caused increases in excessive light energy at PSII (EXC), GSNO spraying led to reductions in EXC and then control plants and those treated with GSNO presented similar values during the first days of water deficit (data not shown).

Rubisco activity was decreased by 65% in plants under water deficit and increased above 82% from controls by GSNO supplying (Fig. 3A). On average, GSNO-supplied plants presented Rubisco activity almost two-fold higher than control ones at the maximum water deficit (Fig. 3A). On the other hand, the Rubisco activation state (Fig. 3A, insert) and PEPC activity were not affected by water deficit or GSNO supplying (Fig. 3B).

GSNO and oxidative damage

Even without a statistical difference in leaf H₂O₂ concentration among treatments (data not shown), the histochemical analysis revealed a local H₂O₂ accumulation in plants under water deficit and without GSNO supplying (Fig. 4B). H₂O₂ accumulation occurred in the mesophyll cells near to the stomatal guard cells, as indicated by a brownish precipitate

staining cell walls and chloroplasts. Such H₂O₂ accumulation was not noticed in WDG and control plants (Fig. 4A,C). At the maximum water deficit and recovery period, the highest O₂⁻ concentrations in both leaves and roots were found in plants subjected to water deficit. Interestingly, plants supplied with GSNO and control ones presented similar leaf and root O₂⁻ concentrations (Fig. 5A,B). Leaf lipid peroxidation was not changed by treatments. However, there was an increase in root MDA content of plants under water deficit without GSNO supplying at the recovery period (Fig. 5C,D).

GSNO stimulates the antioxidant system under water deficit

Leaf CAT activity decreased due to water deficit, regardless whether GSNO was supplied or with evaluation time (Fig. 6A). In plants sprayed with GSNO, root CAT activity increased by 44% at the maximum water deficit and by 49% at the recovery period, as compared to control ones (Fig. 6B). At the maximum water deficit, leaf APX activity was increased only in plants subjected to water deficit and without GSNO treatment (Fig. 6C). In roots, APX activity decreased due to water deficit and GSNO spraying did not modify this response at the maximum water deficit and recovery period (Fig. 6D). Compared to the control condition, leaf SOD activity was significantly increased by GSNO spraying at the maximum water deficit (Fig. 6E). Root SOD activity was increased by water deficit, regardless GSNO spraying and evaluation time (Fig. 6F).

The SOD zymogram revealed details about the activities of SOD isoforms, which were numbered arbitrarily based on the order of appearance on the gels. When considering leaf SOD isoforms, five isoforms were identified in control treatment and seven in water deficit, regardless of GSNO spraying (Fig. 7). There were four and seven root SOD isoforms in

control and water deficit conditions, respectively. In leaves, Cu/Zn-SOD isoforms *iii* and *iv* were detected only under water deficit, regardless of GSNO spraying. However, GSNO increased the activity of all SOD isoforms when compared to the other treatments. In roots, Mn-SOD isoform *iii* and Cu/Zn-SOD isoforms *v* and *vi* were detected only in plants under water deficit, regardless of GSNO supplying (Fig. 7).

Discussion

How does GSNO improve photosynthesis under water deficit?

Our findings clearly show that leaf GSNO spraying improves sugarcane tolerance to water deficit by improving photosynthetic rates. Such improvement in leaf CO₂ assimilation was associated, in part, with higher RWC and higher stomatal conductance under water deficit (Figs. 1A, 2B). For instance, GSNO treatment increased by seven times the stomatal conductance at the maximum water deficit as compared to plants sprayed with water (Fig. 2B). It could be argued that improvements in leaf water status were concomitant with the stomatal conductance in GSNO-sprayed plants under water deficit, which was lower than in control plants (Fig. 2B). As consequence, GSNO-sprayed plants would minimize water vapor loss through transpiration (Suppl. Fig. S2) and maximize CO₂ availability in intercellular spaces. Accordingly, control plants and those sprayed with GSNO presented similar *C_i* values throughout the experimental period (Fig. 2C).

Besides the diffusive limitation of photosynthesis imposed by stomatal closure under water deficit, plants may face biochemical limitation under severe drought. Then, GSNO would also improve CO₂ uptake under water deficit through changes in the activity of key

411 photosynthetic enzymes. In fact, plants supplied with GSNO exhibited an increase in Rubisco
412 activity under water deficit (Fig. 3A). Beligni and Lamattina (2002) found that the NO
413 delayed Rubisco mRNA loss caused by treatment with the herbicide Diquat in potato leaves.
414 On the other hand, NO can also *S*-nitrosylate Rubisco causing reduced Rubisco activity in a
415 dose-dependent manner (Kovacs et al. 2013, Santisree et al. 2015). As possible explanation
416 for contradictory effects of NO on Rubisco, we would consider the NO donor and its
417 concentration as well as plant sensitivity, which likely vary among plant species. By spraying
418 GSNO 100 μ M, our data clearly show improvements in sugarcane photosynthesis through
419 different techniques and approaches, i.e., measuring leaf gas exchange and using biochemical
420 assays. For a complete picture of how GSNO improves sugarcane photosynthesis, we should
421 understand the regulation of photosynthetic enzymes through nitration and/or *S*-nitrosylation
422 and its impact on plant metabolism under water deficit.

423 GSNO also alleviated chlorophyll degradation (Fig. 1B), which is in agreement with
424 previous studies showing that exogenous application of NO may attenuate chlorophyll
425 degradation under stressful conditions (Eum et al. 2009, Wang et al. 2015). Accordingly,
426 plants sprayed with GSNO presented higher photochemical activity under water deficit as
427 compared to those sprayed with only water and also subjected to water deficit. Besides
428 showing ETR values similar to control plants during the beginning of water deficit (Fig. 2D),
429 plants sprayed with GSNO presented less activity of alternative electrons sinks under water
430 deficit (Fig. 2E). Low non-photochemical quenching of chlorophyll fluorescence also
431 suggests less excessive light energy at the PSII level (Fig. 2F).

432 Taken together, we may argue that GSNO spraying benefited plants through
433 improvements in leaf water status, which may be a consequence of better water balance

caused by increases in water supply by roots and/or reduced water loss by stomatal conductance while maintaining CO₂ availability for photosynthesis. Such higher photosynthetic rates may also be due to increases in Rubisco activity in GSNO-sprayed plants with an important regulatory role at the PSII level as the main sink of ATP and NADPH. While less energetic pressure at PSII level can be maintained by using of reducing power and ATP in CO₂ assimilatory reactions under low water availability, an active antioxidant system would also prevent oxidative damage induced by drought. Therefore, GSNO effects on antioxidant metabolism were further investigated in both roots and leaves of sugarcane under water deficit.

GSNO improves antioxidant defense in both roots and leaves under water deficit

Water deficit induced leaf O₂⁻ accumulation (Fig. 5A) without a concomitant increase in SOD activity (Fig. 6E) in plants without GSNO spraying. Presence of H₂O₂ in leaves of plants under water deficit (Fig. 4B) was also found even with increases in APX activity (Fig. 6C). As CAT activity was reduced and leaves presented H₂O₂ under water deficit, one would argue that the main H₂O₂ detoxification pathway in sugarcane is through CAT activity. In roots, accumulation of O₂⁻ was also found under water deficit, with increases in SOD activity and decreases in APX activity (Figs. 5A, 6D,F). Interestingly, GSNO-sprayed plants did not present any increase in O₂⁻ and presence of H₂O₂ in leaves (Figs. 4, 5A,B) and GSNO stimulated leaf SOD activity and root CAT activity under water deficit (Figs. 4C, 6B,E).

The increase in total SOD activity (Fig. 6E) in leaves sprayed with GSNO was associated with increases in the activity of isoforms (Fig. 7) found in cellular compartments such as mitochondria (Mn-SOD), peroxisomes (Mn-SOD and Cu/Zn-SOD), chloroplasts

(Fe-SOD and Cu/Zn-SOD), cytosol (Cu/Zn-SOD) and apoplast (Cu/Zn-SOD) (Alscher et al. 2002). As a product of SOD activity, accumulation of H₂O₂ in leaves would be expected. However, evidence of H₂O₂ production was not found in GSNO-sprayed plants under water deficit. It is known that the detoxification of H₂O₂ can also be achieved by non-enzymatic antioxidants such as non-protein thiol, ascorbate, GSH or proline. The protective effect of GSH could not be discarded in plants sprayed with GSNO and subjected to water deficit. GSNO is decomposed by GSNO reductase to oxidized glutathione (GSSG), which is the substrate of the glutathione reductase (GR) that regenerates GSH (Corpas et al. 2013). In fact, GSH spraying improved photochemical activity in sugarcane leaf discs subjected to natural drying (Silveira et al. 2016).

Although we have not found evidence of membrane damage under water deficit in both leaves and roots (Figs. 5C,D), effects of oxidative stress on protein and DNA integrity and function cannot be ruled out (Oliveira et al. 2010). Leaf and root O₂^{•-} concentrations remained high even after the recovery period in plants previously exposed to water deficit, with increased lipid peroxidation in roots (Figs. 5A,B,D). The production of ROS may occur by the action of NADPH oxidase and peroxidases, causing an oxidative burst during rehydration (Colville and Kranner 2010), which was also avoided in both leaves and roots by spraying GSNO on leaves.

Interestingly, we have found that root enzymes were also affected due to leaf applications, demonstrating the potential GSNO signaling in response to water deficit. Accordingly, Silveira et al. (2016) found increases in root dry mass in plants sprayed with GSNO, which improved leaf water status and the photosynthetic apparatus under water deficit. A recent study demonstrated that GSNO promotes cell wall remodeling, alters transcription and induces the formation of root hair in mutants of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. It has

also been shown that unlike auxin, GSNO affects the transcription of genes encoding ribosomal proteins and DNA-modifying enzymes and histones, such as histone acetylases, which have been shown to be the target of *S*-nitrosylation (Moro et al. 2017).

The changes observed in antioxidant metabolism indicate that leaf GSNO spraying increased the antioxidant responses of both leaves and roots, avoiding oxidative damage induced by $O_2^{\cdot-}$ and H_2O_2 under water deficit. Such responses may be related to plant water status as H_2O_2 may inhibit aquaporin activity and reduce water transport (Liu et al. 2015). In fact, higher RWC and stomatal conductance in GSNO-sprayed plants were noticed (Figs. 1A, 2B). Silva et al. (2015) have already reported that sugarcane genotypes showing an active antioxidant metabolism are able to maintain root hydraulic conductance and leaf gas exchange under water deficit. Additionally, NO by itself has been reported to play an important role in aquaporin regulation by stimulating the transcription of *OsPIP1;1*, *OsPIP1;2*, *OsPIP1;3* and *OsPIP2;8* isoforms during rice seed germination (Liu et al. 2007). Further studies about the potential effect of NO on plant hydraulic conductance and aquaporin expression and activity should reveal another interesting interaction among this radical, antioxidant metabolism and plant water balance.

Conclusion

Sugarcane plants supplied with GSNO presented increases in the activity of SOD in leaves and CAT in roots, indicating higher antioxidant capacity under water deficit. Such adjustments induced by GSNO were sufficient to prevent oxidative damage in both organs and were associated with better leaf water status. As consequence, GSNO spraying alleviated the negative impact of water deficit on stomatal conductance and photosynthetic rates, with

plants also showing increases in Rubisco activity under water deficit. Herein, we not only gave one step more toward the understanding of how NO may modulate plant responses to water deficit but also we provided insights about the underlying physiological processes supporting improved plant performance under stressful conditions.

Acknowledgment

The authors acknowledge the financial support provided by the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP, Brazil) through the BIOEN Program (Grant no. 2008/57519-2) as well as the scholarship (NMS, Grant no. 2012/19167-0) and fellowship (BBM, Grant no. 2014/13524-0) granted. LF is a European Molecular Biology Organization (EMBO) - Long Term Fellow (nº. 420/2015). The authors also acknowledge the fellowships (ABS; IS; ECM; RVR) and scholarship (FCCM) granted by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq, Brazil).

References

- Alexieva V, Sergiev I, Mapelli S, Karanov E (2001) The effect of drought and ultraviolet radiation on growth and stress markers in pea and wheat. *Plant Cell Environ* 24: 1337-1344.
- Alscher RG, Erturk N, Heath LS (2002) Role of superoxide dismutases (SODs) in controlling oxidative stress in plants. *J Exp Bot* 53: 1331-1341.
- Azevedo RA, Alas RM, Smith RJ, Lea PJ (1998). Response of antioxidant enzymes to transfer from elevated carbon dioxide to air and ozone fumigation, in the leaves and roots of wild-type and a catalase-deficient mutant of barley. *Physiol Plant* 104: 280-292.

530 Baker NR (2008) A probe of photosynthesis: *in vivo*. Annu Rev Plant Biol 59: 89-113.

531 Beligni MV, Lamattina L (2002) Nitric oxide interferes with plant photo-oxidative stress by
532 detoxifying reactive oxygen species. Plant Cell Environ 25: 737-748.

533 Bilger W, Schreiber U, Bock M (1995) Determination of the quantum efficiency of photo-
534 system II and of non-photochemical quenching of chlorophyll fluorescence in the field.
535 Oecologia 102: 425-32.

536 Bradford MM (1976) A rapid and sensitive method for the quantitation of microgram
537 quantities of protein utilizing the principle of protein-dye binding. Anal Biochem 72: 248-
538 254.

539 Broniowska KA, Diers AR, Hogg N (2013) *S*-nitrosoglutathione. Biochim Biophys Acta
540 1830: 3173-3181.

541 Cai W, Liu W, Wang WS, Fu ZW, Han TT, Lu YT (2015) Overexpression of rat neurons
542 nitric oxide synthase in rice enhances drought and salt tolerance. PLoS One
543 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0131599.

544 Colville L, Kranner I (2010) Desiccation tolerant plants as model systems to study redox
545 regulation of protein thiols. Plant Growth Regul 62: 241-255.

546 Corpas FJ, Alché JD, Barroso JB (2013) Current over view of *S*-nitrosoglutathione (GSNO)
547 in higher plants. Front Plant Sci 4: 126-128.

548 Degl'innocenti E, Guidi L, Soldatini GF (2002) Effect of chronic O₃ fumigation on the
549 activity of some Calvin cycle enzymes in two poplar clones. Photosynthetica 40: 121-126.

550 Edwards GE, Baker NR (1993) Can CO₂ assimilation in maize leaves be predicted accurately
551 from chlorophyll fluorescence analysis? Photosynth Res 37: 89-102.

552 Eum HL, Hwang DK, Lee SK (2009) Nitric oxide reduced chlorophyll degradation in
 553 broccoli (*Brassica oleracea* L. var. *italica*) florets during senescence. Food Sci Technol Int
 554 15: 223-228.

555 Faoro F, Iriti M (2005) Cell death behind invisible symptoms: early diagnosis of ozone
 556 injury. Biol Plant 49: 585-592.

557 Faoro F, Sant S, Iriti M, Maffi D, Appiano A (2001) Chitosan-elicited resistance to plant
 558 viruses: a histochemical and cytochemical study. In: R.A.A. Muzzarelli (ed.). Chitin
 559 Enzymology 57-62.

560 Farnese FS, Menezes-Silva PE, Gusman GS, Oliveira JA (2016) When bad guys become
 561 good ones: the key role of reactive oxygen species and nitric oxide in the plant responses to
 562 abiotic stress. Front Plant Sci 7: 471-486.

563 Ferreira RR, Fornazier RF, Vitoria AP, Lea PJ, Azevedo RA (2002) Changes in antioxidant
 564 enzyme activities in soybean under cadmium stress. J Plant Nutr 25: 327-342.

565 Foyer CH, Noctor G (2005) Oxidant and antioxidant signalling in plants: a re-evaluation of
 566 the concept of oxidative stress in a physiological context. Plant Cell Environ 28: 1056-1071.

567 Garcia-Mata C, Lamattina L (2001) Nitric oxide induces stomatal closure and enhances the
 568 adaptive plant responses against drought stress. Plant Physiol 126: 1196-1204.

569 Gay C, Gebicki JM (2000) A critical evaluation of the effect of sorbitol on the ferric-xylenol
 570 orange hydroperoxide assay. Anal Biochem 284: 217-220.

571 Ghannoum O (2009) C4 photosynthesis and water stress. Ann Bot 103: 635-644.

572 Giannopolitis CN, Ries SK (1977) Superoxide dismutases: Occurrence in higher plants. Plant
 573 Physiol 59: 309-314.

574 Hatamzadeh A, Molaahmad Nalouisi A, Ghasemnezhad M, Biglouei MH (2014) The
 575 potencial of nitric oxide for reducing oxidative damage induced by drought stress in two
 576 turfgrass species, creeping bentgrass and tall fescue. *Grass Forage Sci* 70: 538-548.
 577 Havir EA, Mchale NA (1987) Biochemical and development characterization of multiples
 578 forms of catalase in tobacco leaves. *Plant Physiol* 84: 450-455.
 579 Heath RL, Packer L (1968) Photoperoxidation in isolated chloroplast. I. kinetics and
 580 stoichiometry of fatty acid peroxidation. *Arch Biochem Biophys* 125: 189-198.
 581 Huseynova IM (2012) Photosynthetic characteristics and enzymatic antioxidant capacity of
 582 leaves from wheat cultivars exposed to drought. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1817: 1516-1523.
 583 Jamaux I, Steinmetz A, Belhassen E (1997) Looking for molecular and physiological markers
 584 of osmotic adjustment in sunflower. *New Phytol* 137: 117-127.
 585 Kovacs I, Lindermayr C (2013) Nitric oxide-based protein modification: formation and site-
 586 specificity of protein *S*-nitrosylation. *Front Plant Sci* 4: 137.
 587 Kuo MC, Kao CH (2003) Aluminum effects in lipid peroxidation and antioxidative enzyme
 588 activities in rice leaves. *Biol Plant* 46: 19-152.
 589 Lawlor DW (2002) Limitation to photosynthesis in water-stressed leaves: stomata vs
 590 metabolism and the role of ATP. *Ann Bot* 62: 3235-3246.
 591 Lawlor DW, Cornic G (2002) Photosynthetic carbon assimilation and associated metabolism
 592 in relation to water deficits in higher plants. *Plant Cell Environ* 25: 275-294.
 593 Liu H-Y, Yu X, Cui D-Y, Sun M-H, Sun W-N, Tang Z-C, Kwak S-S, Su W-A (2007) The
 594 role of water channel proteins and nitric oxide signaling in rice seed germination. *Cell Res*
 595 17: 638-649.

596 Liu P, Yin L, Wang S, Zhang M, Deng X, Zhang S, Tanaka K (2015) Enhanced root hydraulic
 597 conductance by aquaporin regulation accounts for silicon alleviated salt-induced osmotic
 598 stress in *Sorghum bicolor* L. Environ Exp Bot 111: 42-51.

599 Lopes MS, Araus JL, Van Heerden PDR, Foyer CH (2011) Enhancing drought tolerance in
 600 C4 crops. J Exp Bot 62: 3135-3153.

601 Machado RS, Ribeiro RV, Marchiori PER, Machado DFSP, Machado EC, Landell MGA
 602 (2009) Respostas biométricas e fisiológicas ao déficit hídrico em cana-de-açúcar em
 603 diferentes fases fenológicas. Pesq Agropec Bras 44: 1575-1582.

604 Marino D, Dunand C, Puppo A, Pauly N (2012) A burst of plant NADPH oxidases. Trends
 605 Plant Sci 17: 9-15.

606 Moro CF, Gaspar M, Da Silva FR, Pattathil S, Hahn MG, Salgado I, Braga MR (2017) S-
 607 nitrosoglutathione promotes cell wall remodelling, alters the transcriptional profile and
 608 induces root hair formation in the hairless root hair defective 6 (rhd6) mutant of *Arabidopsis*
 609 *thaliana*. New Phytol 213: 1771-1786.

614 Nakano Y, Asada K (1981) Hydrogen peroxide scavenged by ascorbate specific peroxidase
 615 in spinach chloroplasts. Plant Cell Physiol 22: 867-880.

616 Neill SJ, Desikan R, Hancock JT (2003) Nitric oxide signalling in plants. New Phytol 159:
 617 11-35.

618 Oliveira M, Ahmad I, Maria VL, Pacheco M, Santos MA (2010) Antioxidant responses
 619 versus DNA damage and lipid peroxidation in golden grey mullet liver: A field study at Ria
 620 de Aveiro (Portugal). Arch Environ Con Tox 59: 454-463.

621 Radi R, Cassina A, Hodara R (2002) Nitric oxide and peroxynitrite interactions with
 622 mitochondria. Biol Chem 383: 401-409.

623 Reid CD, Tissue DT, Fiscus EL, Strain BR (1997) Comparison of spectrophotometric and
 624 radioisotopic methods for the assay of Rubisco in ozone-treated plants. *Physiol Plant* 101:
 625 398-404.

626 Ribeiro RV, Machado RS, Machado EC, Machado DFSP, Magalhães Filho JR, Landell
 627 MGA (2013) Revealing drought-resistance and productive patterns in sugarcane genotypes
 628 by evaluating both physiological responses and stalk yield. *Exp Agric* 49: 212-224.

629 Sage RF, Sharkey TD, Seemann JR (1988) The *in-vivo* response of the ribulose-1,5-
 630 biphosphate carboxylase activation state and the pool sizes of photosynthetic metabolites to
 631 elevated CO₂ in *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. *Planta* 174: 407-416.

632 Sales CRG, Ribeiro RV, Silveira JAG, Machado EC, Martins OM, Lagôa AMMA (2013)
 633 Superoxide dismutase and ascorbate peroxidase improve the recovery of photosynthesis in
 634 sugarcane plants subjected to water deficit and low substrate temperature. *Plant Physiol*
 635 *Biochem* 73: 326-336.

636 Sales CRG, Marchiori PER, Machado RS, Fontenele AV, Machado EC, Silveira JAG,
 637 Ribeiro RV (2015) Photosynthetic and antioxidant responses to drought during the sugarcane
 638 ripening. *Photosynthetica* 53: 547-554.

639 Santisree P, Bhatnagar-Mathur P, Sharma KK (2015) NO to drought multifunctional role of
 640 nitric oxide in plant drought: do we have all the answers? *Plant Sci* 239: 44-55.

641 Sarruge JR (1975) Soluções nutritivas. *Summa Phytopathol* 3: 231-233.

642 Silva KI, Sales CRG, Marchiori PER, Silveira NM, Machado EC, Ribeiro RV (2015) Short-
 643 term physiological changes in roots and leaves of sugarcane varieties exposed to H₂O₂ in root
 644 medium. *J Plant Physiol* 177: 93-99.

645 Silva PP, Soares L, Costa JG, Viana LS, Andrade JCF, Gonçalves ER, Santos JM, Barbosa
 646 GVS, Nascimento VX, Todaro AR, Riffel A, Grossi-De-Sa MF, Barbosa MHP, Sant'ana

647 AEG, Neto CER (2012) Path analysis for selection of drought tolerant sugarcane genotypes
 648 through physiological components. Ind Crops Prod 37: 11-19.
 649 Silveira NM, Frungillo L, Marcos FCC, Pelegriño MT, Miranda MT, Seabra AB, Salgado I,
 650 Machado EC, Ribeiro RV (2016) Exogenous nitric oxide improves sugarcane growth and
 651 photosynthesis under water deficit. Planta 244: 181-190.
 652 Tian X, Lei Y (2006) Nitric oxide treatment alleviates drought stress in wheat seedlings. Biol
 653 Plant 50: 775-778.
 654 Wang Y, Luo Z, Du R (2015) Nitric oxide delays chlorophyll degradation and enhances
 655 antioxidant activity in banana fruits after cold storage. Acta Physiol Plant 37: 74.
 656 Wu F, Yang H, Chang Y, Cheng J, Bai S, Yin J (2012) Effects of nitric oxide on reactive
 657 oxygen. Sci Hort 135: 106-111.
 658 Yamamoto Y, Kobayashi Y, Devi SR, Rikiishi S, Matsumoto H (2002) Aluminum toxicity
 659 is associated with mitochondrial dysfunction and the production of reactive oxygen species
 660 in plant cells. Plant Physiol 128: 63-72.
 661 Yun BW, Feechan A, Yin, MH, Saidi NBB, LE Bihant, YU M, Moore, JW, Kang JG, Kwon
 662 E, Spoel SH, Pallas JA, Loake GJ (2011) *S*-nitrosylation of NADPH oxidase regulates cell
 663 death in plant immunity. Nature 478: 264-268.
 664 Zhang H, Li YH, Hu LY, Wang SH, Zhang FQ, Hu KD (2008) Effects of exogenous nitric
 665 oxide donor on antioxidant metabolism in wheat leaves under aluminum stress. Russ J Plant
 666 Physiol 55: 469-474.
 667 Zhao L, He J, Wang X, Zhang L (2008) Nitric oxide protects against polyethylene glycol-
 668 induced oxidative damage in two ecotypes of reed suspension cultures. J Plant Physiol 165:
 669 182-191.
 670

Figure captions

Fig. 1. Leaf relative water content (RWC, in A) and chlorophyll content (B) in sugarcane plants maintained well-hydrated (Control), subjected to water deficit and sprayed with water (WD) or subjected to WD and sprayed with GSNO 100 μ M (WDG). The shaded area indicates recovery period, when plants were moved to nutrient solution used in control treatment. Each symbol represents the mean value of four replications $\pm$ standard deviation. Different lowercase letters indicate statistical difference between treatments (Scott-Knott test, $P < 0.05$).

Fig. 2. Leaf CO_2 assimilation (A , in A), stomatal conductance (g_s , in B), intercellular CO_2 concentration (C_i , in C), apparent electron transport rate (ETR, in D), ratio of electron transport rate and CO_2 assimilated (ETR/ A , in E), and non-photochemical quenching (NPQ, in F) in sugarcane plants maintained well-hydrated (Control), subjected to water deficit and sprayed with water (WD) or subjected to WD and sprayed with GSNO 100 μ M (WDG). The shaded area indicates recovery period, when plants were moved to nutrient solution used in control treatment. Each symbol represents the mean value of four replications $\pm$ standard deviation. Different lowercase letters indicate statistical difference between treatments (Scott-Knott test, $P < 0.05$).

Fig. 3. *In vitro* activity of ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase/oxygenase (Rubisco, in A) and phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase (PEPC, in B) in sugarcane plants maintained well-hydrated (Control), subjected to water deficit and sprayed with water (WD) or subjected to WD and sprayed with GSNO 100 μ M (WDG). Evaluations were done at the maximum water

deficit. In A, Rubisco activation state is shown as insert. The data represents the mean value of three replications $\pm$ standard deviation. Different lowercase letters indicate statistical difference between treatments (Scott-Knott test, $P < 0.05$).

Fig. 4. Cross section of sugarcane leaves in which with H_2O_2 was stained brown by DAB. A, well-hydrated (Control) samples with no H_2O_2 accumulation. B, sample subjected to water deficit (WD) with intense H_2O_2 accumulation in cell walls (cw) and chloroplast (ch) of mesophyll (mc) and guard cells (sgc). C, samples subjected to WD and sprayed with GSNO 100 μ M (WDG) with no H_2O_2 accumulation. ep: epidermis, bsc: bundle-sheath cells. Bars: 20 μ m.

Fig. 5. Concentration of superoxide anion ($O_2^{\cdot-}$, in A and B) and malondialdehyde (MDA in C and D) in leaves (A and C) and roots (B and D) in sugarcane plants maintained well-hydrated (Control), subjected to water deficit and sprayed with water (WD) or subjected to WD and sprayed with GSNO 100 μ M (WDG). MWD indicates maximum water deficit and Rec and shaded area indicate recovery period. The data represents the mean value of three replications $\pm$ standard deviation. Different lowercase letters indicate statistical difference between treatments (Scott-Knott test, $P < 0.05$).

Fig. 6. Activity of catalase (CAT, in A and B), ascorbate peroxidase (APX, C and D) and superoxide dismutase (SOD, in E and F) in leaves (A, C and E) and roots (in B, D and F) in sugarcane plants maintained well-hydrated (Control), subjected to water deficit and sprayed with water (WD) or subjected to WD and sprayed with GSNO 100 μ M (WDG). MWD indicates maximum water deficit and Rec and shaded area indicate recovery period. The data

represents the mean value of three replications $\pm$ standard deviation. Different lowercase letters indicate statistical difference between treatments (Scott-Knott test, $P < 0.05$).

Fig. 7. Superoxide dismutase isoforms by non-denaturing polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis in leaves and roots in sugarcane plants maintained well-hydrated (Control), subjected to water deficit and sprayed with water (WD) or subjected to WD and sprayed with GSNO 100 μ M (WDG). Evaluations were done at the maximum water deficit. Gels are representative of three runs. Lanes were loaded with 39.5 μ g of leaf protein and 17.2 μ g of root protein.

Figure 1

734 Figure 2

735

736

Figure 3

Figure 4

746 Figure 5

747

748

749

Figure 7

Supplementary material

Figure S1

Fig S1. Simplified scheme showing GSNO spraying and reduction of the osmotic potential of nutrient solution by adding PEG-8000. PEG-8000 was added to the nutrient solution to cause a gradual decrease in its osmotic potential: -0.25 MPa on the first day; -0.5 MPa on the second day; -0.6 MPa from the third to 5th day; and -0.75 MPa from the 6th to 12th day of treatment. Recovery means the return to the nutrient solution without PEG-8000.

Figure S2

Fig S2. Transpiration (E) in sugarcane plants maintained well-hydrated (Control), subjected to water deficit and sprayed with water (WD) or subjected to WD and sprayed with GSNO 100 μ M (WDG). The shaded area indicates recovery period, when plants were moved to nutrient solution used in control treatment. Each symbol represents the mean value of four replications $\pm$ standard deviation. Different lowercase letters indicate statistical difference between treatments (Scott-Knott test, $P < 0.05$).