Peer-reviewed version available at *Agronomy* **2017**, *7*, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032

Article

CO_2-Induced Changes in Wheat Grain Composition: Meta-Analysis and Response Functions

Malin C. Broberg [1,*], Petra Högy [2] and Håkan Pleijel [1]

[1] Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Gothenburg, P.O. Box 461, SE-40530 Göteborg, Sweden; hakan.pleijel@bioenv.gu.se
[2] Institute for Landscape and Plant Ecology, University of Hohenheim, Ökologiezentrum 2, August-von-Hartmann Str. 3, D-70599 Stuttgart, Germany; petra.hoegy@uni-hohenheim.de
* Correspondence: malin.broberg@bioenv.gu.se; Tel.: +46-31-786-4805

Abstract: Elevated carbon dioxide (eCO_2) stimulates wheat grain yield, but simultaneously reduces protein (N) concentration. Also other essential nutrients are subject to change. This study is a comprehensive synthesis of wheat experiments with eCO_2, estimating effects on N, minerals (B, Ca, Cd, Fe, K, Mg, Mn, Na, P, S, Zn), and starch. Analysis was made by i) deriving response functions for the relative effect on element concentration in relation to CO_2 concentration, ii) meta-analysis to test the magnitude and significance of observed effects, and iii) relating CO_2 effects on minerals to effects on N and grain yield. Responses range from zero to strong negative effects of eCO_2 on mineral concentration, with largest reductions for the nutritionally important elements N, Fe, S, Zn and Mg. Together with the positive but small and non-significant effect on starch concentration, the large variation in effects suggests that CO_2-induced responses cannot be explained by a simple dilution model. To explain the observed pattern, uptake and transport mechanisms may have to be considered, along with the link of different elements to N uptake. Our study shows that eCO_2 has a significant effect on wheat grain stoichiometry, with implications for human nutrition in a world of rising CO_2.

Keywords: *Triticum aestivum*; carbon dioxide; minerals; protein; starch; baking properties; crop quality; food security

1. Introduction

The atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide (CO_2) has steadily increased since the 19th century, from the pre-industrial level of 280 ppm to current 400 ppm [1]. Latest projections by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [1] suggest that concentrations are likely to reach levels in the range of 420 ppm (RCP2.6) to 1300 ppm (RCP8.5) by the year 2100.

Effects of elevated CO_2 (eCO_2) on plants are well studied, in particular on food crops due to the strong concern for future food security. Photosynthesis and growth in C3 plants are often enhanced by eCO_2 resulting in a higher yield, which has been observed for many crops [2]. The magnitude of yield response has been shown to vary between different crops [3] and crop varieties [4,5], but also to depend on differences in experimental systems [6]. It has been argued that yield stimulation is overestimated due to unrealistic growing conditions in enclosure systems, including open-top chambers (OTCs) [7,8]. In contrast, Ziska and Bunce [9] found that there were no significant differences in yield response for rice, soybean and wheat when comparing experiments using enclosure methodologies with Free-Air-CO_2-Enrichment (FACE) technology in a single experiment. According to Körner [10], carbon is rarely the limiting factor for plant growth but soil resources, e.g., nutrients and water, are more likely to determine plant performance and the observed positive effects of eCO_2 are according to this argument consequently a result of improved water use efficiency. Comparing the eCO_2 effects on plants grown in different experimental systems could possibly reveal if these statements are valid also for effects on wheat crop quality.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 31 January 2017 doi:10.20944/preprints201701.0134.v1

Peer-reviewed version available at *Agronomy* **2017**, *7*, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032

Wheat is a major food crop globally, being the second most important energy source for the human population with an annual global production of approximately 700 million tons [11]. The main source of food energy within the wheat grain is starch, accounting for 50-70% of total grain mass. It has been proposed that eCO_2 could enhance concentration of carbohydrates, starch being the major component, and thus reduce the concentrations of other constituents, often referred to as the "dilution hypothesis" [12]. Photosynthetic nitrogen (N) use efficiency can potentially increase under eCO_2 [13], and consequently more carbon can be assimilated with the same amount of N, resulting in a relative decrease in N content in the leaf. Since most of the grain N is translocated from non-reproductive parts of the plant during grain filling [14], also grain N content could be affected under eCO_2 by this mechanism.

Changes in crop quality, like nutritional aspects, have often been neglected in research synthesis and assessments of future food production. The average effect on protein (hereafter referred to as N) content, estimated in a meta-analysis by Taub et al. [15], showed a significant decrease for several crops, including wheat, barley, rice and soybean. Along with the "dilution hypothesis" a few more hypotheses have been proposed to explain the observed pattern of decreasing N concentration in plants exposed to eCO_2, such as a reduction in transpiration driven mass flow [16] and impaired N acquisition [17], processes that both can result in a reduced N uptake under eCO_2 even without yield stimulation. According to the mechanism put forward by Bloom [17], the decrease in photorespiration under eCO_2 leads to a reduced malate export from the chloroplasts, and the nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide hydride (NADH) generated from this malate in the cytoplasm powers the reduction of nitrate (NO_3^-) to nitrite (NO_2^-), which is the first step of plant NO_3^- assimilation. In line with this, Pleijel and Uddling [18] found that the dilution hypothesis is likely to exist, but cannot fully explain the reduction in N concentration and yield in wheat under eCO_2, since N concentration is reduced also where grain yield is unaffected. This suggests a role for the mechanism proposed by Bloom [17]. Another important and related question is if there is a level of CO_2 where the effect of eCO_2 on grain N concentration saturates, analogous to the saturation seen in the response of photosynthesis under eCO_2 of C3 plants [19].

The effects on N content in wheat grains have been observed in a rather large number of studies with wheat grown under eCO_2, while observations of effects on other elements are limited. Decrease in concentrations of some essential mineral nutrients (Fe and Zn) have been documented [20,21], while it is still uncertain to what extent other elements are affected by eCO_2 and the mechanism behind observed changes. Reduction in concentrations of N and nutrient elements are of great concern for future food security and the issue of so called 'hidden hunger', where the amount of calories might be sufficient but with undernourishment with respect to essential nutrients. A modelling study by Myers et al. [22] estimated that the CO_2-induced reduction in Zn concentration in staple crops could substantially increase the number of people at risk of Zn deficiency by 138 million until 2050. Cereals, including wheat, are also an important source of dietary Cadmium (Cd) exposure [23], which could cause injury to kidney and bones [24], hence the CO_2 effect on Cd content is also of importance.

Due to the fact that N is often considered to be one of the most limiting elements for crop growth, the uptake of other nutrients could be expected to match the available N, assuming that excess uptake of other minerals does not occur. With these assumptions the effect on plant nutrients would follow the same pattern as N when wheat is grown under eCO_2, which could be tested by relating the eCO_2 effects on minerals to the effect on N. If dilution is the main process that acts to reduce mineral concentration the eCO_2 effect on grain yield would be closely related to effects on minerals, where a negative effect on mineral concentration will only occur in association with yield stimulation.

Since wheat is used for baking to a large extent, it is also relevant to study how different baking properties are affected by eCO_2, where alteration in quality may affect market value and quality of products (e.g. review by Högy et al. [25]). Many measures of baking properties are related to the content and quality of protein, such as gluten concentration and composition, dough elasticity/resistance, and bread loaf volume, and consequently these variables are likely to be impaired by eCO_2 following the pattern of grain N concentration. Negative effects on various baking

Peer-reviewed version available at Agronomy 2017, 7, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032

properties have been observed in individual experiments [26-30], but to our knowledge no meta-analysis has been made on this aspect.

This study intends to provide a comprehensive overview of observed effects of eCO_2 on wheat grain quality based on all available ecologically realistic experiments, presented as meta-analysis (to test the overall magnitude and statistical significance of the effects) and as response regressions (to assess effect size in relation to CO_2 concentration [CO_2]). Further, the effect of eCO_2 on the concentration of a range of minerals is related to the effect on N concentration and grain yield in order to understand to what extent eCO_2 effects are consistent among different minerals and the degree to which they are related to the effects on N concentration and yield stimulation. By these three approaches our study aims to examine the following hypotheses:

1. The negative effects of eCO_2 on N concentration and yield are independent of experimental setup, such as exposure system, rooting environment, and concentration level of CO_2 treatment.
2. The negative effect of eCO_2 on N concentration is saturating at high CO_2.
3. Nutritional and baking quality of wheat grain is negatively affected by eCO_2.
4. Concentrations of N and minerals are reduced due to starch dilution under eCO_2.
5. Effects of eCO_2 on minerals concentration are linked to the effect on N concentration and grain yield stimulation.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 31 January 2017 doi:10.20944/preprints201701.0134.v1

Peer-reviewed version available at Agronomy 2017, 7, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032

2. Results

2.1. Nitrogen and starch

Grain N concentration was significantly reduced by eCO_2 with an overall effect of -8.4% (CI -9.8 -7.4; Figure 1a). The magnitude of effect was shown to be dependent on experimental setup where significant differences were observed between exposure systems (FACE < OTC) and rooting environment (pots > field soil). There was, however, no significant difference between OTC and FACE when excluding eCO_2 treatments >600 ppm (only OTC experiments). Comparing concentration levels (above or below 600 ppm) in OTC experiments did not show any significant difference, but indicated a larger effect with higher [CO_2]. Even though N concentration was reduced by eCO_2 there was a significant increase in N yield, with an overall effect of 12% (CI 7.93 15.90; Figure 1a), associated with a strong grain yield stimulation. Subgroup analysis revealed that experiments performed in field tunnels (FT) and pots did not show a significant CO_2 effect on N yield; however, it should be noted that those groups have few observations and thus larger CIs. There were no significant differences with regard to the effect on N yield when comparing OTC with FACE or different CO_2 concentrations.

The response function for the relationship between N concentration and [CO_2] (Figure 1b) showed a strong non-linear relationship (r^2=0.57), with an initial reduction in N concentration with increasing [CO_2], but reaching a minimum at ~600 ppm. N yield was positively affected by eCO_2, but showed a rather weak relationship with [CO_2] (r^2=0.19). Details of the regression models are presented in Table 1.



Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 31 January 2017 doi:10.20944/preprints201701.0134.v1

Peer-reviewed version available at Agronomy 2017, 7, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032

b)



Figure 1. a) Meta-analysis of eCO_2 effects on N concentration and N yield using ambient [CO_2] as the reference, with subgroup-analysis of exposure systems, rooting environment, and concentration level for eCO_2 treatment. Number of comparisons for concentration and yield, respectively, are given within brackets. b) Response function for N concentration with [CO_2], grey markers show data points identified as outliers not included in the curve fitting.

Figure 2 shows the eCO_2 effect on various baking properties, where a significant negative effect is observed for Hagberg falling number (-5.8%, CI -9.9 -1.7), Zeleny value (-21.2%, CI -25.5 -16.9), dry gluten content (-16.5%, CI -22.0 -11.2), wet gluten content (-17.0%, CI -23.0 -11.5), peak resistance (-11.4%, CI -17.3 -3.0), and bread loaf volume (-11.9%, CI -21.3 -2.3). Mixing time significantly increased (11.2%, CI 0.6 21.5) under eCO_2, while resistance breakdown remained unaffected (-2.6%, CI -12.5 9.0).



Figure 2. Meta-analysis showing the effect of eCO_2 on various baking properties using ambient [CO_2] as the reference. Number of comparisons for concentration and yield, respectively, are given within brackets.

 doi:10.20944/preprints201701.0134.v1

Peer-reviewed version available at *Agronomy* **2017**, *7*, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032

Meta-analysis for eCO_2 effect on grain starch concentration (Figure 3a) showed a non-significant positive effect of 2.2% (CI -0.6 6.2). In line with this result the response function for starch concentration with [CO_2] did not reveal any relationship (Figure 3b). Starch yield was significantly positively affected by 20.8% (CI 12.4 30.9). Due to limited amount of data (19 observations) subgroup analysis was not performed for starch concentration and starch yield.



Figure 3. a) Meta-analysis of eCO_2 effects on starch concentration using ambient [CO_2] as reference. Number of comparisons for concentration and yield, respectively, are given within brackets. b) Response function for starch concentration with [CO_2]. Grey markers show data points identified as outliers and not included in the curve fitting.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 31 January 2017 doi:10.20944/preprints201701.0134.v1

Peer-reviewed version available at *Agronomy* **2017**, *7*, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032

Table 1. Response functions for regression of concentration and yield of N, starch, and minerals with [CO_2]. Model parameters are presented for both linear (y=B1x+B0) and quadratic (y=B2x²+B1x+B0) curve fit. The AICc comparison gives the probability of model (linear vs. quadratic) being correct. Data points identified as outliers were excluded from regressions.

Variable		Observations (outliers)	B0	B1	B2	R^2	Probability[1] (%)	Sign.
N	concentration	132 (4)	1.10	-3.10E-04		0.43	<0.01	*
			1.50	-1.98E-03	1.66E-06	0.57	100.0	
	yield	96 (11)	0.94	2.49E-04		0.12	11.8	*
			0.48	2.16E-03	-1.85E-06	0.18	88.2	
Starch	concentration	30 (3)	1.00	6.79E-06		0.00	73.4	ns
			1.10	-3.89E-04	3.71E-07	0.03	26.6	
	yield	30 (2)	0.86	5.18E-04		0.35	79.4	*
			0.92	2.55E-04	2.47E-07	0.35	20.6	
B	concentration	68 (2)	1.01	-2.46E-05		0.00	-	ns
	yield	32 (4)	0.34	1.96E-03		0.40		*
Ca	concentration	83 (4)	1.13	-3.69E-04		0.32	-	*
	yield	47 (7)	0.84	5.64E-04		0.16	-	*
Cd	concentration	13	1.12	-3.95E-04		0.31	81.2	*
			1.64	-2.53E-03	2.08E-06	0.39	18.8	
	yield	13	0.99	3.19E-05		0.00	89.5	ns
			1.10	-4.51E-04	4.70E-07	0.01	10.5	
Cu	concentration	80 (2)	1.07	-2.03E-04		0.14		*
	yield	44 (5)	0.67	1.04E-03		0.27		*
Fe	concentration	86 (7)	1.14	-3.87E-04		0.51	-	*
	yield	50 (4)	0.88	4.71E-04		0.07	19.4	ns
			-1.12	9.11E-03	-9.00E-06	0.17	80.6	
K	concentration	87 (4)	1.02	-4.44E-05		0.01	-	ns
	yield	51 (8)	0.58	1.27E-03		0.60	77.0	*
			0.64	9.96E-04	2.80E-07	0.60	23.0	
Mg	concentration	83 (8)	1.12	-3.33E-04		0.61	-	*
	yield	47 (7)	0.75	7.85E-04		0.42	-	*
Mn	concentration	84 (3)	1.06	-1.91E-04		0.13	8.1	*
			1.59	-2.47E-03	2.39E-06	0.20	91.9	

Peer-reviewed version available at *Agronomy* **2017**, *7*, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032

	yield	48 (8)	0.80	6.74E-04		0.36	72.8	*
			0.48	2.05E-03	-1.41E-06	0.36	27.2	
P	concentration	87 (3)	1.08	-2.22E-04		0.19	65.5	*
			1.24	-9.25E-04	7.40E-07	0.20	34.6	
	yield	51 (7)	0.55	1.27E-03		0.56	0.5	*
			2.01	-4.94E-03	6.31E-06	0.68	99.5	
S	concentration	83 (3)	1.10	-2.84E-04		0.32	-	*
	yield	47 (7)	0.80	6.51E-04		0.20	-	*
Zn	concentration	92 (5)	1.11	-3.10E-04		0.15	53.9	*
			1.44	-1.76E-03	1.50E-06	0.17	46.1	
	yield	56 (5)	0.78	7.30E-04		0.29	0.6	*
			-0.73	7.18E-03	-6.58E-06	0.44	99.4	

[1]Probability of model being correct according to AICc.

2.2. Minerals

Meta-analysis (Figure 4) showed that eCO_2 significantly reduced the concentration of various minerals (Ca, Cd, Cu, Fe, Mg, Mn, P, S, and Zn) in wheat grains, while others were unaffected (B and Na) or significantly increased by a small amount (K). A significant increase in yield was observed for all minerals except for Cd. It should be noted that there was a considerable variation in the magnitude of response (concentration and yield) among the different elements.



Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 31 January 2017 doi:10.20944/preprints201701.0134.v1

Peer-reviewed version available at *Agronomy* **2017**, *7*, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032

Figure 4. Meta-analysis output for mineral concentration and yield using ambient [CO_2] as the reference. Numbers within brackets gives the number of comparisons for concentration and yield, respectively.

Response functions in Figure 5 show that concentrations of several mineral nutrients had a strong linear relationship with increasing [CO_2], with a significant negative slope for all elements (Fe, Mg, P, S, and Zn) except K. Regression models for remaining elements are presented in Table 1. Ca, Cd, and Cu also showed a significant linear decrease with higher [CO_2], however, a quadratic model had a better fit for Mn, while B did not show any relationship with [CO_2]. Na was excluded from this analysis due to the small number of observations. The slope of the linear regression line suggests a reduction in mineral concentration of about 2-4% per 100 ppm for all minerals except for B and K, which had a non-significant slope close to zero. Mineral yield showed a positive relationship with [CO_2] and a significant slope for all elements except for Cd and Fe (Table 1). The strongest relationships were found for B, K, Mg, and P with an r^2 between 0.40 and 0.68.

2.3. Effects on minerals in relation to effects on N concentration and grain yield

Figure 6 shows the relationship between eCO_2 effects on concentration of various minerals and eCO_2 effect on N concentration. The correlation coefficient provides an estimate of the association of effects, and a strong association ($r>0.75$) is found for S and Fe ($r=0.87$ and $r=0.79$, respectively). Ca, Cd, Mg, P, and Zn show a moderately association ($0.5<r<0.75$), while it was rather weak for remaining elements (B, Cu, K, and Mn).

Regression analysis of the eCO_2 effect on mineral concentrations with the CO_2 effect on N concentration (Table 2) showed a strong relationship for S ($R^2=0.75$) and Fe ($R^2=0.63$), while the relationships were rather weak for B, Cu, K, and Mn ($R^2<0.25$). Remaining elements were found in the intermediate range ($0.25<R^2<0.50$). A deviation of the fitted curve from the 1:1 line indicates that the element:N ratio was affected by eCO_2, hence that the grain stoichiometry was altered. The majority of minerals (Ca, Cu, K, Mg, Mn, P, and S) were less affected by eCO_2 compared to N (slope of line <1), whereas the regression lines for Zn and Fe were close to 1, and for B and Cd the slope was >1. Relating the eCO_2 effect on minerals to the effect on grain yield showed a weak and non-significant relationship for most elements (Table 2), except for concentrations of K, P, and Zn that had a significantly negative relationships with the effects on grain yield (Figure 7).

Peer-reviewed version available at *Agronomy* **2017**, *7*, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032



Figure 5. Response-functions for mineral concentrations of P, Mg, Fe, K, Zn, and S with [CO_2]. Grey markers show data points identified as outliers and not included in the curve fitting.

Peer-reviewed version available at Agronomy 2017, 7, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032



Figure 6. Relative effect of eCO_2 on mineral concentration (B, Ca, Cd, Cu, Fe, K, Mg, Mn, P, S, and Zn) related to the relative effect on N concentration. Correlation coefficient (r) and its significance is presented in each plot. Black solid lines represent the linear regression model, for which parameters and model performance are presented in Table 2. Grey markers show data points identified as outliers not included in the curve fitting. Gray dashed lines represent the hypothetical situation where the effect of eCO_2 on mineral concentration is equal to the effect on N concentration.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 31 January 2017 doi:10.20944/preprints201701.0134.v1

Peer-reviewed version available at Agronomy 2017, 7, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032



Figure 7. Relative effect of eCO_2 on mineral concentration of B, Ca, Cd, Cu, Fe, K, Mg, Mn, N, P, S, and Zn vs. the relative effect on grain yield. Black solid lines represent the linear regression model, for which parameters and model performance are presented in Table 2

Table 2. Response functions for regression between the relative eCO_2 effect on the concentration of various minerals with eCO_2 effect on N concentration and grain yield. Data points identified as outliers were excluded from the regression analysis.

Mineral	N/grain yield	Observations (outliers)	R^2	Intercept	Slope	Significance
B	N	64	0.20	0.076	1.28	*
	grain yield	28	0.00	-0.019	0.03	ns
Ca	N	69	0.46	0.018	0.80	*
	grain yield	40	0.04	-0.051	-0.07	ns
Cd	N	6	0.49	-0.042	1.29	ns
	grain yield	10	0.11	-0.039	-0.42	ns
Cu	N	65 (1)	0.17	-0.007	0.48	*
	grain yield	36 (1)	0.00	-0.012	-0.24	ns
Fe	N	70	0.63	0.008	0.99	*
	grain yield	42	0.04	-0.071	-0.07	ns
K	N	69 (1)	0.11	0.026	0.21	*
	grain yield	42	0.59	0.036	-0.14	*
Mg	N	76	0.32	-0.029	0.42	*
	grain yield	40	0.09	-0.044	-0.51	ns
Mn	N	74 (1)	0.08	-0.008	0.31	*
	grain yield	43	0.01	-0.026	-0.02	ns
P	N	69 (3)	0.46	0.018	0.80	*
	grain yield	42	0.36	-0.014	-0.14	*
S	N	68	0.75	-0.002	0.74	*
	grain yield	40 (1)	0.06	-0.043	-0.07	ns
Zn	N	83	0.30	-0.001	1.11	*
	grain yield	50	0.37	-0.211	-0.22	*
N	grain yield	87 (6)	0.18	-0.057	-0.08	*

3. Discussion

The overall results from this study suggest that eCO_2 can cause a significant shift in wheat grain stoichiometry, with concentration reductions for N and several nutritionally important minerals together with a decreased baking quality and thus lower commodity value. This is the most comprehensive synthesis of eCO_2 effects on mineral elements in wheat, with meta-analyses including more than 60 pair of observations for most mineral elements and 105 for N.

Our results support the first hypothesis, where a significant negative effect on N concentration was observed regardless of experimental setup, although magnitudes of effects were significantly different as shown in the subgroup analysis comparing experimental methods. The negative effect of eCO_2 on N concentration observed in some recent studies was estimated to be between 6.3% [21] and 9.8 % [15], which is in line with the overall results in this study (8.4%). The large amount of data gives robust results (small CIs) and allows for subgroup analysis to unravel sources of variation within the data.

The response function for the relationship between N concentration and [CO_2] indicates that the negative effect on N concentration saturates around 600 ppm, supporting the second hypothesis. The meta-analysis, however, points to a stronger response in experiments using an eCO_2 level above 600 ppm compared to below 600 ppm, although this difference was not statistically significant. The significant difference detected when comparing OTC and FACE for all data was indicated to be a consequence of the different levels of eCO_2 used, and not the exposure system itself, since the difference was not found when comparing FACE with the subset of OTC experiment data with eCO_2 concentrations below 600 ppm (average [CO_2] 550 ppm and 528 ppm respectively).

The comparison of rooting environment showed that there was a much stronger negative effect on N concentration in potted plants compared to those grown in field soil. This is in line with the results from Taub et al. [15] where wheat grown in OTCs showed a similar difference in response between rooting environments. Assuming that experiments in field soil are more realistic, this suggests that potted experiments may strongly overestimate the negative effect of eCO_2 on N concentration. Potted plants are more likely to suffer from nutrient limitation due to their restricted rooting space, thus nutrient uptake cannot increase with the same rate as photosynthesis under eCO_2. It should, however, be noted that only 8 pairs of observations from potted plants were included in this study, compared to 97 observations for field soil, and the large CIs for potted plants indicate that conclusions about them are uncertain.

As a consequence of the decrease in N concentration, eCO_2 had a significant negative effect on most baking properties (Figure 2), even though the number of observations is rather small. A reduction in gluten proteins results in lower elasticity and resistance of the dough and smaller bread loaf volume, but also longer mixing time [31]. In addition, the falling number was reduced under eCO_2 reflecting an increase in α-amylase activity, which is associated with poor baking properties, such as sticky dough and poorly structured loaves [32], but also shortens the storage time of flour and grains [33].

No significant effect of eCO_2 on starch concentration could be demonstrated and consequently the negative effect on N could not be explained by starch dilution, thus the third hypothesis was not supported. On the other hand the number of observations is rather small, resulting in large CIs and low statistical power. Since starch is a major component of the wheat grain (50-70 %) even a small change in its concentration could alter the grain stoichiometry considerably. To detect an effect with small magnitude a large sample size is required and the non-significant results found here could be a consequence of power failure and a dilution effect by starch may be of importance for some elements. Further investigations would be needed to confirm this.

Meta-analysis for eCO_2 effect on mineral concentrations (Figure 4) showed that there was a large variation in magnitude of effects, ranging from effects close to zero to reductions of about 10%. Together with the non-significant effect on starch concentration, the large variation in effects on mineral elements indicates that CO_2-induced responses cannot be explained by a simple growth dilution model. In addition, almost all elements (except K) showed a weak relationship when comparing eCO_2 effects on mineral concentration with grain yield stimulation. If dilution was the only mechanism operating, the reduction in mineral concentration would closely follow the increase in biomass and would be the same for all elements.

The eCO_2 effects on Fe and S were closely related to the effects on N (Figure 5) and those elements were also among the ones most strongly negatively affected by eCO_2 in the meta-analysis (Figure 4). In contrast, the effect on minerals (B, Cu, K, and Mn) that showed a weak relationship with effects on N, were observed to be little (B, Cu, Mn) or not significantly (K) affected by eCO_2. This suggests that eCO_2 effects on N may play a role also for other minerals such as Fe and S. The regression of effects between B and N gives a slope >1, however, this should not be interpreted as a stronger effect on B than N since it is mainly a result of large response range in B (with both positive and negative effects) compared to N. As shown in the meta-analysis (Figure 4) the large variation of eCO_2 effects on B cancel each other out, resulting in a net zero effect.

The different response patterns of mineral elements could possibly be attributed to their different functions in the plant. In a study by Ågren and Weih [34] stoichiometric clusters of mineral elements were identified in leaves of six *Salix* genotypes grown under altered water and nutrient supply. Changes in concentration for one group of elements (N, P, S, and Mn) were associated with growth, the second group (K, Ca, and Mg) followed changes in biomass, while the third group (Fe, B, Zn, and Al) were believed to be limited by soil availability. It was also suggested that these groups could be associated with different biochemical functions, where elements of the first group are linked

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 31 January 2017 doi:10.20944/preprints201701.0134.v1

Peer-reviewed version available at *Agronomy* **2017**, *7*, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032

to nucleic acids/proteins, the second group is related to structure/photosynthesis, and the third group is associated with enzymes. The significant relationship between K and grain yield stimulation (Figure 7) confirms that K concentration is associated with changes in biomass, while the corresponding relationships was rather weak (non-significant) for Ca and Mg. With the current data it is not possible to test if the elements most strongly affected by eCO_2 in our study, Fe and Zn, are reduced due to soil limitation or if they are functionally linked to N. It is also important to note that effects on element concentration in leaves do not necessarily translate to the same response in seeds.

The mineral concentration in wheat grains is generally a result of total plant uptake, biomass accumulation, and the rate of translocation from vegetative tissues during grain filling. Waters et al. [35] showed that the translocation of Fe, Zn, and N from vegetative tissues to grain is partly regulated by the same proteins in wheat plants. eCO_2 could possibly affect translocation rates indirectly through higher leaf temperatures due to lower transpiration rates [36]. Increase in leaf temperature can lead to heat stress, which is known to promote senescence [37], and thus shorten the grain filling period [38]. This is, however, likely to increase concentrations of minerals since starch accumulation is often more strongly reduced than N and minerals [37]. If the rate and efficiency of translocation were strongly affected by eCO_2, Fe, Zn, and N could be expected to follow the same response pattern. Our results (Figure 6) show a strong correlation between eCO_2 effects on Fe and N ($r=0.79$), while the relationship is moderately strong for Zn and N ($r=0.55$), suggesting that additional mechanisms are of importance in terms of wheat grain concentrations for Zn.

In line with other minerals, Cd concentration was significantly reduced under eCO_2, which could be considered a positive effect due to the toxicity of Cd. A reduction in Cd concentration was also observed for wheat grown under CO_2 enrichment [20] and ozone exposure [39]. Cd is a non-essential element for the plant and the uptake is known to be dependent on transpiration driven mass-flow [40], therefore lower concentrations could be expected since transpiration rates are often reduced under both eCO_2 and high ozone [41].

The yield of N (Figure 1) and all minerals, except for Cd (Figure 4), were significantly increased under eCO_2, which indicates that there is an increase in total soil uptake of these elements. As a potential mitigation strategy more fertilizers could be added to the agricultural system, however, with the risk of also increasing leaching of nutrients and enhanced emissions of N_2O.

eCO_2-induced reductions in the concentration of N and essential minerals can have significant impacts on human nutrition. Fe and Zn deficiency is already an urgent issue in many parts of the world. An estimated two billion people suffer these deficiencies [42], especially in regions where people depend on C3 grains such as wheat as their primary dietary source of Zn and Fe. Consequently, these factors are also important to take into account when assessing the effects of CO_2 and climate change on global food security.

4. Materials and Methods

4.1. Database

Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar were used to survey all peer-reviewed literature published between 1980 and 2016 (May) related to the response of wheat grain quality to eCO_2. Experimental data were included in the database if at least one of the following variables were reported: grain protein concentration (or N concentration), grain starch concentration, grain mineral concentrations (B, Ca, Cd, Cu, Fe, K, Mg, Mn, Na, P, S, and Zn), grain yield (to calculate yield of N/protein and other minerals), and baking properties (Hagberg falling number, Zeleny value, gluten content, mixing time, peak resistance, resistance breakdown, bread loaf volume). In order to only include ecologically realistic data, experiments performed in greenhouse or closed growth chambers were excluded. For factorial design experiments with elevated ozone only treatments without ozone fumigation were included, since ozone is known to have significant effects on both yield and grain quality [39]. Data sources for the included experiments are presented in Supplementary (Table 1, Table 2).

Data from figures were extracted using software GetData Graphic Digitizer [43]. For experiments where ambient $[CO_2]$ were not reported it was assumed to be equal to the global mean

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 31 January 2017 doi:10.20944/preprints201701.0134.v1

Peer-reviewed version available at *Agronomy* **2017**, *7*, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032

for the year the study was conducted, with the Mauna Loa record used as reference (retrieved from National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, (NOAA), www.noaa.gov).

4.2. Meta-analysis

Meta-analysis was performed using a meta-analytical software package MetaWin [44]. The experimental treatment with ambient CO_2 was used as control, and parameter values were considered independent if they were made on different cultivars, different [CO_2], or different years, in line with previous meta-analysis [41,45]. The effect size used was the natural log of the response ratio (r, the ratio of the means of two groups, experimental and control) reported as percentage change from the control [41,44,46]. All variables were analyzed using an un-weighted approach due to lack of data for computation of sample variance (standard deviation or standard error with degree of replication). In line with previous meta-analysis [39,44] variance of the effect size was calculated using a resampling method with 9999 iterations, and confidence intervals (CI) were calculated using the bootstrap method. If the 95% CI did not overlap zero the average effect size for each variable was considered to be significant, and for subgroup analysis the different groups were considered significantly different if the 95% CI did not overlap [45].

Experiments with additional treatments were included, such as different application levels of N, water supply, temperature, and time of sowing. However, only the effect of eCO_2 was tested in the meta-analysis, and interactions of eCO_2 and additional treatments were not further examined. Subgroup analysis was performed for N concentration and yield, for which a substantial amount of data was available, where data was categorized by 1) exposure system, Free-Air-CO_2-Enrichment (FACE), Open-Top-Chamber (OTC), and Field Tunnel (FT), 2) rooting environment, pots or field soil, and 3) the concentration level of the eCO_2 treatment, above or below 600 ppm (only applicable for OTC experiments).

4.3. Response functions

Response functions were derived through regression between the relative effect of each variable and the corresponding [CO_2] for the treatment. The response was related to the effect estimated at 350 ppm by linear regression for each individual experiment. At 350 ppm the variables were set to take the value of 1 on a relative scale. Both a linear (first order polynomial) and quadratic (second order polynomial) model was fitted to the data, and the model preferred by Akaike information criterion (AICc) comparison method [47] was chosen. All additional treatments, such as low N, drought, and high temperature, were excluded from the response functions since they were observed to cause large scatter not related to the effect of [CO_2]. All response functions were derived using automatic outlier removal [48].

4.4. Comparison of CO_2 effects on different response variables

The eCO_2 effect was related to the control treatment (ambient [CO_2]) when relating the effects on minerals to effects on N or grain yield. The correlation coefficient was calculated to estimate the association of effects, while regression was used to test if effects on minerals are dependent on effects on N or grain yield. Only linear regression was used to explore the relationship with N, since the slope of a linear trend line could be compared to a 1:1 line that represents the theoretical situation where the mineral and N concentrations are equally affected. For regression between effect on minerals and effect on grain yield both linear and quadratic curve fit was tested, and best fit chosen with AICc comparison method.

5. Conclusions

Our study, based on an extensive database, shows that eCO_2 has significant negative effects on the concentration of several minerals and N in wheat grain, and that the effects on N translates into reduced baking quality. Subgroup analysis of experimental systems reveals that N concentration was more strongly affected in potted plants than plants grown in field soil. Also, the significant difference found between FACE and OTC studies could be attributed to the different concentration levels used

Peer-reviewed version available at *Agronomy* **2017**, *7*, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032

and not the enclosure system itself. The pattern of effects by eCO_2 on different minerals was complex, showing that a single mechanism cannot account for the diversity of responses. Although the positive effect on starch concentration was not statistically significant, a dilution effect by starch may be of importance for some elements. However, for most of the minerals the eCO_2 effect was not strongly related to the effect on grain yield, suggesting that dilution was not of large importance. The association with N was strong for eCO_2 effects on S and Fe, elements being important components of proteins, and fairly strong also for P. The response functions and relationships between different elements and N presented in this study can be used in risk assessments of effects on nutrition in a future high CO_2 world.

Supplementary Materials: The following are available online at www.mdpi.com/link, Table S1: Data sources, grain yield, N, starch, and minerals, Table S2: Data sources for baking properties.

Acknowledgments: The work by M.B. and H.P. was supported by the strategic research area Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services in a Changing Climate (BECC, http://www.becc.lu.se/).

Author Contributions: M.B. and H.P. conceived and designed the study; data collection was made by M.B. in close collaboration with P.H.; all authors participated in the analysis of the data; M.B. wrote the paper with substantial input from P.H. and H.P.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest. The founding sponsors had no role in the design of the study, in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data, in the writing of the manuscript, and in the decision to publish the results.

References

1. IPCC, Climate chang 2013: The physical science basis. **2013**.
2. Long, S.P.; Ainsworth, E.A.; Rogers, A.; Ort, D.R., Rising atmospheric carbon dioxide: Plants face the future. *Annu Rev Plant Biol* **2004**, *55*, 591-628.
3. Parry, M.L.; Rosenzweig, C.; Iglesias, A.; Livermore, M.; Fischer, G., Effects of climate change on global food production under sres emissions and socio-economic scenarios. *Global Environ Chang* **2004**, *14*, 53-67.
4. Manderscheid, R.; Weigel, H.J., Photosynthetic and growth responses of old and modern spring wheat cultivars to atmospheric CO_2 enrichment. *Agr Ecosyst Environ* **1997**, *64*, 65-73.
5. Schmid, I.; Franzaring, J.; Muller, M.; Brohon, N.; Calvo, O.C.; Hogy, P.; Fangmeier, A., Effects of CO_2 enrichment and drought on photosynthesis, growth and yield of an old and a modern barley cultivar. *J Agron Crop Sci* **2016**, *202*, 81-95.
6. Amthor, J.S., Effects of atmospheric CO_2 concentration on wheat yield: Review of results from experiments using various approaches to control co_2 concentration. *Field Crop Res* **2001**, *73*, 1-34.
7. Long, S.P.; Ainsworth, E.A.; Leakey, A.D.B.; Morgan, P.B., Global food insecurity. Treatment of major food crops with elevated carbon dioxide or ozone under large-scale fully open-air conditions suggests recent models may have overestimated future yields. *Philos T Roy Soc B* **2005**, *360*, 2011-2020.
8. Schimel, D., Climate change and crop yields: Beyond cassandra. *Science* **2006**, *312*, 1889-1890.
9. Ziska, L.H.; Bunce, J.A., Predicting the impact of changing CO_2 on crop yields: Some thoughts on food. *New Phytol* **2007**, *175*, 607-617.
10. Korner, C., Plant co_2 responses: An issue of definition, time and resource supply. *New Phytol* **2006**, *172*, 393-411.
11. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Fao cereal supply and demand brief. http://www.fao.org/worldfoodsituation/csdb/en/ (2016-12-12),

12. Loladze, I., Hidden shift of the ionome of plants exposed to elevated CO_2 depletes minerals at the base of human nutrition. *Elife* **2014**, *3*.
13. Leakey, A.D.B.; Ainsworth, E.A.; Bernacchi, C.J.; Rogers, A.; Long, S.P.; Ort, D.R., Elevated CO_2 effects on plant carbon, nitrogen, and water relations: Six important lessons from face. *J Exp Bot* **2009**, *60*, 2859-2876.
14. Simpson, R.J.; Lambers, H.; Dalling, M.J., Nitrogen redistribution during grain-growth in wheat (triticum-aestivum l) .4. Development of a quantitative model of the translocation of nitrogen to the grain. *Plant Physiol* **1983**, *71*, 7-14.
15. Taub, D.R.; Miller, B.; Allen, H., Effects of elevated co_2 on the protein concentration of food crops: A meta-analysis. *Glob Change Biol* **2008**, *14*, 565-575.
16. McGrath, J.M.; Lobell, D.B., Reduction of transpiration and altered nutrient allocation contribute to nutrient decline of crops grown in elevated CO_2 concentrations. *Plant Cell Environ* **2013**, *36*, 697-705.
17. Bloom, A.J., Photorespiration and nitrate assimilation: A major intersection between plant carbon and nitrogen. *Photosynth Res* **2015**, *123*, 117-128.
18. Pleijel, H.; Uddling, J., Yield vs. Quality trade-offs for wheat in response to carbon dioxide and ozone. *Glob Change Biol* **2012**, *18*, 596-605.
19. Ainsworth, E.A.; Rogers, A., The response of photosynthesis and stomatal conductance to rising [CO_2]: Mechanisms and environmental interactions. *Plant Cell Environ* **2007**, *30*, 258-270.
20. Högy, P.; Wieser, H.; Kohler, P.; Schwadorf, K.; Breuer, J.; Franzaring, J.; Muntifering, R.; Fangmeier, A., Effects of elevated CO_2 on grain yield and quality of wheat: Results from a 3-year free-air CO_2 enrichment experiment. *Plant Biology* **2009**, *11*, 60-69.
21. Myers, S.S.; Zanobetti, A.; Kloog, I.; Huybers, P.; Leakey, A.D.B.; Bloom, A.J.; Carlisle, E.; Dietterich, L.H.; Fitzgerald, G.; Hasegawa, T., *et al.*, Increasing CO_2 threatens human nutrition. *Nature* **2014**, *510*, 139-+.
22. Myers, S.S.; Wessells, K.R.; Kloog, I.; Zanobetti, A.; Schwartz, J., Effect of increased concentrations of atmospheric carbon dioxide on the global threat of zinc deficiency: A modelling study. *Lancet Glob Health* **2015**, *3*, E639-E645.
23. EFSA *Cadmium in food*; The EFSA Journal 980, 2009; pp 1-139.
24. Satarug, S.; Garrett, S.H.; Sens, M.A.; Sens, D.A., Cadmium, environmental exposure, and health outcomes. *Environ Health Persp* **2010**, *118*, 182-190.
25. Högy, P.; Fangmeier, A., Effects of elevated atmospheric CO_2 on grain quality of wheat. *J Cereal Sci* **2008**, *48*, 580-591.
26. Blumenthal, C.; Rawson, H.M.; McKenzie, E.; Gras, P.W.; Barlow, E.W.R.; Wrigley, C.W., Changes in wheat grain quality due to doubling the level of atmospheric CO_2. *Cereal Chem* **1996**, *73*, 762-766.
27. Högy, P.; Wieser, H.; Kohler, P.; Schwadorf, K.; Breuer, J.; Erbs, M.; Weber, S.; Fangmeier, A., Does elevated atmospheric CO_2 allow for sufficient wheat grain quality in the future? *J Appl Bot Food Qual* **2009**, *82*, 114-121.
28. Kimball, B.A.; Morris, C.F.; Pinter, P.J.; Wall, G.W.; Hunsaker, D.J.; Adamsen, F.J.; LaMorte, R.L.; Leavitt, S.W.; Thompson, T.L.; Matthias, A.D., *et al.*, Elevated CO_2, drought and soil nitrogen effects on wheat grain quality. *New Phytol* **2001**, *150*, 295-303.

Peer-reviewed version available at *Agronomy* **2017**, *7*, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032

29. Piikki, K.; De Temmerman, L.; Ojanpera, K.; Danielsson, H.; Pleijel, H., The grain quality of spring wheat (triticum aestivum l.) in relation to elevated ozone uptake and carbon dioxide exposure. *Eur J Agron* **2008**, *28*, 245-254.
30. Fernando, N.; Panozzo, J.; Tausz, M.; Norton, R.M.; Neumann, N.; Fitzgerald, G.J.; Seneweera, S., Elevated co_2 alters grain quality of two bread wheat cultivars grown under different environmental conditions. *Agr Ecosyst Environ* **2014**, *185*, 24-33.
31. Wrigley, C.W.; Békés, F.; Bushuk, W., Chapter 1 gluten: A balance of gliadin and glutenin. In *Gliadin and glutenin: The unique balance of wheat quality*, AACC International, Inc.: 2006; pp 3-32.
32. Kindred, D.R.; Gooding, M.J.; Ellis, R.H., Nitrogen fertilizer and seed rate effects on hagberg failing number of hybrid wheats and their parents are associated with alpha-amylase activity, grain cavity size and dormancy. *J Sci Food Agr* **2005**, *85*, 727-742.
33. Hruskova, M.; Skodova, V.; Blazek, J., Wheat sedimentation values and falling number. *Czech J Food Sci* **2004**, *22*, 51-57.
34. Agren, G.I.; Weih, M., Plant stoichiometry at different scales: Element concentration patterns reflect environment more than genotype. *New Phytol* **2012**, *194*, 944-952.
35. Waters, B.M.; Uauy, C.; Dubcovsky, J.; Grusak, M.A., Wheat (triticum aestivum) nam proteins regulate the translocation of iron, zinc, and nitrogen compounds from vegetative tissues to grain. *J Exp Bot* **2009**, *60*, 4263-4274.
36. Ainsworth, E.A.; Long, S.P., What have we learned from 15 years of free-air CO_2 enrichment (face)? A meta-analytic review of the responses of photosynthesis, canopy. *New Phytol* **2005**, *165*, 351-371.
37. Wang, Y.X.; Frei, M., Stressed food - the impact of abiotic environmental stresses on crop quality. *Agr Ecosyst Environ* **2011**, *141*, 271-286.
38. Gelang, J.; Pleijel, H.; Sild, E.; Danielsson, H.; Younis, S.; Sellden, G., Rate and duration of grain filling in relation to flag leaf senescence and grain yield in spring wheat (triticum aestivum) exposed to different concentrations of ozone. *Physiol Plantarum* **2000**, *110*, 366-375.
39. Broberg, M.C.; Feng, Z.Z.; Xin, Y.; Pleijel, H., Ozone effects on wheat grain quality - a summary. *Environ Pollut* **2015**, *197*, 203-213.
40. Salt, D.E.; Prince, R.C.; Pickering, I.J.; Raskin, I., Mechanisms of cadmium mobility and accumulation in indian mustard. *Plant Physiol* **1995**, *109*, 1427-1433.
41. Feng, Z.Z.; Kobayashi, K.; Ainsworth, E.A., Impact of elevated ozone concentration on growth, physiology, and yield of wheat (triticum aestivum l.): A meta-analysis. *Glob Change Biol* **2008**, *14*, 2696-2708.
42. Tulchinsky, T.H., Micronutrient deficiency conditions: Global health issues. *Public Health Reviews* **2010**, *32*, 243-255.
43. Federov, S. *Getdata graph digitizer*, 2.26.0.20; 2002.
44. Rosenberg, M.S.; Adams, D.C.; Gurevitch, J. *Metawin: Statistical software for meta-analysis*, Version 2.0; Sinauer Associates, Inc: Sunderland, MA, USA, 2000.
45. Curtis, P.S.; Wang, X.Z., A meta-analysis of elevated CO_2 effects on woody plant mass, form, and physiology. *Oecologia* **1998**, *113*, 299-313.
46. Koricheva, J.; Gurevitch, J.; Mengersen, K., *Handbook of meta-analysis in ecology and evolution*. Princeton Univeristy Press: New Jersey, 2013.

Peer-reviewed version available at *Agronomy* **2017**, *7*, , 32; doi:10.3390/agronomy7020032

47. GraphPad Software Inc., *Prism*, 7; 2016.
48. Motulsky, H.J.; Brown, R.E., Detecting outliers when fitting data with nonlinear regression – a new method based on robust nonlinear regression and the false discovery rate. *BMC Bioinformatics* **2006**, *7*, 1-20.