**The arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis regulates aquaporins activity and improves
root cell water permeability in maize plants subjected to water stress**

Gabriela Quiroga¹, Gorka Erice¹, Lei Ding², François Chaumont², Ricardo Aroca¹, Juan
Manuel Ruiz-Lozano^{*1}

¹*Departamento de Microbiología del Suelo y Sistemas Simbióticos, Estación Experimental del
Zaidín (CSIC), C/ Profesor Albareda 1, 18008 Granada, Spain.*

²*Louvain Institute of Biomolecular Science and Technology, UC Louvain, Croix du Sud 4-
L7.07.14. B-1348, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.*

*Corresponding author: Dr. Juan Manuel Ruiz-Lozano

Telph. + 34 958181600

e-mail: juanmanuel.ruiz@eez.csic.es

Running title: Root cell water permeability in AM plants

ABSTRACT

Studies have suggested that increased root hydraulic conductivity in mycorrhizal roots could be the result of increased cell-to-cell water flux via aquaporins. This study aimed to elucidate if the key effect of the regulation of maize aquaporins by the arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) symbiosis is the enhancement of root cell water transport capacity. Thus water permeability coefficient (P_f) and cell hydraulic conductivity (L_{pc}) were measured in root protoplast and intact cortex cells of AM and non-AM plants subjected or not to water stress. Results showed that cells from droughted-AM roots maintained P_f and L_{pc} values of non-stressed plants, while in non-AM roots these values declined drastically as consequence of water deficit. Interestingly, the phosphorylation status of PIP2 aquaporins increased in AM plants subjected to water deficit, and P_f values higher than $12 \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$ were found only in protoplasts from AM roots, revealing the higher water permeability of AM root cells. In parallel, the AM symbiosis increased stomatal conductance, net photosynthesis and related parameters, showing a higher photosynthetic capacity in these plants. This study demonstrate a better performance of AM root cells in water transport under water deficit, which is connected to the shoot physiological performance in terms of photosynthetic capacity.

KEYWORDS: aquaporins, arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis, cell hydraulic conductivity, cell pressure probe, photosynthesis, protoplasts, water permeability

INTRODUCTION

Maize is one of the most consumed crops worldwide (Lobell *et al.* 2008) with annual production of more than one trillion ton (FAOSTAT), and is expected to double its demand by 2050. However, its production is affected by a number of constraints, including an array of biotic and abiotic stresses (Daryanto *et al.* 2016). Drought stress has a high impact on plant growth and development, reducing crop production worldwide (Lesk *et al.* 2016), including maize (Daryanto *et al.* 2016). Thus, it seems necessary to elucidate the mechanisms that enhance maize drought tolerance, in order to guarantee food production in the near future (Trenberth *et al.* 2014; Lesk *et al.* 2016).

To this respect the arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) symbiosis, the mutual association that naturally occurs between different fungal species of the Glomeromycota phylum and plant roots, is extensively reported in literature as beneficial for improving the resilience of the majority of crops to water stress (Augé 2001; Augé *et al.* 2015). In a climate change context, the AM symbiosis is likely to be a way to reduce water input in arid and semiarid soils being a feasible solution to overcome the stressful conditions. This symbiosis produces changes in soil properties (Augé 2004; Bedini *et al.* 2009) and in the plant that affect both the root and the shoot during drought stress, resulting in a better plant fitness (Ruiz-Lozano *et al.* 2012; Chitarra *et al.* 2016).

In plants, the water status of the shoot is determined by the balance between root water uptake and stomatal aperture. Root resistance to water is the highest within the soil-plant-atmosphere continuum (Steudle *et al.* 1987). Thus, to keep the stomata open, the root water conductivity (L_{pr}) must be high enough (Sack & Holbrook 2006). The AM association has been found to differently regulate root water transport both under well-watered and water deficit conditions, generally enhancing L_{pr} (Aroca *et al.* 2007; Bárzana *et al.* 2012, 2014, 2015; Sánchez-Romera *et al.* 2016; Quiroga *et al.* 2017). This effect has been related to the

uptake of water through fungal hyphae from soil pores inaccessible to roots and to changes induced by the AM fungi affecting the hydraulic properties of the soil (Augé *et al.* 2004; Allen 2009; Hallet *et al.* 2009) and inside the roots (Ruiz-Lozano & Aroca 2017). Indeed, there is increasing evidence that mycorrhizal fungi transport water towards the host (Marulanda *et al.* 2003; Allen, 2009; Ruth *et al.* 2011; Li *et al.* 2013; Xu *et al.* 2015). Moreover, the AM symbiosis has been suggested to modulate the switching between apoplastic and cell-to-cell water transport pathways in roots (Bárzana *et al.* 2012), providing higher flexibility to these plants for reacting to water shortage depending on the demand of the aerial part.

Aquaporins are thought to be the main pathway for water movement through the cell membranes (Maurel *et al.* 2015), providing the capacity of rapidly modify membrane water permeability, which help the plant with the maintenance of the water balance during stress episodes, and affecting root hydraulic conductivity (Hachez *et al.* 2006, 2012; Maurel *et al.* 2008; Moshelion *et al.* 2009; Zarrouk *et al.* 2016). Among higher plant aquaporins, the plasma membrane intrinsic proteins (PIPs) and the tonoplast intrinsic proteins (TIPs), have been highlighted for their involvement in the control of radial transcellular water transport and also of cell osmoregulation and, in general, PIP and TIP aquaporin expression seems to be more abundant in roots than in leaves (Chaumont & Tyerman 2014). Moreover, the expression of PIP aquaporins in roots has been correlated to the presence of apoplastic barriers, suggesting an essential role in the transmembrane water diffusion when its movement is hindered (Shatil-Cohen *et al.* 2011; Prado *et al.* 2013). Water is also transported by TIPs, but they display a great diversity of substrates and Ar/R selectivity filter configurations. Thus, besides water, TIPs also play roles in glycerol, urea, ammonia and H₂O₂ transport, as well as, in abiotic stress responses (Afzal *et al.* 2016; Fox *et al.* 2017). It has also been proposed that TIPs may provide a quick way for cellular osmotic balance by controlling the exchange of water between vacuole and cytosol (Forrest & Bhawe 2007). In

any case, there is increasing evidence of a higher contribution of aquaporin-mediated water transport to global root water uptake than previously thought, even under high transpiration conditions (Knipfer & Fricke 2010, 2011). Furthermore, their relevance for plant physiology is emphasized by the fact that, apart from water, some aquaporin isoforms can facilitate membrane diffusion of other small solutes such as CO₂, metalloids, urea, ammonia, H₂O₂, oxygen or even ions (Li *et al.* 2014; Byrt *et al.* 2017; Zwiazek *et al.* 2017). Hence, although the role of aquaporins in the maintenance of water homeostasis in the whole plant and in the stress responses has been well established (Afzal *et al.* 2016; Chaumont & Tyerman 2014), their numerous functions in plant growth and development seem to be essential but not well understood yet (Chaumont & Tyerman 2014; Li *et al.* 2014; Afzal *et al.* 2016).

The importance of aquaporins for both nutrient and water exchanges during mycorrhizal symbiosis was recognized by Maurel & Plassard (2011) and supported by the results obtained by Bárzana *et al.* (2014), who found that 16 out of the 36 maize aquaporins (Chaumont *et al.* 2001) were regulated by the AM fungus *R. irregularis* during drought stress. However, results obtained so far on aquaporins regulation by the AM symbiosis show that the effects of the symbiosis on aquaporin gene expression are complex and depend on the intrinsic properties of the osmotic stress. Under drought stress conditions, the AM symbiosis usually decreases or anticipates the decrease of aquaporin gene expression. Under salt stress, the trend is just the opposite since the AM symbiosis enhanced the expression of most of the aquaporin genes analyzed (Aroca *et al.* 2007). In addition, the regulation of the plant aquaporins also depends on the severity and duration of the stress applied, as evidenced by Bárzana *et al.* (2014) for maize aquaporins. Moreover, given the diversity of substrates that can be transported by the AM-regulated aquaporin isoforms, they may have a role in the regulation of leaf and root hydraulics, as well as, in other physiological processes such as nutrient uptake and translocation, stomatal movement and carbon fixation (Uehlein

et al. 2007) or signalling processes (Fox *et al.* 2017). Thus, the elucidation of *in planta* transport capacities of the AM-regulated aquaporins is required in order to understand their role in the AM-induced drought tolerance.

The above mentioned results suggested that additional studies should elucidate the specific function of aquaporin isoforms regulated by the AM symbiosis in order to know how the AM symbiosis alters the plant fitness under stressful conditions. Thus, we aimed to elucidate if the key effect of the regulation of maize aquaporins by the AM symbiosis is indeed the enhancement of root cell membrane water transport capacity. One approach to quantify the permeability of plant cells to water consists in the isolation of protoplasts and measuring their osmotic water permeability coefficient (P_f) upon an osmotic challenge (Moshelion *et al.* 2004) and is a convenient way to measure the role of aquaporins in cell water transport (Shatil-Cohen *et al.* 2014). This method overcomes the limitation of measuring only root hydraulic permeability that can be mediated by cell-to-cell pathway (determined in part by aquaporins activity, but also by plasmodesmata) and by apoplastic pathway, which is unrelated to aquaporins activity (Steudle 2000). Besides, the cell pressure probe is also used as a technique to do direct and accurate measurements of cell turgor pressure, cell wall elasticity and cell hydraulic conductivity (L_{pc}) in intact cells (Husken *et al.* 1978). Using both approaches to determine permeability of cells may provide better information about the water transport ability of AM root cells.

We hypothesized that if the aquaporins regulated by the AM symbiosis are mainly involved in cell to cell water transport, the values of these parameters measured in protoplasts and intact cells from AM plants should be different from those of non-AM plants, and regulated by the watering conditions. We also aimed to determine if the expected changes in root cell membrane water permeability have a significant effect on plant fitness and alter important physiological parameters such as plant photosynthetic capacity. For that,

we performed two independent experiments, one focused on the effect of AM on root cell membrane water permeability, and the other one focused on the effect of AM on the water transport from soil to leaves in order to be used in CO₂ exchange at stomatal level, leading to greater photosynthetic efficiency.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Experimental design and statistical analysis

Two independent experiments with the same design were performed. The first was used for measurements of root cell membrane water permeability and the second one for measurements of plant photosynthesis-related parameters.

The two experiments consisted of a factorial design with two factors: (1) inoculation treatment, including plants inoculated with the AM fungus *Rhizophagus irregularis*, strain EEZ 58 (Ri) and non-inoculated control plants (C); (2) water regime, so that one half of the plants were cultivated under well-watered conditions (WW) throughout the entire experiment and the other half of the plants were subjected to water deficit (WD) for two weeks just before harvest. Each treatment had 15 replicates giving a total of 60 pots for each experiment. The experiments were repeated twice.

Statistical analyses for both experiments were performed in SPSS Statistics (Version 23, IBM Analytics) using two way analysis of variance (ANOVA), with AM inoculation (M), water regime (W) and their interaction (M X W) as sources of variation. Duncan's or Student-T were used as posthoc tests to find out differences between means at $\alpha=0.05$.

Biological material and growth conditions

The growing substrate consisted of a mixture of soil and sand (v/v 1:1). Soil was collected at the grounds of IFAPA (Granada, Spain), sieved (2 mm), diluted with quartz-sand (<1 mm) and sterilized by steaming (100°C for 1 h on 3 consecutive days). Soil had a pH of 8.1 (water); 0.85% organic matter, nutrient concentrations (mg kg⁻¹): N, 1; P, 10 (NaHCO₃-extractable P); K, 110. The soil texture was made of 38.3% sand, 47.1% silt and 14.6% clay.

Seeds of *Zea mays* L. (cv PR34B39, Pioneer Hi-Bred, Spain) were sown in 1.5 L pots containing 1250 g of the substrate described above.

Mycorrhizal inoculum was bulked in an open-pot culture of *Z. mays* L. and consisted of soil, spores, mycelia and infected root fragments. The AM fungus was *Rhizophagus irregularis* (Schenck and Smith), strain EEZ 58. Ten grams of inoculum with about 60 infective propagules per gram (according to the most probable number test), were added to appropriate pots at sowing time. Non inoculated control plants received the same amount of autoclaved mycorrhizal inoculum together with a 10 ml aliquot of a filtrate (<20 µm) of the AM inoculum in order to provide a general microbial population free of AM propagules. For experiment 1 maize plants were grown under greenhouse conditions (25/20°C, 16/8 light dark period, 50-60% RH and average photosynthetic photon flux density 800 µmol m⁻² s⁻¹) during the first 5 weeks and during the last 3 weeks plants were maintained in a controlled environmental chamber with the following conditions: 25/18 °C, 16h/8h light/dark period, and photosynthetic photon flux density 300 µmol m⁻² s⁻¹.

For experiment 2 plants were grown under greenhouse conditions (25/20°C, 16/8 light dark period, 50-60% RH and average photosynthetic photon flux density 800 µmol m⁻² s⁻¹) for 8 weeks, until harvest.

For both experiments soil moisture was measured with the ML2 ThetaProbe (AT Delta-T Devices Ltd., Cambridge, UK) as described previously (Quiroga *et al.* 2017). Water was supplied daily to maintain soil at 100% of field capacity during the first 6 weeks after

sowing. Then, half of the plants were allowed to dry (DS treatments) until soil water content reached 60% of field capacity (2 days needed), while the other half were maintained at field capacity (WW treatments). Plants were maintained under such conditions for 14 additional days. The water stress imposed was similar to that described by Quiroga *et al.* (2017).

Common measurements

Biomass production and symbiotic development

At harvest, the shoots and roots of 10 replicates per treatment were collected and used for fresh weight recording.

In order to visualize and quantify AM fungal structures, roots were stained with trypan blue according to Phillips & Hayman (1970). The percentage of mycorrhizal colonization was calculated by the gridline intersect method according to Giovannetti & Mosse (1980) in 3 replicates per treatment.

Measurements in experiment 1

Stomatal conductance

Stomatal conductance was measured two hours after the onset of photoperiod with a porometer system (Leaf porometer, model SC-1, Decagon devices, WA, USA) following the user manual instructions. Measurements were taken one day before harvest in the second youngest leaf from eight plants per treatment.

Cell Pressure Probe measurement

Cell pressure probe measurements were done as described by Moshelion *et al.* (2009)

with some modifications. Briefly, an oil-filled microcapillary was inserted in cortex cells of the medium part of intact roots with the aid of a micromanipulator (Leica, Wetzlar, Germany) under a stereomicroscope (magnification: 130x). When the cell was punctured, cell sap started entering the capillary and formed a meniscus between sap and oil. Cell turgor pressure (P) was measured when returned to its original level by pushing the meniscus back to the cell side by means of a motor-driven metal rod. Then, peaks of pressure relaxations were used to see how the pulses affected the cell permeability by monitoring the change in the half time of water exchange ($T_{1/2}$). Cell elastic properties are described by the cell wall volumetric elastic modulus (ϵ) that is a measure of the cell wall resistance to be deformed and produce changes in cell volume upon pressure application. It was calculated by inducing changes in turgor that resulted in modification of the cell volume ($\epsilon = V \cdot \Delta P / \Delta V$). The cell hydraulic conductivity is given by $L_{pc} = \ln(2)V / (AT_{1/2}(\epsilon + \pi_i))$, where V is the cell volume, A is the cell surface area and π_i is the cell osmotic pressure.

Root cell protoplast isolation and protoplast swelling assay

Measurements were done as described by Moshelion *et al.* (2004) with slight modifications. Root segments taken at 4 cm from the tips were cut into small fragments and placed in a plate containing 2.5 mL of ~ 660 mOsm isotonic buffer (10 mM KCl, 1 mM CaCl₂, 8 mM MES, pH 5.75), adjusted with the appropriate amount of D-sorbitol 2M, and containing 2% cellulose R-10, 0.5% BSA, 0.5% PVP K30, 0.1% pectolyase and 0.3% macerozyme R-10 in order to degrade the cell wall. Samples were submitted to vacuum for 15 min and transferred for digestion in the dark during 3 h on a shaker at 70 rpm. Subsequently, enzyme solution was removed, and 2.5 mL of new isotonic buffer without enzymes were added and put into the dark for 1 h on a shaker at 120 rpm. The protoplast-containing liquid was then filtrated through a 100 μ m nylon mesh and centrifuged at 90g for 3 min, then washed once

with isotonic buffer and centrifuged at 90g for 3 min. The protoplasts were suspended in 100 μ L of isotonic buffer and measured as rapidly as possible.

The hypotonic challenge assay was performed as described in Shatil-Cohen *et al.* (2014).

Sub-cellular fractionation

Sub-cellular fractionation was performed according to Hachez *et al.* (2006). Pieces of intact roots were grinded with 600 μ L of a protein extraction buffer containing 250 mM Sorbitol, 50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 8), 2 mM EDTA and protease inhibitors. All steps were performed at 4°C. The homogenate was centrifuged during 10 min at 770g and the supernatant obtained was centrifuged 10 min at 10000g. The resulted supernatant was finally centrifuged during 30 min at 100000g and the final pellet (corresponding to the microsomal fraction) was resuspended in 30 μ L of suspension buffer (5 mM KH_2PO_4 , 330 mM sucrose, 3 mM KCl, pH 7.8) and sonicated twice for 5 s.

PIP aquaporins abundance and phosphorylation status

Ten micrograms of the microsomal fraction were solubilized for 10 min at 50°C in loading buffer (27 mM Tris/HCl, 0.7% SDS, 3.3% glycerol, 0.0016% bromophenol blue, 1% DTT) and the proteins were separated by SDS-PAGE on a 10% polyacrylamide gel. After electrophoresis, the gel was incubated for 10 min in semi-dry buffer (48 mM Tris, 39 mM glycine, 20% methanol, 0.0375% SDS) before semi-dry transfer to a polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF; Bio-Rad) membrane (30 min at 22 V).

Western blot analysis were performed using antisera against ZmPIP2;1/2;2, ZmPIP2;5, ZmPIP2;6 and ZmPIP1 as described in Hachez *et al.* (2006). The dilutions used

were 1/3500 for the anti-ZmPIP2;1/2;2, 1/1000 for anti-ZmPIP2;5 and anti-ZmPIP2;6 and 1/350 for anti-ZmPIP1.

Ten micrograms of the same extract were used for Colloidal blue gel staining as a gel-loading control.

Signal quantification of the bands in the obtained images was performed using ImageJ software (Rasband, W.S., ImageJ, U. S. National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA, <https://imagej.nih.gov/ij/>, 1997-2016).

Three antibodies recognizing the phosphorylation state of PIP2 proteins in the C-terminal region were used: PIP2A (which recognizes phosphorylation at Ser-280), PIP2B (which recognizes phosphorylation at Ser-283) and PIP2C (which recognizes phosphorylation at Ser-280 and Ser-283). The antibodies were described and used in previous experiments and the quantification of these proteins was done by ELISA technique (Calvo-Polanco *et al.* 2014; Quiroga *et al.* 2018).

Quantitative RT-PCR

Total RNA was extracted from three biological replicates of maize roots as described in Quiroga *et al.* (2017). First-strand cDNA was synthesized using 1 µg of purified RNA with the Maxima H Minus first strand cDNA synthesis kit (Thermo Scientific™), according to the manufacturers' instructions.

The expression of previously selected maize aquaporins (Quiroga *et al.* 2017) together with *ZmPIP2;1*, *ZmPIP2;5* and *ZmPIP2;6* and the stress marker gene *ZmNCED1*, encoding for 9-cis-epoxycarotenoid dioxygenase (Capelle *et al.* 2010), was measured by qRT-PCR using 1 µL of diluted cDNA (1:9) with PowerUp™ SYBR™ Green Master Mix in a QuantStudio™ 3 system (Thermo Fisher Scientific). The reaction was repeated for 40 cycles at annealing temperature of 58°C for all primers except for *ZmPIP2;6*, annealing at 60°C. For

normalization of gene expression values, four reference genes were measured in all the treatments. These genes were polyubiquitin (gi:248338), tubulin (gi:450292), GAPDH (gi:22237) and elongation factor 1 (gi:2282583) (Bárcana *et al.* 2014). Standardization was carried out based on the expression of the two best-performing reference genes under our specific conditions, which were chosen by using “NormFinder” algorithm (Andersen *et al.* 2004) (<https://moma.dk/normfinder-software>). Thus, expression levels were normalized according to *Zmtubulin* and *ZmGAPDH* genes. Fungal aquaporins (*GintaQPF1*, *GintaQPF1* and *GintaQPF2*) were analysed as previously described (Aroca *et al.* 2009; Li *et al.* 2013) using fungal *elongation factor 1α* as reference gene for standardization. The relative abundance of transcripts was calculated using the $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ method (Livak & Schmittgen 2001). The threshold cycle (Ct) of each biological sample was determined in duplicate. Negative controls without cDNA were used in all PCR reactions.

Measurements in experiment 2

Gas exchange measurements

Net photosynthesis (A_n), stomatal conductance (g_s), intercellular CO_2 concentration (C_i) and instantaneous water use efficiency ($iWUE = A_n/g_s$) of fully expanded young leaves in five different plants were measured using portable photosynthesis system LI-6400 (LICOR Biosciences, Lincoln, NE, USA) after 8 weeks of growth. The response of A_n to C_i was recorded to examine the effects of mycorrhizal inoculation on the maximum apparent rate of phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase (PEPc) activity (V_{pmax}) and CO_2 -saturated photosynthetic rate (V_{max}). The gas exchange response to CO_2 was initiated at ambient intercellular $[CO_2]$, then the reference $[CO_2]$ was stepped down to $25 \mu mol mol^{-1}$ and afterwards it was increased stepwise to $1000 \mu mol mol^{-1}$ at $1500 \mu mol m^{-2} s^{-1}$ PPFD as described in Yendrek *et al.*

(2017). According to Caemmerer (2000) the initial slope of the A_n/C_i curve ($C_i < 60 \mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}$) was used to estimate $V_{p\text{max}}$. Assessment of V_{max} as the horizontal asymptote of the A_n/C_i curve was performed using a four parameter nonrectangular hyperbolic function as described in Yendrek *et al.* (2017).

Specific leaf area

Specific leaf area (SLA) was determined by weighting a known area of six leaf discs per plant, five plants per treatment, after drying for seven days at 65°C. SLA was calculated as the ratio between leaf area and leaf dry mass.

Shoot area

Shoot area was determined from 8-bit images of the detached leaves and shoots on six plants per treatment using ImageJ processing software (Rasband, W.S., ImageJ, U. S. National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA, <https://imagej.nih.gov/ij/>, 1997-2016.).

Photosynthetic efficiency

The efficiency of photosystem II of light adapted maize leaves was measured with Fluor-Pen FP100 (Photon Systems Instruments, Brno, Czech Republic) as previously described in Quiroga *et al.* (2017, 2018) in the second youngest leaf of 10 different plants of each treatment after 8 weeks of growth.

RESULTS

Experiment 1

Biomass production and symbiotic development

Plant biomass production significantly decreased (by 41%) with water deficit. The decrease was unaffected by mycorrhization, being similar in AM and non-AM plants (Table 1).

The percentage of fungal root colonization was similar in well-watered and droughted plants inoculated with *R. irregularis*, being of 57% for well-watered plants and of 52% for the plants subjected to water deficit. Uninoculated control plants did not present fungal colonization (Table 1).

Stomatal conductance (gs)

We measured *gs* in order to characterize the magnitude of the water stress in the aerial part of the plants. Well-watered AM plants presented significantly higher *gs* compared to non-AM plants. Water deficit significantly decreased *gs* to similar values in both AM and non-AM plants (Table 1).

Water permeability of roots cells

To investigate the effect of the mycorrhizal colonization on root cell water permeability, we measured cell hydraulic parameters by means of the cell pressure probe. The cell turgor pressure (P) was similar for all the treatments regardless of AM inoculation or water regime (Table 2), as well as, the cell size (data not shown). The half time of water exchange ($T_{1/2}$) was similar in AM and non-AM plants under well-watered conditions, but under water deficit

conditions it was 45% lower in AM plants than in non-AM ones (Table 2). The cell wall elastic modulus (ε) was 116% higher in AM plants than in non-AM ones under well-watered conditions, while under water deficit it was 40% lower in AM plants (Table 2). In any case, water deficit enhanced notably the ε values in non-AM plants to reach 8.16 MPa, while it did not affect these values in AM plants that remained at 4.86 MPa. Under well-watered conditions, AM plants showed significantly lower cell hydraulic conductivity (L_{pc}) values than non-AM plants (42% of decrease). However, under water deficit, L_{pc} values were maintained unaltered in AM plants, but diminished drastically in non-AM plants (68% of decrease). Thus, under water deficit conditions AM plants exhibited 110% higher L_{pc} values as compared to non-AM plants (Figure 1). The obtained L_{pc} values were converted into osmotic water permeability (P_f) values (Figure 1) for comparison with P_f data from the protoplast swelling assay (Volkov *et al.* 2007).

P_f values obtained by a swelling assay on isolated root protoplasts of AM and non-AM plants did not differ significantly under well-watered conditions (Figure 2a). When plants were subjected to water deprivation, P_f values decreased in non-AM plants, although the decrease was not significant. In contrast, in AM plants P_f values remained similar as under well-watered conditions, almost doubling the values of non-AM plants subjected to water deficit.

We analysed the distribution of P_f values among the different treatments (Figure 2b), establishing three categories (less than 6 $\mu\text{m/s}$, 6 to 12 $\mu\text{m/s}$ and more than 12 $\mu\text{m/s}$). Data showed that non-AM plants did not present protoplasts with P_f values over 12 $\mu\text{m/s}$. These higher P_f values were observed only in protoplasts coming from AM treatments, either under well-watered or water deficit conditions. Most P_f values were under 6 $\mu\text{m/s}$ in all treatments. However, AM plants exhibited a lower proportion of protoplast with P_f values under 6 $\mu\text{m/s}$ than non-AM plants. Moreover, the highest proportion of P_f values within this category (92%) was found in droughted non-AM plants and the lowest proportion of P_f values within this

category (65%) was found in well-watered AM plants. Altogether, the P_f values distribution could explain the differences in water permeability between the treatments.

Aquaporin accumulation and phosphorylation status of PIP2s

Since aquaporins could be responsible for changes in cell water permeability, we measured the accumulation of these proteins in root cell membranes by western blot (Figure 3). Protein accumulation showed the same pattern for PIP2;1/2;2 and PIP2;6 aquaporins. Water deficit slightly decreased the amounts of both proteins in non-inoculated plants. In AM plants, the protein amounts remained unchanged regardless of the water treatment, being in both cases significantly lower as compared to non-AM plants.

In the case of PIP1s, AM plants subjected to water deficit showed a significantly lower amount of protein compared to non-AM counterparts. However, no-significant differences were found between both treatments under well-watered conditions.

No significant differences were found among treatments when analysing PIP2;5 accumulation.

We also used three antibodies recognizing the phosphorylation of PIP2 aquaporins at two serine residues in the C-terminal region in order to estimate the phosphorylation status of such proteins (Figure 4). Interestingly, the three antibodies showed the same PIP2 aquaporins accumulation pattern, with lower levels of phosphorylation at Ser-280, Ser-283 or both Ser residues in well-watered AM plants compared to the corresponding non-AM plants. However, when plants were subjected to water deficit, AM plants increased significantly the phosphorylation levels of these Ser residues to reach values similar to non-AM plants.

Root gene expression levels under well-watered and water deficit conditions

We analysed the mRNA levels of *ZmPIP1;1*, *ZmPIP1;3*, *ZmPIP2;2*, *ZmPIP2;4*, *ZmTIP1;1*, *ZmTIP2;3*, *ZmTIP4;1* and *ZmNIP2;1* genes, previously selected as being regulated by the AM symbiosis (Quiroga *et al.* 2017), as well as, other aquaporins recognized for their role in root water transport (*ZmPIP2;1*, *ZmPIP2;5* and *ZmPIP2;6*) (Figure 5a). Several of the analysed aquaporins did not show significant differences in their expression patterns. Nonetheless, the levels of *ZmPIP2;2* and *ZmPIP2;6* mRNA were indeed regulated by the AM symbiosis and/or by water deficit and exhibited a similar expression pattern. Under well-watered conditions the mRNA levels of both genes decreased significantly in AM plants. The expression of both genes in non-AM plants did not vary after the application of the water shortage treatment. In contrast, in AM plants the expression of both genes increased significantly to reach the same levels than well-watered non-AM plants.

The expression of the three aquaporin genes of *R. irregularis* was also analysed (*GintAQP1*, *GintAQPF1* and *GintAQPF2*) (Figure 5b). *GintAQPF1* was found to be down-regulated when the AM plants were subjected to water deficit. On the contrary, *GintAQPF2* was up-regulated with water shortage. In the case of *GintAQP1* no significant differences in expression levels were found.

As a marker of the water stress level, we measured the expression of *ZmNCED1* gene, encoding for 9-cis-epoxycarotenoid dioxygenase, which is involved in the biosynthesis of the stress hormone ABA (Capelle *et al.* 2010). The expression of this gene was significantly up-regulated by the water deficit imposed in both experiments, regardless of mycorrhizal inoculation, with increases ranging 6 to 8 folds (Figure 6).

Experiment 2

Plant growth, specific leaf area (SLA) and symbiotic development

Despite water deficit treatment decreased significantly plant fresh weight (PFW), AM plants showed 19% higher PFW than non-AM ones after 8 weeks of growth (Table 3). Similar result was observed for shoot area. It declined under water deficit conditions by 48% in non-AM plants and by 34% in AM plants, but was maintained 44% higher in AM plants.

No changes in specific leaf area (SLA) were observed due to watering conditions, but AM inoculation led to lower SLA values regardless of water regime (Table 3).

The extent of mycorrhizal root colonization was similar for both AM inoculated treatments, with an average of 58% of mycorrhizal root length for the well-watered plants and 52% of mycorrhizal root length for the plants subjected to water deficit. Uninoculated plants did not show fungal colonization (Table 3).

Gas exchange, photosynthetic capacity and efficiency of photosystem II

After 8 weeks of growth, at the end of the water deficit treatment, plants maintained under well-watered conditions showed no significant differences in gas exchange parameters (net photosynthetic activity, A_n ; stomatal conductance, g_s , or intercellular CO_2 concentration, C_i) due to AM fungal inoculation (Table 4). Nevertheless, plants under water deficit exhibited lower A_n , g_s , as well as, C_i leading to greater intrinsic water-use efficiency (data not shown), regardless of the fungal treatment. Under such water limited conditions AM inoculated plants featured enhanced A_n (by 75%) and g_s (90%) values. Similar result was obtained when analysing photosynthetic capacity at this growth period (Figure 7). Well-watered plants presented no differences in the maximum apparent rate of phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase activity (V_{pmax}) or CO_2 -saturated photosynthetic rate (V_{max}) due to AM inoculation, but

water deficit treatment significantly dropped both photosynthetic parameters regardless of AM inoculation. In any case, droughted AM plants showed greater V_{pmax} (by 30%) and V_{max} (by 32%) than non-AM ones.

Under well-watered conditions the light-adapted maximum quantum yield of photosystem II primary photochemistry ($\Delta F_v/F_m'$) did not show significant differences due to AM inoculation after 8 weeks of growth (Table 4). However, when plants were subjected to water deficit, AM plants presented the highest $\Delta F_v/F_m'$ value, being significantly greater than in non-AM plants.

DISCUSSION

In the last years, a number of experimental evidences have shown that the AM symbiosis alters several aquaporin isoforms in the host plant and that these isoforms can transport water and other solutes of physiological importance (Barzana *et al.* 2014, Quiroga *et al.* 2017). It has been also demonstrated that the AM symbiosis regulates root hydraulic conductivity in different plant species, including maize (Sánchez-Blanco *et al.* 2004; Aroca *et al.* 2008; Ruiz-Lozano *et al.* 2009; Bárzana *et al.* 2012, 2014; Quiroga *et al.* 2017, 2018). The osmotic root hydraulic conductivity (L_o) is considered as an estimation of water flow via the cell-to-cell pathway, and is highly related to the activity or density of water channels in the plasma membrane (Chaumont & Tyerman 2014; Fox *et al.* 2017). Some studies have suggested that increases in root hydraulic conductivity in mycorrhizal roots could be the result of increased cell-to-cell water flux mediated by aquaporins (Marjanović *et al.* 2005; Lee *et al.* 2010; Ruiz-Lozano & Aroca 2017). However, the intimate mechanisms of such an effect are not well-understood. Indeed, the described increase in L_o in AM plants may be due to positive regulation of abundance and activity of the host aquaporins, (Chaumont & Tyerman 2014; Fox *et al.* 2017) or to changes in size or density of plasmodesmata in AM roots, as

described by Blee & Anderson (1998), since symplastic water movement via plasmodesmata may also significantly contribute to Lo (Galmés *et al.* 2007). Thus, in this study we aimed to determine whether the AM symbiosis could improve the root cell membrane water permeability, possibly mediated by modification of aquaporins activity/abundance and if the expected changes in root cell water permeability have a significant effect on plant physiology and performance under water deficit. For that, two independent experiments were conducted with the same design, maize cultivar, AM inoculum and water deficit level, although the growing conditions during the last three weeks varied slightly. In any case, the trend of plant biomass production in response to water deficit and the percentage of mycorrhizal root colonization in both experiments were similar. Thus, water deficit reduced plant biomass by about 40% in non-AM plants and by 30-40% in AM plants. The stomatal conductance (gs) showed a higher variation in both experiments. In experiment 1 gs declined by 38% and 49% in non-AM and AM plants, respectively, while in experiment 2 the declined was by 69% and 40%, respectively. However, these fluctuations of gs values were likely due to the differences in the growing conditions during the last three weeks in the greenhouse or in the controlled environmental chamber and can be considered within a similar range, indicating that the water deficit imposed was effective and of similar intensity in both experiments. As a probe of that the expression of the stress marker gene *ZmNCED1* was considerably up-regulated in both experiments due to the water deficit imposed, regardless of mycorrhizal inoculation (Figure 6).

Mycorrhization enhanced the cell water permeability of root cortex cells under water deficit conditions

Previous studies demonstrated an improved whole root hydraulic conductivity under water deficit in presence of a mycorrhizal fungus (Ruiz-Lozano & Aroca 2017), but, to our

knowledge, this is the first time that an enhancement of the root cell water permeability was measured both in intact cortex cells and protoplasts from AM plants. Droughted-AM maize plants maintained P_f levels observed in non-stressed plants, while these levels declined drastically in the absence of the AM fungus (Figures 1 and 2a). Interestingly, P_f values higher than $12 \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$ were found only in protoplasts extracted from AM plants (Figure 2b), revealing the higher water permeability of AM root cells, as compared to non-AM ones.

It is noteworthy that the duration of the protoplast isolation process (4 h) could affect the gene and protein expression or the regulation of aquaporin activity in the membranes, leading to low P_f values ($1\text{-}17 \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$) compared to the pressure probe P_f values ($10\text{-}100 \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$) inferred from L_{pc} data. These discrepancies were previously observed using the two techniques in different cell types (Volkov *et al.* 2007; Moshelion *et al.* 2009). Furthermore, the pressure probe assay integrates the elastic properties of the cell wall (ϵ), while this information is lacking on isolated protoplasts. The higher accuracy of the pressure probe technique for measuring hydraulic parameters *in planta* may explain the greater differences observed by this method among treatments, compared to the protoplast swelling assay. In any case, it is remarkable that the enhanced L_{pc} and P_f values in AM plants as compared to non-AM plants are observed just under water deficit conditions, when root water mobilization is crucial for plant performance. Besides, the P_f reduction observed in AM plants compared to non-AM under well-watered conditions using the pressure probe could be related to the inactivation of aquaporins during the transpiring conditions (Figure 1), when the apoplastic flow is predominant, as proved in mesophyll cells (Morillon & Chrispeels 2001). In consequence, mycorrhizal plants could have higher apoplastic water flow compared to non-inoculated plants under these conditions, as it has been already reported for maize roots colonized by the same mycorrhizal fungus (Bárzana *et al.* 2012).

The $T_{1/2}$ parameter is considered to be a direct measure of hydraulic conductivity ($T_{1/2} \sim 1/L_{pc}$) at constant ε (Wan *et al.* 2004). In our study, only non-AM plants under water deficit presented significantly higher half-times of water exchange (~5 s compared to ~3 s in the other treatments, Table 2). The higher differences observed in L_{pc} values can be due to the differences in $T_{1/2}$ and ε among treatments, as cell volume (data not shown) and P (Table 2) were unaltered. AM plants had similar ε values regardless of the water treatment. However, in non-AM plants, the water deficit treatment increased ε compared to well-watered plants, enhancing the cell resistance to be deformed and produce changes in cell volume upon pressure application (Zimmermann 1989), evidencing a dynamic control of the cell elastic properties during the water stress (Tomos & Leigh 1999) that is modified by root AM fungal colonization.

Are aquaporins responsible for the P_f and L_{pc} changes in AM roots?

Several aquaporin isoforms were analyzed in this study, in order to determine if protein or mRNA levels correlated with the observed changes in cell water permeability. The genes *ZmPIP2;2* and *ZmPIP2;6* presented significant differences among treatments (Figure 5a) and were down-regulated by mycorrhization either under well-watered conditions, as previously evidenced by Bárzana *et al.* (2014). However, in AM plants both *ZmPIP2;2* and *ZmPIP2;6* had enhanced mRNA levels under water deficit conditions as compared to well-watered conditions. *ZmPIP2;2* and *ZmPIP2;6* have a high water transport capacity when expressed in *Xenopus* oocytes (Bárzana *et al.* 2014; Moshelion *et al.* 2009) and are therefore strong candidates for the reported changes in P_f . Although *ZmPIP2;2* and *ZmPIP2;6* showed similar trends compared to P_f and L_{pc} results, differences due to fungal inoculation after water deficit treatment were not significant, thus being not possible to explain the increased cell permeability of AM plants only by their mRNA expression levels. However, other aquaporin

isoforms could be playing a prevalent role in the enhanced P_f of the AM plants during water deficit. In this line, AM fungal aquaporins need to be also considered, even if their contribution to the plant water transport is not well understood yet (Lehto & Zwiazek 2011). Among the three identified aquaporins in *R. irregularis*, only *GintAQPF2* showed a significant increased mRNA expression during water deficit (Figure 5b). This isoform has been described to feature high water transport capacity (Li *et al.*, 2013) and may have accounted for the enhanced L_{pc} values in AM root cells under water deficit. Using antisera raised against ZmPIP2;1/2;2, ZmPIP2;5, ZmPIP2;6 and ZmPIP1s we observed a decrease of protein levels (only significant for ZmPIP2;2 and ZmPIP2;6) in the membranes of AM plants compared to non-AM regardless of the water treatment (Figure 3). These results do not follow the same pattern described for mRNA expression levels or water permeability results. However, it is well known that changes in mRNA expression do not always translate into protein levels, as post-transcriptional and post-translational are common regulatory mechanisms (Baerenfaller *et al.* 2008). In fact, the mRNA level of a gene is not, necessarily strictly, related to the abundance and activity of a protein in a cell or tissue (Fox *et al.* 2017) and some previous studies did not found a correlation between aquaporin mRNA level and protein abundance (Aroca *et al.* 2005; Boursiac *et al.* 2005).

Gating of aquaporins through different mechanisms, one of them being the phosphorylation of some residues, could represent a fast way to respond to environmental stressful situations like water stress (Moshelion *et al.* 2009). We checked accumulation of phosphorylated PIP2s since aquaporin activity can be regulated by phosphorylation events and it has been previously shown that the phosphorylation of PIP2 aquaporins at Ser-280 and Ser-283 was linked to the regulation of hydraulic conductivity in plants (Prado *et al.* 2013). Interestingly, during water deficit stress, AM plants increased phosphorylation levels of PIP2 at Ser-280, Ser-283 and Ser-280/283 (Figure 4), suggesting a higher activity of PIP2

aquaporins and overcoming their lower abundance in the AM membranes. Apart from phosphorylation, several other posttranscriptional regulation mechanisms not studied here have been demonstrated to affect the channel abundance and activity of aquaporins, such as heteromerization, interactions with syntaxin SYP121, protonation, pressure gradient, methylation, glycosylation, ubiquitination and Ca^{2+} concentration (Chaumont *et al.* 2005; Santoni 2017). These regulation mechanisms, together with the trafficking of each aquaporin to its target membrane, have high influence on the aquaporin water transport capacity and must be considered as they are continuously used by plants to regulated membrane permeability and are very often responsible of discrepancies between aquaporin expression data and biophysical measurements of water permeability (Chaumont & Tyerman 2014). For instance, Grondin *et al.* (2016), working with six rice varieties showed that drought stress decreased the aquaporin expression, while the contribution of aquaporins to root hydraulic conductivity increased. Prado *et al.* (2013) worked with the four most highly expressed PIP isoforms in *Arabidopsis* (PIP1;2, PIP2;1, PIP2;6, and PIP2;7), either in wildtype (Col-O) plants or in knockouts lines silenced individually for these PIP isoforms. They observed that, regardless of the gene expression level, light regime did not have any effect on their protein abundance, while phosphorylation of PIP2;1 critically enhanced leaf hydraulic conductivity in response to light.

In any case, it must be also taken into account that L_{pc} and P_f values were measured on isolated cortical cells. Some of these cells may be colonized by the AM fungus and other not colonized. The lack of a clear correlation between L_{pc} and P_f values with aquaporin gene expression or protein accumulation patterns may be due to the fact that L_{pc} and P_f were measured on isolated cells, while gene and protein levels were measured on the whole root tissue. We do not know yet if the mycorrhizal effect on cell water transport is local or

systemic. But, if the effect of the AM symbiosis is not systemic it may be diluted in the whole root system and this must be elucidated in future studies.

In summary, under well-watered conditions we observed a downregulation of certain aquaporins in AM plants (*ZmPIP2;2* and *ZmPIP2;6*) as well as PIP2 phosphorylation levels, whereas when AM plants were submitted to water deficit *ZmPIP2;2*, *ZmPIP2;6* and the fungal *GintAQPF2* genes were induced and there was a general increase in phosphorylation levels, which may translate into a higher water channel activity in these plants.

Mycorrhizal plants showed a higher photosynthetic efficiency under water deprivation

Plants need a constant water flow, starting from the absorption of water from soil by roots and its distribution throughout the plant body and evaporation in the atmosphere, in order to carry out all their physiological activities, especially the photosynthesis (Afzal *et al.* 2016). Thus, under water deficit conditions, the higher or lower capacity for water mobilization in roots in order to maintain transpiration must have an important influence on the shoot photosynthetic capacity. In this study we aimed to elucidate if the altered root cell water permeability in AM plants translate into altered gas exchange capacity and photosynthetic efficiency. Therefore we measured gas exchange parameters and contrasted them as both fixed CO₂ concentration and performing An/Ci curves in order to determine if the alteration of photosynthesis was due to the greater water availability, larger stomatal conductance, or to the higher enzymatic capacity.

Net photosynthetic rate (An) depends on internal CO₂ concentration (Ci) in the leaf, which is linked to the water evaporation rate. Hence, the reduction of stomatal conductance caused by water deficit may reduce CO₂ fixation (Chaves *et al.* 2009). However, in this study AM fungal inoculation increased An under water deficit conditions. This effect could be related to improved N and P nutrition in AM plants, as has been widely described for this

symbiosis (Varma *et al.* 2008). However, AM plants also exhibited greater g_s values (Table 4), suggesting an AM-enhanced photosynthetic efficiency due to higher water availability for transpiration. Moreover, the calculated maximum carboxylation capacity of PEPc (V_{pmax}) and CO_2 -saturated photosynthetic rate (V_{max}) values (Figure 7) revealed the higher photosynthetic capacity of AM plants. At the end, this is reflected in the bigger size of mycorrhizal-droughted plants (Table 3) compared to non-inoculated ones. The enhanced activity of enzymes involved in CO_2 fixation due to mycorrhizal inoculation was previously described. Chen *et al.* (2017) found a higher activity of key Calvin cycle enzymes in mycorrhizal cucumber plants, and a higher Rubisco activity was also found in grapevine for droughted-AM plants (Valentine *et al.* 2006) or in rice for AM plants subjected to salinity (Porcel *et al.* 2015). In our case, enhanced photosynthesis was due to both, decreasing stomatal limitation due to higher water availability and via the improvement of photosynthetic enzymatic apparatus.

SLA is a crucial leaf characteristic determining photosynthetic and hydraulic behaviour in plants (Zhu *et al.* 2013). Mycorrhizal plants from both treatments presented lower SLA values (Table 3), meaning thicker leaves. Barros *et al.* (2018) had similar results with mycorrhizal plants after few days of water stress. This can be interpreted as an hydraulic strategy to surpass the stress, as the decreased leaf area per leaf matter would be more efficient controlling water loss under water deficit conditions (Erice *et al.* 2010). Moreover, the lower SLA may be related to higher leaf protein concentration and linked to the enhancement of the photosynthetic capacity.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study give a better understanding of the role of mycorrhizal symbiosis on root water conductivity, demonstrating that under water deprivation AM

inoculated plants enhance root cells water permeability by increasing L_{pc} and P_f values, in order to overcome water deficit. Under these conditions, the AM symbiosis differentially regulates plant aquaporins, increasing the phosphorylation status of PIP2s during water deficit, which may mean a higher activity of their water channels. The better performance of root cells in water transport is connected to the physiological status of the shoot. AM plants displayed higher photosynthetic capacity thanks to an increased PEPc activity and CO₂-saturated photosynthetic rate. Altogether, we demonstrated the systemic benefits of the AM symbiosis for the tolerance of maize crop during water deficit episodes.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT:

Authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was financed by Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad (Projects AGL2014-53126-R and AGL2017-88341-R) (JMRL and RAA) and by grants from the Belgian National Fund for Scientific Research (FNRS) and the Belgian French community (Project ARC16/21-075) (FC). GQ is a FPI grant holder. LD was supported by a Move-in Louvain Incoming Postdoctoral Fellowship. We thank DuPont Pioneer Corporation for providing us the maize seeds.

REFERENCES

- Afzal Z., Howton T., Sun Y. & Mukhtar M. (2016) The roles of aquaporins in plant stress responses. *Journal of Developmental Biology* **4**, 9.
- Allen M.F. (2009) Bidirectional water flows through the soil-fungal-plant mycorrhizal continuum. *New Phytologist* **182**, 290-293.

685 Andersen C.L., Jensen J.L. & Ørntoft T.F. (2004) Normalization of real-time quantitative
 686 reverse transcription-PCR data: A model-based variance estimation approach to identify
 687 genes suited for normalization, applied to bladder and colon cancer data sets. *Cancer*
 688 *Research* **64**, 5245-5250.

689 Aroca R., Amodeo G., Fernández-Illescas S., Herman E.M., Chaumont F. & Chrispeels M.J.
 690 (2005) The role of aquaporins and membrane damage in chilling and hydrogen peroxide
 691 induced changes in the hydraulic conductance of maize roots. *Plant Physiology* **137**,
 692 341-353.

693 Aroca R., Bago A., Sutka M., Paz J.A., Cano C., Amodeo G. & Ruiz-Lozano J.M. (2009)
 694 Expression analysis of the first arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi aquaporin described reveals
 695 concerted gene expression between salt-stressed and nonstressed mycelium. *Molecular*
 696 *Plant-Microbe Interactions* **22**, 1169-1178.

697 Aroca R., Porcel R. & Ruiz-lozano J.M. (2007) How does arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis
 698 regulate root hydraulic properties and plasma membrane aquaporins in. *New Phytologist*
 699 **173**, 808-816.

700 Aroca R., Vernieri P. & Ruiz-Lozano J.M. (2008) Mycorrhizal and non-mycorrhizal *Lactuca*
 701 *sativa* plants exhibit contrasting responses to exogenous ABA during drought stress and
 702 recovery. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **59**, 2029-2041.

703 Augé R.M. (2001) Water relations , drought and vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis.
 704 *Mycorrhiza* **11**, 3-42.

705 Augé R.M. (2004) Arbuscular mycorrhizae and soil/plant water relations. *Canadian Journal*
 706 *of Soil Science* **84**, 373-381.

707 Augé R.M., Sylvia D.M., Park S.J., Bittery B.R., Saxton A.M., Moore J.L. & Cho K. (2004)
 708 Partitioning mycorrhizal influence on water relations of *Phaseolus vulgaris* into soil and

709 plant components. *Canadian Journal of Botany* **82**, 503-514.

710 Augé R.M., Toler H.D. & Saxton A.M. (2015) Arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis alters
 711 stomatal conductance of host plants more under drought than under amply watered
 712 conditions: a meta-analysis. *Mycorrhiza* **25**, 13-24.

713 Baerenfaller K., Grossmann J., Grobei M. A., Hull R., Hirsch-Hoffmann M., Yalovsky S., ...
 714 Baginsky S. (2008) Genome-scale proteomics reveals *Arabidopsis thaliana* gene models
 715 and proteome dynamics. *Science* **320**, 938-941.

716 Barros V., Frosi G., Santos M., Ramos D.G., Falcão H.M. & Santos M.G. (2018) Arbuscular
 717 mycorrhizal fungi improve photosynthetic energy use efficiency and decrease foliar
 718 construction cost under recurrent water deficit in woody evergreen species. *Plant*
 719 *Physiology and Biochemistry* **127**, 469-477.

720 Bárzana G., Aroca R., Bienert G.P., Chaumont F. & Ruiz-Lozano J.M. (2014) New insights
 721 into the regulation of aquaporins by the arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis in maize plants
 722 under drought stress and possible implications for plant performance. *Molecular Plant-*
 723 *Microbe Interactions* **27**, 349-363.

724 Bárzana G., Aroca R., Paz J.A., Chaumont F., Martinez-Ballesta M.C., Carvajal M. & Ruiz-
 725 Lozano J.M. (2012) Arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis increases relative apoplastic water
 726 flow in roots of the host plant under both well-watered and drought stress conditions.
 727 *Annals of Botany* **109**, 1009-1017.

728 Bárzana G., Aroca R. & Ruiz-Lozano J.M. (2015) Localized and non-localized effects of
 729 arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis on accumulation of osmolytes and aquaporins and on
 730 antioxidant systems in maize plants subjected to total or partial root drying. *Plant, Cell*
 731 *and Environment* **38**, 1613–1627.

732 Bedini S., Pellegrino E., Avio L., Pellegrini S., Bazzoffi P., Argese E. & Giovannetti M (2009)

733 Changes in soil aggregation and glomalin related soil protein content as affected by the
 734 arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal species *Glomus mosseae* and *Glomus intraradices*. Soil
 735 Biology and Biochemistry **41**, 1491-1496.

736 Blee K.A. & Anderson A.J. (1998) Regulation of arbuscle formation by carbon in the plant.
 737 *Plant Journal* **16**, 523-530.

738 Boursiac Y., Chen S., Luu D.-T.D., Sorieul M., Dries N. Van Den & Maurel C. (2005) Early
 739 effects of salinity on water transport in arabidopsis roots. Molecular and cellular features
 740 of aquaporin expression. *Plant Physiology* **139**, 790-805.

741 Byrt C.S., Zhao M., Kourghi M., Bose J., Henderson S.W., Qiu J., ... Tyerman S. (2017) Non-
 742 selective cation channel activity of aquaporin AtPIP2;1 regulated by Ca²⁺ and pH. *Plant*,
 743 *Cell & Environment* **40**, 802-815.

744 Caemmerer S.V. (2000) *Biochemical models of leaf photosynthesis*. Victoria, Australia:
 745 CSIRO Publishing.

746 Calvo-Polanco M., Molina S., Zamarreño A.M., García-Mina J.M. & Aroca R. (2014) The
 747 symbiosis with the arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus *Rhizophagus irregularis* drives root
 748 water transport in flooded tomato plants. *Plant & Cell Physiology* **55**, 1017-1029.

749 Capelle V., Remoué C., Moreau L., Reyss A., Mahé A., Massonneau A., Falque M.,
 750 Charcosset A., Thévenot C., Rogowsky P., Coursol S. & Prioul J.L. (2010) QTLs and
 751 candidate genes for desiccation and abscisic acid content in maize kernels. *BMC Plant*
 752 *Biology* **10**, 2.

753 Chaumont F., Barrieu F., Wojcik E., Chrispeels M.J. & Jung R. (2001) Aquaporins constitute
 754 a large and highly divergent protein family in maize. *Plant Physiology* **125**, 1206-1215.

755 Chaumont F., Moshelion M. & Daniels M.J. (2005) Regulation of plant aquaporin activity.
 756 *Biology of the Cell* **97**, 749-764.

757 Chaumont F. & Tyerman S.D. (2014) Aquaporins: Highly regulated channels controlling plant
758 water relations. *Plant Physiology* **164**, 1600-1618.

759 Chaves M.M., Flexas J. & Pinheiro C. (2009) Photosynthesis under drought and salt stress:
760 Regulation mechanisms from whole plant to cell. *Annals of Botany* **103**, 551-560.

761 Chen S., Zhao H., Zou C., Li Y., Chen Y., Wang Z., ... Ahammed G.J. (2017) Combined
762 inoculation with multiple arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi improves growth, nutrient uptake
763 and photosynthesis in cucumber seedlings. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **8**, 1-11.

764 Chitarra W., Pagliarani C., Maserti B., Lumini E., Siciliano I., Cascone P., ... Guerrieri E.
765 (2016) Insights on the impact of arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis on tomato tolerance to
766 water stress. *Plant Physiology* **171**, 1009-1023.

767 Daryanto S., Wang L. & Jacinthe P.A. (2016) Global synthesis of drought effects on maize
768 and wheat production. *PLoS ONE* **11**, 1-15.

769 Erice G., Louahlia S., Irigoyen J.J., Sanchez-Diaz M. & Avise J.-C. (2010) Biomass
770 partitioning, morphology and water status of four alfalfa genotypes submitted to
771 progressive drought and subsequent recovery. *Journal of Plant Physiology* **167**, 114-
772 120.

773 Forrest K.L. & Bhavé M. (2007) Major intrinsic proteins (MIPs) in plants: a complex gene
774 family with impact on plant phenotype. *Functional and Integrative Genomics* **7**, 263-289.

775 Fox A.R., Maistriaux L.C. & Chaumont F. (2017) Toward understanding of the high number of
776 plant aquaporin isoforms and multiple regulation mechanisms. *Plant Science* **264**, 179-
777 187.

778 Galmés J., Hipólito M. & Flexas J. (2007) Photosynthetic limitations in response to water
779 stress and recovery in Mediterranean plants with different growth forms. *New Phytologist*
780 **175**, 81-93.

781 Giovannetti M. & Mosse B. (1980) An evaluation of techniques for measuring vesicular
 782 arbuscular mycorrhizal infection in roots. *New Phytologist* **84**, 489-500.

783 Grondin A., Mauleon R., Vadez V. & Henry A. (2016) Root aquaporins contribute to whole
 784 plant water fluxes under drought stress in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Plant, Cell and*
 785 *Environment* **39**, 347-365.

786 Hachez C., Moshelion M., Zelazny E., Cavez D. & Chaumont F. (2006) Localization and
 787 quantification of plasma membrane aquaporin expression in maize primary root: A clue
 788 to understanding their role as cellular plumbers. *Plant Molecular Biology* **62**, 305-323.

789 Hachez C., Veselov D., Ye Q., Reinhardt H., Knipfer T., Fricke W. & Chaumont F. (2012)
 790 Short-term control of maize cell and root water permeability through plasma membrane
 791 aquaporin isoforms. *Plant, Cell and Environment* **35**, 185-198.

792 Hallet P.D., Feeney D.S., Bengough A.G., Rillig M.C., Scrimgeour C.M. & Young I.M. (2009)
 793 Disentangling the impact of AM fungi versus roots on soil structure and water transport.
 794 *Plant and Soil* **314**, 183-196.

795 Husken D., Steudle E. & Zimmermann U. (1978) Pressure probe technique for measuring
 796 water relations of cells in higher plants. *Plant Physiology* **61**, 158-163.

797 Knipfer T. & Fricke W. (2010) Root pressure and a solute reflection coefficient close to unity
 798 exclude a purely apoplastic pathway of radial water transport in barley (*Hordeum*
 799 *vulgare*). *New Phytologist* **187**, 159-170.

800 Knipfer T. & Fricke W. (2011) Water uptake by seminal and adventitious roots in relation to
 801 whole-plant water flow in barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.). *Journal of Experimental Botany*
 802 **62**, 717-733.

803 Lee S.H., Calvo-Polanco M., Chung G.C. & Zwiazek J.J. (2010) Role of aquaporins in root
 804 water transport of ectomycorrhizal jack pine (*Pinus banksiana*) seedlings exposed to

805 NaCl and fluoride pce. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **33**, 769-780.

806 Lehto T. & Zwiazek J.J. (2011) Ectomycorrhizas and water relations of trees: A review.
807 *Mycorrhiza* **21**, 71-90.

808 Lesk C., Rowhani P. & Ramankutty N. (2016) Influence of extreme weather disasters on
809 global crop production. *Nature* **529**, 84-87.

810 Li G., Santoni V. & Maurel C. (2014) Plant aquaporins: Roles in plant physiology. *Biochimica
811 et Biophysica Acta* **1840**, 1574-1582.

812 Li T., Hu Y.-J., Hao Z., Li H., Wang Y., Chen B. & Chen B. (2013) First cloning and
813 characterization of two functional aquaporin genes from an arbuscular mycorrhizal
814 fungus *Glomus intraradices*. *New Phytologist* **197**, 617-630.

815 Livak K.J. & Schmittgen T.D. (2001) Analysis of relative gene expression data using real-time
816 quantitative PCR and the $2^{-\Delta\Delta CT}$ method. *Methods* **25**, 402-408.

817 Lobell D.B., Burke M.B., Tebaldi C., Mastrandrea M.D., Falcon W.P. & Naylor R.L. (2008)
818 Prioritizing climate change adaptation needs for food security in 2030. *Science* **319**, 607-
819 610.

820 Marjanović Ž., Uehlein N., Kaldenhoff R., Zwiazek J.J., Wieß M., Hammp R. & Nehls U.
821 (2005) Aquaporins in poplar: what a difference a symbiont makes! *Planta* **222**, 258-268.

822 Marulanda A., Azcón R. & Ruiz-Lozano J.M. (2003) Contribution of six arbuscular
823 mycorrhizal fungal isolates to water uptake by *Lactuca sativa* L. plants under drought
824 stress. *Physiologia Plantarum* **119**, 526-533.

825 Maurel C. & Plassard C. (2011) Aquaporins: for more than water at the plant – fungus
826 interface? *New Phytologist* **190**, 815-817.

827 Maurel C., Boursiac Y., Luu D.-T., Santoni V., Shahzad Z. & Verdoucq L. (2015) Aquaporins
828 in Plants. *Physiological Reviews* **95**, 1321-1358.

829 Maurel C., Verdoucq L., Luu D.-T. & Santoni V. (2008) Plant aquaporins: membrane
830 channels with multiple integrated functions. *Annual Review of Plant Biology* **59**, 595-624.

831 Morillon R. & Chrispeels M.J. (2001) The role of ABA and the transpiration stream in the
832 regulation of the osmotic water permeability of leaf cells. *Proceedings of the National*
833 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **98**, 14138-14143.

834 Moshelion M., Hachez C., Ye Q., Cavez D., Bajji M., Jung R. & Chaumont F. (2009)
835 Membrane water permeability and aquaporin expression increase during growth of
836 maize suspension cultured cells. *Plant, Cell and Environment* **32**, 1334–1345.

837 Moshelion M., Moran N. & Chaumont F. (2004) Dynamic changes in the osmotic water
838 permeability of protoplast plasma membrane. *Plant Physiology* **135**, 2301-2317.

839 Phillips J.M. & Hayman D.S. (1970) Improved procedures for clearing roots and staining
840 parasitic and vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi for rapid assessment of infection.
841 *Transactions of the British Mycological Society* **55**, 158-161.

842 Porcel R., Redondo-Gómez S., Mateos-Naranjo E., Aroca R., Garcia R. & Ruiz-Lozano J.M.
843 (2015) Arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis ameliorates the optimum quantum yield of
844 photosystem II and reduces non-photochemical quenching in rice plants subjected to salt
845 stress. *Journal of Plant Physiology* **185**, 75-83.

846 Prado, K., Boursiac, Y., Tournaire-Roux, C., Monneuse, J.M., Postaire, O., Da Ines, O.,
847 Schäffner, A.R., Hem, S., Santoni, V. & Maurel, C. (2013) Regulation of Arabidopsis leaf
848 hydraulics involves light-dependent phosphorylation of aquaporins in veins. *Plant Cell*
849 **25**, 1029-1039.

850 Quiroga G., Erice G., Aroca R., Chaumont F. & Ruiz-Lozano J.M. (2017) Enhanced drought
851 stress tolerance by the arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis in a drought-sensitive maize
852 cultivar is related to a broader and differential regulation of host plant aquaporins than in

853 a drought-tolerant cultivar. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **8**, 1056.

854 Quiroga G., Erice G., Aroca R., Zamarreño Á.M., García-Mina J.M. & Ruiz-Lozano J.M.
855 (2018) Arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis and salicylic acid regulate aquaporins and root
856 hydraulic properties in maize plants subjected to drought. *Agricultural Water*
857 *Management* **202**, 271-284.

858 Ruiz-Lozano, J. M., Aroca, R. (2017) Plant aquaporins and mycorrhizae: Their regulation and
859 involvement in plant physiology and performance. In *Plant Aquaporins. From Transport*
860 *to Signaling*. Signaling and Communication in Plants Series. (eds F. Chaumont & S.D.
861 Tyerman), pp 333-353. Springer International Publishing, Cham, Switzerland.

862 Ruiz-Lozano J.M, Alguacil M.M., Bárzana G., Vernieri P. & Aroca R. (2009) Exogenous ABA
863 accentuates the differences in root hydraulic properties between mycorrhizal and non
864 mycorrhizal maize plants through regulation of PIP aquaporins. *Plant Molecular Biology*
865 **70**, 565-579.

866 Ruiz-Lozano J.M., Porcel R., Azcón R., Bárzana G. & Aroca R. (2012) Contribution of
867 arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis to plant drought tolerance: state of the art. In *Plant*
868 *Responses to Drought Stress: From Morphological to Molecular Features* (ed R. Aroca)
869 pp 335-362. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, Germany.

870 Ruth B., Khalvati M. & Schmidhalter U. (2011) Quantification of mycorrhizal water uptake via
871 high-resolution on-line water content sensors. *Plant and Soil* **342**, 459-468.

872 Sack L. & Holbrook N.M. (2006) Leaf Hydraulics. *Annual Review of Plant Biology* **57**, 361-
873 381.

874 Sánchez-Blanco M.J., Ferrández T., Morales M.A., Morte A. & Alarcón J.J. (2004) Variations
875 in water status, gas exchange, and growth in *Rosmarinus officinalis* plants infected with
876 *Glomus deserticola* under drought conditions. *Journal of Plant Physiology* **161**, 675-682.

877 Sánchez-Romera B., Ruiz-Lozano J.M., Zamarreño Á.M., García-Mina J.M. & Aroca R.
 878 (2016) Arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis and methyl jasmonate avoid the inhibition of
 879 root hydraulic conductivity caused by drought. *Mycorrhiza* **26**, 111-122.

880 Santoni V. (2017). Plant aquaporin posttranslational regulation. In *Plant Aquaporins. From*
 881 *Transport to Signaling*. Signaling and Communication in Plants Series. (eds F.
 882 Chaumont & S.D. Tyerman), pp 333-353. Springer International Publishing, Cham,
 883 Switzerland.

884 Shatil-Cohen A., Sibony H., Draye X., Chaumont F., Moran N. & Moshelion M. (2014)
 885 Measuring the osmotic water permeability coefficient (P_f) of spherical cells: isolated plant
 886 protoplasts as an example. *Journal of Visualized Experiments* **8**, e51652.

887 Steudle E. (2000) Water uptake by roots: effects of water deficit. *Journal of Experimental*
 888 *Botany* **51**, 1531-1542.

889 Steudle E., Oren R. & Schulze E-D. (1987) Water transport in maize roots. *Plant Physiology*
 890 **84**, 1220-1232.

891 Steudle E. & Peterson C.A. (1998) How does water get through roots? *Journal of*
 892 *Experimental Botany* **49**, 775-788.

893 Tomos A.D. & Leigh R.A. (1999) The pressure probe: A versatile tool in plant cell physiology.
 894 *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology* **50**, 447-472.

895 Trenberth K.E., Dai A., van der Schrier G., Jones P.D., Barichivich J., Briffa K.R. & Sheffield
 896 J. (2014) Global warming and changes in drought. *Nature Climate Change* **4**, 17-22.

897 Uehlein N., Fileschi K., Eckert M., Bienert G.P., Bertl A. & Kaldenhoff R. (2007) Arbuscular
 898 mycorrhizal symbiosis and plant aquaporin expression. *Phytochemistry* **68**, 122-129.

899 Valentine A.J., Mortimer P.E., Lintnaar M. & Borgo R. (2006) Drought responses of
 900 arbuscular mycorrhizal grapevines. *Symbiosis* **41**, 127-133.

- 901 Varma A. (2008) Mycorrhiza. State of the art, genetics and molecular biology, eco-funcion,
 902 biotecnology, eco-physiology, structure and systematics. Third Edition. Springer-Verlag,
 903 Berlin, Heidelberg.
- 904 Volkov V., Hachez C., Moshelion M., Draye X., Chaumont F. & Fricke W. (2007) Water
 905 permeability differs between growing and non-growing barley leaf tissues. *Journal of*
 906 *Experimental Botany* **58**, 377-390.
- 907 Wan X., Steudle E. & Hartung W. (2004) Gating of water channels (aquaporins) in cortical
 908 cells of young corn roots by mechanical stimuli (pressure pulses): Effects of ABA and of
 909 HgCl₂. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **55**, 411-422.
- 910 Xu H., Kemppainen M., El Kayal W., Lee S.H., Pardo A.G., Cooke J.E.K. & Zwiazek J.J.
 911 (2015) Overexpression of *Laccaria bicolor* aquaporin JQ585595 alters root water
 912 transport properties in ectomycorrhizal white spruce (*Picea glauca*) seedlings. *New*
 913 *Phytologist* **205**, 757-770.
- 914 Yendrek C.R., Erice G., Montes C.M., Tomaz T., Sorgini C.A., Brown P.J., ... Ainsworth E.A.
 915 (2017) Elevated ozone reduces photosynthetic carbon gain by accelerating leaf
 916 senescence of inbred and hybrid maize in a genotype-specific manner. *Plant Cell and*
 917 *Environment* **40**, 3088-3100.
- 918 Zarrouk O., Garcia-Tejero I., Pinto C., Genebra T., Sabir F., Prista C., ... Chave M.M. (2016)
 919 Aquaporins isoforms in cv. Touriga Nacional grapevine under water stress and recovery.
 920 Regulation of expression in leaves and roots. *Agricultural Water Management* **164**, 167-
 921 175.
- 922 Zhu S.D., Song J.J., Li R.H. & Ye Q. (2013) Plant hydraulics and photosynthesis of 34 woody
 923 species from different successional stages of subtropical forests. *Plant, Cell and*
 924 *Environment* **36**, 879-891.

925 Zimmermann, U. (1989) Water relations of plant cells: Pressure probe technique. *Methods in*
926 *Enzymology* 174, 338-366.

927 Zwiazek J.J., Xu H., Tan X., Navarro-Ródenas A., Morte A. (2017) Significance of oxygen
928 transport through aquaporins. *Scientific Reports* **7**, 40411.

929

930

Table 1. Percentage of mycorrhizal root length, plant fresh weight and stomatal conductance (gs) in maize plants inoculated or not with the AM fungus *Rhizophagus irregularis* and submitted to two water regimes (well-watered, WW or water deficit, WD).

Experiment 1			
	Mycorrhization (%)	Plant FW (g plant ⁻¹)	gs (mmol H ₂ O m ⁻² s ⁻¹)
WW non-AM	n.d.	59.5 ± 4.4 a	73.1 ± 8.4 b
WW AM	57.3 ± 5.4 a	57.6 ± 2.1 a	99.3 ± 5.4 a
WD non-AM	n.d.	35.1 ± 2.3 b	45.6 ± 4.9 c
WD AM	51.7 ± 6.6 a	34.0 ± 1.0 b	50.4 ± 3.4 c
Mycorrhiza (M)		ns	ns
Water Regime (W)		***	***
M x W		ns	ns

Data represent the means of three values ± SE for mycorrhization, twelve values ± SE for plant FW and six values ± SE for gs. Data were analyzed by two-way ANOVA with mycorrhiza (M), water regime (W) and their interaction (M x W) as sources of variation. Significance of sources of variation were evaluated by P-value; ns, not significant; *P<0.05, **P<0.01; ***P<0.001. Different letter indicates significant differences between treatments (p < 0.05) based on t-test for mycorrhization and on Duncan's test for the other parameters. n.d. non detected.

Table 2. Water relation parameters of intact root cortex cells of maize plants inoculated or not with the AM fungus *Rhizophagus irregularis* and submitted to two water regimes (well-watered, WW or water deficit, WD).

Experiment 1			
	Cell turgor pressure	Cell wall elastic modulus	Half-time of water exchange
	P (Mpa)	ϵ (Mpa)	$T_{1/2}$ (s)
WW non-AM	0.29 ± 0.03 a	2.44 ± 0.5 c	3.03 ± 0.5 b
WW AM	0.36 ± 0.02 a	5.26 ± 0.6 b	3.34 ± 0.2 b
DS non-AM	0.33 ± 0.04 a	8.16 ± 1.8 a	5.44 ± 0.7 a
DS AM	0.29 ± 0.03 a	4.86 ± 0.9 bc	3.17 ± 0.3 b
Mycorrhiza (M)	ns	ns	ns
Water Regime (W)	ns	**	*
M x W	ns	***	**

Data represent the means of ten to fifteen values $\pm$ SE (three different plants). Data were analyzed by two-way ANOVA with mycorrhiza (M), water regime (W) and their interaction (M x W) as sources of variation. Significance of sources of variation were evaluated by P-value; ns, not significant; *P<0.05, **P<0.01; ***P<0.001. Different letter indicates significant differences between treatments (p < 0.05) based on Duncan's test.

Table 3. Percentage of mycorrhizal root length, plant fresh weight (FW), shoot area, specific leaf area (SLA) and in maize plants inoculated or not with the AM fungus *Rhizophagus irregularis* and submitted to two water regimes (well-watered, WW or water deficit, WD).

Experiment 2				
	Mycorrhization (%)	Plant FW (g plant ⁻¹)	Shoot area (cm ²)	SLA (cm ² g ⁻¹)
WW non-AM	n.d.	33.2 ± 2.0 a	302.8 ± 7.9 b	408.8 ± 5.4 a
WW AM	58.0 ± 4.5	34.1 ± 1.2 a	343.5 ± 16.7 a	330.3 ± 6.1 b
WD non-AM	n.d.	20.1 ± 0.9 c	157.7 ± 8.9 d	401.5 ± 14.0 a
WD AM	52.3 ± 3.3	24.0 ± 0.8 b	227.1 ± 14.9 c	316.5 ± 10.4 b
Mycorrhiza (M)		ns	*	**
Water Regime (W)		***	***	ns
M x W		ns	ns	ns

Data represent the means of three values ± SE for mycorrhization, twelve values ± SE for SFW, six values ± SE for EL and five values ± SE for shoot area and SLA. Data were analyzed by two-way ANOVA with mycorrhiza (M), water regime (W) and their interaction (M x W) as sources of variation. Significance of sources of variation were evaluated by P-value; ns, not significant; *P<0.05, **P<0.01; ***P<0.001. Different letter indicates significant differences between treatments (p < 0.05) based on t-test for mycorrhization and on Duncan's test for the other parameters. n.d. non detected.

Table 4. Net photosynthesis (An), stomatal conductance (gs), intercellular CO₂ concentration (Ci) and photosystem II efficiency in the light-adapted state ($\Delta F_v/F_m'$) of maize plants inoculated or not with the AM fungus *Rhizophagus irregularis* and submitted to two water regimes (well-watered, WW or water deficit, WD).

Experiment 2				
	An ($\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)	gs ($\text{mmol H}_2\text{O m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)	Ci $\mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}$	$\Delta F_v/F_m'$
WW non-AM	15.9 $\pm$ 0.7 a	123.5 $\pm$ 10.2 a	153.2 $\pm$ 8.4 a	0.43 $\pm$ 0.03 bc
WW AM	15.5 $\pm$ 0.8 a	121.7 $\pm$ 7.7 a	157.4 $\pm$ 6.2 a	0.50 $\pm$ 0.03 ab
WD non-AM	6.5 $\pm$ 0.8 c	37.8 $\pm$ 3.5 c	105.4 $\pm$ 18.4 b	0.40 $\pm$ 0.04 c
WD AM	11.4 $\pm$ 1.3 b	72.1 $\pm$ 12.5 b	107.4 $\pm$ 16.9 b	0.56 $\pm$ 0.02 a
Mycorrhiza (M)	ns	ns	***	***
Water Regime (W)	**	***	***	ns
M x W	ns	ns	***	ns

Data represent the means of five values $\pm$ SE. Data were analyzed by two-way ANOVA with mycorrhiza (M), water regime (W) and their interaction (M x W) as sources of variation. Significance of sources of variation were evaluated by P-value; ns, not significant; *P<0.05, **P<0.01; ***P<0.001. Different letter indicates significant differences between treatments (p < 0.05) based on Duncan's test for the other parameters.

Figure 1. Experiment 1. Cell hydraulic conductivity (L_{pc}) and inferred P_f values of intact root cell of plants inoculated or not with the AM fungus *Rhizophagus irregularis* and submitted to two water regimes (well-watered, WW or water deficit, WD), determined with the cell pressure probe. Data were analyzed by two-way ANOVA with mycorrhiza (M), water regime (W) and their interaction (M x W) as sources of variation. Significance of sources of variation were evaluated by P-value; ns, not significant; * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$. Values (mean $\pm$ SE for >15 cells) are given. Different letter indicates significant differences between treatments ($p < 0.05$) based on Duncan's test.

Figure 2. Experiment 1. **(a)** Osmotic water permeability coefficient (Pf) of isolated protoplasts from roots of plants inoculated or not with the AM fungus *Rhizophagus irregularis* and submitted to two water regimes (well-watered, WW or water deficit, WD). Data show the mean $\pm$ SE for 30 cells (at least three different plants). Data were analyzed by two-way ANOVA with mycorrhiza (M), water regime (W) and their interaction (M x W) as sources of variation. Significance of sources of variation were evaluated by P-value; ns, not significant; *P<0.05, **P<0.01; ***P<0.001. Different letter indicates significant differences between treatments (p<0.05) based on Duncan's test. **(b)** Percentage of protoplast of plants from the different treatments classified per range of Pf.

Figure 3. Experiment 1. **(a)** Accumulation of ZmPIP proteins in the microsomal fraction of roots from plants inoculated or not with the AM fungus *Rhizophagus irregularis* and submitted to two water regimes (well-watered, WW or water deficit, WD). The position of the molecular mass markers is indicated. **(b)** Quantification of signals on membranes (relative units, normalized to Coomassie blue gel signal). Data were analyzed by two-way ANOVA with mycorrhiza (M), water regime (W) and their interaction (M x W) as sources of variation. Significance of sources of variation were evaluated by P-value; ns, not significant; *P<0.05, **P<0.01; ***P<0.001. Data show the mean $\pm$ SE for three biological replicates. Different letter indicates significant differences between treatments (p<0.05) based on Duncan's test.

1017
 1018
 1019
 1020
 1021
 1022
 1023
 1024
 1025
 1026
 1027
 1028
 1029
 M **
 W ns
 M x W *

M **
 W ns
 M x W **

Figure 4. Experiment 1. PIP2A (Ph-Ser280), PIP2B (Ph-Ser283) and PIP2C (Ph-Ser280/Ser283) relative protein abundance in the microsomal fraction of roots from plants inoculated (black bars) or not (white bars) with the AM fungus *Rhizophagus irregularis* and submitted to two water regimes (well-watered, WW or water deficit, WD). Data were analyzed by two-way ANOVA with mycorrhiza (M), water regime (W) and their interaction (M x W) as sources of variation. Significance of sources of variation were evaluated by P-value; ns, not significant; *P<0.05, **P<0.01; ***P<0.001. Data were obtained by ELISA and show the mean $\pm$ SE for three biological replicates. Different letter indicates significant differences between treatments (p<0.05) based on Duncan's test.

Figure 5. Experiment 1. **(a)** Relative mRNA levels of *ZmPIP2;2* and *ZmPIP2;6* normalized to *Zmtubulin* and *ZmGAPDH* genes. Plants were inoculated or not with the AM fungus *Rhizophagus irregularis* and submitted to two water regimes (well-watered, WW or water deficit, WD). Data were analyzed by two-way ANOVA with mycorrhiza (M), water regime (W) and their interaction (M x W) as sources of variation. Significance of sources of variation were evaluated by P-value; ns, not significant; *P<0.05, **P<0.01; ***P<0.001. Data indicates the mean $\pm$ SE for three biological replicates. Different letter indicates significant differences between treatments (p<0.05) based on Duncan's test. **(b)** Relative mRNA levels of *GintAQP1*, *GintAQP1* and *GintAQP2* normalized to fungal EF 1 α gene. Data indicates the mean $\pm$ SE for three biological replicates. Different letter indicates significant differences between treatments (p<0.05) based on t-test.

Figure 6. Relative mRNA levels of *ZmNCED1* gene normalized to *Zmtubulin* and *ZmGAPDH* genes. Plants were inoculated or not with the AM fungus *Rhizophagus irregularis* and submitted to two water regimes (well-watered, WW or water deficit, WD). Data were analyzed by two-way ANOVA with mycorrhiza (M), water regime (W) and their interaction (M x W) as sources of variation. Significance of sources of variation were evaluated by P-value; ns, not significant; *P<0.05, **P<0.01; ***P<0.001. Data indicates the mean $\pm$ SE for three biological replicates. Different letter indicates significant differences between treatments (p<0.05) based on Duncan's test.

Figure 7. Experiment 2. **(a)** An/Ci curves, **(b)** Maximum carboxylation capacity of PEPC (Vpmax) and **(c)** CO₂-saturated photosynthetic rate (Vmax) of maize plants inoculated or not with the AM fungus *Rhizophagus irregularis* and submitted to two water regimes (well-watered, WW or water deficit, WD). Data were analyzed by two-way ANOVA with mycorrhiza (M), water regime (W) and their interaction (M x W) as sources of variation. Significance of sources of variation were evaluated by P-value; ns, not significant; *P<0.05, **P<0.01; ***P<0.001. Data show the mean $\pm$ SE for five biological replicates. Different letter indicates significant differences between treatments (p<0.05) based on Duncan's test.