Understanding olive adaptation to abiotic stresses as a tool to increase crop performance

José-Enrique Fernández

Irrigation and Crop Ecophysiology Group

Instituto de Recursos Naturales y Agrobiología de Sevilla (IRNAS, CSIC)

Avenida de Reina Mercedes n.º 10, 41012 Seville, Spain

Author details:

Phone: +34 954 62 47 11 (ext. 175) fax: +34 954 62 40 02

E-mail address: jefer@irnase.csic.es

Review article

Keywords:

Crop management

Hydraulic functionality

Irrigation

Photosynthesis

Somata

Transpiration

Water uptake

Water productivity

This manuscript includes:

List of contents

List of most used symbols and abbreviations

Text

9 Figures

2 Tables

Reviewed version, submitted to Environmental and Experimental Botany

December 1, 2013.

36	Contents
37	
38	Abstract
39	1. Introduction
40	2. The olive biennial cycle
41	2.1. Shoot growth
42	2.2. Flowering
43	2.3. Fruit development
44	3. Morphological adaptations to abiotic stresses
45	3.1. The root system
46	3.2. The stem
47	3.3. The leaf
48	4. Physiological adaptations to abiotic stresses
49	4.1. Water uptake from drying soils
50	4.1.1. Osmotic adjustment and elastic module
51	4.1.2. Hydraulic redistribution
52	4.2. Vulnerability to embolism
53	4.3. Stomatal control of gas exchange
54	4.3.1. Response of the stomata to soil water and atmospheric demand
55	4.3.2. Stomatal conductance, plant water status and transpiration
56	4.3.3. Root-to-shoot signalling
57	4.3.4. Leaf hydraulics
58	4.4. Leaf photosynthesis
59	4.4.1. Diffusional limitations of photosynthesis
60	4.4.2. Non-diffusional limitations of photosynthesis
61	4.4.3. WUE and water productivity
62	4.5. Response to re-watering
63	5. Improving crop performance and management
64	5.1. Modelling
65	5.2. Development and production as influenced by orchard conditions
66	5.2.1. Water
67	5.2.2. Nutrients
68	5.2.3. Salinity
69	5.3. Water management

70	5.3.1. Deficit irrigation strategies
71	5.3.2. New methods for scheduling irrigation
72	
73	5.4. Facing global change
74	

75 **Most used symbols and abbreviations**

76

77	A	net CO ₂ assimilation rate
78	ABA	abscisic acid
79	C_a	ambient CO ₂ concentration
80	C_c	CO ₂ concentration in the chloroplast
81	C_i	CO ₂ concentration in the intercellular air spaces within the leaf
82	C_s	CO ₂ concentration next to the stomata
83	D_a	vapour pressure deficit of the air
84	D_{l-a}	leaf-to-air vapour pressure deficit
85	DI	deficit irrigation, deficit irrigated
86	d.w.	dry weight
87	E_p	plant transpiration
88	E_s	soil evaporation
89	EC	electrical conductivity
90	ET _c	crop evapotranspiration
91	ET ₀	potential evapotranspiration
92	FI	full irrigation, fully irrigated
93	f.w.	fresh weight
94	g_b	boundary layer conductance
95	g_c	cuticular conductance
96	G_c	canopy conductance
97	g_m	mesophyll conductance
98	g_s	stomatal conductance
99	g_{s-max}	maximum stomatal conductance
100	GMT	Greenwich mean time
101	GSI	growing season index
102	HR	hydraulic redistribution
103	HS	period of high sensitivity to water stress
104	I_p	photosynthetic photon flux density
105	IA	irrigation amount
106	IN	irrigation needs
107	J_{max}	maximum rate of electron transport at saturating irradiance
108	K_c	crop coefficient

109	k_l	leaf-specific conductivity
110	L_v	root length density
111	LA	leaf area
112	LFDI	low-frequency deficit irrigation
113	N_a	nitrogen content per unit leaf area
114	P	atmospheric pressure
115	P_e	air entry pressure
116	P_{eff}	effective precipitation
117	P_{50}	xylem pressure at which 50% loss of hydraulic conductivity occurs
118	PAR	photosynthetically active radiation
119	PLC	percentage loss of conductivity
120	P-M	Penman-Monteith
121	$p-v$	pressure-volume
122	R_p	plant hydraulic resistance
123	r_s	soil surface resistance
124	RDI	regulated deficit irrigation
125	RuBP	ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate
126	RUE	radiation use efficiency
127	RWC	relative water content
128	RWC_{tlp}	relative water content at turgor loss point
129	S_D	stomatal density
130	SAR	sodium adsorption ratio
131	SDI	sustained deficit irrigation
132	SHD	super-high-density
133	SLW	specific leaf weight
134	T_a	air temperature
135	t_{cw}	cell wall thickness
136	T_l	leaf temperature
137	T_s	soil temperature
138	TPU	triose phosphate utilization
139	UV-B	ultraviolet-B
140	V_{c-max}	maximum carboxylation efficiency
141	VC	vulnerability curve
142	WAB	weeks after bloom

143	WP	water productivity
144	WUE	water use efficiency
145	WUE _i	intrinsic water use efficiency
146	$\Delta\Psi$	gradient between soil and leaf water potential
147	ε	elastic modulus, modulus of elasticity
148	Ψ_l	leaf water potential
149	Ψ_p	leaf turgor potential
150	Ψ_{pd}	predawn leaf water potential
151	Ψ_s	soil water potential
152	Ψ_{stem}	midday stem water potential
153	Ψ_{tlp}	leaf water potential at turgor loss, or bulk turgor loss point
154	Ψ_x	xylem water potential
155	Ψ_π	leaf osmotic potential

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

ABSTRACT

In this work we give an overview of both morphological characteristics and physiological mechanisms responsible for the high adaptability of olive to harsh environments, and how this knowledge is currently used to design new sustainable and efficient crop management practices. We first describe the biennial vegetative and reproductive cycle of olive, and how these are affected by environmental conditions. Then we address main morphological, functional and physiological traits of olive that may contribute to stress tolerance. We also summarize innovative crop management practices that have been developed from our understanding of the mechanisms of response to abiotic stresses.

Keywords: crop management, hydraulic functionality, irrigation, photosynthesis, stomata, transpiration, water uptake, water productivity

1. Introduction

Olive has become a major crop in wide arid and semi-arid areas due to both its capacity to grow and produce acceptable yields under harsh environmental conditions and the demand for olive products, especially olive oil, which is considered by an increasing number of consumers as a key ingredient for a healthy diet. In addition, olive has shown a marked response to improved crop management practices. Both circumstances explain the substantial increase, since the 1980's, in the number of research groups focussed on understanding the biology of this species and its response to the environment, as well as in using the acquired knowledge to improve crop management practices and to design new cropping systems for more sustainable olive orchards. As a consequence, a substantial amount of information on olive biology and olive growing has been published in the last decades. Main findings have been summarized in comprehensive reviews on biology and physiology (Lavee, 1996; Connor and Fereres, 2005), response to environmental stimuli (Bongi and Palliotti, 1994; Sanzani et al., 2012), water use and irrigation (Fernández and Moreno, 1999; Gucci et al., 2012a; Carr, 2013). Other reviews focus on particular aspects, such as biology (Lavee, 1985, 1986; Fabbri and Benelli, 2000), drought stress (Xiloyannis et al., 1996), salinity stress (Gucci and Tattini, 1997; Ben-Gal, 2011), atmospheric pollutants and ultraviolet-B (UV-B) radiation (Sebastiani et al., 2002). The aim of this analysis is to highlight both the characteristics and the mechanisms responsible for the high

adaptation of olive to harsh Mediterranean environments, and how this knowledge is currently used to improve sustainable crop management practices.

2. The olive biennial cycle

Commercial olive belongs to *Olea europaea* L., subspecies *sativa*. The growth and reproductive cycle is biennial because flower induction occurs at summer, at the time of endocarp sclerification (Fernández-Escobar et al. 1992), but flower initiation and differentiation occurs during the next spring (Rallo and Cuevas, 2010). Following a period of winter dormancy, flower initiation occurs soon after bud burst, about two months before flowering (Fig. 1). Some buds are initiated and some of those differentiate to produce inflorescences. The crop load of the current year affects flower induction, by compounds released from developing fruits that are translocated back to the buds. The inhibition of floral induction by fruit and seed growth contributes to alternate bearing, a typical feature of olive. Years of intense fruiting ('on' years) tend to be followed by years of restricted flowering and reduced crop load ('off' years), causing the pattern of biennial flowering and yield. During the 'on' year, the developing fruits limit vegetative growth of the current year and flowering of the following year (Cuevas et al., 1994; Lavee, 1996). Results reported by Dag et al. (2010) suggest that flowering-site limitation, due to insufficient or immature vegetative growth during the 'on' years is the primary factor inducing alternate bearing in olive. Details on the phenological stages of olive are given in Sanz-Cortés et al. (2002).

2.1. Shoot growth

In winter, during dormancy, air temperature (T_a) values of -7 -8 °C can cause damage to olive, although resistance to temperatures as low as -18 °C have been reported (Sanzani et al., 2012). The threshold temperature below which frost damage occurs mostly depends on cultivar, plant age, sanitary and nutritional status. In the spring, during active shoot growth, olive is very sensitive to frost injury, and can suffer damage even at temperatures just below freezing, especially in tissues with high water content, such as the apexes of young leaves. It has been reported that organ sensitivity to low temperatures is in the order drupes > roots > new leaves > older leaves > twigs > buds (Fiorino and Mancuso, 2000; Graniti et al., 2011).

After a period of winter dormancy, and when T_a is above 12 °C, shoot growth starts. In the northern hemisphere this occurs in early spring. Shoot growth rate and leaf size are cultivar-dependent and vary considerably according to plant age and vigour, and environmental conditions. A seasonal sequential change is apparent in current-year shoot (Lavee, 1996). In mid-summer, when $T_a > 30$ °C, vegetative growth decreases and new leaves are progressively smaller. In autumn, following the reduction in T_a , a second period of rapid growth may occur, when soil water is newly available. Shoot growth is affected by crop load, since shoots and fruits compete for assimilates. In ‘off’ years, shoot growth rate is usually more constant than in ‘on’ years (Rallo and Cuevas, 2010). Shoot growth rate also depends on whether the bud from which the shoot originates is lateral or apical), and on the parent shoot age (Castillo-Llanque and Rapoport, 2011).

FIGURE 1 about here

2.2. Flowering

Olive blooms in spring, the exact date being related to the average daily T_a experienced approximately two months before (Rallo and Cuevas, 2010). Flowers are born on panicle inflorescences of up to ~40 flowers each, which develop from buds in the leaf axis of the previous-season shoot (Lavee, 1996; De la Rosa et al., 2000). Consequently, flower number is determined by both auxiliary buds which differentiate into inflorescences and flower number per inflorescence. Subsequent changes from axillary bud to blooming inflorescence requires 2 to 3 months of growth and development, including elongation and branching of inflorescence axis, and formation and development of individual flowers (Rapoport et al., 2012). Olive inflorescences bear a mixture of hermaphrodite (perfect) and functionally staminate (imperfect) flowers due to pistil abortion (Reale et al., 2009). Imperfect flowers do not produce fruit. The proportion of imperfect flowers is cultivar-dependent (Rallo and Fernández-Escobar, 1985; Rosati et al., 2011) and it is affected by water availability and nutritional status (Uriu, 1960). Perfect flowers contain four ovules, two in each of two locules and are short-living. Pollen is produced in abundance over 5 days and individual stigmas remain receptive for 2 days. Flowering in individual trees lasts 10 days and in orchards for 20 days. The transformation of an olive ovary into a fruit requires, apart from fertilization, the development of a seed from at least one of the four ovules present in the ovary. Fruit set at 2 to 3 weeks after

flowering may account for 10 to 15% of total flowers, but it decreases, to 7 to 10% in the following 4 to 5 weeks, i.e. 6 to 7 weeks after bloom (WAB). In years of heavy flowering, a fruit set of 1 to 2% can be adequate for a good commercial yield, 50% of flowers can be removed without affecting final fruit number (Lavee, 1996). Some ovaries develop parthenocarpically, i.e. without fertilization. The resulting fruits, named shotberries, are smaller and commercially unimportant because most abort quickly and few persist until harvest (Rapoport, 2010). Pollination is hindered by strong winds and rain, and may also suffer from high T_a or hot winds that desiccate pollen and stigmas (Connor and Fereres, 2005; Koubouris et al., 2009). Flowering is also affected by endogenous conditions. Ulger et al. (2004) reported that high levels of gibberellic acid GA_3 had an inhibitory effect on floral formation during the induction and initiation periods, and that high concentrations of gibberellic acid GA_4 , abscisic acid (ABA) and cytokinins may have a positive effect on flower formation during the induction and initiation periods.

The effect of water deficit at different times from winter dormancy until flowering, and also at the time of flowering and initial fruit set, was studied in 3-year-old 'Picual' olive by Rapoport et al. (2012). Water deficit during winter dormancy had no effect on inflorescence and flower formation. During the period of inflorescence formation, water deficit caused significant reductions in flowering parameters. Water deficit during the floral development period caused lesser reductions in flowering parameters but hampered the pollination and fertilization processes. Water deficit during flowering and initial fruit set reduced pollination by hindering flower opening. Some compensation in fruit size occurred when the deficit treatments resulted in lower fruit number, but it was insufficient for maintaining full fruit production. Typical olive adaptive responses and detrimental effects of water deficit during the pre-flowering and flowering periods were described by Pierantozzi et al. (2013). Both flowering and fruit set are strongly affected by T_a (Sanzani et al., 2012), so that olive flowering date is a reliable indicator of climatic warming (Osborne et al., 2000; Bonofiglio et al., 2009). The effect of T_a on flowering, however, is not clear. Temperatures between 2-4 °C and 15.5-19 °C were reported by Denney and McEachern (1983) as providing an optimum balance between the chilling signal (vernalization) that releases induced buds for further development and the warm conditions that supports the associated growth, as higher temperatures reverse the chilling effect (devernalization). Chilling requirement is not absolute because olive flowers and produces fruits in various subtropical locations where vernalization conditions (as defined above), do not occur (Connor and Fereres, 2005; Searles et al., 2011). Yields are usually low in areas

with T_a above olive requirements. Ayerza and Sibbet (2001) evaluated the suitability of new sites for olive production in Argentina, where the maximum number of vernalizing days is 110, while in Spain or Italy 150 vernalizing days per year are common. They concluded that in Argentina and in other olive expanding areas, greater damage was produced due to high T_a at flowering more than by low T_a . A common practice in that region is indeed to suspend irrigation during the winter months, because water stress promotes flowering once irrigation resumes in spring.

2.3. Fruit development

Olive is a drupe consisting of fleshy pericarp (pulp) and woody endocarp (stone) that encloses a single seed. The pericarp has an outer epicarp composed of a layer of small cells rich in chloroplasts, and an inner mesocarp composed of parenchymatous cells rich in oil, the size of which increases radially from outside to inside (Sánchez, 1994). Olive oil is present in both mesocarp and seed. Part of the oil present in the mesocarp is imported from other plant organs, whereas the rest is formed *in situ*, due to fruit CO₂ assimilation. Oil in the seed is imported, and used for nourishing the embryo during the initial stages of germination. The oil in the mesocarp is for attracting animals, which then contributes to seed dissemination (Sánchez 1994). Mesocarp volume is important for oil production, since this tissue is where up to 98% of the oil accumulates. The oil content of olives can reach over 30% fresh weight (f.w.) at the end of ripening period.

Most of the endocarp and mesocarp cells are produced between 4 and 10 WAB period (Rallo and Rapoport, 2001; Rapoport, 2010). From that time until fruit maturity, considerable cell expansion occurs, and an additional 10% to 40% of mesocarp cells may still be produced, depending on cultivar. During the first half of the developmental period the fruits increase their weight at more or less linear rates, so that at ~ 25 WAB they reach final size (Fig. 1). Ninety per cent of the endocarp growth occurs by 8 WAB (Rapoport et al., 2004), and then cells become highly lignified in contrast to the basically parenchymatic oil-storing cells of the mesocarp. Water deficit at the period of 4 to 10 WAB might highly affect both cell number and cell size (Rapoport et al., 2004; Gucci et al., 2009). Hammami et al. (2011) reported that excessive water stress in the first 8 WAB may lead to reduce cell number in olive fruits. Thus the final fruit f.w. and volume can be reduced if water supplies are not enough at that period of high sensitivity of the olive fruit to water stress (Fig. 1). The effect of water availability on endocarp development was further investigated by

Hammami et al. (2013). Maximum mesocarp-to-endocarp ratio is an important feature for olive fruit quality for both table consumption and oil production. Irrigation increases the mesocarp-to-endocarp ratio when compared with rain-fed trees (d'Andria et al., 2004; Gómez-Rico et al., 2007; Lavee et al., 2007), but this ratio is not affected much at mild water stress (Gucci et al., 2009; Lavee et al., 2007).

Oil accumulation begins from ca. 8 WAB. Oil accumulation in the seed is relatively fast and is completed in about 10 weeks. In the pulp the oil content increases more slowly and takes some 20 weeks or more to reach a plateau (Lavee and Wodner, 1991). The oil accumulation pattern changes considerably under stressing conditions. The mesocarp is more responsive to water deficit than the endocarp. Gucci et al. (2009) reported that both the fruit f.w. and dry weight (d.w.) responded to water status, but f.w. was more sensitive, for both endocarp and mesocarp. Both fruit size and oil content in the mesocarp were affected by crop load. High crop loads decreased fruit f.w. at harvest in fully irrigated (FI) and deficit irrigated (DI) trees, but not in severely stressed olive trees (Gucci et al., 2007). This may explain why irrigation affects fruit size differently in 'on' and 'off' years (Moriani et al., 2003; Lavee and Wonder, 2004). The ripening process, characterized by a change in the colour of the fruit, starts ca. 30 WAB, when the rate of oil accumulation is reaching a plateau (Fig 1).

The importance of sunlight irradiance for olive production is long known. Ortega-Nieto (1962) reported greater oil content in illuminated than in shaded fruits. Recently, Gómez-del-Campo and García (2012) reported that fruits from the illuminated canopy areas produced stable oil, rich in phenols saturated fatty acids. Knowledge on the accumulation of photosynthates and their redistribution within the plant are crucial for developing good pruning practices in olive orchards (Gucci and Cantini, 2000), as well as for designing new olive growing systems such as hedgerow olive orchards with high plant densities, also called super-high-density (SHD) orchards (Rius and Lacarte, 2010).

Early frosts in autumn, before harvesting, can dehydrate the drupes and cause skin shrivelling (-0.4 °C), permanent fruit damage, fruit drop (-1.7 °C), and fruit freezing (-3 °C) (Sanzani et al., 2012). Damaged fruit parts are frequently colonized by pathogens, which penalizes oil quality. However, slight frost damage can increase oil extractability, because fruit water content decreases. Water stress during fruit development affects ripening date, thus favouring early harvesting and minimizing risk of frost damage. Contrasting results of the effect of water stress on ripening date, however, have been reported. Motilva et al. (2000), Berenguer et al. (2006) and Gucci et al. (2007) showed that ripening was delayed

by irrigation, whereas irrigation caused earlier ripening in other circumstances (Morales-Sillero et al., 2013; García et al., 2013).

3. Morphological adaptations to abiotic stresses

The high capacity of olive to grow under harsh conditions is due to morphological characteristics as well as to physiological mechanisms, related with escape, avoidance and tolerance components of stress resistance. In this section, we address the morphological adaptations olive has developed to survive and yield under ‘limiting’ conditions. Main physiological mechanisms related to stress resistance are detailed in the next section.

3.1. The root system

The olive root system is adapted to scarce and intermittent rainfall events typical of Mediterranean areas. A large root portion, in fact, grows, more or less, parallel to soil surface, thus exploring top soil layers (Fernández et al., 1991; Searles et al., 2009). In aerated soils of light texture, however, olive roots may reach depths of 6-7 m (Lavee, 1996). Olive roots are sensitive to hypoxia, although olive root system can adapt to heavy, unaerated soils by developing a shallow and wide root system (Lavee, 1996). In dual soils, characterized by sandy top layer and clayey bottom layer of high resistance to penetration, roots may only explore top layer, and penetrate deeper layers due to soil cracks and favourable aeration when soil dries (Diaz-Espejo et al., 2012). For olive trees with localized irrigation, the greatest root length densities (L_v) of fine ($\varnothing < 0.5$ mm), active roots, are found in wetted soil volumes close to the drippers, with a favourable balance between air and water for root growing (Fernández et al., 1991; Searles et al., 2009). For rain-fed trees, the greatest L_v and root activity values are usually found at less than 0.5-0.6 m from the trunk and between 0.15-1.0 m in depth (Abd-El-Rahman et al., 1966; Fernández et al., 1991). The high concentration of active roots in superficial soil volumes close to the trunk increases the efficiency of the olive tree in absorbing rainfall water that runs down the stem (Gómez et al., 2001).

The capacity of olive to take up water and nutrients not only depends on root distribution, but also on root growth dynamics and activity. Sap flow methods are currently used to quantify both absolute values and the dynamics of water uptake by single roots (Moreno et al., 1996; Fernández et al., 2001; Nadezhdina et al., 2007) (Section 4.1.2).

Fernández et al. (1992) evaluated the effect of irrigation on olive root growth and activity. They showed that irrigation may shorten the period for orchard establishment, and deeply influences relations between the above-grown and the below-ground tissues. The growth dynamics of olive roots also depends on sink-source competition, which establishes between aerial and subterranean organs throughout the year (Celano et al., 1998). Water supply, tree age, plant density and soil characteristics greatly affect the root/canopy ratio. Rain-fed olive trees usually show greater root/canopy ratios than irrigated trees, since they have to explore larger soil volumes to collect similar water and nutrient amounts (Celano et al., 1999; Fernández et al., 1991, 1992). The capacity of the olive tree to explore big soil volumes can be markedly curtailed both by the soil and tree characteristics conditions and the orchard design and management (Fernández et al. 2008a; Diaz-Espejo et al., 2012).

An example of root ‘plasticity’ in olive to adapt to soil conditions is given in Rewald et al. (2011a). They evaluated salt tolerance of ‘Barnea’, ‘Arbequina’ and ‘Proline’, and reported that fine roots of ‘Barnea’ trees irrigated with saline water (electrical conductivity, $EC = 7.5 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$) increased specific conductivity due to the development of high conduit diameter and root biomass. Additional results on sap flow and carbon allocation (Rewald et al. 2011b) show that under moderate salinity, the tolerant ‘Barnea’ was to sustain higher fine root biomass and root sap flow density than ‘Proline’ trees. Soil temperature (T_s) also influences root functioning. In most olive growing areas, low T_s at winter may induce tree water deficit even at optimal water supply. In an experiment with FI ‘Picual’ potted saplings exposed to $T_s < 10 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$, both the leaf water potential (Ψ_l) and the stem water potential (Ψ_{stem}) decreased, and root hydraulic resistance increased. At $T_s < 6.4 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$, stomatal conductance (g_s) also decreased. The authors speculated with these effects being due to temperature-driven changes in ABA, membrane permeability, enzymatic activity and water viscosity (Pavel and Fereres, 1998).

3.2. The stem

The bark and wood of olive stem may differ greatly depending on environmental conditions. Under dry conditions stem develops a thick cork layer covering the living bark tissues, thus protecting against sunburning. In mature, rain-fed ‘Manzanilla’ trees bark thickness 6-8 mm was detected, of which the outer 3-4 mm consisted of death tissues. Below the bark there is the phloem, the cambium, and the xylem. The sapwood, i.e. the outer part of the xylem through which water flows from roots to leaves, shows high

azimuthal variability, ranging from 12 mm to 53 mm in the same tree (Fernández et al., 2006a, Giorio and Giorio, 2003; Nadezhdina et al., 2007). Radial sap flow profiles within the same tree have also been reported to change greatly depending on water stress. When the stress increases, greater flows are recorded deeper into the xylem (Fernández et al., 2001). The authors hypothesized that both stomatal control in young leaves and embolism within the outer xylem vessels were responsible for the loss of flow in the xylem vessels of the outer annuli. Nadezhdina et al. (2007) also reported great radial changes on sap flow rate in olive trunks, and hypothesized that they reflect a vertical distribution of water uptake that varies with water availability at different soil layers.

3.3. The leaf

The olive leaf is hypostomatous, i.e. stomata occur on abaxial leaf surface. This is typical of plants growing in dry and hot areas (Hetherington and Woodward, 2003). Leaf is also homobaric, i.e. displays a uniform stomatal distribution (Marchi et al., 2008). In the adaxial surface the epidermis is covered by a waxy cuticle. Palisade parenchyma usually consists of two- three highly-packed layers of elongated cells, which are interspaced by tricosclereids (Fig. 2). Spongy mesophyll anatomy greatly depends on leaf water status (Ehrenberger et al., 2012). Leaves suffering from water deficit display palisade-like cells just below the abaxial epidermis (bifacial-like leaves) (Chartzoulakis et al., 1999; Bacelar et al., 2004).

In the lower, abaxial surface of the leaf there are the stomata hidden by numerous trichomes, thus limiting water loss. Well-developed trichome layer may also increase water-use efficiency through the increase in leaf boundary-layer resistance (Pallioti et al., 1994). Hairy abaxial surface limits sunlight absorption: absorption of incident photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) in ‘Manzanilla’ leaves is 97% or 63% for adaxial and abaxial surface, respectively (Diaz-Espejo, 2000). Olive leaves display paraheliotropism, i.e. leaf movements aimed reduce light interception and then photoinhibition (Schwabe and Lionakis, 1996; Natali et al., 1999; Werner et al., 2002). The small size of olive leaves also contributes to high adaptation to atmospheric demand, e.g., vapour pressure deficit of the air (D_a) being the main driving variable for plant transpiration (E_p) (Tognetti et al., 2009; Diaz-Espejo et al., 2012) This explains the effective stomatal control on E_p usually detected in olive (Section 4.3). Leaf dehydration is also limited by a negligible cuticular conductance (g_c). Our measurements of g_c in leaves of

‘Arbequina’ showed that g_c ranged from 1 to 3 $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$, whereas g_s was 300 $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$. This confirmed negligible g_c values due to waterproof capacity of olive leaf cuticle (Fernández and Moreno, 1999; Connor and Fereres, 2005).

In olive leaves may be up to 3-year-old. Aging modifies leaf characteristics and response to environmental stimuli. Leaf thickness, total chlorophyll concentration, and photosynthetic capacity increases during leaf development (Marchi et al., 2008). Olive leaves become fully expanded usually in 3-4 weeks. A great proportion of stomata are not fully developed prior the leaf reaches 50% of final size (Lavee, 1996; Marchi et al., 2008). Bongi et al. (1987) reported an increase in A over first two months of leaf life, a plateau from 2 to 11-13 months, and decreases of ~50% when the leaf was 2-year-old. Marchi et al. (2005) observed that net daily A was negative in young expanding leaves, and leaves became source leaves when the size was approximately at 30% of the size at full development.

Environmental conditions during development also have marked influence on olive leaf features. Leaves developed under drought usually have more but smaller stomata than leaves under well-watered conditions (Larcher, 1995). They also have higher specific leaf weight (SLW), as a consequence of increased density and thickness (Centritto, 2002). The greater leaf tissue density may contribute to drought tolerance, because of greater resistance to physical damage driven by desiccation (Mediavilla et al., 2001). Similar results have been reported by Boughllef and Hajlaoui (2011).

FIGURE 2 about here

4. Physiological adaptations to abiotic stresses

Main functional and physiological mechanisms of adaptation to environmental constraints of Mediterranean climate in olive have been summarised in Figure 3, which includes equations to estimate E_p . Equation 1 quantifies E_p at daily central hours, when the transpiration rate is relatively constant, i.e. from 09:00 to 15:00 Greenwich mean time (GMT) for olive growing in typical Mediterranean areas. In this equation, Ψ_s is the ‘effective’ soil water potential at the root surface and Ψ_l is the ‘effective’ leaf water potential for the whole canopy (Jones, 1983). The equation shows that a minimum $\Psi_s - \Psi_l$ gradient ($\Delta \Psi$) must be achieved for water to flow from roots to leaves, thus allowing

plant transpiration. During soil drying $\Delta\Psi$ may reach a threshold value for inducing embolism (Tyree and Sperry 1989). We prefer refer as to threshold value for the loss of hydraulic conductance, since the increase in the plant hydraulic resistance (R_p) is not merely due to increased number of embolized xylem vessels. The effect of water stress on other features involved in plant hydraulic functionality, such as aquaporins, is also significant (Secchi et al., 2007). Estimating Ψ_s is difficult. When water is homogeneously distributed in the soil Ψ_s is assumed similar to pre-dawn water potential measured in basal leaves (Ψ_{pd}). This assumption, however, is not true when water is not heterogeneously distributed in the rhizosphere, e.g., in olive under localized irrigation: Ψ_{pd} values are usually biased towards the wettest part of the root zone (Jones, 1983). Ψ_l is determined by integrating leaf water potentials of sunlit and shaded leaves, following estimate of both types of leaves in the canopy (Moreschet et al., 1990; Diaz-Espejo et al., 2002).

Equation 2 shown in Fig. 3 links E_p with canopy conductance (G_c), leaf-to-air vapour pressure deficit (D_{l-a}) and atmospheric pressure (P). It can be used to estimate leaf transpiration, just replacing G_c with g_s . Both conductances strongly depends on stomatal control, an effective mechanism to withstand drought operating in olive as well as in other plants inhabiting arid and semi-arid areas. Under water stress, plants minimize the loss of hydraulic conductivity by closing stomata. This helps the xylem water potential (Ψ_x) to remain above the safety threshold for loss of hydraulic conductance. Equations 1 and 2 illustrate that g_s , Ψ_x and R_p are mutually influenced and relate with E_p . The link between these variables, together with their feedback loops and feed-forward regulations is still matter of debate (Buckley 2005). Nonetheless, here we summarize main mechanisms that relate with these variables and that confer to olive a high capability to keep Ψ_x above safe limits. Comprehensive analyses of the effect of above mentioned mechanisms operating in olive have been given in Tognetti et al. (2009) and Diaz-Espejo et al. (2012).

FIGURE 3 about here

4.1. Water uptake from drying soils

The pressure-volume (p - v) curve relates Ψ_l vs. water volume in drying leaves. From the analysis of p - v curves we can derive six key leaf parameters related with stress tolerance (Barlett et al., 2012). One relevant parameter is leaf water potential at turgor loss,

or at bulk turgor loss point (Ψ_{tlp} , MPa), classically used to assess drought tolerance. Plants with low Ψ_{tlp} tend to maintain g_s , hydraulic conductance, photosynthetic gas exchange and growth as the soil dries. Ψ_{tlp} defines the permanent wilting point. For many species the permanent wilting point occurs at $\sim \Psi_s = -1.5$ MPa (Veihmeyer and Hendrickson, 1928). In olive, however, this value ranges from ~ -2.5 MPa (Xiloyannis et al., 1996; Dichio et al., 2003) to ~ -3.5 MPa (Lo Gullo and Salleo, 1988; Dichio et al., 2005). However, olive may transpire and photosynthesize at Ψ_{tlp} of -5.3 MPa (Perez-Martin et al., 2009) and even of -8.0 MPa (Moriana et al., 2003). This conforms to well-known capacity of olive to take up water from drying soils (Fernández and Moreno, 1999; Connor and Fereres, 2005, see below for details).

4.1.1. Osmotic adjustment and elastic module

The leaf water potential depends on the turgor (Ψ_p) and osmotic potentials (Ψ_π), being $\Psi_l = \Psi_p - \Psi_\pi$. Time course of Ψ_π under increasing water stress shows that olive is capable of large osmotic adjustment, leading to high values of $\Delta \Psi$ (Eq. 1, Fig. 3). Osmotic adjustment must not be confused with the passive (i.e. driven by tissue dehydration) increase in solute concentrations under increasing water stress or salinization. Active osmotic adjustment occurs via net accumulation of solutes to decrease Ψ_π (Section 4.5). In an experiment with 2-year-old ‘Coratina’ trees, Dichio et al. (2005) reported, for severely stressed trees ($\Psi_{\text{pd}} = -5.35$ MPa), that osmotic adjustment ranged from 2.4 MPa at 05.00 h to 3.8 MPa at 18.00 h. Previously, Dichio et al. (2003) had reported that leaf osmotic potentials at full turgor and at turgor loss decreased from -2.06 ± 0.01 MPa and -3.07 ± 0.16 MPa in controls to -2.81 ± 0.03 MPa and -3.85 ± 0.12 MPa in the most stressed plants. Dell’Amico et al. (2012) evaluated the effect of increased water stress at mid-summer (between HS2 and HS3 periods described in Fig. 1) in 43-year-old ‘Manzanilla’. They explored changes in water relations of fruit and leaves, including Ψ_π , and suggested that a valued of $\Psi_{\text{stem}} \approx -1.8$ MPa could be considered as a reference for DI in olive.

At cellular level, turgor pressure is given as the difference between pressures inside and outside of cell wall. When cell wall is rigid, water potential and its components change rapidly following loss of water. The wall rigidity is described by the elastic modulus or modulus of elasticity (ϵ) of the cell. Wall rigidity measured in tissues is termed bulk modulus of elasticity of the cell (Jones 1983). In olive ϵ tends to increase with drought.

Bongi and Palliotti (1994) reported that elasticity in olive leaf tissues decreased with leaf ageing, in turn affecting ε . These authors reported that in olive leaves at 87.5% of maximal cell volume, ε was 8.4 MPa in young leaves and 22.5 MPa in mature leaves. Dichio et al (2003) reported ε to increase from 11.6 ± 0.95 MPa in fully irrigated to 18.6 ± 0.61 MPa in stressed plants. It is assumed ε contributes to maintain Ψ_p in water-stressed plants. The role of ε in drought tolerance has been recently examined in Barlett et al. (2012). Authors compared five hypotheses to clarify the relationship between high ε , Ψ_{tlp} and drought tolerance, to conclude that high ε allows cells to maintain high relative water content at loss point (RWC_{tlp}), at very negative osmotic potential at full turgor. This confers to plants tolerance to low Ψ_s and prevents cell dehydration and shrinkage. Therefore, during water stress, osmotic adjustment-induced reduction in Ψ_{tlp} must be paralleled with changes in to maintain high RWC_{tlp} . The work of Diaz-Espejo et al. (2012, 2013) illustrate the importance of considering Ψ_π and ε for establishing water stress related behaviours in olive, as well as for simulating transpiration.

4.1.2. Hydraulic redistribution

The movement of water through plant roots from moist to dry soil layers, or hydraulic redistribution (HR) (Burgess et al., 1998) is crucial for the survival of species in arid environments. Hydraulic lift is the nocturnal uptake of water by roots from deep, wetter soil layers and the release of this water from shallow roots into drier, upper layers of soil. Lateral flows and downwards flows in the root system may also occur, depending on the soil water distribution at the root zone. These types of reverse flow are termed HR (Fernández and Clothier, 2002). The process is believed to be passive, driven by soil and root water potential gradients (Prieto et al., 2012). External features in and around roots, however, influence HR. Thus, resistance to water flow through roots depends partly on aquaporins (McElrone et al., 2007) and architectural- morphological root traits, as well as root history. For example, HR occurs in species with dimorphic root systems, as occurs in fruit tree species including olive, whereas monomorphic species do not usually exhibit HR (Grigg et al., 2010). HR contributes in maintaining root hydraulic conductivity in drying soils and in repairing embolized xylem vessels (Domec et al., 2006). HR allows root survival and root growth in dry soil layers, which are usually superficial layers rich in nutrients, microorganisms and organic matter as compared with deeper, wetter layers (Domec et al., 2010).

HR was recently found to operate in olive Nadezhdina et al. (2012) and Ferreira et al. (2013). Nocturnal reverse flow in shallow roots of the rain-fed tree started at the beginning of June, as soon as the top soil layer explored by the root dried up, and increased, both in magnitude and duration, along the summer. High night flows were recorded in the deep root. The authors concluded that olive trees under dry-farming conditions use deep water sources for transpiration as well as to water superficial roots in the dry top soil layers. Ferreira et al. (2013) explored the role of lignotubers in the same rain-fed ‘Cobrançosa’ orchard and its connections with root dynamics. They reported marked changes on the relative contribution of deep and shallow roots, including hydraulic lift in shallow roots before the arrival of the rainy season.

FIGURE 4 about here

4.2. Vulnerability to embolism

During drought, leaf transpiration often exceeds the water transport capacity of the xylem. Then Ψ_x drops and the risk for cavitation within the xylem conduits increases. Cavitation or air-seeding in plants is caused by the aspiration of air into the transpiration stream through the pit membrane. The wall of olive xylem vessels has numerous pits from which water and air can flow between adjacent vessels (Fig. 5). Within each pit there is a porous membrane. When a vessel is embolized, air is prevented from moving into the neighbour vessel by the capillary force of the air-water meniscus in the pores of the pit membrane. Air will be aspirated into the adjacent, functional vessel when the pressure difference across the meniscus exceeds the force caused by the sap tension in the vessel (Sperry and Tyree, 1988). If the tension in the sap increases further, the air bubble expands and the conduit is simultaneously drained of water. Ultimately, a mixture of air and vapour fills the entire conduit to create embolism, which blocks water transport in the conduit. Because embolism reduces the number of functional conduits, R_p increases. Under drought conditions, therefore, higher tensions predispose the xylem to further cavitation events that can potentially lead to embolism and plant death (Tyree and Sperry, 1988; Pittermann, 2010). However, not all cavitation events cause embolism, which explains the use of cavitation resistance and vulnerability to cavitation being currently replaced with embolism resistance and vulnerability to embolism.

Vulnerability curves (VCs) are typically used to evaluate the vulnerability to embolism. These curves express the percentage loss of conductivity (PLC) due to

embolism in response to increasingly negative Ψ_x . Vulnerability curves can be generated from samples taken from any conductive organ of the plant, such as roots, stems and leaves. The VCs show the xylem pressure at which samples exhibits 50% loss of hydraulic conductivity. This is referred to as the P_{50} or cavitation pressure. The P_{50} value is used to compare embolism resistance between plant organs or species. Another parameter of interest that can be derived from VCs is the air entry pressure (P_e), which indicates the threshold xylem pressure at which loss of conductivity begins to increase rapidly (Meinzer et al., 2009). Torres-Ruiz et al. (2013a) worked with 41-year-old ‘Manzanilla’ olive trees under contrasting water treatments. Figure 6 shows the calculated VCs for rain-fed trees and for trees under localized irrigation, with daily supplies to replace 100% of the crop evapotranspiration (ET_c). The VCs yielded a P_e value of ca. -1.3 MPa. Water treatments did not influence the vulnerability to embolism, which agree with anatomical observations showing no significant effects of water status on either vessel-diameter distribution or vessel density. Other authors, however, have shown that olive under different water regimes display differences in xylem structure and function (Bacelar et al., 2007a; Lopez-Bernal et al., 2010; Rossi et al., 2013).

Woody plants growing in Mediterranean-type ecosystems usually show a high resistance to drought-induced embolism (Maherali et al., 2004). Olive displays low hydraulic conductivity and is able to withstand water potentials below $\Psi_{t\text{tp}}$ with minor seasonal xylem embolism (Salleo and Lo Gullo, 1983; Torres-Ruiz et al., 2013a). A trade-off may exist between xylem vulnerability to embolism and xylem hydraulic conductance (or wood construction cost, Martinez-Vilalta et al., 2002; Hacke et al., 2006). It has been reported that the diameter of the xylem vessel, together with Ψ_x , highly determines the occurrence of embolism and, consequently, the value of R_p . The vulnerability to embolism is determined, however, by the diameter of the intervessel pit membrane pore, rather than by that of the xylem vessel (Tyree and Sperry, 1989). In fact, the pit area hypothesis (Wheeler et al., 2005) states that the Ψ_x value corresponding to P_{50} is determined by the largest pit pore in the total pit area of a vessel. Recent evidence shows that water in the xylem vessels under tension contain a large number of nanobubbles which size depends on the structure and porosity of the pit membrane, and that these nanobubbles can explode, leading to embolism, or can shrink, causing nocturnal embolism repair (Weijs et al., 2012; Brodersen et al., 2013). It seems that the origin and size of the nanobubbles depend on the structure of the pit membrane, rather than on absolute pore diameters (Jansen et al., 2009).

Equation 1 (Fig. 3) can be used to calculate R_p . Larsen et al. (1989) followed this approach and calculated R_p values, in $\text{MPa } \mu\text{g}^{-1} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}$, of 0.182 for apple, 0.319 for peach, 0.329 for grape, 0.465 for olive, and 0.511 for apricot. They stated that high value of R_p in olive, together with stomatal closing, may account for the low transpiration losses per unit leaf area (LA) measured in this species. Bongi and Pallioti (1994) mentioned that large water potential differences between leaves and roots usually found in olive might reflect a strong resistance to water movement. In field experiments with well-irrigated trees, in which $\Psi_s \approx \Psi_{pd}$, we have observed that the drop in water potential from leaves to roots is usually greater than 2 MPa, with a maximum difference of about 4 MPa (unpublished data).

FIGURE 5 about here

FIGURE 6 about here

4.3. Stomatal control of gas exchange

The role of stomata is to regulate the entry of sufficient CO_2 for optimal photosynthesis while conserving water inside the plant. As in many other plants well adapted to dry areas, stomatal closure in olive limits transpiration and avoids risky Ψ_x for hydraulic functioning (Fernández et al., 1997; Tognetti et al., 2009; Boughalleb and Hajlaoui, 2011). As already mentioned, the relationships among Ψ_l , g_s , E_p and R_p , and of these variables with environment, are still in the dark. There are feedback and feed-forward mechanisms involved (Chaves et al., 2003; Lovisolo et al., 2010), and differences between cultivars have been reported (Fernández et al., 2008b). It appears that stomatal guard cells respond by negative feedback to Ψ_p , which is related with Ψ_l and then with Ψ_x . Thus, the plant can operate near the embolism threshold, generating the required $\Delta\Psi$ for transpiration and at the same time avoiding the risk of excessive R_p (Eq. 1, Fig. 3). However, is unclear whether this equilibrium is achieved by passive feedback, active feedback, feed forward, or some combination of these processes (Buckley 2005). A metabolically mediated feedback response of stomatal guard cells to water status in their immediate vicinity ('hydro-active local feedback') is likely the best explanation for many well-known features of hydraulically related stomatal behaviour. Both apparent feedforward response of stomata to D_a and isohydric behaviour observed in many cases, may be explained through the

juxtaposition of hydro-active local feedback and hysteretic and threshold-like effect of Ψ_x on R_p . The matter is further complicated by long-distance and short-distance signalling mechanisms acting on stomata (Sections 4.3.2 and 4.3.3). In other words, trees respond to drought by processing information from simultaneous, often conflicting, and sometimes rapidly changing signals, related with several mechanisms acting in a nested hierarchy and occurring at different time scales (Hetherington and Woodward, 2003; Limousin et al., 2010). Below we give an overview of the most relevant stomatal responses to both exogenous and endogenous plant conditions.

4.3.1. Response of the stomata to soil water and atmospheric demand

The available soil water has great influence on stomatal closure. In FI ‘Manzanilla’ trees under localized irrigation, Cuevas et al. (2010) recorded a maximum stomatal conductance (g_{s-max}) of $0.29 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, a value similar to that reported by Diaz-Espejo et al. (2006) for the same cultivar growing under non-limiting conditions. In trees under dry-farming conditions, g_{s-max} was only $0.13 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Values of Ψ_l measured at midday (-1.31 MPa for irrigated trees, -1.51 MPa for rain-fed trees) showed no significant differences in leaf water status in differentially irrigated trees. This implies that effective control of Ψ_l by stomatal closure operates in rain-fed trees. Torres et al. (2013a) observed stomatal control of transpiration in irrigated trees, such that Ψ_l did not change along the day, despite of two-fold increase in D_a from morning to afternoon. In irrigated trees Ψ_l was maintained around 1.4-1.6 MPa, i.e. above critical values for losing xylem functionality (Fig. 6). These results illustrate the role of stomatal closure in avoiding marked decrease in Ψ_l and consequently in Ψ_x , under conditions of low soil water and high evaporative demand. Stomatal closure is a key mechanism that operates in olive to minimize loss of xylem functionality during the dry season. However, the capacity of stomata to regulate transpiration is lost when soil water is severely depleted: severe water stress overrides olive functions, including the control of gas exchange driven by stomata (Moriani et al., 2002). In their rain-fed trees, in fact, Torres et al. (2013a) found no effective regulation of Ψ_l by stomatal closure when Ψ_l was as low as -4.8 MPa.

Available soil water as well as its distribution at the root zone affect stomatal closure. Cuevas et al. (2010) and Torres et al. (2013a) observed stomatal regulation of transpiration in plants under localized irrigation (LI treatment) which, despite of receiving daily water supplies to replace 100% of ET_c , had a fraction of their roots under soil-drying

conditions. Morales-Sillero et al. (2013) worked in the same orchard and considered an additional treatment in which the whole root zone was kept under non-limiting soil water conditions all throughout the irrigation season (Pond treatment). They reported similar values of Ψ_l in both LI and Pond trees, but the LI trees usually showed lower values of g_s . The authors agreed with Cuevas et al. (2010), who reported that olive showed a near-isohydric behaviour, similar to that reported for other woody crops is the area such as grapevine (Schultz 2003).

Main driving meteorological variable for stomatal opening in olive is photon flux density (I_p) and D_a (Fernández and Moreno, 1999). Upper-bound relationships between g_s and I_p and D_a have been analysed in Fernández et al. (1997) for ‘Manzanilla’. Authors found that relatively low levels of I_p , $\sim 500 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$, were enough to achieve maximum potential values of g_s . Decreasing g_s values were observed from D_a over the range 1 kPa to 3.5 kPa. At greater D_a stomata remained partially open. High values of g_s were observed in the morning, during the opening phase, than in the afternoon at similar D_a and I_p . This may result from maximum I_p occurring early in the day as compared with daily maxima in D_a . The fact that D_a is the main driving variable for stomatal closure in olive is true except in winter. In winter, soil temperature (Gimenez et al., 1996), and factors related to root functioning (Ferreira et al., 1998), may depress Ψ_l and g_s values, despite high Ψ_s and relatively low atmospheric demand. Moriana et al. (2002) derived relationships between D_a and g_s at midday, for ‘Picual’ under different drought levels. Stomatal conductance decreased linearly as D_a increased, for trees suffering from low ($\Psi_l > -1.65 \text{ MPa}$) to high ($-2.5 \text{ MPa} > \Psi_l > -4.0 \text{ MPa}$) water stress. For trees with $\Psi_l < -4.0 \text{ MPa}$ D_a did not effect stomatal closure, and similar g_s ($< 25 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$) were found for D_a in the range 2-7 kPa. Diaz-Espejo et al. (2006) reported t maximum g_s in ‘Manzanilla’ growing in southwest Spain when soil was around field capacity and values of I_p , leaf temperature (T_l) and D_a of $1600 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$, 25°C , and 1 kPa, respectively.

4.3.2. Stomatal conductance, plant water status and transpiration

In experiments with olive saplings in pots, i.e. under highly uniform soil water distribution, robust Ψ_l vs. g_s relationships have been observed: g_s decreases progressively as Ψ_l becomes more negative (Guerfel et al., 2009; Boughalleb and Hajlaoui, 2011). In trees under field conditions, however, correlations between Ψ_l and g_s are much weaker. This can be due to stomatal response to variable distribution of soil water, reported above.

791 Additionally, water potential of stomatal apparatus differs from the bulk Ψ_1 (Fernández and
792 Moreno, 1999). Correlations between Ψ_{stem} and g_s are more robust as compared with Ψ_1 vs
793 g_s , in several fruit tree species (Naor et al., 2004, 2006). For olive, significant, non-linear
794 correlations between Ψ_{stem} and g_s have been reported, in both potted (Di Vaio et al., 2012)
795 and field-grown trees (Naor et al., 2013).

796 The daily dynamics of g_s differs from daily variation in E_p . In south Spain $g_{s\text{-max}}$ are
797 usually achieved at 08:00-09:00 GMT, whereas maximum E_p is achieved from 09:00 GMT
798 to 15:00 GMT, depending on atmospheric conditions (Fernández et al., 2011a). This is
799 because D_a , the main driving variable for E_p , increases in south Spain from early morning
800 to late afternoon. Plants respond to increasing D_a by closing stomata, such that decreasing
801 g_s counterbalances increasing D_a until late afternoon (Eq. 2, Fig. 3). This may explain
802 results of Moreno et al. (1996), who measured maximum sap flow rates in trunks of mature
803 ‘Manzanilla’ between 13:00 and 14:00 GMT. However, porometer measurements showed
804 that stomatal closure began much earlier, at 10:00 GMT. Sap flow at night also occurs in
805 olive, the rate depending on environmental water status and plant capacity for water
806 storage capacitance (Moreno et al., 1996; Fernández et al., 2006b). This accounts for
807 nocturnal water recovery, which occurs at great extent in olive (Fernández et al., 2008b).

808 The seasonal trends of E_p in olive follow similar patterns than those of the potential
809 evapotranspiration (ET_o), i.e. maximum daily E_p values are recorded at mid-summer in
810 most olive orchards of Mediterranean areas (Fernández et al., 2008a). But, as compared to
811 the spring and the autumn, ET_o values increase more in mid-summer than E_p values,
812 contributing to lower crop coefficient (K_c) values in July and August than before and after
813 this mid-summer period of great atmospheric demand (Fernández et al., 2006b; Testi et al.,
814 2006a). The seasonal dynamics of the water evaporated from the soil (E_s) also affects
815 markedly the K_c values, contributing to the low K_c values at mid-summer (Testi et al.,
816 2006a).

817 4.3.3. *Root-to-shoot signalling*

820 A great number of papers have been published on stomatal closure being mediated
821 by chemical and hydraulic signals, which are generated in roots suffering from water
822 deficit. These signals are transported via the xylem to the shoots, and may act before a
823 decrease in Ψ_1 occurs, thus regulating stomatal opening and shoot growth (Wilkinson and
824 Davies, 2002; Chaves et al., 2010). Inorganic ions, hormones and ethylene are involved in

root-to-shoot signalling (Wilkinson and Davies, 2002; Dodd et al., 2006). Roots in drying soil synthesize ABA, part of which is transported through the xylem vessels, enters the leaf and reaches the apoplast of guard cells, thus affecting stomatal opening (Zhang and Outlaw, 2001). The fundamentals behind this long-distance signalling mechanism are complex, and seem to depend on xylem sap pH (Wilkinson, 2004) as well as on leaf microclimate (Davies et al., 2001). However, the source of drought-induced ABA remains under debate. Some authors argue that stomata mostly respond to ABA generated in the leaf, rather than in roots (Wilkinson and Hartung, 2009; Lobet et al., 2013). Recently the response of stomata to soil drying seems to depend mostly on hydraulic signals rather than on chemical signals in olive, especially under saturating light and high evaporative demand (e.g., at midday, Diaz-Espejo et al., 2012; Rodriguez-Dominguez, 2013). Fernández et al. (2003) reported restricted E_p in trees under localized irrigation, but they were unable to discriminate between ABA-induced or hydraulic signal-induced in response to decreasing soil hydraulic conductivity.

4.3.4. *Leaf hydraulics*

As mentioned above, different plant organs may have different vulnerability to embolism. This phenomenon, known as vulnerability segmentation (Zimmermann, 1983; Tyree et al., 1993), has been observed in a variety of species (Martinez-Vilalta et al., 2002). When embolism occurring, stomatal closure can be influenced by hydraulic signals originated in different organs. In olive, estimations of leaf-specific conductivity (k_l), i.e. leaf hydraulic conductivity normalised to unit leaf area, have been performed from hydraulic conductivity measurements at the whole-plant level (Dichio et al., 2013). Actual k_l measurements in olive potted plants can be found in Torres-Ruiz et al. (2013b): g_s and k_l showed considerable reductions at $\Psi_l < -1.5\text{MPa}$, thus suggesting a correlation between leaf hydraulic functioning and stomatal behaviour. Ψ_l and k_l recovered faster than g_s during re-watering, indicating other factors (possibly ABA) were involved in stomata opening (Section 4.6). Results on vulnerability to embolism of the different organs also show the occurrence of hydraulic segmentation in olive, making leaves effective in reducing whole-plant transpiration and, hence, in avoiding the spread of embolism in other plant organs (Torres-Ruiz et al., 2013b).

4.4. Leaf photosynthesis

The daily course of net CO₂ assimilation rate (A) is similar to that of g_s , such that maximum A values are achieved early in the morning (08:00-09:00 GMT), whereas g_s limits A in the remaining part of the day (Moriana et al., 2002; Fernández et al. 2006b). Olive is a C₃ plant which, under non-limiting conditions, can reach maximum A of 25 $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ (Moriana et al., 2002; Diaz-Espejo et al., 2006; Tognetti et al., 2007; Fernández et al., 2008b), a low values as compared with other fruit trees. However, under limiting conditions olive tree is able to maintain appreciable A . In olive saturation of A occurs at $I_p = 1000\text{-}1200 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ (Natali et al., 1991). The dynamics of leaf water relations at the onset and as drought stress progresses greatly affect A . Jorba et al. (1985) found that reducing RWC from 96% to 65% depressed A by 85% in olive. Ennajeh et al. (2006) have shown steep decrease in g_s and A , in leaves of ‘Chemlali’ and ‘Meski’, when RWC decreased from 75% to 60%. At 35% RWC, g_s and A were $< 50 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and $< 4 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, respectively. In ‘Leccino’ Larcher et al. (1981) observed a decrease in A when Ψ_1 fell to -1.3 MPa, and 50% reduction in photosynthesis occurred at Ψ_1 of -2.2 MPa. Detectable A at Ψ_1 as low as -7.0 MPa (Dichio et al., 2005) and Ψ_{stem} of -8.0 MPa (Moriana et al., 2002) have been reported.

Leaf photosynthesis depends on diffusional and non-diffusional limitations. The first limitation is due to diffusional resistances in the gas phase of CO₂ transport pathway from ambient air to carboxylation sites: this relates with both g_s and mesophyll conductance (g_m). The second includes biochemical processes, namely carboxylation rate and photosynthesis efficiency, which greatly depends on photoinhibition in olive.

4.4.1. Diffusional limitations of photosynthesis

At the beginning of the olive growing period (Fig. 1) the available soil water is usually high and values of global solar radiation (R_s) and ET_0 are low. Under these conditions of low-to-moderate water stress, any decrease in A is mainly due to diffusional limitations, imposed by leaf resistances to ambient CO₂ from reaching the chloroplast (Fig. 2). Later in the season, increased water deficit and changes in leaf biomechanical and biochemical traits modify diffusional limitations to photosynthesis. Soil water depletion may increase diffusional limitation due to stomatal closure. In addition, g_m usually decreases in summer, in both irrigated and non-irrigated trees, because of increasing T_a

and D_a . Diaz-Espejo et al. (2007) found in ‘Manzanilla’ a maximum g_m of $0.224 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ at $T_l = 29.61 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$, and g_m of $0.14 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ at $T_l = 40 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$. Perez-Martin et al. (2009) showed a decrease in both g_s and g_m when soil water deficit and D_a increased: water deficit actually affected g_s more than g_m . Centritto et al. (2003) had already noted of considering stress-induced depletion in g_m to avoid overestimation of biochemical limitations to photosynthesis in olive. Changes in A due to leaf development in olive growing under harsh summer conditions have been reported as due to leaf age increasing the number of mesophyll cells and chloroplasts, as well as in CO_2 -uptake cell surface (Bosabalidis and Kofidis (2002). Marchi et al. (2007) also reported of photosynthetic capacity increasing as leaves approaching to full expansion: mesophyll thickness doubled from initial through final leaf developmental. Proietti et al. (2012) observed that current-season leaves had greater A levels than one-year-old leaves. Recently published evidence on the importance of anatomical traits in the limitation of CO_2 diffusion from substomatal cavities to chloroplasts shows that g_m is strongly correlated with chloroplast exposed surface to leaf area ratio and mesophyll cell wall thickness, t_{cw} (Tomás et al., 2013).

4.4.2. *Non-diffusional limitations of photosynthesis*

During summer most Mediterranean species, including olive, likely suffer from photoinhibition due to soil water deficit and increasing atmospheric demand (Centritto et al., 2003, 2005; Denaxa et al., 2012). As summarized in Bacelar et al. (2007b) and in Boussadia et al. (2008), water stress-induced stomatal closure limits carbon availability at carboxylation sites. Therefore, absorbed light energy largely exceeds its use in photochemistry, thus leading to an excess of excitation in photosystem II (PSII). Under severe water stress, electron transport rate and quenching of excitation energy in PSII antennae are likely unable in dissipating excess excitation energy, leading to photodamage of PSII and net loss in D1 protein in PSII reaction centres. Photoinhibition may explain the lack of correlation between g_s and A in severely stressed olive (Natali, et al., 1991; Angelopoulos et al., 1996). Photoinhibition curtails olive performance, irrespective of morphological and anatomical adjustments (see Section 3.3 for details). Water stress-induced effects on leaf photochemistry have been reported in Bongi et al. (1994), Bacelar et al. (2007b), Sofo et al. (2008), and Boughllef and Hajlaoui (2011).

Diaz-Espejo et al. (2006) showed the ability of olive to adjust the photosynthetic apparatus to changes in environmental conditions. After seeing that ‘Manzanilla’ leaves

had higher photosynthetic capacity in April than in August, the authors speculated that leaves with an inherently high potential in A conflicts with the highly-demanding summer conditions, when stomatal closure strongly limits CO_2 uptake. Maximum carboxylation efficiency ($V_{c\text{-max}}$), maximum rate of electron transport at saturating irradiance (J_{max}), and the capacity for triose phosphate utilization (TPU) were determined. Photosynthesis was limited by TPU and seasonal decrease in $V_{c\text{-max}}$ compensated for the stomatal limitation to CO_2 fixation, as the soil water deficit increased. This enables leaves to operate near to the transition point between photosynthetic limitation due to ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate (RuBP) carboxylation capacity and RuBP regeneration capacity, thus resulting in almost constant internal CO_2 concentration from April to August. Main model parameters, $V_{c\text{-max}}$, TPU, J_{max} and R_d (the rate of CO_2 evolution in the light resulting from processes other than photorespiration) were markedly influenced by T_l . Further, $V_{c\text{-max}}$ was positively correlated with leaf nitrogen content on area basis (N_a) and with SLW. Diaz-Espejo et al. (2007) worked with mature ‘Manzanilla’ trees under dry-farming conditions. In the spring the authors observed a positive relationship between $V_{c\text{max}}$ and N_a and daily integrated quantum flux density (Q_{int}). This, however, was not observed in summer. The authors hypothesized that this was due to stomatal limitations during summer, but also to a $V_{c\text{max}}$ down-regulation affected by g_m .

Bacelar et al (2007b) reported that the decline in daily A was largely due to stomatal limitations. However, C_i/C_a ratio increased markedly from morning to midday in non-irrigated plants, in spite of lower g_s , suggesting that non-stomatal limitations of photosynthesis prevailed under severe stress. Perturbations at chloroplastic level in rain-fed plants followed depression in maximum photochemical efficiency of photosystem II in the afternoon. Chlorophyll fluorescence measurements also revealed the occurrence of dynamic photoinhibition in irrigated trees. Boughlaleb and Hajlaoui (2011) reported that water stress caused a marked decline on photosynthetic capacity and chlorophyll fluorescence in ‘Chemlali’ and ‘Zalmati’. As water stress developed, A , g_s , E_p , the maximal photochemical efficiency of PSII (F_v/F_m) and the intrinsic efficiency of open PSII reaction centres (F'_v/F'_m) decreased. Proietti et al. (2012) observed lower A at the end of July than before and after, and shared the thesis that the low olive A values in the summer are due to damage of the photosystem induced by high temperature and drought stress, rather than to the lower g_s .

FIGURE 7 about here

4.4.3. WUE and water productivity

The plant water use efficiency (WUE) is evaluated from long-term measurements of cumulated dry matter and consumed water. When instantaneous gas exchange measurements are used, intrinsic water use efficiency (WUE_i) is estimated, i.e. the rate of carbon assimilated per unit leaf area per unit time and per unit water cost. Values of WUE_i in olive have been reported by Angelopoulos et al. (1996), Moriana et al. (2002) and Diaz-Espejo et al. (2006). Olive uses water more efficiently than other fruit trees. Bongi and Palliotti (1994) calculated that in southern Mediterranean area, the number of grams of fruit dry matter per kilogram of consumed water was 3.17 for olive, 2.46 for *Citrus*, and 1.78 for *Prunus*. Xiloyannis et al. (1996) reported WUE values ($\text{g CO}_2 \text{ kg H}_2\text{O}^{-1}$) between 5.5 and 9.6 for olive, between 3.2 and 4.4 for grape, and between 2.3 and 3.5 for peach.

Although linear A vs. g_s relationships have been reported for olive (Chartzoulakis et al., 1999; Moriana et al., 2002; Boughalleb and Hajlaoui, 2011), A is affected later than g_s under water stress. Figure 7 shows A vs. g_s values collected in different Spanish- Italian locations and different cultivars (Fernández et al., 2008b). Constant A is estimated for decreasing g_s , until $g_s \approx 0.25 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. This is a key trait for the adaptation of olive to drought, and explains usually greater WUE_i recorded in plants under rain-fed than in irrigated conditions.

For agricultural purposes, achieving maximum WUE values is not necessarily the best option. Rather than WUE, most growers look at water productivity (WP). Water productivity as defined by Kijne et al. (2003) is the ratio of the amount of marketable product (per hectare) to unit of supplied water. In other words, WP is the net income per unit water used. A properly chosen irrigation strategy must increase both WP and the productive life of the orchard. Water productivity values, both for fresh fruits and oil, have been reported for different olive orchards (Table 1). Relationships between fruit yield and oil yield, and water consumed by the crop, have also been reported (Table 2). As expected, Tables 1 and 2 shows significant differences on WP depending on the cultivar, water regime and plant density. Additional details are given in Section 6.2.1. Other interesting relationships related to crop performance, such as the yield:LA ratio have been reported by Caruso et al. (2013), Proietti et al. (2012) and Fernández et al. (2013).

TABLE 1 about here

4.5. Response to re-watering

After a period of drought, root water uptake in olive increases immediately after soil water is newly available (Fernández et al., 2001). The rapid water uptake can explain the quick recovery in Ψ_1 observed in olive after re-watering. The rate in Ψ_1 recovery depends on the severity of previous water stress. Recovery may last few hours up to 4 days for plants with $\Psi_1 = -8.0$ MPa at stress (Ferreles et al., 1996; Fernández et al., 1997; Perez-Martin et al., 2011). Moreno et al. (1996) performed a recovery experiment with 25-year-old ‘Manzanilla’, by supplying water on September 12 to plants under dry-farming conditions over the whole summer. Both Ψ_1 and E_p only partially recovered: sap flow measurements in main roots showed a significant increase in water uptake, but water flow was not detected in the outer sapwood annuli. This means that hydraulic root capacity did not fully recover, possibly due to cavitation of vessels.

In olive, gas exchange takes longer to recover than plant water status. As compared with Ψ_1 , the delay in g_s and A recovery depends on the severity of the suffered water stress. Fernández et al. (1997) reported full recovery in g_s over two days re-watering in plants displaying $\Psi_1 = -4.2$ MPa at midday. In the experiment by Fereres et al. (1996), on which trees reached midday $\Psi_1 = -8.0$ MPa, g_s took several weeks to recover. The amount of water supplied during the recovery phase also conditions the speed of variables coming back to normal values (Fernández et al., 2013). Torres-Ruiz et al. (2013a) did not find a correlation between leaf hydraulic functioning and stomatal behaviour during recovery. They suggested that, similarly to that found in grape by Lovisolo et al. (2008), ABA accumulated in roots during drought was delivered to the rehydrated leaves, contributing to the slow g_s recovery. ABA-induced control in water transpiration may promote gradual embolism repair (Lovisolo et al., 2008).

5. Improving crop performance and management

In this section we address how new knowledge on the response mechanisms adopted by olive to cope with the environmental constraints imposed by the Mediterranean climate are currently used to both improve crop management practices and design more sustainable and productive crop systems. First we give an overview of models that have been

developed to simulate key processes of olive performance. Examples on the use of modelling exercises as valuable tools to optimize orchard design and management are included. Then we summarize main knowledge for the effect of water and salinity on tree development and production. Then we consider new crop management practices for improving production and quality, as well as for increasing the sustainability of olive orchards, even in global change scenario.

5.1. Modelling

Moreno et al. (1996) used a transpiration model based on Penman–Monteith (P-M) equation to get reliable results for olive, after evaluating the fractions of sunlit and shaded leaves in the canopy. Mariscal et al. (2000a) formulated and evaluated a model to estimate PAR interception by olive orchards, at both instantaneous and daily levels. Leaf reflectance and transmittance, as well as the distribution of leaf inclination derived from field measurements were included in the model for reliable predictions of diffuse and total transmittance. Additional aspects related to radiation use efficiency (RUE) and dry matter partitioning were modelled by Mariscal et al. (2000b). Moriana et al. (2002) evaluated, for ‘Picual’ trees, the models of leaf conductance proposed by Jarvis (1976) and Leuning (1995). In addition, they proposed a third model to include the effect of water deficit into the Leuning’s model. Diaz-Espejo et al. (2006) evaluated a photosynthesis model for ‘Manzanilla’ trees. They linked the photosynthesis model of Farquhar et al. (1980) with the model of stomatal conductance of Jarvis (1976), in which an effect of soil water deficit was included. Fernández et al. (2008b) used the model of Diaz-Espejo et al. (2006), together with the RATP model, to simulate daily values of E_p and A for olive trees with different leaf area density and canopy shapes. The RATP model was developed by Sinoquet et al. (2001) to simulate radiation transfer through the canopy of fruit trees. Marchi et al. (2007) built a model to simulate the rate of leaf development rate. The model allows simulate the import and export of carbohydrates, i.e. the sink-source balance in growing leaves. Authors estimated that the onset of carbohydrate export from olive leaves occurred at 28-29 days from leaf emergence. Diaz-Espejo et al. (2012) used the mechanistic BMF model of Buckley et al. (2003) to improve our understanding of the effect of limiting environmental conditions on the transpiration of drip irrigated olive trees.

Villalobos et al. (2000) used the P-M approach to build a model on ET_c for olive orchards. After combination with a modified version of the Ritchie’s soil evaporation

model (Bonachela et al., 1999), the model showed acceptable reliability and proved that the K_c approach can lead to substantial errors due to local and temporal variations of main driving variables for transpiration, such as D_a . The effect of soil evaporation (E_s) on K_c estimations was further addressed by Testi et al. (2004), who used eddy covariance and water balance measurements in olive orchard to assess the relationships between orchard architecture and ET_c , under both dry and wet soil conditions. Testi et al. (2006b) used similar approaches to separate the two components of ET_c , and derived G_c values by inverting the P-M equation. Authors used the Jarvis model, calibrated for their orchard conditions, to improve the reliability of G_c . Villalobos et al. (2006) proposed a growth model for olive, based on the RUE concept. They showed that olive orchards have low RUE but compensate low RUE through high Harvest Index and large fraction of intercepted radiation. As a result, olive shows high oil productivity (ca. 3 t ha⁻¹) when compared to other oilseed crops. In addition, estimates of carbon sequestration by olive orchards showed a much larger potential for capture in olive than in other agricultural systems.

The model by Ritchie (1972) was used by Bonachela et al. (1999) to propose a soil evaporation model for rain-fed olive orchards. Bonachela et al. (2001) proposed a model for drip-irrigated orchards, which considered separately E_s in dry and wet ground areas. Lysimeter measurements were performed by Diaz-Espejo et al. (2008), who derived an improved model to estimate E_s in olive orchards. This allowed an accurate estimation of surface resistance (r_s) and E_s . Their results were unexpected, as cumulative E_s in drip-irrigated olive orchard were higher in ground areas with lower irradiance. Testi et al. (2006a) proposed a model of olive water requirements which estimates E_p and E_s separately. Values of K_c were calculated as the sum of three relevant coefficients related with tree transpiration (K_p), evaporation from the dry soil (K_{s1}) and evaporation from the areas wetted by the emitters (K_{s2}). The model offers the possibility of adding a fourth component, accounting for evaporation of the water intercepted by the canopy (K_{pd}). The model by Testi et al. (2006a) is a more mechanistic approach than that of the FAO crop coefficient method (Allen et al., 1998), since it takes into account main soil, weather and plant conditions.

5.2. Development and production as influenced by orchard conditions

5.2.1. Water

Soil water favours the number of fruits per tree, fruit f.w., fruit volume and pulp:stone ratio and, as a consequence, increases fruit and oil yields (Goldhamer et al., 1994; d'Andria et al., 2004; Gucci et al., 2007). It is known, however, that the water supplies needed to achieve the greatest WP values are usually below 100% ET_c. In fact, the relationships between water consumed by olive trees and both fruit and oil yield are curvilinear (Moriana et al., 2003; Grattan et al., 2006) (Table 2). This means that maximum potential production can be achieved with DI strategies. Reduced water supplies may have additional benefits in areas where local conditions lead to excessive vegetative growth, such as in northern Argentina (Correa-Tedesco et al., 2010; Searles et al., 2011). Deficit irrigation has greater impact on fresh fruit yield than on oil yield (Lavee et al., 2007). Fernández et al. (2013) carried out a 3-year study in an 'Arbequina' SHD olive orchard with trees under FI and two regulated deficit irrigation (RDI) strategies supplying 60% and 30% of the irrigation needs, IN (60RDI and 30RDI, respectively). Reductions in fruit and oil yields, as compared to FI, were 23% and 29% for 60RDI and 40% and 26% for 30RDI, respectively. Results for different olive cultivars are quite consistent in showing oil yield reductions of ca. 20% with ca. 50% DI strategies (Moriana et al., 2003; Iniesta et al., 2009; Caruso et al., 2013). The lower differences, between FI and DI trees in oil yield than in fruit yield, are partly due to the fact that irrigation increases the mesocarp water content, which penalizes physical oil extraction (Ramos and Santos, 2010; García et al., 2013; Gómez-del-Campo, 2013).

When the target is oil quality there are additional reasons for reducing irrigation. Results from experiments carried out in areas where the length of rainy season and average precipitation are high, have shown no clear effects of irrigation on oil quality (Tognetti et al., 2007; d'Andria et al., 2008). Most olive orchards, however, are in arid and semi-arid areas with dry seasons lasting for 5-6 months and average precipitation is lower than ~ 500 mm. Under these conditions, increasing irrigation s decreases total phenols content in olive oil and affect phenolic composition, resulting in oils of lower stability and poorer sensory attributes (d'Andria et al., 2004; Tovar et al., 2002; Servili et al., 2007; Machado et al., 2013). The bitterness, fruitiness and pungency are indeed less pronounced in oils from irrigated than from rain-fed trees (Stefanoudaki et al., 2009; Fernandes-Silva et al., 2013). Other attributes, such as colour, are also influenced by water supply (Pastor et al., 1998; Gómez-Rico et al., 2006, 2007; Servili et al., 2007). Grattan et al. (2006) and Berenguer et al. (2006) reported, for a SHD 'Arbequina' olive orchard, that production was maximized

when irrigation water amounted to 70-75% of ET_c , but a sustained deficit irrigation (SDI) supplying 33-40% of ET_c resulted in excellent oil chemical parameters, flavour and stability. García et al. (2013) explored the impact of low-frequency deficit irrigation (LFDI) on the production and oil quality of ‘Arbequina’ olive trees. Severe water stress occurred between consecutive irrigation events causing leaf curling and fruit shrivelling. Oil quality is negatively affected when severe water stress episodes causing fruit shrivelling occurs near or at harvest time (Greven et al. 2009). García et al. (2013), however, found no negative effect on oil quality due to several periods of severe water stress. These findings support general believing that DI favours oil quality. However, physiological and productive responses under reduced irrigation depend on cultivar, local conditions and management practices (Tognetti et al. 2007, 2008; Fernández et al., 2008b; Ghandari et al., 2012). This may explain contrasting results in the pertinent literature (Dabbou et al., 2010; Tognetti et al., 2007; Stefanoudaki et al., 2009). Fatty acid composition was either unaffected (d’Andria et al., 2004, 2009; Motilva et al., 2000; Patumi et al., 2002) or affected (Berenguer et al., 2006; Gómez-Rico et al., 2007; Stefanoudaki et al., 2009) by irrigation treatments.

Other factors significantly influencing oil quality are harvesting date and fruit load. Dag et al. (2011) observed contrasting effects of harvesting date on the amount and quality of oil produced by ‘Barnea’ and ‘Souri’. ‘Barnea’ required late harvest and advanced fruit maturity to get the maximum amount of good quality oil. In ‘Souri’, however, late harvest and advanced maturation caused an increase in fatty acids combined with a decline in polyphenol content resulting in loss of oil quality. García et al. (2013) reported that a late harvesting in ‘Arbequina’ led to loss of sensory quality and lower tocopherol content. In areas with early frosts it is recommended to harvest when the amount of oil expressed as % d.w. peaks (Gracia et al., 2012). The impact of water stress on yield and quality increases with crop load (Martín-Vertedor et al., 2011a; Naor et al., 2013). Concerning the harvesting method, handpicking is advantageous to improved oil quality, as compared to mechanical harvesting (Dag et al., 2008).

5.2.2. *Nutrients*

The response of olive to nutrient supplies has been addressed by Bonghi and Palliotti (1994), Connor and Fereres (2005) and Sanzani et al. (2012). Here we just want to address

the N fertilization, which is too often made incorrectly in olive orchards, and that of K, B and Fe, key elements for a correct olive fertilization.

The effect of N fertilization on growth, yield and oil accumulation in rain-fed ‘Picual’ olive trees was addressed by Fernández-Escobar et al. (2009, 2012). They concluded that annual applications of N are not needed in olive orchards growing in fertile soils, thanks to N mineralization of soil organic matter and the N supplied by rainwater. Rather, N must be applied only when the previous season’s leaf analysis indicates that leaf N concentration is below the standard deficiency threshold, i.e. 1.4% of N in dried leaf. Reduced N fertilization was also recommended by Rodrigues et al. (2012), who made an above-ground balance of the nutrients removed by ‘Cobrançosa’ trees in a rain-fed orchard with 204 trees ha⁻¹ and average fruit yield of 2500 kg ha⁻¹. They reported that 15-18 kg N ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ was adequate to balance the N annually exported. Morales-Sillero et al. (2007) fertigated ‘Manzanilla’ trees with a 4N-1P-3K fertilizer and three treatments supplying 200, 400 and 600 g N tree⁻¹ year⁻¹, respectively. Fertilizing with 400 g N tree⁻¹ year⁻¹ led to the best equilibrium among oil quality, fertilization costs and environmental impact. The treatment supplying 600 g N tree⁻¹ year⁻¹ was considered the best for table olive production, since increased fruit size. This amount, however, was found to increase the risk for groundwater contamination (Morales-Sillero et al., 2009).

Potassium is a key element in the fertilization of olive orchards. Its concentration in the fruit is highly correlated with oil accumulation (Deidda, 1968). Potassium starvation has been reported to reduce shoot growth and WUE in ‘Chemlali de Sfax’ olive cuttings (Arquero et al., 2006). Moderate K deficiency impaired the plant’s ability to regulate stomatal closure, so g_s increased. This effect was more evident in water-stressed plants than in FI plants. Although results on B application in olive are controversial, it seems that B deficiency affects negatively fruit set and development (Perica et al., 2001), and that foliar B applications have positive effects on blooming rate and yield, especially on years of low fruit set (Larbi et al., 2011). Foliar application of B, therefore, may be advisable in ‘off’ years following a year of high production. Another important element for olive fertilization is Fe, especially for trees growing in calcareous soils. Iron chelates are widely used, but they are expensive and can be easily lost by leaching. Poorly soluble, slow-release Fe fertilizers such as synthetic siderite (FeCO₃) are effective on preventing Fe chlorosis in ‘Picual’, ‘Picudo’ and Lechín de Sevilla’ trees (Sánchez-Alcalá et al., 2012). Olive trees fertilized with FeCO₃ showed greater leaf chlorophyll concentration, as well as greater yields, although the effect on yield was significant in ‘Picual’ trees only.

5.2.3. Salinity

The response of the olive tree to both salty soils and irrigation with saline water has been widely studied, likely because of high number of olive orchards being affected by salinity. Details have been summarized in several review papers (Bongi and Pallioti, 1994; Gucci and Tattini, 1997; Chartzoulakis, 2005; Ben-Gal, 2011; Sanzani et al., 2012). Olive is considered to have a moderate-to-high tolerance to the presence of salts in the soil (Tattini et al., 1995). Crop performance decreases when water for irrigation has an EC greater than 5.5 dS m^{-1} (Freeman et al., 1994), and the limit of salt content in irrigation water for is 8 g L^{-1} of solid residue (Zarrouk and Cherif, 1981). Positive effects of salinity on oil quality have been reported for irrigation at $\text{EC} > 7.5 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$ (Ben-Gal, 2011). For the sodium adsorption ratio (SAR), values lower than 9 do not affect production (Freeman et al., 1994), and a SAR value of 26 has been observed to be tolerated by mature olive trees (Loreti and Natali, 1981).

A balanced presence of salts in the rhizosphere is required for plant growth, but high concentrations of soluble salts in the rhizosphere lower Ψ_s . The energy required to take up water then increases (Eq. 1, Fig. 3), such that growth and production markedly decrease. In extreme cases, plant cannot compete for water vs. the soil and dies due to dehydration. Most often, salt-induced decrease in Ψ_s just increases water stress in the tree, such that salt stress depresses Ψ_l , RWC (Gucci et al., 1997) and g_s (Tattini et al., 1995). It is not surprising, therefore, that A is reduced with increasing salinity in olive (Bongi and Loreto, 1989; Tattini et al. 1997; Loreto et al., 2003; Chartzoulakis et al., 2002; Chartzoulakis 2005). Detailed experiments on the effect of irrigating several Greek cultivars with salty water were conducted by Centritto et al. (2003) and Loreto et al. (2003). They show that salt stress affected g_s and g_m but not the biochemical capacity to assimilate CO_2 . Salt-induced reductions in A were mostly driven by low g_s and g_m .

Toxicity by specific ions can also affect olive growing in saline environments. Na^+ and Cl^- , toxicity occurs when concentrations in leaves sampled in July are greater than 0.2% and 0.5%, respectively (López-Villalta, 1996). Olive is able to avoid ion toxicity by salt exclusion as well as by compartmentalization of specific ions. Plants retain greater concentrations of Na^+ and Cl^- in roots and basal parts of the trunk as compared with upper parts of the canopy (Tattini et al., 1992; Gucci and Tattini, 1997; Chartzoulakis, 2005). Salt exclusion by olive roots was reported by Benlloch et al. (1991) and Melgar et al. (2006). Reductions in growth and yield due to salinity have been widely reported (Gucci and

Tattini, 1997; Chartzouloulakis et al., 2002; Chartzoulakis 2005; Bracci et al., 2008). Long-term studies with trees under field conditions by Aragües et al (2005) with ‘Arbequina’ trees show that above 4 dS m⁻¹ EC, reductions in yield ranging from 16 to 23% per 1 dS m⁻¹ occurred. In contrast, Melgar et al (2009a) did not find significant effects on plant performance of salinity in the range 0.5 - 10 dS m⁻¹. The response of the olive tree to salinity can change if combined with other environmental stresses, such as hypoxia (Aragües et al., 2004) and high solar irradiance (Remorini et al., 2009; Melgar et al. (2009b). Other examples of the salinity tolerance of olive trees when affected by other stresses are given by Cimato et al. (2010) and Ben-Gal (2011).

5.3. Water management

The increasing understanding of the response of olive to environmental stresses has allowed the development of water management practices which greatly contribute to the sustainability and productivity of olive orchards in areas with harsh conditions. Bellow we summarize those practices with a greater impact on the design and management of new olive orchards.

5.3.1. Deficit irrigation strategies

The effective adaptation of olive to stressing conditions confers it both a high capability for survival and a marked productive response to favourable conditions. This explains that ca. 22% of the ca. 10.5 Mha global area cultivated with olive is under irrigation (IOC www.internationaloliveoil.org). In Mediterranean regions with mean annual ET_o and precipitation values of ca. 1200 mm and ca. 500 mm, respectively, mature drip-irrigated olive orchards with planting densities from 100 to 300 trees ha⁻¹ require about 7000 m³ ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ to replace ET_c. Of these, between 3000 and 4000 m³ ha⁻¹ are the IN required for FI (Fernández and Moreno, 1999; Gucci et al., 2012a). For SHD olive orchards with plant densities close to 2000 trees ha⁻¹, IN may increase to 5000 m³ ha⁻¹ (Fernández et al., 2013). As mentioned in Section 4.4.3, however, acceptable WP values are achieved with irrigation amounts (IA) lower than IN, which explains the success of several DI strategies applied to olive orchards.

On the first years after planting IA must be similar to IN, for the orchard to establish as soon as possible. Later, a DI strategy is usually the best option. When water for irrigation is really scarce, supplementary irrigation, also called complementary irrigation, could be the only suitable DI strategy. Despite of consisting of just one or very few irrigation events, it can lead to substantial increases in crop performance (Lavee et al., 1990; Proietti et al., 2012). Greater IA are supplied with LFDI (Lavee and Wodner, 1991), SDI (Goldhamer et al., 1994), and RDI (Goldhamer, 1999). A comparison study between SDI and LFDI in an ‘Arbequina’ orchard with led to no differences on main variables related to oil production and quality were (García et al., 2013). Both SDI and RDI are being widely used in olive orchards (Moriana et al., 2003; Iniesta et al., 2009; Ramos and Santos, 2009). With SDI a fixed fraction of IN is supplied all throughout the irrigation season. With RDI water supplies are equal or close to IN in the phases of the growing cycle when the crop is more sensitive to water stress, and are markedly reduced for the rest of the cycle (Chalmers et al., 1981). Significant water savings are achieved with both strategies, with little impact on yield and marked improvements in oil quality (Fernández et al., 2013; García et al., 2013). As compared to FI, SDI is particularly interesting in the ‘off’ years, when the lower crop load makes the olive tree less sensitive to water deficit (Martín-Vertedor et al., 2011a,b).

Both tree density and root zone size condition the choice of the DI strategy. SDI seems to be particularly interesting when the trees explore large soil volumes, i.e. in orchards with medium to low densities and deep soils (Moriana et al., 2003; Iniesta et al., 2009; Ramos and Santos, 2010; Fernandes-Silva, 2010). In these cases, the soil water stored during the rainy season may better compensate for the difference between IA and IN. The literature provides examples of olive orchards with 400 to 600 trees ha⁻¹ under FI (Testi et al., 2006a; Pastor et al., 2007), SDI (Gucci et al., 2012b) and RDI conditions (Patumi et al., 2002; d’Andria et al., 2004). Grattan et al. (2006) and Berenguer et al. (2006) explored the convenience of applying SDI with different levels of irrigation reduction in a SHD olive orchard in California. In these orchards, however, the reduced root zone makes RDI more advisable than SDI, to limit the risk of excessive water depletion on the most sensitive phenological stages. Examples of the application of RDI to SHD olive orchards have been published by Gómez-del-Campo (2010, 2013) and Fernández et al. (2013) (Fig. 8). When applied to SHD olive orchards, DI strategies can be adequate not only to increase WP, but also to avoid problems derived from excessive vigour (Connor, 2006; León et al., 2007) and to improve oil quality (Section 6.2.1).

The partial root zone drying (PRD), first developed in Australia for vineyards, is a DI strategy which relies on root-to-leaf signalling (Dry et al., 1996). When a fraction of the root system remains in drying soil while the rest are kept well watered, a root-to-leaf signalling mechanism is triggered, reducing stomatal aperture and leaf growth, preventing water loss (Dry et al., 2001; Dodd et al., 2006). The wet portion of the root system maintains a favourable plant water status such that yield is not compromised and quality may improve (Dry et al., 2001). Wahbi et al. (2005) and Centritto et al. (2005) analysed the effect of applying PRD (50% of ET_c) to ‘Picholine marocaine’ olive trees. Wahbi et al. (2005) reported a yield reduction of 15-20% only, and no reduction in yield quality, as compared to control trees irrigated in both sides to 100% of ET_c . Centritto et al. (2005) found a significant decrease in Ψ_l measured in the PRD trees as compared to the FI trees, although values of leaf RWC and A were similar. Unfortunately, they did not have a companion RDI treatment. Fernández et al. (2006b) compared a PRD and a RDI treatment, both supplying 50% of IN, in a ‘Manzanilla’ orchard, and found no differences on water status, gas exchange and sap flow. In mature trees with localized irrigation roots are under a wide range of soil water conditions, from well watered roots within the irrigation bulbs to roots in dry soil far away from the bulbs and roots in the interface between the wet bulbs and dry soil volumes, which have an intermediate water status. It seems that, in those cases, there is no need to alternate irrigation for a root-to-shoot signalling mechanism to occur.

FIGURE 8 about here

5.3.2. *New methods for scheduling irrigation*

Reliable monitoring of tree water stress is required for a correct management of any DI strategy. This applies mainly to RDI, since the occurrence of severe water stress episodes on sensitive phases of the growing period must be avoided (Fig. 8) to minimize the risk of reducing both the current year yield and the productive life of the orchard (Fernández et al., 2013). New water stress monitoring methods are being developed from the increase on knowledge on crop physiology and improvements on monitoring and data transmission systems. Most of these methods are based on plant measurements (Fig. 9), including sap flow (SF) and trunk diameter variation (TDV) measurements (Fernández and Cuevas, 2010; Ortuño et al., 2010). Conventional indicators such as Ψ_{stem} are also reliable

and can be used for an effective control of irrigation in olive orchards (Moriana et al., 2012; Naor et al., 2013). Those indicators, however, do not have the advantages derived from automatic and continuous recording and data transmission and storage systems of the new methods. The works by Fernández et al. (2008c), Ramos and Santos (2009) and Rousseaux et al. (2009) with SF measurements and those by Pérez-López et al. (2008), Moriana et al. (2010) and Cuevas et al. (2010) with TDV measurements show the potential and limitations of both methods for monitoring water stress and scheduling irrigation in olive orchards. Fernández et al. (2011a) used concomitant SF and TDV measurements to assess water needs in a mature ‘Manzanilla’ olive orchard. Their results, together with those reported by Fernández et al. (2011b) and Cuevas et al. (2013) show that the daily difference, both for tree water consumption (D_{Ep}) and maximum trunk diameter (D_{MXTD}), between deficit irrigated trees and trees growing under non-limiting soil water conditions were reliable indicators of the onset and severity of water stress.

The leaf patch clamp pressure probe, or ZIM probe (Zimmermann et al., 2008) is a relatively new device able to record automatically and continuously the so called leaf patch output pressure (P_p), which is inversely correlated with the leaf turgor pressure, P_c ($> ca.$ 50 kPa), a variables closely related to Ψ_l and g_s (Ache et al., 2010). The ZIM probe have been tested in olive by Ben-Gal et al. (2010), Fernández et al. (2011b), Ehrenberger et al. (2012) and Rodriguez-Dominguez et al. (2012). Results show that this is a promising method to monitor water stress and to schedule irrigation. Other plant-based method with a potential for scheduling irrigation in olive is that based on measurements of stem electrical conductivity with TDR probes (Nadler et al., 2008), although this method is less popular than the previously mentioned.

When combined with aerial or satellite imaging, the reported methods can be used for precise irrigation in large orchards with high crop-water-stress variability. An example on drought-induced changes in the spectral reflectance of olive leaves was given by Sun et al. (2008). Examples on the use of field measurements in olive orchards combined with airborne images are given in Zarco-Tejada et al. (2009) and Berni et al. (2009). Results showed that combining airborne imagery with automated records of plant water stress is a promising approach for monitoring water stress in large commercial olive orchards. Thermal images of individual trees, such as those taken from a crane about 15 m above the canopy by Ben-Gal et al. (2009), also shows a potential to schedule irrigation, although difficulties arise form the need of normalizing the canopy temperature to remove the effect of environmental conditions.

FIGURE 9 about here

5.4. Facing global change

Climate scenarios foresee significant changes in atmospheric conditions of main olive growing areas. The atmospheric demand is expected to increase, the rainfall to decrease, and the concentration of several gases in the air, such as sulphur dioxide (SO_2), tropospheric ozone (O_3) and carbon dioxide (CO_2) to increase. In addition, the quality of the incoming radiation is expected to change, with a possible increase in solar ultraviolet radiation (Sebastiani et al., 2002). These changes can affect olive productivity. In a work by Giorgelli et al. (1994), ‘Frantoio’ and ‘Moraiolo’ olive plants were exposed to increasing $[\text{SO}_2]$ (0, 35, 70 and 100 ppb). After five months, ‘Frantoio’ plants showed decreasing A and g_s values with increasing $[\text{SO}_2]$. These effects were not observed in ‘Moraiolo’ plants. Stomatal density (S_D), stomatal opening and the percentage of transpiring surface decreased progressively with $[\text{SO}_2]$, especially in ‘Frantoio’ but also in ‘Moraiolo’ plants. Minocci et al. (1999) studied the effect of O_3 concentrations on the leaf physiology and morphology of both cultivars. Both g_s and A decreased significantly in plants exposed to $[\text{O}_3] = 100$ ppb, as compared to those exposed to $[\text{O}_3] < 3$ ppb (control), especially for ‘Frantoio’. Leaves developed under high $[\text{O}_3]$ showed greater S_D than leaves under natural, control conditions, but the actual transpiring stomatal surface decreased by ca. 50% in both cultivars. The authors concluded that this can lead to significant O_3 -induced reduction in olive productivity in areas where $[\text{O}_3]$ is expected to increase. Also in ‘Frantoio’ and ‘Moraiolo’ plants, Tognetti et al. (2001) reported that exposure to elevated $560 \mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ mol}^{-1}$ enhanced A and decreased g_s , leading to greater WUE_i values. Stomatal density decreased with elevated $[\text{CO}_2]$. Differences in A were due to the stomata limitation and not to differences in the capacity of the photosynthetic apparatus. Additional details on the effects of air pollutants in the olive tree performance are given in the review paper by Sebastiani et al. (2002). They also reported main effects of enhanced UV-B radiation. The depletion of the ozone layer, a natural filter for UV-B radiation, is leading to increasing crop UV-B irradiance. The authors summarized a number of papers on the effect of UV-B radiation in olive, and outlined that the species shows high resistance to increased levels of UV-B, thanks to the protective effect of trichomes and to the synthesis of UV-B absorbing compounds at the leaf surface, such as flavonoids and anthocyanins.

Other air pollutants are particles from industrial activities. The effect of dust released from cement factories on olive leaf physiology was investigated by Nanos and Ilias (2007). Cement kiln dust applied to developing ‘Knoservolea’ olive leaves caused the chlrophyll a/chlorophyll b ratio to change and *A* to decrease. According to the authors, this could have been due to changes both on the amount and quality of the light reaching the chloroplasts. They also suggested a negative effect of the heavy metal toxicity of the dust on the photosynthetic apparatus.

The influence of climate change on the olive flowering phenology was evaluated, for Spanish and Italian cultivars, by García-Mozo et al. (2009). They reported that the olive flowering phenology will be more affected by the late spring temperature than by the winter or the early spring temperature, such thus that olive may be less affected by global warming than other early-spring-flowering species. Even so, Avolio et al. (2012) estimated that an advance of pollen season in Calabria (Italy) of about 9 days is expected for each degree of T_a rise. The authors estimated, from phenological model results and climate predictions, an anticipation of maximum olive flowering between 10 and 34 days, depending on the area. Tunahoğlu and Durdu (2012) evaluated the vulnerability of several Turkish olive cultivars to climate change. They reported that the expected increases in moisture deficit, average temperature and the frequency of extreme events in the Mediterranean Basin, will lead to significant decreases in olive oil yield. Recently, Orlandi et al. (2013) implemented a regional phenological model derived through the growing season index (GSI, developed for the prediction of plant phenology in response to climate). The authors demonstrated that the GSI-phenological model for olive predicted its intra-annual dynamics throughout Mediterranean cultivation areas. With the help of the model and data on local climatic changes over the last two decades, the authors predicted the possibility of a northward shift of olive cultivation areas, due to the enlargement of the growing season in winter, as well as a failure to satisfy the minimum chilling requirements in traditional southern cultivation areas.

Caution must be taken when extrapolating the abovementioned results to other locations and conditions. Iglesias et al. (2010) evaluated the adaptation of several crops, including olive, to changing climate. Results for the same crop were highly variable depending on location. The authors concluded that not only crop-specific responses, but also location-specific responses, including management and socio-economic conditions, must be taken into account when assessing the effect of changing climate scenarios in agriculture.

Acknowledgements

I thank Dr. M.V. Cuevas and Dr. A. Diaz-Espejo for their valuable comments and suggestions on early versions of the manuscript.

References

- Abd-El-Rahman, A.A., Shalaby, A.F., Balegh, M.S., 1966. Water economy of olive under desert conditions. *Flora* 156, 202–219.
- Ache, P., Bauer, H., Kollist, H., Al-Rasheid, K.A.S., Lautner, S., Hartung, W., Hedrich, R., 2010. Stomatal action directly feeds back on leaf turgor: new insights into the regulation of the plant water status from non-invasive pressure probe measurements. *The Plant Journal* 62, 1072–1082.
- Allen, R.G., Pereira, L.S., Raes, D., Smith, M., 1998. Crop evapotranspiration. Guidelines for computing crop water requirements. Irrigation and drainage paper 56. FAO, Rome, Italy.
- Angelopoulos, K., Dicchio, B., Xiloyannis, C., 1996. Inhibition of photosynthesis in olive trees (*Olea europaea* L.) during water stress and rewatering. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 47(301), 1093–1100.
- Aragües, R., Puy, J., Isidoro, D., 2004. Vegetative growth response of young olive trees (*Olea europaea* L., cv. Arbequina) to soil salinity and waterlogging. *Plant and Soil* 258, 69–80.
- Aragües, R., Puy, J., Royo, A., Espada, J.L., 2005. Three-year field response of young olive trees (*Olea europaea* L., cv. Arbequina) to soil salinity: Trunk growth and leaf ion accumulation. *Plant and Soil* 271, 265–273.
- Arquero, O., Barranco, D., Benlloch, M., 2006. Potassium starvation increases stomatal conductance in olive trees. *HortScience* 41(2), 433–436.
- Avolio, E., Orlandi, F., Bellecci, C., Fornaciari, M., Federico, S., 2012. Assessment of the impact of climate change on the olive flowering in Calabria (southern Italy). *Theoretical and Applied Climatology* 107, 531–540.
- Ayerza, R., Sibbett, G. S., 2001. Thermal adaptability of olive (*Olea europaea* L.) to the Arid Chaco of Argentina. *Agriculture Ecosystems and Environment* 84, 277–285.
- Bacelar, E.A., Correia, C.M., Moutinho-Pereira, J.M., Gonçalves, B.C., Lopes, J.I., Torres-Pereira, J.M.G., 2004. Sclerophylly and leaf anatomical traits of five field-grown

1467 olive cultivars growing under drought conditions. *Tree Physiology* 24, 233–239.

1468 Bacelar, E.A., Dario, L.S., Moutinho-Pereira, J.M., Lopes, J.I., Gonçalves, J.E., Ferreira,
1469 T.C., Correia, C.M., 2007b. Physiological behaviour, oxidative damage and
1470 antioxidative protection of olive trees grown under different irrigation regimes.
1471 *Plant and Soil* 292, 1–12.

1472 Bacelar, E.A., Moutinho-Pereira, J.M., Goncalves, B.C., Ferreira, H.F., Correia, C.A.,
1473 2007a. Changes in growth, gas exchange, xylem hydraulic properties and water use
1474 efficiency of three olive cultivars under contrasting water availability regimes.
1475 *Environmental and Experimental Botany* 60, 183–192.

1476 Barlett, M.K., Scoffoni, C., Sack, L., 2012. The determinants of leaf turgor loss point and
1477 prediction of drought tolerance of species and biomes: a global meta-analysis.
1478 *Ecology Letters* 15, 393–405.

1479 Ben-Gal, A., 2011. Salinity and olive: From physiological responses to orchard
1480 management. *Israel Journal of Plant Sciences* 59, 15–28.

1481 Ben-Gal, A., Kool, D., Agam, N., van Halsema, G.E., Yermiyahu, U., Yafe, A., Presnov,
1482 E., Erel, R., Majdop, A., Zipori, I., Segal, E., Rüger, S., Zimmermann, U., Cohen,
1483 Y., Alchanatis, V., Dag, A., 2010. Whole-tree water balance and indicators for
1484 short-term drought stress in non-bearing ‘Barnea’ olives. *Agricultural Water*
1485 *Management* 98, 124–133.

1486 Ben-Gal, A., Sagam, N., Alchanatis, V., Cohen, Y., Yermiyahu, U., Zipori, I., Presnov, E.,
1487 Sprintsin, M., Dag, A., 2009. Evaluating water stress in irrigated olives: correlation
1488 of soil water status, tree water status, and thermal imagery. *Irrigation Science* 27,
1489 367–376.

1490 Benlloch, M., Arboleda, F., Barranco, D., Fernández-Escobar, R., 1991. Response of
1491 young olive trees to sodium and boeron excess in irrigation water. *HortScience* 26,
1492 867–870.

1493 Berenguer, M.J., Vossen, P.M., Grattan, S.R., Connell, J.H., Polito, V.S., 2006. Tree
1494 irrigation levels for optimum chemical and sensory properties of olive oil.
1495 *HortScience* 41, 427–432.

1496 Berni, J.A.J., Zarco-Tejada, P., Suárez, L., Fereres, E., 2009. Thermal and narrowband
1497 multispectral remote sensing for vegetation monitoring from an unmanned aerial
1498 vehicle. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 47, 722–738.

1499 Bonachela, S., Orgaz, F., Villalobos, F.J., Fereres, E., 1999. Measurement and simulation
1500 of evaporation from soil in olive orchards. *Irrigation Science* 18, 205–211.

1501 Bonachela, S., Orgaz, F., Villalobos, F.J., Fereres, E., 2001. Soil evaporation from drip-
1502 irrigated olive orchards. *Irrigation Science* 20(2), 65–71.

1503 Bongi, G., Loreto, F., 1989. Gas-exchange properties of salt-stressed olive (*Olea europaea*
1504 L.) leaves. *Plant Physiology* 90, 1408–1416.

1505 Bongi, G., Mencuccini M., Fontanazza, G., 1987. Photosynthesis of olive leaves: effect of
1506 light flux density, leaf age, temperature, peltates, and H₂O vapor pressure deficit on
1507 gas exchange. *Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science* 112(1),
1508 143–148.

1509 Bongi, G., Palliotti, A., 1994. Olive. In: Schaffer, B., Andersen, P.C., (Eds.), *Handbook of*
1510 *Environmental Physiology of Fruit Crops. Volume I: Temperate Crops*. CRC Press,
1511 Inc., pp. 165–187.

1512 Bonofiglio, T., Orlandi, F., Sgromo, C., Romano, B., Fornaciari, M., 2009. Evidences of
1513 olive pollination date variations in relation to spring temperature trends.
1514 *Aerobiologia* 25, 227–237.

1515 Bosabalidis, A.M., Kofidis, G., 2002. Comparative effects of drought stress on leaf
1516 anatomy of two olive cultivars. *Plant Science* 163(2), 375–379.

1517 Boughalleb, F., Hajlaoui, H., 2011. Physiological and anatomical changes induced by
1518 drought in two olive cultivars (cv Zalmati and Chemlali). *Acta Physiologiae*
1519 *Plantarum* 33, 53–65.

1520 Boussadia, O., Mariem, F.B., Mechri, B., Boussetta, W., Braham, M., Ben El Hadj, S.,
1521 2008. Response to drought of two olive tree cultivars (cv Koroneiki and Meski).
1522 *Scientia Horticulturae* 116, 388–393.

1523 Bracci, T., Minnocci, A., Sebastiani, L., 2008. In vitro olive (*Olea europaea* L.) cvs
1524 Frantoio and Moraiolo microshoot tolerance to NaCl. *Plant Biosystems* 142(3),
1525 563–571.

1526 Brodersen, C.R., McElrone, A.J., Choat, B., Lee, E.F., Shackel, K.A., Matthews, M.A.,
1527 2013. In vivo visualizations of drought-induced embolism spread in *Vitis vinifera*.
1528 *Plant Physiology* 161, 1820–1829.

1529 Buckley, T.N., 2005. The control of stomata by water balance. *New Phytologist* 168, 275–
1530 292.

1531 Buckley, T.N., Mott, K.A., Farquhar, G.D., 2003. A hydromechanical and biochemical
1532 model of stomatal conductance. *Plant, Cell and Environment* 26, 1767–1785.

1533 Burgess, S.S.O., Adams, M.A., Turner, N.C., Ong, C.K., 1998. The redistribution of soil
1534 water by tree root systems. *Oecologia* 115, 306–311.

- Carr, M.K.V., 2013. The water relations and irrigation requirements of olive (*Olea europaea* L.): A review. *Experimental Agriculture* 49(4), 597–639.
- Caruso, G., Rapoport, H.F., Gucci, R. 2013. Long-term evaluation of yield components of young olive trees during the onset of fruit production under different irrigation regimes. *Irrigation Science* 31, 37–47.
- Castillo-Llanque, F., Rapoport, H.F., 2011. Relationship between reproductive behaviour and new shoot development in 5-year-old branches of olive trees (*Olea europaea* L.). *Trees* 25, 823–832.
- Celano, G., Dichio, B., Montanaro, G., Nuzzo, V., Palese, A.M., Xiloyannis, C., 1999. Distribution of dry matter and amount of mineral elements in irrigated and non-irrigated olive trees. *Acta Horticulturae* 474, 381–384.
- Celano, G., Nuzzo, V., Palese, A.M., Romano, M., Dichio, B., 1998. Dinamica di crescita dell'apparato radicale di giovani piante di olivo allevate in differenti condizioni di disponibilità idrica del suolo. In: *Proceedings of the Convegno Nazionale "Irrigazione e Ricerca: Progressi nell'uso della risorsa acqua"*. Bari, Italy, 1-2 October, pp. 225–229.
- Centritto, M., 2002. Interactive effects of elevated [CO₂] and drought on peach seedlings. *Plant Biosystems* 5, 177–188.
- Centritto, M., Loreto, F., Chartzoulakis, K., 2003. The use of low [CO₂] to estimate diffusional and non-diffusional limitations of photosynthetic capacity of salt-stressed olive saplings. *Plant, Cell and Environment* 26, 585–594.
- Centritto, M., Wahbi, S., Serraj, R., Chaves, M.M., 2005. Effects of partial rootzone drying (PRD) on adult olive tree (*Olea europaea*) in field conditions under arid climate II. Photosynthetic responses. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 106, 303–311.
- Chalmers, D.J., Mitchell, P.D., van Heek, L., 1981. Control of peach tree growth and productivity by regulated water supply, tree density and summer pruning. *Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science* 106, 307–312.
- Chartzoulakis, K.S., 2005. Salinity and olive: growth, salt tolerance, photosynthesis and yield. *Agricultural Water Management* 78, 108–121.
- Chartzoulakis, K., Loupassaki, M., Bertaki, M., Androulakis, I., 2002. Effects of NaCl salinity on growth, ion content and CO₂ assimilation rate of six olive cultivars. *Scientia Horticulturae* 96, 235–247.
- Chartzoulakis, K., Patakas, A., Bosabalidis, A.M., 1999. Changes in water relations, photosynthesis and leaf anatomy induced by intermittent drought in two olive

1569 cultivars. *Environmental and Experimental Botany* 42, 113–120.

1570 Chaves, M.M., Maroco, J.P., Pereira, J.S., 2003. Understanding plant responses to drought
1571 - from genes to the whole plant. *Functional Plant Biology* 30, 239–264.

1572 Chaves, M.M., Zarrouk, O., Francisco, R., Costa, J.M., Santos, T., Regalado, A.P.,
1573 Rodrigues, M.L., Lopes, C.M., 2010. Grapevine under deficit irrigation: hints from
1574 physiological and molecular data. *Annals of Botany-London* 105, 661–676.

1575 Cimato, A., Castelli, S., Tattini, M., Traversi, M.L., 2010. An ecophysiological analysis of
1576 salinity tolerance in olive. *Environmental and Experimental Botany* 68, 214–221.

1577 Connor, D.J., 2006. Towards optimal designs for hedgerow olive orchards. *Australian*
1578 *Journal of Agricultural Research* 57, 1067–1072.

1579 Connor, D.J., Fereres, E., 2005. The physiology of adaptation and yield expression in
1580 olive. *Horticultural Reviews* 34, 155–229.

1581 Correa-Tedesco, G., Rousseaux, M.C., Searles, P.S., 2010. Plant growth and yield
1582 responses in olive (*Olea europaea*) to different irrigation levels in an arid region of
1583 Argentina. *Agricultural Water Management* 97, 1829–1837.

1584 Cuevas, J., Rallo, L., Rapoport, H.F., 1994. Crop load effects on floral quality in olive.
1585 *Scientia Horticulturae* 59, 123–130.

1586 Cuevas, M.V., Martín-Palomo, M.J., Diaz-Espejo, A., Torres-Ruiz, J.M., Rodriguez-
1587 Dominguez, C.M., Perez-Martin, A., Pino-Mejías, R., Fernández, J.E., 2013.
1588 Assessing water stress in a hedgerow olive orchard from sap flow and trunk
1589 diameter measurements. *Irrigation Science* 31(4), 729–746.

1590 Cuevas, M.V., Torres-Ruiz, J.M., Álvarez, R., Jiménez, M.D., Cuerva, J., Fernández, J.E.,
1591 2010. Assessment of trunk diameter variation derived indices as water stress
1592 indicators in mature olive trees. *Agricultural Water Management* 97, 1293–1302.

1593 Dabbou, S., Chehab, H., Brahmi, F., Dabbou, S., Esposto, S., Selvaggini, R., Taticchi, A.,
1594 Servili, M., Montedoro, G.F., Hammami, M., 2010. Effect of three irrigation
1595 regimes on Arbequina olive oil produced under Tunisian growing conditions.
1596 *Agricultural Water Management* 97, 763–768.

1597 Dag, A., Ben-Gal, A., Yermiyahu, U., Basheer, L., Nir, Y., 2008. The effect of irrigation
1598 level and harvest mechanization on virgin olive oil quality in a traditional rain-fed
1599 ‘Souri’ olive orchard converted to irrigation. *Journal of the Science of Food and*
1600 *Agriculture* 88, 1524–1528.

- Dag, A., Bustan, A., Avni, A., Tzipori, I., Lavee, S., Riov, J., 2010. Timing of fruit removal affects concurrent vegetative growth and subsequent return bloom and yield in olive (*Olea europaea* L.). *Scientia Horticulturae* 123, 469–472.
- Dag, A., Kerem, Z., Yogev, N., Zipori, I., Lavee, S., Ben-David, E., 2011. Influence of time of harvest and maturity index on olive oil yield and quality. *Scientia Horticulturae* 127, 358–366.
- d'Andria, R., Lavini, A., Morelli, G., Patumi, M., Terenziani, S., Calandrelli, D., Fragnito, F., 2004. Effect of water regimes on five picking and double aptitude olive cultivars (*Olea europaea* L.). *Journal of Horticultural Science and Biotechnology* 78(1), 15–23.
- d'Andria, R., Lavini, A., Morelli, G., Sebastiani, L., Tognetti, R., 2009. Physiological and productive responses of *Olea europaea* L. cultivars Frantoio and Leccino to a regulated deficit irrigation regime. *Plant Biosystems* 143, 222–231.
- d'Andria, R., Lavini, A., Morelli, G., Tognetti, R., Aronne, G., De Micco, V., Ambrosino, M.L., Paduano, A., Conte, F., Sacchi, R., Sebastiani, L., 2008. The effect of irrigation management on plant performance and oil quality of two olive cvs. grown in a typical environment of Southern Italy. *Acta Horticulturae* 791 PART 1, 297–305.
- Davies, W.J., Wilkinson, S., Loveys, B.R., 2001. Stomatal control by chemical signalling and the exploitation of this mechanism to increase water use efficiency in agriculture. *New Phytologist* 153, 449–460.
- Deidda, P., 1968. Osservazioni sull'accrescimento delle drupe nell'olivo: variazioni di alcuni macroelementi nelle foglie e nei frutti ed andamento dell'inolizione. *Studi Sassaresi, Sez. III Annali della Facolta di Agraria dell' Universita di Sassari* 16, 1–15.
- De la Rosa, R., Rallo, L., Rapoport, H.F., 2000. Olive floral bud growth and starch content during winter rest and spring budbreak. *HortScience* 35, 1223–1227.
- Dell'Amico, J., Moriana, A., Corell, M., Girón, I.F., Morales, D., Torrecillas, A., Moreno, F., 2012. Low water stress conditions in table olive trees (*Olea europaea* L.) during pit hardening produced a different response on fruit and leaf water relations. *Agricultural Water Management* 114, 11–17.
- Denaxa, N.-K., Ropussos, P.E., Damvakaris, T., Stournaras, V., 2012. Comparative effects of exogenous glycine betaine, kaolin clay particles and Ambiol on photosynthesis,

1634 leaf sclerophylly indexes and heat load of olive cv. Chondrolia Chalkidikis under
1635 drought. *Scientia Horticulturae* 137, 87–94.

1636 Denney, J.O., McEachern, G.R., 1983. An analysis of several climatic temperature
1637 variables dealing with olive reproduction. *Journal of the American Society for*
1638 *Horticultural Science* 108(4), 578–581.

1639 Diaz-Espejo, A., 2000. Modelización del intercambio gaseoso en el olivo: aplicación a la
1640 optimización del riego. Doctoral Thesis. University of Seville. Department of
1641 Vegetal Biology and Ecology, 218 pp.

1642 Diaz-Espejo, A., Buckley, T.N., Sperry, J.S., Cuevas, M.V., de Cires, A., Elsayed-Farag,
1643 S., Martin-Palomo, M.J., Muriel, J.L., Perez-Martin, A., Rodriguez-Dominguez, C.,
1644 Rubio-Casal, A., Torres-Ruiz, J.M., Fernández, J.E., 2012. Steps toward an
1645 improvement in process-based models of water use by fruit trees: A case study in
1646 olive. *Agricultural Water Management* 114, 37–49.

1647 Diaz-Espejo, A., Fernández, J.E., Verhoef, A., Knight, J.R., Villagarcía, L., 2008. The use
1648 of high-resolution weighing lysimeters to improve estimates of soil evaporation in
1649 drip-irrigated olive orchards. *Acta Horticulturae* 791, 315–320.

1650 Diaz-Espejo, A., Hafidi, B., Fernández, J.E., Palomo, M.J., Sinoquet, H., 2002.
1651 Transpiration and photosynthesis of the olive tree: a model approach. *Acta*
1652 *Horticulturae* 586: 457–460.

1653 Diaz-Espejo, A., Nicolás, E., Fernández, J.E., 2007. Seasonal evolution of diffusional
1654 limitations and photosynthetic capacity in olive under drought. *Plant, Cell and*
1655 *Environment* 30, 922–933.

1656 Diaz-Espejo, A., Nicolás, E., Nortes, P., Rodriguez-Dominguez, C.M., Cuevas, M.V.,
1657 Perez-Martin, A., Torrez-Ruiz, J.M., 2013. Xylem functioning and water relations
1658 of the elastic living tissue of the bark: new insights about their coordination. *Acta*
1659 *Horticulturae* 991, 163–169.

1660 Diaz-Espejo, A., Walcroft, A.S., Fernandez, J.E., Hafidi, B., Palomo, M.J., Giron, I.F.,
1661 2006. Modeling photosynthesis in olive leaves under drought conditions. *Tree*
1662 *Physiology* 26, 1445–1456.

1663 Dichio, B., Montanaro, G., Sofo, A., Xiloyannis, C., 2013. Stem and whole-plant
1664 hydraulics in olive (*Olea europaea*) and kiwifruit (*Actinidia deliciosa*). *Trees* 27,
1665 183–191.

- 1666 Dichio, B., Xiloyannis, C., Angelopoulos, K., Nuzzo, V., Bufo, S.A., Celano, G., 2003.
1667 Drought-induced variations of water relations parameters in *Olea europea*. Plant
1668 and Soil 257, 381–389.
- 1669 Dichio, B., Xiloyannis, C., Sofo, A., Montanaro, G., 2005. Osmotic regulation in leaves
1670 and roots of olive trees during a water deficit and rewatering. Tree Physiology 26,
1671 179–185.
- 1672 Di Vaio, C., Marra, F.P., Scaglione, G., La Mantia, M., Caruso, T., 2012. The effect of
1673 different vigour olive clones on growth, dry matter partitioning and gas exchange
1674 under water deficit. Scientia Horticulturae 134, 72–78.
- 1675 Dodd, I.C., Theobald, J.C., Bacon, M.A., Davies, W.J., 2006. Alternation of wet and dry
1676 sides during partial rootzone drying irrigation alters root to-shoot signalling of
1677 abscisic acid. Functional Plant Biology 33, 1081–1089.
- 1678 Domec, J.C., King, J.S., Noormets, A., Treasure, E., Gavazzi, M.J., Sun, G., McNulty,
1679 S.G., 2010. Hydraulic redistribution of soil water by roots affects whole-stand
1680 evapotranspiration and net ecosystem carbon exchange. New Phytologist 187, 171–
1681 183.
- 1682 Domec, J.C., Scholz, F.G., Bucci, S.J., Meinzer, F.C., Goldstein, G., Villalobos-Vega, R.,
1683 2006. Diurnal and seasonal changes in root xylem embolism in neotropical savanna
1684 woody species: impact on stomatal control of plant water status. Plant, Cell and
1685 Environment 29, 26–35.
- 1686 Dry, P.R., Loveys, B.R., Botting, D., During, H., 1996. Effects of partial rootzone drying
1687 on grapevine vigour, yield, composition of fruit and use of water. In: Stockley,
1688 C.S., Sas, A.N., Johnstone, R.S., Lee, T.H. (Eds.), Proceedings of the 9th
1689 Australian Wine Industry Technical Conference. Winetitles, Adelaide, Australia,
1690 pp. 126–131.
- 1691 Dry, P.R., Loveys, B.R., McCarthy, M.G., Stoll, M., 2001. Strategic irrigation
1692 management in Australian vineyards. Journal International des Sciences de la
1693 Vigne et du Vin 35, 129–139.
- 1694 Ehrenberger, W., Rüger, S., Rodríguez-Domínguez, C.M., Díaz-Espejo, A., Fernández,
1695 J.E., Moreno, J., Zimmermann, D., Sukhorukov, V.L., Zimmermann, U., 2012.
1696 Leaf patch clamp pressure probe measurements on olive leaves in a nearly
1697 turgorless state. Plant Biology 14(4), 666–674.
- 1698 Ennajeh, M., Vadel, A.M., Khemira, H., Ben Mimoun, M., Hellali, R., 2006. Defense
1699 mechanisms against water deficit in two olive (*Olea europaea* L.) cultivars ‘Meski’

1700 and 'Chemlali'. Journal of Horticultural Science and Biotechnology 81(1), 99–104.

1701 Fabbri, A., Benelli, C., 2000. Flower bud induction and differentiation in olive. Journal of
1702 Horticultural Science and Biotechnology 75(2), 131–141.

1703 Farquhar, G.D., von Caemmerer, S., Berry, J.A., 1980. A biochemical model of
1704 photosynthetic CO₂ assimilation in leaves of C₃ species. Planta 149, 78–90.

1705 Fereres, E., Moriana, A., Ruz, C., 1998. Relaciones hídricas en olivo durante el invierno.
1706 In: Proceedings of the 4th Simposium Hispano-Portugués “Relaciones Hídricas en
1707 las Plantas”, Murcia, Spain, 2-3 November, pp. 49–52.

1708 Fereres, E., Ruz, C., Castro, J., Gómez, J.A., Pastor, M., 1996. Recuperación del olivo
1709 después de una sequía extrema. In: Proceedings of the XIV Congreso Nacional de
1710 Riegos. Aguadulce, Almería, Spain, 11-13 June, pp. 89–93.

1711 Fernandes-Silva, A.A., Ferreira, T.C., Correia, C.M., Malheiro, A.C., Villalobos, F.J.,
1712 2010. Influence of different irrigation regimes on crop yield and water use
1713 efficiency of olive. Plant and Soil 333, 35–47.

1714 Fernandes-Silva, A.A., Falco, V., Correia, C.M., Villalobos, F.J., 2013. Sensory analysis
1715 and volatile compounds of olive oil (cv. Cobrançosa) from different irrigation
1716 regimes. Grasas Aceites 61, 59–67.

1717 Fernández, J.E., Cuevas, M.V., 2010. Irrigation scheduling from stem diameter variations:
1718 a review. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology 150, 135–151.

1719 Fernández, J.E., Clothier, B.E., 2002. Water Uptake by Plants. In: *The Encyclopaedia of*
1720 *Life Support Systems (EOLSS)*, Developed under the Auspices of the UNESCO,
1721 Eolss Publishers, Oxford, UK, [<http://www.eolss.net>].

1722 Fernández, J.E., Diaz-Espejo, A., d'Andria, R., Sebastiani, L., Tognetti, R., 2008b.
1723 Potential and limitations of improving olive orchard design and management
1724 through modelling. Plant Biosystems 142, 130–137.

1725 Fernández, J.E., Diaz-Espejo, A., Infante, J.M., Durán, P., Palomo, M.J., Chamorro, V.,
1726 Girón, I.F., Villagarcía, L., 2006b. Water relations and gas exchange in olive trees
1727 under regulated deficit irrigation and partial rootzone drying. Plant and Soil 284,
1728 273–291.

1729 Fernández, J.E., Durán, P.J., Palomo, M.J., Diaz-Espejo, A., Chamorro, V., Girón, I.F.,
1730 2006a. Calibration of sap flow estimated by the compensation heat pulse method in
1731 olive, plum and orange trees: relationships with xylem anatomy. Tree Physiology
1732 26, 719–728.

1733 Fernández, J.E., Green, S.R., Caspari, H.W., Diaz-Espejo, A., Cuevas, M.V., 2008c. The

1734 use of sap flow measurements for scheduling irrigation in olive, apple and Asian
 1735 pear trees and in grapevines. *Plant and Soil* 305, 91–104.

1736 Fernández, J.E., Moreno, F., 1999. Water use by the olive tree. *Journal of Crop Production*
 1737 2, 101–162.

1738 Fernández, J.E., Moreno, F., Cabrera, F., Arrúe, J.L., Martín-Aranda, J., 1991. Drip
 1739 irrigation, soil characteristics and the root distribution and root activity of olive
 1740 trees. *Plant and Soil* 133, 239–251.

1741 Fernández, J.E., Moreno, F., Girón, I.F., Blázquez, O.M., 1997. Stomatal control of water
 1742 use in olive tree leaves. *Plant and Soil* 190, 179–192.

1743 Fernández, J.E., Moreno, F., Martín-Aranda, J., Fereres, E., 1992. Olive-tree root dynamics
 1744 under different soil water regimes. *Agricultura Mediterranea* 122, 225–235.

1745 Fernández, J.E., Moreno, F., Martín-Palomo, M.J., Cuevas, M.V., Torres-Ruiz, J.M.,
 1746 Moriana, A., 2011a. Combining sap flow and trunk diameter measurements to
 1747 assess water needs in mature olive orchards. *Environmental and Experimental*
 1748 *Botany* 72, 330–338.

1749 Fernández, J.E., Palomo, M.J., Diaz-Espejo, A., Giron, I.F., 2003. Influence of partial soil
 1750 wetting on water relation parameters of the olive tree. *Agronomie* 23, 545–552.

1751 Fernández, J.E., Perez-Martin, A., Torres-Ruiz, J.M., Cuevas, M.V., Rodriguez-
 1752 Dominguez, C.M., Elsayed-Farag, S., Morales-Sillero, A., García, J.M., Hernandez-
 1753 Santana, V., Diaz-Espejo, A., 2013. A regulated deficit irrigation strategy for
 1754 hedgerow olive orchards with high plant density. *Plant and Soil*, DOI:
 1755 10.1007/s11104-013-1704-2

1756 Fernández, J.E., Palomo, M.J., Díaz-Espejo, A., Clothier, B.E., Green, S.R., Girón, I.F.,
 1757 Moreno, F., 2001. Heat-pulse measurements of sap flow in olives for automating
 1758 irrigation: tests, root flow and diagnostics of water stress. *Agricultural Water*
 1759 *Management* 51, 99–123.

1760 Fernández, J.E., Rodriguez-Dominguez, C.M., Perez-Martin, A., Zimmermann, U., Rüger,
 1761 S., Martín-Palomo, M.J., Torres-Ruiz, J.M., Cuevas, M.V., Sann, C., Ehrenberger,
 1762 W., Diaz-Espejo, A., 2011b. Online-monitoring of tree water stress in a hedgerow
 1763 olive orchard using the leaf patch clamp pressure probe. *Agricultural Water*
 1764 *Management* 100, 25–35.

1765 Fernández, J.E., Romero, R., Montañó, J.C., Diaz-Espejo, A., Muriel, J.L., Cuevas, M.V.,
 1766 Moreno, F., Girón, I.F., Palomo, M.J., 2008a. Design and testing of an automatic

1767 irrigation controller for fruit tree orchards, based on sap flow measurements.
 1768 Australian Journal of Agricultural Research 59, 589–598.

1769 Fernández-Escobar, R., Benlloch, M., Navarro, C., Martin, G.C., 1992. The time of floral
 1770 induction in the olive. Journal of the American Society of Horticultural Science
 1771 117(2), 304–307.

1772 Fernández-Escobar, R., García-Novelo, J.M., Molina-Spria, C., Parra, M.A., 2012. An
 1773 approach to nitrogen balance in olive orchards. Scientia Horticulturae 135, 219–
 1774 226.

1775 Fernández-Escobar, R., Marin, L., Sánchez-Zamora, M.A., García-Novelo, J.M., Molina-
 1776 Soria, C., Parra, M.A., 2009. Long-term effects of N fertilization on cropping and
 1777 growth of olive trees and on N accumulation in soil profile. European Journal of
 1778 Agronomy 31, 223–232.

1779 Ferreira, M.-I., Conceição, N., David, T.S., Nadezhdina, N. 2013. Role of lignotuber
 1780 versus roots in the water supply of rainfed olives. Acta Horticulturae 991, 181–188.

1781 Fiorino, P., Mancuso, S., 2000. Differential thermal analysis , supercooling and cell
 1782 viability in organs of *Olea europaea* at subzero temperatures. Advances in
 1783 Horticultural Science 14, 23–27.

1784 Flexas, J., Ribas-Carbó, M., Diaz-Espejo, A., Galmés, J., 2008. Mesophyll conductance to
 1785 CO₂: current knowledge and future prospects. Plant, Cell and Environment 31,
 1786 602–621.

1787 Freeman, M., Uriu, K., Hartmann, H.T., 1994. Diagnosing and correcting nutrient
 1788 problems. In: Ferguson, L., Sibbett, G.S., Martin, G.C. (Eds.), Olive Production
 1789 Manual. University of California, Publication 3353, pp. 77–86.

1790 García, J.M., Cuevas, M.V., Fernández, J.E. 2013. Production and oil quality in
 1791 ‘Arbequina’ olive (*Olea europaea*, L.) trees under two deficit irrigation strategies.
 1792 Irrigation Science 31(3), 359–370.

1793 García-Mozo, H., Orlandi, F., Galan, C., Fornaciari, M., Romano, B., Ruiz, L., Diaz de la
 1794 Guardia, M., Trigo, M.M., Chuine, I., 2009. Olive flowering phenology variation
 1795 between different cultivars in Spain and Italy: modeling analysis. Theoretical
 1796 Applied Climatology 95, 385–395.

1797 Ghandari, R., Anwar, F., Alkharfy, K.M., Gilani, A.-H., Saari, N., 2012. Valuable nutrients
 1798 and functional bioactives in different parts of olive (*Olea europaea* L.) – A review.
 1799 International Journal of Molecular Sciences 13, 3291–3340.

1800 Gimenez, C., Fereres, E., Ruz, C., Orgaz, F., 1996. Water relations and gas exchange of

1801 olive trees: diurnal and seasonal patterns of leaf water potential photosynthesis and
1802 stomatal conductance. *Acta Horticulturae* 449, 411–415.

1803 Giorgelli, F., Lorenzino, G., Minnocci, A., Panicucci, A., Vitagliano, C., 1994. Effects of
1804 long-term SO₂ pollution on olive trees. *Acta Horticulturae* 356, 185–188.

1805 Giorio, P., Giorio, G., 2003. Sap flow of several olive trees estimated with the heat-pulse
1806 technique by continuous monitoring of a single gauge. *Environmental and*
1807 *Experimental Botany* 49, 9–20.

1808 Goldhamer, D.A., 1999. Regulated deficit irrigation for California canning olives. *Acta*
1809 *Horticulturae* 474, 369–372.

1810 Goldhamer, D.A., Ferguson, L., Dunai, J., 1994. Irrigation requirements of olive trees and
1811 responses to sustained deficit irrigation. *Acta Horticulturae* 356, 172–175.

1812 Gómez, J.A., Giráldez, J.V., Fereres, E., 2001 Rainfall interception by olive trees in
1813 relation to leaf area. *Agricultural Water Management* 49, 65–76.

1814 Gómez-del-Campo, M., 2010. Physiological and growth responses to irrigation of a newly
1815 established hedgerow olive orchard. *HortScience* 45(5), 809–814.

1816 Gómez-del-Campo, M., 2013. Summer deficit-irrigation strategies in a hedgerow olive
1817 orchard cv. ‘Arbequina’: effect on fruit characteristics and yield. *Irrigation Science*
1818 31(3), 259–269.

1819 Gómez-del-Campo, M., García, J.M., 2012. Canopy fruit location can affect olive oil
1820 quality in ‘Arbequina’ hedgerow orchards. *Journal of the American Oil Chemistry*
1821 *Society* 89, 123–133.

1822 Gómez-Rico, A., Salvador, M.D., la Greca, M., Fregapane, G., 2006. Phenolic and volatile
1823 compounds of extra virgin olive oil (*Olea europaea* L. cv. Cornicabra) with regard
1824 to fruit ripening and irrigation management. *Journal of Agricultural Food*
1825 *Chemistry* 54, 7130–7136.

1826 Gómez-Rico, A., Salvador, M.D., Moriana, A., Pérez, D., Olmedilla, N., Ribas, F.,
1827 Fregapane, G., 2007. Influence of different irrigation strategies in a traditional
1828 Cornicabra cv. Olive orchard on virgin olive oil composition and quality. *Food*
1829 *Chemistry* 100, 568–578.

1830 Gracia, P., Sánchez-Gimeno, A.C., Benito, M., Oria, R., Lasa, J.M., 2012. Short
1831 communication. Harvest time in hedgerow ‘Arbequina’ olive orchards in areas with
1832 early frosts. *Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research* 10(1), 179–182.

1833 Graniti, A., Faedda, R., Cacciola, S.O., Magnano di San Lio, G., 2011. Olive diseases in a
1834 changing ecosystem. In: Schena L., Agosteo, G.E., Cacciola, S.O. (Eds.). *Olive*

1835 diseases and disorders. Transworld Research Network, Trivandrum, Kerala, India,
1836 pp. 403–433.

1837 Grattan, S.R., Berenguer, M.J., Connell, J.H., Polito, V.S., Vossen, P.M., 2006. Olive oil
1838 production as influenced by different quantities of applied water. *Agricultural*
1839 *Water Management* 85, 133–140.

1840 Greven, M., Neal, S., Green, S., Dichio, B., Clothier, B., 2009. The effects of drought on
1841 the water use, fruit development and oil yield from young olive trees. *Agricultural*
1842 *Water Management* 96, 1525–1531.

1843 Grigg, A., Lambers, H., Veneklaas, E., 2010. Changes in water relations for *Acacia*
1844 *ancistrocarpa* on natural and mine-rehabilitation sites in response to an
1845 experimental wetting pulse in the Great Sandy Desert. *Plant and Soil* 326, 75–96.

1846 Gucci, R., Cantini, C., 2000. *Pruning and Training Systems for Modern Olive Growing*.
1847 CSIRO Publish, Collingwood, Australia. 144 pp.

1848 Gucci, R., Caruso, G., Bertolla, C., Urbani, S., Taticchi, A., Esposto, S., Servili, M., Sifola,
1849 M.I., Pellegrini, S., Pagliai, M., Vignozzi, N., 2012b. Changes of soil properties and
1850 tree performace induced by soil management in a high–density olive orchard.
1851 *European Journal of Agronomy* 41,18–27.

1852 Gucci, R., Goldhamer, D.A., Fereres, E., 2012a. Olive. In: Steduto, P., Hsiao, T.C.,
1853 Fereres, E., Raes, D. (Eds.), *Crop Yield Response to Water*. Irrigation & Drainage
1854 Paper No. 66, FAO, Rome, Italy, pp. 298–313.

1855 Gucci, R., Lodolini, E., Rapaport, H.F., 2007. Productivity of olive tress with different
1856 water status and crop load. *Journal of Horticultural Science and Biotechnology* 82,
1857 648–656.

1858 Gucci, R., Lodolini, E.M., Rapoport, H.F., 2009. Water deficit-induced changes in
1859 mesocarp cellular processes and the relationship between mesocarp and endocarp
1860 during olive fruit development. *Tree Physiology* 29, 1575–1585.

1861 Gucci, R., Lombardini, L., Tattini, M., 1997. Analysis of leaf water relations in leaves of
1862 two olive (*Olea europaea*) cultivars differingin tolerance to salinity. *Tree*
1863 *Physiology* 17, 31–21.

1864 Gucci, R., Tattini, M., 1997. Salinity tolerance in olive. *Horticultural Reviews* 21, 177–
1865 214.

1866 Guerfel, M., Baccouri, O., Boujnah, D., Chaïbi, W., Zarrouk, M., 2009. Impacts of water
1867 stress on gas exchange, water relations, chlorophyll content and leaf structure in the
1868 two main Tunisian olive (*Olea europaea* L.) cultivars. *Scientia Horticulturae* 119,

1869 257–263.

1870 Hacke, U.G., Sperry, J.S., Wheeler, J.K., and Castro, L., 2006. Scaling of angiosperm
1871 xylem structure with safety and efficiency. *Tree Physiology*, 26, 689–701.

1872 Hammami, S.B.M., Manrique, T., Rapoport, H.F., 2011. Cultivar-based fruit size in olive
1873 depends on different tissue and cellular processes throughout growth. *Scientia*
1874 *Horticulturae* 130, 445–451.

1875 Hammami, S.B.M., Costagli, G., Rapoport, H.F., 2013. Cell and tissue dynamics of olive
1876 endocarp sclerification vary according to water availability. *Physiologia Plantarum*
1877 doi:10.1111/ppl.12097

1878 Hetherington, A.M., Woodward, F.I., 2003. The role of stomata in sensing and driving
1879 environmental change. *Nature* 424, 901–8.

1880 Iglesias, A., Quiroga, S., Schlickenrieder, J., 2010. Climate change and agricultural
1881 adaptation: assessing management uncertainty for four crop types in Spain. *Climate*
1882 *Research* 44, 83–94.

1883 Iniesta, F., Testi, L., Orgaz, F., Villalobos, F.J., 2009. The effects of regulated and
1884 continuous deficit irrigation on the water use, growth and yield of olive trees.
1885 *European Journal of Agronomy* 30, 258–265.

1886 Jansen, S., Choat, B., Pletsers, A., 2009. Morphological variation of intervessel pit
1887 membranes and implications to xylem function in angiosperms. *American Journal*
1888 *of Botany* 96(2), 409–419.

1889 Jarvis, P.G., 1976. The interpretation of the variation in leaf water potential and stomatal
1890 conductance found in canopies in the field. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*
1891 *Society, London Ser. B* 273, 593–610.

1892 Jones, H.G., 1983. Estimation of an effective soil water potential at the root surface of
1893 transpiring plants. *Plant, Cell and Environment* 6, 671–674.

1894 Jorba, J., Tapia, L., Sant, D., 1985. Photosynthesis, leaf water potential, and stomatal
1895 conductance in *Olea europaea* under wet and drought conditions. *Acta Horticulturae*
1896 171, 237–246.

1897 Kijne, J.W., Barker, R., Molden, D.J., 2003. *Water Productivity in Agriculture: Limits and*
1898 *Opportunities for Improvement*. CABI, IWMI, Wallingford, UK.

1899 Koubouris, G.C., Metzidakis, I.T., Vasilakakis, M.D., 2009. Impact of temperatura on
1900 olive (*Olea europaea* L.) pollen performance in relation to relative humidity and
1901 genotype. *Environmental and Experimental Botany* 67, 209–214.

1902 Larbi, A., Gargouri, K., Ayadi, M., Dhiab, A.B., Msallem, M., 2011. Effect of foliar boron

- 1903 application on growth, reproduction, and oil quality of olive trees conducted under
1904 a high density planting system. *Journal of Plant Nutrition* 34, 2083–2094.
- 1905 Larcher, W., 1995. *Physiological Plant Ecology* (3rd ed.), Springer-Verlag, Berlin,
1906 Heidelberg, 506 pp.
- 1907 Larcher, W., Moraes, J.A.P.V., Bauer, H., 1981. Adaptative responses of leaf water
1908 potential, CO₂-gas exchange and water used efficiency of *Olea europea* during
1909 drying and rewatering. In: Margaris, N.S., Mooney, H.A. (Eds.), *Components of*
1910 *productivity of Mediterranean-Climate Regions. Basic and Applied Aspects*. The
1911 Hague, Boston, London, pp. 77–84.
- 1912 Larsen, F.E., Higgins, S.S., Al Wir, A., 1989. Diurnal water relations of apple, apricot,
1913 grape, olive and peach in an arid environment (Jordan). *Scientia Horticulturae* 39,
1914 211–222.
- 1915 Lavee, S., 1985. *Olea europea*. In: Halevy, A.H. (Ed.), *CRC Handbook of Flowering*,
1916 Volume III. CRC Press, Inc., pp. 423–434.
- 1917 Lavee, S., 1986. Olive. In: Monselise, S.P. (Ed.), *CRC Handbook of Fruit Set and*
1918 *Development*. CRC Press, Inc., pp. 261–276.
- 1919 Lavee, S., 1996. Biology and Physiology of the Olive Tree. In: Lavee, S., Barranco, D.,
1920 Bongi, G., Jardak, T., Loussert, R., Martin, G.C., Trigui, A. (Eds.), *World Olive*
1921 *Encyclopedia*. International Olive Council, pp. 61–110.
- 1922 Lavee, S., Hanoeh, E., Wodner, M., Abramowich, H., 2007. The effect of predetermined
1923 deficit irrigation on the performance of cv. Muhasan olives (*Olea europaea* L.) in
1924 the eastern coastal plain of Israel. *Scientia Horticulturae* 112, 156–163.
- 1925 Lavee, S., Nashef, M., Wodner, M., Harshemesh, H., 1990. The effect of complementary
1926 irrigation added to old olive trees (*Olea europaea* L.) cv. Souri on fruit
1927 characteristics, yield and oil production. *Advances in Horticultural Science* 4, 135–
1928 138.
- 1929 Lavee, S., Wodner, M., 1991. Factors affecting the nature of oil accumulation in fruit of
1930 olive (*Olea europaea* L.) cultivars. *Journal of Horticultural Science* 66(5), 583–591.
- 1931 Lavee, S., Wodner, M., 2004. The effect of yield, harvest time and fruit size on the oil
1932 content in fruits of irrigated olive trees (*Olea europaea*), cvs. Barnea and
1933 Manzanillo. *Scientia Horticulturae* 99(3-4), 267–277.
- 1934 León, L., de la Rosa, R., Rallo, L., Guerrero, N., Barranco, D., 2007. Influence of spacing
1935 on the initial production of hedgerow ‘Arbequina’ olive orchards. *Spanish Journal*
1936 *of Agricultural Research* 5(4), 554–558.

- 1937 Leuning, R., 1995. A critical appraisal of a combined stomatal-photosynthesis model for
1938 C₃ plants. *Plant, Cell and Environment* 18, 339–355.
- 1939 Limousin, J.M., Longepierre, D., Huc, R., Rambal, S., 2010. Change in hydraulic traits of
1940 Mediterranean *Quercus ilex* subjected to long-term throughfall exclusion. *Tree*
1941 *Physiology* 30, 1026–1036.
- 1942 Lobet, G., Pagès, L., Draye, X., 2013. First steps towards an explicit modelling of ABA
1943 production and translocation in relation with the water uptake dynamics. *Acta*
1944 *Horticulturae* 991, 373–381.
- 1945 Lo Gullo, M.A., Salleo S., 1988. Different strategies of drought resistance in three
1946 Mediterranean sclerophyllous trees growing in the same environmental conditions.
1947 *The New Phytologist* 108, 267–276.
- 1948 Lopez-Bernal, A., Alcantara, E., Testi, L., Villalobos, F.J., 2010. Spatial sap flow and
1949 xylem anatomical characteristics in olive trees under different irrigation regimes.
1950 *Tree Physiology* 30, 1536–1544.
- 1951 Lopez-Villalta, L.C., 1996. The importance of nutrients in olive orchards. In: International
1952 Olive Oil Council (Eds.), *World Olive Enciclopedia*. pp. 159–161.
- 1953 Loreti, F., Natali S., 1981. Irrigazione. In: Baldini, E., Scaramuzzi, F. (Eds.), *L’Olivo*.
1954 Ramo Editoriale Agricoltori, Rome, Italy, pp. 93–118.
- 1955 Loreto, F., Centritto, M., Chantzoulakis, K., 2003. Photosynthetic limitations in olive
1956 cultivars with different sensitivity to salt stress. *Plant, Cell and Environment* 26,
1957 595–601.
- 1958 Lovisolo, C., Perrone, I., Carra, A., Ferrandino, A., Flexas, J., Medrano, H., Schubert, A.,
1959 2010. Drought-induced changes in development and function of grapevine (*Vitis*
1960 spp.) organs and in their hydraulic and non-hydraulic interactions at the whole-plant
1961 level: a physiological and molecular update. *Functional Plant Biology* 37, 98–116.
- 1962 Lovisolo, C., Perrone, I., Hartung, W., Schubert, A., 2008. An abscisic acid-related reduced
1963 transpiration promotes gradual embolism repair when grapevines are rehydrated
1964 after drought. *New Phytologist* 180, 642–651.
- 1965 Machado, M., Felizardo, C., Fernandes-Silva, A.A., Nunes, F.M., Barros, A., 2013.
1966 Polyphenolic compounds, antioxidant activity and L-phenylalanine ammonia-lyase
1967 activity during ripening of olive cv. “Cobrançosa” under different irrigation
1968 regimes. *Food Research International* 51, 412–421.
- 1969 Maherali, H., Pockman, W.T., Jackson, R.B., 2004. Adaptive variation in the vulnerability
1970 of woody plants to xylem cavitation. *Ecology* 85, 2184–2199.

1971 Marchi, S., Guidotti, D., Sebastiani, L., Tognetti, R., 2007. Changes in assimilation
1972 capacity during leaf development in broad-leaved *Prunus persica* and
1973 sclerophyllous *Olea europaea*. Journal of Horticultural Science and Biotechnology
1974 82(1), 69–78.

1975 Marchi, S., Sebastiani, L., Gucci, R., Tognetti, R., 2005. Changes in sink-source
1976 relationships during shoot development in olive. Journal of the American Society
1977 for Horticultural Science 130(4), 631–637.

1978 Marchi, S., Tognetti, R., Minocci, A., Borghi, M., Sebastiani, L., 2008. Variation in
1979 mesophyll anatomy and photosynthetic capacity during leaf development in a
1980 deciduous mesophyte fruit tree (*Prunus persica*) and an evergreen sclerophyllous
1981 Mediterranean shrub (*Olea europaea*). Trees 22, 559–571.

1982 Mariscal, M.J., Orgaz, F., Villalobos, F., 2000b Radiation-use-efficiency and dry matter
1983 partitioning of a young olive (*Olea europaea*) orchard. Tree Physiology 20, 65–72.

1984 Mariscal, M.J., Orgaz, F., Villalobos, F.J., 2000a. Modelling and measurement of radiation
1985 interception by olive canopies. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology 100, 183–197.

1986 Martín-Vertedor, A.I., Pérez-Rodríguez, J.M., Prieto-Losada, E., Fereres-Castiel, E.,
1987 2011a. Interactive responses to water deficits and crop load in olive (*Olea europaea*
1988 L., cv. Morisca). II: Water use, fruit and oil yield. Agricultural Water Management
1989 98, 950–958.

1990 Martín-Vertedor, A.I., Pérez-Rodríguez, J.M., Prieto-Losada, E., Fereres-Castiel, E.,
1991 2011b. Interactive responses to water deficits and crop load in olive (*Olea europaea*
1992 L., cv. Morisca). I: Growth and water relations. Agricultural Water Management
1993 98, 941–949.

1994 Martinez-Vilalta, J., Prat, E., Oliveras, I., Piñol, J., 2002. Xylem hydraulic properties of
1995 roots and stems of nine Mediterranean species. Oecologia 133, 19–29.

1996 McElrone, A.J., Bichler, J., Pockman, W.T., Addington, R.N., Linder, C.R., Jackson, R.B.,
1997 2007. Aquaporin-mediated changes in hydraulic conductivity of deep tree roots
1998 accessed via caves. Plant, Cell and Environment 30, 1411–1421.

1999 Mediavilla, S., Escudero, A., Heilmeyer, H., 2001. Internal leaf anatomy and
2000 photosynthetic resource-use efficiency: interspecific and intraspecific comparisons.
2001 Tree Physiology 21, 251–259.

2002 Meinzer, F.C., Johnson, D.M., Lachenbruch, B., McCulloh, K.A., Woodruff, D.R., 2009.
2003 Xylem hydraulic safety margins in woody plants: coordination of stomatal control
2004 of xylem tension with hydraulic capacitance. Functional Ecology 23, 922–930.

2005 Melgar, J.C., Benlloch, M., Fernandez-Escobar, R., 2006. Calcium increases sodium
2006 exclusion in olive plants. *Scientia Horticulturae* 109, 303–305.

2007 Melgar, J.C., Guidi, L., Remorini, D., Agati, G., Degl’Innocenti, E., Castelli, S., Baratto,
2008 M.C., Faraloni, C., Tattini, M., 2009b. Antioxidant defences and oxidative damage
2009 in salt-treated olive plants under contrasting sunlight irradiance. *Tree Physiology*
2010 29(9), 1187–1198.

2011 Melgar, J.C., Mohamed, Y., Serrano, N., García-Galavís, P.A., Navarro, C., Parra, M.A.,
2012 Benlloch, M., Fernández-Escobar, R., 2009a. Long term responses of olive trees to
2013 salinity. *Agricultural Water Management* 96, 1105–1113.

2014 Minnocci, A., Panicucci, A., Sebastiani, L., Lorenzini, G., Vitagliano, C., 1999.
2015 Physiological and morphological responses of olive plants to ozone exposure
2016 during a growing season. *Tree Physiology* 19, 391–397.

2017 Morales-Sillero, A., Fernández, J.E., Ordovás, J., Suárez, M.P., Pérez, J.A., Liñán, J.,
2018 López, E.P., Girón, I., Troncoso, A., 2009. Plant-soil interactions in a fertigated
2019 ‘Manzanilla de Sevilla’ olive orchard. *Plant and Soil* 319, 147–162.

2020 Morales-Sillero, A., García, J.M., Torres-Ruiz, J.M., Montero, A., Sánchez-Ortiz, A.,
2021 2013. Is the productive performance of olive trees under localized irrigation affected
2022 by leaving some roots in drying soil? *Agricultural Water Management* 123, 79–92.

2023 Morales-Sillero, A., Fernández, J.E., Beltrán, G., Jiménez, R., Troncoso, A., 2007.
2024 Influence of fertigation in ‘Manzanilla de Sevilla’ olive oil quality. *HortScience* 42,
2025 1157–1162.

2026 Moreno, F., Fernández, J.E., Clothier, B.E., Green, S.R., 1996. Transpiration and root
2027 water uptake by olive trees. *Plant and Soil* 184, 85–96.

2028 Moreshet, S., Cohen, Y., Green, G.C., Fuchs, M., 1990. The partitioning of hydraulic
2029 conductances within mature orange trees. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 41, 833–
2030 839.

2031 Moriana, A., Girón, I.F., Martín-Palomo, M.J., Conejero, W., Ortuño, M.F., Torrecillas,
2032 A., Moreno, F., 2010. New approach for olive trees irrigation scheduling using
2033 trunk diameter sensors. *Agricultural Water Management* 97, 1822–1828.

2034 Moriana, A., Orgaz, F., Pastor, M., Fereres, E., 2003. Yield responses of a mature olive
2035 orchard to water deficits. *Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science*
2036 128(3), 425–431.

- Moriana, A., Pérez-López, D., Prieto, M.H., Ramírez-Santa-Pau, M., Pérez-Rodríguez, J.M., 2012. Midday stem water potential as a useful tool for estimating irrigation requirements in olive trees. *Agricultural Water Management* 112, 43–54.
- Moriana, A., Villalobos, F.J., Fereres, E., 2002. Stomatal and photosynthetic responses of olive (*Olea europaea* L.) leaves to water deficits. *Plant, Cell and Environment* 25, 395–405.
- Motilva, M.J., Tovar, M.J., Romero, M.P., Alegre, S., Girona, J., 2000. Influence of regulated deficit irrigation strategies applied to olive trees (Arbequina cultivar) on oil yield and oil composition during the fruit ripening period. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture* 80(14), 2037–2043.
- Nadezhdina, N., David, T.S., David, J.S., Nadezhdin, V., Cermak, J., Gebauer, R., Ferreira, M.I., Conceicao, N., Dohnal, M., Tesar, M., Gartner, K., Ceulemans, R., 2012. Root function: In situ Studies Through Sap Flow Research. In: Manusco, S. (Ed.), *Measuring Roots, An Updated Approach*, Chapter 14th. Springer Heidelberg Dordrecht, London, New York. pp. 267–290.
- Nadezhdina, N., Nadezhdin, V., Ferreira, M.I., Pitacco, A., 2007. Variability with xylem depth in sap flow in trunks and branches of mature olive trees. *Tree Physiology* 27, 105–113.
- Nadler, A., Raveh, E., Yermiyahu, U., Lado, M., Nasser, A., Barak, M., Green, S., 2008. Detecting water stress in trees using stem electrical conductivity measurements. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 72, 1014–1024.
- Nanos, G.D., Ilias, I.F., 2007. Effects of inert dust on olive (*Olea europaea* L.) leaf physiological parameters. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 14(3), 212–214.
- Naor, A., Peres, M., Greenblat, Y., Gal, Y., Ben Aire, R., 2004. Effects of pre-harvest irrigation regime and crop level on yield, fruit size distribution and fruit quality of field grown ‘Black Amber’ Japanese plum. *Journal of Horticultural Science and Biotechnology* 79, 281–288.
- Naor, A., Gal, Y., Peres, M., 2006. The inherent variability of water stress indicators in apple, nectarine and pear orchards, and the validity of a leaf-selection procedure for water potential measurements. *Irrigation Science* 24, 129–135.
- Naor, A., Schneider, D., Ben-Gal, A., Zipori, I., Dag, A., Kerem, Z., Birger, R., Peres, M., Gal, Y., 2013. The effects of crop load and irrigation rate in the oil accumulation stage on oil yield and water relations of ‘Koroneiki’ olives. *Irrigation Science* 31,

2071 781–791.

2072 Natali, S., Bignami, C., Cammilli, C., Muganu, M., 1999. Effect of water stress on leaf
2073 movement in olive cultivars. *Acta Horticulturae* 474, 445–448.

2074 Natali, S., Bignami, C., Fusari, A., 1991. Water consumption, photosynthesis, transpiration
2075 and leaf water potential in *olea europea* L., cv. “Frantoio”, at different levels of
2076 available water. *Agricoltura Mediterranea* 121, 205–212.

2077 Orlandi, F., Garcia-Mozo, H., Ben Dhiab, A., Galán, C., Msallem, M., Romano, B.,
2078 Abichou, M., Dominguez-Vilches, E., Fornaciari, M., 2013. Climatic changes in
2079 the interpretation of the phenologica phases of the olive in mediterranean areas
2080 during its biological cycle. *Climatic Change* 116, 263–284.

2081 Ortega-Nieto, J.M., 1962. La Poda del Olivo. Ministerio de Agricultura, Madrid.

2082 Ortuño, M.F., Conejero, W., Moreno, F., Moriana, A., Intrigliolo, D.S., Biel, C.A.,
2083 Mellisho, C.A.D., Pérez-Pastor, A., Domingo, R., Ruiz-Sánchez, M.C.A.,
2084 Casadesus, J., Bonany, J., Torrecillas, A., 2010. Could trunk diameter sensors be
2085 used in woody crops for irrigation scheduling? A review of current knowledge and
2086 future perspectives. *Agricultural Water Management* 97, 1–11.

2087 Osborne, C.P., Chuine, I., Viner, D., Woodward, F.I., 2000. Olive phenology as a sensitive
2088 indicator of future climatic warming in the Mediterranean. *Plant, Cell and*
2089 *Environment* 23, 701–710.

2090 Pallioti, A., Bonghi, G., Rocchi, P., 1994. Peltate trichomes effects on photosynthetic gas
2091 exchange of *Olea europaea* L. leaves. *Plant Physiology* 13, 35–44.

2092 Pastor, M., García-Vila, M., Soriano, M.A., Vega, V., Fereres, E., 2007. Productivity of
2093 olive orchards in response to tree density. *Journal of Horticultural Science and*
2094 *Biotechnology* 84(4), 555–562.

2095 Pastor, M., Humanes, J., Vega, V., Castro, J., 1998. Diseño y manejo de plantaciones de
2096 olivar. In: Consejería de Agricultura y Pesca, Junta de Andalucía (Ed.), Serie
2097 Monografías 22/98. Seville, Spain, pp. 59–79.

2098 Patumi, M., d’Andria, R., Marsilio, V., Fontanazza, G., Morelli, G., Lanza, B., 2002. Olive
2099 and olive oil quality after intensive monocone olive growing (*Olea europaea* L., cv.
2100 Kalamata) in different irrigation regimes. *Food Chemistry* 77, 27–34.

2101 Pavel, E.W., Fereres, E., 1998. Low soil temperatures induce water deficits in olive (*Olea*
2102 *europaea*) trees. *Physiologia Plantarum* 104, 525–532.

2103 Pérez-López, D., Moriana, A., Rapoport, H., Olmedilla, N., Ribas, F., 2008. New approach
2104 for using trunk growth rate and endocarp development in the irrigation scheduling

2105 of young olive orchards. *Scientia Horticulturae* 115, 244–251.

2106 Perez-Martin, A., Flexas, J., Ribas-Carbó, M., Bota, J., Tomás, M., Infante, J.M., Diaz-
2107 Espejo A., 2009. Interactive effects of soil water deficit and air vapour pressure
2108 deficit on mesophyll conductance to CO₂ in *Vitis vinifera* and *Olea europea*. *J.*
2109 *Experimental Botany* 60(8), 2391–2405.

2110 Perez-Martin, A., Michelazzo, C., Torres-Ruiz, J.M., Flexas, J., Fernández, J.E.,
2111 Sebastiani, L., Diaz-Espejo, A., 2011. Physiological and genetic response of olive
2112 leaves to water stress and recovery: implications of mesophyll conductance and
2113 genetic expression of aquaporins and carbonic anhydrase. *Acta Horticulturae* 922,
2114 99–106.

2115 Perica, S., Brown, P.H., Connell, J.H., Nyomora, A.M.S., Christos, D., Hu, H., 2001.
2116 Foliar boron application improves flower fertility and fruit set of olive. *HortScience*
2117 36, 714–716.

2118 Pierantozzi, P., Torres, M., Bodoira, R., Maestri, D., 2013. Water relations, biochemical-
2119 physiological and yield responses of olive trees (*Olea europaea* L. cvs. Arbequina
2120 and Manzanilla) under drought stress during the pre-flowering and flowering
2121 period. *Agricultural Water Management* 125, 13–25.

2122 Pittermann, J., 2010. The evolution of water transport in plants: an integrated approach.
2123 *Geobiology* 8, 112–139.

2124 Prieto, I., Armas, C., Pugnaire, F.I., 2012 Water release through plant roots: new insights
2125 into its consequences at the plant and ecosystem level. *New Phytologist* 193, 830–
2126 841.

2127 Proietti, P., Nasini, L., Ilarioni, L., 2012. Photosynthetic behavior of Spanish Arbequina
2128 and Italian Maurino olive (*Olea europaea* L.) cultivars under super-intensive grove
2129 conditions. *Photosynthetica* 50(2), 239–246.

2130 Rallo, L., Cuevas, J., 2010. Fruiting and Production. In: Barranco, D., Fernández-Escobar,
2131 R., Rallo, L. (Eds.), *Olive Growing*. RIRDC/AOA, Australia, pp.113–145.

2132 Rallo, L., Fernández-Escobar, R., 1985. Influence of cultivar and flower thinning within
2133 the inflorescence on competition among olive fruit. *Journal of American Society for*
2134 *Horticultural Science* 110(2), 303–308.

2135 Rallo, L., Rapoport, H.F., 2001. Early growth and development of the olive fruit mesocarp.
2136 *Journal of Horticultural Science and Biotechnology* 76, 408–412.

2137 Ramos, A.F., Santos, F.L., 2009. Water use, transpiration, and crop coefficients for olives
2138 (cv. Cordovil), grown in orchards in Southern Portugal. *Biosystems Engineering*

2139 102, 321–333.

2140 Ramos, A.F., Santos, F.L., 2010. Yield and olive oil characteristics of a low-density
 2141 orchard (cv. Cordovil) subjected to different irrigation regimes. *Agricultural Water*
 2142 *Management* 97, 363–373.

2143 Rapoport, H.F., 2010. Botany and morphology. In: Barranco, D., Fernández-Escobar, R.,
 2144 Rallo, L. (Eds.), *Olive Growing*. RIRDC/AOA, Australia, pp.33–57.

2145 Rapoport HF, Costagli G, Gucci R. 2004. The effect of water deficit during early fruit
 2146 development on olive fruit morphogenesis. *Journal of the American Society for*
 2147 *Horticultural Science*, 129: 121-127.

2148 Rapoport, H.F., Hammami, S.B.M., Martins, P., Pérez-Priego, O., Orgaz, F., 2012.
 2149 Influence of water deficits at different times during olive tree inflorescence and
 2150 flower development. *Environmental and Experimental Botany* 77, 227–233.

2151 Reale, L., Sgromo, C., Ederli, L., Pasqualini, S., Orlandi, F., Fornaciari, M., Ferranti, F.,
 2152 Romano, B., 2009. Morphological and cytological development and starch
 2153 accumulation in hermaphrodite and staminate flowers of olive (*Olea europea* L.)
 2154 *Sexual Plant Reproduction* 22, 109–119.

2155 Remorini, D., Melgar, J.C., Guidi, L., Degl’Innocenti, E., Castelli, S., Traversi, M.L.,
 2156 Massai, R., Tattini, M., 2009 Interaction effects of root-zone salinity and solar
 2157 irradiance on the physiology and biochemistry of *Olea europaea*. *Environmental*
 2158 *and Experimental Botany* 65, 210–219.

2159 Rewald, B., Leuschner, C., Wiesman, Z., Ephrath, J.E., 2011a. Influence of salinity on root
 2160 hydraulic properties of three olive varieties. *Plant Biosystems* 145(1), 12–22.

2161 Rewald, B., Rachmilevitch, S., McCue, M.D., Ephrath, J.E., 2011b. Influence of saline
 2162 drip-irrigation on fine root and sap-flow densities of two mature olive varieties.
 2163 *Environmental and Experimental Botany* 72, 107–114.

2164 Ritchie, J.T., 1972. Model for predicting evaporation from a row crop with incomplete
 2165 cover. *Water Resources Research* 8, 1204–1213.

2166 Rius, X., Lacarte, J.M., 2010. La revolución del olivar. El cultivo en seto, 340 pp.

2167 Rodrigues, M.A., Ferreira, I.Q., Claro, M.A., Arrobas, M., 2012. Fertilizer
 2168 recommendations for olive based upon nutrients removed in crop and pruning.
 2169 *Scientia Horticulturae* 142, 205–211.

2170 Rodriguez-Dominguez, C.M., Ehrenberger, W., Sann, C., Rüger, S., Sukhorukov, V.,
 2171 Martín-Palomo, M.J., Diaz-Espejo, A., Cuevas, M.V., Torres-Ruiz, J.M., Perez-
 2172 Martin, A., Zimmermann, U., Fernández, J.E., 2012. Concomitant measurements of

2173 stem sap flow and leaf turgor pressure in olive trees using the leaf patch pressure
 2174 probe. *Agricultural Water Management* 114, 50–58.

2175 Rodriguez-Dominguez, C.M., Buckley, T.N., Egea, G., de Cires, A., Hernandez-Santana,
 2176 V., Diaz-Espejo, A., 2013. The contribution of hydraulic and non-hydraulic factors
 2177 to suppression of stomatal conductance during soil drought. *New Phytologist*, in
 2178 press.

2179 Rosati, A., Caporali, S., Paoletti, A., Famiani, F., 2011. Pistil abortion is related to ovary
 2180 mass in olive (*Olea europaea* L.). *Scientia Horticulturae* 127, 515–519.

2181 Rossi, L., Sebastiani, L., Tognetti, R., d'Andria, R., Morelli, G., Cherubini, P., 2013. Tree-
 2182 ring wood anatomy and stable isotopes show structural and functional adjustments
 2183 in olive trees under different water availability. *Plant and Soil* DOI
 2184 10.1007/s11104-013-1759-0.

2185 Rousseaux, M.C., Figuerola, P.I., Correa-Tedesco, G., Searles, P.S., 2009. Seasonal
 2186 variations in sap flow and soil evaporation in an olive (*Olea europaea* L.) grove
 2187 under two irrigation regimes in an arid region of Argentina. *Agricultural Water*
 2188 *Management* 96, 1037–1044.

2189 Salleo, S., Lo Gullo, M.A., 1983. Water transport pathways in nodes and internodes of 1-
 2190 year-old twigs of *Olea europaea* L. *Giornale botanico italiano* 117, 63-74.

2191 Sánchez, J., 1994. Lipid photosynthesis in olive fruit. *Progress in Lipid Research* 33(1/2),
 2192 97–104.

2193 Sánchez-Alcalá, I., Bellón, F., del Campillo, M.C., Barrón, V., Torrent, J., 2012.
 2194 Application of synthetic siderite (FeCO₃) to the soil is capable of alleviating iron
 2195 chlorosis in olive trees. *Scientia Horticulturae* 138, 17–23.

2196 Sanz-Cortés, F., Martínez-Calvo, J., Badenes, M.L., Bleiholder, H., Hack, H., Llácer, G.,
 2197 Meier, U., 2002. Phenological growth stages of olive trees (*Olea europaea*). *Annals*
 2198 *of Applied Biology* 140, 151–157.

2199 Sanzani, S.M., Schena, L., Nigro, F., Sergeeva, V., Ippolito, A., Salerno, M.G., 2012.
 2200 Abiotic diseases of olive. *Journal of Plant Pathology* 94(3), 469–491.

2201 Schwabe, W.W., Lionakis, S.M., 1996. Leaf attitude in olive in relation to drought
 2202 resistance. *Journal of Horticultural Science* 71, 157–166.

2203 Schultz, H.R., 2003. Differences in hydraulic architecture account for near-isohydric and
 2204 anisohydric behaviour of two field-grown *Vitis vinifera* L. cultivars during drought.
 2205 *Plant, Cell and Environment* 26, 1393–1405.

2206 Searles, P.S., Agüero-Alcarás, M., Rousseaux, M.C., 2011. El consumo del agua por el

- 2207 cultivo de olivo (*Olea europaea* L.) en el noroeste de Argentina: una comparación
2208 con la Cuenca Mediterránea. *Ecología Austral* 21, 15–28.
- 2209 Searles, P.S., Saravia, D.A., Rousseaux, M.C., 2009. Root length density and soil water
2210 distribution in drip-irrigated olive orchards in Argentina under arid conditions.
2211 *Crop and Pasture Science* 60, 280–288.
- 2212 Sebastiani, L., Minocci, A., Tognetti, R., 2002. Olive (*Olea europaea* L.) plant reactions to
2213 atmospheric pollutants and UV-B radiation: current state of the research. *Advances*
2214 *in Horticultural Science* 16(3-4):144–154.
- 2215 Secchi, F., Lovisolo, C., Schubert, A., 2007. Expression of OePIP2.1 aquaporin gene and
2216 water relations of *Olea europaea* twigs during drought stress and recovery. *Annals*
2217 *of Applied Biology* 150(2), 163–167.
- 2218 Servili, M., Esposto, S., Lodolini, E., Selvaggini, R., Taticchi, A., Urbani, S., Montedoro,
2219 G., Serravalle, M., Gucci, R., 2007. Irrigation effects on quality, phenolic
2220 composition, and selected volatiles of virgin olive oils cv. Leccino. *Journal of*
2221 *Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 55, 6609–6618.
- 2222 Sinoquet, H., Le Roux, X., Adam, B., Ameglio, T., Daudet, F.A., 2001. RATP: A model
2223 for simulating the spatial distribution of radiation absorption, transpiration and
2224 photosynthesis within canopies: Application to an isolated tree crown. *Plant, Cell*
2225 *and Environment* 24, 395–406.
- 2226 Sofo, A., Manfreda, S., Fiorentino, M., Dichio, B., Xiloyannis, C., 2008. The olive tree: a
2227 paradigm for drought tolerance in Mediterranean climates. *Hydrology and Earth*
2228 *System Sciences* 12, 293–301.
- 2229 Sperry, J.S., Tyree, M.T., 1988. Mechanism of water stress-induced xylem embolism.
2230 *Plant Physiology* 88, 581–587.
- 2231 Stefanoudaki, E., Williams, M., Chartzoulakis, K., Harwood, J., 2009. Effect of irrigation
2232 on quality attributes of olive oil. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 57,
2233 7048–7055.
- 2234 Sun, P., Grignetti, A., Liu, S., Casacchia, R., Salvatori, R., Pietrini, F., Loreto, F.,
2235 Centritto, M., 2008. Associated changes in physiological parameters and spectral
2236 reflectance indices in olive (*Olea europaea* L.) leaves in response to different levels
2237 of water stress. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 29(6), 1725–1743.
- 2238 Tattini, M., Bertoni, P., Caselli, S., 1992. Genotypic responses of olive plants to sodium-
2239 chloride. *Journal of Plant Nutrition* 15, 1467–1485.
- 2240 Tattini, M., Gucci, R., Coradeschi, M.A., Ponzio, C., Everard, J.D., 1995. Growth, gas-

2241 exchange and ion content in *Olea europaea* plants during salinity stress and
 2242 subsequent relief. *Physiologia Plantarum* 95, 203–210.

2243 Tattini, M., Lombardini, L., Gucci, R., 1997. The effect of NaCl stress and relief on gas
 2244 exchange properties of two olive cultivars differing in tolerance to salinity. *Plant*
 2245 *and Soil* 197, 87–93.

2246 Testi, L., Orgaz, F., Villalobos, F., 2006b. Variations in bulk canopy conductance of an
 2247 irrigated olive (*Olea europaea* L.) orchard. *Environmental and Experimental*
 2248 *Botany* 55, 15–28.

2249 Testi, L., Villalobos, F.J., Orgaz, F., 2004. Evapotranspiration of a young irrigated olive
 2250 orchard in southern Spain. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 121, 1–18.

2251 Testi, L., Villalobos, F.J., Orgaz, F., Fereres, E., 2006a. Water requirements of olive
 2252 orchards: I. Simulation of daily evapotranspiration for scenario analysis. *Irrigation*
 2253 *Science* 24: 69–76.

2254 Tognetti, R., d’Andria, R., Sacchi, R., Lavini, A., Morelli, G., Alvino, A., 2007. Deficit
 2255 irrigation affects seasonal changes in leaf physiology and oil quality of *Olea*
 2256 *europaea* (cultivars Frantoio and Leccino). *Annals of Applied Biology* 150, 169–
 2257 186.

2258 Tognetti, R., Giovannelli, A., Lavini, A., Morelli, G., Fragnito, F., d’Andria, R., 2009.
 2259 Assessing environmental controls over conductances through the soil-plant-
 2260 atmosphere continuum in an experimental olive tree plantation of southern Italy.
 2261 *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 149, 1229–1243.

2262 Tognetti, R., Morales-Sillero, A., d’Andria, R., Fernández, J.E., Lavini, A., Sebastiani, L.,
 2263 Troncoso, A., 2008. Deficit irrigation and fertigation practices in olive growing:
 2264 Convergences and divergences in two case studies. *Plant Biosystems* 142(1), 138–
 2265 148.

2266 Tognetti, R., Sebastiani, L., Vitagliano, C., Raschi, A., Minnocci, A., 2001. Responses of
 2267 two olive tree (*Olea Europaea* L.) cultivars to elevated CO₂ concentration in the
 2268 field. *Photosynthetica* 39(3), 403–410.

2269 Tomás, M., Flexas, J., Copolovici, L., Galmes, J., Hallik, L., Medrano, H., Ribas-Carbo,
 2270 M., Tosens, T., Vislap, V., Niinemets, U., 2013. Importance of leaf anatomy in
 2271 determining mesophyll diffusion conductance to CO₂ across species: quantitative
 2272 limitations and scaling up by models. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 64(8), 2269–
 2273 2281.

2274 Torres-Ruiz, J.M, Diaz-Espejo, A., Morales-Sillero, A., Martín-Palomo, M.J., Mayr, S.,

2275 Beikircher, B., Fernández, J.E., 2013a. Shoot hydraulic characteristics, plant water
2276 status and stomatal response in olive trees under different soil water conditions.
2277 Plant and Soil DOI 10.1007/s11104-013-1774-1.

2278 Torres-Ruiz, J.M., Diaz-Espejo, A., Perez-Martin, A., Hernandez-Santana, V., 2013b. Loss
2279 of hydraulic functioning at leaf, stem and root level and its role in the stomatal
2280 behaviour during drought in olive trees. *Acta Horticulturae* 991, 333–339.

2281 Tovar, M.J., Romero, M.P., Alegre, S., Girona, J., Motilva, M.J., 2002. Composition of
2282 organoleptic characteristics of oil from Arbequina olive (*Olea europaea* L.) trees
2283 under deficit irrigation. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture* 82, 1755–
2284 1763.

2285 Tunahoğlu, R., Durdu, Ö.F., 2012. Assessment of future olive crop yield by a comparative
2286 evaluation of drought indices: a case study in western Turkey. *Theoretical and*
2287 *Applied Climatology* 108, 397–410.

2288 Tyree, M.T., Cochard, H., Cruiziat, P., Sinclair, B., Ameglio, T., 1993. Drought-induced
2289 leaf shedding in walnut: evidence for vulnerability segmentation. *Plant, Cell and*
2290 *Environment* 16, 879–882.

2291 Tyree, M.T., Sperry, J.S., 1988. Do woody plants operate near the point of catastrophic
2292 xylem dysfunction caused by dynamic water stress? Answers from a model. *Plant*
2293 *physiology* 88, 574–580.

2294 Tyree, M.T., Sperry, J.S., 1989. Vulnerability of xylem to cavitation and embolism.
2295 *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology* 40, 19–38.

2296 Ulger, S., Sonmez, S., Karkacier, M., Ertoý, N., Akdesir, O., Aksu, M., 2004.
2297 Determination of endogenous hormones, sugars and mineral nutrition levels during
2298 the induction, initiation and differentiation stage and their effects on flower
2299 formation in olive. *Plant Growth Regulation* 42, 89–95.

2300 Uriu, K., 1960. Periods of pistil abortion in the development of the olive flower.
2301 *Proceedings of the American Society for Horticultural Science* 73, 194-202.

2302 Veihmeyer, F.J., Hendrickson, A.H., 1928. Soil moisture at permanent wilting of plants.
2303 *Plant Physiology* 3(3), 355-357.

2304 Villalobos, F.J., Orgaz, F., Testi, L., Fereres, E., 2000. Measurement and modeling of
2305 evapotranspiration of olive (*Olea europaea* L.) orchards. *European Journal of*
2306 *Agronomy* 13, 155–163.

2307 Villalobos, F.J., Testi, L., Hidalgo, J., Pator, M., Orgaz, F., 2006. Modelling potential
2308 growth and yield of olive (*Olea europaea* L.) canopies. *European Journal of*

2309 Agronomy 24: 296–303.

2310 Wahbi, S., Wakrim, R., Aganchich, B., Tahi, H., Serraj, R., 2005. Effects of partial root
 2311 zone drying (PRD) on adult olive tree (*Olea europaea*) in field conditions under
 2312 arid climate. I. Physiological and agronomic responses. Agriculture, Ecosystems
 2313 and Environment 106, 289–301.

2314 Weijjs, J.H., Seddon, J.R.T., Lohse, D., 2012. Diffusive shielding stabilizes bulk
 2315 nanobubble clusters. ChemPhysChem 13, 2197–2204.

2316 Werner, C., Correia, O., Beyschlag, W., 2002. Characteristics patterns of chronic and
 2317 dynamic photoinhibition of different functional groups in a mediterranean
 2318 ecosystem. Functional Plant Biology 29, 999–1011.

2319 Wheeler, J.K., Sperry, J.S., Hacke, U.G., Hoang, N., 2005. Intere-vessel pitting and
 2320 cavitation in woody Rosaceae and other vesselled plants: a basis for a safety versus
 2321 efficiency trade-off in xylem transport. Plant, Cell and Environment 28, 800–812.

2322 Wilkinson, S., 2004. Water use efficiency and chemical signalling. In: Bacon, M.A. (Ed.),
 2323 Water Use Efficiency in Plant Biology. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, UK, pp.
 2324 75–112.

2325 Wilkinson, S., Davies, W., 2002. ABA-based chemical signalling: the co-ordination of
 2326 responses to stress in plants. Plant, Cell and Environment 25, 195–210.

2327 Wilkinson, S., Hartung, W., 2009. Food production: reducing water consumption by
 2328 manipulating long-distance chemical signalling in plants. Journal of Experimental
 2329 Botany 60, 1885–1891.

2330 Xiloyannis, C., Dichio, B., Nuzzo, V., Celano, G., 1996. L'olivo: pianta esempio per la sua
 2331 capacità di resistenza in condizioni di estrema siccità. *Seminari di Olivicoltura*.
 2332 Spoleto, 7 and 28 June. pp. 79–111.

2333 Zarco-Tejada, P.J., Berni, J.A.J., Suárez, L., Sepulcre-Cantó, G., Morales, F., Miller, J.R.,
 2334 2009. Imaging chlorophyll fluorescence with an airborne narrow-band multispectral
 2335 camera for vegetation stress detection. Remote Sensing of Environment 113, 1262–
 2336 1275.

2337 Zarrouk, M., Cherif, A., 1981. Effect of sodium chloride on lipid content of olive trees
 2338 (*Olea europaea* L.). Zeitschrift fur Pflanzenphysiologie 105, 85–92.

2339 Zhang, S.Q., Outlaw, W.H. Jr, 2001. Absciscic acid introduced into the transpiration stream
 2340 accumulates in the guard-cell apoplast and causes stomatal closure. Plant, Cell and
 2341 Environment 24, 1045–1054.

2342 Zimmermann, M.H., 1983. Xylem structure and the ascent of sap. Springer, Berlin.

2343 Zimmerman, D., Reuss, R., Westhoff, M., Geßner, P., Bauer, W., Bamberg, E., Bentrup, F-
2344 W., Zimmermann, U., 2008. A novel, non-invasive, online-monitoring, versatile
2345 and easy plant-based probe for measuring leaf water status. Journal of Experimental
2346 Botany 59, 3157–3167.
2347
2348

Fig. 1. Growing cycle of the olive tree in south Spain on a typical year. Shoot growth normally stops in July, although it may resume from late August. Fruit growth does not always show a double sigmoid curve as that depicted in the figure. Instead, a rather constant fruit growth rate is often observed, all throughout the summer, especially in fully irrigated trees. HS1 to 3 = periods of high sensitivity to water stress. WAB = weeks after bloom.

Fig. 2. Cross sections of the upper, or adaxial (A), and lower, or abaxial (B), surfaces of an olive leaf. The conductances of the boundary layer (g_b), stomata (g_s) and mesophyll (g_m), related to changes from the CO_2 concentration in the surrounding air (C_a) to that in the chloroplast (C_c), are depicted. The CO_2 concentrations next to the stomata (C_s) and in the intercellular air spaces within the leaf (C_i) are also represented. The photos show chloroplast within cells both of the palisade parenchyma (left) and spongy mesophyll (right). Photos by Dr. A. Diaz-Espejo. After Flexas et al. (2008).

Fig. 3. Main functional and physiological traits of the olive tree related to its adaptation to drought. Equations 1 and 2 relate main variables related to tree transpiration (E_p). Ψ_s = effective soil water potential; Ψ_l = effective leaf water potential; Ψ_x = xylem water potential; R_p = plant hydraulic resistance; G_c = canopy conductance; D_{l-a} = leaf-to-air vapour pressure deficit; P = atmospheric pressure; g_s = stomatal conductance.

Fig. 4. Sap flow probes (Heat Field Deformation method) installed in roots of a ‘Cobrançosa’ olive tree to estimate ‘normal’ (from roots to leaves) and reverse flows. This was part of an experiment run by the team of Prof. M.I. Ferreira (ISA, University of Lisbon) with the collaboration of Prof. N. Nadezhdina (Mendel University, Brno), within the frame of the WUSSIAAME project coordinated by the ISA team. Photos taken by Prof. Ferreira at the experimental plot, in an olive orchard close to Beja (Portugal).

Fig. 5. Cryo-scanning electron microscope images of frozen-hydrated samples of current-year ‘Manzanilla’ olive shoots. On the left, a longitudinal freeze-fracture showing several pits along the xylem vessels. On the right, a transversal fracture of a single pit, showing the inner membrane. The samples were analysed by Dr. A. Minnocci, (Inst. of Life Sciences, Scuola Superiore Sant’ Anna, Italy), in a Philips SEM 515 equipped with a SEM Cryo Unit SCU 020. The work was made within the frame of a Bilateral Agreement MIUR-CSIC

involving the author and Prof. L. Sebastiani (Inst. of Life Sciences, Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna, Italy).

Fig. 6. Xylem vulnerability curves built from samples of current-year shoots taken from mature 'Manzanilla' olive trees growing close to Seville, southwest Spain. Both rain-fed trees and fully irrigated trees were sampled. The curves show the percentage loss of hydraulic conductivity (PLC) as a function of decreasing xylem water potential (Ψ_x). Data points are the average of five to seven samples; vertical bars represent $\pm$ the standard error. The dotted grey lines indicate the Ψ_x value associated with a 50% loss of hydraulic conductivity (P_{50}). Data represented in the figure were recomputed considering PLC = 0 at $\Psi_x = 0$, and the resulting vulnerability curve (in grey colour) fitted and plotted. The dashed line represents the tangent through the midpoint of the vulnerability curve and its x-intercept represents the air entry pressure (P_e) following Meinzer et al. (2009). After Torres-Ruiz et al. (2013a).

Fig. 7. Net CO₂ assimilation (A) versus stomatal conductance (g_s) values measured in five different olive cultivars, irrigated and non-irrigated, at four locations in Spain and Italy. Data points represent the average of single measurements averaged for 0.05 mol m⁻² s⁻¹ g_s intervals. After Fernández et al. (2008b).

Fig. 8. Regulated deficit irrigation strategy for hedgerow olive orchards with high plant densities. The three periods on which the irrigation needs (IN) are equal or close to the crop demand correspond to the three periods of high sensitivity to water stress depicted in Fig. 1. ET_c = crop evapotranspiration under non-limiting soil water conditions; P_{eff} = effective precipitation, or fraction of total precipitation that reaches the root zone; i.e. / w. = irrigation events per week; WAB = weeks after bloom. After Fernández et al. (2013).

Fig. 9. Plant-based methods used in olive trees to monitor water stress and to schedule irrigation: heat-pulse velocity probes for sap flow estimations (a), a leaf patch clamp pressure probe to estimate leaf turgor pressure (b), a radial dendrometer to record trunk diameter variations (c) and a time domain reflectometry sensor to measure the trunk electrical conductivity (d).

Figure 4
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

Figure 6

Figure 7

Figure 9
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

Table 1

Table 1 Water productivity values, in terms of fresh fruit and oil, reported for different olive cultivars and growing conditions. FI = full irrigation; SDI= sustained deficit irrigation; RDI = regulated deficit irrigation. The number before SDI and RDI indicates the aimed water supply, expressed as percentage of that for the FI treatment (the actual amounts varied slightly).

Reference	Crop characteristics			Water productivity (kg ha ⁻¹ mm ⁻¹)	
	Cultivar & location	Water regime	Plant density (trees ha ⁻¹)	Fresh fruits	Oil
Moriana et al. (2003) ¹	Picual <i>South Spain</i>	FI	278	22.0	5.0
		Rainfed		9.0	0.2
Tognetti et al. (2007) ²	Frantoio <i>Central Italy</i>	FI	555	56.0	13.3
		60RDI		68.0	16.0
Iniesta et al. (2009) ³	Arbequina <i>South Spain</i>	FI	408	33.0	4.5
		25SDI		80.7	13.2
		25RDI		94.2	14.6
Correa-Tedesco et al. (2010) ⁴	Manzanilla <i>Northwest Argentina</i>	FI	312	18.0	
		60SDI		21.0	
Ramos and Santos (2010) ³	Cordovil <i>South Portugal</i>	FI	69	2.6	0.5
		50SDI		6.8	1.4
Fernández et al. (2013) ⁵	Arbequina <i>South Spain</i>	FI	1666	40.6	2.5
		60RDI		51.4	2.8
		30RDI		86.3	6.4

¹ Average of ‘on’ and ‘off’ years with no alternate bearing.

³ Average of ‘on’ and ‘off’ years with marked alternate bearing.

⁵ Average of 3 years, no alternate bearing.

² Sub-humid area with an average yearly rainfall of 722 mm.

⁴ 7-year-old, not fully productive trees.

Table 2 Relationships between fruit and oil yields and water consumed by the crop, for different olive cultivars and growing conditions. ET_c = crop evapotranspiration IA = irrigation amount. E_p = plant transpiration. $R^2 = r^2$ = coefficient of determination.

Reference	Orchard type	Relationship between yield and water consumed	
Moriana et al. (2003)	Mature ‘Picual’ 278 trees ha ⁻¹ South Spain	Fruit yield = $-16.84 + 0.063 ET_c - 0.035 \times 10^{-3} ET_c^2$ Oil yield = $-2.78 + 0.011 ET_c - 0.006 \times 10^{-3} ET_c^2$ (Yield in t ha ⁻¹ ; ET_c in mm year ⁻¹)	$R^2 = 0.71$ $R^2 = 0.59$
Grattan et al. (2006)	Young ¹ ‘Arbequina’ 1709 trees ha ⁻¹ California	Fruit yield = $128.72 + 23.147 IA - 0.0215 IA^2$ Oil yield = $-98.243 + 2.5481 IA - 0.00215 IA^2$ (Yield in kg ha ⁻¹ ; IA in mm)	$R^2 = 0.79$ $R^2 = 0.94$
Martín-Vertedor et al. (2011a)	Young ² ‘Morisca’ 417 trees ha ⁻¹ Southwest Spain	Fruit yield = $0.078 E_p - 2.524$ (Yield in kg tree ⁻¹ ; E_p in mm year ⁻¹)	$r^2 = 0.63$

¹ Relationships apply to the 2nd harvest (trees not fully productive yet).

² The relationship applies to 4 to 6 year old trees (not fully productive yet).