

ISSN 1678-3921

Journal homepage: www.embrapa.br/pab

For manuscript submission and journal contents, access: www.scielo.br/pab

Sérgio Luiz Rodrigues Donato⁽¹⁾, Ednei de Souza Pires⁽² 🖾 (10), Alessandro de Magalhães Arantes⁽¹⁾ (10) and Beatriz Lima Barros⁽¹⁾ (10)

⁽¹⁾ Instituto Federal de Educação, Ciência e Tecnologia Baiano, Campus Guanambi, Caixa Postal 009, Distrito de Ceraíma, CEP 46430-000 Guanambi, BA, Brazil. E-mail: sergio.donato@ifbaiano.edu.br, alessandro.arantes@ifbaiano.edu.br, bbagro@gmail.com

⁽²⁾ Universidade Estadual de Montes Claros, Campus de Janaúba, Caixa Postal 91, Avenida Reinaldo Viana, nº 2.630, Bico da Pedra, CEP 39440-000 Janaúba, MG, Brazil. E-mail: ednei.agro@hotmail.com

^{I Corresponding} author

Received January 11, 2022

Accepted May 24, 2022

How to cite

DONATO, S.L.R.; PIRES, E. de S.; ARANTES, A. de M.; BARROS, B.L. Photosynthetic response of umbu trees to vapor pressure deficit. **Pesquisa Agropecuária Brasileira**, v.57, e02827, 2022. DOI: https://doi. org/10.1590/S1678-3921.pab2022.v57.02827. Plant Physiology/ Scientific Notes

Photosynthetic response of umbu trees to vapor pressure deficit

Abstract – The objective of this work was to evaluate the photosynthetic response to vapor pressure deficit (VPD) in umbu (*Spondias tuberosa*) tree accessions. The experiment was carried out in a completely randomized design in a $5 \times 7 \times 2$ factorial arrangement (five umbu accessions – BRS-68, EPAMIG-05, BGU-61, BGU-75, and BGU-50 –, seven evaluation times, and two reading times – at 8 a.m. and 2 p.m.) in split-split plots in time. Leaf temperature increased with air temperature. The variation of stomatal conductance and transpiration with the VPD was not significant. Net photosynthesis rate, carboxylation efficiency, and instantaneous water-use efficiency decreased with increasing VPD in all accessions, except in BRS-68, whose rates remained positive.

Index terms: *Spondias tuberosa*, carboxylation efficiency, correlation, ecophysiology, giant umbu.

Resposta fotossintética de umbuzeiro ao deficit de pressão de vapor

Resumo – O objetivo deste trabalho foi avaliar a resposta fotossintética ao deficit de pressão de vapor (DPV) em acessos de umbuzeiro (*Spondias tuberosa*). O experimento foi conduzido em delineamento experimental inteiramente casualizado, em arranjo fatorial $5 \times 7 \times 2$ (cinco acessos de umbuzeiro – BRS-68, EPAMIG-05, BGU-61, BGU-75 e BGU-50 –, sete épocas de avaliação e dois momentos de leitura – às 8h e às 14h), em parcelas subsubdivididas no tempo. A temperatura foliar aumentou com a temperatura do ar. A variação da condutância estomática e da transpiração com o DPV não foi significativa. A fotossíntese líquida, a eficiência de carboxilação e a eficiência instantânea do uso da água decresceram com o aumento do DPV em todos os acessos, exceto no BRS-68, cujas taxas se mantiveram positivas.

Termos para indexação: *Spondias tuberosa*, eficiência de carboxilação, correlação, ecofisiologia, umbu-gigante.

Umbu tree (*Spondias tuberosa* Arruda Câmara) is a fruit tree native to the Caatinga biome, in the Northeast Brazil, which has morphological and physiological adaptations to water deficit conditions (Lima Filho et al., 2008). These adaptations include senescence and leaf abscission during the dry season, the presence of water- and nutrient-storing root tubers, osmotic adjustment, and leaves with high stomatal resistance.

Umbu tree importance has been growing, thereby increasing the demand for information on several aspects associated with this tree, especially on its physiology (Silva et al., 2009; Donato et al., 2019a; Santos et al., 2020).

Physiological measurements in umbu tree accessions allow of the identification of genetic and environmental influences on the development of the tree (Santos et al., 2020). An important environmental factor regulating leaf gas exchange in plants is the vapor pressure deficit (VPD) which, in association with soil moisture deficit, affects their stomatal conductance, photosynthesis, growth, and yield (Lima et al., 2015). Vapor pressure deficit – defined as the difference between the pressure exerted by the amount of moisture in the air and the maximum pressure of water-saturated air – integrates temperature and relative humidity. Due to its influence on the photosynthesis, many authors have established relationships between VPD and gas exchange for several plants (Habermann et al., 2003; McAdam & Brodribb, 2015; Lima Filho & Aidar, 2016).

Understanding how VPD affects gas exchanges in umbu tree accessions can help technicians and growers with the managing of the crop.

The objective of this work was to evaluate the photosynthesis response of umbu tree accessions to the vapor pressure deficit.

The experiment was carried out at the Instituto Federal Baiano, Campus Guanambi, in the state of Bahia, Brazil (14°17'32"S, 42°41'34"W, at 547 m altitude). The soil of the area is classified as a Latossolo Vermelho-Amarelo, according to the Brazilian Soil Classification System (Santos et al., 2018), i.e., Oxisol. The predominant climate in the region, according to the Köppen-Geiger classification, is a hot and dry semiarid, with 25.9°C and 664.7 mm annual means of temperature and rainfall, respectively, based on the average of the past 39 years.

The experiment was carried out in a completely randomized design with treatments arranged in split-split plots and three replicates. Five accessions from two different Brazilian states were assigned to the plots: BRS-68 (EPAMIG-01), EPAMIG-05, and BGU-61, from the municipalities of Lontra, Porteirinha, and Januária, in the state of Minas Gerais, respectively; and BGU-75 and BGU-50, from the municipalities of Macaúbas and Santana, in the state of Bahia, respectively. Seven evaluation periods (12/02/2020, 12/23/2020, 01/19/2021, 02/12/2021, 04/14/2021, 04/27/2021, and 05/27/2021) and two reading times (8 a.m. and 2 p.m.) were assigned to the subplots and the sub-subplots, respectively.

In the orchard, trees were arranged in a quincunx pattern, $8 \times 8 \times 8$ m, and were 13 years old at the time of measurement. Crop practices used in the orchard followed Donato et al. (2019b).

Measurements took place from the rainy season until the beginning of the dry season (December to May). The following parameters were determined: leaf temperature (T_{leaf}, in °C); stomatal conductance $(g_s, in mol H_2O m^{-2} s^{-1})$, transpiration (E, in mmol H₂O $m^{-2} s^{-1}$; net photosynthesis (A, in µmol CO₂ $m^{-2} s^{-1}$); instantaneous water-use efficiency (WUE, in µmol CO₂ m⁻² s⁻¹ /mmol H₂O m⁻² s⁻¹); and carboxylation efficiency (A/C_i, in μ mol CO₂ m⁻² s⁻¹/ μ mol CO₂ mol⁻¹). These parameter were measured using an infrared gas analyzer (IRGA) model Lcpro + Portable Photosynthesis System (ADC BioScientific Limited, UK), at ambient temperature and irradiance, with 200 mL min⁻¹ air flow, and a radiation shield facing the sun (Arantes et al., 2016). Readings were carried out on the leaves located in the middle third of the crown, between the 3rd and 5th fully expanded pair of leaves. Air temperature – T_{air} (°C) and VPD (kPa) were recorded using an automatic weather station at the time of readings. Pearson correlations used T_{leaf} to estimate T_{air}, and VPD to estimate A, A/Ci, and WUE.

For five umbu tree accessions, T_{leaf} increased with air temperature (Table 1). For every 1°C increment of the air temperature, T_{leaf} increased by 0.57°C for EPAMIG-05, 0.61°C for BGU-50, 0.75°C for BRS-68 and BGU-75, and 0.79°C for BGU-61. All correlations were significant, as the accessions originating from the state of Minas Gerais, EPAMIG-05 and BGU-61, showed lower and higher increments in T_{air} with T_{leaf} , respectively, while the accessions bearing heavier fruit, BRS-68 and BGU-75, had similar increments.

Net photosynthesis rate (A) decreased with increasing VPD, for all five umbu tree accessions (Table 1). This is understandable, since the higher is the VPD, the drier is the air. This condition leads to an increase of the stomatal resistance, thereby preventing water loss and restricting the entry of CO_2 (Lima Filho et al., 2008). Decreases of A rates, down to negative values, were recorded on all accessions, except for BRS-68, which showed a lower decrease of A rates (-4.224983 µmol CO_2 m⁻² s⁻¹) for every kilopascal of VPD. Lima Filho & Aidar (2016) inferred that the accession bearing heavier

fruit has greater photosynthetic potential; however, the same outcome was not observed in the accession with giant fruit, BGU-75, which may suggest that the greater photosynthesis capacity is a competitive advantage of the BRS-68 accession.

Carboxylation efficiency (A/Ci) decreased with increasing VPD (Table 1). As recorded for photosynthesis, A/Ci reached negative values, except for the BRS-68 accession, on which the smallest decline of A/Ci was recorded (-0.1546 μ mol CO₂ m⁻² s⁻¹/ μ mol CO₂ mol⁻¹ kPa⁻¹ of VPD). This means that Rubisco – the enzyme responsible for fixing CO₂ in C3 plants such as the umbu tree – maintained a higher carboxylation rate in BRS-68, with an increase of the VPD, while for the other accessions, the enzyme oxygenase activity intensified the photorespiration.

Table 1. Correlations between leaf temperature and air temperature, and between photosynthesis rate, carboxylation efficiency, and water-use efficiency with vapor pressure deficit for five umbu tree (*Spondias tuberosa*) accessions.

$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Accession	Correlation	Correlation	
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$			coefficient	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Leaf temperature - T_{leaf} (°C) and air temperature - T_{air} (°C)			
$\begin{array}{c c} BGU-61 & \hat{T}_{Leaf} = 17.30569 + 0.79967Tair & 0.601* \\ BGU-75 & \hat{T}_{Leaf} = 18.52477 + 0.75895Tair & 0.598* \\ \hline BGU-50 & \hat{T}_{Leaf} = 22.51507 + 0.61661Tair & 0.506* \\ \hline Photosynthesis rate - A (µmol CO2 m-2 s-1) and vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa) \\ \hline BRS-68 & \hat{A}=13.99501-4.22483VPD & -0.701* \\ \hline EPAMIG-05 & \hat{A}=16.62090-6.65729VPD & -0.746** \\ BGU-61 & \hat{A}=13.98097-5.661821VPD & -0.568* \\ BGU-75 & \hat{A}=14.99233-6.01194VPD & -0.657** \\ BGU-50 & \hat{A}=15.70150-6.56296VPD & -0.595* \\ \hline Carboxylation efficiency - A/Ci (µmol CO2 m-2 s-1/µmol CO2 mol-1) \\ BRS-68 & A/C_i=0.01546-0.01546VPD & -0.702** \\ EPAMIG-05 & A/C_i=0.06046-0.02426VPD & -0.571* \\ BGU-75 & A/C_i=0.04673-0.01846VPD & -0.662* \\ BGU-75 & A/C_i=0.04981-0.01957VPD & -0.662* \\ BGU-50 & A/C_i=0.05203-0.02046VPD & -0.611* \\ \hline Water-use efficiency - WUE (µmol CO2 m-2 s-1/mmol H2O m-2 s-1) and vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa) \\ BRS-68 & WUE = 3.44816-0.89762VPD & -0.514* \\ EPAMIG-05 & WUE = 2.86952-0.85643VPD & -0.698** \\ BGU-61 & WUE = 3.45356-1.94132VPD & -0.662** \\ BGU-75 & WUE = 2.74730-1.23844VPD & -0.685** \\ \hline BGU-75 & WUE = 2.74730-1.23844VPD & -0.685** \\ \hline BGU-75 & WUE = 2.74730-1.23844VPD & -0.685** \\ \hline BGU-75 & WUE = 2.74730-1.23844VPD & -0.685** \\ \hline BGU-75 & WUE = 2.74730-1.23844VPD & -0.685** \\ \hline BGU-75 & WUE = 2.74730-1.23844VPD & -0.685** \\ \hline D = 0.000000000000000000000000000000000$	BRS-68	$\hat{T}_{\text{Leaf}} = 16.16521 + 0.75475 \text{Tair}$	0.575*	
BGU-75 $\hat{T}_{Leaf} = 18.52477 + 0.75895Tair 0.598* BGU-50 \hat{T}_{Leaf} = 22.51507 + 0.61661Tair 0.506* Photosynthesis rate - A (µmol CO2 m-2 s-1) and vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa) BRS-68 \hat{A}=13.99501-4.22483VPD -0.701* EPAMIG-05 \hat{A}=16.62090-6.65729VPD -0.746** BGU-61 \hat{A}=13.98097-5.661821VPD -0.568* BGU-75 \hat{A}=14.99233-6.01194VPD -0.657** BGU-50 \hat{A}=15.70150-6.56296VPD -0.595* Carboxylation efficiency – A/Ci (µmol CO2 m-2 s-1/µmol CO2 mol-1) BRS-68 \hat{A}C_i=0.01546-0.01546VPD -0.702** EPAMIG-05 \hat{A}C_i=0.06046-0.02426VPD -0.571* BGU-61 \hat{A}C_i=0.04673-0.01846VPD -0.662* BGU-50 \hat{A}C_i=0.04981-0.01957VPD -0.662* BGU-50 \hat{A}C_i=0.05203-0.02046VPD -0.601* Water-use efficiency – WUE (µmol CO2 m-2 s-1/µmol H2O m-2 s-1) and vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa) BRS-68 \overline{WUE} = 3.44816-0.89762VPD -0.514* EPAMIG-05 \overline{WUE} = 2.86952-0.85643VPD -0.682** BGU-61 \overline{WUE} = 3.45356-1.94132VPD -0.682** $	EPAMIG-05	$\hat{T}_{\text{Leaf}} = 22.37378 + 0.57752 \text{Tair}$	0.498*	
BGU-50 $\hat{T}_{Leaf} = 22.51507 + 0.61661Tair$ 0.506* Photosynthesis rate - A (µmol CO ₂ m ² s ⁻¹) and vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa) BRS-68 $\hat{A}=13.99501-4.22483VPD$ -0.701* EPAMIG-05 $\hat{A}=16.62090-6.65729VPD$ -0.746** BGU-61 $\hat{A}=13.98097-5.661821VPD$ -0.568* BGU-75 $\hat{A}=14.99233-6.01194VPD$ -0.657** BGU-50 $\hat{A}=15.70150-6.56296VPD$ -0.595* Carboxylation efficiency - A/C _i (µmol CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹ /µmol CO ₂ mol ⁻¹) BRS-68 $\hat{A}C_i=0.06046-0.02426VPD$ -0.738** BGU-61 $\hat{A}C_i=0.06046-0.02426VPD$ -0.571* BGU-75 $\hat{A}C_i=0.06046-0.02426VPD$ -0.662* BGU-75 $\hat{A}C_i=0.04673-0.01846VPD$ -0.662* BGU-75 $\hat{A}C_i=0.05203-0.02046VPD$ -0.662* BGU-50 $\hat{A}C_i=0.05203-0.02046VPD$ -0.601* Water-use efficiency - WUE (µmol CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹ /µmol H ₂ O m ⁻² s ⁻¹) and vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa) BRS-68 WUE = 3.44816-0.89762VPD -0.514* EPAMIG-05 WUE = 2.86952-0.85643VPD -0.698** BGU-61 $\widehat{WUE} = 3.45356-1.94132VPD$ -0.682** BGU-61	BGU-61	$\hat{T}_{\text{Leaf}} = 17.30569 + 0.79967 \text{Tair}$	0.601*	
Photosynthesis rate - A (µmol CO2 m² s¹) and vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa)BRS-68Â=13.99501-4.22483VPD-0.701*EPAMIG-05Â=16.62090-6.65729VPD-0.746**BGU-61Â=13.98097-5.661821VPD-0.568*BGU-75Â=14.99233-6.01194VPD-0.657**BGU-50Â=15.70150-6.56296VPD-0.595*Carboxylation efficiency – A/C _i (µmol CO2 m² s¹/µmol CO2 m0l¹)BRS-68A7C _i =0.01546-0.01546VPDPAMIG-05A7C _i =0.0646-0.02426VPD-0.702**EPAMIG-05A7C _i =0.04673-0.01846VPD-0.571*BGU-75A7C _i =0.04981-0.01957VPD-0.662*BGU-50A7C _i =2.05203-0.02046VPD-0.601*Water-use efficiency – WUE (µmol CO2 m² s¹/µmol H₂O m² s¹) and vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa)BRS-68 \widehat{WUE} =3.44816-0.89762VPDBGU-61 \widehat{WUE} =3.44816-0.89762VPD-0.698**BGU-75 \widehat{WUE} =2.86952-0.85643VPD-0.682**BGU-75 \widehat{WUE} =2.74730-1.23844VPD-0.685**	BGU-75	$\hat{T}_{\text{Leaf}} = 18.52477 + 0.75895 \text{Tair}$	0.598*	
VPD (kPa)BRS-68 $\hat{A}=13.99501-4.22483VPD$ -0.701*EPAMIG-05 $\hat{A}=16.62090-6.65729VPD$ -0.746**BGU-61 $\hat{A}=13.98097-5.661821VPD$ -0.568*BGU-75 $\hat{A}=14.99233-6.01194VPD$ -0.657**BGU-50 $\hat{A}=15.70150-6.56296VPD$ -0.595*Carboxylation efficiency – A/C ₁ (µmol CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹ /µmol CO ₂ mol ⁻¹)BRS-68 $\hat{A/C}_i=0.01546-0.01546VPD$ -0.702**EPAMIG-05 $\hat{A/C}_i=0.06046-0.02426VPD$ -0.738**BGU-61 $\hat{A/C}_i=0.04673-0.01846VPD$ -0.571*BGU-75 $\hat{A/C}_i=0.04981-0.01957VPD$ -0.662*BGU-50 $\hat{A/C}_i=0.05203-0.02046VPD$ -0.601*Water-use efficiency – WUE (µmol CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹ /µmol H ₂ O m ⁻² s ⁻¹) andvapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa)BRS-68 $\widehat{WUE} = 3.44816-0.89762VPD$ -0.514*EPAMIG-05 $\widehat{WUE} = 2.86952-0.85643VPD$ -0.698**BGU-61 $\widehat{WUE} = 3.45356-1.94132VPD$ -0.682**BGU-75 $\widehat{WUE} = 2.74730-1.23844VPD$ -0.685**	BGU-50	$\hat{T}_{\text{Leaf}} = 22.51507 + 0.61661 \text{Tair}$	0.506*	
BRS-68 $\hat{A}=13.99501-4.22483VPD$ -0.701^* EPAMIG-05 $\hat{A}=16.62090-6.65729VPD$ -0.746^{**} BGU-61 $\hat{A}=13.98097-5.661821VPD$ -0.568^* BGU-75 $\hat{A}=14.99233-6.01194VPD$ -0.657^{**} BGU-50 $\hat{A}=15.70150-6.56296VPD$ -0.595^* Carboxylation efficiency – A/C ₁ (µmol CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹ /µmol CO ₂ mol ⁻¹)BRS-68 $\hat{A/C}_i=0.01546-0.01546VPD$ -0.702^{**} EPAMIG-05 $\hat{A/C}_i=0.06046-0.02426VPD$ -0.738^{**} BGU-61 $A/C_i=0.04073-0.01846VPD$ -0.571^* BGU-75 $A/C_i=0.04981-0.01957VPD$ -0.662^* BGU-50 $A/C_i=0.05203-0.02046VPD$ -0.601^* Water-use efficiency – WUE (µmol CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹ /µmol H ₂ O m ⁻² s ⁻¹) andvapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa)BRS-68 $\widehat{WUE} = 3.44816-0.89762VPD$ -0.514^* EPAMIG-05 $\widehat{WUE} = 2.86952-0.85643VPD$ -0.698^{**} BGU-61 $\widehat{WUE} = 3.45356-1.94132VPD$ -0.685^{**} BGU-75 $\widehat{WUE} = 2.74730-1.23844VPD$ -0.685^{**}	Photosynthesis rate - A (µmol CO $_2~m^{\text{-2}}~s^{\text{-1}})$ and vapor pressure deficit -			
EPAMIG-05 \hat{A} =16.62090-6.65729VPD-0.746**BGU-61 \hat{A} =13.98097-5.661821VPD-0.568*BGU-75 \hat{A} =14.99233-6.01194VPD-0.657**BGU-50 \hat{A} =15.70150-6.56296VPD-0.595*Carboxylation efficiency – A/C_i (µmol CO2 m² s²¹/µmol CO2 m0l²¹)BRS-68 A/C_i =0.01546-0.01546VPD-0.702**EPAMIG-05 A/C_i =0.06046-0.02426VPD-0.738**BGU-61 A/C_i =0.04673-0.01846VPD-0.571*BGU-75 A/C_i =0.04981-0.01957VPD-0.662*BGU-50 A/C_i =0.05203-0.02046VPD-0.601*Water-use efficiency – WUE (µmol CO2 m² s²¹/mmol H2O m² s²¹) andvapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa)BRS-68 WUE =3.44816-0.89762VPD-0.514*EPAMIG-05 WUE =2.86952-0.85643VPD-0.698**BGU-61 WUE =3.45356-1.94132VPD-0.682**BGU-75 WUE =2.74730-1.23844VPD-0.685**	VPD (kPa)			
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	BRS-68	Â=13.99501-4.22483VPD	-0.701*	
BGU-75 \hat{A} =14.99233-6.01194VPD-0.657**BGU-50 \hat{A} =15.70150-6.56296VPD-0.595*Carboxylation efficiency – A/C _i (µmol CO ₂ m² s ⁻¹ /µmol CO ₂ mol ⁻¹)BRS-68 $A\hat{C}$ =0.01546-0.01546VPD-0.702**EPAMIG-05 $A\hat{C}$ =0.06046-0.02426VPD-0.738**BGU-61 $A\hat{C}_i$ =0.04673-0.01846VPD-0.571*BGU-75 $A\hat{C}_i$ =0.04981-0.01957VPD-0.662*BGU-50 $A\hat{C}_i$ =0.05203-0.02046VPD-0.601*Water-use efficiency – WUE (µmol CO ₂ m² s ⁻¹ /mmol H ₂ O m² s ⁻¹) andvapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa)BRS-68 WUE =3.44816-0.89762VPD-0.514*EPAMIG-05 WUE =2.86952-0.85643VPD-0.698**BGU-61 WUE =3.45356-1.94132VPD-0.682**BGU-75 WUE =2.74730-1.23844VPD-0.685**	EPAMIG-05	Â=16.62090-6.65729VPD	-0.746**	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	BGU-61	Â=13.98097-5.661821VPD	-0.568*	
$\label{eq:constraint} \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	BGU-75	Â=14.99233-6.01194VPD	-0.657**	
BRS-68 $\widehat{A/C_i}=0.01546-0.01546VPD$ -0.702^{**} EPAMIG-05 $\widehat{A/C_i}=0.06046-0.02426VPD$ -0.738^{**} BGU-61 $\widehat{A/C_i}=0.04673-0.01846VPD$ -0.571^{*} BGU-75 $\widehat{A/C_i}=0.04981-0.01957VPD$ -0.662^{*} BGU-50 $\widehat{A/C_i}=0.05203-0.02046VPD$ -0.601^{*} Water-use efficiency – WUE (µmol CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹ /mmol H ₂ O m ⁻² s ⁻¹) and vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa) BRS-68 \widehat{WUE} =3.44816-0.89762VPD -0.514^{*} EPAMIG-05 \widehat{WUE} =2.86952-0.85643VPD -0.698^{**} BGU-61 \widehat{WUE} =3.45356-1.94132VPD -0.682^{**} BGU-75 \widehat{WUE} =2.74730-1.23844VPD -0.685^{**}	BGU-50	Â=15.70150-6.56296VPD	-0.595*	
EPAMIG-05 $\widehat{A/C}_i=0.06046-0.02426VPD$ -0.738^{**} BGU-61 $\widehat{A/C}_i=0.04673-0.01846VPD$ -0.571^{*} BGU-75 $\widehat{A/C}_i=0.04981-0.01957VPD$ -0.662^{*} BGU-50 $\widehat{A/C}_i=0.05203-0.02046VPD$ -0.601^{*} Water-use efficiency – WUE (µmol CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹ /mmol H ₂ O m ⁻² s ⁻¹) andvapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa)BRS-68 \widehat{WUE} =3.44816-0.89762VPD -0.514^{*} EPAMIG-05 \widehat{WUE} =2.86952-0.85643VPD -0.698^{**} BGU-61 \widehat{WUE} =3.45356-1.94132VPD -0.682^{**} BGU-75 \widehat{WUE} =2.74730-1.23844VPD -0.685^{**}	$Carboxylation \ efficiency - A/C_i \ (\mu mol \ CO_2 \ m^{-2} \ s^{-1} / \mu mol \ CO_2 \ mol^{-1})$			
BGU-61 $\widehat{A/C}_i$ =0.04673-0.01846VPD -0.571* BGU-75 $\widehat{A/C}_i$ =0.04981-0.01957VPD -0.662* BGU-50 $\widehat{A/C}_i$ =0.05203-0.02046VPD -0.601* Water-use efficiency – WUE (µmol CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹ /mmol H ₂ O m ⁻² s ⁻¹) and vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa) -0.514* BRS-68 \widehat{WUE} =3.44816-0.89762VPD -0.514* EPAMIG-05 \widehat{WUE} =2.86952-0.85643VPD -0.698** BGU-61 \widehat{WUE} =3.45356-1.94132VPD -0.682** BGU-75 \widehat{WUE} =2.74730-1.23844VPD -0.685**	BRS-68	A7Ci=0.01546-0.01546VPD	-0.702**	
BGU-75 $A\overline{l}C_1=0.04981-0.01957VPD$ $-0.662*$ BGU-50 $A\overline{l}C_1=0.05203-0.02046VPD$ $-0.601*$ Water-use efficiency – WUE (µmol CO2 m ⁻² s ⁻¹ /mmol H2O m ⁻² s ⁻¹) and vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa)BRS-68 $\overline{WUE} = 3.44816-0.89762VPD$ $-0.514*$ EPAMIG-05 $\overline{WUE} = 2.86952-0.85643VPD$ $-0.698**$ BGU-61 $\overline{WUE} = 3.45356-1.94132VPD$ $-0.682**$ BGU-75 $\overline{WUE} = 2.74730-1.23844VPD$ $-0.685**$	EPAMIG-05	A7Ci=0.06046-0.02426VPD	-0.738**	
BGU-50 $A \sqrt{L_1} = 0.05203 - 0.02046VPD$ -0.601^* Water-use efficiency – WUE (µmol CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹ /mmol H ₂ O m ⁻² s ⁻¹) and vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa) BRS-68 $\widehat{WUE} = 3.44816 - 0.89762VPD$ -0.514^* EPAMIG-05 $\widehat{WUE} = 2.86952 - 0.85643VPD$ -0.698^{**} BGU-61 $\widehat{WUE} = 3.45356 - 1.94132VPD$ -0.682^{**} BGU-75 $\widehat{WUE} = 2.74730 - 1.23844VPD$ -0.685^{**}	BGU-61	A7Ci=0.04673-0.01846VPD	-0.571*	
Water-use efficiency – WUE (μ mol CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹ /mmol H ₂ O m ⁻² s ⁻¹) and vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa) BRS-68 $\overline{WUE} = 3.44816 - 0.89762VPD$ $-0.514*$ EPAMIG-05 $\overline{WUE} = 2.86952 - 0.85643VPD$ $-0.698**$ BGU-61 $\overline{WUE} = 3.45356 - 1.94132VPD$ $-0.682**$ BGU-75 $\overline{WUE} = 2.74730 - 1.23844VPD$ $-0.685**$	BGU-75	A7C _i =0.04981-0.01957VPD	-0.662*	
vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa)BRS-68 $\widehat{WUE} = 3.44816 - 0.89762VPD$ -0.514^* EPAMIG-05 $\widehat{WUE} = 2.86952 - 0.85643VPD$ -0.698^{**} BGU-61 $\widehat{WUE} = 3.45356 - 1.94132VPD$ -0.682^{**} BGU-75 $\widehat{WUE} = 2.74730 - 1.23844VPD$ -0.685^{**}	BGU-50	A7Ci=0.05203-0.02046VPD	-0.601*	
BRS-68 $\widehat{WUE} = 3.44816 - 0.89762 VPD$ -0.514^* EPAMIG-05 $\widehat{WUE} = 2.86952 - 0.85643 VPD$ -0.698^{**} BGU-61 $\widehat{WUE} = 3.45356 - 1.94132 VPD$ -0.682^{**} BGU-75 $\widehat{WUE} = 2.74730 - 1.23844 VPD$ -0.685^{**}	Water-use efficiency – WUE (µmol CO $_2~m^{\text{-}2}~s^{\text{-}1}/\text{mmol}~H_2O~m^{\text{-}2}~s^{\text{-}1})$ and			
EPAMIG-05 \widehat{WUE} =2.86952-0.85643VPD-0.698**BGU-61 \widehat{WUE} =3.45356-1.94132VPD-0.682**BGU-75 \widehat{WUE} =2.74730-1.23844VPD-0.685**	vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa)			
BGU-61 \widehat{WUE} = 2.74730-1.23844VPD -0.682** BGU-75 \widehat{WUE} = 2.74730-1.23844VPD -0.685**	BRS-68	WUE =3.44816-0.89762VPD	-0.514*	
BGU-75 WUE =2.74730-1.23844VPD -0.685**	EPAMIG-05	WUE =2.86952-0.85643VPD	-0.698**	
	BGU-61	WUE =3.45356-1.94132VPD	-0.682**	
BGU-50	BGU-75	WUE =2.74730-1.23844VPD	-0.685**	
	BGU-50	WUE =2.73392-1.14338VPD	-0.723**	

**,*Significant at 1% and 5%, respectively, by the t-test.

Decreases of the photosynthesis rates result from the stomatal resistance increase that restricts the entry of CO_2 and from the increase of Rubisco oxygenase activity with an increase of VPD, which implies high temperature and low relative humidity (Lima Filho & Aidar, 2016).

Instantaneous water-use efficiency (WUE) - the ratio between photosynthesis and transpiration (A/E) - decreased with increasing VPD, as well as A and A/Ci (Table 1). Similarly, the only accession that kept WUE at positive rates with the increase of VPD was BRS-68 which, together with EPAMIG-05, expressed the lowest decreases of WUE per unit of VPD. These results corroborate those by Silva et al. (2009), who reported lower transpiration values for BRS-68 under optimal soil moisture conditions, as WUE is inversely proportional to E, and it varies proportionally with A. These authors also found a greater drought responsiveness for this accession because it exhibited faster stomatal closure. Therefore, it appears that BRS-68 maintains a higher photosynthesis and lower transpiration rates under conditions of high VPD, in comparison with other accessions, due to its greater stomatal control and Rubisco carboxylase activity.

The variation of stomatal conductance with the VPD was random (Table 2). Most correlations were nonsignificant, of very low magnitude, and negative.

Table 2. Correlations between stomatal conductance and transpiration rate with vapor pressure deficit for five umbu (*Spondias tuberosa*) tree accessions.

Accession	Correlation	Correlation	
		coefficient	
Stomatal conductance - $g_s \mbox{ (mol } H_2O \mbox{ m}^{-2} \mbox{ s}^{-1}\mbox{)}$ and vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa)			
BRS-68	\hat{g}_s =0.27139-0.03974VPD	-0.175 ^{ns}	
EPAMIG-05	\hat{g}_s =0.31537-0.03039VPD	-0.087 ^{ns}	
BGU-61	\hat{g}_s =0.30731+0.033305VPD	0.055 ^{ns}	
BGU-75	\hat{g}_s =0.57797-0.18292VPD	-0.406*	
BGU-50	\hat{g}_s =0.43151-0.07171VPD	-0.154 ^{ns}	
Transpiration rate – $E \mbox{ (mmol } H_2O m^{-2} s^{-1}\mbox{)}$ and vapor pressure deficit - VPD (kPa)			
BRS-68	Ê=3.94119+0.63071VPD	0.118 ^{ns}	
EPAMIG-05	Ê=4.53666+0.78644VPD	0.101 ^{ns}	
BGU-61	Ê=4.86618+0.88778VPD	0.105 ^{ns}	
BGU-75	Ê=6.91645-0.63685VPD	-0.088 ^{ns}	
BGU-50	Ê=6.29799+0.17067VPD	0.023 ^{ns}	

*Significant by the t-test, at 5% probability. nsNonsignificant.

Exceptions were recorded for the accession BGU-75 which showed a significant correlation with moderate magnitude, and for the accession BGU-61 which was positive. The correlations between transpiration and VPD were all nonsignificant, without significant magnitude, and positive, except for the accession BGU-75 which was negative.

These results suggest that the greatest effect on photosynthesis was enzymatic, supported by variations of carboxylation efficiency and water-use efficiency (Table 1), despiste fateful claims about rubisco carboxylation efficiency demand determination of the enzyme kinetic parameters, such as maximum carboxylation rate of ribulose 1,5-bisphosphate photosynthetic carboxylase/oxygenase (Rubisco), rate of electron transport, use of triose phosphate, daytime respiration and mesophyll conductance (Sharkey et al., 2007). However, these parameters require measurements adjusted at 25°C to facilitate the comparison, and this work was carried out at room temperature.

Leaf temperature increases with increasing air temperature, while net photosynthesis rates, carboxylation efficiency and instantaneous wateruse efficiency decrease at increasing vapor pressure deficit, in all umbu tree accessions; however, the accession BRS-68 (EPAMIG-01) maintains these rates at positive values, which suggests its greater adaptation to conditions of high vapor pressure deficit.

Acknowledgments

To Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) and to Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (Capes, Finance Code 001), for financial support.

References

ARANTES, A. de M.; DONATO, S.L.R.; SIQUEIRA, D.L. de; COELHO, E.F.; SILVA, T.S. Gas exchange in different varieties of banana prata in semi-arid environment. **Revista Brasileira de Fruticultura**, v.38, e-600, 2016. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/0100-29452016600.

DONATO, S.L.R.; ARANTES, A. de M.; GONÇALVES, N.P.; MATOS, F.S.; RODRIGUES, M.G.V.; SATURNINO, H.M. Aspectos ecofisiológicos, morfológicos, fenológicos e de produção do umbuzeiro e umbu-cajazeira. Informe Agropecuário, v.40, p.22-38, 2019a.

DONATO, S.L.R.; FONSECA, N.; GONÇALVES, N.P.; MACHADO, C. de F.; MATOS, F.S.; SATURNINO, H.M.; RODRIGUES, M.G.V. Práticas de cultivo do umbuzeiro. **Informe Agropecuário**, v.40, p.65-79, 2019b.

HABERMANN, G.; MACHADO, E.C.; RODRIGUES, J.D.; MEDINA, C.L. Gas exchange rates at different vapor pressure deficits and water relations of 'Pera' sweet orange plants with citrus variegated chlorosis (CVC). **Scientia Horticulturae** v.98, p.233-245, 2003. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4238(02)00228-5.

LIMA FILHO, J.M.P. **Ecofisiologia do umbuzeiro**. In: LEDERMAN, I.E.; LIRA JÚNIOR, J.S. de; SILVA JÚNIOR, J.F. da (Ed.). *Spondias* no Brasil: umbu, cajá e espécies afins. Recife: IPA: Embrapa Agroindústria Tropical, 2008. p.31-39.

LIMA FILHO, J.M.P.; AIDAR, S. de T. **Ecofisiologia**. In: DRUMOND, M.A; AIDAR, S. de T.; NASCIMENTO, C.E. de S.; OLIVEIRA, V.R. de. (Ed.). **Umbuzeiro**: avanços e perspectivas. Brasília: Embrapa, 2016. Cap.4, p.117-146.

LIMA, R.S.N. de; FIGUEIREDO, F.A.M.M. de A.; MARTINS, A.O.; DEUS, B.C. da S. de; FERRAZ, T.M.; GOMES, M. de M. de A.; SOUSA, E.F. de; GLENN, D.M.; CAMPOSTRINI, E. Partial rootzone drying (PRD) and regulated deficit irrigation (RDI) effects on stomatal conductance, growth, photosynthetic capacity, and water-use efficiency of papaya. **Scientia Horticulturae** v.183, p.13-22, 2015. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2014.12.005.

MCADAM, S.A.M.; BRODRIBB, T.J. The evolution of mechanisms driving the stomatal response to vapour pressure deficit. **Plant Physiology**, v.167, p833-843, 2015. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.114.252940.

SANTOS, H.G. dos; JACOMINE, P.K.T.; ANJOS, L.H.C. dos; OLIVEIRA, V.Á. de; LUMBRERAS, J.F.; COELHO, M.R.; ALMEIDA, J.A. de; ARAÚJO FILHO, J.C. de; OLIVEIRA, J.B. de; CUNHA, T.J.F. **Sistema brasileiro de classificação de solos**. 5.ed. rev. e ampl. Brasília: Embrapa, 2018. 356p.

SANTOS, L.J.S.; ARANTES, A. de M.; DONATO, S.L.R.; BRITO, C.F.B.; LIMA, M.A.C. de; RODRIGUES FILHO, V.A. Leaf contents and biochemical cycling of nutrients in accessions of umbu and umbu-caja. **Revista Caatinga**, v.33, p.690-701, 2020. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/1983-21252020v33n312rc.

SHARKEY, T.D.; BERNACCHI, C.J.; FARQUHAR, G.D.; SINGSAAS, E.L. Fitting photosynthetic carbon dioxide response curves for C3 leaves. **Plant, Cell and Environment**, v.30, p.1035-1040, 2007. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.2007.01710.x.

SILVA, E.C.; NOGUEIRA, R.J.M.C.; VALE, F.H.A.; ARAÚJO, F.P. de; PIMENTA, M.A. Stomatal changes induced by intermittent drought in four umbu tree genotypes. **Brazilian Journal of Plant Physiology**, v.21, p.33-42, 2009. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/S1677-04202009000100005.