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ABSTRACT

• **Background and Aims** *Ottelia alismoides* (Hydrocharitaceae) is a freshwater macrophyte that, unusually, possesses three kinds of carbon dioxide-concentrating mechanisms. Here we describe its leaf anatomy and chloroplast ultrastructure, how they are altered by CO₂ concentration and may underlie C₄ photosynthesis.

• **Methods** Light and transmission electron microscopy were used to study the anatomy of mature leaves of *O. alismoides* grown at high and low CO₂ concentrations. Diel acid change and the activity of PEP carboxylase were measured to confirm that CAM activity and C₄ photosynthesis were present.

• **Key Results** When *O. alismoides* was grown at low CO₂ the leaves performed both C₄ and CAM photosynthesis whereas with high CO₂ leaves used C₄ photosynthesis. The leaf comprised an upper and lower layer of epidermal cells separated by a large air space occupying about 22% of the leaf transverse-section area, and by mesophyll cells connecting the two epidermal layers. Kranz anatomy was absent. At low CO₂, chloroplasts in the mesophyll cells were filled with starch even at the start of the photoperiod, while epidermal chloroplasts had small starch grains. The number of chloroplasts in the epidermis was greater than in the mesophyll cells. At high CO₂, the structure was unchanged but the thickness of the two epidermal layers, the air space, mesophyll and the transverse-section area of cells and air space were greater.

• **Conclusions** Leaves of *O. alismoides* have epidermal and mesophyll cells that contain chloroplasts and large air spaces but lack Kranz anatomy. The high starch content of mesophyll cells suggests they may benefit from an internal source of CO₂, for example via C₄ metabolism, and are also sites of starch storage. The air spaces may help in the recycling of decarboxylated or respired CO₂. The structural similarity of leaves from low and high CO₂ is consistent with the constitutive nature of
bicarbonate and C₄ photosynthesis. There is sufficient structural diversity within the leaf of *O. alismoides* to support dual-cell C₄ photosynthesis even though Kranz anatomy is absent.
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INTRODUCTION

In their evolution from terrestrial ancestors, freshwater plants have traded-off problems of water shortage for problems of carbon-shortage (Maberly and Gontero, 2018). Carbon-shortage is mainly caused by low rates of CO₂ diffusion across boundary layers surrounding aquatic leaves (Black et al., 1981). Additionally, especially in productive lakes, generation of CO₂ concentrations below air-equilibrium and, oxygen concentrations above air-equilibrium, can together stimulate photorespiration (Maberly, 1996; Sand-Jensen et al., 2019). In response to the absence of water shortage and the presence of carbon limitation, the leaves of submerged freshwater plants have thin cuticles, lack stomata and sub-stomatal spaces and have chloroplasts in epidermal cells (Sculthorpe, 1967). Laminar leaves are generally thin with a high specific leaf area (Enríquez et al., 1996; Poorter et al., 2009) and the lamina often comprises only two or three cell layers (Maberly and Gontero, 2018). Aerenchyma is a common feature of aquatic plants (Sculthorpe, 1967) and is present in the roots, leaves and stems of most aquatic species (Silveira et al., 2016).

In addition to these structural changes, freshwater macrophytes employ a number of avoidance, exploitation and amelioration strategies to overcome carbon limitation (Klavsen et al., 2011). Amelioration strategies involve active CO₂-concentrating mechanisms (CCMs) that increase CO₂ around the primary carboxylase, ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase/oxygenase (Rubisco). There are three known CCMs in freshwater macrophytes: of the species investigated, about half have the ability to use HCO₃⁻, 8% have CAM and 4% have C₄ (Maberly and Gontero, 2017; Iversen et al., 2019). Bicarbonate is the dominant form of inorganic carbon when pH
is between about 6.3 and 10.1 and even when CO₂ becomes depleted as pH increases, bicarbonate can be present at appreciable concentrations. C₄ photosynthesis and CAM depend on temporary fixation of bicarbonate by phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase (PEPC) to form a C₄ compound that is subsequently decarboxylated, raising the CO₂ concentration around the active site of Rubisco (Keeley, 1981; Bowes et al., 2002). The carboxylation and decarboxylation processes are separated spatially in C₄ photosynthesis and temporally in CAM. C₄ photosynthesis reduces photorespiration during the day in aquatic and terrestrial plants. In addition, CAM can reduce the loss of carbon from dark respiration and extend the duration of carbon uptake to the night (Maberly and Madsen, 2002; Pedersen et al., 2011).

Function and structure are often closely associated (Smith et al., 2012). In freshwater macrophytes, use of bicarbonate can be associated with polar leaves with high pH produced at the adaxial/upper surface and low pH at the abaxial/lower surface (Steemann Nielsen, 1947; Prins and Elzenga, 1989). Terrestrial CAM plants have large vacuoles to store the C₄ compound, often in the form of malate, accumulated during the night (Nelson and Sage, 2008; Silvera et al., 2010). Terrestrial C₄ plants, typically have a specialised ‘Kranz anatomy’, that comprises mesophyll cells with C₄ photosynthesis surrounding bundle sheath cells where CO₂ is concentrated and assimilated by the Calvin-Benson-Bassham cycle (Sage and Monson, 1999). In addition to different photosynthetic enzymes, these two types of cell also differ in starch content and chloroplast ultrastructure (Edwards et al., 2004) so that the initial carboxylation and the subsequent decarboxylation can be spatially separated in these two distinctive types of photosynthetic cell (Raghavendra and Sage, 2011; Sage, 2016). However, a few terrestrial plants within the dicot Amaranthaceae family, e.g. *Bienertia cycloptera*, *Bienertia sinuspersici* and *Suaeda aralocaspica* (formerly...
Borszczowia aralocaspica), operate C4 photosynthesis through the spatial separation of dimorphic chloroplasts within a single cell (Voznesenskaya et al., 2001; Voznesenskaya et al., 2002; Voznesenskaya et al., 2003; Edwards et al., 2004; Akhani et al., 2005).

C4 photosynthesis is also present in freshwater plants from the monocot Hydrocharitaceae family: Egeria densa, Ottelia alismoides and Ottelia acuminata (Casati et al., 2000; Lara et al., 2002; Zhang et al., 2014), as well as in the well-studied species Hydrilla verticillata, where it takes place within a single cell (Bowes and Salvucci, 1989; Bowes, 2011). In E. densa and H. verticillata, C4 photosynthesis is induced by carbon limitation whereas in O. alismoides it is present in mature leaves regardless of the CO2 concentration (Zhang et al., 2014; Shao et al., 2017; Huang et al., 2018). In contrast, the CAM activity of O. alismoides is facultative and is induced at low CO2 but absent at high CO2 (Zhang et al., 2014). In addition, O. alismoides has a constitutive ability to use bicarbonate and is the only plant known to have three different CCMs (Zhang et al., 2014; Shao et al., 2017; Huang et al., 2018).

In terrestrial plants, elevated CO2 concentrations can alter anatomical structure (Pritchard et al., 1999; Uprety et al., 2001). Leaves of freshwater plants grown in air and water can have very different morphologies and structure (Maberly and Gontero, 2018). However, the anatomical response of leaves of freshwater plants to different CO2 concentrations has not been studied. Since O. alismoides is the only known species with three kinds of CCMs, we hypothesized that its leaf anatomy and chloroplast ultrastructure might be peculiar and reflect the integration of these three different processes and that they might be affected by CO2 concentration.
MATERIALS AND METHODS

Plant material

On 22 March 2018, seeds of *O. alismoides* were sown in plastic pots (11 cm in diameter and 7 cm deep) containing sterile soil from nearby Donghu Lake and covered with 2 cm of sterile tap water. The chemical composition of the tap water was analyzed. The concentrations of total nitrogen (TN) and total phosphorus (TP) were determined spectrophotometrically after digestion with K$_2$S$_2$O$_8$ (Huang et al., 1999). The concentrations of Na$^+$, K$^+$, Ca$^{2+}$ and Mg$^{2+}$ were determined using optical emission spectrometry (ICP-OES) Optima 8000DV (Perkin Elmer, MA, USA) after addition of 200 μL HNO$_3$ to 10 mL tap water. The concentrations of Cl$^-$, SO$_4^{2-}$ and NO$_3^-$ were measured using Dionex ICS-5000+ HPIC system (Thermo Fisher Scientific, MA, USA). The composition is shown in Supplementary Data Table S1.

The pots were placed in a plant growth chamber at 28 °C, 12/12 hours photoperiod (150 μmol photon m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, photosynthetically active radiation). The water level was increased as the seedlings grew to keep them submerged. When the seedlings were about 4 cm tall, the pots were placed in 1 L glass beakers in the growth chamber. After 40 days, three to five seedlings (~8 cm tall) were transplanted into another plastic pot (15 cm diameter, 12 cm deep) containing the sterile soil. These containers were placed in a 400 L tank (64 cm deep) located in a glasshouse receiving natural daylight. The tap water in the tank was changed weekly and snails were removed daily.

Response of mature *O. alismoides* leaves to different CO$_2$ concentrations
In August 2018, when the plants had produced many broad, oval-shaped mature leaves, one pot was placed in each of eight white plastic buckets (25 × 25 × 35 cm). These were filled with tap water and placed in the rooftop tanks, surrounded by water to keep the water temperature consistent among all the buckets, but the solution in each bucket was independent from the others. High and low CO$_2$ concentrations were produced using the method described in Shao et al. (2017) with four replicates of each treatment. The water in the buckets was changed twice during the 40-days acclimation.

Low CO$_2$ (LC) was produced by allowing plant photosynthesis to deplete inorganic carbon and increase pH while high CO$_2$ (HC) was produced by adding a CO$_2$ solution to produce a set pH twice each day. In the morning (between 08:00 and 09:00) and afternoon (between 17:30 to 19:00), the water was gently stirred to thoroughly mix it and pH was measured with a pH electrode and temperature was measured with a thermometer. Alkalinity was measured every two days by Gran titration (Shao et al., 2017). On each sampling occasion, CO$_2$-saturated tap water was added to the HC treatment, to bring the pH to 6.8. Concentrations of CO$_2$ were calculated from pH, alkalinity and temperature (Maberly, 1996). In the LC treatment, the pH increased from 8.0 to over 9.8 and the CO$_2$ concentration varied between 0.1 and 13 μmol L$^{-1}$ with a mean of 2.4 μmol L$^{-1}$. In the HC treatment, the pH varied between 6.6 and 6.9, producing CO$_2$ concentrations between 481 μmol L$^{-1}$ and 1110 μmol L$^{-1}$ with a mean of 720 μmol L$^{-1}$. Water temperature ranged between 25 and 35 °C with a mean of 30 °C. As a reference, the CO$_2$ concentration in equilibrium with 400 ppm atmospheric CO$_2$ will be about 14 μmol L$^{-1}$ at 30 °C. Changes in CO$_2$ concentration in the two treatments are shown in Supplementary Data Fig. S1. After 40-days acclimation to LC and HC treatments, fully expanded mature leaves that had been produced during the
experiment and appeared to be of similar age were sampled for structure and physiology studies.

**Light Microscopy and Transmission Electron Microscopy**

Leaf segments (3 mm × 3 mm) sampled at 0500 and 1800 were fixed overnight in 2.5% glutaraldehyde in 0.1 M phosphate buffer (pH 7.4) at 4°C and post-fixed in 1% OsO₄ at 4°C for 2.5 h (Farnese et al., 2017). They were dehydrated using a stepwise ethanol series (30, 50, 70, 90 and 100%) and processed with a mixed solution of ethanol and acetone, then infiltrated in a mixture of acetone and epoxy resin (1: 1 for 1 h, and then 1: 2 for 8 h) and finally embedded using SPI-PON 812 at 60°C for 48 h. Semi-thin sections (1.5 μm) and ultrathin sections (72 nm) were obtained on a Leica EM UC7 ultramicrotome. Semi-thin sections were stained with methylene blue and observed using a Motic BA310 digital light microscope. Quantitative characteristics of leaf structures were measured using the Motic Images Plus 2.0 ML software. For the ultrathin sections, after staining with uranyl acetate and lead citrate, they were observed and photographed with a HT7700 transmission electron microscope (Hitachi High-Tech, Japan). Leaf chloroplasts and starch grains in electron micrograph were measured using Image J software. The distribution of chloroplasts in cells was assessed by measuring the number of chloroplasts per unit length of cell wall at different locations from the semi-thin sections under the light microscope, including the upper epidermis next to water, the upper epidermis next to air space, the upper mesophyll cells, the lower mesophyll cells, the lower epidermis next to air space and the lower epidermis next to water.
Enzyme activity measurement

Mature leaves were collected at 0500 and 1800 using the extraction and assay protocols for Rubisco and PEPC activities as described previously (Zhang et al., 2014; Shao et al., 2017; Huang et al., 2018). Enzyme activities were calculated from the rate of disappearance of NADH at 340 nm and 25°C measured with a microplate reader (Tecan M200 PRO, Austria).

CAM activity measurement

CAM activity was assessed by calculating the daily change in titratable acidity, in leaves harvested at 0500 and 1800 as previously described (Zhang et al., 2014). Briefly, to measure leaf acid content, 10 mL CO₂-free deionized water were added to the leaf samples of known fresh weight (0.2 ~ 0.5 g) and then boiled for 30 min. The acidity was titrated to pH 8.3 using 0.01 N NaOH.

Statistical analysis

SPSS 20 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) was used to analyze the data. An independent sample t-test was used for two groups of data with normal distribution, the Mann-Whitney U-test was used for two groups of data where the distribution was not normal and the Kruskal-Wallis test was used for three or more groups of data where the distribution was not normal. The significance level of the statistics was accepted at $P < 0.05$. 
RESULTS

C₄ photosynthesis and CAM activity

The enzyme activities of PEPC and Rubisco in mature leaves under HC and LC treatments were measured to confirm that C₄ photosynthesis was present. There was no significant difference in PEPC activities between leaves collected at dusk and dawn regardless of the treatments, but the PEPC activities were significantly higher in leaves grown at a low versus a high concentration of CO₂ (Fig. 1A). Rubisco activity was significantly lower in leaves collected at dawn versus dusk, but was not affected by CO₂ concentration (Fig. 1B). The ratio of PEPC to Rubisco was between 1.6 and 4.2 (Fig. 1C) within a range typical of terrestrial C₄ plants (Zhang et al., 2014). This ratio was significantly higher at low than at high CO₂ both at dawn and dusk. At dawn, the ratio was about 2.6-fold higher in low compared to high CO₂ leaves suggesting that leaves from low CO₂ had more active C₄ photosynthesis than those from high CO₂. Leaves at low CO₂ had a marked diel change in acidity that was significantly higher (58 µequiv g⁻¹ FW) than at high CO₂ concentrations (19 µequiv g⁻¹ FW, Fig. 2). These results confirm that these mature O. alismoides leaves perform both C₄ photosynthesis and CAM when acclimated to low CO₂ and C₄ photosynthesis at high CO₂.

Effects of CO₂ concentration on leaf anatomy

Transverse sections showed that there were no major differences in basic structure and types of cell in leaves grown at high and low concentrations of CO₂ (Fig. 3).
Leaves from both treatments comprised an upper and lower layer of epidermal cells separated by a large air space and between one and three but most often two stacked mesophyll cells connecting the two epidermal layers. In transverse section, the epidermal cells varied in shape between rectangular and elliptical while the mesophyll cells were less elongated (Fig. 3B, E). Parenchymal cells containing some chloroplasts occurred around the vascular bundle, the bundle sheath, but this was not surrounded by mesophyll cells and thus Kranz anatomy was absent (Fig. 3C, F).

Leaf width was significantly greater at high (8.56 (mean) cm ± 0.50 (SD)) compared to low CO₂ concentration (5.44 cm ± 0.18), but leaf length was unaltered at ~12 cm (Table 1). Consequently, the length to width ratio was greater at low CO₂. The leaves of *O. alismoides* were thicker at high than at low CO₂ concentration (Fig. 3, Table 1). The ratio of air space area to leaf area in transverse section was 0.22 to 0.23 but was not affected significantly by CO₂ concentration (Table 1). The air spaces were bounded top and bottom by the epidermal cells and surrounded at the sides by a network of mesophyll cells and so were not connected to one another (see also Supplementary Data Fig. S2).

The epidermis and mesophyll of plants grown at high CO₂ concentration were significantly thicker and of greater cell area than in plants grown at low CO₂ concentration (Fig. 4). Furthermore, the upper epidermis was thicker than the lower epidermis, both at low and high CO₂ (*P* < 0.001), but the area was not different. The thickness and area of an air space were correspondingly greater at high CO₂ concentration.

**Effects of CO₂ concentration on chloroplasts**
Chloroplasts were present in epidermal and mesophyll cells (Fig. 3). Since chloroplasts can differ in cells carrying out different processes, such as in C4 photosynthesis, we characterized chloroplast size, shape and ultrastructure in leaves grown at high and low CO2. In leaves grown at high CO2, the chloroplasts in epidermis and mesophyll cells were all nearly spherical with large starch grains (Fig. 5A, C, D, E), which occupied ~65 and ~80% of the chloroplast area both at dusk and dawn (Fig. 6E & F). In contrast, in leaves grown at low CO2, epidermal chloroplasts were spindle-shaped (Fig. 5F), while the mesophyll chloroplasts were spherical (Fig. 5I) and consequently, their minor axis length was shorter (Fig. 6B). In the leaves collected at dusk, starch occupied 40% and 64% of the chloroplast area in the epidermal and the mesophyll cells, respectively (Fig. 6E). The same trend was also observed in the leaves sampled at dawn (Fig. 6F), small and large starch grains were distributed in the chloroplasts of the epidermal and mesophyll cells, respectively (Fig. 5H & J). Grana with many thylakoids were clearly visible in epidermal chloroplasts (Fig. 5B & G) whereas in mesophyll chloroplasts, the grana thylakoids were indistinct because of the high starch content.

The average area of a chloroplast was greater in leaves grown at high versus low CO2 in both types of cell (Fig. 6C). The area of a chloroplast was greater in mesophyll than in epidermal cells for both CO2 treatments. At high CO2, the number of mitochondria within 1 µm around a chloroplast in mesophyll and epidermal cells was not significantly different (Fig. 6D). However, at low CO2, the number of mitochondria around chloroplasts in mesophyll cells was significantly higher than in the epidermal cells.
The distribution of chloroplasts in epidermal and mesophyll cells was measured under different CO₂ concentrations (Fig. 7). The frequency of chloroplasts in the upper and lower epidermis was significantly greater than in the mesophyll cells. The chloroplast frequency at the cell walls next to air spaces in the lower epidermis was less than the equivalent location in the upper epidermis, at high and low CO₂. The frequency of chloroplasts at the upper epidermis next to an air space was significantly lower in leaves acclimated to low compared to high CO₂.

**DISCUSSION**

**Adaptation to photosynthesis underwater**

The presence of chloroplasts in epidermal cells is a common feature in submerged angiosperms, but rare in their terrestrial ancestors (Sculthorpe, 1967; Rascio, 2002; Maberly and Gontero, 2018). Mature leaves of *O. alismoides* have two types of photosynthetic cell, epidermal and mesophyll. In contrast, leaves from three other species of Hydrocharitaceae, *H. verticillata*, *E. densa* and *Elodea callitrichoides*, only have two layers of epidermal cells and no mesophyll cells (Falk and Sitte, 1963; Pendland, 1979; Hara et al., 2015). As a consequence, the leaf thickness of *O. alismoides*, especially in the leaves grown at high CO₂, at 196 µm, is much greater than the median (95 µm) for submerged leaves from a range of freshwater macrophytes (Maberly and Gontero, 2018) and greater than *E. callitrichoides* and *E. densa* estimated from published images to be about 65 µm. While Black et al. (1981) estimated that the internal resistance to diffusion of CO₂ within the relatively thin leaves of four *Potamogeton* species (48 to 63 µm) was only 3 to 4% of the total, the internal resistance in the thicker leaves of *O. alismoides* could be greater but could be
offset by the high porosity (ratio of air space to transverse sectional leaf area, 0.22 to
0.23). In *O. alismoides*, the sizes of the upper and lower epidermal cells are similar
while in *H. verticillata*, the upper epidermal cells are noticeably larger than the lower
cells (Pendland, 1979). In *E. callitrichoides* the transverse sectional area of the upper
epidermal cells is about four-times that of the lower epidermis (Falk and Sitte, 1963),
assuming the orientation in Fig. 1 in Falk and Sitte (1963) is correct since the adaxial
and abaxial layers are not specifically labelled. Similarly, in *E. densa*, the transverse
sectional area of the upper epidermal cells is about five-times larger than that of the
lower epidermal cells (Hara et al., 2015). The functional significance of these
differences is currently unknown but they could be linked to the use of bicarbonate
involving different processes in upper and lower cell layers (Steemann Nielsen, 1947;
Prins and Elzenga, 1989).

Well-developed aerenchyma is a common feature of aquatic plants (Jung et al.,
2008). *O. alismoides* contains large air spaces between the epidermal layers while in
*H. verticillata* and *E. callitrichoides*, there are numerous small intercellular spaces
between the upper and lower epidermal cells that comprise a small proportion of the
leaf volume (Falk and Sitte, 1963; Pendland, 1979). In many isoetids, the aerenchyma
is a large proportion of the leaf volume and is continuous from the roots to the leaves,
allowing sedimentary CO2 to be taken up and fixed (Madsen et al., 2002) and oxygen
to be supplied to the roots (Sand-Jensen and Prahl, 1982). Since in *O. alismoides* the
air spaces are discrete (Supplementary Data Fig. S2), and so not connected to the
roots, these two processes are unlikely to occur. Air spaces comprise about 22 to 23%
of the transverse section leaf area in *O. alismoides*, which is within the broad range
recorded for terrestrial leaves (3 - 73%, Slaton and Smith, 2002; Earles et al., 2018).
In terrestrial leaves, the intercellular air spaces are connected to the atmosphere via
stomata and help to maximize the mesophyll surface area in contact with atmospheric CO₂. Aquatic plants generally lack functional stomata, so the air spaces within a leaf are not connected to the exterior. The air spaces provide buoyancy, allowing the leaves to float towards the surface where light is higher, but could also act as a reservoir of respiratory CO₂ (Wetzel et al., 1984) or photorespiratory CO₂ (Søndergaard and Wetzel, 1980) as can also occur in terrestrial C₃ plants (Busch et al., 2013). However, a calculation for low CO₂ leaves based on a one-sided specific leaf area of 100.5 cm² g⁻¹ FW and net rates of photosynthesis at around air-equilibrium CO₂ of 2 µmol g⁻¹ FW h⁻¹ (Zhang et al., 2014), air space area as a proportion of leaf area of 0.23 (this study) and maximal CO₂ partial pressure in the air space of 10,000 ppm (Madsen, 1987) suggests that air-space CO₂ could only support net photosynthesis for about 5 minutes. Nevertheless, if C₄ decarboxylation occurs in the mesophyll cells, as seems possible given the relatively high chloroplast density in these cells in relation to their distance from external inorganic carbon sources, then the air spaces may serve to trap and recycle CO₂ produced by C₄ decarboxylation. This could be efficient as loss of CO₂ from the air spaces to the outside will be limited by the chloroplasts in the epidermis and the low rate of CO₂ exchange between the leaf and the bulk water as a result of transport limitation across the boundary layer. At 25 °C the air-equilibrium molar ratio of oxygen to CO₂ in water is about 28-fold less than in air, so the air spaces may also provide a means to reduce the concentration of photosynthetically produced oxygen within mesophyll and epidermal cells.

C₄ photosynthesis and absence of Kranz anatomy
In the Hydrocharitaceae, four species are known to have constitutive or facultative C₄ photosynthesis, *H. verticillata*, *E. densa*, *O. acuminata* and *O. alismoides* (Bowes et al., 2002; Lara et al., 2002; Zhang et al., 2014; Yin et al., 2017) and lack Kranz anatomy. There is evidence that *H. verticillata* has single cell C₄ photosynthesis (Bowes et al., 2002). In this respect, it is similar to single-cell terrestrial C₄ plants (Voznesenskaya et al., 2001; Voznesenskaya et al., 2002) such as *B. cycloptera* and *S. aralocaspica* where C₄ production and decarboxylation occur in different parts of a cell (Edwards et al., 2004; Edwards and Voznesenskaya, 2011; Sharpe and Offermann, 2014; von Caemmerer et al., 2014). In these terrestrial plants, C₄ decarboxylation occurs in mitochondria using NAD malic enzyme (NAD-ME). In *O. alismoides*, Zhang et al. (2014) suggested, on the basis of enzyme activity measurements, that NAD-ME is also the decarboxylating enzyme, unlike in *H. verticillata* where NADP-ME is believed to be involved (Bowes, 2011). The location of primary CO₂ fixation and decarboxylation in *O. alismoides*, and whether they take place in a single cell, is unknown. Here we show that the mesophyll cells of *O. alismoides* have a high starch content which is consistent with these cells either being the site of high rates of photosynthesis resulting from decarboxylation, producing CO₂ locally or being sites of starch storage. However, the high frequency of mitochondria around mesophyll chloroplasts in leaves acclimated to low CO₂ supports the possibility that these cells are the site of decarboxylation by the mitochondrial NAD-ME, as does the presence of chloroplasts in mesophyll cells despite their distance from external sources of inorganic carbon. In this dual-cell model, the *O. alismoides* epidermal cells would then perform the function of the terrestrial C₄ mesophyll cells by producing a C₄ product and the *O. alismoides* mesophyll cells would perform the function of the
terrestrial C₄ bundle sheath cells in decarboxylating the C₄ product. However, it is also possible that both processes could be occurring within the mesophyll cells.

Some C₄ terrestrial plants have dimorphic chloroplasts in a single cell (Voznesenskaya et al., 2001; Voznesenskaya et al., 2002; Voznesenskaya et al., 2003; Akhani et al., 2005; Sharpe and Offermann, 2014). The different forms of chloroplasts in the Kranz anatomy cells are linked to different energy requirements and fixation of carbon (Edwards et al., 2004). Dimorphic chloroplasts differing in size and ultrastructure also occur in leaves of freshwater plants. In *Cabomba caroliniana* (Cabombaceae), the chloroplasts in mesophyll cells have larger starch grains, more thylakoids per granum, and are larger than epidermal chloroplasts (Galati et al., 2015; Table 2). Species within the aquatic angiosperm family Podostemaceae also have two types of chloroplasts. Small chloroplasts with a normal grana ultrastructure and very small starch grains occur at the upper tangential walls of epidermal cells, while large chloroplasts with more thylakoids per granum and many well-developed starch grains occur at the lower tangential walls of these cells and also in mesophyll cells (Fujinami et al., 2011; Table 2). However, there is no evidence for CCMs in *C. caroliniana* (Yin et al., 2017). In the Podostemaceae, although carbon isotope values range widely between -12.8 and -38.6‰ (Ziegler and Hertel, 2007) at different locations suggesting that there could be differences in discrimination resulting from C₄ photosynthesis or bicarbonate use, differences in carbon isotope signature caused by the source inorganic carbon cannot be excluded so the presence or absence of CCMs in these plants is currently unknown.

In terrestrial C₄ plants, cells or parts of cells where C₄ fixation occurs have smaller chloroplasts with less starch than chloroplasts in cells or parts of cells where
decarboxylation occurs (Table 2). Chloroplasts from the epidermal cells of *O. alismoides* are similar to those involved in C4 fixation while chloroplasts from mesophyll cells are similar to those involved in C4 decarboxylation, suggesting that C4 photosynthesis in this species may involve both cell types. However, although the biochemical evidence suggests that *O. alismoides* belongs to the NAD-ME sub-type of C4 (Zhang et al., 2014), its pattern of thylakoids per granum in epidermal compared to mesophyll cells is closer to that of terrestrial NADP-ME C4 plants, suggesting that there is not a direct ‘read-across’ between C4 photosynthesis in aquatic and terrestrial plants.

**Responses to CO2**

To maximise plant productivity there is an intricate relationship between leaf structure and function (Oguchi et al., 2018). In terrestrial plants, where water can be limiting, there is an evolutionary pressure to maximise the ratio of carbon gain to water loss. Cell size and leaf thickness are dependent on environmental conditions (Zeiger, 1983; Jones, 1985; Radoglou and Jarvis, 1990). In *Liquidambar styraciflua*, *Pinus taeda*, and *Brassica juncea*, high CO2 also has a structural effect, increasing the thickness of the upper and lower epidermis and mesophyll cell of leaves (Rogers et al., 1983; Uprety et al., 2001). Elevated CO2 generally increases the size of terrestrial plants (Pritchard et al., 1999). We found the same here for the freshwater plant *O. alismoides*, suggesting that the increase of this resource has a universal effect on plant size.

**Conclusions**
*O. alismoides* has three CCMs that requires structural and functional coordination to operate efficiently. Unlike terrestrial plants, the anatomy of *O. alismoides* is relatively simple, and spongy and palisade tissues are absent, as they are in submerged leaves of all aquatic plants (Maberly and Gontero, 2018). The leaf comprises two types of photosynthetic cell, epidermal and mesophyll. The conceptual overview summarizing the structure of *O. alismoides* leaves acclimated to high CO\(_2\) and low CO\(_2\) concentrations is shown in Supplementary Data Fig. S3. Epidermal cells, containing chloroplasts, maximise uptake of external CO\(_2\), aided by bicarbonate use, while the mesophyll cells may be sites where CO\(_2\) is concentrated by decarboxylation. Abundant discrete air spaces provide buoyancy but may also trap (photo)-respiratory CO\(_2\), or CO\(_2\) produced by decarboxylation, permitting its refixation. Overall, there is sufficient structural diversity within the leaf of *O. alismoides* to support dual-cell C\(_4\) photosynthesis even though Kranz anatomy is absent. However, further studies are needed to conclude definitively if *O. alismoides* has dual-cell C\(_4\) with the mesophyll cells representing the site of decarboxylation. Work is underway to test this by locating key photosynthesis enzymes in the epidermal and mesophyll cells.

**SUPPLEMENTARY DATA**

Supplementary data consist of the following. Figure S1: Fluctuations of CO\(_2\) concentration in high CO\(_2\) and low CO\(_2\) treatments during the 40-days acclimation. Figure S2: Photographs of the surface of a mature *O. alismoides* leaf from the low CO\(_2\) treatment using a laser scanning confocal microscope. Figure S3: Conceptual overview summarizing the structure of *O. alismoides* leaves acclimated to high CO\(_2\) and low CO\(_2\) concentrations. Table S1: The chemical composition of the tap water used in the growth experiments.
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Legends

FIG. 1. Influence of CO₂ concentration on activities of enzymes from O. alismoides leaves collected at dusk (1800) and dawn (0500). (A) PEPC activity. (B) Rubisco activity. (C) Ratio of PEPC to Rubisco activity. The mean values (n = 3-4), with their SD are shown. The statistical differences between means were tested using independent sample t-tests in panel A and B and independent sample t-tests and the Mann-Whitney U test in panel C. The statistic above the horizontal line compares leaves exposed to high CO₂ (black bars) and low CO₂ (white bars) collected at the same time (NS not significant, *P < 0.05, **P < 0.001); data with different small and large letters are significantly different between dusk and dawn, under high and low CO₂ treatments respectively (P < 0.05).

FIG. 2. Influence of high CO₂ (HC) and low CO₂ (LC) on acidity of O. alismoides leaves from dusk (1800) and dawn (0500). The mean values (n = 3-4), with their SD are shown. The statistical differences between means were tested using independent sample t-tests and the Mann-Whitney U test. The statistic above the horizontal line compares acidity in dusk and dawn (NS not significant, **P < 0.01) within the same CO₂ treatment; changes in acidity with different letters are significantly different between HC and LC treatments (P < 0.05).

FIG. 3. Transverse sections of O. alismoides leaves under high CO₂ concentration (A-C) and low CO₂ concentration (D-F) at dusk (1800). a, air space; le, lower epidermis; m, mesophyll cell; ue, upper epidermis; v, vascular bundle. The arrowhead indicates the chloroplasts. Scale bar = 100 μm.

FIG. 4. Effects of CO₂ concentration on anatomical characteristics of O. alismoides leaves. (A) The thickness of upper epidermis, lower epidermis, mesophyll and air space in transverse section. (B) The area of upper epidermal cell, lower epidermal cell, mesophyll cell and air space in transverse section. The mean values (n ≥ 30), with their SD are shown. The statistical differences between means were tested using independent sample t-tests and the Mann-Whitney U test. The statistic above the
horizontal line compares leaves under high CO₂ (black bars) and low CO₂ (white bars) concentration (\(^*P < 0.05, \)**P < 0.01, \(***P < 0.001\)).

FIG. 5. Ultrastructure of chloroplasts in *O. alismoides* leaves under different CO₂ concentrations and times of day. The upper row cells are from high and the lower row cells from low CO₂ concentration. A, B, F and G are epidermal cells at dusk (1800). C and H are epidermal cells at dawn (0500). D and I are mesophyll cells from dusk (1800) and E and J are mesophyll cells from dawn (0500). cw, cell wall; g, grana; m, mitochondria; p, plastoglobuli; s, starch grain. Scale bar = 1 μm.

FIG. 6. Effects of CO₂ concentration on characteristics of chloroplasts located in epidermal and mesophyll cells of *O. alismoides* leaves. (A & B) Chloroplast major and minor axis length at dusk (1800). (C) Area of chloroplast at dusk (1800). (D) Number of mitochondria within 1 μm of a chloroplast at dusk (1800). (E & F) Area ratio of starch to chloroplast in *O. alismoides* leaves collected at dusk (1800) and dawn (0500). The mean values (n ≥ 20), with their SD are shown. The statistical differences between means were tested using independent sample t-tests in panels A and C and independent sample t-tests and the Mann-Whitney U test in panels B, D, E and F. The statistic above the horizontal line compares high CO₂ (black bars) with low CO₂ (white bars) treatments (\(NS\) not significant, \(^*P < 0.05, \)**P < 0.01, \(***P < 0.001\)); data with different small and large letters are significantly different between chloroplasts in the two cell types, under high and low CO₂ treatments respectively (\(P < 0.05\)).

FIG. 7. The number of chloroplasts per unit length of cell wall under different CO₂ concentrations at dusk (1800). UEW, Upper epidermis, wall next to water; UEA, Upper epidermis, wall next to air space; UM, Upper mesophyll cell; LM, Lower mesophyll cell; LEA, Lower epidermis, wall next to air space; LEW, Lower epidermis, wall next to water. Error bars represent SD (n ≥ 20). The statistic above the horizontal line compares high CO₂ (black bars) and low CO₂ (white bars) treatments based on independent sample t-tests and the Mann-Whitney U-test (\(NS\) not significant,
**P < 0.01); data with different small and large letters are significantly different among different locations based on the Kruskal-Wallis test (P < 0.05) under high and low CO2 treatments.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

**Supplementary Data Fig. S1.** Fluctuations of CO2 concentration in high CO2 and low CO2 treatments during the 40-days acclimation.

**Supplementary Data Fig. S2.** Photographs of the surface of a mature *O. alismoides* leaf from the low CO2 treatment using a laser scanning confocal microscope.

**Supplementary Data Fig. S3.** Conceptual overview summarizing the structure of *O. alismoides* leaves acclimated to high CO2 and low CO2 concentrations.

**Supplementary Data Table S1.** The chemical composition of the tap water used in the growth experiments.
Table 1. Influence of CO\textsubscript{2} concentration on characteristics of *O. alismoides* leaves.
The mean values are given with SD in parenthesis. Significant differences between leaves treated with different CO\textsubscript{2} concentration are shown based on independent sample t-test (NS not significant, *P* < 0.05, ***P* < 0.001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>High CO\textsubscript{2}</th>
<th>Low CO\textsubscript{2}</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaf length (cm)</td>
<td>12.08 (0.36)</td>
<td>11.58 (0.68)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf width (cm)</td>
<td>8.56 (0.50)</td>
<td>5.44 (0.18)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length-width ratio</td>
<td>1.41 (0.06)</td>
<td>2.13 (0.12)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf thickness (μm)</td>
<td>196 (17)</td>
<td>161 (18)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ratio of air space to leaf area in transverse section</td>
<td>0.22 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.23 (0.02)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Characteristics of dimorphic chloroplasts in aquatic and terrestrial plants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment /type/ species</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area (μm²)</th>
<th>Thylakoids per granum</th>
<th>Starch</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aquatic C₃</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hydrobryum khaoyaiense</em></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.7 ± 1.8</td>
<td>3~4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Fujinami et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>23.7 ± 11</td>
<td>4~5</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cabomba caroliniana</em></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>~3.8²</td>
<td>4~5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Galati et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>~33.2²</td>
<td>~9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aquatic NAD-ME C₄</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ottelia alismoidesᵇ</em></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>9.0 ± 2.3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13.8 ± 3.3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terrestrial NADP-ME C₄</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zea mays</em></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Hodge et al. (1955); Laetsch (1968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Saccharum officinarum</em></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Laetsch and Price (1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sorghum bicolor</em></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>Woo et al. (1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salsola australis</em></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.67~8.2ᵃ</td>
<td>6~12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>P’yankov et al. (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>14.6~16.1ᵃ</td>
<td>2~5</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terrestrial NAD-ME C₄</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Amaranthus edulis</em></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Laetsch (1968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Atriplex lentiformis</em></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>2~3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Laetsch (1968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Atriplex spongiosa</em></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>Woo et al. (1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terrestrial Single-cell</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAD-ME C₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bienertia cycloptera</em></td>
<td>Cᵇ</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>~2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Voznesenskaya et al. (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cᵈ</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>3~5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Suaeda aralocaspica</em></td>
<td>Cᵇ</td>
<td>3.48~4.0ᵃ</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Voznesenskaya et al. (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cᵈ</td>
<td>7.18~8.0ᵃ</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ᵃ Calculated according to axis length in reference
ᵇ Plants treated with low CO₂ concentrations
c Chloroplasts have structural characteristics like those in mesophyll
ᵈ Chloroplasts have structural characteristics like those in bundle sheath cell
− Lack grana/starch; + Rudimentary grana/starch; + + Contain grana/starch; + + + Well-developed grana/starch; BS = Bundle sheath cell; C = Chlorenchyma cell; E = Epidermal cell; M = Mesophyll cell; P = Palisade cell; nd = not determined.
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Table S1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alkalinity</td>
<td>2200 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>1.61 (0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>100 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na⁺</td>
<td>635 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K⁺</td>
<td>130 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca²⁺</td>
<td>2255 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg²⁺</td>
<td>789 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl⁻</td>
<td>590 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₄²⁻</td>
<td>670 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₃⁻</td>
<td>86 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>