

Gillison, A.N. (1992) Photosynthetic activities in foliar and non-foliar organs; changes in the photosynthetically active radiation from canopy to ground level. Preliminary results. In: Hallé, F. & Pascal, O. (eds.) Rapport de Mission: Radeau des cimes Octobre/ Novembre 1991. Réserve de Campo, Cameroun. pp. 193-198. Ministère de la Recherche et de la Technologie, France.

BIOLOGIE D'UNE CANOPÉE DE FORÊT ÉQUATORIALE - II

**RAPPORT DE MISSION : RADEAU DES CIMES
OCTOBRE / NOVEMBRE 1991
RÉSERVE DE CAMPO, CAMEROUN**

(AVEC LE PARRAINAGE DU MINISTÈRE DE LA RECHERCHE ET DE LA TECHNOLOGIE)

ÉDITEURS

Francis HALLÉ - Olivier PASCAL

Photo couverture : HIROSHIKA SETSUMASA

N° ISBN : 2-950 6703-1-8

(1992)

PHOTOSYNTHETIC ACTIVITIES IN FOLIAR AND NON-FOLIAR ORGANS ; CHANGES IN THE PHOTOSYNTHETICALLY ACTIVE RADIATION FROM CANOPY TO GROUND LEVEL. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Andrew N. GILLISON

CSIRO Division of Wildlife and Ecology P.O. Box 780
ATHERTON - QUEENSLAND 4883 - AUSTRALIA
Tél. : 70 911 755 - Fax : 70 913 245

1/ INTRODUCTION

During my visit to Campo from 22 to 30 October 1991, I was able to complete the following brief investigations at Radeau I et II and in the surrounding forest and secondary vegetation :

a) A survey of relative photosynthetic activity of on-ground and canopy plant leaf and bark tissue.

b) A through-canopy to ground profile of photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) at two sites.

Due to my continued absence overseas since the end of February on an extended consultancy, I have been unable to complete any detailed assessment of results. Part of the aim of my study at Campo was to collate data which could be analysed and compared with similar data collected from North Queensland rain forests. The following results are therefore very skeletal and a more complete report will be completed later on.

2/ A SURVEY OF RELATIVE PHOTOSYNTHETIC ACTIVITY OF ON GROUND AND CANOPY PLANT LEAF AND BARK TISSUE

Aim : to determine patterns of relative photosynthetic activity in a range of plants from canopy to ground level and to compare activities bet-

ween chlorophyllous tissue in both leaves and green stems.

METHODS

A Brancker SF-30 fluorescence meter was used to detect P/S activity. The meter focusses a 670 nm light pulse through a lens on tissue which has been dark-adapted (usually about three minutes). The resulting excitation in chlorophyll results in energy release through three pathways : loss in heat, loss due to photosynthesis and loss due to fluorescence. The fluorescence emission is captured via the same lens through which the light pulse is transmitted. The data are recorded at 1/100 sec intervals over a period of 30 seconds which is usually sufficient to record a decay curve to a useful terminal point. The resulting fluorescence induction curve is known as the Kautsky effect. The present meter is capable only of recording slow kinetics and gives only a crude estimation of photosynthetic activity. Three critical points on the curve allow some comparative estimates to be made. By convention these are O, P and T, which are the initial rise time (Fo), Fmax (the Peak) and the Terminal value. The quantity Fv is Fmax or Peak value - Fo. The ratio Fv/Fmax is used to indicate a relative estimate of photosynthetic activity in the plant.

The kinetics of these reactions are complex and

data must be used with caution. Apart from the OPT values listed in the accompanying table, the general nature of the fluorescence induction curve is itself characteristic of individual plant behaviour. In the field, leaves were removed from the plant and a curve extracted usually within 20 minutes of collection. A 25 cm x 20 cm x 1 cm thick rubber collar was placed firmly around the light probe as a light seal and applied to the surface of the leaf to facilitate dark-adaptation. The light probe was mostly calibrated to provide a light pulse of 75 Dw/m² which appeared to produce a measurable curve in most plants. For green stem tissue the probe was either strapped to the stem *in situ* or else a portion of bark was removed and measured *ex situ* in the laboratory. There was limited opportunity on the raft to obtain leaves from the top and lower side of tree crowns and from canopy lianas.

In most cases two and sometimes three readings were taken on each specimen. As these took upwards of 15 minutes each, the process was time consuming. Erratic results were discarded. In this way approximately 90 specimens were recorded (see Table I). Data were downloaded into a COMPAQ 386/s portable computer, (courtesy of RANDOM Computer Company) and stored on 3 1/2 floppy disc. In Australia, modified software was used to generate fluorescence induction curves for each recording. Examples of these are attached.

RESULTS

Further laboratory analyses of curvilinear data are necessary to provide a more complete discussion. Superficial results indicate that apart from a few isolated instances such as semi-aquatics, (Araceae), some ground succulents (*Palisota*), lithophytes (*Streptocarpus*) and epiphytic orchids (CAM), there are no readily predictable characteristics that distinguish leaves of understorey plants from upper canopy leaves or of changes through canopy in individual trees other

than in certain species. Analyses so far indicate there are repeatable trends within species which may be more characteristic of guild structures as a whole. This requires further investigation. Fluorescence data obtained from stems and leaves of the same plant showed interesting response patterns. The most significant of these was obtained from *Musanga cecropioides* where, in one case, photosynthetic response from bark exceeded that of the leaves. Response patterns from plants in secondary vegetation habitats (*Alstonia boonei*), whereas 'ant-plants' *Barteria fistulosa* and *Leonardoxa africana* were extremely variable. Position (exposure) in successional status also seems to play a part as leaves of *B. fistulosa* collected in the forests were more variable than that of those collected on the forest edge.

3/ A THROUGH CANOPY TO GROUND PROFILE OF PHOTOSYNTHETICALLY ACTIVE RADIATION (PAR) AT TWO SITES

Aim: to determinate changes in quantum flux density of photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) through canopy to ground level.

METHODS

Two quantum flux sensors Q1 (Delta-T type QS) and Q2 (custom-made sensor built on a Telefunken BPW light cell) were calibrated in Australia where a linear relationship between the two was found to be of the level $r^2 = 99,4$. Q1 was mounted on a supporting metal cup and placed on an outer arm of the raft approximately one metre above the raft edge and away from any reflecting surface. A marlin fishing rod was mounted one metre away on a specially prepared laminated wooden base. The second sensor Q2 was attached to a weighted cord and lowered via the fishing rod approximately 1,5 m out from the raft edge and down through the canopy to ground level. Care was taken to

Table 1 - Fluorescence Induction Curve Data *

| Record # | Ang no | Taxon | O | P | T | FV-MAX |
|----------|--------|----------------------------------|------|------|------|--------|
| 1 | 0 | <i>Anthocleista</i> | 3156 | 6815 | 3988 | 0.54 |
| 2 | 0 | <i>Anthocleista</i> | 3221 | 6680 | 3571 | 0.52 |
| 3 | 0 | <i>Glochidion ?</i> | 3348 | 5824 | 4147 | 0.43 |
| 4 | 0 | <i>Glochidion ?</i> | 3230 | 4852 | 3949 | 0.33 |
| 5 | 0 | <i>Glochidion ?</i> | 3488 | 5489 | 4395 | 0.36 |
| 6 | 0 | <i>Alstonia boonei</i> | 3051 | 5723 | 3401 | 0.47 |
| 7 | 0 | <i>Alstonia boonei</i> | 3104 | 6151 | 3699 | 0.50 |
| 8 | 0 | <i>Barteria fistularia (bar)</i> | 2932 | 3447 | 3443 | 0.15 |
| 9 | 0 | <i>Barteria fistularia (bar)</i> | 2950 | 3685 | 3678 | 0.20 |
| 10 | 0 | <i>Barteria fistularia (bar)</i> | 2918 | 3207 | 3207 | 0.09 |
| 11 | 0 | <i>Macaranga</i> | 5439 | 5763 | 3656 | 0.06 |
| 12 | 0 | <i>Trema</i> | 2453 | 4190 | 3067 | 0.41 |
| 13 | 0 | <i>Trema</i> | 2692 | 5235 | 4135 | 0.49 |
| 14 | 0 | <i>Passiflora</i> | 3347 | 4864 | 4338 | 0.31 |
| 15 | 0 | <i>Passiflora</i> | 3167 | 4622 | 4285 | 0.31 |
| 16 | 0 | <i>Cissus</i> | 2849 | 5101 | 3360 | 0.44 |
| 17 | 0 | <i>Cissus</i> | 3100 | 6128 | 3858 | 0.49 |
| 18 | 0 | <i>Geophila</i> | 3425 | 6024 | 3664 | 0.43 |
| 19 | 0 | <i>Geophila</i> | 3533 | 6242 | 3776 | 0.43 |
| 20 | 0 | <i>Geophila</i> | 3679 | 6300 | 3749 | 0.42 |
| 21 | 0 | <i>Bulbophyllum</i> | 2457 | 3952 | 2774 | 0.38 |
| 22 | 0 | <i>Bulbophyllum</i> | 2429 | 3395 | 2591 | 0.28 |
| 23 | 0 | Sapotaceae | 3112 | 6040 | 4008 | 0.48 |
| 24 | 0 | Sapotaceae | 3311 | 6367 | 4053 | 0.52 |
| 25 | 0 | <i>Palisota ambigua</i> | 3072 | 6339 | 4077 | 0.52 |
| 26 | 0 | <i>Chlorophytum</i> | 3200 | 5125 | 3435 | 0.38 |
| 27 | 0 | <i>Chlorophytum</i> | 3304 | 5880 | 3624 | 0.44 |
| 28 | 0 | <i>Cyrtosperma</i> | 2745 | 3714 | 3284 | 0.26 |
| 29 | 0 | <i>Cyrtosperma</i> | 3146 | 5247 | 3923 | 0.40 |
| 30 | 0 | <i>Streptocarpus</i> | 3002 | 5776 | 4026 | 0.48 |
| 31 | 0 | <i>Streptocarpus</i> | 2930 | 5605 | 3741 | 0.48 |
| 32 | 0 | Marantaceae | 3683 | 6478 | 4994 | 0.43 |
| 33 | 0 | Marantaceae | 3832 | 6010 | 5025 | 0.36 |
| 34 | 0 | Icacinaceae (garlic) | 3317 | 4773 | 3959 | 0.31 |
| 35 | 0 | Icacinaceae (garlic) | 3364 | 5043 | 4234 | 0.33 |
| 36 | 0 | Bamboo | 3724 | 4598 | 4310 | 0.19 |
| 37 | 0 | Bamboo | 3469 | 5191 | 4082 | 0.33 |
| 38 | 0 | Aroid (semi-aquatic) | 3075 | 4029 | 3315 | 0.24 |
| 39 | 0 | Aroid (semi-aquatic) | 3008 | 4357 | 3357 | 0.31 |
| 40 | 0 | <i>Palisota</i> | 3317 | 5910 | 4264 | 0.44 |
| 41 | 0 | <i>Palisota</i> | 3621 | 6067 | 4719 | 0.40 |
| 42 | 0 | <i>Anthocleista nobilis</i> | 2668 | 3668 | 2979 | 0.27 |
| 43 | 0 | <i>Anthocleista nobilis</i> | 2249 | 3241 | 2722 | 0.31 |
| 44 | 0 | <i>Anthocleista nobilis</i> | 2535 | 3363 | 2786 | 0.25 |
| 45 | 06 | <i>Barteria fistularia (edg)</i> | 2758 | 2916 | 3223 | 0.05 |
| 46 | 06 | <i>Barteria fistularia (edg)</i> | 2722 | 3306 | 3188 | 0.18 |
| 47 | 02 | <i>Barteria fistularia (for)</i> | 3013 | 4434 | 3259 | 0.32 |
| 48 | 02 | <i>Barteria fistularia (for)</i> | 2819 | 4276 | 2912 | 0.34 |
| 49 | 05 | <i>Rhektophyllum</i> | 3090 | 5039 | 3948 | 0.39 |
| 50 | 05 | <i>Rhektophyllum</i> | 2829 | 4953 | 3724 | 0.43 |
| 51 | 05 | <i>Rhektophyllum</i> | 3067 | 5745 | 3992 | 0.47 |
| 52 | 04 | Annonaceae | 2716 | 4439 | 3053 | 0.39 |
| 53 | 04 | Annonaceae | 2666 | 3347 | 2859 | 0.20 |
| 54 | 04 | Annonaceae | 2926 | 3977 | 3069 | 0.26 |
| 55 | 03 | Caesaplinaeae | 3098 | 4598 | 3666 | 0.33 |
| 56 | 03 | Caesaplinaeae | 3085 | 4179 | 3568 | 0.26 |
| 57 | 01 | Rubiaceae | 2972 | 5049 | 3905 | 0.41 |
| 58 | 01 | Rubiaceae | 3428 | 6502 | 4426 | 0.47 |
| 59 | 01 | Rubiaceae | 3064 | 5145 | 3849 | 0.40 |
| 60 | 11 | <i>Anthocleista nobilis</i> | 3524 | 5742 | 3512 | 0.39 |
| 61 | 11 | <i>Anthocleista nobilis</i> | 3127 | 5218 | 3137 | 0.40 |
| 62 | 11 | <i>Anthocleista nobilis</i> | 3148 | 5587 | 3222 | 0.47 |
| 63 | 08 | <i>Macaranga</i> | 3382 | 4840 | 3778 | 0.30 |
| 64 | 08 | <i>Macaranga</i> | 3447 | 5861 | 3862 | 0.41 |
| 65 | 08 | <i>Macaranga</i> | 2506 | 4522 | 3198 | 0.45 |
| 66 | 09 | <i>Macaranga</i> | 3188 | 3360 | 3211 | 0.05 |
| 67 | 09 | <i>Macaranga</i> | 2868 | 3053 | 2930 | 0.06 |
| 68 | 09 | <i>Macaranga</i> | 3156 | 3282 | 3051 | 0.04 |
| 69 | 10 | <i>Musanga</i> | 2718 | 3156 | 3098 | 0.14 |

Table 1 - Suite.

| Record # | Ang no | Taxon | O | P | T | FV-MAX |
|----------|--------|---------------------------------|------|------|------|--------|
| 70 | 10 | <i>Musanga</i> | 2834 | 3652 | 3259 | 0.22 |
| 71 | 10 | <i>Musanga</i> | 2798 | 4133 | 2973 | 0.32 |
| 72 | 12 | <i>Tetracera alnifolia</i> | 2404 | 3621 | 2754 | 0.34 |
| 73 | 12 | <i>Tetracera alnifolia</i> | 2506 | 4522 | 3198 | 0.45 |
| 74 | 12 | <i>Tetracera alnifolia</i> | 2790 | 4591 | 3597 | 0.39 |
| 75 | 15 | <i>Leonardoxa</i> | 2420 | 5569 | 5242 | 0.57 |
| 76 | 15 | <i>Leonardoxa</i> | 2246 | 4974 | 4679 | 0.55 |
| 77 | 15 | <i>Leonardoxa</i> | 2039 | 4759 | 4370 | 0.57 |
| 78 | 16 | Apocynaceae ? <i>rejoua</i> | 2662 | 6060 | 4856 | 0.56 |
| 79 | 16 | Apocynaceae ? <i>rejoua</i> | 2527 | 5967 | 4012 | 0.58 |
| 80 | 16 | Apocynaceae ? <i>rejoua</i> | 2614 | 6048 | 4280 | 0.57 |
| 81 | 20 | Lauraceae ? <i>Beilschmedia</i> | 2438 | 3837 | 2951 | 0.36 |
| 82 | 20 | Lauraceae ? <i>Beilschmedia</i> | 2393 | 4099 | 2768 | 0.42 |
| 83 | 20 | Lauraceae ? <i>Beilschmedia</i> | 2495 | 4796 | 3000 | 0.48 |

*Indicative values of a partial set of fluorescence. Induction curves y material from Campo I. O = Initial rise time. P = Peak value. T = Terminal value. FV/FMAX = FV/FMAX, a relative indication y photosynthetic response.

ensure compression effects on the canopy from the raft were avoided. In each case readings were commenced at noon. The sensors were connected via a resistor to a meter which produced cumulative, integrated output over a time interval of five minutes. The process was repeated on both rafts where a total of four sets of readings were taken.

RESULTS

While further analysis is pending some trends are apparent. In every case there was a sudden decrease in flux density in the first metre within crown as if due to a crown "monolayer". Values then increased to below crown (ca. 7m) where a sudden increase occurred beyond crown base to about 7m above ground where

decreasing values tended to coincide with denser understorey growth. Evidence of inversion effects will not be clear until remaining data are analysed. An example is given in Table 2.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am particularly indebted to Prof. Francis HALLÉ and team at Campo I for making this visit possible. Dr. P. GRARD of IRCT/CIRAD kindly assisted with the marvellous computing facilities at the camp. The COMPAQ 386/s portable computer was kindly supplied by the RANDOM Computer Co. and was invaluable in downloading and transferring data. Fondation ELF is to be congratulated in sponsoring this notable expedition and their generosity in assisting with my visit is much appreciated.

Table 2 - Photosynthetically Active Quantum Flux Densities From Canopy to Ground Level - Radeau I West Side.
Date : 23 Oct. 1992.

| Time | Interval mins. | Height m | Q1 meter | Q2 meter | Q1 PPF (μmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) | Q2 PPF (μmol m ⁻² s ⁻¹) | External conditions |
|------|----------------|----------|----------|----------|--|--|---------------------|
| 1207 | 5 | 40 | 431 | 501 | 71,83 | 157,74 | Sunny top |
| 1214 | 5 | 39 | 289 | 13 | 48,17 | 4,09 | Sunny top |
| 1221 | 5 | 38 | 278 | 17 | 46,33 | 5,35 | Cl. bright |
| 1227 | 5 | 33 | 262 | 21 | 43,67 | 6,61 | Cl. bright |
| 1233 | 5 | 28 | 356 | 26 | 59,33 | 8,19 | Cl. bright |
| 1240 | 5 | 23 | 222 | 16 | 37,00 | 5,04 | Cl. bright |
| 1246 | 5 | 18 | 252 | 12 | 42,00 | 3,78 | Cl. bright |
| 1252 | 5 | 13 | 260 | 12 | 43,33 | 3,78 | Cl. bright |
| 1258 | 5 | 8 | 232 | 6 | 38,67 | 1,89 | Cl. bright |
| 1316 | 5 | 3 | 279 | 4 | 46,50 | 1,26 | Cl. bright |

Q1 = Quantum sensor 1 attached to radeau above canopy. Q2 = Quantum sensor 2 attached to line lowered down through canopy. Conversion for Q1 sensor = reading x 5 (mins) = millivolt seconds/0,1 = μmol m⁻² (integral)/300 (secs) = μmol m⁻² s⁻¹ (average flux). Conversion for Q2 sensor = reading x 5 (mins) = millivolt seconds/0,052935 = μmol m⁻² (integral)/300 (secs) = μmol m⁻² s⁻¹ (average flux). Note : calculated flux densities are yet to be standardised for comparative purposes.



