Ethanol reduces grapevine water consumption by limiting transpiration

Neila Ait Kaci[1], Alice Diot[1], Beatrice Quinquiry[1], Olivier Yobregat[2], Anne Pellegrino[3], Pierre Maury[1]*, Christian Chervin[1]*

Addresses:

[1] AgroToulouse, Toulouse INP, Université de Toulouse, UMR AGIR et LRSV, BP 32607, 31326 Castanet-Tolosan, France

[2] Institut Français de la Vigne et du Vin, V'Innopôle Sud-Ouest – 1920 route de Lisle sur Tarn, 81310 Peyrole, France

[3] UMR LEPSE, University of Montpellier, INRAE, Institut Agro Montpellier, 34060 Montpellier, France

*corresponding authors: pierre.maury@toulouse-inp.fr; christian.chervin@toulouse-inp.fr

Keywords: drought acclimation, ethanol, Gamay cuttings, hormesis, *Vitis vinifera*, transpiration.

Abbreviations

DWS – Days of Water Stress
EtOH – Ethanol
FTSW – Fraction of Transpirable Soil Water
FTSWt – Fraction of Transpirable Soil Water threshold
HSPs – Heat Shock Proteins
NTR – Normalised transpiration rate
sHSPs – small Heat Shock Proteins
WS – Water Stress
WW – Well Watered

Abstract

Studies suggest that ethanol (EtOH), triggers plant adaptation to various stresses at low concentrations (10 µM to 10 mM). This study investigates whether EtOH induces drought acclimation in grapevine, as demonstrated previously in *Arabidopsis*, rice, and wheat. Preliminary results with bare root Gamay cuttings showed that those pre-treated with 10 µM EtOH aqueous solutions lost fewer leaves when deprived of water compared to controls. Subsequently, we ran a potted-cutting experiment with progressive soil water deficit. Plants pre-treated with EtOH solutions (0.4 and 250 mM) exhibited slower depletion of the fraction of transpirable soil water (FTSW), compared to controls. While 0.4 and 250 mM EtOH tended to decrease transpiration in early days, these EtOH pre-treated plants maintained higher leaf transpiration than controls after 10 days of soil water depletion. The transpiration response to FTSW was affected by EtOH application. EtOH pre-treatments limited plant leaf expansion without increasing leaf senescence, and increased root dry mass. The grapevine responses to EtOH priming followed typical hormesis curves. RNA-seq data revealed transcripts related to this EtOH priming effect. These results suggest that EtOH improves grapevine acclimation to drought, leading to potential water-savings in wine growing regions prone to high water shortages, linked to climate change.

Introduction

Many recent studies show that ethanol at physiological concentrations can have positive roles in plant development (Diot *et al*., 2024a). In particular, the work of Bashir *et al*. (2022) demonstrated that ethanol could induce drought acclimation in several plant species, including Arabidopsis, rice, and wheat. This induced acclimation is particularly interesting in the context of climate change, which is expected to increase water stress in certain geographical areas, such as the Mediterranean region (Cramer *et al*., 2018; IPCC, 2021). Given that viticulture is particularly developed in this region (OIV, 2022), we sought to test the effect of ethanol on grapevine under controlled conditions of water stress, to verify if the observations of Bashir *et al.* (2022) are applicable to this species.

Initially, experiments were conducted on grapevine cuttings with bare roots in water, with the main observation being the percentage of dried leaves one week after rehydration. Then, trials were carried out on potted grapevine cuttings, monitoring the weight of the pots

to estimate plant transpiration, as this is a commonly monitored parameter in water stress experiments (Rodrigues *et al*., 2008; Huang *et al*., 2020). This gravimetric method enabled the estimation of the fraction of transpirable soil water (FTSW), a variable widely used as an indicator of the soil water deficit imposed on the plant (Sinclair, 2005). Thus, the response of plant transpiration to soil drying can be characterised by the FTSW threshold, i.e. the soil water status above which the plant ecophysiological processes are sensitive to soil drying. According to the FTSWt, the eco-physiological processes showed differences in sensitivity to water deficit: leaf expansion exhibits the highest sensitivity, followed by plant transpiration, and leaf senescence (Kang *et al.*, 2024). Our innovative results about ethanol altering grapevine transpiration lead us to propose a companion paper to our RNA-seq data and results obtained regarding grapevine resistance to heat stress (Diot *et al.*, 2024b). We hope to quickly stimulate further research to find the appropriate conditions of EtOH application for the various varieties and geographical situations encountered in vineyards affected by water stress episodes.

Material and Methods

Plant material

Grapevine cuttings were made from one-year-old dormant Gamay shoots, clone 787, from a collection of genetic material whose plant material is tested to be safe for the main vine viruses (IFV Sud-ouest, Peyrole, France). The cuttings were prepared as described by Mullins (1966), with the following modifications. Single-node cuttings, 5-cm long with two cutter scars at the bottom to facilitate rooting, were disinfected with active chlorine (1.5% v/v) for one minute and rinsed three times with running water. Then, 12 cuttings were placed in 250 ml plastic crates filled with 150 ml water and covered with aluminium foil to hold the cuttings up, the lower end being immersed in water, the bud ending up upwards (Fig. 1A). The cuttings were left for one month in a growing chamber at 25°C/20°C 16h/8h (day/night) with light set to 250 $\mu mol.m^{-2}.s^{-1}$. The water level was maintained to the initial filling mark.

Two experiments were conducted, one with bare root cuttings (Exp. 1), one with potted cuttings (Exp. 2).

98 **Ethanol treatments applied to bare-root cuttings**

99 In Exp. 1, the water was removed and 150 ml of freshly prepared ethanol solutions at
100 various concentrations were poured into the crates and left for 24 h to allow ethanol priming.
101 Then, all solutions were removed and the cuttings were left without water for 38h (duration
102 determined by preliminary trials). After this drying period, 150 ml of water were poured into
103 each crate, and the cuttings were left to recover in the growing chamber. The percentage of
104 dry leaves was assessed one week later.

105

106 **Ethanol treatments applied to potted cuttings**

107 In Exp. 2, the one-month cuttings (Fig. 1B) were transferred into 105 ml nursery plastic
108 pots, filled with P.A.M.2 Proveen→ substrate (Proveen, Netherlands), and water saturated.
109 Plants were left to settle down and develop roots for one week in a growing chamber
110 25°C/20°C (day/night) with a 16 h photoperiod providing 250 $\mu mol.m^{-2}.s^{-1}$ photosynthetically
111 active radiation at the top of the plants. The plants were maintained at maximum Fraction of
112 Transpirable Soil Water (FTSW = 1) over the week. The pots were covered with aluminium foil
113 on the top, and an additional 3 mm polystyrene sheet (Depron→, Germany) was added onto
114 the top to limit soil evaporation (Fig. 1D, E, F, G, J). Evaporation did not exceed 10% of the
115 FTSW after 30 days (Supplementary Fig. S1). Then, the day prior to the beginning of the water
116 deficit, 52.5 ml of ethanol solutions at various concentrations were poured onto the pots, after
117 removing temporarily the bottom aluminium foil to allow run-off of the solution into a saucer.
118 The ethanol concentrations tested in this study were 0, 0.4, 2, 10, 50 and 250 mM. These
119 concentrations correspond to ethanol/water ratios of 0, 0.002, 0.012, 0.06, 0.29, and 1.46%
120 (v/v), respectively. The range was chosen with 5-fold increments to minimise errors from soil
121 variability. Pairs of plants one well-watered (WW) and one water-stressed (WS) were
122 established for all EtOH doses. A total of eight blocks were set-up, in each block we added one
123 pot without any plant, to measure the evaporation of the pot.

124

125 **Soil water status measurements**

126 The day following the ethanol treatment (Exp. 2), the watering of Water Stress "WS"
127 pots was stopped, while the Well Watered "WW" pots were maintained at FTSW = 1. FTSW
128 was calculated from pot weights, as described previously (Lebon *et al*., 2006). The daily FTSW
129 was calculated from pot weight on d day (pot weight d), the pot weight at full soil water
130 capacity (pot weight at fc), and the pot weight when transpiration of the non-irrigated pot was

131 less than 10% of WW controls of the same EtOH treatment (pot weight 10%). Prior to water
132 deficit treatment, pots were irrigated to saturation, and after the excess water had drained,
133 the pots were weighed to estimate the pot mass at full soil water capacity. Each pot was
134 weighed daily, twice for the WW, before and after re-watering. $FTSW_d$ was then determined
135 as follow (eq.1):

136 $$FTSW_d = (\text{pot weight } d - \text{pot weight } 10\%) / (\text{pot weight fc} - \text{pot weight}) \quad \text{(eq. 1)}$$

137

138 **Grapevine transpiration and leaf area measurements**

139 Water loss for individual plants (T) over 24h (Exp. 2) was calculated from the pot
140 weights difference, considering pot weight after irrigation (d-1 day) and before irrigation (d
141 day) for WW. Then, transpiration rate per leaf area (Tr) was determined by dividing the daily
142 pot weights difference by the total leaf area values measured as close as possible to the
143 transpiration date (eq.2).

144 $$Tr\ (g.cm^{-2}) = (\text{pot weight } d - \text{pot weight } d\text{-}1) / \text{total leaf area} \quad \text{(eq. 2)}$$

145 The leaf area of all plants was estimated using a regression between the longest leaf
146 vein and the leaf area of 230 leaves (Supplementary Fig. S2). The leaf area was determined
147 with the "easy leaf area" application (https://www.quantitative-plant.org/software/easy-leaf-
148 area). For this purpose, leaf main vein lengths were measured twice, once around day 3 and
149 once around day 8. The calculation of plant transpiration of days 2, 3, 4 and 5 was performed
150 using the first set of leaf area estimates, and the transpiration of days 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 was
151 calculated using the second set of leaf estimates.

152

153 **Normalised transpiration rate (NTR)**

154 Daily plant transpiration values (T in $g.plant^{-1}.d^{-1}$) were normalised as described by King
155 and Purcell (2017), according to equation 3. Briefly, a correction factor (CF) was calculated to
156 adjust for differences in transpiration among plants within an EtOH treatment under WW
157 conditions. The correction factor was calculated while all plants were WW (before Day 0) by
158 dividing the water loss of individual plants by the average water loss of the WW plants at the
159 same EtOH dose. A second correction was made to account for differences in transpiration
160 that occurred among days after initiation of water deficit treatment. Water loss for individual
161 plants was divided by the average water loss for WW plants of the same EtOH treatment
162 (T_WW average). Normalised transpiration for each plant for a given weighing interval was:

163 NTR = [T /(T_WW average)]/CF (eq. 3)

164

165 **Modelling the response of normalised transpiration rate to progressive soil water deficit**

166 The response of NTR at the whole plant level to FTSW was fitted according to equation
167 2 (Muchow and Sinclair, 1991), in which "a" is the model parameter describing the response
168 of NTR to FTSW, "a" characterise the curvature of the fit. As the "a" parameter increases, the
169 sensitivity of the NTR strengthens at a given same FTSW value. The FTSW threshold (FTSWt)
170 represents the FTSW at which NTR (modelled by equation 2) starts to be influenced by soil
171 water deficit. FTSWt was reached when the NTR maximum was reduced by 5%, as proposed
172 for nonlinear models by Sadras and Milroy (1996). A higher FTSWt indicates a higher sensitivity
173 to water deficit (Andrianasolo *et al.*, 2016).

174 NTR = 1/[1 + 9 x exp(*a* x FTSW)] (eq. 4)

175

176 **Re-watering of WS plants and experiment ending (Exp.2)**

177 After preliminary tests, to find a parameter to decide the time at which the WS plants
178 will be re-watered, it was decided to choose the wilting of at least two top leaves in the canopy
179 for Exp. 2. We thought initially to choose the time when plants reached FTSW = 0, but some
180 plants showed severe wilting before reaching FTSW = 0. The plants were then re-watered with
181 30 ml the first day, then the amount of water was calculated daily to reach FTSW = 0.95. The
182 plants were harvested one week after re-watering. The WW plants and their corresponding
183 WS plants (being part of the same pair, as defined above) were harvested the same day. The
184 harvest period was spread over a week from day 28 to day 34 after the beginning of Exp. 2.
185 On the harvest day, all leaves and roots were collected and the leaf area was estimated directly
186 with Easy Leaf Area application. The percentage of dried leaves was calculated over the seven
187 oldest leaves, as at day 0 there was a minimum of seven leaves per plant (example of dry
188 leaves in Fig. 1I). Finally, the roots were dried at 60°C for at least 72h, and then weighed.

189

190 **RNA-seq analyses on grapevine cell cultures**

191 RNA-seq analyses have been performed on *Vitis vinifera* cv. Gamay Fréaux cell cultures. The
192 complete material and method is described in Diot *et al*. (2024b). However, the following
193 modifications in the formal analysis have been done: the relative estimated transcript counts
194 have been performed only with the two conditions used in this study (comparison between

195 6h_0mM and 6h_1mM) and for this analysis, the thresholds for Differentially Expressed Genes
196 were set at |Log2 Fold Change| > 0.5, and padj < 0.1. The raw data discussed in this publication
197 have been deposited in NCBI's Gene Expression Omnibus (Edgar *et al*., 2002) and are
198 accessible through GEO Series accession number GSE275842
199 (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/query/acc.cgi?acc=GSE275842).
200
201 **Statistical treatments**
202 Data normality and homoscedasticity hypotheses were first assessed using
203 respectively Shapiro-Wilk tests and Levene tests (SWL tests). When SWL tests were successful,
204 ANOVA were used to assess the effects of water treatment, ethanol treatments, their
205 respective interactions on transpiration, green leaf area at harvest, leaf senescence (dried
206 leaves), root dry weight, FTSW threshold, and "a" parameter describing the response of NTR
207 to FTSW; and multi-comparisons tests were assessed with Tukey HSD tests. When SWL tests
208 were not successful, we used rank-based nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis tests followed by
209 pairwise Wilcoxon tests. We also completed these analyses with pairwise tests: Student tests
210 when normality and homoscedasticity were respected, otherwise, we used pairwise Wilcoxon
211 tests. Differences were considered significant when $p < 0.05$. Fits of NTR to FTSW were
212 performed using the non-linear least squares (NLS) regression model. The goodness of fit was
213 assessed by calculating the Rsquare (R^2), root mean square error (RMSE), and mean squared
214 error (MSE). All fitting and statistical analyses were performed with Rstudio version 4.2.1,
215 using the packages 'car' and 'rstatix'.
216
217
218 **Results**
219
220 **Ethanol priming reduced the percentage of dried leaves in bare root cuttings subjected to a**
221 **temporary water depletion**
222 Figure 1 shows the various stages of the culture of Gamay single-node cuttings, from
223 the bare root initial one-month growing stages in water and plastic crates (Fig. 1A) then
224 potting stages (Fig. 1B, C) and the growing chamber in environmentally controlled conditions
225 (Fig. 1J). A preliminary experiment (Exp.1) was conducted with the bare root cuttings, by
226 priming them with EtOH at various concentrations, before removal of the aqueous solutions

227 for 38h, then re-filling the crates with water. After an additional week, we observed the
228 amount of dried leaves (Fig. 2). The priming with EtOH reduced the percentage of dried leaves
229 from 35.5% (controls at 0 mM) to 17.7% (EtOH at 0.01 mM), without being significant. But, as
230 observed with increasing EtOH doses, there was a clear trend of reduction of the dried leaves
231 compared to controls. Instead of running more bare root trials to reach significance levels,
232 with conditions which are not natural, we decided to run a larger trial, with cuttings in light
233 potting soil (Exp. 2), and to follow a larger set of parameters. At least, these conditions can be
234 met in some nurseries.
235
236 **Ethanol maintained higher Fractions of Transpirable Soil Water than controls both for well**
237 **watered and dried pots**
238 The changes in FTSW over a three-week period in potted single-node cuttings (Exp. 2)
239 were plotted for WW pots (Fig. 3A) and WS pots (Fig. 3B). FTSW of WW pots were brought up
240 daily to FTSW of 0.95. The results show the FTSW just before re-watering the pots. Most pots
241 remained above 0.7, regardless of the EtOH concentration used for priming, which was a one-
242 time-24 h-treatment preceding day 0. The FTSW of WS pots gradually decreased after their
243 last irrigation on day 0, and we observed that, in plants primed with 250 mM EtOH, the FTSW
244 decreased more slowly than in other conditions. Interestingly, plants primed with 250 mM
245 also kept a higher FTSW than controls for WW plants (Fig. 3A), even if it was less obvious than
246 in WS plants. We also noticed slight differences around day 5, between WS controls and WS
247 plants primed with 0.4 and 10 mM EtOH, with EtOH-primed cultures maintaining a higher
248 FTSW than controls. Finally, given that there was a negligible decrease in FTSW in pots without
249 plants due to soil evaporation (Supplementary Fig. S1), we assumed that changes in FTSW
250 were primarily due to plant transpiration and tested this hypothesis in a series of subsequent
251 analyses.
252
253 **Ethanol slowed down the grapevine transpiration**
254 Figure 4 shows the changes in transpiration per unit of leaf area from day 2 to day 10,
255 a period with the biggest FTSW differences between the various treatments (Fig. 3). The full
256 statistics regarding the Figure 4 graphs are given in Supplementary Table S1, to avoid
257 overloading the transpiration graphs. The transpiration of WS plants started to be significantly
258 lower than WW plants from day 6 (Fig. 4; Supplementary Table S1). It is noticeable that 250
259 mM EtOH reduced significantly plant transpiration, in comparison to controls, from day 4 to

260 day 5 in WS plants, and from day 3 to day 8 in WW plants. We also observed that, compared
261 to the controls, the transpiration of WS plants treated with EtOH showed opposite trends at
262 the beginning and at the end of the experiment. For example, cuttings treated with 250 mM
263 of EtOH had a lower rate of transpiration than controls at days 4 and 5, but displayed higher
264 transpiration than controls at days 9 and 10. Figure 4 also shows that WS plants which
265 transpired less than controls at the beginning of the experiment, were transpiring more than
266 controls at the end, this was particularly noticeable in 0.4 and 250 mM treated plants, thus
267 confirming trends of smaller FTSW drop observed in Figure 3. Indeed, when pooling the
268 transpiration results from day 2 to day 6, there was a significant transpiration decrease in the
269 plants treated with 0.4 mM EtOH compared to controls (data not shown). We also noticed
270 that there was no significant difference between WS plant transpiration at days 8 to 10, when
271 testing with multiple comparisons obtained after ANOVA (Supplementary Table S1). But when
272 testing the results with pairwise tests, Student or Wilcoxon (Supplementary Table S2),
273 significant differences were noticed at days 8 to 10, as pre-treating with 250 mM led to higher
274 transpiration than in plants pre-treated with 0, 2 and 50 mM EtOH.
275 Finally, we observed a bell-shaped distribution in the transpiration rates according to
276 increasing EtOH doses (not taking the controls into account), particularly noticeable in WW
277 and WS at day 10 (Supplementary Fig. S3). This is classical of a hormesis effect, which will be
278 discussed later.
279
280 **Ethanol altered the plant transpiration response to FTSW**
281 The normalised transpiration rate (NTR) response to FTSW is shown in Figure 5.
282 According to the values of R^2, RMSE, MSE (Fig. 5), the performance of non-linear fitting was
283 satisfactory. NTR started at 1 when the plants transpired at the same rate as the WW plants
284 within the same EtOH treatment, then dropped to lower values when FTSW became a limiting
285 factor for transpiration. The FTSW threshold (FTSWt) from which NTR dropped below 0.95 was
286 determined. We observed that priming plants with 250 mM led the plants to switch the FTSWt
287 to higher values (FTSWt = 0.59) than plants primed with lower doses (FTSWt < 0.46) (detailed
288 values and stats are given in Supplementary Table S3). Regarding the "a" parameter, the
289 curvature coefficient, pairwise comparisons showed significant differences between 0.4 mM
290 and 50 mM, compared to 250 mM. Thus, priming plants with 250 mM EtOH showed earlier
291 regulation of transpiration in response to a progressive soil drying.
292

293 **Soil water deficit and ethanol differentially impacted the leaf development and senescence**

294 As shown in Figure 6 the soil water deficit limited the leaf expansion over the 4-week
295 trial. At the end of the experiment, the average leaf area of the WW control plants was just
296 above 200 cm² (Fig. 6A), when the one of the WS control plants was just above 100 cm² (Fig.
297 6B). The EOH priming also reduced the leaf expansion, this was particularly noticeable on the
298 plants primed with 250 mM EtOH which were harbouring an average leaf area twice smaller
299 than the controls (0 mM EtOH) in WW plants (Fig. 6A) and in WS plants (Fig. 6B).
300 The results of Figure 7A showed that, at harvest, WW plants harboured around 10% of dried
301 leaves, while WS plants harboured around 80% of dried leaves (Fig. 7B). In none of these two
302 series, WW and WS, the ethanol changed significantly the % of dried leaves.
303
304 **Soil water deficit reduced root development**

305 Regardless of the EtOH priming, all the root systems of WW plants reached dry weights
306 around 500 mg (Fig. 8A), while the ones of WS plants hardly exceeded 200 mg.
307 Similarly to the transpiration rates (Fig. 4), the WW plants displayed a trend of hormetic
308 response to EtOH, with a boost of root dry weight for EtOH doses around 2mM. The root
309 system at this latter dose presented an increase in dry weight by 20% compared to the WW
310 controls at 0 mM. This trend was also visible in WS plants (Fig. 8B), but its intensity was
311 lowered by the water deficit. However, none of these responses were significantly different
312 from controls.
313
314 **RNA-seq analysis highlights some metabolisms potentially involved**

315 As we ran RNA-seq experiments in parallel to this study, using a similar Gamay cultivar
316 (Diot *et al.*, 2024b), we analysed this RNA-seq data focussing on metabolisms described by
317 Bashir *et al*. (2022) as major causes of ethanol-induced resistance to drought in other plant
318 species they studied. The Figure 9 shows that some genes involved in metabolisms of abscisic
319 acid (ABA), aldehyde dehydrogenase (Ald DH), gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA),
320 neoglucogenesis, starch and sucrose were differentially regulated 6 hours after priming
321 Gamay cell cultures with 1 mM ethanol. We also checked the responses of genes involved in
322 calcium related metabolisms and found many whose expression was either up- or down-
323 regulated by ethanol priming. But no strong trend was observed, either upward or downward
324 in any particular metabolism. The number of calcium related genes was standing out, but this
325 is also due to the fact that calcium related genes are more represented in Differentially

326 Expressed Genes (DEGs) than genes related to the metabolisms cited above. Finally, it is worth
327 noticing that the only three sucrose related DEGs were all down regulated.
328
329
330 ## Discussion
331
332 **Ethanol priming and grapevine bare root cuttings**
333 Water is becoming a scarce resource and the risk of excessive drought linked to climate
334 change is a serious concern for vineyard management (van Leeuwen *et al*., 2024). Our
335 observations may provide solutions to limit water use by the grapevine, possibly by limiting
336 transpiration, following an ethanol priming at very low doses, close to physiological values
337 obtained in Gamay cells, 100 µM to 2 mM (Diot *et al.*, 2024b); however we did not measure
338 endogenous EtOH in Gamay cuttings. In a preliminary experiment with bare root cuttings, we
339 observed a better acclimation to drought induced by ethanol priming (Fig. 2), but using a non-
340 physiological drought simulation, i.e. removing suddenly the water from bare-root cuttings
341 and leaving the plants without water for more than 30 hours. Nevertheless, the obvious
342 reduction in dry leaves observed in plants pre-treated with 10 µM EtOH, one week after re-
343 watering, was noteworthy; this latter concentration corresponds to 0.0006% of ethanol in
344 water, which is extremely low, but has been hypothesised to be in the range of detectable
345 level of EtOH for organisms to use as a signal to adapt to stressful environments, by eliciting
346 physiological changes (Diot *et al*. 2024a).
347
348 **Ethanol reduces water use by potted cuttings**
349 These preliminary results on bare root cuttings prompted us to carry out more
350 physiological tests with plants in soil, in order to apply water deficit kinetics on root systems
351 closer to vineyard conditions. The FTSW dropped below 0.1 between 10 and 15 days in most
352 water-deprived plants (Fig. 3B), which is consistent with the dynamics reported in other
353 studies on grapevine with different pot sizes and various climatic conditions (Lebon *et al.*,
354 2006). The most obvious effect of ethanol priming was the slower drop of FTSW after priming
355 with 250 mM (Fig. 3B), a limitation of soil water use that was also observable in well-watered
356 plants pre-treated with a similar EtOH dose (Fig. 3A).
357

358 **Ethanol reduces cuttings transpiration**

359 As pots without plants showed marginal FTSW decrease over the period of experiment
360 (Supplementary Fig. S1), we assumed that all water loss was due to transpiration. And as it
361 was demonstrated by Bashir *et al*. (2022) in three other plant species, the EtOH priming
362 reduced plant transpiration in grapevine too (Fig. 4). The strongest effect was obtained with
363 250 mM EtOH, which corresponds to a dilution of 1.4% EtOH/water (v/v). This EtOH
364 concentration reduced transpiration in both well-watered and water-deprived plants, as soon
365 as two days after the priming, even if the transpiration drop became significant only after
366 three days. Interestingly, the WS plants treated with this 250 mM concentration maintained
367 a higher transpiration rate than WS controls (pre-treated with water alone) after 8 days of
368 experiment This effect could be beneficial in cases of combined water deficit and heat stress,
369 as transpiration is critical to cool down leaf temperature (Costa *et al.*, 2012). Even more
370 interesting, we want to attract reader attention to a similar set of responses obtained with
371 the EtOH smallest dose, 0.4 mM which corresponds to 0.002% EtOH/water (v/v). Indeed, the
372 reduction of transpiration was also observed in the early days of experiment, but to a lesser
373 extent than 250 mM, and where the maintained transpiration was also observed at the end
374 of the 10 day period. Even if some of these effects are not significant in our experiment
375 conditions, the drop of transpiration induced by 0.4 mM, compared to water stress controls
376 (pre-treated with water alone), was noticeable from day 2 to day 4, and it was lower by up to
377 20%. This could generate big water savings at a vineyard scale, and definitely prompt us to
378 test these effects at a larger scale. As in the 250 mM conditions, the 0.4 mM EtOH also
379 maintained a higher transpiration rate than water stress controls after 8 to 10 days of
380 experiment.

381

382 **Transpiration variation follows a hormesis response**

383 These effects obtained at low and high EtOH are logical, as EtOH is known to generate
384 hormesis responses (Calabrese and Baldwin, 2003; Diot *et al.*, 2024a). These responses
385 harbour a bell shaped curve as a function of increasing concentration of the priming chemical.
386 This is quite obvious in all curves of the well-watered plants (Fig. 4). To illustrate this point, we
387 reproduced the plots of day 10 with bell-shaped curves in Supplementary Fig. S5. The green
388 curve highlights an increased transpiration at low ethanol doses in WW plants. Remarkedly,
389 the water stress led to inversing the hormesis response, highlighted by the red curve in WS
390 plants. Hormesis responses are known to be the initial parts of sigmoid curves (Kendig *et al.*,

2010), and it is known that environmental conditions can modulate hormesis responses in plants (Belz and Cedergreen, 2010). These latter showed that environmental factors, such as temperature and light, modulated the stimulation of lettuce growth by low doses of a phytotoxin, parthenin. However, further experiments would be necessary to bring more explanations about modulation of grapevine transpiration in response to a combination of EtOH priming and water stress.

The progressive soil drying affects plant transpiration; the FTSWt on plants not subjected to ethanol priming was equal to 0.42. This value is very close to 0.4, the value reported for grapevines in previous studies using the two-segment plateau regression procedure (Lebon *et al.*, 2003, Hofmann *et al.*, 2014). FTSWt values calculated using the two-segment plateau regression procedure resulting in lower values than those obtained in our study with the inverse exponential model (Kang *et al.*, 2024). The response of transpiration to FTSW is employed in various dynamic crop models to monitor vineyards water status (Lebon *et al.*, 2003; Valdés-Gomez *et al.,* 2009 ; Ramos and Casasnovas, 2014; Er-Raki *et al.,* 2021), and it is worth noting that ethanol is modulating this response. According to the "a" parameter describing the response of NTR to FTSW, priming with 250 mM EtOH showed a higher "a" than smaller doses, which indicates an earlier regulation of transpiration in response to a progressive soil drying (FTSWt = 0.42 vs 0.59 for 0 mM EtOH and 250 mM, respectively). This response is associated with a reduction of transpiration and leaf growth even under non-limiting soil water conditions. It should be concluded that high doses of ethanol reduce plant transpiration regardless of the water status of the soil, with a greater response when the soil dries out.

Ethanol effects on leaf and root developments

The hormesis effect was also observed when looking at the green leaf area at harvest, around four weeks after trial beginning (Fig. 6) with a slight stimulation of leaf area at 2 mM, regardless of the water-deficit conditions. These results also showed that high doses of ethanol (250 mM) limited the leaf development whatever the water deficit (in WW and in WS), probably due the beginning of a toxic effect of ethanol at this high concentration, already visible at 50 mM. This toxic response to exogenous ethanol has already been observed in oilseed rape by Wu *et al.* (2019). However, the water deficit induced a stronger effect than ethanol, clearly limiting leaf development in all WS cases compared to WW cases.

423 The observation of high percentages of dry leaves, mainly in WS plants (Fig. 7), was as
424 expected a classical plant response to water deficit (Fischer and Turner, 1978). The ethanol
425 was not significantly modulating this drought effect in WS plants, even if there was a slight
426 trend to increasing it at the highest dose. Because the choice of the harvest date was based
427 on the wilting of top leaves, and because the 250 mM treated plants showed nearly no wilting,
428 they were probably harvested too late. Nevertheless, the absence of ethanol effect on the
429 percentage of dry leaves in WW plants (Fig. 7), always below 10%, proved that we did not use
430 highly toxic ethanol concentrations.
431 The last phenotype we described in this experiment was the dry weight of the root
432 systems (Fig. 8). Once again, we observed a hormesis effect in the WW plants with an
433 increased root weight from 500 mg in controls to 600 mg in 2 mM EtOH treated plants, thus a
434 +20% increase in dry weight. This trend was not significant, with a t-test p-value = 0.15,
435 nevertheless this boosting effect of ethanol on root development has already been observed
436 in various plant species, such as mung bean (Bhattacharya *et al*., 1985) and oilseed rape (Wu
437 *et al.*, 2019). At higher EtOH doses, above 2 mM, the dry root weight decreased to control
438 levels.
439
440
441
442 **Regulations at the transcription level, potential roles for small heat shock proteins**
443 In an attempt to find explanations for the differences in transpiration, we used the
444 RNA-seq data from a companion paper (Diot *et al*. 2024b), performed on Gamay cells, to
445 screen transcript accumulation in response to an exogenous ethanol application. First, we
446 must highlight that Gamay Freaux is genetically very close to Gamay, as it is Gamay mutant
447 (see cultivars numbers 4377 and 4382 in https://vivc.de/). We searched particularly for
448 markers of the metabolisms revealed by Bashir *et al.* (2022) as major causes of ethanol-
449 induced resistance to drought: ABA, Ald DH, GABA, neoglucogenesis, starch and sucrose.
450 However, no marker stood out as a critical consequence of the priming by ethanol, even if a
451 slight trend for down regulation of sucrose related genes was observed. Nevertheless, the
452 RNA-seq data are available through the companion paper (Diot *et al.*, 2024b) and it may be a
453 resource for teams looking for a particular gene or sets of genes. We also checked for
454 regulation of calcium related gene transcripts, as calcium involvement has been described in
455 stomatal closure (Huang *et al.*, 2019), but there was no tendency for up or down regulation of

456 calcium related genes. Diot *et al.* (2024b) observed a strong induction of small heat shock
457 proteins (sHSPs) after ethanol priming of Gamay cells. The link between sHSPs and drought
458 stress is known (Rizhsky *et al*., 2002; Sarkar *et al.*, 2009) and Reddy *et al*. (2014) have observed
459 the induction of class I and II sHSPs following drought stress in barley. Finally, it is worth noting
460 that heat shock protein families, HSC70 and HSP90, are known to be involved in stomatal
461 closure (Clément *et al.*, 2011). Whether small HSPs are also involved in stomatal closure would
462 deserve further research, but our observations: EtOH priming reduced transpiration, as shown
463 in this article, and EtOH priming induced a strong sHSPs up-regulation, as shown in the RNA-
464 seq data (Diot *et al.*, 2024b), highlight a potential positive correlation.
465
466

467 ## Conclusion

468 We showed that ethanol priming induces a slowdown of the grapevine transpiration,
469 which was obvious with the 250 mM dose, but could also be effective at much lower dose
470 around 0.4 mM. This latter concentration corresponds to an ethanol dilution of 0.002% in
471 water, which would be easy and economical to implement; even though the ethanol dilution
472 of 1.4% in water, equivalent to 250 mM, is still relatively low. Confirming the promising effects
473 of such low doses would deserve further studies with older vines, either at greenhouse or
474 vineyard scales. Additionally, we also observed that grapevine responds to the range of
475 ethanol concentrations in a typical hormesis way. This clearly requires more studies to better
476 understand this type of biochemical responses, linked to chemical priming or hormesis, which
477 are now attracting more attention from the scientific community (Sako *et al*., 2020; Salinitro
478 *et al*. 2021). Finally, the links between sHSPs, ethanol priming and plant resistance to drought
479 also deserves more attention.
480
481

482 ## Supplementary data

483 The following supplementary data are available at JXB online.
484 **Fig. S1**. Variations of FTWS with time in pots without plants
485 **Fig. S2.** Regression between the longest leaf vein and the leaf area
486 **Fig. S3.** Hormesis effects on transpiration, leading to bell-shape curves
487 **Table S1.** Multiple comparisons on Fig. 4 data

488 **Table S2.** Pairwise comparisons on Fig. 4 data

489 **Table S3.** Responses parameter of water deficit for NTR

490

491 **Acknowledgments**

492 We thank EUR TULIP and the Occitanie Region for the PhD grant to AD. We also thank M.
493 Bouzayen and J. Pirrello for GBF team co-direction and side-funding, L. Lemonnier and D. Saint-
494 Martin for help in cell and plant cultures.

495

496 **Author contributions**

497 NAK, AP, PM and CC conceptualised the project and designed the research. OY provided the
498 Gamay cuttings. NAK, BQ, PM and CC performed the cuttings experimentations. AD performed
499 RNA-seq experiments on Gamay cells. NAK, AD, PM and CC ran statistical tests. All co-authors
500 contributed to writing and editing the manuscript.

501

502 **Conflict of interest**

503 The authors declare they have no conflict of interest.

504

505 **Funding**

506 This work was supported by Toulouse-INP which provided an ATER fellowship to NAK. The
507 École Universitaire de Recherche TULIP-GS (ANR-18-EURE-0019), provided half of a PhD grant
508 to AD and the other half was provided by the Occitanie Region. We also acknowledge the
509 financial support for operating our laboratories, from INRAE, CNRS and Toulouse INP.

510

511 **Data availability**

512 The data underlying this article will be shared upon request to the corresponding authors.

513

514 **Special Issue**

515 This article is part of the Special Issue 'Grapevine'. See the companion article Diot *et al*., 2024b.

516

517

518

519

References

Andrianasolo FN, Casadebaig P, Langlade N, Debaeke P, Maury P. 2016. Effects of plant growth stage and leaf aging on the response of transpiration and photosynthesis to water deficit in sunflower. Functional Plant Biology **43**, 797-805.

Bashir K, Todaka D, Rasheed S, Matsui A, Ahmad Z, Sako K, Utsumi Y, Vu AT, Tanaka M, Takahashi S, Ishida J. 2022. Ethanol-mediated novel survival strategy against drought stress in plants. Plant and Cell Physiology **63**(9), 1181-1192.

Belz RG, Cedergreen N. 2010. Parthenin hormesis in plants depends on growth conditions. Environmental and Experimental Botany **69**, 293-301**.**

Bhattacharya S, Bhattacharya NC, Bhatnagar VB. 1985. Effect of ethanol, methanol and acetone on rooting etiolated cuttings of Vigna radiata in presence of sucrose and auxin. Annals of Botany **55**: 143-145.

Calabrese EJ, Baldwin LA. 2003. Ethanol and hormesis. Critical Reviews in Toxicology **33**, 407–424.

Clément M, Leonhardt N, Droillard MJ, Reiter I, Montillet JL, Genty B, Laurière C, Nussaume L, Noël LD. 2011. The cytosolic/nuclear HSC70 and HSP90 molecular chaperones are important for stomatal closure and modulate abscisic acid-dependent physiological responses in Arabidopsis. Plant Physiology **156,** 1481-1492.

Costa JM, Ortuño MF, Lopes CM, Chaves MM. 2012. Grapevine varieties exhibiting differences in stomatal response to water deficit. Functional Plant Biology, **39**, 179-189

Cramer W, Guiot J, Marini K, Verger A. 2018. Climate change and interconnected risks to sustainable development in the Mediterranean. Nature Climate Change **8**, 972-980.

Diot A, Groth G, Blanchet S, Chervin C. 2024a. Responses of animals and plants to physiological doses of ethanol: a molecular messenger of hypoxia? FEBS Journal **291**, 1102-1110.

Diot A, Madignier G, Maza E, Djari A, Di Valentin O, Chen Y, Blanchet S, Chervin C. 2024b. Responses of grapevine cells to physiological doses of ethanol, among which induced resistance to heat stress. Submitted to Journal of Experimental Botany (companion paper).

Edgar R, Domrachev M, Lash AE. 2002. Gene Expression Omnibus: NCBI gene expression and hybridization array data repository. Nucleic acids research **30**(1), 207-210.

Er-Raki S, Bouras E, Rodriguez JC, Watts CJ, Lizarraga-Celaya C, Chehbouni A. 2021. Parameterization of the AquaCrop model for simulating table grapes growth and water productivity in an arid region of Mexico. Agricultural Water Management **245**, 106585.

Fischer RA, Turner NC. 1978. Plant Productivity in the Arid and Semiarid Zones. Annual Reviews of Plant Biology **29**, 277-317.

Hofmann M, Lux R, Schultz HR. 2014. Constructing a framework for risk analyses of climate change effects on the water budget of differently sloped vineyards with a numeric simulation

using the Monte Carlo method coupled to a water balance model. Frontiers in Plant Science **5**, 645.

Huang S, Waadt R, Nuhkat M, Kollist H, Hedrich R, Roelfsema MRG. 2019. Calcium signals in guard cells enhance the efficiency by which abscisic acid triggers stomatal closure. New Phytologist **224**, 177-187.

Huang Z, Liu F, Bao Y, Zou Z, Jiang Z. 2020. Water stress timing effects on gas exchange and water use efficiency of grapevine leaves. Scientia Horticulturae **267**, 109346.

IPCC. 2021. Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M.I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J.B.R., Maycock, T.K. , Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R. & Zhou, B. (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press.

Kang L, Debaeke P, Schoving C, Maury P. 2024. Responses of Leaf Expansion, Plant Transpiration and Leaf Senescence of Different Soybean (*Glycine max*.(L.) Merr.) Genotypes to Soil Water Deficit. Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science **210**, e12746.

Kendig EL, Le HH, Belcher SM. 2010. Defining Hormesis: Evaluation of a Complex Concentration Response Phenomenon. International Journal of Toxicology **29**, 235-246.

King CA, Purcell LC. 2017. Evaluation of methods for estimating transpiration response to soil drying for container-grown plants. Crop Science **57**, 2143–2148.

Lebon E, Dumas V, Pieri P, Schultz HR. 2003. Modelling the seasonal dynamics of the soil water balance of vineyards. Functional Plant Biology **30**, 699–710.

Lebon E, Pellegrino A, Louarn G, Lecoeur J. 2006. Branch Development Controls Leaf Area Dynamics in Grapevine (*Vitis vinifera*) Growing in Drying Soil. Annals of Botany **98**, 175–185.

Muchow RC, Sinclair TR. 1991. Water Deficit Effects on Maize Yields Modeled under Current and "Greenhouse" Climates. Agronomy Journal **83**, 1052–1059.

Mullins MG. 1966. Test-plants for investigations of the physiology of fruiting in *Vitis vinifera* L. Nature **209**, 419-420.

Naulleau A, Gary C, Prévot L, Hossard L. 2021. Evaluating strategies for adaptation to climate change in grapevine production — a systematic review. Frontiers in Plant Science **11**, 607859.

OIV. 2022. State of the World Vitivinicultural Sector. OIV Report. https://www.oiv.int/sites/default/files/documents/OIV_State_of_the_world_Vine_and_Wine_sector_in_2022_2.pdf

Ramos M, Casasnovas JM. 2014**.** Soil water variability and its influence on transpirable soil water fraction with two grape varieties under different rainfall regimes. Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment **185**, 253–262.

Reddy PS, Kavi Kishor PB, Seiler C, Kuhlmann M, Eschen-Lippold L, Lee J, Reddy MK, Sreenivasulu N. 2014. Unraveling regulation of the small heat shock proteins by the heat shock factor HvHsfB2c in barley: its implications in drought stress response and seed development. PLoS One. **9**, e89125.

Rizhsky L, Liang H, Mittler R. 2002. The combined effect of drought stress and heat shock on gene expression in tobacco. Plant Physiol. **130**, 1143-51.

Rodrigues ML, Santos TP, Rodrigues AP, de Souza CR, Lopes CM, Maroco JP, Chaves MM. 2008. Hydraulic and chemical signaling in the regulation of stomatal conductance and plant water use in field grapevines growing under deficit irrigation. Functional Plant Biology **35**, 565-579.

Sadras VO, Milroy SP. 1996. Field crops research soil-water thresholds for the responses of leaf expansion and gas exchange: a review. Field Crops Research **47**, 253-266,

Sako K, Nguyen HM, Seki M. 2020. Advances in chemical priming to enhance abiotic stress tolerance in plants. Plant and Cell Physiology **61**, 1995-2003.

Salinitro M, Mattarello G, Guardigli G, Odajiu M, Tassoni A. 2021. Induction of hormesis in plants by urban trace metal pollution. Scientific Reports **11**, 20329.

Sarkar NK, Kim YK, Grover A. 2009. Rice sHsp genes: genomic organization and expression profiling under stress and development. BMC Genomics. **10**, 393.

Sinclair TR. 2005. Theoretical analysis of soil and plant traits influencing daily plant water flux on drying soils. Agronomy Journal **97**, 1148–1152.

Valdés-Gómez H, Celette F, García de Cortázar-Atauri I, Jara-Rojas F, Ortega-Farías S, Gary C. 2009. Modelling soil water content and grapevine growth and development with the stics crop-soil model under two different water management strategies. OENO One **43**, 13–28.

Van Leeuwen C, Sgubin G, Bois B, Ollat N, Swingedouw D, Zito S, Gambetta GA. 2024. Climate change impacts and adaptations of wine production. Nature Reviews Earth & Environment **5**, 258–275.

Wu Z, Yang L, Jiang L, Zhang Z, Song H, Rong X, Han Y. 2019. Low concentration of exogenous ethanol promoted biomass and nutrient accumulation in oilseed rape (*Brassica napus L*.). Plant Signaling & Behavior **14**, 1681114.

Fig. 1. Various stages of the culture of Gamay cuttings: **A)** bare root cuttings in water; **B-C)** repotting after one month; **D-G)** variability of cuttings; **H)** measurement of leaf surface with Easy Leaf Area; **I)** example of dry leaves on the bottom at the end of the experiment; **J)** set-up in the growth chamber.



Fig. 2: Effects of ethanol (EtOH) priming on Gamay one-node cuttings with bare roots (preliminary study); One-month-old cuttings were primed with EtOH at various concentrations for 24h, then left without water for 38h, then assessed for dry leaves one week after rewatering; 4 replicates of 10 cuttings per concentration. Multiple comparisons with t-tests against controls (0).



Fig. 3. Effects of ethanol (EtOH) priming on FTSW as a function of time after « soil water deficit » initiation in Gamay one-node cuttings growing on light potting soil. **A)** well watered plants, WW, **B)** water stress plants, WS, irrigation stopped at day 1. n = 8, error bars show S.E.



Fig. 4. Effects of ethanol (EtOH) priming on transpiration (Tr) of Gamay one-node cuttings in pots, from day 2 to day 10 after the initiation of soil water deficit n = 8, error bars show S.E.; all statistical details in Supp. Table S1; multiple comparisons: capital letters to compare within WW; small caps to compare within WS; * stands for significant differences at 0.05 between WW and WS within the same EtOH dose.



Fig. 5. Response of normalised transpiration rate (NTR) at the whole plant level to the fraction of transpirable soil water (FTSW) for six ethanol priming doses 0, 0.4, 2, 10, 50 and 250 mM. The curve fitting and calculations have been performed with the R software as described in material and methods. "a" represents the curvature of the fit; RMSE stands for root mean square error; MSE stands for mean square error; Rsquared is the goodness of fit; FTSWt stands for FTSW threshold.



Fig. 6. Impact of ethanol (EtOH) priming on leaf area at harvest, n = 7 plants, error bars show SE. Multiple comparisons by Tukey HSD. Capital letters to compare within WW, small caps to compare within WS, and * to show $p < 0.05$ when comparing water deficit effect within a similar EtOH dose.



Fig. 7: Impact of ethanol (EtOH) priming on the % of dry leaves at harvest, n = 7 plants, error bars show SE. No significant difference due to EtOH within WW and WS by Tukey HSD, but * show a $p < 0.05$ in all comparisons of water deficit effect within each EtOH dose.



Fig. 8. Impact of ethanol (EtOH) priming on the root development at harvest, n = 7 plants, error bars show SE. No significant difference due to EtOH within WW and WS by Tukey HSD, but * show a $p < 0.05$ in all comparisons of water deficit effect within each EtOH dose.



Fig. 9. Differentially Expressed Genes linked to metabolisms related to stomatal closure, for the comparison 0 vs. 1 mM EtOH priming of Gamay cell cultures, 6 hours after treatment (see companion paper Diot *et al*., 2024b).

Supplementary Data



Supplementary Fig. S1. Variation of FTSW over time in pots without plants, n = 8 pots, error bars show SE.



Supplementary Fig. S2. Regression between the longest vein and the leaf area, n = 233 leaves measured in 30 different Gamay one-node cuttings, dedicated to this purpose, in the same experiment and similar growing conditions.



Supplementary Fig. S3. Hormesis effects on transpiration, leading to bell-shape curves (green for WW, red for WS) as a function of increasing ethanol doses. The water stress is changing the bell-shape curve, and such an environmental effect on the hormesis response has been described by Belz and Cedergreen (2010).

Supplementary Table S1. Post-hoc multiple comparisons issued from ANOVA on Tr values (data in Fig. 4) performed with R software.

Tab 1 - Water treatment effect on NTR with EtOH treatments pooled, and EtOH treatments effect on NTR with water treatments pooled, as a function of time (02 to 10 days)

		02 days		03 days		04 days		05 days		06 days		07 days		08 days		09 days		10 days	
		Mean NTR	Wilcoxon	Mean NTR	Wilcoxon	Mean NTR	Wilcoxon	Mean NTR	Wilcoxon	Mean NTR	Tukey HSD	Mean NTR	Tukey HSD	Mean NTR	Wilcoxon	Mean NTR	Tukey HSD	Mean NTR	Wilcoxon
Water	WW	0.0748	a	0.0775	a	0.0892	a	0.0904	a	0.0570	a	0.0762	a	0.0590	a	0.0715	a	0.0702	a
	WS	0.0753	a	0.0773	a	0.0853	a	0.0817	a	0.0454	b	0.0480	b	0.0297	b	0.0296	b	0.0248	b
EtOH	0 mM	0.0751	AB	0.0816	A	0.0951	A	0.0950	A	0.0567	A	0.0645	A	0.0455	A	0.0509	A	0.0475	A
	0,4 mM	0.0693	AB	0.0732	A	0.0834	A	0.0838	A	0.0541	A	0.0683	A	0.0499	A	0.0556	A	0.0512	A
	2 mM	0.0872	A	0.0942	A	0.1058	A	0.0975	A	0.0526	A	0.0640	A	0.0465	A	0.0527	A	0.0507	A
	10 mM	0.0758	AB	0.0808	A	0.0969	A	0.0984	A	0.0528	A	0.0645	A	0.0452	A	0.0518	A	0.0509	A
	50 mM	0.0818	A	0.0786	A	0.0839	A	0.0818	AB	0.0507	A	0.0606	A	0.0417	A	0.0490	A	0.0433	A
	250 mM	0.0604	B	0.0525	B	0.0532	B	0.0551	B	0.0399	A	0.0525	A	0.0399	A	0.0481	A	0.0467	A

Tab 2 - Interaction of water and EtOH treatment effects on NTR, as a function of time (02 to 10 days)

	02 days		03 days		04 days		05 days		06 days		07 days		08 days		09 days		10 days	
Water x Ethanol	p = 0,4		p = 0,0227		p < 0,01		p = 0,016		p = 0,1		p = 0,02		p < 0,01		p < 0,01		p < 0,01	
WW		**Wilcoxon**		**Wilcoxon**		**Wilcoxon**		**Wilcoxon**		**Tukey HSD**		**Tukey HSD**		**Tukey HSD**		**Tukey HSD**		**Tukey HSD**
0 mM	0.0726	A	0.0786	AB	0.0934	AB	0.0949	AB	0.0609	AB	0.0813	AB	0.0638	A	0.0775	AB	0.0748	A
0,4 mM	0.0695	A	0.0748	AB	0.0860	AB	0.0884	AB	0.0574	AB	0.0784	AB	0.0619	A	0.0722	AB	0.0727	A
2 mM	0.0890	A	0.0967	A	0.1116	A	0.1111	A	0.0656	A	0.0877	A	0.0689	A	0.0831	A	0.0818	A
10 mM	0.0782	A	0.0822	AB	0.1009	A	0.1044	AB	0.0601	AB	0.0803	AB	0.0610	A	0.0734	AB	0.0743	A
50 mM	0.0821	A	0.0803	AB	0.0898	AB	0.0898	AB	0.0608	AB	0.0802	AB	0.0614	A	0.0775	AB	0.0724	A
250 mM	0.0588	A	0.0527	B	0.0531	B	0.0531	B	0.0382	B	0.0505	B	0.0380	B	0.0466	B	0.0460	A
WS																		
0 mM	0.0777	a	0.0847	a	0.0968	a	0.0951	a	0.0525	a	0.0478	a	0.0273	a	0.0243	a	0.0202	a
0,4 mM	0.0692	a	0.0719	a	0.0811	a	0.0798	a	0.0513	a	0.0596	a	0.0393	a	0.0411	a	0.0323	a
2 mM	0.0853	a	0.0913	a	0.0992	a	0.0819	a	0.0377	a	0.0370	a	0.0210	a	0.0180	a	0.0152	a
10 mM	0.0730	a	0.0792	a	0.0924	a	0.0915	a	0.0444	a	0.0465	a	0.0271	a	0.0272	a	0.0240	a
50 mM	0.0814	a	0.0770	a	0.0780	a	0.0739	a	0.0405	a	0.0411	a	0.0219	a	0.0206	a	0.0141	a
250 mM	0.0630	a	0.0521	a	0.0533	b	0.0583	a	0.0427	a	0.0556	a	0.0429	a	0.0504	a	0.0476	a

Tab 3 - Interaction of WW and WS treatment effects on NTR, as a function of time (02 to 10 days)

	02 days		03 days		04 days		05 days		06 days		07 days		08 days		09 days		10 days	
WW x WS																		
Ethanol	diff of means	p	diff of means	p	diff of means	p	diff of means	p	diff of means	p	diff of means	p	diff of means	p	diff of means	p	diff of means	p
0 mM	did not test*		0.0061	0.624	0.0034	0.818	0.0002	0.992	0.0084	0.282	0.0335	0.002	0.0365	<0.001	0.0533	<0.001	0.0546	<0.001
0,4 mM			0.0029	0.824	0.0049	0.745	0.0087	0.627	0.0061	0.449	0.0188	0.089	0.0226	0.004	0.0311	0.005	0.0404	<0.001
2 mM	*no factor showed		0.0055	0.674	0.0125	0.411	0.0292	0.104	0.0279	<0.001	0.0507	<0.001	0.0479	<0.001	0.0651	<0.001	0.0667	<0.001
10 mM	sig. effect by 2W ANOVA		0.0031	0.814	0.0085	0.574	0.0129	0.469	0.0157	0.053	0.0338	0..003	0.0353	<0.001	0.0463	<0.001	0.0503	<0.001
50 mM			0.0033	0.819	0.0119	0.483	0.0159	0.425	0.0202	0.026	0.0391	0.002	0.0394	<0.001	0.0569	<0.001	0.0583	<0.001
250 mM			0.0011	0.939	0.0001	0.996	0.0048	0.812	0.0040	0.66	0.0043	0.73	0.0048	0.581	0.0026	0.829	0.0002	0

Supplementary Table S2. Pairwise comparisons on Tr values (data in Fig. 4) performed with R software.

Day 2

WW						
Ethanol Doses	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.786	0.257	*0.959*	0.398	0.206
0.4		/	0.216	*0.867*	0.310	0.379
2			/	*0.574*	0.666	0.056
10				/	*0.414*	*0.281*
50					/	0.040
250						/

WS						
Ethanol Doses	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.395	0.576	0.691	0.745	0.241
0.4		/	0.157	0.660	0.127	0.421
2			/	0.351	0.763	0.122
10				/	0.411	0.347
50					/	0.059
250						/

Day 3

WW						
Ethanol Doses (mM)	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.759	0.286	0.780	0.897	0.024
0.4		/	0.226	0.582	0.693	0.054
2			/	0.414	0.400	0.017
10				/	0.898	0.025
50					/	0.032
250						/

WS						
Ethanol Doses (mM)	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.234	0.677	0.669	0.511	0.022
0.4		/	0.163	0.468	0.492	0.023
2			/	0.452	0.354	0.035
10				/	0.841	0.038
50					/	0.008
250						/

Day 4

WW						
Ethanol Doses	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.622	0.342	0.671	0.827	0.006
0.4		/	0.200	0.411	0.811	0.014
2			/	0.610	0.312	*0.001*
10				/	0.573	0.009
50					/	0.013
250						/

WS						
Ethanol Doses	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.013	*0.779*	0.755	0.133	0.003
0.4		/	*0.397*	0.376	0.750	0.009
2			/	*0.710*	*0.366*	*0.010*
10				/	0.334	0.022
50					/	0.037
250						/

Day 5

WW						
Ethanol Doses (mM)	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.698	0.440	0.642	0.769	0.011
0.4		/	0.287	0.439	0.934	0.016
2			/	0.775	0.343	0.008
10				/	0.502	0.014
50					/	0.014
250						/

WS						
Ethanol Doses (mM)	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.193	*0.121*	0.845	0.149	0.008
0.4		/	*0.613*	0.513	0.662	0.064
2			/	*0.383*	*0.836*	*0.432*
10				/	0.418	0.136
50					/	0.273
250						/

Day 6

WW						
Ethanol Doses (mM)	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.699	0.589	0.918	0.990	0.014
0.4		/	0.331	0.702	0.683	0.022
2			/	0.433	0.552	0.002
10				/	0.918	0.002
50					/	0.006
250						/

WS						
Ethanol Doses (mM)	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.880	0.114	0.351	0.213	0.224
0.4		/	0.159	0.444	0.279	0.316
2			/	0.501	0.789	0.597
10				/	0.711	0.849
50					/	*1.000*
250						/

Day 7

WW						
Ethanol Doses (mM)	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.829	0.603	0.929	0.931	0.017
0.4		/	0.440	0.844	0.884	0.021
2			/	0.418	0.498	0.002
10				/	0.984	0.001
50					/	0.005
250						/

WS						
Ethanol Doses (mM)	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	*0.328*	*0.336*	*0.955*	*0.950*	*0.284*
0.4		/	0.106	0.346	0.232	0.783
2			/	0.421	0.749	0.118
10				/	0.689	0.450
50					/	0.289
250						/

Day 8

WW						
Ethanol Doses (mM)	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.841	0.543	*0.798*	0.776	0.003
0.4		/	0.440	*0.779*	0.949	0.007
2			/	*0.279*	0.362	*0.000*
10				/	*0.950*	*0.001*
50					/	0.002
250						/

WS						
Ethanol Doses (mM)	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.192	0.352	0.987	0.471	0.041
0.4		/	0.069	0.238	0.111	0.740
2			/	0.433	0.896	0.009
10				/	0.546	0.080
50					/	0.021
250						/

Day 9

WW						
Ethanol Doses (mM)	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.696	0.686	0.729	0.997	*0.072*
0.4		/	0.387	0.904	0.679	0.032
2			/	0.373	0.674	0.006
10				/	0.703	0.008
50					/	0.018
250						/

WS						
Ethanol Doses (mM)	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.168	0.282	0.736	0.564	0.003
0.4		/	0.083	0.331	0.152	0.542
2			/	0.320	0.696	0.001
10				/	0.512	0.055
50					/	0.004
250						/

Day 10

WW						
Ethanol Doses (mM)	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	0.872	0.579	0.966	0.856	0.021
0.4		/	0.480	0.876	0.979	0.027
2			/	0.481	0.479	*0.014*
10				/	0.851	0.003
50					/	*0.073*
250						/

WS						
Ethanol Doses (mM)	**0**	**0.4**	**2**	**10**	**50**	**250**
0	/	*0.382*	*0.232*	*0.955*	*0.282*	*0.011*
0.4		/	*0.232*	*0.613*	*0.181*	*0.093*
2			/	*0.456*	*0.945*	*0.010*
10				/	0.291	0.060
50					/	0.002
250						/

numbers in standard font obtained by Student test
numbers in italic font obtained by Wilcoxon test

Supplementary Table S3. Parameters describing the NTR response to FTSW variations, modulated by six ethanol doses. All fitting and calculations details are given in Material and Methods

	a		FTSWt		R^2
EtOH	mean	group	mean	group	
0 mM	-12.25	A	0.42	*a*	0.95
0.4 mM	-12.21	A	0.39	*a*	0.92
2 mM	-10.63	A	0.42	*a*	0.96
10 mM	-11.17	A	0.46	*a*	0.87
50 mM	-13.98	A	0.37	*a*	0.89
250 mM	-8.35	A	0.59	*a*	0.86

Groups in standard font obtained by Tukey HSD test
Groups in italic font obtained by Wilcoxon test

After anova on the "a", the effect of the treatment was not significant (p = 0.1)
After anova on the "FTSWt", the effect of the treatment was not significant (p = 0.06)
Then, we ran pairwise comparisons with other tests (see below)

coefficient "a"						
	0 mM	**0.4 mM**	**2 mM**	**10 mM**	**50 mM**	**250 mM**
0 mM	/	*0.51*	*0.28*	*1.00*	*0.41*	*0.15*
0.4 mM		/	0.26	0.48	0.41	0.04
2 mM			/	0.80	0.089	0.23
10 mM				/	0.21	0.23
50 mM					/	0.02
250 mM						/

numbers in standard font obtained by student test
numbers in in italic font obtained by wilcoxon test

FTSWt						
	0 mM	**0.4 mM**	**2 mM**	**10 mM**	**50 mM**	**250 mM**
0 mM	/	*0.60*	*0.27*	*1.00*	*0.56*	*0.08*
0.4 mM		/	0.26	*0.82*	0.70	0.06
2 mM			/	*0.80*	0.11	0.17
10 mM				/	0.35	0.22
50 mM					/	0.09
250 mM						/

numbers in standard font obtained by student test
numbers in in italic font obtained by wilcoxon test