Concentration matters: different stomatal CO₂-responses at sub-ambient and above-ambient CO₂ levels

Hanna Hõrak*, Kaspar Koolmeister*, Ebe Merilo, Hannes Kollist

Author affiliation: University of Tartu, Institute of Technology, Nooruse 1, 50411, Tartu, Estonia

*These authors contributed equally

Corresponding author contact: Hanna Hõrak, hanna.horak@ut.ee

Abstract

Stomatal pores, formed of paired guard cells, mediate CO₂ uptake for photosynthesis and water loss via transpiration in plants. Globally rising atmospheric CO₂ concentration triggers stomatal closure, contributing to increased leaf temperature and reduced nutrient uptake due to lower transpiration rate¹. Hence, it is important to understand the signalling pathways that control elevated CO₂-induced stomatal closure to identify targets for breeding climate-ready crops. CO₂-induced stomatal closure can be studied by increasing CO₂ concentration from ambient to above-ambient concentrations^{2,3}, or elevation of CO₂ levels from sub-ambient to above-ambient^{4,5}. Previous experiments comparing ferns with angiosperms suggested that stomatal responses to CO₂ may be different, when changing CO₂ levels in the sub-ambient or above-ambient ranges^{3,6}. Here, we set out to test this by comparing CO₂-induced stomatal closure in key guard cell signalling mutants in response to CO₂ elevation from 100 to 400 ppm or 400 to 800 ppm. We show that signalling components that contribute to CO₂-induced stomatal closure are different in the sub-ambient and above-ambient CO₂ levels, with guard cell slow-type anion channel SLAC1 involved mainly in above-ambient CO₂-induced stomatal closure.

Stomata open in response to reduced CO₂ concentration and close in response to elevated CO₂ levels to balance photosynthetic CO₂ uptake and water loss via transpiration. The drought-inducible plant hormone abscisic acid (ABA) is a key regulator of stomatal closure. The ABA-induced signalling cascade in stomatal guard cells is triggered by the binding of ABA to its receptors, the PYR/PYL/RCAR proteins^{7,8}, that then form ternary complexes with negative regulators of ABA signalling, the protein phosphatases of group 2C (PP2C)⁹. In the absence of ABA, PP2Cs suppress the activation of positive regulators of ABA signalling, the protein kinase OST1^{10–13} and the leucine-rich receptor-like pseudokinase GHR1^{14,15}. In the presence of ABA, PP2Cs are inactivated, OST1 and GHR1 are activated and trigger anion efflux through the central guard cell slow-type anion channel SLAC1^{12,13,16–18}. Thus, the activation of slow-type anion channel SLAC1 is the crucial step for effective ABA-induced stomatal closure.

Stomatal closure induced by elevated CO₂ concentration has remained less well understood. Similar to ABA, the activation of SLAC1 is required for stomatal closure in response to CO₂^{16,18}. Mutations in genes coding for ABA signal transduction pathway components, such as the ABA receptors^{5,19,20}, PP2C phosphatases¹⁹, and SLAC1-activating proteins OST1²¹ and GHR1^{15,22}, have also been shown to result in impaired CO₂-induced stomatal closure. These

data indicate that the ABA signal transduction pathway contributes to CO₂-induced stomatal closure.

Nevertheless, some signalling components are involved in stomatal response to CO₂ but not ABA. Plants deficient in the function of the carbonic anhydrases CA1 and CA4²³, the mitogen-activated protein kinase MPK12²⁴ and the kinase HT1^{22,25,26} all have impaired CO₂-responses but close stomata in response to ABA. Recently, MPK12 and a highly similar mitogen-activated protein kinase, MPK4, were shown to inhibit the activity of the HT1 kinase which in turn influenced activation of the SLAC1 anion channel by OST1 and GHR1^{22,24,27}. This indicates the presence of a CO₂-specific branch of guard cell signal transduction pathways that is not required for ABA responses.

To understand the molecular mechanisms of CO₂-induced stomatal closure, it is important to define, what we mean by stomatal response to CO₂. Experiments assessing CO₂-induced stomatal closure have been carried out in different ways. In some studies, CO₂-induced stomatal closure is defined as a process that occurs, when CO₂ concentration is increased from ambient to above-ambient levels^{2,3}. In others, a change from sub-ambient to above-ambient CO₂ concentration is used to trigger CO₂-induced stomatal closure^{4,5}. Data from previous studies comparing CO₂-responses in ferns and angiosperms suggests that stomatal responses to CO₂ are different, when changing CO₂ levels in the sub-ambient or above-ambient ranges^{3,6}. Thus, to understand stomatal regulation by CO₂, it is important to clarify, what do we talk about, when we talk about stomatal response to CO₂. Whether the underlying molecular mechanisms of stomatal closure caused by elevation of CO₂ concentration in the sub-ambient and above-ambient concentration ranges are different, has not been addressed.

We analysed stomatal responses to CO₂ in the sub-ambient and above-ambient concentration ranges in the model plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* to clarify whether these responses are controlled by the same regulators or display distinct underlying mechanisms. To this end, we used two types of experimental setups (Figure 1). In both types of experiments, we first reduced CO₂-levels from ambient 400 to 100 ppm to induce stomatal opening. Subsequently, CO₂ was either elevated from 100 to 400 ppm, and then from 400 to 800 ppm (Figure 1a), or alternatively directly from 100 to 800 ppm (Figure 1b). This approach allowed us to analyse three types of CO₂-induced stomatal closure: transition from 100 to 400 ppm (from here on referred to as 100-400), from 400 to 800 ppm (400-800), and from 100 to 800 ppm (100-800) of CO₂. Reaction kinetics of these responses were clearly different for wild type Col-0 plants. Stomatal closure induced by changing CO₂ from 100 to 400 ppm had the slowest reaction kinetics (rate constant $k = 0,026 \text{ min}^{-1}$) and 400 to 800 ppm closure had the fastest reaction kinetics ($k = 0.062 \text{ min}^{-1}$, Figure 1a). Stomatal closure induced by 100 to 800 ppm CO₂ transition is a mixture of 100 to 400 ppm and 400 and 800 ppm responses as also reflected in its intermediate reaction kinetics ($k = 0.038 \text{ min}^{-1}$, Figure 1b). The clearly different kinetics of these CO₂ responses suggest that underlying mechanisms could be regulated by different components.

To address the underlying mechanisms of CO₂-induced stomatal closure at different CO₂ transitions we studied plants deficient either in guard cell anion channel SLAC1 and its activation (*slac1-3*, *ghr1-3*, *ost1-3*) or in the CO₂-specific stomatal signalling branch regulated

by MPK12 and HT1 kinases (*mpk12-4*, *ht1-2*, *ht1-8D*) and carbonic anhydrases CA1 and CA4 (*cal ca4*) that convert CO₂ to bicarbonate. All studied mutants, except *ht1-2*, opened stomata at CO₂ transition from 400 to 100 ppm, although the responses of *ht1-8D*, *mpk12-4* and *calca4* mutants were slower and smaller in magnitude compared to wild-type plants, as described before²²⁻²⁵ (Figure 2a, f and Figure 3a, d). The 100-400 and 400-800 [CO₂] transitions revealed differences in sub-ambient and above-ambient CO₂-induced stomatal closure responses between SLAC1 and related mutants and plants deficient in CO₂-specific branch of stomatal signalling. We discuss these differences in terms of how fast stomata closed (k-values of fitted exponential functions, where appropriate) and what was the magnitude of response (reduction of stomatal conductance in absolute units).

In response to the 100-400 transition, the *slac1-3* and *ghr1-3* mutants closed their stomata with relatively fast exponential kinetics (Figure 2a); although the response was slower than in wild-type (Figure 2b), it was similar to wild-type in magnitude for *slac1-3* and close to that in *ghr1-3* (Figure 2c), indicating that SLAC1 and GHR1 are not of major importance in CO₂-induced stomatal closure at sub-ambient 100-400 CO₂ shifts. On the other hand, both SLAC1 and GHR1 were crucial for stomatal response to above-ambient CO₂ levels: *slac1-3* had slow, linear closure response of small magnitude and although *ghr1-3* had relatively fast closure response to the 400-800 transition, it was very low in magnitude (Figure 2a, d, e). The *ost1-3* mutant showed slow, linear response to both 100-400 and 400-800 transitions, indicating a regulatory role for the OST1 kinase in stomatal CO₂-responses across varying CO₂ concentration ranges. As SLAC1 is not the sole substrate of the OST1 kinase²⁸, it is likely that other OST1 targets are involved in CO₂-induced stomatal closure at sub-ambient CO₂ levels.

All the CO₂-signalling mutants, except *mpk12-4*, showed either no response (*ht1-2*, *ht1-8D*) or slow response with linear kinetics and small magnitude (*calca4*) in response to 100-400 transition (Figure 2f, h). The response of *mpk12-4* to the 100-400 transition was exponential but significantly reduced in magnitude (Figure 2f-h). To the 400-800 transition, *ht1* mutants were again unresponsive, whereas *mpk12-4* and *calca4* plants closed their stomata with exponential kinetics; their closure response was slower than in wild-type, but larger in magnitude (Figure 2f, i, j). Together, these data suggest that HT1 is crucial to initiate stomatal closure in response to CO₂ irrespective of CO₂ levels, whereas MPK12 function is more important at sub-ambient CO₂ concentrations. The carbonic anhydrases are needed at sub-ambient CO₂ levels to ensure fast stomatal closure in response to CO₂ elevation, whereas their role becomes less important in the 400-800 transition. This may be explained by increased nonenzymatic bicarbonate formation at higher CO₂ levels, rendering carbonic anhydrases less important.

In experiments where CO₂ concentrations were changed directly from 100 ppm to 800 ppm, the differences in responses that were detected for 100-400 and 400-800 transitions shown in Figure 2, were masked (Figure 3). Both *slac1-3* and *ost1-3* showed similar slow, non-exponential stomatal closure, whereas *ghr1-3* plants closed stomata as fast as wild-type plants but to a lower magnitude that was comparable with *slac1-3* and *ost1-3* (Figure 3a-c). Thus, by such an experimental set-up the important role for SLAC1 and GHR1 specifically in above-ambient CO₂-induced stomatal closure was not clear. The *ht1* mutants were insensitive to CO₂ shift from

100 to 800, as expected, whereas *mpk12-4* mutants had slower response of smaller magnitude compared to wild-type plants (Figure 3d-f). The *calca4* mutants closed stomata slower but to the same extent as wild-type plants (Figure 3d-f). Thus, this experimental set-up did not allow to detect a more prominent role for MPK12 and carbonic anhydrases at sub-ambient CO₂ levels that was clear from experiments addressing the 100-400 and 400-800 transitions separately (Figure 2). In many cases the stomatal response to CO₂ elevation is studied by increasing CO₂ concentration from sub-ambient to above-ambient levels. Our experiments indicate that this can confound the interpretation of the results; and highlight the importance of experimental set-up, when studying and trying to understand the molecular mechanisms of stomatal response to elevated CO₂ concentration.

Here we show that stomatal closure in response to an increase in CO₂ concentration, which occurs both at sub-ambient and above-ambient CO₂ concentration ranges, comprises two different underlying processes. The CO₂-induced stomatal closure at a transition from ambient to above-ambient CO₂ levels displays fastest reaction kinetics and requires the activation of guard cell anion channel SLAC1 (Figure 2a-e), just like the ABA signal transduction pathway^{16,18}. Conversely, the CO₂ specific carbonic anhydrases and the MPK12-HT1 signalling pathway have a major role when CO₂ levels change in the sub-ambient range (Figure 2f-j), albeit they also contribute to above-ambient CO₂-induced stomatal closure^{22-24,27}.

The mechanisms of CO₂-responses in the sub-ambient range of CO₂ concentrations, including stomatal opening response at low CO₂ levels, remain largely uncharacterised. During active photosynthesis, CO₂ concentrations in the intercellular air spaces, where CO₂ is perceived by the plant²⁹, are below ambient. Therefore, adequate and efficient responsiveness of plant stomata in this CO₂ concentration range is especially important to maximise photosynthetic efficiency. On the other hand, in the context of increasing global CO₂ levels and changing climate, understanding the molecular mechanisms of CO₂-induced stomatal closure, when CO₂ concentration rises above the current ambient levels, is of special interest. From the perspective of breeding water use efficient, but productive crops for the future climates, it is important to clearly define and differentiate the distinct processes underlying stomatal responses to CO₂, and to study them by experimental approaches that help to disentangle their molecular mechanisms.

Methods

Plant lines and growth conditions

Arabidopsis thaliana accession Col-0 and the following mutants in the same genetic background were used for experiments: *slac1-3*¹⁶, *ost1-3*³⁰, *ghr1-3*¹⁵, *ht1-2*²⁵, *ht1-8D*²², *mpk12-4*²⁴, *calca4*²³. Plants were grown in 4:2:3 v/v peat:vermiculite:water mixture at 12/12 photoperiod with 150 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹ light in controlled-environment growth cabinets (AR-66LX; Percival Scientific; MCA1600, Snijders Scientific) at 70% relative humidity and day-time temperature of 23°C and night-time temperature 18°C. Plant age at experiment time was ~25 days.

Gas-exchange measurements

Measurements of stomatal conductance were carried out with a temperature-controlled custom-built gas-exchange device^{3,31}. Plants were inserted into measurement cuvettes and allowed to acclimate for 1-2 hours at ~70% relative humidity, 24°C air temperature and 400 ppm CO₂. When stomatal conductance had stabilised, CO₂ concentration was reduced to 100 ppm for 2 hours. Thereafter, CO₂ concentration was either increased to 400 ppm and then to 800 ppm or directly from 100 ppm to 800 ppm; stomatal conductances were followed for 2 hours in each condition (Figure 1).

Data analysis

Magnitude of stomatal closure response was calculated as the difference in stomatal conductance between last time point before treatment and at the end of 2 hours of treatment at a given CO₂ level. Response curves were classified as exponential and non-exponential, the latter mostly comprising linear response curves. Response rate constants (k-values) were calculated by fitting exponential functions to response curves that behaved exponentially with GraphPad Prism 8.0.1. One-way ANOVA with Tukey *post hoc* test was used for statistical analysis as indicated in the figure legends, $p < 0.05$ were considered statistically significant. Statistical analyses were carried out with Past 4.0³².

References

1. Ainsworth, E. A. & Long, S. P. 30 years of free-air carbon dioxide enrichment (FACE): What have we learned about future crop productivity and its potential for adaptation? *Glob. Change Biol.* **27**, 27–49 (2021).
2. Franks, P. J. & Britton-Harper, Z. J. No evidence of general CO₂ insensitivity in ferns: one stomatal control mechanism for all land plants? *New Phytol.* **211**, 819–827 (2016).
3. Hörak, H., Kollist, H. & Merilo, E. Fern Stomatal Responses to ABA and CO₂ Depend on Species and Growth Conditions. *Plant Physiol.* **174**, 672–679 (2017).
4. Azoulay-Shemer, T. *et al.* Guard cell photosynthesis is critical for stomatal turgor production, yet does not directly mediate CO₂- and ABA-induced stomatal closing. *Plant J.* **83**, 567–581 (2015).
5. Chater, C. *et al.* Elevated CO₂-Induced Responses in Stomata Require ABA and ABA Signaling. *Curr. Biol.* **25**, 2709–2716 (2015).
6. Brodribb, T. J., McAdam, S. A. M., Jordan, G. J. & Feild, T. S. Evolution of stomatal responsiveness to CO₂ and optimization of water-use efficiency among land plants. *New Phytol.* **183**, 839–847 (2009).
7. Ma, Y. *et al.* Regulators of PP2C Phosphatase Activity Function as Abscissic Acid Sensors. *Science* **324**, 1064–1068 (2009).
8. Park, S.-Y. *et al.* Abscissic Acid Inhibits Type 2C Protein Phosphatases via the PYR/PYL Family of START Proteins. *Science* **324**, 1068–1071 (2009).
9. Melcher, K. *et al.* A gate-latch-lock mechanism for hormone signalling by abscissic acid receptors. *Nature* **462**, 602–608 (2009).
10. Mustilli, A.-C., Merlot, S., Vavasseur, A., Fenzi, F. & Giraudat, J. Arabidopsis OST1 Protein Kinase Mediates the Regulation of Stomatal Aperture by Abscissic Acid and Acts Upstream of Reactive Oxygen Species Production. *Plant Cell* **14**, 3089–3099 (2002).
11. Fujii, H. *et al.* *In vitro* Reconstitution of an ABA Signaling Pathway. *Nature* **462**, 660–664 (2009).
12. Geiger, D. *et al.* Activity of guard cell anion channel SLAC1 is controlled by drought-stress signaling kinase-phosphatase pair. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **106**, 21425–21430 (2009).

13. Lee, S. C., Lan, W., Buchanan, B. B. & Luan, S. A protein kinase-phosphatase pair interacts with an ion channel to regulate ABA signaling in plant guard cells. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **106**, 21419–21424 (2009).
14. Hua, D. *et al.* A Plasma Membrane Receptor Kinase, GHR1, Mediates Absciscic Acid- and Hydrogen Peroxide-Regulated Stomatal Movement in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell Online* **24**, 2546–2561 (2012).
15. Sierla, M. *et al.* The Receptor-like Pseudokinase GHR1 Is Required for Stomatal Closure. *Plant Cell* **30**, 2813–2837 (2018).
16. Vahisalu, T. *et al.* SLAC1 is required for plant guard cell S-type anion channel function in stomatal signalling. *Nature* **452**, 487–491 (2008).
17. Vahisalu, T. *et al.* Ozone-triggered rapid stomatal response involves the production of reactive oxygen species, and is controlled by SLAC1 and OST1. *Plant J.* **62**, 442–453 (2010).
18. Negi, J. *et al.* CO₂ regulator SLAC1 and its homologues are essential for anion homeostasis in plant cells. *Nature* **452**, 483–486 (2008).
19. Merilo, E. *et al.* PYR/RCAR Receptors Contribute to Ozone-, Reduced Air Humidity-, Darkness-, and CO₂-Induced Stomatal Regulation. *Plant Physiol.* **162**, 1652–1668 (2013).
20. Dittrich, M. *et al.* The role of *Arabidopsis* ABA receptors from the PYR/PYL/RCAR family in stomatal acclimation and closure signal integration. *Nat. Plants* **5**, 1002–1011 (2019).
21. Xue, S. *et al.* Central functions of bicarbonate in S-type anion channel activation and OST1 protein kinase in CO₂ signal transduction in guard cell. *EMBO J.* **30**, 1645–1658 (2011).
22. Hōrak, H. *et al.* A Dominant Mutation in the HT1 Kinase Uncovers Roles of MAP Kinases and GHR1 in CO₂-Induced Stomatal Closure. *Plant Cell* **28**, 2493–2509 (2016).
23. Hu, H. *et al.* Carbonic anhydrases are upstream regulators of CO₂-controlled stomatal movements in guard cells. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **12**, 87–93 (2010).
24. Jakobson, L. *et al.* Natural Variation in *Arabidopsis* Cvi-0 Accession Reveals an Important Role of MPK12 in Guard Cell CO₂ Signaling. *PLOS Biol.* **14**, e2000322 (2016).
25. Hashimoto, M. *et al.* *Arabidopsis* HT1 kinase controls stomatal movements in response to CO₂. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **8**, 391–397 (2006).
26. Hashimoto-Sugimoto, M. *et al.* Dominant and recessive mutations in the Raf-like kinase HT1 gene completely disrupt stomatal responses to CO₂ in *Arabidopsis*. *J. Exp. Bot.* **67**, 3251–3261 (2016).
27. Töldsepp, K. *et al.* Mitogen-activated protein kinases MPK4 and MPK12 are key components mediating CO₂-induced stomatal movements. *Plant J.* **96**, 1018–1035 (2018).
28. Wang, P. *et al.* Mapping proteome-wide targets of protein kinases in plant stress responses. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* (2020) doi:10.1073/pnas.1919901117.
29. Mott, K. A. Do Stomata Respond to CO₂ Concentrations Other than Intercellular? *Plant Physiol.* **86**, 200–203 (1988).
30. Yoshida, R. *et al.* ABA-Activated SnRK2 Protein Kinase is Required for Dehydration Stress Signaling in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell Physiol.* **43**, 1473–1483 (2002).
31. Kollist, T. *et al.* A novel device detects a rapid ozone-induced transient stomatal closure in intact *Arabidopsis* and its absence in *abi2* mutant. *Physiol. Plant.* **129**, 796–803 (2007).
32. Hammer, O., Harper, D. A. T. & Ryan, P. D. PAST: Paleontological Statistics Software Package for Education and Data Analysis. *Palaeontol. Electron.* **4**, 10 (2001).

256

257 **Acknowledgements**

258 This work was supported by the Estonian Research Council grants PSG404 to H.H., Basic
259 funding from the Institute of Technology and PRG719 to E.M. and PRG433 to H.K.; and
260 European Regional Development Fund via Center of Excellence in Molecular Cell Engineering.

261 **Author Contributions**

262 H.H. designed the study, H.H., K.K. and E.M. performed experiments, H.H., K.K., E.M. and
263 H.K. analysed data, H.H. and H.K. wrote the manuscript, all authors commented, edited and
264 approved the final manuscript.

265 **Competing Interests statement**

266 The authors declare no competing interests.

267 **Figure Legends**

268 **Figure 1. Kinetics of CO₂-induced stomatal closure in wild-type Arabidopsis.**

269 Col-0 wild-type Arabidopsis stomatal response to elevation of CO₂ concentration (a) from 100
270 to 400 ppm and 400 to 800 ppm, (b) and from 100 to 800 ppm. Fitted k-values (rate constant)
271 with 95% confidence intervals are shown next to respective response curves. Mean stomatal
272 conductance $\pm$ SEM is shown. Sample size was 17 in (a) and 14 in (b).

273 **Figure 2. Stomatal responses to CO₂ concentration elevation from 100 to 400 ppm and 274 400 to 800 ppm are mediated by different regulators.**

275 (a) and (f) Stomatal response to CO₂ concentration elevation from 100 to 400 ppm and 400 to
276 800 ppm, mean stomatal conductance $\pm$ SEM is shown. (b, g) and (d, i) Boxplot of fitted k-
277 values (rate constants) of stomatal response to CO₂ concentration elevation from 100 to 400
278 ppm and 400 to 800 ppm respectively, linear responses are marked as NA (not applicable). (c,
279 h) and (e, j) Boxplot of absolute stomatal closure ($\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$) in response to CO₂
280 concentration elevation from 100 to 400 ppm and 400 to 800 ppm respectively. (b-i) and (g-j)
281 Boxes represent 25-75 % quartiles and median as the horizontal line inside, whiskers indicate
282 the smallest and largest values, points show individual plant values. Statistically significantly
283 different groups are marked with different letters (One-way ANOVA with Tukey *post hoc* test).
284 (a-j) Sample size was 17 for Col-0 and *ost1-3*; 7 for *ht1-2* and *ht1-8D*; 16 for *ghr1-3* and *slac1-3*,
285 10 for *calca4* and 12 for *mpk12-4*.

286 **Figure 3. Analysing stomatal response to CO₂-elevation from sub-ambient to above- 287 ambient CO₂ levels masks underlying mechanisms.**

288 (a) and (d) Stomatal responses to CO₂ concentration elevation from 100 to 800 ppm, mean
289 stomatal conductance $\pm$ SEM is shown. (b) and (e) Boxplot of k-values (rate constants) during
290 stomatal response to CO₂ concentration elevation from 100 to 800 ppm, linear responses are
291 marked as NA (not applicable). (c) and (f) Boxplot of absolute stomatal closure ($\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$)

292 in response to CO₂ concentration elevation from 100 to 800 ppm. **(b, c, e, f)** Boxes represent
 293 25-75 % quartiles and the median as horizontal line inside, whiskers indicate the smallest and
 294 largest values, points show individual plant values. Statistically significantly different groups
 295 are marked with different letters (One-way ANOVA with Tukey *post hoc* test). **(a-f)** Sample
 296 size was 14 for Col-0; 6 for *ht1-2*; 7 for *ht1-8D*; 8 for *ghr1-3*, *mpk12-4* and *ost1-3*; 9 for *slac1-*
 297 *3* and *calca4*.

Figure 1. Kinetics of CO₂-induced stomatal closure in wild-type Arabidopsis.

Col-0 wild-type Arabidopsis stomatal response to elevation of CO₂ concentration (a) from 100 to 400 ppm and 400 to 800 ppm, (b) and from 100 to 800 ppm. Fitted k -values (rate constant) with 95% confidence intervals are shown next to respective response curves. Mean stomatal conductance $\pm$ SEM is shown. Sample size was 17 in (a) and 14 in (b).

Figure 2. Stomatal responses to CO₂ concentration elevation from 100 to 400 ppm and 400 to 800 ppm are mediated by different regulators.

(a) and (f) Stomatal response to CO₂ concentration elevation from 100 to 400 ppm and 400 to 800 ppm, mean stomatal conductance $\pm$ SEM is shown. (b, g) and (d, i) Boxplot of fitted k-values (rate constants) of stomatal response to CO₂ concentration elevation from 100 to 400 ppm and 400 to 800 ppm respectively, linear responses are marked as NA (not applicable). (c, h) and (e, j) Boxplot of absolute stomatal closure (mmol m⁻² s⁻¹) in response to CO₂ concentration elevation from 100 to 400 ppm and 400 to 800 ppm respectively. (b-i) and (g-j) Boxes represent 25-75 % quartiles and median as the horizontal line inside, whiskers indicate the smallest and largest values, points show individual plant values. Statistically significantly different groups are marked with different letters (One-way ANOVA with Tukey *post hoc* test). (a-j) Sample size was 17 for Col-0 and *ost1-3*; 7 for *ht1-2* and *ht1-8D*; 16 for *ghr1-3* and *slac1-3*, 10 for *ca1ca4* and 12 for *mpk12-4*.

Figure 3. Analysing stomatal response to CO₂-elevation from sub-ambient to above-ambient CO₂ levels masks underlying mechanisms.

(a) and (d) Stomatal responses to CO₂ concentration elevation from 100 to 800 ppm, mean stomatal conductance $\pm$ SEM is shown. (b) and (e) Boxplot of k-values (rate constants) during stomatal response to CO₂ concentration elevation from 100 to 800 ppm, linear responses are marked as NA (not applicable). (c) and (f) Boxplot of absolute stomatal closure (mmol m⁻² s⁻¹) in response to CO₂ concentration elevation from 100 to 800 ppm. (b, c, e, f) Boxes represent 25-75 % quartiles and the median as horizontal line inside, whiskers indicate the smallest and largest values, points show individual plant values. Statistically significantly different groups are marked with different letters (One-way ANOVA with Tukey *post hoc* test). (a-f) Sample size was 14 for Col-0; 6 for *ht1-2*; 7 for *ht1-8D*; 8 for *ghr1-3*, *mpk12-4* and *ost1-3*; 9 for *slac1-3* and *ca1ca4*.