

# ÍNDICE

---

<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>RESUMEN</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>RESUM</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>AGRADECIMIENTOS</b>	<b>VII</b>
<b>ÍNDICE</b>	<b>XI</b>
<b>LISTADO DE FIGURAS</b>	<b>XV</b>
<b>LISTADO DE TABLAS</b>	<b>XVII</b>
<b>1 ANTECEDENTES Y CONTEXTO</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 PROBLEMÁTICA DE LA SALINIDAD	1
1.2 SALINIDAD EN UN CONTEXTO DE CAMBIO CLIMÁTICO	1
1.3 IMPACTO SOCIOECONÓMICO	3
1.4 ESTRATEGIAS ABORDADAS	4
1.4.1 PLANTAS HALOFITAS	4
1.4.2 BIOESTIMUADORES EN PLANTAS	6
1.5 NUEVOS ENFOQUES EN ALIMENTACIÓN	7
1.6 EL SECTOR PRIVADO – SAKATA	8
1.7 LOCALIZACIÓN Y ESPECIES OBJETO DE ESTUDIO	9
1.7.1 EL SURESTE ESPAÑOL - LA REGIÓN DE MURCIA	9
1.7.2 ESPECIES SELECCIONADAS	10
<b>2 SINOPSIS</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1 PLANTEAMIENTO DEL PROBLEMA Y OBJETIVO GENERAL	15
2.2 OBJETIVOS ESPECÍFICOS	15

<b>3</b>	<b><u>CAPÍTULO UNO - ANALYSIS OF PHYSIOLOGICAL TRAITS IN THE RESPONSE OF CHENOPODIACEAE, AMARANTHACEAE, AND BRASSICACEAE PLANTS TO SALINITY STRESS</u></b>	<b>17</b>
	<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>MATERIAL AND METHODS</b>	<b>21</b>
3.2.1	PLANT CULTURE	21
3.2.2	GROWTH	21
3.2.3	LEAF PARAMETERS	21
3.2.4	ANALYSIS OF MINERAL ELEMENTS	22
3.2.5	ROOT HYDRAULIC CONDUCTANCE ( $L_0$ )	22
3.2.6	LEAF WATER POTENTIAL ( $\Psi_\Omega$ )	22
3.2.7	OSMOTIC POTENTIAL ( $\Psi_\Pi$ )	22
3.2.8	LEAF TURGOR POTENTIAL ( $\Psi_T$ )	22
3.2.9	PROTEIN CONTENT, LIPID EXTRACTION, AND FATTY ACID DETERMINATION	23
3.2.10	CATALASE DETERMINATION	23
3.2.11	STATISTICS ANALYSIS	23
<b>3.3</b>	<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	<b>24</b>
3.3.1	GROWTH	25
3.3.2	LEAF SUCCULENCE AND SALT ACCUMULATION	25
3.3.3	MINERAL ANALYSIS	27
3.3.4	HYDRAULIC PARAMETERS	29
3.3.5	PROTEIN CONTENT, CATALASE ACTIVITY, DOUBLE BOND INDEX, AND FATTY ACIDS	31
<b>3.4</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>34</b>
	<b>CONTRIBUTIONS</b>	<b>35</b>
	<b>FUNDING INFORMATION</b>	<b>35</b>
	<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>35</b>
	<b>APPENDIX A. SUPPLEMENTARY DATA</b>	<b>36</b>
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>4</b>	<b><u>CAPÍTULO 2: GROWING BROCCOLI UNDER SALINITY: THE INFLUENCE OF CULTIVAR AND SEASON ON GLUCOSINOLATES CONTENT</u></b>	<b>47</b>
	<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b>	<b>50</b>

4.2.1 PLANT MATERIAL AND GROWTH CONDITIONS	50
4.2.2 INTACT GLUCOSINOLATES ANALYSIS	51
4.2.3 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS	51
<b>4.3 RESULTS</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>4.4 DISCUSSION</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>63</b>
<b><u>5 COMPOSICIÓN Y PROCEDIMIENTO PARA INCREMENTAR EL CONTENIDO DE GLUCOSINOLATOS EN PLANTAS ADULTAS DEL GÉNERO BRASSICA</u></b>	<b><u>67</u></b>
<b>RESUMEN</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>DESCRIPCIÓN</b>	<b>68</b>
5.1 ANTECEDENTES DE LA INVENCION	69
5.2 DESCRIPCIÓN DE LA INVENCION	72
5.3 BREVE DESCRIPCIÓN DE LAS FIGURAS	76
5.4 EJEMPLOS	76
5.4.1 MATERIAL Y MÉTODOS	76
5.5 REIVINDICACIONES	83
<b><u>6 CAPÍTULO 4: HALOPHYTES OF THE MEDITERRANEAN BASIN - UNDERUTILIZED SPECIES WITH THE POTENTIAL TO BE NUTRITIOUS CROPS IN THE SCENARIO OF THE CLIMATE CHANGE</u></b>	<b><u>87</u></b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>88</b>
6.1 INTRODUCTION	89
6.2 MATERIAL AND METHODS	90
6.2.1 RELATIVE GROWTH RATE	90
6.2.2 ANALYSIS OF MINERAL ELEMENTS	91
6.2.3 PHENOLIC COMPOUNDS	91
6.2.4 PROTEIN AND TOTAL LIPID ANALYSIS	91
6.3 RESULTS	92
6.3.1 RELATIVE GROWTH RATE	92
6.3.2 MINERAL ELEMENTS	92
6.3.3 PHENOLIC CONTENT	93
6.3.4 PROTEIN AND LIPID CONTENT	93
6.4 DISCUSSION	98

<b>6.5 CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>FUNDING</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD STATEMENT</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>CONFLICTS OF INTEREST</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>7 <u>DISCUSIÓN GENERAL</u></b>	<b><u>111</u></b>
<b>8 <u>CONCLUSIONES</u></b>	<b><u>119</u></b>
<b>9 <u>REFERENCIAS</u></b>	<b><u>121</u></b>

## LISTADO DE FIGURAS

## CAPITULO 1

- Fig. 1. Dry weight (g) in *A. halimus*, *S. fruticosa*, *C. maritima* and *B. rapa* plants treated with 0, 100, 200 or 300mM NaCl. Different letters mean significant differences \_\_\_\_\_ 25
- Fig. 2. Leaf succulence,  $L_s$ , ( $g\ mm^{-2}$ ) against leaf Na content (A) and leaf thickness,  $L_t$ , ( $\mu m$ ) (B) in *A. halimus*, *S. fruticosa*, *C. maritima* and *B. rapa* plants treated with \_\_\_\_\_ 26
- Fig. 3. DCA graphic of the canonical discriminant analysis for the salinity $\times$ species interaction, for macronutrients (A) and micronutrients (B). There are 16 subgroups, where the saline treatment (mM) is the first number and the letters are the species (*A.h*=*A. halimus*, *S.f*=*S. fruticosa*, *C.m*=*C. maritima*, and *B.r*=*B. rapa*). The centroids of each group are indicated by the symbol "+". The obligatory halophyte species (*A. halimus* and *S. fruticosa*) are surrounded by dots and dashes (-.-), and the facultative halophyte species (*C. maritima*) and the glycophyte species (*B. rapa*) are surrounded by dotted lines (.....). \_\_\_\_\_ 27
- Fig. 4. DCA graphic of the canonical discriminant analysis for the salinity $\times$ species interaction, for hydric parameters ( $L_0$ , water potential, and osmotic potential). There are 16 subgroups, where the saline treatment (mM) is the first number and the letters are the species (*A.h*=*A. halimus*, *S.f*=*S. fruticosa*, *C.m*=*C. maritima*, and *B.r*=*B. rapa*). \_\_\_\_\_ 29
- Fig. 5. DCA graphic of the canonical discriminant analysis for the salinity $\times$ species interaction, for the variables protein, catalase activity (CAT), and double bond index (DBI). There are 16 subgroups, where the saline treatment (mM) is the first number and the letters are the species (*A.h*=*A. halimus*, *S.f*=*S. fruticosa*, *C.m*=*C. maritima*, and *B.r*=*B. rapa*). The obligatory halophyte species (*A. halimus* and *S. fruticosa*) are surrounded by dashed lines (- - -), the facultative halophyte species (*C. maritima*) is surrounded by dots and dashes (-.-), and the glycophyte species (*B. rapa*) is surrounded by dotted lines (.....). \_\_\_\_ 31
- Fig. 6. DCA graphic of the canonical discriminant analysis for the salinity $\times$ species interaction, for fatty acids. There are 16 subgroups, where the saline treatment (mM) is the first number and the letters are the species (*A.h*=*A. halimus*, *S.f*=*S. fruticosa*, *C.m*=*C. maritima*, and *B.r*=*B. rapa*). The obligatory halophyte species (*A. halimus* and *S. fruticosa*) are surrounded by continuous lines, the facultative halophyte species (*C. maritima*) is surrounded by dots and dashes (-.-), and the glycophyte species (*B. rapa*) is surrounded by dotted lines (.....). \_\_\_\_\_ 33

## CAPÍTULO 2

- Figure 1. Inflorescence yield of different broccoli cultivars grown in control and saline conditions, in the field, during the (A) autumn, (B) winter, and (C) spring seasons. Bars with different letters show significant differences according to the Duncan's test at  $p < 0.05$ . Values are means  $\pm$  SE ( $n = 5$ ). \_\_\_\_\_ 54
- Figure 2. Total GLS concentrations in different organs of broccoli plants grown in control and saline conditions, in the field, during the autumn, winter, and spring seasons. For each glucosinolate, different letters show significant differences according to the Duncan's test at  $p < 0.05$ . Values are means  $\pm$  SE ( $n = 4$ ). \_\_\_\_\_ 58

***CAPÍTULO 3***

FIG. 1	85
FIG. 2	85
FIG. 3	85
FIG. 4	86

***CAPÍTULO 4***

Figure 1. Relative Growth Rate, RGR ( $\text{g}\cdot\text{g}^{-1}\text{ DW}\cdot\text{day}^{-1}$ ) of <i>Atriplex halimus</i> , <i>Cakile maritima</i> , and <i>Salicornia fruticosa</i> under different salinity treatments (0, 100, 200, and 300 mM NaCl) after two weeks of treatment. Means ( $n = 5 \pm \text{SE}$ ) with different letter are significantly different at $p\text{-value} < 0.05$ , different lower-case letters are significantly different among the same species under different treatments, and different capital letters are significantly different among different species under the same treatment. Tukey HSD test was used for mean comparison.	92
---	----

## LISTADO DE TABLAS

## CAPÍTULO 1

Table 1. Two-way MANOVA for five groups of variables, where $df_1$ is the numerator degrees of freedom, $df_2$ is the denominator df, Pillai is the value of the statistic, $\sim F$ is the approximate value of the F statistic, and P is the probability ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ).	24
Table S 1. The macronutrients content ( $g \cdot 100g^{-1}$ DW) in <i>A. halimus</i> , <i>S. fruticosa</i> , <i>C. maritima</i> and <i>B. rapa</i> . Treated with 0, 100, 200 or 300 mM NaCl. Values are the mean of three replicates $\pm$ S.E.	36
Table S 2. The micronutrient content ( $mg \cdot kg^{-1}$ DW) in <i>A. halimus</i> , <i>S. fruticosa</i> , <i>C. maritima</i> and <i>B. rapa</i> . Treated with 0, 100, 200 or 300 mM NaCl. Values are the mean of three replicates $\pm$ S.E.	36
Table S 3. Hydraulic parameters (root hydraulic conductance (L0) ( $mg \cdot g \text{ root FW}^{-1} \cdot h^{-1} \text{ MPa}^{-1}$ ), leaf water potential ( $\Psi_w$ ) (MPa), osmolarity of exuded sap ( $\Psi_\pi$ ) (MPa), leaf turgor potential ( $\Psi_t$ ) (MPa)) in <i>A. halimus</i> , <i>S. fruticosa</i> , <i>C. maritima</i> and <i>B. rapa</i> . Treated with 0, 100, 200 or 300 mM NaCl. Values are the mean of three replicates $\pm$ S.E.	37
Table S 4. Protein content ( $mg \cdot g^{-1}$ DW), double bond index of fatty acids (DBI), and CAT activity ( $UC \cdot mg^{-1} \text{ protein} \cdot \text{min}^{-1}$ ) in <i>A. halimus</i> , <i>S. fruticosa</i> , <i>C. maritima</i> and <i>B. rapa</i> . Treated with 0, 100, 200 or 300 mM NaCl. Values are the mean of three replicates $\pm$ S.E.	37
Table S 5. The fatty acid percentage (%) in <i>A. halimus</i> , <i>S. fruticosa</i> , <i>C. maritima</i> and <i>B. rapa</i> . Treated with 0, 100, 200 or 300 mM NaCl. Values are the mean of three replicates $\pm$ S.E.	38
Table S 6. Coefficients of total canonical structure of the first three canonical functions and variation explained by each vector variable for the species $\times$ salinity interaction for each group of variables.	39

## CAPÍTULO 2

Table 1. Average values of environmental conditions in each month during experiments.	50
Table 2. GLS concentrations in different organs of broccoli plants grown in control and saline conditions, in the field, during autumn season. Each glucosinolate followed with different letter showed significant differences according to the Duncan's test at $p < 0.05$ . Values are means $\pm$ SE ( $n = 4$ ).	55
Table 3. GLS concentrations in different organs of broccoli plants grown in control and saline conditions, in the field, during winter season. Each glucosinolate followed with different letter showed significant differences according to the Duncan's test at $p < 0.05$ . Values are means $\pm$ SE ( $n = 4$ ).	56
Table 4. GLS concentrations in different organs of broccoli plants grown in control and saline conditions, in the field, during spring season. Each glucosinolate followed with different letter showed significant differences according to the Duncan's test at $p < 0.05$ . Values are means $\pm$ SE ( $n = 4$ ).	57
Table 5. Cinnamoyl-indol-GLs in different organs of broccoli plants grown under control and saline stress in the field during the autumn, winter, and spring seasons. Different letters in a column and treatment show significant differences according to the Duncan's test at $p < 0.05$ . Values are means $\pm$ SE ( $n = 4$ ).	59

## CAPÍTULO 3

Tabla A. Clasificación de los glucosinolatos más representativos en brócoli según su estructura. _____	70
Tabla 1. Concentración de los glucosinolatos y de un feruloil-GLS en hojas de distintas variedades de <i>Brassica oleracea</i> var. <i>Italica</i> ) registradas en el ensayo en campo utilizando distintos tratamientos. _____	79
Tabla 2. Concentración de los glucosinolatos y de un feruloil-GLS en inflorescencias de distintas variedades de <i>Brassica oleracea</i> var. <i>Italica</i> ) registrados en el ensayo en campo utilizando distintos tratamientos. _____	80
Tabla 3. Concentración de los glucosinolatos en hojas e inflorescencias de la variedad <i>Parthenon</i> en el ensayo en invernadero utilizando distintos tratamientos _____	81
Tabla 4. Resultados del porcentaje de inflorescencias comerciales de la variedad <i>Parthenon</i> en el ensayo en invernadero _____	82

## CAPÍTULO 4

Table 1. Macronutrient content in the leaves and stems of <i>Atriplex halimus</i> , <i>Cakile maritima</i> , and <i>Salicornia fruticosa</i> grown with different salinity doses (0, 100, 200, and 300 mM NaCl) for two weeks. Cation concentrations are expressed as mg/100 g <sup>-1</sup> DW (mean ± SE, n = 5). Values followed by different letters are significantly different at p-value < 0.05; upper-case letters indicate the differences among the salinity treatments for the same species, lower-case letters indicate the differences among the species for the same treatment. The Tukey HSD test was used for the comparison of means. _____	94
Table 2. Micronutrients content in the leaves and stems of <i>Atriplex halimus</i> , <i>Cakile maritima</i> , and <i>Salicornia fruticosa</i> grown with different salinity doses (0, 100, 200, and 300 mM NaCl) for two weeks. Cation concentrations are expressed as mg 100 g <sup>-1</sup> DW (mean ± SE, n = 5). Values followed by different letters are significantly different at p < 0.05; upper-case letters indicate the differences among the salinity treatments for the same species, lower-case letters indicate the differences among the species for the same treatment. The Tukey HSD test was used for the comparison of means. _____	95
Table 3. Flavonoid glycosides, Sinapic and Chlorogenic acid derivatives, and Total (as the sum of all) in the leaves and stems of <i>Atriplex halimus</i> , <i>Cakile maritima</i> , and <i>Salicornia fruticosa</i> , (mg g <sup>-1</sup> DW) under different treatments (0, 100, 200, and 300 mM NaCl). Means (n = 5 ± SE) with different letter are significantly different at p-value < 0.05; different lower-case letters are significantly different among the same species under different treatments, and different capital letters are significantly different among different species under the same treatment. Tukey HSD test was used for mean comparison. ____	96
Table 4. Protein and Lipid content in the leaves and stems of <i>Atriplex halimus</i> , <i>Cakile maritima</i> , and <i>Salicornia fruticosa</i> (mg g <sup>-1</sup> DW) under different treatments (0, 100, 200, and 300 mM NaCl). Means (n = 5 ± SE) with different letter are significantly different at p-value < 0.05, different lower-case letters are significantly different among the same species under different treatments, and different capital letters are significantly different among different species under the same treatment. Tukey HSD test was used for mean comparison. _____	97