



HAL
open science

Rosy apple abundance is shaped by vegetative growth and water status

Aurélie Rousselin, Danièle Bevacqua, Gilles Vercambre, Marie-Hélène Sauge, Françoise Lescourret, Marie Odile Jordan

► **To cite this version:**

Aurélie Rousselin, Danièle Bevacqua, Gilles Vercambre, Marie-Hélène Sauge, Françoise Lescourret, et al.. Rosy apple abundance is shaped by vegetative growth and water status. *Crop Protection*, 2018, 105, pp.1-9. 10.1016/j.cropro.2017.11.001 . hal-02621135

HAL Id: hal-02621135

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02621135>

Submitted on 26 May 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Rosy apple aphid abundance on apple is shaped by vegetative growth and water status

Aurélie Rousselin^a, Daniele Bevacqua^a, Gilles Vercambre^a, Marie-Hélène Sauge^a, Françoise Lescourret^a,
Marie-Odile Jordan^{a*}

a: INRA, UR1115 Plantes et Systèmes de culture Horticoles (PSH), Domaine Saint-Paul, Site Agroparc, 84914
Avignon cedex 09, France

*: corresponding author. Marie-Odile.Jordan@avignon.fr

Key message: Rosy apple aphid abundance is positively correlated to plant vegetative growth at both the shoot and tree scales. Water restriction has a negative impact on aphid abundance only at the tree scale.

Highlights

Rosy apple aphid abundance on apple is related to growth at both the shoot and the tree scale

This relation is modulated by genotype and water supply

At the shoot level the effect of water restriction on aphid abundance depends on genotype

At the tree level, water restriction always has a negative impact on aphid abundance

Abstract

Regulated deficit irrigation, which is a common practice to cope with water scarcity, can impact plant-aphid interactions, and possibly lead to a reduction in the use of pesticides. To test the possible effect of water restriction on the apple tree-rosy apple aphid (*Malus domestica*-*Dysaphis plantaginea*) system, we performed a factorial experiment with two levels of water supply and two genotypes on artificially infested trees. Plant growth and aphid abundance were characterized during the entire infestation period at two scales of analysis: the apical shoot scale and the tree scale, and additional measures were performed to evaluate plant water status. Aphid abundance increased with plant vegetative growth at both scales of analysis, which is consistent with the Plant Vigor Hypothesis (i.e. with the fact that most of the phloem feeders prefer fast growing plants). At the tree scale, aphid abundance was lower on trees that underwent water restriction, but at the shoot scale, aphid abundance responded differently to water restriction depending on the tree genotype. Water restriction modified the relationship between aphid abundance and growth, thus indicating that host suitability for aphids was affected by different plant

Comment citer ce document :

Rousselin, A., Bevacqua, D., Vercambre, G., Sauge, M.-H., Lescourret, F., Jordan, M. O. (2018).
Rosy apple abundance is shaped by vegetative growth and water status. *Crop Protection*, 105,
1-9. , DOI : 10.1016/j.cropro.2017.11.001

31 variables susceptible to water stress, among which growth. The different response patterns at the two scales of
32 analysis highlight the importance of scale choice in the study of plant-insect interactions.

33

34 **Keywords:** *Dysaphis plantaginea*, *Malus domestica*, pest management, drought stress, Plant Vigor Hypothesis

35

36 1 INTRODUCTION

37 Reducing the use of pesticides and coping with water scarcity are two of the main challenges in
38 Mediterranean horticulture. The use of less drought susceptible plant varieties and the implementation of regulated
39 deficit irrigation represent possible solutions to decrease water consumption in horticulture. Interestingly, due to
40 cross tolerance mechanisms between abiotic and biotic stresses, the implementation of deficit irrigation can also
41 reduce host plant suitability for pests and especially aphids (Foyer et al., 2016). Host plant suitability for aphids
42 encompasses multi-aspects, which can be modulated by plant water status. The four main ones are (i) nutrition (or
43 settlement) site availability, *i.e.* the number of growing apices (Forrest and Dixon, 1975), (ii) phloem nutritional
44 quality, *e.g.* the secondary metabolites (Czerniewicz et al., 2011) and the amino acid profiles (Ryan et al., 2014),
45 (iii) phloem accessibility (Mody et al., 2009) and (iv) phyllosphere microenvironment (Pangga et al., 2012). As the
46 effects of water scarcity on host plant characteristics vary with stress timing, intensity, and duration (Tariq et al.,
47 2012), the published results on the effect of host plant water stress on aphid performance, are often contradictory.
48 Water stress has been shown to have a positive (Archer et al., 1995; Mewis et al., 2012), a negative (Agele et al.,
49 2006; King et al., 2006; Simpson et al., 2012) or no effect (Bethke et al., 1998; King et al., 2006; Mewis et al.,
50 2012) on aphid performance. The plant genotype is also a factor that is expected to influence the plant-aphid
51 interaction under water restriction. Yet, the studies evaluating the effects of drought stress on aphid performance on
52 different plant genotypes generally considered genotypes contrasted for their resistance to the insect (Agele et al.,
53 2006; Dardeau et al., 2015; Verdugo et al., 2015) rather than genotypes contrasted for their response to drought
54 stress.

55 In the present work, the apple tree-rosy apple aphid system [*Malus domestica* Borkh. – *Dysaphis*
56 *plantaginea* (Passerini)] was chosen as the study case, because apple trees are cultivated worldwide under a wide
57 range of climatic conditions and also in semi-arid areas such as the Mediterranean basin. Moreover apple is the
58 major deciduous fruit tree production worldwide (FAO 2016). *Dysaphis plantaginea* is a major apple tree pest
59 (Forrest and Dixon, 1975). It causes leaf roll (Forrest and Dixon, 1975), shoot and fruit deformations (Marchetti et
60 al., 2009), and populations resistant to pesticides have already appeared (Delorme et al., 1999). Two apple

61 genotypes with different drought response mechanisms were identified from a “Starkinson”×”Granny Smith”
62 cross progeny (Lauri et al., 2016). The first genotype (referred to as DAG: Drought Avoidance Genotype) is
63 characterised by drought avoidance strategy, with reduced stomatal conductance and photosynthesis under water
64 deficit, growth being affected to a smaller extent. The second one (referred to as GCG: Growth Cessation
65 Genotype) is characterised by a high percentage of shoots experiencing growth cessation under drought stress. We
66 intend to use these contrasted genotypes to test how far the mechanism involved in drought resistance affects the
67 apple tree – rosy apple aphid interactions, namely under water stress conditions whose effects on shoot growth may
68 be modulated by the genotype. Other determinants of plant suitability to aphids, such as leaf water potential and
69 gas exchange rates, may also be affected to a greater or lesser extent according to genotype. The related
70 physiological traits, namely leaf temperature (Satar et al., 2008), turgor pressure (Verdugo et al., 2015), phloem sap
71 soluble sugars content (Zehnder and Hunter, 2009) and viscosity (Sevanto, 2014) to which aphids are sensitive,
72 could be modified in turn. The relationship between shoot growth and aphid performances may therefore be
73 disentangled by water stress conditions.

74 Thus, aphid abundance has been positively correlated to vegetative growth at the shoot scale (Stoekli et al.,
75 2008; Rousselin et al., 2016). Yet, the existence of a similar relationship at the tree scale remains unclear. Indeed,
76 the susceptibility of tree organs to aphids may vary within the tree, between long and short shoots and between
77 fruiting and non-fruiting shoots (Simon et al., 2011). This could affect the patterns of aphid dispersion within the
78 crown. We will therefore consider simultaneously two study scales: the infested shoot and the whole tree, thus
79 verifying if the relation between aphid abundance and growth still holds at the tree scale, and how far it is affected
80 by water stress conditions.

81 To reach these goals, both apple genotypes were submitted to contrasted irrigation regimes, *i.e.* control vs
82 deficit irrigation, and the aphid population monitored after artificial infestation as well as tree growth, leaf gas
83 exchanges and leaf water potential. Gathered data were then analysed via hierarchical analysis of multiple
84 regression to test how far the plant genotype and the irrigation treatment affected aphid density, possibly via an
85 effect on the plant vegetative growth.

86 2 MATERIAL AND METHODS

87 2.1. Experimental design and plants

88 The experiment was conducted in Avignon (southern France) under an 126 m² insect proof shelter (PEHD Cristal
89 500*600 µm mesh), insulated from the ground with a tarpaulin (PP 86gr UV stabilized), and treated with various
90 chemicals to eliminate weeds, insects, culture auxiliaries and pests. This treatment was applied first on bare soil

91 when the tunnel was built (2013) then repeated without herbicide every year (in February). The trees were
92 therefore moved for two weeks to a nearby clean shelter which also allowed control of the tarpaulin status and
93 manual weeding of the few plants that would have grown through. From 10/April/2015 until the end of the
94 experiment (1/July/2015), the temperature under the shelter was recorded every 30 min using a Hobo® Pro V2
95 logger (U23-002, Onset®, Bourne, USA).

96 For each of the two apple genotypes DAG and GCG (described in introduction), 30 scions were whip
97 grafted on M9 Pajam 2 on March 2014. They were grown in 12 L-pots filled with a medium consisting of 1:2 (v:v)
98 perlite and potting soil (Florabella® Klasmann-Deilmann®). Two drippers per pot, each with a delivery rate of 2
99 dm³ h⁻¹ and connected to a different pipe, provided respectively tap water and an NPK fertilizer.

100 After one-year of growth, plants were hand-pruned in February 2015. Only the main axis (or trunk) was
101 left with 15 non latent buds (i.e. meaning that the trunk was pruned back to less than 80 cm above the grafting
102 point). Pruning wounds were protected with Phytopast®-G. The differentiation of the irrigation treatments started
103 on 24/Apr/2015. The pots were covered with a white plastic sheet to avoid penetration of rain water. Two sets of 12
104 plants of each genotype were selected for their homogeneity, and subjected to two different watering treatments,
105 denoted by W+ and W-. Plants assigned to the W+ treatment were daily irrigated until run-off and the plants
106 assigned to the W- treatment received a halved water supply. The W- treatment was adjusted by reducing the
107 duration of each of the two to four daily irrigation periods.

108

109 2.2. *Aphid rearing and infestation*

110 To ensure that individual aphids did not genetically differ in their intrinsic performance, a single clone of *D.*
111 *plantaginea* (Dp15) was used for the infestation. The aphid colony was established from a single female collected
112 on an apple tree 'Ariane' on 26/March/2015 in Avignon. Aphids were reared in the laboratory on the apple cultivar
113 M9 susceptible to aphids, under parthenogenesis-inducing conditions: 20°C +/- 1°C, 60-70% relative humidity and
114 a 16-h-day cycle (Sauge et al., 1998). Five 7-days old wingless adult females were placed on one single current
115 year axis (i.e. which had emerged on the trunk in early spring) per plant on 28/April/2015. The chosen axis for
116 infestation was positioned in the apical position of the trunk. Aphids were then free to disperse all over the plant
117 but could not move to the soil, being blocked by a glue barrier (Rampastop®, Protecta®) provided at the stem
118 base, neither to a neighbouring plant since spacing was large enough to avoid canopy contact throughout the
119 experiment.

120

121 2.3. Data collection

122 The infested trees were monitored weekly from the 30/April/2015 to the 01/July/2015 for vegetative growth and
123 from the 04/May/2015 to the 01/July/2015 for aphid abundance. Vegetative growth was computed by counting the
124 number of expanded leaves separately on each developing proleptic bud, or bud formed in 2014 whose
125 development was delayed by dormancy (Wheat, 1980). Two types of vegetative proleptic structures were
126 distinguished: (i) rosettes, which correspond to the expansion of the preformed leaves of the bud, and (ii) shoots,
127 which correspond to a main axis resulting from the activation of the apical meristem (*i.e.* to the transformation of
128 the rosettes into axes) and all its axillary structures. The diameter at the trunk base, considered as an accurate
129 indicator of plant vigor and classically used as a covariable to explain interplant variability (Nesme et al., 2005),
130 was measured at the start and at the end of the experiment. It varied by less than 12% within the tree populations
131 sorted by genotype (April 4) and treatment combination (July 2). This variability was too small to affect the
132 number of leaves or the aphid abundances, as shown by preliminary covariance analyses (data not shown)
133 performed at shoot and tree scale. Aphid abundance was estimated by assigning to each proleptic structure (shoot
134 or rosette) one class of infestation: C0 (no aphid), C1 (1 to 5 individuals), C2 (6 to 25), C3 (26 to 125), C4 (125 to
135 625) and C5 (more than 625) (Grechi et al., 2008, Rousselin et al., 2016). As a result, a total of 629 proleptic
136 structures (an average of 13 per tree) were monitored, among which 55% were assigned to class C4 or C5 at the
137 time of infestation peak.

138 During the same period, midday leaf water potentials were measured with a Scholander pressure bomb on
139 eight sunny dates (*i.e.* approximately once a week according to the weather conditions) on a subsample of 3 to 6
140 randomly chosen trees per treatment, using a non-infested sun-exposed leaf near an apex. Simultaneously, leaf
141 photosynthetic rate, leaf stomatal conductance, leaf transpiration and leaf temperature were measured on a non-
142 infested sun-exposed attached leaf with an open gasometric system LCA-4 (ADC®, Hoddesdon, UK).

143

144 2.4. Data analysis

145 Hereafter, dates are expressed in days after infestation (DAI). Doing so, 28/April/2015 corresponds to 0
146 DAI and 01/July/2015 corresponds to 64 DAI. Possible differences in leaf water potential, leaf photosynthetic rate,
147 leaf transpiration rate, leaf stomatal conductance, leaf temperature, the percentage of tree leaves on a shoot,
148 numbers of developing buds, shoots and rosettes, were analysed with Kruskal-Wallis tests on treatment groups
149 (water × genotype) and, when significant, they were followed by non-parametric Tukey multiple comparisons.

150 Data were analysed at two different scales: the shoot scale, considering the primarily infested shoot (i.e.
151 the apical shoot) and the tree scale. The vegetative growth was computed as the increase in the number of fully
152 expanded leaves between two and 64 DAI, at the shoot scale considering the apical infested proleptic axis plus all
153 its axillary structures, leading to the final shoot vegetative growth (FSVG) and at the tree scale, considering all
154 types of proleptic structures, *i.e.* rosettes and shoots, leading to final tree vegetative growth (FTVG). Both
155 vegetative growth variables (*i.e.* FSVG and FTGV) were log transformed to fulfil the conditions required for
156 statistical analysis.

157 The actual aphid abundance, was estimated from the reported infestation classes by drawing a value from
158 a uniform distribution with boundaries relevant to the different abundance classes (e.g. 125 – 624 for the infestation
159 level C4), for each of the 629 proleptic structures (shoots and rosettes) and sampling dates. It is therefore evident
160 that any reconstruction of the actual aphid abundance differed from another due to the randomness of the drawing
161 process. We constructed 10,000 virtual aphid abundance curves per shoot and then per tree (by summing the values
162 obtained for the proleptic structures belonging to each individual tree). At tree scale, the rosettes contributed to less
163 than 20% to aphid abundances, despite the fact that they represented 36% of the proleptic structures whatever the
164 genotype or the irrigation treatment (see Results section). Indeed, the aphid abundances were significantly lower on
165 the rosettes than on the shoots for all measurements dates (Kurskall-Wallis tests, $p < 0.001$ for all tests, undetailed
166 data). The aphid indexes, representative of the infestation severity throughout the infestation period, were
167 calculated as the sums of the actual aphid abundances estimated for each notation date at infested shoot and tree
168 scales. This synthetic variable was representative of the diversity of the infestation dynamics among the proleptic
169 structures (and among the trees) taking into account the infestation duration and the evolution of the aphid
170 population while present on the shoots. The median values (over the 10,000 random resamples) obtained at the tree
171 level or at the infested shoot level were then used for statistical analysis. Such a resampling procedure is intended
172 to obtain continuous variables (e.g. aphid abundance and aphid index), rather than a categorical one (e.g. reported
173 classes of infestation) to describe a continuous value: the aphid abundance. Using a continuous variable simplified
174 moreover the scale change, allowing the calculation of the tree aphid abundance from the data collected on its
175 constitutive proleptic structures.

176 To test the effects of water treatment W, final vegetative growth (FSVG or FTVG) and genotype V on
177 aphid abundance, a hierarchical analysis of multiple regression models was performed, with aphid abundance as
178 the dependent variable, plant or shoot growth (*i.e.* FSVG or FTVG) as continuous predictor variables and W and V
179 as categorical predictor variables. All possible models were ranked according to AICc (second-order Akaike

180 Information Criterion). One model was assumed to be better than another if $\Delta AICc > 2$ (Bolker, 2008),
181 consequently the models with a value of $\Delta AICc$ of more than 2 from the best models were ignored. After being run
182 on the median values of aphid indexes, the model selection procedure was also run on the 10,000 datasets issued
183 from the transformation of aphid abundance classes into aphid index in order to estimate possible model selection
184 sensitivity to drawings.

185 To better understand why the effects of irrigation on aphids varied with the study scale (see Results
186 section), we also analysed possible correlations between apical shoot and total tree growth. Therefore, a
187 hierarchical analysis of multiple regression models was performed with final tree vegetative growth (FTVG) as the
188 dependent variable and final shoot vegetative growth (FSVG) as continuous predictor variable and water treatment
189 W and genotype V as categorical predictor variables. We then performed the same kind of analyses with FSVG or
190 FTVG as the response variable, and the number of proleptic shoots as the continuous predictor variable and W and
191 V as categorical predictor variables. To test if the percentage of tree leaves inserted on shoots was dependant on
192 FTVG, we performed a hierarchical analysis of multiple regression models, with FTVG as continuous variable and
193 W and V as categorical variables.

194 All data analyses were carried out using R software version 3.3.1 (R Core Team, 2016) and additional
195 packages 'nparcomp' and 'glmulti'.

196 3—RESULTS

197 3.1. Plant water status and leaf functioning

198 Trees subject to water restriction, *i.e.* the W- trees, had a higher leaf water potential in absolute values than W+
199 trees (Fig. 1), the differences being significant for DAG (Drought Avoidance Genotype), at 14 (Fig. 1c) and 30
200 DAI (Days After Infestation, Fig. 1d) and for GCG (Growth Cessation Genotype) at 30 and 58 DAI (Fig. 1h).
201 Among the same watering treatment there was no significant difference between genotype for leaf water potential,
202 except for 14 and 37 DAI (Fig. 1e) between W+ trees, where GCG W+ had a higher leaf water potential in absolute
203 values than DAG W+.

204 Over the six monitoring dates of leaf stomatal conductance, leaf photosynthetic rate, leaf transpiration rate
205 and leaf temperature, the differences were significant between the treatments for only one date. On 30 DAI (Fig.
206 2), leaf stomatal conductance (Fig. 2a) and leaf transpiration rate (Fig. 2b) were reduced for the W- trees compared
207 to the W+ trees for both genotypes. For DAG, leaf photosynthetic rate (Fig. 2c) was significantly higher for W+
208 trees than W- trees. For GCG, leaf temperature (Fig. 2d) was significantly lower for W+ than W-.

209

210 3.2. Vegetative growth

211 The temporal dynamics of vegetative growth followed similar patterns at the tree and the infested shoot scales with
212 a slowdown of growth after 30 DAI (Fig. 3). The ranking of the different treatments were identical between the two
213 scales with, in decreasing order: the higher vegetative growth for GCG W+, followed by GCG W-, then DAG W+
214 and the smaller vegetative growth for DAG W-. Water restriction decreased vegetative growth for both genotypes.

215
216 Final tree vegetative growth FTVG, estimated by the increase of the number of fully expanded leaves
217 during the infestation period was positively correlated to final shoot vegetative growth FSVG, and the relationship
218 was influenced by both water treatment and tree genotype (Fig 4a). Additionally, FTVG was positively correlated
219 to the number of proleptic shoots per tree (Fig 4b), whereas FSVG was independent of this number (Fig 4c), which
220 was probably a consequence of tree acrotony, as the infested shoot was in the apical position. At shoot and tree
221 scales the ranking of the treatments were consistent. GCG was more vigorous than DAG.

222 Although the number of proleptic structures per tree was significantly higher for GCG W- than DAG W-,
223 the number of rosettes per tree and the number of shoots per tree did not differ significantly between treatments
224 (data not shown). The percentage of tree leaves inserted on shoots was positively correlated to FTVG since the
225 proportion of tree leaves on shoots increased during the season. Indeed, axes expanded leaves throughout the
226 infestation period while rosettes stopped growing after expansion of their preformed leaves. The percentage of tree
227 leaves inserted on shoots vs rosettes was lower for the trees which underwent a water restriction after 24 DAI,
228 suggesting that W+ shoots grew more vigorously than W- shoots.

229

230 3.3. Aphid population dynamics

231

232 There was at first a period of slow increase of aphid abundance between 0 and 13 DAI, then the aphid population
233 peaked between 29 and 36 DAI and after that there was a quick decrease in aphid abundance at both study scales
234 (Fig. 5). The aphid population started to decrease when the maximal daily temperatures exceeded 42.5°C. The
235 ranking of the mean aphid abundances of the different treatments at the peak was different between the two scales.
236 However, given the size of the standard deviation these rankings were only indicative of trends. At the infested
237 shoot scale (Fig. 5a), GCG W+ experienced the highest infestation, followed by both genotypes under W- and the
238 lowest infestation was on DAG W+ whereas at the tree scale (Fig. 5b), GCG W+ still experienced the higher
239 infestation but it was followed by DAG W+ and then both genotypes under W- treatment.

240

241 3.4. Aphid abundance as related to water supply, genotype and vegetative growth

242 3.4.1. At shoot scale

243 The best model to explain shoot aphid index included the final shoot vegetative growth FSVG, water treatment W,
244 tree genotype V and the interaction term ($W \times V$) (Fig. 6). When considering the 10,000 different estimated aphid
245 index curves, the same model gave the best results in 82.8% of the cases. At equivalent shoot growth, DAG
246 sustained a more abundant aphid population than GCG. The two genotypes responded oppositely to the water
247 treatment. Thus a water restriction enhanced the positive effect of shoot growth on the aphid index for DAG, but
248 depleted it for GCG.

249 3.4.2. At tree scale

250 The best model to explain the tree aphid index included final tree vegetative growth FTVG, water treatment W and
251 the interaction term FTVG \times W (Fig. 7). This model was selected as the best for 68.5% of the 10,000 datasets
252 resulting from the transformation of aphid infestation classes into aphid numbers. The second best model took into
253 account FTVG, V, W and the interaction term FTVG \times W had a Δ AICc of 0.28 and it was selected as the best in
254 31.4% of the 10,000 runs. Then, an effect of the tree genotype (V) on the tree aphid index cannot be ruled out. At
255 the tree scale, aphid abundance was positively correlated to vegetative growth. The slope of the regression line was
256 smaller for W- trees compared to W+ trees.

257 4=DISCUSSION

258 Our results showed a positive relationship between vegetative growth and aphid abundance whatever the study
259 scale, the genotype or the water supply. At the shoot scale, tree genotype played a role on aphid abundance in
260 interaction with water supply. Thus, the effects of water restriction on the two genotypes were opposite: it
261 increased aphid abundance on DAG and reduced it on GCG. At the tree scale, aphid abundance was penalized by
262 water restriction and the effect of genotype on aphid abundance was less clear.

263 The positive relationship between *D. plantaginea* abundance and both shoot and tree vegetative growths is
264 consistent with the Plant Vigour Hypothesis that predicts a better performance of phytophagous insects on vigorous
265 plants or organs (Price 1991). Our result, at the shoot scale, is consistent with another study conducted on apple
266 tree, evidencing that *Aphis pomi* abundance on a current-year shoot was well correlated to the shoot growth but
267 was independent of trunk diameter and median shoot length that are indicators of tree vigour (Stoekli et al. 2008).
268 Final tree vegetative growth (FTVG) was positively correlated to the percentage of tree leaves inserted on shoot
269 and also to the number of shoots. However, there was no relation between final apical shoot vegetative growth (or

270 FSVG) and the number of shoots per tree, suggesting that, due to their apical position and apple tree acrotony, the
271 infested shoots had priority for vegetative growth with respect to the other shoots. As aphids have been shown to be
272 more performant on long shoots (Grechi et al., 2008; Simon et al., 2011), the most suitable one for aphid
273 development within the tree crown, was likely the apical shoot which grew at the most rapid rate. Apical shoot
274 growth, like tree growth, varied moreover with genotype. Thus, since grafting, GCG was more vigorous than DAG,
275 which could be related either to difference in genotypic vigour or in grafting compatibility. After grafting and
276 throughout 2014, vegetative growth was more important for GCG than for DAG (data not shown). The dry mass
277 suppressed by winter pruning prior to the experiment was consequently significantly higher for GCG (Kruskal-
278 Wallis test, $p < 0.001$, i.e. 41.3 ± 16.5 g (mean \pm SD) for GCG vs 25.2 ± 9.5 g for DAG). It means that in 2014,
279 GCG had not only more functional leaves but, according to the functional equilibrium theory (Brouwer, 1983), also
280 more roots than DAG, and therefore probably higher amounts of C and N stored therein (higher reservoir size and
281 higher C and N intake in 2014). Higher vegetative growth of GCG during the first growth flush of 2015, which
282 correspond to the period of aphid population development, could thus result from higher spring remobilisation
283 (Jordan et al., 2009) or higher pruning intensity (Bevacqua et al., 2012). The infestation dynamic at tree level
284 depended not only on the population increase on a single shoot, but also on aphid dispersion within the crown,
285 which was affected by other aspects of plant development and architecture than solely individual shoot growth.
286 Indeed, dispersion could first depend on tree architecture complexity. On apple-*D. plantaginea* system strong and
287 complex branching decreased infestation, as pedestrian aphids attempting to colonize other plant shoots are less
288 likely to find suitable feeding sites (Simon et al., 2011). However as the architecture of our small trees was quite
289 homogeneous in term of branching complexity, this was unlikely to have played a major role in our study.
290 Dispersion within the tree might also depend on the number of individuals able to feed on the apical shoot, i.e. on
291 the aphid density in relation with phloem sap quality and accessibility, but also on the attractiveness of the other
292 tree shoots compared to apical favoured one. Indeed, aphids preferentially settled on plant stratum with the highest
293 nitrogen availability (Chau et al., 2005) but nitrogen allocation and leaf transpiration (phloem sap flow) vary
294 greatly within a tree as a function of tree height (Livingston et al., 1998), leaf age (Constable and Rawson, 1980),
295 genotype in interaction with leaf area (Tausend et al., 2000), shoot orientation (Le Roux et al., 2012) or cultural
296 practices (Jordan et al., 2011). Therefore, if the phloem quality is poor on a given shoot, aphids are more likely to
297 start roaming about to test other available feeding sites (Nowak and Komor, 2010), or might even return to the
298 apical shoot. The within tree variability varies moreover with stress intensity (Jordan et al., 2012; Ballester et al.,

299 2013), which might partly explain why deficit irrigation could be oppositely related to aphid abundance at shoot
300 and tree scale.

301 The effect of water restriction on aphid abundance was partially mediated by vegetative growth, which was
302 reduced by deficit irrigation at shoot and tree scales for both genotypes. However a water restriction also modified
303 the relationship between aphid and vegetative growth, which indicated additional physiological consequences of
304 water restriction on tree suitability for aphid. However, we did not find clear difference among treatments in
305 midday leaf water potential which is correlated to predawn leaf water potential considered as the most accurate
306 indicator of plant water stress (Paço et al., 2013). We therefore hypothesize that water restriction modified several
307 variables related to plant water status, which possibly impact aphid performance. Water restriction could increase
308 sap viscosity (Sevanto, 2014), due to higher solute concentration, which may impair efficient sap uptake by the
309 aphid. Aphids are also affected by phloem carbohydrate concentrations that determine excretion costs (Zehnder and
310 Hunter, 2009), by turgor pressure (Mody et al., 2009; Verdugo et al., 2015) and cell wall thickness (Goggin, 2007;
311 Foyer et al., 2016) that influence phloem accessibility. If the host plant condition is worsened by water restriction
312 (or any other treatment), the aphids modify their feeding behaviour, spending less time in passive ingestion of
313 phloem sap (Lu et al., 2016). They are therefore smaller in size and exhibit longer pre-adult life stage and reduced
314 fecundity (Lu et al., 2016). Intermittent stress seems to impose harsher conditions than a continuous and lasting
315 drought, thus reducing the aphid performances, among which the fecundity, to a greater extent as a continuous
316 drought (Banfield-Zanin and Leather, 2015, on the Stika spruce – green spruce aphid system). Under pulsed stress
317 conditions, tree mortality was also higher when previously infested by aphids (Banfield-Zanin and Leather, 2014),
318 which is consistent with the fact that aphids have been shown to affect their host plant water potential, in ways
319 similar to drought (Cabrera et al., 1995). Notice that in our study the W⁺ trees were also the most infested, so the
320 differences in the severity of aphid infestation between W⁺ and W⁻ might have reduced the difference in leaf water
321 potential observed between the two water treatments.

322 Water restriction seemed to impair aphid abundance first at tree scale. This negative effect can also result from
323 an increased leaf temperature consecutive to a decrease in leaf transpiration after stomata closure as evidenced by
324 Ballester et al. (2013). On 30 DAI, for instance, leaf temperature was significantly higher for GCG W⁻ compared to
325 GCG W⁺, and the difference was 3.7°C. These differences could partially explain the more rapid decrease of aphid
326 abundance on the water restricted trees, all the more because the temperatures peaked above 42.5°C and up to
327 43.3°C, which is below the lethal temperature for most aphid species (Satar et al. 2008, Hullé et al. 2010).

328 At the shoot scale, the effect of water restriction on the relation between vegetative growth and aphid
329 abundance was negative for GCG but positive for DAG. A modulation of genotypic resistance to aphids by water
330 restriction has also been observed on other tree-aphid systems. On both poplar-*Phloeomyzus passerinii* (Dardeau et
331 al., 2015) and peach tree-*Myzus persicae* (Verdugo et al., 2015) systems, water stress had no effect on the aphid
332 population on aphid susceptible cultivar, but it increased aphid performance on aphid resistant cultivar. In the
333 present study, deficit irrigation favoured aphid development on the DAG W- apical shoots, despite it also reduced
334 their vegetative growth. We hypothesized therefore that the irrigation treatment modified also other determinants of
335 plant suitability for aphids, among which shoot N concentration, thereby counterbalancing the expected negative
336 effect of low shoot growth. Indeed, DAG W- had the lowest number of proleptic structures, the difference being
337 significant between DAG W- and GCG W-, so the nitrogen resource (mainly amino acids) might have been less
338 diluted in those trees. Decreased C:N ratio or increased amino acids contents have been shown to increase aphid
339 performance (Nowak and Komor, 2010; Ryalls et al., 2014). This hypothesis relies furthermore on the assumption
340 that the tree aphids gathered on the apical shoot because of its higher nutritional quality due to its position, as
341 shown on the Chrysanthemum-Melon aphid system [*Dendranthema grandiflora* - *Aphis gossypii*] in which within
342 plant aphid distribution is driven by nutrient availability (Chau et al., 2005).

343 The absence of the expected marked differences in physiological measures of the trees of the two genotypes
344 impairs the identification of mechanisms acting differently on aphid performance between the two genotypes.
345 According to Lauri et al. (2016), we expected DAG to close its stomata quicker than GCG. Our measured values of
346 stomatal conductance of well-watered trees are halved compared to the values obtained by Lauri et al. (2016),
347 which may result from the use of a different rootstock, which influenced the response of the plant to water
348 restriction (Liu et al., 2012). Photosynthetic rate was significantly affected by watering treatment for only one date
349 and furthermore only for DAG. In addition, we expected GCG vegetative growth to be more affected by water
350 restriction than DAG, but we obtained the reverse.

351 The different effects of water restriction on the aphid performance on DAG at tree and shoot levels underlined
352 the importance of the scale choice. Most studies on tree-aphid interaction focused on a few number of sub-sample
353 shoots (Stoekli et al., 2008; Rousselin et al., 2016), or even at a smaller scale, such as the individual leaf (Mace
354 and Mills, 2015). In the present study we demonstrated that the responses to abiotic constraints might be different
355 at apical shoot and tree scales. As far as orchard aphid management is concerned, the patterns at the tree scale seem
356 more representative of the overall aphid induced damages. Thus the reduction of tree vigour can be a lever to
357 control *D. plantaginea* populations. In addition, trees submitted to water restriction were less favourable to aphids

358 than well-watered trees, so it may be possible to address at the same time the water scarcity and the chemical use
359 reduction issues, by reducing water supply in apple orchards. Water restriction has to be applied preferably in
360 spring, i.e. when aphid populations were susceptible to develop on the trees. But, host plant suitability to aphids
361 could probably also be affected by regulated deficit irrigation techniques, currently applied for longer periods but
362 mainly in summer and autumn, techniques which were, to our knowledge, evaluated only for fruit production
363 (Girona et al., 2010). Indeed, a water restriction modifies determinants of plant suitability others than growth, and
364 those effects could last several months, especially when shoot composition is concerned.

365

366 **Acknowledgements:** This work was funded by the ARIMNET (ANR-12-AGR-0001): “APMed” project (Apple
367 and Peach in Mediterranean orchards). The PACA region (Provence-Alpes-Côtes d’Azur) and INRA (Institut
368 National de Recherche Agronomique) founded the PhD grant of A. Rousselin. The GIS-Fruit (Groupement
369 d’Intérêt Scientifique- Fruits) funded the internship grant of A. Sghaier. We would like to thank P.E. Lauri for
370 providing the plant material used in this study and for advice. We would like to thank V. Serra, J.P. Lacroze and F.
371 Bouvery for their technical help. The authors are grateful to A. Sghaier, N. Carles and S. Masson for their
372 contribution to the field measurements.

373

374 References

375

376 Agele SO, Ofuya TI, James PO (2006) Effects of watering regimes on aphid infestation and performance of
377 selected varieties of cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L. Walp) in a humid rainforest zone of Nigeria. Crop Prot 25: 73-
378 78. doi:10.1016/j.cropro.2005.03.005

379 Archer TL, Bynum ED, Onken AB, Wendt C.W (1995) Influence of water and nitrogen-fertilizer on biology of the
380 Russian wheat aphid (Homoptera, Aphididae) on wheat. Crop Prot 14: 165-169. doi:10.1016/0261-2194(95)92872-
381 K

382 Ballester C, Jimenez-Bello MA, Castel JR, Intrigliolo DS (2013) Usefulness of thermography for water stress
383 detection in citrus and persimmon trees. Agric For Meteorol 168:120–129. doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2012.08.005

384 Banfield-Zanin JA, Leather SR (2014) Frequency and intensity of drought stress alters the population size and
385 dynamics of *Elatobium abietinum* on Sitka spruce. Ann Appl Biol 165: 260-269. doi: 10.1111/aab.12133

386 Banfield-Zanin JA, Leather SR (2015) Drought intensity and frequency have contrasting effects on development
387 time and survival of the green spruce aphid. Agric Forest Entomol 17: 309-316. doi: 10.1111/afe.12109

Comment citer ce document :

Rousselin, A., Bevacqua, D., Vercambre, G., Sauge, M.-H., Lescourret, F., Jordan, M. O. (2018).
Rosy apple abundance is shaped by vegetative growth and water status. Crop Protection, 105,
1-9. , DOI : 10.1016/j.cropro.2017.11.001

388 Bethke JA, Redak RA, Schuch UK (1998) Melon aphid performance on chrysanthemum as mediated by cultivar,
389 and differential levels of fertilization and irrigation. *Entomol Exp Appl* 88:41-47. doi:10.1046/j.1570-
390 7458.1998.00344.x

391 Bevacqua D, Genard M, Lescourret F (2012) A simple model to predict the probability of a peach (*Prunus*
392 *persicae*) tree bud to develop as a long or short shoot as a consequence of winter pruning intensity and previous
393 year growth. *PLoS ONE* 7: e52185. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0052185

394 Bolker BM (2008) *Ecological Models and Data in R*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

395 Brouwer R (1983) Functional equilibrium: sense or nonsense? *Neth J Agr Sci* 31: 335-348

396 Burnham, K P, Anderson D R (2004). Multimodel inference: Understanding AIC and BIC in model selection. *Socio*
397 *Meth Res* 33: 261–304. doi:10.1177/0049124104268644

398 Cabrera HM, Argandona VH, Zuniga GE, Corcuera LJ (1995) Effect of infestation by aphids on the water status of
399 barley and insect development. *Phytochemistry* 40: 1083-1088. doi:10.1016/0031-9422(95)00325-2

400 Chau A, Heinz KM, Davies FT (2005) Influences of fertilization on *Aphis gossypii* and insecticide usage. *J Appl*
401 *Entomol* 129: 89-97. doi:10.1111/j.1439-0418.2005.00943.89-97

402 Constable GA, Rawson HM (1980) Effect of leaf position, expansion and age on photosynthesis, transpiration and
403 water use efficiency of cotton. *Aust J Plant Physiol* 7: 89–100

404 Czerniewicz P, Leszczynski B, Chrzanowski G, Sempruch C, Sytykiewicz H (2011) Effects of host plant phenolics
405 on spring migration of bird cherry-oat aphid (*Rhopalosiphum padi* L.). *Allelopathy Journal* 27: 309-316

406 Dardeau F, Berthier A, Feinard-Duranceau M, Brignolas F, Laurans F, Lieutier F, Sallé A (2015) Tree genotype
407 modulates the effects of water deficit on a plant-manipulating aphid. *Forest Ecol Manag* 353: 118-125.
408 doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2015.05.037

409 Delorme R, Ayala V, Touton P, Augé D, Vergnet C (1999) Le puceron cendré du pommier (*Dysaphis plantaginea*):
410 Etude des mécanismes de résistance à divers insecticides. In: ANPP, P.F. (Ed.), Cinquième conférence
411 internationale sur les ravageurs, Montpellier, France, pp. 89-97.

412 FAO (2016) FAOstat Crops production data 2013.

413 Forrest JMS, Dixon AFG (1975) The induction of leaf-roll galls by the apple aphids *Dysaphis devectora* and *D.*
414 *plantaginea*. *Ann Appl Biol* 81: 281-288. doi:10.1111/j.1744-7348.1975.tb01643.x

415 Foyer CH, Rasool B, Davey JW, Hancock RD (2016) Cross-tolerance to biotic and abiotic stresses in plants: a
416 focus on resistance to aphid infestation. *J Exp Bot* 67: 2025–2037. doi:10.1093/jxb/erw079

Comment citer ce document :

Rousselin, A., Bevacqua, D., Vercambre, G., Sauge, M.-H., Lescourret, F., Jordan, M. O. (2018).
Rosy apple abundance is shaped by vegetative growth and water status. *Crop Protection*, 105,
1-9. , DOI : 10.1016/j.cropro.2017.11.001

- 417 Girona J, Behboudian MH, Mata M, Del Campo J, Marsal J (2010) Exploring six reduced irrigation options under
418 water shortage for 'Golden Smoothie' apple: responses of yield components over three years. *Agric. Water*
419 *Manage.* 98:370–375. doi:10.1016/j.agwat.2010.09.011
- 420 Goggin FL (2007) Plant–aphid interactions: molecular and ecological perspectives. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* 10: 399-
421 408. doi:10.1016/j.pbi.2007.06.004
- 422 Grechi I, Sauge MH, Sauphanor B, Hilgert N, Senoussi R, Lescourret F (2008) How does winter pruning affect
423 peach tree-*Myzus persicae* interactions? *Entomol Exp Appl* 128: 369-379. doi:10.1111/j.1570-7458.2008.00720.x
- 424 Hullé M, Coeur d'Acier A, Bankhead-Dronnet S, Harrington R (2010) Aphids in the face of global changes. *C R*
425 *Biol* 333: 497-503. doi:10.1016/j.crvi.2010.03.005
- 426 Jordan MO, Wendler R, Millard P (2009) The effect of autumn N supply on the architecture of young peach
427 (*Prunus persica* L.) trees. *Trees-Struct Funct* 23: 235-245. doi:10.1007/s00468-008-0271-2
- 428 Jordan MO, Vercambre G, Le Bot J, Adamowicz S, Gomez L, Pages L (2011) Autumnal nutrition affects C and N
429 storage and architecture of young peach trees. *Trees-Struct Funct* 25: 333-344. doi: 10.1007/s00468-010-0509-7
- 430 Jordan MO, Wendler R, Millard P (2012) Autumnal N storage determines the spring growth, N uptake and N
431 internal cycling of young peach trees. *Trees-Struct Funct* 26: 393-404. doi:10.1007/s00468-010-0509-7
- 432 King C, Jacob HS, Berlandier F (2006) The influence of water deficiency on the relationship between canola
433 (*Brassica napus* L.), and two aphid species (Hemiptera: Aphididae), *Lipaphis erysimi* (Kaltenbach) and
434 *Brevicoryne brassicae* (L.). *Aust J Agr Res* 57: 439-445. doi:10.1071/ar05137
- 435 Lauri PÉ, Barigah TS, Lopez G, Martinez S, Losciale P, Zibordi M, Manfrini L, Corelli-Grappadelli L, Costes E,
436 Regnard JL (2016) Genetic variability and phenotypic plasticity of apple morphological responses to soil water
437 restriction in relation with leaf functions and stem xylem conductivity. *Trees-Struct Funct* 30:1893-1908.
438 doi:10.1007/s00468-016-1408-3
- 439 Le Roux X, Bariac T, Sinoquet H, Genty B, Piel C, Mariotti A, Girardin C, Richard P (2001) Spatial distribution of
440 leaf water-use efficiency and carbon isotope discrimination within an isolated tree crown. *Plant. Cell Environ.* 24:
441 1021–1032.
- 442 Liu BH, Cheng L, Ma FW, Liang D, Zou YJ (2012) Influence of rootstock on drought response in young 'Gala
443 Gala' apple (*Malus domestica* Borkh.) trees. *J Sci Food Agric* 92: 2421-2427. doi:10.1002/jsfa.5647
- 444 Livingston NJ, Whitehead D, Kelliher FM, Wang Y-P, Grace JC, Walcroft AS, Byers JN, McSeveny TM, Millard P
445 (1998) Nitrogen allocation and carbon isotope fractionation in relation to intercepted radiation and position in a
446 young *Pinus radiata* D. Don tree. *Plant Cell Environ* 21:795–803. doi:10.1046/j.1365-3040.1998.00314.x

Comment citer ce document :

Rousselin, A., Bevacqua, D., Vercambre, G., Sauge, M.-H., Lescourret, F., Jordan, M. O. (2018).
Rosy apple abundance is shaped by vegetative growth and water status. *Crop Protection*, 105,
1-9. , DOI : 10.1016/j.cropro.2017.11.001

- 447 Lu H, Yang P, Xu Y, Luo L, Zhu J, Cui N, Kang L, Cui F (2016). Performances of survival, feeding behavior, and
448 gene expression in aphids reveal their different fitness to host alteration. *Sci Rep* 6:19344. doi:10.1038/srep19344
- 449 Mace KC, Mills NJ (2015) Response of walnut aphid populations to increasing foliar nitrogen content. *Agr Forest*
450 *Entomol* 17: 277-284. doi:10.1111/afe.12103
- 451 Marchetti E, Civolani S, Leis M, Chicca M, Tjallingii WF, Pasqualini,E, Baronio P (2009) Tissue location of
452 resistance in apple to the rosy apple aphid established by electrical penetration graphes. *Bull insectology* 62: 203-
453 208
- 454 Mewis I, Khan MAM, Glawischnig E, Schreiner M, Ulrichs C (2012) Water stress and aphid feeding differentially
455 influence metabolite composition in *Arabidopsis thaliana* (L.). *PLoS ONE* 7: e48661.
456 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0048661
- 457 Mody K, Eichenberger D, Dorn S (2009) Stress magnitude matters: different intensities of pulsed water stress
458 produce non-monotonic resistance responses of host plants to insect herbivores. *Ecol Entomol* 34: 133-143.
459 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2311.2008.01053.x
- 460 Neilsen GH, Neilsen D (2003) Nutritional requirements of apple. In: Ferree, D.C., Warrington, I.J. (Eds.), *Apples:*
461 *Botany, production and uses*. CABI Publ, Wallingford, UK, pp. 267-302.
- 462 Nesme T, Plénet D, Hucbourg B, Fandos G, Lauri PE (2005). A set of vegetative morphological variables to
463 objectively estimate apple (*Malus domestica*) tree orchard vigour. *Sci Hortic* 106: 76-90. doi:
464 10.1016/j.scienta.2005.02.017
- 465 Nowak H, Komor E (2010) How aphids decide what is good for them: experiments to test aphid feeding behaviour
466 on *Tanacetum vulgare* (L.) using different nitrogen regimes. *Oecologia* 163: 973-984. doi:10.1007/s00442-010-
467 1652-y
- 468 Paço TA, Ferreira MI, Pacheco CA (2013) Scheduling peach orchard irrigation in water stress conditions: use of
469 relative transpiration and predawn leaf water potential. *Fruits* 68: 147-158. doi:10.1051/fruits/2013061
- 470 Pangga IB, Hanan J, Chakraborty S (2012) Climate change impacts on plant canopy architecture: implications for
471 pest and pathogen management. *Eur J Plant Pathol* 135: 595-610. doi:10.1007/s10658-012-0118-y
- 472 Price PW (1991) The plant vigor hypothesis and herbivore attack. *Oikos* 62: 244-251. doi:10.2307/3545270
- 473 R Core Team (2016) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical
474 Computing, Vienna, Austria.

- 475 Rousselin A, Sauge MH, Jordan MO, Vercambre G, Lescourret F, Bevacqua D (2016) Nitrogen and water supplies
476 affect peach tree-green peach aphid interactions: the key role played by vegetative growth. *Agric Forest Entomol*
477 18: 367-375. doi:10.1111/afe.12168
- 478 Ryalls JM, Moore BD, Riegler M, Gherlenda AN, Johnson SN (2014) Amino acid-mediated impacts of elevated
479 carbon dioxide and simulated root herbivory on aphids are neutralized by increased air temperatures. *J Exp Bot* 66:
480 613-623. doi:10.1093/jxb/eru439
- 481 Ryan GD, Shukla K, Rasmussen S, Shelp BJ, Newman JA (2014) Phloem phytochemistry and aphid responses to
482 elevated CO₂, nitrogen fertilization and endophyte infection. *Agric Forest Entomol* 16: 273-283.
483 doi:10.1111/afe.12055
- 484 Satar S, Kersting U, Uygun N (2008) Effect of temperature on population parameters of *Aphis gossypii* Glover and
485 *Myzus persicae* (Sulzer) (Homoptera: Aphididae) on pepper. *J. Plant Dis Protect* 115: 69-74. doi:
486 10.1007/BF03356241
- 487 Sauge MH, Kervella J, Pascal T (1998) Settling behaviour and reproductive potential of the green peach aphid
488 *Myzus persicae* on peach varieties and a related wild *Prunus*. *Entomol Exp Appl* 89: 233-242.
- 489 Sevanto S (2014) Phloem transport and drought. *J Exp Bot* 65: 1751-1759. doi:10.1093/jxb/ert467
- 490 Simon S, Morel K, Durand E, Brevalle G, Girard T, Lauri PÉ (2011) Aphids at crossroads: when branch
491 architecture alters aphid infestation patterns in the apple tree. *Trees* 26: 273-282. doi:10.1007/s00468-011-0629-8
- 492 Simpson KLS, Jackson GE, Grace J (2012) The response of aphids to plant water stress - the case of *Myzus*
493 *persicae* and *Brassica oleracea* var. *capitata*. *Entomol Exp Appl* 142: 191-202. doi:10.1111/j.1570-
494 7458.2011.01216.x
- 495 Stoeckli S, Mody K, Dorn S (2008) *Aphis pomi* (Hemiptera: Aphididae) population development, shoot
496 characteristics, and antibiosis resistance in different apple genotypes. *J Econ Entomol* 101: 1341-1348.
497 doi:10.1603/0022-0493(2008)101[1341:APHAPD]2.0.CO;2
- 498 Tariq M, Wright DJ, Rossiter JT, Staley JT (2012) Aphids in a changing world: testing the plant stress, plant vigour
499 and pulsed stress hypotheses. *Agric Forest Entomol* 14: 177-185. doi:10.1111/j.1461-9563.2011.00557.x
- 500 Tausend PC, Meinzer FC, Goldstein G (2000) Control of transpiration in three coffee cultivars: the role of
501 hydraulic and crown architecture. *Trees-Struct Funct*, 14: 181-190
- 502 Verdugo JA, Sauge MH, Lacroze JP, Francis F, Ramirez CC (2015) Drought-stress and plant resistance affect
503 herbivore performance and proteome: the case of the green peach aphid *Myzus persicae* (Hemiptera: Aphididae).
504 *Physiol Entomol* 40: 265-276. doi:10.1111/phen.12111

505 Wheat D (1980) Syllaptic branching in *Myrsine floridana* (Myrsinaceae). Am J Bot 67(4), 490-499.
506 doi:10.2307/2442288
507 Zehnder CB, Hunter MD (2009) More is not necessarily better: the impact of limiting and excessive nutrients on
508 herbivore population growth rates. Ecol Entomol 34: 535-543. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2311.2009.01101.x
509

510 **Caption of figures**

511 **Fig. 1** Absolute values of midday leaf water potential of on apple trees (sample size indicated within the figure for
512 each date), subject to four treatments, combining two levels of water supply (W+ and W-) and two tree genotypes
513 (DAG, drought avoidance genotype and GCG, growth cessation genotype).

514 Each panel corresponds to a date expressed in days after infestation (DAI), and to a total number of n plants.
515 Different letters indicate significant differences between treatment combinations (Kruskal-Wallis test and Tukey
516 multiple comparisons, performed at each date). No significant differences were observed on DAI = 1, 9 and 49.

517 **Fig. 2** Characterisation of leaf functioning of 17 apple trees on 30 DAI (days after infestation) according to the
518 different treatments, combining two tree genotypes: GCG (Growth cessation genotype) and DAG (Drought
519 Avoidance Genotype) and two levels of water supply: W+ and W-. (a) Leaf stomatal conductance, (b) transpiration
520 rate, (c) photosynthetic rate, (d) temperature. Different letters indicate significant differences between treatment
521 combinations (Kruskal-Wallis test and Tukey multiple comparisons).

522 **Fig. 3** Vegetative growth dynamics at both shoot (a) and tree (b) scales as an increase of leaves number from 2 to
523 64 days after infestation (DAI). Each point represents the mean value for a treatment combination: water supply
524 (W+ and W-) and tree genotype (DAG: Drought Avoidance Genotype and GCG: Growth Cessation Genotype).
525 Bars stand for standard deviation.

526 **Fig. 4** Relationship between the number of proleptic shoots per tree and final vegetative growth variables in
527 increase in number of leaves at tree (FTVG) and shoot (FSVG) scales. (a) FTVG as a function of FSVG, the
528 regression lines result from the selected best model (based on AICc, $R^2_{adj} = 0.74$) including FSVG, W (water
529 treatment), V (tree genotype) and the interaction FSVG \times V. (b) FTVG as a function of the number of proleptic
530 shoots per tree: the regression lines result from the selected best model ($R^2_{adj} = 0.68$) including the number of
531 proleptic shoots, W, V and the interaction the number of proleptic shoots and genotype. (c) FSVG as a function of
532 the number of proleptic shoots: the regression lines result from the selected best model ($R^2_{adj} = 0.34$) including W
533 and V. Notice that FTVG and FSVG have been log transformed to fulfil the conditions required for statistical
534 analysis

535 **Fig. 5** Aphid abundance temporal dynamics (mean \pm standard deviation) for each treatment combination at (a) the
536 infested shoot scale and (b) the tree scale for the different dates (in days after infestation: DAI).


537 **Fig. 6** Relationship between final shoot vegetative growth (FSVG) and shoot aphid index. Each point represents
538 the value of the apical shoot of a tree. The regression lines result from the selected best model (based on AICc,
539 $R^2_{adj} = 0.52$) including FSVG, water treatment W, tree genotype V and the interaction term (W \times V) as explanatory
540 variables and factors. Notice that FSVG has been log transformed to fulfil the conditions required for statistical
541 analysis.

542 **Fig. 7** Relationship between tree aphid index and final tree vegetative growth (FTVG). Each point represents the
543 value of a single tree. The regression lines result from the selected best model (based on AICc, $R^2_{adj} = 0.42$)
544 including FTVG, water treatment W and the interaction term FTVG \times H, as explanatory variable and factor. Notice
545 that FTVG has been log transformed to fulfil the conditions required for statistical analysis.

546
547


548 **Figure 1:** 2 columns fitting image, original size (w/l) 16*21 cm in a separate eps file


549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577



578
579

580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598






600

601

602 **Figure 4:** 2 columns fitting image, original size (w/l) 17.5*21 cm in a separate eps file
603




604
605

606

607 **Figure 5:** 2 columns fitting image, original size (w/l) 14* 14.5 cm in a separate eps file

608


609



Comment citer ce document :

Rousselin, A., Bevacqua, D., Vercambre, G., Sauge, M.-H., Lescourret, F., Jordan, M. O. (2018). Rosy apple abundance is shaped by vegetative growth and water status. *Crop Protection*, 105, 1-9. , DOI : 10.1016/j.cropro.2017.11.001


610 **Figure 6:** 1 column fitting image, original size (w/l) 12* 12 cm in a separate eps file



611

612

613 **Figure 7:** 1 column fitting image, original size (w/l) 12* 12 cm in a separate eps file
614



615