# There is no carbon transfer between Scots pine and pine mistletoe but the assimilation capacity of the hemiparasite is constrained by host water use under dry conditions

Ao Wang<sup>1</sup>, Marco Lehmann<sup>1</sup>, Andreas Rigling<sup>1</sup>, Arthur Gessler<sup>1</sup>, Matthias Saurer<sup>1</sup>, Zhong Du<sup>1</sup>, and Mai-He Li<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Eidgenossische Forschungsanstalt für Wald Schnee und Landschaft

March 07, 2024

# Abstract

Pine mistletoe is a hemiparasitic shrub that can produce its own photosynthates. There is a lack of knowledge about the interaction of mistletoe and host under varying environmental condition that might influence carbon gain and allocation. In a  $^{13}$ C-pulse labeling experiment with mature *Pinus sylvestris* (pine) infected by mistletoes grown in naturally dry or irrigated conditions, (1) mistletoe clusters were shielded from  $^{13}$ CO <sub>2</sub> added , and (2) mistletoes or host needles were removed to manipulate the local assimilate and water availability. No  $^{13}$ C signal was found in shielded mistletoes, indicating no carbon transfer from the host to the mistletoe. When the pine needles were removed from girdled branches, no  $^{13}$ C signal was found in the host tissues, implying no carbon transfer from mistletoe to the host. However, mistletoes on needle-removed pine trees accumulated more labelled assimilates and had higher non-structural carbohydrate (NSC) concentrations only under naturally dry conditions but not in irrigated plots. Our results suggest that mistletoes show full carbon autonomy, as they neither receive carbon from nor provide carbon resource to the host trees. Moreover, the high assimilation capacity of mistletoes seems to be constrained by the host water use under dry conditions, suggesting that drought stress is not only negatively impacting trees but also mistletoes. Therefore, we conclude that the hemiparasites live on their own in terms of carbon gain which, however, depends on the water provided by the host tree.

# Introduction

The relationship between a parasite and its host is important ecologically and widely discussed in animal and plant pathology and physiology. Most research on parasite–host relationships in plants has concentrated on host responses to infections by parasites (Solomon, James, Alphonsus, & Nkiruka, 2015; Streicker, Fenton, & Pedersen, 2013). In contrast, the interactions between plant hosts and plant parasites, especially the effects of hosts on parasites in different habitats and varying site conditions, have rarely been studied. However, such parasite–host relationships, including a possible feedback system between the host and parasite, are of central interest because they can strongly affect the growth and survival of the higher plants serve as hosts.

Mistletoes are well-known hemiparasitic plants that maintain their own carbon assimilation by photosynthesis and can infect many tree species in various ecosystem types worldwide, making them an important and relevant species in parasitism research (Glatzel & Geils, 2009; Zuber, 2004). *Viscum album* ssp. *austriacum* (Santalaceae), pine mistletoe, is the most widely distributed species across the European continent (M Dobbertin & Rigling, 2006; Zuber, 2004). Pine mistletoe survival and development in forest ecosystems mainly rely on water and mineral resources obtained from the xylem sap of the host tree (M Dobbertin & Rigling, 2006; Rigling, Eilmann, Koechli, & Dobbertin, 2010). If water availability is high and nutrients are not limited, pine mistletoes and their hosts co-exist for years without major restrictions for the host tree (Solomon et al., 2015; Zuber, 2004). However, if water is limited during dry periods, the high-water consumption and low water-use efficiency of pine mistletoes may exacerbate drought stress in the host tree, with negative consequences on the host's physiology and growth performance (M Dobbertin & Rigling, 2006; Rigling et al., 2010; Zweifel, Bangerter, Rigling, & Sterck, 2012). As a consequence, pine mistletoe infection leads to a reduction of branching and of branch and needle growth (Rigling et al., 2010), resulting in an increased risk of mortality for the host tree (M Dobbertin & Rigling, 2006). This contribution of pine mistletoe to drought-induced forest decline processes has been demonstrated in several xeric forest ecosystems in Spain (Galiano, Martínez-Vilalta, & Lloret, 2011; Sanguesa-Barreda, Linares, & Camarero, 2012, 2013; M. Scalon, Haridasan, & Franco, 2013) and inner-Alpine regions in Switzerland and Italy (M Dobbertin & Rigling, 2006; Rigling et al., 2010; Vacchiano, Garbarino, Mondino, & Motta, 2012).

Along with the negative effects of mistletoes on the host water balance, pine mistletoes have also been found to affect the carbon balance of the host in a variety of ways (Glatzel & Geils, 2009; Q. Le, K. U. Tennakoon, F. Metali, L. B. Lim, & J. F. Bolin, 2016; M. C. Scalon & Wright, 2015). High water use of mistletoes and thus considerable water loss from the whole host–parasite system may induce closure of the stomata in host trees to save water (Rigling et al., 2010; Zweifel et al., 2012), resulting in lower photosynthesis rates of the trees (M Dobbertin & Rigling, 2006; Yan et al., 2016). Therefore, pine mistletoe can indirectly reduce the host's ability to acquire carbon resources, especially under drought-stress conditions (Sanguesa-Barreda et al., 2013; Yan et al., 2016).

Mistletoes perform photosynthesis at a rate similar to that of the host (Luttge et al., 1998; M. C. Scalon & Wright, 2017). In some studies, however, it has been reported that mistletoes are able to additionally acquire organic carbon from the host in the form of xylem-mobile organic acids and amino acids (Escher, Eiblmeier, Hetzger, & Rennenberg, 2004b; Těšitel, Plavcová, & Cameron, 2010). Richter, Popp, Mensen, Stewart, and Willert (1995) estimated that mistletoe leaves take up over 50% of its required heterotrophic carbon from its host. Nevertheless, according to Smith and Gledhill (1983), the haustorium of *V. album* grows only within the host's xylem and does not connect to the host's phloem. This means that there should be only acropetal carbon transport from the host, even under strong carbon limitation of the host (Glatzel & Geils, 2009; M. C. Scalon & Wright, 2015). Hence, it remains unclear whether mistletoes can directly absorb carbon resources from host tissues in considerable amounts, in addition to their own photosynthetic activities. By utilizing the stable <sup>13</sup>C isotope tracer technique, it is possible to determine the direction and quantity of carbon assimilate flow between mistletoe and host, and also to assess how this process depends on carbon and water availability.

Most studies on mistletoe-host relationships have been conducted by comparing trees infected by mistletoes with non-infected trees growing under the same conditions (M. Dobbertin et al., 2010; M Dobbertin & Rigling, 2006; Rigling et al., 2010; Yan et al., 2016). Whether the host's carbon resource availability, which is strongly associated with its growth conditions (e.g. soil water moisture), affects the mistletoe-host relationship has only been investigated in a few studies, and these studies were only focused on the response of hosts to mistletoe infection (Q. Le, K. Tennakoon, F. Metali, L. Lim, & J. Bolin, 2016; Sangüesa-Barreda et al., 2013; Zweifel et al., 2012). It is still unclear if the carbon dynamics in the mistletoe and in its host, as well as the potential exchange of assimilates between the two, changes in response to the local water availability of both the host tree and the mistletoe.

To address these unresolved questions, we conducted two separate experiments under the umbrella of a whole-tree <sup>13</sup>C-pulse labeling experiment with mature Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*) trees infected by pine mistletoe (*V. album*). Host trees whose crowns were exposed to <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> were growing either in naturally dry conditions (~600 mm precipitation per year) or in irrigated areas (+700 mm per year, applied during the growing season) for 15 years in the Swiss Pfynwald forest ecosystem experimental platform (Joseph et al., 2020; Schaub, Haeni, Hug, Gessler, & Rigling, 2016).

In a wrapping experiment (Exp. 1), we shielded mistletoe clusters with gas-tight plastic foil and darkened them with aluminum foil before the whole-tree labeling to prevent  $^{13}$ C assimilation by these clusters. We investigated the  $^{13}$ C values in both wrapped and non-wrapped mistletoes, as well as in their host twigs, to test the hypothesis (H1) that V. album takes up carbon resources from its host via the haustorium. Any signal in the wrapped mistletoes (shielding from  ${}^{13}\text{CO}_2$  and light exclusion) would originate from the host and we assumed the contribution of the host (if any) to be higher in irrigated vs drought-stressed trees due to increased assimilation rates in irrigated trees (Schonbeck et al., 2021)).

To change source–sink carbon and water relationships, we performed a tissue removal experiment (Exp. 2). We girdled pine branches infected with mistletoes of drought-stressed and irrigated host trees to restrict the phloem carbon translocation between the remaining tree and the girdled branch (Andersen, Nikolov, Nikolova, Matyssek, & Haberle, 2005; De Schepper & Steppe, 2013), while keeping a constant water and nutrient flow. Beyond the girdled pine branches to manipulate source-sink relationships and water relations locally on the branch level. Through Exp. 2, we aimed to test the hypothesis (H2a) that local changes in source–sink relationships by reducing assimilate ability (i.e. host needle removal), would decrease the mistletoes' carbon level due to lower amounts of carbon obtained from the host (conditional H1 is supported). An alternative hypothesis (H2b) is that needle removal increases the mistletoes' carbon level due to increased carbon assimilation by the hemiparasite itself as a result of decreased competition for water with the host. This effect would be more pronounced under the dry control conditions. Finally, we hypothesize (H3) that mistletoes do not provide any carbon to the host, even when the host is carbon limited due to needle removal.

## Material and Methods

# Study site

Our experiment was conducted in a naturally regenerated, mature Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*) forest in Pfynwald, Valais, Switzerland (46°19'27"N, 7deg34'40"E, 610 m a.s.l.). The forest site is located in a dry, inner-Alpine region of Switzerland with repeated occurrence of Scots pine mortality events within the last decades (M Dobbertin et al., 2005; Rigling et al., 2013). The mean annual precipitation is around 657 mm and the mean annual temperature is 9.7 degC (M. Dobbertin et al., 2010). A long-term irrigation experiment was started in 2003, where four plots of 1000 m<sup>2</sup> are irrigated with water from a nearby channel during the growing season (+700 mm year<sup>-1</sup>, resulting in 1300–1400 mm total precipitation per year = irrigated). Four additional plots of the same size are used as a naturally dry control (= non-irrigated). The dominant species in this forest (> 10 km<sup>2</sup>) is *P. sylvestris*, with *Quercus pubescens* occurring occasionally. The pine trees are over 100 years old, with a mean height of 11 m and a diameter at breast height (DBH) of 12 cm (Schaub et al., 2016). The soil type is a Rendzic Leptosol derived from limestone (Brunner et al., 2009). Many of the Scots pine trees are severely infected by pine mistletoe (*V. album*), with variations in the density and age of the mistletoes (mostly more than 10 years old) (M. Dobbertin et al., 2010). Since the irrigation experiment started, the environmental conditions (i.e. air temperature, air humidity, precipitation, soil temperature and soil water potential) have been continuously monitored.

# <sup>13</sup>C labeling at the whole-tree level

We conducted whole-tree-crown <sup>13</sup>C labeling experiments in summer 2017, i.e. in the 15<sup>th</sup> year of irrigation treatment (Joseph et al., 2020). Six mature pine trees that were severely infected (over) by mistletoes (three control & three irrigated) were selected from the labeling experiment for the present study. For each selected tree, the whole tree crown was enclosed within a large temperature controlled transparent chamber, and approx. 10 g of CO<sub>2</sub> with >99 atom% <sup>13</sup>C (Cambridge Isotopes, Tewksbury, MA, USA) was released into the chamber over a period of 3.5 h. Pulse labeling of the six trees was applied from 29 to 31 August 2017 (one pair of trees (control / irrigated) per day). Within this whole-tree labeling experiment, we conducted the following two experiments for the present study (Fig. 1):

Wrapping experiment (Exp. 1) : We selected six to eight mistletoe clusters from each of the six <sup>13</sup>Clabeled trees. Half of them (three to four) were randomly selected and wrapped with gas-tight plastic sheets to avoid direct uptake and assimilation of <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub>, and additionally darkened with aluminum foil to avoid exposure to sunlight before the chamber was closed (Fig. 1). The other three to four clusters selected per tree remained unwrapped and were allowed to take up<sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> during the 3.5 h of labeling. Tissues from the host (needle, twig xylem and phloem) and mistletoe clusters (leaf and shoot) were sampled at -1 d (the day before labeling) and at 4 h, 8 h, 24 h, 3 d, 7 d, 14 d, 30 d, 60 d, and 180 d after the start of labeling for analysis of the  $^{13}$ C abundance.

**Removal experiment (Exp. 2)** : In each of the  $six^{13}C$  labeled trees considered in this study, three well-foliaged branches (around 1 m in length) that were infected by mistletoes were selected for a girdling treatment to stop the basipetal transport of photo assimilates (Fig. 1). A bark strip (including the phloem) of 2 cm width was removed over the entire circumference of the branch, basipetal to the mistletoe, 1 d before the whole-tree labeling started. In one of the three girdled branches per tree, all mistletoe tissues (leaf and shoot) were completely removed before the <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub>-labeling (mistletoe removal), while in a second girdled branch, all host needles were removed (needle removal). The third one was kept intact and was used as a control (no removal). Plant material from the host (needle, twig xylem and phloem) and mistletoe (leaf and shoot) were sampled at -1 d (the day before labeling) and at 4 h, 8 h, 24 h, 3 d, 8 d, and 15 d after the start of labeling for <sup>13</sup>C abundance measurements. Measurement of non-structural carbohydrate (NSC) concentrations was conducted for the sampling at -1 d, label1 d, 3 d, 8 d, and 15 d.



Figure 1: Scheme of the wrapping experiment (Photo (a): Exp. 1) and the girdling and removal experiment (Photo (b): Exp. 2), with drawings showing the treatments applied to mistletoes and pine twigs on the right-hand site. In Exp. 1, mistletoe clusters were covered with gas-tight plastic sheets and aluminum foil to prevent direct<sup>13</sup>C label uptake during the whole-tree<sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> labeling experiment; non-wrapped controls were allowed to take up<sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub>. In Exp. 2, the bark including phloem was girdled for three branches per tree before the whole-tree labeling to create an isolated environment without top-down carbon transportation via the host's phloem, and each of these three branches was randomly assigned to mistletoe removal, pine needle removal, or intact control.

### Analysis of morphological traits in pine needles and mistletoe leaves

One day before the labeling, 10 mistletoe leaves and 20 pine needles of each selected tree were harvested separately for leaf morphological measurements. Leaf area was measured using a scanner and image analysis software (PIXSTAT v1.3, WSL, Birmensdorf, Switzerland). Fresh weight of all leaves was firstly measured, and dry weight was measured after oven-drying the samples at 65°C for 5 d, and leaf water content and leaf mass per area (LMA) were then calculated.

# Analysis of non-structural carbohydrate concentrations

All tissues harvested for NSC and isotope analyses were dried in an oven at 65°C for 5 d. After drying, each sample was ground with a Retsch MM 300 ball mill (Retsch, Germany) until finely and homogeneously ground. NSCs are defined here as low-molecular-weight sugars and starch, and analysis followed the protocol by Schönbeck et al. (2018). About 10 mg of the sample powder was first vortexed with 2 ml of deionized water and then boiled in the steam for 30 min. For free-sugar analysis, a 200  $\mu$ l aliquot of the extract was treated with invertase and isomerase (in 0.4 M Na-acetate buffer; Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, USA) to break down sucrose to fructose and glucose. For the total NSC<sub>T</sub>(NSC<sub>T</sub> = soluble sugars + starch) analysis, a 500  $\mu$ l aliquot of the extract (sugars and starch) was incubated with a fungal amyloglucosidase from *Aspergillus niger* (Sigma-Aldrich, St Louis, MO, USA) for 15 h at 49°C to digest starch into glucose. Both soluble sugars and NSC<sub>T</sub> concentrations were determined at 340 nm in a 96-well microplate photometer (Multiskan GO, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) after enzymatic conversion of glucose molecules derived from sugars and starch to gluconate-6-phosphate (via isomerase, hexokinase, and glucose-6-P dehydrogenase; all supplied by Sigma-Aldrich). NSC concentrations are expressed as a percentage of dry matter, and the concentration of starch was calculated as NSC<sub>T</sub> minus free sugars.

# Analysis of <sup>13</sup>C abundance

Around 1 mg of ground tissue material (same as used for the NSC analysis) was weighed into tin capsules. Organic carbon was converted to  $CO_2$  in an elemental analyzer Euro EA3000 (Hekatech GmbH, Wegberg, Germany) connected to an isotope ratio mass spectrometer (IRMS; Delta V Advantage, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Bremen, Germany) to determine the total carbon and carbon isotopic composition. Laboratory standards with known <sup>13</sup>C values were measured with a precision of 0.1 $\delta$  notation (Belemnite (VPDB). The carbon isotope ratio was corrected to account for pre-labeling isotope ratios of bulk material to indicate the extent of <sup>13</sup>C-label incorporation in different tissues.

$$\Delta \delta^{13} \mathrm{C} = \delta^{13} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{L}} - \delta^{13} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{NA}}$$
 Eqn. 1

where  $\delta^{13}C_L$  is the isotope ratio after the start of the labeling and  $\delta^{13}C_{NA}$  is the natural (pre-labeling) isotope abundance.

# Data analysis

All data (i.e.  $\delta^{13}$ C, NSC<sub>T</sub> and its components) were first tested for normality with Kolmogorov–Smirnov tests to assess the within- and between-subject effects in different tissues of pine (i.e. needle, xylem, phloem) and mistletoe (i.e. leaf, shoot).

For the wrapping experiment (Exp. 1), a linear mixed model (tree replicates as random effect) was used for testing the effects of time (sampling time), irrigation treatment (i.e. non-irrigated vs. irrigated), wrapping treatment (i.e. wrapping vs. non-wrapped), and their interactions on the carbon isotopic composition in different mistletoe tissues (i.e. leaf, shoot). The assessment of residuals normality and homoscedasticity were tested before analysis.

For the removal experiment (Exp. 2) (above the girdled branches), the assessment of residuals normality and homoscedasticity were tested before analysis. A linear mixed model (tree replicates as random effect) was used for testing the effects of time (sampling time), irrigation treatment (i.e. non-irrigated vs. irrigated), removal treatments (i.e. needle removal for phloem, xylem and mistletoe tissues; mistletoe removal for pine tissues; and no removal for both pine and mistletoe tissues), and their interactions on  $\delta^{13}$ C and NSC<sub>T</sub> concentrations. For each sampling time point, one-way ANOVA and a Tukey-HSD post-hoc test were used to investigate the difference in  $\delta^{13}$ C and NSC<sub>T</sub> concentrations in different pine and mistletoe tissues under different irrigation and removal treatments. R version 4.1.0 was used for all statistical analyses (R Core Team, 2021).

### Results

# Irrigation effects on the morphology of pine needles and mistletoe leaves

Long-term irrigation significantly influenced the morphological traits of both pine needles and mistletoe leaves. Host leaf mass per unit leaf area (LMA) was significantly higher in control trees than in irrigated ones, but mistletoe leaves showed the opposite pattern (Fig. 2a). There was no detectable difference in leaf water content between irrigated and control pine needles (Fig. 2b). In contrast, leaf water content was significantly higher in control compared with irrigated mistletoe leaves (Fig. 2b). The area of single pine needles was not affected by the irrigation treatment, but mistletoe had significantly larger leaves under control dry conditions than when irrigated (Fig. 2c).

# Wrapping effects on <sup>13</sup>C assimilates in mistletoe tissues (Exp. 1: wrapping)

Irrigation had no significant effects on the <sup>13</sup>C assimilates of mistletoe tissues in the wrapping experiment, whereas the wrapping treatment had a strong effect on the <sup>13</sup>C accumulation in mistletoe tissues (Table 1). Strong labeling signals were found in the non-wrapped mistletoe leaves and shoots, while in the wrapped mistletoe clusters no <sup>13</sup>C signal was found in leaves or shoots (Fig. 3). The peak value of  $\Delta\delta^{13}$ C in non-wrapped leaves occurred approximately 8 h after the labeling started, after which point  $\Delta\delta^{13}$ C values decreased gradually (Fig. 3a).  $\Delta\delta^{13}$ C values reached a peak in wrapped mistletoe shoots at the first sampling time after labeling, remained at a relatively stable high level until 15 d after labeling, and decreased slowly thereafter (Fig. 3b).

# Removal effects on carbon assimilates in pine and mistletoe tissues (Exp. 2: girdling and removal)

The irrigation treatment and its interaction with other factors (time or removal treatment) did not affect  $\Delta\delta^{13}$ C or NSC concentration (NSC<sub>T</sub>, sugars, starch) in the pine tissues (Table 2). However, there was a direct effect of the removal treatments on the carbon assimilates in host tissues (Table 2). Mistletoe removal resulted in significantly lower needle  $\Delta\delta^{13}$ C at 24 h after labeling (Fig. 4a), but did not affect needle NSC concentrations (Table 2, Fig. 5a). Mistletoe removal did not affect new carbon assimilates in the host phloem (Figs. 4b, 5b) but led to significantly lower  $\Delta\delta^{13}$ C in the pine xylem tissue at 3 and 15 d after labeling (Figs. 4c, 5c). When the needles were removed, no significant <sup>13</sup>C signals were found anymore in host phloem or xylem (Fig. 4b, c). Needle and mistletoe removal did not affect the NSC concentrations in pine phloem (Fig. 5b). Needle removal decreased the host xylem NSC concentrations, while such effects were not observed in the mistletoe removal treatment (Fig. 5c).

Irrigation significantly (P< 0.05) or marginally significantly (P<0.10) influenced the  $\Delta\delta^{13}$ C and NSC concentrations (except sugars) in both mistletoe leaves and shoots (Table 2), and host needle removal also significantly affected the carbon assimilates and NSC concentrations in both mistletoe leaves and shoots (Table 2). In addition, host needle removal interacted with irrigation to significantly affect  $\Delta\delta^{13}$ C and NSC concentrations in mistletoe leaves and  $\Delta\delta^{13}$ C in mistletoe shoots (Table 2). Mistletoes on trees grown under dry control conditions tended to have higher  $\Delta\delta^{13}$ C levels in leaves and shoots than those on irrigated trees, irrespective of host needle removal, but the higher  $\Delta\delta^{13}$ C levels of mistletoes were found when needles were removed in trees grown under dry conditions (Fig. 4d, e). Similarly, NSC concentrations in mistletoe leaves were higher in the control compared with the irrigated trees, but mainly when the pine needles were removed (Fig. 5d, e).

**Table 1:** Results of linear mixed models for  $\Delta \delta^{13}$ C values (uptake and incorporation of  ${}^{13}$ C) of bulk material in different tissues of *Viscum album* ssp. *austriacum* in the wrapping experiment (Exp. 1). Degrees of freedom (df) and F-values are given for time, irrigation treatment and wrapping treatment (i.e. wrapped vs non-wrapped; n = 3).

Factors	$\mathbf{d}\mathbf{f}$	Μιστλετοε λεαφ $\Delta \delta^{13}$ "	Μιστλετοε σηοοτ $\Delta \delta^{13}$		
Time (T)	9	9.08***	3.43**		
Irrigation (I)	1	1.11	0.47		
Wrapping (W)	1	185.99***	137.74***		

Factors	$\mathbf{d}\mathbf{f}$	Μιστλετοε λεαφ $\Delta \delta^{13}$ "	Μιστλετοε σηοοτ $\Delta \delta^{13}$ "
$T \times I$	9	1.99	1.03
$T \times W$	9	8.70***	3.49**
$I \times W$	1	2.72	3.41
$T  \times  I  \times  W$	9	1.80	0.47

Note \*P<0.05, \*\*P<0.01, \*\*\*P<0.001

**Table 2:** Results of linear mixed models for  $\Delta\delta^{13}$ C values (uptake and incorporation of  $^{13}$ C) of bulk material, as well as the concentration of NSC<sub>T</sub> and its compounds (i.e. soluble sugars and starch) in different tissues of *Pinus sylvestris* and *Viscum albumssp. austriacum* in the removal experiment (Exp. 2). The degrees of freedom (df) and F-values are given (P-values are given with the significance level indicated, with values corresponding to P<0.05 given in red) for time, irrigation treatment and different removal treatments (i.e. mistletoe removal for pine needle, needle removal and mistletoe removal for pine phloem and xylem, needle removal for mistletoe leaf and shoot; n = 3).

	df	$\Delta \delta^{13} C$	df	NSC <sub>T</sub>	Sugar	Starch
Pine needle	Pine needle	Pine needle	Pine needle	Pine needle	Pine needle	Pine r
Time (T)	6	$18.25^{***}$	4	0.89	0.14	0.87
Irrigation (I)	1	0.11	1	0.06	1.01	0.01
Mistletoe removal (MR)	1	9.94***m	1	2.11	2.64	0.38
Τ×Ι	6	0.58	4	0.54	0.72	0.89
$T \times R$	6	1.13	4	1.31	1.54	0.96
$I \times MR$	1	0.43	1	0.11	0.36	1.02
Pine phloem	Pine phloem	Pine phloem	Pine phloem	Pine phloem	Pine phloem	Pine p
Time $(T)$	6	$3.26^{*}$	4	0.33	1.99	1.93
Irrigation (I)	1	0.17	1	1.40	0.01	2.61
Removal (R)	2	$10.23^{***}$	2	$11.35^{***}$	$6.49^{*}$	$5.39^{*}$
Τ×Ι	6	0.14	4	1.59	1.22	1.08
$T \times R$	12	1.15	8	1.23	1.66	1.74
$I \times R$	2	0.48	2	0.31	1.73	1.38
Pine xylem	Pine xylem	Pine xylem	Pine xylem	Pine xylem	Pine xylem	Pine x
Time (T)	6	2.29*	4	2.36	2.06	1.71
Irrigation (I)	1	0.08	1	0.63	1.21	2.21
Removal (R)	2	11.89***	2	$23.58^{***}$	21.93***	9.87**
$T \times I$	6	0.14	4	1.20	1.51	0.89
$T \times R$	12	1.13	8	$3.25^{**}$	$2.63^{*}$	$2.95^{*}$
$I \times R$	2	0.06	2	2.04	1.11	0.84
Mistletoe leaf	Mistletoe leaf	Mistletoe leaf	Mistletoe leaf	Mistletoe leaf	Mistletoe leaf	Mistle
Time $(T)$	6	$9.24^{***}$	4	2.71	0.44	2.28
Irrigation (I)	1	11.89***	1	5.14 +	0.59	3.04 +
Needle removal (NR)	1	$25.93^{***}$	1	$7.69^{*}$	$5.23^{*}$	$6.01^{*}$
$T \times I$	6	$10.35^{***}$	4	1.22	1.02	0.87
$T \times NR$	6	8.21***	4	2.83 +	2.54 +	2.77 +
I * NR	1	$15.47^{***}$	1	$17.62^{***}$	$14.54^{***}$	$11.25^{*}$
Mistletoe shoot	Mistletoe shoot	Mistletoe shoot	Mistletoe shoot	Mistletoe shoot	Mistletoe shoot	Mistle
Time $(T)$	6	$16.03^{***}$	4	2.41	0.44	1.88
Irrigation (I)	1	4.45 +	1	3.74 +	2.05	3.03 +
Needle removal (NR)	1	25.11***	1	9.08*	4.72*	$4.09^{*}$
$T \times I$	6	4.11**	4	1.13	1.17	1.24

	df	$\Delta \delta^{13} C$	df	$\mathrm{NSC}_{\mathrm{T}}$	Sugar	Starch
$T \times NR$	6	$2.62^{*}$	4	0.93	0.87	0.74
I * NR	1	$35.15^{***}$	1	0.12	0.05	2.64

# Note \*P < 0.05, \*\*P < 0.01, \*\*\*P < 0.001, +P < 0.1



Figure 2: Comparison of the leaf traits between *Pinus sylvestris* and *Viscum album* ssp. *austriacum* in the control and irrigation treatments (n = 3 trees per treatment). (a) Leaf mass per unit leaf area (LMA) of mistletoe leaves and pine needles, (b) leaf water content of mistletoe leaves and pine needles, (c) single leaf area of mistletoe leaves and pine needles. Different letters indicate significant differences (P<0.05) for each tissue between dry controls and irrigated trees.



Figure 3: Incorporation of the <sup>13</sup>C label into the bulk organic matter ( $\Delta \delta^{13}C_{\text{bulk}}$ ) of mistletoe leaves and shoots in the wrapping experiment (i.e. wrapped vs. non-wrapped; n = 3) after a 3.5 h of exposure to <sup>13</sup>C-enriched CO<sub>2</sub> (grey shaded area). Please note that the initial point is from 1 d before the labeling and that the scaling of the x-axis changes after each break.



Figure 4: Initial (1 d before the labeling) and incorporation of the <sup>13</sup>C label into the bulk organic matter  $(\Delta \delta^{13}C_{\text{bulk}})$  of different pine (*Pinus sylvestris*) and mistletoe (*Viscum album* ssp.*austriacum*) tissues under different removal treatments (i.e. pine needle removal for pine phloem and xylem, mistletoe leaf and shoot; mistletoe removal for pine needle, phloem and xylem). Girdled branches were exposed to <sup>13</sup>C-enriched CO<sub>2</sub>(shaded area) for 3.5 h. Dashed lines (d, e) are used to indicate where the  $\Delta \delta^{13}$ C values of mistletoe leaves and shoots showed a significant difference (P<0.05) between irrigated and non-irrigated trees (see Table 2). Different letters indicate significant differences among treatments at the same sampling time (n = 3). Please note the difference in scale of the x-axis before and after the red break points

and the difference in y-axis scale among panels.



**Figure 5:**NSC<sub>T</sub> concentration (% of dry matter (d.m.)) in different pine (*Pinus sylvestris*) and mistletoe (*Viscum album* ssp. *austriacum*) tissues under different removal treatments (i.e. pine needle removal for pine phloem and xylem, mistletoe leaf and shoot; mistletoe removal for pine needle, phloem and xylem) applied to the girdled branches. The initial samples were collected 1 d before the labeling. Dashed lines (d, e) are used to indicate where the irrigation treatment had significant effect (P<0.05) on NSC<sub>T</sub> concentration (see Table 2). Different letters indicate significant differences among treatments at the same sampling time (n = 3). Please note the difference in y-axis scale among panels.

Discussion

### No transport of newly assimilated carbon from host to mistletoes

The wrapping experiment showed that non-wrapped mistletoes efficiently assimilate carbon (Fig. 3), although the incorporation of  $^{13}$ C originating from the labeled CO<sub>2</sub>in mistletoe leaves was only half of that in pine needles (Figs. 3, 4). We did not find a strong effect of irrigation on the  $^{13}$ C incorporation in mistletoe leaves or shoots (Table 1), indicating that the carbon assimilation capacity of mistletoes was not affected by restricted soil water availability, although mistletoes are known to rely on acquiring water resources via the xylem of the host tree (Glatzel & Geils, 2009; Zweifel et al., 2012). M. C. Scalon and Wright (2017) investigated 42 mistletoe–host species pairs sampled from 5 sites in Australia and Brazil under different soil water availability and found that the photosynthetic capacity of mistletoes and their hosts were on a similar level, but that mistletoes had leaf dark respiration rates that were twice that of the hosts at a given photosynthetic capacity, resulting in higher leaf maintenance costs for these hemiparasitic plants. In our study, it is possible that higher respiration rates, and thus loss of previously fixed  $^{13}$ C, contributed to the lower overall incorporation of  $^{13}$ C in bulk organic matter of mistletoe leaves compared with pine needles.

In contrast, wrapped mistletoes were not able to assimilate new carbon assimilates after the labeling event (Fig. 3). This clearly shows that new carbon assimilates are not transported from the host to any mistletoe tissue in significant amounts, which is consistent with the concept suggested in previous studies assuming that no phloem connection is established between hemiparasite and host (Glatzel & Geils, 2009; M. C. Scalon & Wright, 2015; Těšitel et al., 2010). In contrast, Popp and Richter (1998) compared the theoretical values predicted from gas exchange measurements with calculations of the amount of heterotrophic carbon gain and observed that only part of the carbon in the biomass of V. album originates from its own photosynthesis activities. Escher, Eiblmeier, Hetzger, and Rennenberg (2004a) also provided indirect evidence of heterotrophic carbon gain of pine mistletoes via the xylem sap from the host by comparing the carbon concentrations in tissues in different seasons. However, even after 180 d, we did not find any <sup>13</sup>C signal in the wrapped mistletoe clusters, indicating that also in the longer term no labeled carbon was obtained from the host. Within the same whole-tree labeling experiment, Gao et al. (2021) showed that even 10 months after labeling, tree respired  $CO_2$  still had  $\delta^{13}C$  values of up to 25 in the host's tissues and transport systems on our final sampling date, yet not transferred to the mistletoes. We conclude that mistletoes are complete carbon autotrophs and do not receive significant amounts of carbon directly from the host; thus, we can reject H1.

# The photosynthetic capacity of pine mistletoes is suppressed by the host trees under drier conditions

Although we did not find a significant effect of the irrigation treatment on mistletoe <sup>13</sup>C uptake and incorporation in the wrapping experiment (Fig. 3), mistletoe leaves and shoots accumulated more<sup>13</sup>C-labeled assimilates in the control trees than in the irrigated trees, but only when the needles were removed from the girdled branches (Table 2, Fig. 4). This is surprising, as photosynthetic carbon acquisition is normally greater in an environment with higher soil moisture (Joseph et al., 2020; Reich et al., 2018; Wang, Hawkins, & Letchford, 1998). Since we have shown in Exp. 1 that no direct carbon transport occurred from the host to the mistletoes, this phenomenon needs to be attributed to the mistletoe photosynthetic activity. We need to consider that mistletoe leaves were larger and had a higher water content under the dry control conditions (Fig. 2). This might indicate a higher photosynthetic potential of mistletoe leaves in drier sites, which is, however, only expressed when the host's needles are removed. These results further signify that needle removal not only affected source–sink carbon relationships in the girdled branch but might also result in more available water for the mistletoe due to discontinued host transpiration. The reduced competition for water may allow the mistletoes to keep stomates more open, thus allowing for higher photosynthesis rates.

We also found that mistletoe leaf  $NSC_T$  concentrations were significantly higher in the control trees compared with the irrigated trees when pine needles were not present anymore (Table 2, Fig. 5), which corroborates our assumption of higher assimilation by mistletoes when there were no needles to demand water under dry conditions. The high carbon accumulation capacity of mistletoes in a stressful environment also demonstrates the competitive ability of the hemiparasite. However, it seemed that mistletoes with bigger leaf size and higher assimilation potential benefit more from pine needle removal than the pine needles benefit from mistletoe removal (see discussion below). Still, mistletoes are known to exacerbate tree mortality in drought-exposed regions (M Dobbertin & Rigling, 2006; Durand-Gillmann, Cailleret, Boivin, Nageleisen, & Davi, 2014; Rigling et al., 2010; Sangüesa-Barreda et al., 2013; Zweifel et al., 2012). Our findings support our hypothesis **H2b** that expected an increased carbon level in mistletoes due to increased carbon assimilation by the hemiparasite itself as a result of decreased competition for water with the host after host needle removal. In contrast to our hypothesis **H2a**, an increase in carbon level and carbon assimilation of mistletoes after host needle removal was found, which is not related to a change in source activity of the host but is rather due to the released water restrictions of the mistletoe by removing the transpiring host needles under dry conditions.

# Mistletoes cannot act as a carbon provider, even when the host is carbon limited

In the needle removal treatment, no strong  ${}^{13}C$  signal was found upon  ${}^{13}C$  labeling in the pine sink tissues (i.e. phloem and xylem). The minimal  ${}^{13}C$  traces detected (Fig. 4b, c) might be due to bark photosynthesis (Aschan & Pfanz, 2003; Simkin, Faralli, Ramamoorthy, & Lawson, 2020). This finding suggests that mistletoe assimilates do not act as a significant carbon source for the host sink tissues. We thus conclude that there is no exchange of carbon assimilates between mistletoe and host. Neither do mistletoes use host carbon resources nor do they provide any carbon to the host, even when the host is carbon limited in special situations (needle removal treatment, drought). These results support H3and prove that mistletoes and hosts are carbon-independent and that only water and nutrients are transported from the host to the mistletoes.

Meanwhile, needle removal also resulted in a decrease in  $NSC_T$  concentrations in pine xylem tissue after one week, which can be explained by the lack of delivery of new assimilates to the sink tissues. Pine xylem, however, also accumulated less<sup>13</sup>C-labeled carbon assimilates when mistletoes were removed from the branches (Fig. 4). As there is no transport of assimilates from the mistletoe to the host, we propose the following explanation: mistletoe tissues have lower water potentials compared with host tissues, which ensures continuous water uptake from the host xylem (M. C. Scalon & Wright, 2015; Schulze, Turner, & Glatzel, 1984; Zweifel et al., 2012). Thus, xylem parenchymatic tissues compete for water with the hemiparasite. Removing the mistletoe might reduce the need to incorporate large amounts of osmotically active compounds in the woody tissues and thus decrease the transport of new <sup>13</sup>C-labeled soluble carbon compounds to the host xylem.

## Conclusion

Our results demonstrate that pine mistletoes are fully carbon-autonomous: they do not provide carbon to the host and are also not supplied with carbon compounds by the host. We also observed that mistletoes are constrained in their photosynthesis by the host when soil water availability is low, most likely due to competition for xylem water – when the competition is released by removing the host needles, the  $^{13}$ C assimilation of the mistletoe increases. This result provides physiological evidences that mistletoes do increase the drought stress of their hosts, resulting in an increased mortality risk during severely dry periods previously proposed. We, therefore, conclude that the hemiparasites live on their own in terms of carbon gain which, however, depends on the water provided by the host tree.

#### Acknowledgement

The study was supported by the Chinese Scholarship Council (grant No. 201706510023). The labeling event was based on a long-term irrigation experiment in Pfynwald, Switzerland, which is part of the Swiss Long-term Forest Ecosystem Research Programme LWF (www.lwf.ch).

# Author Contribution

M.L., A.G. and A.R. planned the labeling experiment; M.L. and A.W. designed the treatment and sampling experiment; A.W. and M.M.L conducted the field work; A.W. and Z.D. conducted experiment work and analyzed the data; A.W. wrote the manuscript; M.L., A.G., A.R., M.M.L and M.S. revised the manuscript

## References

Andersen, C. P., Nikolov, I., Nikolova, P., Matyssek, R., & Haberle, K. H. (2005). Estimating "autotrophic" belowground respiration in spruce and beech forests: decreases following girdling. *European Journal of Forest Research*, 124 (3), 155-163. doi:10.1007/s10342-005-0072-8

Aschan, G., & Pfanz, H. (2003). Non-foliar photosynthesis–a strategy of additional carbon acquisition. *Flora-*Morphology, Distribution, Functional Ecology of Plants, 198 (2), 81-97.

Brunner, I., Pannatier, E. G., Frey, B., Rigling, A., Landolt, W., Zimmermann, S., & Dobbertin, M. (2009). Morphological and physiological responses of Scots pine fine roots to water supply in a dry climatic region in Switzerland. *Tree Physiology*, 29 (4), 541-550.

De Schepper, V., & Steppe, K. (2013). Tree Girdling: a Tool to Improve our Understanding of Coupled Sugar and Water Transport. In *Ii International Symposium on Woody Ornamentals of the Temperate Zone*(Vol. 990, pp. 313-320).

Dobbertin, M., Eilmann, B., Bleuler, P., Giuggiola, A., Pannatier, E. G., Landolt, W., . . . Rigling, A. (2010). Effect of irrigation on needle morphology, shoot and stem growth in a drought-exposed Pinus sylvestris forest. *Tree Physiology*, *30* (3), 346-360. doi:10.1093/treephys/tpp123

Dobbertin, M., Mayer, P., Wohlgemuth, T., Feldmeyer-Christe, E., Graf, U., Zimmermann, N., & Rigling, A. (2005). The decline of *Pinus sylvestris L*. forests in the Swiss Rhone valley-a result of drought stress? *Phyton*, 45 (4), 153.

Dobbertin, M., & Rigling, A. (2006). Pine mistletoe (*Viscum album ssp. austriacum*) contributes to Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*) mortality in the Rhone valley of Switzerland. *Forest Pathology*, 36 (5), 309-322.

Durand-Gillmann, M., Cailleret, M., Boivin, T., Nageleisen, L.-M., & Davi, H. (2014). Individual vulnerability factors of Silver fir (*Abies alba Mill.*) to parasitism by two contrasting biotic agents: mistletoe (*Viscum album ssp. abietis*) and bark beetles (Coleoptera: Curculionidae: Scolytinae) during a decline process. *Annals of Forest Science*, 71 (6), 659-673.

Escher, P., Eiblmeier, M., Hetzger, I., & Rennenberg, H. (2004a). Seasonal and spatial variation of carbohydrates in mistletoes (*Viscum album*) and the xylem sap of its hosts (*Populus euamericana* and *Abies alba*). *Physiologia Plantarum*, 120 (2), 212-219.

Escher, P., Eiblmeier, M., Hetzger, I., & Rennenberg, H. (2004b). Spatial and seasonal variation in amino compounds in the xylem sap of a mistletoe (*Viscum album*) and its hosts (*Populus spp.* and *Abies alba*). *Tree Physiology*, 24 (6), 639-650.

Galiano, L., Martínez-Vilalta, J., & Lloret, F. (2011). Carbon reserves and canopy defoliation determine the recovery of Scots pine 4 yr after a drought episode. *New Phytologist, 190* (3), 750-759.

Gao, D., Joseph, J., Werner, R. A., Brunner, I., Zurcher, A., Hug, C., . . . Hagedorn, F. (2021). Drought alters the carbon footprint of trees in soils—tracking the spatio-temporal fate of<sup>13</sup>C-labelled assimilates in the soil of an old-growth pine forest. *Global Change Biology*, 27 (11), 2491-2506.

Glatzel, G., & Geils, B. (2009). Mistletoe ecophysiology: host-parasite interactions. Botany, 87 (1), 10-15.

Joseph, J., Gao, D., Backes, B., Bloch, C., Brunner, I., Gleixner, G., . . . Hug, C. (2020). Rhizosphere activity in an old-growth forest reacts rapidly to changes in soil moisture and shapes whole-tree carbon allocation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117 (40), 24885-24892.

Le, Q., Tennakoon, K., Metali, F., Lim, L., & Bolin, J. (2016). Ecophysiological responses of mistletoe Dendrophthoe curvata (Loranthaceae) to varying environmental parameters. *Journal of Tropical Forest Science, 28* (1), 59-67.

Le, Q., Tennakoon, K. U., Metali, F., Lim, L. B., & Bolin, J. F. (2016). Host specific variation in photosynthesis of an obligate xylem-tapping mistletoe Dendrophthoe curvata in a Bornean heath forest. *Nordic Journal of Botany*, 34 (2), 235-243.

Luttge, U., Haridasan, M., Fernandes, G. W., de Mattos, E. A., Trimborn, P., Franco, A. C., . . . Ziegler, H. (1998). Photosynthesis of mistletoes in relation to their hosts at various sites in tropical Brazil. *Trees*, 12 (3), 167-174.

Popp, M., & Richter, A. (1998). Ecophysiology of xylem-tapping mistletoes. In *Progress in botany* (pp. 659-674): Springer.

R Core Team. (2021). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Version 3.5.1. R foundation for statistical computing, Vienna, Austria, https://www.r-project.org/.

Reich, P. B., Sendall, K. M., Stefanski, A., Rich, R. L., Hobbie, S. E., & Montgomery, R. A. (2018). Effects of climate warming on photosynthesis in boreal tree species depend on soil moisture. *Nature*, 562 (7726), 263-267.

Richter, A., Popp, M., Mensen, R., Stewart, G., & Willert, D. (1995). Heterotrophic carbon gain of the parasitic angiosperm Tapinanthus oleifolius. *Functional Plant Biology*, 22 (4), 537-544.

Rigling, A., Bigler, C., Eilmann, B., Feldmeyer-Christe, E., Gimmi, U., Ginzler, C., . . . Weber, P. (2013). Driving factors of a vegetation shift from Scots pine to pubescent oak in dry Alpine forests. *Global Change Biology*, 19 (1), 229-240.

Rigling, A., Eilmann, B., Koechli, R., & Dobbertin, M. (2010). Mistletoe-induced crown degradation in Scots pine in a xeric environment. *Tree Physiology*, 30 (7), 845-852.

Sanguesa-Barreda, G., Linares, J. C., & Camarero, J. J. (2012). Mistletoe effects on Scots pine decline following drought events: insights from within-tree spatial patterns, growth and carbohydrates. *Tree Physiology*, 32 (5), 585-598.

Sanguesa-Barreda, G., Linares, J. C., & Camarero, J. J. (2013). Drought and mistletoe reduce growth and water-use efficiency of Scots pine. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 296, 64-73.

Scalon, M., Haridasan, M., & Franco, A. (2013). A comparative study of aluminium and nutrient concentrations in mistletoes on aluminium-accumulating and non-accumulating hosts. *Plant Biology*, 15 (5), 851-857.

Scalon, M. C., & Wright, I. J. (2015). A global analysis of water and nitrogen relationships between mistletoes and their hosts: broad-scale tests of old and enduring hypotheses. *Functional Ecology*, 29 (9), 1114-1124.

Scalon, M. C., & Wright, I. J. (2017). Leaf trait adaptations of xylem-tapping mistletoes and their hosts in sites of contrasting aridity. *Plant and Soil*, 415 (1), 117-130.

Schaub, M., Haeni, M., Hug, C., Gessler, A., & Rigling, A. (2016). Tree measurements 2002-2016 from the long-term irrigation experiment Pfynwald, Switzerland. Swiss Federal Research Institute WSLSwissForestLab .

Schonbeck, L., Gessler, A., Hoch, G., McDowell, N. G., Rigling, A., Schaub, M., & Li, M.-H. (2018). Homeostatic levels of nonstructural carbohydrates after 13 yr of drought and irrigation in *Pinus sylvestris*. *New Phytologist*, 219 (4), 1314-1324. doi:doi:10.1111/nph.15224

Schonbeck, L., Grossiord, C., Gessler, A., Gisler, J., Meusburger, K., D'Odorico, P., . . . Zweifel, R. (2021). Photosynthetic acclimation and sensitivity to short-and long-term environmental changes. *bioRxiv*.

Schulze, E. D., Turner, N., & Glatzel, G. (1984). Carbon, water and nutrient relations of two mistletoes and their hosts: a hypothesis. *Plant, Cell & Environment,* 7 (5), 293-299.

Simkin, A. J., Faralli, M., Ramamoorthy, S., & Lawson, T. (2020). Photosynthesis in non-foliar tissues: implications for yield. *The Plant Journal*, 101 (4), 1001-1015.

Smith, P. L., & Gledhill, D. (1983). Anatomy of the endophyte of *Viscum album* L.(Loranthaceae). *Botanical journal of the Linnean Society*, 87 (1), 29-53.

Solomon, N. U., James, I. M., Alphonsus, N. O.-O., & Nkiruka, R. U. (2015). A review of host-parasite relationships. *Annual Research & Review in Biology*, 5 (5), 372-384.

Streicker, D. G., Fenton, A., & Pedersen, A. B. (2013). Differential sources of host species heterogeneity influence the transmission and control of multihost parasites. *Ecology letters*, 16 (8), 975-984.

Těšitel, J., Plavcová, L., & Cameron, D. D. (2010). Interactions between hemiparasitic plants and their hosts: the importance of organic carbon transfer. *Plant signaling & behavior*, 5 (9), 1072-1076.

Vacchiano, G., Garbarino, M., Mondino, E. B., & Motta, R. (2012). Evidences of drought stress as a predisposing factor to Scots pine decline in Valle d'Aosta (Italy). *European Journal of Forest Research*, 131 (4), 989-1000.

Wang, J. R., Hawkins, C., & Letchford, T. (1998). Photosynthesis, water and nitrogen use efficiencies of four paper birch (*Betula papyrifera*) populations grown under different soil moisture and nutrient regimes. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 112 (3), 233-244.

Yan, C. F., Gessler, A., Rigling, A., Dobbertin, M., Han, X. G., & Li, M. H. (2016). Effects of mistletoe removal on growth, N and C reserves, and carbon and oxygen isotope composition in Scots pine hosts. *Tree Physiol*, 36 (5), 562-575. doi:10.1093/treephys/tpw024

Zuber, D. (2004). Biological flora of central Europe: Viscum album L. Flora-Morphology, Distribution, Functional Ecology of Plants, 199 (3), 181-203.

Zweifel, R., Bangerter, S., Rigling, A., & Sterck, F. J. (2012). Pine and mistletoes: how to live with a leak in the water flow and storage system? *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 63 (7), 2565-2578.