



Full Length Article

Comprehensive Evaluation on the Tolerance of Eight Crop Species to CO₂ Leakage from Geological Storage

Lu Xue^{1,2}, Junjie Ma^{1,3*}, Jiangli Wu¹, Chenyang Zhao¹, Haodong Liu¹, Dan Liu¹ and Jinfeng Ma³

¹College of Urban and Environmental Sciences, Northwest University, Xi'an 710127, China

²College of Life Science, Yulin University, Yulin 719000, China

³National & Local Joint Engineering Research Center of Carbon Capture and Storage Technology, Northwest University, Xi'an 710127, China

*For correspondence: xdhgvip@163.com

Abstract

Carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) is considered as the most promising and potential technology of reduction in CO₂ emission. However, the risk of CO₂ leakage resulting from geological storage projects has a significant impact on the surroundings, especially on the associated farmland ecosystem. As the basis for agricultural production decision-making in the CCS project area, it is very important to carry out in-depth research on the response of crops to high CO₂ concentration and quantitative evaluation of crop tolerance to CO₂. In this paper, the impacts of ultra-high CO₂ on the plant height, maximum root length, leaf number, net photosynthetic rate, transpiration rate, stomatal conductance, intercellular CO₂ concentration, fresh and dry biomass of eight typical crops were simulated using CO₂ artificial climate chamber. A comprehensive evaluation method on the crop tolerance to CO₂ was established based on principal component analysis (PCA) and fuzzy comprehensive evaluation method (FCE) and the tolerance of eight typical crops to CO₂ in the Loess Plateau of China was evaluated. The results indicated that the growth of eight crops was promoted in a certain range of CO₂ concentration and the maximum growth indicators of C₃ crops was at 10 mmol·mol⁻¹ and that of C₄ crops was at 20 mmol·mol⁻¹. When the CO₂ concentration continued to increase, the growth of C₃ and C₄ crops were inhibited in varying degrees, in which the inhibition for C₃ crops was higher. The relative tolerance of crops to CO₂ was as follows: sorghum > broomcorn millet > foxtail millet > maize > mung bean > soybean > potatoes > buckwheat and C₄ crops were more tolerant to CO₂ than C₃ crops. The priority crops for CO₂ leakage of the CCS project area was recommended in Loess Plateau of China. © 2019 Friends Science Publishers

Keywords: CCS; CO₂ leakage; Crop tolerance; Photosynthetic pathways; Farmland

Introduction

As a key part of clean energy technology, carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) provides a sustainable path to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions and ensures energy security (GCCSI, 2018). It injects CO₂ captured from the emission sources of industry or related energy industries into stable geological structures such as oil and gas reservoirs, deep saltwater layers and unexploited coal seams to reduce CO₂ emissions and its sequestration from the atmosphere permanently (IPCC, 2005; Christensen, 2007; Leung *et al.*, 2014). However, in terms of the current CCS development, there are still risks of CO₂ leakage through injection wells, abandoned wells or ineffective confining layers (Metz and Davidson, 2008). Once CO₂ leakage occurs, it will have a significant impact on water and soil environment, growth and development of plants and animals, as well as on human security (Zwaan and Gerlagh, 2009; Blackford *et al.*, 2013).

Previous studies about climate change impact mostly

focused on the effects of doubling CO₂ concentration on typical plants (Cure and Acock, 1986; Kimball *et al.*, 1993; Wang *et al.*, 1995; Yang *et al.*, 1997; Rogers *et al.*, 1999). With the development of CCS technology, the studies of impact on typical plants or crops in ultra-high CO₂ concentration which is much higher than doubling CO₂ concentration have become an important field of CCS environmental risk research (Stenhouse *et al.*, 2009a, b). Due to the short construction time, small quantity and small storage scale of the actual CCS project, there is no obvious CO₂ leakage phenomenon in the project area. Current researches on the impact of CO₂ leakage on plants or crops are mostly focused on the field or indoor simulation of CO₂ leakage and on-site investigation or research of other CO₂ leakage points. Beaubien *et al.* (2008) and Krüger *et al.* (2009) found that the vegetation coverage was significantly affected within 6 meters around the natural CO₂ leakage point, and gradually recovered from 6 meters away. Pfanz *et al.* (2007) found that the increase of CO₂ concentration at volcanic eruption led to a decrease in photosynthesis of

timothy grass. Amonette *et al.* (2010), Lakkaraju *et al.* (2010) and Zhou *et al.* (2013) observed that plant growth withered or even plant died in the central area of CO₂ leakage source using artificial simulation platform. Pierce and Sjögersten (2009) and Patil *et al.* (2010) found that the growth of winter bean was significantly inhibited and its biomass reduced remarkably compared to pasture grass through artificial simulation platform experiments. In addition, Tian (2013), Wu *et al.* (2014) and Deng *et al.* (2017) showed that the root length and biomass of wheat, alfalfa and pea decreased more severely than that of maize by simulating CO₂ leakage in different laboratory scenarios. Many studies pointed out that the difference in response of various plants to CO₂ maybe due to different photosynthesis pathways (Beaubien *et al.*, 2008; Krüger *et al.*, 2009; West *et al.*, 2009; Xue *et al.*, 2014).

It is well known that the photosynthesis of C₃ plants is the conversion of carbon dioxide into organic matter by the Calvin cycle under the action of Rubisco enzyme in mesophyll cells. However, the photosynthesis of C₄ plants is a process that CO₂ is converted to C₄ acid under the action of PEPC carboxylase firstly and the C₄ acid is converted to CO₂ again by decarboxylation reaction in mesophyll cells through Hatch-Slack pathway, and the converted CO₂ is entered to the vascular bundle sheath cells and synthesized to organic matter through the Calvin cycle (Hatch and Slack, 1966; Rosie, 1973, Sayre *et al.*, 1979; Hatch, 1987; Weiner *et al.*, 1988). Under normal CO₂ concentration, photosynthesis of C₃ and C₄ plants is significantly different due to their photosynthesis sites and participating enzymes, and C₄ plants are considered to be superior to C₃ crops in assimilation efficiency of CO₂ and more tolerant for the stress of low CO₂ concentration, drought and other factors (Cerling *et al.*, 1993, 1998; Koch *et al.*, 2004). Whether there is a difference in the tolerance of C₃ and C₄ plants to ultra-high concentrations of CO₂ is still a problem worth studying.

In this paper, the simulation experiment of eight typical C₃ and C₄ crops in Loess Plateau of China was carried out to understand the impact of ultra-high CO₂ concentration on the crops. Meanwhile, the evaluation method of crop tolerance to CO₂ was established on the basis of principal component analysis (PCA) and fuzzy comprehensive evaluation method (FCE) to assess the eight typical crops for tolerance to CO₂. The main purpose of this paper is to systematically understand the response and quantitative evaluate the tolerance of crops to CO₂, so as to provide a reference for the agricultural production of CCS project area in the Loess Plateau of China.

Materials and Methods

Plants and Soil Characteristics

The seeds of eight typical crops (includes four C₃ crops and four C₄ crops) were provided by the Agricultural

Technology Extension Station of Jingbian County, Shaanxi Province of China. Species of tested crops are shown in Table 1. The experimental soil was sampled from the surface soil of 0–20 cm on farmland in the CO₂ injection test area of the CCS testing project (E108°17'–109°27', N36°58'–38°03') in Jingbian County. The type of experimental soil is sandy loam comprising sand (79.3%), silt (12.95%) and clay (7.75%). The pH is 7.8, the organic matter is 0.31%, and the available N, P, K of experimental soil is 30.02, 1.19 and 46.40 mg.kg⁻¹, respectively.

Experimental Methods

Experimental design and procedures: In this experiment, a CO₂ artificial climate chamber (RXZ-500C-CO₂, Ningbo, China) was used to simulate the ultra-high CO₂ environment of CO₂ leakage from CCS (Fig. 1).

The PID control system (Proportion, Integral and Derivative Control System, PIDCS) was used to collect and control CO₂ in the artificial climate chamber, and ensure the CO₂ concentration to meet and maintain the experimental requirements. The temperature, relative humidity, illumination and CO₂ concentration of the CO₂ artificial climate chamber ranged from 0 to 50°C, from 30 to 95%, from 0 to 22 KLux, and from 380 to 100000 μmol·mol⁻¹ respectively. All parameters are multi-stage adjustable according to the experimental needs.

In the experiment, 8–10 pots and 4–5 plants/pots of each crop were cultivated to 2–3 leaves stage in the condition of no entrancing CO₂ gas in the CO₂ artificial climate chamber. 6 pots and 1–3 plants/pots of healthy crops were selected and cultivated with watering and fertilizing regularly for 30 days under the controlled CO₂ concentration. Five CO₂ concentrations of the CO₂ artificial climate chamber were set to 380 μmol·mol⁻¹ (the control group), 10, 20, 40, and 80 mmol·mol⁻¹, respectively. The other conditions of the CO₂ artificial climate chamber were set with the temperature of 25°C, RH of 75% and illumination of 22 KLux at daytime of 12 h, and with the temperature of 20°C, RH of 75% and illumination of 4.4 KLux at nighttime of 12 h, respectively.

Growth measurement indicators: Nine growth indicators including plant height, leaf number, maximum root length, fresh and dry biomass, net photosynthetic rate (*Pn*), transpiration rate (*E*), stomatal conductance (*gs*) and intercellular CO₂ concentration (*Ci*) were determined in which *Pn*, *E*, *gs*, *Ci* were measured by LI-6400X photosynthesis analyzer (Nebraska, USA).

Evaluation for Crop Tolerance to CO₂

According to Shelford's law of tolerance, the adaptation of organisms to their ecological factors have the limit of

Table 1: Species of tested corps

Photosynthetic pathway	Species	Cultivar
C ₃	Mung bean (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L. Wilczek)	Local Jingbian
	Soyabean (<i>Glycine max</i> L.Merrill)	Qindou No. 8
	Buckwheat (<i>Fagopyrum esculentum</i> . Moench)	Yuqiao No. 4
	Potatoes (<i>Solanum tuberosum</i>)	Favorita
C ₄	Maize (<i>Zea mays</i> L.)	Ximeng No. 6
	Sorghum (<i>Sorghum bicolor</i> L. Moench)	Jinza No. 12
	Foxtail millet (<i>Setaria italica</i> L. Beauv)	Jingu No. 29
	Broomcorn millet (<i>Panicum miliaceum</i> L.)	Neimi No. 5




Fig. 1: CO₂ artificial climate chamber

minimum and/or maximum, and the range from the minimum to the maximum is called the biological tolerance range (Shelford, 1911a, 1911b, 1931). Shelford answered the question of biological tolerance range, but there still is difference of the optimal range and the adaptive range within the range and the measurement of ecological factor tolerance within the adaptive range needs to be further refined. On the basis of mechanism that CO₂ have effects of fertilization and inhibition on crops, the concept of crop tolerance coefficient to CO₂ is introduced to express the tolerance of crops to high CO₂ concentration compared to normal atmospheric CO₂ concentration.

The tolerance of crops is referred to the growth and development of crops which can be measured by morphological indicators, physiological indicators, biomass indicators and other indicators. As there is a certain degree of independence or complementarity between single indicators of plant, the tolerance between single indicators and the tolerance between single indicators and comprehensive indicators of crops are different, therefore, based on the tolerance coefficient of single indicator, the PCA and FCE are used to construct a comprehensive evaluation method of crop tolerance to CO₂, so as to comprehensively calculate the tolerance coefficient of different crops, in which the PCA is used to identify and eliminate the correlation between single indicators, and the FCE is used to comprehensively calculate from single indicators to comprehensive indicators. The details are as follows:

Tolerance coefficient of single indicator: The tolerance coefficient of single indicator was calculated

as follows (Luo *et al.*, 2013):

$$x_i = \frac{\bar{V}_i}{V_{CK}}, (i = 1, 2 \dots m) \tag{1}$$

Where *i* refers to *i*-th single indicator, *m* is the number of single indicators, \bar{V}_i refers to an average value under different treatments of single indicator, and *V_{CK}* refers to the measured value under the control treatment.

Principal component analysis: According to the calculation method of the correlation coefficient, the correlation coefficients between each single indicator were calculated, and the correlation coefficient matrix of all indicators was obtained. When there were significant or extremely significant correlations between the single indicators in the correlation coefficient matrix, the PCA was used to convert the original correlation indicators into independent indicators. The formula is as follows (Yu, 1993):

$$Z_j = \sum_{i=1}^m b_{ij}x_i, (i = 1, 2 \dots m, j = 1, 2 \dots n, n \leq m) \tag{2}$$

Where *Z_j* is the value of *j*-th principal component indicator; *b_{ij}* is the Eigen vector of *i*-th indicator to *j*-th principal component, and *n* is the number of principal component.

The Eigen value (*λ_j*), variance contribution (*P_j*), and cumulative variance contribution ($\sum P_j$) for each principal component were calculated. Generally, the number of principal components extracted is required to satisfy $\sum P_j > 0.85$.

Comprehensive tolerance coefficient: According to FCE, the comprehensive tolerance coefficient (*D_k*) of each crop to CO₂ was calculated using the following formula (Xie and Liu, 2013):

$$D_k = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_{(Z_{jk})} * W_j, (j = 1, 2 \dots n) \tag{3}$$

$$\mu_{(Z_{jk})} = \frac{Z_{jk} - Z_{min}}{Z_{max} - Z_{min}} \tag{4}$$

$$W_j = \frac{P_j}{\sum_{j=1}^n P_j} \tag{5}$$

Where *Z_{jk}* is *Z_j* value of *k*-th crop, *Z_{max}* and *Z_{min}* represent the maximum and minimum values of *j*-th principal component of all crops respectively, *W_j* is the weight value of *j*-th principal component, and $\mu_{(Z_{jk})}$ is the membership function value of *Z_{jk}* for comprehensive tolerance in formula 3–5.

Statistics Analysis

Microsoft Office Excel 2010 and origin 8.5 were used for data statistics. SPSS 22.0 was used for significance analysis, correlation analysis and principal component analysis.

Result

Impacts of Ultra-high CO₂ on Growth and Development of Crops

Morphological indicators: The impacts of ultra-high CO₂ on plant height, maximum root length and leaf number of eight crops were shown in Fig. 2. Different CO₂ concentration had significant effects on plant height (Fig. 2a) and maximum root length (Fig. 2b) of the eight crops ($P < 0.05$), but had no significant effect on the number of leaves (Fig. 2c), especially the C₄ crop. Although plant height and maximum root length of C₃ crops were increased at CO₂ concentration of 10 mmol·mol⁻¹ compared to CK group, significantly inhibited when CO₂ concentration increased to 20, 40, 80 mmol·mol⁻¹. The plant height and longest root length of C₄ crops were promoted at CO₂ concentration of 10 and 20 mmol·mol⁻¹, while inhibited when CO₂ concentration increased to 40 and 80 mmol·mol⁻¹.

Physiological indicators: Gas exchange is often used to reflect the physiological characteristics of plants, which usually involves four indicators; net photosynthetic rate (P_n), transpiration rate (E), stomatal conductance (g_s) and intercellular CO₂ concentration (C_i). The photosynthesis of C₃ and C₄ crops showed different trends with the increase of CO₂ concentration, which were explained by the examples of mung bean of the C₃ plant and maize of the C₄ plant (Fig. 3). The P_n , E and g_s of mung bean and maize had significant differences at CO₂ concentration of 10, 20, 40, 80 mmol·mol⁻¹ compared to CK group. The P_n , E and g_s of mung bean reached the maximum when CO₂ concentration was 10 mmol·mol⁻¹, while those of maize reached the maximum when CO₂ concentration was 20 mmol·mol⁻¹. As the concentration of CO₂ continues increased, the P_n , E and g_s of mung bean and maize gradually decreased, and the decrease in mung bean was greater than that of maize. In addition, the C_i of mung bean and maize showed an increasing trend with the increase of CO₂ concentration. At different CO₂ concentration, the difference of C_i in mung bean was slightly larger than that in maize.

Biomass indicators: Biomass indicators are usually measured by fresh and dry biomass. The impacts of ultra-high CO₂ concentration on fresh and dry biomass of eight crops were shown in Fig. 4. Different CO₂ levels had significant effects on fresh and dry biomass of eight crops ($P < 0.05$), and there were the same trends with that of plant height and maximum root length. However, the impacts of ultra-high CO₂ on fresh and dry biomass of C₃ and C₄ crops were different. The impact of ultra-high CO₂ concentration on dry biomass of C₃ crops was greater than that of fresh biomass, while it was opposite for C₄ crops ($P < 0.05$).

Assessment of Crop Tolerance to CO₂

Tolerance coefficient of single indicator: The tolerance coefficient of single indicator for each crop was calculated




Fig. 2: Impacts of different CO₂ concentration on plant height (a), maximum root length (b) and leaf number (c) of eight crops

using formula (1) given in Table 2. It can be seen that the differences of tolerance coefficients in P_n , E , and g_s were greater than that in plant height, leaf number, longest root length, fresh biomass, dry biomass and C_i , and the tolerance coefficient in C_i was all greater than 1.

Principal component analysis: Through the correlation analysis of the tolerance coefficient of single indicators, the correlation coefficient matrix of each indicator can be obtained as shown in Table 3. It can be seen that the tolerance coefficient of plant height, leaf number, fresh biomass, dry biomass, net photosynthetic rate and stomatal conductance were extremely significantly correlated, the tolerance coefficient of maximum root length, leaf number, net photosynthetic rate and transpiration rate were significant correlated, and while the tolerance coefficient of intercellular CO₂ concentration was not related to that of the other indicators.

The Eigen values (λ_i), variance contributions (P_j), and cumulative variance contributions (ΣP_j) of each principal component were obtained by the PCA as shown in Table 4.

Table 2: The tolerance coefficient of each indicator to CO₂ for eight crops (x_i)

Species	Height	Leaf number	Maximum root length	Fresh biomass	Dry biomass	P_n	E	g_s	C_i
Mung bean	0.8659	0.8125	1.0122	0.8940	0.8841	0.7904	0.8575	0.9108	1.1206
Soyabean	0.8613	0.6932	0.9044	0.8892	0.8884	0.4609	1.0858	0.8576	1.1077
Buckwheat	0.8399	0.6667	0.8971	0.8842	0.8479	0.5257	0.7799	0.4391	1.1087
Potatoes	0.8414	0.7185	0.9760	0.9255	0.8770	0.4553	1.0944	0.6116	1.1425
Maize	0.9926	0.9000	1.0125	0.9835	0.9755	1.1481	1.2275	1.0737	1.1537
Sorghum	1.0063	0.9000	0.9996	0.9776	1.0005	1.0970	1.1741	1.1444	1.2337
Foxtail millet	0.9966	1.0000	1.0020	0.9946	0.9943	1.2274	1.2078	1.2287	1.1048
Broomcorn millet	0.9948	1.0000	1.0042	1.0188	1.0254	1.1045	1.2610	1.2778	1.0840




Fig. 3: Impacts of different CO₂ concentration on P_n (a), E (b), g_s (c) and C_i (d) of mung bean and maize




Fig. 4: Impacts of different CO₂ concentration on fresh (a) and dry (b) biomass of eight crops

It can be seen that the cumulative variance contribution of the first three principal components has reached 92.24%, which can reflect the information of the tolerance coefficients of the nine single indicators. The Eigen vector of the single indicator to the first three principal components is shown in Table 5.

Comprehensive evaluation of crop tolerance to CO₂: Z₁, Z₂ and Z₃ of each crop were calculated according to Table 5

and formula (2). The membership degree ($\mu_{(Z_k)}$) of each principal component to the comprehensive tolerance coefficient of each crop were calculated by formula (4), the weight values of each principal component were calculated by formula (5) and the comprehensive tolerance coefficient (D) of each crop were finally calculated according to formula (3) as shown in Table 6.

Table 3: The correlation matrix of each indicator

Indicators	Height	Leaf number	Maximum root length	Fresh biomass	Dry biomass	<i>Pn</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>Gs</i>
Leaf number	0.919**							
Maximum root length	0.661	0.719*						
Fresh biomass	0.927**	0.924**	0.694					
Dry biomass	0.974**	0.940**	0.670	0.960**				
<i>Pn</i>	0.954**	0.953**	0.719*	0.873**	0.909**			
<i>E</i>	0.789*	0.719*	0.527	0.862**	0.847**	0.642		
<i>gs</i>	0.898**	0.931**	0.711*	0.837**	0.933**	0.880**	0.780*	
<i>Ci</i>	0.304	0.046	0.275	0.137	0.210	0.209	0.176	0.104

Note: **indicate extremely significant correlation ($P < 0.01$); * indicate significant correlation ($P < 0.05$)

Table 4: λ_i , P_j and $\sum P_j$ of each principal component

Principal components	λ_i	$P_j\%$	$\sum P_j\%$
1	6.899	76.65	76.65
2	1.022	11.36	88.01
3	0.561	6.23	94.24
4	0.313	3.48	97.72
5	0.157	1.75	99.47
6	0.041	0.46	99.93
7	0.008	0.08	100.00
8	0.000	0.00	100.00
9	0.000	0.00	100.00

Table 5: The Eigen vector of the single indicator to the principal component

Indicator	b_{i1}	b_{i2}	b_{i3}
Height	0.971	0.075	0.093
Leaf number	0.968	-0.170	-0.157
Maximum root length	0.784	0.153	-0.501
Fresh biomass	0.957	-0.086	0.128
Dry biomass	0.982	-0.028	0.137
<i>Pn</i>	0.947	0.005	-0.189
<i>E</i>	0.833	-0.035	0.447
<i>gs</i>	0.941	-0.119	-0.014
<i>Ci</i>	0.226	0.970	0.075

Table 6: Z values, μ values and D values of eight crops

Species	Z_1	Z_2	Z_3	$\mu_{(Z1)}$	$\mu_{(Z2)}$	$\mu_{(Z3)}$	D value	Order
Mung bean	6.7176	0.9326	-0.0134	0.4101	0.7000	0.0000	0.4162	5
Soyabean	6.3381	0.9205	0.2230	0.2637	0.6349	1.0000	0.3598	6
Buckwheat	5.6543	0.9857	0.0796	0.0000	0.9864	0.3935	0.1459	8
Potatoes	6.2011	0.9855	0.1954	0.2109	0.9856	0.8831	0.3509	7
Maize	7.9089	0.9185	0.1065	0.8696	0.6243	0.5070	0.8148	4
Sorghum	7.9226	0.9882	0.1077	0.8749	1.0000	0.5121	0.8645	1
Foxtail millet	8.2239	0.8340	0.0708	0.9911	0.1686	0.3561	0.8479	3
Broomcorn millet	8.2470	0.8027	0.1216	1.0000	0.0000	0.5712	0.8500	2

According to the above definition of crop tolerance to CO₂, greater the D value, stronger would be the crop tolerance to CO₂. It can be seen from Table 6 that the comprehensive tolerance coefficient (D value) to CO₂ of the eight crops ranged from 0.1459 to 0.8645, wherein the D values of the C₃ crop were from 0.1459 to 0.4162, and the D values of the C₄ crop were from 0.8148 to 0.8645. The comprehensive tolerance coefficient to CO₂ of the eight typical crops in the Loess Plateau of China was: sorghum > broomcorn millet > foxtail millet > maize > mung beans > soybean > potatoes > buckwheat successively. That is to say, the tolerance of C₄ crops to CO₂ was obviously stronger than that of C₃ crops. This finding is highly consistent with the results of the actual potted plant

in simulation experiment on the apparent characteristics and biomass changes of crops.

Discussion

This study mainly simulated the impacts of ultra-high CO₂ concentration from CO₂ leakage of CCS project on typical crops. It was found that the growth of crops in experiment were all promoted as the CO₂ concentration was less than 10 mmol·mol⁻¹ for C₃ crops and 20 mmol·mol⁻¹ for C₄ crops. At those points of CO₂ concentration, the plant height, maximum root length, biomass, *Pn*, *E* and *gs* of the eight crops were reached to the highest among the different treatments of CO₂ concentration (Fig. 2–4).

As we know, photosynthesis of C₃ and C₄ plants immobilizes CO₂ using the Ribulose-1, 5-bisphosphate carboxylase (Rubisco) in Calvin cycle (Pan, 2015). The elevation of CO₂ concentration within a certain range can increase the activity of Rubisco and the binding of Rubisco with CO₂, so as to improve the carboxylation rate of Rubisco and the photosynthesis rate of plants, and thereby promoting the growth of plants (Mauney *et al.*, 1978; Sharkey, 1985; Wong, 1990). When the CO₂ concentration was higher than 20 mmol·mol⁻¹, the growth of C₃ and C₄ crops was inhibited in varying degrees, and the tolerance of C₄ crops to CO₂ was more stronger than that of C₃ crops, which is consistent with the results of West *et al.* (2009), Wu *et al.* (2014) and Ji *et al.* (2018). In general, the reason of the inhibition in most crops is that high concentration of CO₂ may cause a decrease in soil O₂, or lead to the decrease of soil pH and the acidification of soil solution, which may reduce the source of plant energy and inhibit the absorption of water and mineral nutrition by root system (Beaubien *et al.*, 2008; Li *et al.*, 2009; Patil *et al.*, 2010; Zhang *et al.*, 2016).

The impacts of CO₂ on crop growth and development are very complex and the tolerance of crops to CO₂ is diverse (Krüger *et al.*, 2009; West *et al.*, 2009; Ziogou *et al.*, 2013; West *et al.*, 2015). The selection, interaction and treatment of indicators should be considered in establishment of evaluation method for the crops tolerance to CO₂ (Donnelly *et al.*, 2016; Nan *et al.*, 2016). Based on the study of the impacts of CO₂ on crops, nine indicators were selected to evaluate the crop tolerance to CO₂ in the study. According to the measured values of indicators under normal CO₂ concentration, the tolerance coefficient of each single indicator was calculated (Table 2). Nine single indicators were converted into three principal components by PCA (Table 4). On the basis of the Eigen vector of the single indicator to the principal component (Table 5), the comprehensive tolerance coefficient of eight crops was obtained by FCE. In this study, the correlation between single indicators was eliminated by PCA (Table 3). Through FCE, the comprehensive effect of the evaluation indicators of crop tolerance was refined (Table 6). By setting the weight value of evaluation indicators of crop tolerance with the variance contributions of each principal component, the subjectivity of weight value determination of evaluation indicators of crop tolerance can be avoided, and the quantitative evaluation of crop tolerance to CO₂ can be realized (Table 6).

In the determination of the tolerance coefficient of single indicators, the tolerance of indicators only with simple inhibition is easy to measure, while the tolerance of the indicators both with promotion and inhibition is more complicated. The measured values of the indicators under normal CO₂ concentration were used as the control in this study. The ratio of the average value at all concentrations to the measured values under normal CO₂ concentration was used as the tolerance coefficient of the single indicator, and

the "fertilization" and "inhibition" effects of CO₂ were simply synthesized. Whether it is necessary to distinguish and how to more accurately describe the difference between the effects of "fertilization" and "inhibition" is a question that needed further consideration.

Conclusion

Growth of C₃ crops was promoted when CO₂ concentration was less than 10 mmol·mol⁻¹, and growth of C₄ crops was improved when CO₂ level was less than 20 mmol·mol⁻¹. When CO₂ concentration continues to increase, the growth of C₃ and C₄ crops was inhibited by varying degrees, in which the inhibition for C₃ crops were more obvious. Based on PCA and FCE, a comprehensive evaluation method of crop tolerance to CO₂ was established, which not only dealt with the information overlap caused by the correlation among the single indicators, but also dealt with the assignment of the weight values of each indicator in comprehensive evaluation. The C₄ crops showed stronger tolerance to CO₂ than C₃ crops. Thus, when CCS project is implemented in the Loess Plateau of China, C₄ crops, especially sorghum, can be used as priority crops for agricultural production, while C₃ crops, especially buckwheat, may be the indicator crops for CO₂ leakage.

Acknowledgements

Research for this article was supported by 863 Program Grant of Ministry of Science and Technology of China (2012AA050103), and Natural Science Research Program of Education Department in Shaanxi Province of China (2019).

References

- Amonette, J.E., J.L. Barr, L.M. Dobeck, K. Gullickson and S.J. Walsh, 2010. Spatiotemporal changes in CO₂ emissions during the second ZERT injection, August–September 2008. *Environ. Earth Sci.*, 60: 263–272.
- Beaubien, S.E., G. Ciotoli, P. Coombs, M.C. Dictor, M. Krüger, S. Lombardi, J.M. Pearce and J.M. West, 2008. The impact of a naturally occurring CO₂ gas vent on the shallow ecosystem and soil chemistry of a Mediterranean pasture (*Latera, Ital*). *Intl. J. Greenhouse Gas Cont.*, 2: 373–387
- Blackford, J., C. Hattam, S. Widdicombe, N. Burnside, M. Naylor, K. Kirk, P. Maul and I. Wright, 2013. CO₂ leakage from geological storage facilities: environmental, societal and economic impacts, monitoring and research strategies. *Geol. Storage CO₂*, 10: 149–178
- Cerling, T.E., J.R. Ehleringer and J.M. Harris, 1998. Carbon dioxide starvation, the development of C₄ ecosystems, and mammalian evolution and discussion. *Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. Lond. Ser. B. Biol. Sci.*, 353: 159–171
- Cerling, T.E., Y. Wang and J. Quade, 1993. Expansion of C₄ ecosystems as an indicator of global ecological change in the late Miocene. *Nature*, 361: 344–345
- Christensen, J.M., 2007. Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage. *Environ. Policy Collect.*, 33: 303–305
- Cure, J.D. and B. Acock, 1986. Crop response to carbon dioxide doubling: a literature survey. *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 38: 127–145
- Deng, H.Z., H.H. Zhang, C.R. Li, F. Han and H. Zhang, 2017. Effect of artificial simulation for sealed CO₂ leakage on soil enzyme activities. *Appl. Chem. Ind.*, 46: 4–9

- Donnelly, L., A.M. Jagodziński, O.M. Grant and C.O. Reillya, 2016. Above-and below-ground biomass partitioning and fine root morphology in juvenile Sitka spruce clones in monoclonal and polyclonal mixtures. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, 373: 17–25
- GCCSI, 2018. *The Global Status of CCS*. Global CCS Institute Report. Melbourne, Australia
- Hatch, M.D., 1987. C₄ photosynthesis: A unique blend of modified biochemistry, anatomy and ultrastructure. *BBA- Rev. Bioener.*, 895: 81–106
- Hatch, M.D. and C.R. Slack, 1966. Photosynthesis by sugar-cane leaves. A new carboxylation reaction and the pathway of sugar formation. *Biochem. J.*, 101: 103–111
- IPCC, 2005. *IPCC Special Report on Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage*. Cambridge University Press, UK
- Ji, X., X. Ma, Y.J. Han, M.Y. Yu and C.C. Meng, 2018. Effect of different leakage speeds on plants in carbon capture and storage by simulation in chamber. *Chin. Soc. Agric. Eng.*, 34: 242–247
- Kimball, B.A., J.R. Mauney and F.S. Nakayama, 1993. Effects of increasing atmospheric CO₂ on vegetation. *Vegetatio*, 104/105: 64–75
- Koch, P.L., N.S. Diffenbaugh and K.A. Hoppe, 2004. The effects of late Quaternary climate and pCO₂ change on C₄ plant abundance in the south-central United States. *Palaeogeograp. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol.*, 207: 331–357
- Krüger, M., D. Jones, J. Frerichs, I. Birte, Oppermann, J. West, P. Coombs, K. Green, T. Barlow, R. Lister, R. Shaw, M. Strutt and I. Möllera, 2009. Effects of elevated CO₂ concentrations on the vegetation and microbial populations at a terrestrial CO₂ vent at Laacher See, Germany. *Intl. J. Greenhouse Gas Cont.*, 5: 1093–1098
- Lakkaraju, V.R., X. Zhou, M.E. Apple, A.I. Cunningham, L.M. Dobeck, K. Gullickson and L.H. Spangler, 2010. Studying the vegetation response to simulated leakage of sequestered CO₂ using spectral vegetation indices. *Ecol. Inform.*, 5: 379–389
- Leung, D.Y.C., G. Caramanna and M.M. Maroto-Valer, 2014. An overview of current status of carbon dioxide capture and storage technologies. *Renewable Sustain. Ener. Rev.*, 39: 426–443
- Li, T.L., H.B. Chen, Z.P. Sun and W.H. Wang, 2009. Effects of rhizosphere aeration on matrix gas, matrix nutrition and xylem sap in cucumber. *Chin. Soc. Agric. Eng.*, 25: 301–305
- Luo, Y., J.B. Xi, X.H. Tan and J.M. Zhang, 2013. Evaluation of shade tolerance of nine warm-season turfgrass and selection of their shade tolerant indices. *Caoye Xuebao*, 22: 239–247
- Mauney, J.R., K.E. Fry and G. Guinn, 1978. Relationship of photosynthetic rate to growth and fruiting of cotton, soybean, sorghum, and sunflower. *Crop Sci.*, 18: 259–263
- Metz, B. and O. Davidson, 2008. Working group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage. *MRS Bull.*, 33: 303–305
- Nan, Z.B., S.M. Wang, Y.R. Wang, H. Fu, C.J. Li and Y.Y. Duan, 2016. Stress tolerance mechanisms of 6 native plant species growing in China's northern grassland and their utilization. *Chin. Sci. Bull.*, 61: 239–249
- Pan, R.Z., 2015. *Plant Physiology*. 5th edition. Higher Education Press, Beijing, China
- Patil, R.H., J.J. Colls and M.D. Steven, 2010. Effects of CO₂ gas as leaks from geological storage sites on agro-ecosystems. *Energy*, 35: 4587–4591
- Pfanz, H., D. Vodnik, C. Wittmann, G. Aschan, F. Batic, B. Turk and I. Macek, 2007. Photosynthetic performance (CO₂-compensation point, carboxylation efficiency, and net photosynthesis) of timothy grass (*Phleum pratense* L.) is affected by elevated carbon dioxide in post-volcanic mofette areas. *Environ. Exp. Bot.*, 61: 41–48
- Pierce, S. and S. Sjögersten, 2009. Effects of below ground CO₂ emissions on plant and microbial communities. *Plant Soil*, 325: 197–205
- Rogers, H.H., G.B. Runion, S.A. Prior and H.A. Torbert, 1999. 8-Response of plants to elevated atmospheric CO₂: root growth, mineral nutrition, and soil carbon. *CO₂ Environ. Stress*, 75: 215–244
- Rosie, C.M.D., 1973. Some enzyme activities associated with the Chlorophyll containing layers of the immature barley pericarp. *Planta*, 114: 219–226
- Sayre, R.T., R.A. Kennedy and D.J. Pringnitz, 1979. Photosynthetic enzyme activities and localization in *Mollugo verticillata* populations differing in the levels of C₃ and C₄ cycle operation. *Plant Physiol.*, 64: 293–299
- Sharkey, T.D., 1985. Photosynthesis in intact leaves of C₃ plants: physics, physiology and rate limitations. *Bot. Rev.*, 51: 53–105
- Shelford, V.E., 1911a. Ecological succession I. stream fishes and the method of physiographic analysis. *Biol. Bull.*, 21: 9–35
- Shelford, V.E., 1911b. Ecological succession II. pond fishes. *Biol. Bull.*, 21: 127–151
- Shelford, V.E., 1931. Some concepts of bioecology. *Ecology*, 12: 455–467
- Stenhouse, M., R. Arthur and W. Zhou, 2009a. Assessing environmental impacts from geological CO₂ storage. *Ener. Proc.*, 1: 1895–1902
- Stenhouse, M., J. Gale and W. Zhou, 2009b. Current status of risk assessment and regulatory frameworks for geological CO₂ storage. *Ener. Proc.*, 1: 2455–2462
- Tian, D., 2013. *Research on the Effect of Captured CO₂ Leakage on Crops, Grass and Soil Environment*. Anhui Normal University, Anhui, China
- Wang, C.Y., Y.R. Pan, M.Y. Bai and M. Wen, 1995. The experiment study of effects doubled CO₂ concentration on several main crops in China. *Qixiang Xuebao*, 55: 86–94
- Weiner, H., J.N. Burnell, I.E. Woodrow, H.W. Heldt and M.D. Hatch, 1988. Metabolite diffusion into bundle sheath cells from C₄ plants: relation to C₄ photosynthesis and plasmodesmatal function. *Plant Physiol.*, 88: 815–822
- West, J.M., D.G. Jones, A. Annunziatelles, T.S. Barlow, S.E. Beaubien, A. Bond, N. Breward, P. Coombs, D. Angelis, A. Gardner, V. Gemeni, S. Graziani, K.A. Green, S. Gregory, S. Gwosdz, S. Hannis, K. Kirk, N. Koukouzas and F. Ziogou, 2015. Comparison of the impacts of elevated CO₂ soil gas concentrations on selected European terrestrial environments. *Intl. J. Greenhouse Gas Cont.*, 42: 357–371
- West, J.M., J. Pearce, P. Coombs, J.R. Ford, C. Scheib, J.J. Colls, K.L. Smith and M.D. Steven, 2009. The impact of controlled injection of CO₂ on the soil ecosystem and chemistry of an English lowland pasture. *Ener. Proc.*, 1: 1863–1870
- Wong, S., 1990. Elevated atmospheric partial pressure of CO₂ and plant growth. *Oecologia*, 23: 171–180
- Wu, Y., X. Ma, Y.E. Li and Y.F. Wan, 2014. The impacts of introduced CO₂ flux on maize/alfalfa and soil. *Intl. J. Greenhouse Gas Cont.*, 23: 86–97
- Xie, J.J. and C.P. Liu, 2013. *Methods of Fuzzy Mathematics and Applications*, 4th edition. Huazhong University of Science and Technology. Press, Wuhan, China
- Xue, L., J.J. Ma, S. Wang, Q. Li, J.F. Ma, H.G. Yu, S.J. Jiang and C.X. Huang, 2014. Effects of CO₂ leakage from CCS on the physiological characteristics of C₄ crops. *Ener. Proc.*, 63: 3209–3214
- Yang, S.T., Y.F. Li, Y.X. Hu and J.X. Lin, 1997. Effects of CO₂ concentration doubling on the leaf morphology and structure of 10 species in Gramineae. *Zhiwu Xuebao*, 39: 859–866
- Yu, J.L., 1993. *Agricultural Multivariate Experiment Statistics*. Beijing Agricultural University Press, Beijing, China
- Zhang, X.Y., M. Xin, Z. Zhao, Y. Wu and Y. Li, 2016. CO₂ leakage-induced vegetation decline is primarily driven by decreased soil O₂[J]. *J. Environ. Manage.*, 171: 225–230
- Zhou, X., M.E. Apple, L.M. Dobeck, A.B. Cunningham and L.H. Spangler, 2013. Observed response of soil O₂ concentration to leaked CO₂ from an engineered CO₂ leakage experiment. *Intl. J. Greenhouse Gas Cont.*, 16: 116–128
- Ziogou, F., V. Gemeni, N. Koukouzas, D. Angelis, S. Libertini, S.E. Beaubien, S. Lombardi, J.M. West, D.G. Jones, P. Coombs, T.S. Barlow, S. Gwosdz and M. Krüger, 2013. Potential Environmental Impacts of CO₂ Leakage from the Study of Natural Analogue Sites in Europe. *Ener. Proc.*, 37: 3521–3528
- Zwaan, B.V.D. and R. Gerlagh, 2009. Economics of geological CO₂ storage and leakage. *Climatic Change*, 93: 285–309

[Received 09 Mar 2019; Accepted 06 Apr 2019; Published (online) 12 Jul 2019]