

pH/T duality – the equation of state for plants

Mariusz Pietruszka

Faculty of Biology and Environment Protection, University of Silesia, Jagiellońska 28, PL-40032 Katowice, Poland.

Abstract We examine pH/T (or μ /T) duality of acidic pH (or auxin-induced acidification) and temperature (T) for growth of grass shoots, to determine the equation of state (EoS) for living plants. By considering shoot growth as a dynamic series of phase transitions in the extending wall, we identify critical exponents for this phenomenon, exhibiting singular behaviour at critical temperature, critical pH and critical chemical potential (μ) in the form of four power laws: $F(\tau)_\pi \propto |\tau|^{\beta-1}$, $F(\pi)_\tau \propto |\pi|^{1-\alpha}$, $G(\tau)_\mu \propto |\tau|^{-2-\alpha+2\beta}$ and $G(\mu)_\tau \propto |\mu|^{2-\alpha}$. The power-law exponents α and β are numbers, independent of pH (or μ) and T, which are known as critical exponents, while π and τ represent the reduced pH and reduced temperature, respectively. Various scaling predictions are obtained: a convexity relation $\alpha + \beta \geq 2$ for practical pH-based analysis, and $\beta \equiv 2$ identity in microscopic representation. In this scenario, a magnitude decisive for growth is the chemical potential. The EoS span areas of the biological, physical, chemical and Earth sciences, crossing the borders with the language of phase transitions.

To whom correspondence should be addressed: Mariusz Pietruszka, E-mail: mariusz.pietruszka@us.edu.pl

Introduction

This work deals with the derivation and determination of an equation of state (EoS) for plants integrating the relationship between temperature and pH (or chemical potential, μ) with growth. Based on reliable (published) data we seek for identifying state variables for optimal growth (at constant turgor pressure). Sparse number of parameters can be misleading – this approach does not oversimplify the complexity of the biologic systems, but – conversely – takes all of them into account by building an outer scaffold that cannot be surpassed. We cannot dismiss the possibility that this is the role of phenomenology to make universal statements, in this case imposing physical constraint (EoS) on the extending wall.

A commonly held view is that biological systems are complex, and therefore modelling has to cope with the fact that the degrees of freedom are numerous, and – correspondingly – the amount of parameters should be high. Though physical systems in microscopic scale are complex too and the number of degrees of freedom in real systems is abundant (Avogadro number, as in the solid state physics), their behaviour (and evolution) can usually be described by few parameters and thermodynamic potentials (e.g. Ginzburg–Landau theory of superconductivity [1]) in the framework of phase transitions theory. Similar argument concerns also microscopic (quantum) theories, like the Hubbard [2] model possessing only two parameters: t – for “hopping” integral, and U – for Coulomb interaction of electrons in narrow energy bands. In what follows, I argue that similar to physical systems low number of relevant parameters may be also adequate in biological systems.

Growth of plant cells and organs (like extending cylindrical organs such as grass shoots) are affected by light and humidity, along with pH and temperature, the important factors influencing growth in the environment of plants. It can be a rewarding enterprise to understand growth in terms of the time evolution of phase transitions taking place in the peripheral cell wall exchanging particles and energy-consuming metabolic processes (like energy-conserving ATP) with the inside of cell compartment – vacuole and cytoplasm, treated as molecules’ and heat reservoir (thermostat).

Plant developmental systems have evolved within the universal limitations imposed by the plant cell wall [3]. Plant cells encase themselves within a complex polysaccharide wall [4], and characteristically obtain most of their energy from sunlight *via* photosynthesis by primary chloroplasts. Expansive growth of turgid cells, defined as an irreversible increase in cell volume, can be regarded as a physical process governed by the mechanical properties of the cell wall and the osmotic properties of the protoplast [5]. The precise biochemical mechanism that regulates the ability of the growth-limiting walls to extend irreversibly under the force of turgor pressure has not yet been identified [6].

Growing plant cells characteristically exhibit acid growth [7, 8, 9], which has been formulated in a form of “acid growth hypothesis” [10, 11]. The acid growth hypothesis postulates that both phytotoxin fusaric acid (FA) and the growth promoting factor auxin (indole-3-acetic acid, IAA) cause wall-loosening and produces the concomitant induction of growth (growth enhancement) by rapid acidification of the extension-limiting cell wall [12]. Enigmatic “wall loosening processes” are in fact minor changes within the polymer network of the extension limiting walls (i.e. incorporation of proteins, enzymatic splitting of polymer backbones or covalent cross-links; disruption of non-covalent interactions between wall polymers).

Temperature is an underappreciated tool for research; in many cases the process of growth can be differentiated by their temperature responses [13]. Actually, only a few papers can be mentioned, in which temperature response is treated as a major problem [14]. Though, cell growth, especially cell elongation, has a high Q_{10} factor which indicates that this is a chemically rather than physically controlled phenomenon (The Q_{10} temperature coefficient is a measure of the rate of change of a biological or chemical system as a consequence of increasing the temperature by 10 °C). Growth is accomplished through enlargement of the cell volume owing to water uptake, maintaining appropriate inside pressure in the vacuole, and irreversible extension of the pre-existing (primary) cell wall. Hereafter, we assume an almost constant or slowly varying turgor pressure, which by definition is a force generated by water pushing outward on the plasma membrane and plant cell wall, that results in plant cell – and plant as a whole – rigidity.

Expansive growth is the result of coupling effects [15] between mechanical (pressure), thermal (temperature) and chemical energy (pH). Thermal sensitivity of biochemical processes refers to the coupling effect between the thermal and the chemical energies. In search for a plant-specific ‘equation of state’ in growing biological cells or non-meristematic tissues, we consider two ‘state variables’, namely temperature and pH, at a constant turgor. We note that pH is not *sensu stricte* a fundamental physical quantity, and cannot be treated as a usual intense variable. Nonetheless, relying on the definition of pH, and next considering chemical potential – a proper state variable, we may propose the following.

Evidence has accumulated that the final goal of auxin action is to activate the plasma membrane (PM) H^+ -ATPase, a process which excretes H^+ ions into the cell wall. The auxin-enhanced H^+ -pumping lowers the cell wall pH, activates pH-sensitive enzymes and proteins (like expansins [16], xyloglucans [17] or yieldins [18]) within the wall, and initiates cell-wall loosening and extension growth [10]. It has also been observed that when auxin depleted segments were submerged in acid buffer solution the segments started elongation growth immediately (“acid growth”), whereas the auxin induced growth (“auxin growth”) began after a delay (lag phase), as shown in Fig. 1 (curve 1) in Hager [10]; see also the remaining plots, of quite different character, (curves 2 – 6) corresponding to “acid growth”. From many investigations, lasting for more than four decades, it was deduced that protons exerted into the wall compartment are directly responsible for wall-loosening processes by hydrolysis of covalent bonds, transglycosylation or disruption of non-covalent bonds [10]. The growth effect is illustrated in Fig. 2 in Hager [10], where the “Zuwachs” (increment in %) is plotted against pH (SI Fig. 1a), defined as the decimal logarithm of the reciprocal of the hydrogen ion activity a_{H^+} in a solution ($pH = -\log_{10} a_{H^+} = \log_{10} 1/a_{H^+}$). The pH value is a logarithmic measure of H^+ -activity (tendency of a solution to take H^+) in aqueous solutions and defines their acidity or alkalinity; a_{H^+} denotes the activity of hydronium ions in units of mol/l. Logarithmic pH scale ranges from 0 to 14 (neutral water has a pH equal 7). Though pH can be expressed in terms of more elementary chemical potential μ_{H^+} of the proton (H^+) through the relation $pH = (\mu_{H^+}^0 - \mu_{H^+}) / RT \log_{10}$, where R denotes the gas constant and $\mu_{H^+}^0$ is the reference potential.

Indirect measurements of the chemical potential (μ) by means of pH, can be compared to our previous measurements of the electromotive force (EMF) to detect phase transitions, localized by the “kinks” in the chemical potential in condensed matter physics [19, 20]. pH is not a typical generalized coordinate, though the microscopic state of the system can be expressed in collective way through it.

Temperature is among the most important environmental factors that determine plant growth and cell wall yielding [21]. Temperatures at which most physiological processes go on normally in plants range from approximately 0 °C to 40 °C, which determines the typical temperature scale (in Kelvin scale: [K] = [°C] + 273.15). The temperature responses of plants include all biological processes throughout biochemical reactions. This is clearly visible in the relative rates of all development or growth processes of maize as a function of temperature in Fig. 3 in Yan and Hunt [14], reconstructed as SI Fig. 1b, to become self-contained. For future applications we propose to setup the “absolute” temperature scale for plants [0 – 40] °C (or [0 – 45] °C) corresponding to [0, 1] interval after rescaling.

Astonishingly enough, the pH plots presented in Fig. 2 in Hager [10] and temperature-plots, Fig. 3 in Yan and Hunt [14], look similar (when applying mirror symmetry). Providing that we perform a substitution $x \rightarrow (1 - x)$, and consider a function $f(x)$ of a variable x and of its reflection $(1 - x)$, one might expect they will look approximately the same after proper scaling. Not surprisingly, such a function in mathematics exists, and can be conveniently described by the Euler beta density distribution (or just the Euler function). In this approach we assume that x equals either pH or temperature (both rescaled to [0, 1] interval), an assignment which makes sense, since at relatively low pH (corresponding to relatively high T) plant cells and organs grow (elongate) the fastest, which is clearly reproduced in SI Fig. 1.

Now, inspired by the Ansatz (“educated guess”: using beta function $f(x, \alpha, \beta)$ for growth empirical data), we will show that the final action of temperature and pH on plant growth is effectively the same, though both triggers of these responses are apparently of a different nature.

Materials and methods

Based on the “acid growth hypothesis” and relevant dense experimental data [14, 10] we examine pH/T (or μ/T) duality of acidic pH (or auxin-induced acidification) and temperature (T) for growth of grass shoots, to determine the equation of state (EoS) for living plants.

Comparing the results from different experiments [14, 10], we have noticed that the x – variable may, after rescaling, bear the following meaning: either acidity (basicity) $x = \text{pH}$ or temperature $x = T$, see SI Fig. 2, with a characteristic beta function cut-off at $x = 0$ (SI Fig. 2a and the inset) and at $x = 1$ (SI Fig. 2b); the normalised scale we used is presented in SI Fig. 2b (inset).

Results

Derivation of the equation of state for plants

The probability density function of the beta distribution (also called the Euler integral of the first kind [22], for $0 \leq x \leq 1$, and shape parameters $\alpha, \beta > 0$, is a power function of the variable x and of its reflection $(1 - x)$

$$f(x; \alpha, \beta) = \text{const} \cdot x^{\alpha-1} (1-x)^{\beta-1} = \frac{x^{\alpha-1} (1-x)^{\beta-1}}{\int_0^1 u^{\alpha-1} (1-u)^{\beta-1} du} = \frac{1}{B(\alpha, \beta)} x^{\alpha-1} (1-x)^{\beta-1} \quad (1)$$

and has a normalization constant $B(\alpha, \beta)$. Based on the experimental observations as described above, equation (1) can be merged into a single expression

$$c_{pH} \cdot pH^{\alpha-1} (1-pH)^{\beta-1} = c_T \cdot T^{\beta-1} (1-T)^{\alpha-1} \quad (2)$$

where c_{pH} and c_T are constants, and “pH” is treated here as a non-separable variable name.

By defining the state function F at constant turgor pressure P (isobaric: $\delta P \approx 0$) and assuming adequate water uptake to fulfil this requirement

$$F(T, pH; \alpha, \beta)|_P \equiv \left(\frac{T}{1-pH} \right)^{\beta-1} \left(\frac{1-T}{pH} \right)^{\alpha-1} \quad (3)$$

we determine from equation (2)

$$\frac{T^{\beta-1} (1-T)^{\alpha-1}}{pH^{\alpha-1} (1-pH)^{\beta-1}} = \left(\frac{T}{1-pH} \right)^{\beta-1} \left(\frac{1-T}{pH} \right)^{\alpha-1} = \frac{c_{pH}}{c_T} = \Omega_S \quad (4)$$

where Ω_S is a dimensionless constant. We notice, that the above equation takes the usual form of the equation of state. Hence, the constitutive ‘equation of state’ (EoS) for living plants explicitly reads

$$\boxed{\left(\frac{T}{1-pH} \right)^{\beta-1} \left(\frac{1-T}{pH} \right)^{\alpha-1} = \frac{c_{pH}}{c_T} = \Omega_S} \quad (5)$$

which has an elegant form of a double power law. Note, that T is not the absolute temperature in the Kelvin scale, but the temperature rescaled to $[0, 1]$ interval, as pH is. Here α and β are the shape exponents (SI Table 1 and SI Figure 3). The saddle-point type of solution presented in Fig. 1a represents a concave surface (Fig. 1b, for contour plot), roughly accurate at low pH and moderate temperatures. Equation (5) becomes increasingly inaccurate (divergent) at very low or very high pH values (close to zero or one in the normalized scale, we use throughout the article), though such excessive conditions – constituting unacceptable extremes for life to come to existence – are excluded by Nature. The so called “threshold pH ”, corresponding to the minimum of pH in Fig. 1a (or the horizontal line in the derivative, Fig. 1c), has already been observed by Lüthen et al. [23]. The isotherms of Eq. (3) are presented in Fig. 2.

Even though we (apparently) launched our derivation from “acid growth theory”, closer look at the ‘initial conditions’ reveals that, in fact, it was established on raw experimental data of pH and T – dependent growth (SI Figure 1), free from – accepted or not by the scientific community – interpretations. For that reason Eq. (5) is independent of whether acid growth theory applies or not, and therefore seems universal, at least for tip-growing grass shoots. Note, Eq. (5) is not an evolution (growth) equation, but a system (cell wall) property equation. The solutions of Eq. (5) for α and β in the form of contour plots are presented in SI Fig. 4, for comparison.

Essential thermodynamic relations are property relations and for that reason independent of the type of process. In other words, they are valid for any substance (here: cell wall of a given plant species) going through any process (mode of extension), although in our case we should be aware the empirical origin of Eq. (5), and memorize that a fundamental

state variable of the system is the Gibbs energy – the chemical potential μ at constant pressure and temperature (here: $\mu = \mu_{H^+}$ for H^+ ions). Then

$$F(T, pH; \alpha, \beta) \approx G(T, pH(T); \alpha, \beta) = G(T, \mu_{H^+}; \alpha, \beta) \quad (6a)$$

where

$$G(T, \mu_{H^+}; \alpha, \beta) \Big|_P \equiv -\frac{(\log 10)^a}{T-1} (\mu_0 - \mu_{H^+})^2 \left[\frac{T-1}{(\mu_0 - \mu_{H^+})RT} \right]^\alpha \left[\frac{RT^2}{RT + (\mu_0 - \mu_{H^+}) \log 10} \right]^{\beta-1} \quad (6b)$$

$G_P(T, \mu)$ is another state function though expressed properly by intense, microscopic state variables; temperature T belongs here to $[0, 1]$ interval. In approximation, since pH is measured in isothermal conditions (SI Fig. 1a), we may temporarily neglect $pH(T)$ dependence in equation (6a), and consider pH and T as intense (non-additive) variables.

Equation of state is a relation between state variables, describing the state of matter under a given set of physical conditions. It is a constitutive equation which provides a relationship between two or more state functions associated with the matter, such as its temperature, pressure, volume, or internal energy. They are useful in describing the properties of gases (ideal gas law: $PV = nRT$), fluids (van der Waals equation of state, which is an improvement of the ideal gas law), condensed matter, and even the interior of stars or (presently) accelerated expansion of the Universe ($P = w\rho$ [24]). In this context, equation (5) is the EoS describing plant cell growth at constant turgor pressure P , where the ‘state functions’ are temperature and pH of the extending cell volume. Here pH, even though it is not an intense variable in usual sense, being intimately connected with the acid growth hypothesis, introduces a direct link between physical variables (P, V) representing the thermodynamic state of the system (growing cell or tissue), and biological response (*via* pH altering – H^+ -ATPase) resulting in growth. Clearly, equation (5) can be further verified by diverse experiments conducted for many species, to determine characteristic triads (α, β, Ω_S), belonging taxonomically to different species or families (classes), or just controlled by growth factors (growth stimulators like auxin, fusicoccin or inhibitors like $CdCl_2$). From these triads, Eq. (5) should be possible to connect with the underlying physiological processes or their molecular drivers. In particular, whether the underlying molecular mechanism is identical or different should be reflected in critical exponents (at phase transition, see beneath). Despite the fact that F is not a generalized homogeneous function, it can also be used to check for a kind of “universality hypothesis” [25], and validate the commonly accepted evolutionary paradigm with genuine numbers.

Calculation of critical exponents

Phase transitions occur in thermodynamic limit at a certain temperature, called the critical temperature T_c , where the whole system is correlated (radius of coherence ξ becomes infinite at $T = T_c$). We want to describe the behaviour of the function $F(pH, T)$ expressed in terms of a double power law by equation (3), close to the critical temperature and, specifically in our case – for practical reasons, about the critical $pH = pH_c$. In physics, critical exponents describe the behaviour of physical quantities near continuous phase transitions. It is believed, though not proven, that they are universal, i.e. they do not depend on the details of the system. Since growth (like cell growth, or elongation growth of shoots of grasses: coleoptiles or hypocotiles) may be imagined as advancing with the course of time a quasi-continuous phase transition, encouraged by the form of equation (3), we may calculate the critical exponents.

Let us introduce the dimensionless control parameter (τ) for the reduced temperature

$$\tau = 1 - \frac{T}{T_c} \quad (7)$$

and similarly (π), for the reduced pH

$$\pi = 1 - \frac{pH}{pH_c} \quad (8)$$

which are both zero at the phase transition, and calculate the critical exponents. It is important to keep in mind that critical exponents represent the asymptotic behaviour at phase transition, offering unique information of how the system (here: cell wall) approaches the critical point. A critical point is defined as a point at which $\xi = \infty$, so in this sense $T = T_c$ and $pH = pH_c$ is a bi-critical point of Eq. (5). We believe, this significant property can help determining a peculiar microscopic mechanism(s) allowing for wall extension and growth in the future research. The information gained from this asymptotic behaviour may advance our present knowledge of these processes and their mechanisms.

By substituting equation (7) and (8) into equation (3) we may calculate from definition [25] the critical exponents (when $T \rightarrow T_c$ and $pH \rightarrow pH_c$), to give us

$$\lambda_1 = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log F(\tau, \pi)}{\log(\tau)} = \beta - 1 \quad (9)$$

$$\lambda_2 = \lim_{\pi \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log F(\tau, \pi)}{\log(\pi)} = 1 - \alpha \quad (10)$$

and

$$\lambda_3 = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\pi \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log F(\tau, \pi)}{\log(\tau) \log(\pi)} = 0 \quad (11)$$

Here $\lambda_1 = \beta - 1$ and $\lambda_2 = 1 - \alpha$ are the critical exponents ($\lambda_3 = 0$). The above equations result in two power relations, valid in the very immediate vicinity of the critical points

$$F(\tau)_\pi \propto |\tau|^{\beta-1} \quad (12)$$

$$F(\pi)_\tau \propto |\pi|^{1-\alpha} \quad (13)$$

where lower indices denote constant magnitudes. Equations (12) and (13) represent the asymptotic behaviour of the function $F(\tau)$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$ or $F(\pi)$ as $\pi \rightarrow 0$. In fact, we observe singular behaviour at $T = T_c$ (Fig. 3a) and $pH = pH_c$ (Fig. 3b). At this bi-critical point, the following convexity relation [25] holds: $\alpha + \beta \geq 2$.

Retaining τ for the reduced temperature, let us introduce another – microscopic – control parameter, μ , for the chemical potential

$$\mu = 1 - \frac{\mu_{H+}}{\mu_c} \quad (14)$$

Substituting τ and equation (14) into equation (6b) for $G(T, \mu)$ and assuming the reference potential $\mu_0 = 0$, we may calculate [25] the critical exponents (when $T \rightarrow T_c$ and $\mu_{H^+} \rightarrow \mu_c$) to get

$$\lambda_1 = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log G(\tau, \mu)}{\log(\tau)} = -2 - \alpha + 2\beta \quad (15)$$

$$\lambda_2 = \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log G(\tau, \mu)}{\log(\mu)} = 2 - \alpha \quad (16)$$

$$\lambda_3 = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log G(\tau, \mu)}{\log(\tau) \log(\mu)} = 0 \quad (17)$$

The above limits result in another two power relations, valid in the very immediate vicinity of the critical points

$$G(\tau)_\mu \propto |\tau|^{-2-\alpha+2\beta} \quad (18)$$

$$G(\mu)_\tau \propto |\mu|^{2-\alpha} \quad (19)$$

Equations (18) – (19) represent the asymptotic behaviour of the function $G(\tau, \mu)$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$ or $G(\tau, \mu)$ as $\mu \rightarrow 0$. At the microscopic level, we observe singular behaviour at $T = T_c$ (Fig. 4a) and $\mu = \mu_c$ (Fig. 4b – c).

For the bi-critical point the exact relation holds: $\beta = 2$ (compare with SI Table 1 and SI Fig. 3), leaving us with the only free parameter (α) of the theory. Note a broad peak at the critical temperature (optimal growth occurs for a certain temperature *range*) and a sharp, more pointed peak for the critical chemical potential (a *single* value corresponding to the optimum growth). In this representation, growth can be treated as a series of subsequent phase transitions taking place in the cell wall. It looks as though, a cardinal magnitude decisive for growth – in phase transitions approach – is the chemical potential. In time evolution of the extending cell wall the chemical potential may form an asymmetrical ratchet mechanism: oscillating biochemical reactions, which are common in cell dynamics, may be closely related to the emergence of life phenomenon itself [26]. In this context relations for the chemical potential could be one of the most fundamental dynamical constraints also for life's origin.

Complex systems like the cell wall of a growing plant are at the same time solid and liquid-like. On the molecular level they are both ordered and disordered. Equation of state explains the properties of the wall which can be described in general way. Whether the structure is ordered or disordered, universal features can be identified by simple scaling laws.

Discussion

Erwin Schrödinger [27] may have been the first to consider the thermodynamic constraints within which life evolve, raising fundamental questions about organismal evolution and development. Here we attempted a more formal description of life couched in terms of the equation of state (EoS). More precisely, this work seeks to model the relationship between plant growth and temperature (or pH) in terms of the EoS, describing growth optima as functions of state variables and critical exponents. Apparently, from the biological point of view there is already a simple and compelling explanation for growth optima of plant growth. Growth is mediated both directly and indirectly by enzymes and increases broadly in line with

the frequently observed effect of temperature on enzyme activities [28]. However, once temperatures are sufficient to denature proteins, enzyme activities rapidly decrease, and plasma membranes and some other biological structures will also experience damage (compare SI Fig. 1b, at a high temperature end). In this context the kink observed at $T = T_c$ in Fig. 3a coincides with a temperature-driven phase transition, pointing at the critical temperature T_c , in agreement with the interpretation of the enhancement in effective diffusion rates [29]. On the other hand, plot in Fig. 3b resembles a “lambda” kind of phase transition, where the state function F tends towards infinity as pH approaches the lambda point, which is similar to heat capacity diffusive transition [30, 31]. Interestingly, at the low-pH end, the plot does not approach zero, but tends to the finite value of one, naturally preferring lower pH-values regime (below pH_c) for growth, as predicted by acid growth hypothesis, nonetheless allowing also for limited (though diminished) growth at $pH > pH_c$. At the critical points a continuous phase transition can be observed.

In continuous phase transitions [32], there always exist a magnitude that infinitesimal changes effect in symmetry change at phase transition. Seemingly, in biological systems such (order/disorder) symmetry change [33] may be connected with a mechanism [34], where chemically mediated deposition causes turnover of cell wall cross-links, thereby facilitating mechanical deformation. It may also reflect the pectate structure and distortion suggested by Boyer [35], Fig. 5c, d in Chara cell walls, by putting wall polymers in tension and make the load bearing bonds susceptible to calcium loss and allow polymer slippage that irreversibly deforms the wall. Proseus and Boyer [36] suggested that the ladder like structure would be susceptible to distortion, and that the distortion would increase the distance between adjacent galacturonic residues (Fig. 5D in (35)) – the bonds may lengthen and thus weaken and decrease their affinity for Ca^{2+} . Then dissociation may occur, allowing turgor dependent irreversible expansion (Fig. 4 in [37]; applicable also for non-isochronous growth in pollen tubes). The direction of maximal expansion rate is usually regulated by the direction of net alignment among cellulose microfibrils, which overcomes the prevailing stress anisotropy [38]. The transient changes in wall composition and bonds’ deformation may be a hallmark of symmetry change and a kind of phase transition (orchestrated instability) taking place in the cell wall. A situation, already pointed out in the Introduction, that protons excreted into the wall compartment are directly responsible for wall-loosening processes by hydrolysis of covalent bonds, or disruption of non-covalent bonds, can be also a signature for symmetry change and phase transitions occurring in the wall compartment of the growing cell.

Though, as yet underlying microscopic mechanisms are not well recognized (and – in consequence – order parameters are difficult to identify), pH-driven “lambda” phase transition may be attributed to the maximum activity of PM H^+ -ATPase, while temperature-driven phase transitions in the cell wall can be directly referred to the maximum elevation of the effective diffusion rate (k_2 coefficient in [29]) – we consider primary (diffusive) growth throughout this article. As an aside, from calculation of cross-correlations we may draw further conclusions connected with the biochemical picture of acid growth theory [10]. The result presented here in SI Fig. 5 is a clear characteristic that temperature-induced growth and auxin induced acidification (PM H^+ -ATPase) growth strikingly correlate (there is good experimental evidence that higher temperature induces auxin biosynthesis in some plants), though the convolution of acidic pH growth and temperature growth is less shifted away from zero (lag), and even more pronounced. This strict quantitative result may donate to the acid growth hypothesis developed by plant physiologists and contribute to resolving problems arose in the long lasting discussion. However, still a problem arises: It is unclear to what

degree Eq. (5) applies universally, as the published raw data that constitute the experimental basis are only for grass shoot elongation growth.

Now we show, that our findings may be embedded in the evolutionary context connected with the migration of plants away from the Equator (changes in latitudes) as climate altered, and adaptation to spatial distribution of pH in the soil as a substitute for high temperature. As an example, exhibiting the potential strength of equation (5), let us consider the following. The dominant factors controlling pH at the European scale are geology (crystalline bedrock) in combination with climate (temperature and precipitation), as it is summarized in the GEMAS project account [39]. The GEMAS pH maps mainly reflect the natural site conditions on the European scale, whilst anthropogenic impact is hardly detectable. The authors state, the results provide a unique set of homogenous and spatially representative soil pH data for the European continent (note Fig. 5 in [39]). In this context, the EoS expressed by equation (5), may also gain evolutionary dimension when considering spatial distribution of pH data as affected by latitude (angular distance from the Equator) elevation on the globe, which is associated with climate reflection [39]: pH is strongly influenced by climate and substrate – the pH of agricultural soils in southern Europe is one pH unit higher than in northern Europe. See also Fig. 4 in Fabian et al. [39], or equivalently SI Fig. 6, where pH (CaCl₂) of soil samples grouped by European climate zones are measured, ranging (descending) from pH \approx 7 (mediterranean), pH \approx 6 (temperate) through pH \approx 5.25 (boreal) to pH \approx 4.80 (sub-polar). This fact may be reinterpreted in terms of here considered pH – temperature duality: while the migration of plants away from the Equator took place, lower pH values further to the North might had been acting in a similar way onto the growth processes, as high temperatures at the tropic zones. This situation could have lead to the energetically favourable mechanisms (adaptation), like the amplified ATP-powered H⁺-extrusion into the expanding wall of plant cells, and secondary acidification of the environment (released protons decrease pH in the incubation medium), irrespective of the initial pH level, which is a main foundation for the acid growth hypothesis. Apparently, the evolutionary aspect of equation (5), suggest a possible link with self-consistent adaptation processes ("The individual organism is not computed, or decoded; it is negotiated" [40], as one of its first applications, seems difficult to underestimate, and the potentially predicative power of EoS looks impressive considering the modest input we made, deriving equation (5) and the true thermodynamic relation given by equation (6b). In this perspective, the pH-response could potentially provide the plant with an adaptive advantage under unfavourable climate conditions.

The EoS for biological system has not been reported until this study. To further verify the EoS and its implications, we note that based on the obtained results (calculated critical exponents) the kind of “universality hypothesis”, known from the physics of phase transitions [25], can be tested experimentally to extract “classes of universality” for plant species (Ω_S), substantiating taxonomic divisions in the plant kingdom by quantitative measures. This issue, however, demands further experimentation and is beyond the scope of this work.

The discovery of the EoS for plants adds an important dimension to the biophysical search for a better explanation of growth-related phenomena in a coherent way, through applicability for usually observed visco-elastic (or plastic) monotonically ascending and asymptotically saturated [29] cell wall extension, as well as pollen tube oscillatory growth. The underlying biochemical foundation expressed in a form of acid growth hypothesis, though not yet quite obvious, could also help to understand growth conditions ubiquitous in biological systems through coupling to EoS. In this respect our method is accompanied by its

partial validation – its application to the important biological question concerning acid growth hypothesis. In the above context, it is not surprising that growth of plants can be thought of as a time-driven series of phase transitions (by breaking of polymer bonds or other earlier mentioned mechanisms), though ultimately connected with the physics and chemistry by the equation of state (equations (5) or (6b)), solved at subsequent time instants by Nature. Since non-equilibrium stationary states are achieved after discrete intervals of time, for single cells like pollen tubes, such mechanism can lead to a kind of ‘leaps’ – macroscopically (of μm scale) observed growth rate oscillations [41, 42, 43]. This phenomenon may be treated as a result of subsequent phase transitions taking place in the cell wall. When the whole system is correlated (spontaneous bond polarization / breaking may be synchronized – through Pascal’s principle – by pressure fluctuations δP [44], acting as a long-range (ξ) messenger), at the phase change (e.g. the radius of coherence $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ at a Γ -interface [37]), and the stress-strain relations are fulfilled (ibid.), the simultaneous extension of the cell wall at the sub-apical region, possibly will correspond to pollen tube oscillation(s). Hence, the uncorrelated or weakly correlated extension would result in the observed bendings in extension of the growing tube. In multi-cell systems (tissues) possessing higher organisation (coleoptiles or hypocotyles in non-meristematic zones) the equation of state for plants will manifest itself by the emergent action of acidic incubation medium, or will be induced by endogenous auxin acidification, as it is presumed in the acid growth theory. In this aspect, the EoS may serve as a new tool for further investigation, and verification claims about the acid growth hypothesis and should greatly facilitate the analysis of auxin-mediated cell elongation as well as provide insight into the environmental regulation of auxin metabolism. It also delivers a narrative that provides a biophysical context for understanding the evolution of the apoplast, uncovering hidden treasures in – as yet – unscripted biophysical control systems in plants.

Conclusions

Cross-disciplinary research at the interface between the physical and life sciences has been accomplished in this work. We first considered the Euler beta function enigma – a duality of acidic pH (or auxin-induced acidification) and temperature, to receive the equation of state (EoS) for living plants. We started from a striking similarity (mirror symmetry) between elongation growth of grass shoots incubated in different pH environments, or auxin-induced elongation in water (or neutral buffer), with the respective growth at different temperatures. We based on a hypothesis that the action of temperature on the elongation growth is effectively equivalent for the relative growth increments, as caused by the change of pH (or endogenous auxin induced acidification) in the incubation medium. To resolve this ambiguity we first used the beta function, for both dependences, normalized prior to comparison, to receive the beta function shape parameters α and β . It turned out, that even without referring to biochemical underpinning, we might have concluded that acidic conditions of the incubation medium (or auxin-induced acidification) and environmental temperature can act interchangeably, at least when they are considered at phenomenological level – i.e. from the effectiveness’ of plant growth point of view. The numerically verified high accuracy of these complementary representations, allowed us to treat this dual approach, as a new apparatus predicting outcomes in the swapping growth conditions, especially useful in changing climate surroundings. We presume, that by applying a beta distribution, continuously changing its character with the values of the shape parameters, our findings may be related to the evolutionary context connected with the migration of plants away from the Equator as climate altered, and adaptation to spatial distribution of pH in the soil as a substitute for high temperature. The equation of state may be also helpful in delivering solutions (respective (α , β , Ω_s) – triads) for assisted migration of plant species [45] at risk of extinction in the face of

rapid climate change. In this application EoS tool can be an alternative for genetic modifications in assisted migration processes.

In physics, it is believed [46, 47] that the critical exponents are ‘universal’, i.e. independent of the details of the Hamiltonian (energy function) describing a system. The implications of this are, however, far reaching. One could take a realistic and complicated Hamiltonian, ‘strip’ it to a highly idealized Hamiltonian, and still obtain exactly the same critical exponents. For instance, on these grounds it is believed that carbon dioxide, xenon and the three-dimensional Ising model should all have the same critical exponents [48]. To within experimental error, this appears to be the case [49]. In this context, since growth phenomenology and phase transition approach have converged to a form for a universal critical equation of state for plants, the potential role of critical exponents to discriminate different modes of wall extension [50] of growing cells or tissues seems promising in opening new avenues of research.

It seems the EoS may explain a number of phenomena and is powerful in its simplicity. It positions itself at the brink of biology and nano-materials. We believe, it may be helpful in the description of processes of polymers’ self-assembly. In agricultural implementations, any departures from the optimum growth may be simply corrected by the appropriate adjusting of pH or T.

By resolving the duality of low pH or auxin action (producing acidic pH) against temperature, not only have we introduced equations of state for the realm of plants, but also, by considering growth (life?) as a dynamic series of phase transitions, identified critical exponents for this phenomenon exhibiting singular behaviour at critical temperature and critical pH (or critical value of the chemical potential) in the form of power laws. Furthermore, universal (and exact) “scaling relations” (like $\beta = 2$) were introduced holding at the bi-critical point, in agreement with experiment. The EoS, as being strongly predicative, can either be helpful for resolving food resource problems on Earth, or could even be used as an analytical tool (calculator) for optimizing fresh food production in manned exploration of space.

Acknowledgment

I thank Paweł Gusin for a helpful comment at early stage of this study.

References

1. Ginzburg, V. L. 2004. On superconductivity and superfluidity (what I have and have not managed to do), as well as on the 'physical minimum' at the beginning of the 21st century. *Chem. Phys. Chem.* 5: 930–945.
2. Hubbard, J. 1963. Electron correlations in narrow energy bands. *Proc. Roy. Soc.* 276: 238–257.
3. Lintilhac, P. M. 2014. The problem of morphogenesis: unscripted biophysical control systems in plants. *Protoplasma* 251: 25–36.
4. Cosgrove, D. J. 2005. Growth of the plant cell wall. *Nature* 6: 850.
5. Schopfer, P. S. 2006. Biomechanics of plant growth. *Am. J. Bot.* 93: 1415–1425.

6. Kutschera, U. 2000. Cell expansion in plant development. *R. Bras. Fisiol. Veg.* 12: 65–95.
7. Rayle, D. L. and R. E. Cleland. 1970. Enhancement of wall loosening and elongation by acid solutions. *Plant Physiol.* 46: 250–253.
8. Hager, A., H. Mentzel and A. Krauss. 1971. Versuche und hypothese zur primaervirkung des auxins beim steckungswastum. *Planta* 100: 47–75.
9. Cosgrove, D. J. 1989. Characterization of long-term extension of isolated cell walls from growing cucumber hypocotyls. *Planta* 177: 121–130.
10. Hager, A. 2003. Role of the plasma membrane H⁺-ATPase in auxin-induced elongation growth: historical and new aspects. *J. Plant. Res.* 116: 483–505.
11. Taiz, L. and E. Zeiger. 2006. *Plant Physiology*. Sinauer.
12. Kutschera, U. 1994. The current status of the acid-growth hypothesis. *New Phytol.* 126: 549–569.
13. Went, F. W. 1953. The effect of temperature on plant growth. *Ann. Rev. Plant Physiol.* 4: 347–362.
14. Yan, W. and L. A. Hunt. 1999. An equation modelling the temperature response of plants using only the cardinal temperatures. *Ann. Bot.* 84: 607–614.
15. Barbacci, A., M. Lahaye and V. Magnenet. 2013. Another brick in the cell wall: biosynthesis dependent growth model. *PLoS ONE* 8: e74400.
16. Cosgrove, D. J. 1993. How do plant cell walls extend? *Plant Physiol.* 102: 1–6.
17. Fry, S. C., S.C. Smith, K. F. Renwick, D. J. Martin, S. K. Hodge and K. J. Matthews. 1992. Xyloglucan endotransglucosylase, a new wall-loosening enzyme activity from plants. *Biochem. J.* 282: 821–828.
18. Okamoto-Nakazato, A., K. Takahashi, R. Katoh-Semba and K. Katou. 2001. Distribution of yieldin, a regulatory protein of the cell wall field threshold in etiolated cowpea seedlings. *Plant Cell Physiol.* 42: 952–958.
19. Matlak, M. and M. Pietruszka. 2000. Critical behaviour of the chemical potential at phase transitions. *Physica B* 291: 12–18.
20. Matlak, M., M. Pietruszka and E. Rówiński. 2001. Experimental method to detect phase transitions *via* the chemical potential. *Phys. Rev. B* 63: 052101-1–052101-3.
21. Pietruszka, M., S. Lewicka and K. Pazurkiewicz-Kocot. 2007. Temperature and the growth of plant cells. *J. Plant Growth. Regul.* 26: 15–25.
22. Polyanin, A. D., A. I. Chernoutsan. 2011. *A concise handbook of Mathematics, Physics and Engineering*. Science CRC Press.
23. Lüthen, H., M. Bigdon and M. Böttger. 1990. Re-examination of the acid growth theory of auxin action. *Plant Physiol.* 93: 931–939.

24. Weinberg, S. 1972. Gravitation and Cosmology: Principles and Applications of the General Theory of Relativity. Wiley & Sons.
25. Stanley, H. E. 1971. Introduction to phase transitions and critical phenomena. Oxford University Press.
26. Martin, O., L. Penate, A. Alvare, R. Cardenas and J. E. Horvath. 2009. Some possible dynamical constraints for life's origin. *Orig. Life Evol. Biosph.* 39: 533–544.
27. Schrödinger, E. 1944. What is life? Cambridge University Press.
28. Berg, J. M., J. L. Tymoczko and L. Stryer. 2002. Biochemistry. Freeman & Company.
29. Pietruszka, M. 2012. A biosynthesis/inactivation model for enzymatic WLFs or non-enzymatically mediated cell evolution. *J. Theor. Biol.* 315: 19–127.
30. Münster, A. 1969. Statistical Thermodynamics. Springer.
31. Matlak, M. and M. Pietruszka. 2001. Comparative study of the specific heat and chemical potential at phase transitions. *Solid State Comm.* 117: 413–417.
32. Landau, L. D. and E. M. Lifshitz. 1980. Statistical Physics. Butterworth-Heinemann.
33. De Gennes, P. G. 1991. The Nobel Prize in Physics; press release.
http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/physics/laureates/1991/press.html
34. Rojas, E. R., S. Hotton and J. Dumais. 2011. Chemically mediated mechanical expansion of the pollen tube cell wall. *Bioph. J.* 101: 1844–1853.
35. Boyer, J. S. 2009. Cell wall biosynthesis and the molecular mechanism of plant enlargement. *Funct. Plant Biol.* 36: 383–394.
36. Proseus, T. E. and J. S. Boyer. 2007 Tension required for pectate chemistry to control growth in *Chara corallina*. *J. Exp. Bot.* 57: 3989–4002.
37. Pietruszka, M. 2013. Pressure – induced cell wall instability and growth oscillations in pollen tubes. *PLoS ONE* 8: e75803.
38. Baskin, T. 2005. Anisotropic expansion of the plant cell wall. *Annu. Rev. Cell. Dev. Biol.* 21: 20322.
39. Fabian, C., C. Reimann, K. Fabian, M. Birke, R. Baritz and E. Haslinger. 2014. GEMAS: Spatial distribution of the pH of European agricultural and grazing land soil. *Appl. Geoch.* 48: 207–216.
40. Walsh, D. M. 2010. Two neo-Darwinisms. *History and philosophy of the life sciences* 32: 317–339.
41. Geitmann, A., M. Cresti. 1998. Ca²⁺ channels control the rapid expansions in pulsating growth of *Petunia hybrida* pollen tubes. *J. Plant Physiol.* 152: 439–447.
42. Hepler, P. K., L. Vidali and A. Y. Cheung. 2001. Polarized cell growth in higher plants. *Annu. Rev. Cell Dev. Biol.* 17: 159–187.

43. Zonia, L. and T. Munnik. 2007. Life under pressure: hydrostatic pressure in cell growth and function. *Trends Plant Sci.* 12: 90–97.
44. Pietruszka, M. and A. Haduch-Sendecka. 2015. Pressure-induced wall thickness variations in multi-layered wall of a pollen tube and Fourier decomposition of growth oscillations. *Gen. Physiol. Biophys.* 34: 145–156.
45. Vitt, P., K. Havens, A. T. Krame, D. Sollenberger and E. Yates. 2010. Assisted migration of plants: changes in latitudes, changes in attitudes. *Biol. Conserv.* 143: 18–27.
46. Fisher, M.E. 1966. Quantum corrections to critical-point behavior. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 16: 11–14.
47. Griffiths, R. B. 1970. Thermodynamics near the two-fluid critical mixing point in He^3 - He^4 . *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 24: 1479-82.
48. Baxter, R. J. 1989. Exactly solved models in statistical mechanics. Academic Press. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.
49. Hocken, R. and M. R. Moldover. 1976. Ising critical exponents in real fluids: an experiment. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 37: 29.
50. Breidwood, L., C. Breuer and K. Suigimoto. 2014. My body is a cage: mechanisms and modulation of plant cell growth. *New Phytol.* 201: 388–402.

Figures captions

Figure 1 Plot of the state function F given by equation (3), showing the optimum conditions for plant cell/organ growth. Both coordinates, temperature (T) and acidity or basicity (alkaline medium) pH , are rescaled to unity. Best conditions for maximum growth are found at (a) the saddle point (a stationary point) corresponding to (b) the lines' crossing in the contour plot, or in the plot (c) of $F - \text{derivative}$. Simulation parameters used, as for auxin-induced growth – see SI Table 1.

Figure 2 The (a) isotherms (scaled values indicated) as a function of pH (scaled) of Eq. (3); (b) constant pH curves as a function of temperature (scaled). Simulation parameters: $\alpha = 1.7$ and $\beta = 3.52$ (SI Table 1).

Figure 3 Critical behaviour at phase transitions taking place in the cell wall (pH , T – variables). (a) A “kink” (discontinuity in the first derivative) at the critical temperature $T = T_c$. (b) a “log-divergent” (“ λ ” – type) solution at the critical $\text{pH} = \text{pH}_c$. Control parameters: the reduced temperature (τ) and reduced pH (π). Simulation parameters (a) $\beta = 1.93$ and (b) $\alpha = 1.7$ (SI Table 1).

Figure 4 Critical behaviour at phase transitions taking place in the cell wall (for μ , T – intense state variables). (a) A “log-divergent” (“ λ ” – type) solution at $T = T_c$. (b – c) Solution at the critical value of the chemical potential $\mu = \mu_c$; (b) “acid growth”, (c) “auxin growth” (SI Table 1). Control parameters: the reduced temperature (τ) and chemical potential (μ). Simulation parameters (a) $\alpha = 3.52$, $\beta = 1.93$; (b) $\alpha = 1.87$, $\beta = 3.17$; (c) $\alpha = 1.7$ and $\beta = 3.52$ (SI Table 1).




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4