



# Shade Avoidance Syndrome: A Colour Ratio Regulated Growth

Nalishma Raghu <sup>a\*</sup>, Viji M.M <sup>a</sup> and Simhi Samyukta S.M <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Plant Physiology, College of Agriculture, Vellayani, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, India.

## **Authors' contributions**

*This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

## **Article Information**

DOI: 10.9734/AJSSPN/2024/v10i1248

## **Open Peer Review History:**

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/114322>

**Review Article**

**Received: 04/01/2024**

**Accepted: 10/03/2024**

**Published: 16/03/2024**

## **ABSTRACT**

When plants are exposed to the shade of another plant, they exhibit a set of responses called shade avoidance syndrome (SAS). The most remarkable trait observed in plants subjected to low R:FR are an upward reorientation of leaves (leaf hyponasty) and a rapid elongation of leaves and stems. PIF (Phytochrome Interacting Factor) and DELLA gene families interact with endogenous and external signals, which are mediated by several photoreceptors including phytochrome, cryptochrome, and UVR8, and are the main regulators of molecular responses for shade signalling. Plants combine information about R:FR with a variety of signalling routes, which involve environmental elements and plant hormones such as auxin, gibberellin, ethylene, and brassinosteroid. In order to balance resource allocation between development and defence, shade also represses defence responses caused by salicylic acid and jasmonate. These molecular discoveries aid to understand the mechanisms of plant strategies such as dampening of shade-avoidance traits and optimizing growth under low light conditions to foster crop improvement and also to develop shade tolerant varieties for different agricultural ecosystems.

*Keywords: Phytochrome; phytohormones; shade avoidance syndrome; shade tolerance; shade.*

\*Corresponding author: Email: nalishma6@gmail.com;

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Over the last few decades, increasing plant density and crop diversification have been key factors in improving crop yield. Amidst the current situation of swift population expansion and restricted arable land, effective farming methods may necessitate increased planting densities, intercropping, and modifications to plant design to optimise crop yields. Crop compatibility in intercropping systems depends on both the environmental conditions and crops' requirements that affect plant growth and, in turn, crop output.

Plants, which are sessile, have to constantly modify their growth and development to maximize photosynthetic activity under varying circumstances. Resources are few in an agricultural system, and individual competition frequently leads to plastic developmental responses that allow people to adapt to these resource constraints. Light is the primary environmental component that limits production under agricultural systems. Perception, transmission, and integration of many environmental cues enable this developmental plasticity.

Apart from being an essential source of energy for photosynthesis, light signals furnish plants with significant temporal and spatial information regarding their surroundings. Because of this, evolution has moulded plant systems and strategies to maximise light intake, changing the patterns of development in order to reconcile the sessile character of plants with variations in the amount of light available in their surroundings. Under natural conditions, one of the situations in which light might become scarce is in areas with canopy shade, like forests and prairies where a variety of species coexist in dense growth and might eventually result in shading which reduces the amount and quality of solar energy available for photosynthesis. Another situation is under agricultural ecosystem, where plants are cultivated communally, resulting in reduction of light quality by proximity shade. The ratio of photon irradiance in the red region of the spectrum to that in the FR region (abbreviated R:FR ratio) is the measure that is frequently used to characterise the quality of light in natural surroundings. The most used and researched light-related characteristic for plant growth and development is the R:FR ratio.

$$R : FR = \frac{\text{photon irradiance between 660 and 670 nm}}{\text{photon irradiance between 725 and 735 nm}}$$

## 2. SHADE RESPONSES

Gommers et al. [1] subjected two wild species of Geranium to FR-enriched (low R: FR = 0.2) versus control (R: FR = 1.8) white light settings. The species were found to be from contrasting environments. Petiole elongation was the reaction shown by *G. pyrenaicum*, whereas this was not seen in *G. robertianum*, suggesting that plants of the same species have distinct responses to shade.

### 2.1 Shade Avoidance Syndrome (SAS)

When plants are exposed to the shade of another plant, they develop a complex of reactions known as shade avoidance. It frequently involves increased apical dominance, elongation, changed flowering period, and changed resource partitioning. The shade-avoidance syndrome (SAS) is the collective term for these sets of reactions. The two most noticeable traits found in dicotyledonous plants are leaf hyponasty [2] and rapid elongation of leaves and stem [3]. Franklin and Whitelam [4] have noted similar shade responses in Brassica rapa and Arabidopsis.

With the help of these adaptations, plants are able to outcompete vegetation and increase their capacity for light-foraging in dense stands. In fact, it has been demonstrated that reflected and horizontally propagated FR radiation in the lower vegetation strata of canopies have been shown as important regulatory signals, controlling the elongation of stems in species that avoid shade [5].

Reduced chlorophyll content and increased apical dominance are two additional responses to low R: FR [6]. If the shade signal continues and the plant is not able to surpass the competing vegetation, it enters into reproductive phase, therefore encouraging seed set and improving the rate of reproduction [7]. According to Robinson et al., [8], these adaptations include decreases in shoot biomass, leaf area and the size of harvestable organs.

### 2.2 Shade Tolerance

Shade tolerance is the ability of a certain plant to withstand low light conditions. The lowest amount of light that a plant can withstand is known as shade tolerance from a physiological perspective. However, from a biological perspective, the entire plant life cycle—from early

survival and growth to reproduction—must be taken into account in order to classify a species as shade tolerant. As a result, while many plants can survive at low light levels, not all of them can procreate in such environments. These include cultivars of Fuchsia, various coleus (*Solenostemon scutellarioides*), holly (*Ilex aquifolium* L.), elephant ear (*Alocasia macrorrhiza*), and impatiens (*Impatiens balsamina*) [9].

Shade tolerance is attained by a variety of responses in various species, including modifications to the physiology and biochemistry of leaves, their anatomy and morphology, and/or their architectural design. According to Valladares and Niinemets [10], shade tolerance generally adapts to a very conservative use of resources under low light. This is typically accompanied by reduced growth rates as well as biochemical and structural changes to improve photosynthetic energy transduction efficiency and lower respiration losses. Shade-tolerant plants grow morphologically with thinner leaves, less apical dominance, more branching frequency, and less elongation response. Furthermore, under shade conditions, plants develop higher levels of chlorophyll content per leaf area or leaf dry mass [10]. Additionally, altered source partitioning and leaf shape are typically associated with shade tolerance [11].

### 3. PHOTORECEPTOR REGULATION OF SHADE AVOIDANCE

#### 3.1 Phytochrome

Phytochromes are photoreceptors present in algae, cyanobacteria, bacteria, fungi, and land plants, to perceive light, which differ significantly among phyla [12]. Phytochromes are two types of interconvertible red and far-red light receptors. The initial state is the inactive Pr state, which is transformed into the active Pfr conformation by light absorption. The Pfr conformation is then inactivated by thermal reversion or far-red (FR) light absorption.

Three kinds of phytochromes—phytochrome A (phyA), phyB, and phyC—have been found in the majority of angiosperms. On the other hand, five phytochrome members (PHYA-PHYE) have been found in Arabidopsis and are divided into two subgroups, PHYA/PHYC and PHYB/PHYD/PHYE, according to sequence homology. Every phytochrome plays a distinct role, and the contributions it makes change

based on the plant's developmental stage and environmental circumstances.

Activated phytochromes and blue and UV light receptors (UVR8) work together to sense inductive wavelengths and regulate a variety of physiological functions and developmental processes in plants. Active phytochromes cause germination to occur when a seed comes into contact with water [4]. When a seedling grows in the soil it adopts an etiolated morphology achieved through fast-growing hypocotyls and closed apical hook, in order to maximize its reach to the surface. Upon exposure to light, phytochromes are triggered, resulting in a reduction of de-etiolation: hypocotyl formation, followed by the opening of the apical hook, expansion of the cotyledons, and the initiation of chloroplast development in the leaves. This initial response to light occurs even in poor light conditions where blue and red light are scarce. However, because green tissues reflect FR light and absorb mostly red and blue light, the R/FR decreases in high plant density situations. Green seedlings experience decreased phytochrome activity as a result, which sets off the shade-avoidance response. Under these circumstances, plants shift their metabolism and devote more energy to developing aerial portions [13].

Plant phytochromes are dimeric, with each monomer comprising roughly 1150 amino acids covalently attached to their chromophore, phytochromobilin (PΦB), a linear tetrapyrrole. The apoprotein is composed of three structurally related domains: cGMP phosphodiesterase/adenylyl cyclase/FhIA (GAF), Period/Arnt/SIM (PAS), and a phytochrome-specific domain (PHY). The N-terminal PSM is made up of the N-terminal extension (NTE) and three structurally related domains. A histidine kinase-related domain (HKRD) and two PAS domains make up the C-terminal module (CTM).

Phytochromes go from the cytosol to the nucleus upon sensing light. This is a crucial stage that is necessary for every phytochrome response that is now understood, and it is widely maintained in both sea algae and land plants.

#### 3.2 Cryptochrome

Stems sense less blue light when developing beneath dense stands before leaves do [14]. Using selective spectral filters, glasshouse experiments demonstrated that removing blue wavelength light led to a noticeable elongation of

the stem. Tobacco plants exposed to lower photon irradiances of blue light have also been found to exhibit enhanced leaf hyponasty [15]. Therefore, certain physiological reactions that are indicative of low R:FR ratio perception can be elicited by reductions in the quantity of blue light.

Cryptochromes control a variety of developmental responses and resemble DNA photolyases structurally. In Arabidopsis, two cryptochromes (CRY1 and CRY2), which vary in fluence rate and light lability, control the blue light-mediated suppression of hypocotyl. Cry1 function predominates to limit hypocotyl development under increasing photon irradiances of blue light [16]. In situations where light is limited, CRY2 exhibits increased stability and inhibits hypocotyl growth at lower photon irradiances ( $< 1 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ), which increases blue light sensitivity [16]. According to Mazzella et al. [17], double mutants lacking in both photoreceptors showed more elongation than cry1 monogenic mutants, indicating the critical function of cry2 in inhibiting this response. Arabidopsis CRY1 and CRY2 interact with phytochrome-interacting factors (PIF) 4 and 5, according to Keller et al. [18]. The main photoreceptors that govern elongation responses to a decrease in the amount of blue light are the cryptochromes CRY1 and CRY2. Lin et al. [19] noticed the reversal of Arabidopsis cry1 function in response to green light, which resulted in the identification of a green light-absorbing flavin semiquinone state of this photoreceptor. According to Padmale et al. [20], cryptochromes (CRYs) in higher plants regulate growth in response to variations in blue light. When growth occurs beneath a canopy, blue light wavelengths are diminished. CRY1 and CRY2 detect this change and interact with PIF4 and PIF5, two bHLH transcription factors. These two factors are also controlled by phytochromes. But the transcriptome analyses indicated that the gene regulatory programs regulated by different wavelengths are specific [20].

Additionally, the data showed that PIF activity can affect the CRYs signal across the genome and that these factors combine the binding of several plant photoreceptors to enable changes in growth under various light circumstances. More recently, Arabidopsis cry2 has been found to be in a semi-reduced state [21]. Bouly et al. [22] states that with green light supplementation of blue and red light mixtures and under certain instance, green light had reverse cryptochrome-mediated growth inhibition. Therefore, it is possible that the inactivation of cryptochrome

signalling by green light, which is mediated by light reflected from living vegetation, will amplify the consequences of decreased the quality of blue light. In Arabidopsis seedlings, cryptochrome was discovered to downregulate two XTHs, which corresponded to a reduction in hypocotyl elongation.

## 4. CROSSTALK WITH HORMONES

The combination of phytochrome signalling with other environmental elements makes it easier to identify fluctuations in the environment. Plants integrate R:FR information through a variety of signalling routes that include plant hormones such as auxin, brassinosteroid, gibberellin, and ethylene, as well as other environmental influences.

### 4.1 Auxin

The YUCCA (YUC) gene family encodes the rate-limiting enzyme in TAA1-dependent auxin biosynthesis. PIF7 regulates YUCCA gene transcription, which is linked with auxin biosynthesis [23]. PIF4 and PIF5 are redundant, while PIF7 regulates YUCCA gene expression [24]. Tissue-level measurements in Brassica rapa seedlings have shown that auxin is produced in the cotyledons and transported to the hypocotyl [25]. Tao et al. [26] found that seedlings treated with an auxin transport inhibitor, such as naphthylphalamic acid (NPA), did not exhibit any shade-induced hypocotyl elongation. Pin3-3 (PIN3, auxin transporter) consistently showed a reduction in shade-induced hypocotyl elongation [27].

Auxin sensitivity increases in the shade in addition to auxin production and transport. A group of auxin-related genes that showed up-regulation in shade responders and down-regulation in shade-tolerant tomato lines suggests that auxin has a role in the natural variation of the SAS (Shade Avoidance Syndrome). Shade response pathways involve auxin signalling components such AUX/IAAs [(28)].

Besides Arabidopsis, the function of auxin in the shade avoidance mechanism has been found in several crop species [29]. Auxin levels in shade have been shown to vary in tomatoes [30] and sunflowers [31].

### 4.2 Gibberellin

Gibberellin (GA) production was enhanced by shade in Arabidopsis seedlings, cowpea (*Vigna*

*sinensis*) epicotyls, sunflower stems [31], and bean internodes. In Arabidopsis, shade also activates the GA biosynthesis enzymes GA20ox1, GA20ox2, and GA3ox [32]. According to Harberd et al. [33] bioactive GA leads to proteasomal degradation of DELLA proteins through 26S proteasome [33]. Due of DELLAs' inability to directly bind DNA, they will instead connect with PIFs. This will stop PIF proteins from binding DNA and adversely affect gene expression. On the other hand, increased gibberellin production caused by shade causes the degradation of DELLA proteins. According to Djakovic-Petrovic et al. [34], the GA-insensitive gai gain-of-function mutant, which possesses the GAI (DELLA) protein, had a decreased shade response, indicating that DELLA proteins restrict the SAS.

### 4.3 Ethylene

According to Pierik et al. [35], ethylene is a positive regulator of shade-induced petiole elongation in Arabidopsis because ethylene-insensitive mutants like *ein2-1* and *ein3-1eil1-3* did not exhibit shade-induced petiole elongation. Yet according to Das et al. [36], the *ein3eil1* mutant has maintained the entire shade-induced hypocotyl response. This controversy suggests that ethylene has an organ-specific shade response. According to Shi et al. [37], the ethylene signalling pathway's master transcription factor EIN3 is rapidly degraded when photoreceptor phyB is activated by light.

### 4.4 Cytokinin

Low R:FR signal triggers a rapid arrest of leaf-primordia growth by the breakdown of cytokinin by activating cytokinin oxidase. Furthermore, it has been revealed that the root-to-hypocotyl ratio is mediated by the CK receptor AHK3 under shaded conditions [38]. This reduction of bioactive CKs ensures redirecting of source for the extension of growth under shade, reduced photosynthetic capacity and a transient arrest of leaf development

### 4.5 Jasmonic acid

According to Ballare [39] low R:FR ratios down-regulate defence responses in shade-intolerant species. The shade inactivates phyB that leads to increased susceptibility to microbial pathogens and pest. The reason for this is the decreased expression of features associated to defence, such as additional floral nectar [40], glucosinolates [39], latex [41], and phenolic

chemicals [42]. Attenuation of the two main hormonal pathways, the JA and SA signalling pathways, may also account for it [39].

According to studies by Agrawal et al. [41] and De Wit et al. [43], shading has been demonstrated to lessen herbivory-induced JA accumulation. Likewise, inactivating phyB has been shown to reliably decrease plant susceptibility to exogenous JA. The higher turnover of DELLA proteins and the improved stability of the repressor proteins of the jasmonate ZIM domain (JAZ) attenuated the sensitivity to JA [44]. According to Yang et al. [23], the physical contact between DELLA and JAZ proteins is essential for allocating resources between immunity and growth. Thus, phyB's capacity to influence how members of these two protein families balance out is a crucial component of the defense-response chain that links shade-avoidance and defensive response [39].

## 5. CONCLUSION

- Light is an essential resource for plants, especially in densely populated areas where competition is high. Plants are equipped with an abundance of photoreceptors, which enable them to detect the presence of competitors and modify their growth and development accordingly.
- The dynamic and complex shade-induced transcriptional network, which is altered by both internal and external stimuli, provides the molecular foundation for the SAS responses. The dynamic and complex shade-induced transcriptional network, which is altered by both internal and external stimuli, provides the molecular foundation for the SAS responses.
- The majority of modern "Green Revolution" crops are semi-dwarfs, but they still compete for light in their monoculture system and exhibit shade avoidance responses, which is not recommended. Studies on shade tolerance will therefore become a key focus of future investigation
- Even though the majority of today's "Green Revolution" crops are semi-dwarfs, they nevertheless compete with one another for light in monoculture systems and exhibit shade avoidance characters, which is not advised.

## 6. CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITY

The main problem is to identify which all plant responses should be altered to have a significant affect on crop yield and health. For example, to counteract the impacts of light proximity signals, that diverts resources to petiole and stem elongation, at the expense of other desirable functions. For optimal light interception, however, it is equally important to retain the capacity of shoots to photo tropically locate gaps in the canopy, for the maximum light interception. Recent developments in dissecting the molecular pathways that governs the downstream of photoreceptors offer a chance to modify individual responses.

Identifying targets for crop improvement will be made easier with the development of novel model systems, genetic resources, and high-throughput sequencing technology. Recent developments in artificial lighting technologies such as development of high-output LED arrays [46,45], offer a wealth of opportunities to apply our knowledge of plant photobiology to increase crop productivity and quality.

### COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

### REFERENCES

- Gommers CM, Keuskamp DH, Buti S, van Veen H, Koevoets IT, Reinen E, Voesenek LA, Pierik R. Molecular profiles of contrasting shade response strategies in wild plants: differential control of immunity and shoot elongation. *The Plant Cell*. 2017;29(2):331-44.
- Whitelam GC, Johnson CB. Photomorphogenesis in *Impatiens parviflora* and other plant species under simulated natural canopy radiations. *New Phytologist*. 1982;90(4):611-8.
- Morgan DC, Smith H. Control of development in *Chenopodium album* L. By shadelight: The effect of light quantity (total fluence rate) and light quality (red. Far-red ratio). *New Phytologist*. 1981;88(2):239-48.
- Franklin KA, Whitelam GC. Light-quality regulation of freezing tolerance in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Nature genetics*. 2007;39(11):1410-3.
- Ballaré CL, Scopel AL, Sanchez RA. Far-red radiation reflected from adjacent leaves: An early signal of competition in plant canopies. *Science*. 1990;247(4940):329-32.
- Smith H, Whitelam GC. The shade avoidance syndrome: Multiple responses mediated by multiple phytochromes. *Plant, Cell & Environment*. 1997;20(6):840-4.
- Donohue K, Pyle EH, Messiqua D, Heschel MS, Schmitt J. Adaptive divergence in plasticity in natural populations of *Impatiens capensis* and its consequences for performance in novel habitats. *Evolution*. 2001;55(4):692-702.
- Robson PR, Whitelam GC, Smith H. Selected components of the shade-avoidance syndrome are displayed in a normal manner in mutants of *Arabidopsis thaliana* and *Brassica rapa* deficient in phytochrome B. *Plant Physiology*. 1993;102(4):1179-84.
- Valladares F, Arrieta S, Aranda I, Lorenzo D, Sánchez-Gómez D, Tena D, Suárez F, Pardos JA. Shade tolerance, photoinhibition sensitivity and phenotypic plasticity of *Ilex aquifolium* in continental mediterranean sites. *Tree physiology*. 2005;25(8):1041-52.
- Valladares F, Niinemets Ü. Shade tolerance, a key plant feature of complex nature and consequences. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*. 2008;39:237-57.
- Ntawuhiganayo EB, Uwizeye FK, Zibera E, Dusenge ME, Ziegler C, Ntirugulirwa B, Nsabimana D, Wallin G, Uddling J. Traits controlling shade tolerance in tropical montane trees. *Tree Physiology*. 2020;40(2):183-97.
- Burgie ES, Vierstra RD. Phytochromes: An atomic perspective on photoactivation and signaling. *The Plant Cell*. 2014;26(12):4568-83.
- Krahmer J, Ganpudi A, Abbas A, Romanowski A, Halliday KJ. Phytochrome, carbon sensing, metabolism, and plant growth plasticity. *Plant Physiology*. 2018;176(2):1039-48.
- Ballaré CL, Sánchez RA, Scopel AL, Casal JJ, Ghera CM. Early detection of neighbour plants by phytochrome perception of spectral changes in reflected sunlight. *Plant, Cell & Environment*. 1987;10(7):551-7.
- Pierik R, Cuppens ML, Voesenek LA, Visser EJ. Interactions between ethylene and gibberellins in phytochrome-mediated shade avoidance responses in tobacco. *Plant Physiology*. 2004;136(2):2928-36.

16. Lin C, Yang H, Guo H, Mockler T, Chen J, Cashmore AR. Enhancement of blue-light sensitivity of Arabidopsis seedlings by a blue light receptor cryptochrome 2. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 1998;95(5):2686-90.
17. Mazzella MA, Cerdan PD, Staneloni RJ, Casal JJ. Hierarchical coupling of phytochromes and cryptochromes reconciles stability and light modulation of Arabidopsis development.
18. Keller MM, Jaillais Y, Pedmale UV, Moreno JE, Chory J, Ballaré CL. Cryptochrome 1 and phytochrome B control shade-avoidance responses in Arabidopsis via partially independent hormonal cascades. *The Plant Journal*. 2011;67(2):195-207.
19. Lin C, Robertson DE, Ahmad M, Raibekas AA, Jorns MS, Dutton PL, Cashmore AR. Association of flavin adenine dinucleotide with the Arabidopsis blue light receptor CRY1. *Science*. 1995;269(5226):968-70.
20. Pedmale UV, Huang SS, Zander M, Cole BJ, Hetzel J, Ljung K, Reis PA, Sridevi P, Nito K, Nery JR, Ecker JR. Cryptochromes interact directly with PIFs to control plant growth in limiting blue light. *Cell*. 2016;164(1):233-45.
21. Banerjee R, Schleicher E, Meier S, Viana RM, Pokorny R, Ahmad M, Bittl R, Batschauer A. The signaling state of Arabidopsis cryptochrome 2 contains flavin semiquinone. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*. 2007;282(20):14916-22.
22. Bouly JP, Schleicher E, Dionisio-Sese M, Vandenbussche F, Van Der Straeten D, Bakrim N, Meier S, Batschauer A, Galland P, Bittl R, Ahmad M. Cryptochrome blue light photoreceptors are activated through interconversion of flavin redox states. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*. 2007;282(13):9383-91.
23. Yang DL, Yao J, Mei CS, Tong XH, Zeng LJ, Li Q, Xiao LT, Sun TP, Li J, Deng XW, Lee CM. Plant hormone jasmonate prioritizes defense over growth by interfering with gibberellin signaling cascade. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2012;109(19):E1192-200.
24. Hornitschek P, Kohnen MV, Lorrain S, Rougemont J, Ljung K, López-Vidriero I, Franco-Zorrilla JM, Solano R, Trevisan M, Pradervand S, Xenarios I. Phytochrome interacting factors 4 and 5 control seedling growth in changing light conditions by directly controlling auxin signaling. *The Plant Journal*. 2012;71(5):699-711.
25. Procko C, Crenshaw CM, Ljung K, Noel JP, Chory J. Cotyledon-generated auxin is required for shade-induced hypocotyl growth in Brassica rapa. *Plant Physiology*. 2014;165(3):1285-301.
26. Tao Y, Ferrer JL, Ljung K, Pojer F, Hong F, Long JA, Li L, Moreno JE, Bowman ME, Ivans LJ, Cheng Y. Rapid synthesis of auxin via a new tryptophan-dependent pathway is required for shade avoidance in plants. *Cell*. 2008;133(1):164-76.
27. Keuskamp DH, Pollmann S, Voeselek LA, Peeters AJ, Pierik R. Auxin transport through PIN-FORMED 3 (PIN3) controls shade avoidance and fitness during competition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2010;107(52):22740-4.
28. Procko C, Burko Y, Jaillais Y, Ljung K, Long JA, Chory J. The epidermis coordinates auxin-induced stem growth in response to shade. *Genes & Development*. 2016;30(13):1529-41.
29. Carriedo LG, Maloof JN, Brady SM. Molecular control of crop shade avoidance. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*. 2016;30:151-8.
30. Kozuka T, Kobayashi J, Horiguchi G, Demura T, Sakakibara H, Tsukaya H, Nagatani A. Involvement of auxin and brassinosteroid in the regulation of petiole elongation under the shade. *Plant Physiology*. 2010;153(4):1608-18.
31. Kurepin LV, Emery RN, Pharis RP, Reid DM. Uncoupling light quality from light irradiance effects in Helianthus annuus shoots: Putative roles for plant hormones in leaf and internode growth. *Journal of Experimental Botany*. 2007;58(8):2145-57.
32. Hisamatsu T, King RW, Helliwell CA, Koshioka M. The involvement of gibberellin 20-oxidase genes in phytochrome-regulated petiole elongation of Arabidopsis. *Plant Physiology*. 2005; 138(2):1106-16.
33. Harberd NP, Belfield E, Yasumura Y. The angiosperm gibberellin-GID1-DELLA growth regulatory mechanism: How an "inhibitor of an inhibitor" enables flexible response to fluctuating environments. *The Plant Cell*. 2009;21(5):1328-39.
34. Djakovic-Petrovic T, Wit MD, Voeselek LA, Pierik R. DELLA protein function in growth responses to canopy signals. *The Plant Journal*. 2007;51(1):117-26.



35. Pierik R, Djakovic-Petrovic T, Keuskamp DH, de Wit M, Voeselek LA. Auxin and ethylene regulate elongation responses to neighbor proximity signals independent of gibberellin and DELLA proteins in Arabidopsis. *Plant Physiology*. 2009; 149(4):1701-12.
36. Das D, St. Onge KR, Voeselek LA, Pierik R, Sasidharan R. Ethylene- and shade-induced hypocotyl elongation share transcriptome patterns and functional regulators. *Plant Physiology*. 2016; 172(2): 718-33.
37. Shi H, Shen X, Liu R, Xue C, Wei N, Deng XW, Zhong S. The red light receptor phytochrome B directly enhances substrate-E3 ligase interactions to attenuate ethylene responses. *Developmental Cell*. 2016; 39(5): 597-610.
38. Novák J, Černý M, Pavlů J, Zemánková J, Skalák J, Plačková L, Brzobohatý B. Roles of proteome dynamics and cytokinin signaling in root to hypocotyl ratio changes induced by shading roots of Arabidopsis seedlings. *Plant and Cell Physiology*. 2015;56(5):1006-18.
39. Cargnel MD, Demkura PV, Ballaré CL. Linking phytochrome to plant immunity: low red: far-red ratios increase Arabidopsis susceptibility to Botrytis cinerea by reducing the biosynthesis of indolic glucosinolates and camalexin. *New Phytologist*. 2014;204(2):342-54.
40. Izaguirre MM, Mazza CA, Astigueta MS, Ciarla AM, Ballaré CL. No time for candy: passionfruit (*Passiflora edulis*) plants down-regulate damage-induced extra floral nectar production in response to light signals of competition. *Oecologia*. 2013;173:213-21.
41. Agrawal AA, Kearney EE, Hastings AP, Ramsey TE. Attenuation of the jasmonate burst, plant defensive traits, and resistance to specialist monarch caterpillars on shaded common milkweed (*Asclepias syriaca*). *Journal of Chemical Ecology*. 2012;38:893-901.
42. Moreno JE, Tao Y, Chory J, Ballaré CL. Ecological modulation of plant defense via phytochrome control of jasmonate sensitivity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2009;106(12):4935-40.
43. De Wit M, Spoel SH, Sanchez-Perez GF, Gommers CM, Pieterse CM, Voeselek LA, Pierik R. Perception of low red: far-red ratio compromises both salicylic acid- and jasmonic acid-dependent pathogen defences in Arabidopsis. *The Plant Journal*. 2013;75(1):90-103.
44. Leone M, Keller MM, Cerrudo I, Ballaré CL. To grow or defend? Low red: far-red ratios reduce jasmonate sensitivity in Arabidopsis seedlings by promoting DELLA degradation and increasing JAZ10 stability. *New Phytologist*. 2014;204(2):355-67.
45. Demotes-Mainard S, Péron T, Corot A, Bertheloot J, Le Gourrierec J, Pelleschi-Travier S, Crespel L, Morel P, Huché-Théliet L, Boumaza R, Vian A. Plant responses to red and far-red lights, applications in horticulture. *Environmental and Experimental Botany*. 2016;121:4-21.
46. Ballaré CL, Mazza CA, Austin AT, Pierik R. Canopy light and plant health. *Plant Physiology*. 2012;160(1):145-55.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*  
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:  
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/114322>