ERRATUM

Erratum to: Genetic variability and phenotypic plasticity of apple morphological responses to soil water restriction in relation with leaf functions and stem xylem conductivity

Pierre-Éric Lauri^{1,7} · Têtè Sévérien Barigah^{2,6} · Gerardo Lopez^{1,3} ·
Sébastien Martinez¹ · Pasquale Losciale⁴ · Marco Zibordi³ · Luigi Manfrini³ ·
Luca Corelli-Grappadelli³ · Evelyne Costes¹ · Jean-Luc Regnard⁵

Published online: 9 August 2016
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2016

Erratum to: Trees
DOI 10.1007/s00468-016-1408-3

Unfortunately, some part text of Table 3 was missing in the original publication of this article. The complete corrected Table 3 is given in the following page.

The online version of the original article can be found under
doi:[10.1007/s00468-016-1408-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00468-016-1408-3).

✉ Pierre-Éric Lauri
lauri@supagro.inra.fr

¹ INRA, UMR AGAP, 34398 Montpellier, Cedex 05, France

² INRA, UMR 547 PIAF, 63100 Clermont-Ferrand, France

³ Dipartimento Scienze Agrarie, University of Bologna, V.le
G. Fanin 46, 40127 Bologna, Italy

⁴ Consiglio per la ricerca in agricoltura e l'analisi
dell'economia agraria (CREA), Research Unit for
Agriculture in Dry Environments [CREA-SCA], Bari, Italy

⁵ Montpellier SupAgro, UMR AGAP,
34060 Montpellier, Cedex 02, France

⁶ Clermont Université, Université Blaise-Pascal, UMR 547
PIAF, BP 10448, 63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France

⁷ Present Address: UMR System, Campus Montpellier
SupAgro, 2 place Pierre Viala, Bât. 27, 34060 Montpellier,
France

Table 3 Whole-shoot response to drought of two apple cultivars ‘Starkrimson’ and ‘Granny Smith’ and in 19 of their progenies, during two consecutive periods of growth (I and II)

Period and water regime	Whole-shoot-response to drought						Effects of factors (<i>F</i> or χ^2 , <i>P</i>)
	Low		Medium		High		
	Values	MD/WWI (%)	Values	MD/WWI (%)	Values	MD/WWI (%)	
Period I							
No. of genotypes	7		7		7		
WWI							
TLA	646.4 ± 201.5	–	709.3 ± 194.0	–	635.3 ± 109.2	–	0.37, 0.69
L	26.7 ± 6.5	–	32.8 ± 3.8	–	27.5 ± 7.3	–	2.13, 0.15
PercGC	28.5 ± 18.5	–	7.6 ± 13.5	–	21.7 ± 0.19	–	3.3, 0.05
<i>g</i> _s	337.2 ± 40.0	–	370.8 ± 41.5	–	360.5 ± 52.8	–	1.02, 0.38
SWP	–0.8 ± 0.1	–	–0.8 ± 0.0	–	–0.8 ± 0.1	–	0.44, 0.65
<i>P</i> _n	11.3 ± 1.0	–	11.4 ± 0.9	–	11.2 ± 1.2	–	0.07, 0.93
PLC	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
MD							
TLA	323.9 ± 89.4a	50.1	221.6 ± 60.7b	31.2	121.9 ± 37.1c	19.2	16.42, 8.73 10 ^{–5}
L	17.0 ± 4.6a	63.2	13.4 ± 1.6b	40.9	7.7 ± 3.6c	28.0	12.37, 4.18 10 ^{–4}
PercGC	41.5 ± 33.6b	145.6	50.2 ± 23.2ab	660.5	80.9 ± 17.8a	372.8	15.76, 3.80 10 ^{–4}
<i>g</i> _s	289.2 ± 35.7	85.8	284.3 ± 27.7	76.7	275.6 ± 37.7	76.5	0.29, 0.75
SWP	–1.2 ± 0.2	145.4	–1.1 ± 0.3	143.7	–1.1 ± 0.2	145.2	0.33, 0.72
<i>P</i> _n	10.1 ± 0.8	89.4	9.6 ± 0.6	84.2	9.8 ± 1.3	87.5	0.19, 0.83
PLC	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Period and water regime							
	Whole-shoot-response to drought						Effects of factors (<i>F</i> or χ^2 , <i>P</i>)
	Low		Medium		High		
	Values	SD/WWII (%)	Values	SD/WWII (%)	Values	SD/WWII (%)	
Period II							
No. of genotypes	7		7		7		
WWII							
TLA	1252.7 ± 163.1	–	1424.6 ± 301.7	–	1347.7 ± 340.6	–	0.99, 0.39
L	42.3 ± 6.8	–	45.4 ± 7.8	–	42.6 ± 4.5	–	0.48, 0.63
PercGC	9.5 + 18.9	–	7.1 ± 13.1	–	7.6 ± 9.6	–	3.17, 0.20
<i>g</i> _s	360.6 ± 63.3	–	387.9 ± 38.1	–	358.3 ± 27.4	–	0.91, 0.42
SWP	–0.9 ± 0.1	–	–0.9 ± 0.1	–	–0.9 ± 0.1	–	1.45, 0.26
<i>P</i> _n	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
PLC	3.2 ± 3.1a	–	4.7 ± 6.9a	–	2.2 ± 1.4b	–	71.86, 2.49 10 ^{–16}
SD							
TLA	448.5 ± 88.1a	35.8	309.7 ± 76.1b	20.2	163.7 ± 74.0c	12.1	22.38, 1.31 10 ^{–5}
L	20.8 ± 4.7a	49.3	16.2 ± 3.0a	35.6	8.4 ± 3.0b	19.7	21.02, 1.96 10 ^{–5}
PercGC	41.5 ± 17.2	435.7	38.1 ± 28.4	533.3	67.7 ± 22.8	889.1	5.12, 0.08
<i>g</i> _s	212.2 ± 55.1	58.9	193.9 ± 30.8	50.0	163.5 ± 23.6	45.6	2.80, 0.09
SWP	–1.5 ± 0.1	176.4	–1.7 ± 0.3	189.0	–1.6 ± 0.2	168.8	1.44, 0.26
<i>P</i> _n	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
PLC	15.2 ± 9.8a	475.4	15.8 ± 6.3a	332.1	11.8 ± 10.1b	539.0	53.71, 2.17 10 ^{–12}

For each class of response (low, medium, high) absolute values (mean ± SD) of shoot morphology and plant functioning traits are provided. For each trait, values with different letters indicate significant differences ($P < 0.05$) between means (ANOVA with the class of response as factor, followed when significant by HSD-Tukey multiple mean comparison test). The ratios MD/WWI in period I and SD/WWII in period II are also provided for each trait. Units of the variables are figured in Table 1