# **1** Quantification of root growth patterns from the soil perspective via

# 2 root distance models

- 3 Steffen Schlüter<sup>1</sup>, Sebastian Blaser<sup>1</sup>, Matthias Weber<sup>2</sup>, Volker Schmidt<sup>2</sup>, Doris Vetterlein<sup>1,3</sup>
- Department of Soil System Science, Helmholtz-Centre for Environmental Research –
   UFZ, Halle, Germany
- 6 2. Institute of Stochastics, Ulm University, Ulm, Germany
  - 3. Soil Science, Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg, Halle, Germany
- 8 Keywords: X-ray tomography, Euclidean distance, root system architecture, time-lapse imaging,9 parametric model

# 10 Abstract:

7

11 The rhizosphere, the fraction of soil altered by plant roots, is a dynamic domain that rapidly changes during plant growth. Traditional approaches to quantify root growth patterns are very 12 limited in estimating this transient extent of the rhizosphere. In this paper we advocate the 13 analysis of root growth patterns from the soil perspective. This change of perspective addresses 14 more directly how certain root system architectures facilitate the exploration of soil. For the first 15 16 time, we propose a parsimonious root distance model with only four parameters which is able to describe root growth patterns throughout all stages in the first three weeks of growth of Vicia 17 faba measured with X-ray computed tomography. From these models, which are fitted to the 18 frequency distribution of root distances in soil, it is possible to estimate the rhizosphere volume, 19 20 i.e. the volume fraction of soil explored by roots, and adapt it to specific interaction distances for water uptake, rhizodeposition, etc. Through 3D time-lapse imaging and image registration it is 21 possible to estimate root age dependent rhizosphere volumes, i.e. volumes specific for certain 22 root age classes. These root distance models are a useful abstraction of complex root growth 23 24 patterns that provide complementary information on root system architecture unaddressed by 25 traditional root system analysis, which is helpful to constrain dynamic root growth models to 26 achieve more realistic results.

# 27 **1. Introduction:**

- 28 Root-soil interactions are an essential part of global matter cycles as all water and nutrients taken
- 29 up by the plant have to be transported through the rhizosphere (York et al., 2016). Roots have to
- 30 fulfill a range of different functions at the same time, resulting in the plasticity of the root system,
- 31 with individual root segments changing their function during ontogeny (Morris et al., 2017;
- Vetterlein and Doussan, 2016). The consortium of root segments comprising the root system can thus adapt to heterogeneity in resource availability and demand in time and space (Carminati and
- Vetterlein, 2012). The actual root system architecture is both a manifestation of genetic
- 35 predisposition and environmental factors (De Smet et al., 2012). There is a genotype specific
- regulation of root development (Atkinson et al., 2014). However, this program is modified by soil
- traits like bulk density, soil structure, water distribution or nutrient supply (Drew, 1975; Giehl

and von Wiren, 2014; Hodge et al., 2009; Malamy, 2005; Passioura, 1991; Robinson, 1994;

39 Smith and De Smet, 2012).

The rhizosphere, i.e. the zone of soil modified by the roots, is closely related to root system architecture. The spatial arrangement of root segments determines the fraction of the soil volume directly altered by roots with respect to a specific process. An even distribution of root segments may be advantageous, and cost effective in terms of carbon investment as well as for the acquisition of resources that have a high fluctuation over time like water. However, clustering of roots may be beneficial for resource acquisition that requires alteration of biochemical properties (Ho et al., 2005; Lynch and Ho, 2005).

Methods to quantify root system architecture – the three-dimensional distribution of the root 47 system from a single plant within the soil volume – have so far mainly focused on the plant 48 perspective (Clark et al., 2011; Danjon and Reubens, 2008; Flavel et al., 2017; Iyer-Pascuzzi et 49 al., 2010). Traditionally, destructive sampling is carried out, separating the roots from soil by 50 51 washing and detecting roots visually (Tennant, 1975) or by semi-automatic detection with a flat scanner and analysis with WinRHIZO (Regent Instruments, Canada). Results are presented as 52 root length density, root surface or root volume distributed over a certain sampling depth, 53 54 occasionally, specified for certain root diameter classes. Alternatively root system architecture in 55 the field has been described by tedious and only semi-quantitative root profile methods and drawings as in Kutschera (1960). 56

The rise of non-invasive imaging methods like X-ray computed tomography (X-ray CT) and 57 magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) has enabled the analysis of undisturbed root system 58 architecture (Helliwell et al., 2013; Schulz et al., 2013). This has brought about additional 59 insights into root networks like branching patterns (Flavel et al., 2017), root-soil contact 60 61 (Carminati et al., 2012; Schmidt et al., 2012) and root growth response to localized application of 62 e.g. phosphorus (Flavel et al., 2014). In addition, it enables repeated sampling to analyze root growth dynamics (Helliwell et al., 2017; Koebernick et al., 2015; Koebernick et al., 2014). 63 However, these approaches focus on the plant perspective and are not able to describe all spatial 64 aspects of root-soil interactions. Complementary information on root growth patterns is provided 65 instead by a shift towards the soil perspective. That is, the root growth patterns are not 66 characterized solely based on root traits, but based on consequences that these patterns have for 67 the exploration of soil. For any soil voxel, the distance to the closest root voxel can be determined 68 by employing the so-called Euclidean distance transform on segmented 3D root images. The 69 70 concept has been suggested by van Noordwijk et al. (1993), however, at the time they could only apply it to a stack of 2D slices from resin embedded samples and calculations were very tedious. 71 This might explain why the concept has not been adopted more widely, despite the fact that 72 numerous studies have shown that alterations of soil properties by the root in the rhizosphere 73 74 extend to a distance which is specific for the process in question (Hinsinger et al., 2009). We suggest to use distance maps not only as a tool to approximate travel distances in radial transport 75 to and from the root, but also as a genuine alternative to describe root system architecture. To our 76

knowledge the only study in this regard was reported by Koebernick et al. (2014). They showed

that the frequency distribution of root distances integrated over all soil voxels, from now on

79 denoted as root distance histogram (RDH), typically exhibits a shift from long to short root

80 distances as the root network develops and explores the soil.

81 We will compare the information which can be derived from this new approach, to the classical

82 half-mean distance parameter. Half-mean distance is used as an approximation in many

83 modelling approaches, when real spatial information is missing. We show that the average

distance to root segments estimated from an RDH can be linked to the root length density  $R_L$ 

85  $[L/L^3, e.g. cm/cm^3]$  through the theoretical half-mean distance HMD [L]

$$HMD = (\pi R_L)^{-1/2} , (1)$$

86

a formula which has been derived for equidistant ensembles of cylindrical roots (de Parseval et
al., 2017; Gardner, 1960; Newman, 1969). However, it is unclear whether this relationship still
holds for a natural, more complex root system, since experimental studies on such a comparison
are lacking.

91 The objective of the present paper is to advocate the use of root distance histograms as

92 complementary information on root system architecture, which remains unaddressed by

traditional metrics focused on root density and morphology. We will show that root distance

histograms evolve in a very regular manner, which can be predicted by means of a simple model

95 with only four parameters. The experimental dataset to calibrate and validate the model stems

96 from a recent study about radiation effects on early root development in *Vicia faba* (Blaser et al.,

97 2018).

#### 98 2. Theoretical background

99 To better understand the nature of the distribution of the Euclidean distance from a randomly

100 chosen point in soil to the nearest root voxel, we take a closer look at two synthetic test cases

101 (Figure 1). For both test cases considered, we fix a cylindrical region of interest (ROI) in line with

sample geometries used in X-ray tomography analysis. First, we create one vertical root, typical

103 for the tap root of a dicotyledonous plant (black). We assume that the horizontal coordinates of

the root are not aligned with the center of the soil column, as it is frequently observed in real pot experiments. Calculating the Euclidean distance transform inside the cylinder leads to a roughly

106 triangular-shaped distance distribution, whose probability density function is given by

$$f_{p}^{\Delta}(d) = \begin{cases} \frac{d}{p^{2}} & , & \text{if } 0 \le d \le p, \\ \frac{2p - d}{p^{2}} & , & \text{if } p < d \le 2p, \\ 0 & , & \text{if } d > 2p, \end{cases}$$
(2)

where d [L] denotes the radial distance from the vertical root. This distribution has only one parameter, p [L], reflecting the distance between the vertical root and the wall. The linearity in

- the left slope follows from the linear relationship between radial distance and perimeter. The
- 110 exact slope depends on the ROI diameter and the exact position of the root. The tailing towards
- 111 larger distances is a result of the random horizontal root position. For young tap roots the right
- tailing can also be caused by incomplete vertical exploration of the soil, which contributes larger
- distances to the RDH that originate from the unexplored lower ROI layer (not shown).



Figure 1: (a) Synthetic test image of a vertical tap root only (black) and a fully developed root architecture including the tap root and lateral roots at various depths (purple). (b) The root distance histogram (RDH) of the single, vertical tap root follows a triangular distribution, whereas the addition of lateral roots changes the RDH towards a Gamma distribution.

118 The addition of lateral roots (purple) to the tap root changes the RDH towards a Gamma

119 distribution with density

$$f_{k,\theta}^{\Gamma}(d) = d^{k-1} \frac{exp\left(\frac{-d}{\theta}\right)}{\theta^{k} \Gamma(k)}, \text{ for all } d \ge 0,$$
(3)

120

with distance d [L], scaling parameter  $\theta$  [L] and dimensionless shape parameter k. Here,  $\Gamma$ 121 denotes the Gamma function, i.e.  $\Gamma(k) = \int_0^\infty x^{k-1} e^{-x} dx$ . The shape parameter k has two special 122 cases, the exponential distribution for k = 1 and the Gaussian distribution for  $k = \infty$ . While the 123 scaling parameter  $\theta$  is likely to reflect the general exploration of soil by roots, the shape 124 parameter k is more likely to reflect the balance between the frequency of minimal distances and 125 most frequent distances, depicted in blue and green in Figure 1(a). In this synthetic test case the 126 expected Euclidean root distance  $\langle f_{k,\theta}^{\Gamma}(d) \rangle = k\theta$  is mainly governed by the vertical separation 127 distance between laterals. In this particular example the variance  $var(f_{k,\theta}^{\Gamma}(d)) = k\theta^2$  is mainly 128 governed by the ratio between sample diameter and the vertical separation distance between 129 laterals. The intercept with the y-axis at zero distance is increased because there are more soil 130

131 voxels located directly at the root surface. The combination of Eqs. (2) and (3) leads to the

132 proposed root distance model, the so-called mixed triangular-gamma distribution with density

133

$$f_{c,k,\theta,p}(x) = c f_{k,\theta}^{\Gamma}(x) + (1-c) f_p^{\Delta}(x), \text{ for all } x \ge 0,$$
(4)

which has one additional parameter,  $c \in [0,1]$ , the dimensionless weighting factor for linear mixing of both densities. This mixed triangular-gamma distribution will be used to model intermediate structural scenarios between a vertical tap root only and a fully developed root architecture including the tap root and lateral roots at various depths.

#### 138 3. Materials and methods

The present paper is based on the data obtained in a study on radiation effects on early root 139 development in faba bean (Blaser et al., 2018). The experimental setup is briefly summarized 140 here. Vicia faba plants (L., cv. 'Fuego') were grown in cylindrical columns (250 mm height, 35 141 mm radius, 5 mm wall thickness) filled with sieved (< 2 mm) silty clay loam with a bulk density 142 143 of 1.2 g/cm<sup>3</sup> and a constant volumetric water content of 27%. Root growth during the first 17 days after planting (DAP) was detected via X-ray CT. Two treatments (with 5 biological 144 replicates each) were considered for this study, differing in frequency of X-ray CT scanning. In 145 the high radiation treatments, from now on denoted as frequent scanning (FS), samples were 146 147 scanned every second day and exposed to an estimated, total radiation of 7.8 Gy. In the low radiation treatment, from now on denoted as moderate scanning (MS), samples were only 148 scanned every fourth day resulting in an estimated total dose of 4.2 Gy. Doses were calculated 149 with the Rad Pro Calculator Version 3.26 (McGinnis, 2009). For both treatments the first 150 application of X-ray CT was performed at 4 DAP. The X-ray CT images were filtered with 151 152 Gaussian smoothing and segmented with semi-automated region growing. Registration of segmented images of consecutive time steps of the same sample was performed in order to 153 154 achieve the best visualization of growth dynamics (Figure 2) and to enable subsequent analysis of distances related to root age. A root age image was computed using simple image arithmetic, i.e. 155 156 a gray value represents the time step, when a voxel was assigned to the root class for the first 157 time. By means of a skeletonization algorithm the root network was analyzed with respect to total 158 root length density and individual root length densities of tap roots and lateral roots. Detailed information about the growth conditions, X-ray CT scan settings and all image processing steps 159 160 can be retrieved from Blaser et al. (2018). For each treatment, examples of a root network with age information and root distances in the soil matrix are depicted in Figure 2. 161



Figure 2: Different root growth dynamics of *Vicia faba* in two radiation treatments: (a) frequent scanning (FS) every second day exposed to an estimated total dose of 7.8 Gy, (b) moderate scanning (MS) every fourth day exposed to an estimated total dose of 4.2 Gy. Accordingly, time step (6 DAP, blue) and (10 DAP, red) are only available for frequent scanning (a). The main difference between both treatments is the slower growth of laterals around 12 days after planting (DAP) in the FS treatment. The root distances in the soil are depicted for the final time step at 16 DAP.

#### 168 **4. Results**

#### 169 4.1. Root distance histograms

- 170 The experimental root distance histograms in the frequent scanning treatments exhibit a clear
- transition from triangular distributions (4-8 days after planting) to left skewed gamma
- distributions (12-16 days after planting) (Figure 3a). Data for 14 DAP are left out as it barely
- differs from the final state at 16 DAP. The root system at 10 DAP is in a transitional stage, during
- 174 which the lateral roots are already developed in the upper part of the column but still absent at the
- 175 lower part. The mixed triangular-gamma model is capable of fitting all growth stages very well.
- 176 The temporal evolution of all model parameters displays some consistent trends (Figure 3b). The
- 177 weighting factor *c* of the gamma distribution is increasing monotonically with the development
- of laterals. The scale parameter  $\theta$  and the shape parameter k are only meaningful when c clearly

179 differs from zero, i.e. c > 0.15. In that case,  $\theta$  decreases with increasing exploration of soil by 180 laterals. The shape parameter k, in turn, fluctuates around 2 during all development stages, i.e. 181 the ratio between the volume fraction of soil voxels with minimal root distance and most frequent 182 root distance remains rather constant. The tap root-wall distance parameter p of the triangular 183 model decreases while the tap root is still expanding vertically and loses meaning as c approaches 184 one.



Figure 3: (a) Root distance histograms for all time steps in the FS treatment including the fitted mixed triangular-gamma models (eq. (4)) (b) Time series of the four parameters of the mixed triangular-gamma model: c - weighting factor, k - shape parameter,  $\theta$  - scaling parameter, p - tap root-wall distance.

185

Parameter profiles for each time step reveal vertical differences in the development of laterals as 189 already discussed above for the root network at 10 DAP (Figure 4). In fact, only for this sampling 190 date a steep transition in the weighting factor c exists within the soil column, i.e. from a gamma 191 192 model at the top to a triangular model in the lower part. The shape parameter k is rather stable across all soil layers and time points except for cases when roots are generally absent (4-6 DAP, 193 lower ROI). Apparently the value of k is characteristic for Vicia faba during all development 194 stages, perhaps reflecting the rather constant separation distance of laterals along the tap root and 195 the absence of secondary lateral roots in this study. The scaling parameter  $\theta$  varies with depth 196 during the transitional stages (10-12 DAP) and reflects the uneven exploration of the soil further 197 away from the tap root. Obviously, the tap root-wall distance parameter p is almost constant 198 across all depths for a constant ROI diameter and a vertically oriented tap root. The parameter p 199 200 loses meaning when c > 0.85 and starts to fluctuate. Differences between FS and MS radiation 201 treatment are also depicted in Figure 4. In line with visual inspection, the largest differences emerge at the joint sampling date 12 DAP. The MS treatment has already reached its final RDH 202

- everywhere except for the lowest layers (depth > 100 mm), whereas the FS treatment has reached
- this final state only at the very top (depth < 30 mm).



Figure 4: Parameter profiles (c - weighting factor, k – shape parameter,  $\theta$  – scaling parameter, p – tap root-wall distance) of the mixed triangular-gamma model at each scan time (days after planting) in equidistant, 5 mm thick slices. Dashed lines indicate uncertain values due to imbalanced mixing of the two models in Eq. (4) (c < 0.15 or c > 0.85).

- 209 This congruency of space and time is further demonstrated for two soil depths and scanning dates
- of the FS treatment. The RDH at 10 DAP in a shallow depth range of 29-45 mm (Figure 5a) is
- very similar to the RDH at 12 DAP in a larger depth range of 93-109 mm (Figure 5d). The RDH at
- 12 DAP in the shallow soil layer has already fully turned into a Gamma distribution (Figure 5c), a
- stage that is only reached at 16 DAP in the deeper soil layer (not shown). The RDH at 10 DAP in

- the deeper soil layer, in turn, is still dominated by the triangular distribution (Figure 5b). The
- 215 mixed triangular-gamma distribution is suitable to fit the experimental RDH in all cases
- 216 considered. Note, however, that this congruency of space and time is characteristic for Vicia faba
- 217 in the radiation experiment considered in the present paper, but not necessarily the case for other
- 218 plant species and growth stages beyond those studied. Potentially this is a typical phenomenon
- observed in tap rooted plant species but more studies are needed to proof this hypothesis.



Figure 5: Root distance histograms in two different soil depths at two scanning times (DAP – days after planting) of the frequent scanning (FS) radiation treatment.

#### 223 4.2. Rhizosphere volumes

224 The relative frequency value of a certain root distance in the RDH represents the volume fraction 225 of voxels with a given Euclidean distance to the nearest root voxel. Integrating the RDH over all 226 distances smaller than a maximum rhizosphere extent accordingly results in the volume fraction 227 of the rhizosphere. The extent of the rhizosphere depends on the considered process. It can be 228 large for water depletion by root water uptake as the resulting gradient in water potential around 229 roots drives water flow towards the roots, which stretches the zone of water depletion far into the bulk soil (Carminati et al., 2011). The capacity for this water redistribution depends on the 230 unsaturated conductivity and water retention of the surrounding soil. The extent of the 231 232 rhizosphere is much smaller for strongly adsorbed nutrients like ammonium and phosphate which 233 are less mobile (Hinsinger et al., 2009). Substances released by the roots, like enzymes and mucilage, are also only present in a small volume of soil for their susceptibility to microbial 234 attack (Carminati and Vetterlein, 2012). Furthermore, they are not released uniformly by the 235 236 entire root network but mainly by young root segments (Vetterlein and Doussan, 2016). This variability of the rhizosphere extent in time and space can be accounted for with root age 237

dependent RDHs as shown in Figure 6. The top row demonstrates the increase in total rhizosphere 238 239 volume for both radiation treatments and two hypothetical rhizosphere extents. Approximately 2% of the soil columns are explored by the roots after 16 days in both treatments, when a 240 rhizosphere extent of 0.5 mm is assumed. This increases to approximately 40% if the extent is 241 enlarged to 5 mm. The differences in the growth dynamics between both radiation treatments is 242 fully developed 12 days after planting and significant for 5 mm rhizosphere extent but has 243 vanished at 16 DAP because root growth only occurs outside the ROI by then. This is also 244 confirmed by the rhizosphere volume fraction of young roots only, i.e. root segments that have 245 246 grown since the last scan time four days earlier (Figure 6c-d). Until 12 DAP, this restricted 247 rhizosphere volume develops in line with the total rhizosphere volume. The differences between 248 radiation treatments become significant after 12DAP. The gap in absolute values between the two rhizosphere volume fractions (young vs. total) increases with decreasing rhizosphere extent. At 249 250 16 DAP, there are less young roots in the ROI and hence their rhizosphere volume fraction 251 decreases. Note that this decline is not an inevitable consequence of pot experiments but a 252 manifestation of the root system architecture of Vicia faba in this experiment, which largely lacked the development of second order laterals that could have entered the space between the 253

254 first order laterals at that growth stage.



255

Figure 6: Temporal change of rhizosphere volume fraction in both radiation treatments for two hypothetical rhizosphere radii (0.5 and 5 mm) and shown separately for the complete root network (a, b) and only the young roots that have grown since the previous scan time (c, d). Error bars refer to minimum and maximum for five biological replicates of each treatment and asterisk refers to significant differences tested at p < 0.05.

#### 260 **5. Discussion**

#### 261 5.1. Root perspective versus soil perspective

262 The results presented so far describe spatial patterns in root-soil interactions from the soil

263 perspective through distance distributions in soil and volume fractions of soil explored by roots.

264 Traditional approaches to describe root system architectures are focused on the root perspective,

e.g. by quantifying root length densities and branching patterns. We therefore discuss the

266 question if this change in perspective provides complementary information or merely redundant

267 information. This is assessed by comparing features of the root distance histogram with results

obtained by skeletonization analysis of the segmented root network (Blaser et al., 2018)
summarized in Figure 7.

11





Figure 7: Relationship between several root system traits derived from a skeleton analysis (root length density, half mean distance, tap root fraction) and root distance traits derived from mixed triangular-gamma models (relative root surface, mean root-soil distance, i.e. first central moment of the root distance histogram, and the parameters θ and c). Root system traits are shown on the abscissa and root distance traits on the ordinate. In (b), the half mean distance derived from root length density is added as a reference for comparison (black line). In (c), the 1:1 line is added.

276 There is a close, linear relationship (R<sup>2</sup>=0.991) between root length density  $R_L$  [cm/cm<sup>3</sup>] and root

surface density [cm<sup>2</sup>/cm<sup>3</sup>], derived from the frequency of the smallest root distance (Figure 7a).

278 This very good agreement is not surprising and only confirms the reliability of the complimentary

approaches to estimate two highly correlated metrics. Another characteristic metric of the root

280 distance histogram is the mean root-soil distance, i.e. its first central moment,

$$\langle RDH \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{d_{max}} f_i d_i, \tag{5}$$

- with distance  $d_i$  and relative frequency  $f_i$ . The relationship between  $R_L$  and mean root-soil
- distance  $\langle RDH \rangle$  is non-linear (Figure 7b) with a huge reduction in mean distance by a relatively
- small  $R_L$  that is only composed of the tap root in the first week after planting. Note that  $\langle RDH \rangle$
- would be bounded by  $p \approx 2.5$  cm, if the ROI was reduced to the maximum depth of the tap root
- (Figure 3b), as then p would be simply the horizontal distance between the tap root and the ROI
- 286 perimeter. The theoretical half mean distance *HMD* derived from  $R_L$  (Eq. (1)) and the measured
- 287 mean root-soil distance  $\langle RDH \rangle$  show good agreement (Figure 7b) which has already been reported
- 288 previously (Koebernick et al., 2014). Note that *HMD* refers to root-root distances, whereas  $\langle RDH \rangle$
- 289 refers to root-soil distances. The relationship between both entities depends on the spatial
- 290 distribution of roots. This is shown by the following example.
- For a bundle of equidistant roots on a hexagonal lattice (*RDH*) amounts to 69% of the *HMD*
- 292 (Figure 8a). For a random distribution of roots in two-dimensional cross sections it amounts to
- 293 89% of the theoretical *HMD* derived from  $R_L$  (Figure 8b). Evidently, the branching and clustering
- of roots changes the root distance histogram in characteristic ways (Figure 8c): (1) Short distances
- directly at the root surface (d < 0.5HMD) are just as abundant and mainly imprinted by the root
- length density itself. (2) Intermediate root distances (0.5HMD < d < HMD) are less frequent,
- when neighbouring roots approach each other in the randomly distributed example (Figure 8b).
- 298 That is, the local root length density increases by a factor of two, but not the volume fraction of
- intermediate distances between them. (3) Long distances beyond the equidistant spacing (d > d
- 300 *HMD*) can only occur in random point patterns. Taken together this leads to a higher  $\langle RDH \rangle$  than
- 301 what would be theoretically expected for a bundle for parallel roots with the same root length
- 302 density. Note that these relations between root-root distances and root-soil distances are constant
- for a given pattern and do not depend on the actual spacing between roots (data not shown).



Figure 8: Root-soil distances in (a) an equidistant, hexagonal root bundle and (b) for a random pattern of roots in a two dimensional cross section. The distances are normalized by the half-mean distance between roots. The root length density is
 the same in both point patterns. (c) The root distance histograms for both point patterns. Shaded areas for random point
 patterns represent standard deviation of ten realizations.

309 It turns out that for real root networks of *Vicia faba*, the  $\langle RDH \rangle$  is in fact even larger than for

- random point patterns and amounts to 97% of the theoretical *HMD* derived from  $R_L$ . This is also
- 311 indicated by a 1:1 relationship in Figure 7(c) for all dates within 8-16 DAP, whereas the

- relationship starts to become non-linear and flattens out around  $\langle RDH \rangle \approx 2$  cm or  $R_L < 0.08$
- $cm/cm^3$  due to the incomplete exploration of the full ROI depth by the young tap root at 4 DAP.
- In a previous experiment with *Vicia faba* by Koebernick et al. (2014) the  $\langle RDH \rangle$  amounted to a
- similar value of 93% of the theoretical *HMD* and the linear relationship between  $\langle RDH \rangle$  and *HMD*
- started to flatten out around  $R_L < 0.12 \text{ cm/cm}^3$  due to the same limitations in soil exploration by
- young roots. Real three-dimensional root networks differ from two-dimensional random point
  patterns in that they are continuous, i.e. they cannot emerge everywhere but have to branch and
- grow to explore the soil. This immanent alignment and clustering causes larger unexplored areas
- for the same root density in two-dimensional sections. As a consequence the normalized  $\langle RDH \rangle$  is
- larger in real root networks of *Vicia faba* than in random root configurations. Future studies will
- 322 show whether differences in root system architecture between different plant species lead to
- 323 characteristic differences in the relationship between the introduced metrics for root length
- 324 density and soil exploration.
- 325 The weighting factor c should be inversely related to the tap root fraction, which is confirmed by
- Figure 7(e). There is some scatter in the data, which is presumably due to some correlation in the
- 327 parameter set of the mixed triangular-gamma model leading to an equally good fit of the model to
- the RDH for a range of *c* values. Finally, the scaling parameter  $\theta$  decreases as the root length
- density increases (Figure 7d). The relationship is mildly non-linear for 8-16 DAP, since an
- additional increase in root length density beyond  $0.6 \text{ cm/cm}^3$  does not lead to a proportional
- reduction in root distances for this root system architecture presumably due to the lack of
- 332 secondary laterals. The large  $\theta$ -values at 4 DAP are not reliable, since the weighting factor *c* is
- rather small, which renders the model fit insensitive to the  $\theta$ -parameter.
- 334 In summary, the root distance traits reveal information that cannot be derived from conventional
- root system traits based on a skeleton analysis of the root network. The exact relationship
- between parameters derived from the root perspective (root network traits) and the soil
- perspective (root distance traits) hints to characteristic root growth patterns. An in-depth analysis
- of such scaling relations is out of scope of this study, as it would require a set of different plant
- 339 species to compare different root system architectures.
- 340 5.2. Strengths and limitations of soil perspective
- 341 The quantitative analysis of root growth patterns via root distance models has several advantages
- over traditional approaches based on root network analysis: (1) It is a more direct assessment of
  which soil volume is accessible to roots. (2) It can take into account variable extents of the
- rhizosphere with respect to different elements and processes (water uptake, nutrient uptake,
- rhizodeposits, etc.). (3) The proposed combination of root distance histograms and root age,
- obtained by differential imaging of registered X-ray CT datasets, enables a dedicated analysis of
- 347 soil exploration by young roots. (4) Root distance analysis is more robust against image
- 348 segmentation problems, as it is virtually insensitive to root surface roughness and small gaps,
- 349 which are notorious problems for skeleton analysis of the root network.

- 350 Similar to dynamic root growth models based on root network traits (Leitner et al., 2010) the
- 351 mixed triangular-gamma model proposed in the present paper lends itself to interpolation
- between sampling dates, since its parameters either change monotonically or remain rather
- 353 constant. Especially during intermediate growth stages it might be necessary to carry out
- 354 interpolation for different depths separately.

355 There are also some limitations of the description of root growth patterns from the soil perspective: (1) Branching angles, hierarchical ordering of laterals, length distributions of root 356 357 segments and related traits of root networks cannot be assessed with root distance models. This is the reason why a combined analysis from the root perspective and the soil perspective may 358 provide a more comprehensive representation of root growth patterns (2) Even though the mixed 359 360 triangular-gamma model is versatile enough to model RDHs at all growth stages with only four 361 parameters which have an easily conceivable, geometrical meaning, there is the downside that some parameters become unconstrained and start to fluctuate when the weighting factor of the 362

363 corresponding model becomes too small or too large.

# 364 6. Conclusions and outlook

We have introduced the mixed triangular-gamma model to describe root distance histograms, i.e. frequency distributions of Euclidean distances from soil to root, at several growth stages of *Vicia faba*. This new approach to assess root growth patterns from the soil perspective delivers complementary information to the traditional plant perspective based on root network analysis and facilitates a more direct assessment on rhizosphere processes.

370 In future work, the approach needs to be extended to further plant species, differing in root 371 architecture. In particular the method needs to be tested for adventitious root architectures of 372 grass species and in general for older plants. A prerequisite for such tests is obtaining 3D time resolved datasets with sufficient resolution to capture all roots, including fine roots. This is still a 373 374 challenge for many grass species if the pot size is chosen to enable unrestricted root growth at 375 least for the seedling stage. Another approach could be the extraction of undisturbed soil cores 376 from the field, which enables the study of older plants with the trade-off of introducing field heterogeneity into the investigations. Finally, the approach can also be applied to root system 377 378 architectures for a suite of plant species derived from dynamic root growth models like 379 CRootBox (Schnepf et al., 2018). The benefits are two-fold. Metrics derived from root distance 380 histograms may complement established skeleton-based metrics in high-throughput phenotyping. 381 In addition, comparing parameter sets derived by model fitting to root distance histograms from 382 plant species with vastly different root system architectures is helpful to scrutinize the physical 383 meaning of each parameter in the proposed model.

### 384 7. Acknowledgments

- 385 The experimental work providing the CT-data sets was supported by SKW Stickstoffwerke
- 386 Piesteritz. The collaboration between the authors was promoted by the establishment of the DFG
- priority program 2089 Rhizosphere spatiotemporal organisation a key to rhizosphere functions.

#### 388 8. References

- Atkinson, J.A., Rasmussen, A., Traini, R., Voß, U., Sturrock, C., Mooney, S.J., Wells, D.M.,
   Bennett, M.J., 2014. Branching out in roots: uncovering form, function, and regulation.
   Plant Physiology 166(2), 538-550.
- Blaser, S.R.G.A., Schlüter, S., Vetterlein, D., 2018. How much is too much? Influence of X-ray
   dose on root growth of faba bean (Vicia faba) and barley (Hordeum vulgare). PLOS ONE
   (in revision).
- Carminati, A., Schneider, C.L., Moradi, A.B., Zarebanadkouki, M., Vetterlein, D., Vogel, H.-J.,
   Hildebrandt, A., Weller, U., Schüler, L., Oswald, S.E., 2011. How the rhizosphere may
   favor water availability to roots. Vadose Zone Journal 10(3), 988-998.
- Carminati, A., Vetterlein, D., 2012. Plasticity of rhizosphere hydraulic properties as a key for
   efficient utilization of scarce resources. Annals of Botany 112(2), 277-290.
- Carminati, A., Vetterlein, D., Koebernick, N., Blaser, S., Weller, U., Vogel, H.J., 2012. Do roots
  mind the gap? Plant and Soil 367(1-2), 651-661.
- Clark, R.T., MacCurdy, R.B., Jung, J.K., Shaff, J.E., McCouch, S.R., Aneshansley, D.J.,
  Kochian, L.V., 2011. Three-dimensional root phenotyping with a novel imaging and
  software platform. Plant Physiology 156(2), 455-465.
- Danjon, F., Reubens, B., 2008. Assessing and analyzing 3D architecture of woody root systems, a
   review of methods and applications in tree and soil stability, resource acquisition and
   allocation. Plant and Soil 303(1-2), 1-34.
- de Parseval, H., Barot, S., Gignoux, J., Lata, J.-C., Raynaud, X., 2017. Modelling facilitation or
   competition within a root system: importance of the overlap of root depletion and
   accumulation zones. Plant and Soil 419(1), 97-111.
- 411 De Smet, I., White, P.J., Bengough, A.G., Dupuy, L., Parizot, B., Casimiro, I., Heidstra, R.,
  412 Laskowski, M., Lepetit, M., Hochholdinger, F., 2012. Analyzing lateral root
  413 development: how to move forward. The Plant Cell 24(1), 15-20.
- Drew, M., 1975. Comparison of the effects of a localised supply of phosphate, nitrate,
  ammonium and potassium on the growth of the seminal root system, and the shoot, in
  barley. New Phytologist 75(3), 479-490.
- Flavel, R.J., Guppy, C.N., Rabbi, S.M., Young, I.M., 2017. An image processing and analysis
  tool for identifying and analysing complex plant root systems in 3D soil using nondestructive analysis: Root1. PLOS ONE 12(5), e0176433.
- Flavel, R.J., Guppy, C.N., Tighe, M.K., Watt, M., Young, I.M., 2014. Quantifying the response
  of wheat (Triticum aestivum L) root system architecture to phosphorus in an Oxisol. Plant
  and Soil 385(1-2), 303-310.
- 423 Gardner, W.R., 1960. Dynamic aspects of water availability to plants. Soil Science 89(2), 63-73.
- 424 Giehl, R.F., von Wiren, N., 2014. Root nutrient foraging. Plant Physiology 166(2), 509-517.
- 425 Helliwell, J., Sturrock, C., Grayling, K., Tracy, S., Flavel, R., Young, I., Whalley, W., Mooney,
- S., 2013. Applications of X-ray computed tomography for examining biophysical
  interactions and structural development in soil systems: a review. European Journal of
  Soil Science 64(3), 279-297.
- Helliwell, J.R., Sturrock, C.J., Mairhofer, S., Craigon, J., Ashton, R.W., Miller, A.J., Whalley,
  W.R., Mooney, S.J., 2017. The emergent rhizosphere: imaging the development of the
  porous architecture at the root-soil interface. Scientific Reports 7(1), 14875.
- 432 Hinsinger, P., Bengough, A.G., Vetterlein, D., Young, I.M., 2009. Rhizosphere: biophysics,
- biogeochemistry and ecological relevance. Plant and Soil 321(1-2), 117-152.

- Ho, M.D., Rosas, J.C., Brown, K.M., Lynch, J.P., 2005. Root architectural tradeoffs for water and
   phosphorus acquisition. Functional Plant Biology 32(8), 737-748.
- Hodge, A., Berta, G., Doussan, C., Merchan, F., Crespi, M., 2009. Plant root growth, architecture
  and function. Plant and Soil 321(1-2), 153-187.
- Iyer-Pascuzzi, A.S., Symonova, O., Mileyko, Y., Hao, Y., Belcher, H., Harer, J., Weitz, J.S.,
  Benfey, P.N., 2010. Imaging and analysis platform for automatic phenotyping and trait
  ranking of plant root systems. Plant Physiology 152(3), 1148-1157.
- Koebernick, N., Huber, K., Kerkhofs, E., Vanderborght, J., Javaux, M., Vereecken, H.,
  Vetterlein, D., 2015. Unraveling the hydrodynamics of split root water uptake
  experiments using CT scanned root architectures and three dimensional flow simulations.
  Frontiers in Plant Science 6(370).
- Koebernick, N., Weller, U., Huber, K., Schlüter, S., Vogel, H.-J., Jahn, R., Vereecken, H.,
  Vetterlein, D., 2014. In situ visualization and quantification of three-dimensional root
  system architecture and growth using X-ray computed tomography. Vadose Zone Journal
  13(8).
- Kutschera, L., 1960. Wurzelatlas mitteleuropäischer Ackerunkräuter und Kulturpflanzen DLG,
   Frankfurt/M.
- Leitner, D., Klepsch, S., Bodner, G., Schnepf, A., 2010. A dynamic root system growth model
  based on L-Systems. Plant and Soil 332(1-2), 177-192.
- Lynch, J.P., Ho, M.D., 2005. Rhizoeconomics: carbon costs of phosphorus acquisition. Plant and
   Soil 269(1-2), 45-56.
- Malamy, J., 2005. Intrinsic and environmental response pathways that regulate root system
  architecture. Plant, Cell & Environment 28(1), 67-77.
- 457 McGinnis, R., 2009. Rad Pro Calculator, http://www.radprocalculator.com/.
- Morris, E.C., Griffiths, M., Golebiowska, A., Mairhofer, S., Burr-Hersey, J., Goh, T., von
  Wangenheim, D., Atkinson, B., Sturrock, C.J., Lynch, J.P., Vissenberg, K., Ritz, K.,
- Wells, D.M., Mooney, S.J., Bennett, M.J., 2017. Shaping 3D Root System Architecture.
  Current Biology 27(17), R919-R930.
- Newman, E.I., 1969. Resistance to water flow in soil and plant. I. Soil resistance in relation to
- 463 amounts of root: Theoretical estimates. Journal of Applied Ecology 6(1), 1-12.
- 464 Passioura, J., 1991. Soil structure and plant growth. Soil Research 29(6), 717-728.
- Robinson, D., 1994. Tansley review no. 73. The responses of plants to non-uniform supplies of
   nutrients. New Phytologist, 635-674.
- Schmidt, S., Bengough, A.G., Gregory, P.J., Grinev, D.V., Otten, W., 2012. Estimating root-soil
  contact from 3D X-ray microtomographs. European Journal of Soil Science 63(6), 776786.
- Schnepf, A., Leitner, D., Landl, M., Lobet, G., Mai, T. H., Morandage, S., Sheng, C., Zörner, M.,
  Vanderborght, J., Vereecken, H., 2018. CRootBox: a structural-functional modelling
  framework for root systems. Annals of Botany 121(5), 1033-1053.
- Schulz, H., Postma, J.A., van Dusschoten, D., Scharr, H., Behnke, S., 2013. Plant root system
  analysis from MRI images, In: Computer Vision, Imaging and Computer Graphics.
  Theory and Application (Eds. Battiato et al.). Springer, pp. 411-425.
- Smith, S., De Smet, I., 2012. Root system architecture: insights from Arabidopsis and cereal
  crops. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 367(1595),
  1441-1452.
- Tennant, D., 1975. A test of a modified line intersect method of estimating root length. The
  Journal of Ecology, 995-1001.

- 481 van Noordwijk, M., Brouwer, G., Harmanny, K., 1993. Concepts and methods for studying
  482 interactions of roots and soil structure. Geoderma 56(1), 351-375.
- Vetterlein, D., Doussan, C., 2016. Root age distribution: how does it matter in plant processes? A
  focus on water uptake. Plant and Soil 407(1-2), 145-160.
- York, L.M., Carminati, A., Mooney, S.J., Ritz, K., Bennett, M.J., 2016. The holistic rhizosphere:
  integrating zones, processes, and semantics in the soil influenced by roots. Journal of
  Experimental Botany 67(12), 3629-3643.