

5 (15). Regarding the data on page 110, provide a simple mechanistic explanation for why the growth of a plant (measured in g m^{-2}) should be positively correlated with carbon isotope discrimination. Justify your answer. Remember that this is "carbon isotope discrimination" and **not** "carbon isotope ratio".

6 (16). OK, please help Winston with his data on page 111. Please fill in the correct carbon isotope ratios for these samples. Remember the values are -29.1, -25.8, -16.2, and -15.9 per mil. From page 112 of Winston's notebook (which you did not have access to earlier), we now know that the carbon isotope ratio values are only different from each other if the values differ by more than 0.3 per mil.

amaranth leaf, well watered _____ per mil

amaranth leaf, limited water _____ per mil

wheat leaf, well watered _____ per mil

wheat leaf, limited water _____ per mil

7 (15). OK, let's think about the data on page 108. It turns out that all of these data were collected from the same leaf, simply by changing the incident PFD levels and observing the response. Using an Ohm's Law analogy, what was the intercellular CO_2 within the leaf when the leaf conductance was $300 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$? [Show your calculations.]

8 (15). OK, a bit more about the data on page 108. What does a linear relationship between net photosynthesis and leaf conductance say about the values of intercellular CO_2 over the leaf conductance range of 50 - 350 $\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$? Specifically, over the leaf conductance range of 50 - 350 $\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, is the intercellular CO_2 value constant, increasing, and/or decreasing? Justify your answer.