
**INTEGRATED IRRIGATION AND CANOPY MANAGEMENT
STRATEGIES FOR *VITIS VINIFERA* CV. SHIRAZ.**

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at The University of Adelaide

By

RACHEL MARGARET ASHLEY

September 2004

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being available for loan or photocopying.

Rachel Margaret Ashley
15 September 2004

Dedicated to the memory of Eve Cottral.

SUMMARY

Modern canopy management practices and irrigation strategies have improved the economic and environmental sustainability of Australia's wine industry, in terms of increased production and improved wine quality for minimal production cost and environmental impact. This study tested the hypothesis that partial rootzone drying (PRD) integrated with low input, minimal pruning practices can improve sustainability of winegrape production in warm-climate, irrigated vineyards. The bi-factorial experiment investigated three conventional pruning practices; hand spur pruning (SPUR), mechanical hedging (MECH) and minimal pruning (MIN) integrated with standard drip (SD) and PRD irrigation strategies. The sustainability of winegrape production of field-grown cv. Shiraz grapevines was determined by examining yield, fruit composition, wine composition and quality, vine physiology and susceptibility of bunches to *Botrytis* bunch rot.

Winegrape production was strongly influenced by pruning level and the resultant bunch number per vine. Increased node retention at pruning of minimal pruned vines resulted in 4-fold more bunches per vine than spur pruned vines. Mechanical hedged vines had an intermediate number of bunches per vine. Yield generally reflected the trend in bunch number per vine. However, minimally pruned and mechanically hedged vines compensated for greater carbohydrate partitioning between reproductive sinks by producing smaller bunches with fewer berries per bunch. Partial drying of the grapevine rootzone had a detrimental effect on yield relative to SD irrigation (18%). The additive effect of SD combined with light pruning treatments resulted in few statistically significant interactions for the measured yield components. Berry weight was the only parameter influenced by the interaction between irrigation and pruning during the three experimental seasons; PRD + MIN reduced berry weight by 36% compared to SD + SPUR, in response to lower irrigation inputs and higher bunch number. A 2-fold increase in water use efficiency (tonnes per megalitre) was found by the reduced irrigation inputs of PRD combined with the high crop levels of MIN vines compared to SD + SPUR vines.

Fruit and wine composition was also largely unaffected by combined irrigation and pruning treatments, as a result of the additive effect of PRD and MIN. However, light pruning levels (MIN and MECH) and their associated small berry size and high bunch exposure, reduced

pH and increased titratable acidity, and anthocyanin and phenolic concentrations of berry juice compared to SPUR. Minor pruning level effects on wine composition can be directly correlated with those observed on fruit composition. PRD had minimal effect on basic fruit composition but strong effects on wine spectral parameters: density, hue, total anthocyanin and phenolic concentration and ionised anthocyanin concentration, possibly as a result of co-pigmentation of anthocyanin compounds with exocarp tannins. Berry size was strongly correlated with fruit and wine quality. Small berries (i.e. from PRD and MIN) had lower pH and higher anthocyanin and phenolic concentrations in the juice and produced wine that was more acidic, brighter and had higher colour density and anthocyanin (total and ionised) and phenolic concentrations than all other treatments.

Midday and diurnal leaf gas exchange were manipulated by partially drying the rootzone. PRD reduced midday stomatal conductance, photosynthesis and transpiration compared to SD. Stomatal limitation on photosynthesis and transpiration was probable, given the strong positive relationship with stomatal conductance and reduced carbon isotope discrimination by PRD. Transpiration efficiency was improved for PRD irrigated vines compared to SD irrigated vines. Leaf water potential and osmotic potential were measured diurnally, in conjunction with leaf gas exchange to investigate the response of PRD irrigated vines to increasing vapour pressure deficit. Diurnally, stomatal conductance was reduced by PRD compared to SD, which maintained leaf water potential, while no osmotic adjustment occurred. Therefore, PRD irrigation maintained hydraulic water status by hydrating half of the rootzone, whilst dehydration of the other half of the rootzone resulted in the partial closure of stomata. Pruning treatment effects on vine physiology were less pronounced. Minor gas exchange effects showed that pruning level influenced carboxylation efficiency and not stomatal limitations, as photosynthesis was not directly correlated with stomatal conductance.

Bunches were least resistant to infection by *Botrytis* when fully developed and at maximum maturity. The development of bunches into tighter clusters as berry size increased from veraison to harvest and the increase in sugar content may have encouraged development of *Botrytis*. The distinct bunch architecture resulting from the combined pruning and irrigation treatments influenced the incidence and severity of *Botrytis* bunch rot. Light pruning combined with PRD irrigation produced small, loose bunches in season 2001-02, which

were less susceptible to *Botrytis* bunch rot development compared to the large, compact bunches produced on SD + SPUR vines. However, low bunch numbers and high fruit-set on MIN and MECH vines in season 2002-03 led to a significant change in bunch architecture. As a consequence of the increased compactness of bunches in season 2002-03, no pruning effects on *Botrytis* development were observed.

Long term economic and environmental sustainability of winegrape production is dependent on continual improvement in fruit and wine quality, preservation of yield, reduced water and chemical usage. This study has shown partial drying of the rootzone combined with light pruning techniques improved yield, fruit and wine composition, water use efficiency and transpiration efficiency and reduced the incidence and severity of *Botrytis* bunch rot compared to SD and severe pruning levels. Therefore, over the three experimental seasons, PRD combined with minimal pruning was determined as the preferred strategy to enhance the sustainability of winegrape production of Shiraz cv. in warm-climate, irrigated vineyards.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the Co-operative Research Centre for Viticulture and its associated funding and research bodies, in particular CSIRO Plant Industry, DPI Victoria, MDBC, The University of Adelaide and Riverlink, for financial and research support throughout the duration of my PhD candidature. Also, I am greatly appreciative to my co-supervisors Mr Peter Clingeffer, CSIRO PI, Assoc. Prof. Peter Dry, The University of Adelaide and Dr Bob Emmett, DPI. Special thanks to Peter C for sharing his vast knowledge on practical viticulture, to Bob E for exposing me to the fascinating world of pathology and teaching me important mycology techniques and to Peter D for proof-reading my manuscript and providing important feedback.

I am indebted to my colleagues and friends at CSIRO PI, Horticulture Unit, Merbein for their continual research support, especially Dr Rob Walker, Dr Nicola Cooley for assistance with diurnal measurements, Dr Mark Gibberd for help with plant physiology, Dr Paul Petrie for viticultural advice, Peter Lo Iacono and Sonja Needs for sharing their small-lot wine making expertise and producing wine each season. Thanks are given to the viticultural team at DPI; Dr Mark Krstic, Yasmin Chalmers, Glenda Kelly and Lisa Mitchell, for their continual technical and harvest support. Thankyou to my fellow CRCV PhD students for sharing their experience and knowledge, particularly Keren Bindon for proofreading my final draft. A special mention is given to Deakin Estate, Wingara Wine Group Ltd., especially Craig Thornton, Assistant Vineyard Manager, Jeff Milne, Vineyard Manager and Will Davies, Technical Assistant. The experimental site was located in this busy commercial vineyard and it was with Craig's continued co-operation, that all experiments and harvests were successful.

I am truly indebted to my family and friends for their enduring encouragement, support and love throughout the past 4 years. Without the frequent reassurance and guidance of Mum and Dad, it is highly unlikely I would have commenced let alone finished my PhD. Likewise, I am truly thankful for the support and companionship of my dear friends in Mildura, especially Angelica, Ang, Chelsea, Nicky, Sonja, Nicole and Fiona. Finally, a giant thank you to my fiancé, Damian, who has encouraged and loved me through the difficult times of writing-up my thesis.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>Abbreviation</i>	<i>Explanation and Units</i>
PRD	Partial rootzone drying
SD	Standard commercial practice drip irrigation
SPUR	Hand spur pruning
MECH	Mechanical hedging
MIN	Minimal pruning
PAR	Photosynthetically active radiation ($\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$)
DAB	Days after budburst
DAF	Days after flowering
DAI	Days after irrigation
AEDT	Australian Eastern Daylight Savings Time
LSD	Least significant difference
θ_v	Volumetric soil-water content (%)
T	Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)
RH	Relative humidity (%)
VPD	Vapour pressure deficit (kPa)
SGR	Shoot growth rate ($\text{cm}\cdot\text{day}^{-1}$)
LA	Leaf area per vine (m^2)
LA:F	Leaf area to fruit ratio ($\text{m}^2\cdot\text{g}\cdot\text{vine}^{-1}$)
WUE	Water use efficiency ($\text{t}\cdot\text{ML}^{-1}$)
TSS	Total soluble solids ($^{\circ}\text{Brix}$)
TA	Titrateable acidity ($\text{g}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$)
α	Percentage of anthocyanin ionisation (%)
g_s	Stomatal conductance ($\text{m}\cdot\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$)
A	Net leaf photosynthesis ($\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$)
T	Net leaf transpiration ($\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$)
A/T	Transpiration efficiency ($\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{mmol}^{-1}$)
C_i	Internal leaf carbon dioxide concentration ($\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$)
C_a	Atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration ($\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$)
Δ	Carbon isotope discrimination
Ψ_L	Leaf water potential (MPa)
Ψ_s	Osmotic potential (MPa)
SS	Surface sterilisation
NS	Non-surface sterilisation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction and literature review	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Canopy management	1
1.2.1	Winter pruning	3
1.2.2	Pruning systems.....	5
	<i>Hand spur pruning</i>	5
	<i>Mechanical hedging</i>	6
	<i>Minimal pruning</i>	7
1.3	Irrigation management	9
1.3.1	Partial rootzone drying.....	10
1.4	Integration of canopy and irrigation management.....	12
1.5	Conclusion	13
2	Methodology	15
2.1	Experimental site.....	15
2.1.1	Vineyard characteristics	15
2.1.2	Soil characteristics	16
2.2	Experimental field trial.....	17
2.2.1	Irrigation and pruning treatments.....	17
2.2.2	Experimental design	17
2.2.3	Irrigation scheduling.....	19
2.3	Climatic conditions for seasons 2000-2003.....	24
2.4	Phenological growth dates for seasons 2001-2003	25
3	Irrigation and pruning effects on yield.	27
3.1	Introduction and experimental aims.....	27
3.2	Methodology	28
3.2.1	Canopy development and morphology	28
3.2.2	Berry development.....	29
3.2.3	Harvest components	30
3.2.4	Statistical analysis	30
3.3	Results	31
3.3.1	Canopy development and morphology	31
3.3.2	Leaf area development.....	32
3.3.3	Pruning weights	34
3.3.4	Berry development.....	35
3.3.5	Berry maturation	35
3.3.6	Bunch number and bunch weight	42
3.3.7	Yield.....	44
3.3.8	Berry weight and berry number	46

3.3.9 Vine balance.....	48
3.4 Discussion.....	49
3.4.1 Pruning and irrigation effects on canopy development.....	49
3.4.2 Treatment effects on berry development.....	51
3.4.3 Pruning effect on yield components	52
3.4.4 PRD influence on yield components	53
3.4.5 Treatment effects on vine balance.....	54
3.4.6 Improvements in water use efficiency caused by PRD	55
3.5 Conclusions	56
4 Irrigation and pruning effects on fruit and wine composition.....	58
4.1 Introduction and experimental aims.....	58
4.2 Methodology	60
4.2.1 Determination of fruit total soluble solids, pH and titratable acidity.....	60
4.2.2 Determination of fruit anthocyanin and phenolic concentration.....	61
4.2.3 Small-scale wine production	61
4.2.4 Determination of wine composition.....	62
4.2.5 Statistical analysis	63
4.3 Results	63
4.3.1 Fruit total soluble solid, pH and titratable acidity	63
4.3.2 Fruit anthocyanin and phenolics concentrations and content	66
4.3.3 Relationship between anthocyanin concentration and temperature	68
4.3.4 Wine pH and titratable acidity	69
4.3.5 Wine spectral evaluation.....	71
4.4 Yield and fruit composition correlations	76
4.5 Yield, fruit and wine composition correlations	79
4.6 Discussion.....	82
4.7.1 Pruning effects on fruit and wine composition.....	82
4.7.2 Irrigation effects on fruit and wine composition	83
4.7.3 Irrigation and pruning effects on fruit and wine composition	85
4.7.4 Influence of yield on fruit and wine composition.....	87
4.7.5 Influence of berry size and TSS on fruit and wine composition	88
4.7 Conclusions	89
5 Physiological response to irrigation and pruning treatments	91
5.1 Introduction and experimental aims.....	91
5.2 Methodology	93
5.2.1 Midday leaf gas exchange	93
5.2.2 Carbon isotope discrimination	94
5.2.3 PRD vine response to increasing vapour pressure deficit.....	95
5.2.4 Statistical analysis	95
5.3 Results of irrigation and pruning effects on midday leaf gas exchange	96
5.3.1 Midday leaf gas exchange for 2001-02 and 2002-03	96

5.3.2 Vapour pressure deficit and soil water content.....	100
5.3.2 Phenological effect on midday leaf gas exchange.....	101
5.4 Irrigation and pruning effects on carbon isotope discrimination	109
5.5 PRD vine physiological response to increasing vapour pressure deficit	110
5.5.1 Diurnal increase in vapour pressure deficit.....	110
5.5.2 Diurnal response of PRD vines	112
5.6 Discussion.....	126
5.6.1 Irrigation effects on leaf gas exchange.....	126
5.6.2 Pruning effects on leaf gas exchange	127
5.6.3 Irrigation and pruning effect on leaf gas exchange.....	127
5.6.4 Leaf gas exchange at different phenological stages	129
5.6.5 Irrigation and pruning effects on carbon isotope discrimination	131
5.6.6 Diurnal response of PRD vines to increasing vapour pressure deficit.....	132
5.6.7 Proposed mechanisms for stomatal closure by PRD.....	134
5.6.8 Single leaf gas exchange measurements	135
5.7 Conclusions	135
6 Botrytis bunch rot development and bunch architecture	137
6.1 Introduction and experimental aims.....	137
6.2 Methodology	139
6.2.1 Isolates of <i>Botrytis cinerea</i>	139
6.2.2 Spore concentration	140
6.2.3 Botrytis field inoculations at flowering.....	141
6.2.4 Late season Botrytis field inoculations.....	141
6.2.5 Bunch architecture.....	142
6.2.6 Statistical analysis	142
6.3 Results	143
6.3.1 Effect of spore concentration on incidence and severity of Botrytis	143
6.3.2 Botrytis field inoculations at flowering.....	143
6.3.3 Late season Botrytis field inoculations.....	150
6.3.4 Seasonal effects on bunch architecture.....	154
6.3.5 Integrated irrigation and pruning effects on bunch architecture	155
6.3.6 Bunch architecture and Botrytis incidence and severity at harvest	158
6.4 Discussion.....	159
6.4.1 Influence of spore concentration on inoculation experiments	159
6.4.2 Botrytis incidence and severity at different bunch development stages.....	160
6.4.3 Susceptibility of bunches to late season Botrytis inoculations	161
6.4.4 Influence of irrigation and pruning treatments on Botrytis bunch rot.....	162
6.4.5 Irrigation and pruning effects on bunch architecture and Botrytis infection.....	163

6.5 Conclusions	165
7 General Discussion	166
7.1 Introduction to the experiment	166
7.2 Irrigation effects on sustainability of winegrape production	167
7.3 Pruning effects on sustainability of winegrape production	169
7.4 Integrated irrigation and pruning effects on sustainability of winegrape production ..	171
7.5 Recommendations for the Australian Wine Industry.....	173
8 References.....	174
APPENDIX A	194
APPENDIX B	195
APPENDIX C	196
APPENDIX D.....	197

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Response of net photosynthesis of grapevine laminae to sunlight, measured as PAR (Smart 1985).....	2
Figure 1.2: Stomatal conductance of Chardonnay (g_s) for PRD vines (σ) and non-irrigated vines (\square) expressed as a percentage of fully irrigated vines (Dry and Loveys 1999)	11
Figure 1.3: Net Photosynthesis of Chardonnay (A) for PRD vines (σ) and non-irrigated vines (\square) expressed as a percentage of fully irrigated vines (Dry and Loveys 1999).....	11
Figure 1.4: Shoot growth rate of Chardonnay (SGR; $cm.d^{-1}$) for PRD vines (σ) and non-irrigated vines (\square) expressed as a percentage of fully irrigated vines (Dry and Loveys 1999).....	12
Figure 2.1: Systematic diagram of alternating PRD irrigation cycles and infrastructure at Deakin Estate; \bullet represents non-irrigating drip line and dry rootzone and \bullet represents irrigating drip line and associated wet rootzone of grapevine.	18
Figure 2.2: Schematic diagram of experimental field site at Deakin Estate; 2 contiguous latin squares of pruning plots (8 vines each) superimposed on to irrigation rows.....	18
Figure 2.2: Photograph of PRD irrigation infrastructure at Deakin Estate, 2 parallel drip lines irrigate half the rootzone of the vine at a time as indicated by the wet and dry rootzone.....	19
Figure 2.4: Figure 2.4: a. Standard drip (SD) volumetric soil-water content of surface (20 cm) and sub-surface soil (50 cm) b. PRD irrigation volumetric soil-water content of surface soil (20-40cm) of north and south side of vine and c. soil-water content of sub-surface soil (50-70cm) of north and south side of vine, as measured by TDR and corresponding irrigation and rainfall events for 2000-01 growing season	21
Figure 2.5: a. Standard drip (SD) volumetric soil-water content of surface (20 cm) and sub-surface soil (50 cm) b. PRD irrigation volumetric soil-water content of surface soil (20-40cm) of north and south side of vine and c. soil-water content of sub-surface soil (50-70cm) of north and south side of vine, as measured by TDR and corresponding irrigation and rainfall events for 2001-02 growing season.	22
Figure 2.6: a. Standard drip (SD) volumetric soil-water content of surface (20 cm) and sub-surface soil (50 cm) b. PRD irrigation volumetric soil-water content of surface soil (20-40cm) of north and south side of vine and c. soil-water content of sub-surface soil (50-70cm) of north and south side of vine, as measured by TDR and corresponding irrigation and rainfall events for 2002-03 growing season	23
Figure 3.1: Pruning treatment effects on shoot growth in season 2000-01; a. shoot length, b. shoots growth rate, c. number of nodes.shoot ⁻¹ and d. internode length from budburst to 89 days after budburst (DAB). Significant differences were calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD) at each time point. LSD is represented by bars and levels of significance are denoted by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05.....	32
Figure 3.2: a Pruning and b. Irrigation effects on total leaf area development n season 2000-01. Significant differences were calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD) at each time point. Levels of significance are denoted by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant.....	33
Figure 3.3: Irrigation and pruning effects on berry weight during the maturation period in season 2000-01. Significance of irrigation and pruning interactions were calculated by Fisher's LSD and are represented on the graph by LSD bars. Levels of significance are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns = not significant.....	36
Figure 3.4: Irrigation and pruning effects on berry weight during the maturation period in season 2001-02. Significance of irrigation and pruning interactions were calculated by Fisher's LSD and are represented on the graph by LSD bars. Levels of significance are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns = not significant.....	36
Figure 3.5: Irrigation and pruning effects on berry weight during the maturation period in season 2002-03. Significance of irrigation and pruning interactions were calculated by Fisher's LSD and are represented on the	

graph by LSD bars. Levels of significance are denoted by *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, ns = not significant.....	37
Figure 3.6: Integrated irrigation and pruning effects on sugar (TSS) accumulation during the maturation period in season 2000-01. Significance of irrigation and pruning interactions were calculated by Fisher's LSD and are represented on the graph by LSD bars. Levels of significance are denoted by *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, ns = not significant.....	38
Figure 3.7: Integrated irrigation and pruning effects on sugar (TSS) accumulation during the maturation period in season 2001-02. Significance of irrigation and pruning interactions were calculated by Fisher's LSD and are represented on the graph by LSD bars. Levels of significance are denoted by *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, ns = not significant.....	38
Figure 3.8: Integrated irrigation and pruning effects on sugar (TSS) accumulation during the maturation period in season 2002-03. Significance of irrigation and pruning interactions were calculated by Fisher's LSD and are represented on the graph by LSD bars. Levels of significance are denoted by *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, ns = not significant.....	39
Figure 3.9: Parallel regression model of sugar accumulation in berries on vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments for season 2000-01. Refer to Table 3.3 for equations	40
Figure 3.10: Parallel regression model of sugar accumulation in berries from vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments for season 2001-02. Refer to Table 3.3 for equations	41
Figure 3.11: Common regression model of sugar accumulation in berries from vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments for season 2002-03. Refer to Table 3.3 for equations	41
Figure 5.1: Curvilinear relationship between photosynthesis and stomatal conductance for midday measurements of all treatments ($R^2 = 0.748$), $P < 0.001$	99
Figure 5.2a: Midday stomatal conductance (g_s) of SD (▲) and PRD (■) irrigation treatments measured on six days between veraison and harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences at each measurement day are represented by *** $P > 0.001$, ** $P > 0.01$, * $P > 0.05$, ns = non significant.....	102
Figure 5.2b: Midday stomatal conductance (g_s) of SPUR (▲), MECH (▲) and MIN (Δ) pruning treatments measured on six days between veraison and harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences at each measurement day are represented by *** $P > 0.001$, ** $P > 0.01$, * $P > 0.05$, ns = non significant.....	103
Figure 5.2c: Midday stomatal conductance (g_s) of integrated irrigation and pruning treatments measured on six days between veraison and harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences at each measurement day are represented by *** $P > 0.001$, ** $P > 0.01$, * $P > 0.05$, ns = non significant.....	103
Figure 5.3a: Midday leaf photosynthesis (A) of SD (▲) and PRD (■) irrigation treatments measured on six days between veraison and harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences at each measurement day are represented by *** $P > 0.001$, ** $P > 0.01$, * $P > 0.05$, ns = non significant.....	104
Figure 5.3b: Midday leaf photosynthesis (A) of SPUR (▲), MECH (▲) and MIN (Δ) pruning treatments measured on six days between veraison and harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences at each measurement day are represented by *** $P > 0.001$, ** $P > 0.01$, * $P > 0.05$, ns = non significant.....	104
Figure 5.3c: Midday leaf photosynthesis (A) of integrated irrigation and pruning treatments measured on six days between veraison and harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences at each measurement day are represented by *** $P > 0.001$, ** $P > 0.01$, * $P > 0.05$, ns = non significant.....	105
Figure 5.4a: Midday transpiration (T) of SD (▲) and PRD (■) irrigation treatments measured on six days between veraison and harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences at each measurement day are represented by *** $P > 0.001$, ** $P > 0.01$, * $P > 0.05$, ns = non significant.....	106
Figure 5.4b: Midday transpiration (T) of SPUR (▲), MECH (▲) and MIN (Δ) pruning treatments measured on six days between veraison and harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences at each measurement day are represented by *** $P > 0.001$, ** $P > 0.01$, * $P > 0.05$, ns = non significant.....	106

Figure 5.4c: Midday transpiration (T) of integrated irrigation and pruning treatments measured on six days between veraison and harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences at each measurement day are represented by ***P>0.001, **P>0.01, *P>0.05, ns = non significant.....	106
Figure 5.5a: Midday internal CO ₂ concentration (C _i) of SD (▲) and PRD (■) irrigation treatments measured on six days between veraison and harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences at each measurement day are represented by ***P>0.001, **P>0.01, *P>0.05, ns = non significant.	107
Figure 5.5b: Midday internal CO ₂ concentration (C _i) of SPUR (▲), MECH (▲) and MIN (Δ) pruning treatments measured on six days between veraison and harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences at each measurement day are represented by ***P>0.001, **P>0.01, *P>0.05, ns = non significant.....	107
Figure 5.5c: Midday internal CO ₂ concentration (C _i) of integrated irrigation and pruning treatments measured on six days between veraison and harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences at each measurement day are represented by ***P>0.001, **P>0.01, *P>0.05, ns = non significant	108
Figure 5.6a: Midday transpiration efficiency (A/T) of SD (▲) and PRD (■) irrigation treatments measured on six days between veraison and harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences at each measurement day are represented by ***P>0.001, **P>0.01, *P>0.05, ns = non significant.....	108
Figure 5.6b: Midday transpiration efficiency (A/T) of SPUR (▲), MECH (▲) and MIN (Δ) pruning treatments measured on six days between veraison and harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences at each measurement day are represented by ***P>0.001, **P>0.01, *P>0.05, ns = non significant.....	109
Figure 5.6c: Midday transpiration efficiency (A/T) of integrated irrigation and pruning treatments measured on six days between veraison and harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences at each measurement day are represented by ***P>0.001, **P>0.01, *P>0.05, ns = non significant	109
Figure 5.7: Diurnal change in vapour pressure deficit (VPD, kPa) for four diurnal measurement days.....	111
Figure 5.8a: Diurnal response of PRD on stomatal conductance (g _s) on 24 January 2002, ± SEM.....	113
Figure 5.8b: Diurnal response of PRD on photosynthesis (A) on 24 January 2002, ± SEM.....	113
Figure 5.8c: Diurnal response of PRD on transpiration (T) on 24 January 2002, ± SEM.....	114
Figure 5.8d: Diurnal response of PRD on transpiration efficiency (A/T) on 24 January 2002, ± SEM	114
Figure 5.8e: Diurnal response of PRD on intercellular CO ₂ partial pressure (C _i) on 24 January 2002, ± SEM	114
Figure 5.8f: Diurnal response of PRD on leaf water potential (Ψ _L) on 24 January 2002, ± SEM.....	115
Figure 5.8g: Diurnal response of PRD on osmotic potential (Ψ _s) on 24 January 2002, ± SEM.....	115
Figure 5.8h: Diurnal response of PRD on turgor on 24 January 2002, ± SEM.....	115
Figure 5.9a: Diurnal response of PRD on stomatal conductance (g _s) on 25 January 2002, ± SEM.....	116
Figure 5.9b: Diurnal response of PRD on photosynthesis (A) on 25 January 2002, ± SEM.....	117
Figure 5.9c: Diurnal response of PRD on transpiration (T) on 25 January 2002, ± SEM.....	117
Figure 5.9d: Diurnal response of PRD on transpiration efficiency (A/T) on 25 January 2002, ± SEM.....	117
Figure 5.9e: Diurnal response of PRD on intercellular CO ₂ partial pressure (C _i) on 25 January 2002, ± SEM	118
Figure 5.9f: Diurnal response of PRD on leaf water potential (Ψ _L) on 25 January 2002, ± SEM.....	118
Figure 5.9g: Diurnal response of PRD on osmotic potential (Ψ _s) on 25 January 2002, ± SEM.....	118

Figure 5.9h: Diurnal response of PRD on turgor on 25 January 2002, \pm SEM.....	119
Figure 5.10a: Diurnal response of PRD on stomatal conductance (g_s) on 26 February 2002, \pm SEM.....	120
Figure 5.10b: Diurnal response of PRD on photosynthesis (A) on 26 February 2002, \pm SEM.....	120
Figure 5.10c: Diurnal response of PRD on transpiration (T) on 26 February 2002, \pm SEM.....	120
Figure 5.10d: Diurnal response of PRD on transpiration efficiency (A/T) on 26 February 2002, \pm SEM.....	121
Figure 5.10e: Diurnal response of PRD on intercellular CO ₂ partial pressure (C_i) on 26 February 2002, \pm SEM	121
Figure 5.10f: Diurnal response of PRD on leaf water potential (Ψ_L) on 26 February 2002, \pm SEM.....	121
Figure 5.10g: Diurnal response of PRD on osmotic potential (Ψ_s) on 26 February 2002, \pm SEM.....	122
Figure 5.10h: Diurnal response of PRD on turgor on 26 February 2002, \pm SEM.....	122
Figure 5.11a: Diurnal response of PRD on stomatal conductance (g_s) on 14 February 2003, \pm SEM.....	123
Figure 5.11b: Diurnal response of PRD on photosynthesis (A) on 14 February 2003, \pm SEM.....	123
Figure 5.11c: Diurnal response of PRD on transpiration (T) on 14 February 2003, \pm SEM.....	124
Figure 5.11d: Diurnal response of PRD on transpiration efficiency (A/T) on 14 February 2003, \pm SEM.....	124
Figure 5.11e: Diurnal response of PRD on intercellular CO ₂ partial pressure (C_i) on 14 February 2002, \pm SEM	124
Figure 5.11f: Diurnal response of PRD on leaf water potential (Ψ_L) on 14 February 2003, \pm SEM.....	125
Figure 5.11g: Diurnal response of PRD on osmotic potential (Ψ_s) on 14 February 2003, \pm SEM.....	125
Figure 5.11h: Diurnal response of PRD on turgor on 14 February 2003, \pm SEM.....	125
Figure 6.1: Mean incidence and severity of Botrytis in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03 at 4 stages of bunch development; flowering, fruit-set, veraison and harvest. Significant differences between treatment means denoted by different letters as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level)	144
Figure 6.2: Incidence of Botrytis in season 2001-02 of surface (SS) and non-surface sterilised (NS) bunches from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments at 4 phenological stages; flowering, fruit-set, veraison and harvest. Significant differences between phenological stage*treatment*sterilisation were calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significance levels are represented by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant.....	148
Figure 6.3: Incidence of Botrytis in season 2002-03 of surface (SS) and non-surface sterilised (NS) bunches from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments at 4 phenological stages; flowering, fruit-set, veraison and harvest. Significant differences between phenological stage*treatment*sterilisation were calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significance levels are represented by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant.....	148
Figure 6.4: Severity of Botrytis in season 2001-02 of surface (SS) and non-surface sterilised (NS) bunches from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments at 4 phenological stages; flowering, fruit-set, veraison and harvest. Significant differences between phenological stage*treatment*sterilisation were calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significance levels are represented by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant.....	149

Figure 6.5: Severity of Botrytis in season 2002-03 of surface (SS) and non-surface sterilised (NS) bunches from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments at 4 phenological stages; flowering, fruit-set, veraison and harvest. Significant differences between phenological stage*treatment*sterilisation were calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significance levels are represented by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant..... 150

Figure 6.6: Photograph of representative bunch architecture for each of the combined irrigation and pruning treatments in season 2001-02..... 156

Figure 6.7: Effect of irrigation and pruning treatments at harvest 2001-02 (■) and 2002-03 (■) on bunch architectural parameters; a. mean bunch weight, b. berry number vine⁻¹, c. bunch volume, d. maximum width, e. bunch length and f. compactness. Significant differences were calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level) and significance levels are indicated by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant. 157

Figure 6.8 Linear relationships between a. incidence ($R^2 = 0.87$, $P < 0.01$) and b. severity ($R^2 = 0.94$, $P < 0.01$) of Botrytis and mean bunch weight for integrated irrigation and pruning treatments in 2001-02..... 158

Figure 6.9: Linear relationships between a. incidence ($R^2 = 0.014$, $P < 0.01$) and b. severity ($R^2 = 0.009$, $P < 0.01$) of Botrytis and mean bunch weight for integrated irrigation and pruning treatments in 2002-03..... 159

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Influence of pruning level on mean photosynthetic rate (Pn), stomatal conductance (gs), leaf water potential (ψ_L), average leaf area and shoot length of Cabernet Sauvignon vines at Mildura, Victoria. Significant difference represented by different letters (P<0.05), adapted from Sommer <i>et al.</i> (1993)	4
Table 1.2: Influence of pruning level on mean yield, bunch number, berry weight, total soluble solid ($^{\circ}$ Brix), pH and titratable acidity of Cabernet Sauvignon vines at Mildura, Victoria. Significant difference represented by different letters (P<0.05), adapted from Sommer <i>et al.</i> (1993).....	4
Table 1.3: Comparison of incidence and severity of Botrytis bunch rot on bunches of Chardonnay at Coonawarra from minimally pruned, mechanically hedged and hand pruned vines, adapted from Emmett <i>et al.</i> (1995)	8
Table 2.1: Average monthly climatic data from Mildura Airport: latitude 34 $^{\circ}$ 14'S, longitude 142 $^{\circ}$ 5'E, 54 years of records (Bureau of Meteorology 2003)	15
Table 2.2: Soil characteristic of surface and subsurface soil of Shiraz vineyard, Deakin Estate, Iraak, Victoria: texture (LS= loamy sand, SL= sandy loam, SCL = sandy clay loam), ECe (dS/m), pH, TOC (%), N (%) and P (mg/kg) of surface soil (10-20 cm) and subsurface soil (50-70 cm).....	17
Table 2.3: Total seasonal irrigation inputs (ML.ha $^{-1}$) for the three experimental seasons for SD and PRD irrigation treatments at Deakin Estate, Iraak, Victoria	20
Table 2.4: Mean monthly climatic data from Nangilic weather station for the 2000-01 growing season.....	24
Table 2.5: Mean monthly climatic data from Nangilic weather station for the 2001-02 growing season.....	25
Table 2.6: Mean monthly climatic data from Nangilic weather station for the 2002-03 growing season.....	25
Table 2.7: Calendar date for phenological stages of budburst, flowering, veraison and harvest for Shiraz grapevines at Deakin Estate for seasons 2000-01, 2001-02 and 2002-03	26
Table 3.1: Irrigation and pruning effect on total leaf area.vine $^{-1}$ (LA, m 2 .vine $^{-1}$) at maximum canopy development, 22 November 2000-02. * Indicates significance level; *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns = non significant .34	
Table 3.2: Irrigation and pruning effects on pruning weight, cane number.vine $^{-1}$ and mean cane weight at winter pruning in season 2002-03. * Indicates significance level; *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns = not significant, different letters denote significant differences between means in each column.	34
Table 3.3: Equations and coefficient of determination (R 2) for parallel regression model of sugar accumulation for season's 2000-01 and 2001-02 and common regression model of sugar accumulation for season 2002-03. Regression model Equations are Total Soluble Solids = constant + slope*Days After Veraison.....	40
Table 3.4: Integrated treatment effects on sugar accumulation rate ($^{\circ}$ Brix.day $^{-1}$) for seasons 2000-01, 2001-02 and 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between seasonal means. *** indicates P<0.001	42
TABLE 3.5: Bunch number.vine $^{-1}$ of vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant.	43
TABLE 3.6: Bunch weight (g) of vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant.	44

Table 3.7: Coefficient of determination (R^2) and statistical significance level (P value) of the negative linear relationship between bunch number vine ⁻¹ and bunch weight for all treatments in each season and over the 3 seasons. Significance level is denoted by ** P<0.01, * P<0.05	44
TABLE 3.8: Yield of vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant.	45
TABLE 3.9: Berry weight of vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant.	47
TABLE 3.10: Berry number.bunch ⁻¹ of vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant	47
TABLE 3.11: Leaf area: fruit ratio of vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant.	48
TABLE 3.12: Water use efficiency of vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant.	49
TABLE 4.1: The total soluble solid concentration of berries from vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant	64
TABLE 4.2: The pH of berries from vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant.	65
TABLE 4.3: The titratable acidity of berries from vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant.....	65
TABLE 4.4: The anthocyanin a. concentration and b. content of berries from vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant	67
TABLE 4.5: The a. concentration and b. content of berries from vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least	

significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, ns= not significant 68

Table 4.6: Correlation coefficients of mean anthocyanin concentration of all treatments with mean daily temperature for the months of December, January and February for the three experimental seasons, n=3. Bold script represents significance at 1% level, $P < 0.01$ 69

TABLE 4.7: The pH of wine from vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, ns= not significant. 70

TABLE 4.8: The titratable acidity of wine from vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, ns= not significant..... 70

TABLE 4.9: The colour density of wine from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments for season 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03 and seasonal means. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments denoted by *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, ns = non significant 71

TABLE 4.10: The colour hue of wine from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments for season 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03 and seasonal means. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments denoted by *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, ns = non significant 72

TABLE 4.11: The ionised anthocyanin concentration of wine from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments for season 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03 and seasonal means. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments denoted by *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, ns = non significant..... 73

TABLE 4.12: The total anthocyanin concentration of wine from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments for season 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03 and seasonal means. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments denoted by *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, ns = non significant 74

TABLE 4.13: The degree of ionisation of anthocyanins of wine from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments for season 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03 and seasonal means. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments denoted by *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, ns = non significant..... 75

TABLE 4.14: The total phenolic concentration of wine from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments for season 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03 and seasonal means. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments denoted by *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$, ns = non significant 75

Table 4.15: Correlation coefficients of mean yield components [yield, bunch number.vine⁻¹ (Bunch No.), bunch weight (Bunch Wt.), berry number.bunch⁻¹ (Berry No.), leaf area:fruit (LA:F), water use efficiency (WUE)] and fruit composition parameters [total soluble solids (TSS), pH, titratable acidity (TA), anthocyanin concentration (Antho.) and phenolic concentration (Phenol)] for seasons a. 2000-01, b. 2001-02, c. 2002-03, n=6. Bold script represents significance at 5% level..... 77

- Table 4.16: Correlation coefficients of mean yield components [yield, bunch number.vine⁻¹ (Bunch No.), bunch weight (Bunch Wt.), berry number.bunch⁻¹ (Berry No.), leaf area: fruit (LA:F), water use efficiency (WUE)] and fruit composition parameters [total soluble solids (TSS), pH, titratable acidity (TA), anthocyanin concentration (Antho.) and phenolic concentration (Phenol)] for seasons 2000-03, n=18. Bold script represents significance at 5% level..... 78
- Table 4.17: Correlation coefficients of mean yield components [yield, bunch number.vine⁻¹ (Bunch No.), bunch weight (Bunch Wt.), berry number.bunch⁻¹ (Berry No.), leaf area:fruit (LA:F), water use efficiency (WUE) and fruit parameters [total soluble solids (TSS), pH, titratable acidity (TA) anthocyanin concentration (Antho.) and phenolic concentration (Phenol.) and wine parameters [tartaric acid addition (TA added), wine pH, wine titratable acidity (TA), colour density, hue, total anthocyanin concentration (Total Antho.), ionised anthocyanin (Ionised Antho.), phenolic concentration (Phenolics), degree of ionisation (alpha)] for season a. 2000-01, b. 2001-02 and 3. 2002-03, n=6. Bold script represents significance at 5% level..... 80
- Table 4.18: Correlation coefficients of mean yield components [yield, bunch number.vine⁻¹ (Bunch No.), bunch weight (Bunch Wt.), berry number.bunch⁻¹ (Berry No.), leaf area:fruit (LA:F), water use efficiency (WUE) and fruit parameters [total soluble solids (TSS), pH, titratable acidity (TA) anthocyanin concentration (Antho.) and phenolic concentration (Phenol.) and wine parameters [tartaric acid addition (TA added), wine pH, wine titratable acidity (TA), colour density, hue, total anthocyanin concentration (Total Antho.), ionised anthocyanin (Ionised Antho.), phenolic concentration (Phenolics), degree of ionisation (alpha)] for seasons 2000-03, n=18. Bold script represents significance at 5% level..... 81
- Table 5.1: Mean midday leaf stomatal conductance (g_s) of vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant..... 97
- Table 5.2: Mean midday photosynthesis (A) of vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant..... 97
- Table 5.3: Mean midday Transpiration (T) of vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant..... 98
- Table 5.4: Mean midday intercellular CO₂ concentration (C_i) of vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant..... 98
- Table 5.5: Mean midday transpiration efficiency (A/T) of vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant..... 99
- Table 5.6: Midday climatic conditions: temperature (T), relative humidity (RH) and vapour pressure deficit (VPD), number of days after an irrigation event (DAI), corresponding amounts of irrigation water applied to SD and PRD treatments, and number of days after a rainfall event (DAR) and amount of rain (mm) for each of the midday gas exchange measurements..... 100
- Table 5.7: Midday volumetric soil water content (θ_v %) of SD and PRD (north and south side of the vine) of surface (20-40 cm) and subsurface soil (50-70 cm) as measured hourly by TDR probes located adjacent to vines. 101

- Table 5.8: Mean Carbon Isotope Discrimination (Δ) of vines with integrated irrigation and pruning treatments and seasonal means for 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03. Different letters denote significant differences between treatment means for each season (column) and across seasons (rows), as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level). Significant differences between treatments are denoted by *** P<0.001, ** P<0.01, * P<0.05, ns= not significant..... 110
- Table 5.9: Hourly climatic conditions (Temperature °C, Relative Humidity % and Vapour Pressure Deficit kPa) for each of the diurnal measurement days..... 111
- Table 5.10: Average volumetric soil water contents (θ_v , %) of diurnal measurement days for SD and PRD (north and south side of the vine) of surface (20-40 cm) and subsurface soil (50-70 cm) as measured hourly by TDR probes located adjacent to vines 111
- Table 6.1: Incidence and severity of *B. cinerea* on bunches from all treatments inoculated in the field at flowering in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03 at spore suspension concentrations of 0, 10² or 10⁴ spores.mL⁻¹. Significant differences calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level) and denoted by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = non significant 143
- Table 6.2: The mean incidence of Botrytis in season 2001-02 on inoculated and control bunches, surface sterilised (SS) and non-surface sterilised (NS) bunches from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments at 4 stages of bunch development. Significant differences between treatment means are denoted by different letters as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level) and significance levels are indicated by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant 145
- Table 6.3: The mean incidence of Botrytis in season 2002-03 on inoculated and control bunches, surface sterilised (SS) and non-surface sterilised (NS) bunches from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments at 4 stages of bunch development. Significant differences between treatment means are denoted by different letters as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level) and significance levels are indicated by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant 146
- Table 6.4: The mean severity of Botrytis in season 2001-02 on inoculated and control bunches, surface sterilised (SS) and non-surface sterilised (NS) bunches from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments at 4 stages of bunch development. Significant differences between treatment means are denoted by different letters as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level) and significance levels are indicated by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant 146
- Table 6.5: The mean severity of Botrytis in season 2002-03 on inoculated and control bunches, surface sterilised (SS) and non-surface sterilised (NS) bunches from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments at 4 stages of bunch development. Significant differences between treatment means are denoted by different letters as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level) and significance levels are indicated by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant 147
- Table 6.6: The mean incidence and severity of Botrytis in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03 on bunches inoculated at flowering, veraison and pre-harvest. Significant differences between treatment means are denoted by different letters as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level) and significance levels are indicated by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant 151
- Table 6.7: The incidence of Botrytis in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03 on bunches inoculated at flowering, veraison and pre-harvest. Significant differences between treatment means are denoted by different letters as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level) and significance levels are indicated by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant 151
- Table 6.8: Severity of Botrytis in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03 on bunches inoculated at flowering, veraison and pre-harvest. Significant differences between treatment means are denoted by different letters as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level) and significance level are indicated by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant 152
- Table 6.9: The incidence of Botrytis in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03 on bunches from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments inoculated at flowering, veraison and pre-harvest. Significant differences between treatment means are denoted by different letters as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level) and significance levels are indicated by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant 153

Table 6.10: Severity of Botrytis in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03 on bunches from integrated irrigation and pruning treatments inoculated at flowering, veraison and pre-harvest. Significant differences between treatment means are denoted by different letters as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level) and significance levels are indicated by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant 154

Table 6.11: Bunch architectural parameters, pooled over all treatments, at harvest in seasons 2001-02 and 2002-03. Significant differences between seasons are denoted by different letters as calculated by Fisher's least significant difference (LSD 5% level) and significance levels are indicated by ***P<0.001, **P<0.01, *P<0.05, ns = not significant 155