

**The reproductive biology of grapevines —  
factors that affect flowering and fruitset**

by

**Mardi Louise Longbottom**

Bachelor of Agricultural Science (Viticultural Science)  
Masters of Viticulture  
The University of Adelaide, South Australia

*Discipline of Wine and Horticulture  
School of Agriculture, Food and Wine  
Faculty of Science  
The University of Adelaide*



A thesis submitted to The University of Adelaide in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

February, 2007

# Table of contents

<b>List of Figures</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of Tables</b> .....	<b>xiv</b>
<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>xix</b>
Molybdenum experiments .....	xix
Effects of molybdenum deficiency on the vegetative growth and yield of <i>Vitis vinifera</i> cv. Merlot.....	xix
Effects of mode of pollination on yield of Merlot and the interacting effects of sodium molybdate sprays .....	xx
The occurrence of 'star' flowers in Australia .....	xxi
<b>Declaration</b> .....	<b>xxiii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>xxiv</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b> .....	<b>xxv</b>
<b>Chapter 1 General introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Flowering and fruitset – significance to Australian viticulture .....	1
1.2 The relationship between molybdenum and Merlot .....	2
1.3 Research aims .....	3
<b>Chapter 2 Literature review</b> .....	<b>4</b>
2.1 Components of yield .....	4
2.1.1 Season 1 .....	4
2.1.2 Season 2 .....	4
2.2 Bud initiation .....	4
2.3 Differentiation of inflorescences .....	5
2.4 Flower structure and development.....	5
2.5 Flower number .....	6
2.6 Flower opening .....	7
2.6.1 Timing of flower opening .....	7
2.7 Cleistogamy .....	8
2.8 Stigma receptivity .....	8
2.9 Pollination.....	8
2.9.1 Insect pollination.....	9
2.9.2 Wind pollination .....	9
2.9.3 Self-pollination and cross-pollination.....	9
2.10 Pollen .....	10
2.10.1 Pollen tube growth .....	10
2.10.2 Pollen tube signalling.....	11
2.11 Fertilisation .....	12
2.12 Bunch development .....	13
2.12.1 Shot berries .....	13
2.12.2 Chicken berries .....	14
2.12.3 Hen berries .....	14
2.13 Fruitset .....	14
2.14 Fruitset disorders.....	15

2.14.1	Coulure.....	15
2.14.2	Millerandage.....	15
2.15	Other factors that affect fruitset.....	17
2.15.1	Environmental factors.....	17
2.15.2	Growth substances.....	18
2.15.3	Carbohydrates and organic nutrients.....	19
2.16	Molybdenum as a potential remedial treatment for low-yielding varieties.....	20
2.16.1	Effects of molybdenum deficiency on yield of Merlot.....	21
2.16.2	Potential negative effects of applying molybdenum to Merlot.....	23
2.16.3	Areas for further investigation.....	23
2.17	Conclusion.....	23
<b>Chapter 3 General materials and methods.....</b>		<b>24</b>
3.1	Experiments.....	24
3.2	Experimental field sites.....	24
3.3	Weather data.....	25
3.4	Phenology.....	26
3.5	Molybdenum sprays.....	26
3.6	Experimental design.....	27
3.6.1	Vine selection.....	27
3.6.2	Molybdenum experiments 2003-04.....	27
3.6.3	Molybdenum experiments 2004-05.....	29
3.6.4	Molybdenum experiments 2005-06.....	30
3.7	Flower observations.....	30
3.7.1	Flower structure.....	30
3.8	Yield components.....	33
3.8.1	Flower number per bunch.....	33
3.8.2	Fruitset.....	33
3.8.3	Ovary retention at harvest.....	33
3.8.4	Mean berry weight.....	34
3.9	Classification of berry types.....	34
3.10	Statistical methods.....	35
<b>Chapter 4 Effects of sodium molybdate sprays on vine and soil nutrient status.....</b>		<b>36</b>
4.1	Introduction.....	36
4.1.1	Aims.....	37
4.2	Materials and methods.....	38
4.2.1	Experimental sites.....	38
4.2.2	Weather data.....	38
4.2.3	Timing of tissue nutrient analysis.....	38
4.2.4	Tissue sampling procedure.....	38
4.2.5	Replication of tissue samples.....	39
4.2.6	Tissue sample processing.....	39
4.2.7	Tissue analyses.....	41
4.2.8	Soil sampling procedure.....	42
4.2.9	Soil analyses.....	42
4.2.10	Statistical analyses.....	42
4.3	Results.....	43
4.3.1	Phenology and weather data.....	43
4.3.2	Molybdenum in vine tissues at modified E-L stage 12.....	43
4.3.3	Other nutrients in the vines at modified E-L stage 12.....	46
4.3.4	Molybdenum in vine tissues at modified E-L stage 25.....	48
4.3.5	Total and nitrate nitrogen in the vines at modified E-L stage 25.....	53

4.3.6	Other nutrients analysed in the vines at modified E-L stage 25 .....	53
4.3.7	Adelaide Hills and McLaren Vale soil properties .....	57
4.3.8	The effects of sodium molybdate foliar sprays on molybdenum and other soil nutrients .....	57
4.4	Discussion.....	59
4.4.1	Molybdenum in vine tissues at modified E-L stage 12 .....	59
4.4.2	Molybdenum in the vines at modified E-L stage 25.....	60
4.4.3	The effect of sodium molybdate foliar sprays on molybdenum concentration in the inflorescences and petioles at modified E-L stage 25.....	61
4.4.4	The effect of sodium molybdate foliar sprays on molybdenum concentration in the shoot tips at modified E-L stage 25 .....	61
4.4.5	The relationship between petiolar molybdenum concentration and the concentration of molybdenum in the shoot tips and inflorescences at modified E-L stage 25 .....	62
4.4.6	Molybdenum in the vines in the season after sodium molybdate treatment....	63
4.4.7	Effects of applying sodium molybdate foliar sprays in consecutive seasons ...	64
4.4.8	Soil properties at the Adelaide Hills and McLaren Vale experimental sites ....	66
4.4.9	Effects of sodium molybdate sprays on molybdenum accumulation in the soil .. .....	66
4.5	Conclusions.....	67
<b>Chapter 5 Effects of sodium molybdate sprays on the vegetative growth of Merlot.....</b>		<b>68</b>
5.1	Introduction.....	68
5.1.1	Aims.....	69
5.2	Materials and methods .....	69
5.2.1	Experimental design .....	69
5.2.2	Phenological data.....	69
5.2.3	Veraison canopy measures.....	69
5.2.4	Pruning weight.....	70
5.2.5	Yield to pruning weight ratio.....	70
5.2.6	Observations at budburst .....	70
5.3	Results.....	71
5.3.1	Phenological data.....	71
5.3.2	Veraison canopy measurements.....	71
5.3.3	Pruning weight and vine balance .....	73
5.3.4	Observations at budburst .....	74
5.4	Discussion.....	76
5.4.1	Effects of Mo-treatment on vine vegetative growth in the season after spraying .....	77
5.5	Conclusions.....	78
<b>Chapter 6 Effects of sodium molybdate sprays on the yield components of Merlot .....</b>		<b>79</b>
6.1	Introduction.....	79
6.1.1	Aims.....	80
6.2	Materials and methods .....	80
6.2.1	Experimental design .....	80
6.2.2	Nutritional analysis .....	80
6.2.3	Yield components .....	80
6.2.4	Total yield.....	80
6.2.5	Seed number .....	81
6.2.6	Berry shrivel .....	81
6.3	Results.....	82
6.3.1	Nutritional analysis.....	82

6.3.2	Fruitset .....	82
6.3.3	Ovary retention .....	85
6.3.4	Berry weight .....	85
6.3.5	Bunch number per vine.....	86
6.3.6	Total yield .....	86
6.3.7	The relationship between molybdenum concentration in the vines at flowering and percent fruitset on bunches from Mo-treated vines .....	86
6.3.8	Berry shrivel .....	88
6.4	Discussion.....	90
6.4.1	Fruitfulness .....	90
6.4.2	Bunch weight .....	90
6.4.3	Millerandage .....	90
6.4.4	Effects of consecutive seasons of Mo-treatment on yield components of Merlot .....	91
6.4.5	Effects of high molybdenum concentration on yield.....	92
6.4.6	What is the critical level of molybdenum for optimum yield of Merlot? .....	93
6.4.7	Berry shrivel .....	94
6.5	Conclusions.....	95

**Chapter 7 Effects of sodium molybdate foliar sprays on flowering and flower characteristics of Merlot .....96**

7.1	Introduction.....	96
7.1.1	Aims.....	97
7.2	Materials and methods.....	98
7.2.1	Experimental design .....	98
7.2.2	Weather data .....	98
7.2.3	Nutritional analyses .....	98
7.2.4	Pollen vitality.....	99
7.2.5	Pollen tube growth.....	30
7.2.6	Flower structure .....	100
7.3	Results.....	102
7.3.1	Weather observations during flowering.....	102
7.3.2	Nutritional analysis .....	104
7.3.3	Pollen vitality.....	108
7.3.4	Pollen tube growth.....	108
7.3.5	Flower structure .....	110
7.3.6	Ultrastructure of ovules .....	111
7.3.7	Ovule structure.....	112
7.4	Discussion.....	113
7.4.1	Weather conditions at flowering.....	113
7.4.2	Nutritional analyses of the flowers .....	113
7.4.3	Pollen vitality.....	115
7.4.4	Pollen tube growth .....	115
7.4.5	Potential causes of poor pollen tube growth in Mo-deficient flowers.....	116
7.4.6	Possible mechanisms for ovary development under Mo-deficient conditions .....	120
7.5	Conclusions.....	122

**Chapter 8 Effects of sodium molybdate foliar sprays on Merlot fruit composition.....123**

8.1	Introduction.....	123
8.1.1	Aims.....	124
8.2	Materials and methods .....	124
8.2.1	Experimental design .....	124

8.2.2	Berry sampling method.....	124
8.2.3	Sample processing .....	124
8.2.4	Nutritional analysis .....	124
8.3	Results.....	125
8.4	Discussion.....	128
8.4.1	Berry total soluble solids, pH and titratable acidity.....	128
8.4.2	Nutritional composition .....	128
8.5	Conclusions.....	129
<b>Chapter 9 Effects of mode of pollination on yield of Merlot and the interacting effects of sodium molybdate sprays.....</b>		<b>130</b>
9.1	Introduction.....	130
9.1.1	Aims.....	131
9.2	Materials and methods .....	132
9.2.1	Vine and inflorescence selection .....	132
9.2.2	Experimental design .....	133
9.2.3	Pollen collection and storage .....	134
9.2.4	Pollination.....	135
9.2.5	Fruitset and berry weight .....	135
9.2.6	Nutritional analysis .....	135
9.3	Results.....	136
9.3.1	Hills.....	136
9.3.2	McLaren Vale 2003-04 and 2004-05 .....	137
9.3.3	McLaren Vale 2005-06 .....	137
9.4	Discussion.....	139
9.4.1	Effects of mode of pollination on berry size.....	139
9.4.2	Effects of mode of pollination on fruitset.....	139
9.4.3	Supplementary pollination or Mo-treatment?.....	140
9.5	Conclusions.....	141
<b>Chapter 10 The occurrence of star flowers in Australia.....</b>		<b>142</b>
10.1	Introduction.....	142
10.1.1	Aims.....	142
10.2	Materials and methods .....	143
10.2.1	Nomenclature.....	143
10.2.2	Microscopy .....	143
10.2.3	Berry classification .....	143
10.2.4	Flower and berry development on Canada Muscat .....	144
10.2.5	Cross pollination of Canada Muscat.....	144
10.2.6	Double pruning of Canada Muscat .....	145
10.2.7	Observations of Chardonnay and Shiraz star flowers.....	145
10.2.8	Other star flower variants .....	146
10.3	Results and discussion .....	148
10.3.1	Structure and development of Canada Muscat star flowers .....	148
10.3.2	Pollen tube growth in Canada Muscat star flowers .....	154
10.3.3	Fruitset of Canada Muscat star flowers .....	155
10.3.4	Ovule structure of Canada Muscat star flowers.....	158
10.3.5	Cross-pollination of Canada Muscat star flowers.....	159
10.3.6	Second generation flowering of Canada Muscat .....	160
10.3.7	Observations of star flowers on Chardonnay and Shiraz.....	161
10.3.8	Pollen tube growth in Chardonnay and Shiraz star flowers.....	166
10.3.9	Ovule development in Chardonnay and Shiraz star flowers.....	168
10.3.10	Star bunch, berry and seed development on Chardonnay and Shiraz.....	170

10.4	Other star flower variants .....	173
10.5	Future directions for star flower research .....	177
10.6	Conclusions.....	177
<b>Chapter 11 General discussion .....</b>		<b>179</b>
11.1	Addressing the confusion about fruitset and fruitset disorders.....	179
11.2	Understanding the contribution of different mechanisms of berry development ...	180
11.3	Advances in understanding the relationship between Merlot and molybdenum ....	181
11.3.1	Effects of molybdenum on yield of Merlot .....	182
11.3.2	Mechanism by which molybdenum affects yield of Merlot .....	182
11.3.3	Predisposing conditions for molybdenum deficiency.....	183
11.3.4	Adoption by the industry and practical implications of the current molybdenum research .....	184
11.3.5	Long-term and environmental implications of Mo-treatment .....	185
11.4	Advances in grapevine tissue analysis.....	187
11.4.1	What is the critical level of molybdenum in Merlot? .....	187
11.4.2	Nutrient analysis of anthers and pistils .....	188
11.5	The potential importance of the star flower discovery to Australian viticulture ....	188
11.6	Remaining questions and areas for further investigation.....	189
11.7	Conclusions.....	189
<b>References.....</b>		<b>191</b>
<b>Appendices.....</b>		<b>201</b>
APPENDIX A.....		201
APPENDIX B .....		202
APPENDIX C .....		203
<b>Publications .....</b>		<b>204</b>

## List of Figures

- Figure 3.1. Molybdenum spray being applied to Merlot vines at modified E-L stage 12 at McLaren Vale. ....26
- Figure 3.2. Experiment layout at McLaren Vale and in the Adelaide Hills in 2003-04. Each X along a row represents 1 panel of vines. Rate 0 (□), rate 1 (■) and rate 2 (■) molybdenum sprays were applied to vines in the central panel in each block plus two vines either side of the central panel leaving unsprayed buffer vines at either end of the block. Alternate rows between the treatments were unsprayed buffer rows. Blocks coloured with ■, ■ and ■ were double-pruned and sprayed with molybdenum in summer. ....28
- Figure 3.3. Experiment layout at McLaren Vale in 2004-05. Each X within a row represents 1 panel of vines. Vines in the old block were sprayed with rate 0 (□), rate 1 (■) and rate 2 (■) molybdenum sprays in 2003-04 and 2004-05 and vines in the new block were sprayed in 2004-05 only. Sprays were applied to the central eight vines in each block leaving two unsprayed buffer vines at either end of the block. Alternate rows between the treatments were unsprayed buffer rows. ....29
- Figure 3.4. Experimental layout at McLaren Vale in 2005-06. Each X represents three vines. Vines were sprayed with rate 0 (control) (■) and rate 1(■) molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2005-06. ....30
- Figure 3.5. A Merlot bunch showing typical hen berries (A), chicken berries (B) and live green ovaries (LGOs) (C). Note that chicken berries were classified as such based on the absence of functional seeds and not on size alone. ....32
- Figure 4.1. Concentration of molybdenum (mg/kg) in Merlot petioles at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) in the Adelaide Hills. In 2003-04 (■) vines received rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm). In 2004-05 (■) the vines were left unsprayed. Different letters above the columns indicate significant differences between treatments ( $p < 0.05$ ). Note the different scales. ....46
- Figure 4.2. Concentration of molybdenum (mg/kg) in Merlot shoot tips at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) in the Adelaide Hills. In 2003-04 (■) vines received rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm). In 2004-05 (■) the vines were left unsprayed. Different letters above the columns indicate significant differences between treatments and seasons ( $p < 0.05$ ). ....47
- Figure 4.3. Concentration of molybdenum (mg/kg) in the inflorescences at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) in the Adelaide Hills in 2004-05. In 2003-04 vines received rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm). In 2004-05 (■) the vines were left unsprayed. Different letters above the columns indicate significant differences between treatments ( $p < 0.05$ ). ....47
- Figure 4.4. Concentration of molybdenum (mg/kg) in Merlot petioles at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) at McLaren Vale. In 2003-04 (■) vines received rate 0 (left), rate 1 (centre) and rate 2 (right) molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm). In 2004-05, vines in the new block (■) were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2004-05 only and vines in the old block (■) had been sprayed at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again at MELS 12 in 2004-05. In 2005-06 (■) vines from the new block were left unsprayed. Different letters above the columns indicate significant differences between seasons ( $p < 0.05$ ). For significant differences between treatments within a season, see Table 4.6. ....48
- Figure 4.5. Concentration of molybdenum (mg/kg) in Merlot shoot tips at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) at McLaren Vale. In 2003-04 (■) vines received rate 0 (left), rate

1 (centre) and rate 2 (right) molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm). In 2004-05, vines in the new block (■) were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2004-05 only and vines in the old block (■) had been sprayed at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again at MELS 12 in 2004-05. Different letters above the columns indicate significant differences between seasons ( $p < 0.05$ ). For significant differences between treatments within a season, see Table 4.6. ....	49
Figure 4.6. Concentration of molybdenum (mg/kg) in Merlot inflorescences at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) at McLaren Vale. In 2004-05 vines in the new block (■) received rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm). Vines in the old block (■) had been sprayed at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again at MELS 12 in 2004-05. Different letters above the columns indicate significant differences between treatments and seasons ( $p < 0.05$ ).....	49
Figure 4.7. The relationship between molybdenum concentrations in the petioles and inflorescences from Merlot vines at modified E-L stage 25 (80% flowering) at McLaren Vale in 2004-05.....	60
Figure 4.8. The relationship between molybdenum concentrations in the petioles and shoot tips from Merlot vines at modified E-L stage 25 (80% flowering) at McLaren Vale in 2003-05. ....	61
Figure 5.1. Delayed budburst on Merlot vines (inside the orange oval) in the Adelaide Hills on 18 November 2004. These vines were treated with rate 2 molybdenum sprays in spring 2003. Note the stage of growth of the unsprayed vines in the same row outside the oval for comparison.....	73
Figure 5.2. Delayed budburst on Merlot vines (inside the orange oval) at McLaren Vale on 15 September 2004. These vines were sprayed with rate 1 molybdenum in spring 2003. Note the stage of growth of the unsprayed vines in the same row outside the oval and those in the buffer row in the background for comparison. ....	73
Figure 6.1. Extreme examples of poor fruitset on Merlot bunches from control vines in 2003-04 ( <b>A1</b> ), a typical control bunch in 2004-05 ( <b>A2</b> ) and typical bunches from vines sprayed with rate 1 ( <b>B</b> ) and rate 2 ( <b>C</b> ) molybdenum sprays at McLaren Vale in 2003-04.....	82
Figure 6.2. The relationship between molybdenum concentration in the petioles (mg/kg) at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) and fruitset (arc sine transformed) on bunches of Merlot vines treated with rates 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2004-05 at McLaren Vale. ....	85
Figure 6.3. The relationship between molybdenum concentration in the shoot tips (mg/kg) at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) and fruitset (arc sine transformed) on bunches of Merlot vines treated with rates 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2004-05 at McLaren Vale. ....	85
Figure 6.4. The relationship between molybdenum concentration (mg/kg) in the inflorescences at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) and fruitset (arc sine transformed) on bunches of Merlot vines treated with rates 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2004-05 at McLaren Vale. ....	86
Figure 6.5. Typical bunches from rate 0 (control) (left) and rate 1 (right) Mo-treated Merlot vines at McLaren Vale collected on March 3 2004. Berries from the Mo-deficient vines appeared shrivelled compared to berries from Mo-treated vines which appeared turgid and in good condition. ....	87
Figure 6.6. Mean berry weights from Merlot bunches collected on February 1 (■) and March 28 (■) from vines treated with rate 0 (control) and rate 1 Mo sprays at McLaren Vale in 2005-06. ....	87

Figure 6.7. The relationship between petiolar molybdenum concentration (mg/kg) at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) and fruitset (arc sine transformed) on bunches from Merlot vines treated with rates 0 (control) (○), rate 1 (●) and rate 2 (●) molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2004-05 at McLaren Vale. Points inside the red circle represent those that have lower fruitset values associated with high molybdenum concentration in the petioles. ....	90
Figure 6.8. The relationship between molybdenum concentration (mg/kg) in the shoot tips at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) and fruitset (arc sine transformed) on bunches from Merlot vines treated with rates 0 (control) (○), rate 1 (●) and rate 2 (●) molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2004-05 at McLaren Vale. ....	91
Figure 6.9. The relationship between molybdenum concentration (mg/kg) in the shoot tips at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) and fruitset on bunches from Merlot vines treated with rates 0 (control) (white), rate 1 (yellow) and rate 2 (red) molybdenum sprays at McLaren Vale. In 2003-04 (■) vines were sprayed at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm). In the new block (▲) vines were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2004-05 only and in the old block (●) vines were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again in 2004-05. The red lines indicate the suggested critical level of molybdenum (0.1 mg/kg) in the shoot tips to increase fruitset to 30%. ....	92
Figure 7.1. Typical images of Merlot flowers taken using fluorescence microscopy. <b>A:</b> This image shows the inner regions of two halves of the stigma and style. (a) Fluorescing pollen grains visible along the edge of the stigma and (b) pollen tubes extend down into the style. <b>B:</b> This image shows the inner region of one half of a pistil. The coloured lines indicate different points along the passage of the pollen tubes towards the ovule. Green: stigma/upper style, yellow: lower style, orange: lower ovary. Arrows indicate pollen tubes entering the ovules. .	99
Figure 7.2. Serial sections of a Merlot ovule showing the outer- and inner integuments (oi, ii), nucellus (n), embryo sac (es) and micropyle (m). A: visible inner and outer integuments; B: cells in the central nucellus are elongated; C: first sign of an embryo sac; D: complete embryo sac; E: remnant of the embryo sac remains visible; F: embryo sac no longer visible, central nucellar cells tend to be elongated. The bar represents 100 µm. ....	101
Figure 7.3. Physical damage on Merlot flowers after a severe storm at McLaren Vale in November 2004. Arrows indicate necrosing and reflexed stamens. ....	103
Figure 7.4. Merlot flowers after a severe storm at McLaren Vale in November 2004. The arrows indicate flower caps that only partially abscised. ....	103
Figure 7.5. Molybdenum concentration in the stamens (■) and pistils (■) of Merlot flowers at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) in the Adelaide Hills in 2004-05. Vines were treated with rate 0 (control) rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04 and were left untreated in 2004-05. ....	105
Figure 7.6. Molybdenum concentration in the stamens (■) and pistils (■) of Merlot flowers at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) in 2004-05 at McLaren Vale. Vines in the new block (left) were treated with rate 0 (control) rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2004-05 only and vines in the old block (right) were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again at MELS 12 in 2004-05. ....	105
Figure 7.7. Molybdenum concentration in the stamens (■) and pistils (■) of Merlot flowers at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) in 2005-06 at McLaren Vale. Vines were treated with rate 0 (control) and rate 1 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2005-06. ....	106
Figure 7.8. A Merlot pistil with a diverted stylar transmitting tissue. Pollen tubes fail to proceed to the lower ovary. ....	110

Figure 7.9. <b>A:</b> A Merlot pistil with a hollow and diverted stylar transmitting tissue, necrotic stigma and necrosis at the edges of the section (indicated by arrows) and <b>B:</b> a healthy ovary with pollen tubes growing in a continuous, straight style.....	110
Figure 7.10. A Merlot pistil from the Adelaide Hills with two penetrated ovules. The redundant pollen tubes appear convoluted (indicated by the arrows). .....	111
Figure 7.11. A convoluted pollen tube in the lower ovary of a Merlot flower from McLaren Vale.....	111
Figure 7.12. The relationship between the percentage of ovaries with at least one penetrated ovule and percent fruitset of Merlot at McLaren Vale in 2004-05. ....	116
Figure 7.13. Diagrammatic representation of proposed proportions of ovary and berry types relative to the incidence of faulty ovules. ....	121
Figure 8.1. Concentration of molybdenum ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ) in Merlot juice from the Adelaide Hills (■) and McLaren Vale (■) at modified E-L stage (MELS) 38 (berries harvest ripe) in 2003-04. Vines were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm). Different letters above the columns indicate significant differences between treatments at a site (Hills = lower case, McLaren Vale = upper case) ( $p < 0.05$ ). ....	126
Figure 9.1. A Merlot inflorescence enclosed inside a mesh bag at McLaren Vale. Note the shed caps in the bottom of the bag.....	132
Figure 9.2. Mean berry number per bunch 2003-04 (■) and percent fruitset 2004-05 (■) on bunches from pollination treatments: supplementary cross- (cross), supplementary self- (self), supplementary self- Mo-treated pollination (Self +Mo) & open-pollination (open) on Merlot in the Adelaide Hills. There were no significant differences between treatments ( $p < 0.05$ )...	136
Figure 9.3. Average berry weights from bunches of the pollination treatments: supplementary cross- (cross), supplementary self- (self), supplementary self- Mo-treated (self+Mo) & open-pollination (open) on Merlot in the Adelaide Hills in 2003-04 (■) and 2004-05 (■). No significant differences were found between treatments in the same season ( $p < 0.05$ ). ....	136
Figure 9.4. Percent fruitset (left) and mean berry weight (g) (right) for pollination treatments: supplementary cross- (cross), supplementary self- (self), supplementary self- Mo-treated pollination (Self +Mo) & open-pollination (open) on Merlot at McLaren Vale in 2003-04 (■) and 2004-05 (■). Different letters above the columns represent significant differences between treatments within the same season ( $p < 0.05$ ). Because percent fruitset was estimated on the self-pollination treatment, this was not included in the statistical analysis. ....	137
Figure 10.1. A Canada Muscat inflorescences with the pedicels of star flowers marked with red acrylic ink (indicated by arrows). .....	144
Figure 10.2. Photographic characterisation of berry and seed development of star Chardonnay. Photographs of the categories are arranged in pairs to represent the initial grading made looking through the uncut berry (left) and an actual representation of the exposed seeds / seed traces (berries dissected longitudinally through the centre). <b>A:</b> no visible seed trace, <b>B:</b> visible seed trace, <b>C:</b> solid, short seed trace, <b>D:</b> normal seed. ....	147
Figure 10.3. Star flowers on a Canada Muscat inflorescence from the variety collection in the Coombe Vineyard at the Waite Campus at The University of Adelaide on 12 October 2003. ....	148
Figure 10.4. The progression of flowering of normal <i>Vitis vinifera</i> flowers. <b>A:</b> The petals separate from the base of the calyptra, <b>B:</b> the petals curl upward and <b>C:</b> the cap lifts off releasing the anthers and exposing the stigma. ....	148
Figure 10.5. Canada Muscat star flowers showing <b>A:</b> The petals start to separate from the top of the compact flower bud and remain attached at the base. Anthers remain intact inside the	

petals and <b>B</b> : the relative size of the filaments and anthers (petals have been removed). <b>C</b> : A normal Shiraz flower after capfall showing the relative size and position of the stamens (NB. The anthers have dehisced).....	149
Figure 10.6. Canada Muscat star flowers at different stages of opening showing necrotic patches on the tips of the petals extending to the anthers. ....	149
Figure 10.7. A Canada Muscat star flower with the stamens standing erect and the anthers separated from the petals. Anthers are pale in appearance, have necrotic patches developing and have not dehisced. ....	150
Figure 10.8. A scanning electron micrograph of a Canada Muscat star flower. The petals separate from the tip of the calyptra to expose the stigma. Note that the anthers have begun to dehisce (indicated by arrow).....	151
Figure 10.9. A side view of a Canada Muscat star flower showing the stigmatic surface and a dehisced anther. ....	151
Figure 10.10. Pollen grains being released from the anther of a Canada Muscat star flower. ....	152
Figure 10.11. Pollen grains on the surface of the anthers of a Canada Muscat star flower....	152
Figure 10.12. A scanning electron micrograph of a normal Canada Muscat flower showing relative sizes of the male and female flower parts. Anthers are dehisced, nectaries ( <b>n</b> ) present. ....	153
Figure 10.13. Swelling of an ovary beneath the lifted but persistent calyptra (cleistogamy) of a Canada Muscat flower .....	153
Figure 10.14. A branch of Canada Muscat with <b>A</b> : a normal flower shedding its cap. Note also the presence of nectaries ( <b>n</b> ), and <b>B</b> : a star flower with persistent petals and stamens.....	154
Figure 10.15. Photographs of the stigma and style of two Canada Muscat star flowers taken using fluorescence microscopy showing <b>A</b> : pollen grains on the stigma and <b>B</b> : pollen tubes in the style. ....	154
Figure 10.16. A swollen ovary of a Canada Muscat star flower. Note the persistent stamens and petals at the base of the berry.....	156
Figure 10.17. Canada Muscat inflorescences showing setting berries and necrotic ovaries abscising from the rachis (indicated by arrows) <b>A</b> : 28 October 2004 and <b>B</b> : 17 December 2004 .....	157
Figure 10.18. Typical Canada Muscat berries from <b>A</b> : normal flowers and <b>B</b> : star flowers, 19 November 2004. Note the persistent petals and stamens (indicated by arrow). ....	157
Figure 10.19. Seed development in Canada Muscat berries from <b>A</b> : normal and <b>B</b> : star flowers, 19 November 2004.....	158
Figure 10.20. Typical ovules from Canada Muscat <b>A</b> : normal and <b>B</b> : star flowers.....	159
Figure 10.21. Typical leaves from Chardonnay vines with <b>A</b> : normal flowers and <b>B</b> : star flowers .....	161
Figure 10.22. Inflorescences from Chardonnay vines that produce <b>A</b> : normal flowers and <b>B</b> : star flowers.....	162
Figure 10.23. Shiraz inflorescences with <b>A</b> : star and <b>B</b> : normal flowers 28 <sup>th</sup> November 2005. ....	163
Figure 10.24. Chardonnay flowers dissected longitudinally just prior to opening on 19 October 2005, <b>A</b> : normal, <b>B</b> : star flower. Note the differences in shape of the flower buds and the relatively small size of the ovules and the pale coloured anthers of the star flower. The	

anther in the foreground of <b>B</b> has been positioned deliberately to more clearly expose the inner organs of the flower.....	164
Figure 10.25. The onset of flower opening of star Chardonnay 29 September 2006. Flowers remain in compact groups.....	164
Figure 10.26. Chardonnay flowers <b>A</b> : a normal immature flower with petals removed to show the relative sizes of the developing pistil and anthers 19 October 2004, and <b>B</b> : a star flower at the onset of flower opening 18 October 2004.....	164
Figure 10.27. Typical Chardonnay star flowers. <b>A</b> : early in development the ovary is small and <b>B</b> : later in development when the ovary has enlarged. ....	165
Figure 10.28. Stages of opening on Shiraz star flowers, 15 November 2005. <b>A</b> : Early separation of the petals at the tip of the flower, <b>B</b> : Petals fully opened and anthers released, <b>C</b> : Petals reflexed and anthers erect.....	165
Figure 10.29. <b>A</b> : Star and <b>B</b> : normal flowers on the same Shiraz inflorescence 30 <sup>th</sup> November 2005. ....	166
Figure 10.30. A star Chardonnay pistil collected 18 October 2005 showing <b>A</b> : no pollen grains on the stigma and no pollen tubes in the style and <b>B</b> : a hollow section in the style (indicated by arrow) and aberrant-shaped ovules. ....	167
Figure 10.31. <b>A</b> : Pollen tube growth and ovule penetration in a normal Shiraz ovary and <b>B</b> : aberrant ovules of a Shiraz star flower. ....	167
Figure 10.32. Anatomic ovule development. ....	168
Figure 10.33. Typical ovules from <b>A</b> : normal and <b>B</b> : star Chardonnay flowers.....	169
Figure 10.34. Typical ovules from Shiraz star flowers.....	169
Figure 10.35. An inflorescence of star Chardonnay shedding its ovaries, 22 November 2005. ....	170
Figure 10.36. Typical bunches from <b>A</b> : star and <b>B</b> : normal Chardonnay at maturity.....	171
Figure 10.37. Seeds extracted from the berries of a star bunch (above the horizontal line) and a normal bunch (below the horizontal line) showing the relative proportions of seeds from each bunch in each of the four categories; 1: enlarged, solid seed traces, 2: small seeds with abnormal appearance, 3: small seeds with normal appearance, 4: seeds of normal size and appearance. Scale bar represents 1cm.....	171
Figure 10.38. Bunches from <b>A</b> : star and <b>B</b> : normal Shiraz, 28 January 2006.....	172
Figure 10.39. Dissected flowers of wild type grapevine and the Mourvèdre and Bouchalès mutants before flowering (A) <i>V. vinifera</i> wild type, (B) Mourvèdre mutant showing carpelloid structures (sic) and pseudo-ovules (sic) and (C) Bouchalès mutant with double row of petals and pseudo-anthers (sic) prematurely opened. a, Anther: a*, pseudo-anther; c, carpelloid structure; o, ovule; o*, pseudo-ovule; ov, ovary; p, petal; s, stigma; sep, sepal. Scale bars = 1 mm (reproduced from Sreekantan et al. 2006). ....	173
Figure 10.40. <i>Phomopsis</i> infection on a Cabernet Sauvignon shoot at Coonawarra, 15 November 2005.....	174
Figure 10.41. <i>Phomopsis</i> infection on Cabernet Sauvignon flowers from Coonawarra causing them to open in star formation, 15 November 2005. ....	174
Figure 10.42. Star flowers from a Merlot vine affected by glyphosate herbicide at Padthaway, 15 November 2005.....	175
Figure 10.43. Star flowers (indicated by arrows) on Merlot vines in the Adelaide Hills probably caused by insect feeding damage.....	176

Figure A.1 Grapevine growth stages – the modified E-L system (Reproduced from Coombe 1995). .....	201
Figure A.2 Layout of the molybdenum-pollination experiment at McLaren Vale in 2005-06. Each X within a row represents 3 vines. Vines were treated with rate 0 (control) (□) and rate 1 (■) molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage 12 (shoots 10cm). The pollen source vines were located in row 2. Different modes of pollination were applied to four inflorescences on each experimental vine in rows 4 and 6.....	203
Figure A.3 Advertisement from the National GrapeGrowers publication, August 2006. ....	203

## List of Tables

Table 3.1. List of experiments .....	24
Table 3.2. Climatic characteristics of and soil types at experimental sites in the Adelaide Hills and at McLaren Vale.....	25
Table 3.3. Description of experimental vines and vineyard layout in the Adelaide Hills and at McLaren Vale. ....	25
Table 3.4. Molybdenum treatments applied to experimental vines at McLaren Vale and in the Adelaide Hills. ....	26
Table 4.1. Nutritional analyses of washed and unwashed petioles from Merlot vines treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays in the Adelaide Hills in 2003-04. Different letters after the values represent significant differences between unwashed and washed values within a treatment ( $p < 0.05$ ). ....	39
Table 4.2. Weather observations from budburst to 80% flowering on Merlot in the Adelaide Hills and at McLaren Vale in 2003-04 and 2004-05 .....	41
Table 4.3. Concentration of molybdenum in the petioles, shoot tips and inflorescences of Merlot at modified E-L stage (MELS) 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04 and 2004-05. Samples from the Hills in 2004-05 and those from the old block at McLaren Vale were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 in 2003-04. All other samples had not received any molybdenum treatment prior to sampling in that season. Samples were not replicated and statistical analysis was not performed. ....	43
Table 4.4. Nutritional analyses of petioles, shoot tips and inflorescences collected from Merlot vines in the Adelaide Hills at modified E-L stage (MELS) 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04 (prior to Mo treatment) and in 2004-05 after treatment with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 at MELS 12 in 2003-04. ....	44
Table 4.5. Nutritional analyses of petioles, shoot tips and inflorescences collected from Merlot vines at McLaren Vale at modified E-L stage 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04 (prior to Mo treatment) and in 2004-05. Vines in the new block had not received any previous Mo treatment and those in the old block received rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays in 2003-04.....	45
Table 4.6. Concentration of molybdenum (mg/kg) in the petioles, shoot tips and inflorescences of Merlot in the Adelaide Hills and at McLaren Vale at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25. In 2003-04 all vines were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm). In 2004-05 vines in the Hills were left unsprayed. At McLaren Vale vines in the new block were sprayed in 2004-05 only and vines in the old block had been sprayed at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again at MELS 12 in 2004-05. In 2005-06 vines in the new block at McLaren Vale were left unsprayed. Different letters after the values within an experiment indicate significant differences between Mo-treatments within rows ( $p < 0.05$ ).....	50
Table 4.7. Nutrient analyses of petioles and shoot tips from Merlot vines at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) in 2003-04 in the Adelaide Hills. Vines were sprayed with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04. Different letters after the numbers indicate significant differences between treatments ( $p < 0.05$ ).....	51
Table 4.8. Nutrient analyses of petioles and shoot tips from Merlot vines at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) in 2003-04 at McLaren Vale. Vines were sprayed with rate	

0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04. Different letters after the numbers indicate significant differences between treatments ( $p < 0.05$ ).....	52
Table 4.9. Nutrient analyses of petioles, shoot tips and inflorescences from Merlot vines at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) in 2004-05 in the Adelaide Hills. Vines were sprayed with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04 and left unsprayed in 2004-05. Different letters after the numbers indicate significant differences between treatments ( $p < 0.05$ ).....	53
Table 4.10. Nutrient analyses of petioles, shoot tips and inflorescences from Merlot vines at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) in 2004-05 at McLaren Vale. Vines in the new block were sprayed with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04 and vines in the old block were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again at MELS 12 in 2004-05. Different letters after the values indicate significant differences between treatments ( $p < 0.05$ ).....	54
Table 4.11. Analyses of soil properties performed in winter 2005 from 0-30 cm and 70-100 cm. Vines in the Hills were sprayed with rate 0 (control) and rate 1 Mo sprays in 2003-04 only. At McLaren Vale vines in the new block were sprayed in 2004-05 only and vines in the old block were sprayed in 2003-04 and 2004-05.....	56
Table 4.12. Concentration of molybdenum (mg/kg) in the petioles, shoot tips and inflorescences of Merlot in the Adelaide Hills and at McLaren Vale at modified E-L stages 12 (shoots 10 cm) and 25 (80% flowering) in 2003-05. Vines in the Hills were sprayed with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and left unsprayed in 2004-05. At McLaren Vale vines in the new block were sprayed MELS 12 in 2003-04 and vines in the old block were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again at MELS 12 in 2004-05. ....	58
Table 4.13. Concentration of molybdenum in Merlot petioles at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) from vines sprayed with rate 0 (control) and rate 1 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2000, 2001 and 2002 at site 1 (Lower Hermitage), site 2 (Meadows) and site 3 (Kuitpo). Adapted from Williams et al. (2004).....	63
Table 5.1. Phenological data for Merlot vines at experimental sites in the Adelaide Hills and at McLaren Vale in 2003-06.....	69
Table 5.2. Canopy measures of Merlot vines performed at veraison in the Adelaide Hills. Vines were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04 and were unsprayed in 2004-05. Different letters within a column indicate significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) between treatments within a season.....	70
Table 5.3 Canopy measures of Merlot vines performed at veraison at McLaren Vale. In 2003-04 vines were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage (MELS) 12 (shoots 10 cm). Vines in the new block were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2004-05 only and vines in the old block were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again in 2004-05. Different letters within a column indicate significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) between treatments within a season or experiment.....	71
Table 5.4. Dormant vine measures performed on Merlot vines in the Adelaide Hills in 2005. Yield per vine was measured at harvest. Vines were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04. ....	71
Table 5.5. Dormant vine measures performed on Merlot vines at McLaren Vale in 2004 and 2005. Yield per vine was measured at harvest. In 2004 vines had been treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage (MELS) 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04. In the new block vines were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2004-05 only and vines in the old block were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again in 2004-05. ....	72

Table 5.6. Growth stage observations made in September 2005 on Merlot vines at McLaren Vale. Vines in the new block were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage (MELS) 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2004-05 only. Vines in the old block were treated at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again in 2004-05. Different letters after the values in rows represent significant differences between treatments within an experiment ( $p < 0.05$ ). Figures below the columns show the proportions of the nodes  $<$  MELS 5 (purple), at MELS 7-9 (red) and  $\geq$  MELS 11 (yellow).....74

Table 6.1. Yield components on Merlot vines treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage (MELS) 12 (shoots 10 cm) in the Adelaide Hills and at McLaren Vale in 2003-04. Different letters after the values represent significant differences between treatments within an experiment ( $p < 0.05$ ).....81

Table 6.2. Yield components on Merlot vines in 2004-05 in the Adelaide Hills and at McLaren Vale. Vines in the Hills were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage (MELS) 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04 only. Vines in the new block at McLaren Vale were treated at MELS 12 in 2004-05 only and vines in the old block at McLaren Vale were treated at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again in 2004-05. Different letters after the values represent significant differences between treatments within an experiment ( $p < 0.05$ ).....81

Table 6.3. Flower number per inflorescence, number of berries per bunch, number of live green ovaries (LGOs) per bunch, percent fruitset and percent ovary retention on bunches from Merlot vines at McLaren Vale in 2004-05. Vines in the new block were treated with rates 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage (MELS) 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2004-05 only and vines in the old block received molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again in 2004-05. Different letters after the values represent significant differences between treatments within an experiment ( $p < 0.05$ ).....83

Table 6.4. The contributions of chicken berries per bunch as a function of total berry number per bunch, and chicken berry weight as a proportion of the total berry weight per bunch on Merlot at McLaren Vale in 2004-05. Vines in the new block were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage (MELS) 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2004-05 only and those in the old block were treated at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again in 2004-05. Different letters after the values indicate significant differences between treatments within an experiment ( $p < 0.05$ ).....84

Table 7.1. Weather observations from the beginning of flowering to 80% flowering on Merlot in the Adelaide Hills and at McLaren Vale in 2003-04 and 2004-05 .....102

Table 7.2. Weather observations during the period of observed pollen tube growth (PTG) in Merlot flowers in the Adelaide Hills and at McLaren Vale in 2003-04 and 2004-05. ....104

Table 7.3. Concentration of molybdenum (mg/kg) in the stamens, pistils, petioles, shoot tips and inflorescences of Merlot in the Adelaide Hills and at McLaren Vale at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) in 2004-05 and 2005-06. Vines in the Hills were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04 and were left untreated in 2004-05. At McLaren Vale vines in the new block were sprayed in 2004-05 only and vines in the old block were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again at MELS 12 in 2004-05. In 2005-06 vines were sprayed at MELS 12 in that season only. Different letters after the values within an experiment and within a row indicate significant differences between treatments ( $p < 0.05$ ). Where there are no letters after the values samples were not replicated and statistical analysis was not performed. ....106

Table 7.4. Nutrient analyses (mg/kg) of Merlot stamens at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) in 2004-05. In the Hills vines were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04 and were left untreated in 2004-05. At McLaren Vale vines in the new block were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2004-05 only and

vines in the old block were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again at MELS 12 in 2004-05. In 2005-06 the vines were sprayed at MELS 12 in that season only. Samples were not replicated and statistical analyses were not performed on the data. ....107

Table 7.5. Nutrient analyses (mg/kg) of Merlot pistils collected at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80 % flowering) in 2004-05. In the Hills vines were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04 and were left untreated in 2004-05. At McLaren Vale vines in the new block were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2004-05 only and vines in the old block were sprayed at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again at MELS 12 in 2004-05. In 2005-06 vines were sprayed at MELS 12 in that season only. Samples were not replicated and statistical analyses were not performed on the data.....107

Table 7.6. Vitality (%) of pollen collected from Merlot vines in the Adelaide Hills and at McLaren Vale at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) in 2004-05. Vines in the Hills were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04 and were left untreated in 2004-05. At McLaren Vale vines in the new block were treated at MELS 12 in 2004-05 only and vines in the old block were treated at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again at MELS 12 in 2004-05. Different letters after the values represent significant differences between treatments within an experiment ( $p<0.05$ ). .....108

Table 7.7. Observations made on Merlot flowers four days after opening in 2003-04. Flowers were collected from vines treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage (MELS) 12 (shoots 10 cm) in the Adelaide Hills and at McLaren Vale. Different letters after the values represent significant differences between treatments ( $p<0.05$ ). .....109

Table 7.8. Observations made on Merlot flowers in 2004-05. In the Hills vines were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 Mo sprays at modified E-L stage (MELS) 12 (shoots 10 cm) in 2003-04. At McLaren Vale vines in the new block were treated at MELS 12 in 2004-05 only and vines in the old block were treated at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again at MELS 12 in 2004-05. Different letters after the values represent significant differences between treatments within an experiment ( $p<0.05$ ). .....109

Table 7.9. Percentages of ovules with elongated central nucellus cells and ovules with an embryo sac in the nucellus from Merlot vines at McLaren Vale in 2005-06. Flowers were collected and fixed on the day prior to opening from vines treated with rate 0 (control) and rate 1 molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage 12 (shoots 10 cm). Different letters after the values indicate significant differences between treatments ( $p<0.05$ ). .....112

Table 8.1. Total soluble solids (TSS), pH and titratable acidity (TA) of berries from the Adelaide Hills and McLaren Vale in 2003-04. Vines were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage 12 in 2003-04. ....125

Table 8.2. Total soluble solids (TSS), pH and titratable acidity (TA) of berries from the Adelaide Hills and McLaren Vale in 2003-04. In the Hills vines were treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage (MELS) 12 in 2003-04 and were left untreated in 2004-05. At McLaren Vale vines in the new block were treated at MELS 12 in 2004-05 only. Vines in the old block were treated at MELS 12 in 2003-04 and again at MELS 12 in 2004-05. Letters after the values represent significant differences between treatments within in an experiment ( $p<0.05$ ). .....126

Table 8.3. Nutritional analysis of juice at modified E-L stage (MELS) 38 (berries harvest ripe) from vines treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm) in the Adelaide Hills in 2003-04. Different letters after values indicate significant differences between treatments ( $p<0.05$ ). .....127

Table 8.4. Nutritional analysis of juice at modified E-L stage (MELS) 38 (berries harvest ripe) from vines treated with rate 0 (control), rate 1 and rate 2 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12

(shoots 10 cm) at McLaren Vale in 2003-04. There were no significant differences between treatments ( $p < 0.05$ ).....	127
Table 9.1. Pollination treatments applied to Merlot (clone D3V14) in the Adelaide Hills in 2003-04 and 2004-05. All pollen was sourced from the Adelaide Hills. ....	133
Table 9.2. Pollination treatments applied to Merlot (clone D3V14) at McLaren Vale in 2003-2005. ....	133
Table 9.3. Spray and pollination treatments applied to Merlot at McLaren Vale 2005-06. ...	134
Table 9.4. Concentration of molybdenum (mg/kg) in Merlot petioles at modified E-L stage (MELS) 25 (80% flowering) at McLaren Vale in 2005-06. Vines were treated with rate 0 (control) and rate 1 molybdenum sprays at MELS 12 (shoots 10 cm). Letters after the values represent significant differences between treatments ( $p < 0.05$ ). The absence of letters after the values indicates that samples were not replicated and statistical analysis was not performed. ....	138
Table 9.5. Percent fruitset of bunches from the pollination experiment at McLaren Vale in 2005-06. Vines were treated with rate 0 (control) or rate 1 molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage 12 (shoots 10 cm) and inflorescences were subjected to pollination treatments: supplementary cross- (Cross), supplementary self- Mo-treated pollen (Self +Mo), supplementary self- Mo-deficient pollen (Self –Mo) or open-pollination treatments at flowering time. Different letters within the same row represent significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) (LSD=7.57).....	138
Table 9.6. Mean berry weight (g) from the pollination experiment at McLaren Vale in 2005-06. Vines were treated with rate 0 (control) or rate 1 molybdenum sprays at modified E-L stage 12 (shoots 10 cm) and inflorescences were subjected to pollination treatments: supplementary cross- (Cross), supplementary self- Mo-treated pollen (Self +Mo), supplementary self- Mo-deficient pollen (Self –Mo) or open-pollination treatments at flowering time. There were no significant differences between treatments ( $p < 0.05$ ). ....	138
Table 10.1. Observations on star and normal Canada Muscat flowers collected from the Coombe Vineyard at the University of Adelaide's Waite campus in 2005. Different letters after the values represent significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ).....	155
Table 10.2. Results of supplementary cross-pollination (CP) and open-pollination (OP) of Canada Muscat in 2003. Statistical analysis not performed. ....	160

## **Abstract**

### ***Molybdenum experiments***

In Australia young Merlot vines sometimes suffer from vegetative disorders such as slow, zigzagged growth and leaf distortion. Merlot is also particularly known as a low- and inconsistent-yielding grape variety. Previous research showed that when foliar applications of molybdenum (Mo) were applied to Merlot vines the vegetative symptoms improved. More recently, when sodium molybdate was applied to Mo-deficient Merlot, yield improved; a function of increased bunch weight brought about by bigger berries. It has also been reported that at high concentrations, molybdenum might be detrimental to yield. Experiments were conducted on own-rooted Merlot (clone D3V14) vines in commercial vineyards in the Adelaide Hills (Hills) and at McLaren Vale, South Australia.

### **Effects of molybdenum deficiency on the vegetative growth and yield of *Vitis vinifera* cv. Merlot**

The aims of the current study were to: a) elucidate the mechanism by which molybdenum affects yield of Merlot; b) to monitor the effects of Mo-treatment on the balance between vine reproductive and vegetative growth; c) to monitor the residual effects of Mo-treatment on growth and yield of Merlot and; d) to determine whether high concentrations of molybdenum are detrimental to yield.

Three rates of sodium molybdate were applied to vines in springtime (control = 0g, rate 1 = 0.101g and rate 2 = 0.202g sodium molybdate per vine). Vine molybdenum status was measured prior to treatment and again at flowering time using petiole, shoot tip and inflorescence analysis. The effects on vegetative growth were monitored at veraison, during dormancy and at budburst in the seasons following Mo-treatment. At flowering time, pollen vitality, pollen tube growth and flower structure were examined. Bunch number per vine, fruitset, berry weight and berry composition were measured at harvest.

In the Hills, the controls had adequate molybdenum however, at McLaren Vale petiolar molybdenum concentration fell within the suggested deficiency range of 0.05-0.09 mg/kg in the petioles at flowering time. No visual symptoms of Mo-deficiency were observed on the experimental vines. At McLaren Vale, Mo-treatment reduced pruning weight and improved vine balance. Mo-treated vines in the Hills and at McLaren Vale were affected by delayed

budburst in the season following Mo-treatment irrespective of their Mo-status. However, no seasonal carryover of molybdenum could be detected in tissue analysis at flowering time.

Juice total soluble solids, pH and titratable acidity were not affected by Mo-treatment at McLaren Vale or in the Hills. However, juice from Mo-treated vines in the Hills had a significantly higher concentration of molybdenum than the controls. At McLaren Vale there was no significant difference in juice molybdenum concentration between treatments.

In the Hills, yield was not affected by Mo-treatment. However, Mo-treated vines at McLaren Vale had significantly higher yields (approximately double) than the Mo-deficient controls. Bunch number per vine was not affected by Mo-treatment, either in the year that treatments were applied or in the following season. However, bunches from Mo-treated vines had significantly better fruitset resulting in more berries per bunch. Berry weight was affected by Mo-treatment in one season only. Yield was not detrimentally affected on vines that received the higher rate of sodium molybdate.

In the Hills, Mo-treatment did not affect pollen numbers, pollen vitality or pollen tube growth. At McLaren Vale, where the controls were Mo-deficient, pollen vitality was not affected by Mo-treatment. However, pollen tube growth was significantly enhanced by Mo-treatment. Significantly more pollen tubes penetrated the ovules from Mo-treated vines and a higher proportion of ovaries had at least one penetrated ovule. Structural observations revealed that a significantly higher proportion of ovules from Mo-deficient vines were defective. The absence of an embryo sac in those ovules is probably the cause of pollen tube growth inhibition and subsequent poor fruitset.

### **Effects of mode of pollination on yield of Merlot and the interacting effects of sodium molybdate sprays**

Pollination experiments were conducted on field-grown own-rooted Merlot (clone D3V14) vines in commercial vineyards in the Adelaide Hills and at McLaren Vale in 2003-04 and in 2004-05. Inflorescences were supplied with supplementary Merlot pollen (self-pollination), with pollen from another variety (cross-pollination) or they were left to pollinate naturally (open pollination). In the Hills, mode of pollination did not affect fruitset or berry weight. In 2003-04 fruitset increased significantly at McLaren Vale when inflorescences were cross-pollinated with Semillon. Applying supplementary Merlot pollen also tended to improve fruitset, however none of the treatments affected berry weight. In 2004-05 there was no

significant difference between treatments. These results indicate that Merlot may be a poor producer of pollen and may suffer from self-incompatibility.

Given the significant improvements in yield gained by spring foliar applications of sodium molybdate to Mo-deficient Merlot vines, in 2005-06 a reciprocal experiment was conducted to separate the effects of Mo-treatment and mode of pollination on the male and female flower parts. The aims of this experiment were to: a) determine whether the male or female reproductive organs are more important in determining the success of fruitset of Merlot and; b) determine which remedial measure, Mo-treatment or pollination, is more effective at overcoming poor fruitset. Supplementary pollination treatments—cross-pollination (Semillon); self-pollination (Mo-deficient pollen); self-pollination (Mo-treated pollen) and; open-pollination—were applied to Mo-treated and Mo-deficient vines.

Cross-pollinating Mo-deficient vines with Semillon significantly improved fruitset of Merlot compared to other pollination treatments on those vines, however applying molybdenum to the vines in springtime was more effective at improving fruitset. Within the Mo-treated vines the effects of supplementary pollination on fruitset were not thought to be of any practical significance.

The results of this experiment provide further evidence that Mo-deficiency affects the female flower parts more than the male reproductive organs of Merlot.

### ***The occurrence of 'star' flowers in Australia***

In 2003 faulty flowers were discovered on Canada Muscat grown in the Coombe Vineyard at the University of Adelaide's Waite Campus. The Canada Muscat flowers opened from the top in 'star' formation in contrast to normal grape flowers, which shed the calyptra from its base. Star flowers were reported in French literature in the late 1800s. They were reported to as a symptom of a 'disease' that caused 'couleure', the cure for which was vine removal. The current report is the first known report of star flowers occurring in Australia.

Through dissemination of the news of this discovery, several star flower variants were found in other varieties in South Australia. The association of star flowers with poor berry development and the frequency of the occurrence of star flowers suggest that this flower aberration may be affecting yield to a greater extent than previously recognised.

This study provides a detailed description of two types of star flowers: those that occur in response to environmental conditions and those that occur every season. Other star flower variants are also documented.

## **Declaration**

I HEREBY DECLARE that the thesis presented here has been carried out by myself and does not incorporate any material previously submitted for another degree in any university. To the best of my knowledge and belief, it does not contain any material previously published or written, except where due reference is made in the text.

I am willing to have this copy of my thesis available for loan and photocopying, once deposited in the university library.

MARDI LOUISE LONGBOTTOM

## Acknowledgements

The completion of this study would not have been possible without the guidance and encouragement of my supervisors, Associate Professor Peter Dry and Professor Margaret Sedgley.

Financial contribution from the Adelaide Hills Wine Region and the Grape and Wine Research and Development Corporation are also gratefully acknowledged.

I would also like to thank:

- Nepenthe Viticulture, especially Murray Leake
- The Hardy Wine Company, especially Rodney Birchmore
- Dr Peter May for his guidance, encouragement and allowing me access to his literature collection
- Dr Robert Hallon for his fastidious translation of the foreign language papers referred to in this text
- Lyn Waterhouse and Dr Meredith Wallwork at Adelaide Microscopy
- Kate Dowley at Biometrics SA
- Technical laboratory assistance - Dr Cassandra Collins, Dr Pauline Glocke, Dr Michelle Wirthensohn, Dr Kate Delaporte and Dr Toby Knight
- Assistance in the field and laboratory – Heath Burzacott, Beau Burzacott, Jon Longbottom, Bill Longbottom, Neil Wellman, Sonali Mookerjee, Joanne Brady, Carrie McDonnell, Dylan Grigg, Rebecca Brooksby, Sarah Murray, Renata Ristic and Toby Tennent
- Students of the University of Adelaide who volunteered their time to assist with data collection in the field and laboratory
- My husband Heath, for giving me time, space and patience

## List of Abbreviations

°C	degrees Celsius
no.	number
p	probability for data
TA	titratable acidity
TSS	total soluble solids (°Brix)