Table 1. Changes in Pd conductivity induced by developmental, biotic, and abiotic signals

Plant type	Temperature (°C)	Lighting[a]	Pd conductivity in leaf type:[b]					
			Sink			Source		
			mean β[c]	SE[d]	$^{GFP}C(Pd)$[e]	mean β	SE	$^{GFP}C(Pd)$
WT	25	L	−1.626 (50)[f]	0.092	0.615	−2.105 (41)	0.133	0.475
		D	−1.086 (46)	0.070	0.921	−1.773 (59)	0.104	0.564
	16	L	−1.407 (50)	0.078	0.711	−1.910 (44)	0.129	0.524
		D	−1.092 (46)	0.084	0.916	−1.743 (59)	0.126	0.574
MP	25	L	−1.669 (48)	0.089	0.599	−1.966 (58)	0.078	0.509
		D	−1.169 (46)	0.094	0.855	−1.666 (56)	0.114	0.600
	16	L	−1.654 (50)	0.105	0.605	−2.293 (37)	0.120	0.436
		D	−1.133 (46)	0.094	0.883	−1.972 (66)	0.105	0.507

[a] L, light; D, dark

[b] The differences in β values between light and dark and between sink and source (other conditions the same) are highly significant ($P = 0.0001$). The differences in β values between WT and MP are only highly significant for source leaves at 16 °C ($P = 0.004$)

[c] Mean β, the average decay parameter β, also termed impedance, which describes the slope of the gradient formed by difference in plasmodesmal conductivity

[d] SE, standard error for mean β

[e] $^{GFP}C(Pd)$, the coefficient of conductivity of plasmodesmata for the cell-to-cell spread of GFP that was calculated as $(-1)\cdot[1/(\text{mean } \beta)]$. For simplicity, Pd conductivity is presented as $^{GFP}C(Pd)$ and not as the decay parameter β

[f] In parentheses, number of cells 0 analyzed