

Supplementary Table S1: Statistical analyses of germination and establishment

Binomial generalized linear mixed models were used to compare different genotypes among each other as well as their response to the different media (Figures 2, 3 and Supplementary Figure S2). Germination and establishment of wildtype and *p5cs1-4* seedlings were too close to 100% to be included in the statistical analyses.

Influence of 0, 2, or 10 mM proline on germination of <i>p5cs2</i> mutants (Figures 2, S2)					Influence of 0, 50, 100, or 200 mM NaCl on germination of <i>p5cs2</i> mutants (Figures 2, S2)					
Source of Variation	DF ^a	AIC ^b	LRT ^c	p-value	Source of Variation	DF ^a	AIC ^b	LRT ^c	p-value	
Supplement	2	157.1	1.64	0.44	Supplement	3	298.5	23.89	<0.001	
Genotype (<i>p5cs2-1</i> vs <i>p5cs2-2</i>)	1	170.3	12.84	<0.001	Genotype (<i>p5cs2-1</i> vs <i>p5cs2-2</i>)	1	284.6	5.96	0.02	
Supplement x genotype	2	159.5	0.35	0.84	Supplement x genotype	3	280.6	21.93	<0.001	
Pairwise comparisons with General Linear Hypotheses										
Fixed factor	comparison	z-value	p-value	Fixed factor	comparison	z-value	p-value			
0 mM proline	<i>p5cs2-1</i> vs <i>p5cs2-2</i>	-2.47	0.04	<i>p5cs2-1</i>	0 vs 50 mM NaCl	-1.59	0.40			
2 mM proline		-1.52	0.34	<i>p5cs2-2</i>		0.78	0.92			
10 mM proline		-2.14	0.09	<i>p5cs2-1</i>	0 vs 100 mM NaCl	-4.09	<0.001			
				<i>p5cs2-2</i>		-1.92	0.22			
				<i>p5cs2-1</i>	0 vs 200 mM NaCl	-7.69	<0.001			
				<i>p5cs2-2</i>		-4.29	<0.001			
Influence of 0, 2, or 10 mM proline on establishment of <i>p5cs2</i> mutants (Figures 3, S2)					Influence of 0, 50 or 100 mM NaCl on establishment of <i>p5cs2</i> mutants (Figure 3)					
Source of Variation	DF ^a	AIC ^b	LRT ^c	p-value	Source of Variation	DF ^a	AIC ^b	LRT ^c	p-value	
Supplement	2	199.3	22.01	<0.001	Supplement	2	199.3	12.21	0.002	
Genotype (<i>p5cs2-1</i> vs <i>p5cs2-2</i>)	1	183.0	3.71	0.054	Genotype (<i>p5cs2-1</i> vs <i>p5cs2-2</i>)	1	223.2	34.11	<0.001	
Supplement x genotype	2	181.3	13.82	<0.001	Supplement x genotype	2	191.1	0.26	0.88	
Pairwise comparisons with General Linear Hypotheses										
Fixed factor	comparison	z-value	p-value	Fixed factor	comparison	z-value	p-value			
0 mM proline	<i>p5cs2-1</i> vs <i>p5cs2-2</i>	3.77	<0.01	0 mM NaCl	<i>p5cs2-1</i> vs <i>p5cs2-2</i>	3.77	<0.01			
2 mM proline		-1.58	0.49	50 mM NaCl			3.61	<0.01		
10 mM proline		-0.70	0.97	100 mM NaCl			2.48	0.08		
<i>p5cs2-1</i>	0 vs 2 mM proline	7.19	<0.001	<i>p5cs2-1</i>	0 vs 50 mM NaCl	3.72	<0.01			
<i>p5cs2-2</i>		5.03	<0.001	<i>p5cs2-2</i>	NaCl	3.58	<0.01			
<i>p5cs2-1</i>	0 vs 10 mM proline	6.71	<0.001	<i>p5cs2-1</i>	0 vs 100 mM NaCl	3.82	<0.001			
<i>p5cs2-2</i>		4.64	<0.001	<i>p5cs2-2</i>	NaCl	3.39	<0.01			

^a Degrees of freedom

^b Akaike information criterion

^c Likelihood ratio test

Supplementary Table S2: Statistical analyses of root length

The effects of proline and NaCl on root growth of wildtype and mutant genotypes were assessed by a Gaussian linear mixed model (Figure 4 and Supplementary Figure S3).

Influence of 0 or 2 mM proline and 0 or 150 mM NaCl on root length (Figures 4, S3)							
Source of Variation		DF ^a	AIC ^b	LRT ^c	p-value		
Proline ^d		1	2007.5	2.12	0.15		
NaCl ^d		1	2006.0	0.60	0.445		
Genotype		3	2028.0	26.61	<0.001		
Genotype x proline		3	1930.3	46.46	<0.001		
Genotype x NaCl		3	1973.6	89.83	<0.001		
Proline x NaCl		1	1889.9	2.15	0.14		
Genotype x proline x NaCl		3	1889.8	99.58	<0.001		
Pairwise comparisons within fixed factors with General Linear Hypotheses							
Fixed factor	comparison	z-value	p-value	Fixed factor	Treatment compared to 0 Pro, 0 NaCl	z-value	p-value
0 Pro, 0 NaCl	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs1-4</i>	-0.42	0.96	Col-0	2 Pro, 0 NaCl	2.84	0.01
	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	17.17	<0.001		0 Pro, 150 NaCl	4.75	<0.001
	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs2-2</i>	18.94	<0.001		2 Pro, 150 NaCl	3.73	<0.001
2 Pro, 0 NaCl	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs1-4</i>	0.55	0.91	<i>p5cs1-4</i>	2 Pro, 0 NaCl	3.22	<0.01
	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.50	0.93		0 Pro, 150 NaCl	5.94	<0.001
	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs2-2</i>	0.42	0.95		2 Pro, 150 NaCl	3.21	<0.01
0 Pro, 150 NaCl	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs1-4</i>	2.44	0.04	<i>p5cs2-1</i>	2 Pro, 0 NaCl	-3.09	<0.01
	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	0.14	1.00		0 Pro, 150 NaCl	-2.12	0.09
	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs2-2</i>	-2.05	0.11		2 Pro, 150 NaCl	-3.99	<0.001
2 Pro, 150 NaCl	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs1-4</i>	-1.32	0.42	<i>p5cs2-2</i>	2 Pro, 0 NaCl	-3.01	<0.01
	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-1.81	0.18		0 Pro, 150 NaCl	-3.46	<0.01
	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs2-2</i>	-3.09	<0.01		2 Pro, 150 NaCl	-4.92	<0.001

^a Degrees of freedom

^b Akaike information criterion

^c Likelihood ratio test

^d Overall effects of proline and NaCl were not significant, because the different genotypes responded in opposite directions

Supplementary Table S3: Statistical analyses of bacterial titers after infection with virulent or avirulent *Pseudomonas syringae* pv tomato DC3000 bacteria

(A) One-way ANOVA and of bacterial titers 0, 2 and 4 days after infection with virulent bacteria (Supplementary Figure S5A)

Source of variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares			Mean squares			F-value			p-value		
		Day 0	Day 2	Day 4	Day 0	Day 2	Day 4	Day 0	Day 2	Day 4	Day 0	Day 2	Day 4
Time													
Genotype	3	2.29E+08	3.61E+14	2.74E+13	7.63E+07	1.20E+14	9.13E+12	3.15	1.01	2.05	0.07	0.42	0.16
Error	12	2.91E+08	1.42E+15	5.33E+13	2.43E+07	1.19E+14	4.44E+12						
Total	15	5.20E+08	1.79E+15	8.07E+13									

(B) One-way ANOVA of bacterial titers 4 days after infection with avirulent, RPM1-expressing, bacteria (Supplementary Figure S5B)

Source of variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares			Mean squares			F-value			p-value		
		Day 0	Day 2	Day 4	Day 0	Day 2	Day 4	Day 0	Day 2	Day 4	Day 0	Day 2	Day 4
Time													
Genotype	2	7.38E+06	4.69E+11	1.16E+13	3.69E+06	2.34E+11	5.79E+12	1.05	3.40	9.89	0.39	0.08	<0.01
Error	9	3.17E+07	6.21E+11	5.27E+12	3.53E+06	6.90E+10	5.86E+11						
Total	11	3.91E+07	1.09E+12	1.69E+13									

(C) Pairwise comparisons of bacterial titers 4 days after infection with avirulent, RPM1-expressing, bacteria with Tukey's HSD test

Genotype pair	q-value	p-value
Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs1-4</i>	4.23	0.04
Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	1.93	0.40
<i>p5cs1-4</i> vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	6.16	<0.01

Supplementary Table S4A: Statistical analyses of solutes in mature rosette leaves of wildtype plants and *p5cs1* or *p5cs2* mutants under non-stressed and stressed conditions.

Source of Variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F-value	p-value
2-way ANOVA of proline content^a (Figure 7A)					
Treatment	1	11.26	11.26	423.2	<0.001
Genotype	2	1.54	0.77	29.0	<0.001
Genotype x treatment	2	0.02	0.01	0.4	0.69
Residual	17	0.45	0.03		
Total	22	13.97	0.64		
2-way ANOVA of leaf sap osmolality^b (Figure 7B)					
Treatment	1	2.36	2.36	919.5	<0.001
Genotype	2	0.57	0.28	110.5	<0.001
Genotype x treatment	2	0.58	0.29	113.4	<0.001
Residual	23	0.06	0.003		
Total	28	3.74	0.13		
All pairwise comparisons with Tukey's HSD test					
comparison	Proline content ^a		Osmolality		
	q-value	p-value	q-value	p-value	
Col-0, ctrl vs <i>p5cs1-4</i> , ctrl	1.69	<0.01	0.006	1.00	
Col-0, ctrl vs <i>p5cs2-1</i> , ctrl	5.83	0.82	0.475	1.00	
Col-0, ctrl vs Col-0, NaCl	15.29	<0.01	41.356	<0.001	
Col-0, ctrl vs <i>p5cs1-4</i> , NaCl	11.72	<0.01	43.502	<0.001	
Col-0, ctrl vs <i>p5cs1-4</i> , NaCl	6.61	<0.01	15.127	<0.001	
<i>p5cs1-4</i> , ctrl vs <i>p5cs2-1</i> , ctrl	4.14	0.08	0.468	1.00	
<i>p5cs1-4</i> , ctrl vs Col-0, NaCl	16.98	<0.01	41.350	<0.001	
<i>p5cs1-4</i> , ctrl vs <i>p5cs1-4</i> , NaCl	13.28	<0.01	43.496	<0.001	
<i>p5cs1-4</i> , ctrl vs <i>p5cs2-1</i> , NaCl	8.30	<0.01	15.121	<0.001	
<i>p5cs2-1</i> , ctrl vs Col-0, NaCl	21.12	<0.01	40.881	<0.001	
<i>p5cs2-1</i> , ctrl vs <i>p5cs1-4</i> , NaCl	17.11	<0.01	43.028	<0.001	
<i>p5cs2-1</i> , ctrl vs <i>p5cs2-1</i> , NaCl	12.44	<0.01	14.679	<0.001	
Col-0, NaCl vs <i>p5cs1-4</i> , NaCl	2.44	<0.01	2.146	0.66	
Col-0, NaCl vs <i>p5cs2-1</i> , NaCl	8.68	0.53	23.864	<0.001	
<i>p5cs1-4</i> , NaCl vs <i>p5cs2-1</i> , NaCl	5.59	0.01	25.888	<0.001	

^a values were log-transformed to obtain normal distribution and equal variance

^a values were $\wedge^{-0.2}$ -transformed to obtain normal distribution and equal variance

Supplementary Table S4B: Statistical analyses of solutes in mature rosette leaves of wildtype plants and *p5cs1* or *p5cs2* mutants under non-stressed and stressed conditions.

2-way ANOVA of total cation concentration (Figure 7C)					
Source of Variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F-value	p-value
Treatment	1	720175	720175	391.5	<0.001
Genotype	2	246765	123383	67.1	<0.001
Genotype x treatment	2	235513	117757	64.0	<0.001
Residuals	24	44150	1840		
Total	29	1246603	42986		
Pairwise comparisons between genotypes or treatments with Tukey's HSD test					
Fixed Factor	Comparison	Diff. of Means	q-value	p-value	
Col-0	ctrl vs NaCl	388.2	20.24	<0.001	
<i>p5cs1-4</i>		476.9	24.86	<0.001	
<i>p5cs2-1</i>		64.6	3.37	0.03	
ctrl	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs1-4</i>	12.53	0.653	0.89	
	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	12.69	0.661	0.89	
	<i>p5cs1-4</i> vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	0.15	0.008	1.00	
NaCl	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs1-4</i>	76.16	3.970	0.03	
	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	336.32	17.534	<0.001	
	<i>p5cs1-4</i> vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	412.48	21.504	<0.001	

Supplementary Table S5: Statistical analyses of pigment contents and pigment ratios in mature rosette leaves of wildtype plants and *p5cs1* or *p5cs2* mutants under non-stressed and stressed conditions.

Source of Variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F-value	p-value		
2-way ANOVA of total pigment contents (Figure 8A)							
Treatment	1	0.44	0.44	14.49	<0.001		
Genotype	2	0.36	0.18	5.86	<0.01		
Treatment x genotype	2	1.04	0.52	17.11	<0.001		
Residual	24	0.73	0.03				
2-way ANOVA of Chl <i>a</i> / Chl <i>b</i> ratio							
Treatment	1	0.44	0.44	14.49	<0.001		
Genotype	2	0.36	0.18	5.86	<0.01		
Treatment x genotype	2	1.04	0.52	17.11	<0.001		
Residual	24	0.73	0.03				
Pairwise comparisons ^a		Total pigment content		Chl <i>a</i> / Chl <i>b</i> ratio			
Fixed Factor	Comparison	q-value	p-value	q-value	p-value		
Col-0	ctrl vs. NaCl	6.79	<0.001	8.28	<0.001		
<i>p5cs1-4</i>		6.17	<0.001	10.37	<0.001		
<i>p5cs2-1</i>		3.64	0.02	2.93	0.05		
ctrl	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs1-4</i>	0.85	0.82	0.48	0.94		
	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	1.84	0.41	0.32	0.97		
	<i>p5cs1-4</i> vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	2.69	0.16	0.17	0.99		
NaCl	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs1-4</i>	1.46	0.56	2.57	0.19		
	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	8.58	<0.001	5.04	<0.01		
	<i>p5cs1-4</i> vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	7.12	<0.001	7.61	<0.001		
2-way ANOVA of Chl <i>a</i> content (Figure 8A)							
Treatment	1	0.256	0.256	25.66	<0.001		
Genotype	2	0.136	0.068	6.83	<0.01		
Treatment x genotype	2	0.412	0.206	20.62	<0.001		
Residual	24	0.239	0.010				
2-way ANOVA of Chl <i>b</i> content (Figure 8A)							
Treatment	1	0.008	0.008	5.23	0.03		
Genotype	2	0.012	0.006	4.18	0.03		
Treatment x genotype	2	0.040	0.020	13.85	<0.001		
Residual	24	0.035	0.001				
2-way ANOVA of total carotenoid content (Figure 8A)							
Treatment	1	0.006	0.006	3.76	0.06		
Genotype	2	0.014	0.007	4.54	0.02		
Treatment x genotype	2	0.032	0.016	10.31	<0.001		
Residual	24	0.037	0.002				
Pairwise comparisons ^a		Chl <i>a</i>		Chl <i>b</i>		Carotenoids	
Fixed Factor	Comparison	q-value	p-value	q-value	p-value	q-value	p-value
Col-0	ctrl vs. NaCl	7.97	<0.001	5.40	<0.001	4.84	<0.01
<i>p5cs1-4</i>		7.72	<0.001	4.38	<0.01	3.51	0.02
<i>p5cs2-1</i>		3.28	0.03	4.18	<0.01	3.60	0.02
ctrl	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs1-4</i>	0.80	0.84	0.88	0.81	0.60	0.91
	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	2.06	0.33	1.90	0.39	1.22	0.67
	<i>p5cs1-4</i> vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	2.86	0.13	2.78	0.14	1.82	0.42
NaCl	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs1-4</i>	1.04	0.74	1.90	0.39	1.94	0.37
	Col-0 vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	9.18	<0.001	7.68	<0.001	7.23	<0.001
	<i>p5cs1-4</i> vs <i>p5cs2-1</i>	8.14	<0.001	5.78	<0.01	5.29	<0.01

^a within fixed factors by Tukey's HSD test

Supplementary Table S6: Statistical analyses of photosynthetic parameters in mature rosette leaves of wildtype plants and *p5cs1* or *p5cs2* mutants under non-stressed and stressed conditions.

Source of Variation		Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F-value	p-value	
2-way ANOVA of (ETR/36.5)² (Figure 8B)							
Treatment		3	0.311	0.104	163.40	<0.001	
Genotype		2	0.049	0.024	38.45	<0.001	
Treatment x genotype		6	0.049	0.008	12.99	<0.001	
Residual		36	0.023	0.001			
2-way ANOVA of NPQ (Figure 8C)							
Treatment		3	0.376	0.125	58.36	<0.001	
Genotype		2	0.046	0.023	10.73	<0.001	
Treatment x genotype		6	0.130	0.022	10.13	<0.001	
Residual		36	0.077	0.002			
Pairwise comparisons ^a		ETR			NPQ		
Fixed Factor	Comparison	Diff of Means	t-value	p-value	Diff of Means	t-value	p-value
LL	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs1-4</i>	0.010	0.58	0.83	-0.004	-0.12	0.99
	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.003	-0.17	0.98	0.048	1.47	0.32
	<i>p5cs1-4</i> vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.013	-0.76	0.73	0.052	1.59	0.26
EL	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs1-4</i>	0.019	1.06	0.55	0.008	0.24	0.97
	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.011	-0.59	0.83	0.022	0.67	0.78
	<i>p5cs1-4</i> vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.029	-1.65	0.24	0.014	0.43	0.90
LL + NaCl	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs1-4</i>	0.016	0.89	0.65	-0.066	-2.02	0.12
	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.053	-2.98	0.01	-0.167	-5.10	<0.001
	<i>p5cs1-4</i> vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.069	-3.87	<0.01	-0.101	-3.08	0.01
EL + NaCl	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs1-4</i>	-0.005	-0.30	0.95	0.066	2.03	0.12
	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.182	-10.21	<0.001	-0.164	-4.99	<0.001
	<i>p5cs1-4</i> vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.176	-9.91	<0.001	-0.230	-7.02	<0.001
Col-0	LL vs. EL	0.071	3.99	<0.01	0.180	5.50	<0.001
	LL vs. LL+NaCl	0.089	5.00	<0.001	0.139	4.25	<0.001
	LL vs. EL+NaCl	0.286	16.06	<0.001	0.262	7.99	<0.001
	EL vs. LL+NaCl	0.018	1.02	0.74	-0.041	-1.25	0.60
	EL vs. EL+NaCl	0.215	12.08	<0.001	0.082	2.49	0.08
	LL+NaCl vs. EL+NaCl	0.197	11.06	<0.001	0.123	3.74	<0.01
<i>p5cs1-4</i>	LL vs. EL	0.079	4.47	<0.001	0.192	5.86	<0.001
	LL vs. LL+NaCl	0.095	5.31	<0.001	0.077	2.35	0.11
	LL vs. EL+NaCl	0.270	15.18	<0.001	0.332	10.14	<0.001
	EL vs. LL+NaCl	0.015	0.85	0.83	-0.115	-3.51	<0.01
	EL vs. EL+NaCl	0.191	10.71	<0.001	0.140	4.27	<0.001
	LL+NaCl vs. EL+NaCl	0.176	9.87	<0.001	0.255	7.79	<0.001
<i>p5cs2-1</i>	LL vs. EL	0.064	3.57	<0.01	0.154	4.70	<0.001
	LL vs. LL+NaCl	0.039	2.20	0.14	-0.076	-2.32	0.11
	LL vs. EL+NaCl	0.107	6.03	<0.001	0.050	1.53	0.43
	EL vs. LL+NaCl	-0.024	-1.37	0.52	-0.230	-7.02	<0.001
	EL vs. EL+NaCl	0.044	2.46	0.08	-0.104	-3.18	0.02
	LL+NaCl vs. EL+NaCl	0.068	3.83	<0.01	0.126	3.85	<0.01

^a with general linear hypotheses

Source of Variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F-value	p-value
2-way ANOVA of (F_v/F_m)^{2.8} (Figure S6A)					
Treatment	3	1.227	0.409	193.23	<0.001
Genotype	2	0.126	0.063	29.87	<0.001
Treatment x genotype	6	0.143	0.024	11.29	<0.001
Residual	36	0.076	0.002		
2-way ANOVA of asin((Φ PSII)²) (Figure S6B)					
Treatment	3	0.453	0.151	147.1	<0.001
Genotype	2	0.057	0.029	28.0	<0.001
Treatment x genotype	6	0.065	0.011	10.6	<0.001
Residual	36	0.037	0.001		
2-way ANOVA of (logit(PAR absorptivity))³ (Figure S6C)					
Treatment	3	0.702	0.234	13.41	<0.001
Genotype	2	0.639	0.319	18.31	<0.001
Treatment x genotype	6	0.476	0.079	4.55	<0.01
Residual	36	0.628	0.017		

Pairwise comparisons ^a		F _v /F _m			Φ PSII			Absorptivity		
Fixed Factor	Comparison	Diff of Means	t-value	p-value	Diff of Means	t-value	p-value	Diff of Means	t-value	p-value
LL	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs1-4</i>	0.015	0.46	0.89	0.015	0.65	0.79	-0.042	-0.45	0.90
	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	0.010	0.30	0.95	-0.004	-0.17	0.98	-0.011	-0.11	0.99
	<i>p5cs1-4</i> vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.005	-0.16	0.99	-0.019	-0.82	0.69	0.031	0.33	0.94
EL	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs1-4</i>	0.038	1.16	0.49	0.022	0.96	0.61	0.036	0.39	0.92
	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.003	-0.09	1.00	-0.009	-0.39	0.92	-0.110	-1.18	0.47
	<i>p5cs1-4</i> vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.040	-1.24	0.44	-0.030	-1.34	0.38	-0.147	-1.57	0.27
LL + NaCl	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs1-4</i>	0.047	1.44	0.33	0.015	0.66	0.79	0.066	0.71	0.76
	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.100	-3.08	0.01	-0.049	-2.18	0.09	-0.282	-3.02	0.01
	<i>p5cs1-4</i> vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.147	-4.52	<0.001	-0.064	-2.83	0.02	-0.349	-3.73	<0.01
EL + NaCl	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs1-4</i>	-0.018	-0.56	0.84	-0.011	-0.49	0.88	0.167	1.79	0.19
	Col-0 vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.296	-9.10	<0.001	-0.209	-9.24	<0.001	-0.441	-4.72	<0.001
	<i>p5cs1-4</i> vs. <i>p5cs2-1</i>	-0.278	-8.54	<0.001	-0.198	-8.76	<0.001	-0.608	-6.52	<0.001
Col-0	LL vs. EL	0.240	7.38	<0.001	0.088	3.89	<0.01	-0.035	-0.37	0.98
	LL vs. LL+NaCl	0.169	5.19	<0.001	0.093	4.08	<0.01	0.300	3.22	0.01
	LL vs. EL+NaCl	0.552	16.98	<0.001	0.343	15.12	<0.001	0.258	2.76	0.04
	EL vs. LL+NaCl	-0.071	-2.19	0.14	0.004	0.19	1.00	0.335	3.59	<0.01
	EL vs. EL+NaCl	0.312	9.60	<0.001	0.254	11.23	<0.001	0.293	3.14	0.02
	LL+NaCl vs. EL+NaCl	0.384	11.79	<0.001	0.250	11.04	<0.001	-0.043	-0.46	0.97
<i>p5cs1-4</i>	LL vs. EL	0.263	8.07	<0.001	0.095	4.20	<0.001	0.043	0.46	0.97
	LL vs. LL+NaCl	0.201	6.16	<0.001	0.093	4.09	<0.01	0.408	4.37	<0.001
	LL vs. EL+NaCl	0.519	15.96	<0.001	0.317	13.98	<0.001	0.467	5.00	<0.001
	EL vs. LL+NaCl	-0.062	-1.91	0.24	-0.002	-0.11	1.00	0.365	3.91	<0.01
	EL vs. EL+NaCl	0.256	7.88	<0.001	0.222	9.79	<0.001	0.424	4.54	<0.001
	LL+NaCl vs. EL+NaCl	0.319	9.79	<0.001	0.224	9.90	<0.001	0.059	0.63	0.92
<i>p5cs2-1</i>	LL vs. EL	0.228	6.99	<0.001	0.083	3.68	<0.01	-0.135	-1.44	0.48
	LL vs. LL+NaCl	0.059	1.81	0.29	0.047	2.08	0.18	0.029	0.31	0.99
	LL vs. EL+NaCl	0.246	7.57	<0.001	0.137	6.05	<0.001	-0.173	-1.85	0.27
	EL vs. LL+NaCl	-0.169	-5.19	<0.001	-0.036	-1.60	0.39	0.163	1.75	0.31
	EL vs. EL+NaCl	0.019	0.58	0.94	0.054	2.37	0.10	-0.038	-0.41	0.98
	LL+NaCl vs. EL+NaCl	0.188	5.77	<0.001	0.090	3.97	<0.01	-0.201	-2.15	0.16

^a with general linear hypotheses