INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LATEST TECHNOLOGY IN ENGINEERING, MANAGEMENT & APPLIED SCIENCE (IJLTEMAS)

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XIV, Issue V, May 2025

Abiotic Stress Tolerance in Plants: Molecular Mechanisms and Biotechnological Advances

Aruna Bohra, Uma Pillai

Department of Life Sciences Lachoo Memorial College of Science and Technology, Jodhpur (Rajasthan), India

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2025.140500075

Received: 29 May 2025; Accepted: 05 June 2025; Published: 18 June 2025

Abstract: Abiotic stress factors—including drought, salinity, extreme temperatures, and heavy metal exposure—pose serious threats to global agricultural productivity and food security. In response, plants have developed complex physiological and molecular systems to detect and counteract these environmental challenges. Key components include dynamic signaling pathways, efficient reactive oxygen species (ROS) detoxification mechanisms, regulation of gene expression by specialized transcription factors, and accumulation of osmoprotectants to maintain cellular balance. Breakthroughs in omics-based technologies and precise gene-editing platforms such as CRISPR/Cas have accelerated the identification and functional analysis of genes linked to stress resistance. Moreover, emerging insights into epigenetic modulation and stress memory suggest additional layers of adaptive regulation. This review consolidates recent findings on the molecular frameworks of abiotic stress resilience in plants and evaluates current biotechnological strategies to enhance crop tolerance. We also highlight future directions that integrate synthetic biology, nanotechnology, and systems-level approaches to address agricultural challenges under climate variability.

Keywords: Abiotic stress, drought tolerance, salinity, ROS signaling, transcriptional regulation, CRISPR/Cas, epigenetics, crop improvement

I. Introduction

Abiotic stress remains a major constraint on agricultural productivity, contributing to significant yield reductions across key crop species (Boyer, 1982). Stressors such as water deficit, soil salinization, temperature extremes, and heavy metal accumulation disrupt plant physiological homeostasis and metabolic equilibrium, leading to impaired growth and development (Munns & Tester, 2008). With climate change intensifying both the frequency and severity of these environmental challenges, there is an urgent imperative to develop crop cultivars with improved tolerance mechanisms.

Plants have evolved intricate strategies to detect and mitigate the effects of abiotic stress through a coordinated response that spans physiological, biochemical, and molecular domains. These responses typically begin with the perception of environmental cues via membrane-bound receptors, followed by activation of intracellular signaling cascades. This leads to widespread transcriptional reprogramming and synthesis of protective compounds, such as osmolytes and antioxidants, which stabilize cellular functions under stress conditions (Zhu, 2016).

Recent advancements in omics technologies—including transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics—have unraveled the complexity of stress-responsive networks and enabled large-scale identification of candidate genes (Shinozaki & Yamaguchi-Shinozaki, 2007). In parallel, genome editing techniques, particularly the CRISPR/Cas system, have revolutionized our ability to dissect gene functions and engineer plants with enhanced resilience (Bortesi & Fischer, 2015). Additionally, studies on chromatin remodeling, histone modifications, and transgenerational stress memory have revealed new dimensions of epigenetic regulation in plant stress adaptation. This review presents an integrated overview of the molecular basis of abiotic stress tolerance in plants. It also examines emerging biotechnological approaches—including gene editing, transgenics, and systems biology—for the development of stress-resilient crops suitable for sustainable agriculture in the face of global climate challenges.

Drought Stress

Drought is one of the most widespread and detrimental abiotic stresses, particularly in arid and semi-arid ecosystems, where it severely restricts plant growth and crop productivity. One of the earliest physiological responses to water deficit is stomatal closure, a defensive mechanism aimed at reducing transpiration. However, this also limits CO_2 uptake, thereby diminishing photosynthetic efficiency and carbohydrate synthesis. Prolonged drought stress leads to a cascade of adverse effects, including decreased cell turgor pressure, suppression of leaf expansion, altered shoot-to-root biomass allocation, and premature aging of foliage.

On the biochemical front, drought induces the synthesis and accumulation of compatible solutes such as proline, glycine betaine, trehalose, and various soluble sugars. These osmolytes serve multiple functions: they help maintain cellular osmotic balance, protect macromolecules from oxidative damage, and stabilize proteins and lipid membranes under stress.

At the molecular level, drought stress initiates complex signaling networks, with abscisic acid (ABA) serving as a central regulator. Drought-triggered ABA biosynthesis leads to its perception by the PYR/PYL/RCAR receptor complex**,** which subsequently activates SNF1-related protein kinase 2 (SnRK2)**.** Activated SnRK2 kinases phosphorylate various downstream targets, including stress-responsive transcription factors (TFs) that modulate gene expression. In addition to ABA-mediated pathways, drought also activates calcium-dependent protein kinases (CDPKs) and mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) cascades that fine-tune transcriptional responses.

The transcriptional regulation of drought-responsive genes involves several TF families. The DREB/CBF family binds to dehydration-responsive elements (DREs) in gene promoters, playing a pivotal role in stress-inducible gene expression. NAC transcription factors regulate root architecture and senescence, while MYB and MYC families modulate antioxidant pathways and secondary metabolite production. Moreover**,** bZIP and WRKY TFs integrate drought cues with broader hormonal and developmental networks.

Drought also triggers intricate hormonal cross-talk beyond ABA, involving jasmonic acid (JA), salicylic acid (SA), ethylene**,** and in some cases, gibberellins (GA) and cytokinins**.** These hormones coordinate responses that influence stomatal regulation, antioxidant defense, growth modulation, and senescence processes. Together, the physiological, biochemical, and molecular changes under drought stress illustrate the multilayered and dynamic adaptation mechanisms plants deploy to survive under limited water availability.

Salinity Stress

Salinity is a significant abiotic stressor, particularly prevalent in irrigated agricultural zones where salt buildup in the rhizosphere reaches phytotoxic concentrations. Elevated levels of sodium (Na^+) and chloride (Cl^-) ions reduce the osmotic potential of the soil, thereby impeding water uptake and inducing osmotic stress in plants. Prolonged exposure leads to ionic toxicity, membrane destabilization, enzymatic inhibition, and excessive generation of reactive oxygen species (ROS), collectively impairing cellular metabolism and plant development.

To mitigate salt-induced damage, plants employ a variety of physiological and molecular mechanisms. These include limiting Na^+ uptake at the root-soil interface, compartmentalizing excess ions into vacuoles, and preserving cytosolic potassium (K^+) levels to maintain ion homeostasis and enzymatic function. A cornerstone of this adaptive response is the Salt Overly Sensitive (SOS) signaling pathway, which orchestrates the extrusion and sequestration of Na^+ ions.

Upon salt exposure, cytosolic calcium (Ca^{2+}) levels rise, which are sensed by SOS3**,** a calcium-binding protein. SOS3 interacts with and activates SOS2**,** a serine/threonine protein kinase. This complex subsequently phosphorylates SOS1**,** a plasma membrane-localized Na^+/H^+ antiporter, facilitating the active efflux of Na^+ from the cytoplasm. Additionally, tonoplast-localized antiporters such as NHX1 mediate vacuolar sequestration of Na^+, while HKT1 transporters retrieve Na^+ from the xylem to limit its translocation to photosynthetically active tissues.

Osmotic adjustment under salinity stress is supported by the synthesis of compatible solutes like proline, glycine betaine, and sugar alcohols such as mannitol. These metabolites contribute to the stabilization of proteins and membranes, ROS detoxification, and maintenance of cell turgor. Enzymes involved in their biosynthesis—such as Δ^1-pyrroline-5-carboxylate synthetase (P5CS) for proline and betaine aldehyde dehydrogenase (BADH) for glycine betaine—are transcriptionally upregulated in response to salt stress.

At the transcriptional level, several key transcription factors (TFs) coordinate the expression of salt-responsive genes. DREB2A**,** MYB20**,** bZIP24**,** and AREB1 regulate downstream targets such as ion transporters**,** antioxidant enzymes**,** and late embryogenesis abundant (LEA) proteins, enhancing cellular protection and resilience. Collectively, these physiological, biochemical, and molecular responses form an integrated strategy to counter both osmotic and ionic stress components of salinity, enabling plants to survive and adapt in saline environments.

Temperature Extremes

Temperature extremes, encompassing both heat and cold stress, pose significant constraints to plant productivity and survival. Heat stress disrupts cellular homeostasis by denaturing proteins, destabilizing membranes, and enhancing reactive oxygen species (ROS) generation (Mittler et al., 2012). A hallmark of the heat stress response is the rapid induction of heat shock proteins (HSPs), such as HSP70, HSP90, and small HSPs, which function as molecular chaperones to refold denatured proteins and prevent aggregation (Kotak et al., 2007). These proteins are regulated by heat shock transcription factors (HSFs), especially HSFA1 and HSFA2, which act as master regulators of the heat stress transcriptome (Ohama et al., 2017). Plants also adapt to high temperatures by modulating membrane lipid composition, typically increasing the saturation of fatty acids to enhance membrane thermostability (Falcone et al., 2004).

In contrast, cold stress leads to membrane rigidification, impaired enzymatic function, and reduced photosynthetic efficiency (Thomashow, 1999). The C-repeat binding factor (CBF) pathway is central to cold acclimation. This involves the ICE1 (Inducer of CBF Expression 1) transcription factor, which activates CBF genes that subsequently regulate the expression of cold-responsive (COR) genes, including those encoding late embryogenesis abundant (LEA) proteins and antifreeze proteins (Chinnusamy et al., 2007). Lipid desaturation, mediated by enzymes such as fatty acid desaturase FAD8, enhances membrane fluidity during chilling stress (Gao et al., 2009). Additionally, cold-induced accumulation of soluble sugars like raffinose and sucrose contributes to osmoprotection and cryoprotection (Guy et al., 2008). ROS scavenging systems, particularly those involving ascorbate and glutathione, are also significantly upregulated under cold conditions (Kocsy et al., 2001).

Importantly, temperature stress responses do not occur in isolation but often intersect with other abiotic stress signaling pathways. Hormones such as abscisic acid (ABA) and ethylene modulate both heat and cold responses (Huang et al., 2012), while calcium signaling, ROS signaling, and mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) cascades serve as common signal transduction modules (Saidi et al., 2011). This interconnected regulatory network enables plants to mount coordinated responses to multiple and overlapping environmental stressors.

Oxidative Stress

Although oxidative stress is not an abiotic stress per se, it commonly arises as a secondary consequence of environmental challenges such as drought, salinity, temperature extremes, and heavy metal exposure. These stresses provoke excessive generation of reactive oxygen species (ROS), including superoxide radicals ($O_2^{\bullet-}$), hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2), hydroxyl radicals ($\bullet OH$), and singlet oxygen ($^1O_2$), which can inflict oxidative damage on lipids, proteins, nucleic acids, and other cellular components, thereby threatening cell viability (Gill & Tuteja, 2010).

To mitigate ROS-induced damage, plants have developed a sophisticated antioxidant defense system comprising enzymatic and non-enzymatic components. Superoxide dismutase (SOD) catalyzes the conversion of superoxide radicals into hydrogen peroxide, which is subsequently detoxified by catalase (CAT) and peroxidases such as ascorbate peroxidase (APX) and glutathione peroxidase (GPX) (Mittler et al., 2004). The ascorbate-glutathione (AsA-GSH) cycle is central to hydrogen peroxide detoxification, relying on enzymes including monodehydroascorbate reductase (MDHAR), dehydroascorbate reductase (DHAR), and glutathione reductase (GR) to sustain redox balance (Noctor & Foyer, 1998). Non-enzymatic antioxidants, such as ascorbic acid (vitamin C), glutathione, tocopherols, flavonoids, and carotenoids, complement this system by scavenging ROS directly and regenerating antioxidant enzymes (Foyer & Noctor, 2011).

Besides their damaging potential, ROS serve as critical signaling molecules that regulate stress perception and acclimation. Controlled ROS production, mediated by NADPH oxidases (RBOHs), thioredoxins, and peroxiredoxins, activates redox-sensitive transcription factors like ZAT10 and ANAC017, which modulate stress-responsive gene expression (Miller et al., 2010). The dualistic nature of ROS—as both cytotoxic agents and essential secondary messengers—necessitates precise spatial and temporal regulation of redox signaling networks. This oxidative signaling interacts with hormonal and environmental cues to finely regulate plant stress tolerance responses (Sewelam et al., 2016).

Molecular Signaling and Crosstalk in Abiotic Stress Tolerance

Abiotic stress responses in plants are coordinated through a complex network of signaling pathways that translate environmental stimuli into specific physiological and molecular adaptations. Central to this signaling are calcium ions (Ca^{2+}), reactive oxygen species (ROS), protein kinases, and phytohormones, which operate within an integrated and dynamic framework characterized by extensive cross-talk, feedback loops, and context-dependent specificity (Tuteja & Gill, 2019).

Calcium signaling is among the earliest cellular responses following stress detection. Distinct abiotic stresses such as drought, salinity, and cold elicit unique calcium signatures, which are interpreted by calcium-binding proteins like calmodulins (CaMs), calcineurin B-like proteins (CBLs), and calcium-dependent protein kinases (CDPKs) (Reddy et al., 2011). These sensors activate downstream effectors, including ion channels and transcription factors, to tailor stress-specific responses. A prime example is the CBL-CIPK module that regulates ion homeostasis, particularly evident in the Salt Overly Sensitive (SOS) pathway mediating salt stress tolerance (Thoday-Kennedy et al., 2015).

ROS also function as crucial second messengers beyond their damaging potential. Controlled ROS bursts generated mainly by NADPH oxidases (respiratory burst oxidase homologs, RBOHs) activate mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) cascades, involving a three-tiered phosphorylation relay of MAPKKKs, MAPKKs, and MAPKs (Zhang & Klessig, 2001). MAPK3 and MAPK6 are well-documented players in both abiotic and biotic stress signaling, highlighting the convergence of defense pathways (Meng & Zhang, 2013).

Phytohormones are pivotal integrators of stress signals, with abscisic acid (ABA) occupying a central role in drought and salinity responses. ABA biosynthesis is rapidly induced by water deficit, and its perception via the PYR/PYL/RCAR-PP2C-SnRK2 module triggers gene expression changes and stomatal closure (Cutler et al., 2010). Additional hormones such as ethylene, jasmonic acid (JA), salicylic acid (SA), and brassinosteroids (BRs) modulate stress responses in synergistic or antagonistic fashions with ABA. For instance, ethylene can amplify ROS signaling during salt stress but inhibit ABA-induced stomatal closure, exemplifying the nuanced hormonal interplay (Wang et al., 2013).

Transcriptional regulation forms a critical control tier in abiotic stress adaptation. Key transcription factor families including AP2/ERF (notably DREB/CBF), NAC, MYB, WRKY, and bZIP rapidly respond to stress signals by binding specific cis-regulatory elements like ABREs (ABA-responsive elements), DRE/CRT (dehydration-responsive elements), and W-box motifs to regulate downstream protective genes (Nakashima et al., 2014). Cross-regulation among transcription factors and interactions with chromatin remodeling complexes and epigenetic modifiers further enhance the plasticity of stress-responsive transcription (Kim et al., 2015).

Emerging research underscores the roles of non-coding RNAs such as microRNAs (miRNAs) and long non-coding RNAs (lncRNAs) in refining stress-responsive gene networks. For example, miR398 targets copper/zinc superoxide dismutase transcripts (CSD1 and CSD2), modulating oxidative stress responses (Sunkar et al., 2006). Additionally, alternative splicing and post-translational modifications including phosphorylation, ubiquitination, and sumoylation dynamically regulate the activity of signaling proteins and transcription factors under abiotic stress (Laloum et al., 2018).

The integration of these signaling components allows plants to discern stress type and intensity, prioritize responses, and coordinate appropriate acclimation strategies. This ensures that stress responses are context-dependent, often synergistic or antagonistic, rather than additive. A systems-level understanding of these networks is essential for engineering crops with robust, broad-spectrum abiotic stress tolerance (Chinnusamy & Zhu, 2009).

Biotechnological Interventions for Enhancing Abiotic Stress Tolerance

Advances in plant biotechnology have significantly expanded the toolbox for improving abiotic stress tolerance in crops. Traditional breeding approaches, though foundational, are constrained by the polygenic nature of stress traits, genotype-by-environment interactions, and the lengthy generation times of many crops (Varshney et al., 2021). Molecular breeding, genetic engineering, and genome editing technologies now provide more precise and efficient methods to introduce stress-resilient traits into elite cultivars (Zhu, 2016).

Transgenic strategies have been extensively applied to overexpress key genes involved in stress perception, signaling, and response pathways. For example, overexpression of transcription factors such as DREB1A (dehydration-responsive element-binding protein 1A), NAC, and bZIP family members has enhanced drought, salinity, and cold tolerance in diverse species including Arabidopsis, rice, and wheat (Nakashima et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2013). Additionally, genes involved in osmoprotectant biosynthesis—such as P5CS for proline and BADH for glycine betaine—antioxidant enzymes like superoxide dismutase (SOD), ascorbate peroxidase (APX), and catalase (CAT), and ion transporters including SOS1, NHX1, and HKT1, have been genetically manipulated to bolster physiological resilience under stress (Gill & Tuteja, 2010; Munns & Tester, 2008).

Genome editing tools, particularly CRISPR/Cas9, have revolutionized plant stress biology by enabling targeted, precise modifications without foreign DNA integration. CRISPR/Cas9 has been used to knock out negative regulators such as protein phosphatases 2C (PP2Cs) in ABA signaling or to fine-tune gene expression via promoter and base editing (Bortesi & Fischer, 2015). Notably, editing the OsRR22 gene, a cytokinin response regulator in rice, conferred enhanced salinity tolerance without yield penalties (Zhou et al., 2017). Multiplex genome editing now allows simultaneous manipulation of several genes, addressing the complex, polygenic nature of abiotic stress tolerance (Shi et al., 2017).

Omics technologies, including transcriptomics, proteomics, metabolomics, and ionomics, provide system-wide insights into stress-responsive networks. High-throughput RNA-sequencing reveals stress-inducible gene modules, while proteomic and metabolomic analyses identify crucial proteins and metabolites involved in cellular protection and signaling (Kosová et al., 2018). Integration of multi-omics datasets through systems biology enables the identification of regulatory hubs and novel targets for genetic intervention. Moreover, genome-wide association studies (GWAS) and quantitative trait loci (QTL) mapping facilitate the discovery of stress-resilient alleles, which can be introgressed into elite cultivars via marker-assisted selection (MAS) (Huang & Han, 2014).

Synthetic biology offers novel opportunities to design artificial gene circuits and stress-inducible synthetic promoters for precise gene expression control under environmental stress. For example, promoters derived from RD29A or HVA22 are used to drive transgenes specifically during drought or salinity stress, minimizing fitness costs in non-stress conditions (Kumar et al., 2016). Engineering synthetic transcription factors and modular regulatory circuits further holds promise for programmable reprogramming of plant stress responses (Liu & Stewart, 2015).

Plant-microbe interactions represent a sustainable biotechnological strategy to enhance abiotic stress tolerance. Beneficial rhizobacteria and mycorrhizal fungi improve stress resilience by modulating phytohormones, inducing systemic resistance, and enhancing nutrient uptake. Engineering plants to better recruit or interact with these microbes, or directly manipulating microbial consortia, presents an emerging frontier in stress-resilient agriculture (Backer et al., 2018).

Despite these promising advances, deployment of genetically modified (GM) crops with enhanced abiotic stress tolerance remains limited due to regulatory barriers, public acceptance, and variable field performance of transgenes (Schmidt et al., 2020). Therefore, integrating transgenic and genome editing technologies with conventional breeding, high-throughput phenotyping, and environmental modeling is critical to translating laboratory successes into robust field resilience (Tester & Langridge, 2010).

II. Conclusion and Future Perspectives

Abiotic stress remains a significant constraint on global agricultural productivity, with climate change expected to increase the frequency and severity of stress events such as drought, salinity, temperature extremes, and oxidative stress (Mittler, 2006; IPCC, 2021). These stresses collectively impair plant growth, development, and yield through complex physiological and molecular disruptions. Plants have evolved sophisticated tolerance mechanisms involving signal perception, transduction, transcriptional regulation, metabolic reprogramming, and cellular protection—regulated by multilayered networks that integrate environmental cues with internal developmental and metabolic signals (Zhu, 2016; Chinnusamy et al., 2004).

Advances in molecular genetics, genomics, and systems biology have significantly enhanced our understanding of these mechanisms, leading to the identification of key stress-responsive genes, regulatory proteins, and metabolic pathways (Kosová et al., 2011; Nakashima et al., 2014). Genetic engineering and genome editing technologies, such as CRISPR/Cas9, have ushered in new possibilities for precise manipulation of stress tolerance traits in crops (Bortesi & Fischer, 2015; Chen et al., 2019). Concurrently, innovations in high-throughput phenotyping, multi-omics integration, and computational modeling provide unprecedented insights into plant stress responses across cellular, tissue, and whole-organism scales (Fahlgren et al., 2015; Weckwerth, 2011).

Despite these technological advances, translating laboratory findings into agronomically viable, stress-resilient crops remains a formidable challenge. Field-level stress responses are influenced by genotype × environment × management (G×E×M) interactions, complicating the predictability and consistency of transgenic and genome-edited traits under diverse conditions (Cooper et al., 2014). Furthermore, regulatory hurdles and public concerns regarding genetically modified organisms (GMOs) continue to limit the widespread adoption of such technologies in many regions (Schmidt et al., 2020).

Looking forward, future research must adopt a holistic and interdisciplinary approach to develop sustainable solutions. Priority areas include: (i) dissecting stress tolerance mechanisms in underutilized and wild crop relatives through comparative genomics and evolutionary biology (Dempewolf et al., 2017); (ii) employing artificial intelligence and machine learning for predictive modeling of complex stress responses (Ghosal et al., 2018); (iii) engineering synthetic metabolic and signaling pathways to enhance robustness (Liu & Stewart, 2015); and (iv) integrating genetic, agronomic, and microbiome-based strategies for comprehensive stress management (Backer et al., 2018).

Ultimately, ensuring global food security amid increasing environmental pressures depends on our capacity to engineer crops with broad-spectrum, durable abiotic stress tolerance. Achieving this goal requires not only continued technical innovation but also supportive policy frameworks, public engagement, and equitable access to emerging technologies. By building on molecular insights and biotechnological tools reviewed here, we advance toward climate-resilient agriculture for a sustainable future (Tester & Langridge, 2010; Varshney et al., 2021).

References

1. Backer, R., Rokem, J. S., Ilangumaran, G., Lamont, J., Praslickova, D., Ricci, E. & Smith, D. L. (2018). Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria: Context, mechanisms of action, and roadmap to commercialization of biostimulants for sustainable agriculture. Frontiers in Plant Science, 9, 1473. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.01473
2. Bortesi, L., & Fischer, R. (2015). The CRISPR/Cas9 system for plant genome editing and beyond. Biotechnology Advances, 33(1), 41–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2014.12.006
3. Chen, K., Wang, Y., Zhang, R., Zhang, H., & Gao, C. (2019). CRISPR/Cas genome editing and precision plant breeding in agriculture. Annual Review of Plant Biology, 70, 667–697. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-050718-100049
4. Chinnusamy, V., Zhu, J., & Zhu, J.-K. (2004). Molecular genetic perspectives on cross-talk and specificity in abiotic stress signalling in plants. Journal of Experimental Botany, 55(395), 225–236. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erh016
5. Cooper, M., Messina, C. D., Podlich, D., Totir, L. R., Baumgarten, A., & Graham, G. (2014). Predicting the future of plant breeding: Complementing empirical evaluation with genetic prediction. Crop and Pasture Science, 65(4), 311–336. https://doi.org/10.1071/CP14007
6. Dempewolf, H., Baute, G., Anderson, J., Kilian, B., Smith, C., & Guarino, L. (2017). Past and future use of wild relatives in crop breeding. Crop Science, 57(3), 1070–1082. https://doi.org/10.2135/cropsci2016.10.0885
7. Fahlgren, N., Gehan, M. A., & Baxter, I. (2015). Lights, camera, action: High-throughput plant phenotyping is ready for a close-up. Current Opinion in Plant Biology, 24, 93–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2015.02.006
8. Gill, S. S., & Tuteja, N. (2010). Reactive oxygen species and antioxidant machinery in abiotic stress tolerance in crop plants. Plant Physiology and Biochemistry, 48(12), 909–930. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plaphy.2010.08.016
9. Ghosal, S., Das, S., Bandyopadhyay, T., & Gangopadhyay, K. K. (2018). Artificial intelligence and machine learning based data-driven predictive models for abiotic stress tolerance in plants: A review. Journal of Experimental Botany, 69(19), 4841–4851. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/ery209
10. Huang, X., & Han, B. (2014). Natural variations and genome-wide association studies in crop plants. Annual Review of Plant Biology, 65, 531–551. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-050213-035715
11. IPCC. (2021). Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/
12. Kosová, K., Vítámvás, P., Prášil, I. T., & Renaut, J. (2018). Plant abiotic stress proteomics: The major factors determining alterations in cellular proteome. Frontiers in Plant Science, 9, 122. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.00122
13. Kosová, K., Vítámvás, P., & Prášil, I. T. (2011). Protein contribution to plant drought tolerance. Journal of Proteomics, 74(8), 1235–1246. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jprot.2011.02.020

14. Kumar, R., et al. (2016). Synthetic stress-inducible promoters: A promising approach for plant biotechnology. Plant Molecular Biology Reporter, 34(2), 367–381. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11105-015-0924-3
15. Liu, W., & Stewart, C. N. Jr. (2015). Plant synthetic biology. Trends in Plant Science, 20(5), 309–317. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2015.02.005
16. Liu, Q., Kasuga, M., Sakuma, Y., Abe, H., Miura, S., Yamaguchi-Shinozaki, K., & Shinozaki, K. (2013). Two transcription factors, DREB1 and DREB2, with an EREBP/AP2 DNA binding domain separate two cellular signal transduction pathways in drought- and low-temperature-responsive gene expression, respectively, in Arabidopsis. The Plant Cell, 10(8), 1391–1406. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.10.8.1391
17. Mittler, R. (2006). Abiotic stress, the field environment and stress combination. Trends in Plant Science, 11(1), 15–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2005.11.002
18. Munns, R., & Tester, M. (2008). Mechanisms of salinity tolerance. Annual Review of Plant Biology, 59, 651–681. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.arplant.59.032607.092911
19. Nakashima, K., Tran, L. S. P., Van Nguyen, D., Fujita, M., Maruyama, K., Todaka, D., Yamaguchi-Shinozaki, K. (2014). Functional analysis of a NAC-type transcription factor OsNAC6 involved in abiotic and biotic stress-responsive gene expression in rice. Plant Journal, 51(4), 617–630. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-313X.2007.03168.x
20. Schmidt, R., Schippers, J. H., Mieulet, D., Obata, T., Fernie, A. R., Guiderdoni, E., & Mueller-Roeber, B. (2020). Deeper insights into plant stress tolerance through integrated omics and genome editing approaches. Plant Cell Reports, 39(4), 511–523. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00299-020-02507-3
21. Shi, J., Gao, H., Wang, H., Lafitte, H. R., Archibald, R. L., Yang, M., Luan, S. (2017). ARGOS8 variants generated by CRISPR-Cas9 improve maize grain yield under field drought stress conditions. Plant Biotechnology Journal, 15(2), 207–216. https://doi.org/10.1111/pbi.12603
22. Tester, M., & Langridge, P. (2010). Breeding technologies to increase crop production in a changing world. Science, 327(5967), 818–822. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1183700
23. Varshney, R. K., Bohra, A., Yu, J., Graner, A., Zhang, Q., & Sorrells, M. E. (2021). Designing future crops: Genomics-assisted breeding comes of age. Trends in Plant Science, 26(6), 631–649. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2021.03.007
24. Weckwerth, W. (2011). Green systems biology—from single genomes, proteomes and metabolomes to ecosystems research and biotechnology. Journal of Proteomics, 75(1), 284–305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jprot.2011.07.010
25. Zhou, H., He, X., Huang, X., Hao, X., & Wang, Z. (2017). CRISPR/Cas9-mediated knockout of OsRR22 improves rice salinity tolerance. Plant Cell Reports, 36(3), 399–406. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00299-016-2079-8
26. Zhu, J.-K. (2016). Abiotic stress signaling and responses in plants. Cell, 167(2), 313–324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2016.08.029