Transcriptome-wide identification and expression analysis of the KT/HAK/KUP family in *Salicornia europaea* L. under varied NaCl and KCl treatments
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ABSTRACT

Background. The KT/HAK/KUP (KUP) transporters play important roles in potassium (K⁺) uptake and translocation, regulation of osmotic potential, salt tolerance, root morphogenesis and plant development. However, the KUP family has not been systematically studied in the typical halophyte *Salicornia europaea* L., and the specific expression patterns of SeKUPs under NaCl condition and K⁺ deficiency are unknown.

Methods. In this study, SeKUPs were screened from PacBio transcriptome data of *Salicornia europaea* L. using bioinformatics. The identification, phylogenetic analysis and prediction of conserved motifs of SeKUPs were extensively explored. Moreover, the expression levels of 24 selected SeKUPs were assayed by real-time quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR).

Results. In this study, a total of 24 putative SeKUPs were identified in *S. europaea*. Nineteen SeKUPs with the fixed domain EA[ML]FADL were used to construct the phylogenetic tree, and they were divided into four clusters (clusters I–IV). MEME analysis identified 10 motifs in *S. europaea*, and the motif analysis suggested that 19 of the identified SeKUPs had at least four K⁺ transporter motifs existed in all SeKUPs (with the exception of SeKUP-2). The RT-qPCR analysis showed that the expression levels of most SeKUPs were significantly up-regulated in *S. europaea* when they were exposed to K⁺ deficiency and high salinity, implying that these SeKUPs may play a key role in the absorption and transport of K⁺ and Na⁺ in *S. europaea*.

Discussions. Our results laid the foundation for revealing the salt tolerance mechanism of SeKUPs, and provided key candidate genes for further studies on the function of KUP family in *S. europaea*.

INTRODUCTION

Salt stress is one of the most important environmental factors affecting plant growth and development (*Nabati et al., 2011*). The excessive salt concentration in soil causes reduction in water potential, ions toxicity, osmotic stresses and induced secondary stress which even...
lead to plants’ death (Munns & Tester, 2008). Halophytes are a special plant species: they can complete their life cycle in a saline environment of at least 200 mM NaCl condition (Flowers, Glenn & Volkov, 2019). Most halophytes are able to maintain the relative stability of potassium ion (K\(^+\)) content in the above-ground organs of plants in a high salt concentration environment (Flowers, Troke & Yeo, 1977), such as Lycium ruthenicum (Dai et al., 2019), Phragmites australis (Takahashi et al., 2007a) and Mesembryanthemum crystallinum (Su et al., 2002).

K\(^+\) is an essential mineral for plant growth and development and is also the most abundant monovalent cation in plants, accounting for approximately 2% to 10% of plant dry weight (Clarkson & Hanson, 1980), and it plays a significant role in various physiological and biochemical processes, for instance, abiotic stress adaptation, stomatal movement, enzyme function and signal transduction (Véry & Sentenac, 2003). According to the transport characteristics of K\(^+\), K\(^+\) transport families are divided into four types: Trk/HKT (tandem-pore K\(^+\) channels) family, KT (K\(^+\) transporter)/HAK (high-affinity K\(^+\))/KUP (K\(^+\) uptake) family, CHX (cation/hydrogen exchanger) family and KEA (K\(^+\) efflux antiporter) family (Gupta et al., 2008; Mäser et al., 2001). Among them, the KT/HAK/KUP (KUP) family belonging to the APC (amino acid polyamine organization) superfamily, is the largest and widely distributed in bacteria, fungi, and plants, but has not yet been identified in animal cells (Corratgé-Faillie et al., 2010). The KUP transporters were first identified in Arabidopsis thaliana (KUP1/KT1 and KUP2/KT2) and Hordeum vulgare (HAK1); thus, the composite name KUP, is widely used to refer to the whole family in plants (Véry et al., 2014; Epstein & Kim, 1971; Bañuelos et al., 1995). In the early stage, the KUP family was divided into four clusters (I–IV) (Rubio, Guillermo & Alonso, 2010). Recently, researchers discovered that this family has been re-divided into five clusters (clusters I–V) (Nieves-Cordones et al., 2016), and the main reason for this phenomenon is due to species diversity.

Firstly, the different cluster members have different physiological functions. The cluster I members can improve the absorption capacity of root system to K\(^+\) under K\(^+\) deficiency condition, such as AtHAK5 (A. thaliana), OsHAK1 (Oryza sativa) and SiHAK1 (Setaria italica) (Rubio, Guillermo & Alonso, 2010; Zhang et al., 2018). Members of cluster II have diverse functions in plant growth and development. For example, VvKUP2 (Vitis vinifera) can promote the expansion of berry epidermal cells (Davies et al., 2006; Elumalai, Nagpal & Reed, 2002). The members of cluster III can maintain K\(^+\)/Na\(^+\) homeostasis, like HcKUP12 (Halostachys capsica) (Yang & Wang, 2015) and PhaHAK5 (Phragmites australis) (Takahashi et al., 2007b). However, members in clusters IV and V have not yet been adequately studied (Bañuelos et al., 2002). Furthermore, some KUPs have been demonstrated to protect plants against salt stress. For instance, the constitutive overexpression of OsHAK5 in tobacco improved K\(^+\) accumulation under salt stress (Elumalai, Nagpal & Reed, 2002). AtHAK11 and McHAK2 (Mesembryanthemum crystallinum) can promote the uptake of K\(^+\) when plants are under salt stress (Su et al., 2002; Maathuis, 2006). These data indicate that members of the KUP family play critical roles in the uptake and transport of K\(^+\) and in regulation of plant growth, development, and abiotic stress tolerance.
Salicornia europaea L., a succulent halophyte, belongs to the family of Amaranthaceae, and it is a typical salt-resistant predominant species in the world (Nikalje et al., 2018). In the long-term evolutionary process, this special plant has gradually formed a strong salt tolerance mechanism in extremely saline environments. It can tolerate soil with more than 1,000 mM NaCl (Flowers & Colmer, 2008; Ozawa, Jianmei & Fujii, 2007), also accumulates large amounts of Na⁺ than K⁺ and compartmentalize Na⁺ in the vacuole (Lv et al., 2012). Meanwhile, some research results show that S. europaea can still maintain a relatively stable K⁺/Na⁺ even under increasing salt concentrations and longer treatment time (Wang et al., 2009; Fan et al., 2013), implying that S. europaea has a strong K⁺ transport system under salt condition. Therefore, it is meaningful to elucidate the mechanism of K⁺ uptake in S. europaea. However, the information about K⁺ uptake family in S. europaea remains unknown.

In this study, we identified SeKUPs in S. europaea using PacBio sequencing system data (Tiika et al., 2021). We thoroughly performed multiple sequence alignment, presence of conserved motifs in the proteins, phylogenetic analysis, and real-time quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) of SeKUPs in different tissues of S. europaea in response to salinity and K⁺ deficiency. This study provides an important theoretical basis for the mechanism of K⁺ uptake in S. europaea.

**MATERIALS & METHODS**

**Plant materials and treatments**

The wild seeds of S. europaea were collected from Liangcao Village, Jingtai County, Baiyin City, Gansu Province in China (37°21′2″N, 104°5′28″W). The seeds were disinfected with 2% NaClO solution for about 3 min and washed with distilled water and then germinated at 28 °C on filter paper in the dark for 72 h. The plantlets were transferred into containers with sterilized sand, and were irrigated with 1/2 Hoagland nutrient solution (pH = 5.7). The formulation of 1/2 Hoagland nutrient solution was: 2 mM KNO₃, 0.5 mM KH₂PO₄, 0.5 mM MgSO₄·7H₂O, 0.5 mM Ca(NO₃)₂·4H₂O, 50 µM H₂BO₃, 10 µM MnCl₂·4H₂O, 1.6 µM ZnSO₄·7H₂O, 0.6 µM CuSO₄, 0.05 µM Na₂MoO₄·2H₂O, 0.06 mM Fe-citrate·2H₂O. All plantlets were grown in an artificial climate box with a temperature of 22 ± 2 °C, relative humidity of about 65% and a daily photoperiod of 16/8 h (day/night; the flux density was approximately 600 µmol/m² s). The nutrient solution was renewed every 3 days.

The four week old plantlets were subjected to NaCl and K⁺ treatments. The seedlings were exposed to 1/2 Hoagland nutrient solution plus NaCl (0 mM, 50 mM and 200 mM) for a period of 0 h, 6 h, 24 h and 48 h, respectively. For K⁺ treatment, the seedlings were exposed to modified 1/2 Hoagland nutrient solution (2 mM KNO₃ was substituted by 2 mM HNO₃, 0.5 mM KH₂PO₄ was substituted by 0.5 mM H₃PO₄) plus 0.01 mM KCl (K⁺ deficiency) or 2.5 mM KCl (normal K⁺) for 0 h, 6 h, 24 h, and 48 h. Samples of shoots and roots were collected separately and quickly frozen in liquid nitrogen, and stored at −80 °C for RNA extraction.
Identification of the SeKUPs in *S. europaea*

We downloaded the transcriptome sequence of *S. europaea* from the NCBI database (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sra) (Accession number: PRJNA725943) (Tiika et al., 2021). Keywords related to potassium transport proteins were used to search candidate SeKUPs in *S. europaea* based on the transcriptome database. The amino acids of SeKUPs were predicted by finder searches for open reading frames (ORFs) (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/gorf/gorf.html), then were further identified (E-value <1e−5) by Blastp (protein-protein BLAST) search from NCBI. Finally, the sequences were subjected to conserved domains validation by InterProScan. We numbered the candidate SeKUPs by using the same overlapping prefix “Se” for *S. europaea*.

Sequence analyses of SeKUPs

The protein sequence of SeKUPs was translated by ORFs (Tian et al., 2019). The biochemical properties of the candidates SeKUPs were predicted using the ExPASy (Expert Protein Analysis System) tool (https://web.expasy.org/protparam) (Feng et al., 2020), including the molecular weight (MW), isoelectric points (pI), extinction coefficients, estimated half-life, instability index, aliphatic index, and grand average of hydropathicity (GRAVY) (Gasteiger et al., 2003).

The conserved motifs of the deduced SeKUPs proteins were identified through MEME (Multiple Expectation Maximization for motif Elicitation) version 5.3.3 (http://meme-suite.org/doc/cite.html) using the following parameters: the number of motifs searched was set to 10 and the range of the motif length was set to 5–50 aa (Bailey et al., 2015). All motifs were further annotated with InterProScan (http://www.ebi.ac.uk/interpro) (Mulder & Apweiler, 2007).

Phylogenetic analysis of SeKUPs

The protein sequences for 13 AtKUPs, 27 OsHAKs, 17 ZmHAKs, and 27 VvKUPs were retrieved from NCBI (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov), UniPort (https://www.uniprot.org) (Consortium, 2015) and maize website (https://maizesequence.org), and the newly identified SeKUPs were selected to construct the phylogenetic tree by using MEGA 5.0 with 1,000 bootstrap replications of maximum likelihood. The phylogenetic tree was embellished by the online tool iTOL (http://itol.embl.de).

RT-qPCR analysis

Total RNA was extracted from root and shoot tissues using TransZol Up Plus RNA Kit (Lot#M31018) referring to the manufacturer’s instructions. The RNA quantity and quality were determined using a TGen Spectrophotometer (TianGen) based on the A260 nm/A280 nm and A260 nm/A230 nm ratio. Evo M-MLV RT Kit (AG11705, Accurate Biotechnology) was used to reverse transcribe the total RNA into cDNA and for removal of genomic DNA mixed in the cDNA before RT-qPCR analysis, following the manufacturer’s protocol.

For RT-qPCR analysis, primers were designed based on mRNA sequences, using Primer 5.0 software and synthesized by TsingKe Biological Technology Co., Ltd. (Xi’an, China). The *S. europaea* Ubiquitin-conjugating (SeUBC) gene was used as the reference gene (Xiao et al., 2015). Three biological repeats were conducted and triplicate quantitative
assays for each replicate were performed on 0.5 µL of each cDNA dilution using Heiﬀ® qPCR SYBR® Green Master Mix kit (Yeasen Biotech Co., Ltd) per the manufacturer’s protocol. The RT-qPCR analysis was performed using the QuantStudio™ 5 Real-Time PCR Instrument (ABI). Cycling parameters were: 95 °C for 5 min, 40 cycles at 95 °C for 10 s, and 60 °C for 30 s. The relative expression of the SeKUPs was calculated according to $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ (Livak & Schmittgen, 2001). The primer sequences for the SeKUPs and the housekeeping gene are listed in Table S1, and some SeKUPs share a pair of primers.

Data analysis
All values reported under gene expression levels are presented as means ± SE (n = 3). The significance level among means was analyzed by Duncan’s multiple range tests ($P \leq 0.05$) after performing a one-way ANOVA analysis using SPSS statistical software (Ver. 25.0, SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA), and all histograms were generated using GraphPad Prism8.0.

RESULTS
Identification of SeKUPs in S. europaea
A total of 24 putative SeKUPs were obtained from S. europaea, which were designated as SeKUP1 - SeKUP24 based on the Blastp results of other plant KUP protein sequences as queries. Among the 24 SeKUPs, the predicted cDNA length varied from 1,641 bp (SeKUP-2) to 3,391 bp (SeKUP-24), and the predicted protein length varied from 101 bp (SeKUP-2) to 845 bp (SeKUP-6, -7, -8, and -9) (Table 1).

To further analyze the characteristics of SeKUPs with complete sequences, a total of 12 SeKUPs were predicted by ORF finder, including SeKUP-1, -3, -4, -6, -7, -8, -9, -10, -11, -12, -14 and -15 (Table S2). Then the MWs, pIs, estimated half-life, instability index, aliphatic index, and GRAVY of these 12 SeKUPs were also calculated. As shown in Table S2, the ORF protein length of the predicted 12 SeKUPs ranged from 772 bp (SeKUP-12) to 845 bp (SeKUP-6, -7, -8, and -9); the molecular weight (MW) varied from 86,940.07 kDa (SeKUP-1, -10, and -12) to 94,683.36 kDa (SeKUP-8); isoelectric point (pI) varied from 5.79 (SeKUP-6, -7, -9) to 8.08 (SeKUP-1, -10, -11, and -12), extinction coefficients varied from 107,565 (SeKUP-8) to 128,660 (SeKUP-3, -4), all estimated half-life >10 h, the instability index of 12 SeKUPs proteins was lower than 42 (with the exception of SeKUP-3), the aliphatic index varied from 105.5 (SeKUP-8) to 111.64 (SeKUP-15), and the GRAVY varied from 0.222 (SeKUP-11) to 0.367 (SeKUP-14, -15), respectively (Table S2). In summary, most SeKUPs of the same subfamily shared similar sequences characteristics (MW, pI estimated half-life, instability index, aliphatic index, and GRAVY).

Phylogenetic analysis of SeKUPs
For the KUP family, it is generally believed that the sequence containing the EA [ML] FADL motif is identified as a KUP member (Ou et al., 2018). Therefore, through analysis, 19 sequences in our data contain this motif. So we use these 19 sequences to construct the evolutionary tree. These SeKUPs were divided into four clusters (cluster I, II, III, and IV) by phylogenetic analysis (Fig. 1) through other KUP protein sequences from four model plants (Table S3). In addition, the SeKUPs members in clusters I, II, and III were further
### Table 1  The statistic information of SeKUPs in *S. europaea*.

| Gene name | Gene ID | cDNA length (bp) | Span on master (bp) | ORF length (bp) | Clusters | Catalytic Site | Full length (“+”) |
|-----------|---------|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------|----------------|------------------|
| SeKUP1    | i3_HQ_samplee11669_c30301_f2p0_3024 | 3024 | 2319 | 773 | II | EAMFADL | + |
| SeKUP2    | i1_HQ_samplee11669_c110009_f2p0_1641 | 1,641 | 471 | 101 | II | EAMFADL | |
| SeKUP3    | i2_HQ_samplee11669_c6179_f2p0_2898 | 2,898 | 2,367 | 788 | II | EAMFADL | + |
| SeKUP4    | i2_HQ_samplee11669_c91677_f3p0_2821 | 2,821 | 2,364 | 787 | II | EAMFADL | + |
| SeKUP5    | i2_HQ_samplee11669_c107214_f19p1_2853 | 2,853 | 2,349 | 782 | II | EAMFAD | |
| SeKUP6    | i2_HQ_samplee11669_c2358_f3p1_2778 | 2,778 | 2,538 | 845 | I | EAMFADL | + |
| SeKUP7    | i3_HQ_samplee11669_c18328_f5p0_3240 | 3,240 | 2,538 | 845 | I | EAMFADL | + |
| SeKUP8    | i3_HQ_samplee11669_c30205_f2p0_3366 | 3,368 | 2,538 | 845 | I | EAMFADL | + |
| SeKUP9    | i3_HQ_samplee11669_c4886_f2p0_3368 | 3,368 | 2,538 | 845 | I | EAMFADL | + |
| SeKUP10   | i2_HQ_samplee11669_c20423_f4p1_2931 | 2,931 | 2,322 | 773 | II | EAMFADL | + |
| SeKUP11   | i2_HQ_samplee11669_c2189_f7p2_2995 | 2,995 | 2,322 | 773 | II | EAMFADL | + |
| SeKUP12   | i2_HQ_samplee11669_c23402_f3p1_2760 | 2,760 | 2,319 | 772 | IV | EAMFADL | + |
| SeKUP13   | i3_HQ_samplee11669_c30270_f2p4_3017 | 3,017 | 1,287 | 428 | II | EAMFADL | |
| SeKUP14   | i2_HQ_samplee11669_c133022_f3p1_2819 | 2,819 | 2,370 | 789 | III | EAMFADL | + |
| SeKUP15   | i2_HQ_samplee11669_c132452_f4p1_2805 | 2,805 | 2,367 | 788 | III | EAMFADL | + |
| SeKUP16   | i3_HQ_samplee11669_c13556_f3p0_3023 | 3,023 | 1,845 | 614 | III | EAMFADL | |
| SeKUP17   | i2_HQ_samplee11669_c131282_f2p0_2417 | 2,417 | 2,181 | 726 | II | EAMFADL | |
| SeKUP18   | i2_HQ_samplee11669_c190749_f5p0_2855 | 2,855 | 2,181 | 726 | II | EAMFADL | |
| SeKUP19   | i2_HQ_samplee11669_c193337_f2p0_2845 | 2,845 | 2,181 | 726 | II | EAMFADL | |
| SeKUP20   | i1_HQ_samplee11669_c182924_f2p0_1885 | 1,885 | 1,857 | 618 | – | KNDNITK | |
| SeKUP21   | i1_HQ_samplee11669_c11500_f7p1_1991 | 1,991 | 1,251 | 416 | – | ALLGIT | |
| SeKUP22   | i1_HQ_samplee11669_c127136_f2p1_1797 | 1,797 | 1,251 | 416 | – | ALLGIT | |
| SeKUP23   | i3_HQ_samplee11669_c18355_f6p0_3074 | 3,074 | 2,148 | 715 | – | EDFDTEE | |
| SeKUP24   | i3_HQ_samplee11669_c19195_f2p0_3391 | 3,391 | 1,008 | 335 | – | – | |

classified into sub-clusters Ia, Ib, IIA, IIB, and IIIA, IIIB, respectively. SeKUP -6, -7, -8, and -9 belonged to cluster I; SeKUP -1, -2, -3, -4, -5, -10, -11, -13, -17, -18, and -19 belonged to cluster II; SeKUP -14, -15, -16 belonged to cluster III and SeKUP-12 belonged to cluster IV (Fig. 1). In summary, cluster II is the most abundant and cluster IV is the least abundant in *S. europaea*.

### Conserved motif analysis of SeKUPs

A total of 10 conserved motifs in putative SeKUP proteins were identified and designated as motifs (1–10) (Fig. 2). More detailed information on all conserved motifs can be found in Table S4. As revealed by our InterProScan search, most of the conserved motifs were found within the sequence of the K\[^+\] transporters, with the exception of motif 10 (Table S4). As shown in Fig. 2, with the exception of SeKUP-2, all the identified SeKUPs contained at least four K\[^+\] transporter motifs. In addition, motifs 1, 2, 6, 7, and 8 had the most amino acid sequences, whereas motif 10 contained the fewest protein sequences (Table S4). The majority of SeKUPs proteins contain the same types of motifs.
Expression patterns of SeKUPs under K⁺ deficiency

Previous studies have demonstrated that the expression levels of KUPs are generally regulated by the concentration of K⁺ (Zhou et al., 2020), such as OsHAK1 (Chen et al., 2015) in O. sativa and TaHAK1 in Triticum aestivum (Cheng et al., 2018). In addition, further studies have shown that members of the KUP family play an important role in the high affinity K⁺ uptake process under K⁺ deficiency condition (Rubio, Guillermo & Alonso, 2010; Santa-Maria, Oliferuk & Moriconi, 2018). To investigate the expression divergence of SeKUPs in response to different K⁺ conditions in S. europaea, we analyzed the expression patterns of SeKUPs in the roots and in the shoots under 2.5 mM KCl (normal growth K⁺ condition) and 0.01 mM KCl (K⁺ deficiency) for different time periods (Table S5).

Under the normal growth condition (2.5 mM KCl), the majority of SeKUPs were expressed in both shoots and roots, except for SeKUP-7/9, which was mainly expressed in the shoots. With the extension of treatment time under 2.5 mM KCl, most of the SeKUPs were induced more in the shoots than in the roots, and peaked at 24 h of treatment (Fig. 3). Under K⁺ deficiency condition, some SeKUPs were induced significantly compared to the control (2.5 mM KCl treatment) both in the roots and shoots with time prolonged, for example, SeKUP-1/10/12, -2, -3, -4, -7/9, -8/24, -17 and -18/19, and the relative expression...
Figure 2  Motif analysis of SeKUPs in *S. europaea*. Conserved motifs of the SeKUPs protein are investigated on the MEME web server, and are named as motif 1 to 10 with different colors. The different colored boxes represent different motifs and their position in each SeKUP sequence. Each motif is indicated by a colored box in the legend at the bottom. The parameter 0–800 is the sequence length of amino acids. New figure legends have been submitted in the system.

| Name | Motif Locations | Motif Consensus |
|------|----------------|-----------------|
| SeKUP1 | ![Motif Locations](image1) | IVASQAMISATFSIKQSLALGCPRVKIVHTSRKFGQIIYIPEINWILM |
| SeKUP2 | ![Motif Locations](image2) | WMSLGILLCTITGEMFADLGHFSVRSIQJAPFPVYPCLLAYMGQAA |
| SeKUP3 | ![Motif Locations](image3) | FSLQHYGTDKVGFLAPIVLLWLLCISIGGLYNI |
| SeKUP4 | ![Motif Locations](image4) | ILGVLSIFYTTLIPLLLKYFVLRLABDNEG |
| SeKUP5 | ![Motif Locations](image5) | GVPAIFSHFVTNLPAFHSVFLVFCIKSVPVPHPPEER |
| SeKUP6 | ![Motif Locations](image6) | ELYYFSAVLKDFDZGNWVFJALSILFVMLIMYVWHYGTVKKYEFELQNKV |
| SeKUP7 | ![Motif Locations](image7) | LCLAHTGPRDKHIGNAYGJAVITYMLVTCMLMLVWKKNTSLVL |
| SeKUP8 | ![Motif Locations](image8) | LGHSYVRARKGSSLKJAINYAYFLRKNCRGPSVALSIPHSLLEVGM |
| SeKUP9 | ![Motif Locations](image9) | LEKHKKLKALLJLVLLLGTCMVIGDGLTPAISVLSAVGL |
| SeKUP10 | ![Motif Locations](image10) | GTFALYSLJCRHAKVSLJPNQ |
Figure 3  Real-time quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) analysis of SeKUPs in *S. europaea* under KCl treatments. Values are means ± standard errors (SEs) (*n* = 3) and bars indicate SEs. Different letters (Duncan’s test, *p* < 0.05) reflect the significant differences among different treatment times under the same KCl concentration, respectively. The gene name is on the top left of each column graph. The seedlings of *S. europaea* are grown in the 1/2 Hoagland nutrient solution, and four weeks old seedlings are treated with modified 1/2 Hoagland nutrient solution plus different KCl concentrations for varied times. In the modified 1/2 Hoagland nutrient solution, 2 mM KNO$_3$ is substituted by 2 mM HNO$_3$, 0.5 mM KH$_2$PO$_4$ is substituted by 0.5 mM H$_3$PO$_4$. The relative expression levels of all SeKUPs are calculated by $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ method, and 2.5 mM KCl-0 h-root is used as the standard control. Some SeKUPs with “/” represent that they shared the same primers and the same expression patterns.
levels of SeKUP-3 in the roots (R)-24 h, SeKUP-3 in the shoots (S)-48 h, SeKUP-4 in S-6 h and SeKUP-7/9 in R-6 h were 8.7, 9.9, 9.6 and 8.7 times higher than their respective controls. Differently, SeKUP-6 showed induced expression in the roots and inhibited expression in the shoots. Besides, some SeKUPs like SeKUP-15, -16, -20, -21/22 exhibited reduced expression in the roots, but they were induced significantly in the shoots than control at short time treatment (6 h). Compared to the control, the expression of SeKUP-23 under K+ deficiency were reduced at 6 h and 24 h treatment, then returned to the normal expression at 48 h treatment.

**Expression patterns of SeKUPs under NaCl treatments**

Studies have found that members of the KUP family are also involved in plant salt stress responses and regulate salt tolerance through a series of mechanisms (Chen et al., 2015; Horie et al., 2011). To further analyze the expression patterns of SeKUPs under salinity, we exposed the seedlings to 50 mM NaCl and 200 mM NaCl treatments for different times (0 h, 6 h, 24 h and 48 h) (Table S6, Fig. 4).

With NaCl application, the majority of SeKUPs were induced in both shoots and roots, and the relative expression levels increased with time, and then peaked at 24 h, except for SeKUP-17 and 23 (expression was inhibited in both shoots and roots). Notably, the transcript abundance of SeKUP-2, -3, -6, -8/24, -15, -16 was 6.1 to 36.5 fold higher in the shoots under 50 mM NaCl condition at 24 h than at 0 h, and the values under 200 mM NaCl condition at 24 h were 9.3 to 45.7 fold higher compared to 0 h. Some SeKUPs like SeKUP-18/19 and SeKUP-20 were inhibited in the roots, while they were induced significantly in the shoots with increasing time under 50 mM and 200 mM NaCl treatments. Compared with 50 mM NaCl treatment, 200 mM NaCl significantly induced the expression of SeKUP-2, -3, -6, -14, -18/19, and -21/22 in the shoots.

**DISCUSSION**

Given their key roles in plant K+ uptake, homeostasis, translocation, stress resistance, and development, the KUP family has been identified in many plant species such as A. thaliana (Ahn, Shin & Schachtman, 2004), O. sativa (Gupta et al., 2008), Zea mays (Zhang et al., 2012) and Pyrus bretschneideri (Yan et al., 2018) genomes, respectively. In our study, we identified 24 SeKUPs from S. europaea (Table 1), compared with A. thaliana (13) (Ahn, Shin & Schachtman, 2004), V. vinifera (17) (Davies et al., 2006), Prunus persica (16) (Song, Ma & Yu, 2015), and Solanum lycopersicum (19) (Hyun et al., 2014), the number of SeKUPs is similar to or more than other plants, providing useful information for further functional validation of SeKUPs in S. europaea.

Conserved domains are the core of a protein family and have important functions in genes. At present, several typical conserved protein domains have been found in KUP family members, such as GVYYGDLGTSPLY (Rodríguez-Navarro, 2000) and LAYMGQAA, but the conserved domains vary among species. Although the conserved structure of KUP family is different, it has some relatively conserved amino acid domains, the highly conserved domains were searched by motif analysis to speculate whether these family members have functional differences during evolution (Wang et al., 2018). The results showed that 19
Figure 4  Real-time quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) analysis of SeKUPs in *S. europaea* under NaCl treatments. Values are means ± standard errors (SEs) (*n* = 3) and bars indicate SEs. Different letters (Duncan’s test, *p* < 0.05) reflect the significant differences among different treatment times under the same NaCl concentration, respectively. The gene name is on the top left of each column graph. The seedlings of *S. europaea* are grown in the 1/2 Hoagland nutrient solution, and four weeks old seedlings are treated with 1/2 Hoagland nutrient solution plus different NaCl concentrations for varied times. The relative expression levels of all SeKUPs are calculated by 2^−ΔΔCt method, and 0 mM NaCl-0 h-root is used as the standard control. Some SeKUPs with “/” represent that they shared the same primers and the same expression patterns.

Full-size DOI: 10.7717/peerj.12989/fig-4
SeKUPs had the same conserved domain EA [ML] FADL, which means these sequences are highly conserved and facilitate phylogenetic tree analysis. In our study, we found 19 SeKUPs with the fixed domain EA[ML]FADL, this domain also appeared in Manihot esculenta (Ou et al., 2018), P. bretschneideri (Wang et al., 2018) P. persica (Song, Ma & Yu, 2015) and T. aestivum (Cheng et al., 2018). MEME revealed motifs that are conserved in the proteins originating from all four clusters. We searched for 10 motifs in S. europaea and 90% belonged to K+ transporters. Motif analysis suggested that 19 of the identified SeKUPs had at least four typical motifs of K+ transporters, with the exception of SeKUP2. A similar phenomenon also appeared in the motif analysis of O. sativa (Gupta et al., 2008). Although some homologous SeKUPs had different motifs structures (such as SeKUP-2/13), the majority of SeKUPs within the same subgroup shared similar motifs, and a similar number of motifs were present in SeKUPs proteins from each of the four clusters, indicating that the classification of SeKUPs was further supported by conserved motifs, with each subgroup sharing similar motifs. In S. europaea, with the exception of SeKUP-2, -13, -16, and -24, all SeKUPs contained 10 motifs, this phenomenon is similar to results in M. esculenta, where all MeKUPs contained 16 motifs with the exception of MeKUP-1, -7, -9, -10, -13, -15, -16, and -17 (Ou et al., 2018). These results support the high conservatism of sequences among KUP subgroup members.

In our study, 19 SeKUPs were classified into four clusters based on their evolutionary relationships (Fig. 2). This is consistent with previous classifications of the KUP family in A. thaliana, O. sativa, V. vinifera and Z. mays (Zhang et al., 2012; Gupta et al., 2008). The results showed that most of the SeKUPs members were concentrated in cluster II. The number distribution of KUPs in the four clusters varied greatly, but this situation was consistent with previous studies that distributed KUPs unevenly in different clusters among angiosperms (Nieves-Cordones et al., 2016). Previous studies indicated that KUPs are widely expressed in different tissues of plants, such as roots, stems, leaves, flowers, and fruits (Corratgé-Faillie et al., 2010; Ahn, Shin & Schachtman, 2004). In the present study, we observed the consistent phenomenon that most SeKUPs were expressed in the shoots and roots, implying that they might play important roles in both shoots and roots. Besides, SeKUPs in the same cluster exhibited similar expression patterns. The representative members of cluster I, such as OsHAK1, OsHAK5 in O. sativa (Chen et al., 2015), and PbrHAK1 in P. bretschneideri (Wang et al., 2018) were reported to be induced by K+ starvation, and they mainly mediate high affinity K+ transport. SeKUP-6, -7, and -9 belonged to cluster I, and their expression abundance was significantly induced under K+ deficiency than under normal K+ condition, especially in the roots, implying that they might be mainly responsible for K+ transport with high affinity. Meanwhile, the expression patterns of SeKUPs members from cluster II showed similar changes under normal K+ condition and under K+ deficiency (Gupta et al., 2008; Rubio, Guillermo & Alonso, 2010; Santa-María, Oliferuk & Moriconi, 2018). Previous reports have shown that members of the cluster II, for example, HvHAK2 in barley, AtKUP1, and AtKUP2 have different K+ transport activities in dicotyledons (Véry et al., 2014). Our consistent results revealed that SeKUPs members from cluster II might be simultaneously involved in high-affinity and low-affinity K+ absorption, and our speculation needs to be further validated.
Transcriptional regulation of K⁺ transporter genes represents a major mechanism in plant responses to K⁺ deficiency, and expression pattern analysis can provide insight into the potential functions of the SeKUPs in S. europaea.

The expression of SeKUPs was affected not only by the concentration of K⁺ in the medium, but also by NaCl in the medium. Similar phenomenon also occurred in other plants with KUPs (Ou et al., 2018; Cheng et al., 2018), implying that these up-regulated KUPs may play a potential role under salt stress. In our study, we found that 22 SeKUPs were significantly up-regulated by salt stress, indicating that they could play a potential function under NaCl treatment, and further functional verification need to be explored among them. The up-regulation of SeKUP-16 was the most significant compared with the control, suggesting that SeKUP-16 might be a candidate gene for the adaptation of S. europaea to saline environment (Fig. 4). In addition, we found that the expression levels of some SeKUPs differed between shoots and roots, and that some SeKUPs were greatly suppressed under salt treatments. This is similar to Camellia sinensis (CsHAK17) (Yang et al., 2020), implying that they are not sensitive to high NaCl and K⁺ deficiency.

CONCLUSIONS

In this study, we use Pac-Bio sequencing transcriptome data to discover 24 SeKUPs from S. europaea. Through conservative domain verification and motif analysis, we found that 19 SeKUPs have a fixed domain sequence (EA[ML]FADL) and were used to construct phylogenetic tree. Based on the phylogenetic relationships, the 19 SeKUPs could be divided into four clusters: I, II, III, and IV, in addition, clusters I to III were subdivided into subclusters a and b, respectively. The RT-qPCR further validated the key role of 24 SeKUPs under abiotic stresses (salt and K⁺ deficiency) in S. europaea.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND DECLARATIONS

Funding
This research was funded by the Natural Science Foundation of China (31700338), the Natural Science Foundation of Gansu Province (20JR5RA578), the Science and Technology Innovation Program of Lanzhou Institute of Husbandry and Pharmaceutical Science, Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences (CAAS-LMY-04), the Innovation Project of Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences (CAAS-XTCX2016011-02) and the Gansu Provincial Science and Technology Major Projects (19ZD2NA002). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Grant Disclosures
The following grant information was disclosed by the authors:
Natural Science Foundation of China: 31700338.
Natural Science Foundation of Gansu Province: 20JR5RA578.
Science and Technology Innovation Program of Lanzhou Institute of Husbandry and Pharmaceutical Science.
Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences: CAAS-LMY-04. 
Innovation Project of Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences: 
CAAS-XTCX2016011-02. 
Gansu Provincial Science and Technology Major Projects: 19ZD2NA002.

**Competing Interests**
The authors declare there are no competing interests.

**Author Contributions**
- Jia Wei and Huirong Duan conceived and designed the experiments, analyzed the data, authored or reviewed drafts of the paper, and approved the final draft.
- Richard John Tiika performed the experiments, analyzed the data, prepared figures and/or tables, and approved the final draft.
- Guangxin Cui and Yanjun Ma performed the experiments, prepared figures and/or tables, and approved the final draft.
- Hongshan Yang conceived and designed the experiments, authored or reviewed drafts of the paper, and approved the final draft.

**Data Availability**
The following information was supplied regarding data availability:
The raw data is available in the Supplementary Files.

**Supplemental Information**
Supplemental information for this article can be found online at http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.12989#supplemental-information.

**REFERENCES**

Ahn SJ, Shin R, Schachtman DP. 2004. Expression of KT/KUP genes in Arabidopsis and the role of root hairs in K⁺ uptake. *Plant Physiology* **134**(3):1135–1145 DOI 10.1104/pp.103.034660.

Bañuelos MA, García-deblas B, Cubero B, Rodríguez-Navarro A. 2002. Inventory and functional characterization of the HAK potassium transporters of rice. *Plant Physiology* **130**(2):784–795 DOI 10.1104/pp.007781.

Bañuelos MA, Klein RD, Alexander-Bowman SJ, Rodríguez-Navarro A. 1995. A potassium transporter of the yeast Schwanniomyces occidentalis homologous to the KUP system of Escherichia coli has a high concentrative capacity. *The EMBO Journal* **14**(13):3021–3027 DOI 10.1002/j.1460-2075.1995.tb07304.x.

Bailey TL, Johnson J, Grant CE, Noble WS. 2015. The MEME suite. *Nucleic Acids Research* **43**(W1):W39–W49 DOI 10.1093/nar/gkv416.

Chen G, Hu Q, Luo L, Yang T, Zhang S, Hu Y, Yu L, Xu G. 2015. Rice potassium transporter OsHAK1 is essential for maintaining potassium-mediated growth and functions in salt tolerance over low and high potassium concentration ranges. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **38**(12):2747–2765 DOI 10.1111/pce.12585.
Cheng X, Liu X, Mao W, Zhang X, Chen S, Zhan K, Bi H, Xu H. 2018. Genome-wide identification and analysis of HAK/KUP/KT potassium transporters gene family in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 19(12):3969 DOI 10.3390/ijms19123969.

Clarkson DT, Hanson JB. 1980. The mineral nutrition of higher plants. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology* 31:239–298 DOI 10.1146/annurev.pp.31.060180.001323.

Consortium UP. 2015. UniProt: a hub for protein information. *Nucleic Acids Research D* 20:4–12 DOI 10.1093/nar/gku989.

Corratgé-Faillie C, Jabnoune M, Zimmermann S, Véry AA, Fizames C, Sentenac H. 2010. Potassium and sodium transport in non-animal cells: the Trk/Ktr/HKT transporter family. *Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences* 67(15):2511–2532 DOI 10.1007/s00018-010-0317-7.

Dai F, Li A, Rao S, Chen J. 2019. Potassium transporter LrKUP8 is essential for K⁺ preservation in Lycium ruthenicum, a salt-resistant desert shrub. *Genes* 10(8):600 DOI 10.3390/genes10080600.

Davies C, Shin R, Liu W, Thomas MR, Schachtman DP. 2006. Transporters expressed during grape berry (*Vitis vinifera* L.) development are associated with an increase in berry size and berry potassium accumulation. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 57(12):3209–3216 DOI 10.1093/jxb/erl091.

Elumalai RP, Nagpal P, Reed JW. 2002. A mutation in the Arabidopsis KT2/KUP2 potassium transporter gene affects shoot cell expansion. *The Plant Cell* 14:119–131 DOI 10.1105/tpc.010322.

Epstein W, Kim BS. 1971. Potassium transport loci in escherichia coli K-12. *Journal of Bacteriology* 108(2):639–644 DOI 10.1128/jb.108.2.639-644.1971.

Fan P, Nie L, Jiang P, Feng J, Lv S, Chen X, Bao H, Guo J, Tai F, Wang J, Jia W, Li Y. 2013. Transcriptome analysis of Salicornia europaea under saline conditions revealed the adaptive primary metabolic pathways as early events to facilitate salt adaptation. *PLOS ONE* 12(8)(11):e80595 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0080595.

Feng X, Wang Y, Zhang N, Wu Z, Zeng Q, Wu J, Wu X, Wang L, Zhang J, Qi Y. 2020. Genome-wide systematic characterization of the HAK/KUP/KT gene family and its expression profile during plant growth and in response to low-K⁺ stress in Saccharum. *BMC Plant Biology* 13; 20(1):20 DOI 10.1186/s12870-019-2227-7.

Flowers TJ, Colmer TD. 2008. Salinity tolerance in halophytes. *New Phytologist* 179(4):945–963 DOI 10.1111/j.1469-8137.2008.02531.x.

Flowers TJ, Glenn EP, Volkov V. 2019. Could vesicular transport of Na⁺ and Cl⁻ be a feature of salt tolerance in halophytes? *Annals of Botany* 123(1):1–18 DOI 10.1093/aob/mcy164.

Flowers TJ, Troke PF, Yeo AR. 1977. The mechanism of salt tolerance in halophytes. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology* 28:89–121 DOI 10.1146/annurev.pp.28.060177.000513.

Gattiker E, Gattiker A, Hoogel C, Ivanyi I, Appel RD, Bairoch A. 2003. ExPASy: the proteomics server for in-depth protein knowledge and analysis. *Nucleic Acids Research* 31(13):3784–3788 DOI 10.1093/nar/gkg563.
Gupta M, Qiu X, Wang L, Xie W, Zhang C, Xiong L, Lian X, Zhang Q. 2008. KT/HAK/KUP potassium transporters gene family and their whole life cycle expression profile in rice (*Oryza sativa*). *Molecular Genetics and Genomics* 280:437–452 DOI 10.1007/s00438-008-0377-7.

Horie T, Sugawara M, Okada T, Taira K, Kaothien-Nakayama P, Katsuhara M, Shinmyo A, Nakayama H. 2011. Rice sodium-insensitive potassium transporter, OsHAK5, confers increased salt tolerance in tobacco BY2 cells. *Journal of bioscience and bioengineering* 111(3):346–356 DOI 10.1016/j.jbiosc.2010.10.014.

Hyun TK, Rim Y, Kim E, Kim JS. 2014. Genome-wide and molecular evolution analyses of the KT/HAK/KUP family in tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L). *Genes & Genomics* 36(3):365–374 DOI 10.1007/s13258-014-0174-0.

Livak KJ, Schmittgen TD. 2001. Analysis of relative gene expression data using real-time quantitative PCR and the 2(-Delta Delta C(T)) Method. *Methods* 25(4):402–408 DOI 10.1006/meth.2001.1262.

Lv S, Nie LL, Fan PX, Wang XC, Dan J, Chen XY, Li YX. 2012. Sodium plays a more important role than potassium and chloride in growth of Salicornia europaea. *Acta Physiologiae Plantarum* 34(2):503–513 DOI 10.1007/s11738-011-0847-0.

Maathuis FJ. 2006. The role of monovalent cation transporters in plant responses to salinity. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 57(5):1137–1147 DOI 10.1093/jxb/erj001.

Mäser P, Thomine S, Schroeder JI, Ward JM, Hirschi K, Sze H, Talke IN, Amtmann A, Maathuis FJ, Sanders D, Harper JF, Tchieu J, Gribskov M, Persans MW, Salt DE, Kim SA, Guerinot ML. 2001. Phylogenetic relationships within cation transporter families of arabidopsis. *Plant Physiology* 126(4):1646–1667 DOI 10.1104/pp.126.4.1646.

Mulder N, Apweiler R. 2007. InterPro and InterProScan: tools for protein sequence classification and comparison. *Methods in Molecular Biology* 396:59–70 DOI 10.1007/978-1-59745-515-2_5.

Munns R, Tester M. 2008. Mechanisms of salinity tolerance. *Annual Review of Plant Biology* 59(1):651–681 DOI 10.1146/annurev.arplant.59.032607.092911.

Nabati J, Kafi M, Nezami A, Moghaddam PR, Mehrjerdi MZ. 2011. Effect of salinity on biomass production and activities of some key enzymatic antioxidants in kochia (kochia scoparia). *Pakistan Journal of Botany* 43(1):539–548 DOI 10.1016/j.tplants.2010.11.004.

Nieves-Cordones M, Ródenas R, Chavanieu A, Rivero RM, Martinez V, Gaillard I, Rubio F. 2016. Uneven HAK/KUP/KT protein diversity among angio-sperms: species distribution and perspectives. *Frontiers in Plant Science* 7(127):1–7 DOI 10.3389/fpls.2016.00127.

Nikalje GC, Srivastava AK, Pandey GK, Suprasanna P. 2018. Halophytes in biosaline agriculture: mechanism, utilization, and value addition. *Land Degradation Development* 29(4):1081–1095 DOI 10.1002/ldr.2819.

Ou W, Mao X, Huang C, Tie W, Yan Y, Ding Z, Wu C, Xia Z, Wang W, Zhou S, Li K, Hu W. 2018. Genome-wide identification and expression analysis of the kup family
under abiotic stress in cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz). *Frontiers in Physiology* 24; 9:17 DOI 10.3389/fphys.2018.00017.

Ozawa T, Jianmei WU, Fujii S. 2007. Effect of inoculation with a strain of *Pseudomonas* pseudoalcaligenes isolated from the endorhizosphere of *Salicornia europea* on salt tolerance of the glasswort. *Soil Science Plant Nutrition* 53(1):12–16 DOI 10.1111/j.1747-0765.2007.00098.x.

Rodríguez-Navarro A. 2000. Potassium transport in fungi and plants. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta* 1469(1):1–30 DOI 10.1016/s0304-4157(99)00013-1.

Rubio F, Guillermo ES, Alonso R. 2010. Cloning of Arabidopsis and barley cDNAs encoding HAK potassium transporters in root and shoot cells. *Physiologia Plantarum* 109(1):34–43 DOI 10.1034/j.1399-3054.2000.100106.x.

Santa-María GE, Oliferuk S, Moriconi JI. 2018. KT-HAK-KUP transporters in major terrestrial photosynthetic organisms: a twenty years tale. *Journal of Plant Physiology* 77–90 DOI 10.1016/j.jplph.2018.04.008.

Song ZZ, Ma RJ, Yu ML. 2015. Genome-wide analysis and identification of KT/HAK/KUP potassium transporter gene family in peach (*Prunus persica*). *Genetics and Molecular Research* 30; 14(1):774–787 DOI 10.4238/2015.

Su H, Golldack D, Zhao C, Bohnert HJ. 2002. The expression of HAK-type K(+) transporters is regulated in response to salinity stress in common ice plant. *Plant Physiology* 129(4):1482–1493 DOI 10.1104/pp.001149.

Takahashi R, Nishio T, Ichizen N, Takano T. 2007a. Cloning and functional analysis of the K(+) transporter, PhaHAK2, from salt-sensitive and salt-tolerant reed plants. *Biotechnology Letters* 29(3):501–506 DOI 10.1007/s10529-006-9246-9.

Takahashi R, Nishio T, Ichizen N, Takano T. 2007b. High-affinity K(+) transporter PhaHAK5 is expressed only in salt-sensitive reed plants and shows Na(+) permeability under NaCl stress. *Plant Cell Reports* 26(9):1673–1679 DOI 10.1007/s00299-007-0364-1.

Tian Y, Wen H, Qi X, Zhang X, Li Y. 2019. Identification of mapk gene family in *Lateolabrax maculatus* and their expression profiles in response to hypoxia and salinity challenges. *Gene* 684:20–29 DOI 10.1016/j.gene.2018.10.033.

Tiika RJ, Wei J, Cui G, Ma Y, Yang H, Duan H. 2021. Transcriptome-wide characterization and functional analysis of Xyloglucan endo -transglycosylase /hydrolase (XTH) gene family of *Salicornia europaea* L. under salinity and drought stress. *BMC Plant Biology* 25; 21(1):491 DOI 10.1186/s12870-021-03269.

Véry AA, Nieves-Cordones M, Daly M, Khan I, Fizames C, Sentenac H. 2014. Molecular biology of K(+) transport across the plant cell membrane:what do we learn from comparison between plant species? *Journal of Plant Physiology* 171(9):748–769 DOI 10.1016/j.jplph.2014.01.011.

Véry AA, Sentenac H. 2003. Molecular mechanisms and regulation of K(+) transport in higher plants. *Annual Review of Plant Biology* 54(1):575–603 DOI 10.1146/annurev.arplant.54.031902.134831.
Wang X, Fan P, Song H, Chen X, Li X, Li Y. 2009. Comparative proteomic analysis of differentially expressed proteins in shoots of Salicornia europaea under different salinity. Journal of Proteome Research 8(7):3331–3345 DOI 10.1021/pr801083a.

Wang Y, Lü J, Chen D, Zhang J, Qi K, Cheng R, Zhang H, Zhang S. 2018. Genome-wide identification, evolution, and expression analysis of the KT/HAK/KUP family in pear. Genome 61(10):755–765 DOI 10.1139/gen-2017-0254.

Xiao X, Ma J, Wang J, Wu X, Li P, Yao Y. 2015. Validation of suitable reference genes for gene expression analysis in the halophyte Salicornia europaea by real-time quantitative PCR. Frontiers in Plant Science 21(5):788 DOI 10.3389/fpls.2014.00788.

Yan L, Peng L, Xie C, Shi X, Dong C, Shen Q. 2018. Genome-wide identification, characterization, and expression analyses of the HAK/KUP/KT potassium transporter gene family reveals their involvement in K⁺ deficient and abiotic stress responses in pear the rootstock seedlings. Plant Growth Regulation 85:187–198 DOI 10.1007/s10725-018-0382-8.

Yang T, Lu X, Wang Y, Xie Y, Ma J, Cheng X, Xia E, Wan X, Zhang Z. 2020. HAK/KUP/KT family potassium transporter genes are involved in potassium deficiency and stress responses in tea plants (Camellia sinensis L.): expression and functional analysis. BMC Genomics 13; 21(1):556 DOI 10.1186/s12864-020-06948-6.

Yang ZM, Wang Y. 2015. Cloning of potassium transporter gene (HcKUP12) from halostachys caspica and its expression profile under salt stress. Plant Science Journal 33(4):499–506 DOI 10.11913/PSJ.2095-0837.2015.40499.

Zhang H, Xiao W, Yu W, Yao L, Li L, Wei J, Li R. 2018. Foxtail millet SiHAK1 excites extreme high-affinity K⁺ uptake to maintain K⁺ homeostasis under low K⁺ or salt stress. Plant Cell Reports 37(11):1533–1546 DOI 10.1007/s00299-018-2325-2.

Zhang Z, Zhang J, Chen Y, Li R, Wang H, Wei J. 2012. Genome-wide analysis and identification of HAK potassium transporter gene family in maize (Zea mays L). Molecular Biology Reports 39(8):8465–8473 DOI 10.1007/s11033-012-1700-2.

Zhou J, Zhou HJ, Chen P, Zhang LL, Zhu JT, Li PF, Yang J, Ke YZ, Zhou YH, Li JN, Du H. 2020. Genome-Wide Survey and Expression Analysis of the KT/HAK/KUP Family in Brassica napus and Its Potential Roles in the Response to K⁺ Deficiency. International journal of molecular sciences 21(24):9487 DOI 10.3390/ijms21249487.