Roles of DgBRC1 in Regulation of Lateral Branching in Chrysanthemum (Dendranthema × grandiflora cv. Jinba)
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Abstract
The diverse plasticity of plant architecture is largely determined by shoot branching. Shoot branching is an event regulated by multiple environmental, developmental and hormonal stimuli through triggering lateral bud response. After perceiving these signals, the lateral buds will respond and make a decision on whether to grow out. TCP transcriptional factors, BRC1/ TBI/FC1, were previously proven to be involved in local inhibition of shoot branching in Arabidopsis, pea, tomato, maize and rice. To investigate the function of BRC1, we isolated the BRC1 homolog from chrysanthemum. There were two transcripts of DgBRC1 coming from two alleles in one locus, both of which complemented the multiple branches phenotype of Arabidopsis brc1-1, indicating that both are functionally conserved. DgBRC1 was mainly expressed in dormant axillary buds, and down-regulated at the bud activation stage, and up-regulated by higher planting densities. DgBRC1 transcripts could respond to apical auxin supply and polar auxin transport. Moreover, we found that the acropetal cytokinin stream promoted branch outgrowth whether or not apical auxin was present. Basipetal cytokinin promoted outgrowth of branches in the absence of apical auxin, while strengthening the inhibitory effects on lower buds in the presence of apical auxin. The influence of auxin and strigolactons (SLs) on the production of cytokinin was investigated, we found that auxin locally down-regulated biosynthesis of cytokinin in nodes, SLs also down-regulated the biosynthesis of cytokinin, the interactions among these phytohormones need further investigation.

Introduction
Branching types of plants have evolved over the history of life to adapt to changing climates or environmental conditions. The two processes mainly involved in the formation of lateral branches are the initiation of axillary meristems (AM) and the outgrowth of branches. During postembryonic development, the shoot apical meristem (SAM) generates the entire aerial part of a plant body [1], which can be divided into several phytomers consisting of leaf, stem segment, and AM [2]. The AMs are initiated from the axes of leaves according to the detached [3] or de novo [4] meristem models; after initiation, the AMs develop into axillary buds. Whether the axillary buds remain dormant or grow out to yield branches is a key decision for branching types of plants which is determined by various environmental and developmental stimuli [5].

During the initiation of AMs, there are at least two pathways involved at different developmental phases. During the vegetative growth phase of Arabidopsis, LAS [6], RAX [7], and ROX [8] are required to initiate AMs. The arabidopsis mutant supershoot (sps) generates several meristems in each leaf axil, which correlates with increased levels of Z-type cytokinins [9].

Another important branching event is the outgrowth of lateral buds. The repression of lateral buds by auxin production in the main shoot is known as apical dominance [10]. Auxin transports basipetally after being synthesized in young leaves, eventually inhibiting branch outgrowth [11,12]. However, auxin has an indirect function in this process, as auxin never enters the axils [12,13]. There are two leading hypotheses explaining this. The second messenger hypothesis is that auxin has been shown to regulate the production of cytokinins or SLs, both of which regulate branches outgrowth in the nodes locally [14,15,16]. However, there are evidences that buds could be activated by the efflux auxin produced in the buds [17,18], moreover, auxin transport capacity in main stem is assumed limited [18], eventually competition of auxin transport between apices and buds leads to apical dominance, which is named as the auxin transportation canalization hypothesis. Both hypotheses are supported by computational model [19,20,21] and experimental evidences [16,22,23,24].

Strigolactones (SLs) are newly defined hormones involved in the inhibition of lateral branching in several species [25,26]. Furthermore, mutants associated with greater branch production have been shown to exhibit deficiencies in SL synthesis or signaling, including the max mutant in Arabidopsis [27,28,29,30], dad mutant in petunia [31,32,33], mu mutant in pea [34,35,36,37], and dwarf mutant in rice [38,39]. The interactions between auxin and SLs in regulation of lateral branching are complicated, SLs may act by dampening auxin transport [18,28,40], or they may act downstream of auxin [16], or be independent from the status of stem auxin [41] to regulate lateral branching. SLs also interacted with auxin and cytokinin in other developmental events such as...
adventitious root formation [42], root-hair elongation [43] or stimulation of secondary growth [44].

In addition to auxin and SLs, cytokinin also plays a role in promoting the outgrowth of branches in nodes locally [45,46,47]. Since auxin and cytokinin could regulate the biosynthesis and signaling of each other, it was proposed that auxin and cytokinin maintain homeostasis during plant development [15,48,49]. The interaction and feedback loop within these phytohormones provide a robust balance for the whole system [41,50,51,52].

After perceiving the endogenous signals or environmental stimuli, the auxillary buds respond and make a decision on whether to grow. A transcription factor known in various species as *teosinte branched1* (*TB1*), *branched1* (*BR1*), or *five clad1* (*FC1*), contains a TCP domain and is regarded as a candidate which can act locally to prevent buds outgrowth in maize [33], rice [54], sorghum [55], tomato [56] and Arabidopsis [5,57]. *TB1* is thought to contribute to the evolution of teosinte to maize, which resulted from a profound increase in apical dominance [53,58]. The functional role of *TB1/BRC1/FC1* is conserved in preventing branch outgrowth in both monocots and dicots, while the *TB1* in maize also plays a role in internode elongation and inflorescence development [5,53]. Moreover, *BRC1* in pea and *FC1* in rice act downstream of the SL pathway, and their functions are essential for SL mediated inhibition of bud outgrowth [59,60]. New evidence has proven that another class 1 HD-Zip transcriptional factor, *GRASSY TILLERS 1*(GTT1), is a local regulator of tillering and consequently influences lateral branching in maize, moreover, the expression of *GT1* was under the control of *tb1* [61].

The branching pattern of ornamental plants determines their esthetic appeal, and hence, their commercial value. Chrysanthemum (*Dendranthema grandiflorum*) is one of the important standard cut flowers, and requires manual decapitation or removal of lateral branches to maintain its architecture, which comprises one-third of the production cost. We previously reported that strigolactones regulates lateral branching in the presence of auxin source in chrysanthemum [40], and that *DgIPT3* isolated from chrysanthemum engages in cytokinin biosynthesis and lateral branching [62]. Other studies provided approaches to control the lateral branching of chrysanthemum, such as the transformation of antisense *DgLSL* [63,64]. The genetic network of branching in chrysanthemum needs further elucidation to provide breeders with new methods to cultivate novel cultivars with ideal traits. Here we build on this understanding by identifying the roles of *DgBRC1* in regulating lateral branching under endogenous and exogenous stimuli. Additional investigations describe the interactions among auxin, cytokinin, and SLs in the regulation of shoot branching.

**Results**

**Apical dominance in chrysanthemum**

While considering the multi-branching nature of chrysanthemum plants, the branching characteristics of chrysanthemum cultivar ‘Jinba’ grown in a greenhouse were recorded during different growth stages. We recorded the length of all buds along the whole plant when the plant heights were 45 cm, 65 cm and 85 cm, respectively. The positions of buds were numbered acropetally, where bud 1 was the lowest bud (Figure S1). All the buds on the 45 cm high plants remained dormant, and started to activate at the lower positions (around buds 21 to 26) when the plants reached 65 cm. Gradually, several active buds elongated and produced branches (around buds 19 to 27 in 85 cm high plants). Interestingly, the lowest buds usually maintained dormancy or expanded by a few leaves without further elongation during the entire growth period. Thus, the activation of axillary buds in chrysanthemum was associated with the developmental status and the distance from the shoot apex, exhibiting the same pattern observed in other species [2]. Additionally, a basipetal elongation of lateral branches was observed during the reproductive phase (Figure S2).

The classic experiment of apical dominance showed that removal of the SAM resulted in the activation of lower AMs and production of lateral branches [10]. For the assays below about decapitation or isolated stem segments, the buds/branches were numbered basipetally where bud 1 was the top bud whose attached leaf expanded to 10 mm below the shoot tip, and the bud 2 was the bud below bud 1. Following decapitation of chrysanthemum, the top three buds elongated. Fifteen days post-decapitation, buds 1 and 2 had the same growth rate and yielded 17 mm branches, whereas buds 4~6 were activated but did not show obvious elongation due to correlative inhibition (Figure S2) [65].

**Isolation of BRC1 homologue from chrysanthemum**

To study the role of *BRC1*-like transcription factors during the development of lateral branches, two cDNA clones contained the TCP domain were isolated from the axils of chrysanthemum leaves. The 1362 bp clone encodes a 335 amino acid protein, and the 1545 bp clone contains an extra 183 bp segment adjacent to the ‘3’ UTR which introduces a stop codon, truncating the protein at 318 amino acids (Figure 1, Figure 2D); these two segments were named as *DgBRC1-1* and *DgBRC1-2*, respectively. In *DgBRC1-2*, only one amino acid is encoded in the un-spliced intron I and then a stop codon occurs (Figure 1). Both copies contain the conserved TCP and R domains, and the ECE motif typical for the CYC/TB1 clade of the TCP family (Figure S3) [5,66]. Two segments were cloned from genomic DNA; one has the same sequence as *DgBRC1-2*, whereas the other has a 49 bp intron (intron II) (Figure 1). Because that these clones were almost identical, even in the 3’ UTR region, so they were alleles from the same locus. As a hexaploid, chrysanthemum is thought to be a hybrid originated from several ancestris such as *D. vestitum*, *D. indicum* and *D. sunkingense* [67], so there may be several alleles with same or different functions in the locus. We performed a phylogenetic analysis with a selected set of class II TCP factors from various plant species to explore the evolutionary relationship among *DgBRC1* genes. The nucleotides sequences coding the conserved TCP domains were aligned and maximum likelihood analyses were performed. As expected, *DgBRC1* belongs to the CYC/ *TB1* clade of the class II TCP family along with other *BRC1*-like genes such as *PsBRC1*, *SlBRC1a*, *SlBRC1b*, and *AIBRC1* (Figure 3), all of which were shown to retain the function of *tb1* in regulating lateral branching [5,65,67,60].

![Figure 1. Structure of the *DgBRC1* genes. Coding sequences are shaded in black, introns in white, 3’ UTR and 3’ UTR in light grey. The two segments isolated from the cDNA were named as *DgBRC1-1* and *DgBRC1-2*. In *DgBRC1-2*, the alternative intron (intron II) is kept (indicated by dark grey box), which ended the protein later. Two copies coming from genomic DNA are shown. The termination codons are indicated by a triangle.](doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0061717.g001)
The basic helix-loop-helix (bHLH) motif of the TCP domain was predicted to promote DNA binding and protein–protein interactions [66,68], and some TCP proteins have been shown to be targeted to the nucleus [5,69,70]. According to our analysis of subcellular localization, DgBRC1-1-GFP localized to nuclei, but DgBRC1-2-GFP was dispersed all over the cells (Figure 2). Compared with DgBRC1-2, DgBRC1-1 has a 17 amino acid tail; we mutated the nucleotides coding these 17 amino acids by inserting 2 nucleotides, resulting in a frameshift mutation (Figure 2D). Interestingly, DgBRC1-1Δ17-GFP still accumulated in nuclei in 20 of 25 cells observed (data not shown), and were widely dispersed in another 5 cells (Figure 2C). To conclude, the peptide in the C-terminal of DgBRC1-1 is partly necessary for nuclear localization, however, the requirements may not be sequence specific.

**DgBRC1 is mainly expressed in dormant axillary buds.**

To investigate the expression pattern of *DgBRC1* during the vegetative phase of chrysanthemum, *DgBRC1* transcripts were
DgBRC1 was mainly expressed in the nodes containing axillary buds, which supported their roles in shoot branching (Figure 4). DgBRC1 was weakly expressed in the stem, leaf, and main shoot, while its expression in root was barely detectable. The highest level of expression was in the first node below the main shoot, and remained high in nodes 2 to 4 (Figure 4). The DgBRC1-1 transcripts levels were also detected in different tissues, whose expression pattern was similar to total DgBRC1 (data not shown).

Functional conservation of the DgBRC1s

To determine whether DgBRC1 is functionally conserved, the DgBRC1 ORFs were overexpressed from the Cauliflower Mosaic Virus 35S promoter (35S::DgBRC1-1, 35S::BRC1-2) in the Arabidopsis WT and brc1-1 mutant. Multiple independent transgenic lines were generated with each construct, and those showing Mendelian segregation patterns 15:1 in T2 lines were taken to homozygosity for detailed analysis. The numbers of rosette and cauline branches with a length of at least 3 mm were scored 10 days post-anthesis (DPA). Figure 5A represents typical lines for each construct with 35S::DgBRC1-1 (35S::DgBRC1-2 lines were similar and not shown). Overexpression of DgBRC1 reduced the number of rosette branches from 7.6 in brc1-1 to 4.5–5.7, which was indistinguishable from wild-type (WT) plants with an average of 4.6 branches (Figure 5B, Table S2). Overexpression of DgBRC1 in WT inhibited the total growth of WT plants, and reduced the number of rosette branches from 4.6 to 1.8–2.1 (Table S2). These results indicated that both variants retain conserved functions of regulating lateral branching.

Accumulation of DgBRC1 transcript is regulated by apical dominance and planting density

To determine whether DgBRC1 transcript levels were sensitive to planting density, chrysanthemum seedlings were planted in 1 or 9 plants per pot (9 cm × 9 cm). No matter in nodes 1+2 or 3+4, the DgBRC1 transcript levels in high density conditions (9 plants per pot) increased significantly compared with...
the lower density (1 plant per pot)(Figure 6B). These results indicated that the shade avoidance response of chrysanthemum correlates with DgBRC1 transcript levels.

Auxin, bud outgrowth and DgBRC1 transcripts

To investigate transcript levels of DgBRC1 regulated by auxin, plant growth regulators (PGR) were applied on two-bud segments including bud 3 and bud 4 cultured in a split-plate system [46]. DgBRC1 transcript analysis was performed on both nodes 3 and 4 following 4 hours of treatment with 5 μM NAA applied apically and 5 μM NPA applied basally; the elongation of branches was recorded 10 days after treatment. In the intact plants, no activation of the buds at nodes 3 or 4 was observed over the course of the experiment, so the growth of branches in intact plants was not shown in Figure 7. Compared with the two-bud segments without any PGR applied (control), 5 μM NAA in the apical media block was found to slightly inhibit the outgrowth of bud 3, and did not alter the growth of bud 4 (Figure 7A, D); the DgBRC1 transcript levels in node 3 and node 4 were restored to the levels in buds of intact plants, which did not correlate with the observed changes in outgrowth of bud 3 and buds 4 (Figure 7G). 5 μM NPA in the basal media block had modest effects on outgrowth of branches (Figure 7A, D) and DgBRC1 transcript levels when compared with the control (Figure 7G). Interestingly, transcription of DgBRC1 in node 3 was higher than in node 4 after NPA application, which could be explained by the inhibition of the PATS by NPA from bud 3 to bud 4.

Cytokinin, bud outgrowth and DgBRC1 transcripts

To investigate the effect of cytokinin on transcripts of DgBRC1, 5 μM synthetic cytokinin Benzylaminopurine (BAP) was added to the apical or basal media blocks. Nodes 3 and 4 were sampled separately 4 hours after PGR treatment, and the elongation of branches were recorded 10 days thereafter. Both apically and basally applied BAP promoted elongation of both buds, especially buds near to the application position (Figure 7B, E). Basally applied BAP on two-bud sections modestly reduce the DgBRC1 transcript levels, while apically applied BAP did not down-regulate transcription of DgBRC1 in both nodes (Figure 7H). These results indicated that cytokinin promoted elongation of lateral branches, but it was not correlated with the transcripts of DgBRC1. DgBRC1 may be regulated post transcriptionally, or there may be other pathways independent of DgBRC1 which can respond to cytokinin.
Antagonism between auxin and cytokinin on lateral branching

To investigate the antagonistic effects of auxin and cytokinin on outgrowth of lateral branches and transcripts of DgBRC1 in chrysanthemum, two assays were designed. Firstly, both 5 μM NAA and BAP were supplied apically; secondly, apical 5 μM NAA and basal 5 μM BAP were supplied simultaneously. Comparing Figure 7F with 7D and 7E, basal cytokinin’s promotion of growth in bud 4 was suppressed a bit by the apical auxin, but apical cytokinin’s promotion of growth of bud 4 was countered by apical auxin. In another way, basal BAP weakened the inhibition by apical auxin, while apical BAP strengthened the inhibition of apical auxin on outgrowth of lateral branches. According to Figure 7I, apical applied auxin did not alter the transcripts of DgBRC1 no matter BAP was applied apically or basally.

Effect of Auxin and Strigolactone on DgiPT3 transcript in nodes

To test the effects of auxin and strigolactone on biosynthesis of cytokinin, transcript levels of DgIPT3 in nodes were investigated 6 hours after application of apical NAA, basal GR24 (a synthetic SL). According to Figure 8, the DgiPT3 transcript levels in two-bud segments (control, as decapitated plants) were enhanced significantly compared with those from intact plant, while DgiPT3 transcript levels were decreased to the level of intact plants when apical NAA was applied (Figure 8). Basal GR24 reduced the DgiPT3 transcript levels compared with the control, especially for node 3, which had DgiPT3 transcript levels significantly different from those of node 4.

To conclude, apical auxin could reduce DgiPT3 transcript levels of in the nodes, implying that auxin reduces the biosynthesis of cytokinin in axillary buds locally. In addition, SLs could also reduce DgiPT3 transcript levels in the nodes.

**Figure 7I.** Apical applied auxin also shares some rare characteristics with transcript levels significantly different from those of node 4.

**Figure 8.** DgiPT3 transcript patterns in nodes 3 and 4 after NAA and GR24 treatments. There were four treatments, including intact plants, control, NAA-A, GR24-B. Plant materials and experiment procedures were prepared as Figure 7. Nodes 3 and node 4 were collected 6 h after treatment for analysis of DgiPT3 transcript levels. Total RNA was subject to quantitative real-time PCR. Results are means of quantitative PCR analyses from three biological replicates, with 10 replicates per treatment. Plant materials and experiment procedures were prepared as Figure 7. Nodes 3 and node 4 were collected 6 h after treatment for analysis of DgiPT3 transcript levels. Total RNA was subject to quantitative real-time PCR. Results are means of quantitative PCR analyses from three biological replicates, with 10 replicates per treatment.

**Discussion**

**Structure of DgBRC1 genes**

The DgBRC1 genes described in this study possessed all the characteristics of TCP family members in other species, such as the TCP domain, R domain, and especially the ECE motif which is contained in the CYC/TB1 clade [75]. TCP genes containing a bHLH motif have been shown to be involved in regulation of plant growth and development [66,68,76]. Two subfamilies of TCP proteins are further subcategorized into class I [68], and class II [53,77,78] based on phylogenetic analyses. The class II TCP proteins could be further divided into two groups: the CINCINNATA (CIN) clade [79] and CYC/TB1 clade [5,80]. In core eudicots, CYC/TB1 has been duplicated twice, generating three subclades: GYC1, GYC2, and GYC3 [75]. The GYC1 subclade mainly functions to regulate lateral branching [5,56,57]. The GYC2 subclade plays a role in determination of flower symmetry [80,81,82]. The function of GYC3 subclade is poorly understood, whereas the long one displayed nuclear localization. Most cells transformed by the mutated DgBRC1-1 in the extra 17 amino acids of the C-terminal still localized in the nuclei. These results indicated that the extra 17 amino acids were necessary for nuclear localization, but the sequence may be not specific.

**Basipetal and acropetal cytokinin regulated lateral branching in different pathways**

There is evidence that xylem cytokinins (mainly tZR type) are transported through the transpiration flow acropetally as long-distance signals, and phloem cytokinins (mainly iP type) are translocated either systemically or basipetally [87]. Xylem cytokinins were supposed to promote sustained outgrowth of lateral branches [21]. In our work, cytokinins supplied in apical or basal medium were supposed to transport in different directions. Both basipetal and acropetal cytokinin promoted the outgrowth of buds 4 when apical auxin was absent, seemed that the correlitive inhibition was released. However, basipetal cytokinin strengthened the inhibition on lower buds manipulated by apical NAA, which was similar to results in other plants [46,88,89,90,91,92], while acropetal cytokinin weakened the repression of auxin on buds outgrowth. Basipetal and acropetal cytokinin also played different roles in regulation of DgBRC1 transcripts in short term. In consequence, cytokinins from different directions or sources may be involved in different pathways.

**Roles of DgBRC1 in regulation of lateral branches**

**BRC1** loss-of-function mutants yielded multiple branches in various plant species [5,53,54,56,57,60], and transcripts of BRC1 were down-regulated upon release of apical dominance; furthermore, BRC1 has been shown to respond to other hormonal or environmental stimuli [5,57]. A strong correlation between bud
repression and expression of \textit{BRC1} genes has been proposed \cite{93}; therefore, \textit{BRC1} was thought to be an integrator of branching signals which could control the outgrowth of lateral branches \cite{5}.

In our work, \textit{DgBRC1} transcripts responded rapidly to the release of apical dominance by decapitation, in addition, 4 hours after auxin was applied to the stem segments apically, transcripts level of \textit{DgBRC1} returned to the level of intact plants. These results indicated that \textit{DgBRC1} transcripts were related with auxin regulation of buds outgrowth in short term. In another aspect, \textit{DgBRC1} transcripts were higher in high planting density, which indicated that \textit{DgBRC1} was also related with shade avoidance syndrome. However, \textit{DgBRC1} transcripts could not respond to cytokinin applied apically or basally at least in short term. Results from other studies suggest that, more branches were generated when pea \textit{brc1} mutants were decapitated or supplied with BAP, which indicated that \textit{BRC1}-independent pathways could control the outgrowth of branches \cite{60}. Furthermore, transcripts of \textit{FC1} remained high in active buds of a rice strigolactone mutant \cite{38}, and \textit{S/OIPT1} transcripts did not increase when strong buds arrest was caused by defoliation \cite{94}. In conclusion, \textit{BRC1} may be not sufficient or necessary for outgrowth of lateral branches.

\textbf{Auxin regulates cytokinin biosynthesis in nodes locally}

Concentration of cytokinin in xylem exudates or axillary buds increased after decapitation \cite{48,95,96,97}, and auxin could regulate the biosynthesis of cytokinin, which makes cytokinin a good candidate as the second messenger of auxin \cite{15,48}. Two hypotheses have been proposed regarding the sites at which auxin effects cytokinin biosynthesis. Since root is the main place of cytokinin synthesis, it was supposed that auxin effects cytokinin biosynthesis in root, followed by cytokinin transport into axillary buds through xylem. To support this, transcripts of \textit{IPT3} and 7 in root were reduced by NAA incubation \cite{98}; the biosynthesis of cytokinin was iPMP dependent in roots of Arabidopsis and tobacco, which could be down-regulated by auxin \cite{15}. However, there is other evidence suggesting that the cytokinin promoting axillary bud outgrowth after decapitation was locally biosynthesized in the nodal stems rather than in the roots \cite{48}. After decapitation, \textit{PsIPT1} and 2 transcripts of in nodal stems increased dramatically, but transcripts in axillary buds remained unaffected \cite{48}. In rice, expression of \textit{OsIPT2, 4, 7} and 8 in the shoot apex (containing the SAM, axillary buds, young leaves and nodes) were clearly suppressed within 3 h following auxin treatment \cite{59}. Here we showed that \textit{DgIPT3} transcripts in nodes were up-regulated after decapitation, and dropped back to the levels of intact plants when auxin was applied apically on decapitated plants, which indicates that auxin could regulate the biosynthesis of cytokinin in nodes locally.

\textbf{The interactions among auxin, cytokinin, and SLs}

Since the mutants of SLs production and signaling were investigated and then the characteristic of SLs was revealed \cite{25,26}, SLs appear to be involved in optimizing several plants growing and developmental events in lower and higher plants \cite{42,43,44,99}. During these events, SLs were found to be interacted with other hormone to balance the homeostasis of plants \cite{42,43,44,99}. In the events of lateral branching, the interactions between SLs and auxin were complicated, for example, SLs was supposed to regulate shoot branching by dampening auxin transport, which is supported by direct evidence that GR24 inhibited branching only in the presence of auxin in the main stem in Arabidopsis and chrysanthemum \cite{23,40}, and PIN1 accumulation in xylem parenchyma cells was reduced by GR24 \cite{18,23}; other evidences indicated that, SLs acted as a second messenger to repress shoot branching \cite{16}, and SLs could repress lateral branching directly without requirement of apical auxin \cite{16,99}.

Auxin and cytokinin were shown to play antagonistic roles in regulation of shoot branching. Auxin could inhibit the biosynthesis of cytokinin in root \cite{15,93} or stem \cite{48}, in our work auxin inhibited cytokinin biosynthesis in nodes, which was supposed to be more fast and effective to regulate lateral branching. Furthermore, cytokinin could regulate the biosynthesis of auxin \cite{50}, and phloem cytokinin could modulate the polar transport of auxin \cite{100}. A homeostasis feedback loop via auxin and cytokinin biosynthesis, transports, and signaling is thought to regulate several important developmental events \cite{46,90}.

There has been no direct evidence about the interactions between SLs and cytokinin. In our study, when GR24 was applied basally in stem segments, the \textit{DgIPT3} transcripts levels were reduced in nodes compared with stem segments without any hormone supplied, which suggested that SLs may inhibit the biosynthesis of cytokinin. Interestingly, \textit{DgIPT3} transcripts level in node 3 was much lower than node 4, which may be explained as that SLs dampened the transport of auxin from node 3, and the accumulation of auxin further repressed the biosynthesis of cytokinin. In addition, auxin could inhibit the biosynthesis of SLs in stems \cite{101}, so it is equally possible that auxin induces SLs to repress cytokinins biosynthesis in our work. Therefore, auxin and SLs could be in a dynamic feedback loop to regulate cytokinin biosynthesis and to control lateral branching. From the above, auxin, cytokinin and SLs are in a dynamic feedback loop, and further studies are needed to reveal this network in regulation of branching.

\textbf{Materials and Methods}

\textbf{Plant materials and growth condition}

Chrysanthemum (\textit{Dendranthema grandiflorum} cv. Jinba) plantlets were propagated under sterile conditions in jars containing MS agar medium \cite{102}, and then grown in tissue culture room at 24°C with a photoperiod of 16/8 h light/dark and a light intensity of 100–120 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\). For the apical dominance characterization assay, plants were transferred to pots (9 cm×9 cm×9 cm) containing peat soil and vermiculite (1:1) in a green house at 24°C, with a photoperiod of 16/8 h light/dark. For the planting density assay, seedlings were cultured with 1 plant per pot, or 9 plants per pot. Seeds of \textit{Arabidopsis thaliana} Col-0 (WT) and \textit{brc1-1} were stratified for 3 d at 4°C, and then sown in cells containing peat soil and vermiculite (1:1); they were transferred to a chamber at 22°C with a photoperiod of 16/8 h light/dark.

\textbf{RNA extraction and gene isolation}

Total RNA was extracted from nodes with TRIzol Reagent (Invitrogen, 15596-026); cDNA synthesis was performed using SuperScript II reverse transcriptase (Invitrogen, 18064-022). Chrysanthemum TCP domain factors were amplified from cDNA prepared from nodes using PCR with two different pairs of degenerate primers (Table S3). After amplification of a fragment containing a partially conserved TCP and R domain, full-length cDNA of \textit{DgBRC1} was elongated by 5’ and 3’ Rapid Amplification of cDNA Ends (RACE) PCR. Complete \textit{DgBRC1} from both cDNA and genomic DNA were cloned with primers specific to the 5’UTR and 3’UTR. Amplified fragments were cloned into the pMD18-T vector (Takara, D101A) and sequenced. Genomic DNA was extracted from young leaves using the CTAB method.
Sequence Alignment and Phylogenetic analyses

DNA Sequences from the start of the TCP domain to the end of the R domain were aligned with ClustalW2 (http://www.ebi.ac.uk/Tools/msa/clustalw2/) using default parameters [103], and visualized with GeneDoc [104]. During phylogenetic analyses, TCP domain-coding DNA sequences were aligned with MUSCLE (http://www.ebi.ac.uk/Tools/msa/muscle/) using default parameters [103]. The test for best nucleotide substitution evolutionary model was done with jMODELTEST [105,106]. The best fit model (Akaike Information Criteria selection) was GTR+I+G (parameter for gamma distribution = 1.0913). Maximum likelihood (ML) tree reconstruction with the best model and 100 bootstrap pseudoreplicates was run in MEGA 5 [106,107]. Plants species and accession numbers are listed in Table S1.

Mutagenesis of DgBRC1-1

Mutagenesis through PCR-driven overlap extension of DgBRC1-1 was performed as previously described [108]. The nucleotides encoding the extra 17 amino acids in C-terminal of DgBRC1-1 were frameshifted, and then cloned into pEZS-NL for further use in subcellular localization observations.

Subcellular localization

For construction of the 3xS::DgBRC1-GFP reporter plasmids, the ORFs of DgBRC1-1 and DgBRC1-2 were each cloned into binary vector pEZS-NL, and then cloned into DgBRC1-1 were frameshifted, and then cloned into pEZS-NL for further use in subcellular localization observations.

Generation of transgenic plants

For complementation experiments, the ORFs of DgBRC1-1 and DgBRC1-2 were each cloned into binary vector pBI121, fusing them with the 35S promoter. The resulting constructs were transformed into Arabidopsis thaliana mutant brc1 plants via Agrobacterium tumefaciens strain LBA4404 using the floral dip method [110,111]. Independent transformatns were screened on MS medium containing 50 mg l⁻¹ kanamycin. Independent homozygous T3 lines with single insertion sites were used for the branching phenotype analysis.

Split-plate and two-bud section system

The split-plate system was modified according to [46]. We used 30 ml MS medium for each 9 cm petri dish; after solidification, a 10 mm wide strip of the medium was removed from the centre of the plate. The volume of the media block remaining on each side was about 12.5 ml; 25 μl of 2.5 mM stock solutions containing various compounds were injected into one or both sides of the media blocks with a micro-pipette, and then the PGR concentration was dissolved 1:4 with water, and quantitative PCR was performed in 20 μl reactions with SYBR® Premix Ex Taq™ II (Takara, DRR081A) and the Applied Biosystems 7500 real-time PCR system according to the manufacturer’s instructions. Ct values were obtained with the 7500 Systems SDS software 2.0.1 (Applied Biosystems). A standard curve for each target gene was generated using a dilution series of known concentrations of plasmid vectors containing target genes and measured by the same quantitative PCR process. Target Ct values were converted to absolute transcript numbers per reaction, and normalized to 18S rRNA transcript levels. Three biological replicates were measured for each treatment, and each replicate represented the RNA extracted from a pool of 10 buds. Primer sets are given in Table S3. The primers for total DgBRC1 transcripts analysis were picked from the same part of DgBRC1-1 and DgBRC1-2, while the sense or antisense primers for DgBRC1-1 were selected exactly in the position where intron I was spliced.

Statistics

ANOVA followed by a Duncan’s test (for more than two comparisons) or a t test (two comparisons) was used (SPSS 18.0) where differences between means were assessed and significance was determined at α=0.05.

Supporting Information

Figure S1 The length of all lateral branches in chrysanthemum plants of 45 cm, 65 cm, and 85 cm height. Position of branches was recorded acropetally. Data were means ± SE; n=20. (TIF)

Figure S2 Elongation of branches after decapitation (A) and flowering transition (B). (A) Overall height of the top 10 branches 15 days after decapitation during vegetative period. (B) Length of flowering branches 15 days after flowering transition. Position of branches indicates branches which were numbered and recorded basipetally. Statistical comparisons were made within the length of intact and decapitated branches; asterisks indicate significant differences between branches at α=0.05. Data are means ± SE, n=11 to 16. (TIF)

Figure S3 Conserved TCP, R and ECE domains in DgBRC1 and other CYP proteins. Alignment of the sequence encoding TCP domain to the R domain is presented. Identical amino acids are in black and amino acids with similar properties
are in grey. The regions typical of TCP domain Basic-Helix-I-Loop-Helix II are indicated. Dots denote the putative variable length of Helix II. The R domain and ECE domains present in the VC1 suballele are indicated by red boxes. Sequences were aligned with Chalhoub2 [91] and represented with Genedoc [91].

(TIF)

Figure S4 Split plate system, and nodal sections including bud 3 and bud 4 for PGR treatment. (TIF)

Table S1 Species and their corresponding accession numbers used to construct the phylogenetic tree. (DOC)

References

1. Lauti P, Grandjean O, Jonak C, Kuš K, Traa J (1998) Cellular Parameters of the Shoot Apical Meristem in Arabidopsis. The Plant Cell Online 10: 1357–1360.
2. McNeen P, Leyer O (2005) Shoot Branching. Annual Review of Plant Biology 56: 353–374.
3. Garrison R (1955) Studies in the Development of Axillary Buds. American Journal of Botany 42: 257–266.
4. Mary Snow RS (1942) The Determination of Axillary Buds. New Phytologist 41: 13–22.
5. Aguilar-Martinez JA, Poza-Carrion C, Cubas P (2007) Arabidopsis BRANCH1/2 Acts as an Integrator of Branching Signals within Auxin Buds. The Plant Cell Online 19: 458–472.
6. Greb T, Clarero O, Schäfer E, Muller D, Herrero R, et al. (2005) Molecular analysis of the LATERAL SUPPRESSOR gene in Arabidopsis reveals a conserved control mechanism for axillary meristem formation. Genes & Development 17: 1175–1187.
7. Muller D (2008) Blind Homologous R2R3 Myb Genes Control the Pattern of Lateral Meristem Initiation in Arabidopsis. The Plant Cell Online 18: 590–597.
8. Yang F, Wang Q, Schmitz G, Muller D, Theres K (2012) The bHLH protein ROX acts in concert with RAX1 and LAS to modulate axillary meristem formation in Arabidopsis. The Plant Journal 71: 61–70.
9. Tanimukajana T (2001) Control of axillary bud initiation and shoot architecture in Arabidopsis through the SUPERSHOOT gene. Genes & Development 15: 1577–1588.
10. Thümml K, Kooq F (1933) Studies on the Growth Hormone of Plants. III. The Inhibiting Action of the Growth Substance on Bud Development. Proceedings of the National Academy of the Sciences of the United States of America 19: 714–716.
11. Goldsmith M (1977) The Polar Transport of Auxin. Annual Review of Plant Physiology 28: 479–498.
12. Booker J, Chatfield S, Leyer O (2003) Auxin Acts in Xylem-Associated or Medullary Cells to Mediate Apical Dominance. The Plant Cell Online 15: 495–507.
13. Hillman JR, Math VB, Mellow GC (1977) Apical dominance and the levels of indole acetic acid in Phaseolus laterals buds. Plants 134: 191–193.
14. Efted S, Åstot C, Blackwell J, Moritz T, Olson O, et al. (1997) Auxin-Cytokinrin Interactions in Wild-Type and Transgenic Tobacco. Plant and Cell Physiology 38: 225–237.
15. Nordstrom A, Tarkowski P, Tarkowska D, Norback R, Åstot C, et al. (2004) Auxin regulation of cytokinin biosynthesis in Arabidopsis thaliana: A factor of potential importance for auxin-cytokinrin-regulated development. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 101: 8039–8044.
16. Brewer PB, Dun EA, Ferguson BJ, Rameau C, Beveridge CA (2009) Stigmasterone Acts Downstream of Auxin to Regulate Bud Outgrowth in Pea and Arabidopsis. Plant Physiology 150: 482–493.
17. Li C-J, Bangerth F (1999) Autoinhibition of indoleacetic acid transport in the shoots of two-branched pea (Pisum sativum) plants and its relationship to correlative dominance. Physiologia Plantarum 106: 415–420.
18. Bennett T, Sieberer T, Willett B, Booker J, Lauschig C, et al. (2006) The Arabidopsis MAX Pathway Controls Shoot Branching by Regulating Auxin Transport. Current Biology 16: 553–560.
19. Pruniniewicz P, Crawford S, Smith RS, Ljung K, Bennett T, et al. (2009) Control of bud activation by an auxin transport switch. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 106: 17431–17436.
20. Reuton M, Hanan J, Ferguson BJ, Beveridge CA (2012) Models of long-distance transport: how is carrier-dependent auxin transport regulated in the stem? New Phytologist 194: 704–715.
21. Dun EA, Hanan J, Beveridge CA (2009) Computational Modeling and Molecular Physiology Experiments Reveal New Insights into Shoot Branching in Pea. The Plant Cell Online 21: 3459–3472.
22. Balla J, Kaloupek P, Reinöhl V, Friml J, Procházková S (2011) Competitive canalization of PIN-dependent auxin flow from axillary buds controls pea bud outgrowth. The Plant Journal 65: 571–577.
23. Crawford S, Shinohara N, Sieberer T, Williamson L, George G, et al. (2010) Stigmasterone enhance competition between shoot branches by dampening auxin transport. Development 137: 2905–2913.
24. Dun EA, de Saint Germain A, Rameau C, Beveridge CA (2013) Dynamics of Strigolactone Function and Shoot Branching Responses in Pismum sativum. Molecular Plant 6: 129–140.
25. Gomez-Roldán V, Femas S, Brewer PB, Puch-Puechs V, Dun EA, et al. (2008) Strigolactone inhibition of shoot branching. Nature 455: 189–194.
26. Umehara M, Hanada A, Yoshida S, Akiyama K, Arite T, et al. (2008) Inhibition of shoot branching by new terpenoid plant hormones. Nature 455: 195–200.
27. Stürberg P, Furon J, Ottoline Leyer HM (2007) MAX2 participates in a SCF complex which acts locally at the node to suppress shoot branching. The Plant Journal 50: 80–94.
28. Stürberg P, van de Sande K, Leyer HM (2002) MAX1 and MAX2 control shoot lateral branching in Arabidopsis. Development 129: 1131–1141.
29. Booker J, Aldridge M, Wills S, McCarty D, Klee H, et al. (2004) MAX3/CCD7 Is a Carotenoid Cleavage Dioxygenase Required for the Synthesis of a Novel Plant Signalising Molecule. Current Biology 14: 1232–1238.
30. Booker J, Sieberer T, Wright W, Williamson L, Willett B, et al. (2005) MAX1 Encodes a Cytochrome P450 Family Member that Acts Downstream of MAX3/4 to Produce a Carotenoid-Derived Branch-Inhibiting Hormone. Developmental Cell 8: 443–449.
31. Simons JL, Napoli CA, Janssen BJ, Plummer KM, Snowden KC (2007) Analysis of the DECREASED APICAL DOMINANCE Genes of Petunia in the Control of Axillary Branching. Plant Physiology 143: 697–706.
32. Snowden KC, Simkin AJ, Janssen BJ, Templeton KR, Loucas HM, et al. (2005) The Decreased apical dominance1/Petunia hybrida CAROTENOID CLEAVAGE DIOXYGENASE5 Gene Affects Branch Production and Plays a Role in Leaf Senescence, Root Growth, and Flower Development. The Plant Cell Online 17: 756–775.
33. Drummond RSM, Martínez-Sánchez NM, Janssen BJ, Templeton KR, Simons JL, et al. (2009) Petunia hybrid CAROTENOID CLEAVAGE DIOXYGENASE7 Is Involved in the Production of Negative and Positive Branching Signals in Petunia. Plant Physiology 151: 1867–1877.
34. Sorefan K, Booker J, Haurogne O, Goussot M, Bainbridge K, et al. (2003) MAX3 and RMs1 are orthologous dioxygenase-like genes that regulate shoot branching in Arabidopsis and pea. Genes & Development 17: 1469–1474.
35. Beveridge CA, Ross JJ, Murlit RC (1996) Branching in Pea (Action of Genes Rms3 and Rms4). Plant Physiology 110: 859–865.
36. Beveridge CA, Symons GM, Murfet IG, Ross JJ, Rameau C (1997) The rms1 Mutant of Pea Has Elevated Indole-3-Acetic Acid Levels and Reduced Root-Sap Zeatin Riboside Content but Increased Branching Controlled by Graft-Transmissible Signals. Plant Physiology 113: 1251–1258.
37. Foo L, Turnbull CGN, Beveridge CA (2001) Long-Distance Signaling and the Control of Branching in the rms1 Mutant of Pea. Plant Physiology 126: 203–209.
38. Arite T, Umehara M, Ishikawa K, Markawa M, Nakajima M, et al. (2007) DWARF10, an RMS1/MAX4/DAD1 ortholog, controls lateral bud outgrowth in rice. The Plant Journal 51: 1019–1029.
39. Arite T, Umehara M, Ishikawa K, Hanada A, Markawa M, et al. (2009) d14, a Strigolactone-Insensitive Mutant of Rice, Shows an Accelerated Outgrowth of Tillers. Plant and Cell Physiology 50: 1416–1424.
40. Liang J, Zhao L, Challis R, Leyer O (2010) Strigolactone regulation of shoot branching in chrysanthemum (Dendranthema grandiflorum). Journal of Experimental Botany 61: 3069–3078.
41. Ferguson BJ, Beveridge CA (2009) Roles for Auxin, Cytokinrin, and Strigolactone in Regulating Shoot Branching. Plant Physiology 149: 1929–1944.
42. Rasmussen A, Maon M, De Cooper C, Brewer PB, Herold S, et al. (2012) Strigolactones suppress adventitious rooting in Arabidopsis and pea. Plant Physiology.
Strigolactones: discovery of the elusive shoot branching hormone. Trends in Plant Science 14: 364–372.

Domagalska MA, Leyser O (2011) Signal integration in the control of shoot branching. Nature 477: 370–377.

Ongaro V, Leyser O (2007) Hormonal control of shoot branching. Journal of Experimental Botany 58: 1001–1007.

Kebrom TH, Burson BL, Finlayson SA (2006) Phytochrome B Represses the LjCYC1 gene in Lotus japonicus. Journal of Plant Physiology 163: 351–355.

Finlayson SA (2007) Arabidopsis TEOSINTE BRANCHED1-LIKE 1 (TeB1-1) Regulates Auxillary Bud Outgrowth and is Homologous to Monocot TEOSINTE BRANCHED1. Plant and Cell Physiology 48: 667–677.

Doebley J, Stec A, Gustus C (1995) teosinte branched1 and the Origin of Maize: Evidence for Epistasis and the Evolution of Dominance. Genetics 141: 333–346.

Minakuchi K, Kamiryo H, Yasuno M, Umehara M, Ito L, et al. (2010) FINE CULM (FC1) Works Downstream of Strigolactones to Inhibit the Outgrowth of Auxillary Buds in Rice. Plant and Cell Physiology 51: 1127–1135.

Whipple CJ, Kebrom TH, Weber AL, Yang F, and Hall D (2011) grasy tillers1 promotes apical dominance in maize and responds to shade signals in the grasses. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 108: 19787–19792.

Jiang B, Miao H, Chen S, Zhang S, Chen F, et al. (2009) The Lateral Suppressor-Like Gene, DcLb, Alters Auxillary Branching to Transgenify Chrysanthemum (Chrysanthemum ×morifolium) by Mediating IAA and GA Content. Plant Molecular Biology Reporter 28: 144–151.

Han B, Sui H, Lee S, Shin H, Lim Y (2007) Selection of non-branching lines induced by introducing Ls-like cDNA into Chrysanthemum (Dendranthema morifolium) ‘Shuho-no-chikara’. Scientia Horticulturae 111: 729–734.

Keroule OA, Tomlinson ML, Leader D, Shaw P, Doonan JH (2005) High-throughput protein localization in Arabidopsis using Agrobacterium-mediated transient expression of GFP-fusions. The Plant Journal 41: 162–174.

Kudo T, Kiha T, Sakakibara H (2010) Metabolism and Long-distance Translocation of Cytokinins. Journal of Integrative Plant Biology 52: 53–60.

Ali A, Fletcher RA (1971) Hormonal interaction in controlling apical dominance in soybeans. Canadian Journal of Botany 49: 172–173.

Davis CR, Seth A, Waring PF (1966) Auxin and Kinetin Interaction in Apical Dominance. Science 153: 468–469.

Wickson M, Thimann KV (1958) The Antagonism of Auxin and Kinetin in Plants. Plant Physiology 33: 400–412.

Shein T, Jackson DI (1972) Interaction between Hormones, Light, and Nutrition on Extension of Lateral Buds in Phaseolus vulgaris L. Annals of Botany 36: 791–800.

Kalousch P, Bichotova D, Balla J, Reinhold V, Prochaska S (2010) Cytokinins and polar transport of auxin in auxillary pea buds. ACTA UNIVERSITATIS AGRICULTARUM ET SILVICULTURAE MENDELIANAE BRUNENSIS 59: 79–80.

Müller D, Leyser O (2011) Auxin, cytokinin and the control of shoot branching. Annales of Botany 107: 1203–1212.

Kebrom TH, Brunell TP, Hays DB, Finlayson SA (2010) Vegetative auxillary bud dormancy induced by shade and defoliation signals in the grasses. Plant Signaling & Behavior 5: 317–320.

Bangerter F (1994) Response of cytokinin concentration in the xylem exudate of bean (Phaseolus vulgaris L.) plants to decapitation and auxin treatment, and relationship to apical dominance. Planta 194: 439–442.

Turnbull CGN, Raymond MAA, Dodd EG, Morris SE (1997) Rapid increases in cytokinin concentration in lateral buds of chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.) during release of apical dominance. Planta 202: 271–276.

Morris DA, Winfield PJ (1972) Kinetin Transport to Axillary Buds of Dwarf Pea (Pisum sativum L.). Journal of Experimental Botany 23: 346–354.

Ando S, Asano T, Tsushima S, Kamachi S, Hagio T, et al. (2005) Changes in GA Content. Plant Molecular Biology Reporter 28: 144–151.

Amor S, Renny S, Diamande G, Le Vern Y, Rasschaert D, et al. (2010) Alternative-spliced and non-coding regulatory elements mediate transcription of root genes in plants. Nucleic Acids Research 34: 6147–6157.

Casal JJ, Sanchez RA, Deregibus VA (1986) The effect of plant density on the expression of the rice proliferating cell nuclear antigen gene. The Plant Cell Online 9: 1607–1619.

Muñoz-Dorado J, Dominguez S, Rodriguez-Buey ML, et al. (2010) TCP domain transcription factor controls flower type specification along the floral axis in Antirrhinum. Nature 465: 257–259.

Karlof RM, Nicholas HB, Deerfield DW (1997) GeneDoc: analysis and visualization of genetic variation. EMERGE NEWS 4: 14–15.

Posada D (2008) ModelTest: Phylogenetic Model Averaging. Molecular Biology and Evolution 25: 1253–1256.
106. Guindon S, Gascuel O (2003) A Simple, Fast, and Accurate Algorithm to Estimate Large Phylogenies by Maximum Likelihood. Systematic Biology 52: 696–704.

107. Tamura K, Peterson D, Peterson N, Stecher G, Nei M, et al. (2011) MEGA5: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis using Maximum Likelihood, Evolutionary Distance, and Maximum Parsimony Methods. Molecular Biology and Evolution 28: 2731–2739.

108. Ho SN, Hunt HD, Horton RM, Pullen JK, Pease LR (1989) Site-directed mutagenesis by overlap extension using the polymerase chain reaction. Gene 77: 51–59.

109. Varagona MJ, Schmidt RJ, Raikhel NV (1992) Nuclear Localization Signal(s) Required for Nuclear Targeting of the Maize Regulatory Protein Opaque-2. The Plant Cell Online 4: 1213–1227.

110. Clough SJ, Bent AF (1998) Floral dip: a simplified method for Agrobacterium-mediated transformation of Arabidopsis thaliana. The Plant Journal 16: 735–743.

111. Zhang X, Henriques R, Lin S-S, Niu Q-W, Chua N-H (2006) Agrobacterium-mediated transformation of Arabidopsis thaliana using the floral dip method. Nat Protocols 1: 641–646.