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Cell Death in Cells Overlying Lateral Root Primordia Facilitates Organ Growth in Arabidopsis

Highlights
- Growth of lateral root primordia (LRP) coincides with cell death gene expression
- A subset of LRP-overlying cells expresses cell death genes and dies upon LRP growth
- ore1 mutants deficient in LRP-overlying cell death show delayed LRP growth
- Rescuing cell death in ore1 via genetics or laser ablation rescues LRP growth

In Brief
Escamez et al. report that a subset of cells overlying newly formed lateral roots within the parent root dies to facilitate early lateral root organ growth. Our findings suggest that, contrary to common belief, cell death can, as in animals, regulate organ growth in plants, which may have implications for our understanding of evolution.
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SUMMARY

Plant organ growth is widely accepted to be determined by cell division and cell expansion, but, unlike that in animals, the contribution of cell elimination has rarely been recognized. We investigated this paradigm during Arabidopsis lateral root formation, when the lateral root primordia (LRP) must traverse three overlying cell layers within the parent root. A subset of LRP-overlying cells displayed the induction of marker genes for cell types undergoing developmental cell death, and their cell death was detected by electron, confocal, and light sheet microscopy techniques. LRP growth was delayed in cell-death-deficient mutants lacking the positive cell death regulator ORESARA1/ANAC092 (ORE1). LRP growth was restored in ore1-2 knockout plants by genetically inducing cell elimination in cells overlying the LRP or by physically killing LRP-overlying cells by ablation with optical tweezers. Our results support that, in addition to previously discovered mechanisms, cell elimination contributes to regulating lateral root emergence.

INTRODUCTION

In contrast to that in animals [1], cell elimination is generally considered not to play a role in regulating plant organ growth [2–4]. Cell elimination occurs frequently as part of plant development in a genetically controlled manner often referred to as programmed cell death (PCD) [5, 6], as evidenced by the expression of a particular set of genes specifically in cells that are bound to undergo developmental cell elimination [7]. Cell death and the subsequent cell degradation are usually considered cell autonomous, as during the formation of water-conducting xylem tracheary elements (TEs) [8] or the elimination of lateral root cap cells that surround the root tip and regulate root growth [9]. Nevertheless, developmentally regulated cell elimination can also rely on non-cell-autonomous mechanisms [10], as in the Arabidopsis endosperm, where the core developmental cell death indicator genes [7] are induced, but where cell death itself is caused by pressure from the growing embryo into the location of the endosperm [11]. The fact that different mechanisms have been co-opted to control developmental cell elimination supports that cell elimination plays several crucial roles during development, suggesting a more prominent role during plant organ growth than previously thought.

Morphological features of cell death have been observed in several species in cells overlying the sites of lateral root (LR) formation within existing roots [12–15]. The lateral roots are initiated from a subset of pericycle cells that form the LR primordium (LRP) deep in the parent organ [16, 17]. The developing LRP must therefore traverse the overlying endodermal, cortical, and epidermal cell layers for LR emergence (LRE) to occur. LRE has been shown to rely on cell divisions and turgor-driven expansion in the LRP [16, 18], as well as on changes in the cell walls and shapes of the LRP-overlying cells [18–24]. Cell death is not believed to occur during LRE in Arabidopsis [25, 26], and the cell death reported in the LRP-overlying cells of other species [12–15] has not been studied in relation to LRP growth, leaving open the question of whether cell death contributes to LRE.

In Arabidopsis, the most dramatic changes reported during LRE occur in the LRP-overlying endodermal cells due to their position in immediate contact with the LRP and the presence of their lignified casparian strip cell wall region. In front of the growing LRP, endodermal cells modify their shape to such an extent that they occasionally split, with both halves having the ability to maintain plasma membrane integrity at least for some time [23]. The cortical and epidermal cells are less affected, as their cell walls are loosened by hydrolytic enzymes so that they can separate to allow the emerging LRP to pass through [19, 26]. There is no report of cell death during LRE in Arabidopsis, suggesting that the remodeling and separation of the LRP-overlying cells are sufficient to ensure LRE without any contribution from cell death. However, cysteine proteases associated with cell death and autolysis are expressed in LRP-overlying cells [27], supporting the occurrence of cell death during LRE in Arabidopsis.
The present study investigates whether cell death occurs in the LRP-overlying cells during LRE in Arabidopsis, and if so, whether it contributes to LRP growth. We detected the expression of several canonical marker genes for developmental cell death [7] in a subset of LRP-overlying cells. Electron microscopy revealed the autolytic features indicative of cell death in endodermal cells overlying early-stage LRPs. Combined viability and cell death stains also indicated the presence of dead LRP-overlying cells before the LRP had crossed any overlying cell layers. Live cell imaging by confocal and light sheet microscopy confirmed that cell death occurred in a subset of the LRP-overlying endodermal cells, concomitant with the growth of the LRP through the endodermis. Plants unable to express ORESARA1/ANAC092 (ORE1), a transcription factor contributing to the transcriptional activation of several cell death-related genes [28], displayed the decreased cell death of LRP-overlying cells as well as a delay in LRE. When cell death was restored in the overlying cells of these plants by either expressing the mammalian cell death-promoting factor mBAX [29–31] or using laser-assisted targeted cell elimination (hereafter called laser ablation) inspired by previous studies [32–35], LRP growth reverted to normal, indicating that cell elimination contributes to the regulation of organ growth during LRE.

RESULTS

Cell Death Indicator Genes Are Induced in Cells Overlying LRP

In a time-course transcriptomics dataset covering various stages of LRP growth [36], we detected the upregulation of BIFUNCTIONAL NUCLEASE 1 (BFN1), which functions in cell autolysis associated with developmental cell death [9] (Table S1). Several other genes belonging to the set of transcriptional reporters for cell types undergoing developmental cell death and autolysis [7] were identified among the genes most correlated with BFN1 in the LRE transcriptome. Among them, METACASPASE 9 (MC9), RIBONUCLEASE 3 (RNS3), EXITUS 1 (EXIT1) and DUF679 DOMAIN MEMBRANE PROTEIN 4 (DMP4), together with BFN1, represent five of the nine core marker genes specifically expressed in cell types undergoing developmental cell death in Arabidopsis [7] and are hereafter referred to as “cell death indicator genes” (Figure 1A; Table S1). Using promoter::GUS reporter lines, we also detected the activation of the promotors of these cell death indicator genes in LRP-overlying cells at different stages of LRP growth (Figure 1B), defined according to Malamy and Benfey [16].

A more detailed time-lapse confocal microscopy analysis of a proBFN1::nucGFP reporter line [37] carrying the proUBQ10::WAVE131::YFP plasma membrane marker [38] indicated BFN1 promoter activity in an endodermal cell overlying an early-stage LRP and revealed the apparent loss of nuclear integrity at stage III (Figure 1C). Overall, for 381 observed LRP, induction of the proBFN1::nucGFP reporter was detected in at least 1 LRP-adjacent cell (i.e., overlying the LRP during early stages of LRP growth or neighboring the LRP in late stages of growth) 53.5% of the time in the endodermis, 14.7% of the time in the cortex, and 9.7% of the time in the epidermis. These averages likely under-estimate the actual frequency of cell death indicator gene expression because transcriptional markers for the activation of cell death disappear upon the execution of cell death. When considering cell death indicator gene expression in relation to LRP stage, the frequency of proBFN1::nucGFP signal adjacent to an LRP reached >90% in the endodermis at stage IV, nearly 50% in the cortex at stage VII, and 38% in the epidermis at stage VII (Figures 1D and 1E). These results indicate that over the course of LRP growth, there is almost always a time when a cell death indicator gene is induced in at least one LRP overlying endodermal cell and also, although less frequently, in adjacent cortical and epidermal cells.

Cell Death Occurs in a Subset of LRP-Overlying Cells

To determine the fate of the cells overlying the growing LRP, we used several cell-death-detection methods. The previously published tonoplastic integrity marker (ToIM) results in a GFP signal in the cytoplasm and nucleus as well as a red fluorescent protein (RFP) signal in the vacuole of viable cells, while both signals mix and GFP rapidly quenches upon tonoplastic rupture and cytoplasmic acidification that result from cell death [9]. This cell death marker driven by the BFN1 promoter (proBFN1::ToIM) indicated the occurrence of cell death in xylem TEs known to undergo developmental cell death [37] as well as in a subset of LRP-adjacent cells (Figures 2A, S1A, and S1B). Activation of autophagy, a cellular process that has been linked to developmental cell death [39–42], could also be visualized in a subset of overlying cells (Figure S1C) by detecting the autophagy marker GFP:ATG8a driven by the ATG8a endogenous promoter [43]. Furthermore, seedlings were stained simultaneously with the viability marker fluorescein diacetate (FDA), which fluoresces in living cells but not in dead cells, and with propidium iodide (PI), which is normally excluded from living cells [44, 45] (Figure 2B). The absence of an FDA signal combined with PI entry (Figures 2B and 2C) indicated that cell death occurred specifically in a subset of endodermal and cortical cells overlying LRP at early stages (stages I to IV, before crossing of the endodermis).

Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) observations on root cross-sections (Figure 2D) showed plasmolysis and autolytic features indicative of cell death, such as leakage of intracellular material outside the protoplasm, specifically in cells overlying even early-stage LRP (Figures 2E–2I). These TEM observations are therefore consistent with the occurrence of cell death and autolysis in a subset of LRP-overlying cells in the endodermis (Figures 2E–2I) before the LRP crossing this cell layer.

The observation of cell death-related features in LRP-overlying endodermal cells (Figures 2B–2I), together with the high frequency of BFN1 transcriptional activation in the endodermis (Figure 1D), prompted us to observe endodermal cells by time-lapse confocal and light sheet microscopy using the endodermis-specific plasma membrane marker proCASPI1::CITRINE:SYT122 [23], together with the proBFN1::nucGFP cell death marker. This latter marker not only reveals transcriptional activation of cell death indicator genes but also can indicate cell death execution, based on the abrupt disappearance of the nuclear GFP signal known to shortly follow cell death [9, 37]. Time-lapse confocal microscopy imaging of LRP provided evidence for the occurrence of cell death in endodermal cells overlying LRP, as revealed by the complete loss of the nuclear GFP signal in these endodermal cells between two consecutive time points (Figures
2J, 2K, and S1D–S1H). Light sheet microscopy (which provided a 12-fold greater time resolution) revealed the complete disappearance of the nuclear GFP signal between two consecutive time points in the LRP-overlying endodermal cells (Figure 2L; Videos S1 and S2). One of these endodermal nuclei disintegrated just before losing its signal (Figure 2L; Video S1). Both the apparent nuclear disintegration and the rapidity of the nuclear signal disappearance can be explained only by cell death. The shapes of the plasma membranes of the LRP-overlying cells at the times of death indicated that the LRP had not yet entirely traversed the endodermis (Figures 2J, 2L, and S1D–S1H; Video S3), meaning that the observed cell death events occurred either before or during the passage of the LRP through the endodermal layer. A very limited number of surviving endodermal cells in close proximity to LRP displayed a slow and gradual decrease in the nuclear GFP signal (Figures S1D–S1H), suggesting deactivation of the cell death and autolysis transcriptional machinery in these cells. A few other endodermal cells kept a high level of nuclear GFP signal over the observation time span (Figures 2L and S1D–S1H), and it is possible that these cells died at a later point during LRP emergence.

Cell Death in LRP-Overlying Cells Facilitates LRP Growth

We reasoned that if cell death played a role in facilitating LRP growth, then plants impaired in parts of the cell death machinery may show delayed LRE. To compare the speed of LRE between genotypes, LR initiation was induced synchronously by gravitational stimulus (90° rotation of the seedlings) [16, 18]. When monitored at 18 and 42 h post-gravitational induction (pgi), the single mutants for the cell death indicator genes did not show any consistent or significant changes in LRP growth (Figure S2), possibly because of functional redundancy, which is a common problem when studying plant cell death [46].
Figure 2. Detection of Cell Death in LRP-Overlying Cells

(A) The top panel displays a time-lapse confocal microscopy 3D projection of proBNF1::ToIM (tonoplast integrity marker, consisting of cytoplasmic and nuclear GFP as well as vacuolar RFP [9]) fluorescence in a cell overlying a naturally occurring LRP. The bottom panel shows the transmission light, where the LRP can be distinguished. Arrowheads mark the indicated fluorophores and the asterisk marks the loss of GFP signal, which reveals cell death. TE, xylem tracheary element, known to undergo canonical developmental cell death. Bars, 50 μm. See also Figures S1A and S1B and Video S4.

(B) Cell death detection relying on the absence of viability staining fluorescein diacetate (FDA) signal (green) and on nuclear staining propidium iodide (PI, magenta) observed with confocal laser scanning microscopy imaging of LRPs and their overlying cells in the main roots of 4- to 5-day-old Arabidopsis seedlings. White arrowhead points at an endodermal cell displaying signs of cell death (absence of FDA combined with PI entry).

(C) Frequency of cell death observed by double staining (y axis), as in (B), in cortical and endodermal cells overlying LRPs at stages I to IV in 4- to 5-day-old Col-0 WT in 13 independent experiments (each bar represents the mean of each independent experiment).

(D–I) TEM of cross-sections through an LRP and the surrounding tissues. The position of the cross-section within the root is shown in (D). Stage-II (E and F) and stage-III (G–I) LRPs are shown. (F) is a magnification from (E). (I) is a magnification of (H), which itself is a magnification of (G). The arrowhead indicates the apparent loss of plasma membrane integrity, while the asterisk indicates leakage of intracellular material. CC, cortical cell. Bar, 5 μm (E and G), 2 μm (H), and 0.5 μm (I).

(J) Time-lapse confocal microscopy 3D projection of the endodermal plasma membrane marker proCASP1::CIT:SYP122 (purple) and the nuclear cell death reporter proBNF1::nucGFP (green) around a developing LRP. The asterisks mark the endodermal cell, which ultimately dies (between 10 and 12 h), while the arrowheads point at the endodermal nuclei displaying the GFP signal. The elongated area with the GFP signal seen in the stele from 2 to 6 h is the nucleus of a xylem TE undergoing developmental cell death and autolysis. Bar, 25 μm. See also Figure S1D–S1H.

(K) Transmission light images corresponding to the images in (J). The LRPs are highlighted by white lines. Bars, 25 μm.

(L) Montage of 3D projection from light sheet microscopy time-lapse imaging of the endodermal plasma membrane marker proCASP1::CIT:SYP122 and the nuclear-localized cell death indicator gene transcriptional reporter proBNF1::nucGFP around a developing LRP. The two rows show two different primordia (each from an independent seedling). In the top panel, the presence of an LRP can be deduced from the bent shape of the overlying endodermal cells, while in the bottom panel, the relative weakness of the plasma membrane compared to nuclear fluorescence makes it necessary to indicate the LRP shape with orange lines. Asterisks indicate time points when an endodermal nucleus is seen to disintegrate or disappear. Arrowheads point at disintegrating nuclei. Bars, 20 μm.

See also Videos S1, S2, and S3.
A large number of cell death-related genes, including the five cell death indicators co-expressed during LRE, are transcriptionally regulated by, among other regulators, the NAC transcription factor ORESARA1/ANAC092 (ORE1) [28]. ORE1 is known to regulate the genes associated with hormones, cell wall remodeling, and cell death, and it is expressed in connection with several types of developmental cell death and autolysis [47, 48]. Furthermore, ORE1 overexpression was previously reported to increase LR number, while knocking it out did not decrease the number of formed LR [49], even if these LR seemed shorter [49]. We detected ORE1 promoter [28] activity in roots, including LRP-overlying cells (Figure S3A). This is consistent with the transcriptomics study over time on sections of roots induced to develop an LRP [36], in which ORE1 shows strong expression. The expression of ORE1 in LRP-overlying cells is compatible with a potential role for ORE1 in the transcriptional control of cell death in the LRP-overlying cells. We therefore hypothesized that analyzing LRP growth in ore1 mutants could overcome potential genetic redundancies between cell death-related genes during LRE.

Consistent with a role for ORE1 during LRE, shorter LRs and fewer emerged LRs were observed in two ore1 mutant alleles compared to wild-type (WT) seedlings (Figures S3B–S3D). Gravitational induction experiments confirmed that LRP growth was delayed in these ore1 mutants compared with WT (Figure 3A), and even without synchronous induction, ore1-2 had significantly fewer emerged LRs than WT (Figure 3B). Furthermore, simultaneous FDA and PI staining showed significantly less frequent cell death in the LRP-overlying cells of ore1-2 than in WT (Figures 3C and 3D). The fact that cell death was strongly reduced in ore1-2 compared with WT, but not completely abolished, indicates that ORE1 is not the sole regulator of LRP-overlying cell death. Nevertheless, the strong reduction in overlying cell death in this mutant (Figures 3C and 3D), concomitant with the reduced speed of LRP growth (Figures 3A and 3B), justifies using the ore1-2 mutant as a tool to test a possible relation between LRP growth speed and overlying cell death.

To test whether loss of ORE1 expression correlated with slower LRP growth as a result of less frequent cell death in the overlying cells, we set out to rescue the LRE delay of ore1-2 by inducing cell death in cells overlying LRP (genetic rescue strategy; Figures 3B–3D) or by mortally wounding LRP-overlying cells by laser ablation (physical rescue strategy; Figures 4A–4D).

For the genetic rescue strategy, we expressed the pro-apoptotic mammalian protein mBAX [29], known to potentely induce cell death in Arabidopsis [30, 31], under the transcriptional control of the BFN1 promoter (proBFN1::mBAX) in the ore1-2 background. The use of the BFN1 promoter is justified because the promoters of the cell death indicator genes such as BFN1 are the only ones known to be active specifically in the subset of LRP-overlying cells that die during LRE. Despite the regulation of BFN1 by ORE1 [28], BFN1 expression in the ore1-2 background has previously been shown to be reduced, but not abolished [48]. Furthermore, the reduced, rather than the abolished, cell death frequency in LRP-overlying cells of ore1-2 (Figures 3C and 3D) strongly suggests that the BFN1 promoter retains some activity in LRP-overlying cells in ore1-2. Consistently, we found that the BFN1 promoter activity in the ore1-2 mutant was still sufficient to drive the expression of mBAX in the ore1-2 proBFN1::mBAX lines (Figures S3E and S3F). In addition, the BFN1 promoter is specific for cells bound to undergo developmental cell death [7], meaning that the use of the BFN1 promoter to drive mBAX expression is not expected to result in the death of cells that should not die, and therefore to result in a WT-like phenotype in both ore1-2 and WT backgrounds (Figure S3G).

While LR density was reduced in upright grown 7-day-old ore1-2 seedlings compared with Col-0 WT (Figures 3B and S3B–S3D), several ore1-2 proBFN1::mBAX lines that we generated showed similar LR densities as WT, while the others showed a variety of pleiotropic phenotypes such as stunted root growth (Figure 3B). Therefore, we focused on the three ore1-2 proBFN1::mBAX lines (1, 4, and 6) with high mBAX expression (Figure S3E), whose main root growth was not impaired (Figure 3B) and that rescued the ore1-2 LRP growth delay (Figure 3B). These three ore1-2 proBFN1::mBAX lines displayed LRP-overlying cell death as frequently as in WT (lines 1 and 4) or at even higher (line 6) levels (Figures 3C and 3D), demonstrating the potency of proBFN1::mBAX to induce cell death in LRP-overlying cells, even in the ore1-2 background. Gravitational induction of ore1-2 proBFN1::mBAX lines 1 and 4 along with ore1-2 and WT (Figure 3E) confirmed that the rescue of LRP-overlying cell death in the ore1-2 background (Figures 3C and 3D) was concomitant with the rescue of LRP growth speed in this mutant (Figure 3E).

For the physical rescue strategy, the junction between an LRP-overlying endodermal cell and its neighboring cortical cell was targeted (to avoid possible damage in the LRP) with optical tweezers to inflict a wound, ultimately leading to the death of the targeted cells (laser ablation) (Figure 4A). The targeted cells showed signs of damage and death within 3 h after laser ablation (Figures 4B and 4C). When laser ablation was performed 24 h after gravitational induction, when the LRP had not yet crossed the endodermis (Figure 4D), the LRP growth became significantly faster and less variable in ablated ore1-2 than in untreated ore1-2 (Figure 4D). This partial rescue of LRP growth speed in ore1-2 following laser ablation of overlying cells confirms that the slower LRP growth in ore1-2 results from defective cell death in LRP-overlying cells.

**DISCUSSION**

Our study demonstrates that developmentally regulated cell death occurs in cells overlying LRP in Arabidopsis and contributes to regulating LRP growth. Previous studies have shown that living LRP-overlying cells undergo a number of major cell wall and cell shape changes, which also contribute to LRP growth [18–24]. Cell death is therefore one of the mechanisms involved in the regulation of LRP growth in Arabidopsis. Regulation of LRP growth by overlying cell death is probably not restricted to Arabidopsis because morphological studies indicate the demise of cells overlying LRP in other species such as maize, field bindweed, and soybean [12–15]. The mechanism of cell death in LRP-overlying cells is not known and its execution may differ from other instances of developmental cell elimination, as suggested by the spreading of proBFN1-driven nuclear GFP signal into the entire protoplast of...
an LRP-overlying endodermal cell (Figure 1C). A non-canonical cell death execution in LRP-overlying cells is also supported by the fact that only five of the nine canonical Arabidopsis developmental cell death indicator genes [7] were highly co-expressed during LRE (Figure 1A; Table S1). In addition, expression of a ToIM [9] under the control of the BFN1 promoter revealed a longer time gap between transcriptional activation of this promoter and loss of tonoplast integrity in LRP-overlying cells than in xylem TEs (Video S4), which undergo a well-studied case of developmental cell death and autolysis [8].

The exact spatial and temporal characterization of cell death during LRE is challenging since it is not possible to record the entire time span of LRP growth while using an appropriate chronological resolution to record all cell death events. Our observations over limited time spans or at single time points with stringent criteria (e.g., double staining FDA + PI) necessarily

Figure 3. LRE Is Delayed by Loss of the Positive Cell Death Regulator ORE1 and Rescued by Inducing Cell Death in Overlying Cells

(A) Distribution of observed LRP stages 18 and 42 h after gravitational induction of LR initiation in WT and two mutant alleles for ORE1 (n = 30 observed seedlings). See also Figures S2 and S3A–S3D.

(B) Number of LRs per mm of main root (i.e., emerged LR density) and average total length of the main root from 7-day-old seedlings. Each bar represents the average of 8 replicate experiments (n = 32: 8 experiments × 4 biological replicates per genotype), while the error bars represent SEMs. Similar results were obtained in another set of 8 replicate experiments. The genotypes were compared by post-ANOVA Fisher test. Genotypes that do not share any letter are significantly different from one another. See also Figures S3C–S3G.

(C) Representative 3D projections of double staining with viability dye FDA signal (green) and PI (magenta) observed by confocal laser scanning microscopy imaging of stage II LRPds (seen in transmission light [Trans]) and their overlying cells in the main roots of 4- to 5-day-old Arabidopsis seedlings of the indicated genotypes. White arrowhead points at an endodermal cell displaying signs of cell death (absence of FDA signal and PI entry). Bars, 20 μm.

(D) Frequency of cell death observed by double staining, as in (C), in cortical and endodermal cells overlying LRP at stages I–IV, before crossing of the endodermis. Bars represent the average of 4 (mBAX-expressing lines) to 13 (WT and ore1-2) replicate experiments, and error bars represent SEMs. The genotypes were compared by post-ANOVA Fisher test. Genotypes that do not share any letter are significantly different from one another.

(E) Distribution of observed LRP stages 18 and 42 h after gravitational induction of LR initiation in WT, ore1-2 mutant, and ore1-2 expressing the cell-death-inducing mBAX protein under the transcriptional control of the BFN1 promoter (20 < n < 33 observed seedlings per genotype). This gravitational induction experiment was repeated 5 times for line 1 and 2 times for line 4.

In (A) and (E), each line was compared with the corresponding WT by Pearson’s chi-square test, to reveal potential differences in the distribution of LRP stages dependent on genotype (n.s., not significant, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001).
underestimate the actual frequency of cell death. Such underestimation of cell death frequency is supported by the fact that cell death indicator genes were almost always induced at some point over the course of LRP development (Figure 1D) and by the strong proBNF1:nucGFP signal that persisted in LRP-overlying cells beyond the end of our limited observation time frames (Figures 2L and S1D–S1H). It is therefore likely that overlying cell death would occur in most LRE events when considering the entire time span of LRP growth. The distribution of cell death indicator gene activation over time (Figures 1D and 1E) in relation to the time of cell death execution (Figures 2A, 2J, 2L, and S1D–S1H) suggests the existence of a switch or threshold leading to the execution of cell death. It is therefore possible that the LRP-overlying cell death would follow a bistable-switch regulation, whereby a certain threshold of pro-cell death signal determines the commitment to cell death execution, as has recently been shown for the cell death of xylem TEs [50].

Possibly contributing to a bistable-switch regulation, mechanical forces can be expected to influence the fate of the LRP-overlying cells. Strong mechanical pressure is likely to be exerted by the LRP growing against the overlying cells, which themselves alter their mechanical properties and rigidity in coordination...
with LRP growth [18, 20]. This could eventually result in the developmentally regulated, non-cell-autonomous death of some weakened overlying cells under intense pressure. Such a scenario is analogous to the elimination of Arabidopsis endosperm cells, which, by loosening their cell walls, allow the embryo to grow into the space that they occupy and then mechanically kill them [11]. Similarly, during adventitious root formation, mechanical pressure has been reported to induce cell death in the epidermis of rice in an ethylene-dependent manner [51]. It is therefore possible that mechanical pressure represents at least one of the mechanisms involved in cell death signaling, or even in the execution of cell death itself [10], during LRP growth. Furthermore, such LRP-mediated mechanical pressure would likely affect the overlying cells differently, depending on their own mechanical properties and on their degree of overlap with the growing LRP, which is in line with our observation that only a subset of the LRP–overlying cells dies.

It is possible that the death of a subset of overlying cells facilitates the growth of the LRP by reducing the mechanical resistance of the overlying cells toward the primordia. The plausibility of such a mode of action is supported by the fact that laser ablation of an endodermal cell is potent enough to trigger cell division in the adjacent pericycle [33], likely because the loss of mechanical feedback from the ablated cell allows the necessary swelling of the pericycle to initiate LRP formation [23, 25]. Alternatively, or in addition, cell death may contribute to cell wall remodeling and cell separation and hence to LRP growth by allowing a massive release of cell wall-modifying enzymes and/or of auxin. For example, the cell death of a few columella stem cell daughter cells in Arabidopsis roots exposed to low temperature has been shown to affect auxin distribution [52]. Furthermore, the developmental cell death of LR cap (LRC) cells has been shown to result in the release of auxin that is necessary for LR initiation [53]. LRP growth was delayed to a comparable extent in mutants for ORE1 and for the LATERAL ORGAN BOUNDARIES-DOMAIN/ASYMMETRIC LEAVES 2-LIKE29 (LBD29) transcription factor that normally controls auxin accumulation in LRP–overlying cells [21] (Figure 3A versus [21] and Figure S3B). It is therefore tempting to hypothesize that the death of LRP–overlying cells may serve an analogous purpose to LRC cell death in quickly releasing high amounts of auxin for cell wall remodeling of other overlying cells and for LRP growth.

Our finding regarding the impact of cell death on LR growth demonstrates that plant organ growth can be regulated by cell elimination. It was also recently shown that embryo growth regulates root organ growth based on the cell death dynamics of LRC cells [9]. These findings, therefore, demonstrate that cell proliferation is not the sole factor determining organ growth in plants and that the regulation of organ growth in plants is not dissimilar from that in animals as previously proposed.

This greater similarity than previously accepted in the regulation of organ growth between animals and plants raises some evolutionary questions. Has cell elimination arisen as a mechanism to regulate organ growth from a shared evolutionary heritage between animals and plants, for example, from the regulation of early unicellular populations by cell death [54]? Alternatively, could the regulation of organ growth by cell death in animals and plants have stricken roots at different locations in the tree of life, making it a form of convergent evolution that may in the future reveal some form of deep evolutionary constraint linked with cell elimination?
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## STAR METHODS

### KEY RESOURCES TABLE

| REAGENT or RESOURCE                        | SOURCE                     | IDENTIFIER |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| **Bacterial and Virus Strains**            |                            |            |
| *Escherichia coli* strain DH5x             | Widely distributed         | N/A        |
| *Escherichia coli* strain DB3.1            | Widely distributed         | N/A        |
| *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* strain GV3101 pMP90 | Widely distributed         | N/A        |
| **Chemicals, Peptides, and Recombinant Proteins** |                            |            |
| Murashige and Skoog (MS) medium (including vitamins) | Duchefa Biochemie         | M0222      |
| Fluorescein diacetate                      | Merck                      | F7378      |
| Propidium iodide                           | Merck                      | P4864-10ML |
| Triton X-100                               | Merck                      | 11332481001|
| X-Gluc                                     | Thermo Fisher              | R0851      |
| Potassium hexacyanoferrate(III) (K3Fe(CN)6) | Merck                      | 244023     |
| Potassium hexacyanoferrate(II) (K4Fe(CN)6) | Merck                      | 455989     |
| Chloral hydrate                            | Merck                      | 15307      |
| PhytagelTM                                 | Merck                      | P8169-250G |
| MES                                        | Merck                      | M1317      |
| Glutaraldehyde                             | Merck                      | G5882      |
| Osmium tetroxide                           | Merck                      | 75632      |
| Propylene oxide                            | Merck                      | 82320      |
| Spurr’s resin                              | Polysciences               | 01916-1    |
| Uranyl acetate                             | Agar scientific            | AGR1260A   |
| Lead Acetate                               | Agar scientific            | AGR1209    |
| Chloramphenicol                            | Merck                      | C0378-25G  |
| Spectinomycin                              | Merck                      | S4014-5G   |
| **Critical Commercial Assays**             |                            |            |
| Gateway BP Clonase II Enzyme mix           | Thermo Fisher              | 11789100   |
| Gateway LR Clonase II Enzyme mix           | Thermo Fisher              | 11791100   |
| RNeasy Plant Kit                           | QIAGEN                     | 74904      |
| RNase-Free DNase Set                       | QIAGEN                     | 79254      |
| QuantiTect Reverse Transcription Kit       | QIAGEN                     | 205311     |
| LightCycler® 480 SYBR Green I Master Mix   | Roche                      | 04707516001|
| **Deposited Data**                         |                            |            |
| LRP growth transcriptomics data from Voß et al. (2015) | ArrayExpress             | E-MTAB-2565|
| **Experimental Models: Organisms/Strains** |                            |            |
| *Arabidopsis thaliana* (Arabidopsis) Columbia-0 (col-0) ecotype, wild-type | NASC                      | N1092      |
| *Arabidopsis* Wassilewskijâ (Ws) ecotype, wild-type | NASC                      | N5390      |
| *Arabidopsis anac092-1* mutant              | NASC & [28]                | SALK_090154|
| *Arabidopsis ore1-2* mutant                | NASC & [56]                | N/A        |
| *Arabidopsis bhn1-1* mutant                | NASC & [9]                 | GK-197G12  |
| *Arabidopsis bhn1-2* mutant                | NASC                       | SALK_017287|
| *Arabidopsis mc9-1* mutant                 | NASC & [37]                | GABI_540_H06|
| *Arabidopsis mc9-2* mutant                 | NASC & [37]                | SALK_075814|
| *Arabidopsis* mutant for DMP4              | NASC                       | SALK_063946|
| *Arabidopsis* mutant for EXI1              | NASC                       | SALK_137383|
| *Arabidopsis* mutant for EXI1              | NASC                       | SAIL_760_G07|

(Continued on next page)
| REAGENT or RESOURCE | SOURCE | IDENTIFIER |
|---------------------|--------|------------|
| Arabidopsis lbd29 mutant | NASC & [56] | SALK_071133C |
| Arabidopsis 35S::SRDX:LBD29 dominant suppressor line | NASC & [21] | N/A |
| Arabidopsis mutant for RNS3 | NASC | FLAG_164_A04 |
| Arabidopsis proDMP4::GUS | This study | N/A |
| Arabidopsis proRNS3::GUS | This study | N/A |
| Arabidopsis proBFN1::GUS | This study | N/A |
| Arabidopsis proMC9::MC9::GUS | [37] | N/A |
| Arabidopsis proORE1::GUS | [28] | N/A |
| Arabidopsis proBFN1::ToM | This study | N/A |
| Arabidopsis proUBQ10::WAVE131::YFP | [38] | N/A |
| Arabidopsis proCASPI::CIT::SYP122 | [23] | N/A |
| Arabidopsis proBFN1::nucGFP | [37] | N/A |
| Arabidopsis proUBQ10::WAVE131::YFP proBFN1::nucGFP | This study | N/A |
| Arabidopsis proCASPI::CIT::SYP122 proBFN1::nucGFP | This study | N/A |
| Arabidopsis 35S::GFP:LTi6a | [57] | N/A |
| Arabidopsis 35S::H2B::YFP | [58] | N/A |
| Arabidopsis 35S::GFP:LTi6a 35S::H2B::YFP | This study | N/A |
| Arabidopsis proATG8a::GFP::ATG8a | [43] | N/A |
| Arabidopsis proBFN1::mBAX (Col-0 background) | This study | N/A |
| Arabidopsis ore1-2 proBFN1::mBAX lines 1-6 | This study | N/A |

**Oligonucleotides**

For Gateway cloning of DMP4 promoter: proAT4G18425-attB1 (Forward), GGGGACAAGTTGTGACAGGGCTTACCG AACTGATCAAACATATATGATC; attB2-proAT4G18425 (Reverse), GGGGACCACCTTGTACAAGAAGCTGGTGTACTTTGAAAGTT GTTTCCCTTGTGTC

For Gateway cloning of RNS3 promoter: proAT1G26820-attB1 (Forward), GGGGACAAGTTGTGACAGGGCTTACCG AACTGATCAAACATATATGATC; attB2-proAT1G26820 (Reverse), GGGGACCACCTTGTACAAGAAGCTGGTGTACTTTGAAAGTT GTTTCCCTTGTGTC

For Gateway cloning of BFN1 promoter: proAT1G11190-attB1 (Forward), GGGGACAAGTTGTGACAGGGCTTACCG AACTGATCAAACATATATGATC; attB2-proAT1G11190 (Reverse), GGGGACCACCTTGTACAAGAAGCTGGTGTACTTTGAAAGTT GTTTCCCTTGTGTC

For checking expression of EXI1 Forward: ATGATGTATCTAAGTCGGAGA Reverse: TTAGTGCGCTGCGAAGGC

For checking expression of RNS3 Forward: ATTTTCTTCTCTATTACGCGGACAAGGGCC Reverse: TTAGTGCGCTGCGAAGGC

For checking expression of DMP4 (5’ end of transcript) Forward: TGACGAAAGGTCTCAAAAAGG Reverse: TAGAAGCTGCGTAGAGCG

For checking expression of DMP4 (3’ end of transcript) Forward: TTGCTCTGGGCGTGTATCGTA Reverse: CAATCCCTATGCGGCGG

(Continued on next page)
| REAGENT or RESOURCE | SOURCE | IDENTIFIER |
|---------------------|--------|------------|
| For checking expression of **BFN1** | This study (synthesis ordered from Thermo Fisher) | N/A |
| Forward: CCCTTTGTGCTTGCATTTT | Reverse: ACGGCTTTGATCCTCATTTT |
| For checking expression of **ORE1** (full length) | This study (synthesis ordered from Thermo Fisher) | N/A |
| Forward: ATGAGATCGAGCGAGCAG | Reverse: ATGAGATCGAGCGAGCAG |
| For checking expression of **ORE1** (3' end of transcript) | This study (synthesis ordered from Thermo Fisher) | N/A |
| Forward: CAGGCTGTTATCTGGAAA | Reverse: CGATTGTGGAAAAACAGA |
| For checking expression of **mBAX** (full length) | This study (synthesis ordered from Thermo Fisher) | N/A |
| Forward: ATGAGCCCGGTCCGGGAGCAG | Reverse: TCAGCCTATCTCGTCCGAT |
| For checking expression of **mBAX** (3' end of transcript, for qPCR) | This study (synthesis ordered from Thermo Fisher) | N/A |
| Forward: TGGCAAGATGATGCTGAC | Reverse: GATCGAGCGACTGCTTAG |
| For checking expression of **UBQ10** (3' end of transcript, reference gene for qPCR) | This study (synthesis ordered from Thermo Fisher) | N/A |
| Forward: GGGCTTGTATAATCCCTGAGT | Reverse: AAAGAGATACGGAACGAAACATAGT |
| For checking expression of **CESA8/IRX1** (3' end of transcript, for qPCR) | This study (synthesis ordered from Thermo Fisher) | N/A |
| Forward: GGTCTTACGTTGGGCTTCTTG | Reverse: ATACTGAGCTGCGGTCTAGT |
| For genotyping of **SALK_063946** (for **DMP4** | This study (synthesis ordered from Thermo Fisher) | N/A |
| Forward: GAACTTCCAATGTTCTGCTG | Reverse: TGTCATTGACAAATGACGG |
| For genotyping of **SALK_017287** (for **bfn1-2** | This study (synthesis ordered from Thermo Fisher) | N/A |
| Forward: TAAACAAAGCAGTCCACAGGC | Reverse: TGGCTTAAGATTGACAGG |
| For genotyping of **SALK_137383** (for **EXI1** | This study (synthesis ordered from Thermo Fisher) | N/A |
| Forward: ACTTTTCCACCTGCAATTG | Reverse: CATCTATGAACTCGCAGG |
| For genotyping of **SAIL_760_G07** (for **EXI1** | This study (synthesis ordered from Thermo Fisher) | N/A |
| Forward: ACATTTTCTGTGCTTGCAGG | Reverse: AAGATGACTGGCTTTGGG |
| For genotyping of **FLAG_164_A04** (for **RNS3** | This study (synthesis ordered from Thermo Fisher) | N/A |
| Forward: (“Left primer” regarding the orientation of the T-DNA): CATGCTTGAATTTCCAGCAG | Reverse: (“Right primer” regarding the orientation of the T-DNA): GCCCAAGATTTCGATTTC |

(Continued on next page)
LEAD CONTACT AND MATERIALS AVAILABILITY

This study did not generate new unique reagents or resources, but new materials such as Arabidopsis transgenic lines were generated in this study. These materials will be made available upon request addressed to the Lead Contact, Dr. Hannele Tuominen (hannele.tuominen@umu.se).

EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND SUBJECT DETAILS

Plant Material
The model plant species Arabidopsis thaliana (Arabidopsis) has been used throughout this study. Most of the Arabidopsis knock-out mutant plants used in this study are in the Columbia-0 (Col-0) genetic background, and were therefore compared with a Col-0 wild-type: anac092-1 (ore1 allele SALK_090154 [28];), ore1-2 (5bp deletion [55];), bfn1-1 (GK-197G12 [9];), bfn1-2 (SALK_017287), mc9-1 (GABI_540_H06 [37];), mc9-2 (SALK_075814 [37];), SALK_063946 (for DMP4), SALK_137383 and SAIL_760_G07 (for EXI1). The knock-out mutant lbd29 (SALK_071133C) and the dominant suppressor 35S::SRDX:LBD29 were also in the Col-0 background, generated in previous studies [56]. The FLAG_164_A04 knock-out mutant (for RNS3) in the Wassilewskija (Ws) genetic background was compared to Ws wild-type.

The transcriptional reporter lines for histological detection of promoter activity were either generated in this study (pro DMP4::GUS, proRNS3::GUS and proBFN1::GUS, as described in the “Method Details” below), or obtained from previous studies (proMC9::MC9::GUS from [37] and proORE1::GUS from [28]).

The BFN1 promoter-driven fluorescent tonoplast integrity marker (proBFN1::ToIM) to monitor cell death was created in this study (as described in “Method Details” below) based on a previously published construct [9]. The double markers for fluorescently labeled plasma membranes (ubiquitous: proUBQ10::WAVE131::YFP; or endodermis-specific: proCASPI1::GFP::SYFP122) and BFN1 promoter-driven nuclear GFP (proBFN1::nucGFP) were generated in this study by crossing previously generated individual markers [23, 37, 38]. The double marker for ubiquitous fluorescent labeling of both plasma membranes (35S::GFP::LTI6a) and nuclei (35S::H2B::YFP) were also generated in this study by crossing previously generated individual markers [57, 58]. The autophagy reporter proATG8a::GFP:ATG8a had been generated previously [43].
Growth conditions
To compare the speed of LRE between genotypes, seedlings were grown on ½ MS medium for three days in constant light (150 μE·m⁻²·s⁻¹) on vertical plates, which were then rotated 90° to induce LRP initiation [18]. For laser ablation, seedlings were transferred to sterile microscopy chambers and covered with a slab of the medium they had been growing on, to allow them to continue growing within the chamber over the course of LRP growth.

Seedlings for observations of naturally initiated LRPs (no gravitational induction) were grown on ½ MS medium for 3.5 - 7 days after germination in 16 h day (150 μE·m⁻²·s⁻¹) / 8 h night cycles.

Genotypes meant to be compared always consisted of seeds that had been harvested at the same time, from plants grown in the same location and conditions.

METHOD DETAILS

BFN1 co-expression analysis
To identify genes correlating in expression with BFN1 during LR development, smooth splines were fitted through the transcriptomic profiles for all genes, to smooth out the noise. The Pearson correlation between each gene’s profile and that of the target gene BFN1 was calculated, including all data points, i.e., not just mean values for each time point. Genes were ranked in decreasing order of the Pearson correlation with BFN1 (Table S1).

Cloning and plant transformation
For promoter-reporter constructs, 1654 bp (AT4G18425; DMP4) or 2000 bp (AT1G26820; RNS3) upstream of the translational start codon were amplified and recombined by Gateway-mediated cloning via pENTR207 (Invitrogen) into the destination vector pBGGUS [59]. pBFN1::GUS was obtained by recombining a 670 bp promoter region of BFN1 (AT1G11190) into pMDC163. Col-0 plants were transformed with Agrobacterium tumefaciens using the floral dip method [61]. At least five independent lines were analyzed for each construct to select representative lines, proBFN1::nucGFP and proMC9::MC9:GUS have been described previously [37].

To place the tonoplast integrity marker (ToIM [9]) downstream of the BFN1 promoter, the promoter of the putative protease PASPA3 previously cloned upstream of the tonoplast integrity marker [9] was replaced by the BFN1 promoter. To do so, the BFN1 promoter was amplified from a plasmid using primers comprising the attB4 and attB1r sequences, and recombined into pDONR P4P1r. The PASPA3 promoter from pK7m34GW-pPASPA3-eGFP-2A-sp-mRFP [9] was removed by a standard BP recombination with pDONR P4P1r. The destination vector was recombined into pENTRL4R1-pBFN1. The resulting expression vector pK7m34GW-pBFN1-eGFP-2A-sp-mRFP was used to electroporate Agrobacterium tumefaciens. Agrobacterium-mediated floral dip transformation of wild-type (Col-0) plants was performed and several apparent transformants were screened for visible ToIM signal, leading to the selection of a representative proBFN1::ToIM marker line.

To express the cell death agonist mammalian protein mBAX under the transcriptional control of the BFN1 promoter, the vectors pENTR4L1 containing the proBFN1 fragment and pENTR221 containing the mBAX gene (a kind gift from Moritz Nowack) were together recombined into pK7m24GW [60] using standard protocols for LR recombination. This vector was transferred into Agrobacterium tumefaciens to transform Col-0 and wcl-1-2 plants by floral dip. Transformants were then screened to identify homozygous lines in each genotype displaying mBAX expression.

Gravitational induction of LRP initiation
Determination of LRP stage was performed 18h and 42h after synchronized LR induction by gravitational stimulus, as described previously [16, 18]. Briefly, the seedlings were fixed and cleared by a 15 min incubation in acidified methanol (20% v/v methanol with 4% v/v HCl), followed by 15 min in 60% v/v ethanol mixed with 7% v/v NaOH, and 5 min steps in an ethanol gradient (40%, 20% and 10% v/v ethanol). The fixed and cleared seedlings were then mounted in 50% glycerol and observed as described in “light microscopy” below.

In the specific case of laser-assisted cell elimination experiments, the seedlings were not fixed or cleared but directly observed inside of the microscopy chambers where they were growing, similar to a previously published method real time analysis of lateral root organs [62].

Confocal Laser Scanning Microscope analyses
All time-lapses with cLSM were acquired using a Zeiss LSM780 inverted microscope, by placing the seedlings in microscope chambers as previously described [62]. GFP and CITRINE signals (Figures 2 and S1D–S1H) were simultaneously recorded with a spectral detector after excitation with a 488 nm laser line, and separated by online fingerprinting (i.e., unmixing which occurs during, rather than after, acquisition). eGFP and mRFP signals (Video S4) from the ToIM marker [9] were detected simultaneously upon excitation with 488 nm (for eGFP) and 561 nm (for mRFP) laser lines.

cLSM micrographs that are not part of any time-lapse were acquired either with a Zeiss LSM780, an upright Zeiss LSM800 or an inverted Zeiss LSM880 microscope. For FDA and PI staining, 3.5-4 days old Arabidopsis seedlings were incubated for 1h in liquid ½ MS medium containing 10 μg/mL PI and 12 nM FDA, and imaged as similarly to the ToIM maker (described above), as previously described [44].
Transmission electron microscopy

An early-stage LRP marker proLBD16::GFP line [63] was used to identify regions of the root containing primordia. Tissues were fixed under vacuum in 2.5% w/v glutaraldehyde in 0.1 M Na cacodylate buffer, pH 7.3 for 30 min, and then without vacuum overnight at 4°C. Tissues were then stained with 1% w/v osmium tetroxide for 2 h at room temperature in the dark, washed twice in water, and then dehydrated in 15-minute steps through an ethanol series (50, 70, 90, and 100%). Root portions were then rinsed in propylene oxide and exchanged with Spurr’s resin (Polysciences) and then baked at 65°C for 2 days. Sections were mounted on formvar-coated copper grids. Contrasting was done for 45 min in 5% uranyl acetate followed by 5 min in Sato’s lead acetate staining.

Light microscopy

All observations were performed with an upright Zeiss Axioplan II microscope or with an inverted Leica DMi8, both equipped for epifluorescence microscopy.

Histochemical GUS assays were performed as described previously [37]. Briefly, 3.5-5 days old transgenic seedlings were incubated for 1h-18h at 37°C in a solution consisting of 1 mM X-Gluc, 1 mM K₄Fe(CN)₆, 1 mM K₃Fe(CN)₆ and 0.1% Triton x-100 in 50 mM sodium phosphate buffer (pH7). After this, the samples were cleared in 70% ethanol and rehydrated in an ethanol gradient in 5 min steps (50%, 40%, 20% and 10% v/v ethanol), followed by additional clearing in a chloral hydrate solution (chloral hydrate/glycerol/H₂O 8:2:3 v/v) for at least 1 h. The samples were mounted in 50% glycerol and observed using differential interference contrast [16].

LRP of seedlings harboring the proBFN1::nucGFP constructs were observed while alive following mounting in liquid ½ MS medium. Both differential interference contrast and fluorescence micrographs were acquired to relate the possible presence of nucGFP signal to the LRP stage.

Lightsheet fluorescence microscopy

Seeds were sterilized for 10min with 70% ethanol supplemented with 0.05% Triton X-100, washed 3 times with 70% ethanol, and incubated for 10 min with 100% ethanol before being dried out under the sterile bench. Glass capillaries (1.8 mm of diameter, Blaubrand intraMark, glass micropipettes 100 µL Ref. 7087 44) were sterilized with 70% ethanol for 20 min, then 100% ethanol for 20 min and left to dry. The capillaries were filled with ½ MS medium buffered with 0.5 g/L MES (adjusted to pH 5.8 with KOH), containing 1% (m/v) of Phytagel (Sigma PhytagelTM P8169-250G) and placed in a small round plate filled with the same medium. One seed was placed on top of each capillary and stratified for 48h before transfer to long day conditions for 4 to 5 days at 22°C.

Imaging was performed on a Luxendo MuViSPIM, equipped with two-sided illumination and two cameras for detection. In the microscope, the plant was continuously illuminated (red and blue LEDs, turned off during stack acquisition) and the temperature was maintained at 24°C. About 5 mm of the root surrounded by a cylinder of Phytagel medium was extruded out of the glass capillary which itself was positioned vertically in the microscope’s chamber containing liquid, sterile ½ MS medium. The shoots of the seedling were left out of the liquid medium.

Samples were excited by a 488 nm laser light sheet (2.5 µm thickness at the waist) generated by Nikon Plan Fluor 10X/0.30W objectives. Laser power was kept < 6 mW. The emitted fluorescence was detected by Nikon Apo 40X/0.80W DIC N2 objectives associated with a 497-553 nm band pass filter and captured using 2 Hamamatsu Orca-flash 4.0 cameras with an exposure time < 100 ms. Under these conditions, both reporters (cell death marker proBFN1::nucGFP and plasma membrane marker proCASP1::CITRINE: SYT122) were collected in the same channel. Stacks were acquired every 10 min for 24 h with a z-step of 0.250 μm spanning a total volume of 200 μm containing the growing LRP and the primary root overlying tissues. Due to drifting of the samples in the liquid medium, a total of only two successful observations could be performed (two LRP, each from a different seedling).

After fusion of the two opposite views with the proprietary script of Luxendo, sample drift was corrected using the BigDataTracker plugin in ImageJ (Fiji).

Laser-assisted targeted cell elimination

Laser ablation was conducted with the same aim as previous studies which successfully caused the death of single cells in Arabidopsis roots [32–35], but with an experimental setup relying on the so called optical tweezers technique. To cause deadly wounds specifically to LRP-overlying endodermal cells, we used a modified inverted microscope (IX71, Olympus) normally utilized in optical tweezers applications [64]. A Gaussian laser beam (TEM00, M2 < 1.1) from a continuous wavelength laser (Rumba, 05-01 Series, Cobolt AB) operating at 1064 nm was introduced into the microscope. We used a 60x water immersion objective (UPlanSApo, Series, Cobolt AB) operating at 1064 nm was introduced into the microscope. We used a 60x water immersion objective (UPlanSApo, Olympus), with a numerical aperture of 1.2 and a working distance of 0.28 mm to focus the beam and create a high-intensity spot. To perform accurate positioning of the laser focal spot we aligned the beam so the focal spot coincides with the focal plane of the microscope objective. A diffraction-limited spot of ~560 nm and a depth of field of ~300 nm was created that we could position with nm-resolution in the lateral and axial planes using a combination of micro-attenuators and a piezo stage (PI-P5613CD, Physik Instruments) [65]. Since the objective strongly focused the laser beam ~65°, the intensity dropped fast from the focal spot, both in the lateral and axial directions, making ablation limited to only one specific cell [66]. We estimated the intensity in the focal spot to 2.48 MW/mm² by measuring the effective power (1490 mW) before the objective and by taking into account the parameter values (transmission, focal length, etc.) of the objective specified by the manufacturer. Finally, we visualized and imaged plants mounted in microscopy chamber (1-well Lab-Tek chamber, Nunc) as previously described [62] using a CCD camera (C11440-10C, HAMAMATSU, 8 bit).
RNA isolation and qPCR

For quantitative real-time PCR analyses, Arabidopsis seedlings of the indicated genotypes were grown for 5 days as indicated above for naturally initiated LRP. For each genotype, 10 seedlings were pooled together and ground in liquid nitrogen. RNA extraction on these ground samples was performed using RNeasy Plant Kit (QIAGEN), including “on column DNase treatment,” following manufacturer’s instruction. RNA concentration was measured with Nanodrop and all samples were diluted to 100 ng/μL. 500 ng of total RNA were used for cDNA synthesis using QuantiTect Reverse Transcription Kit (QIAGEN), including gDNase treatment (for the second time) prior to cDNA synthesis. cDNA samples were diluted 25 times and 5 μL were used as template in a 20 μL total reaction volume, using LightCycler 480 SYBR Green 1 Master (Roche Life Science) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. Each sample was loaded in duplicate into a 96-well qPCR plate (Roche Life Science) and qPCR was run in a LightCycler 480 thermal cycler (Roche Life Science) for 45 cycles (initial denaturation at 98°C for 3 min, cycling: denaturation at 95°C for 5 s, annealing at 55°C for 10 s, elongation at 72°C for 30 s; melting curve from 45°C to 95°C with acquisitions every 1°C).

QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Statistical analyses

For multiple comparison of continuous variables (e.g., root length, lateral root density, frequency of cell death…) between genotypes, post-ANOVA Fisher LSD tests were performed using Minitab 17, provided that the ANOVA indicated significant overall differences (p < 0.05). The choice of this test is justified because statistical studies have shown that under the condition of an ANOVA returning p < 0.05, the post-ANOVA Fisher LSD test provides the best detection of true pairwise differences, while performing as well or better than other tests (e.g., Tukey’s test) against type I error [67].

For comparisons of stages of LRP growth, which is a categorical variable (each stage is a category, and the variable is not continuous but discrete) we opted for the Chi-square test because it allows to test whether two categorical variables are independent from one another. For instance, we tested whether the categorical variable “LRP stage” and the categorical variable “genotype” were independent (H0) or not (H1). If the distribution LRP stage is not independent from genotype (i.e., if p < 0.05), then the conclusion is that the compared genotypes have significantly different LRP growth speed.

All charts displaying values as bars show averages of several replicate experiments (number of combined replicate experiments and of biological replicates are indicated in the figure legends), and error bars always represent standard error of the mean (SEM).

DATA AND CODE AVAILABILITY

Neither custom code nor datasets were generated in this study. Transcriptomics results presented in this study rely on a previously published dataset [36].