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ABSTRACT

Control of flowering time has been a major focus of comparative genetic analyses in plant development. This study reports on a forward genetic approach to define previously uncharacterized components of flowering control pathways in the long-day legume, pea (*Pisum sativum* L.). We isolated two complementation groups of late-flowering mutants in pea that define two uncharacterized loci, *LATE BLOOMER 3* (*LATE3*) and *LATE4*, and describe their diverse effects on vegetative and reproductive development. A map-based comparative approach was employed to identify the underlying genes for both loci, revealing that that *LATE3* and *LATE4* are orthologs of CYCLIN DEPENDENT KINASE8 (CDK8) and CYCLIN C1 (CYCC1), components of the CDK8 kinase module of the Mediator complex, which is a deeply conserved regulator of transcription in eukaryotes. We confirm the genetic and physical interaction of *LATE3* and *LATE4*, and show that they contribute to the transcriptional regulation of key flowering genes, including the induction of the florigen gene *FTa1* and repression of the floral repressor *LF*. Our results establish the conserved importance of the CDK8 module in plants and provide evidence for the function of CYCC1 orthologs in the promotion of flowering and the maintenance of normal reproductive development.
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INTRODUCTION

The initiation of flowering is one of the key developmental changes in the plant life cycle and is regulated by different environmental factors and endogenous cues. Evidence from *Arabidopsis thaliana* indicates that it is a highly complex process, regulated by hundreds of genes through transcriptional, post-transcriptional, and epigenetic pathways (Bratzel & Turck, 2015; Song et al., 2015; Whittaker & Dean, 2017). One well-known control point is the *FT* gene, which encodes a small protein that is formed in leaf vasculature and moves through the phloem to the shoot apical meristem where it interacts with the basic leucine zipper (bZIP) domain transcription factor FD. This complex then activates transcription of floral meristem identity genes such as MADS box genes *LEAFY (LFY)* and *APETALA1 (AP1)* via *SUPPRESSOR OF OVEREXPRESSION OF CONSTANS 1 (SOC1)*, leading to initiation of flowering (Wigge *et al.*, 2005; Andres & Coupland, 2012).

There is growing appreciation of the importance of regulatory mechanisms at the *FT* locus. The effects of many different environmental and endogenous factors on flowering are integrated through effects on *FT* expression (Andres & Coupland, 2012; Song *et al.*, 2015; Cho *et al.*, 2017) and numerous proteins have been reported to associate with the *FT* promoter and other regulatory regions in or near the *FT* gene, including generalist transcription factors, transcriptional co-regulators, and histone-modifying proteins (Bratzel & Turck, 2015; Luo *et al.*, 2018). However, relatively little detail is known about specific mechanisms and interactions by which these factors regulate *FT* transcription.

Transcriptional regulation is also critical at many other different points in the flowering time network. For example, in addition to direct regulation of and by *FT* itself, pathways upstream and downstream also feature transcriptional control. Examples include the circadian and light control of the *FT* activator *CONSTANS* (Shim *et al.*, 2017), repression of the *FT* repressor *FLC* in response to cold (Whittaker & Dean, 2017), and the mutually repressive interactions that establish organ identity and govern the patterning of inflorescences and flowers (Wagner, 2017). In addition to these largely flowering-specific factors, many general transcriptional and epigenetic regulators have also been identified from their effects on flowering time and
reproductive development, or have been shown to participate in these processes. These include
NUCLEAR FACTOR-Y, the TOPLESS co-repressor, and polycomb repressive complex 2
(Causier et al., 2012; Eom et al., 2018).

In comparison to Arabidopsis, less is known about flowering time control in other plant groups.
Loci controlling natural variation for flowering time have been identified across many major
crop species (Fjellheim et al., 2014; Blumel et al., 2015; Brambilla et al., 2017; Cao et al.,
2017b; Higuchi, 2018) and such studies have highlighted aspects of regulation that are deeply
conserved but others that may be confined to specific groups. As in Arabidopsis, flowering time
control involves both specific pathways and general transcriptional and chromatin regulators (Shi
et al., 2014; Brambilla et al., 2017). However, our understanding of the mechanisms controlling
flowering time is still relatively limited in many species.

Legumes are a major plant group that includes many crop plants which display wide,
agriculturally relevant variation in flowering time (Weller & Ortega, 2015). They include both
short-day (SD) and long-day (LD) responsive species for which soybean (Glycine max) and pea
(Pisum sativum) have been prominent examples. Characterization of induced mutants and natural
variation in these and other species have been useful in defining flowering-associated loci
(Weller & Ortega, 2015; Cao et al., 2017a), and reverse genetics is increasingly employed for
defining specific gene functions (e.g. (Laurie et al., 2011; Berbel et al., 2012; Cai et al., 2018)).
A forward genetic strategy in pea has previously identified a number of loci that control
flowering time through primary roles in light perception and signaling, circadian clock function,
and regulation and function of florigen genes (e.g. Sussmilch et al., 2015; Weller & Ortega,
2015; Ridge et al., 2016). In this study, we have characterized two additional loci, LATE
BLOOMER 3 (LATE3) and LATE4, that have extremely late-flowering mutant phenotypes and
other pleiotropic effects on vegetative and reproductive development. We identify these genes as
likely components of the Mediator transcriptional co-regulator complex, and present evidence
that their effects on flowering may in part result from effects on the transcription of FT and TFL1
homologs.
RESULTS

**LATE3 and LATE4 promote flowering and impair responsiveness to photoperiod**

Among a number of flowering-time mutants generated through EMS mutagenesis (Hecht et al., 2007), we identified five similar fully-recessive mutants that showed a substantial delay in flowering and maturity under LD conditions. These mutants defined two genetic loci; *LATE BLOOMER 3* (*LATE3*), with three mutant alleles, and *LATE4*, with two alleles (Figure 1A). Four of the five mutants flowered equivalently late at around node 35 in comparison to WT line NGB5839 which flowered at around node 16 under LD (Figure 1B). Only the *late3-1* mutant was notably earlier in flowering than the other mutants. Overall, the *late3* and *late4* late-flowering phenotype was notably more severe than that of other previously described late-flowering mutants at the *PHYTOCHROME A* (*PHYA*), *LATE1*, and *LATE2* loci (Ridge et al., 2016). We also examined the response of *late3* and *late4* mutants to photoperiod and vernalization. Whereas WT and *late3-1* flowered earlier under LD than under SD, other mutants at both loci showed no effect of photoperiod on flowering initiation (Figure 1B). By contrast, all mutant lines showed a small but significant response to vernalization under SD (P<0.05 in all cases), similar to WT (Figure 1B).

**LATE3 and LATE4 have pleiotropic effects throughout reproductive development**

The *late3* and *late4* mutants also shared a number of additional defects that differed from those seen in previously described flowering-time mutants in pea. The most conspicuous of these was an extreme delay in maturity and senescence illustrated by the substantial increase in the number of reproductive nodes relative to WT (Figure 1C, I-RN; P<0.05 for all comparisons). This was accompanied by, and probably in part enhanced by, numerous defects in other aspects of reproductive development, including flower and inflorescence formation, flower fertility, pod formation, and seed content. For example, whereas most secondary inflorescences in *late3* and *late4* mutants had a normal structure and developed to produce open flowers, a substantial minority showed growth defects in which they remained arrested or aborted at an early growth stage (Figure S1A-C). Other
secondary inflorescences displayed defects in identity, failing to suppress leaflet and bract formation and/or exhibiting reduced determinacy (Figure S1A-C).

Where flowers did develop fully and open, other defects were evident. Some had abnormal organ morphology and number, and in the more severe mutants, pollen abundance was low, and most flowers were sterile, with pods forming on only a small proportion of flowers (Figure 2A).

During the process of genetic analysis, it became apparent that the success rate of crosses made with WT pollen onto late3 and late4 mutants was also markedly reduced, suggesting that the reduced fertility derived from both paternal and maternal defects. When pods were formed they often arrested in a partially developed state, and where they developed fully, were generally shorter and contained fewer, smaller seeds (Figure 2B-D, Figure S2).

Finally, all mutants showed variable expression of these defects across the reproductive phase, with zones of more advanced development followed by stages of greater impairment. In addition, after forming 12–20 reproductive nodes, the mutants reverted to production of vegetative axillary buds, and in some cases subsequently re-initiated reproductive development at later nodes (Figure 1C, Figure S1D-E). Overall, provided they remained disease free, late3 and late4 mutant plants under glasshouse LD continued to grow for more than six months without signs of terminal senescence, in contrast to WT which generally reached maturity within 90 days.

**LATE3 and LATE4 also affect aspects of vegetative development**

Initial observations in segregating progenies suggested late3 and late4 mutants could also be distinguished from WT early in development, on the basis of a number of vegetative growth traits. Both late3 and late4 mutants showed significant reduction in leaflet area, petiole and proximal rachis length (Figure S3A-C, both $p < 0.0001$), and stem diameter compared to WT (Figure S3E, $p < 0.0001$). By 4 weeks after sowing, mutants also exhibited lower shoot and root dry weight in comparison to WT (Figure S3F-G, both $p < 0.05$). The late3 and late4 mutants also showed a substantial increase in shoot branching relative to WT, when assessed as the ratio of total branch length to total height at maturity. (Figure S3H, $p < 0.0001$). For individual late3 and late4 plants, branching started at around node 11 or 12 and continued for a few nodes,
followed by a gap, with branches re-appearing just below the node of flower initiation (Figure S1D-E, Figure S4). Whereas late3 mutants showed only aerial branching, we observed both basal and aerial branching for late4 mutants. Previously, various photoperiod sensitive and non-sensitive late-flowering mutants were shown to exhibit only basal and aerial branching, respectively (Hecht et al., 2007; Berbel et al., 2012; Sussmilch et al., 2015). Also, whereas WT plants typically show an increase in the length of internodes immediately below the node of first open flower (e.g. Weller et al., 1997), this was not seen in the stronger late3 and late4 mutants (Figure S3I). Finally, the mutants also showed a delay in the normal progression of compound leaf morphology from one to two pairs of leaflets (Figure S3J), and never progressed to the three-pair stage.

**LATE3 and LATE4 are putative components of the Mediator complex**

Analysis of the F2 progeny of a cross between cv. Térèse and late3-1 (n=255) located LATE3 in a 0.3-cM interval on pea linkage group III (LG III) between markers BTB1 and SPS1 (Figure S5A, Table S1). The corresponding interval on *Medicago truncatula* chromosome 3 (version 4.0) is 0.9 Mb in length and includes 62 annotated genes (Table S1). A similar mapping population (cv. Térèse x late4-1 F2; n=189) was used initially to define the position of the LATE4 locus within a 3.2-cM interval on LG V, flanked by markers MCO1 and BZIP1 (Figure S5B). Genotyping of further markers within this region in relevant recombinant individuals refined this position to an interval corresponding to a 0.5-Mb region of *M. truncatula* chromosome 7 containing 54 annotated genes (Figure S5C, Table S2).

The very close phenotypic similarity between late3 and late4 mutants suggested the possibility that the LATE3 and LATE4 genes might encode proteins with complementary functions, potentially acting within the same pathway or protein complex. Therefore, the two regions were scanned for pairs of genes that might be closely related in function. These analyses revealed the presence in both intervals of genes orthologous to components of the Mediator transcriptional regulator complex; *CYCLIN DEPENDENT KINASE 8* (CDK8, Medtr3g096960) and *CYCLIN C1* (CYCC1, Medtr7g055650; Figure S6, S7). This complex is deeply conserved from yeast to humans and flowering plants, and consists of 28–34 component proteins that form four distinct
modules (Allen & Taatjes, 2015; Jeronimo & Robert, 2017). The CDK8 and CYCC1 proteins associate with two other proteins, MED12 and MED13, to form the so-called CDK8 module (Dolan & Chapple, 2017; Jeronimo and Robert, 2017).

In parallel, RNA sequencing was used to screen transcripts from genes inferred to be within the LATE3 mapping interval for polymorphisms between late3-1 and LATE3 genotypes. Whereas only partial coverage of the transcripts within the region was achieved (Table S3), this analysis nevertheless identified a G-to-A mutation typical of EMS exposure at position -17 in the 5′UTR of the CDK8 ortholog in late3-1, which was verified by Sanger sequencing. This mutation potentially introduces an alternative start codon (GTG/ATG) codon, defining a short (25 amino-acid) open reading frame (ORF) out of frame with the CDK8 CDS (Figure 3A, S8, S9). Perfect co-segregation of the PsCDK8 genotype with the late3 phenotype in the mapping population confirmed the presence of this gene within the defined genetic interval (Figure S4A). Sequencing of PsCDK8 cDNA and gDNA in late3-2 and late3-3 subsequently revealed splice site mutations in both mutants. In late3-2, a mutation in the -1 position of the 3′ splice site of intron 12 (AG/AA) resulted in skipping of exon 13 (Figure 3A, S8, S9), whereas in late3-3, a mutation in the +1 position of the 5′ splice site of intron 4 (GT/AT) resulted in retention of 7 bp from intron 4 in the cDNA, consistent with the activation of an alternative splice site (Figure 3A, S8, S9). Both splicing defects were verified by PCR from cDNA using primers specific for either WT or mutant transcript and would be predicted to result in frameshift and a truncated protein (Figure S9).

In view of these results, the pea CYCC1 gene (corresponding to transcript PsCam050605) was sequenced from the late4-1 and late4-2 mutants. This revealed a nonsense mutation in exon 5 introducing a premature stop codon (Q103X) in late4-2, and in late4-1, a G-to-A mutation at the +5 position of the 5′ splice site in intron 5 (GTAAGC/GTAAAC) (Figure 3C, Figure S10, S11). As in the analysis of CDK8/LATE3, mapping of PsCYCC1 confirmed its presence within the defined LATE4 interval and demonstrated the absence of recombination with the late4 phenotype in the original mapping population (Figure S4B).
Splicing defects in *late4* mutants

Amplification of cDNA from *late4* mutants indicated the presence of multiple bands suggestive of possible splicing variants (**Figure S11A**). This was confirmed by sequencing of cloned fragments, which identified multiple distinct transcripts with variations around the site of the mutations (**Figure S11B, C**). Whereas the majority of transcripts in the *late4-2* mutant were WT in structure (22 out of 27 clones sequenced), instances of skipping, partial deletion, and partial intron retention involving exon 5 were detected (**Figures 3D, S11, S12**). However, all transcripts would be expected to be non-functional, in view of the presence of the *late4-2* nonsense mutation and/or frameshift. In the case of *late4-1*, a small proportion of WT transcripts were also detected (3 out of 17), but the majority of transcripts displayed splicing defects around exon 5 (**Figures 3D, S11, S13**) indicative of selection of alternative/cryptic splice sites in preference to the standard site affected by the mutation. All proteins hypothetically encoded by the aberrant transcripts would show significant disruption of the major functional domain of the PsCYCC1 protein, the cyclin N domain, and would therefore likely be inactive.

**LATE3 and LATE4 interact genetically and physically**

The molecular identities of LATE3 and LATE4 and the similarity of their mutant phenotypes implied their likely genetic and physical interaction. To examine their genetic interaction, we selected *late3-1 late4-2* double mutants. The results in **Figure 4A-C** showed that the double mutant did not differ from the stronger of the two single mutants with respect to either node of flower initiation or leaflet area, indicating that LATE3 and LATE4 act in the same genetic pathway. The potential direct physical interaction between LATE3 and LATE4 was then examined using the yeast two-hybrid assay. We found that diploid yeast colonies carrying *PsCDK8* and *PsCYCC1* bait and prey plasmids displayed growth similar to a strong positive interaction control on selective medium (SC-L-W-H+10 mM 3AT) (**Figure 4D**), whereas all negative controls showed no growth. These results indicate that LATE3 and LATE4 also show a strong physical interaction, consistent with their molecular identity as components of the same deeply conserved protein complex.
Genetic interactions between *LATE3* and *LATE4* and other flowering genes

Previous genetic analyses in pea have outlined a genetic pathway for flowering time control (Hecht *et al.*, 2011; Sussmilch *et al.*, 2015; Weller & Ortega, 2015). In an attempt to locate *LATE3* and *LATE4* within this model, we examined the genetic interaction of *late3* and *late4* with two early-flowering mutants, namely *sn* and *lf*. *SN* has primary role as a component of the circadian clock evening complex, which acts to repress flowering and *FT* expression (Liew *et al.*, 2014; Rubenach *et al.*, 2017). *LF* is one of three pea *TFL1* co-orthologs (Foucher *et al.*, 2003), and appears to act downstream of the *FT* gene *FTa1* to repress expression of inflorescence identity genes (Hecht *et al.*, 2011; Sussmilch *et al.*, 2015).

**Figure 5A** shows that both *lf late3* and *lf late4* mutants initiated flowering very early, and in this respect were much more similar to *lf* single mutants than to *late3* or *late4*. This indicates that the effects of *late3* and *late4* mutations on flower initiation largely depend on the repressive effects of *LF*, although a small but significant increase in flowering node in the double mutants relative to the *lf* single mutant (P<0.01 for both comparisons) indicates that *LATE3* and *LATE4* can also influence the initiation of flowering independently of *LF* to a small extent. In other respects, the double mutant phenotypes were more similar to *late3* and *late4*, with a massively extended reproductive phase and delayed maturity (**Figure S14**). In the case of *SN*, we identified plants with *sn late4* genotype as late-flowering segregants in F3 progeny derived from *sn* individuals in the F2 of a cross between the *sn-4* and *late4-1* mutants. **Figure 5B** shows that in the presence of *late4*, the *sn* mutation was unable to promote flowering, and *sn late4* plants in fact initiated flowering even later than *late4* single mutant controls. This suggests that *LATE4* acts downstream of the changes to *FT* expression that are assumed to be the primary cause of the *sn* early-flowering phenotype (Liew *et al.*, 2014; Rubenach *et al.*, 2017).

**LATE3** and **LATE4** regulate expression of *FT* genes and inflorescence-identity genes

We next sought to understand how *LATE3* and *LATE4* might regulate the initiation of flowering by examining the effect of *late3* and *late4* mutations on expression of several key flowering-time genes. This analysis focused on the *late3-1* and *late4-1* mutants, which were the only two alleles
for which sufficient quantities of seeds were available. Under LD conditions, WT and late3-1
visible flower buds were first detected in dissected apices of WT and late3-1 plants by 42 and 80
days after sowing respectively, whereas late4-1 mutants did not flower before termination of the
experiment. In Arabidopsis, CDK8 module genes influence the flowering pathway in several
different ways, including partially independent effects on FLC, FT, and SOC1/FUL expression
(Imura et al. 2012). As FLC-like genes are absent from the genomes of pea and related legumes
(Hecht et al. 2005), we focused on an analysis of FT genes and inflorescence-identity genes.

Previous studies have shown that two of the six pea FT genes, FTa1 and FTb2, are induced in
leaves under LD, whereas a third gene (FTc) is induced at the shoot apex in parallel with
inflorescence-identity genes VEG1 and PIM (Hecht et al., 2011; Sussmilch et al., 2015). Figure
6 shows that the expression of the FTa1 gene in leaves was significantly induced above
background by 28 days after sowing in WT plants, but remained low in late3 and late4 mutants.
By contrast, the induction of FTb2 at this same time point was apparently unaffected.
Similar to FTa1 in leaves, expression of the inflorescence-identity genes VEG1 and PIM in shoot
apices was induced by 28 days after sowing in WT plants, but remained at background levels in
late3 and late4 mutants, only rising in late3 at around the time of flower initiation, 10 weeks
after sowing. A similar pattern of expression in the shoot apex was also shown by the LFY
ortholog UNI and the apex-specific FTc gene. Effects on expression of the FTa1, DET/TFL1a,
and VEG2/FD genes were not clear, but LF/TFL1c was expressed at a higher level in late3 and
late4 than in WT.

DISCUSSION

LATE3 and LATE4 are Mediator components

Mapping and sequencing from multiple independent mutant alleles have established the identity
of pea flowering-time loci LATE3 and LATE4 as the pea orthologs of CDK8 and CYCC1; two
genes that encode physically-interacting components of the Mediator transcriptional regulation
complex. This conclusion is further supported by the very similar pleiotropic phenotypes of *late3* and *late4* mutants, and by their genetic and physical interactions.

Mediator is a large and dynamically variable multiprotein complex with diverse and deeply conserved roles in regulation of gene expression from yeast to animals and plants (Allen & Taatjes, 2015; Dolan & Chapple, 2017; Jeronimo & Robert, 2017). It comprises four different modules of which three (head, tail, and middle) form the so-called "core" Mediator, which has a positive role in general regulation of transcription. The core Mediator forms a pre-initiation complex (PIC) with transcription factors at promoters of target genes, in which it acts to convey signals from gene-specific transcription and to enable the continuous reinitiation of transcription by RNA polymerase II (Knuesel *et al.*, 2009a). LATE3 and LATE4 are orthologous to components of the fourth, cyclin-dependent kinase module (CKM), which has been shown to bind reversibly with the core Mediator to modify its transcriptional activity (Knuesel *et al.*, 2009a; Allen & Taatjes, 2015).

In plants, a number of different Mediator subunits have been functionally characterized. The first to be described was Arabidopsis PFT1/MED25 (Cerdán & Chory, 2003; Backstrom *et al.*, 2007) which is a component of the middle module of the core Mediator complex. More recently, functional studies have been reported on a number of other core Mediator components, which have been shown to participate in distinctive ways in diverse processes related to root, shoot, and reproductive development and responses to disease and abiotic stress (Dolan & Chapple, 2017; Kumar *et al.*, 2018; Zhang *et al.*, 2018). Three of the four subunits of the kinase module (CDK8/CDKE1/HEN3, MED12/CRP/CCT, and MED13/MAB2/GCT) have also been directly functionally characterized in Arabidopsis by analysis of loss-of-function, gain-of-function, and overexpression phenotypes. Mutants have been isolated from several different screens and show diverse defects in embryonic and floral patterning (Wang & Chen, 2004; Gillmor *et al.*, 2010; Ito *et al.*, 2011), developmental phase transitions (Imura *et al.*, 2012; Gillmor *et al.*, 2014), stress and defense responses (Zhu *et al.*, 2014), and hormone signaling (Ito *et al.*, 2011; Ito *et al.*, 2016). The phenotypic effects of the fourth subunit, CYCC1, have not previously been clearly defined (Dolan & Chapple, 2017). This
reflects the fact that in Arabidopsis, CYCC1 is present as a recently duplicated tandem pair (Figure S6B), making generation of double mutants by recombination challenging. Zhu et al. (2014) isolated T-DNA-insertion mutants specific for each of these genes but reported no relevant phenotypes, although a mutant with a T-DNA insertion between the two genes showed reduced expression of both genes and some similarities to the defense-related phenotypes of the cdk8 mutant. Our description of LATE4 as the single pea ortholog of CYCC1 and characterization of the late4-2 nonsense mutant therefore describes the direct consequence of loss of CYCC1 in plants. We detected no clear phenotypic differences between strong late3 and late4 mutants, suggesting that their function is intimately related through essential and complementary roles in the CDK8 module.

Unusual mutations in late3 and late4 alleles

Among the five mutant alleles characterized in this study, only one, the late4-2 nonsense mutation, directly affected the coding region. Two others were typical splicing mutations affecting a consensus +1 donor (late3-3) or -1 acceptor site (late3-2). However, the two remaining mutations were notable for being somewhat less often described.

The late3-1 mutant carried a single G>A transition at position -17 in the 5'UTR of CDK8, introducing a novel upstream AUG and an ORF overlapping and out-of-frame with the canonical CDK8 CDS. The most straightforward interpretation is that this uAUG might provide an alternative translation initiation site (TIS), and reduce to some extent the efficiency of translation from the normal AUG (Kozak, 1987). Interference of this nature is known to be greatest when the uORF extends into the major ORF (Kozak, 1987), as seen for late3-1. However, relative to the other late3 and late4 alleles, the late3-1 mutant was distinctly less severe (Figure 1), implying that the WT CDK8 ORF is still translated to some extent in late3-1. This might in part reflect a weaker context of the upstream initiator codon introduced by the late3-1 mutation (AACAAAAUGA), which retains the conserved A in position -3 but not the G in position +4, whereas both are present in the CDK8 TIS (GCAACCAUGG). However, in a recent yeast example, targeted introduction of diverse uAUG revealed effects on both transcription and translation of the associated major ORF that were independent of immediate sequence context.
(Yun et al., 2012) suggesting the possibility of a broader influence of uAUG beyond simply providing a competing site for initiation of transcription.

The second unusual mutant, late 4-1, carried only a single G>A transition at position +5 of the donor site of CYCC1 intron 5, which interferes with normal processing of the CYCC1 transcript (Figure 3). Although +5 G is highly conserved (>75%) in U2 type GT-AG introns in yeast and animals, genome-wide analyses in Arabidopsis indicate a weaker consensus of around 50% (Sheth et al., 2006; Buratti et al., 2011), and some degree of tolerance for +5 A is therefore likely to explain the presence of normally-spliced transcript in late4-1. However, the fact that the late4-1 phenotype appears equivalently severe to that of the late4-2 nonsense allele (Figure 1) may therefore suggest that a threshold level of expression is required for CYCC1 function which exceeds that seen in late4-1. Although less common by far than mutations affecting the highly-conserved +1 and +2 positions, +5 mutations affecting splicing have been described for several human disease genes (e.g. Tran et al., 2005; Fiorentino et al., 2018).

LATE3 and LATE4 influence multiple steps in flowering time control and reproductive development

The dramatic effects of LATE3 and LATE4 mutations point to a key role for the Mediator kinase module in promotion of flowering and maintenance of diverse aspects of reproductive development. In Arabidopsis, effects of CDK8 and CYCC on flowering have not been examined in detail. However, single mutants for the other two CKM components MED12 and MED13 show similar, relatively strong LD-specific late-flowering phenotypes, again consistent with a close functional relationship (Imura et al., 2012). A weaker late-flowering phenotype has also been reported for an RNA-null CDK8 insertion mutant (Zhu et al., 2014) but this effect has not been further characterized. Thus, based on this relatively limited evidence it appears that there may be some difference in the relative effects of CKM components on flowering time in Arabidopsis. This is supported by observations from other systems indicating that CKM components, in addition to their co-operative functions, may also function independently to some extent (e.g. Loncle et al., 2007). It also points to a potential difference between pea and Arabidopsis with respect to CDK8 function in flowering time control.
Mutants for LATE3 and LATE4 have similar effects on flowering gene expression, with reduced expression of GIGAS/FTa1 in leaves and multiple inflorescence-identity genes in the shoot apex. One interpretation of this is that FTa1 might be the primary target of CKM regulation and that effects on other genes might be a downstream consequence of FTa1 misregulation, as most are known to be regulated by FTa1 (Hecht et al., 2011). However, the epistasis of late4 over sn, a mutant in which photoperiod-insensitive early flowering is due to elevated expression of FTa1 and other FT genes in leaves (Liew et al., 2014; Rubenach et al., 2017), suggests that the impaired flowering may not be primarily due to altered FT gene expression, but because of effects on genes downstream. It is also notable that expression of the FTb2 gene, which is qualitatively induced by LD in WT pea and not detectable in late-flowering photoperiod response mutants (Hecht et al., 2011; Ridge et al., 2016), does not appear to be affected in the late3 and late4 mutants (Figure 6) despite their clear insensitivity to photoperiod for induction of flowering (Figure 1). This again suggests a primary requirement for CKM in regulation of signaling from FT genes, rather than in their regulation.

This interpretation is also consistent with observations that expression of LF, a TFL1 paralog, was elevated in late3 and late4 mutants (Figure 6), and that for initiation of flowering, an lf null mutant was epistatic to both late3 and late4 (Figure 5). Formally, this suggests that LF is required for expression of the late3/4 late-flowering phenotype, and that the promotion of flowering by the CKM may at least in part involve the transcriptional repression of LF. However, the effect of late3 and late4 on other aspects of reproductive development in lf mutant plants clearly indicates the existence of LF-independent effects of CKM action.

No direct information about molecular effects of CDK8 and CYCC1 on flowering time is available from Arabidopsis, but characterization of med12 and med13 mutants revealed increased expression of FLC and decreased expression of FT, LFY, and MADS-domain genes SOC1, FUL, and AP1 (Imura et al., 2012). In the same study, analysis in flc and ft mutant backgrounds further established that MED12 and MED13 act at multiple steps, with control of FT expression partly independent of FLC and control of SOC1 and FUL expression at least partly independent of both FT and FLC. This has been interpreted as a potential feed-forward mechanism that may confer
robustness of the flowering transition, and is interesting because it supports the idea that the
CKM, in addition to its more well-established repressive role, may also activate expression in
specific contexts (Nemet et al., 2014). Despite the fact that FLC is not present in pea and related
legumes, it is still probable that the CKM acts at multiple steps of the flowering and
inflorescence-development pathway, including in FT-independent effects on MADS domain
genes and other targets.

**LATE3 and LATE4 have diverse pleiotropic effects**

Phenotypic effects of *late3* and *late4* mutants beyond flowering and reproductive development
indicate that the CDK8 module in pea has pervasive effects throughout development (Figures 1,
2, S1-S4). These include effects on stem thickness, leaflet size and shape, seed size and shape,
and the timing of changes in compound leaf structure, which has been implicated as a possible
marker of vegetative phase change in pea (Wiltshire et al., 1994). These effects are generally
similar to those described for Arabidopsis CKM mutants (e.g. Imura et al., 2012; Gillmor et al.,
2014; Chhun et al., 2016). This suggests that despite the taxonomic distance between pea and
Arabidopsis, and despite the fundamental role of the CKM in regulation of gene expression, its
preferential involvement in certain aspects of growth and development may be conserved to
some extent. This is likely to reflect conservation in the interactions of the CKM with specific
transcription factors and co-repressors.

In yeast and animal systems, CKM may act by interfering with the positive transcriptional role of
the core Mediator complex by blocking its association with PolII, or by directly regulating PolII
activity through phosphorylation (Nemet et al., 2014). However, there is also evidence that the
CKM can have bidirectional effects on transcription through phosphorylation of transcription
factors, and may also act independently of core Mediator, by direct and indirect modification of
histones and regulation of chromatin (Knuesel et al., 2009b; Tsutsui et al., 2013; Allen &
Taatjes, 2015). Recent transcriptome analyses have revealed broad effects of Arabidopsis CDK8
on expression of genes involved in processes such as growth regulation, photosynthesis, and
light, hormone, defense, and stress responses (Zhu et al., 2014; Mao et al., 2019), but there are
few examples in plants where the mechanisms of CKM action have been examined in detail. One
recent report has demonstrated the importance of the CDK8 kinase function for some but not all
effects on defense-related gene expression (Zhu et al., 2014). Another has linked the CKM to
auxin-dependent gene expression through its role in relaying repressive signals from ARF/IAA
proteins in association with the TOPLESS corepressor (Ito et al., 2016). Future genomic-scale
studies will help define the global effects of the pea CDK8 module, and the extent to which they
may be shared with Arabidopsis. Such studies should also help clarify the effects of pea
CDK8/CYCC1 on flowering-time pathways, and shed light on other developmental mechanisms
responsible for other aspects of the late3/late4 phenotype. Finally, in view of reports that the
Arabidopsis CKM is important for defense and abiotic stress tolerance, it may be of interest to
examine the effects of late3 and late4 on these traits.
MATERIALS AND METHODS

Plant materials
The origins of late3, late4, lf, det, and sn-4 mutants in pea (Pisum sativum L.) have been described previously (Foucher et al., 2003; Hecht et al., 2007). Plants for phenotypic characterizations and genetic analysis (Figures 1, 2, 4, 5) were grown in a glasshouse or phytotron under extended natural daylight whereas plants for gene expression analysis (Figure 6) were grown in growth chambers. Growth media, light sources, and growth conditions have been described previously (Hecht et al., 2007). Vernalization treatment was given by subjecting imbibed seeds to 4°C for 4 weeks.

Mapping
Mapping of LATE3 and LATE4 utilized a combination of previously described (Aubert et al., 2006) and new gene-based markers, developed from transcript sequences obtained from the pea gene atlas (http://bios.dijon.inra.fr/FATAL/cgi/pscam.cgi) based on sequence comparisons with orthologous genes within syntenic regions of the M. truncatula genome (Mt4.0v1, https://phytozome.jgi.doe.gov/pz/portal.html#). Marker details are provided in Table S3. Linkage analysis was performed using JoinMAP 4 (Kyazma B.V., Wageningen, Netherlands) software.

RNA sequencing and data analysis
RNA sequencing from isogenic late3-1 and LATE3 genotypes was performed on RNA pooled from entire embryos isolated from seeds 2 days after imbibition, and leaves and shoot apices from 4-week-old plants. Samples were harvested from three plants in two independent replications and one replication was used for cDNA library construction. Samples from the three different tissues were used for RNA extraction according to SV total RNA isolation (Promega). 1 µg of total RNA from each of the three tissues were pooled for preparation and indexing cDNA library using the TruSeq Stranded Total RNA library preparation kit with Ribozero Plant (Illumina). Pool of indexed cDNA libraries of about 260 bp diluted to 6 pM were then used for sequencing in a Miseq next generation sequencing machine using Miseq Reagent v3 150 cycles kit (Illumina). Quality of the reads generated was assessed in FASTQC in galaxy (Giardine et al.,...
Paired-end reads were aligned to pea transcript sequences located within the defined interval of *PsLGIII* ([Supplemental Table 3](#)) in Geneious 8.0.4 software.

### Other molecular analyses

PCR fragments were purified using Promega Wizard SV Gel and PCR Clean-Up System (Promega, Madison, WI, USA) and cloned using pGEM®-T Easy vector (Promega, Madison, WI, USA) by following manufacturer’s protocol. Sequencing was performed at Macrogen Inc. (Seoul, Korea). For gene expression assays, both leaflets from the second youngest fully-expanded leaf and a dissected apical bud containing the shoot apex (~2 mm in length) were harvested from two plants per replicate. These samples were frozen in liquid nitrogen and processed for RNA extraction, reverse transcription, and RT-qPCR, according to procedures described previously (Sussmilch et al. 2015). Two technical and three biological replicates were used for each sample point. Details of primers are given in [Table S3](#).

### Phylogenetic analysis

Phylogenetic analysis was performed by identification of genes through BLAST searches of the *Medicago truncatula* genome (Mt4.0v1) and pea gene atlas with reciprocal BLAST searches against the Arabidopsis genome at TAIR (www.arabidopsis.org) to confirm gene identity. Full-length amino acid sequences were aligned using ClustalX (Thompson *et al.*, 1997), adjusted manually, and analyzed using distance based methods in PAUP* ([Figure S6, S7, S10](#)).

### Yeast two-hybrid assay

Full length coding sequences of *PsCDK8* and *PsCYCC1* were amplified from WT (NGB5839) cDNA, cloned into yeast two-hybrid destination vectors, and tested for interactions following methods of de Folter and Immink (2011) as described previously (Ridge *et al.*, 2016). Empty vector controls were performed to test, and controls for strong and negative interactions provided as part of the ProQuest™ Two-Hybrid System were performed according to the manufacturer’s instructions. Relevant details of primers and constructs are listed in [Supplemental Tables 4 and 5](#).
Statistical analysis

For statistical analysis of data presented in Figures 1, 2, 4 and 6, Welch t-test (two tailed) with 95% confidence interval was performed whereas for Figure 6, a one-way ANOVA followed by Dunnett test was used. Analyses were conducted in GraphPad Prism (v7, GraphPad Software Inc.).

Accession numbers

Sequences referred to in this article can be found in the Pisum sativum v1a genome database (urgi.versailles.inra.fr) under loci Psat5g058480/PsCam048317 (PsCDK8/LATE3) and Psat3g149520/PsCam050605 (PsCYCC1/LATE4)
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**FIGURE LEGENDS**

Figure 1. Mutations at *LATE3* and *LATE4* loci delay flowering and prolong the reproductive phase

(A) Representative WT (NGB5839), *late3*, and *late4* plants grown under 16-h long-day conditions. To account for the disparity in flowering time, this image compares WT and mutants at 62 and 130 days after sowing, respectively. (B, C) Effect of photoperiod and vernalization on flowering initiation in WT, *late3*, and *late4* mutant plants. Data represent mean ± SE for n = 6–8 plants. SD, short day; LD; long day; +V, vernalization; NFI, node of flower initiation; I-RN, initial reproductive nodes, IR-VN, inflorescence reverted – vegetative nodes, L-RN, later reproductive nodes.
Figure 2. Mutations at *LATE3* and *LATE4* loci affect varied aspects of reproductive development

(A) Total number of flowers and pods at maturity (B) Seed content per pod (from 1 to 5 seeds) expressed as a proportion of the total number of seed-bearing pods (C) 10-seed dry weight, and (D) Total number of seeds per plant. Data were collected at the time of harvest and represented as mean ± SE for n = 6 (A, B, D) or n = 3 (C).

Figure 3. Mutant alleles at *LATE3* and *LATE4* loci carry mutations in genes encoding Mediator complex components CYCLIN-DEPENDENT KINASE8 and CYCLIN C1, respectively.

Diagrams showing (A) gene structure of *PsCDK8* and the nature and location of mutations in *late3* alleles; (B) gene structure of *PsCYCC1* and the nature and location of mutations in *late4* alleles. Exons are represented by numbered boxes, with grey shading designating 5′- and 3′UTRs. Dashed lines in (A) represent introns not fully characterized. Sequence details of mutations and splice variants are shown in Supplemental Figures S9, S12, and S13.

Figure 4. *LATE3* and *LATE4* show genetic and physical interaction.

(A-C) Comparison of WT, *late3*-1, and *late4*-2 single mutants, and the *late3*-1 *late4*-2 double mutant grown under LD conditions (A) Representative 75-day-old plants (B) Node of flower initiation (C) Representative leaflet area (single leaflet from leaf 10). Data represent mean ± SE for n=6-10 plants. (D) Yeast two hybrid analysis for interaction between *PsCDK8* and *PsCYCC1* proteins from WT (NGB5839) genotype. The image shows diploid yeast colonies derived via mating of haploid yeast strains PJ694 α and PJ694 A carrying different bait and prey plasmids for experimental and control interactions (as indicated). For each interaction tested, two colonies derived from independent matings (upper panel-colony 1, lower panel- colony 2) were used grown in selective interaction specific (SC-L-W-H +10 mM 3AT; right panels) and selective mating specific (SC-L-W; left panels) medium and incubated at 30°C for 4 days. Key interactions are highlighted in red.
Figure 5. Genetic interactions of late3 and late4 mutants with early-flowering mutants if and sn.
(A) Node of flower initiation (NFI) and number of reproductive nodes (RN) in WT, if, late3-2, late4-1, if late3-2, and if late4-1 genotypes. (B) Node of flower initiation in WT, sn-4, late4-1, and sn-4 late4-1 genotypes. (C, D) Representative plants at 75 days (D) and 63 days (D) after sowing. All plants were grown in long days. Data in (A) and (B) represent mean ± SE for n = 6–10 plants.

Figure 6. LATE3 and LATE4 loci affect expression of several florigen family and inflorescence-identity genes.
Developmental time courses for expression of key flowering genes in leaf and shoot apex material from WT NGB5839 (black), late3-1 mutant (blue), and late4-2 mutant (red) grown under long-day conditions. Data have been normalized to the reference gene TFIIa and represent mean ± SE for n=3 biological replicates each consisting of material pooled from 2 different plants. Black and blue dashed lines indicate the time that flower buds first became visible in dissected shoot apices of WT and late3-1 mutants, respectively. Flower initiation did not occur in late4-1 mutants for the duration of the experiment. Time points at which expression in WT was significantly different from both mutants (p≤0.05) are indicated with an asterisk.
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Figure 1. Mutations at LATE3 and LATE4 loci delay flowering and prolong the reproductive phase

(A) Representative WT (NGB5839), late3 and late4 plants grown under 16-h long-day conditions. To account for the disparity in flowering time, this image compares WT and mutants at 62 and 130 days after sowing, respectively.

(B, C) Effect of photoperiod and vernalization on flowering initiation in WT, late3 and late4 mutant plants. Data represent mean ± SE for n = 6-8 plants. SD, short day; LD; long day; +V, vernalization; NFI, node of flower initiation; I-RN, initial reproductive nodes, IR-VN, inflorescence reverted – vegetative nodes, L-RN, later reproductive nodes.
Figure 2. Mutations at LATE3 and LATE4 loci affect varied aspects of reproductive development

(A) Total number of flowers and pods at maturity (B) Seed content as a proportion of the total number of seed-bearing pods (C) 10-seed dry weight, and (D) Total number of seeds per plant.
Data were collected at the time of harvest and represented as mean ± SE for n = 6 (A, B, D) or n = 3 (C)
Figure 3. Mutant alleles at *LATE3* and *LATE4* loci carry mutations in genes encoding Mediator complex components *CYCLIN-DEPENDENT KINASE8* and *CYCLIN C1*, respectively.

Diagrams showing (A) gene structure of *PsCDK8* and the nature and location of mutations in late3 alleles; (B) gene structure of *PsCYCC1* and the nature and location of mutations in late4 alleles. Exons are represented by numbered boxes, with grey shading designating 5' and 3'UTRs. Dashed lines in (A) represent introns not fully characterized. Sequence details around the mutations and for splice variants are shown in Supplemental Figures S9, S12 and S13.
Figure 4. LATE3 and LATE4 show genetic and physical interaction.

(A-C) Comparison of WT, late3-1 and late4-2 single mutants, and the late3-1 late4-2 double mutant grown under LD conditions (A) Representative 75 day old plants (B) Node of flower initiation (C) Representative leaflet area (single leaflet from leaf 10).

(D) Yeast two hybrid analysis for interaction between PsCDK8 and PsCYCC1 proteins from WT (NGB5839) genotype. The image shows diploid yeast colonies derived via mating of haploid yeast strains PJ694 a and PJ694 A carrying different bait and prey plasmids for experimental and control interactions (as indicated). For each interaction tested, two colonies derived from independent matings (upper panel-colony 1, lower panel- colony 2) were used grown in selective interaction specific (SC-L-W-H +10 mM 3AT; right panels) and selective mating specific (SC-L-W; left panels) medium and incubated at 30 °C for four days. Key interactions are highlighted in red.
Figure 5. Genetic interactions of *late3* and *late4* mutants with early flowering mutants *lf* and *sn*.

(A) Node of flower initiation (NFI) and number of reproductive nodes (RN) in WT, *lf*, *late3-2*, *late4-1*, *lf late3-2*, and *lf late4-1* genotypes. (B) Node of flowering initiation in WT, *sn-4*, *late4-1*, and *sn-4 late4-1* genotypes. (C, D) Representative plants at 75 d (D) and 63 d (D) after sowing. All plants were grown in long days. Data in (A) and (B) represent mean ± SE for *n* = 6-10 plants.
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