Spatial transcriptional signatures define margin morphogenesis along the proximal–distal and medio-lateral axes in tomato (Solanum lycopersicum) leaves
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Abstract

Leaf morphogenesis involves cell division, expansion, and differentiation in the developing leaf, which take place at different rates and at different positions along the medio-lateral and proximal–distal leaf axes. The gene expression changes that control cell fate along these axes remain elusive due to difficulties in precisely isolating tissues. Here, we combined rigorous early leaf characterization, laser capture microdissection, and transcriptomic sequencing to ask how gene expression patterns regulate early leaf morphogenesis in wild-type tomato (Solanum lycopersicum) and the leaf morphogenesis mutant trifoliate. We observed transcriptional regulation of cell differentiation along the proximal–distal axis and identified molecular signatures delineating the classically defined marginal meristem/blastozone region during early leaf development. We describe the role of endoreduplication during leaf development, when and where leaf cells first achieve photosynthetic competency, and the regulation of auxin transport and signaling along the leaf axes. Knockout mutants of BLADE-ON-PETIOLE2 exhibited ectopic shoot apical meristem formation on leaves, highlighting the role of this gene in regulating margin tissue identity. We mapped gene expression signatures in specific leaf domains and evaluated the role of each domain in conferring indeterminacy and permitting blade outgrowth. Finally, we generated a global gene expression atlas of the early developing compound leaf.

Introduction

A major theme in plant development is the reiteration of patterning events, which are influenced by the identity and relative arrangement of neighboring plant parts. The phyto- mer concept describes reiterated units of the leaf, stem, and axillary bud that make up the aboveground shoot
IN A NUTSHELL

Background: Leaf development involves cell division, expansion, and cellular specialization in specific positions along the middle to margin and top to bottom axes of a leaf. These regions expand and develop at different rates.

Question: We wanted to understand what the differences in development are between the middle and the margin of a leaf. We used a microscope-based method and small lasers to dissect out six tiny regions of a young tomato leaf.

Findings: Using precisely dissected regions of the young leaf, we generated a global gene expression atlas of the early developing tomato leaf. We describe when and where leaf cells first begin photosynthesis. Surprisingly, photosynthetic capability is first seen in the middle regions of the leaf and not the blade. We also describe the role of the plant hormone auxin in various regions of the leaf. We evaluated the role of gene expression in each domain in conferring the ability to continue cell division and permitting blade outgrowth. Knockout mutants of one gene, BLADE-ON-PETIOLE2, exhibited shoot apical meristem formation on leaves, highlighting the role of this gene in regulating the balance between cell division and blade outgrowth.

Next steps: Since our gene expression dataset is extremely large, we will test more genes that were identified from the dataset to see the exact way in which they control leaf shape early in development.

(Sussex and Kerk, 2001). Molecular analyses comparing development in various plant species suggest that the reiteration of developmental patterning in plants is defined by the recruitment of a common molecular toolbox, and the dizzying array of leaf architecture found in plants results from variations on a common genetic regulatory program (Blein et al., 2008; Bendahmane and Theres, 2011; Tsukaya, 2014).

The shoot apical meristem (SAM), which is located at the growing tip of the shoot, is a dome-like structure containing reservoirs of continually self-renewing stem cells and is characterized by spatially defined zones. The peripheral zone of the SAM gives rise to most lateral organs, including leaves. Like the SAM, the angiosperm leaf has been historically defined in terms of zones and spatial cell organization. Leaf development begins with periclinal cell divisions on the periphery of the SAM and continues as cells proceed through the specific steps of development beginning with cell division, followed by cell expansion and cell specialization. In many instances, this specialization involves endoreduplication. The timing of these stages varies depending on the cell position on the leaf primordium.

Leaf morphogenesis and patterning occur along three main axes: the abaxial–adaxial, proximal–distal, and medio-lateral axes. Many studies have focused on the importance of the abaxial–adaxial boundary in establishing leaf polarity (Eshed et al., 2001; Kidner and Timmermans, 2007; Moon and Hake, 2011), but less is known about the proximal–distal and medio-lateral axes of the leaf. During the development of many eudicot leaves, including those of Arabidopsis thaliana and Solanum lycopersicum (tomato), cells differentiate more rapidly in the distal (top) region than in the proximal (base) region. Along the medio-lateral axis, the differentiation at the margin of a leaf is decelerated relative to the more medial regions (midvein, rachis, petiole). Thus, historically, the leaf margin is of particular interest because it maintains cellular pluripotency longer than the other regions and has even been described as a meristematic region termed the marginal meristem (Avery, 1933; Poethig and Sussex, 1985b) or marginal blast zone (Hagemann and Gleissberg, 1996).

Although the developmental fate, homology, and even the name of the margin region of a leaf have been debated for roughly 100 years, there is general agreement that the process of cell differentiation in this region largely determines final leaf shape (Ori et al., 2007; Efroni et al., 2008; Scarpella and Helariutta, 2010). The regulation and modulation of the margin identity of a leaf are responsible for blade expansion, serrations, lobing, vascular patterning, and new organ initiation, as in the case of leaflet initiation in compound leaves (Scarpella et al., 2010; Bilsborough et al., 2011).

The genetic regulation and coordination of leaf morphogenesis involve distinct changes in gene expression, as revealed by leaf transcriptomic studies in spatially defined regions across the proximal–distal axes of the simple-leaved plant A. thaliana (Beemster et al., 2005; Efroni et al., 2008; Andriankaja et al., 2012). These studies revealed the role of endoreduplication (DNA replication without cell division) in the acquisition of leaf morphogenic potential (Andriankaja et al., 2012; Beemster et al., 2005; Efroni et al., 2008). The transcriptional mapping of gene expression changes in A. thaliana (Beemster et al., 2005; Efroni et al., 2008; Andriankaja et al., 2012), tomato (Ichihashi et al., 2014), and Zea mays (maize; Li et al., 2010) shed light on how patterning by cellular differentiation along the proximal–distal axis is established. However, this information has not yet been precisely mapped at the transcriptome level outside of A. thaliana (Tian et al., 2019) with sufficient spatial resolution to define margin and midvein/rachis/petiole transcriptional identity in tomato.

Interestingly, the tomato mutant trifoliate (tf-2) loses morphogenetic competence during early leaf development and produces only three leaflets: a terminal leaflet and two lateral leaflets subtended by a long petiole (Robinson and Rick, 1954; Naz et al., 2013). The tf-2 phenotype is caused by a nucleotide deletion resulting in a frameshift in the translated amino acid sequence of an R2R3 MYB transcription factor gene (Solyc05g007870; Naz et al., 2013). Histological and...
scanning electron microscopy (SEM) analyses of the tf-2 mutant revealed that the marginal blastozone region is narrower and has fewer cells, a three-fold increase in epidermal cell size, and faster cell differentiation than the wild-type (Naz et al., 2013). While the application of auxin to the margins of wild-type S. lycopersicum leaf primordia causes leaflet initiation (Koenig et al., 2009; Naz et al., 2013), in tf-2, the margin is unable to generate leaflets in response to exogenous auxin, indicating that it lacks organogenic competency during early development (Naz et al., 2013). Understanding why this mutant is incapable of initiating more than two lateral leaflets, while wild-type leaves continue to generate an average of ten leaflets at maturity (Naz et al., 2013), could help reveal the mechanisms regulating margin maintenance and identity during complex leaf development.

Here, we used the complex tomato leaf as a model system to study the transcriptional mechanisms directing spatial cell differentiation processes during a key developmental stage in a young leaf, including the establishment of margin identity, proximal–distal patterning, and leaflet initiation. Since a leaf primordium develops at varying rates in a spatially defined manner, different developmental stages can be observed at the same time in a single leaf (Hagemann and Gleissberg, 1996; Ori et al., 2007). We anatomically characterized the earliest developmental stages in tomato and identified leaf age P4 as the stage at which the medio-lateral and proximal–distal axes are first identifiable while also containing multiple stages of leaflet organogenesis. We also characterized the role of endoreduplication in tomato leaf morphogenesis. To map the spatial transcriptional regulation of the P4 leaf using laser capture microdissection, we isolated six highly specific tissues previously unattainable during early tomato leaf development and performed RNA-seq analysis to identify gene expression changes that accompany the establishment of spatial cell differentiation patterning during leaf organogenesis. We also included tf-2 in our analysis, as tf-2 lines have early loss of morphogenetic potential in the leaf margin, thus helping us uncover a cluster of genes whose expression differs only in regions that define organogenetic capacity in the margin at the P4 stage. We further validated our results through molecular visualization, providing strong evidence for when and where photosynthesis begins in a leaf. We also used Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats (CRISPR) knockout lines to explore the role of BLADE-ON-PETIOLE2 (BOP2; Solyc10g079460) in margin development. Our approach allowed us to predict multiple gene expression differences that help explain the molecular identity of the classically described, but never transcriptionally defined, marginal meristem/blastozone region and to build a global transcriptome atlas of an early developing compound leaf.

Results

Characterization of the P4 stage of tomato leaf development

The goal of this work was to characterize gene expression changes that occur during tomato leaf morphogenesis. We further focused on the medio-lateral axis in an attempt to identify how the marginal blastozone maintains the potential for leaflet organogenesis and the regulation of cell fate identity. We chose to use the leaf stage primordium 4 (P4), the fourth oldest leaf emerging from the apical meristem (Figure 1, A and B). P4 provides a comprehensive snapshot of tomato leaflet development as it contains three distinct stages of leaflet development. During this stage, the most distal region (destined to become the terminal leaflet) is undergoing early blade expansion, while the most proximal region is undergoing lateral leaflet initiation, and central to these positions is the recently initiated lateral leaflets. All

Figure 1 Experimental set-up for sampling S. lycopersicum P4 leaves. (A) Transverse section from a wild-type apex showing leaf primordia P1–P5 in relation to the SAM. (B) Image of a wild-type apex during P4 leaf development. Images of transverse sections from the (C) top, (F) middle, and (G) base regions of a wild-type P4 leaf. Colors highlight the separation of the margin (lighter colors) and rachis (darker colors) along the top (purple), middle (brown), and base (green). Schematic diagram of a P4 leaf illustrating the six regions identified in (D) wild-type and (E) tf-2. (H) Schematic diagram showing how the margin (gray) and rachis (blue) of a leaf were defined in this study. Images of leaves from wild-type (I) and tf-2 (J). Scale bars (A–E) = 100 μm and (I) and (J) = 5 mm.
three regions can be defined anatomically, allowing the boundaries along both the medio-lateral and proximal–distal axes to be clearly delineated. With our scope defined, we began our analysis with a systematic survey of tissue differentiation patterns of the P4 leaf using a combination of SEM and histological approaches to establish the cellular context for detailed tissue-specific gene expression analysis.

We defined three distinct regions of the P4 leaf along the proximal–distal axis, which are referred to as the top, middle, and base hereafter (Figure 1, C–G). These three regions can further be divided into two distinct tissues types that define the medio-lateral axis: the margin and the midrib/midvein/rachis, hereafter termed the rachis for brevity (Figure 1, C, G, and F). The most distal region, the top, will ultimately become the terminal leaflet of the mature leaf (Figure 1C). In P4 leaves, the top margin region has already begun to develop lamina tissue (blade) and has not yet developed any tertiary vasculature, but the future midvein in the top contains vascular cells including xylem and phloem (Figure 1C). The middle margin tissue has initiated the first lateral leaflets (henceforth called LL1), the first leaflets to form from the marginal blastozone, and the rachis tissue displays clear vascular bundles and more than four layers of cortex cells (Figure 1F). The most proximal area is the base, where rachis tissue has established vascular bundles (Figure 1, C, G). Cells in the margins of all three regions along the proximal–distal axis are small and nonvacuolated and have likely undergone little elongation, a characteristic of the proximal–distal axis (Kondorosi et al., 2000; Sugimoto-Shirasu and Roberts, 2003; De Veylder et al., 2011). While endoreduplication occurs at rates (256–512C) during tomato fruit development (Bergervoet et al., 1996; Joubès et al., 2000; Chenieclet et al., 2005; Bourdon et al., 2010), where and to what extent endoreduplication occurs during tomato leaf development are currently unknown. Since no reports were available on endoreduplication during tomato leaf development, we carefully characterized cell division and endoreduplication processes at the P4 stage to identify similarities and differences between early leaf development in tomato and Arabidopsis.

To observe where cell division is occurring throughout the P4 leaf, we used 5-ethyl-n-29-deoxy-uridine (EdU; Figure 2, A–F), which is incorporated during the S phase of the cell cycle and serves as a proxy to map cell division locations. Along the mediolateral axis, in wild-type and to a lesser extent in tf-2, EdU fluorescence was more prominent in the margin compared with rachis tissue (Figure 2, E and F), indicating that the margin tissue is actively undergoing cell division, as expected for marginal blastozone tissue. At the base margin region of wild-type, where LL2 will arise, EdU was incorporated in a cluster (Figure 2E), clearly demonstrating early cell division processes during LL2 initiation. Therefore, during early P4 development, LL2 initiation has already begun, although this is not always obvious based on external views of the leaf (Figure 1, B and D). The tf-2 mutant did not show clustering of EdU fluorescence in the base margin (Figure 2, E and F), revealing that the cell divisions needed for LL2 initiation have not occurred. In conclusion, cell division across the mediolateral axis in wild-type and tf-2 reflects similar processes that occur in A. thaliana (Donnelly et al., 1999), where cells are actively dividing in the margin. The cell divisions needed for LL2 initiation at P4 have already begun in the wild-type but not in tf-2. Interestingly, previous work found TRIFOLIATE (TF) expression in the marginal blastozone in initiating wild-type leaflet primordia, in regions that are compromised in a tf mutant (Naz et al., 2013). Therefore, the mechanism that restricts LL2 initiation in tf-2 is likely in place at the P4 stage of development where TF spatiotemporal expression could be directly involved.

We used flow cytometry to measure DNA content in tissues from the terminal leaflets of leaves across several developmental ages. We transferred germinated seeds to soil at Day 0 and sampled the oldest leaf on the plant at each time point. Due to the limited availability of tissue from the youngest leaf, we performed flow cytometry of whole terminal leaflet tissue beginning at 8-day old (P6 stage leaf). We detected a combination of 2C and 4C nuclei at all stages examined (Figure 2G). The 4C nuclei were likely G2 nuclei observed following DNA replication and did not reflect the endoreduplication process, although a few 8C nuclei were present at 30 and 60 days, perhaps representing cell type-specific
endocycling (Figure 2G). In A. thaliana plants, there is a difference in ploidy level between tip and base cells (Skirycz et al., 2011), but this was not the case in our analysis (Figure 2H). We conclude that endoreduplication is not as pronounced in tomato as in Arabidopsis and is likely not a vital aspect of tomato leaf morphogenesis, illustrating the diversity of cellular processes in leaf morphogenetic strategies between species.

**Laser capture of six regions of the P4 tomato leaf**

Since the P4 leaf is representative of two key developmental processes that define leaf development, i.e., margin versus rachis specification and leaflet initiation and morphogenesis, we analyzed the P4 stage more carefully. We took advantage of our comprehensive anatomical characterizations to generate a map delineating the medio-lateral axis and leaflet organogenesis. We employed laser capture microdissection following explicit rules for tissue collection (Supplemental Figure 1 and Movie 1) on P4 leaves of both wild-type and tf-2 lines to capture gene expression differences that might explain the morphogenetic differences in the margins of tf-2 plants. Specifically, we sectioned tomato apices transversely to isolate the same six subregions in both wild-type and tf-2, including the (1) top margin blastozone region (top margin), (2) top rachis, (3) middle margin, (4) middle rachis, (5) base margin, and (6) base rachis (Figure 1, C–G and Supplemental Movie 1). We attempted to collect enough tissue for seven replicates per sample, but due to the fragility of RNA at such a small tissue size, a few replicates did not pass quality control and were lost during various steps in the pipeline, resulting in a total of 3–6 biological replicates per region. We collected tissue from 6 to 8 apices per biological replicate to obtain a minimum of 2 ng of RNA per replicate. The number of cuts needed to achieve minimum RNA levels varied depending on sample and tissue density, and the total tissue area collected also varied among samples (Supplemental Figure 2, B and D). The isolated mRNA from the collected tissues was further amplified and prepared for Illumina sequencing (see Methods section). Each replicate resulted in an average of 4.9 million sequencing reads (Supplemental Figure 2, A and C). To assess the overall similarity between samples, we visualized gene expression using Multidimensional Scaling for each of the six subregions per genotype. Tissue types in each genotype generally clustered together in multidimensional space (Supplemental Figure 2A) and we observed an additional separation of margin and rachis tissue regions (Supplemental Figure 2C). The expression patterns from all
tomato genes can be visualized using an interactive electronic fluorescent pictographic (eFP) (http://bar.utoronto.ca/efp_tomato/cgi-bin/efpWeb.cgi?dataSource=Tomato_Meristem).

Differential gene expression between wild-type margin and rachis tissue along the proximal–distal axis reveals signatures of morphogenetic states during early leaf development

Identifying genes that are differentially regulated in margin versus rachis tissue in each region would shed light on gene expression patterning along the medio-lateral axis. To explore the differences between margin and rachis tissue in the three regions along the proximal–distal axis, we performed pairwise differential gene expression analysis of wild-type samples comparing the margin and rachis in each region (top, middle, base) separately (Supplemental Data Set 1) using edgeR (Robinson et al., 2010). We then performed gene ontology (GO) enrichment analysis of the significantly upregulated genes in these samples (Benjamini-Hochberg (BH)-adjusted P < 0.05; Supplemental Data Set 2). More upregulated genes in the margin region, which has historically been considered to proceed at a slower rate through the morphogenetic stages, were enriched in GO terms associated with cell processes that occur during early morphogenesis compared with rachis tissue. For example, when we looked for differentially expressed genes between the margin and rachis tissue in the top region, we identified 603 genes that were upregulated in the margin (Supplemental Figure 3A). These genes were enriched in GO terms that likely reflecting cell growth processes (Figure 3, A and Supplemental Data Set 2). Conversely, upregulated genes in the top rachis region were enriched in GO terms reflecting the cell specialization stage of morphogenesis, including terms related to transport, photosynthesis, sugar biosynthesis, and carbohydrate metabolism (Figure 3, A–C and Supplemental Data Set 2).

A comparison of genes expressed in the margin and rachis in the most proximal region (the base) revealed 1,722 genes that were upregulated in the rachis, which were enriched for GO terms related to cell wall biogenesis, transporter activity, and metabolic processing. In contrast, only 94 differentially expressed genes were upregulated in the margin tissue at the base (Supplemental Figure 3A). These upregulated genes in the margin were enriched for GO terms related to transcription factor activity and DNA binding (Supplemental Data Set 2). The types of genes that were differentially expressed between the margin and rachis also appeared to reflect that stage of morphogenesis of each region and perhaps the distal-to-proximal wave of differentiation as summarized in Figure 3, B and C. The upregulated genes in the top and middle margin regions were enriched in GO terms describing active RNA, DNA, and chromatin processing, whereas those in the base were enriched in GO terms similar to those in the rachis. The active processing of RNA, DNA, and chromatin are key gene expression signatures of cell division and expansion. The base region of the P4 leaf is still in these middle stages of morphogenesis and just beginning to start secondary cell wall biosynthesis and to become specialized for sucrose transport activity (Figure 3, A; Supplemental Data Set 2).

Taken together, the enriched GO terms of the differentially expressed genes describe different stages of morphogenesis, pointing to two trajectories of development along the leaf: development along the proximal–distal axis and the medio-lateral axis (Figure 3, B and C). Cells that have achieved specialized photosynthetic functions, leaf development, and sugar transport define the final morphogenetic stages. Margin regions undergoing active cell division are defined by chromatin assembly and DNA processing (replication, integration, and recombination), which are required for proper cell cycle progression, while the most highly meristematic tissue in the margin region at the base is defined by only transcriptional activity and transcription factor and DNA binding (Figure 3, A–C). Thus, the P4 tomato leaf represents a complex mixture of developmentally distinct regions that cannot be defined solely along the proximal–distal or medio-lateral axes.

Modeling gene expression differences across the medio-lateral axis predicts that photosynthetic activity first occurs in the rachis

Differential gene expression analysis in each region along the proximal–distal axis revealed specific genes and enriched GO terms that are unique to the top, middle, or base of the leaf. Next, we tried to identify gene activity that defines rachis and margin identity across the entire P4 leaf primordium regardless of position on the longitudinal axis. To address this issue, we performed differential gene expression analysis across the margin and rachis tissue and adjusted for variability between the proximal–distal axis by employing an additive linear model using the top, middle, and base identities as a blocking factor in our experimental design using EdgeR (Robinson et al., 2010). In the wild-type, across the entire proximal–distal axis, 1,089 genes were significantly upregulated in the rachis and 188 genes were significantly upregulated in the margin (Figure 4, A; Supplemental Data Set 3). GO enrichment analysis of these upregulated genes revealed 24 enriched GO terms in the rachis (Supplemental Data Set 4). These terms were categorized into eight major categories: sugar biosynthesis and transport, metabolism (carbohydrate and glucose), transmembrane transport, leaf development, photosynthesis/light harvesting, catalytic activity, cell wall organization, and response to light (Figure 4B). These categories reflect the activities of genes that were upregulated in the rachis compared with the margin across the entire proximal–distal axis. These results suggest that the rachis region of a P4 leaf has many specialized tissue types and may already be physiologically active.

Verifying photosynthetic gene expression patterns

Of the gene expression patterns described above, the most prominent pattern revealed by both pairwise and modeled
differential expression analyses was the persistent presence of genes associated with GO terms related to photosynthetic processes; these genes were upregulated in the rachis compared with margin tissues (Figures 3 and 4). While the upregulation of genes involved in cell wall development, leaf development, and transport might be expected in the rachis, a region of the leaf that acts as a connective corridor to the rest of the plant, we were surprised to find upregulation of so many genes defined by GO terms related to photosynthesis. As noted in the pairwise differential gene expression analysis described above, the most abundant enriched GO terms for upregulated genes in the rachis were related to photosynthesis, light harvesting, and carbohydrate metabolism. These findings highlight the importance of photosynthetic processes in the development and function of the rachis.
sugar biosynthesis and photosynthesis, indicating that the rachis region likely has functioning photosynthetic machinery before it is acquired by the P4 margin, which is destined to become the blade, the primary photosynthetic tissue of the leaf. Since little is known about when photosynthesis first begins in a developing leaf, and no previous studies have described photosynthesis specifically in the rachis, we attempted to verify the notion that the rachis is a photosynthetic force during early leaf development.

To verify the photosynthetic signature repeatedly found to be upregulated in rachis compared with margin tissue, we searched for photosynthetic genes in our data set that showed significant differential expression between the rachis and margin in each longitudinal region. We identified three Light Harvesting Chlorophyll A-B binding (CAB) genes (Solyc03g005760 [SlCAB1], Solyc03g005770 [SlCAB2], and Solyc03g005780 [SlCAB3]) with significantly upregulated expression in the rachis regions compared with the margin (Figure 4C; Supplemental Data Set 1). CAB proteins balance excitation energy between Photosystems I and II during photosynthesis (Liu and Shen, 2004) and are important components of photosynthesis.

In an attempt to verify the gene expression differences identified in our experimental setup and visualize when and where photosynthetic activity begins in a leaf primordium, we constructed a transgenic line expressing a representative CAB gene promoter attached to the β-glucuronidase (GUS) reporter (pCAB1:CAB1:GUS; Mitra et al., 2009; Tindamanyire et al., 2013). In the expanded leaflets of P8 leaves, pCAB:CAB1:GUS expression was nearly ubiquitous across the entire blade (Figure 4, D). At this age, the leaf had the anatomy of a fully functional photosynthetic organ. As predicted from our gene expression analysis, in younger leaf primordia, we found a clear pCAB:CAB1:GUS signal localized predominantly in the rachis region along the proximal-distal axis in P4-P7 leaves (Figure 4, E and F). The pCAB:CAB1:GUS signal spread to the distal tips of newly established leaflets and lobes after P4 and continued to spread to the margin tissue as development proceeded until the entire leaf showed expression (Figure 4, D–G).

Since pCAB:CAB1:GUS is predominantly expressed in the rachis region during early development, we suggest that the rachis is the first region in a developing leaf to function photosynthetically, as predicted in our RNA-seq analysis. The
enrichment of photosynthetic genes in the rachis provides evidence that during a very early developmental stage (P4), the rachis region does not simply function as a conduit for nutrients and water transport, but it also functions in photosynthesis and sugar production.

Self-organizing maps identify specific groups of genes that share similar expression patterns
To refine our results and identify groups of genes sharing similar expression patterns that may be too complex to define by differential expression analysis alone, we used self-organizing map (SOM) analysis to cluster genes based on gene expression patterns across the six tissue groups. SOM (Tamayo et al., 1999) begins by randomly assigning a gene to a cluster. Other genes are subsequently assigned to clusters based on similar expression patterns via a reiterative process informed by previous cluster assignments. This clustering method allows genes to be grouped based on specific expression patterns shared across different tissues, allowing genes to be classified into smaller groups than those generated by differential expression analysis alone. SOM analysis also allowed us to survey the most prominent types of gene expression patterns found in our data.

To focus on the most variable genes across tissues, we selected the top 25% of genes with the highest coefficients of variation, resulting in a data set of 6,582 unique genes (Supplemental Data Set 5). We used principal component (PC) analysis to visualize groups of genes and found that the first four PCs explained 31.9, 26.2, 19.0, and 13.5% of the amount of variation in the data set, respectively (Supplemental Figure 5A). Looking at the expression of these genes in the PC space revealed distinct clusters of genes with related expression patterns (Figure 5A), which show us that there is clearly identifiable similar clusters of gene expression.

We started with a small SOM cluster map of six, to identify the gene expression patterns that define the main clusters in PC space, to view the most prominent gene expression patterns in our data, and further verify what was found in our DE and GO enrichment work (Supplemental Data Set 6). To identify the most common gene expression patterns that describe the data, SOM analysis was initially limited to six clusters. One of these clusters, Cluster 4

![Figure 5](image-url)
(with 1,090 genes), defines a clear separation of margin and rachis tissues, which again reinforces our finding that the expression levels of many genes differ depending on where the sampled tissue is localized along the medio-lateral axis (margin versus rachis). This cluster is enriched in genes defined by carbohydrate metabolic processes, hydrolase activity, protein dimerization, membrane, transporter activity, and photosynthesis and light harvesting (Supplemental Figure 5 and Data Set 7). These findings mirror the results obtained by differential gene expression analysis and reflect the overall abundance and diversity of genes upregulated in the rachis and downregulated in margin, comprising the largest signal in our data set. These findings likely reflect the specialization that occurs in tissues as the rachis develops an identity distinct from the margin.

**Auxin transport and regulation as a defining feature of margin identity**

To refine our analysis of gene expression patterns to genes that direct margin identity, we generated a larger clustering map. We used this approach to obtain a smaller subset of genes than could be obtained by differential gene expression analysis or SOM clustering using a smaller number of clusters. We were especially interested in identifying specific types of gene expression patterns that defined the medio-lateral axis; in this case, we looked for groups of genes that were preferentially up or downregulated in the margin compared with the rachis. We specified 36 clusters in a 6 × 6 hexagonal topology, forcing interactions between multiple tissue types (Figure 6, A; Supplemental Figure 5). We surveyed the gene expression patterns of each of the 36 clusters (Supplemental Data Set 8) and identified Clusters 10 (n = 108) and 11 (n = 112), which describe a group of genes that were upregulated in the margin and downregulated in the rachis in stage P4 wild-type plants (Figure 6, B and C). While over half of these genes (57.2%; 126/220) have no known function, many of the remaining genes are known to be involved in leaf margin identity (Table 1). Interestingly, Clusters 10 and 11 also contained genes related to auxin transport, biosynthesis, and regulation (YUC4, PIN1, AUX2-11) and genes (ARGONAUTE7/Solyc01g010970) known to interact with auxin response factors (Yifhar et al. 2012).

Guided by the gene expression data in the wild-type, and the results suggesting that auxin might play a role leaflet initiation in the base margin region, we wanted to see if auxin transport differences in tf-2 could explain the striking feature of loss of meristematic potential in the basal margin of this mutant. To look specifically at the differences in auxin transport between tf-2 and wild-type and to verify the differences in SPI1 gene expression found between the wild type and tf-2, we crossed a fluorescently labeled pPIN1:PIN1-GFP line (PIN1:GFP; Benková et al., 2003; Koenig et al., 2009) with tf-2 to visualize differences in PIN1 localization and expression in P4 leaves. In the wild-type, PIN1:GFP was present along the entire margin region of a P4 leaf, with the strongest signal present at the site of the newly established LL1 (Figure 7, A and B). In tf-2, there was an overall decrease in fluorescent signal along the margin of a P4 leaf. Also, tf-2 had a noticeable decrease in PIN1:GFP fluorescent signal in the base margin region (Figure 7, C and D). In addition, we visualized auxin presence using the auxin-inducible promoter DR5:Venus (Bayer et al., 2009). As observed previously (Shani et al., 2010; Martinez et al., 2016), in the wild-type, DR5:Venus was expressed at the site of leaflet initiation as a sharp wedge-shaped focus region (Figure 7, E and F). In contrast, in tf-2, there was a DR5:Venus focus region, but it was diffuse and located in the upper layers of the margin (Figure 7, G and H). These results support the hypothesis that while tf-2 is capable of forming auxin foci, it is incapable of maintaining proper auxin foci and canalization processes, as evidenced by the reduced PIN1 expression in the basal margin region of the tf-2 P4
| ITAG          | logFC | logCPM | P-value  | FDR     | symbol | Gene_name                                                                 |
|--------------|-------|--------|----------|---------|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Solyc01g010970 | -3.060 | 3.655  | 7.94E–11 | 5.29E–08 | AGO7   | Encodes ARGONAUTE7, a member of the ARGONAUTE family, characterized by the presence of PAZ and PIWI domains. Involved in the regulation of developmental timing |
| Solyc01g058030 | -2.579 | 4.765  | 4.03E–09 | 1.17E–06 | ATGA2OX4 | Encodes a gibberellin-2-oxidase. AtGA2OX4 expression is responsive to cytokinin and KNOX activities |
| Solyc03g093310 | -2.553 | 5.232  | 4.49E–09 | 1.26E–06 | NA     | F-box family protein; similar to F-box family protein | Arabidopsis thaliana (TAIR:AT5G51380.1) |
| Solyc06g062900 | -2.056 | 5.309  | 1.37E–06 | 1.62E–04 | EER4   | Transcription initiation factor IID (TFIID) subunit A family protein; similar to TAFI58 (ata-associated factor II 58) | Arabidopsis thaliana (TAIR:AT5G10070.1) |
| Solyc03g044300 | -1.949 | 2.412  | 6.37E–05 | 3.73E–03 | AP2    | Encodes a floral homeotic gene, a member of the AP2/EREBP (ethylene responsive element binding protein) class of transcription factors and is involved in the specification of floral organ identity, establishment of floral meristem identity, suppression of floral meristem indeterminacy, and development of the ovule and seed coat |
| Solyc06g069430 | -1.878 | 4.123  | 1.32E–05 | 9.92E–04 | AGL8   | MADS box gene negatively regulated by APETALA1 |
| Solyc11g069500 | -1.850 | 6.114  | 1.01E–05 | 7.94E–04 | ARF10  | Involved in root cap cell differentiation |
| Solyc10g080880 | -1.714 | 5.112  | 4.88E–05 | 3.00E–03 | ATPIN1 | Encodes a putative auxin efflux carrier involved in shoot and root development. It is involved in the maintenance of embryonic auxin gradients |
| Solyc08g080120 | -1.671 | 5.772  | 6.33E–05 | 3.72E–03 | IXR11  | Encodes a homeodomain transcription factor of the Knotted family. May be involved in secondary cell wall biosynthesis. Mutants have moderately irregular xylem development |
| Solyc01g007870 | -1.668 | 4.731  | 8.47E–05 | 4.70E–03 | NA     | Similar to unknown protein | Arabidopsis thaliana (TAIR:AT5G06270.1) |
| Solyc06g066340 | -1.594 | 4.125  | 2.07E–04 | 9.44E–03 | KAN2   | Encodes a member of the KANADI family of putative transcription factors. Together with KAN1, this gene appears to be involved in the development of the carpel and the outer integument of the ovule |
| Solyc06g059730 | -1.482 | 3.109  | 9.27E–04 | 3.04E–02 | PIN6   | Rate-limiting factor in saturable efflux of auxins. PINs are directly involved of in catalyzing cellular auxin efflux |
| Solyc08g048430 | -1.458 | 4.183  | 6.33E–04 | 2.30E–02 | NA     | F-box family protein; similar to F-box family protein | Arabidopsis thaliana (TAIR:AT5G18380.1) |
| Solyc08g023460 | -1.416 | 5.178  | 6.79E–04 | 2.41E–02 | NA     | LEM3 (ligand-effect modulator 3) family protein / CDC50 family protein; Arabidopsis thaliana (TAIR:AT5G12740.1) |
| Solyc06g069790 | -1.310 | 7.245  | 1.37E–03 | 4.14E–02 | NA     | Gibberellin-responsive protein, putative; similar to GASA4 (GAST1 PROTEIN HOMOLOG 4) | Arabidopsis thaliana (TAIR:AT5G12740.1); contains InterPro domain | Gibberellin regulated protein; (InterPro:IPR003854) |
| Solyc11g069190 | 1.292  | 7.985  | 1.56E–03 | 4.54E–02 | ARF4   | Encodes a member of the ARF family of transcription factors which mediate auxin responses. ARF4 appears to have redundant function with ETT (ARF3) in specifying abaxial cell identity |
| Solyc01g097290 | 1.317  | 5.626  | 1.34E–03 | 4.04E–02 | IAA16  | Early auxin-induced (IAA16) required for formation of a symmetric flat leaf lamina, encodes a member of a family of proteins characterized by cysteine repeats and a leucine zipper; involved in KNOX gene regulation. Acts together with ASL1 in proximal–distal symmetry determination |
| Solyc03g063140 | 1.351  | 2.980  | 1.62E–03 | 4.67E–02 | AS2    | YAB5 | Plant-specific transcription factor YABBY family protein; Identical to Axial regulator YABBY5 (YAB5) | Arabidopsis thaliana (GB:Q8GW46;GB:O48725); similar to YAB2 (YABBY 2), transcription factor | Arabidopsis thaliana (TAIR:AT1G08465.1) |
| Solyc05g007180 | 1.499  | 6.766  | 2.64E–04 | 1.13E–02 | ATHB13 | Encodes a homeodomain leucine zipper class I (HD-Zip I) protein |

(continued)
leaf. The transcriptomic results and auxin visualization experiments suggest that misregulated auxin transport and biosynthesis, and specifically \textit{SlPIN1} misregulation, are important contributors to the \textit{tf-2} phenotype and that these processes are vital regulators of margin organogenesis.

Differences in gene expression patterns between the wild-type and \textit{tf-2} help define the loss of basal meristematic potential in \textit{tf-2} leaves

We included \textit{tf-2} in this study because it has the intriguing phenotype of being unable to form new leaflets after the first two LL1 leaflets. At the P4 stage, \textit{tf-2} has already lost the organogenetic ability to initiate new leaflets. As revealed by our auxin transport visualization analysis, \textit{tf-2} appears to receive a leaflet initiation signal, as it is capable of forming auxin foci (Figure 7H), but the tissue is unable to initiate leaflet organs. We examined our data to determine whether gene expression differences could explain the loss of meristematic competency in \textit{tf-2}. We performed differential gene expression analysis of only \textit{tf-2} reads. There were fewer differentially expressed genes between the margin and rachis in the top and base regions of this mutant compared with the wild-type (Supplemental Figure 3, A and Data Set 1). However, \textit{tf-2} followed similar gene expression trends to the wild-type when margin and rachis identity were compared. The margin was more enriched in genes related to cell division and cell expansion, while the rachis was enriched in genes related to specialization, including water transport, metabolic processes, photosynthesis, and leaf development; however, these differences were mostly apparent in the base region of the \textit{tf-2} mutant (Supplemental Figure 3, B and Data Set 10). The main difference between wild-type and the \textit{tf-2} mutant was a reduction in upregulated differentially expressed genes in the rachis region compared with the margin in top, middle, and base regions (Supplemental Figure 3A). It should be noted that while wild-type and \textit{tf-2} were similar morphologically at the P4 stage, the \textit{tf-2} mutant appeared to be further along in the morphogenesis process in all regions (top, middle, and base), a feature described by Naz et al. (2013). This overall difference in the two genotypes should be taken into account at the morphological level, and, as evidenced by our transcriptional analysis, at the molecular level. In the margin of \textit{tf-2}, we examined the differentially expressed genes between the rachis and margin and found many genes related to leaf development.

Table 1 Continued

| ITAG         | logFC | logCPM | P-value | FDR     | symbol | Gene_name                                                                 |
|--------------|-------|--------|---------|---------|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Solyc09g082830 | 1.500 | 7.957  | 2.54E–04 | 1.10E–02 | AGO10  | Translation initiation factor. Required to establish the central-peripheral organization of the embryo apex. Along with WUS and CLV genes, controls the relative organization of central zone and peripheral zone cells in meristems |
| Solyc06g049050 | 1.961 | 3.880  | 6.17E–06 | 5.35E–04 | ATEXP8 | Member of Alpha-Expansin Gene Family. Naming convention from the Expansin Working Group (Kende et al., 2004, Plant Mol Bio). Involved in the formation of nematode-induced syncytia in roots of Arabidopsis thaliana |

Using SOM clustering we identified 36 clusters defined by their gene expression patterns across 6 tissue types in wild-type. Clusters 10 and 11 showed a similar expression pattern of upregulation in the margin tissue (top, middle, and base) compared with rachis tissue (top, middle, and base). This table is the leaf development genes from those gene lists.

Figure 7 Auxin visualization during leaflet initiation in wild type and \textit{tf-2}. (A–D) Microscope images of apices from (A) and (B) wild-type and (C) and (D) \textit{tf-2}. (B) and (D) Fluorescence signals of PIN1:GFP (green) and chlorophyll autofluorescence (red) asterisk marks the base marginal blastozone region. (B) shows clear PIN1:GFP signal in wild-type along the entire margin of the P4 leaf, while in (D), \textit{tf-2} has lost signal in the base marginal blastozone region. (E–H) DR5:Venus signal (green) observed by confocal microscopy. (E and F) Wild-type plant apices. (G and H) \textit{tf-2} plants apices (F) and (H) close up on the site of leaflet initiation of the base margin region of P4 leaves. Scale bars = 100 \textmu m.
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**SIBOP2 function in regulating margin and rachis identity**

Taking into account the overall differences between these two genotypes, we were interested in understanding why tf-2 is unable to initiate lateral leaflets beyond LL1. Could transcriptional differences explain the loss of morphogenic capacity in tf-2? To address this issue, we combined both genotypes and used a generalized linear model (glmQLFTest in edgeR) in which we defined each genotype as a group and therefore could compare the top, middle, and base regions of the two genotypes. When we compared the base margin region between tf-2 and the wild type (Figure 1A), only 23 genes were differentially expressed: all were downregulated in the wild-type compared with tf-2 (Table 2). We focused on the 12 genes that were functionally annotated and noticed that SIBOP2 was significantly upregulated in the margin of tf-2 compared with the wild-type (Figure 8B).

We explored the role of SIBOP2 in regulating margin and rachis tissue identity by phenotyping CRISPR/Cas9 gene edited loss-of-function SIBOP2 mutants (CR-sibop2; Xu et al., 2016) with a focus on leaf phenotypes. Surprisingly, in CR-sibop2 plants, we observed ectopic meristems on mature leaves when plants were approximately two months old. The ectopic meristems occurred along the adaxial rachis of mature leaves at the bases of primary leaflets (Figure 8, C–E). These ectopic SAM structures did not persist as the leaf aged, appearing to undergo tissue death ~3 weeks after appearing on the rachis (Supplemental Figure 6A) and only rarely did they generate complex leaf-like organs (Supplemental Figure 6C). Loss of function of SIBOP2 also resulted in increased leaf complexity (Supplemental Figure 6B), as reported previously in these mutants (Xu et al., 2016) and in SIBOP2 knockdown lines (Ichihashi et al., 2014). Since TF is a known transcription factor, we checked for TF binding site motifs in the 3-kb upstream region of BOP2 and found one TF binding site (Figure 8F). Taken together, these findings indicate that SIBOP2 functions in determining margin meristematic identity along the rachis of the leaf and the possibility that SIBOP2 functions via the direct binding of TF to its upstream regulatory region, although more validation is needed to verify this interaction.

**Discussion**

**Characterizing leaf development mechanisms along the proximal–distal and medio-lateral axes**

The overall goal of this work was to gain a better understanding of the processes that regulate leaf morphogenesis along the medio-lateral axis in an early developing compound leaf. As endoreduplication is a defining component of A. thaliana leaf development (Beemster et al., 2005; Gutierrez, 2005), we chose to explore the contribution of cell cycling in tomato leaf development. Our flow cytometry experiment shows low ploidy levels, with a majority of nuclei at 2C and 4C, with only small traces of 8C, even in mature leaves (Figure 2, G and H). These results suggest endoreduplication is not a major component of leaf morphogenesis in tomato. Tomato leaves have a similar pattern to that observed in closely related species Solanum tuberosum leaves (potato; Pijnacker et al., 1989) and the low ploidy numbers found in many monocots—which do not endocycle and grow by ploidy independent mechanisms. It is possible that ploidy differences between cell types, such as trichomes, mesophyll, or epidermal cells, could obscure endocycling signatures that may be present in tomato and occurring in tissue-specific ways, as we sampled whole leaf tissue. One of the reasons tomato leaves might differ from A. thaliana is trichome morphology; A. thaliana trichomes are single celled and reach an average ploidy level of 32C (Hülskamp et al., 1994), while tomato trichomes are multicellular, suggesting cell division as a strategy of enlarging instead of endoreduplication. Overall, we suggest that the mode of growth of leaves seems to be species dependent, but more work measuring ploidy in a tissue specific way is needed to understand the contribution of ploidy at the cellular level.

Based on our anatomical analysis, we chose six unique regions in the P4 leaf (Figure 1, C–F). We analyzed differential gene expression between margin and rachis tissue in the top, middle, and base regions and identified signature patterns of gene regulation along the proximal–distal (tip-base) axis (Figure 3) that help define leaf morphogenesis in the early tomato leaf primordium. Separating the rachis from the marginal blastozone region at three different points along the proximal–distal axis allowed us to determine whether development proceeds uniformly along the proximal–distal axis or if the leaf has a mosaic of developmental states in each segment along the proximal–distal axis. The further along in morphogenesis a region was, the more diverse the GO categories of genes that were upregulated in the region, likely because the last stage of leaf morphogenesis, cell specialization, had occurred. After summarizing the enriched GO terms in each of the three regions along the proximal–distal axis, patterns of developmentally distinct processes were identified in the rachis regions compared with other tissues (Figure 3). The margin regions, classically defined as the marginal blastozone or marginal meristem, retain the potential to divide and differentiate and also exhibit a basipetal gradient of gene expression changes of differentiation from the tip to the base of the leaf. Thus, this analysis suggests that defining leaf development or capturing gene expression in the entire primordium, or even in regions along the proximal–distal axis, does not provide an accurate picture of developmental patterns in a leaf. Further dissecting these events at cellular resolution should help define these patterns even more accurately.

**Photosynthetic capability in the rachis as a regulator of medio-lateral differentiation**

To further define rachis and margin identity, we fitted an additive model that adjusts differential gene expression comparisons based on baseline differences that occur between the margin and rachis. We then performed differential gene
expression analysis to reveal gene expression trends that define margin and rachis tissue regardless of the position on the proximal–distal axis. The most prevalent, though unexpected, gene expression signature we observed was the enrichment of genes associated with photosynthesis in the rachis, which we found by both differential expression analysis (Figures 3, 7) and cluster analysis (Figure 5). Since little is known about when photosynthetic capacity is acquired during early leaf morphogenesis, we further verified photosynthesis activity using a CAB:GUS reporter (Figure 4, C–G).

This analysis suggested that photosynthetic activity is acquired as early as P4 and is not uniformly distributed along the proximal–distal and medio-lateral axes.

When viewed in the context of cell differentiation processes along each axis, it is not surprising that specialized functions are first acquired in regions that mature earliest, although the function of photosynthesis has been traditionally assigned to the blade. What are the developmental consequences of sugar biosynthesis in the rachis during early leaf organogenesis? Could the rachis be the source of morphogenic signaling towards the more immature base along the proximal–distal axis and along the medio-lateral axis to the margin? Multiple studies in *A. thaliana* identified thousands of genes that respond to changes in sugar levels by modifying transcript abundance (Price et al., 2004; Blässing et al., 2005; Osuna et al., 2007; Usadel et al., 2008). These

| ITAG       | logFC | logCPM | F      | P-value   | FDR     | Gene_name |
|------------|-------|--------|--------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| Solyc02g065250 | -2.015 | 4.676  | 34.169 | 8.95E-06  | 1.76E-02 | Esterase, putative; similar to ACL (ACETONE-CYANOXYDRIN LYASE), hydrolase [Arabidopsis thaliana] (TAIR:AT2G23600.1) |
| Solyc02g077940 | -1.586 | 4.128  | 39.370 | 3.43E-06  | 1.00E-02 | NA |
| Solyc02g091910 | -2.669 | 4.631  | 37.889 | 4.47E-06  | 1.18E-02 | NA |
| Solyc03g111770 | -1.544 | 4.169  | 32.999 | 1.13E-05  | 1.76E-02 | Similar to unknown protein [Arabidopsis thaliana] (TAIR:AT5G14390.1) |
| Solyc04g074700 | -1.975 | 4.010  | 49.375 | 6.77E-07  | 2.43E-03 | NA |
| Solyc05g007870 | -3.017 | 6.247  | 54.483 | 3.23E-07  | 1.70E-03 | NA |
| Solyc05g009270 | -2.896 | 4.802  | 38.802 | 7.38E-07  | 2.43E-03 | Involved in wax biosynthesis; required for elongation of C24 very-long-chain fatty acids |
| Solyc05g014000 | -2.224 | 3.662  | 28.683 | 7.24E-05  | 3.61E-02 | Pectate lyase family protein; Identical to Probable pectate lyase 5 precursor |
| Solyc05g018125 | -3.070 | 3.551  | 27.696 | 3.40E-05  | 4.12E-02 | NA |
| Solyc06g0505980 | -1.815 | 4.876  | 35.734 | 6.65E-06  | 1.46E-02 | ASA1 encodes the alpha subunit of anthranilate synthase, which catalyzes the rate-limiting step of tryptophan synthesis. ASA1 is induced by ethylene, and forms a link between ethylene signaling and auxin synthesis in roots |
| Solyc06g050315 | -3.700 | 6.954  | 69.504 | 4.78E-08  | 4.20E-04 | NA |
| Solyc06g051750 | -2.491 | 4.399  | 33.108 | 1.10E-05  | 1.76E-02 | Encodes a member of the CP90A family |
| Solyc06g062670 | -2.734 | 3.575  | 52.530 | 4.26E-07  | 1.87E-03 | NA |
| Solyc06g069460 | -3.121 | 3.742  | 63.518 | 9.82E-08  | 6.46E-04 | NA |
| Solyc06g074630 | -2.874 | 4.409  | 33.839 | 9.55E-06  | 1.76E-02 | NA |
| Solyc07g055210 | -2.325 | 5.911  | 32.946 | 1.14E-05  | 1.76E-02 | Encodes a beta-mannan synthase based on in vitro enzyme assays from heterologously expressed protein |
| Solyc08g075870 | -1.515 | 4.690  | 27.432 | 3.61E-05  | 4.13E-02 | ASPTATE AMINOTRANSFERASE 1; similar to dehydration-responsive protein, putative [Arabidopsis thaliana] (TAIR:AT1G31850.2) |
| Solyc09g061890 | -3.087 | 1.677  | 32.379 | 1.27E-05  | 1.86E-02 | NA |
| Solyc10g079460 | -3.374 | 3.970  | 92.395 | 4.50E-09  | 5.92E-05 | Pectate lyase family protein; Identical to Probable pectate lyase 15 precursor |
| Solyc10g061890 | -3.087 | 1.677  | 32.379 | 1.27E-05  | 1.86E-02 | NA |
| Solyc11g011570 | -1.716 | 2.906  | 29.675 | 2.22E-05  | 3.08E-02 | Encodes the Arabidopsis homologue of yeast SNF5 and represents a conserved subunit of plant SWI/SNF complexes |
| Solyc11g013430 | -5.435 | 6.606  | 191.750 | 6.38E-12 | 1.68E-07 | NA |

Using a generalized linear model (glmQLFTest in edgeR), we defined each genotype as a group and made contrasts between the two genotypes at each of the top, middle, and base regions. When we compared the base margin region between tf-2 and wild-type, we found only 23 genes that were differentially expressed and all of them were downregulated in wild-type compared with tf-2.
studies suggest that the main photosynthetic product, sugar, functions as a signal for plant development and growth. Considering the suggestion that photosynthetic activity and sucrose might function as signaling molecules to help regulate cell differentiation and leaf morphology (Wind et al., 2010; Lastdrager et al., 2014), we propose a potential functional role for the rachis region during early leaf morphogenesis: as a signaling center for cell differentiation.

In the P4 primordium under study, while the rachis has acquired specialized functions, the margin is actively dividing, a process that relies on cell cycle progression. The cyclin genes CYCD2 and CYCD3, encoding critical regulators of the cell cycle, are upregulated in response to sugar (Riou-Khamlichi et al., 2000). Interestingly, sucrose has also been shown to influence auxin levels (Lilley et al., 2012; Sairanen et al., 2012), transport, and signal transduction (Stokes et al., 2013), and metabolism (Ljung, 2013). Moreover, sugar accumulation is spatiotemporally regulated in meristematic tissue in both the shoot and root apical meristem (Francis and Halford, 2006). Is the development of photosynthetic capacity in the rachis a cause or a consequence of its early differentiation? Do the acquisition of photosynthetic capability and the production of sugars represent a global mechanism for signaling quiescent regions to progress into the cell division phase? More work exploring photosynthesis, sugar transport, hormone regulation, and gene expression should help uncover a possible role for the rachis in regulating morphogenetic processes during early leaf organogenesis.

The presence of auxin as a defining feature of organogenic potential in margin tissue
PIN1-directed auxin transport is an important regulator of leaf development (Reinhardt et al., 2003; Heisler et al., 2005; Hay and Tsiantis, 2006; Scarpella et al., 2006; Kawamura et al., 2010; Scarpella and Helariutta, 2010) and leaflet initiation (Koenig et al., 2009). A common mechanism unites PIN1-directed development during leaf organogenesis across the systems studied: PIN1 directs auxin along the epidermal layer to sites of convergence on the meristem and transports the auxin subepidermally into the internal layers (Scarpella et al., 2010). PIN1 can be split into two highly supported sister clades: PIN1 and Sister of PIN1 (SoPIN1) (Bennett et al., 2014; O’Connor et al., 2014; Abraham Juárez et al., 2015). The SoPIN1 and PIN1 clades might have disparate but complementary functions in auxin transport during organ initiation, where SoPIN1 mainly functions in epidermal auxin flux to establish organ initiation sites and PIN1 functions in the transport of auxin inward (O’Connor et al., 2014; Abraham Juárez et al., 2015; Martinez et al., 2016). Tomato has one gene in the PIN1 clade (SIpIN1) and two genes in the SoPIN1 clade (SIpIN1a [Solyct10g078370] and SIpIN1b [Solyct10g080880]) (Nishio et al., 2010; Pattison and Catalá, 2012; Martinez et al., 2016). The current findings suggest that in tf-2, SIpIN1 is downregulated at the region of leaflet initiation compared with the wild-type. Using PIN1::GFP as a reporter, we observed a lack of fluorescence in the base marginal blastozone region of tf-2 (Figure 7, C–G). Using

Figure 8 Differential gene expression analysis in base margin tissue between -type and tf-2 reveals BOP2 as a regulator that suppresses meristematic identity. (A) Schematic illustrating the regions (base margin) compared between wild-type and tf-2 using modeled differential gene expression analysis. (B) Bar graph illustrating the expression patterns of SIBOP2 across all six tissue types between wild-type and tf-2, showing how SIBOP2 is upregulated in the base margin only in tf-2. Colors highlight the separation of the margin (lighter colors) and rachis (darker colors) along the top (purple), middle (brown), and base (green). (C–E) SIBOP2 CRISPR knockout line (CR-sibop2), which displays ectopic shoot apical meristems along the rachis of complex leaves. (F) SIBOP2 genomic region. Black line shows the TF-2 binding site 3kb upstream of SIBOP2. Scale bars (C) = 10 mm, (D) = 2 mm, and (E) = 0.2 mm.
While our understanding of the recruitment of genetic regulators in a spatiotemporal context continues to increase, one of the more exciting questions still remains: is the marginal meristem evolutionarily derived from the SAM (Floyd and Bowman, 2010)? Ectopic adventitious SAMs have been shown to occur on leaves of functional knockouts of CUP-SHAPED-COTYLEDONS2 (CUC2) and CUC3 (Hibara et al., 2003; Blein et al., 2008; Aichinger et al., 2012) and of Arabidopsis lines overexpressing homeobox genes KNOTTED-1 (KN1) and Kn1-like (KNAT1; Sinha and Hake, 1994; Chuck et al., 1996) in a region analogous to the base of an emerging leaflet, suggesting developmental analogy and possibly homology to axillary meristems. Axillary meristems form on the adaxial surface at the boundary zone between the leaf and SAM, where BOP2 has already been shown to play a regulatory role in this process in tomato (Ichikawa et al., 2018), barley (Hordeum vulgare; Tavakol et al., 2015; Dong et al., 2017), and maize (Dong et al., 2017). The ectopic meristem phenotype of CR-slbop2 on the margins of complex tomato leaves suggests that signals might be recruited in the margin that are similar to those present in leaf initiation sites during axillary meristem formation. Our findings add further evidence that the margin is analogous, and possibly homologous at the process level, to the SAM. The leaf margin likely evolved via the genetic recruitment of similar regulatory factors, including BOP, reinforcing the importance of the reiteration of genetic mechanisms to establish distinct spatial identities in neighboring domains during plant development.

Our current understanding of the leaf margin is based on foundational work that defined the margin by explicitly tracking developmental landmarks (Avery, 1933; Poethig and Sussex, 1985a; Wolf et al., 1986; Dolan and Poethig, 1998). Early literature defined the leaf primordium as broadly meristematic during early development, with this meristematic potential becoming restricted and gradually lost as the leaf develops (Foster, 1936; Sachs, 1969; Hagemann and Gleissberg, 1996). Although such studies provide a roadmap for describing growth patterns in the margin, a major challenge is to understand how these patterns are specified at the genetic level (Coen et al., 2017; Whitewoods and Coen, 2017) and how this fits with our interpretation of the recruitment of regulatory mechanisms suppressing the morphogenetic potential of the margin during the evolution of leaves in seed plants. Plant development is reliant on reiterated patterning, and leaf development is no exception. Our findings suggest that we can describe leaf development as the reiteration and modulation of similar evolutionarily derived genetic programs that act to suppress the morphogenetic and organogenetic potential of meristematic regions in order to achieve final leaf form. Follow-up studies in additional species are needed to understand these evolutionarily conserved mechanisms and how they have been modulated to sculpt the diversity of leaf forms observed in nature.

**Organogenic potential of the margin and homology of the leaf margin and the SAM**

In the current study, we were especially interested in obtaining a genetic understanding of the loss of organogenetic potential in the base margin of tf-2. We specifically looked for the transcriptional differences that explain the loss of organogenetic potential in tf-2 compared with the wild-type, specifically in the margin base region. This led us to a small list of 23 differentially expressed genes including SIBOP2 (Figure 8 and Table 2). Characterization of the CR-bop2 line (Figure 8) revealed ectopic SAM production along the adaxial rachis at the bases of primary leaflets of the complex leaf. This finding supports the notion that the suppression of meristematic identity by BLADE-ON-PETIOLE (BOP) family members is important during leaf morphogenesis. BOP1 was first introduced as a suppressor of lamina differentiation on the petioles of simple Arabidopsis leaves (Ha et al., 2003, 2004) that limits meristematic cell activity, as the bop1 mutant displays ectopic meristematic cells beyond the boundary between the base of the blade and petiole (Ha et al., 2003, 2004). Further work using SIBOP knockdown and knockout tomato lines demonstrated that SIBOP2 suppresses organogenetic potential (Supplemental Figure 6; Ichihashi et al., 2014; Xu et al., 2016), as lines with reduced or absent SIBOP function showed increased leaflet organ initiation/leaf complexity. BOPs interact with transcription factors to regulate floral identity, including the interaction of BOP with PERIANTHIA (PAN) in Arabidopsis (Hepworth and Pautot, 2015) and the interaction of TERMINATING FLOWER with SIBOPs to repress meristematic maturation in tomato flowers (MacAlister et al., 2012; Xu et al., 2016). We further hypothesize that SIBOP2 and a transcription factor interact to regulate organogenic potential in complex leaves. Specifically, perhaps the TF transcription factor binds to the upstream regulatory region of SIBOP2 (Figure 8F). We suggest that both TF and SIBOP2 function in suppressing meristematic properties of the margin during an early developmental window that gradually closes with leaf maturation, an idea consistent with the view of the marginal blastozone described by Hagemann (1970).
Methods

Plant growth and tissue embedding
Seeds of tomato mutant tf-2 (LA0512) and wild-type line Condine Red (LA0533) were obtained from the Tomato Genetics Resource Center. The seeds were sterilized with 50% bleach for two minutes and rinsed 10 times with distilled water. The seeds were placed on moist paper towels in Phytotrays (Sigma-Aldrich), incubated in the dark for 2 days, and allowed to germinate in a walk in Conviron growth chamber for 4 days before being transferred to soil (Sunshine Mix #1, Sun Gro Horticulture) for 8 days of growth; the seedlings were grown for a total of 14 days. Chambers were set for 16:8 light–dark cycle, with lighting consisting of alternating fluorescent (F48T12CWHS) 4050 Luminus bulbs. Generation of the transgenic DR5:Venus (cv. M82) line was described in (Shani et al., 2010) and the AtpPIN1:PIN1-GFP (cv. Moneymaker) line was described in (Bayer et al., 2009). CR-bop-2 RNAi lines were received from the Lippman Lab at Cold Spring Harbor. CR-bop-2 RNAi and wild-type plant (M82) were germinated and grown in growth chambers for 2 weeks following methods above. Plants were further grown in a growth chamber for 1 month. After 1 month, plants were transferred to a greenhouse and grown under normal light conditions. The plants were observed, and any abnormalities were noted, dated, and photographed throughout the life-time of each plant. The images are taken from mature leaves and stems of plants that were 63 days old. Leaf complexity counts (Supplemental Figure 6) were taken at the age of 45 days old.

Plants were collected in the afternoon, vacuum infiltrated for 1 h with ice-cold 3:1 (100% EtOH; 100% acetic acid) fixative, and fixed overnight at 4°C. The samples were washed three times in 75% EtOH, passed through an EtOH series on a shaker at room temperature for 1 h per step (75, 85, 95, 100, 100, 100%), and incubated in 100% EtOH overnight at 4°C. All ethanol solutions were made using 2 x autoclaved diethylpyrocarbonate (DEPC) treated water. The tissue was passed through a xylene/EtOH series for 2 h per step (25, 50, 75, 100, 100%) on a shaker at room temperature. The tissue was incubated overnight at room temperature in 100% xylene with 20–40 paraffin chips (Paraplast x-tra, Thermo Fisher Scientific) and DEPC. The embedded blocks were transversely sectioned at 5- to 7-µm thickness using a Leica RM2125RT rotary microtome (Leica Microsystems) on RNase-free polyethylene naphthalate PEN membrane slides (Leica). The slides were dried at room temperature and deparaffinized with 100% xylene.

EdU visualization
Cell division was visualized by observing fluorescent signals derived from an EdU incorporation assay in which EdU is incorporated into cells during the S-phase (Kotogány et al., 2010). The EdU assay was performed as previously described (Ichihashi et al., 2011; Nakayama et al., 2014) with some modifications using a Click-iT EdU Alexa Fluor Imaging kit (Invitrogen). Fourteen-day-old seedlings were dissected under a microscope. After removing older leaves, P4 leaf epidermis was nicked using an insect mounting needle to increase infiltration in subsequent steps. The plant apex was incubated in water containing 10 µM EdU for 2 h. The samples were washed in 1 x phosphate-buffered saline solution (PBS, pH 7.4) and fixed in Formaldehyde Alcohol Acetic Acid (FAA) under vacuum infiltration for 3 h. Subsequently, the samples were fixed in 3.7% formaldehyde in PBS (pH 7.4) for 30 min and washed three times in PBS with shaking. Alexa Fluor coupling to EdU was performed in the dark following the manufacturer’s instructions. Photographs were taken under a Zeiss LSM 710 Confocal Microscope with excitation wavelengths set at 488 and 420 nm.

Flow cytometry and GUS staining
Ploidy levels were measured using a PA-I ploidy analyzer (Partec) as described previously (Sugimoto-Shirasu et al., 2002). We grew up 50 plants and sampled the oldest two leaves on the plant at each time point. To identify the leaves by counting from youngest leaves requires apical meristem destruction; therefore, we choose to measure leaf age from oldest leaf to youngest—Leaf 1 corresponds to the oldest leaf, Leaf 2 is second oldest, and so on. For the first two time points (Days 8 and 18), we sampled L1 or L2 and for the later time points, Day 30 and above, we sampled the oldest intact leaf, which because of age was often damaged, therefore the leaves sampled ranged from Leaf 2 to Leaf 5. All leaves sampled beyond Day 30 had reached maturity. Fresh tissue was extracted from whole leaves at the youngest leaf age (Day 8), whereas older stage tissue was extracted from both the top and bottom sections of the leaf (Days 18 to 90). The tissue was chopped with a razor blade. Cystain extraction buffer (Partec) was used to release nuclei. The solution was filtered through a CellTrics filter (Partec) and stained with Cystain fluorescent buffer (Partec). At least 4,000 nuclei isolated were used for each ploidy measurement. Flow cytometry experiments were repeated at least three times using independent biological replicates.

Histochemical localization of GUS activity was performed as previously described (Kang and Dengler, 2002). Representative images were chosen from >15 samples stained in 3 independent experiments.

Laser capture microdissection and RNA processing
Each tissue type was independently captured through serial sections using a Leica LMD6000 Laser Microdissection System (Leica Microsystems). Each biological replicate contained tissue collected from five to eight apices. Supplemental Figure 1 and Supplemental Movie 1 show how tissue regions were identified and dissected. Tissue was collected in lysis buffer from an RNAsqueous-Micro Total RNA Isolation Kit (Ambion) and immediately stored at
-80°C. RNA extraction was performed using an RNAqueous-Micro Total RNA Isolation Kit (Ambion) following the manufacturer’s instructions. The RNA was amplified using the WT-Ovation Pico RNA Amplification System (ver. 1.0, NuGEN Technologies Inc.). The RNA was purified using RNAclean magnetic beads (Agencourt) and processed within one month of fixation to ensure RNA quality.

RNA-seq libraries were created as described by Kumar and coworkers (Kumar et al. 2012), starting with the second-strand synthesis step, with the following modifications: For second-strand synthesis, 10 µL of cDNA (>250 ng) was combined with 0.5 µL of random primers and 0.5 µL of dNTP. The sample was incubated at 80°C for 2 min, followed by 60°C for 10 s, 50°C for 10 s, 40°C for 10 s, 30°C for 10 s, and 4°C for at least 2–5 min. After adding 5 µL of 10× DNA pol buffer, 31-µL water, and 2.5-µL DNA Pol I on ice, the sample was incubated at 16°C for 2.5 h. The process was continued following the published (Kumar et al. 2012) protocol starting with step 2.3: Bead purification of double-stranded DNA. The libraries were quality checked and quantified using a Bioanalyzer 2100 (Agilent) on RNA 6000 Pico Kit (Agilent) chips at the UC Davis Genome Center. The libraries were sequenced in three lanes using the HiSeq2000 Illumina Sequencer at the Vincent J Coates Genomics Sequencing Laboratory at UC Berkeley.

Read processing, differential expression, and GO enrichment analysis

Quality filtering, N removal, and adaptor trimming were performed on data from each of the three Illumina sequencing lanes separately. We first performed N removal using read_N_remover.py. Sequences below a quality (phred) score of 20 were removed without reducing the read size to below 35 bp. To remove adapter contamination, we used adapterEffectRemover.py, setting the minimum read length to 41. To assess the quality of the reads after pre-processing, we ran FASTQC (available at http://www.bioinformatics.bbsrc.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/) before and after pre-processing. To filter out reads from chloroplast or mitochondrial sequences, all libraries were mapped to the S. lycopersicum_AFYB01.1 mitochondrial sequence from NCBI and the NC_007898.3 chloroplast sequence from NCBI using STAR 2.4.0 (Dobin et al., 2013). Reads that did not map to either organelle were mapped to the ITAG3.10 Solanum lycopersicum genome using STAR 2.4.0, where nongenic sequences were masked using the inverse coordinates of the ITAG3.10 gene model gff file. Bedtools (Quinlan, 2014) coverageBed was then used to count mapped reads, using a bed file generated from ITAG3.10 gene models. We built an online visualization tool for the community to manually explore the reads generated across the six tissue types in both wild-type and tf-2: http://bar.utoronto.ca/efp_tomato/cgi-bin/efpWeb.cgi?dataSource=Tomato_Meristem (Winter et al., 2007; Patel et al., 2012).

Read processing and differential expression analyses were performed using the R package edgeR (Robinson et al., 2010). Pairwise differential gene expression in each region along the proximal–distal axis was calculated in each proximal–distal region (top, middle, base) in separate analyses. Differential gene expression was determined using the 'exactTest()' function in R (R Core Team, 2018), multiple testing correction was performed using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure, and significance of differential expression was determined using a cutoff of FDR <0.05. To estimate differential expression of genes across the entire marginal blastozone and rachis regions, we used an additive linear model where the proximal–distal axis was assigned as a blocking factor, which adjusts for differences between the margin and rachis in the top, middle, and base: model.matrix (~Region + Tissue; Supplemental Data Set 3). For both pairwise and modeling analysis of differential expression, counts per million were calculated from raw reads, and genes with more than five reads in two or more reps were removed. We estimated common negative binomial dispersion and normalized counts across all samples using the trimmed mean of M-value method (Robinson and Oshlack, 2010). Normalized Read counts, as calculated by counts per million (c.p.m.), are available in Supplemental Data Set 9.

Gene Ontology (REVIGO; http://revigo.irb.hr/) for Figure 3. Terms were summarized further using REduce and VIsualize GO.seq and GO.db (Supplemental Data Set 2). The GO enrichment analysis was performed using the R libraries GOseq and GO.db (Supplemental Data Set 2). The GO terms were summarized further using REduce and VIsualize Gene Ontology (REVIGO; http://revigo.irb.hr/) for Figure 3. The full code used for these analyses is available at https://github.com/iamciera/lcmProject.

SOM clustering

To explore the genes whose expression levels were the most variable across tissues, we identified the top 25% genes based on coefficient of variation and ratio of standard deviation compared with mean from our count data. To remove differences in counts between samples, the magnitude of gene expression data was scaled between 2 and -2 in wild-type and tf-2 separately using the "scale()" function in R (R Core Team, 2018). Hexagonal layout was used for all SOM clustering (Kohonen). For basic SOM analysis, the SOM() function was used for each genotype separately, while superSOMs were performed using superSOM() in the Kohonen R package (Wehrens and Buydens, 2007; Wehrens and Kruisselbrink, 2018). Training for both methods was performed in 100 iterations in which the adaptive learning rate decreased from 0.05 to 0.01. Codebook vectors and distance plots of cluster assignments were generated using the visualization functions in ggplot2 (Wickham, 2009) and the Kohonen R package. To ensure that the major variances in gene expression patterns were defined by SOM clustering and to verify consistency in clustering, cluster assignments were projects onto the PC space. All scripts used in clustering are available at https://github.com/iamciera/lcmProject.

Supplemental data

The following materials are available in the online version of this article.
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Supplemental Figure S1. Rules for tissue collection via laser capture microdissection.

Supplemental Figure S2. Laser cutting to obtain sufficient amounts of RNA for RNA amplification and Illumina sequencing.

Supplemental Figure S3. Summary of the results of differential gene expression analysis in wild-type and tf-2.
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Supplemental Data Set S1. Results of differential gene expression analysis between the margin and rachis in the top, middle, and base regions of both genotypes (WT and tf-2).

Supplemental Data Set S2. GO terms describing differentially expressed genes between the margin and rachis in the top, middle, and base regions of both genotypes (WT and tf-2).

Supplemental Data Set S3. Results of differential expression analysis across the margin and rachis tissues performed with only wild-type reads and adjusted for variability between the proximal–distal axis.
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Supplemental Data Set S5. Genes with the most variable expression.
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