Misexpression of \textit{AtTX12} encoding a Toll/interleukin-1 receptor domain induces growth defects and expression of defense-related genes partially independently of EDS1 in \textit{Arabidopsis}
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INTRODUCTION

To survive as sessile organisms, plants exhibit enormous plasticity in growth and development in response to various external cues, including biotic and abiotic stresses. Biotic stresses mainly originate from plant pathogens and herbivores, against which plants have evolved a wide range of defense mechanisms. Plants protect themselves from invasion by biotrophic or hemibiotrophic pathogens through innate immune responses. Resistance against non-specific pathogens is mediated by pattern recognition receptors which can detect conserved molecules such as bacterial flagellin and elongation factor Tu and lead to pathogen-associated molecular pattern-triggered immunity (PTI). However, host-specific pathogens have evolved the ability to deliver effector molecules into host cells, which allow them to evade PTI. Plants have co-evolved diverse resistance (R) proteins in response that sense these effectors or the host proteins that are modified by the effectors. R proteins induce stronger, pathogen-specific resistance responses, and are part of what is known as effector-triggered immunity (ETI), which restricts pathogen proliferation via local programmed cell death, also known as the hypersensitive response (1, 2).

Most R proteins are intracellular immune receptors with nucleotide binding (NB) and leucine-rich repeat (LRR) domains (NLR), possessing either a Toll/interleukin-1 receptor (TIR) or coiled-coil (CC) domain at the N-terminus (3, 4). NLRs with TIR domains (TNLs) require ENHANCED DISEASE SUSCEPTIBILITY 1 (EDS1), a eukaryotic lipase-like protein, and PHYTOALEXIN DEFICIENT 4 (PAD4), an EDS1-interacting partner, for downstream immune responses, including salicylic acid (SA)-mediated signaling, whereas most NLRs with a coiled-coil (CC) domain (CNLs) require NON-RACE-SPECIFIC DISEASE RESISTANCE 1 (NDR1) for immune signaling (5-8). TIR domains are reported to serve as platforms for homo- or hetero-dimerization to induce cell death signaling or effector perception (9-11). The NB domains of NLRs function as internal switches for conformational changes, depending on the status of the bound nucleotide. In the activated state, TIR/CC domains can be exposed to trigger defense signals. Overexpression of TIR regions of TNLs lacking NB domains induced constitutively active immune responses in the absence of effectors (11-14).

In \textit{Arabidopsis} Col-0, there are 92 TNLs, 23 truncated TIR-NBs (TNs) lacking LRR domains, and 30 TIR-unknown domain (TX) proteins lacking both NB and LRR domains (15).
The functions of a few TX genes have been characterized by stable/transient overexpression (16, 17). It is an intriguing question to answer whether or not the uncharacterized TXs possess activity for defense-related gene expression and follow typical TNL-mediated signaling to broaden our understanding of plant defense-related systems.

Activation tagging screening is an efficient way to characterize the unknown functions of redundant genes. Conventional activation tagging systems use viral enhancers to strongly and ubiquitously induce the expression of tagged genes (18), whereas the GAL4/UAS system (19) enhances expression in a tissue-specific manner, which is advantageous for screening genes that induce lethality when ubiquitously expressed.

In this study, a UAS-tagged defective root development 1-D (drd1-D) mutant displaying stunted growth was isolated, and the tagged gene was identified as AtTX12, which encodes a truncated TNL lacking both the NB and LRR domains. Genetic analyses have shown that AtTX12-mediated growth defects and defense-related gene expression are independent of PAD4/NDR1 and partially independent of EDS1.

RESULTS

Isolation of the drd1-D and localization of the tagged gene

A dominant mutant exhibiting arrested growth named defective root development 1-D (drd1-D) was isolated by introducing UAS enhancers into the Q2610 enhancer trap line. The putative homozygous drd1-D was seedling lethal, displaying little post-embryonic development (Fig. 1A, C) compared to wild type (WT) (Fig. 1B, D) as the Q2610 is highly active in post-embryonic roots (19).

Thermal asymmetric interlaced (TAIL)-polymerase chain reaction (PCR) analysis revealed the DNA sequences between the T-DNA and genomic DNA, which are shown in Fig. 1E. The T-DNA, which contains UAS elements, was located 215 bp upstream of the putative start codon of At2g03300, previously designated as AtTX12, encoding a 203-amino acid (aa) truncated TNL containing a TIR domain and a 59-aa extension (17). The genome of the Col-0 contains AtTX11 (At2g03300), which is the closest homologue of AtTX12 probably originated from local gene duplication (15). The TIR domain of AtTX12 shares 34-54% aa-sequence identity with those of TNLs such as RPS4, RPP1, N, and L10, and contains 4 conserved TIR motifs (Supplementary Fig. 1) (15). AtTX12-like proteins are conserved among species of the Brassicaceae family, with 66-94% identity over the entire sequence (Supplementary Fig. 2).

Reverse transcription (RT)-PCR analysis showed the increased expression of AtTX12 in drd1-D compared to that in WT (Fig. 1F). It was also examined whether the transcript levels of defense-related genes increased in drd1-D as TX-overexpressing plants are known to exhibit elevated defense-related responses (16, 17). The transcripts of defense-related genes such as PATHOGENESIS-RELATED 1 (PR1), β1,3-GLUCANASE 2 (BGL2) (20), EDS1, and PAD4, were highly accumulated in drd1-D compared to those in WT (Fig. 1F), suggesting that AtTX12 may induce the expression of downstream defense-related genes.

As shown in Fig. 1G, endogenous AtTX12 was expressed at a very low level in the roots and leaves, and tended to increase as the plants matured. To examine the subcellular localization of AtTX12, transgenic plants expressing AtTX12pro:AtTX12-GFP were screened based on the semi-
dwarf to dwarf phenotypes. RT-PCR analysis showed that the expression of \textit{AtTX12} was well-correlated with the phenotypic strength (Supplementary Fig. 3A, 3B). \textit{AtTX12-GFP} signal was found in either the plasma membrane or plasmodesmata connecting neighboring cells in the root (Fig. 1H), suggesting that the \textit{AtTX12} might function in such subcellular regions.

**Misexpression of \textit{AtTX12} recapitulates the \textit{drd}-1D phenotype**

To further confirm that the \textit{drd1-D} phenotype is induced by misexpression of \textit{AtTX12}, transgenic plants harboring \textit{AtTX12} under the regulation of the 5× UAS promoter (UASpro:AtTX12) were screened and crossed to Q2610 to generate a double hemizygous plant for Q2610 and UASpro:AtTX12 (Q2610+/+ >> AtTX12/+). Q2610+/+ >> AtTX12/+ displayed seedling lethality (Fig. 2A), phenocopying the homozygous \textit{drd1-D}, indicating that the \textit{drd1}-D phenotype originated from the misexpression of \textit{AtTX12}. Two representative transgenic lines exhibited almost the same phenotypes displaying local cell death and pigment accumulation around the root tips (Fig. 2B, C), although Q2610+/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 accumulated a little more \textit{AtTX12} transcripts than line #1 (Fig. 2F). RT-PCR analysis showed increased expression of defense-related genes, such as \textit{PR1}, \textit{EDS1}, and \textit{PAD4} in the Q2610+/+ >> AtTX12/+ seedlings (Fig. 2F). These results suggest that the transcript level of \textit{AtTX12} in Q2610+/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #1 might be enough to induce seedling lethality.

To test whether the \textit{AtTX12} misexpression phenotype is temperature-sensitive or not, Q2610+/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 seedlings were grown at 28°C as TNL-mediated growth defects are often suppressed at a higher temperature (21). As shown in Fig. 2D, no phenotypic change of seedlings harboring transgenes was observed at a high-temperature condition.

To determine whether \textit{AtTX11} induces growth defects like \textit{AtTX12}, transgenic UASpro:AtTX11 lines were prepared and crossed to Q2610. The Q2610+/+ >> AtTX11/+ seedlings also exhibited seedling lethality (Fig. 2E).

To test whether tissue or organ-specific growth inhibition is induced by \textit{AtTX12}, \textit{AtTX12} was expressed by various enhancers. \textit{i1721}+/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 displayed root defects lacking a root tip as \textit{i1721} is highly expressed in the columella root cap and protoxylem during embryogenesis and the phenotype was not recovered at 28°C (Fig. 2G, H). Q0990+/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 exhibited early termination of primary root growth as Q0990 is expressed in the stele initials at a low level, but even this relatively weak phenotype was not rescued at 28°C (Fig. 2I, J). Q0990+/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #1 survived and produced double homozygous Q0990 >> AtTX12 line #1 (Fig. 2K). When \textit{AtTX12} was expressed under the regulation of the \textit{PISTILLATA (PI)} promoter, which is reported to be almost petal-specifically active (22), \textit{PI}+/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #1 displayed suppressed petal and stamen development, mimicking the \textit{pi} phenotype, whereas the development of neighboring floral organs was almost unaffected (Fig. 2L, 2M) suggesting that \textit{AtTX12} expression could induce tissue-specific local cell death.

**Defense-related gene expression induced by \textit{AtTX12}**

Misexpression of \textit{AtTX12} is mainly dependent on \textit{EDS1} and partially independent of \textit{EDS1}

\textit{EDS1-PAD4} and \textit{NDR1} are generally required for TNL- and CNL-mediated defense-related responses, respectively. It was tested whether the \textit{AtTX12} activity is dependent on \textit{EDS1},

**Fig. 2.** Ectopic expression of \textit{AtTX12/11} recapitulates the \textit{drd}-1D phenotype by inducing defense-related gene expression. (A-D) Stunted growth phenotypes of double hemizygous Q2610+/+ >> AtTX12/+ seedlings 4 d after germination. (A) A Q2610+/+ >> AtTX12/+ (left) and WT-like sibling (right) of the \textit{F2} progenies of UASpro:AtTX12 line #2 crossed to Q2610. (B) A Q2610+/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #1 seedling exhibiting local cell death and pigment accumulation. The inset shows an enlarged root tip. (C, D) Q2610+/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 seedlings grown at 22°C (C) and at 28°C (D). (E) A 4-d-old Q2610+/+ >> AtTX11/+ seedling. (F) RT-PCR analysis of AtTX12, PR1, EDS1, PAD4, and EF1 expression in 4-d-old Q2610+/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #1 and #2 seedlings in 25-cycle reactions. EF1 was used as a control. (G, H) i1721+/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 seedlings grown at 22°C (G) and 28°C (H). (I, J) Q0990+/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 seedlings grown at 22°C (I) and 28°C (J). (K) The dwarf phenotype of a 3-week-old double homozygous Q0990 >> AtTX12 line #1. (L, M) Defective petal and stamens of \textit{PI}+/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #1 (L) and a WT-like flower (M). A sepal was removed to expose the inner whorls. Scale bars = 5 mm (A), 0.5 mm (B-E), 0.1 mm (inset of panel B), 0.5 mm (G, H), 0.5 mm (I, J), 5 mm (K), and 1 mm (L, M).
PA

PAD4, or NDR1. Q2610/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 pad4-1 exhibited a seedling-lethal phenotype (Fig. 3A), suggesting that PAD4 may not be essential for AtTX12-triggered growth defects (Fig. 3A). RT-PCR analysis showed that AtTX12 misexpression led to increased transcript accumulation of defense-related genes in the pad4-1 background (Fig. 3B). The seedling-lethal phenotype was consistently observed when Q2610/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 was introduced into 2 different putative pad4 mutants, SALK_206216 and SALK_20654B (data not shown). Q2610/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 ndr1-1 also exhibited a seedling-lethal phenotype. These results suggest that AtTX12 might function PAD4- and NDR1-independently (Fig. 3A).

As there is an additional isoform (At3g48080) of EDS1 (At3g48090) in the genome of the Col-0, the T-DNA insertion mutants eds-1-2 (SALK_071051) and eds-1-23 (SALK_057149), which originated from Col-0, still possess partial EDS1 activity, whereas eds-1-2, which originated from the Ler possessing a single copy of EDS1, could be regarded as a null mutant. In this study, eds-1-2 mutant introgressed into Col-0 (23) was used for the genetic analyses. Seedlings of Q2610/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 in the eds-1-2, eds-1-23, and eds-1-2 backgrounds all displayed partially rescued, moderately short (approximately 65-70% of WT), weakly hairless, and twisted root phenotypes (Fig. 3A). However, at later developmental stages, Q2610/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 eds-1-22 and eds-1-23 exhibited dwarf, semi-sterile, and leaf chlorosis phenotypes, whereas Q2610/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 eds-1-2 did not exhibit any apparent growth defective phenotype (Fig. 3C). These results suggest that the EDS1 isoform, At3g48080 may be more active or abundant in above-ground organs than in the roots and better transduce signals triggered by AtTX12 in these organs.

Therefore, the plant homozygous for both Q2610 and UASpro:AtTX12 line #2 (Q2610 >> AtTX12 line #2) was obtained only in the eds-1-2 mutant background at the F4 generation by examining the presence of Q2610-GFP and the UASpro:AtTX12. Q2610 >> AtTX12 line #2 eds1-2 displayed a shorter and more twisted root phenotype (Fig. 3A) compared to Q2610/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 eds1-2, suggesting that AtTX12 may function in an expression level-dependent manner. This tendency was also found in line #1, as the Q2610/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #1 eds1-2 displayed little defect (data not shown), whereas homozygous Q2610 >> AtTX12 line #1 eds1-2 displayed moderate root defects (Fig. 3A). These results suggest that when highly expressed, AtTX12 may induce growth defects even in the absence of EDS1 through a putative EDS1-independent pathway.

RT-PCR analysis of Q2610/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 eds1-22 and eds1-23 showed increased expression of defense-related genes, such as PR1 and BGL2 possibly due to the presence of the EDS1 isoform transducing the defense-related signals efficiently from the relatively small amount of AtTX12 transcripts, whereas Q2610/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 eds1-2 showed little defense-related gene expression due to the

Fig. 3. The growth inhibition activity of AtTX12 is independent of PAD4/NDR1 and partially independent of EDS1. (A) Left, root tip phenotypes of 4-d-old seedlings of double hemizygous Q2610/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 (upper lanes) and Q2610/+ controls (lower lanes) in various plant defense-related signaling mutants, including pad4-1, ndr1-1, eds1-22, eds1-23, and eds1-2; Right, root tip of double homozygous Q2610 >> AtTX12 line #1 and #2 in eds1-2. Scale bar = 0.5 mm. (B) RT-PCR analysis of AtTX12, PR1, BGL2, and EF1 expression in 4-d-old Q2610/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 pad4-1 seedlings (left), 2-wk-old above-ground tissues of Q2610/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 eds1-2, 1-22, and 1-23 with a WT control (middle) in a 25-cycle reaction, and 1-wk-old above-ground tissues of Q2610 >> AtTX12 line #1 and #2 in eds1-2 in a 30-cycle reactions (right). (C) Above-ground phenotypes of Q2610/+ >> AtTX12/+ line #2 eds1-2, eds1-22, and eds1-23 along with WT controls at 3 wks. after germination. Scale bar = 10 mm. (D) Average root length of eds-1-2 or WT seedlings that misexpressed transgenic AtTX12 (UASpro:AtTX12 line #1 or line #2), hemizygozusly or homozygously with Q2610, together with controls of Col, eds1-2, and WT-like siblings. The root length shown is an average of 8 seedlings. Error bars indicate SD. (E) Above-ground phenotypes of 3-wk-old plants described in panel (D). Scale bar = 10 mm. White lines were drawn to delineate plants of different genetic backgrounds (C and E).
absence of any functional EDS1 thereby withheld the increased expression of AtTX12 and remained healthy (Fig. 3B, 3C). The increase of the PR1/BGL2 expression was detected in the Q2610 > > AtTX12 line #2 eds1-2 at a relatively higher number of PCR cycles (Fig. 3B), suggesting that the PR1/BGL2 expression induced by AtTX12 misexpression may be mainly dependent on EDS1 and partially independent of EDS1.

AtTX12-mediated growth inhibition in eds1-2 was well-correlated with the AtTX12 transcript level, as displayed in the root growth curve. Q2610 > > AtTX12 line #2 eds1-2 developed shorter roots compared with Q2610/+ > > AtTX12/+ line #2 eds1-2 and Q2610 > > AtTX12 line #1 eds1-2 (Fig. 3D, Supplementary Fig. 4). Furthermore, only the Q2610 > > AtTX12 line #2 eds1-2 developed leaf chlorosis and a dwarf phenotype in the above-ground organs (Fig. 3E) which correlate well with increased PR1/BGL2 gene expression (Fig. 3B).

Together, these results further support the idea that AtTX12 can induce growth defects and defense-related gene expression partially EDS1 independently in a dose-dependent manner.

DISCUSSION

It is an intriguing question how plants defend themselves against a myriad of plant pathogens using a limited number of R genes. In addition to the canonical NLRs, there exist a number of truncated NLRs, such as TNs and TXs of which the roles in defense-related gene expression have not been well characterized with a few exceptions (16, 17, 24). In this study, it was shown that AtTX12, containing a TIR domain plus a functional EDS1, low levels of expression did not affect plant growth. However, when AtTX12 expression exceeds a threshold level, the excessive AtTX12 is likely to induce growth defects and defense-related gene expression in an EDS1-dependent or -independent manner. In the presence of functional EDS1, low levels AtTX12 misexpression can efficiently induce a defective growth phenotype together with defense-related gene expression (Fig. 2F), leading to a strong seedling-lethal phenotype (Fig. 2B). In contrast, in the absence of EDS1, only high levels of AtTX12 misexpression can induce growth defects, albeit less efficiently with weakly increased defense-related gene expression (Fig. 3B), resulting in weaker defective phenotypes, such as dwarfism and leaf chlorosis (Fig. 3E). The growth defects induced by AtTX12 in the absence of EDS1 might be transduced through PAD4/SENCENCE ASSOCIATED GENE 101 (27) or, as yet unknown molecules present in the C24 ecotype, with lower efficiency compared to EDS1. As shown in Fig. 3A and C, misexpression of AtTX12 in the pad4-1 background induced growth defects together with defense-related gene expression, which is partially correlated with the previous observation that PAD4 is not required for the local acute response induced by TNs but is required for basal immune responses (28).

Together, it is concluded that AtTX12 could induce growth defects and defense-related gene expression mainly in an EDS1-dependent and partially in an EDS1-independent way.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Plant materials and growth conditions

GAL4/UAS enhancer trap lines, pad4-1, 2 pad4 T-DNA insertion mutants (SALK_206548 and SALK_206216), ndr1-1, and eds1-22 (SALK_071051) were obtained from the Arabidopsis Biological Resource Center (USA). Col eds1-2 (23) and eds1-23 (SALK_057149) were kindly provided by Tae-Hoon Kim (Duksuung Women’s University, Korea). The Q2610 line used in this study was selected based on the non-late flowering phenotype after backcrossing to Col-0. Plants were grown as described in the supplemental materials.

Mutant screening and determination of the T-DNA insertion site

UAS-tagged mutants from the T1 pool of Q2610 transformed with the pBIB-UAS vector kindly provided by Keiji Nakajima (NAIST, Japan) (19) were screened on 0.5 x MS medium containing hygromycin B and then moved to normal medium for observation. TAIL-PCR was performed as described in the Supplementary Materials and Methods.

Preparation of gene constructs and genotyping markers

Gene constructs and genotyping markers were prepared as described in the Supplementary Materials and Methods.

Gene expression analyses

For the RT-PCR analysis, 1 μg of total RNA extracted from the various tissues of WT, mutant, and transgenic plants at various developmental stages was used for RT as described previously (29) and PCR amplified with gene-specific primers for AtTX12 (5’-GACTAGTATGACATTCTTCTCTCACCCT-3’ and 5’-TACTACTGTACACACTTCCGTT-3’) and other genes as described previously (16).

Confocal microscopy

The AtTX12-GFP signal was detected with a Zeiss LSM700 confocal microscope after seedlings were stained as described previously (29).
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