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Physcomitrella patens MAX2 characterization suggests an ancient role for this F-box protein in photomorphogenesis rather than strigolactone signaling.
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Summary (<200 words)

- Strigolactones are key hormonal regulators of flowering plant development and are widely distributed amongst streptophytes. In Arabidopsis, strigolactones signal via the F-box protein MORE AXILLARY GROWTH2 (MAX2), affecting multiple aspects of development including shoot branching, root architecture and drought tolerance. Previous characterization of a Physcomitrella patens moss mutant with defective
Strigolactone synthesis supports an ancient role for strigolactones in land plants, but the origin and evolution of signaling pathway components is unknown.

Here we investigate the function of a moss homolog of MAX2, PpMAX2, and characterize its role in strigolactone signaling pathway evolution by genetic analysis.

We report that the moss Ppmax2 mutant shows very distinct phenotypes from the moss SL-deficient mutant. In addition, the Ppmax2 mutant remains sensitive to strigolactones, showing a clear transcriptional strigolactone response in dark conditions, and the response to red light is also altered. These data suggest divergent evolutionary trajectories for strigolactone signaling pathway evolution in mosses and vascular plants.

In P. patens, the primary roles for MAX2 are in photomorphogenesis and moss early development rather than in strigolactone response, which may require other, still unidentified, factors.
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Introduction

Strigolactones (SLs) are plant hormones that were first identified as root-exudate products, exogenously indicating the vicinity of a host plant to parasitic plants such as Striga (Cook et al. 1966) and Arbuscular Mycorrhizal (AM) fungi (Akiyama et al. 2005). Roles for SLs in a range of endogenous developmental processes including shoot branching and root architecture were more recently described (Waldie et al. 2014; Lopez-Obando et al. 2015). SLs are present in most land plants (Xie et al. 2010) and the charophyte algal sister lineage to land plants.
(Delaux et al. 2012), but signaling pathways are expanded in land plants relative to charophytes (Bowman et al. 2017). Therefore, SLs are key candidate facilitators for plant terrestrialization 480 million years (MY) ago (Bowman et al. 2017).

SL synthesis and signaling pathways have well characterized roles in branching in seed plants such as pea, *Arabidopsis*, *Petunia* and rice (Al-Babili and Bouwmeester 2015; Waters et al. 2017). Genes cloned from SL-deficient mutants have identified synthesis steps requiring a carotenoid isomerase DWARF27 (D27), two CAROTENOID CLEAVAGE DIOXYGENASES (CCD7 and CCD8), at least one Cytochrome P450 MORE AXILLARY GROWTH 1 (MAX1) (Al-Babili and Bouwmeester 2015), and the oxidoreductase-like enzyme LATERAL BRANCHING OXIDOREDUCTASE (LBO) (Brewer et al. 2016). In parallel, the study of SL-insensitive mutants has implicated several gene families in SL signaling. The first step of SL signaling is hormone perception, and this requires an α/β hydrolase enzyme, DECREASED APICAL DOMINANCE2/DWARF14/RAMOSUS3 (DAD2/D14/RMS3), that has been shown to interact with and cleave SL molecules in vitro (Hamiaux et al. 2012; Nakamura et al. 2013; de Saint Germain et al. 2016; Yao et al. 2016). *Petunia* DAD2 and rice D14 have been shown to interact in the presence of SLs with the F-box proteins MORE AXILLARY GROWTH 2A (PhMAX2A) and DWARF3 (D3), which are orthologous to *Arabidopsis* MAX2 (Hamiaux et al. 2012; Jiang et al. 2013; Zhou et al. 2013; Zhao et al. 2014). The current model for SL signaling mostly builds on studies of shoot branching in angiosperms, proposing that SL perception by D14/AtD14 induces the recognition of specific target proteins by an SCF$^{D3/\text{MAX}2}$ complex. This process leads to ubiquitination and proteasome-mediated degradation of targets in a similar process to processes described for other plant hormones including gibberellins (Lopez-Obando et al. 2015; Waters et al. 2017). Whilst roles for MAX2 in SL signaling were first described around 15 years ago (Stirnberg et al. 2002; Johnson et al. 2006; Stirnberg et al. 2007; Shen et al. 2012), the identification of DWARF53 (D53)/SUPPRESSOR OF MAX2-LIKE (SMXL) proteins as putative targets of the SCF$^{D3/\text{MAX}2}$ complex is more recent (Jiang et al. 2013; Stanga et al. 2013; Zhou et al. 2013; Soundappan et al. 2015; Wang et al. 2015).

*Arabidopsis* max2 mutants were also isolated in early genetic screens for delayed dark-induced senescence (Woo et al. 2001), and light hyposensitivity (Shen et al. 2007). Whereas the involvement of SLs in leaf senescence has been confirmed (Yamada et al. 2014; Ueda and Kusaba 2015), the photomorphogenesis phenotype of max2 mutants appears independent of the SL pathway (Shen et al 2012). Furthermore, a requirement for MAX2 in other butenolide
signaling pathways was demonstrated by the isolation of max2 mutants in a genetic screen for insensitivity to smoke-derived karrikins (Nelson et al. 2011; Waters et al. 2012). Karrikins induce Arabidopsis seed germination and affect seedling photomorphogenesis through a similar but distinct signaling pathway to SLs (Scaffidi et al. 2014; Waters et al. 2014), and an α/β hydrolase protein closely related to D14, KARRIKIN INSENSITIVE 2 (KAI2), is required for the response to karrikins (Waters et al. 2012). Whilst karrikins have not been detected in plants, KAI2 is the presumed receptor of an unknown plant-produced KAI2-ligand (KL) (Scaffidi et al. 2013; Waters and Smith 2013; Conn and Nelson 2015). Thus, the MAX2 F-box protein is involved in several signaling pathways apart from strigolactone signaling.

Although several components of the strigolactone synthesis and signaling pathways are shared amongst land plants, their roles in early diverging land plant lineages and contribution to plant evolution are unknown (Bowman et al. 2017). We addressed this evolutionary question using the moss Physcomitrella patens (P. patens) as a model representing an ancient divergence in land plant evolution. Whilst CCD7 and CCD8 orthologues are found in the P. patens genome, a true orthologue of MAX1 is absent (Delaux et al. 2012). We previously generated Ppcd8 SL-deficient mutants and demonstrated SL-functions in repressing radial plant growth and gametophore branching (Proust et al. 2011; Hoffmann et al. 2014; Coudert et al. 2015). Consideration of signaling pathways has revealed no true orthologue of the D14 receptor gene, but there are 13 PpKAI2-LIKE genes that are closer to the KAI2 α/β hydrolase clade in P. patens (Delaux et al. 2012; Lopez-Obando et al. 2016a). Phylogenetic analyses have also identified a single putative homologue for the F-box protein gene MAX2 (Delaux et al. 2012) and three to four PpSMXL genes (Zhou et al. 2013).

Here we wished to explore SL signaling pathway evolution, and we focused on the role of the P. patens MAX2 gene, testing whether PpMAX2 is involved in the SL response. We also generated PpMAX2 KO mutants and characterized their response to SL and red light at the phenotypic and molecular level. Our data indicate that similarly to MAX2 from Arabidopsis, PpMAX2 is involved in photomorphogenesis. However, PpMAX2 is probably not involved in generating a SL response.

Materials and Methods

P. patens growth conditions
The Gransden wild-type strain of *P. patens* was used and grown as previously described in a culture room at 24°C (day)/22°C (night) with a light regime of 16 h light/8 h darkness and a quantum irradiance of 80 \( \mu \text{E m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \) (Proust et al. 2011; Lopez-Obando et al. 2016b). For phenotypic analysis, fragmented protonemal tissue was grown for 7 days on PP-NH\(_4\) medium (=PP-NO\(_3\) medium supplemented with 2.7 mM NH\(_4\)tartrate) then transferred to PP-NO\(_3\) medium (Ashton et al. 1979; Hoffmann et al. 2014). Sporogenesis was induced in Magenta vessels in which 21/28-gold plants were grown on soil plugs (or PP-NO\(_3\) medium) for 10 days as above and then transferred to a growth chamber at 15°C with 8 h of light per day and a quantum irradiance of 15 \( \mu \text{E m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \) and rinsed once a week with sterile tap water till capsule maturity (after 2 to 3 months). For red light experiments, plants were grown on PP-NO\(_3\) medium, at 24°C with a continuous red-light regime of 46 \( \mu \text{E m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \).

**Generation of **Ppmax 2-1, Ppmax 2-2 and Ppccd 8-Ppmax 2 mutants**

Moss protoplasts were obtained and transformed as described previously (Trouiller et al. 2006). For the *Ppmax2-1* mutant, a 735 bp *PpMAX2* genomic 3’ CDS flanking sequence fragment was cloned in the pBHRF vector (Thelander et al. 2007), digested with *Nar*I and *Hpa*I. Next, an 886 bp *PpMAX2* genomic 5’ CDS flanking sequence fragment was inserted into *Avr*II/XhoI sites of the pBHRF vector carrying the 3’ CDS flanking sequence (*PpMAX2KO1* construct). For the *Ppmax2-2* mutant, a 1170 bp 5’ CDS flanking sequence fragment and a 1170 bp 3’ CDS flanking sequence fragment were amplified and subcloned into pJET1.2 vector (Fermentas) with a Geneticin/G418 resistance cassette from pMBL11a plasmid (Knight et al. 2002) (*PpMAX2KO2* construct). WT protoplasts were transformed with the *PpMAX2-KO1* or the *PpMAX2-KO2* constructs, and transformants were selected on 30 mg l\(^{-1}\) Hygromycin B or 50 mg l\(^{-1}\) G418, respectively. For the *Ppccd8-Ppmax2* double mutant, protoplasts from the single *Ppccd8* mutant were transformed with a construct carrying the same flanking sequences as *PpMAX2-KO2*, subcloned into the pJET1.2 vector, with a Hygromycin resistance cassette from pMBLH8a (Knight et al. 2002). Transformants were selected on 30 mg l\(^{-1}\) Hygromycin B. Stable transformants of the *PpMAX2* gene were confirmed by PCR using specific primers (Fig. S1 and Table S1).

**Protoplast assays**

Protoplasts were isolated as described in (Trouiller et al. 2006), counted, and kept overnight in the dark at 24°C, in liquid 8.5 % mannitol PP-NH\(_4\). The next day, drops of 750 protoplasts gently mixed with 0.7% top agar (v/v) were transferred on 8.5 % mannitol PP-NH\(_4\) plates,
with various (0 to 3 µM) concentrations of (±)-GR24 for 5 days, prior to transfer onto plates without mannitol (but with (±)-GR24).

Molecular cloning and subcellular protein localization

Generating the PPpMAX2:GUS lines

The ZmUbi-1 promoter was eliminated from the pMP1300 vector [http://labs.biology.ucsd.edu/estelle/Moss_files/pMP1300-K108N+Ubi-GW-GUS.gb] by PCR amplification using primers Ubi-pr and Ubi-exp (Table S1) and the plasmid backbone was self-ligated and renamed pMP1301. A 1961 bp promoter region for PpMAX2 was amplified from P. patens gDNA using primers PPpMAX2_F and PPpMAX2_R (Table S1). The product was purified and cloned into the vector pCR®8/GW/TOPO® (Life Technologies®, USA-CA). An LR-clonase reaction between the pMP1301 and pCR8::PPpMAX2 plasmids yielded PPpMAX2:GUS, which was used to transform WT P. patens. A stable G418 resistant line was used for subsequent histochemical analysis to determine GUS localisation.

Generating the ZmUbi:gfp:PpMAX2 lines

Single-stranded P. patens cDNA was used as template to amplify the PpMAX2 coding sequence using the PPpMAX2_F and PPpMAX2_R primer set (Table S1). The 2493 bp product was cloned into the pCR®8/GW/TOPO®. pCR8::PPpMAX2 was recombined with the pMP1335 vector [http://labs.biology.ucsd.edu/estelle/Moss_files/ pK108N+Ubi-mGFP6-GW.gb] to get pMP1335::PPpMAX2. pMP1335::PPpMAX2 was linearised by SfiI digestion and transformed into WT P. patens. Stable G418 resistant lines were screened for insertion by PCR using the GFP_F and PPpMAX2_R primers (Table S1). For one of these positive GFP:PPpMAX2 lines the localisation of the recombinant GFP:PPpMAX2 was determined by visualising protonemal tissue on a confocal microscope (Carl Zeiss Confocal LSM 780 Elyra with SR- SIM superresolution plasform). For analysis, protonemal tissue was fixed in 4% (v/v) formaldehyde for 10 min and then stained with a 0.0125% (w/v) Hoescht33342 solution. Images were analysed by the ZEN 2012 (blue edition) software package (Carl Zeiss, Germany).

Arabidopsis complementation and phenotyping experiments

Constructs in which the PpMAX2 coding sequence was constitutively expressed alone or in a GFP fusion were introduced into the max2-3 (N592836) T-DNA insertion mutant. The pUbi10 promoter, corresponding to the first 634 base pairs immediately upstream of the
ubiquitin-10 gene from Arabidopsis (At4g05320) was used to drive PpMAX2 expression (Grefen et al. 2010). Expression of the PpMAX2 mRNA and/or fluorescence of the GFP were checked in the corresponding transformed lines (Fig. S2). Results for two independent lines carrying each PpMAX2 construct are shown. Hypocotyl length under low fluence experiments were carried out as previously described (de Saint Germain et al. 2016).

**RNA extraction and gene expression analyses**

Gene expression analyses were done by reverse-transcription quantitative PCR (RT-qPCR) as previously described (Hoffmann et al. 2014; Lopez-Obando et al. 2016a), with primers listed in Table S1.

**Statistical analyses**

For statistical analyses, ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis tests were used (R Commander version 1.7-3).

**Results**

**Physcomitrella patens contains a single MAX2 homologue**

The single P. patens MAX2 homologue (Pp3c17_1180v3) was named PpMAX2 (Delaux et al. 2012; Li et al. 2016). Phylogenetic analysis of full-length predicted MAX2 proteins indicated that, in contrast to previously published phylogenies that used a higher number of EST and full-length sequences, MAX2 from P. patens, Marchantia polymorpha and Selaginella moellendorffii formed a separate clade to seed plant proteins (Fig. S3a) (Delaux et al. 2012; Bythell-Douglas et al. 2017). Thus, the precise relationships between MAX2 homologues in vascular plants and those in non-vascular plants remain ambiguous. Nevertheless, the lack of any other close homologue in moss and the fact that MAX2 is present as a single copy gene in a large majority of plant genomes suggest that PpMAX2 is likely orthologous to AtMAX2. PpMAX2 has no intron (Fig. S3b), and the predicted PpMAX2 protein is larger than vascular plant MAX2 proteins, containing C terminal insertions (Fig. S3c). Alignment of several predicted MAX2 protein sequences from vascular plants and bryophytes showed that PpMAX2 has a conserved F-box domain and similar LRR repeats composition to AtMAX2, with the exception that LRR13 is longer and consequently could not be modeled to existing F-box structures in this region (Fig. S3c-d).
**PpMAX2 is expressed in most cells, and PpMAX2 localizes to the nucleus**

To characterize the expression profile of *PpMAX2*, a 1961 bp promoter fragment was cloned upstream of the GUS coding sequence and introduced into the neutral Pp108 locus of wild-type (WT) moss plants by targeted insertion (Schaefer and Zryd 1997). Expression of the GUS reporter was observed in protonemal filaments, but not at the very tips of caulonema (Fig. 1a). Expression was also observed in gametophore axes and leaves (Fig. 1a-d), with stronger staining in older leaves than in young leaves at the top of the gametophore (Fig. 1c,d). This pattern was corroborated by expression data from the *P. patens* eFP-Browser and Genevestigator public databases (Hiss et al. 2014; Ortiz-Ramirez et al. 2016), that also indicated strong expression in sporophytes (Fig. S4). To determine the sub-cellular localization of PpMAX2, a GFP sequence was inserted in-frame and upstream of the PpMAX2 protein coding sequence, and introduced into WT plants. In accordance with knowledge of F-box protein function from flowering plants (Stirnberg et al. 2007), PpMAX2 localized to nuclei in protonemal cells (Fig. 1e-h).

**Ppmax2 mutants are small plants with few but large gametophores, and show converse phenotypes to Ppccd8 mutants**

To determine the role of PpMAX2, *Ppmax2* mutants were engineered by targeted replacement using two replacement strategies, and two independent knockout lines were obtained (Fig. S1a,b). Whilst regeneration efficiencies were very low relative to WT plants (not shown), both *Ppmax2-1* and *Ppmax2-2* mutants showed the same phenotype (Fig. 2a) with very few protonema and rapid differentiation of large gametophores relative to WT plants (Fig. 2a). *Ppmax2* mutants were small with limited growth after several weeks of culture (Fig. 2b,c). When grown on soil plugs, plant diameter and the number of gametophores per plant were considerably reduced (Fig. 2c-d) and no sporophytes were found. We also tested the effect of the *Ppmax2* mutation on gametophore branch patterning (Coudert et al. 2015). Although the size of the apical inhibition zone (the apical portion of gametophores devoid of branches) was slightly smaller and the overall branch number was slightly higher in *Ppmax2-1* mutants than in WT plants, the spacing between branches was similar in both genotypes (Fig. 2e, Fig S5). These data suggest that *PpMAX2* plays a minor role in gametophore branching. If *PpMAX2* has roles in moss SL signaling, we would expect that the phenotype of *Ppmax2* mutants should resemble *Ppccd8* SL biosynthesis mutant phenotype, as in flowering plants (Gomez-Roldan et al. 2008; Umehara et al. 2008). However, *Ppmax2* and *Ppccd8* appear to have...
opposite phenotypes, as if Ppmax2 displayed SL over-production or a constitutive SL response (Fig. 2a,b,d).

**Ppmax2 mutants can elicit a strigolactone response**

As SL molecules are very difficult to quantify, we used an indirect approach to determine whether Ppmax2 overproduces SL and quantified expression of PpCCD7, a SL-responsive gene whose transcript levels decrease following (±)-GR24 application (Proust et al. 2011). We used Ppccd8 mutant plants for these experiments as the SL response is easier to observe in mutants than in WT plants (Hoffmann et al. 2014), and plants were transferred onto media containing no exudate, 1 µM (±)-GR24, WT, Ppccd8 or Ppmax2-1 exudate. PpCCD7 transcript levels were assayed 6 h after transfer (Fig. 3). Transfer of plants onto medium containing Ppccd8 exudate led to PpCCD7 transcript levels similar to those observed following transfer onto fresh medium. However, transfer onto medium containing Ppmax2-1 exudate led to a significant decrease of PpCCD7 transcript level, as was observed following transfer onto media containing (±)-GR24 or WT exudate (Fig. 3). Thus Ppmax2-1 exudate affects PpCCD7 transcript levels in a similar way to WT exudate, and Ppmax2-1 is likely to produce SL at similar levels to WT plants.

**Ppmax2 mutants show growth responses to (±)-GR24 application**

The response of Ppmax2 mutants to exogenously applied (±)-GR24 was tested and compared to the response of Ppccd8 mutants to identify any roles for PpMAX2 in SL signaling. These experiments were carried out using dark-grown caulonema where differences in growth are most pronounced (Hoffmann et al. 2014), and plants were grown vertically so that caulonema extending with a negative gravitropism on the medium could be directly measured. Under these conditions both Ppmax2-1 and Ppccd8 mutant caulonema showed significant and dose-dependent growth suppression (Fig. 4a). The relative decrease in caulonema length was greater in the Ppmax2-1 mutant than in Ppccd8 in all tested conditions (Fig. 4a). We also assayed SL responsiveness using a protoplast regeneration assay, and found that fewer plants regenerated in WT and Ppccd8 and Ppmax2 mutant plants following (±)-GR24 application, with the response being dose-dependent (Fig. 4b). Thus, Ppmax2 mutants can respond to SL application, and the response is pronounced in caulonema when mutants are grown in the dark, or in protoplasts regenerating in the light.
Ppmax2 mutants show transcriptional responses to (±)-GR24 application

Ppmax2 responses to SL were further analyzed using SL-responsive genes as molecular markers. The PpCCD7 transcript level was very low in Ppmax2-1 mutants relative to levels in Ppcdd8 mutants and WT plants, and in contrast to a significant response observed in WT and Ppcdd8, no significant decrease was noted in Ppmax2-1 mutants 6 h after transfer on medium with (±)-GR24, (Fig. 4c). We also measured transcript abundance of the PpKUF1LA gene (Pp3c2_34130v3.1), a moss homologue of Arabidopsis KAR:UP F-BOX1 (KUF1). KUF1 transcript levels are sensitive to (±)-GR24 application in Arabidopsis SL biosynthesis mutants (Nelson et al. 2011; Waters et al. 2012; Stanga et al. 2016). PpKUF1LA (Pp3c2_34130v3.1) transcript levels increased 6 h after transfer on medium containing (±)-GR24 in both light-grown WT and Ppcdd8 mutants, but no response was detected in light-grown Ppmax2-1 mutants (Fig. S6a). As the bioassay suggested a Ppmax2-1 response to SL in the dark (Fig. 4a), we tested gene expression in dark grown plants. In contrast to WT and Ppcdd8 mutant plants, no decrease of the PpCCD7 transcript level was observed in Ppmax2 mutants following transfer on (±)-GR24 (Fig. S6b). However, in dark-grown Ppmax2-1 plants, transcript levels of PpKUF1LA significantly increased following transfer on (±)-GR24 as in WT and Ppcdd8 mutant plants (Fig. 4d). Thus Ppmax2 mutants remain responsive to exogenously-applied SL.

PpMAX2 expression is light responsive, and Ppmax2 has impaired light responses

To further investigate roles for PpMAX2 in light-regulated development, WT tissues were grown in the light for 7 days and then placed in the dark for 5 days prior to transfer into red light for increasing lengths of time. PpMAX2 transcript levels were higher in the dark than in the light (Fig. 5a). One hour of red light treatment led to a significant decrease in PpMAX2 transcript levels, and a 3-hour treatment resulted in a minimal expression level that was comparable to PpMAX2 expression levels in white light (Fig. 5a), thus PpMAX2 expression is light regulated. In white light, gametophores with the same number of leaves as WT, Ppcdd8 or Ppmax2-2 mutant plants were taller in Ppmax2-2 mutants (Fig. 5b), showing an etiolation phenotype associated with light regulated development in other plants. To investigate a potential role for PpMAX2 in photomorphogenesis, Ppmax2-1 mutants were grown under continuous red light for 25 days. A strong etiolation phenotype was observed in Ppmax2-1 mutant gametophores but not in WT or Ppcdd8 (Fig. 5c). We analyzed the transcript levels of
genetic markers for light response in WT versus *Ppmax2-1* mutant tissues. *Ppmax2-1* mutant and WT plants were first grown in white light for 2 weeks and then transferred into the dark for 4 days prior to exposure to red light for increasing time periods (0.5h to 24h). After red light treatment, transcript levels of both *ELONGATED HYOCOTYL 5a* (*PpHY5a*) and *NADPH-PROTOCHLOROPHYLLIDE OXIDOREDUCTASE 1* (*PpPOR1*) were measured by RT-qPCR (Fig. 5d,e). The transcript levels of *PpHY5a* showed a transient and rapid increase with red light exposure in WT whilst remaining almost unchanged in *Ppmax2-1*. *PpPOR1* transcript levels also increased with red light exposure in WT but remained lower in *Ppmax2-1*. The *Ppmax2* mutants thus have an impaired response to red light.

*Ppmax2* is epistatic to *Ppccd8*

To examine the genetic interaction between *PpMAX2* and *PpCCD8*, *Ppmax2* mutants were engineered in the *Ppccd8* mutant background (Fig. S1c). *Ppccd8-Ppmax2* double mutants had a phenotype similar to that of *Ppmax2* mutants, with no additive effects on plant extension or gametophore development, indicating that the *Ppmax2* mutation can override the effect of the *Ppccd8* mutation (Fig. 6a,b). Whilst up-regulated *PpCCD7* transcript levels are a genetic marker of *Ppccd8* mutants, *PpCCD7* expression was down-regulated in both *Ppmax2-1* and *Ppccd8-Ppmax2* double mutants (Fig. 6c), further suggesting that the *Ppmax2* mutation is epistatic to the *Ppccd8* (Fig. 6a,b).

*PpMAX2* cannot complement *Atmax2* mutant phenotypes

The data above suggest that roles for MAX2 in SL signaling are not conserved between *P. patens* and *Arabidopsis*. To test this hypothesis, we heterologously expressed *PpMAX2* in the *Atmax2-3* mutant background, and used *AtMAX2* as a control (Fig. 7, FigS2). Whilst *AtMAX2* expression was able to restore WT plant phenotypes, *PpMAX2* expression failed to complement the reduced height, higher branching and elongated hypocotyl under low fluence mutant phenotypes of *Atmax2-3* (Fig. 7). Some partial complementation of the branching phenotype was observed in the lines where the *PpMAX2* gene was fused to the GFP, with intermediate branching between WT and *Atmax2-3* (Fig. 7c). However, as these lines are smaller in size than the *Atmax2-3* mutant (Fig. 7a), one cannot conclude that these were complemented lines. Thus *PpMAX2* and *AtMAX2* are not functionally equivalent.
Discussion

Phylogenetic studies have suggested that SL biosynthesis and signaling pathways are conserved amongst land plants (Proust et al. 2011; Delaux et al. 2012; Waters et al. 2012; Bowman et al. 2017). SLs or SL-like compounds are found in bryophytes and in the moss, P. patens, both the PpCCD7 and PpCCD8 proteins have been shown to have in vitro enzymatic activities that are conserved with seed plants, indicating probable conservation of at least the early steps in SL biosynthesis (Decker et al. 2017). Homologues of key genes of the SL signaling pathway are found in the P. patens genome, with one PpMAX2, 13 PpKAI2-LIKE and four PpSMXL genes. Whilst it is likely that some of the KAI2 proteins may function as SL receptors in moss (Lopez-Obando et al. 2016a), as yet no functional studies demonstrate their involvement in SL perception. This study focused on the moss PpMAX2 gene and our results indicate that roles in photomorphogenesis are conserved with Arabidopsis MAX2, but that a role of PpMAX2 in SL signaling is unlikely.

SL signaling pathway in moss is distinct from flowering plants, and does not require the PpMAX2 F-box protein

The Ppmax2 phenotype and the ability of the mutant to respond to SL are evidence that PpMAX2 is not necessary for SL signaling. Gametophore branching (Coudert et al. 2015) and plant spread phenotypes are different between the Ppccd8 and Ppmax2 mutants. These results contrast with mutant phenotypes in seed plants, where shoot branching and plant height are comparable in ccd8 and max2 mutants (Gomez-Roldan et al. 2008; Umehara et al. 2008). In Arabidopsis, the max2 mutation is considerably more pleiotropic in comparison to the ccd8 (max4) mutation. SL-independent seed germination and photomorphogenesis phenotypes are observed in Atmax2 mutants (Nelson et al. 2011; Shen et al. 2012). As both SL and the unidentified KAI2-Ligand (KL) signal through AtMAX2, the mutant combines the effect of alteration of several pathways. It is possible that in moss the Ppmax2 mutation is also highly pleiotropic and that the strong effect of the Ppmax2 mutation masks or overrides the Ppccd8 phenotype. This hypothesis is supported by the Ppccd8-Ppmax2 double mutant phenotype that resembles the Ppmax2 phenotype.

Several bioassays were used to test the SL response of the Ppmax2 mutant, and the Ppmax2 mutant is sensitive to (±)-GR24 applications under protoplast regeneration and early growth in light conditions, as well as during caulonemal growth in the dark. Furthermore, a
transcriptional response of SL-responsive genes in the \textit{Ppmax2} mutant is observed in dark conditions. We observed that the scale of the \textit{Ppmax2} response to (±)-GR24 was variable compared to that of WT or \textit{Ppccd8} mutants (Fig. 4). This may be related to the use of racemic (±)-GR24 that could induce SL-independent effects (Scaffidi et al. 2014), not yet characterized in moss. The fact that PpMAX2 expression does not restore the \textit{Arabidopsis} \textit{max2} phenotypes also argues against a role in SL response, although the moss PpMAX2 F-box protein may not be able to recognize \textit{Arabidopsis} protein interaction partners in transformed lines due to differences in C-terminus protein structure (Fig. S3,c).

Our conclusion that PpMAX2 is not crucial for SL signaling in moss leads us to hypothesize that other factors (e.g. F-box proteins) may be required. Interestingly, MAX2-independent SL responses have previously been hypothesized for roots of seed plants (Ruyter-Spira et al. 2011; Shinohara et al. 2013; Walton et al. 2016) and high doses of (±)-GR24 (5-10 µM) can induce a response in \textit{Arabidopsis} \textit{max2} mutants (Ruyter-Spira et al. 2011). Furthermore, MAX2-independent promotion of stromule formation can be induced by (±)-GR24 (Vismans and van der Meer 2016). An unknown factor involved in SL signaling could thus be conserved between moss and vascular plants and able to signal with more subtle effects than the MAX2 pathway. SL signaling in moss could also be F-box protein independent, implicating different downstream mechanisms to those so far described in vascular plants in signaling. Investigation of the roles of \textit{PpSMXL} genes, and putative degradation of PpSMXL proteins should clarify this point in the future.

Do \textit{Ppmax2} and \textit{Ppccd8} mutants really have opposite phenotypes?

The response to SL of the \textit{Ppmax2} mutant was difficult to pinpoint because \textit{Ppmax2} mutants have a converse phenotype to \textit{Ppccd8} mutants. Whilst \textit{Ppmax2} mutant plants are small and have few protonemal filaments, \textit{Ppccd8} plants produce many protonemata and spread across the substrate. We previously showed that whilst WT plants cease protonemal spread in response to near neighbors, \textit{Ppccd8} mutants are insensitive to neighbors in Petri cultures (Proust et al. 2011). This phenomenon leads to small plant size as in the \textit{Ppmax2} mutants and WT plants grown on high (non-physiological) doses of (±)-GR24 are also small with comparable size to \textit{Ppmax2} plants (Fig. S7). Another line of evidence supporting the interpretation that \textit{Ppmax2} and \textit{Ppccd8} mutant phenotypes are converse is the transcript level of several SL-responsive genes, conversely affected in \textit{Ppccd8} and \textit{Ppmax2} mutants. For
instance, $PpCCD7$ transcript levels are very low in $Ppmax2$ but much higher in $Ppccd8$ mutants (Fig. 4c).

If the phenotypes of $Ppccd8$ and $Ppmax2$ mutants are converse, $Ppmax2$ plants may over-produce and/or over-accumulate SLs. This hypothesis was tested indirectly by monitoring the $Ppecd8$ mutant response to $Ppmax2$ exudate versus $Ppecd8$ or WT exudates or (±)-GR24 treatment (Fig. 3), and the results suggest that $Ppmax2$ does not over-produce SLs, but verification by SL quantification is required, and these assays are challenging in moss.

Alternatively, $Ppmax2$ mutants could phenocopy a constitutive SL response.

As PpMAX2 is an F-box protein, putatively involved in degradation processes by the proteasome system, PpMAX2 could target activators of SL signaling for degradation, and such activators so far remain unidentified. SMXL proteins are known targets for degradation in seed plant SL signaling pathways, and SMXLs are considered as repressors of this pathway (Soundappan et al. 2015; Wang et al. 2015). Interestingly, the converse phenotypes of $Ppmax2$ and $Ppccd8$ mutants did not hold for gametophore branching, as $Ppmax2$ gametophores did not lack branches as in a pea CCD8 overexpressor line ($PpRMS1OE$) (Coudert et al. 2015). PpMAX2 may function in protonema and early gametophore development, but not in later development (Fig. 8).

The low levels of $PpCCD7$ expression in $Ppmax2$ in comparison to WT suggest that PpMAX2 and SL are not completely independent. However, this could be an indirect effect of reduced gametophore production in the mutant (Fig. 2d) as the highest $PpCCD7$ transcript levels were observed at the base of the gametophore (Proust et al. 2011). There may also be indirect feedback control on transcript levels. In vascular plants, environmental conditions (N, P, drought) or endogenous factors as auxin control the expression levels of SL biosynthesis genes (Al-Babili and Bouwmeeste 2015; Ligerot et al. 2017). It would be interesting to quantify auxin levels in both $Ppmax2$ and $Ppccd8$ mutants to test whether differences in IAA levels translate into differences in $PpCCD7$ transcript levels. Further experiments are needed to have a clear understanding of the moss SL signaling pathway. In particular, biochemistry to test protein interactions and quantification of the levels of other hormones should be very informative.

The role of MAX2 in light response is similar between moss and seed plants
The shoot elongation phenotype of the *Ppmax2* mutant under red light and its misregulation of light responsive genes support the notion that *PpMAX2* plays a role in light responses (Fig. 5), as does its flowering plant homologue (Shen et al. 2007). The paucity of caulonemal filaments in *Ppmax2* may also be related to a defective light response as a similar phenotype was observed in the light sensing-defective *P. patens* Δhy5ab and pubs-hy2 double mutants (Yamawaki et al. 2011; Chen et al. 2012). In our experiments, tissue used for RNA extraction included a mix of protonemata and gametophores, and the ratio of different tissue types may be different in mutants versus WT plants given their distinct phenotypes. Whilst we interpret the light responsive gene expression data with caution, our results suggest that the ancestral role of MAX2 may be to promote photomorphogenesis. Despite this likely shared role with AtMAX2, PpMAX2 cannot complement the *Atmax2* mutant hypocotyl phenotype under low fluence light (Fig. 7d), potentially because *Arabidopsis* MAX2 and moss PpMAX2 protein partners may not recognize one another. As with the shade avoidance response of vascular plants it is possible that PpMAX2 helps plants to grow in an ideal amount of light. In this instance, PpMAX2 could allow plants to respond to low light, delaying gametophore growth and investing energy in spreading protonemal tissues to find light patches. This regulation could also require HY5, given the similar phenotypes of the mutants (see above) and the misregulation of HY5a transcript levels in the *Ppmax2* mutant.

**An ancestral role of MAX2 in moss development**

Our data and our model for roles for MAX2 in land plants (Fig. 8) open the question of an evolutionary benefit to seed plants in recruiting this F-box protein to SL signaling. We propose that combining the ability of MAX2 to regulate the levels of downstream proteins (e.g. SMXL proteins) would have added a level of fine (endogenous) regulation to photomorphogenesis or aspects of development already under the control of this F-box protein in early land plants. Further studies in other land plants including gymnosperms, lycophytes and other bryophytes will answer this question.

The expression of the *PpMAX2* gene during all stages of moss development is in agreement with the putative function of PpMAX2 as a component of an SCF complex regulating the homeostasis of multiple targets. Phenotypes of *Ppmax2* mutants and the *Ppccd8-Ppmax2* double mutant indicate an early and simultaneous role in repressing gametophore/bud differentiation and stimulating the chloronema to caulonema transition. Thus PpMAX2 could act conversely to SLs which repress plant spread (Proust et al. 2011). Interestingly, in moss,
auxin has been shown to regulate the chloronema to caulonema transition (Ashton et al. 1979; Prigge et al. 2010; Jang and Dolan 2011), while cytokinins induce bud differentiation (von Schwartzenberg et al. 2007). It would thus be interesting to investigate both the auxin and cytokinin status of the \textit{Ppmax2} mutant. Involvement of all three hormonal pathways in moss gametophore branching has been recently addressed (Coudert et al. 2015), and this study suggests that auxin, cytokinin and SL signaling may interact, as in vascular plants.

In seed plants, MAX2 has been linked to signaling by a still unknown KL compound “which interacts at some level with auxin and light signaling to regulate growth and development” (Waters and Smith 2013; Conn and Nelson 2015). As the receptor KAI2 is ancestral, this pathway may be present in bryophytes. It could then be argued that the \textit{Ppmax2} phenotype is the consequence of disturbing this second signaling pathway (Fig. 8). Given this scenario, KL signaling could interfere with or mask SL signaling, because the phenotype of the \textit{Ppced8-Ppmax2} double mutant is closer to that of \textit{Ppmax2}. It has not yet been possible to test this hypothesis as moss does not seem to respond to karrikins (Hoffmann et al. 2014) and the nature of KL compound is still elusive. The study of interactions of PpMAX2 with some of the 13 PpKAI2-LIKE and/or the four PpSMXL putative targets found in moss genome (Bennett and Leyser 2014; Lopez-Obando et al. 2016a) will be key to confirming the place of PpMAX2 in these signaling events.
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**Figure legends:**

Fig. 1: Pattern of *Physcomitrella patens* *PpMAX2* gene expression and subcellular localization of the protein. (a-d): Pattern of *PpMAX2* gene expression by staining of a moss line expressing the GUS coding sequence under the control of *PpMAX2* gene promoter (inserted in *Pp108* locus) (a) protonema cells, (b-d) gametophore leaves and stems; arrow in (c): rhizoids. scale bars: (a-b): 0.1 mm; (c): 1 mm (d): 0.5 mm. (e-h) Nuclear localization of *PpMAX2* in a protonemal tip cell of a WT moss line transformed with a mGFP6::PpMAX2 translational fusion by homologous recombination. (e) Nucleus labeling with Hoescht33342. (f) GFP fluorescence (g) chloroplast autofluorescence (h) Merge of all 3 images (e-g), indicating co-localization of Hoescht33342 and GFP to the nucleus. Scale bar: 20 µm.

Fig. 2: *Physcomitrella patens* *Ppmax2* mutants are affected in development and show contrasting phenotype to the *Ppccd8* SL synthesis mutant. (a): Bright field photographs of 7 day-old (left), 13 day-old (middle) and 20 day-old plants (right). Scale = 500 µM (b): Comparison of *Ppmax2* mutants plant diameter to that of WT and *Ppccd8* mutant after 5 weeks (left, mean ± SE of 3 plates with 16 plants measured per plate) and 5 month (right, mean ± SE of 10 plants grown on soil plugs) growth in the light. Asterisks denote significant differences between WT and mutants based on a Kruskal–Wallis test (P < 0.001) (c) Pictures of 5 month-old WT and *Ppmax2-1* plants grown on soil plugs. (d): Comparison of *Ppmax2-1* mutant fitness to that of WT and *Ppccd8* mutant in 5 month-old plants, measuring gametophore number per plant (left) and sporangia number per plant (right). Data are means of 10 plants ± SE. Asterisks denote significant differences between the genotypes based on a Kruskal–Wallis test (***P<0.01; ****P<0.001) (e): *Ppmax2-1* gametophore branching pattern.
compared to that of WT (left panel). Apical inhibition zone size (middle panel) was reduced in Ppmax2-1 (mean ± SD; bilateral t-test different from WT,*p < 0.05), while distance to closest branch was similar (mean ± SD).

Fig. 3: The Physcomitrella patens Ppmax2 mutant exudate tested on PpCCD7 expression is similar to WT.

Three-week-old Ppcd8 plants were transferred for 6h on medium with 0µM (±)-GR24 (Ctl), or 1µM (±)-GR24, or on medium where the WT, or the different mutants had grown (and exuded SLs) for 3 weeks noted as “exud”. Data represent means of transcript levels of 3 biological repeats relative to PpAPT expression level, ± SE. Different letters indicate significantly different results based on a post-hoc Kruskal–Wallis test (P < 0.05).

Fig. 4: The Physcomitrella patens Ppmax2 mutant is sensitive to the synthetic SL (±)-GR24. (a) Caulonema length measurements in the dark in Ppmax2-1 mutant and Ppcd8 SL synthesis mutant, following application of increasing concentrations of (±)-GR24. Control (Ctl): same amount of acetone. Asterisks denote significant differences between the control and the treatment within the genotypes based on a Kruskal–Wallis test (P < 0.001). (b) Protoplast regeneration tests. Asterisks denote significant differences between the control and the treatment within the genotypes based on a Kruskal–Wallis test (P < 0.001). (c) Transcript levels of the SL responsive gene PpCCD7 relative to PpAPT and PpACT3 transcript levels in WT, Ppcd8 and Ppmax2-1 grown for 3 weeks in the light. (d) Transcript levels analysis of the SL responsive gene PpKUF1LA relative to PpAPT and PpACT3 transcript levels in WT, Ppcd8 and Ppmax2-1 mutants, grown for two weeks in the light then one week in the dark and transferred onto control medium (Ctl) or 3 µM of (±)-GR24. On the right, a close-up of transcript levels in Ppmax2-1 is shown. Different letters indicate significantly different results between non-treated genotypes based on a Kruskal–Wallis test (P < 0.05). Asterisks denote significant differences between treated and control plants within a genotype based on a post-hoc Kruskal–Wallis test (P < 0.001). Data represent means of 3 biological repeats, relative to mean (PpAPT-PpACT3) transcript level ± SE.

Fig. 5: The Physcomitrella patens Ppmax2 mutant has impaired photomorphogenesis. (a) Transcript levels of PpMAX2 gene in WT, following growth in the dark (5 days) then in red
light for increasing lengths of time (0.5h to 24h). Controls: growth in dark or light conditions (6 days). Data represent mean of transcript levels of 3 biological repeats, relative to PpACT3 and PpAPT expression level, ± SE. Asterisks denote significant differences between the dark control and the treatment based on a Kruskal–Wallis test (P < 0.001). (b) Leaf distribution on gametophores from WT (blue dots) Ppccd8 (orange squares) and Ppmax2-2 (black triangles). (c) Gametophore height of WT, Ppccd8, Ppmax2-1 phenotype after 25 days under red light (left, scale = 5 mm) and quantifications (right) mean of 3 Magenta, n=43-50 counted gametophores per Magenta. Different letters indicate significantly different results between genotypes based on a post hoc Kruskal–Wallis test. (d-e) Transcript levels of red light response markers (PpHY5 (d) and PpPOR1 (e)), in WT and Ppmax2-1 mutants following different times of red light exposure as indicated below the histograms. WL= White Light control. Data represent mean of transcript levels of 3 biological repeats, relative to PpACT3 expression level, ± SE. Asterisks denote significant differences between the genotypes based on a Kruskal–Wallis test (P < 0.001).

Fig. 6 The Physcomitrella patens Ppmax2 mutation is epistatic to Ppccd8. (a) Bright field photographs of WT, single Ppccd8, single Ppmax2 mutant and Ppccd8-Ppmax2 double mutant. Scale: left, 20 day-old: 1mm; right, 2 month-old: 5mm. (b) Comparison of Ppccd8-Ppmax2 mutant plant diameter to that of WT and Ppccd8 and Ppmax2 mutants after 4 weeks (mean of 3 plates with 16 plants measured per plate, ± SE). Different letters indicate significantly different results between genotypes based on an ANOVA (P < 0.05) (c) Expression of the SL responsive gene PpCCD7 relative to PpAPT and PpACT3 expression in Ppccd8, Ppmax2-1 and Ppccd8-Ppmax2 grown for 3 weeks in the light. Asterisks denote significant differences between Ppccd8 and the other mutants based on a post-hoc Kruskal–Wallis test (P < 0.001). Data represent means of 3 biological repeats ± SE.

Fig. 7: Expression of Physcomitrella patens PpMAX2 gene in the Arabidopsis max2 mutant does not restore MAX2 function (a) Mean height and (c) mean number of rosette branches , ± SE, from 4-week-old Arabidopsis plants (n=12) of each genotype 10 days after decapitation. (b) Corresponding pictures of one exemplary plant per genotype are shown. (d) Hypocotyl length of 5-day-old Arabidopsis plantlets (n=15) grown in vitro under low light intensity (20-30 µE). Names of the transformed plants indicate the construct harbored. Controls used for all experiments were Arabidopsis WT Columbia (Col-0, white bar), Atmax2-3 mutant (N592836,
black bar) and Atmax2-3 transformed with constructs expressing AtMAX2 under the control of
the pUbi10 promoter. Different letters indicate significantly different results based on a post-
hoc Kruskal–Wallis test (P < 0.05). Data represent means ± SE.

Fig. 8: Model for MORE AXILLARY GROWTH2 (MAX2) roles in land plants. In vascular
plants, the MAX2 F-box protein is central for shoot branching, seed germination and
photomorphogenesis, by mediating Strigolactone (SL), the still unknown KAI2 Ligand (KL)
and light signals. D14 and KAI2 are known receptors for SL and KL respectively. In moss,
the F-box protein, PpMAX2, is likely involved in photomorphogenesis and plant spread
(protonemal growth), but another F-box protein may be required for SL signaling. Receptors
for these signals are still to be identified among the numerous moss PpKAI2Like predicted
proteins. The similar photomorphogenic phenotypes of Atkai2 and Atmax2 mutants suggest
that the effect of light on development through MAX2 could, at least in part, be mediated via
changes in KL that are perceived by KAI2 (dotted line). Arrows on the left mean signaling
mediation. Arrows on the right mean positive action while blunt-ended lines mean repression.
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