Rice SEPALLATA genes OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 cooperate to limit inflorescence branching by repressing the TERMINAL FLOWER1-like gene RCN4
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Summary

- The spatiotemporal control of meristem identity is critical for determining inflorescence architecture, and thus yield, of cereal plants. However, the precise mechanisms underlying inflorescence and spikelet meristem determinacy in cereals are still largely unclear.
- We have generated loss-of-function and overexpression mutants of the paralogous OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 genes in rice (Oryza sativa), and analysed their panicle phenotypes. Using chromatin immunoprecipitation, electrophoretic mobility-shift and dual-luciferase assays, we have also identified RICE CENTRORADIALIS 4 (RCN4), a TFL1-like gene, as a direct downstream target of both OsMADS proteins, and have analysed RCN4 mutants.
- The osmads5 osmads34 mutant lines had significantly enhanced panicle branching with increased secondary, and even tertiary and quaternary, branches, compared to wild-type (WT) and osmads34 plants. The osmads34 mutant phenotype could largely be rescued by also knocking out RCN4. Moreover, transgenic panicles overexpressing RCN4 had significantly increased branching, and initiated development of c. 7 x more spikelets than WT.
- Our results reveal a role for OsMADS5 in panicle development, and show that OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 play similar functions in limiting branching and promoting the transition to spikelet meristem identity, in part by repressing RCN4 expression. These findings provide new insights to better understand the molecular regulation of rice inflorescence architecture.

Introduction

The Poaceae, including many agriculturally important cereals such as rice (Oryza sativa), maize (Zea mays), barley (Hordeum vulgare), and wheat (Triticum spp.), produce a diverse range of complex inflorescence architectures, with distinct branched arrangements of flower-bearing spikelets that produce grain (Benlloch et al., 2007; Kellogg, 2007). Rice, a grain crop that feeds more than half of the world’s population, produces panicle-type compound racemes, normally with primary and secondary branches, which bear single-flowered spikelets.

Rice panicle architecture is defined by the sequential identity of the meristems produced by the shoot apical meristem (SAM) (Koizuka et al., 2014), and can be classified into developmental ‘in’ stages (Itoh et al., 2005). Upon the initiation of reproductive development, the vegetative SAM is converted to inflorescence meristem (IM, stage In1), which is indeterminate and produces the main stem or rachis and several lateral primary branch meristems (PBMs) before it arrests (stages In2–In3). Each primary branch elongates and produces several lateral meristems (stages In4–In5); those formed near the rachis preferentially acquire the identity of secondary branch meristems (SBMs) and develop secondary branches, while the others directly become spikelet meristems (SMs). Finally, each PBM and SBM has a determinate fate and converts to a terminal SM (In6), and each SM produces the glumes and a floral meristem (FM), from which floral organ primordia differentiate (In7). At stage In8, floral organs develop and mature, while the rachis elongates rapidly. Key determinants of rice inflorescence architecture are thus the timing of IM arrest, the amount and proportion of SBMs/SMs, and the transformation of branch meristems into SMs. Early developmental events are often susceptible to abortion of branches and spikelet primordia, which can be triggered by physiological or environmental conditions to reduce the complexity and productivity of the mature panicle (Yamagishi et al., 2004; Kato et al., 2008).
To date, several key genes that determine meristem fate have been characterized in maize and rice, many of which encode transcription factors (TFs; Tanaka et al., 2013; Zhang & Yuan, 2014). The SQUAMOSA promoter binding protein-like OsSPL14, also known as IDEAL PLANT ARCHITECTURE1 (IPA1) or WEALTHY FARMER’S PANICLE (WFP) promotes panicle branching (Jiao et al., 2010; Miura et al., 2010), while FRIZZY PANICLE (FPZ), an ethylene-responsive element binding factor, promotes SM identity (Komatsu et al., 2003; Bai et al., 2016). While most reported mutations in master regulatory genes negatively affect panicle development and floral fertility, mutations that increase OsSPL14 or reduce FPZ amounts can have significant beneficial effects to improve rice productivity (Jiao et al., 2010; Zhang et al., 2017; Huang et al., 2018).

The phosphatidylethanolamine-binding proteins (PEBP) family also affects panicle development, and consists of three main subfamilies: FLOWERING LOCUS T (FT)-like, MOTHER OF FT AND TFL1 (MFT)-like, and TERMINAL FLOWER1 (TFL1)/CENTRORADIALIS (CEN)-like genes (Chardon & Damerval, 2005). There are 19 PEBP-like genes in rice, including 13 FT-like genes, two MFT-like genes, and four TFL1/CEN-like genes named RICE CENTRORADIALIS 1 (RCN1) to RCN4 (Chardon & Damerval, 2005; Danilevskaya et al., 2008). Panicles overexpressing RCN1, RCN2, or RCN3 exhibit a more highly branched, denser morphology owing to a delayed phase transition from IM to SM (Nakagawa et al., 2002; Zhang et al., 2005). Conversely, knocking down simultaneously all RCN genes caused much reduced panicles (Liu et al., 2013; Kaneko-Suzuki et al., 2018).

Rice also has five SEPALLATA (SEP) subfamily MADS-box genes required for spikelet and flower development: OsMADS11 LEAFY HULL STERILE1 (LHS1), OsMADS5, and OsMADS34/PANICLE PHYTOMER2 (PAP2) are paralogous members of the LOFSEP clade; while OsMADS7 (allelic to OsMADS45) and OsMADS8 (allelic to OsMADS24) belong to the SEP3 clade (Malcomber & Kellogg, 2005; Zahn et al., 2005; Arora et al., 2007). Rice LOFSEP genes specify the identity of the SM and of the lateral organs it produces, i.e., the rudimentary glumes, sterile lemmas, lemma, and palea. LOFSEP and SEP3 genes are then both required to specify FM and floral organ identity (Jeon et al., 2000; Prasad et al., 2001, 2005; Agrawal et al., 2005; Cui et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2010; Khanday et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2013; Hu et al., 2015; Wu et al., 2018). Only OsMADS34/PAP2 has been implicated in panicle development, with a role in specifying IM development downstream of the rice FT-like florigens, and in promoting the transition from PBMs/SBMs to SMs (Gao et al., 2010; Kobayashi et al., 2010, 2012). Loss of OsMADS34/PAP2 function increases primary branching, but there is some disagreement about its effect on secondary branches and spikelets as osmads34 mutation causes secondary branch abortion (Gao et al., 2010; Kobayashi et al., 2010).

In this study, we present a rigorous evaluation of panicle architecture phenotypes, focusing on the roles of OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 during inflorescence development. We have used single and double loss-of-function mutants, and overexpression constructs, to demonstrate the effect of these genes on panicle branching, and identify the TFL1-like gene RCN4 as a direct downstream target of both OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 proteins. Our results reveal that OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 cooperatively regulate panicle branching in rice by modulating RCN4 activity, while they promote rachis and branch elongation through a RCN4-independent mechanism.

Materials and Methods

Plant materials and growth conditions

Rice (Oryza sativa ssp. japonica) variety 9522 was used as the wild-type (WT) and the background for all subsequent mutations. The osmads34-1 single mutant of the variety 9522 has been previously described by our group (Gao et al., 2010). We have previously described also the osmads5(5M)-, osmads5(1I)- and osmads34(I)-CRISPR mutagenesis (Wu et al., 2018). The four osmads5 knockout alleles generated in this study in both 9522 WT and osmads34-1 background are shown in Supporting Information Fig. S1. The ren4 single mutant, and ren4 osmads34-1 double mutant were obtained using CRISPR/Cas9 technology as previously described (Zhang et al., 2014). Therefore, all the single and higher-order mutants presented in this study were in variety 9522. Primers used for constructing single guide RNA (sgRNA) and overexpression vectors are listed in Table S1. Plant genotyping was performed by PCR-amplification of the regions carrying the mutations, and sequencing the PCR products. The primers used for PCR are listed in Table S1.

All plants were cultivated in the paddy field of Shanghai Jiao Tong University under natural growing conditions from May to September.

To construct overexpression vectors for OsMADS5, OsMADS34 and RCN4, RNA from the 9522 inflorescence at stage In5 was isolated, and complementary DNA (cDNA) generated as previously described (Li et al., 2006). Coding sequences for the three genes were amplified (primers in Table S1) and cloned into the overexpression vector PTCK303 under control of the Ubiquitin promoter (pUbi) using the In-Fusion HD Cloning Kit (Takara, Shiga, Japan) and sequenced (BGI, Beijing, China). Overexpression constructs were introduced into 9522 calli using Agrobacterium-mediated transformation and selection by hygromycin B, following Hiei et al. (1994).

A total of 24 and 17 T0 lines were obtained and observed for pUbi::OsMADS5 in 9522 and pUbi::OsMADS34 in 9522, respectively, and three lines from each population were chosen for further analysis based on high levels of transgene expression in panicle primordia (Figs S2, S3). For pUbi::RCN4 in 9522, 14 T0 lines were obtained, and two lines with representative phenotypes and high levels of transgene expression in panicle primordia (Fig. S4) were chosen for further analysis.

For each experiment and plant line, only the panicle from the main shoot was used for analysis.

Complementation of the osmads34-1 mutant

The WT genomic fragment of OsMADS34, containing the 3108 bp promoter sequence upstream of the start codon and the
6101 bp genomic fragment containing the OsMADS34 gene coding sequence (eight exons and seven introns) minus the stop codon, was amplified using the primers OsM34 gDNA-1F and OsM34 gDNA-1R (Table S1). OsMADS34 gDNA was first cloned into pDONR207 (Invitrogen) using Gateway BP clonase II mix (Invitrogen), and then introduced into the Gateway vector pK7FWG0 from VIB-Ugent (Karimi et al., 2002) using Gateway LR clonase II mix (Invitrogen). From this vector, the full-length fragment of OsMADS34 gDNA plus eGFP (enhanced green fluorescent protein) was amplified with primers OsM34 Pro-gDNA-GFP-1F and OsM34 Pro-gDNA-GFP-1R (Table S1) and cloned into the BamHI and BdeII sites of pCAMBIA1301, thus replacing the CaMV 35S promoter and all the other sequences before the NOS polyadenylation signal, to generate pOsMADS34::gOsMADS34-GFP. The constructed vector was introduced into osmads34-1 calli using the Agrobacterium-mediated transformation method (Hiei et al., 1994). Regenerated plants were confirmed to carry the osmads34-1 mutation by sequencing the PCR product from primers JD M34-1F and JD M34-1R (Table S1).

A total of 29 T0 lines expressing pOsMADS34::gOsMADS34-GFP in the osmads34-1 background were obtained, of which 27 lines rescued completely the osmads34-1 phenotype. Preliminary Western blot experiments were carried out to confirm the expression of the OsMADS34-GFP fusion protein and its expected size (Fig. S5), using young panicle chromatin samples from successful complementation lines (Fig. S6) and the Western blot protocol later. We selected one T3 independent line that carried a single, homozygous copy of the OsMADS34-GFP transgene for further analysis.

Western blotting
OsMADS34-GFP was detected using the GFP polyclonal antibody (Invitrogen). Chromatin from WT or pOsMADS34::gOsMADS34-GFP osmads34-1 young panicles was prepared as described for the chromatin immunoprecipitation-quantitative polymerase chain reaction (ChIP-qPCR) assay (see later). After centrifuging at 16 000 g at 4°C for 5 min, the supernatant was separated by 10% sodium dodecyl sulphate-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (SDS-PAGE) gel. Proteins were blotted onto a nitrocellulose membrane, detected by a 1:3000 GFP polyclonal antibody dilution, with the goat anti-rabbit secondary antibody at a dilution of 1:5000, and visualized with Omni-ECL Pico Light Chemiluminescence Kit (Epizyme Biomedical Technology, Shanghai, China).

Confocal imaging
To observe OsMADS34-GFP fluorescence, transgenic shoot apices and young inflorescences at different stages were embedded in 4% (w/v) low melting agarose and sliced into 50 μm thick sections using Leica Vibrotome VT1000S as described by Fang et al. (2020). Fluorescent and bright field images were taken on a TCS SP5 confocal microscope (Leica, Wetzlar, Germany). GFP signal was imaged using 488 nm excitation and 505–530 nm emission.

Microscope and image processing
Fresh young panicles were fixed in FAA (50% ethanol, 3.5% formalin and 5% acetic acid) for 24 h. For clearing, after dehydration in a graded ethanol series, samples were transferred into benzylbenzoate-four-and-a-half fluid (Herr, 1982). The cleared samples were observed using a microscope (Eclipse 80i; Nikon, Tokyo, Japan) that was equipped with Nomarski differential interference contrast optics. Samples for scanning electron microscopy (SEM) were prepared and observed as described by Li et al. (2006).

Quantitative reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction
Total RNA from three biological replicates of young panicles (stages In2–In6) and leaves was extracted using Trizol reagent (Invitrogen), according to the manufacturer’s instructions. The cDNA was synthesized using the FastQuant RT Kit with gDNase (Tiangen Biotech, Beijing, China). Quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (qRT-PCR) was performed in triplicate using the LightCycler 96 Real-Time PCR System (Roche, Basel Switzerland) with QuantiT Nova SYBR Green PCR Kit (QIagen, Hilden, Germany) using primers as described in Table S1. The OsActin gene (LOC_Os03g50885) was used to normalize expression levels.

In situ hybridization
Fresh young panicles (stages In1–In6) were harvested and immediately fixed in FAA solution, dehydrated, infiltrated, and embedded in paraffin (Wu et al., 2018). Probes were labelled with digoxigenin using the DIG RNA Labelling Kit (SP6/T7; Roche) and primers in Table S1. Pre-treatment of sections, hybridization, and digoxigenin signal detection were performed following Dreni et al. (2007). Images were obtained using a Nikon microscope (Eclipse 80i).

Bimolecular fluorescence complementation assay
The bimolecular fluorescence complementation (BiFC) assay was performed in Nicotiana benthamiana leaves, following Mao et al. (2020). The cDNAs of OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 were amplified (primers in Table S1) and cloned into both pXY104 and pXY106 vectors, which contained C- and N-terminal domain of yellow fluorescent protein (cYFP and nYFP, respectively). Vectors were introduced in combination into Agrobacterium tumefaciens GV3101, and transiently expressed in N. benthamiana leaves for 48 h. YFP signal was imaged using 514 nm excitation and 525–555 nm emission using a Leica TCS SP5 confocal microscope.

Dual-luciferase assay
The dual-luciferase (LUC) transactivation assay was performed in N. benthamiana leaves, following Tao et al. (2018) with six biological replicates. To prepare the pGreenII-0000-VP16
effector vector, the coding region of the Herpes Simplex Virus VP16 activation domain was artificially synthesized and cloned into pGreenII-0000. The effector plasmids 35S::OsMADS5 and 35S::OsMADS34 were prepared by cloning the full length cDNAs of OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 from cDNA used for qRT-PCR analysis. Coding sequences were cloned into both pGreenII-0000 and pGreenII-0000-VP16, such that constitutive OsMADS expression was driven by the CaMV 35S promoter, with VP16 (if present) fused at their 3′. The empty vector pGreenII-0000 was used as the negative control. The reporter pRCN4::LUC was constructed by cloning the 3665 bp RCN4 promoter sequence upstream of the start codon into the vector pGreenII-0800-LUC to drive LUC expression. Primers used to amplify coding sequences are listed in Table S1.

Effectors and reporters were introduced in combination into A. tumefaciens GV3101, and then into 28-d old N. benthamiana leaves, following Li et al. (2014). LUC and REN activities were measured using the Dual-Luciferase reporter kit (Promega, Madison, WI, USA). The LUC:REN ratio was measured in a GloMax 20/20 luminometer (Promega). Six biological replicates were used for each experiment. Primers are available in Table S1.

Chromatin immunoprecipitation-quantitative polymerase chain reaction
The ChIP assay was performed according to Bowler et al. (2004) with minor modifications. Approximately 1 g of inflorescence < 5 mm in length from WT or pOsMADS34::gOsMADS34-GFP osmads34-1 complemented plants was crosslinked by 1% (v/v) formaldehyde in extraction buffer (0.4 M sucrose, 10 mM Tris-HCl, 5 mM β-mercaptoethanol, 0.1 mM PMSF and protease inhibitor cocktail, pH 8.0) and ground in liquid nitrogen. Subsequently, the chromatin was isolated and sonicated to yield DNA fragments of 200 to 500 bp in length. The GFP-Trap Magnetic Agarose (ChromoTek, Munich, Germany) was used to precipitate the OsMADS34–DNA complexes. RCN4 promoter fragments were quantified by qRT-PCR as described earlier (Li et al., 2011) using primers listed in Table S1, and enrichment in M34-GFP samples was compared to levels in WT plants.

Electrophoretic mobility-shift assays
The full-length cDNAs of OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 were cloned into the vector pGADT7 (Clontech, TaKaRa, Shiga, Japan) for in vitro transcription/translation (TNT T7/SP6 Coupled Wheat Germ Extract System; Promega). Fluorescein amidite (FAM)-labelled probes were generated by annealing complementary primers containing FAM at the 5′-end. The binding reaction mixture contained 25 mM Tris-acetate (pH 7.5), 1 mM DTT, 0.1 mg ml−1 BSA, 2 mM MgAc, 20 mM FAM-labelled DNA, and 3 μl of in vitro synthesized protein. The binding reaction was performed for 30 min at 25°C before loading on a 6% native polyacrylamide gel. Competition was tested using 100-fold excess of nonlabelled probes. FAM-labelled probes were visualized using the FAM channel of a ChemiDoc MP imaging system (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA, USA). Primers are listed in Table S1.

Statistical analysis
The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA, P < 0.05) and Student t-tests (P < 0.05, P < 0.01, and P < 0.001) were run with PASW STATISTICS 18 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA). All data are shown as means ± SD (n ≥ 3).

Accession numbers
The sequences for all the genes mentioned in this article are available in the Rice Genome Annotation Project Database (http://rice.plantbiology.msu.edu/) with the following accession numbers: OsMADS5 (LOC_Os06g06750), OsMADS34 (LOC_Os03g54170), RCN1 (LOC_Os11g05470), RCN2 (LOC_Os02g32950), RCN3 (LOC_Os12g05590), and RCN4 (LOC_Os04g33570).

Results
Expression of OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 at panicle initiation
The spatio-temporal expression patterns of OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 were analysed throughout early inflorescence development by in situ RNA hybridization (Figs 1a, S7). OsMADS5 expression was almost undetectable in the IM and primary branch primordia until stage In4, after which OsMADS5 was expressed highly in SBMs and SMs (stages In5 and In6), as previously reported (Kobayashi et al., 2010; Wu et al., 2018). OsMADS34 transcript appeared in the apical IM at stage In1, and was expressed consistently in the initiating PBM, SBM, and SM throughout inflorescence development, consistent with previous results (Gao et al., 2010; Kobayashi et al., 2010; Wu et al., 2018). OsMADS34 expression thus dominates over OsMADS5 until stage In4, after which the two genes share a similar expression profile.

We further characterized OsMADS34 expression by analysing the spatio-temporal distribution of its GFP-tagged protein under control of its native promoter. A reporter construct containing the OsMADS34 promoter and genomic sequence, fused in frame with GFP, was introduced into osmads34-1 calli (hereafter referred to as osmads34; Gao et al., 2010). The mutant inflorescence, branch, and spikelet phenotypes of osmads34 were fully rescued in the transgenic plants, indicating that OsMADS34-GFP is biologically functional (Fig. S6). GFP fluorescence was not detected in the SAM at the vegetative stage, nor in the stem parenchyma and pro-vasculature underlying the SAM (Fig. 1b). Upon transition to reproductive development (stage In1), GFP fluorescence was clearly visible throughout the elongating IM, which extended to developing PBMs at stages In2, In3, and In4, the newly formed SBMs at stage In5, and the developing SBMs at stage In6. OsMADS34-GFP localized in the nuclei (Figs 1b, S7). These results indicate that the OsMADS34 protein persists in meristems throughout inflorescence development, consistent with the in situ hybridization results (Fig. 1a) and previous studies on the distribution of OsMADS34 transcript (Gao et al., 2010; Kobayashi et al., 2010, 2012; Meng et al., 2017).
Expression of OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 in the developing rice inflorescence. (a) In situ RNA hybridization of OsMADS5 (upper) and OsMADS34 (lower) in the wild-type inflorescence at stages In1–In6. Bar, 100 µm. (b) Confocal images (green fluorescent protein (GFP) only or GFP + bright field merge) of transgenic plants expressing the pOsMADS34::gOsMADS34-GFP reporter gene: the shoot apex meristem (SAM) at the vegetative stage; the inflorescence meristem (IM) at stages In1, In2, In3, In4, In5, and In6, indicating emergence of primary branch meristems (PBM), secondary branch meristems (SBM), and spikelet meristems (SM); an enlargement of an SBM at In5 (red box from IM image). Bar, 50 µm.
**OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 redundantly regulate inflorescence architecture**

The effect of OsMADS34 in panicle architecture was examined using an existing osmads34 mutant (Gao et al., 2010). Extensive abortion of branches and spikelets was observed in the basal nodes in the dense mutant panicle, whose small white vestigials were still visible at the heading stage (Fig. 2a,b). Once these arrested organs were carefully dissected under the stereo-microscope and included in the total count, osmads34 panicles displayed more primary, secondary, and even tertiary, branches compared with the WT panicle (Fig. 2c). This phenotype was consistent with the description of the pap2-1 allele from an independent research team (Kobayashi et al., 2010) and we further confirmed it on the osmads34 knockout mutant that we recently generated using CRISPR/Cas9 system (osmads34(I)-CRISPR; Wu et al., 2018; Fig. S8). Both the numbers of secondary branches per panicle and per primary branch increased in osmads34 mutants (Figs 2c, S8b), demonstrating that the increase in secondary branch number is not simply due to an increase in primary branch numbers. Thus, the activities of both the IM and lateral branching meristems are significantly increased in osmads34 panicles.

Since OsMADS5 is co-expressed with its paralogue OsMADS34 at the SBM stage (stages In5 and In6, Fig. 1a), we also hypothesized a role of OsMADS5 in inflorescence branching (Fig. 2). We extended the CRISPR-Cas9 mutagenesis targeting the first and second exons of OsMADS5 that we described recently (Wu et al., 2018), and we obtained four knockout alleles in this work, in both 9522 WT and osmads34 single mutant backgrounds (Fig. S1), to examine their branching pattern in detail (for simplicity, they will be referred as osmads5 and osmads5 osmads34 hereafter). The osmads5 knockout mutants did not show any obvious branching phenotype compared with WT panicles (Fig. 2). The osmads5 osmads34 panicles had a number of primary branches equivalent to osmads34 single mutant (Fig. 2c), but compared with the WT and single mutants, the double mutant panicles exhibited significantly enhanced branching, with increased numbers of secondary branches, higher-order branches up to quaternary, and spikelets (mature + arrested) (Fig. 2). The number of secondary branches per primary branch also increased significantly in osmads5 osmads34 panicle (Fig. 2c). These results reveal a new role for OsMADS5 in inflorescence development, sharing some functional redundancy with OsMADS34 to limit the iteration of branch meristem formation and favour their switch to SM identity.

**Ectopic expression of OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 inhibits secondary branch formation**

Our next step was to examine the phenotype for OsMADS5 overexpression during inflorescence development. A constitutively expressed OsMADS5 cDNA was introduced into WT background (Fig. S2). The number of primary branches per panicle after OsMADS5 OE was comparable to WT, whereas the number of secondary branches and spikelets decreased significantly (Fig. 3), supporting our hypothesis that OsMADS5 positively regulates the transition of branch meristems to SM in rice.

For comparison, we also overexpressed OsMADS34 in the WT background (Fig. S3). The number of primary branches per panicle in OsMADS34 overexpression lines was comparable to WT plants; however, the number of secondary branches and spikelets decreased significantly, even more than in OsMADS5 overexpression lines (Fig. 3c). These results are consistent with OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 having partially redundant roles in limiting lateral branching by promoting the transition to SM identity.

**Knockout of RCN4 can partially restore the osmads34 panicle phenotype**

TFL1 family genes are key regulators of inflorescence development, with four members in rice (RCN1–RCN4; Nakagawa et al., 2002; Zhang et al., 2005; Liu et al., 2013; Kaneko-Suzuki et al., 2018), and we have previously shown that RCN4 is highly expressed in osmads34 inflorescence primordia, compared to WT (Meng et al., 2017). To further explore the regulatory interactions of OsMADS5/34 and RCN genes during early inflorescence development, the expression of all four RCN genes was investigated in osmads knockout lines (Fig. S9). RCN1, RCN2, and RCN3 were generally expressed at similar levels in WT and mutant inflorescences during primary and secondary branch formation. However, RCN4 was highly upregulated in both osmads34 lines, more so in the double mutant, and expression continued to increase as development progressed. In situ hybridization revealed that RCN4 transcript was strongly present in secondary branch primordia of osmads34, but not WT, panicles (Fig. 4a), confirming that the dramatic increase of RCN4 expression in osmads34 lines was not simply due to their higher number of meristems. These results suggest that de-repression of RCN4 is directly linked, rather than incidental, to enhanced branching in osmads34 lines.

To test the hypothesis that RCN4 works downstream of OsMADS34, and to determine which aspects of the osmads34 phenotype depend on RCN4 function, we generated the rcn4-1 and rcn4-2 knockout alleles by CRISPR-Cas9, in both 9522 WT and osmads34 single mutant backgrounds (Fig. S10), to examine their branching pattern in detail (for simplicity, they will be referred as rcn4 and rcn4 osmads34 hereafter). The rcn4 panicles do not show any obvious phenotype compared to WT (Fig. 4b,c). However, the rcn4 osmads34 panicles were quite distinct from either WT or osmads34 panicles. Panicles in the double mutant had a number of primary branches equivalent to osmads34 panicles (Fig. 4b,c). However, the number of secondary branches per primary branch in rcn4 osmads34 panicles decreased to a level even lower than WT, tertiary branches did not form, and the overall number of spikelets per panicle fell to below WT levels (Fig. 4c). These results are consistent with expression data (Figs 4a, S9), indicating that RCN4 acts downstream of OsMADS34 to trigger lateral branching, and support a genetic model in which OsMADS34 regulates the transition to SM by repressing RCN4 expression.
Fig. 2 Branching phenotypes of wild-type (WT), osmads5 (m5), osmads34 (m34), and osmads5 osmads34 (m5 m34) mutants in rice panicle development. (a) The main panicle (upper) and a schematic representation of its structure (lower, inspired by Kyozuka et al., 2014), indicating primary branch (PB), secondary branch (SB), tertiary branch (TB), and quaternary branch (QB); terminal spikelet (TS) and lateral spikelet (LS); and arrest point of the inflorescence meristem (AP). Aborted branches and spikelets are shown in blue. Bar, 2 cm. (b) Primary and secondary branches generated from the main panicle. Yellow and white arrowheads indicate the position of normal and aborted SBs, respectively. Aborted SB shown for m34 and m5 m34 lines. Bars: 1 cm (PB), 1 mm (SB). (c) Panicle traits, including numbers of PB, SB, TB, and QB per panicle; number of SB per PB; and number of spikelets per panicle. Means ± SD, n = 16. Letters indicate significant differences (one-way ANOVA: P < 0.05).
Effect of OsMADS5 or OsMADS34 overexpression (OE) in rice wild-type (WT) plants. (a) The main panicle (upper) and a schematic representation of its structure (lower, inspired by Kyozuka et al., 2014), indicating primary branch (PB) and secondary branch (SB); terminal spikelet (TS) and lateral spikelet (LS); and arrest point of the inflorescence meristem (AP). Bar, 2 cm. (b) PB and SB generated from the main panicle. Yellow arrowheads indicate the position of normal SB. Bars: 1 cm (PB), 1 mm (SB). (c) Panicle traits, including numbers of PB and SB per panicle; number of SB per PB; and number of spikelets per panicle. Means ± SD, n = 16. Letters indicate significant differences (one-way ANOVA: P < 0.05).

Fig. 3 Effect of OsMADS5 or OsMADS34 overexpression (OE) in rice wild-type (WT) plants. (a) The main panicle (upper) and a schematic representation of its structure (lower, inspired by Kyozuka et al., 2014), indicating primary branch (PB) and secondary branch (SB); terminal spikelet (TS) and lateral spikelet (LS); and arrest point of the inflorescence meristem (AP). Bar, 2 cm. (b) PB and SB generated from the main panicle. Yellow arrowheads indicate the position of normal SB. Bars: 1 cm (PB), 1 mm (SB). (c) Panicle traits, including numbers of PB and SB per panicle; number of SB per PB; and number of spikelets per panicle. Means ± SD, n = 16. Letters indicate significant differences (one-way ANOVA: P < 0.05).
OsMADS34 and OsMADS5 directly bind the *RCN4* promoter

To examine whether OsMADS34 directly regulates *RCN4* expression, we performed ChIP assays using the pOsMADS34::gOsMADS34-GFP osmads34 complementation plants (Fig. 1b).

We analysed the *RCN4* genomic region for CArG box motifs, the canonical binding site for MADS-domain proteins (de Folter & Angenent, 2006), and designed primers to eight regions in *RCN4* regulatory regions: four in the upstream promoter with CArG boxes (C1–C5); two in the second intron with CArG boxes (C6–C8); one in the 3′UTR region with CArG boxes (C9 and C10), and a control region with no CArG box (Fig. 5a).

Immuno-precipitation with the anti-GFP antibody revealed enrichment of five CArG-containing regions compared with the WT control (Fig. 5b).

To verify the binding of OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 to these regulatory regions, we performed electrophoretic mobility-shift assays (EMSA; Fig. 5c). OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 strongly bound to all six probes and competition with nonlabelled probes inhibited binding (Fig. 5c). A dual-LUC assay in tobacco leaves confirmed that OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 could drive LUC expression under control of the *RCN4* upstream promoter when fused to a viral VP16 activation domain (Fig. 5d), confirming a direct interaction between them, but the native OsMADS proteins neither activated nor repressed *RCN4* expression. Together, these results demonstrate that OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 directly bind the promoter and second intron of *RCN4*, but do
Fig. 5 Binding of rice OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 to the RCN4 promoter. (a) Schematic representation of the RCN4 genomic region showing the 10 CArG box motifs, C1–C10. (b) Chromatin immunoprecipitation-quantitative polymerase chain reaction (ChIP-qPCR) results for the eight targeted amplicons. Enrichment was compared with the input sample. Mean ± SD, n = 3. (c) Electrophoretic mobility-shift assay (EMSA) using the OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 proteins and fragments of the RCN4 promoter containing CArG box motifs as probes labelled with 5′-FAM. A 100× excess of nonlabelled probes were used for competition. (d) Transient dual-luciferase (LUC) assays to show OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 binding to the RCN4 promoter. Constructs are shown in the left panel; the RCN4 promoter in the reporter construct contains promoter sequence upstream of the start codon. Transcriptional activation of pRCN4::LUC by the MADS proteins was effected by conjugation to VP16, a transcriptional activation domain. Means ± SD, n = 6. Statistical significance is indicated by: *, P < 0.05; **, P < 0.01; ***, P < 0.001 (Student’s t-test).
The lower activation of OsMADS5 homodimerization was only observed in BiFC assays. OsMADS34 heterodimers and OsMADS34 homodimers, while et al. assays (Wu et al., 2018) showed the formation of OsMADS5-OsMADS34 heterodimers and OsMADS34 homodimers, while OsMADS5 homodimerization was only observed in BiFC assays. The lower activation of pRCN4::LUC by OsMADS5-VP16 (Fig. 5d) might be related to a weaker ability of OsMADS5 to homodimerize in the tested conditions.

**RCN4 overexpression dramatically alters panicle architecture**

Constitutive overexpression of RCN4 in WT plants reduced plant growth and delayed flowering time (Figs S4, S12a). The RCN4 overexpression plants also produced abortant florets with smaller palea, lemma, anthers, and malformed carpel with three stigmata (Fig. S12b). The RCN4 overexpression panicle phenotype was very different compared to WT: while the number of primary branches was similar, the RCN4 overexpression panicles had a much higher number of secondary and higher-order branches (Figs 6, 7). In WT panicles, a primary branch produces up to five secondary branches, and further branching is never observed (Fig. 6c). In contrast, RCN4 overexpression panicles produced up to nine secondary branches from a primary branch (Fig. 6b), and the development of tertiary, quaternary, and even quinary, branches was frequently observed (Fig. 6c). Overall, a seven-fold increase in the number of initiated spikelets was observed in RCN4 overexpression compared with WT panicles (Fig. 6c), although branches and spikelets on the lower part of a panicle often aborted (Figs 6b, 7). These results show that also RCN4, like other RCN genes, suppresses the transition from branch to spikelet meristem, and its overexpression promotes lateral branching.

**Inactivation of OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 prolongs secondary branching phase**

For the large-scale phenotyping described earlier, branches were dissected and counted at heading stage. To validate our interpretation of the ontogenesis of the white vestigials as true branches, we also analysed panicles directly at the young stage In7. Whole primary branches were visualized after clearing treatment to make bract hairs invisible, while details of secondary branches were imaged by SEM (Fig. 7). We confirmed that SBMs, especially those at the very base of young primary branches near the rachis, acquired a partial indeterminacy and proliferated in osmads34, osmads5 osmads34 and RCN4 overexpression plants. The resulting structures were clearly identifiable as higher-order branch primordia (Fig. 7). Compared to the distichous pattern of WT, these extra branches developed towards all directions. Furthermore, when the terminal spikelets were visibly synchronous at late stage Sp8 in the primary branches of WT, osmads34 and osmads5 osmads34, the most basal spikelets were already around stage Sp4 in WT; instead, the developmental gap between terminal and basal structures was much increased in the mutants, where basal meristems still at the earlier Sp or even SM stages were observed. This analysis confirms the proposed model of delayed meristem transition caused by the loss of OsMADS5 and OsMADS34.

Along the rachis, the increased SBM proliferation occurred mostly in the basal primary branches of the mutants, with a decreasing gradient towards the rachis apices, and apical primary branches were partially affected only in the RCN4 overexpression lines (schematics in Figs 2a, 6a).

**OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 promote rachis and primary branch elongation**

Despite the robust increase in branching activity, osmads34 and osmads5 osmads34 panicles are consistently smaller than WT, with visibly shorter rachis and branches (Fig. 2a). As for inflorescence branching, the osmads5 single mutant does not affect the process of rachis elongation, while osmads34 panicles have a shorter rachis with more nodes (Fig. 8a,b). The osmads5 osmads34 rachis is further shortened, but with the same number of nodes than osmads34. In both WT and, more frequently, in these mutants, some rachis internodes do not develop at all, giving the impression of two or three primary branches attached at the same node (Fig. 2a), explaining why the number of apparent rachis nodes is lower than the number of primary branches per panicle (Figs 2c, 8b). In osmads34, only the internodes up to position 9 are shorter than WT, and the double osmads5 osmads34 mutation causes the lengths of the first two basal internodes to reduce even further (Fig. 8c). The longest primary branches are those in position 2–6 in WT and 6–12 in osmads34, while primary branch length is strikingly consistent in the osmads5 osmads34 mutant panicle (Fig. 8d).

The effect of OsMADS5 overexpression is also interesting, as it does not modify the number of primary branches (Fig. 3c) or rachis nodes (Fig. 8b), but decreases the rachis length (Fig. 8a), mostly at the first two internodes (Fig. 8e). In addition, OsMADS5 overexpression reduces primary branch length, except terminal ones (Fig. 8f). Furthermore, OsMADS34 overexpression reduces the length of rachis and primary branches more than OsMADS5 overexpression (Fig. 8a,f). Taken together, these observations indicate that the effect of OsMADS34 in rachis and primary branch elongation is higher than that of OsMADS5, consistent with the gene expression patterns (Fig. 1).

Loss of RCN4 function had almost no effect on the WT and osmads34 panicle elongation (Figs 4, 8a,b,g,h), except for the subtle decrease of primary branch length in ren4 compared with WT (Fig. 8h) and subtle increase of the rachis nodes number in ren4 osmads34 compared with osmads34 (Fig. 8b). Although RCN4 overexpression produced more compact panicles, and more compact plants in general, than WT (Figs 6a,c, 8a,b,g,h, S12), the loss of its function do not rescue the rachis and primary branch elongation in osmads34 mutants. Taken together, these data show that RCN4 repression by OsMADS34 primarily functions to counterbalance SBM identity and promote meristem transition to SM identity.
Fig. 6 Effect of RCN4 overexpression (OE) in rice wild-type (WT) plants. (a) The main panicle (upper) and a schematic representation of its structure (lower, inspired by Kyozuka et al., 2014), indicating primary branch (PB), secondary branch (SB), tertiary branch (TB), quaternary branch (QB), and quinary branch (QUB); terminal spikelet (TS) and lateral spikelet (LS); and arrest point of the inflorescence meristem (AP). Aborted branches and spikelets are shown in blue. Bar, 2 cm. (b) PB and SB generated from the main panicle. Yellow and white arrowheads indicate the position of normal and aborted SB, respectively. Aborted SB shown for RCN4 OE lines. Bars: 1 cm (PB), 1 mm (SB). (c) Panicle traits, including numbers of PB, SB, TB, QB, and QUB per panicle, and number of spikelets per panicle. Means ± SD, n = 4. Letters indicate significant differences (one-way ANOVA: P < 0.05).
Discussion

OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 limit panicle branching by promoting spikelet meristem identity

Rice SEP subfamily genes show diverse spatial and temporal expression patterns (Kobayashi et al., 2010). OsMADS34 expression begins first, at the reproductive transition of the SAM (stage In1, Fig. 1a), and the OsMADS34 protein accumulates in the IM and branch meristems during early inflorescence development (Fig. 1b). OsMADS5 transcription begins at stage In5, when secondary branches begin to form, and overlaps with OsMADS34 expression, especially in the SBM and SM (Fig. 1a; Wu et al., 2018). Previous studies have shown that OsMADS34 plays a positive role in the establishment of SM identity (Gao et al., 2010; Kobayashi et al., 2010, 2012), and here, we have shown that OsMADS5 is also an important regulator of panicle architecture. Its function is partially redundant with OsMADS34, and the osmads5 osmads34 double mutant showed significantly enhanced panicle branching, up to the fourth order, compared to WT and single mutant plants (Fig. 2).

While OsMADS34 seems to be the more important gene in determining panicle architecture, it is important to notice that OsMADS5 is downregulated about three-fold in osmads34 branch meristems (Fig. S2), which likely contributes to the osmads34 lateral branching phenotype; and suggests that OsMADS34 may act upstream of OsMADS5 to regulate its expression, which would be consistent with the timing of expression of these two genes (Fig. 1). Our loss-of-function and overexpression experiments also show that OsMADS5 and OsMADS34 both contribute to regulate rachis and branch elongation (Fig. 8). Transcripts of both genes, and the OsMADS34-GFP protein, accumulated in the forming rachis and branch axes as well as in meristems (Fig. 1), so OsMADS genes may have other, cell type–autonomous functions independent of stimulus from meristems. While some genetic factors that interact with OsMADS34 (PAP2) have been identified (FUL-like genes (Kobayashi et al., 2012) and LAX1 (Meng et al., 2017)), further research will be required to understand how OsMADS34 interacts with other pivotal genes like FZP and IPA1 to shape rice panicle formation.

The remaining LOFSEP gene, OsMADS1, is unlikely to participate in determining panicle architecture since it activates only from the SM stage (Prasad et al., 2001, 2005; Kobayashi et al., 2010) and, indeed, is used as a marker of SM identity in various Oryza species (Ta et al., 2016). Then, a hierarchy in the activation of LOFSEP genes, OsMADS34 > OsMADS5 > OsMADS1,
bears close association with the progression of identity transition in rice reproductive meristems. Once SM identity is established (stage In6), the three LOFSEP genes become unequally redundant to promote the final meristem transition to FM (Ohmori et al., 2009; Cui et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2010; Hu et al., 2015; Wu et al., 2018).

Rice TFL1-like genes play a conserved role in regulating inflorescence branching

TFL1-like genes in eudicots and monocots play a highly conserved role in regulating flowering time and inflorescence architecture (Shannon & Meeks-Wagner, 1991; Alvarez et al., 1992; Nakagawa et al., 2002; Zhang et al., 2005; Carmona et al., 2007; Danilevskaya et al., 2010). In Arabidopsis, loss of TFL1 function causes early flowering and the development of determinate inflorescences with a terminal flower, compared with indeterminate WT inflorescences (Bradley et al., 1997), while TFL1 overexpression delays flowering and prevents the development of apical meristems, resulting in an increased number of flowers (Ratcliffe et al., 1998; Hanzawa et al., 2005).

Here, we have found that RCN4 overexpression significantly delays flowering and causes a significant increase in the number of branches and spikelets, indicating a weakened stimulus to switch from branch meristem to SM identity (Fig. 6). The performance of our RCN4 overexpression plants was very similar to

Fig. 8 Rachis and primary branch traits of wild-type (WT) and mutant (knockout and overexpression) OsMADS5, OsMADS34, and RCN4 lines in rice. (a, b) Rachis length and number of rachis nodes per panicle for all WT, single, and double mutants generated in this study. Letters indicate significant differences (one-way ANOVA: \( P < 0.05 \)). (c–h) Lengths of rachis internodes and primary branches for all lines. Means ± SD, \( n = 4 \) for RCN4 overexpression (OE), \( n = 16 \) for all other lines.
equivalent experiments conducted by other authors using \textit{RCN1}/3 (Nakagawa et al., 2002; Zhang et al., 2005), implying that TFL1-like genes in rice play a conserved role in maintaining the indeterminacy and undifferentiated state of reproductive meristems.

It is unknown how the four \textit{RCN} genes contribute to regulate rice inflorescence architecture. \textit{RCN1–4} were expressed in WT panicles in early inflorescence development (Fig. S9), and loss of \textit{RCN4} did not affect panicle architecture (Fig. 4). However, of the four \textit{RCN} genes, only \textit{RCN4} expression responded to the loss of \textit{OsMADS34} (Fig. S9); \textit{RCN4} de-repression can explain the increased branching activity in \textit{osmads34}, which is lost in \textit{rcn4 osmads34} double mutants (Fig. 4). Thus, while \textit{RCN} genes may have similar roles in maintaining undifferentiated meristems, they seem to have specific responses to different molecular factors, and the individual contributions of each \textit{RCN} gene to inflorescence development are worthy of further study.

The antagonism between \textit{LOFSEP} and TFL-like genes is widely conserved

We have demonstrated that \textit{OsMADS5} and \textit{OsMADS34} have opposing functions to \textit{RCN4} in regulating panicle architecture: the two MADS-box genes suppress branching, while \textit{RCN4} promotes it (Figs 2–4, 6). The ability of \textit{OsMADS5} and \textit{OsMADS34} to interact with the promoter of \textit{RCN4}, and the dramatic de-repression of \textit{RCN4} in \textit{osmads34} and \textit{osmads5 osmads34} mutants (Fig. 5), suggest that they directly target \textit{RCN4}. A previous study in Arabidopsis has proposed that \textit{SOC1}, AGL24, \textit{SVP}, and the \textit{LOFSEP} gene \textit{SEP4} cooperate to suppress \textit{TFL1} in emerging lateral meristems, thus regulating the overall inflorescence architecture, and that their orthologues in rice may play a similar role (Liu et al., 2013). A similar antagonism between \textit{OsMADS34}/\textit{PAP2} orthologues and TFL-like genes in regulating inflorescence architecture and grain yield is also demonstrated in wheat (Wang et al., 2017b) and foxtail millet (\textit{Setaria italica}; Hussin et al., 2021).

The native \textit{OsMADS5} and \textit{OsMADS34} proteins neither activated nor repressed activity of the \textit{RCN4} upstream promoter in tobacco leaves (Fig. 5d). Either some \textit{RCN4} regulatory sequences required for repression may have been absent (Fig. 5a,b), or the \textit{OsMADS} proteins may require interaction with other proteins for full activity. Previous studies have shown the \textit{OsMADS5} and \textit{OsMADS34} have lost several conserved exon sequences and motifs in their C-terminus (Gao et al., 2010; Lin et al., 2014), and that \textit{OsMADS34} has lost its transcriptional activation function (Gao et al., 2010; Ren et al., 2016). It is also well known that SEP proteins function by forming heterotrimmers with other MADS-box homeotic TFs (Goto et al., 2001; Honma & Goto, 2001; Jack, 2001), and by recruiting members of different TF families and chromatin remodelling factors (Smaczniak et al., 2012). Thus, \textit{OsMADS5} and \textit{OsMADS34} may depend on other TFs, chromatin regulators, and/or cofactors to properly regulate \textit{RCN4} and other target genes, and limiting amounts or distribution of such interactors may explain the relatively mild effects of \textit{OsMADS5} and \textit{OsMADS34} overexpression (Fig. 3).

Implications of inflorescence architectural variations for cereal breeding

We have adopted a rigorous and detailed phenotypic approach to revisit the effect of \textit{OsMADS34} on panicle architecture. In addition, we show that its paralogue \textit{OsMADS5}, known only as a floral identity gene so far (Wu et al., 2018), redundantly contributes to this process after the establishment of PBMs. Our results indicate that \textit{OsMADS34} function is predominant at IM and PBM stage, while cooperating with \textit{OsMADS5} later to suppress secondary and higher-order branching and to promote the transition from branch meristem to SM. We propose a developmental model in which \textit{OsMADS34} specifically fine-tunes the activity of IM before its arrest, thus limiting the number of primary branches, after which \textit{OsMADS5} and \textit{OsMADS34} act together as potent repressors of secondary and higher-order branching, at least partially through repression of \textit{RCN4} (Fig. 9). This second function is particularly interesting, since secondary branching has been identified as the major determinant of spikelet number and yield in rice domestication, overcoming the contribution of primary branching (Harrop et al., 2019).

To be able to remodel inflorescence architecture in crops, we need to further advance our knowledge on its molecular control. Loss of rice \textit{OsMADS5} and \textit{OsMADS34} functions leads to strong increase in panicle branching and spikelet initiation, which is a highly desirable phenotype in breeding. However, the subsequent defects of branch abortion and elongation (Figs 2, 8; Kobayashi et al., 2010) and in spikelet development (Wu et al., 2018) hampers the direct use of \textit{osmads5} and \textit{osmads34} in breeding, similarly to \textit{fzp} loss of function (Komatsu et al., 2003; Bai et al., 2016). Yet, counteracting excess branch numbers by abortion suggests the existence of compensatory mechanisms to constrain spikelet production, and deciphering this regulatory network may reveal yet unknown factors, or new functions for already identified regulators. Such new factors or alleles affecting the transcriptional or post-transcriptional regulation of \textit{OsMADS5} and \textit{OsMADS34} may overcome the problem of branch and spikelet abortion, similar to what has already happened with \textit{FZP} and \textit{SPL14} (Jiao et al., 2010; Miura et al., 2010; Bai et al., 2017a; Zhang et al., 2017; Huang et al., 2018). In addition, the various functions of \textit{OsMADS5} and \textit{OsMADS34} are likely to be genetically separable, as suggested by the involvement of \textit{RCN4} exclusively in secondary and higher-order branching, but not in primary branching or rachis/branch elongation (Figs 6, 8).

Such discoveries will be assisted by the diverse transcriptomic profiles of rice IMs, branch meristems, and SMs (Harrop et al., 2016) and by quantitative trait loci (QTLs) specifically affecting only primary branch formation, secondary branch/spikelet formation, and/or spikelet abortion (Yamagishi et al., 2004). A recent phenotypic survey of wild and domesticated \textit{Oryza} accessions provided more evidence that primary and secondary branch numbers are controlled by different genetic mechanisms (Harrop et al., 2019), while this and previous works show that \textit{OsMADS34} affects both (Gao et al., 2010; Kobayashi et al., 2010). The rate of secondary branch abortion in \textit{osmads34} may also be influenced by environmental conditions, as suggested by
our preliminary phenotypic comparisons in open field in Shanghai and in the southern island of Hainan, China (W. Zhu et al., unpublished), and better understanding of how these complex networks are regulated to control inflorescence development, and therefore yield, in response to physiological and environmental signal will provide new avenues to benefit molecular breeding.
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