Genetic variation associated with plastic and homeostatic growth responses to

drought in Arabidopsis

Running head: Adaptive homeostasis in Arabidopsis drought response

Ángel Ferrero-Serrano[1*] & Sarah M. Assmann[1*]

[1]Biology Department, Penn State University, 208 Mueller Laboratory, University Park, PA, 16802,

USA

* Correspondence:

Ángel Ferrero-Serrano: aaf11@psu.edu

Sarah M. Assmann: sma3@psu.edu

Highlight

Information on phenotype, genotype, and transcript abundance is integrated to identify candidate

plasticity and homeostasis genes and processes associated with local adaptation to drought stress in

Arabidopsis accessions of the Iberian Peninsula.

Abstract

Natural genetic variation influences plant responses to environmental stressors. However, the extent to which such variation underlies plastic versus homeostatic response phenotypes has been little studied. We quantified the extent of drought-induced changes in leaf area in a set of Iberian Arabidopsis accessions and then performed association studies correlating plasticity in this phenotype with genomic and transcriptomic variation. Drought-induced plastic reductions in relative leaf area typified accessions originating from productive environments. In contrast, homeostasis in relative leaf area typified accessions originating from unproductive environments. Genome-Wide Association Studies (GWAS), Transcriptome Wide Association Studies (TWAS), and expression GWAS (eGWAS) highlighted the importance of auxin-related processes and, in particular, the potential role of the *SMALL AUXIN UP RNA 26* (*SAUR26*) gene in conferring leaf area plasticity. Homeostatic responses in relative leaf area were associated with a diverse gene set and positively associated with a higher intrinsic water use efficiency (WUE$_i$), as confirmed in a TWAS metanalysis of previously published $\delta^{13}C$ measurements. Thus, we have identified not only candidate "plasticity genes" but also candidate "homeostasis genes" controlling leaf area. Our results demonstrate the value of a combined GWAS, TWAS, and eGWAS approach to identify mechanisms underlying phenotypic responses to stress.

Keywords: *Arabidopsis thaliana* (Arabidopsis), drought, eGWAS, GWAS, plasticity, transcriptome, TWAS, WUE$_i$.

Introduction

In the Italian novel The Leopard, one of the main characters famously conveys the idea that 'Everything must change so that everything can stay the same.' Often, there is a cost associated with change that resonates with the plastic developmental responses observed in plants when faced with stress (Bradshaw, 1965; West-Eberhard, 2003). Plasticity marks a departure from a homeostatic state in response to an environmental cue, often followed by "allostatic" responses to return to a homeostatic state (Fig. 1). These allostatic responses involve a myriad of physiological and developmental regulatory processes that stabilize critical aspects of plant physiology. Under repeated stress there is an associated metabolic and physiological cost associated with departure from the optimal state that is not completely alleviated upon return to homeostasis These retained detrimental

effects are known as allostatic load (McEwen and Stellar, 1993), with important implications for

fitness and survival from an evolutionary standpoint.

Stress often elicits plastic responses in plant developmental traits (Dorn *et al.*, 2000; van

Kleunen and Fischer, 2005; Forsman, 2015). However, simply because a given trait is plastic does

not mean that this plasticity is adaptive (Ghalambor *et al.*, 2007). Plants that are not adapted to stress

may exhibit plastic responses that are maladaptive. Under such conditions, homeostasis or lack of

plasticity may, in turn, be adaptive (Fig. 1; Ferrero-Serrano and Chakravorty, 2023). This study aims

to explore the genetic basis of both plasticity and homeostasis imposed by recurrent drought events

during the vegetative development of *Arabidopsis thaliana*.

Drought is among the strongest factors driving adaptation in plants (Siepielski *et al.*, 2017;

Exposito-Alonso *et al.*, 2019). Since climate projections predict drought events to become more

frequent, intense, and unpredictable (Donat *et al.*, 2016), we can expect that drought episodes will

become increasingly more difficult for plants to adapt to. For this reason, understanding the genetic

basis and adaptation potential of phenotypic traits and their plastic or homeostatic responses to

drought is paramount for ameliorating climate change impacts in natural and managed ecosystems.

The Iberian Peninsula is a drought-prone region particularly vulnerable to the effects of

climate change on precipitation (Vicente-Serrano, 2006a; Vicente-Serrano, 2006b; Coll *et al.*, 2016;

Páscoa *et al.*, 2017). The Iberian Arabidopsis population is particularly valuable because its

accessions originate from a broad range of environments (Lobo *et al.*, 2001; Rey Benayas and

Scheiner, 2002), and previous studies of this population have provided considerable insight into

Arabidopsis evolution and development (Picó *et al.*, 2008; Montesinos *et al.*, 2009; Gomaa *et al.*,

2011; Méndez-Vigo *et al.*, 2011; Montesinos-Navarro *et al.*, 2011; Picó, 2012; Manzano-Piedras *et*

al., 2014; Wolfe and Tonsor, 2014; Vidigal *et al.*, 2016; Exposito-Alonso *et al.*, 2018a; Marcer *et al.*,

2018; Castilla *et al*. 2020). In the present study, we utilize GWAS, Transcriptome-Wide Association

Studies (TWAS), and Expression Genome-Wide Association Studies (eGWAS) to identify natural

genetic and transcript abundance variation underlying both plastic and homeostatic leaf area

responses to drought in Iberian Arabidopsis accessions. Leaf area is a vital trait in relation to growth:

leaf area production determines the total amount of light intercepted by plants, carbon assimilation,

and the extent of evaporative water loss. We uncover an adaptive homeostatic growth strategy in

accessions from less productive environments, address its genetic basis, and conclude that phenotypic

homeostasis is under genetic control and of evolutionary importance, just as previously argued for
plasticity (Bradshaw, 1965; Via *et al.*, 1995).

Materials and Methods
87

Plant materials and phenotyping
89

Seeds for 43 Iberian accessions (Table P1 for the list of accessions) were cold-stratified for four days
at 4°C to synchronize germination. Plants were grown in 10 cm square pots containing Metro-mix
360 potting mixture (Sun Gro Horticulture Canada Ltd) in a greenhouse with an average daytime 500
μmol m^{-2}s^{-1} photosynthetic photon flux density (PPFD) (8h light: 16h dark, with light supplied as
natural daylight supplemented with 1000W metal halide lamps) and average day/night temperatures
of 22°C /20°C.

For each Iberian accession, we grew one plant per pot, with five replicates for each of the
control and drought treatments (10 plants for each individual accession), for a total of 430 plants (43
accessions × five control × five droughted plants). Both control and drought treatment were well-
watered for the first 28 days, maintaining the soil relative water content at field capacity as measured
by monitoring pot weight daily and adding water when necessary. After 28 days, soil in the drought
treatment was allowed to dry down. These pots were then rewatered to soil saturation once every 10
days for a total of 14 drought cycles until the conclusion of the experiment 175 days after seeds were
sown. Here, as in the natural environments we sought to mimic, the soil water content was not
adjusted based on the size of individual plants. Our protocol simulated the natural recurring cycle of
rainfall and drought. Such cycles are often used in studies of natural variation (i.e. Exposito-Alonso
et al., 2018b; Exposito-Alonso *et al.*, 2019) and in field trials on crop cultivars (IRRI, 2021). In
contrast, the well-watered treatment was maintained near field capacity throughout the experiment.
Plants were spatially randomized within the greenhouse every week throughout the experiment. At
the end of the experiment, nine accessions within the drought treatment with mortality rates higher
than 40% (i.e., at least two of the five replicates; Table P1) were excluded from downstream analyses.
Photographs of the rosettes were taken at the time of flowering and subsequently analyzed
using ImageJ (http://imagej.nih.gov/ij/) to determine the projected leaf area for each accession under
both well-watered and drought treatments (Fig. S1; Table P1).

Determination of relative leaf area and plasticity

Relative leaf area (rLA) is defined here as the leaf area (LA) at the time of flowering for each accession under each experimental condition (either well-watered or drought) relative to all the accessions under the same condition. The relative leaf area of a given accession under well-watered conditions ($rLA_{i\ (well\text{-}watered)}$) is thus calculated as:

$$rLA_{i\ (well-watered)} = \frac{LA_{i\ (well-watered)}}{LA_{m\ (well-watered)}}$$

where $LA_{i\ (well\text{-}watered)}$ is the leaf area of any individual accession, and $LA_{m\ (well\text{-}watered)}$ is the average leaf area for all accessions grown under the same conditions. Similarly, the relative leaf area under drought ($rLA_{i\ (drought)}$) for each accession is calculated as:

$$rLA_{i\ (drought)} = \frac{LA_{i\ (drought)}}{LA_{m\ (drought)}}$$

where $LA_{i\ (drought)}$ is the leaf area of any individual accession under drought and $LA_{m\ (drought)}$ is the average value for all accessions when grown under drought. A high rLA reflects greater vegetative growth of any given accession relative to the set of accessions utilized in this study. The use of rLA, rather than actual values, was essential to allow a normalized comparison of the leaf area of each accession between the watering regimes. Reaction norms based on rLA were employed to quantify plastic changes in relative leaf area between the two treatments (well-watered vs. drought). Leaf area plasticity indexes were calculated based on an established definition (Weijschedé *et al.*, 2006). The leaf area plasticity index to drought (PI) was calculated for each accession as follows:

$$PI = rLA_{i\ (drought)} - rLA_{i\ (well-watered)}$$

A positive leaf area plasticity index does not necessarily imply that the leaf area for that accession was higher under drought, but rather that under drought, a given accession displays a higher rLA relative to the rest of accessions in the study.

Genome-wide association study

Genome-Wide Association Studies (GWAS) identify genetic variants associated with natural variation in a phenotypic trait of interest. We used a GWAS approach to identify polymorphisms associated with natural variation in rLA and its plasticity. The online tool GWAPP (http://gwas.gmi.oeaw.ac.at/) was employed using a linear regression model (Seren *et al.*, 2012). The linear regression model does not address the confounding effects of population stratification, family

structure, and cryptic relatedness (Price *et al.*, 2010); however, these issues are minimized by our

choice of a regional (Iberian) population (Frachon *et al.*, 2018; Tabas-Madrid *et al.*, 2018; Frachon

et al., 2019). Nonetheless, we demonstrate that the candidate SNPs discussed here were also

significant after the application of a mixed model approach implemented either using GWAPP (Seren

et al., 2012) or GWAS-Flow (Freudenthal *et al*., 2019) (Figs S2, S3, and S4; Tables G1-G6),

providing further confidence in our results.

We filtered out low-frequency variants (minor allele frequency (MAF) < 10%) to focus on

variants less likely to be undergoing negative selection or to be spurious SNPs from sequencing

errors. We obtained gene model annotation from the TAIR11 genome release. We defined the

'consensus' transcript variant as the variant producing the longest transcript. We predicted the effect

of every SNP using SnpEff (Cingolani *et al.*, 2012). We focused on SNPs within gene transcriptional

units, including introns, untranslated regions at the 5′ and 3′ ends, and open reading frames, as defined

in Araport11 (Cheng *et al.*, 2017). We also included the promoter region, defined as 5 kb upstream

of the most distal transcription start site. We imposed a stringent arbitrary significance threshold

corresponding to a score of four ($P < 0.0001$; Fig. S5A-E).

Using the results from GWAS obtained from the association with rLA, we obtained reaction

norms that reflect plastic or homeostatic patterns of genome-wide associations of these traits in

response to drought. The association between a phenotype and any given SNP was designated as

homeostatic if it was found significantly associated with that trait under both conditions (well-watered

and drought).

Transcriptome-wide association

Natural variation in gene expression is an important mechanism of local adaptation (Des Marais *et*

al., 2012; Lasky *et al.,* 2014). Transcriptome-Wide Association Studies (TWAS) identify variation

in transcript abundance associated with observed variation in phenotypic traits (Gusev *et al.*, 2016;

Kremling *et al.*, 2019). TWAS analysis does not suffer from the limitations imposed by false non-

causal synthetic associations due to linkage disequilibrium (Li *et al.*, 2021) that are typical of GWAS

(Korte and Farlow 2013). Also, TWAS evaluates continuous variation in transcript abundance rather

than the discrete presence/absence of SNPs with (potentially) additive or synergistic effects on a

continuous phenotype. We retrieved the transcriptome data from rosette leaves of 727 Arabidopsis

accessions from the GEO dataset with accession number GSE80744 and SRA study SRP074107

(Kawakatsu *et al.*, 2016) and subsetted the 35 Iberian accessions that overlapped with the 43 Iberian

accessions used in our study. Data wrangling was conducted utilizing the dplyr (Wickham *et al.*,

2015) and tidyr (Wickham and Henry, 2018) packages. Spearman's rank correlation coefficients

between the variation in individual phenotypic values (relative leaf area (rLA_i), plasticity index (PI),

and intrinsic water use efficiency (WUE_i) from Dittberner *et al.* (2018; Tables P1 and P2)), and

individual transcript abundance values within the study population, were calculated using the

correlation function of the Hmisc package (Harrell Jr and Dupont, 2019). The stronger the association

of the two variables, the closer the Pearson's correlation coefficient, r_s, will be to either +1 or -1. We

imposed a threshold based on this correlation coefficient ($|r_s| \geq 4.0$). We considered this threshold to

be stringent after inspection of the distribution of the results (Fig. S5F-J). We include the r_s and

corresponding *P*-values in Tables T1 and T2.

Using the results from TWAS, we derived reaction norms to reflect homeostatic patterns of

transcriptome-wide associations of rLA in response to drought. Any given transcript was designated

homeostatic if found significantly associated with rLA (either positively or negatively; $|r_s| \geq 4.0$)

under both conditions (well-watered and drought).

eGWAS

Natural variation in transcript abundance can also be used to identify candidate SNPs (expression

SNPs or eSNPs) that control transcript abundance in an Expression Genome-Wide Association Study

(eGWAS). eGWAS was conducted by compiling the transcript abundance values of a given gene of

interest, extracting the transcript abundance for that particular gene in the 727 Arabidopsis accessions

from the GEO dataset with accession number GSE80744 and SRA study SRP074107 (Kawakatsu *et*

al., 2016), then subsetting the 665 accessions included in the 1001 Genomes project (The 1001

Genomes Consortium, 2016). Then, the online tool GWAPP (http://gwas.gmi.oeaw.ac.at/) was

employed using a linear regression model (Seren *et al.*, 2012) to identify candidate regulatory

variants. Regulatory variants are either cis- or trans-acting, depending on the location of the genetic

variant. cis-eSNPs were defined as those located within the ORF, introns, UTRs, or the promoter

region of the regulated gene. Trans-eSNPs were defined as those located within the ORF, introns,

UTRs, or promoter region of a gene different from the gene transcriptionally regulated by that genetic

variant.

Analyses

AraCLIM (https://github.com/CLIMtools/) is a database that describes the local environment of the Arabidopsis accessions sequenced as part of the 1001 Genomes Project (Ferrero-Serrano and Assmann, 2019; Ferrero-Serrano et al., 2022). We obtained from AraCLIM the values for MOD17A2 (Net Primary Productivity in the spring season) (Heinsch *et al.*, 2003; Running and Zhao, 2015) at the collection site of each accession and evaluated the correlation with the phenotypes obtained in our experiment.

WUE$_i$ is defined as the ratio between instantaneous carbon gain and transpirational water loss, typically calculated per unit of leaf area (Condon *et al.*, 2002). To integrate information from previously published studies on the Iberian Arabidopsis population, we retrieved available data on natural variation in intrinsic water use efficiency (WUE$_i$, δ^{13}C), previously recorded by Dittberner *et al.* (2018). During photosynthesis, plants discriminate against $^{13}CO_2$ in the reaction center of *Ribulose 1, 5-biphosphate carboxylase/oxidase* (*RuBisCO*). As stomata close, minimizing water loss in response to drought, the discrimination against $^{13}CO_2$ decreases because the internal CO_2 concentration (C$_i$) becomes unavoidably reduced. As a result of their reduced C$_i$, plants with greater WUE$_i$ experience lower CO_2 concentrations at the sites of carboxylation (C$_c$) and have less negative δ^{13}C values.

All statistical analyses and figures were produced using R (Team, 2013). The code and data to reproduce the analysis, figures, and tables are available at https://github.com/AssmannLab and Zenodo. Gene Ontology (GO) biological process analysis (Tables GO1-GO10) was performed using the open-source software ShinyGO v0.61: http://bioinformatics.sdstate.edu/go60/ (Ge *et al.*, 2020) with the following settings: the search species was "*Arabidopsis thaliana*," the *P*-value cutoff (FDR) was 0.05, and the number of most significant terms to show was ten. To replicate these results, the lists of genes that were input into these analyses based on significance thresholds can be selected from Tables G1-G6, T1, and T2. Each analytical technique used in this study has assumptions and limitations, which we discuss in Document S1. The code and data necessary to reproduce all analyses and figures in this study are available on GitHub (https://github.com/AssmannLab).

Results

Natural variation in leaf area and plasticity in response to long-term cyclical drought

To quantify phenotypic variation in Iberian Arabidopsis accessions exposed to drought, we conducted a common garden experiment (Fig. 2A). We used image analysis to derive rosette leaf area under well-watered or drought conditions (Figs 2B, S1; Table P1). As expected, we observed a significant ($P < 0.001$) reduction in leaf area resulting from drought in most genotypes, as evidenced by the phenotypic reaction norms. In contrast, a small number of accessions exhibited constant or increased leaf area under drought (Fig. 2B; Table P1), demonstrating that a reduction in leaf area in drought is not inescapable. Based on these data, we calculated the relative leaf area (rLA) of each accession under both well-watered and drought conditions (see Materials & Methods; Fig. 2C; Table P1). We used rLA rather than the actual leaf area to allow comparison of the leaf area of each accession relative to the study population for each watering regime. We also show that the plasticity index derived from the difference in rLA between conditions (i.e. reflecting the slopes of the reaction norms in Fig. 2C; Table P1) is proportional to the fold change in leaf area under drought relative to well-watered conditions (Fig. S6).

We explored the relationship between rLA in the absence of drought and its plastic response (plasticity index; PI) to drought. Fig. 2D shows that accessions with higher rLA under well-watered conditions displayed greater plastic reductions in rLA when subjected to drought (negative leaf area plasticity; yellow datapoints in Figs 2D, E). On the contrary, accessions with lower rLA under well-watered conditions displayed homeostatic phenotypic responses to drought (Fig. 2D, E blue datapoints). Despite this overall trend, we also observed individual accessions with high rLA under well-watered conditions and positive plasticity indexes under drought (green datapoints in Fig. 2D and Fig. 2E). Conversely, a few accessions displayed low rLA and negative leaf area plasticity indexes (red datapoints in Fig. 2D and Fig. 2E).

While the severity of drought depends on multiple environmental parameters, its physiological response is very characteristic. It results in stomatal closure and a reduction in CO_2 assimilation, as reflected in decreases in Net Primary Productivity (NPP), an index that, therefore, can be used as a reliable drought indicator (Huang *et al.*, 2016). We determined that the plastic leaf area responses (negative values of leaf area plasticity index) we observed in our study were typical

of accessions from more productive habitats as reflected in Net Primary Productivity in spring (NPP

spring; Fig. 3A). In contrast, homeostatic leaf area responses (zero or positive values of leaf area

plasticity index) were typical of accessions from less productive habitats (Fig. 3A).

Genetic variants significantly associated with leaf area plasticity were identified by GWAS

(Fig. 3B; Table G3). Gene ontology (GO) analysis of functions associated with the genes harboring

the variants identified by GWAS revealed an enrichment in auxin-related processes (Table GO1).

Among the variants identified from GWAS (Fig. 3B; Table G3) as associated with leaf area plasticity,

we highlight two co-varying SNPs in the 5' and 3' UTR that comprise a haplotype of *SMALL AUXIN*

UP RNA 26 (*SAUR26,* AT3G03850) (Fig. 3C). These variants were identified by GWA analysis using

a linear model (Fig. 3B; Table G3). To confirm that the identification of these candidates was not an

artifact due to population structure, we verified that these variants were also identified using two

different analyses that correct for population structure in the sample: an Accelerated Mixed Model

using GWAPP and an alternative Mixed Model approach, GWAS-Flow (these two SNPs are among

the green datapoints in Fig. S7A and C; see Table G3).

We additionally found from TWA analysis that the transcript levels of *SAUR26* are also

correlated with natural variation in leaf area plasticity in response to drought (Tables T1, T2).

eGWAS confirmed the cis-regulatory effect of the same two genetic variants as depicted in Fig. 3C

(cis-regulation; Fig. 3D; Table G6), consistent with the correlation between the genetic variation in

SAUR26, its transcript abundance, and leaf area plasticity.

Fig. 3E illustrates the haplotypic differences in leaf area plasticity for *SAUR26* in our study.

Accessions harboring the minor *SAUR26* haplotype display negative plasticity in rLA, while the

major *SAUR26* haplotype is associated with homeostatic and positive plasticity responses in rLA (Fig.

3E; Wilcoxon *P*-value < 0.001). These haplotypic differences were also associated with the transcript

levels of *SAUR26* (Fig. 3F), which we confirmed not only in the group of accessions included in our

study (Wilcoxon *P*-value < 0.001) but also in the much larger group of 189 Iberian accessions

included within the 1001 Genomes Project (Fig. 3F; Wilcoxon *P*-value < 0.001). Both the genetic

variation defined by this haplotype in *SAUR26* and the resulting *SAUR26* transcript abundance are

associated with the interplay between plasticity and homeostasis that we determine in our study (Figs

3E, F). These results highlight *SAUR26* as a candidate regulator of leaf area plasticity in response to

drought (Figs 3G, H).

In our GWA analysis on rLA (Fig. S8A, Table G1, G2), no SNPs were associated with rLA
under both well-watered and drought conditions, i.e., no SNPs were associated with homeostasis and
thus horizontal lines are absent from Fig. S8A. The results from TWA analysis were strikingly
different, identifying not only transcripts associated with leaf area plasticity but also transcripts
associated with leaf area homeostasis (Fig. 4; Fig. S8B). Regarding homeostasis, four transcripts are
positively correlated with rLA under both well-watered and drought conditions: *SOFL2*
(AT1G68870), CPN60B (AT1G55490), AT5G39471, and CKL8 (AT5G43320) (Fig. 4A). Accessions
with higher transcript abundance of these genes display a higher rLA under both well-watered and
drought conditions (Fig. 4B-E; note the similarity of the regression lines in each panel). Conversely,
we identified four genes negatively correlated with rLA: *RHF1A* (AT4G14220), *AT5G60160*,
AT4G15260, and *AT5G16800* (Fig. 4F). Accessions with a higher transcript abundance of these genes
display lower rLA under both well-watered and drought conditions (Fig. 4G-J; note the similarity of
the regression lines in each panel).

Trade-off between plasticity and intrinsic water use efficiency

It was not surprising to find a trade-off between growth and drought resistance among the accessions
in our study (Fig. 2D), as this is a well-established phenomenon (Zhang *et al.*, 2020). Accordingly,
we hypothesized that those accessions that displayed a homeostatic response to drought minimized
water loss, and thus would exhibit an increased intrinsic water-use efficiency (WUE_i). Given that
$\delta^{13}C$ reflects intrinsic water use efficiency (WUE_i) (Juenger *et al.*, 2005; Easlon *et al.*, 2014), we
analyzed the $\delta^{13}C$ values recorded by Dittberner *et al.* (2018), available for 21 of the accessions used
in our study. The results confirm a trade-off between plasticity and WUE_i (Fig. 5A). Accessions that
exhibit strong negative plasticity following drought (negative leaf area plasticity indices) have a lower
WUE_i in the absence of drought (more negative $\delta^{13}C$ values). Those accessions that maintain or
increase leaf area in response to drought (positive leaf area plasticity indices) display a higher WUE_i
in the absence of drought (more positive $\delta^{13}C$ values).
GWA analysis failed to identify any genetic variants associated with the observed phenotypic
trade-off between intrinsic WUE_i and leaf area plasticity (Fig. 5B; Table G3, G4), i.e., no datapoints
in the upper right quadrant of Fig. 5B. However, TWA analysis (Fig. 5C) provided insight into this
trade-off. Red datapoints in Fig. 5C are transcripts with greater abundance in those negatively plastic
and less water-use efficient accessions depicted in red in Fig. 5A; GO analysis revealed that these

were enriched in processes involved in RNA modification (Table GO2); we chose the putative pseudouridine synthase *CBF5* (*AT3G57150*) as an example (Figs 5D, E). Conversely, green points in Fig. 5C represent transcripts with greater abundance in the homeostatic and water-use efficient accessions depicted in green in Fig. 2D. We chose *CYCLIC NUCLEOTIDE-GATED CHANNEL 16* (*AT3G48010*; *CNGC16*) as an example (Figs 5F, G).

We determined that in our study, accessions that in response to drought displayed either increased or homeostatic leaf area plasticity also had higher WUE_i in the absence of drought (Fig. 5A). We then conducted a meta-analysis on the 95 Iberian accessions with published $\delta^{13}C$ information (Dittberner *et al.*, 2018). GWA analysis of these accessions rendered a distinctive peak in a single gene, identifying a haplotype consisting of eight co-varying SNPs in *ClpX3* (*AT1G33360*; Fig. 6A; Table G5), an ATP-dependent Clp protease subunit that plays essential roles in chloroplast development (Kim *et al*., 2009). Consistent with this result but more informative was the TWA analysis of WUE_i in the 88 Iberian accessions with both published transcript abundance and $\delta^{13}C$ information (Fig. 6B): we uncovered a distinctive enrichment in photosynthesis-related genes (Fig. 6C; Table GO3) among transcripts that are upregulated in accessions with high WUE_i (more positive $\delta^{13}C$ values; Fig. 6B; Table T1, T2). We highlight the positive relationships with WUE_i uncovered for the transcript abundance of *RuBisCO small subunit 2B* (*AT5G38420*; *RBCS2B;* Fig. 6D) and the positive relationship between the transcript abundance of *SAUR26* and WUE_i (Fig. 6E), in concordance with other findings in our study.

DISCUSSION

Identifying candidate regulators of plasticity and homeostasis

An adaptive trade-off between growth and drought resistance in plants is well-established (Zhang *et al.*, 2020). In productive environments, accessions with higher rLA in the absence of drought may have an advantage in competing for aboveground resources relative to smaller individuals, as proposed by Tilman (1988). On the other hand, plants adapted to unproductive environments typically fix less carbon, have higher WUE_i, and display reduced vegetative growth, even when grown in rich environments (Parsons, 1968; Chapin, 1991); however, these plants are typically stress-tolerant (Billings and Mooney, 1968; Grime, 1974, 1977). In our study, accessions typical of more productive areas display strong and negative plastic responses to drought (Fig. 3A). Conversely, accessions with

homeostatic or even positive plasticity in rLA in response to drought typify less productive areas (Fig.

3A). Here, we sought to identify the genetic basis of these contrasting ecological strategies.

Our main interest was not to identify natural variation associated with well-watered or drought

phenotypes, but rather natural variation associated with the degree of plasticity evoked in response to

drought, i.e., natural variation associated with reaction norms, rather than with phenotypes in one

environment or the other (well-watered or droughted). In exploring the genetic basis of plasticity, we

identified 31 genes corresponding to the top 50 candidate SNPs with the strongest association with

the leaf area plasticity index (Fig. 3B; Table 1; Table G3). To the best of our knowledge, 20 out of

these 31 genes have been previously characterized, and many of these are related to auxin regulation

and leaf expansion. This enrichment in auxin-related processes was confirmed by GO analysis (Table

GO1). Notably, when we compare the candidates resulting from GWA analysis on rLA vs. leaf area

plasticity, only eight candidate SNPs overlapped between both traits (green datapoints in Fig. S9A),

and none of these eight SNPs are in genes related to auxin. In other words, the auxin-related candidate

genes are related to *plasticity* in this trait and not to the trait itself.

The variant with the strongest association with the plastic response to drought was the auxin

efflux carrier family protein *PIN8* (*AT5G15100*). Among the associated SNPs, we also found two co-

varying SNPs in *AUXIN RESPONSE FACTOR 16* (*ARF16*; *AT4G30080),* two co-varying SNPs in

SMALL AUXIN UP RNA 26 (*SAUR26*; *AT3G03850*); two variants in *AGAMOUS-like 15*

(*AT5G13790*; *AGL15*), a gene that negatively regulates auxin signaling in Arabidopsis (Zheng *et al.*,

2016); and three variants in *LONESOME HIGHWAY LIKE 1* (*LL2*; *AT2G31280*), an atypical basic

helix-loop-helix (bHLH) transcription factor that regulates early xylem development downstream of

auxin (Ohashi-Ito *et al.*, 2013).

Among the candidates that are not formally included in the GO category "response to auxin,"

we found six co-varying SNPs in the abscisic acid receptors *PYR1-like 11* (*PYL11*; *AT5G45860*) and

PYR1-like 12 (*PYL12*; *AT5G45870*). ABA and auxin pathways interact in the regulation of growth

(Emenecker & Strader 2020), and also in the regulation of plasma membrane H^+ ATPases (of which

there is one member in the list, H^+ *ATPase 2* (*AHA2; AT4G30190*)) during cell expansion (Spartz *et*

al., 2014) and stomatal control (Wong *et al.*, 2021). We also found four co-varying SNPs in the *Basic*

helix-loop-helix (bHLH) DNA-binding family protein MYC3 (*AT5G46760*), a known regulator of

glucosinolate biosynthesis (Schweizer *et al.*, 2013). Auxin negatively regulates glucosinolate levels,

which appears to integrate growth and stomatal regulation during drought (Salehin *et al.*, 2019) and

ABA response (Zhao *et al.*, 2008). GO biological process analysis on positively correlated candidates

resulting from TWAS analysis on leaf area plasticity index for drought also revealed an enrichment

of glucosinolate biosynthesis genes (Table GO4).

We found that among the auxin-related variants associated with leaf area plasticity (Fig. 3B),

SNPs in *SAUR26* were of particular interest. The majority of characterized *SAUR* genes are positive

regulators of plant growth (Spartz *et al.*, 2014; Li *et al.*, 2015; Stortenbeker and Bemer, 2019). The

two associated variants in *SAUR26* were found in the 5' and 3' UTR, respectively (Fig. 3C), regions

of the transcript that typically regulate gene expression. Indeed, we found the transcript levels of

SAUR26 to be associated with this genetic variation in *SAUR26* itself (cis-regulation; Fig. 3D), which

we confirmed both in the group of accessions included in this study and, importantly, in the larger

group of 189 Iberian accessions in the 1001 Genomes Project (Fig. 3F). The minor haplotype is

associated with negative plasticity in leaf area in response to drought. Conversely, the major

haplotype, associated with higher transcript abundance of *SAUR26*, is associated with leaf area

homeostasis and positive plastic responses (Fig. 3E).

Natural variation in transcript abundance of *SAUR26* explained 18% of the observed plastic

response in leaf area to drought in our study (Fig. 3G, H). The importance of *SAUR26* is supported

by previous work that revealed natural genetic variation in *SAUR26* associated with growth thermo-

responsiveness of the rosette compactness index (Wang *et al.*, 2019), and cis-elements in the 5'

upstream region or the 3'UTR region of *SAUR26* that were responsible for this response (Wang *et al.*

2021). This conclusion is also supported by our meta-analysis of the larger Iberian population with

transcriptome data, which also identified *SAUR26* transcript abundance as positively correlated with

higher WUE$_i$ (Fig. 6B, E), along with other related auxin-related transcripts such as *AUXIN*

RESISTANT 3 (*AXR3*, also known as *IAA17*, *AT1G04250;* Fig. S10A) (Leyser *et al.*, 1996) and

SMALL AUXIN UPREGULATED 15 (*SAUR15*, *AT4G38850*; Fig. S10B) (Oh *et al.*, 2014). As we

uncover in this study, both transcript abundance and natural genetic variation in *SAUR26* cis-

regulatory elements are associated with the interplay between plasticity and homeostasis in rLA

following drought stress (Fig. 3, Tables G3, T1, T2).

Interestingly, the minor haplotype frequency for this *SAUR26* haplotypic variant in our study

sample (minor haplotypic frequency, MHF = 38.09%) is similar to the frequencies we find in the 189

accessions within the Iberian population (MHF = 35.98%). However, the minor haplotype in the

Iberian population becomes the haplotype in higher frequency (64.14%) in the global 1001 Genomes

collection (The 1001 Genomes Consortium, 2016). It has been shown that Iberian Arabidopsis

populations locally adapted to drought conditions in this region out-perform accessions from wetter

areas of Northern Europe when both are exposed to drought (Exposito-Alonso *et al.*, 2019).

Following this, given that the major haplotype in our study is associated with homeostatic responses

to drought (Fig. 3E) and that its frequency becomes reduced outside the drought-prone Iberian region,

we can speculate that this *SAUR26* haplotypic variant is under selection in the Iberian population,

conferring an adaptive advantage to the water-limited conditions of the region.

We did not identify any SNPs associated with rLA under both well-watered and drought

conditions. Therefore, the genetic basis of growth homeostasis under drought could not be defined in

our study using GWAS (Fig. S8A). On the other hand, the reaction norms based on the strength of

association of transcript abundance with rLA, i.e., TWAS, identify four transcripts that are positively

correlated with rLA under both well-watered and drought conditions (Figs 4A-E, S8B). This means

that accessions with greater transcript abundance for those genes display higher rLA under both well-

watered and drought conditions. Conversely, we identified four transcripts negatively correlated with

rLA such that accessions with a higher transcript abundance of those genes display lower rLA under

both well-watered and drought conditions (Fig. 4F-J). Therefore, these eight genes are strong

functional candidates for the homeostatic regulation of rLA.

Of the eight resultant candidate genes, *CPN60B* (homeostatic, higher rLA) encodes a rubisco

large subunit-binding protein (Cheng *et al.*, 2020). *SOFL2* (homeostatic, higher rLA) is implicated in

the control of cytokinin content (Zhang *et al.*, 2009), which can contribute to drought tolerance

(Rivero *et al.*, 2007), while *AT4G15260* (homeostatic, lower rLA) is a putative UDP-

glycosyltransferase, with another member of this superfamily identified as a cytokinin

glycosyltransferase (Hou *et al.*, 2004) that improves vegetative-stage drought survival when

overexpressed. *AT5G16800* encodes a N-terminal acetyl transferase for which null mutants exhibit

sensitivity to salinity stress. We can surmise functions in homeostatic control of leaf area for these

four genes based on their described functions and phenotypes. The other four homeostatic genes are

AT5G39471 (annotated as a "Cysteine/Histidine-rich C1 domain family protein") and *CKL8*

(annotated as a casein kinase), both correlated with homeostatic and high rLAs, and *RHF1A* (RING-

finger E3 ubiquitin ligase (Liu *et al.*, 2008) and *AT5G60180* (vacuolar aminopeptidase (Park *et al.*,

2017), both correlated with homeostatic and low rLAs. For these genes further research is needed

regarding how they might contribute to homeostasis.

Trade-off between relative leaf area (rLA), plasticity and WUE$_i$

Plant species with low relative growth rates exhibit high WUE$_i$ (Angert *et al.*, 2009; Kimball *et al.*, 2012). We can hypothesize that those plants with lower growth rates will have better drought resistance, consequently displaying growth homeostasis. These observations are both consistent with results from ecological studies and confirmed in crop species (Kasuga *et al.*, 1999; Ferrero-Serrano and Assmann, 2016; Ferrero-Serrano *et al.*, 2018; Ferrero-Serrano et al., 2024). In our study, accessions with lower rLA and homeostatic responses to drought display a greater abundance of transcripts encoding functions related to ion transport (yellow datapoints in Fig. S9B; Tables T1, T2, GO5), which could be related to osmoregulation and stomatal control of transpiration. Consistent with this argument, the homeostatic response in rLA in response to prolonged drought that we observe in our study correlates positively with a high predicted WUE$_i$ recorded by Dittberner *et al.* (2018) for the same accessions (Fig. 5A).

We then studied the genetic basis of this trade-off between rLA, plasticity, and WUE$_i$. There were no SNPs associated with both the leaf area plasticity index and WUE$_i$ (Fig. 5B). However, when we compare the candidates obtained from TWA analysis, we identify transcripts associated with both low WUE$_i$ and a negative plastic response in leaf area following sustained drought (Fig. 5C). Conversely, we also identify a set of transcripts that is significantly associated with both leaf area homeostasis (more positive leaf area plasticity index) and increased WUE$_i$ (Fig. 5C). To exemplify these opposed responses to drought, given the enrichment in RNA modification and ion transport genes that we found in the transcripts regulating the trade-off between relative leaf area and plasticity (Fig S12B; Tables T1, T2), we highlight two of the genes identified by TWAS, with opposite correlations between transcript abundance and relative leaf area plasticity (Figs 5D, E vs. Figs 5F, G): (*CBF5*; *AT3G57150*) and *CYCLIC NUCLEOTIDE GATED CHANNEL 16* (*CNGC16*; *AT3G48010*).

CBF5 encodes a protein with homology to a category of pseudouridine synthases, and its knockout in Arabidopsis is lethal (Lemontova *et al.,* 2007). Originally only non-coding RNAs, particularly rRNAs, were thought to be pseudouridylated, but it is now recognized that mRNAs are also a target for pseudouridylation. In both yeast and human cells, this post-transcriptional modification is induced by heat shock, with consequent impacts on splicing, mRNA stability, and translation (Karijolich *et al*., 2015), and some candidate pseudouridine synthases in rice have been

shown to be transcriptionally regulated by drought (Dingra et al., 2023). We observe that accessions

with higher transcript abundance of *CBF5* display both strong negative plastic responses in rLA in

response to drought (Fig. 5D) and reduced WUE_i (Fig. 5E). Our observations suggest that stress-

induced pseudouridylation may also occur in plants, with functional consequences for drought

tolerance; other types of mRNA modifications in plants have been correlated with increased mRNA

stability and translation under salinity stress (Kramer et al., 2020) and improved heat tolerance (Tang

et al., 2020).

Conversely, transcript abundance of *CNGC16* is associated with homeostatic responses in

rLA and increased WUE_i. CNGCs are a superfamily of ion channels permeable to divalent and

monovalent cations (Köhler *et al.*, 1999; DeFalco *et al.*, 2016). *CNGC*s like *CNGC5* and *CNGC6*

have been reported to be the basis of a cyclic GMP (cGMP)-activated nonselective Ca^{2+}-permeable

cation channel activity in the plasma membrane of Arabidopsis guard cells (Wang *et al.*, 2013)

associated with stomatal closure. *CNGC16* is also critical for reproductive success following drought

stress (Tunc-Ozdemir *et al.*, 2013). Consistent with these functional roles, in our study, higher

transcript abundance of *CNGC16* is found in accessions with positive leaf area plasticity indexes

under drought (leaf area homeostasis; Fig. 5F); and with high WUE_i (Fig. 5G).

Given the increased plastic responses in leaf area found in accessions with lower WUE_i, we

next conducted a meta-analysis on the larger set of 95 Iberian accessions with $\delta^{13}C$ information from

a previous study focused on the global Arabidopsis population (Dittberner *et al.*, 2018). We identified

a distinctive peak consisting of eight co-varying SNPs in a single gene, *ClpX3* (*AT1G33360*; Fig.

6A), an ATP-dependent Clp protease subunit (Nishimura and van Wijk, 2015). Null mutants in a

different chloroplast protease subunit, ClpR, display a remarkable loss of chlorophyll (95 to 98%

reduction) and photosynthetic capacity, turning entirely white when grown under high light (Kim *et*

al., 2009).

TWA analysis of WUE_i determined from $\delta^{13}C$ values in the 88 Iberian accessions with both

$\delta^{13}C$ information (Dittberner *et al.*, 2018) and published transcript abundance (Kawakatsu *et al.*,

2016) further supported the relationship with photosynthesis. Our TWAS on WUE_i in the larger

Iberian population identified 31 out of the 45 candidate genes for WUE_i that we also identified in the

subset of 20 Iberian accessions in our experimental study for which published $\delta^{13}C$ data were

available (Table T1 and T2). Gene Ontology (GO) biological process analysis of the resultant 45

candidates positively correlated with $\delta^{13}C$ uncovered an unequivocal enrichment in photosynthesis-

509 related genes for transcripts that are upregulated in accessions with high WUE_i (less negative $\delta^{13}C$

510 values; Figs 6B, 6C; Table GO3). Among the candidates from our TWA analysis that are positively

511 related to WUE_i was *RuBisCO small subunit 2B* (*AT5G38420*; *RBCS2B;* Figs 6B, D). An

512 upregulation in *RuBisCO* may compensate for suboptimal CO_2 concentrations at the sites of

513 carboxylation arising from reduced stomatal apertures in plants from drought-prone environments.

514 We illustrate eight additional genes with transcript abundances that were positively associated with

515 WUE_i in Fig. S10. Among these are *NADH dehydrogenase-like complex M* (*NdhM, AT4G37925;* Fig.

516 S10C), required for *NdH* complex assembly (Ifuku *et al.*, 2011), and *High cyclic electron flow 1*

517 (*HCEF1*; *AT3G54050*; Fig. S10D; Livingston *et al.*, 2010), both regulators of cyclic electron flow

518 around PSI (Yamori *et al.*, 2011), *ATP-Synthase δ-Subunit* (*ATPD, AT4G09650*; Fig. S10E)

519 (Maiwald *et al.*, 2003), *Photosystem I reaction center subunit PSI-N* (*PSAN, AT5G64040;* Fig. S10F)

520 (Haldrup *et al.*, 1999), and *Photosystem II subunit O-2* (*PSBO2*; *AT3G50820;* Fig. S10G) (Murakami

521 *et al.*, 2005). Also, the candidate with the highest association score is a member of the plasma

522 membrane intrinsic protein (PIP) subfamily of aquaporins (*PIP1;5*; *AT4G23400*; Fig. S10H). PIPs

523 regulate water flux in guard cells as well as membrane permeability to CO_2 in the mesophyll, with an

524 important effect on mesophyll conductance and CO_2 concentration at the sites of carboxylation (C_c)

525 (Groszmann *et al.*, 2017; Zait, Ferrero-Serrano & Assmann 2021). Thus, *PIP1;5* is also a candidate

526 regulator of photosynthetic rates. As discussed before, *SAUR26* is also among these candidates (Fig.

527 6B, E), increasing our confidence in the role of this gene as a regulator of plastic responses to drought

528 (Fig. 3).

529   Among the candidates that are negatively related to high WUE_i there is an enrichment in

530 carbohydrate transport-related processes (Table GO6). We can speculate that this enrichment reflects

531 the transport of carbohydrates produced during photosynthesis to promote plant growth. This would

532 be concordant with the trade-off between growth and WUE_i that we observe in our study.

534 Conclusions

535 The adaptive role of plasticity has been at the center of a long-standing debate. Much work and

536 discussion have focused on the principle that if plasticity is indeed adaptive, it may be under genetic

537 control (Bradshaw, 1965; Via *et al.*, 1995); however, few relevant genes have been identified. Here,

538 we propose that not only plasticity but also homeostasis is under genetic control and subject to natural

539 selection. This concept is supported by our dissection of the genetic basis of both plasticity and

homeostasis in leaf area following drought, which identifies specific genes implicated in each process.

Knowledge from natural populations of how plants adapt to their environment can be incorporated in breeding and biotechnological approaches to crop improvement. In this study, we observe a trade-off between growth and drought response. A similar trade-off between stress tolerance and productivity threatens food security. It is noteworthy that we also found accessions that did not display this trade-off, e.g., those accessions marked in green in Fig. 2D, E. These accessions may be of particular interest from an agronomic perspective.

The concerted use of TWAS and GWAS increases the power to link genes to phenotypes (Kremling et al., 2019). A similarly integrative approach has identified water use efficiency traits in sorghum (Ferguson et al., 2020). Here, this approach has yielded insights into the genetic basis of response to resource limitation, identifying both candidate "plasticity genes" and candidate "homeostasis genes" for further study. In particular, the identification of potential homeostatic mechanisms has important implications for maintaining crop yield in the face of climate change. Results arising from diverse genome-wide analyses in both model and crop species (Schindele et al., 2020) can now be used to inform powerful new CRISPR-based approaches for gene editing and modulation of transcript abundance toward crop improvement (Abudayyeh et al., 2017).

Figures

Fig. 1. Conceptual framework for the adaptive role of plastic and homeostatic responses across productivity gradients in the local environment. (A) Schematic illustration representing the balance *sensu* Grime (1974, 1977), between stress tolerance in lower productivity, stress-prone environments, and competitive ability in and homeostasis in plants. In less productive environments, homeostatic responses to stress and lower relative growth rates result in lower biomass production, which is tuned in to the lower resources that are typically available in their environment and favors adaptation to those environments. In contrast, in productive environments, in which competition becomes more intense, plastic responses are favored from an adaptive standpoint. (B). In unproductive environments, frequent stress events can increase the allostatic load in individuals adapted to high-productivity environments where plastic responses are beneficial. During the lifetime of an individual, this results in a maladaptive response that increases allostatic load. In contrast, individuals

adapted to unproductive environments exhibit less plastic (more homeostatic) responses to repeated

stress that reduces their allostatic load over their lifetime.

Fig. 2. Accession-specific rosette leaf area responses in Arabidopsis. (A) Detail of the common

garden experiment, illustrating the randomization of well-watered and drought treatments, as

reflected in soil coloration. (B) Phenotypic reaction norms illustrating a reduction of leaf area in

response to drought in most but not all accessions. Violin distributions represent probability densities

of leaf area (cm^2) among the accessions included in this study. Datapoints depict the mean phenotypic

values of individual accessions, and the reaction norms represent the plastic response in the leaf area

of each accession in response to drought (t-test; P-value < 0.001). (C) Phenotypic reaction norms

illustrating plastic and homeostatic responses in relative leaf area (rLA). Violin distributions represent

probability densities of rLA among the accessions included in this study. Datapoints depict the rLA

of individual accessions, and the reaction norms represent the plastic response in rLA of each

accession in response to drought (t-test; P-value > 0.05). (D) Negative relationship (P-value < 0.05)

between leaf area plasticity index (slope of the reaction norms in 2C) in response to drought (y-axis)

and rLA under well-watered conditions (x-axis). Data were fitted using a linear regression model.

Grey shadow represents the 95% CI of the fit regression line. Four different quadrants are defined by

two dashed lines: the average rLA (x-axis), and y = 0, which is the homeostatic point at which a

change in water availability does not affect rLA (i.e. a plasticity index of 0). Data points depict

individual accessions with their respective label. Data points are colored based on in which quadrant

they fall (see text). (E) Images illustrating the plastic and homeostatic responses to drought found

among the accessions included in this study.

Fig. 3. *SMALL AUXIN UP RNA 26* (*SAUR26,* AT3G03850**)** is a candidate regulator of Arabidopsis

leaf area plasticity in response to drought. (A) Accessions from more productive areas display

stronger negative reductions in leaf area plasticity relative to accessions from less productive

environments. Scatter plot depicting the negative relationship (P-value < 0.05) between leaf area

plasticity index (y-axis) and Net Primary Productivity during the spring season (x-axis). (B)

Manhattan plot representing the strength of association between genetic variants and leaf area

plasticity in response to drought. (C) *SAUR26* gene model, including the two co-varying SNPs

highlighted in 2B. Orange block depicts the sole exon, green block the 5' UTR, dark green block the

3' UTR. Labels above indicate the position of the two SNPs that co-vary, forming a haplotype in our

sample. Major/minor allele frequency in our sample, in the 189 accessions from the Iberian Peninsula included in the 1001 Genome Project, and the whole 1001 Genomes Project sample dataset is provided. (D) Manhattan plot representing the genome-wide strength of association between the genetic variation present within the 665 accessions from the transcript abundance reference panel (Kawakatsu *et al.*, 2016) that overlap with the collection of accessions included in the 1001 Genomes Project, and the variation in the transcript abundance of *SAUR26* (Kawakatsu *et al.*, 2016). The peak in chromosome 3 represents the cis-genetic variants in *SAUR26* affecting its transcript abundance. For the Manhattan plots in 3B and D, the score (y-axis) consists of the negative logarithm of the *P*-value and provides association strength. Each data point represents a SNP with a color corresponding to the chromosome where the genetic variants are located. The x-axis and the different colors shown in the SNPs depicted in the Manhattan plots represent the different chromosomes. The higher the score, the lower the *P*-value, and the stronger the association between genetic variation and leaf area plasticity or *SAUR26* transcript abundance. (E) In the Iberian population, the major haplotype of *SAUR26* is associated with homeostatic or positive responses of relative leaf area (rLA) in response to drought. Conversely, the minor haplotype in the Iberian population is associated with plastic responses in rLA in response to drought. Violin plots show significantly different probability densities of leaf area plasticity in response to drought for the major and minor allele haplotypes in *SAUR26*. (F) The haplotypes in *SAUR26* associated with leaf area plasticity/homeostasis in response to drought are associated with differences in *SAUR26* gene expression. Violin plots show significantly different probability densities of *SAUR26* transcript abundance for the major and minor allele haplotypes in *SAUR26* for both our sample and the entire Iberian population. (G) Scatter plot illustrating the positive relationship between leaf area plasticity index (y-axis) and *SAUR26* transcript abundance (x-axis). For 2A and 2G, the grey shadow represents the 95% CI of the fit regression line (dark grey). (H) Cartoon illustrating the regulatory role of genetic and transcript variation in *SAUR26* and the response of leaf area to drought.

Fig. 4. Transcriptomic reaction norms uncover genetic correlates of Arabidopsis leaf area homeostasis in response to drought. (A) homeostatic reaction norms for transcripts significantly and positively correlated with relative leaf area (rLA) under both watering regimes. (B) to (E). Scatter plots illustrating positive and homeostatic relationships (*P*-value < 0.05) between rLA under both well-watered (closed circles) and drought conditions (open circles) conditions (y-axis), and transcript abundance (FPKM; x-axis) of (B) AT5G39471, (C) *SOB FIVE-LIKE 2* (*SOFL2; AT1G68870*)**,** (D)

CHAPERONIN 60 BETA (*CPN60B*; *AT1G55490*), and (E) *CASEIN KINASE I-LIKE 8* (*CKL8*;

AT5G43320). (F) homeostatic reaction norms for transcripts significantly and negatively correlated

with rLA under both watering regimes. (G) to (J) Scatter plots illustrating negative and homeostatic

relationships (*P*-value < 0.05) between rLA under both well-watered (closed circles) and drought

conditions (open circles) (y-axis), and transcript abundance (FPKM; x-axis) of (G) AT5G60160, (H)

AT4G15260, (I) *AT5G16800*, and (J) *RING-H2 GROUP F1A* (*RHF1A*; *AT4G14220*). For 3a and 3f,

Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (r_s; y-axis) indicates the correlation between the rLA and the

natural variation in transcript abundance of each gene. In Figs B to E and G to J, data were fitted

using a linear regression model. Also, in panels b-e and g-j, filled circles depict the rLA of accessions

grown under well-watered conditions, while empty circles squares depict the rLA of accessions

grown under drought.

Fig. 5. Arabidopsis accessions that display leaf area homeostasis in response to drought, display

higher water use efficiency as defined by δ^{13}C. **(A)** Scatter plot illustrating the positive relationship

(*P*-value < 0.05) between leaf area homeostasis in response to drought (leaf area plasticity index, y-

axis) and water use efficiency (x-axis) among Iberian Arabidopsis accessions used in this study. Data

were fitted to a linear regression model. Grey shadow represents the 95% CI of the fit regression line

(black). δ^{13}C data for the accessions were retrieved from Dittberner *et al.* (2018). Four different

quadrants are defined by two dashed lines: y = 0, which is the homeostatic point at which a change

in water availability does not affect relative leaf area (i.e., a plasticity index of 0), and the average

intrinsic water use efficiency (WUE$_i$, δ^{13}C; x-axis). Data points depict individual accessions with

their respective labels. **(**B) The genetic basis of leaf area plasticity in response to drought and water

use efficiency. This plot depicts the respective relationship between the GWAS associations found

for the leaf area plasticity index in response to drought (y-axis) and those for WUE$_i$ (Dittberner *et al.*,

2018) (x-axis). Data points represent individual SNPs. The y-axis and x-axis depict the extent of the

association with, respectively, leaf area plasticity, and WUE$_i$, as the negative logarithm of the p-value.

Dashed lines depict an arbitrary threshold for significance that is consistent across comparisons. (C)

Transcriptomic association with plastic leaf area responses to drought and WUE$_i$. Spearman's rank

correlation depicts the relationship between the association of the transcript abundance of each gene

in the Arabidopsis genome with leaf area plasticity in response to drought (r_s) on the y-axis and with

WUE$_i$ on the x-axis. Dashed lines define an arbitrary threshold to consider transcripts correlated

positively ($r_s \geq 0.4$) or negatively ($r_s \leq$ -0.4) associated with leaf area plasticity (y-axis) or WUE$_i$ (x-

axis). *CBF5* and *CNGC16* exemplify transcripts with opposing relationships to leaf area plasticity

and water use efficiency as shown in 4C, D and E. Scatter plots depicting the relationship (P-value <

0.05) between leaf area plasticity index in response to drought (4D), or water use efficiency (4E) on

the y-axis, and transcript abundance (FPKM) of *CBF5* on the x-axis. F and G. Scatter plots depicting

the relationship (*P*-value < 0.05) between (4F) leaf area plasticity index in response to drought or

(4G) water use efficiency (Dittberner *et al.*, 2018) on the y-axis, and transcript abundance (FPKM)

of *CYCLIC NUCLEOTIDE-GATED CHANNEL 16* (*CNGC16*) on the x-axis. In all panels, data were

fitted using a linear regression model. Grey shadow represents the 95% CI of the fit regression line.

Fig. 6. Photosynthesis-related transcript variants regulate water use efficiency in Iberian Arabidopsis

accessions**. (**A) Manhattan plot representing the genome-wide strength of association between genetic

variation and variation in $\delta^{13}C$ present within 95 Iberian accessions with $\delta^{13}C$ values available from

Dittberner *et al.* (2018). The score (y-axis) consists of the negative logarithm of the *P*-value and

provides association strength. Inset: Violin plots representing the probability densities of WUE$_i$ for

the major and minor allele haplotypes in *ClpX* for the accessions included in Fig. 6A. (B) T-

Manhattan plot representing transcriptome-wide strength of association between variation in

transcript abundance (Kawakatsu *et al.*, 2016) and natural variation in $\delta^{13}C$. This analysis was

performed on all Iberian accessions with both transcript abundance data (Kawakatsu *et al.*, 2016) and

$\delta^{13}C$ information (Dittberner *et al.*, 2018) (n = 88 accessions). The relationship is defined by the

Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (r_s). Dashed lines define an arbitrary threshold for positive

($r_s \geq 0.4$) or negative ($r_s \leq$ -0.4) correlation with water-use efficiency (y-axis). Blue labels highlight

the transcripts positively associated with higher WUE$_i$, while red labels highlight those negatively

associated with higher WUE$_i$. (C) Hierarchical clustering tree summarizing the correlation among

significant GO Biological Process categories resulting from analysis of the positively correlated

candidates resulting from TWA analysis of water use efficiency determined from $\delta^{13}C$ values in 88

Iberian Arabidopsis accessions. Ratios provide the number of genes positively correlated with WUE$_i$

within each GO category relative to the total number of genes within that category. The size of the

blue dots increases proportionally with P-value significance. (D) Scatter plot depicting the positive

relationship (*P*-value < 0.05) between WUE$_i$ (y-axis) and *RuBisCO SMALL SUBUNIT 2B*

(*AT5G38420*; *RBCS2B*) transcript abundance (x-axis) for the Iberian accessions included in Fig. 6B.

(E) Scatter plot depicting the positive relationship (P-value < 0.05) between intrinsic water-use

efficiency (WUE$_i$; y-axis) and *SMALL AUXIN UP RNA 26* (*SAUR26,* AT3G03850) transcript

abundance (x-axis) for the Iberian accessions included in 6b. Inset: Scatter plot depicting the positive

relationship (P-value < 0.05) between intrinsic water-use efficiency (WUE$_i$; y-axis) and *SMALL*

AUXIN UP RNA 26 (*SAUR26,* AT3G03850) transcript abundance (x-axis) for the 43 accessions

included in our study. For 5D, and 5E, gray shadow represents the 95% CI of the fit regression line

(black).

Tables

Table 1. List of 31 genes corresponding to the top 50 candidate SNPs with the strongest association

with the leaf area plasticity index. Genes encoding proteins with auxin-related functions from GO

analysis are bolded; additional genes related to auxin based on literature analysis are underlined.

Chr	Position	MAF (%)	Gene ID	Gene description	Label
5	**4892996**	**38.24**	***AT5G15100***	***Auxin efflux carrier family protein***	***PIN8***
3	1787622	26.47	*AT3G05970*	*long-chain acyl-CoA synthetase 6*	*LACS6*
4	**14703801**	**26.47**	***AT4G30080***	***auxin response factor 16***	***ARF16***
4	**14705049**	**26.47**	***AT4G30080***	***auxin response factor 16***	***ARF16***
5	5238732	23.53	*AT5G16030*	*mental retardation GTPase activating protein*	*AT5G16030*
3	975320	32.35	*AT3G03810*	*O-fucosyltransferase family protein*	*EDA30*
3	970856	20.59	*AT3G03800*	*syntaxin of plants 131*	*SYP131*
5	15293597	26.47	*AT5G38280*	*PR5-like receptor kinase*	*PR5K*
5	15293610	26.47	*AT5G38280*	*PR5-like receptor kinase*	*PR5K*
5	15293481	41.18	*AT5G38280*	*PR5-like receptor kinase*	*PR5K*
4	14691629	35.29	*AT4G30060*	*Core-2/I-branching beta-1,6-N-acetylglucosaminyltransferase family protein*	*AT4G30060*
5	4659907	35.29	*AT5G14450*	*GDSL-like Lipase/Acylhydrolase superfamily protein*	*AT5G14450*
<u>5</u>	<u>18974632</u>	<u>20.59</u>	<u>*AT5G46760*</u>	<u>*Basic helix-loop-helix (bHLH) DNA-binding family protein*</u>	<u>*MYC3*</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>18974915</u>	<u>20.59</u>	<u>*AT5G46760*</u>	<u>*Basic helix-loop-helix (bHLH) DNA-binding family protein*</u>	<u>*MYC3*</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>18975625</u>	<u>20.59</u>	<u>*AT5G46760*</u>	<u>*Basic helix-loop-helix (bHLH) DNA-binding family protein*</u>	<u>*MYC3*</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>18975826</u>	<u>20.59</u>	<u>*AT5G46760*</u>	<u>*Basic helix-loop-helix (bHLH) DNA-binding family protein*</u>	<u>*MYC3*</u>
3	**983189**	**38.24**	***AT3G03850***	***SAUR-like auxin-responsive protein family***	***SAUR26***
3	**983517**	**38.24**	***AT3G03850***	***SAUR-like auxin-responsive protein family***	***SAUR26***
3	1798927	29.41	*AT3G05990*	*Leucine-rich repeat (LRR) family protein*	*AT3G05990*
5	4433730	29.41	*AT5G13740*	*zinc induced facilitator 1*	*ZIF1*
5	4433740	29.41	*AT5G13740*	*zinc induced facilitator 1*	*ZIF1*
5	4436472	29.41	*AT5G13740*	*zinc induced facilitator 1*	*ZIF1*
5	4436745	29.41	*AT5G13740*	*zinc induced facilitator 1*	*ZIF1*
5	4442005	29.41	*AT5G13760*	*Plasma-membrane choline transporter family protein*	*AT5G13760*
5	**4450177**	**29.41**	***AT5G13790***	***AGAMOUS-like 15***	***AGL15***
5	**4450180**	**29.41**	***AT5G13790***	***AGAMOUS-like 15***	***AGL15***
2	13323264	23.53	*AT2G31260*	*autophagy 9*	*APG9*
2	13330862	23.53	*AT2G31270*	*CDT1-like protein A*	*CDT1A*
<u>2</u>	<u>13341047</u>	<u>23.53</u>	<u>*AT2G31280*</u>	<u>*transcription factor bHLH155-like protein*</u>	<u>*LL2*</u>
<u>2</u>	<u>13341186</u>	<u>23.53</u>	<u>*AT2G31280*</u>	<u>*transcription factor bHLH155-like protein*</u>	<u>*LL2*</u>
<u>2</u>	<u>13342866</u>	<u>23.53</u>	<u>*AT2G31280*</u>	<u>*transcription factor bHLH155-like protein*</u>	<u>*LL2*</u>
2	13343940	23.53	*AT2G31290*	*Ubiquitin carboxyl-terminal hydrolase family protein*	*AT2G31290*
2	13345229	23.53	*AT2G31290*	*Ubiquitin carboxyl-terminal hydrolase family protein*	*AT2G31290*
2	13345701	23.53	*AT2G31290*	*Ubiquitin carboxyl-terminal hydrolase family protein*	*AT2G31290*
2	13346191	23.53	*AT2G31300*	*actin-related protein C1B*	*ARPC1B*
2	13358923	23.53	*AT2G31320*	*poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase 2*	*PARP1*

3	22329843	23.53	*AT3G60400*	*Mitochondrial transcription termination factor family protein*	*SHOT1*
<u>4</u>	<u>14775183</u>	<u>32.35</u>	<u>*AT4G30190*</u>	<u>*H^{+}-ATPase 2*</u>	<u>*AHA2*</u>
4	6154596	32.35	*AT4G09770*	*TRAF-like family protein*	*AT4G09770*
1	29310771	20.59	*AT1G77960*	*repressor ROX1-like protein*	*AT1G77960*
5	18596240	20.59	*AT5G45840*	*Leucine-rich repeat protein kinase family protein*	*AT5G45840*
<u>5</u>	<u>18604234</u>	<u>20.59</u>	<u>*AT5G45860*</u>	<u>*PYR1-like 11*</u>	<u>*PYL11*</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>18606400</u>	<u>20.59</u>	<u>*AT5G45870*</u>	<u>*PYR1-like 12*</u>	<u>*PYL12*</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>18606524</u>	<u>20.59</u>	<u>*AT5G45870*</u>	<u>*PYR1-like 12*</u>	<u>*PYL12*</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>18606721</u>	<u>20.59</u>	<u>*AT5G45870*</u>	<u>*PYR1-like 12*</u>	<u>*PYL12*</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>18606940</u>	<u>20.59</u>	<u>*AT5G45870*</u>	<u>*PYR1-like 12*</u>	<u>*PYL12*</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>18606953</u>	<u>20.59</u>	<u>*AT5G45870*</u>	<u>*PYR1-like 12*</u>	<u>*PYL12*</u>
5	**18613579**	**20.59**	**AT5G45890**	**senescence-associated gene 12**	**SAG12**
5	3708088	20.59	*AT5G11550*	*ARM repeat superfamily protein*	*AT5G11550*
5	4655788	20.59	*AT5G14430*	*S-adenosyl-L-methionine-dependent methyltransferases superfamily protein*	*AT5G14430*

704
705

Supporting information

The following supplemental materials are available:

Fig. S1. Rosette leaf area observations at the time of flowering (Table P1).

Fig. S2. Quantile-quantile (QQ) plots for GWAS analysis using the Linear Model.

Fig. S3. Quantile-quantile (QQ) plots for GWAS analysis using the Accelerated Mixed Model.

Fig. S4. Quantile-quantile (QQ) plots for GWAS analysis using GWAS-Flow.

Fig. S5. Histograms of the distribution of r_s and scores obtained from GWA and TWA analyses of

the traits discussed in this study illustrate the stringent significance thresholds imposed in this study

(vertical dashed lines).

Fig. S6. The plasticity index that we calculated is predictive of the percentage change in leaf area

under drought relative to well-watered conditions.

Fig. S7. The identification of our candidate genes upon application of several different GWAS

methods improves confidence in candidates for leaf area plasticity and intrinsic water use efficiency

(WUE$_i$).

Fig. S8. Genotypic and transcriptomic reaction norms based on the strength of association of

individual SNPs and transcripts highlight the variation in the strength of these associations depending

on water availability.

Fig. S9. The genetic and transcriptomic basis of the relationship between leaf area plasticity potential

in response to drought with (Figs S9A, B) leaf area potential and (Figs S9C, D) intrinsic water use

efficiency (WUE$_i$).

Fig. S10. Illustration of candidate transcript variants that regulate intrinsic water use efficiency in
Iberian Arabidopsis accessions.

Table P1. Leaf area measurements recorded in this experiment (well-watered and drought).
Calculated relative leaf area (rLA) and plasticity, water use efficiency (WUE$_i$, δ^{13}C) values recorded
by Dittberner *et al.* (2018) and MOD17A2 (net primary productivity) information obtained from
AraCLIM (Ferrero-Serrano & Assmann, 2019) for the accessions included in our study.

Table P2. Water use efficiency (WUE$_i$, δ^{13}C) values recorded by Dittberner *et al.* (2018) for 95
Iberian Arabidopsis accessions.

Table G1. Candidates obtained from GWAS on relative leaf area (rLA) under well-watered
conditions. Only associations with a score ≥ 4 are included here. For a raw, unfiltered, as well as for
a fully filtered and annotated (see Materials & Methods) version of this GWAS output, please visit
the data repository.

Table G2. Candidates obtained from GWAS on relative leaf area (rLA) under drought. Only
associations with a score ≥ 4 are included here. For a raw, unfiltered, as well as for a fully filtered
and annotated (see Materials & Methods) version of this GWAS output, please visit the data
repository.

Table G3. Candidates obtained from GWAS on leaf area plasticity. Only associations with a score $\geq$
4 are included here. For a raw, unfiltered, as well as for a fully filtered and annotated (see Materials
& Methods) version of this GWAS output, please visit the data repository.

Table G4. Candidates obtained from GWAS on water use efficiency (WUE$_i$, δ13C) values recorded
by Dittberner *et al.* (2018) for the accessions included in our study. Only associations with a score $\geq$
4 are included here. For a raw, unfiltered, as well as for a fully filtered and annotated (see Materials
& Methods) version of this GWAS output, please visit the data repository.

Table G5. Candidates obtained from GWAS on water use efficiency (WUE$_i$, δ13C) values recorded
by Dittberner *et al.* (2018) for 95 Iberian Arabidopsis accessions. Only associations with a score ≥ 4
are included here. For a raw, unfiltered, as well as for a fully filtered and annotated (see Materials &
Methods) version of this GWAS output, please visit the data repository.

Table G6. Candidates obtained from eGWAS on the natural variation in transcript abundance of
SAUR26 extracted from Kawakatsu *et al.* (2016). For a raw, unfiltered, as well as for a fully filtered
and annotated (see Materials & Methods) version of this GWAS output, please visit the data
repository.

Table T1. Results from TWAS (r_s).

Table T2. Results from TWAS (*P*-value).

Table GO1. GO analysis on the 31 genes corresponding to the top 50 candidate SNPs resulting from GWAS analysis on leaf area plasticity index for drought.

Table GO2. GO analysis on the 58 genes identified from TWAS to exhibit transcript abundances that are negatively correlated with leaf area plasticity index for drought, and negatively correlated with water use efficiency determined from (δ^{13}C) values from accessions overlapping with our sample (red datapoints in Fig. 5C).

Table GO3. GO analysis on the 45 genes identified from TWAS to exhibit transcript abundances that are positively correlated with water use efficiency determined from (δ^{13}C) values in 88 Iberian Arabidopsis accessions (datapoints with $r_s \geq 0.4$ in Fig. 6B).

Table GO4. GO analysis on the 494 genes identified from TWAS to exhibit transcript abundances that are positively correlated with leaf area plasticity index for drought (green and grey datapoints with $r_s \geq 0.4$ in the y-axis representing leaf area plasticity index in Fig. 5C).

Table GO5. GO analysis on the 28 genes identified from TWAS to exhibit transcript abundances that are negatively correlated with relative leaf area (rLA) under well-watered conditions, and positively correlated with leaf area plasticity index for drought (blue datapoints in S9B).

Table GO6. GO analysis on the 11 genes identified from TWAS to exhibit transcript abundances that are negatively correlated with water use efficiency determined from (δ^{13}C) values in 88 Iberian Arabidopsis accessions (datapoints with $r_s \leq -0.4$ in Figure 6B).

Table GO7. GO analysis on the 302 genes identified from TWAS to exhibit transcript abundances that are positively correlated with relative leaf area (rLA) under drought.

Table GO8. GO analysis on the 134 genes identified from TWAS to exhibit transcript abundances that are negatively correlated with relative leaf area (rLA) under well-watered conditions (blue and grey datapoints with $r_s \leq 0.4$ in the x-axis of Figure S9B).

Table GO9. GO analysis on the 177 genes identified from TWAS to exhibit transcript abundances that are positively correlated with relative leaf area (rLA) under well-watered conditions (yellow and grey datapoints with $r_s \geq 0.4$ in the x-axis of Figures S9B).

Table GO10. GO analysis on the 233 genes identified from TWAS that exhibit transcript abundances which are negatively correlated with relative leaf area (rLA) under drought.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by funding from The Pennsylvania State University to S.M.A. We thank Mr. Leland Burghard, Ms. Sarah Cronk, and Dr. Yotam Zait for greenhouse assistance. We thank Drs. David Chakravorty and Yotam Zait for helpful comments on the manuscript.

Author contributions

S.M.A & A.F-S. conceived the project, research plans, and experimental design. A.F-S. performed the experiments while S.M.A provided guidance throughout the experimental work. A.F-S. analyzed the data and prepared the figures; S.M.A supervised data analysis and figure preparation. S.M.A & A.F-S wrote the manuscript. A.F-S agrees to serve as the author responsible for contact and ensuring communication and assistance with the reproducibility of the results of this study.

Data Availability

The data supporting the results are available as Supporting Information files. The code and data to easily reproduce the analysis, figures, and tables in this manuscript are available at https://github.com/AssmannLab and will be uploaded to Zenodo upon acceptance.

References

Abudayyeh OO, Gootenberg JS, Essletzbichler P, Han S, Joung J, Belanto JJ, Verdine V, Cox DBT, Kellner MJ, Regev A, *et al*. 2017. RNA targeting with CRISPR-Cas13. Nature **550**, 280–284.

Angert AL, Huxman TE, Chesson P, Venable DL. 2009. Functional tradeoffs determine species coexistence via the storage effect. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, U.S.A. **106**, 11641–11645.

Billings WD, Mooney HA. 1968. The ecology of arctic and alpine plants. Biological Reviews **43**, 481–529

Bradshaw AD. 1965. Evolutionary significance of phenotypic plasticity in plants. Elsevier, pp 115–155.

Castilla AR, Méndez-Vigo B, Marcer A, Martínez-Minaya J, Conesa D, Picó FX, Alonso-Blanco

C. 2020. Ecological, genetic and evolutionary drivers of regional genetic differentiation in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. BMC Evolutionary Biology **20**, 1-13.

Chapin, FS. 1991. Integrated responses of plants to stress. Bioscience **41**, 29–36.

Cheng, CY, Krishnakumar, V, Chan, AP, Thibaud-Nissen, F, Schobel, S, & Town, CD. 2017. Araport11: a complete reannotation of the *Arabidopsis thaliana* reference genome. The Plant Journal **89**, 789-804.

Cheng X, Fang T, Zhao E, Zheng B, Huang B, An Y, Zhou P. 2020. Protective roles of salicylic acid in maintaining integrity and functions of photosynthetic photosystems for alfalfa (*Medicago sativa L.*) tolerance to aluminum toxicity. Plant Physiology and Biochemistry **155** 570-578.

Cingolani P, Platts A, Wang LL, Coon M, Nguyen T, Wang L, Land SJ, Lu X, Ruden DM. 2012. A program for annotating and predicting the effects of single nucleotide polymorphisms, SnpEff: SNPs in the genome of *Drosophila melanogaster* strain w1118; iso-2; iso-3. Fly (Austin) **6**, 80–92.

Coll JR, Aguilar E, Ashcroft L. 2016. Drought variability and change across the Iberian Peninsula. Theoretical and Applied Climatology **130**, 901-916.

Condon AG, Richards RA, Rebetzke GJ, Farquhar GD. 2002. Improving intrinsic water-use efficiency and crop yield. Crop Science **42**, 122–131.

DeFalco TA, Moeder W, Yoshioka K. 2016. Opening the gates: insights into cyclic nucleotide-gated channel-mediated signaling. Trends in Plant Science **21**, 903–906.

Des Marais DL, McKay JK, Richards JH, Sen S, Wayne T, Juenger TE. 2012. Physiological genomics of response to soil drying in diverse Arabidopsis accessions. Plant Cell **24**, 893–914.

Dhingra Y, Lahiri M, Bhandari N, Kaur I, Gupta S, Agarwal M, Katiyar-Agarwal S. 2023. Genome-wide identification, characterization, and expression analysis unveil the roles of pseudouridine synthase (PUS) family proteins in rice development and stress response. Physiology and Molecular Biology of Plants **29**, 1981-2004.

Dittberner H, Korte A, Mettler-Altmann T, Weber APM, Monroe G, de Meaux J. 2018. Natural variation in stomata size contributes to the local adaptation of water-use efficiency in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Molecular Ecology **27**, 4052–4065.

Donat MG, Lowry AL, Alexander LV, O'Gorman PA, Maher N. 2016. More extreme

precipitation in the world's dry and wet regions. Nature Climate Change **6**, 508–513.

Dorn LA, Pyle EH, Schmitt J. 2000. Plasticity to light cues and resources in *Arabidopsis thaliana*:
testing for adaptive value and costs. Evolution **54**, 1982–1994.

Easlon HM, Nemali KS, Richards JH, Hanson DT, Juenger TE, McKay JK. 2014. The
physiological basis for genetic variation in water use efficiency and carbon isotope
composition in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Photosynthesis Research **119**, 119–129.

Emenecker, R. J., & Strader, L. C. 2020. Auxin-abscisic acid interactions in plant growth and
development. Biomolecules **10**, 281.

Exposito-Alonso M, 500 Genomes Field Experiment Team, Burbano HA, Bossdorf O, Nielsen
R, Weigel D. 2019. Natural selection on the *Arabidopsis thaliana* genome in present and
future climates. *Nature* **573**, 126–129.

Exposito-Alonso M, Brennan AC, Alonso-Blanco C, Picó FX. 2018a. Spatio-temporal variation in
fitness responses to contrasting environments in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Evolution **72**, 1570-
1586.

Exposito-Alonso M, Vasseur F, Ding W, Wang G, Burbano HA, Weigel D. 2018b. Genomic basis
and evolutionary potential for extreme drought adaptation in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Nature
Ecology & Evolution **2**, 352–358.

Ferguson JN, Fernandes SB, Monier B, Miller ND, Allan D, Dmitrieva A, Schmuker P, Lozano
R, Valluru R, Buckler ES, et al. 2020. Machine learning enabled phenotyping for GWAS
and TWAS of WUE traits in 869 field-grown sorghum accessions. Plant Physiology
10.1093/plphys/kiab346.

Ferrero-Serrano Á, Assmann SM. 2019. Phenotypic and genome-wide association with the local
environment of Arabidopsis. Nature Ecology & Evolution **3**, 274–285.

Ferrero-Serrano Á, Assmann SM. 2016. The α-subunit of the rice heterotrimeric G protein, RGA1,
regulates drought tolerance during the vegetative phase in the dwarf rice mutant *d1*. Journal
of Experimental Botany **67**, 3433–3443.

Ferrero-Serrano Á, Cantos C, Assmann SM. 2019. The role of dwarfing traits in historical and
modern agriculture with a focus on rice. Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology, **11***,
p.a034645.

Ferrero-Serrano Á, Chakravorty D, Kirven KJ, Assmann SM. 2024. Oryza CLIMtools: A
genome–environment association resource reveals adaptive roles for heterotrimeric G

proteins in the regulation of rice agronomic traits. Plant Communications. 100813.

Ferrero-Serrano, Á, Chakravorty D. 2023. Plants and heterotrimeric G proteins: Expect the
unexpected. Molecular plant, *16*, 506-508.

Ferrero-Serrano Á, Sylvia MM, Forstmeier, PC, Olson, AJ, Ware, D, Bevilacqua, PC,
Assmann, SM. 2022. Experimental demonstration and pan-structurome prediction of
climate-associated riboSNitches in Arabidopsis. Genome biology, **23**, 101.

Ferrero-Serrano Á, Su Z, Assmann SM. 2018. Illuminating the role of the Gα heterotrimeric G
protein subunit, *RGA1*, in regulating photoprotection and photoavoidance in rice. Plant, Cell
& Environment **41**, 451–468.

Forsman A. 2015. Rethinking phenotypic plasticity and its consequences for individuals, populations
and species. Heredity **115**, 276–284.

Frachon L, Bartoli C, Carrère S, Bouchez O, Chaubet A, Gautier M, Roby D, Roux F. 2018. A
genomic map of climate adaptation in *Arabidopsis thaliana* at a micro-geographic scale.
Frontiers in Plant Sciences **9**, 967.

Frachon L, Mayjonade B, Bartoli C, Hautekèete N-C, Roux F. 2019. Adaptation to plant
communities across the genome of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Molecular Biology & Evolution **36**,
1442–1456.

Freudenthal, JA, Ankenbrand, MJ, Grimm, DG, & Korte, A. 2019. GWAS-Flow: A GPU
accelerated framework for efficient permutation based genome-wide association studies.
BioRxiv. doi: 10.1101/783100.

Ge SX, Jung D, Yao R. 2020. ShinyGO: a graphical gene-set enrichment tool for animals and plants.
Bioinformatics **36**, 2628–2629.

Gomaa NH, Montesinos-Navarro A, Alonso-Blanco C, Picó FX. 2011. Temporal variation in
genetic diversity and effective population size of Mediterranean and subalpine *Arabidopsis*
thaliana populations. Molecular Ecology **20**, 3540–3554.

Grime, JP. 1974. Vegetation classification by reference to strategies. Nature **250**, 26–31.
905

906 **Grime JP.** 1977. Evidence for the existence of three primary strategies in plants and its relevance to
907   ecological and evolutionary theory. The American Naturalist **111**, 1169–1194.

908 **Groszmann M, Osborn HL, Evans JR.** 2017. Carbon dioxide and water transport through plant
909   aquaporins. Plant, Cell & Environment **40**, 938–961.

910 **Gusev A, Ko A, Shi H, Bhatia G, Chung W, Penninx BWJH, Jansen R, de Geus EJC, Boomsma**

DI, **Wright FA, *et al*.** 2016. Integrative approaches for large-scale transcriptome-wide association studies. Nature Genetics **48**, 245–252.

Haldrup A, Naver H, Scheller HV. 1999. The interaction between plastocyanin and photosystem I is inefficient in transgenic Arabidopsis plants lacking the *PSI-N* subunit of photosystem I. The Plant Journal **17**, 689–698.

Harrell Jr F, Dupont C. 2019. Package 'Hmisc'. CRAN2018 2019: 235–6.

Heinsch FA, Reeves M, Votava P, Kang S, Milesi C, Zhao M, Glassy J, Jolly WM, Loehman R, Bowker CF, *et al*. 2003. Gpp and npp (mod17a2/a3) products nasa modis land algorithm. MOD17 User's Guide 1–57.

Hou, B, Lim, EK, Higgins, GS, Bowles, DJ. 2004. N-glucosylation of cytokinins by glycosyltransferases of Arabidopsis thaliana. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, *279*, 47822-47832.

Huang, L, He, B, Chen, A, Wang, H, Liu, J, Lű, A, & Chen, Z. 2016. Drought dominates the interannual variability in global terrestrial net primary production by controlling semi-arid ecosystems. Scientific reports *6*, 1-7.

Ifuku K, Endo T, Shikanai T, Aro E-M. 2011. Structure of the chloroplast NADH dehydrogenase-like complex: nomenclature for nuclear-encoded subunits. Plant & Cell Physiology **52**, 1560–1568.

IRRI. 2021. Phenotyping protocols for abiotic stress tolerance in rice. International Rice Research Institute, Los Baños, Phillipines.

Juenger TE, McKay JK, Simms EI, Richards JH. 2005. Identification and characterization of QTL underlying whole-plant physiology in *Arabidopsis thaliana*: δ^{13}C, stomatal conductance and transpiration efficiency. Plant, Cell & Environment **28**, 697–708.

Karijolich, J., Yi, C., & Yu, Y. T. 2015. Transcriptome-wide dynamics of RNA pseudouridylation. Nature reviews Molecular cell biology, **16**, 581-585.

Kasuga M, Liu Q, Miura S, Yamaguchi-Shinozaki K, Shinozaki K. 1999. Improving plant drought, salt, and freezing tolerance by gene transfer of a single stress-inducible transcription factor. Nature Biotechnology **17**, 287–291.

Kawakatsu T, Huang S-SC, Jupe F, Sasaki E, Schmitz RJ, Urich MA, Castanon R, Nery JR, Barragan C, He Y, *et al*. 2016. Epigenomic diversity in a global collection of *Arabidopsis thaliana* accessions. Cell **166**: 492–505.

Kim J, Rudella A, Ramirez Rodriguez V, Zybailov B, Olinares PDB, van Wijk KJ. 2009. Subunits of the plastid ClpPR protease complex have differential contributions to embryogenesis, plastid biogenesis, and plant development in Arabidopsis. The Plant Cell **21**, 1669–1692.

Kimball S, Gremer JR, Angert AL, Huxman TE, Venable DL. 2012. Fitness and physiology in a variable environment. Oecologia *169,* 319–329.

Van Kleunen M, Fischer M. 2005. Constraints on the evolution of adaptive phenotypic plasticity in plants. New Phytologist **166**, 49–60.

Köhler C, Merkle T, Neuhaus G. 1999. Characterisation of a novel gene family of putative cyclic nucleotide- and calmodulin-regulated ion channels in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. The Plant Journal **18**, 97–104.

Korte A, Farlow A. 2013. The advantages and limitations of trait analysis with GWAS: a review. Plant Methods **9**, 29.

Kramer, MC, Janssen, KA, Palos, K, Nelson AD, Vandivier LE, Garcia BA, ..., Gregory BD. 2020. N6-methyladenosine and RNA secondary structure affect transcript stability and protein abundance during systemic salt stress in Arabidopsis. e00239

Kremling KAG, Diepenbrock CH, Gore MA, Buckler ES, Bandillo NB. 2019. Transcriptome-wide association supplements genome-wide association in *Zea mays*. G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics **9**, 3023–3033.

Lasky JR, Des Marais DL, Lowry DB, Povolotskaya I, McKay JK, Richards JH, Keitt TH, Juenger TE. 2014. Natural variation in abiotic stress responsive gene expression and local adaptation to climate in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Molecular Biology and Evolution **31**, 2283–2296.

Lermontova, I, Schubert, V, Börnke, F, Macas, J, & Schubert, I. 2007. Arabidopsis CBF5 interacts with the H/ACA snoRNP assembly factor NAF1. Plant molecular biology *65*, 615-626.

Leyser HM, Pickett FB, Dharmasiri S, Estelle M. 1996. Mutations in the *AXR3* gene of Arabidopsis result in altered auxin response including ectopic expression from the *SAUR-AC1* promoter. The Plant Journal **10**, 403–413.

Li Z-G, Chen H-W, Li Q-T, Tao J-J, Bian X-H, Ma B, Zhang W-K, Chen S-Y, Zhang J-S. 2015. Three SAUR proteins *SAUR76*, *SAUR77* and *SAUR78* promote plant growth in Arabidopsis.

Scientific Reports **5**, 12477.

Li D, Liu Q, & Schnable, PS. 2021. TWAS results are complementary to and less affected by
linkage disequilibrium than GWAS. Plant Physiology **186**, 1800-1811.

Liu J, Zhang Y, Qin G, Tsuge T, Sakaguchi N, Luo G, Sun K, Shi D, Aki S, Zheng N, Aoyama
T. 2008. Targeted degradation of the cyclin-dependent kinase inhibitor ICK4/KRP6 by
RING-type E3 ligases is essential for mitotic cell cycle progression during Arabidopsis
gametogenesis. *The Plant Cell*, *20*,1538-1554.

Livingston AK, Cruz JA, Kohzuma K, Dhingra A, Kramer DM. 2010. An Arabidopsis mutant
with high cyclic electron flow around photosystem I (*hcef*) involving the NADPH
dehydrogenase complex. Plant Cell **22**, 221–233.

Lobo JM, Castro I, Moreno JC. 2001. Spatial and environmental determinants of vascular plant
species richness distribution in the Iberian Peninsula and Balearic Islands. Biological Journal
of the Linnean Society **73**, 233–253.

Maiwald D, Dietzmann A, Jahns P, Pesaresi P, Joliot P, Joliot A, Levin JZ, Salamini F, Leister
D. 2003. Knock-out of the genes coding for the Rieske protein and the ATP-synthase delta-
subunit of Arabidopsis. Effects on photosynthesis, thylakoid protein composition, and nuclear
chloroplast gene expression. Plant Physiology **133**, 191–202.

Manzano-Piedras E, Marcer A, Alonso-Blanco C, Picó FX. 2014. Deciphering the adjustment
between environment and life history in annuals: lessons from a geographically-explicit
approach in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. PLoS One 9, e87836.

Marcer A, Vidigal DS, James PMA, Fortin MJ, Méndez-Vigo B, Hilhorst HWM, Bentsink L,
Alonso-Blanco C, Picó FX. 2018. Temperature fine-tunes Mediterranean *Arabidopsis*
thaliana life-cycle phenology geographically. Plant Biology **20**, 148–156.

Méndez-Vigo B, Picó FX, Ramiro M, Martínez-Zapater JM, Alonso-Blanco C. 2011. Altitudinal
and climatic adaptation is mediated by flowering traits and FRI, FLC, and PHYC genes in
Arabidopsis. Plant Physiology **157**, 1942–1955.

Montesinos A, Tonsor SJ, Alonso-Blanco C, Picó FX. 2009. Demographic and genetic patterns of
variation among populations of *Arabidopsis thaliana* from contrasting native environments.
PLoS One 4, e7213.

Montesinos-Navarro A, Wig J, Pico FX, Tonsor SJ. 2011. *Arabidopsis thaliana* populations show
clinal variation in a climatic gradient associated with altitude. New Phytologist **189**, 282–294.

Murakami R, Ifuku K, Takabayashi A, Shikanai T, Endo T, Sato F. 2005. Functional dissection of two Arabidopsis PsbO proteins: *PsbO1* and *PsbO2*. The FEBS Journal **272**, 2165–2175.

Nagatoshi Y, Ikeda M, Kishi H, Hiratsu K, Muraguchi A, Ohme-Takagi M. 2016. Induction of a dwarf phenotype with IBH1 may enable increased production of plant-made pharmaceuticals in plant factory conditions. Plant Biotechnology Journal **14**, 887–894.

Nilson, S. E., & Assmann, S. M. 2010. Heterotrimeric G proteins regulate reproductive trait plasticity in response to water availability. New Phytologist **185***, 734-746.

Nishimura K, van Wijk KJ. 2015. Organization, function and substrates of the essential Clp protease system in plastids. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta* **1847**, 915–930.

Oh E, Zhu J-Y, Bai M-Y, Arenhart RA, Sun Y, Wang Z-Y. 2014. Cell elongation is regulated through a central circuit of interacting transcription factors in the Arabidopsis hypocotyl. Elife. doi: 10.7554/eLife.03031.

Ohashi-Ito K, Matsukawa M, Fukuda H. 2013. An atypical bHLH transcription factor regulates early xylem development downstream of auxin. Plant Cell Physiol **54**, 398–405.

Park SY, Scranton MA, Stajich JE, Yee A, Walling LL. 2017. Chlorophyte aspartyl aminopeptidases: ancient origins, expanded families, new locations, and secondary functions. Plos one *12*, p.e0185492.

Parsons RF. 1968. The significance of growth-rate comparisons for plant ecology. The American Naturalist **102**, 595–597.

Páscoa P, Gouveia CM, Russo A, Trigo RM. 2017. Drought Trends in the Iberian Peninsula over the Last 112 Years. Advances in Meteorology **2017**, 1–13.

Picó FX. 2012. Demographic fate of *Arabidopsis thaliana* cohorts of autumn- and spring-germinated plants along an altitudinal gradient. Journal of Ecology **100**, 1009–1018.

Picó FX, Méndez-Vigo B, Martínez-Zapater JM, Alonso-Blanco C. 2008. Natural genetic variation of *Arabidopsis thaliana* is geographically structured in the Iberian peninsula. Genetics **180**, 1009–1021.

Price AL, Zaitlen NA, Reich D, Patterson N. 2010. New approaches to population stratification in genome-wide association studies. Nature Reviews Genetics **11**, 459–463.

Rey Benayas JM, Scheiner SM. 2002. Plant diversity, biogeography and environment in Iberia: Patterns and possible causal factors. Journal of Vegetation Science **13**, 245.

Rivero RM, Kojima M, Gepstein A, Sakakibara H, Mittler R, Gepstein S, Blumwald E. 2007.

Delayed leaf senescence induces extreme drought tolerance in a flowering plant. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **104**,19631-19636.

Running SW, Zhao M. 2015. Daily GPP and annual NPP . MOD17A2/A3. products NASA Earth Observing System MODIS land algorithm. MOD17 User's Guide 2015, 1–28.

Salehin M, Li B, Tang M, Katz E, Song L, Ecker JR, Kliebenstein DJ, Estelle M. 2019. Auxin-sensitive Aux/IAA proteins mediate drought tolerance in Arabidopsis by regulating glucosinolate levels. Nature Communications **10**, 4021.

Schindele A, Dorn A, Puchta H. 2020. CRISPR/Cas brings plant biology and breeding into the fast lane. Current Opinion in Biotechnology **61**, 7–14.

Schweizer F, Fernández-Calvo P, Zander M, Diez-Diaz M, Fonseca S, Glauser G, Lewsey MG, Ecker JR, Solano R, Reymond P. 2013. Arabidopsis basic helix-loop-helix transcription factors MYC2, MYC3, and MYC4 regulate glucosinolate biosynthesis, insect performance, and feeding behavior. Plant Cell **25**, 3117–3132.

Seren Ü, Vilhjálmsson BJ, Horton MW, Meng D, Forai P, Huang YS, Long Q, Segura V, Nordborg M. 2012. GWAPP: a web application for genome-wide association mapping in Arabidopsis. Plant Cell **24**, 4793–4805.

Siepielski AM, Morrissey MB, Buoro M, Carlson SM, Caruso CM, Clegg SM, Coulson T, DiBattista J, Gotanda KM, Francis CD, *et al*. 2017. Precipitation drives global variation in natural selection. Science **355**, 959–962.

Spartz AK, Ren H, Park MY, Grandt KN, Lee SH, Murphy AS, Sussman MR, Overvoorde PJ, Gray WM. 2014. SAUR inhibition of PP2C-D Phosphatases activates plasma membrane H^+-ATPases to promote cell expansion in Arabidopsis. Plant Cell **26**, 2129–2142

Stortenbeker N, Bemer M. 2019. The SAUR gene family: the plant's toolbox for adaptation of growth and development. Journal of Experimental Botany **70**, 17–27.

Tabas-Madrid D, Méndez-Vigo B, Arteaga N, Marcer A, Pascual-Montano A, Weigel D, Xavier Picó F, Alonso-Blanco C. 2018. Genome-wide signatures of flowering adaptation to climate temperature: regional analyses in a highly diverse native range of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Plant, Cell & Environment **41**, 1806–1820.

Tang, Y., Gao, C. C., Gao, Y., Yang, Y., Shi, B., Yu, J. L., ... & Chong, K. 2020. OsNSUN2-mediated 5-methylcytosine mRNA modification enhances rice adaptation to high temperature. Developmental cell **53**, 272-286.

Team RC. 2013. R: A language and environment for statistical computing.

The 1001 Genomes Consortium 2016. 1,135 Genomes reveal the global pattern of polymorphism
in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Cell **166**, 481–491.

Tilman D. 1988. Plant strategies and the dynamics and structure of plant communities. Princeton
University Press.

Tunc-Ozdemir M, Tang C, Ishka MR, Brown E, Groves NR, Myers CT, Rato C, Poulsen LR,
McDowell S, Miller G, *et al.* 2013. A cyclic nucleotide-gated channel (CNGC16) in pollen
is critical for stress tolerance in pollen reproductive development. Plant Physiology **161**,
1010–1020.

Via S, Gomulkiewicz R, De Jong G, Scheiner SM, Schlichting CD, Van Tienderen PH. 1995.
Adaptive phenotypic plasticity: consensus and controversy. Trends in Ecology & Evolution.
10, 212–217.

Vicente-Serrano SM. 2006a. Spatial and temporal analysis of droughts in the Iberian Peninsula.
1910–2000. Hydrological Sciences Journal **51**, 83–97

Vicente-Serrano SM. 2006b. Differences in spatial patterns of drought on different time scales: an
analysis of the iberian peninsula. Water Resources Management **20**, 37–60.

Vidigal DS, Marques ACSS, Willems LAJ, Buijs G, Méndez-Vigo B, Hilhorst HWM, Bentsink
L, Picó FX, Alonso-Blanco C. 2016. Altitudinal and climatic associations of seed dormancy
and flowering traits evidence adaptation of annual life cycle timing in *Arabidopsis thaliana*.
Plant, Cell & Environment **39**, 1737–1748.

Wang Y-F, Munemasa S, Nishimura N, Ren H-M, Robert N, Han M, Puzõrjova I, Kollist H,
Lee S, Mori I, *et al.* 2013. Identification of cyclic GMP-activated nonselective Ca2+-
permeable cation channels and associated *CNGC5* and *CNGC6* genes in Arabidopsis guard
cells. Plant Physiology **163**, 578–590.

Wang Z, Yang L, Liu Z, Lu M, Wang M, Sun Q, Lan Y, Shi T, Wu D, Hua J. 2019. Natural
variations of growth thermo-responsiveness determined by SAUR26/27/28 proteins in
Arabidopsis thaliana. New Phytologist **224**, 291–305.

Wang Z, Yang L, Wu D, Zhang N, Hua J. 2021. Polymorphisms in cis-elements confer SAUR26
gene expression difference for thermo-response natural variation in Arabidopsis. New
Phytologist **229**, 2751–2764.

Weijschedé, J, Martínková, J, De Kroon, H, & Huber, H. 2006. Shade avoidance in *Trifolium*
repens: costs and benefits of plasticity in petiole length and leaf size. New Phytologist *172,*
655-666.

West-Eberhard MJ. 2003. Developmental plasticity and evolution. Oxford University Press

Wickham H, Francois R, Henry L, Müller K. 2015. dplyr: A grammar of data manipulation. R
package version 0.4 3.

Wickham H, Henry L. 2018. tidyr: Easily Tidy Data with 'spread 'and 'gather'Functions. R package
version 0.8 2.

Wolfe MD, Tonsor SJ. 2014. Adaptation to spring heat and drought in northeastern Spanish
Arabidopsis thaliana. New Phytologist **201**, 323–334.

Wong JH, Klejchová M, Snipes SA, Nagpal P, Bak G, Wang B, ..., Gray WM. 2021. SAUR
proteins and PP2C. D phosphatases regulate H^+-ATPases and K+ channels to control
stomatal movements. Plant Physiology **185**, 256-273.

Yamori W, Sakata N, Suzuki Y, Shikanai T, Makino A. 2011. Cyclic electron flow around
photosystem I via chloroplast NAD. P.H dehydrogenase. NDH. complex performs a
significant physiological role during photosynthesis and plant growth at low temperature in
rice. Plant Journal **68**, 966–976.

Zait Y, Ferrero-Serrano Á & Assmann, SM. 2021. The α subunit of the heterotrimeric G protein
regulates mesophyll CO_2 conductance and drought tolerance in rice. New Phytologist, **232**,
2324-2338.

Zhang, J, Vankova, R, Malbeck, J, Dobrev, PI, Xu, Y, Chong, K, Neff, MM. 2009. *AtSOFL1* and
AtSOFL2 act redundantly as positive modulators of the endogenous content of specific
cytokinins in Arabidopsis. *PLoS One*, *4*, p.e8236.

Zhang H, Zhao Y, Zhu J-K. 2020. Thriving under stress: how plants balance growth and the stress
response. Developmental Cell **55**, 529–543.

Zhao Z, Zhang W, Stanley BA, Assmann SM. 2008. Functional proteomics of *Arabidopsis thaliana*
guard cells uncovers new stomatal signaling pathways. The Plant Cell, **20**, 3210-26.

Zheng Q, Zheng Y, Ji H, Burnie W, Perry SE. 2016. Gene regulation by the *AGL15* transcription
factor reveals hormone interactions in somatic embryogenesis. Plant Physiology **172**, 2374–
2387.

1126

Fig 1. Conceptual framework for the adaptive role of plastic and homeostatic responses across productivity gradients in the local environment. (A) Schematic illustration representing the balance *sensu* Grime (1974, 1977), between stress tolerance in lower productivity, stress-prone environments, and competitive ability in and homeostasis in plants. In less productive environments, homeostatic responses to stress and lower relative growth rates result in lower biomass production, which is tuned in to the lower resources that are typically available in their environment and favors adaptation to those environments. In contrast, in productive environments, in which competition becomes more intense, plastic responses are favored from an adaptive standpoint. (B). In unproductive environments, frequent stress events can increase the allostatic load in individuals adapted to high-productivity environments where plastic responses are beneficial. During the lifetime of an individual, this results in a maladaptive response that increases allostatic load. In contrast, individuals adapted to unproductive environments exhibit less plastic (more homeostatic) responses to repeated stress that reduces their allostatic load over their lifetime.

Fig. 2. Accession-specific rosette leaf area responses in Arabidopsis. (A) Detail of the common garden experiment, illustrating the randomization of well-watered and drought treatments, as reflected in soil coloration. (B) Phenotypic reaction norms illustrating a reduction of leaf area in response to drought in most but not all accessions. Violin distributions represent probability densities of leaf area (cm²) among the accessions included in this study. Datapoints depict the mean phenotypic values of individual accessions, and the reaction norms represent the plastic response in the leaf area of each accession in response to drought (t-test; P-value < 0.001). (C) Phenotypic reaction norms illustrating plastic and homeostatic responses in relative leaf area (rLA). Violin distributions represent probability densities of rLA among the accessions included in this study. Datapoints depict the rLA of individual accessions, and the reaction norms represent the plastic response in rLA of each accession in response to drought (t-test; P-value > 0.05). (D) Negative relationship (P-value < 0.05) between leaf area plasticity index (slope of the reaction norms in 2C) in response to drought (y-axis) and rLA under well-watered conditions (x-axis). Data were fitted using a linear regression model. Grey shadow represents the 95% CI of the fit regression line. Four different quadrants are defined by two dashed lines: the average rLA (x-axis), and y = 0, which is the homeostatic point at which a change in water availability does not affect rLA (i.e. a plasticity index of 0). Data points depict individual accessions with their respective label. Data points are colored based on in which quadrant they fall (see text). (E) Images illustrating the plastic and homeostatic responses to drought found among the accessions included in this study.

Fig. 3. *SMALL AUXIN UP RNA 26* (*SAUR26,* AT3G03850) is a candidate regulator of Arabidopsis leaf area plasticity in response to drought. (A) Accessions from more productive areas display stronger negative reductions in leaf area plasticity relative to accessions from less productive environments. Scatter plot depicting the negative relationship (*P*-value < 0.05) between leaf area plasticity index (y-axis) and Net Primary Productivity during the spring season (x-axis). (B) Manhattan plot representing the strength of association between genetic variants and leaf area plasticity in response to drought. (C) *SAUR26* gene model, including the two co-varying SNPs highlighted in 2B. Orange block depicts the sole exon, green block the 5' UTR, dark green block the 3' UTR. Labels above indicate the position of the two SNPs that co-vary, forming a haplotype in our sample. Major/minor allele frequency in our sample, in the 189 accessions from the Iberian Peninsula included in the 1001 Genome Project, and the whole 1001 Genomes Project sample dataset is provided. (D) Manhattan plot representing the genome-wide strength of association between the genetic variation present within the 665 accessions from the transcript abundance reference panel (Kawakatsu *et al.*, 2016) that overlap with the collection of accessions included in the 1001 Genomes Project, and the variation in the transcript abundance of *SAUR26* (Kawakatsu *et al.*, 2016). The peak in chromosome 3 represents the cis-genetic variants in *SAUR26* affecting its transcript abundance. For the Manhattan plots in 3B and D, the score (y-axis) consists of the negative logarithm of the *P*-value and provides association strength. Each data point represents a SNP with a color corresponding to the chromosome where the genetic variants are located. The x-axis and the different colors shown in the SNPs depicted in the Manhattan plots represent the different chromosomes. The higher the score, the lower the *P*-value, and the stronger the association between genetic variation and leaf area plasticity or *SAUR26* transcript abundance. (E) In the Iberian population, the major haplotype of *SAUR26* is associated with homeostatic or positive responses of relative leaf area (rLA) in response to drought. Conversely, the minor haplotype in the Iberian population is associated with plastic responses in rLA in response to drought. Violin plots show significantly different probability densities of leaf area plasticity in response to drought for the major and minor allele haplotypes in *SAUR26*. (F) The haplotypes in *SAUR26* associated with leaf area plasticity/homeostasis in response to drought are associated with differences in *SAUR26* gene expression. Violin plots show significantly different probability densities of *SAUR26* transcript abundance for the major and minor allele haplotypes in *SAUR26* for both our sample and the entire Iberian population. (G) Scatter plot illustrating the positive relationship between leaf area plasticity index (y-axis) and *SAUR26* transcript abundance (x-axis). For 2A and 2G, the grey shadow represents the 95% CI of the fit regression line (dark grey). (H) Cartoon illustrating the regulatory role of genetic and transcript variation in *SAUR26* and the response of leaf area to drought.

Fig. 4. Transcriptomic reaction norms uncover genetic correlates of Arabidopsis leaf area homeostasis in response to drought. (A) homeostatic reaction norms for transcripts significantly and positively correlated with relative leaf area (rLA) under both watering regimes. (B) to (E). Scatter plots illustrating positive and homeostatic relationships (*P*-value < 0.05) between rLA under both well-watered (closed circles) and drought conditions (open circles) conditions (y-axis), and transcript abundance (FPKM; x-axis) of (B) AT5G39471, (C) *SOB FIVE-LIKE 2* (*SOFL2; AT1G68870*)**,** (D) *CHAPERONIN 60 BETA* (*CPN60B; AT1G55490*), and (E) *CASEIN KINASE I-LIKE 8* (*CKL8; AT5G43320*). (F) homeostatic reaction norms for transcripts significantly and negatively correlated with rLA under both watering regimes. (G) to (J) Scatter plots illustrating negative and homeostatic relationships (*P*-value < 0.05) between rLA under both well-watered (closed circles) and drought conditions (open circles) (y-axis), and transcript abundance (FPKM; x-axis) of (G) AT5G60160, (H) *AT4G15260***,** (I) *AT5G16800*, and (J) *RING-H2 GROUP F1A* (*RHF1A; AT4G14220*). For 3a and 3f, Spearman's rank correlation coefficient ($r_{s;}$ y-axis) indicates the correlation between the rLA and the natural variation in transcript abundance of each gene. In Figs B to E and G to J, data were fitted using a linear regression model. Also, in panels b-e and g-j, filled circles depict the rLA of accessions grown under well-watered conditions, while empty circles squares depict the rLA of accessions grown under drought.

Fig. 5. Arabidopsis accessions that display leaf area homeostasis in response to drought, display higher water use efficiency as defined by $\delta^{13}C$. **(A)** Scatter plot illustrating the positive relationship (*P*-value < 0.05) between leaf area homeostasis in response to drought (leaf area plasticity index, y-axis) and water use efficiency (x-axis) among Iberian Arabidopsis accessions used in this study. Data were fitted to a linear regression model. Grey shadow represents the 95% CI of the fit regression line (black). $\delta^{13}C$ data for the accessions were retrieved from Dittberner *et al.* (2018). Four different quadrants are defined by two dashed lines: y = 0, which is the homeostatic point at which a change in water availability does not affect relative leaf area (i.e., a plasticity index of 0), and the average intrinsic water use efficiency (WUE$_i$, $\delta^{13}C$; x-axis). Data points depict individual accessions with their respective labels. **(B)** The genetic basis of leaf area plasticity in response to drought and water use efficiency. This plot depicts the respective relationship between the GWAS associations found for the leaf area plasticity index in response to drought (y-axis) and those for WUE$_i$ (Dittberner *et al.*, 2018) (x-axis). Data points represent individual SNPs. The y-axis and x-axis depict the extent of the association with, respectively, leaf area plasticity, and WUE$_i$, as the negative logarithm of the p-value. Dashed lines depict an arbitrary threshold for significance that is consistent across comparisons. (C) Transcriptomic association with plastic leaf area responses to drought and WUE$_i$. Spearman's rank correlation depicts the relationship between the association of the transcript abundance of each gene in the Arabidopsis genome with leaf area plasticity in response to drought (r$_s$) on the y-axis and with WUE$_i$ on the x-axis. Dashed lines define an arbitrary threshold to consider transcripts correlated positively (r$_s \geq 0.4$) or negatively (r$_s \leq -0.4$) associated with leaf area plasticity (y-axis) or WUE$_i$ (x-axis). *CBF5* and *CNGC16* exemplify transcripts with opposing relationships to leaf area plasticity and water use efficiency as shown in 4C, D and E. Scatter plots depicting the relationship (P-value < 0.05) between leaf area plasticity index in response to drought (4D), or water use efficiency (4E) on the y-axis, and transcript abundance (FPKM) of *CBF5* on the x-axis. F and G. Scatter plots depicting the relationship (*P*-value < 0.05) between (4F) leaf area plasticity index in response to drought or (4G) water use efficiency (Dittberner *et al.*, 2018) on the y-axis, and transcript abundance (FPKM) of *CYCLIC NUCLEOTIDE-GATED CHANNEL 16* (*CNGC16*) on the x-axis. In all panels, data were fitted using a linear regression model. Grey shadow represents the 95% CI of the fit regression line.

Fig. 6. Photosynthesis-related transcript variants regulate water use efficiency in Iberian Arabidopsis accessions. (A) Manhattan plot representing the genome-wide strength of association between genetic variation and variation in δ13C present within 95 Iberian accessions with δ13C values available from Dittberner *et al.* (2018). The score (y-axis) consists of the negative logarithm of the *P*-value and provides association strength. Inset: Violin plots representing the probability densities of WUEi for the major and minor allele haplotypes in *ClpX* for the accessions included in Fig. 6A. (B) T-Manhattan plot representing transcriptome-wide strength of association between variation in transcript abundance (Kawakatsu *et al.*, 2016) and natural variation in δ13C. This analysis was performed on all Iberian accessions with both transcript abundance data (Kawakatsu *et al.*, 2016) and δ13C information (Dittberner *et al.*, 2018) (n = 88 accessions). The relationship is defined by the Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (rs). Dashed lines define an arbitrary threshold for positive (rs ≥ 0.4) or negative (rs ≤ -0.4) correlation with water-use efficiency (y-axis). Blue labels highlight the transcripts positively associated with higher WUEi, while red labels highlight those negatively associated with higher WUEi. (C) Hierarchical clustering tree summarizing the correlation among significant GO Biological Process categories resulting from analysis of the positively correlated candidates resulting from TWA analysis of water use efficiency determined from δ13C values in 88 Iberian Arabidopsis accessions. Ratios provide the number of genes positively correlated with WUEi within each GO category relative to the total number of genes within that category. The size of the blue dots increases proportionally with P-value significance. (D) Scatter plot depicting the positive relationship (*P*-value < 0.05) between WUEi (y-axis) and *RuBisCO SMALL SUBUNIT 2B* (*AT5G38420*; *RBCS2B*) transcript abundance (x-axis) for the Iberian accessions included in Fig. 6B. (E) Scatter plot depicting the positive relationship (*P*-value < 0.05) between intrinsic water-use efficiency (WUEi; y-axis) and *SMALL AUXIN UP RNA 26* (*SAUR26,* AT3G03850) transcript abundance (x-axis) for the Iberian accessions included in 6b. Inset: Scatter plot depicting the positive relationship (*P*-value < 0.05) between intrinsic water-use efficiency (WUEi; y-axis) and *SMALL AUXIN UP RNA 26* (*SAUR26,* AT3G03850) transcript abundance (x-axis) for the 43 accessions included in our study. For 5D, and 5E, gray shadow represents the 95% CI of the fit regression line (black).