Title: Gene co-expression reveals the modularity and integration of C_4 and CAM in *Portulaca*

Ian S. Gilman[1], Jose J. Moreno-Villena[1], Zachary R. Lewis[1,2], Eric W. Goolsby[3], and Erika J. Edwards[*,1]

[1] Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA; [2] Present

address: Nanostring Technologies, Seattle, WA, USA; [3] Department of Biology, University of Central

Florida, Orlando, FL, USA

Corresponding authors: Ian S. Gilman (ian.gilman@yale.edu), Erika J. Edwards

(erika.edwards@yale.edu)

Abstract

11
C_4 and Crassulacean acid metabolism (CAM) have been considered as largely independent photosynthetic
adaptations in spite of sharing key biochemical modules. *Portulaca* is a geographically widespread clade
of over 100 annual and perennial angiosperm species that primarily use C_4 photosynthesis, but
facultatively exhibit CAM when drought stressed, a photosynthetic system known as C_4+CAM. It has
been hypothesized that C_4+CAM is rare because of pleiotropic constraints, but these have not been deeply
explored. We generated a chromosome-level genome assembly of *P. amilis* and sampled mRNA from *P.
amilis* and *P. oleracea* during CAM induction. Gene co-expression network analyses identified C_4 and
CAM gene modules shared and unique to both *Portulaca* species. A conserved CAM module linked
phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase (PEPC) to starch turnover during the day-night transition and was
enriched in circadian clock regulatory motifs in the *P. amilis* genome. Preservation of this co-expression
module regardless of water status suggests that *Portulaca* constitutively operate a weak CAM cycle that is
transcriptionally and post-transcriptionally upregulated during drought. C_4 and CAM mostly used
mutually exclusive paralogs for primary carbon fixation and, although it is likely that nocturnal CAM
malate stores are shuttled into diurnal C_4 decarboxylation pathways, we find some evidence that
metabolite cycling may occur at low levels. C_4 likely evolved in *Portulaca* through co-option of
redundant paralogs and integration of the diurnal portion of CAM. Thus, the ancestral CAM system did
not strongly constrain C_4 evolution because photosynthetic gene networks are not co-regulated for both
daytime and nighttime functions.

Introduction

Modularity and evolvability have become central research areas in biology over the past three decades (Wagner and Altenberg 1996; Clune et al. 2013). Modularization generates simple building blocks that facilitate rapid and complex adaptations through the combination of smaller functions and the ability of simpler units to explore mutational space with minimal pleiotropic effects (Wagner and Altenberg 1996; Lenski et al. 2003; Kashtan et al. 2005, 2007; Clune et al. 2013). Earlier literature on modularity focused on genetic algorithms or digital organisms (Lenski et al. 2003; Kastan et al. 2005, 2007) and animal morphological development (e.g., Davidson and Erwin 2006), but modern -omics strategies have enabled detailed resolution of gene regulation in diverse study systems. Modeling results have shown that carbon metabolic networks have high potential for exaptation into evolutionary innovations in bacteria (Barve and Wagner 2013); and empirical research has identified deeply conserved carbon metabolic modules from anaplerotic pathways that have been repeatedly recruited into plant photosynthetic adaptations known as carbon concentrating mechanisms (CCMs) (Heyduk et al. 2019). CCMs provide classic examples of rapid, adaptive evolution through the exaptation of existing metabolic modules that are subsequently refined for new functions.

Since the early Oligocene, CCMs—typically taking the form of C_4 photosynthesis or Crassulacean acid metabolism (CAM)—have evolved many dozens, if not hundreds, of times independently (Keeley and Rundel 2003; Edwards et al. 2010; Christin et al. 2011; Sage 2016; Edwards 2019). Certain facets of CCMs, such as the main biochemical pathways, are evolutionarily accessible to all green plant lineages because they belong to deeply conserved photosynthetic and respiratory gene networks (Bräutigam et al. 2017; Heyduk et al. 2019). It is thought that by coupling these gene networks to light responses (C_4) (Hibberd and Covshoff 2010) and circadian oscillators (CAM) (Hartwell 2006), CCMs create two-stage carbon fixation pathways that address the most fundamental ecophysiological tradeoff in land plants: balancing CO_2 influx with water loss to transpiration.

Most plants assimilate carbon using C_3 photosynthesis, in which CO_2 is directly fixed by the enzyme RuBisCO during the day in mesophyll cells, and transformed into glucose in the Calvin-Benson cycle. However, RuBisCO can also bind to O_2, triggering a set of costly reactions called photorespiration, which is exacerbated by hot, dry conditions (reviewed in Peterhansel et al. 2010). C_4 and CAM increase the efficiency of photosynthesis by increasing the concentration of CO_2 around RuBisCO. This is achieved by first assimilating carbon with phosphoenolpyruvate (PEP) carboxylase (PEPC), which is either spatially (C_4) or temporally (CAM) decoupled from final fixation of CO_2 by RuBisCO (fig. 1A and B). In both CCMs, CO_2 is first converted into bicarbonate by beta carbonic anhydrase (BCA), and then bicarbonate and PEP are transformed into oxaloacetate (OAA) by PEPC (fig. 1A and B). This occurs in the mesophyll of both C_4 and CAM species, but exclusively during the night in CAM (fig. 1B),

whereafter OAA is reduced to malate by malate dehydrogenase (MDH) and stored in the vacuole

overnight as malic acid. During the day, CAM plants limit gas exchange with the external environment,

and instead decarboxylate stored malate with malic enzymes (MEs) to release CO_2 in the mesophyll—

therefore increasing the concentration of CO_2 around RuBisCO. Most C_4 species also convert OAA to

malate (termed NADP-type biochemistry), but others first transform it to aspartate (NAD-type

biochemistry) via aspartate aminotransferase (ASP). These 4-carbon acids are transported to the bundle

sheath cells of C_4 species, and are decarboxylated into CO_2 by MEs. In the case of NAD-type C_4 species,

ASP reversibly transforms aspartate back into OAA in bundle sheath mitochondria, where it is reduced to

form malate by NAD-MDH and finally decarboxylated by NAD-ME. By separating initial CO_2 fixation

in the mesophyll from ultimate assimilation in the bundle sheath, C_4 increases maximum photosynthetic

rates and water use efficiency while minimizing energy and carbon lost to photorespiration (Ogren 1984;

Sage 2004; Taylor et al. 2014). CAM does not always reduce photorespiration (Niewiadomska and

Borland 2007; Lüttge 2011), but greatly increases water use efficiency (Szarek and Ting 1975; Winter et

al. 2005) and reduces the harmful effects of high heat and radiation caused by oxidative stress

(Niewiadomska and Borland 2007).

79   C_4 and CAM boost the efficiency of photosynthesis in different ways and are therefore

hypothesized to have evolved in response to different stressors. C_4 has been primarily considered as an

adaptation to high rates of photorespiration (Ehleringer et al. 1997; Sage et al. 2012), and CAM to water

limitation (Raven and Spicer 1996; Keeley and Rundel 2003), though photorespiratory stress and drought

stress are often experienced simultaneously (Arakaki et al. 2011). Given the overlapping environmental

contexts of CAM and C_4 evolution, their repeated assembly of a similar set of biochemical modules

(Christin et al. 2014) (fig. 1A and B), and their apparent ease of evolution, it is perhaps surprising that use

of both C_4 and CAM (hereafter C_4+CAM) has only been reported in three lineages: *Portulaca*

(Portulacaceae) (Koch and Kennedy 1980), *Spinifex* (Poaceae) (Ho et al. 2019), and *Trianthema*

(Aizoaceae) (Winter et al. 2020). On the other hand, it may be precisely the large overlap in CCM genes,

gene networks, and metabolites that may make C_4 and CAM mutually exclusive in most lineages (Sage

2002). Plants that use both C_4 and CAM seemingly must regulate the same gene networks in often

contrasting patterns that may result in futile metabolite cycling and inefficient transport. For example,

daytime decarboxylation activity in the mesophyll during CAM would directly oppose the carboxylation

activity of C_4.

Portulaca, a geographically widespread clade of over 100 annual and perennial herbs and small

shrubs, predominantly use C_4, but facultatively exhibit CAM in response to drought (Koch and Kennedy

1980, 1982; Lara et al. 2003, 2004; Guralnick et al. 2007; Christin et al. 2014; Holtum et al. 2017; Ferrari

et al. 2020b, 2020c; Winter et al. 2019). It has been hypothesized that full C_4 and CAM cycles cannot co-

operate in the same mesophyll cells, and so the CAM cycle must be either spatially separated from the C_4

cycle, that is, relegated to a subpopulation of leaf cells such as water storage or bundle sheath (Sage 2002;

Guralnick et al. 2002, 2007); or alternatively, that *Portulaca* might operate a novel two cell CAM system,

whereby CAM malate eventually becomes decarboxylated in the bundle sheath (Lara et al. 2003, 2004).

Facultative CAM, the reversible induction of CAM in response to drought stress, is assumed to be

ancestral in *Portulaca* because it has been observed in every major sub-clade assayed (Holtum et al. 2017;

Winter et al. 2019) as well as in *Portulaca*'s closest relatives (Guralnick and Jackson 2001; Edwards and

Diaz 2006; Guralnick et al. 2007; Brillhaus et al. 2016; Holtum et al. 2018; Hancock et al. 2019; Holtum

et al. 2021) (fig. 1C). Transcriptomic studies of *P. oleracea* (Ferrari et al. 2020b, 2020c), and in a closely

related facultative CAM species, *Talinum* (Talinaceae) (Brillhaus et al. 2016), suggest that the ancestrally

inherited CAM pathway uses both NAD- and NADP-enzymes for CAM. The biochemical diversity of C_4

pathways in major *Portulaca* clades and the observation of intermediate photosynthetic phenotypes (C_3-

C_4) in the Cryptopetala clade (Ocampo et al. 2013; Voznesenskaya et al. 2017; Winter et al. 2019) imply

multiple origins of C_4 within a facultative CAM context (fig. 1C). Multiple C_4 origins are further

evidenced by major differences in leaf ultrastructure among *Portulaca* lineages (Ocampo et al. 2013;

Voznesenskaya et al. 2010, 2017). Most C_4 plants have high leaf vein density and large bundle sheath

cells—termed Kranz anatomy—to increase the efficiency of C_4 (Slack and Hatch 1967; Sage et al. 2012),

and these changes in leaf morphology occur early in C_4 evolution (Williams et al. 2012; Christin et al.

2013).

117   A detailed survey of photosynthetic gene activity has only been completed in one *Portulaca*

species, *P. oleracea* (Ferrari et al. 2020b, 2020c), which focused on CCM gene identification in an NAD-

type C_4 species. Similar experiments on other *Portulaca* species are needed to answer fundamental

questions about the function and evolution of C_4+CAM, and the integration of new metabolic modules

more generally. For example, facultative CAM is hypothesized to be ancestral to *Portulaca* based on

physiological studies and phylogenetic relationships, but expression of CAM-specific orthologs in

multiple species has not yet been documented. And although multiple carboxylation/decarboxylation

pathways can co-exist in some C_4 plants (Furbank 2011), it is not obvious why or how different C_4

biochemistries would evolve in *Portulaca* lineages that shared an ancestral, mixed CAM biochemistry

type, nor do we know the extent to which these CCMs have been integrated in various lineages.

127   Here, we present a chromosome-level genome assembly of *Portulaca amilis*, the first sequenced

128   genome of any C_4+CAM plant. We also analyzed transcriptomic data during a CAM-induction

129   experiment to understand the synergistic evolution of multiple metabolic modules. Concurrent

130   transcriptomic data for *P. oleracea* provided a comparison to assess the similarity of C_4+CAM across a

131   deep split in the *Portulaca* phylogeny and discriminate between ancestral, inherited and lineage specific

gene networks. Our experiments confirm hypotheses based on data from the 1KP Initiative (Matasci et al. 2014) that *Portulaca* species share one CAM-specific PEPC ortholog *(PPC-1E1c)* and another C$_4$-specific ortholog *(PPC-1E1a')* (Christin et al. 2014). Our analyses suggest that the nocturnal CAM gene network is more highly conserved compared to the C$_4$ pathways of the two *Portulaca* species. The components of this deeply conserved portion of the CAM pathway link PEPC to starch catabolism via core circadian clock elements, lending evidence to previous hypotheses of CAM evolution (Bräutigam et al. 2017). These nocturnal CAM networks were mostly preserved regardless of water status, but were upregulated under drought. We found some evidence for CAM-specific decarboxylation pathways, but the diurnal portion of CAM appears to have been largely integrated into the C$_4$ metabolism, and we predict that nocturnal acids produced by CAM are likely shuttled into the diurnal pool of bundle sheath C$_4$-acids. Finally, although *P. amilis* and *P. oleracea* C$_4$ gene co-expression networks share some central C$_4$ orthologs, exclusive use of orthologs from most core gene families highlights the diversity of C$_4$+CAM systems and provides further evidence that C$_4$ evolved largely independently in multiple *Portulaca* lineages.

Results

CAM induction experiment

Significant diel fluctuations in titratable leaf acidity indicative of CAM activity were observed after seven and eight days without water in *P. amilis* and *P. oleracea*, respectively (fig. 1D). Diel fluctuations in titratable acidity were not significantly different from zero when well-watered (one sample *t*-test, $p > 0.05$ for both species), but were significantly different under drought ($p < 0.001$ for both species; fig. 1D). There was no significant difference between the magnitude of diel fluctuations between species (independent *t*-test, $p = 0.12$).

Genome and transcriptome assembly and annotation

The *Portulaca amilis* v1 genome assembly was 403.89 Mb in length and extremely contiguous (L50/N50 = 5 scaffolds/42.598 Mb; L90/N90 = 9 scaffolds/39.183 Mb), with nine primary scaffolds representing the nine expected chromosomes of the haploid *P. amilis* genome (fig. 2A) based on the karyotype of a close relative (*P. grandiflora*; Sharma and Bhattacharyya 1956). The scaffolds were 96.9% complete as measured by the BUSCO v5 embryophyta database (n = 1,614 BUSCOs), and 92.9% of BUSCOs were complete and single copy—further supporting the assembly as an accurate haploid representation of the *P. amilis* genome. Only 4.0% of embryophyta BUSCOs were duplicated, 1.5% were fragmented, and 1.6% were missing; eukaryotic BUSCOs were similarly complete (C:98.0% [S:82.7%, D:15.3%], F:1.2%, M:0.8%, n:255). Slightly less than half of the assembly was masked as repetitive elements (46.96%),

which primarily consisted of LTRs (41.96%), DNA elements (29.36%), and LINEs (13.85%) (fig. 2B). A

repeat landscape of these elements did not show any sudden bursts of element activity or multiple peaks

(fig. 2B), which can be signs of genomic upheaval due to hybridization or polyploidy events (McClintock

1984; Dion-Côté et al. 2014). The genome was annotated by integrating RNA-seq data from the CAM

induction experiment and multiple *ab initio* gene prediction pipelines to arrive at well-supported

consensus gene models (see Materials and Methods). The final annotation contained 53,094 gene models

with 58,732 unique coding sequences. These counts likely slightly overestimate the number of true gene

models and coding sequences due to incorrect splitting of some gene models (fig. 2C).

The *P. oleracea de novo* transcriptome assembly contained 413,658 transcripts corresponding to

230,086 "unigenes" (hereafter, "genes"). The assembly was 94.7% complete as measured by the BUSCO

v5 embryophyta database, but only 16.4% of BUSCOs were single copy, while the remaining 78.3% were

duplicated; another 3.2% were categorized as fragmented, and 2.1% were missing. These fractions were

mirrored in the eukaryotic BUSCOs (C:98.9% [S:16.9%, D:82.0%], F:0.0%, M:1.1%, n:255), and the

high rate of duplicate BUSCOs was expected as most members of the *P. oleracea* species complex are

polyploid (Ocampo and Columbus 2012). Less than half of the transcripts (198,026) were predicted to be

coding sequences, which corresponded to 45,285 genes.

A total of 21,621 *P. amilis* and 44,532 *P. oleracea* genes met the filtering criteria for differential

abundance analysis with sleuth (Pimentel et al. 2017), and over half of these genes (*P. amilis*, 62%; *P.*

oleracea, 51.0%) were found to be significantly differentially abundant between well-watered and

drought conditions following Benjamini Hochberg corrections (Benjamini and Hochberg 1995) for false

discovery ($q < 0.01$). Although we could not explicitly test cycling parameters of transcripts given our

sampling strategy, *P. oleracea* and *P. amilis* appeared to have slightly different rhythms of transcript

abundance. For transcripts with peak morning abundance, the final nocturnal sampling time points had

abundances much closer to morning levels in *P. oleracea*, resulting in many "U"-shaped abundance

profiles. This suggests either a slightly higher cycling frequency in *P. oleracea* or a phase shift earlier

relative to *P. amilis*.

Co-expression network analysis

After filtering and outlier detection within WGCNA (Langfelder and Horvath 2008), the final *P. amilis*

and *P. oleracea* co-expression datasets contained 26,760 genes for 24 samples and 26,337 genes for 22

samples, respectively. Simultaneous network construction and module detection partitioned genes into 41

well-watered and 21 drought *P. amilis* modules and 29 well-watered and 20 drought *P. oleracea* modules

(supplementary fig. S1A and B), where modules are mutually exclusive clusters of highly correlated

genes. In both species, the largest drought and well-watered modules were similar in size (i.e., number of

genes), but the well-watered networks contained many more small modules than the drought networks

(supplementary fig. S1A and B). To focus on photosynthetic gene networks (PGNs), we used over 500

(*P. amilis*) and over 600 (*P. oleracea*) manually curated photosynthesis-associated nuclear genes to

extract subnetworks by subsetting WGCNA adjacency matrices, and categorized the resulting genes into

14 functional groups (fig. 3).

The well-watered and drought *P. amilis* PGNs were similar in size and density, but had different

distributions of node degree (the number of connections of a given gene) (supplementary fig. S1C). The

well-watered *P. amilis* PGN had a lower median degree but higher mean degree compared to the drought

PGN (supplementary table S1) due to a small number of extremely highly connected genes belonging to

modules paWW1 and paWW3 (fig. 3A and supplementary fig. 1C). There was a greater size discrepancy

between the *P. oleracea* PGNs, and the drought PGN was much larger and denser than the well-watered

PGN (supplementary table S1). The 104 genes of paWW1 represented all functional groups except starch

synthesis, and paWW1 was characterized by expression typical of the C_4 pathway: very high abundance

early in the morning that rapidly tapered off by late afternoon. Indeed, paWW1 contained at least one

homolog of all core elements of the C_4 pathway; including *paPPC-1E1a'* PNMthe ortholog of the C_4-

specific *PPC* used by *P. oleracea* (Christin et al. 2014; Ferrari et al. 2020b, 2020c) (fig. 3C). The paWW1

module also contained many light response transcription factors, and the majority of photorespiratory

genes (fig. 3A). The most similar drought module to paWW1 in terms of constituent genes, paD6, was

31% smaller (72 genes), while the largest drought module (paD1) was characterized by dark period peak

expression and consisted primarily of light response and circadian transcription factors, and starch

catabolism-related genes (fig. 3B). Similar to *P. amilis*, the largest well-watered *P. oleracea* module

(poWW2) also contained *poPPC-1E1a'*, however the *P. oleracea* transcriptome contained five *poPPC-*

1E1a' transcripts; four were recovered in poWW2 but one (TRINITY_DN22457_c0_g2) was recovered

in poWW1. Both poWW2 and poWW1 had expression profiles consistent with C_4 photosynthesis and had

similar functional compositions, but poWW2 had a more "U"-shaped normalized pattern with higher late

dark period abundance (fig. 3E). In contrast to *P. amilis*, the largest *P. oleracea* module was in the

drought PGN (poD4; fig. 3F), which maintained C_4-like expression and contained all five *poPPC-1E1a'*

transcripts but no genes with decarboxylating functions, the largest fraction of which were found in poD3

(fig. 3F).

We expected the CAM cycle to be broken into two co-expression networks: one that builds PEP

from transitory starches and carboxylates CO_2 into malate via BCA, PEPC, and MDH from dusk until

dawn, and a second that decarboxylates malate into CO_2 for fixation by RuBisCO during the day (fig.

1B). As reported in *P. oleracea* (Christin et al. 2014; Ferrari et al. 2020b, 2020c), *P. amilis* used the *PPC*

paralog *paPPC-1E1c* for CAM (fig. 3D), and this gene belonged to smaller modules with abundance

profiles that peaked across the light-dark transition, and were dominated by starch degradation and core

circadian clock elements (paWW5 and paD4; figs. 3A, B, and D). Extracting the genes that remained co-

expressed (preserved) across well-watered and drought conditions resulted in 28 genes of the *paPPC-*

1E1c modules (42%) (fig. 4A). With the exception of one photorespiratory gene (*paCAT1-2*,

FUN_025647), all had functions related to carboxylation (*paPPC-1E1c* and *paBCA1-2*), starch

metabolism/catabolism, or circadian clock and light response. At least one paralog of all members of the

starch degradation pathway were preserved, except amylase (*AMY*) and beta-amylase (*BAM*), but one

BAM homolog (*paBAM3-2*, FUN_041354) was recovered exclusively in the drought module, along with

one paralog of aluminum activated malate transporter 4 (*paALMT4-2*, FUN_033599), which imports

malate into the vacuole. Contrary to our expectations, no *MDH* homologs were recovered in this

nocturnal CAM network, and most were recovered in drought modules paD6, paD2, and paD5 with C_4-

like expression. Of the 11 *paMDH* homologs, two chloroplastic paralogs (*paNAD-MDH-1*, FUN_011866,

paWW2, and paD13; *paNAD-MDH-2*, FUN_029296, paWW4, and paD3) exhibited nocturnal peak

abundance under both well-watered and drought conditions, but their peak abundances were orders of

magnitude lower than other, more highly abundant copies. And although there was high preservation of

the phosphorylative starch degradation pathway, little of the downstream pathway that builds PEP from

simpler sugars was recovered in the nocturnal CAM network.

The *P. oleracea* transcriptome contained multiple transcripts of *poPPC-1E1c* that were recovered

in two well-watered modules (poWW4 and poWW8) and three drought modules (poD2, poD5, and

poD9). All modules had expression profiles consistent with CAM expression, and peaked over the day-

night transition (fig. 3E and F). The number of preserved genes between these sets of well-watered and

drought modules (39) was similar to that of *P. amilis*, but the fraction of preserved genes in *P. oleracea*

was much lower (21.5%) because the *poPPC-1E1c* drought PGN (143 genes) was over three times the

size of *P. amilis* (45 genes). The preserved genes were functionally similar to those preserved in the *P.*

amilis nocturnal CAM network, and largely consisted of genes involved with starch

metabolism/catabolism, and circadian clock elements (fig. 4B). Among the genes preserved with *poPPC-*

1E1c was a cytoplasmic *poNAD-MDH1* (TRINITY_DN7462_c3_g1), which was the most highly

expressed *NAD-MDH* under drought. Furthermore, many of the genes that link phosphorylative starch

degradation to PEP generation were preserved in the nocturnal CAM network, including *AMY*, fructose-

bisphosphate aldolase (*FBA*), glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase (*GAP*), and

phosphofructokinase (*PFK*). Although not preserved, the *poPPC-1E1c* drought modules importantly

included copies of phosphoglucomutase (*PGM*) and enolase (*ENO*), the final two steps in PEP generation

from starch or soluble sugars.

We used the *paPPC-1E1c* and *poPPC-1E1c* drought modules to identify the set of genes common

to both nocturnal CAM networks (fig. 4C and D). By taking the intersection of the two sets of *PPC-1E1c*

drought module genes (i.e., preserved and drought exclusive genes), we uncovered 21 *P. amilis* and 24 *P.*

oleracea orthologs (some genes had multiple paralogs in the *P. oleracea* network). These nocturnal CAM

networks contained one gene involved in starch synthesis (starch branching enzyme 3, *SBE3*), five

phosphorylative starch degradation genes, and alpha-glucan phosphorylase 2 (*PHS2*), which is also part

of phosphorylative starch metabolism; it reversibly transforms larger heteroglycans into smaller

heteroglycans and glucose 1-phosphate (fig. 4E). These common nocturnal CAM networks covered much

of the phosphorylative starch degradation pathway that forms the basis of PEP generation in most CAM

plants (Weiss et al. 2011; Borland et al. 2016), but the interactions among many genes were different

between species (fig. 4C and D). The largest group of shared genes were core circadian clock elements:

Adagio/ZEITLUPE (*ADO/ZTL*) *1* and *3*, two *Arabidopsis pseudo-response regulator 5* (*APRR5*) paralogs,

EARLY FLOWERING (*ELF*) *1* and *4*, *GIGANTEA* (*GI*), one *LUX ARRHYTHMO* (*LUX*) homolog, and

one *REVEILLE 6* (*RVE6*) paralog (fig 4C-E). Although the two species' nocturnal CAM PGNs shared

many key orthologs, there were some notable differences. The *P. amilis* CAM PGN was much smaller

(45 genes) than that of *P. oleracea* (143 genes), but the latter did not contain an *ALMT* homolog, while

the most highly expressed *paALMT* homolog (*ALMT4-2*) was recovered in the *P. amilis* CAM PGN. The

P. oleracea nocturnal CAM PGN contained three paralogs of *PPC kinase 1* (*PPCK1*) that were all highly

abundant, differentially expressed between well-watered and drought, and had peak abundance early in

the dark period (supplementary figs. S4). PPCK increases the activity of PEPC, which is inhibited by

malate, forming a negative feedback loop (Nimmo 2000). The single *PPCK* ortholog in *P. amilis*

(FUN_002684) was also significantly more abundant under drought ($q = 0.001$) and had peak nocturnal

expression (supplementary figs. S3), but it was recovered in drought module paD1, which increased in

abundance throughout the night (fig. 3B), unlike *paPPC-1E1c*. PPCK activity is typically essential for

highly active CCMs, and a CAM-like expression pattern in *paPPCK1* would suggest low *paPPC-1E1a'*

activity during C_4. However, we found a derived amino acid residue, glutamic acid (E), in *paPPC-1E1a'*

at the same location where an aspartic acid (D) residue (D509) was demonstrated to reduce malate

inhibition in *Kalanchoë* and *Phalaenopsis* orchids (Yang et al. 2017). In *Kalanchoë* and *Phalaenopsis*, the

D509 residue was shown to be derived from either arginine (R), lysine (K), or histidine (H), the latter of

which is present at position 509 in *poPPC-1E1a'*.

We considered two modules each in *P. amilis* (paWW1 + paWW3 and paD5 + paD6) and *P.*

oleracea (poWW2 + poWW1 and poD3 + poD4) when calculating the preservation of the C_4 pathway

because these pairs of modules had C_4-like expression patterns and were strongly connected (fig. 3A and

E). In the *P. amilis* C_4 PGNs, 86 genes (38%) were preserved across well-watered and drought conditions

(supplementary fig. S4). This preserved set contained representatives of all core C_4 (*ALAAT*, *ASP*, *BCA*,

ME, *MDH*, *PPC-1E1a'*) and PEP regeneration gene families (adenylate kinase (*ADK*), sodium/pyruvate

cotransporter (*BASS*), sodium-hydrogen antiporter (*NDH*), soluble inorganic pyrophosphatase (*PPA*),

pyruvate, phosphate dikinase (*PPDK*), and PEP/phosphate translocator (*PPT*)). It also contains members

of the entire transitory starch pathway that builds and transports various sugars and carbohydrates (e.g.,

ENO, *GAP*, phosphoglycerate kinase (*PGK*), *PGM*, and triose phosphate/phosphate translocator (*TPT*)).

In addition to *paBASS2-1* (FUN_026309), which imports pyruvate into the chloroplast as a substrate for

PEP generation, we recovered two paralogs of methyl erythritol phosphate/*RETICULATA-RELATED 4*

(*MEP4*/*RER4*; *A. thaliana* ortholog AT5G12470). MEP transporters have been implicated as mesophyll

pyruvate importers and bundle sheath pyruvate exporters in maize (Friso et al. 2010; Chang et al. 2012),

and thus may serve a similar function to BASS. The preserved modules also contained key enzymatic

regulators (e.g., serine/threonine-protein phosphatase (*PP2A*) subunits and RuBisCO activase (*RCA*)) and

transcription factors and clock elements (e.g., *CIRCADIAN CLOCK ASSOCIATED 1* (*CCA1*)).

Portulaca amilis and *P. oleracea* span a fairly deep node in the *Portulaca* phylogeny (fig. 1C)

and it was unclear which facets of C_4 they might share. A similar fraction of C_4 module genes were

preserved between well-watered and drought C_4 PGNs in *P. oleracea* (117; 41.2%), and these largely

consisted of the same gene families (58.3% overlap with preserved *P. amilis* C_4 gene families). To

identify the common orthologs used in the two species, we took the intersection of the genes in their well-

watered C_4 PGNs. The *P. amilis* and *P. oleracea* well-watered C_4 PGNs contained 186 and 165

homologs, respectively, which represented 258 unique ortholog groups, as many single copy genes in *P.*

amilis have multiple paralogs in the *P. oleracea* transcriptome. Roughly one quarter (26.7%) of these

ortholog groups (69/258) were recovered in the common C_4 networks, while 117 (45.3%) and 72 (27.9%)

were exclusive to *P. amilis* and *P. oleracea*, respectively. The common networks included many of the

most highly expressed copies of key C_4 genes, such as *PPC-1E1a'*, *BCA1-1*, *BCA1-4*, *ASP1-1*, *ASP5-2*,

mtNAD-ME1-1, *cpNADP-ME4-4*, and *cpNADP-ME4-5*; supplementary fig. S5). They also contained the

PEP generation pathway, including *ADK2-1*, *BASS2-1*, *MEP4-2*, *PPT1-2* and *PPT2-1*, and *PPDK-2*. The

photorespiratory pathway was also largely shared, including glycine decarboxylase subunits H (*GDH1-1*),

P (*GLDP1-1*), and T (*GDCST-2*), two homologs of serine hydroxymethyltransferase (*SHM1-1* and

SHM2-1), phosphoglycolate phosphatase 1 (*PGLP1-1*) and 2 (*PGLP2-3*), plastidial glycolate/glycerate

translocator (*PLGG-1*) and three copies of dicarboxylate transporter 1 (*DIT1-1*, *DIT1-3*, and *DIT1-4*).

Indicative of the unique evolutionary histories of *P. amilis* and *P. oleracea*, each species' C_4 PGN

contained exclusive homologs of most C_4 gene families, some of which represent species-specific

duplication events. Both species exhibited exclusive use of orthologs of *ADK*, *ALAAT*, *ASP*, *BCA*, *MDH*,

ME, *NDH*, *PP2A*, *PPA*, mitochondrial uncoupling protein (*PUMP*), RuBisCO, and *RCA*, among others.

Some exclusive homologs fit biochemical expectations. For example, exclusive to *P. amilis* (NADP-type

C_4) were three chloroplastic *NADP-ME4* paralogs (FUN_006401, FUN_006404, and FUN_006411)

which did not have orthologs in the *P. oleracea* transcriptome. These three copies were on the same

strand and physically close in the genome (within ~85kb); they possibly represent tandem duplication

events of *paNADP-ME4-4* (FUN_006423), which is ~50kb downstream of FUN_006411 (fig. 2A). In *P.*

oleracea, two *ASP* (TRINITY_DN71325_c0_g1 and TRINITY_DN346_c1_g3) and three *ALAAT*

(TRINITY_DN43865_c0_g1, TRINITY_DN43865_c0_g2, and TRINITY_DN81553_c0_g1) homologs

were found in orthogroups that had no ortholog in the *P. amilis* genome. Many of the genes that were

exclusive to either C_4 PGN were transcription factors involved in the circadian clock and light response,

or regulatory enzymes. For example, unique orthologs of the *FAR-RED IMPAIRED RESPONSE* family

were part of each C_4 PGN, while only the *P. amilis* C_4 PGN contained an *APRR* homolog, and only the *P.*

oleracea C_4 PGN contained a *LATE ELONGATED HYPOCOTYL* (*LHY*) transcription factor.

We also used the intersection of the drought C_4 PGNs to identify potential ancestral elements of

the daytime portion of the CAM cycle. We expected this portion of the CAM cycle (decarboxylation of

malate leading to the release of CO_2) to be nearly indistinguishable from the C_4 cycle (fig. 1A and B), but

to only exhibit this expression pattern when elicited by drought stress. To be considered part of the

ancestral CAM cycle, elements needed to meet the following criteria: 1) be shared between the two

drought C_4 PGNs and 2) be significantly more abundant under drought. Eleven orthologs met these

potentially CAM-induced criteria, and only one had a function directly related to daytime CO_2 release

from nocturnal malate stores. Chloroplastic malic enzyme *NADP-ME4-5* (FUN_015913;

TRINITY_DN81025_c0_g1) was shared between both species' C_4 drought PGNs and upregulated under

drought ($q < 0.01$). *PUMP5-1*—also known as dicarboxylate transporter 1 (*DIC1*)—of both species also

appeared CAM-induced, but was not significantly differentially abundant when considering the entire

time series in *P. oleracea* ($q = 0.24$). The *P. amilis* C_4 PGNs contained a drought exclusive mitochondrial

malic enzyme (*NAD-ME2-1*; FUN_037145) that was significantly upregulated ($q < 0.01$), and a second,

preserved ortholog (*NAD-ME1-1*; FUN_021996) that was significantly upregulated under drought ($q <$

0.05). Coupled with upregulated *PUMP5-1* expression, this may suggest that the NAD decarboxylation

pathway, which occurs mainly in the mitochondria, may still be elicited by CAM in *P. amilis* despite

NADP-type C_4. However, three photorespiratory genes were also in this group: alanine-glyoxylate

aminotransferase 3 (*AGT3*), *SHM2-3*, and dihydrolipoyl dehydrogenase/glycine cleavage system L

subunit 2 (*LPD2*). Therefore, an alternative hypothesis is that increased *PUMP5-1* abundance in concert

with photorespiratory genes indicated greater photorespiratory and oxidative stress under drought.

Finally, and unexpectedly, one *P. amilis* paralog of the RuBisCO small subunit B (*paRBCS-B-1*;

FUN_016561) fit a CAM induced abundance pattern ($q < 0.001$) and was expressed on the same order of

magnitude as other *RBCS* homologs.

Motif identification and enrichment

Enriched motifs were detected in at least one region (i.e., 3'UTR, 5'UTR, introns, or upstream promoter)

for gene models in many *P. amilis* modules. However, no enriched motifs were identified for paWW1 or

paWW3—which contained the bulk of C_4 genes when well-watered. In contrast, the 5'UTRs and

upstream promoter regions of the preserved *paPPC-1E1c* module were enriched in 10 unique motifs ($p <$

0.01), all of which had circadian or light response functions (Table 1). These motifs were all annotated to

Myb-related families, except bHLH74, which contains a G-box motif (CACGTG), and plays a role

governing flowering time in response to blue light (Liu et al. 2013). All enriched motifs contained either

an Evening Element (EE; AAATATCT) or GATA (HGATAR) motif. EE and GATA motifs often serve

as binding sites for core circadian oscillator transcription factors such as RVEs, CCA1, LHY, and

APRR1/TIMING OF CAB 1 (TOC1) (Reyes et al. 2004; Gendron et al. 2012; McClung 2019).

There were no enriched motifs in or near genes preserved with *paPPC-1E1a'*, and the *P. amilis*

C_4 PGN genes were only enriched in four motifs: one Myb (MA1028.1), two bZIP (MA0968.1,

MA1033.1), and one AP2/ERF (MA1261.1) factor (supplementary table S2). While these motifs were

significantly enriched ($p < 0.01$), they were much less widespread than the enriched motifs found in the

preserved CAM genes. At the low end, the KAN4 motif (MA1033.1) was present in just five 5'UTRs

(8.5% of sequences), and the most widespread (bZIP68, MA0968.1) was present in 12 sequences

(20.3%). Motifs found in the preserved *paPPC-1E1c* genes were present in 20.7-58.6% of the sequences,

and all 10 enriched motifs were found at least once in the 5'UTR and promoter region of *paPPC-1E1c*.

Discussion

Plant photosynthetic adaptations can serve as models for exploring many central themes of biology, such

as the evolution of modularity and evolvability, gene and genome duplication, convergent evolution, and

the evolution of novel phenotypes. Network analyses provide powerful tools for identifying and

comparing modules of genes related to functions of interest against a background of tens of thousands of

genes with complicated temporal expression patterns. C_4+CAM photosynthesis has only been reported in

three plant lineages, *Portulaca* (Koch and Kennedy 1980), *Spinifex* (Ho et al. 2019), and *Trianthema*

(Winter et al. 2020), but carbon concentrating mechanisms (CCMs) have evolved many dozens of times

(Keeley and Rundel 2003; Edwards et al. 2010; Christin et al. 2011; Sage 2016; Edwards 2019) and the

use of multiple CCMs has been documented in aquatic plant lineages (Zhang et al. 2013; Huang et al.

2018). More generally, CCM evolution is a classic example of the repeated assembly of a new function

via the integration of multiple, existing gene networks (Heyduk et al. 2019). When coupled with patterns

of transcript abundance and placed in an evolutionary context, our network results provide an initial

interpretation of how these metabolic pathways interact in *Portulaca,* and how they were evolutionarily

assembled.

The evolution of C_4+CAM in Portulaca

A detailed map of the transitions from facultative CAM to the diversity of C_4+CAM (including C_3-C_4)

pathways of extant *Portulaca* is not possible given a comparison of just two species, but we can identify

key commonalities and differences. There is good evidence that facultative CAM is ancestral in

Portulaca, and evolved by coupling elements of the TCA cycle (i.e., PEPC and BCA) to the

phosphorylative starch degradation pathway via a core circadian oscillator. CAM in both species was

restricted to a minimal set of tightly regulated nocturnal pathways that link *PPC-1E1c* to the transitory

starch pathway, with only parts of the decarboxylation pathways distinguishable from C_4. This aligns with

the hypothesis proposed by Bräutigam et al. (2017) that the initial steps in CAM evolution do not require

any "rewiring" of gene networks, but rather occur by upregulating nocturnal organic acid production that

occurs in all plants to some degree. Subsequent canalization of these fluxes occurs by bringing these

networks under circadian control. If C_4 evolution began with such a partial CAM system in *Portulaca*,

where the nighttime portion of the cycle included derived gene networks but the daytime portion did not,

CAM would have likely imposed few pleiotropic constraints on C_4 evolution given sufficient redundant

paralogs. In this scenario, recruitment of genes into C_4 would proceed as in other C_4 lineages (reviewed in

Heyduk et al. 2019), and no modification of existing CAM decarboxylation pathways in the mesophyll

would be necessary. However, transcriptomic data presented here and elsewhere (Brilhaus et al. 2016;

Ferrari et al. 2020b) imply that CAM-specific decarboxylation pathways did exist in the common ancestor

to *Portulaca*. It therefore seems likely that the initial steps towards C_4 evolved within a narrow window of

CAM evolution, before other aspects of CAM were fixed, such as diurnal stomatal closure or changes to

leaf ultrastructure that greatly reduced intercellular diffusion of metabolites.

Congruent with previous studies (Christin et al. 2014; Ferrari et al. 2020b, 2020c), we found that

C_4 and CAM in *Portulaca* use different paralogs for initial carboxylation (e.g., PEPC, ME, ASP,

MDH)—thus avoiding potential pleiotropic constraints on individual genes. Furthermore, sufficient

paralogs of NAD- and NADP-type enzymes were present in the most recent common ancestor of *P.*

amilis and *P. oleracea* to allow differential enzyme co-option during their independent C_4 origins.

However, use of *PPC-1E1a'* for C_4 in both species suggests a bias in gene recruitment that would indicate

some "preconditioning" for C_4. Preconditioning of a particular paralog could take multiple forms, such as

increased expression (Moreno-Villena et al. 2018) or adaptive amino acid substitutions (Christin et al.
2014), which would lead to multiple parallel recruitments of PPC-1E1a' into C_4.
Shared use of photorespiratory modules found here and proto-C_4 anatomy in C_3-C_4 intermediate
taxa (Voznesenskaya et al. 2010, 2017) suggest that *Portulaca* may share further steps towards C_4, such
as C_2 metabolism. C_2 metabolism refers to the enhanced refixation of photorespired CO_2 by preferential
expression of various photorespiratory enzymes in mesophyll and bundle sheath (Sage et al. 2012;
Mallmann et al. 2014). C_2 metabolism activity defines Type I C_3-C_4 intermediates, such as the members
of the Cryptopetala clade (Voznesenskaya et al. 2010, 2017), and like other CCMs, requires the
recruitment of existing gene networks for specialized expression patterns. Our comparison of well-
watered C_4 gene networks revealed many shared orthologs of photorespiratory genes, including subunits
of glycine decarboxylase, SHM, and PLGG that may point to a single origin of C_2 in *Portulaca*. However,
these genes tended to belong to smaller gene families than many C_4 and CAM genes, and it is difficult to
distinguish between a scenario in which these paralogs were co-opted into C_2 metabolism once near the
stem of extant *Portulaca*, or more recently along multiple branches in parallel. C_2 metabolism is
hypothesized to typically be followed by rapid evolution of a C_4 system (Sage et al. 2012; Mallman et al.
2014), and therefore represents a limit of what we expect to be shared among *Portulaca* lineages with
distinct morphologies and biochemistries. Broader sampling across the *Portulaca* phylogeny is needed to
precisely delimit the shared initial steps towards C_4 and subsequent parallel refinement of C_4+CAM.
453
Integration of C_4 and CAM in Portulaca
Portulaca amilis and *P. oleracea* have canonical C_4 pathways, but constitutively operate very weak CAM
cycles (at least at the transcriptional level) that are upregulated under drought. The core elements of C_4
and CAM were moderately preserved in both species, and where parts of the C_4 and CAM pathways
could theoretically overlap, we often found alternative paralogs. Increased CAM activity was associated
with a reduction in size of C_4 PGNs, but there was no evidence that this was due to dual roles of genes in
nocturnal CAM physiology under drought. The primary reason for reduced correlations between C_4 genes
was significant downregulation under water limitation. If transcript abundances of C_4 and CAM related
genes can serve as a proxy for enzymatic and metabolic activity, conflicting intracellular physiological
cues from CAM likely played a minor role in altering C_4 activity. Our investigation into possible drought
induced diurnal CAM genes found evidence that diurnal elements of the CAM pathway could be
identified against the strong background activity of C_4 decarboxylation, but only at low levels. Drought-
induced upregulation of chloroplastic *NADP-ME4-5* in both species and mitochondrial *paNAD-ME1-1*
and *paNAD-ME2-1* in *P. amilis* suggests that C_4 did not co-opt the entirety of the diurnal portion of the
CAM cycle for decarboxylation. If *Portulaca* had fully recruited the CAM decarboxylation pathways into

the C_4 system, we would not expect upregulation of any decarboxylation pathway under drought. In

contrast, constitutive C_4-like expression of the same mitochondrial orthologs in *P. oleracea* (*poNAD-*

ME1-1 and *poNAD-ME2-1*) is consistent with use in C_4, suggesting that *P. oleracea* may have recruited

its primary ancestral CAM decarboxylating pathway into its C_4 system.

During the day, a CAM-specific decarboxylation pathway could result in futile carboxylation and

decarboxylation fluxes if present in the mesophyll. However, a comparison of *ME* abundance levels

suggests that any CAM related decarboxylation would be orders of magnitude below C_4 pathway activity.

Given the strong diffusion gradients between mesophyll and bundle sheath of C_4 species (Leegood 1985),

we suspect that the evolution of C_4 in *Portulaca* has resulted in two-cell CAM, as has been previously

hypothesized (Lara et al. 2004), where malate produced by CAM in the mesophyll is largely shuttled to

the bundle sheath to be decarboxylated, but it is unclear if overnight storage occurs in the mesophyll,

bundle sheath, or both (fig. 5). While likely functionally insignificant, the signal of a second

decarboxylation pathway suggests that the CAM decarboxylation modules were not entirely repurposed to

the bundle sheath during the evolution of C_4. Rather, an entirely new decarboxylation pathway was

assembled in *P. amilis*, and some decarboxylation elements (i.e., *PUMP5-1*, *NADP-ME4-5*) were not

recruited into C_4 in *P. oleracea* (supplementary fig. S6).

Our network results confirm that the nocturnal portion of CAM is a fixed gene network—rather

than the result of drought-induced rewiring—that is both transcriptionally and post-transcriptionally

regulated under drought to increase CAM activity. Gas exchange measurements in other *Portulaca*

species (Holtum et al. 2017; Winter et al. 2019; Ferrari et al. 2020b, 2020c) show substantial net CO_2 loss

during the night when well-watered. Therefore, well-watered expression levels of the preserved CAM-

related genes are either not high enough to re-fix all nocturnally respired CO_2 or must have their products

regulated at a post-transcriptional level. Evidence for the latter is given by expression patterns of PPCK,

which increases the activity of PEPC (Nimmo 2000). *PPCK* was upregulated in both species under

drought, and during the dark period in particular, which implies a role in increasing nocturnal PEPC

activity for CAM under drought. We were surprised to find just a single *PPCK* ortholog in *P. amilis*, and

are not aware of other C_4 species without high morning expression of *PPCK*. The glutamic acid (E)

residue at position 509 in *paPPC-1E1a'* warrants further investigation because an aspartic acid residue at

this position has been shown to increase PEPC activity by reducing malate inhibition (Yang et al. 2017).

Glutamic acid is functionally similar to aspartic acid, and may similarly reduce malate inhibition.

Previous transcriptomic studies (Brillhaus et al. 2016; Ferrari et al. 2020b) suggest that *Portulaca*

inherited a CAM cycle that used both NAD- and NADP-type enzymes, but it was not clear how the

evolution of divergent C_4 biochemistries would affect CAM biochemistry. Water limitation studies in

Portulaca have shown similar CAM responses (i.e., titratable acidity and net gas exchange) across

species, including in C_3-C_4 *P. cryptopetala* (Winter et al. 2019). This provides evidence that carbon

concentrating mechanisms function mostly independently of one another in *Portulaca*, and are not

strongly affected by C_4 (or C_2) biochemistry type. Prior to our CAM induction experiment in *P. amilis*,

transcriptomic experiments had been restricted to *P. oleracea* (Ferrari et al. 2020b, 2020c), focused on

other traits, such as flowering in *P. grandiflora* (Maguvu et al. 2020), or used transcriptomic data (i.e.,

1KP Initiative) collected at one time point from well-watered plants (Christin et al. 2014) that could not

link orthologs to metabolic modules. The addition of *P. amilis* (NAD-type C_4 species) allowed us to test

the expectation of differential loss and gain of mesophyll- and bundle sheath-specific reactions in *P.*

amilis and *P. oleracea* due to their different C_4 biochemistries (fig. 5). Our findings show that these two

C_4+CAM systems appear to have evolved through differential gene family expansion and paralog use.

At the transcriptional level, both *P. amilis* and *P. oleracea* used NADP- and NAD-type

biochemistry, but expression was biased toward NADP-type enzymes in *P. amilis* and, to a lesser extent,

toward NAD-type enzymes in *P. oleracea*. We found only one *NADP-MDH* ortholog in each species, but

it was the most abundant *MDH* in both *P. amilis* and *P. oleracea*. In our data, chloroplastic *NADP-MDH-*

1 was significantly upregulated in *P. oleracea* under drought, as previously reported for some *NADP-*

MDH transcripts in Ferrari et al. (2020b). To our knowledge, there has been no protein labelling of MDH

in *Portulaca*; NADP-MDH activity in the mesophyll of *P. oleracea* is theoretically compatible with

predominantly NAD-type C_4+CAM, but protein assays are needed to confirm the functional significance

of these findings. Of the ten *P. oleracea ME* transcripts analyzed, six were NAD- and four were NADP-

type, with *NADP-ME1-1* and *NADP-ME4-4* being the most highly abundant *ME* of all, although multiple

*NAD-ME*s were expressed at the same order of magnitude. Western blots by Voznesenskaya et al. (2010)

showed faint labelling of NAD-ME in *P. amilis* and strong labelling in *P. oleracea* during the day when

well-watered, and strong and no labelling of NADP-ME in *P. amilis* and *P. oleracea*, respectively.

Moderate expression levels of *NADP-ME* in *P. oleracea* were also found by Ferrari et al. (2020b) when

well-watered, which implies that strong post-transcriptional regulation must occur in *P. oleracea* such

that minimal protein is created. The small amount of NAD-ME labeling in *P. amilis* western blots is

compatible with low levels of NAD-type CAM, as suggested here by *paPUMP5-1* and mitochondrial

malic enzymes *paNAD-ME1-1* and *paNAD-ME2-1*. As an NAD-type C_4 species, *P. oleracea* was

expected to constitutively express *NAD-ME* and *PUMP* in the bundle sheath to move malate and aspartate

across the mitochondrial membrane (fig. 5A). We observed a potential CAM-specific *NADP-ME* in both

species, consistent with experiments by Ferrari et al. (2020) that found one *NAD-ME* transcript

significantly upregulated in the morning under drought. When well-watered, *poPUMP1-1* had C_4-like

expression, but it was significantly downregulated under drought in an equal magnitude but inverse

pattern of the upregulated *poPUMP5-1*. Although *poPUMP5-1* was not significantly differentially

abundant under drought when considering the entire time series, its striking change in expression makes it

a compelling candidate as a member of the ancestral *Portulaca* CAM cycle that warrants further

investigation across the clade more broadly.

Portulaca as a model for metabolic evolution

The natural history of *Portulaca* provides a compelling model system for studying many evolutionary and

ecophysiological questions, and its unique metabolism and experimental practicality make it a powerful

tool for genetic engineering. Forward engineering of both C_4 (Schuler et al. 2016) and CAM (Borland et

al. 2014) have become priorities for agriculture as arid lands expand and populations grow. *Portulaca*

comprises over 100 species that are found in nearly every country and have invaded some continents

multiple times (Ocampo and Columbus 2012). Despite the small genome size of *P. amilis*, duplication

events deeper in the history of the Portulacineae (Wang et al. 2019) have played large roles in the

evolution of C_4+CAM, with implications for neofunctionalization and the evolution of modularity. With

the generation of the first *Portulaca* genome, we provide a resource for studying these past events and for

the functional genetic work to understand and engineer CCMs.

CAM is found in every major clade of the Portulacineae to varying degrees (Ting and Hanscom

1997; Guralnick and Jackson 2001; Guralnick et al. 2007; Edwards and Ogburn 2012; Holtum et al. 2018;

Hancock et al. 2019) (fig. 1C), and stronger and constitutive CAM have evolved in *Portulaca*'s closest

relatives, Anacampserotaceae and Cactaceae (Nobel 2003; Guralnick et al. 2007; Edwards and Donoghue

2006). These three clades overlap in climate space (Edwards and Ogburn 2012) and in many parts of their

geographic ranges (Eggli 2004), exhibit succulent morphologies capable of photosynthesis in their stems

(Guralnick et al. 2007; Ogburn and Edwards 2009), and likely share the same ancestral CAM cycle. It

remains an open question why only *Portulaca* evolved C_4+CAM, while stronger CAM evolved in its

relatives. C_4 and CAM consume more energy than C_3 photosynthesis, and we lack models to predict

environmental conditions that would select for C_4 in a CAM plant (or vice versa). As mentioned above,

photorespiration plays a central role in the transition from C_3 to C_4 photosynthesis through C_2

metabolism. Selective pressures to evolve C_2 in the facultative CAM ancestor of *Portulaca* may have

been no different than in C_3 plants as CAM does not necessarily reduce photorespiration, and in some

cases can exacerbate it (Niewiadomska and Borland 2007). Future progress on these topics will be made

through continued study of the C_3-C_4 Cryptopetala clade that uses C_2 metabolism.

Despite an increased general interest in CCMs over recent years, and *Portulaca*'s C_4+CAM

system in particular, we have only a limited understanding of the benefits of combining C_4 and CAM. The

advantages of facultative CAM vary between lineages, as does carbon gain, which is typically <10% of

the daytime photosynthetic activity (Herrera 2009; Winter 2019). Facultative CAM increases water use

efficiency and can prevent reduced growth and reproductive output under drought (Herrera 2009; Winter

et al. 2019) while also reducing photoinhibition (radiation induced damage to photosystems) (Herrera

2009). Measures of chlorophyll *a* in *P. oleracea* over a water limitation experiment provide evidence that

facultative CAM reduced photoinhibition (Ferrari et al. 2020b). A photoprotective role of CAM is further

corroborated by rapid recovery of photosynthetic rate upon rewatering (Holtum et al. 2017; Winter et al.

2019), indicating little or no damage was done to photosystems. Gas exchange measurements also

demonstrate that *Portulaca* continue to grow despite several days of drought stress (Holtum et al. 2017;

Winter et al. 2019). Furthermore, drought stress may increase CO_2 leakiness of bundle sheath in C_4 plants,

a problem augmented when carboxylation activity decreases relative to decarboxylation (Ghannnoum,

2009). Facultative CAM may provide some carbon and photoprotection during drought that accelerates

the transition to full photosynthetic capacity upon rewatering and allows for growth and reproduction

despite large water deficits.

The annotated *P. amilis* genome and metabolic modules identified here, combined with recent

resources for transgenic research in *Portulaca* (Ferrari et al. 2020a) signal a significant shift toward the

development of an experimental, functional genomics-based research program in C_4+CAM. The

publication of the *Kalanchoë* genome (Yang et al. 2017) and subsequent functional genetic work have

confirmed previous hypotheses and made unexpected discoveries, such as the role of PEPC1 in regulation

of the core circadian clock (Boxall et al. 2020). Unlike CAM in *Kalanchoë*, C_4+CAM has explicit

structure in both time and space that must be mapped to confirm the use of various mesophyll- and bundle

sheath-specific enzymes. On one level, we suggest that *P. amilis* is a better candidate than *P. oleracea* for

further model system development, in part because *P. oleracea* exists within the context of a larger

species complex of over a dozen described species and subspecies with uncertain relationships and

multiple whole genome duplication events (Ocampo and Columbus 2012). *P. amilis* has an

indistinguishable life history from *P. oleracea* (i.e., 3-5 week life cycle, thousands of seeds produced,

self-fertilization), but does not suffer from the same taxonomic challenges and variations in ploidy. On

the other hand, we view the *Portulaca* clade as providing not one, but at least three, evolutionary origins

of C_4+CAM systems, and there is much to be learned in understanding their similarities and differences.

Conclusions

The evolution of modularity is a common theme in studies of evolutionary development and the

origination of novel phenotypes. We have demonstrated how network-based analyses can distinguish

complex and highly overlapping metabolic modules, and establish their orthology between species. A

C_4+CAM system provides a unique opportunity to understand how a single module that is typically

recruited into two distinct functions is regulated when both of the new functions are operating in a single

organism. Remarkably, their integration appears possible in part via additional modularization, with little

overlap in C_4 and CAM gene networks. Assignment of paralogs to functions and generation of a high-

quality genome for *P. amilis* were necessary first steps for future functional genetic work on C_4+CAM.

Perhaps the most pertinent questions surround the utility of C_4+CAM, which could be addressed in part

by knock-down or knock-out *PPC-1E1c* lines to study the fitness of a purely C_4 *Portulaca*. In addition to

functional genetic experiments, similar CAM-induction experiments are needed throughout *Portulaca* to

establish homology between metabolic pathways across the multiple origins; especially in the C_3-C_4

Cryptopetala clade, which will provide greater clarity on which elements of C_4+CAM are ancestrally

shared across multiple origins in *Portulaca*.

Materials and Methods

Plant materials and CAM-induction experiment

Specimens of *Portulaca amilis* were collected in Casselberry, Florida, U.S.A. and propagated in the Plant

Environmental Center at Brown University. All studied *Portulaca* are selfing, and many are primarily

cleistogamous (Geesink 1969, Kim and Carr 1990); cleistogamous flowers self-pollinate in the

developing flower bud without the need of a vector, and most buds progress directly to fruit set without

opening. S2 seeds were germinated at Yale's Marsh Botanical Garden. One S2 *P. amilis* was removed

from soil, gently washed to remove soil, flash frozen whole in liquid N_2, and shipped overnight to

Dovetail Genomics (Scotts Valley, CA, U.S.A.) for whole genome sequencing and assembly. An S4

generation was collected and vouchered at the Yale University Herbarium in the Peabody Museum of

Natural History.

S3 *P. amilis* were germinated in a growth chamber with the following environmental conditions:

00:00-06:00, dark, 22°C; 06:00-20:00, lights on, 25°C; 20:00-23:59, dark, 22°C. Plants were regularly

bottom watered and the mean photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) at plant level was ~385 mol · m^{-2}

· s^{-1} during the 14 hour photoperiod. After plants had reached maturity and branched sufficiently (~4

weeks), eight plants were selected for CAM-induction: six biological replicates and two indicator plants.

Indicator plants were monitored daily for fluctuations in titratable acidity to determine CAM induction,

and were not included in any further analyses. To induce CAM, water was withheld from plants, and

significant increases in nocturnal titratable acidity were observed in *P. amilis* and *P. oleracea* indicator

plants after seven and eight days, respectively. Leaf tissue was collected from all six biological replicates

for titratable acidity assays at 16:00 and 04:00 (the following day) and bulk RNA at 10:00, 16:00, 22:00,

and 04:00 (the following day) on day 0 (referred to as "well-watered") and days 8 and 9 (referred to

"drought").

Titratable acidity was assessed by boiling 0.2-0.3g fresh leaf tissue in 60mL 20% EtOH until the

volume was reduced by half (~30mL). Distilled water was then added to return the volume to 60mL. This

process was repeated, and the supernatant was then covered and allowed to cool to room temperature.

Samples were then titrated to a pH of 7.0 using 0.002M NaOH, and recorded in units of μEq H$^+$ per gram

fresh mass—calculated as volume titrant (μL) $\times$ titrant molarity (M) / tissue mass (g).

Total leaf RNA was extracted using Option 2 (CTAB/TRIzol/sarkosyl) from Jordon-Thaden et al.

(2015). Sample purity was measured using a NanoDrop (Invitrogen by Thermo Fisher Scientific,

Carlsbad, CA), and a representative set of 12 samples were further assayed on using a 2100 Bioanalyzer

(Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA) for fragment length distribution and RNA integrity (RIN); RIN

scores ≥ 7 were considered high quality. Library preparation included poly(A) tailing to pull down

mRNA, and sequencing was done on an Illumina HiSeq (2x100bp paired-end reads), with an expected 25

million reads per sample. Four of the 96 total libraries failed during sequencing; all were *P. oleracea*

samples (one 10:00 drought, one 16:00 drought, and two 04:00 drought).

Genome and transcriptome assembly and annotation

The *Portulaca amilis* v1 genome was assembled *de novo* by Dovetail Genomics, using one Chicago (see

details in Putnam et al. 2016) and two Dovetail Hi-C (see details in Lieberman-Aiden et al. 2009)

libraries. The Chicago library was sequenced on an Illumina HiSeqX, resulting in 178 million 2x150bp

paired-end reads that yielded 169.1x physical coverage of the genome (1-100kb pairs). The two Dovetail

Hi-C libraries were also sequenced on an Illumina HiSeqX; libraries one and two contained 202 million

and 342 million 2x150bp paired-end reads, respectively, which together provided 52,626.57x physical

coverage of the genome (10-10000kb pairs). Meraculous 2 (Chapman et al. 2011) was used to generate an

assembly from 791 million paired-end shotgun read pairs (mean insert size ~550bp and ~350bp) with

kmer size 91. The Meraculous assembly and shotgun, Chicago, and Hi-C reads were then used for

iterative scaffolding using HiRise v2.1.6-072ca03871cc (Lieberman-Aiden et al. 2009; Putnam et al.

2016) to create the final assembly consisting of 4,053 scaffolds.

The *P. amilis* v1 genome was annotated using funannotate v1.6.0 (Palmer and Stajich, 2019), a

modular software package for genomic scaffold cleaning, genomic element prediction (i.e., genes, UTRs,

tRNAs, etc.), functional annotation, and comparative genomics. All annotation steps after genome

assembly were run within funannotate unless otherwise noted, and a step-by-step walkthrough of the

entire annotation process can be found on GitHub (https://github.com/isgilman/).

Using funannotate's 'clean' function, scaffolds were checked for duplicates with a "leave one

out" strategy where, starting with the shortest scaffold, one scaffold was left out and mapped back to the

remaining scaffolds with minimap2 (Heng, 2018). Scaffolds were sorted by size from largest to smallest

using funannotate's 'sort' function. Outside of funannotate, repetitive element analysis was conducted

with RepeatModeler v1.0.11 (Smit and Hubley [online]) and RepeatMasker v4.0.9-p2 (Smit et al.

[online]). RepeatModeler was used to create a custom repeat database for *P. amilis* and further

classification of unknown repeats was done with TEclass v2.1.3 (Abrusán et al. 2009). The custom

repeats were then passed to RepeatMasker, where complex repeats were soft masked. An additional round

of masking was done using the Viridiplantae repeat database from RepBase

(RepBaseRepeatMaskerEdition - 26 October 2018) (Bao et al. 2015) and transposable element data from

Dfam v3.0 (Hubley et al. 2016). All repetitive elements were then cleaned using the RepeatMasker utility

script 'ProcessRepeats'.

Prior to *ab initio* gene prediction, we used funannotate's 'train' function to create a preliminary

set of high-quality gene models for training prediction software using the soft masked scaffolds and

RNAseq reads from the CAM-induction experiment. Paired-end raw RNAseq reads were filtered by

quality (phred < 25) and trimmed to remove adapters, poly-A/T tails longer than 12 bp, and low-quality

tails (phred < 20) using PRINSEQ v0.20.4 (Schmieder and Edwards, 2011). To capture the greatest

diversity of transcripts and provide sufficient depth to call rare isoforms, we pooled all RNAseq reads

from the six biological replicates across four time points and two conditions (well-watered and drought),

totaling ~1.58 billion reads from mature leaf tissue. RNAseq reads were then normalized using the

'insilico_read_normalization.pl' utility script within Trinity v2.8.5 (Grabherr et al. 2011). Funannotate's

'train' function first builds a coordinate-sorted BAM file and associated index file using HISAT2 v2.1.0

(Him et al. 2019) for an initial genome-guided transcriptome assembly with Trinity v2.5.1. The resulting

initial transcripts then were fed through the PASA pipeline v2.3.3 (Haas et al. 2003) to generate gene

models and predicted coding sequences using TransDecoder v5.5.0 (https://transdecoder.github.io).

Kallisto v0.45.1 (Bray et al. 2016) was then used to quantify abundance data, and PASA gene models

with with abundance at least 10% of the most abundance gene model at each respective locus were

retained for training the *ab initio* predictors Augustus v3.2.3 (Stank et al. 2008), SNAP v2013_11_29

(Korf 2004), glimmerHMM v3.0.4 (Majoros et al. 2004), and GeneMark-ET (Besemer and Borodovsky,

2005).

Funannotate's 'predict' function was then used to produce an initial set of gene models from the

scaffolds using high abundance PASA models, *ab initio* prediction software, and evidence from

transcripts and predicted proteins. First, transcript alignment information from the coordinate-sorted

BAM file and protein alignments using Diamond v0.9.24 (Buchfink et al. 2015) and Exonerate v2.4.0

(Slater and Birney, 2005) were used to generate a 'hints' file for Augustus and GeneMark-ET. Augustus

models with at least 90% exon overlap with protein alignments were selected as high-quality models

(HiQ). Gene models from the above predictors, HiQ models, transcripts, and predicted proteins were then

used as sources of evidence to create consensus models in EVidenceModeler v1.1.1 (Haas et al. 2008)

with weights Augustus:1, HiQ:1, GeneMark-ET:1, PASA:10, SNAP:1, glimmerHMM:1, proteins:1,

transcripts:1.The resulting consensus gene models were filtered to remove any proteins less than 50

amino acids, models that began or ended in assembly gaps, and transposable elements. Next, tRNA gene

models were identified with tRNAscan-SE v2.0 (Chan and Lowe, 2019). Final consensus gene models

were constructed by funannotate's 'update' function which added and updated UTRs and refined exon

boundaries of alternatively spliced models.

To assemble the *de novo* transcriptome for *P. oleracea*, we again filtered all paired-end raw

RNAseq reads by quality (phred < 25) and trimmed to remove adapters, poly-A/T tails longer than 12 bp,

and low-quality tails (phred < 20) using PRINSEQ v0.20.4. As with *P. amilis*, we pooled all *P. oleracea*

RNAseq reads across time points, conditions, and replicates. Pooled reads were input into Trinity v2.11.0

and assembled *de novo*. We reduced the redundancy of the resulting contigs using CD-HIT v4.8.1 (Fu et

al. 2012) by collapsing contigs with at least 98% similarity (-c 98).

RNAseq differential abundance analysis

We used sleuth (Pimentel et al. 2017) to assess differential abundance of RNAseq reads quantified by

Kallisto for each species independently. For *P. amilis*, we mapped reads to the predicted mRNA

transcripts from the genome annotation, and for *P. oleracea* we used the redundancy reduced *de novo*

transcriptome. All analyses were conducted at the gene level by providing a transcript-to-gene map to

sleuth generated from the final set of gene models and setting 'gene_mode' = TRUE. Abundance data

were quantified in transcripts per million (TPM) and differential abundance was assessed using a

likelihood ratio test between the reduced design matrix, where abundance was purely a function of

sampling time ('y ~ time_point'), and the full design matrix that included time and water treatment ('y ~

time_point + treatment'). *p*-values for unique transcripts were aggregated for each gene model and

transformed into *q*-values by adjusting for false discovery rate (Benjamini Hochberg correction).

Co-expression network analysis

We used Weighted Gene Correlation Network Analysis (WGCNA) (Langfelder and Horvath 2008) to

construct co-expression networks and identify modules, and NetworkX (Hagberg et al. 2008) to visualize

and measure network features. WGCNA was run separately for each species and condition, resulting in

four networks. Using the normalized abundance data for all biological replicates from sleuth, we first

divided samples into well-watered and drought conditions for separate network construction (hereafter

referred to as the well-watered and drought datasets, networks, modules, etc). We then removed genes

from each dataset with maximum expression less than 5 TPM. Remaining genes with excessive missing

data or too low variance were removed with the WGCNA function 'goodSampleGenes'. Outlier samples

were detected using hierarchical clustering with 'hclust' (stats v3.6.2; R-core team), and removed from

each dataset. We determined the soft threshold powers for each network separately using

'pickSoftThreshold'; soft threshold power was 8 for both well-watered and drought *P. amilis* networks,

and 14 and 7 for *P. oleracea* well-watered and drought networks, respectively. We constructed networks

and identified modules using 'blockwiseModules' with corType="bicor", maxPOutliers=0.05,

TOMType="signed", deepSplit=2, and mergeCutHeight=0.25 for all networks. With corType="bicor",

we allowed modules to contain both correlated and anti-correlated expression time profiles. We set

minModuleSize=30 for *P. amilis* networks and minModuleSize=100 for *P. oleracea* networks.

In order to extract photosynthetic gene networks (PGNs; see Results), we subsetted the resulting

adjacency matrices from WGCNA using over 500 (*P. amilis*) and over 600 (*P. oleracea*) manually

curated genes with functions broadly related to photosynthesis and removed edges with adjacency < 0.25.

This resulted in networks containing 368-466 genes (supplementary table S1). We binned these genes into

functional categories reflecting major metabolic pathways (e.g., Calvin-Benson cycle, photorespiration,

and starch degradation) and enzymatic reactions or functions (e.g., aminotransferase and PEPC

regulation). As many enzymes catalyze reversible reactions or function in multiple pathways, these

categorizations are intended to reflect the primary role each protein plays and we recognize that

alternative categorizations are possible. For example, RuBisCO is the central protein in both the Calvin-

Benson cycle and photorespiration, and MDH functions in both the initial carboxylation pathway that

generates malate from CO_2 and in the decarboxylation pathway that liberates CO_2 from malate in NAD-

type C_4 biochemistry, albeit to a lesser extent.

Motif identification and enrichment

Putative *cis*-regulatory motif identification and enrichment was done using the MEME Suite (Bailey et al.

2009). First, 5'- and 3'UTRs, introns, and 2kb upstream regions were extracted from all *P. amilis* gene

models. The MEME tool (Bailey and Elkan 1994) was used to identify *de novo* motifs for each co-

expression module and region using an e-value threshold of 0.05 and a minimum motif size of 6bp. We

downloaded the JASPAR CORE 2018 motif database (Khan et al. 2018), supplemented it with the *de*

novo motifs identified in Wai et al. (2019) related to CAM, and finally added our *de novo P. amilis* motifs

after checking for redundancy with Tomtom (Gupta et al. 2007). We then used AME (--scoring avg --

method fisher --hit-lo-fraction 0.25 --evalue-report-threshold 10.0) (McLeay and Bailey, 2010) with

random sets of control sequences to measure motif enrichment in every module-region combination, as

well as the preserved genes of the *PPC-1E1c* and C_4 modules.

Acknowledgements

We thank C. M. Mason (University of Central Florida) for identification and collection of *P. amilis*,
Karolina Heyduk (University of Hawaii) for insightful comments on early drafts of this work, and
Christopher Bolick at Yale's Marsh Botanic Gardens, who's tireless support made this work possible.
This research was funded by the National Science Foundation (IOS-1754662 to EJE and IOS-1708941 to
EWG).

Data availability

Genomic scaffolds, peptide and coding sequences, assembled transcriptome, and annotations (including
repeats) for *Portulaca amilis* are available through the Phytozome web portal (https://phytozome-
next.jgi.doe.gov). Raw RNAseq data for *P. amilis* and *P. oleracea* are available through the NCBI's SRA
within BioProject PRJNA732408.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Simplified C_4 (A) and CAM (B) pathways showing shared carboxylation and decarboxylation
pathways. ASP, aspartate aminotransferase; BCA, beta carbonic anhydrase; CBC, Calvin-Benson cycle;
MDH, malate dehydrogenase; ME, malic enzyme; PEPC, PEP carboxylase. Cartoon dendrogram of the
Portullugo (Portulacineae + Molluginaceae), highlighting major *Portulaca* clades (C), which are colored
by primary C_4 biochemical pathway. Mean age estimates for focal *Portulaca* clades are from Ocampo and
Columbus (2012). Night-day differences in titratable acidity of experimental *P. amilis* (orange) and *P.
oleracea* plants (purple) (D). WW, well-watered; D, drought. Asterisks connecting lines indicate
significant differences between well-watered and drought treatments ($p < 0.001$). Images of *P. amilis*
when well-watered and after 8 days without water (E).

Figure 2. Idiogram of the nine primary scaffolds of the *P. amilis* genome with key C_4 and CAM genes
highlighted (A). Breakdown of repetitive elements of the *P. amilis* genome (B). The horizontal bar chart
shows the fractions of major classes of repetitive elements and the repeat landscape (histogram) shows the
relative abundances of repetitive elements versus the Kimura substitution level from the consensus.
Scatterplot of number of gene models versus the log10-transformed genome size for 107 angiosperm
genomes (C) with notable benchmarking and CCM genomes highlighted; data is from Zhao and Schranz
(2019). Line in (C) shows results of ordinary least squares regression.

Figure 3. Photosynthetic gene networks (PGNs). Well-watered and drought PGNs of *P. amilis* (A-B), and
P. oleracea (E-F) colored by WGCNA co-expression module identity. Each node in the graph represents

one gene and node sizes represent their degrees (the number of other genes in the network that they are

correlated or anticorrelated to). Each module's size and functional composition is shown in the histogram,

and the z-score normalized expression of each module's constituent genes is shown along the horizontal

axis. An example of the *z*-score normalized expression for module paWW1 is enlarged in (A) to show

individual gene expression with the median highlighted in bold. Transcripts per million (TPM)

normalized expression profiles of two focal *PPC* transcripts (*paPPC-1E1a'* and *paPPC-1E1c*) are shown

in (C) and (D), respectively.

Figure 4. *PPC-1E1c* PGN preservation and subnetworks of common genes. Stacked bar charts showing

the number and functional composition of genes that were exclusive to the well-watered or drought *PPC-*

1E1c PGNs, or preserved across treatments in *P. amilis* (A) and *P. oleracea* (B). Subnetworks induced by

genes common to both *P. amilis* (C) and *P. oleracea* (D) drought *PPC-1E1c* PGNs; drought PGNs

include preserved and drought exclusive genes. Orange edges represent correlations among genes shared

between species, while black edges are unique to each respective species. Metabolic pathways of the

shared *PPC-1E1c* subnetworks (E), showing PEPC, sugar transport, and starch metabolism. Colors of bar

plot units (A and B) and gene boxes (C, D, and E) indicate functional categories as in fig. 3.

Figure 5. Hypothesized biochemical cycles of C_4+CAM in *P. amilis* when well-watered (A) and

droughted (B). Red, blue, and purple lines indicate NAD-specific, NADP-specific, and shared reactions,

respectively, and grey lines show novel, possible pathways for malate that are unique to C_4+CAM

photosynthesis. Line thicknesses are indicative of relative fluxes through pathways. ALAAT, alanine

aminotransferase; ASP, aspartate aminotransferase; BCA, beta carbonic anhydrase; CBC, Calvin-Benson

cycle; NAD-MDH, NAD-dependent malate dehydrogenase; NADP-MDH, NADP-dependent malate

dehydrogenase; NAD-ME, NAD-dependent malic enzyme; NADP-ME, NADP-dependent malic enzyme;

PEP, phosphoenolpyruvate; PEPC, PEP carboxylase; PPDK, pyruvate, phosphate dikinase; OAA,

oxaloacetate.

Tables

Table 1. Motifs enriched in the 5'UTR of genes preserved in the *paPPC-1E1c* module

Motif name	JASPAR matrix ID	Consensus sequence*	Associated TF	*Arabidopsis* ortholog
RVE7L	MA1191.1	HHHVA**AAATATCT**WA	REVEILLE 7-like (RVE7L)	AT3G10113

RVE1	MA1184.1	HHVW**AAATATCT**WH	REVEILLE 1 (RVE1)		AT5G17300
RVE8	MA1182.1	**AGATAT**TTTWDD	LHY-CCA1-like 5 (LCL5)/REVEILLE 8 (RVE8)		AT3G09600
RVE4	MA1187.1	**AGATAT**TTTT	LHY-CCA-like 1 (LCL1)/REVEILLE 4 (RVE4)		AT5G02840
RVE6	MA1183.1	**AGATAT**TTTD	REVEILLE 6 (RVE6)		AT5G52660
RVE5	MA1190.1	**AGATAT**TTTD	REVEILLE 5 (RVE5)		AT4G01280
LHY1	MA1185.1	**AGATAT**TTTN	LATE ELONGATED HYPOCOTYL 1 (LHY1)		AT1G01060
EPR1	MA1401.1	RA**AAATATCT**WA	Early-phytochrome-responsive 1 (EPR1)/REVEILLE 7 (RVE7)		AT1G18330
CCA1	MA0972.1	**AAATATCT**	CIRCADIAN CLOCK ASSOCIATED 1 (CCA1)		AT2G46830
bHLH74	MA1360.1	**AGATAT**	ACTIVATOR FOR CELL ELONGATION 2 (ACE2)/Basic helix-loop-helix protein 74 (bHLH74)		AT1G10120

*Bold text indicates EE (AAATATCT) or GATA (HGATAR) motifs

References

1. Abrusán G, Grundmann N, DeMester L, Makalowski W. 2009. TEclass—a tool for automated classification of unknown eukaryotic transposable elements. *Bioinformatics* 25:1329–1330.

2. Arakaki M, Christin P-A, Nyffeler R, Lendel A, Eggli U, Ogburn RM, Spriggs E, Moore MJ, Edwards EJ. 2011. Contemporaneous and recent radiations of the world's major succulent plant lineages. *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA.* 108:8379–8384.

3. Bailey TL, Elkan C. 1994. Fitting a mixture model by expectation maximization to discover motifs in biopolymers. In Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Intelligent Systems for Molecular Biology. AAAI Press, Menlo Park, California. p. 28-36.

4. Bailey TL, Bodén M, Buske FA, Frith M, Grant CE, Clementi L, Ren J, Li WW, Noble WS. 2009. MEME SUITE: tools for motif discovery and searching. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 37:W202-W208.

5.   Bao W, Kojima KK, Kohany O. 2015. Repbase Update, a database of repetitive elements in
eukaryotic genomes. *Mob DNA.* 6:11.

6.   Barve A, Wagner A. 2013. A latent capacity for evolutionary innovation through exaptation in
metabolic systems. *Nature* 500:203–206.

7.   Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. 1995. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful
Approach to Multiple Testing. *J Royal Statistical Soc B (Meth). 57*: 289-300.

8.   Besemer J., Borodovsky M. 2005. GeneMark: web software for gene finding in prokaryotes,
eukaryotes and viruses. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 33:W451–4.

9.   Borland AM, Hartwell J, Weston DJ, Schlauch KA, Tschaplinski TJ, Tuskan GA, Yang X, Cushman
JC. 2014. Engineering crassulacean acid metabolism to improve water-use efficiency. *Trends in
Plant Science* 19:327–338.

10.   Borland AM, Guo H-B, Yang X, Cushman JC. 2016. Orchestration of carbohydrate processing for
crassulacean acid metabolism. *Curr Opinion in Plant Bio.* 31:118–124.

11.   Boxall SF, Kadu N, Dever LV, Knerova J, Waller JL, Gould PD, Hartwell J. 2020. Kalanchoë PPC1
is Essential for Crassulacean Acid Metabolism and the Regulation of Core Circadian Clock and
Guard Cell Signaling Genes. *Plant Cell* 32:1136–1160.

12.   Bray NL, Pimentel H, Melsted P, Pachter L. 2016. Near-optimal probabilistic RNA-seq
quantification. *Nat Biotechnol.* 34:525–527.

13.   Brilhaus D, Bräutigam A, Mettler-Altmann T, Winter K, Weber APM. 2016. Reversible Burst of
Transcriptional Changes during Induction of Crassulacean Acid Metabolism in *Talinum triangulare*.
Plant Phys. 170:102–122.

14.   Buchfink B, Xie C, Huson DH. 2015. Fast and sensitive protein alignment using DIAMOND.
Nature Methods 12:59–60.

15.   Chan PP, Lowe TM. 2019. tRNAscan-SE: Searching for tRNA genes in genomic sequences.
Methods in Mol Bio. p. 1–14.

16.   Chang Y-M, Liu W-Y, Shih AC-C, Shen M-N, Lu C-H, Lu M-YJ, Yang H-W, Wang T-Y, Chen
SC-C, Chen SM, et al. 2012. Characterizing Regulatory and Functional Differentiation between
Maize Mesophyll and Bundle Sheath Cells by Transcriptomic Analysis. *Plant Phys.* 160:165–177.

17.   Chapman JA, Ho I, Sunkara S, Luo S, Schroth GP, Rokhsar DS. 2011. Meraculous: De Novo
Genome Assembly with Short Paired-End Reads. *Plos One* 6:e23501.

18.   Christin P-A, Arakaki M, Osborne CP, Bräutigam A, Sage RF, Hibberd JM, Kelly S, Covshoff S,
Wong GK-S, Hancock L, et al. 2014. Shared origins of a key enzyme during the evolution of C_4 and
CAM metabolism. *J Exp Bot.* 65:3609–3621.

19.   Christin P-A, Sage TL, Edwards EJ, Ogburn RM, Khoshravesh R, Sage RF. 2011. Complex
evolutionary transitions and the significance of C_3-C_4 intermediate forms of photosynthesis in
Molluginaceae. *Evolution* 65:643–660.
20.   Christin P-A, Osborne CP, Sage RF, Arakaki M, Edwards EJ. 2011. C_4 eudicots are not younger
than C_4 monocots. *J Exp Bot.* 62:3171–3181.
21.   Clune J, Mouret J-B, Lipson H. 2013. The evolutionary origins of modularity. *Proc Royal Soc B Biol*
Sci. 280:20122863.
22.   Davidson EH, Erwin DH. 2006. Gene Regulatory Networks and the Evolution of Animal Body
Plans. *Science* 311:796–800.
23.   Dion-Côté A-M, Renaut S, Normandeau E, Bernatchez L. 2014. RNA-seq Reveals Transcriptomic
Shock Involving Transposable Elements Reactivation in Hybrids of Young Lake Whitefish Species.
Mol Biol Evol. 31:1188–1199.
24.   Edwards E. J., Diaz M. 2006. Ecological physiology of *Pereskia guamacho*, a cactus with leaves.
Plant Cell Environ. 29:247–256.
25.   Edwards EJ, Donoghue MJ. 2006. *Pereskia* and the Origin of the Cactus Life-Form. *Am Nat.*
167:777–793.
26.   Edwards EJ, Ogburn RM. 2012. Angiosperm Responses to a Low-CO_2 World: CAM and C_4
Photosynthesis as Parallel Evolutionary Trajectories. *Int J Plant Sci.* 173:724–733.
27.   Edwards EJ, Osborne CP, Strömberg CAE, Smith SA, Consortium CG, Bond WJ, Christin P-A,
Cousins AB, Duvall MR, Fox DL, et al. 2010. The origins of C_4 grasslands: integrating evolutionary
and ecosystem science. *Science* 328:587–591.
28.   Edwards EJ. 2019. Evolutionary trajectories, accessibility and other metaphors: the case of C_4 and
CAM photosynthesis. *New Phytologist* 223:1742–1755.
29.   Eggli U. 2004. Illustrated Handbook of Succulent Plants: Dicotyledons. Berlin: Springer.
30.   Ehleringer JR, Cerling TE, Helliker BR. 1997. C_4 photosynthesis, atmospheric CO_2, and climate.
Oecologia 112:285–299.
31.   Ferrari RC, Bittencourt PP, Nagumo PY, Oliveira WS, Rodrigues MA, Hartwell J, Freschi L. 2020a.
Developing *Portulaca oleracea* as a model system for functional genomics analysis of C_4/CAM
photosynthesis. *Func Plant Biol.* 48:666-682.
32.   Ferrari RC, Bittencourt PP, Rodrigues MA, Moreno-Villena JJ, Alves FRR, Gastaldi VD, Boxall SF,
Dever LV, Demarco D, Andrade SCS, et al. 2020b. C_4 and Crassulacean Acid Metabolism within a
single leaf: deciphering key components behind a rare photosynthetic adaptation. *New Phytologist*
225:1699–1714.

33.   Ferrari RC, Cruz BC, Gastaldi VD, Storl T, Ferrari EC, Boxall SF, Hartwell J, Freschi L. 2020c.

Exploring C_4-CAM plasticity within the *Portulaca oleracea* complex. *Scientific Reports* 10:14237–

14.

34.   Friso G, Majeran W, Huang M, Sun Q, van Wijk KJ. 2010. Reconstruction of Metabolic Pathways,

Protein Expression, and Homeostasis Machineries across Maize Bundle Sheath and Mesophyll

Chloroplasts: Large-Scale Quantitative Proteomics Using the First Maize Genome Assembly. *Plant*

Phys. 152:1219–1250.

35.   Fu L, Niu B, Zhu Z, Wu S, Li W. 2012. CD-HIT: accelerated for clustering the next-generation

sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* 28:3150–3152.

36.   Geesink R. 1969. An account of the genus *Portulaca* in Indo-Australia and the Pacific

(Portulacaceae). *Blumea* 17.

37.   Grabherr MG, Haas BJ, Yassour M, Levin JZ, Thompson DA, Amit I, Adiconis X, Fan L,

Raychowdhury R, Zeng Q, et al. 2011. Full-length transcriptome assembly from RNA-Seq data

without a reference genome. *Nat Biotechnol*. 29:644–652.

38.   Gupta S, Stamatoyannopoulos JA, Bailey TL, Noble WS. 2007. Quantifying similarity between

motifs. *Genome Biol.* 8:R24.

39.   Guralnick LJ, Jackson MD. 2001. The occurrence and phylogenetics of Crassulacean acid

metabolism in the Portulacaceae. *Int J Plant Sci.* 162:257–262.

40.   Guralnick LJ, Edwards G, Ku MSB, Hockema B, Franceschi VR. 2002. Photosynthetic and

anatomical characteristics in the C_4-Crassulacean Acid Metabolism-cycling plant, *Portulaca*

grandiflora. *Func Plant Biol*. 29:763–773.

41.   Guralnick LJ, Cline A, Smith M, Sage RF. 2007. Evolutionary physiology: the extent of C_4 and

CAM photosynthesis in the genera *Anacampseros* and *Grahamia* of the Portulacaceae. *J Exp Bot*.

59:1735–1742.

42.   Haas BJ, Delcher AL, Mount SM, Wortman JR, Smith RK, Hannick LI, Maiti R, Ronning CM,

Rusch DB, Town CD, et al. 2003. Improving the *Arabidopsis* genome annotation using maximal

transcript alignment assemblies. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 31:5654–5666.

43.   Haas BJ, Salzberg SL, Zhu W, Pertea M, Allen JE, Orvis J, White O, Buell CR, Wortman JR. 2008.

Automated eukaryotic gene structure annotation using EVidenceModeler and the Program to

Assemble Spliced Alignments. *Genome Biol.* 9:R7.

44.   Hagberg AA, Schult DA, Swart PJ. 2008. Exploring network structure, dynamics, and function using

NetworkX. In: Varoquaux G, Vaught T, Millman J editors. Proceedings of the 7th Python in Science

Conference (SciPy2008). Pasadena, CA, USA

45. Hancock LP, Holtum JAM, Edwards EJ. 2019. The Evolution of CAM Photosynthesis in Australian
Calandrinia Reveals Lability in C_3+CAM Phenotypes and a Possible Constraint to the Evolution of
Strong CAM. *Integr Comp Biol.* 59:517–534.

46. Hartwell J. 2006. The Circadian Clock in CAM Plants. In: Hall AJW, McWatters H editors. Annual
Plant Reviews Volume 21: Endogenous Plant Rhythms. Kundli, Insi. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. p.
211–236.

47. Hibberd JM, Covshoff S. 2010. The Regulation of Gene Expression Required for C_4 Photosynthesis.
Ann Rev Plant Biol. 61:181–207.

48. Heng Li. 2018. Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. *Bioinformatics* 34:3094–
3100.

49. Herrera A. 2009. Crassulacean Acid Metabolism and fitness under water deficit stress: if not for
carbon gain, what is facultative CAM good for? *Ann Bot.* 103:645–653.

50. Heyduk K, Moreno-Villena JJ, Gilman IS, Christin P-A, Edwards EJ. 2019. The genetics of
convergent evolution: insights from plant photosynthesis. *Nat Rev Gen.* 313:1–9.

51. Ho C-L, Chiang J-M, Lin T-C, Martin CE. 2019. First report of C_4/CAM-cycling photosynthetic
pathway in a succulent grass, *Spinifex littoreus* (Brum. f.) Merr., in coastal regions of Taiwan. *Flora*
254:194-202.

52. Holtum JAM, Hancock LP, Edwards EJ, Winter K. 2017. Optional use of CAM photosynthesis in
two C_4 species, *Portulaca cyclophylla* and *Portulaca digyna. J Plant Phys.* 214:91–96.

53. Holtum JAM, Hancock LP, Edwards EJ, Winter K. 2018. Crassulacean Acid Metabolism in the
Basellaceae (Caryophyllales). *Plant Biol.* 20:409–414.

54. Holtum JAM, Hancock LP, Edwards EJ, Winter K. 2021. CAM photosynthesis in desert blooming
Cistanthe of the Atacama, Chile. *Func Plant Biol.* 48:691-702.

55. Huang WM, Shao H, Zhou SN, Zhou Q, Fu WL, Zhang T, Jiang H-S, Li W, Gontero B, Maberly
SC. 2018. Different CO_2 acclimation strategies in juvenile and mature leaves of Ottelia alismoides.
Photosynth Res. 138:219–232.

56. Hubley R, Finn RD, Clements J, Eddy SR, Jones TA, Bao W, Smit AFA, Wheeler TJ. 2016. The
Dfam database of repetitive DNA families. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 44:D81–9.

57. Jordon-Thaden IE, Chanderbali AS, Gitzendanner MA, Soltis DE. 2015. Modified CTAB and
TRIzol Protocols Improve RNA Extraction from Chemically Complex Embryophyta. *Apps Plant*
Sci. 3:1400105–1400122.

58. Kashtan N, Alon U. 2005. Spontaneous evolution of modularity and network motifs. *Proc Nat Acad*
Sci USA. 102:13773–13778.

59. Kashtan N, Noor E, Alon U. 2007. Varying environments can speed up evolution. *Proc Nat Acad Sci*
USA. 104:13711–13716.

60. Keeley JE, Rundel PW. 2003. Evolution of CAM and C$_4$ Carbon-Concentrating Mechanisms. *Int J*
Plant Sci. 164:S55–S77.

61. Khan A, Fornes O, Stigliani A, Gheorghe M, Castro-Mondragon JA, van der Lee R, Bessy A,
Chèneby J, Kulkarni SR, Tan G, et al. 2018. JASPAR 2018: update of the open-access
database of transcription factor binding profiles and its web framework. *Nucleic Acids Res*.
46:D260–D266.

62. Kim I, Carr GD. 1990. Reproductive biology and uniform culture of *Portulaca* in Hawaii. *Pac Sci*.
44:123–129.

63. Korf I. 2004. Gene finding in novel genomes. *BMC Bioinformatics* 5:59.

64. Langfelder P, Horvath S. 2008. WGCNA: An R package for weighted correlation network analysis.
BMC Bioinformatics 9:559.

65. Lara MV, Disante KB, Podestá FE, Andreo CS, Drincovich MF. 2003. Induction of a Crassulacean
Acid like Metabolism in the C$_4$ succulent plant, *Portulaca oleracea* L.: physiological and
morphological changes are accompanied by specific modifications in phosphoenolpyruvate
carboxylase. *Photosynth Res* 77:241.

66. Lara MV, Drincovich MF, Andreo CS. 2004. Induction of a Crassulacean Acid-like Metabolism in
the C$_4$ Succulent Plant, *Portulaca oleracea* L.: Study of Enzymes Involved in Carbon Fixation and
Carbohydrate Metabolism. *Plant Cell Phys.* 45: 618–626.

67. Leegood RC. 1985. The intercellular compartmentation of metabolites in leaves of *Zea mays* L.
Planta 164:163–171.

68. Lenski RE, Ofria C, Pennock RT, Adami C. 2003. The evolutionary origin of complex features.
Nature 423:139–144.

69. Liu Y, Li X, Li K, Liu H, Lin C. 2013. Multiple bHLH Proteins form Heterodimers to Mediate
CRY2-Dependent Regulation of Flowering-Time in *Arabidopsis*. *Plos Genet.* 9:e1003861.

70. Lüttge, U. 2011. Photorespiration in Phase III of Crassulacean Acid Metabolism: Evolutionary and
Ecophysiological Implications. In: Lüttge U, Beyschlag W, Büdel B, Francis D editors. Progress in
Botany 72. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg. p. 371-384.

71. Maguvu TE, Higuchi Y, Sugiura S, Ito H, Shibata M. 2021. De novo Whole Transcriptome Analysis
of Wingpod Purslane, *Portulaca umbraticola*, and Its Application to the Discovery of Genes Related
to Flower Senescence and Opening Rhythm. *Hortic J.* 70:97-107.

72. Majoros WH, Pertea M, Salzberg SL. 2004. TigrScan and GlimmerHMM: two open source ab initio
eukaryotic gene-finders. *Bioinformatics* 20:2878–2879.

73. Mallmann J, Heckmann D, Bräutigam A, Lercher MJ, Weber APM, Westhoff P, Gowik U. 2014.
The role of photorespiration during the evolution of C$_4$ photosynthesis in the genus *Flaveria*. *eLife*
3:e02478.

74. Matasci N, Hung L-H, Yan Z, Carpenter EJ, Wickett NJ, Mirarab S, Nguyen N, Warnow T,
Ayyampalayam S, Barker M, et al. 2014. Data access for the 1,000 Plants (1KP) project.
GigaScience 3:17.

75. McLeay RC, Bailey TL. 2010. Motif Enrichment Analysis: a unified framework and an evaluation
on ChIP data. *BMC Bioinformatics* 11:165.

76. McClintock B. 1984. The significance of responses of the genome to challenge. *Science* 226:792-
801.

77. McClung C. 2019. The Plant Circadian Oscillator. *Biology* 8:14–17.

78. Moreno-Villena JJ, Dunning LT, Osborne CP, Christin P-A. 2018. Highly Expressed Genes Are
Preferentially Co-Opted for C$_4$ Photosynthesis. *Mol Biol Evo.* 35:94–106.

79. Niewiadomska E, Borland A. 2007. Crassulacean Acid Metabolism: a cause or consequence of
oxidative stress in planta? In: Luttge U, Beyschlag W, Murata J editors. Progress in Botany 69.
Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg. p. 247-266.

80. Nimmo HG. 2000. The regulation of phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase in CAM plants. *Trends Plant*
Sci 5:75–80.

81. Nobel PS. 2003. Environmental Biology of Agaves and Cacti. Cambridge University Press

82. Ocampo G, Koteyeva NK, Voznesenskaya EV, Edwards GE, Sage TL, Sage RF, Columbus JT.
2013. Evolution of leaf anatomy and photosynthetic pathways in Portulacaceae. *Am J Bot.*
100:2388–2402.

83. Ogburn RM, Edwards EJ. 2009. Anatomical variation in Cactaceae and relatives: Trait lability and
evolutionary innovation. *Am J Bot.* 96:391–408.

84. Ogren WL. 1984. Photorespiration: Pathways, Regulation, and Modification. *Ann Rev Plant Phys.*
35:415–442.

85. Palmer J, Stajich J. [online]. nextgenusfs/funannotate: funannotate v1.6.0 (Version 1.6.0). Zenodo.
http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3354704.

86. Peterhansel C, Horst I, Niessen M, Blume C, Kebeish R, Kürkcüoglu S, Kreuzaler F. 2010.
Photorespiration. *The Arabidopsis Book* 8:e0130.

87. Pimentel H, Bray NL, Puente S, Melsted P, Pachter L. 2017. Differential analysis of RNA-seq
incorporating quantification uncertainty. *Nature Methods* 14:687–690.

88. Putnam NH, O'Connell BL, Stites JC, Rice BJ, Blanchette M, Calef R, Troll CJ, Fields A, Hartley
PD, Sugnet CW, et al. 2016. Chromosome-scale shotgun assembly using an in vitro method for
long-range linkage. *Genome Res.* 26:342–350.

89. Raven JA, Spicer RA. 1996. The evolution of Crassulacean Acid Metabolism. In: Winter K, Smith
JAC, editors. Ecological Studies 114: Crassulacean Acid Metabolism: Biochemistry, Ecophysiology,
and Evolution. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg. p. 360–385.

90. Reyes JC, Muro-Pastor MI, Florencio FJ. 2004. The GATA Family of Transcription Factors in
Arabidopsis and Rice. *Plant Phys.* 134:1718–1732.

91. Sage RF. 2002. Are Crassulacean Acid Metabolism and C_4 photosynthesis incompatible? *Func Plant*
Biol. 29:775–785.

92. Sage RF. 2004. The evolution of C_4 photosynthesis. *New Phytologist.* 161: 341-370.

93. Sage RF. 2016. A portrait of the C_4 photosynthetic family on the 50th anniversary of its discovery:
species number, evolutionary lineages, and Hall of Fame. *J Exp Bot.* 67:4039–4056.

94. Sage RF, Sage TL, Kocacinar F. 2012. Photorespiration and the Evolution of C_4 Photosynthesis.
Plant Biol. 63:19–47.

95. Schuler ML, Mantegazza O, Weber APM. 2016. Engineering C_4 photosynthesis into C_3 chassis in
the synthetic biology age. *Plant J.* 87:51–65

96. Schmieder R, Edwards R. 2011. Quality control and preprocessing of metagenomic datasets.
Bioinformatics 27:863–864.

97. Sharma AK, Bhattacharyya NK. 1956. Cytogenetics of some members of Portulacaceae and related
families. *Caryologia* 8:257–274.

98. Simão FA, Waterhouse RM, Ioannidis P, Kriventseva EV, Zdobnov EM. 2015. BUSCO: assessing
genome assembly and annotation completeness with single-copy orthologs. *Bioinformatics* 31:3210–
3212.

99. Slack CR, Hatch MD. 1967. Comparative studies on the activity of carboxylases and other enzymes
in relation to the new pathway of photosynthetic carbon dioxide fixation in tropical grasses. *Biochem*
J. 103(3):660-665.

100. Slater GSC, Birney E. 2005. Automated generation of heuristics for biological sequence comparison.
BMC Bioinformatics 6:31.

101. Smit AFA, Hubley R. [online]. RepeatModeler Open-1.0. http://www.repeatmasker.org [2008-
2015].

102. Smit AFA, Hubley R, Green P. [online]. RepeatMasker Open-4.0. http://www.repeatmasker.org
[2013-2015].

103. Szarek SR, Ting IP. Photosynthetic Efficiency of CAM Plants in Relation to C_3 and C_4 Plants. In:
Environmental and Biological Control of Photosynthesis. Marcelle, R, editor. Springer Netherlands.
p. 289-297.

104. Taylor SH, Ripley BS, Martin T, De-Wet L, Woodward FI, Osborne CP. 2014. Physiological
advantages of C_4 grasses in the field: a comparative experiment demonstrating the importance of
drought. *Global Change Biol.* 20:1992–2003.

105. Ting IP, Hanscom Z. 1977. Induction of Acid Metabolism in *Portulacaria afra*. *Plant Phys.* 59:511–
514.

106. Voznesenskaya EV, Koteyeva NK, Edwards GE, Ocampo G. 2010. Revealing diversity in structural
and biochemical forms of C_4 photosynthesis and a C_3-C_4 intermediate in genus Portulaca L.
(Portulacaceae). *J Exp Bot.* 61:3647–3662.

107. Voznesenskaya, EV, Koteyeva NK, Edwards GE, Ocampo G. Unique photosynthetic phenotypes in
Portulaca (Portulacaceae): C_3-C_4 intermediates and NAD-ME C_4 species with Pilosoid-type Kranz
anatomy. *J Exp Bot.* 68, 225–239 (2017).

108. Wagner GP, Altenberg L. 1996. Perspective: Complex Adaptations And The Evolution Of
Evolvability. *Evolution* 50:967–976.

109. Wang N, Yang Y, Moore MJ, Brockington SF, Walker JF, Brown JW, Liang B, Feng T, Edwards C,
Mikenas J, et al. 2019. Evolution of Portulacineae Marked by Gene Tree Conflict and Gene Family
Expansion Associated with Adaptation to Harsh Environments. *Mol Biol Evo.* 36:112–126.

110. Williams BP, Johnston IG, Covshoff S, Hibberd JM. 2013. Phenotypic landscape inference reveals
multiple evolutionary paths to C_4 photosynthesis. *eLife* 2:e00961.

111. Winter K, Aranda J, Holtum JAM. 2005. Carbon Isotope Composition and Water-use Efficiency in
Plants with Crassulacean Acid Metabolism. *Func Plant Biol.* 32:381–388.

112. Winter K, Sage RF, Edwards EJ, Virgo A, Holtum JAM. 2019. Facultative Crassulacean Acid
Metabolism in a C_3–C_4 intermediate. *J Exp Bot.* 108:8379–9.

113. Winter K. 2019. Ecophysiology of constitutive and facultative CAM photosynthesis. *J Exp Bot.*
2:16178–14.

114. Winter K, Garcia M, Virgo A, Ceballos J, Holtum JAM. 2021. Does the C_4 plant *Trianthema*
portulacastrum (Aizoaceae) exhibit weakly expressed crassulacean acid metabolism (CAM)? *Func*
Plant Biol. 48:655-665.

115. Yang X, Hu R, Yin H, Jenkins J, Shu S, Tang H, Liu D, Weighill DA, Yim WC, Ha J, et al. 2017.
The *Kalanchoë* genome provides insights into convergent evolution and building blocks of
crassulacean acid metabolism. *Nat. Comm.* 8:1–15.

116. Zhang Y, Yin L, Jiang H-S, Li W, Gontero B, Maberly SC. 2013. Biochemical and biophysical CO$_2$

concentrating mechanisms in two species of freshwater macrophyte within the genus *Ottelia*

(Hydrocharitaceae). *Photosynth Res.* 121:285–297.

117. Zhao T, Schranz ME. 2019. Network-based microsynteny analysis identifies major differences and

genomic outliers in mammalian and angiosperm genomes. *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA.* 116:2165–2174.

Figure 1.

1119

1120   Figure 2

1121

1122   Figure 3.

1123

1124   Figure 4.

1125

1126   Figure 5.

A. [mesophyll] BCA, PEPC, MDH/ASP, carboxylation → 4-carbon acid; [bundle sheath] decarboxylation, (ASP + MDH), ME, CBC

B. [mesophyll] BCA, PEPC, MDH, carboxylation; Night — stomata open; Day — stomata closed; malic acid; ME, decarboxylation; CBC

C.

- Molluginaceae (C_3, C_3-C_4, C_4)
- Montiaceae (C_3, C_3+CAM)
- Halophytaceae (C_3+CAM)
- Basellaceae (C_3+CAM)
- Didiereaceae (C_3+CAM)
- Talinaceae (C_3+CAM)
- Cactaceae (CAM)
- Anacampserotaceae (C_3+CAM, CAM)
- OL clade — 18.6 Ma
- Cryptopetala clade
- Oleracea clade (*P. oleracea*) — 23.0 Ma, 13.6 Ma, 6.2 Ma
- Umbraticola clade — 2.2 Ma
- Pilosa clade (*P. amilis*) — 17.5 Ma, 15.2 Ma, 10.7 Ma

Portulaca

C_4 biochem.
- NADP
- NAD
- NAD C_3-C_4

D. ΔH^+ (μeq / g FM); NS; ***; WW | D — *P. amilis*; WW | D — *P. oleracea*

E. *P. amilis* — well-watered — 8 day drought

A. *paPPC-1E1c* modules

B. *poPPC-1E1c* modules

WW exclusive · preserved genes · D exclusive
PPC-1E1c well-watered modules · *PPC-1E1c* drought modules

C. *P. amilis* common drought network

paPPC-1E1c drought module · common drought orthologs · *poPPC-1E1c* drought modules
P. amilis exclusive · *P. oleracea* exclusive

D. *P. oleracea* common drought network

E.

chloroplast
branched phosphoglucans — PHS1-2 → glucose-1-phosphate
GWD1-1 · LSF1-1
P_i
branched glucans
ISA3-1 → linear malto-oligosaccharides
DPE1-1 → glucose
SBE3-1

heteroglycans$_{n-1}$ · P
PHS2-2
P_i
heteroglycans$_n$

PEP · HCO_3^- → OAA
PPC-1E1c

ADO1-1 · ADO3-1 · ADO3-2
APRR5-1 · APRR5-2 · GI-1
ELF1-1 · ELF4-1
LUX-5 · RVE6-2
circadian rhythm

vacuole
H^+ · glucose · H^+
ERDL16-2 · MSSP1-1
H^+ · H^+

A. *Portulaca amilis* well-watered

CO₂ — CO_2
BCA
HCO₃ — HCO_3
PEPC-1E1a'
PEP
OAA
NADP-MDH
malate
malate
pyruvate
PPDK
PEP
mesophyll
bundle sheath
pyruvate
CO₂ — CO_2
CBC
NADP-ME
malate

B. *Portulaca amilis* drought

NAD-ME1-1
NAD-ME2-1
malate
malate
pyruvate
CO₂ — CO_2
PUMP5-1
NAD-MDH
CO₂ — CO_2
BCA
HCO₃ — HCO_3
PEPC-1E1c
PEP
OAA
NADP-MDH
malic acid
CO₂ — CO_2
BCA
HCO₃ — HCO_3
PEPC-1E1a'
PEP
OAA
NADP-MDH
malate
malate
malate
transitory starches
CO₂ — CO_2
pyruvate
NADP-ME4-5
PPDK
PEP
mesophyll
bundle sheath
pyruvate
CO₂ — CO_2
CBC
NADP-ME
malate
malic acid

NAD-specific
NADP-specific
Shared
mitochondrion
chloroplast
vacuole

A. *P. amilis*

B. *P. oleracea*

Legend:
- Transitory starch pathway
- Starch/sugar transport
- Starch synthesis
- Starch degradation
- Proton transport
- Photorespiration
- PEPC regulation
- PEP generation
- Metabolite transport
- Decarboxylation
- Circadian/Light response
- Carboxylation
- Calvin cycle
- Aminotransferase

X-axis categories (both panels): WW exclusive, Shared, D exclusive

A. *P. amilis* well-watered C4 PGN

B. *P. oleracea* well-watered C4 PGN

Legend:
- Transitory starch pathway
- Starch/sugar transport
- Starch synthesis
- Starch degradation
- Proton transport
- Photorespiration
- PEPC regulation
- PEP generation
- Metabolite transport
- Decarboxylation
- Circadian/Light response
- Carboxylation
- Calvin cycle
- Aminotransferase

A. *P. oleracea* well-watered

B. *P. oleracea* drought

NAD-specific
NADP-specific
Shared

mitochondrion
chloroplast
vacuole