Conservation and diversification of the molecular functions of YTHDF proteins

Daniel Flores-Téllez, Mathias Tankmar, Sören von Bülow, Junyu Chen, Kresten Lindorff-Larsen, Peter Brodersen* and Laura Arribas-Hernández*

University of Copenhagen, Biology Department. Ole Maaløes Vej 5, DK-2200 Copenhagen N

*Corresponding authors

Email pbrodersen@bio.ku.dk (P.B.) and laura.arribas@bio.ku.dk (L.A.-H.)

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest

1   **Abstract**

2   YTHDF proteins bind to *N6*-methyladenosine (m^{6}A) in eukaryotic mRNA to determine many

3   cytoplasmatic properties of target transcripts. Vertebrates encode three YTHDF proteins

4   whose possible functional specialization is debated. In land plants, the YTHDF clade has

5   expanded from one member in basal lineages to eleven EVOLUTIONARILY CONSERVED

6   C-TERMINAL REGION1-11 (ECT1-11) proteins in arabidopsis, named after the conserved

7   YTH domain placed behind a divergent intrinsically disordered region. The origin and

8   implications of YTHDF expansion in higher plants are unknown, as only three of these eleven

9   m^{6}A readers have been studied. Here, we show that stimulation of primordial cell division

10   relies on an ancestral molecular function of the m^{6}A-YTHDF axis that was present in the first

11   land plants and remained conserved over YTHDF diversification, as it appears in all major

12   clades of YTHDF proteins in flowering plants. Nevertheless, lineage-specific neo-

13   functionalization of ECT1, ECT9 and ECT11 happened after late duplication events, and

14   involves altered properties mainly of the IDRs. Metazoan YTHDFs cannot provide stimulation

15   of stem cell division in arabidopsis, suggesting different molecular activities of YTHDF proteins

16   across kingdoms.

17

Introduction

N6-methyladenosine (m⁶A) is the most abundant modified nucleotide occurring internally in

eukaryotic mRNA. It is of major importance in gene regulation as illustrated by the embryonic

lethality of mutants in the dedicated mRNA adenosine methyltransferase in higher plants

(Zhong *et al*, 2008) and in mammals (Geula *et al*, 2015). The presence of m⁶A in an mRNA

may have multiple biochemical consequences. These include changes in the secondary

structure (Liu *et al*, 2015; Roost *et al*, 2015; Spitale *et al*, 2015) and the creation of binding

sites for RNA-binding proteins specialized for m⁶A recognition (Dominissini *et al*, 2012; Patil

et al, 2018). YT521-B homology (YTH) domain proteins (Stoilov *et al*, 2002) constitute the best

studied class of m⁶A-binding proteins (Dominissini *et al.*, 2012; Patil *et al.*, 2018; Wang *et al*,

2014a). They achieve specificity for m⁶A via an aromatic pocket accommodating the *N6*-

adenosine methyl group, such that the affinity of isolated YTH domains for m⁶A-containing

RNA is 10-20-fold higher than for unmodified RNA (Li *et al*, 2014b; Luo & Tong, 2014; Theler

et al, 2014; Wang *et al.*, 2014a; Xu *et al*, 2014; Zhu *et al*, 2014).

Two different phylogenetic clades of YTH domains have been defined, YTHDC and

YTHDF (Patil *et al.*, 2018; Zhang *et al*, 2010). Genetic studies establish that major functions

of m⁶A in development in both vertebrates and plants depend on the YTHDF clade of readers

(Arribas-Hernández *et al*, 2018; Arribas-Hernández *et al*, 2020; Ivanova *et al*, 2017; Kontur *et*

al, 2020; Lasman *et al*, 2020; Li *et al*, 2018; Shi *et al*, 2018). In all cases studied in detail thus

far, plant and animal YTHDF proteins are cytoplasmic in unchallenged conditions (Arribas-

Hernández *et al.*, 2018; Arribas-Hernández *et al*, 2021b; Haussmann *et al*, 2016; Lence *et al*,

2016; Scutenaire *et al*, 2018; Zhang *et al.*, 2010), and contain a long N-terminal intrinsically

disordered region (IDR) in addition to the C-terminal YTH domain (Li *et al*, 2014a; Patil *et al.*,

2018; Stoilov *et al.*, 2002). While the YTH domain is necessary for specific binding to m⁶A in

mRNA (Li *et al.*, 2014b; Luo & Tong, 2014; Theler *et al.*, 2014; Wang *et al.*, 2014a; Xu *et al.*,

2014; Zhu *et al.*, 2014), the IDR is considered to be the effector part of the protein (Boo *et al*,

2022; Du *et al*, 2016; Park *et al*, 2019; Wang *et al.*, 2014a). Nonetheless, it has been proposed

that the IDR may also participate in RNA binding, because the YTH domain alone has low

affinity for mRNA (Patil *et al.*, 2018). Indeed, the IDR-dependent crosslinks between a YTHDF

protein and mRNA detected upon UV-irradiation of living arabidopsis seedlings (Arribas-

Hernández *et al*, 2021a) experimentally supports such a mechanism, conceptually equivalent

to the contribution of IDRs in transcription factors to specific DNA binding (Brodsky *et al*, 2020).

While yeast, flies and primitive land plants encode only one YTHDF protein

(Haussmann *et al.*, 2016; Lence *et al.*, 2016; Scutenaire *et al.*, 2018; Scutenaire *et al*, 2022;

Varier *et al*, 2022), vertebrates have three closely related paralogs (YTHDF1-3) (Patil *et al.*,

2018; Stoilov *et al.*, 2002; Zaccara & Jaffrey, 2020; Zhang *et al.*, 2010) and higher plants

encode an expanded family, with eleven members in *Arabidopsis thaliana* (*Ath*) referred to as

EVOLUTIONARILY CONSERVED C-TERMINAL REGION1-11 (ECT1-11) (Li *et al.*, 2014a;

Ok *et al*, 2005). It is a question of fundamental importance for the understanding of how

complex eukaryotic systems use the regulatory potential of m^{6}A whether these many YTHDF

proteins perform the same biochemical function, or whether their molecular properties are

specialized. Such molecular specialization could, for instance, arise as a consequence of

differential binding specificity to mRNA targets, distinct protein-protein interaction properties,

or distinct biophysical properties of IDRs, such as those related to the propensity to phase

separate (Bergeron-Sandoval *et al*, 2016; Borcherds *et al*, 2021). Alternatively, diversification

of biological functions could be achieved with distinct expression patterns or induction by

environmental cues, even if targets and molecular functions are the same.

Initial studies on mammalian cell cultures advocated a model in which YTHDF1 would

enhance translation of target mRNAs, YTHDF2 would promote mRNA decay, and YTHDF3

would be able to trigger either of the two (Li *et al*, 2017; Shi *et al*, 2017; Wang *et al.*, 2014a;

Wang *et al*, 2015). Nonetheless, recent studies in mouse, zebrafish and human cell culture

involving single and combined *ythdf* knockouts and analysis of interacting mRNAs and

proteins do not support functional specialization, and propose a unified molecular function for

all three vertebrate YTHDFs in accelerating mRNA decay (Kontur *et al.*, 2020; Lasman *et al.*,

2020; Zaccara & Jaffrey, 2020).

The great expansion of YTHDF proteins in higher plants is unique among eukaryotes

(Stoilov *et al.*, 2002). Phylogenetic analyses of plant YTHDF domains have established the

existence of 3 clades in angiosperms, DF-A (comprising *Ath* ECT1, ECT2, ECT3, ECT4), DF-

B (comprising *Ath* ECT5, ECT10, ECT9), and DF-C (comprising *Ath* ECT6, ECT7, ECT8 and

ECT11) (Scutenaire *et al.*, 2018). The fact that the eleven arabidopsis paralogs have the

aromatic residues necessary for specific binding to m^{6}A (Fray & Simpson, 2015) suggests

that they may all function as m^{6}A readers. The unified model for YTHDF function recently

proposed for the three vertebrate paralogs (Kontur *et al.*, 2020; Lasman *et al.*, 2020; Zaccara

& Jaffrey, 2020) is consistent with what had already been established for *Ath* ECT2, ECT3

and ECT4 in the plant DF-A clade (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2018), even though the three

plant paralogs are more divergent in sequence than the highly similar mammalian YTHDF1-3

(Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2018; Stoilov *et al.*, 2002; Zaccara & Jaffrey, 2020). The two most

highly expressed members in *A. thaliana*, ECT2 and ECT3, accumulate in dividing cells of

organ primordia and exhibit genetic redundancy in the stimulation of stem cell proliferation

during organogenesis (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2018; Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2020). The

two proteins probably act truly redundantly *in vivo* to control this process, because they

associate with highly overlapping target sets in wild type plants, and each exhibits increased

target mRNA occupancy in the absence of the other protein (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2021b).

Simultaneous knockout of *ECT2* and *ECT3* causes a 2-day delay in the emergence of the first

true leaves, aberrant leaf morphology, slow root growth and defective root growth directionality
among other defects (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2018; Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2020) that
resemble those of plants with diminished m^{6}A deposition (Bodi *et al*, 2012; Růžička *et al*, 2017;
Shen *et al*, 2016). For the third DF-A clade member, *ECT4*, the genetic redundancy is only
noticeable in some tissues as an exacerbation of *ect2/ect3* phenotypes upon additional
mutation of *ect4*, most conspicuously seen in leaf morphogenesis (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*,
2018; Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2020). Despite the strong evidence for redundant functions
among these three YTHDF paralogs in the DF-A clade, the presence of many other YTHDF
proteins in arabidopsis leaves open the question of whether substantial functional
specialization of YTHDF proteins exists in plants.

In this study, we systematically define overlaps in molecular functions of plant YTHDF
proteins. Employing functional complementation of leaf formation in triple *ect2/ect3/ect4*
(*te234*) mutants, we demonstrate that at least one member of all clades in arabidopsis, and
the only YTHDF protein from a group of primitive land plants, are able to replace ECT2/3/4
functions. In contrast, a few late-diverging ECTs were not able to perform the molecular
functions of ECT2/3/4. Based on these results, we propose an ancestral molecular role for
land plant YTHDF proteins in stimulation of primordial cell proliferation, and sustained
functional redundancy during the diversification process that started more than 400 million
years ago (Mya). In addition, our results also support the functional divergence of a small
subset of fast-evolving plant YTHDF proteins with contributions to specialization mainly from
the IDRs, but also from the YTH domains.
113

Results

The phylogeny of plant YTHDF proteins comprises several clades

The adaptation of plants to terrestrial life, since the transition from freshwater to land until the
rise of angiosperms, was accompanied by the acquisition of morphological,
physiological and genomic complexity (One Thousand Plant Transcriptomes, 2019;
Pires & Dolan, 2012). Knowing how diversification of YTHDF proteins came about
during the course of plant evolution is relevant to understand their distinct functions,
and may hint at roles they might have played in this process. However, the species
included in the so far most detailed phylogenetic study on plant YTHDF proteins jump
from bryophytes (mosses, liverworts and hornworts (Harris *et al*, 2020; Li *et al*, 2020;
One Thousand Plant Transcriptomes, 2019; Puttick *et al*, 2018; Su *et al*, 2021; Zhang
et al, 2020b)) to angiosperms (flowering plants) (Scutenaire *et al.*, 2018). To include
the YTHDF repertoires of intermediately diverging clades such as ferns and

gymnosperms, we performed a phylogenetic analysis using YTHDF proteins from taxa

widely spread across terrestrial plant evolution (Fig. 1A). When possible, we included

basal clades of each group in addition to model organisms. The resulting phylogenetic

tree largely agrees with the DF-A/B/C clades defined on the basis of angiosperm

YTHDF sequences (Scutenaire *et al.*, 2018), with some minor differences. We

consider that the former DF-C group comprising *Ath* ECT6/7/8/11 (Scutenaire *et al.*,

2018) can be subdivided into two groups that diverged early during YTHDF radiation

(approximate likelihood-ratio test (aLRT) = 87), because the split between them is

comparable to that of clades DF-A and -B (Fig. 1B). Thus, we introduced the name

'DF-D' for the clade defined by one *Amborella trichopoda* (a basal angiosperm)

YTHDF protein (*Atr* DFD) and *Ath* ECT6/7 (Fig. 1B). Furthermore, since the group

comprising bryophyte YTHDFs did not receive a designation in previous studies, we

named it DF-E (mnemotechnic for 'Early') (Fig. 1B). Finally, an additional group

composed of early-diverging YTHDF proteins from the fern *Ceratopteris richardii* (*Cri*

DF1/2/3) and the gymnosperm *Ginkgo biloba* (*Gb* DF1/2) was named DF-F, as it did

not fall into any of the other clades (Fig. 1B). We conclude that land plant YTHDFs are

phylogenetically more diverse than previously appreciated.

YTHDF protein diversification occurred early during land plant evolution

Our phylogenetic analysis shows that plant YTHDF diversification started at least

before the radiation of Euphyllophytes (plants with true leaves comprising ferns,

gymnosperms and angiosperms) more than 410 Mya (Magallón *et al*, 2013; Su *et al.*,

2021). This is because bryophytes possess one or two YTHDFs in the 'early clade'

(DF-E) while the fern *C. richardii* has six YTHDFs in 3 different clades (Fig. 1B). Thus,

our analysis reveals that YTHDF radiation started early in land plant evolution and coincided

with the acquisition of morphological complexity and the adaptation to diverse environments.

A functional complementation assay for plant YTHDF proteins

To address the degree of functional specialization among plant YTHDF proteins in a simple

manner, we set up a functional complementation assay that scores the ability of each of the

eleven arabidopsis YTHDF proteins (Fig. 2A) to perform the molecular functions of ECT2/3/4

required for rapid cellular proliferation in leaf primordia. Initial attempts at using the *ECT2*

promoter for ectopic *ECT* expression in primordial cells were unsuccessful, as pilot

experiments with a genomic *ECT4* fragment revealed that its expression was substantially

lower than that of a similar *ECT2* genomic fragment when driven by the *ECT2* promoter (Fig. S1), perhaps pointing to the presence of internal *cis*-regulatory elements. We therefore turned to the use of *ECT* cDNAs (c*ECT*s) under the control of the promoter of the ribosomal protein-encoding gene *AthuS7B/RPS5A* (At3g11940 (Lan *et al*, 2022)) active in dividing cells (Weijers *et al*, 2001) in a pattern that resembles the *ECT2/3/4* expression domain (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2018; Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2020). Transformation of the *uS7Bp:cECT2-mCherry* construct in *te234* plants resulted in complementation frequencies of ~40-50% among primary transformants, a percentage slightly lower but comparable to that obtained with the genomic *ECT2-mCherry* construct under the control of *ECT2* promoter and terminator regions (*ECT2p:gECT2-mCherry*) (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2018) (Fig. S2A). Free mCherry expressed from a *uS7Bp:mCherry* transgene showed no complementation (Fig. S2A), as expected. Importantly, the leaf morphology and the pattern of mCherry fluorescence in *uS7Bp:cECT2-mCherry* lines was indistinguishable from that of *ECT2p:gECT2-mCherry* (Fig. S2B). Hence, we proceeded with expression of cDNAs encoding all of ECT1-11 fused to C-terminal mCherry under the control of the *uS7B* promoter (henceforth ECT1-11) in *te234* mutants (Fig. 2B).

Percentage of complementation among primary transformants as a readout for functionality

To design the experimental approach in detail, we considered the fact that expression of transgenes involves severe variations in levels and patterns among transformants. This is due to positional effects of the T-DNA insertion and the propensity of transgenes to trigger silencing in plants (Fagard & Vaucheret, 2000), and explains why only a fraction of *ECT2-mCherry* lines rescues loss of ECT2 function (Fig. S2A, (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2018)). Hence, many independent lines need to be analyzed before choosing stable and representative lines for further studies. Taking this into account, we decided to perform systematic and unbiased comparisons of ECT functionality by counting the fraction of primary transformants (henceforth T1s) able to complement the late leaf emergence of *te234* plants for each construct. We set a size threshold for the rapid assessment of large numbers of transformants considering that leaves longer than 0.5 mm after 10 days of growth constitute unambiguous sign of complementation, because this is the minimum size never reached by *te234* or control lines (Fig. S2B). Hence, we calculated complementation percentages as the number of T1s with leaf size (s) larger than 0.5 mm relative to the total number of transformants, and averaged that score over several independent transformations (Figs. 2C, S3A, and S4A).

Most arabidopsis YTHDF paralogs can perform the molecular function required for leaf development

The results of the comparative analysis reveal a high degree of functional overlap within the arabidopsis YTHDF family, because eight out of the eleven YTHDF proteins, namely ECT2/3/4/5/6/7/8/10, are able to complement delayed leaf emergence of *ect2/3/4* mutants with frequencies ranging from 14% (ECT6) to 39% (ECT2) when expressed in the same cells (Figs. 2C and S4A). Importantly, complementation is indirect proof of m^{6}A-binding ability, because the proteins must bind to the targets whose m^{6}A-dependent regulation is necessary for correct leaf organogenesis in order to restore ECT2/3/4 function (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2018). This conclusion is not trivial, as some eukaryotes lacking canonical m^{6}A-methyltransferases encode YTH domain proteins (Balacco & Soller, 2019) and, indeed, the YTH domain of fission yeast Mmi1 does not bind to m^{6}A (Wang *et al*, 2016). Thus, most, but not all, arabidopsis YTHDF proteins retain the molecular functions required to stimulate proliferation of primed stem cells. Of the three remaining proteins, ECT1 showed only residual complementation capacity, while no complementation was observed for ECT11 at this stage (Figs. 2C and S4A). Finally, we could not conclude at this point whether ECT9 could replace ECT2/3/4 function or not, because this transgene produced very few transformants in the *te234* background (Figs. 2C, S3A and S5) with barely visible fluorescence. All such transformants underwent complete silencing in the following generation (T2).

Differences in complementation scores are not explained by a bias in expression levels

Our T1 scoring method relies on the assumption that the *uS7B* promoter drives similar ranges of expression of the different *ECT* cDNAs. However, different silencing propensities between the *ECT* cDNAs might introduce bias in the results. To take this possibility into account, we first performed western blotting from three lines per transgene selected as the best-complementing in their group (Fig. S4B). The results showed that the higher complementation scores of e.g. ECT2, ECT3 and ECT8 are not explained by higher expression. Rather, the reverse was true. For example, while ECT2 could complement *te234* plants with the lowest expression among all ECTs, the few lines expressing ECT1 able to pass the complementation threshold had the highest expression of all ECTs, suggesting that ECT1 can only partially compensate for loss of ECT2/3/4 when overexpressed.

The same functional classes of ECTs emerge from complementation of silencing-deficient te234

Next, we tested whether the same results could be reproduced in plants lacking *RNA-DEPENDENT RNA POLYMERASE 6* (*RDR6*), a gene essential for the biogenesis of transgene-derived short interfering RNAs (siRNAs) (Dalmay *et al*, 2000; Mourrain *et al*, 2000). Because siRNA-guided transgene silencing is impaired in *rdr6* mutants, higher and more homogenous ranges of expression among different transgenes can be expected in this

background. Hence, we constructed *rdr6-12/te234* mutants that exhibited both the narrow, downward-curling leaf phenotype of *rdr6* mutants (Peragine *et al*, 2004) and the characteristic rosette morphology of *te234* (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2018) (Fig. S6A). Importantly, the delay in leaf emergence was identical in *te234* and *rdr6-12/te234* mutants (Fig. S6A) and the complementation rates of *ECT2* transgenes were much higher in the silencing-deficient plants (Fig. S2A), indicating that the <100% complementation frequencies in *te234* were indeed due to RDR6-dependent silencing. In the *rdr6/te234* background, complementation scores of the eight functionally equivalent ECTs (ECT2/3/4/5/6/7/8/10) ranged from 59% (ECT6) to 94% (ECT2), and the differences between these ECTs were less pronounced, but followed a trend largely unchanged compared to the *te234* background (Fig. 2C,D). On the other hand, the difference between the eight ECTs with ECT2/3/4-like function and the group of ECTs with negligible complementation capacity (ECT1/9/11) was highlighted by the *rdr6* mutation: ECT1 and ECT11 did not increase their scores (Fig. 2D), and absence of silencing resulted in a number of *ECT9* transformants with visible mCherry fluorescence, yet no complementation activity (Figs. 2D and S6B), thus verifying the lack of ECT2/3/4-like function of ECT9.

Rosette phenotypes corroborate the complementation scores

To verify the results of the complementation assay in the adult phenotype, we characterized rosettes of two independent lines for each transgene (Fig. 2E-H). As expected, *rdr6-12/te234* plants expressing ECTs with high complementation scores resembled single *rdr6-12* mutants (Fig. 2E,F), while the ECT1 and ECT11 transformants with the biggest first true leaves at 10 DAG produced plants only slightly bigger than the *rdr6-12/te234* background (Fig. 2E,G), indicating low but residual ECT2/3/4-like function for these two proteins. Strikingly, *rdr6-12/te234* plants expressing ECT9 exhibited strong developmental phenotypes (Figs. 2H and S6B) that resembled those of severely m^{6}A-depleted plants (Růžička *et al.*, 2017; Shen *et al.*, 2016). Such an effect was not observed for any other *Ath* ECT. This result suggests that ECT9 can bind to m^{6}A targets, either exerting opposite molecular actions compared to ECT2/3/4, or simply precluding their possible regulation by remaining ECTs such as ECT5/6/7/8/10 by competitive binding. We tested whether ECT9 can outcompete endogenous ECT2/3/4 in the proliferating cells of the apex by expressing the ECT9 transgene in single *rdr6-12* mutant plants. We found no evidence for this, because the transformation produced a high amount of fluorescent T1s without obvious defects (Fig. S7).

Altogether, our results indicate that arabidopsis YTHDF proteins may be divided into three functional classes, i) ECT2/3/4/5/6/7/8/10 with the molecular functionality of ECT2/3/4 required for correct and timely leaf formation; ii) ECT1/11, with only residual ECT2/3/4 functions, and iii) ECT9, unable to perform such functions and toxic when present in the expression domain of ECT2/3/4 in their absence.

Validation of the functional assay by loss-of-function genetic analysis

One of the predictions of the genetic interactions between *ECT* genes that can be drawn from our results is particularly unexpected and, therefore, suitable for the validation of our complementation assay by classical genetic analysis: Mutation of *ECT1* should not exacerbate the developmental defects of *te234*, even if it is endogenously expressed in leaf primordia. *ECT1* is especially suitable for validation for two reasons. First, ECT1 is the closest paralog of ECT2/3/4 in arabidopsis (Fig. 1B), intuitively suggesting some degree of genetic redundancy. Second, *ECT1* promoter-reporter fusions (Ok *et al.*, 2005) and mRNA-seq data (Fig. S9, Zhang *et al*, 2020a) suggest that expression levels and tissue specificity of *ECT1* are comparable to that of *ECT4*, whose activity is easily revealed as an enhancer mutant of *ect2/ect3* (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2018).

ECT1 and ECT2/3/4 are cytoplasmic and are expressed in the same cell types

We first assessed the expression pattern and subcellular localization of ECT1 using stable transgenic lines expressing TFP translationally fused to the C-terminus of *ECT1* (*ECT1-TFP*, Fig. S10A). The pattern of turquoise fluorescence was strongly reminiscent of that of fluorescent ECT2/3/4 fusions (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2018) with signal at the base of young leaves, in leaf primordia, main root tips and lateral root primordia at different stages (Fig. 3A-D). In addition, confocal microscopy of meristematic root cells showed cytoplasmic ECT1-TFP signal with heterogenous texture similar to ECT2/3/4 (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2018) (Fig. 3E). We noticed, however, that most root tips had a few cells containing distinct ECT1-TFP foci (Fig. 3F) in the absence of stress. We found no trace of free TFP that could be causing imaging artifacts (Fig. S10A), but note that the *ECT1-TFP* transgenic lines selected on the basis of visible and reproducible pattern of fluorescence may overexpress *ECT1* (Fig. S10B). We conclude from the similar expression pattern and subcellular localization of ECT1 and ECT2/3/4 that assessment of the possible exacerbation of *te234* phenotypes by additional loss of *ECT1* function is a meaningful test of our functional assay.

Mutation of ECT1 does not exacerbate the phenotype of ect2/ect3/ect4 plants

We isolated three homozygous knockout lines caused by T-DNA insertions in the *ECT1* gene, *ect1-1*, *ect1-2*, and *ect1-3* (Fig. 3G,H), and crossed two of them to different *ect2/ect3/ect4* triple mutants to obtain two independent allele combinations of quadruple *ect* mutants, *qe1234* and *Gqe1234* (Fig. S10C). In both cases, the quadruple mutant plants were indistinguishable from the corresponding *te234* and *Gte234* triple mutant parentals (Figs. 3I and S10C,D). Similarly, triple *ect1/ect2/ect3* mutants were identical to double *ect2/ect3* mutants, and single *ect1* mutants did not show any obvious defects in *ect2/3*-associated traits such as leaf or root

308   organogenesis and trichome branching (Figs. 3I and S10D-F). Thus, despite their similar
309   expression pattern, there is no indication of redundancy between ECT1 and the other three
310   DF-A clade paralogs. This unexpected conclusion agrees with the poor ECT2/3/4-like activity
311   of ECT1 in our functional assay, thereby validating the approach.
312
The divergent function of ECT1 and ECT11 is caused mainly by properties of their IDRs
Having established that different molecular functions are represented in the arabidopsis
YTHDF family, we went on to map the molecular regions responsible for this functional
divergence. First, we investigated whether lack of *te234* mutant complementation by
ECT1/9/11 is due to altered target binding by the YTH domain, IDR-related effector functions,
or a combination of both. Thus, we built chimeric IDR/YTH constructs between ECT2 and
ECT1/9/11 (Fig. 4A). We also tested an ECT8$_{IDR}$/ECT2$_{YTH}$ chimera (C-8/2) to assess whether
hybrid constructs can at all be functional, choosing ECT8 as a positive control due to its robust
complementation of seedling and adult phenotypes (Fig. 2C,D,F). Expression of the constructs
in *te234* mutants showed that the C-8/2 chimera was fully functional (Figs. 4B, S3B and S8),
thus validating the approach. In contrast, ECT1- and ECT11-derived chimeras proved that
both the IDR and the YTH domain of these two proteins only retain a reduced degree of
function compared to the equivalent regions in ECT2 (Figs. 4B, S3B and S8). In particular, the
IDRs of both proteins scored lower than their YTH domains when combined with the other half
from ECT2 (Fig. 4B), pointing to divergence in the IDR as the main cause for different
functionality. In wild type ECT1 and ECT11 proteins, the combination of the two poorly-
performing parts is likely the cause for the minute ECT2/3/4-like activity.
330
The IDR of ECT9 is incapable of performing ECT2/3/4 molecular functions, but its YTH domain
retains some ECT2/3/4-like function
The ECT2$_{IDR}$/ECT9$_{YTH}$ chimera (C-2/9) yielded normal transformation efficiencies and up to
17% of T1s had signs of complementation compared to 56% for ECT2 (Figs. 4B, S3B and
S8), suggesting that the YTH domain of ECT9 retains at least partial functionality. However,
the reverse construct (ECT9$_{IDR}$/ECT2$_{YTH}$, C-9/2) recapitulated the results obtained for ECT9:
low transformation efficiency and low fluorescence in the few T1s recovered, and complete
silencing in the next generation (Figs. 4B, S3B and S8). Hence, we introduced the C-9/2
chimera into the *rdr6-12/te234* background and observed plants with stronger fluorescence
exhibiting aberrant morphology, again similar to what was obtained with ECT9 (Figs. 4C,D,
S3C and S6B). These results confirm that ECT9 is not functionally equivalent to ECT2/3/4,
and point to the IDR as the main site of functional divergence of the protein.
343
344   *The molecular requirements for m^{6}A-binding are conserved in the YTH domains of ECT1/9/11*

To pinpoint molecular characteristics of ECT1/9/11 responsible for their different functionality, we performed a series of comparative analyses between ECT1/9/11 and other ECT proteins. We first analyzed the YTH domains, taking ECT2 as a reference and using the structurally well-characterized YTH domain of *Homo sapiens* (*Hs*) YTHDF1 in complex with RNA GGm⁶ACU (Xu *et al*, 2015) as a model. Amino acid sequence alignment of the YTH domains of all arabidopsis ECTs (Fig. S11), AlphaFold-predictions (Jumper *et al*, 2021; Varadi *et al*, 2022) of the apo structures (Fig. S12) and homology models (Biasini *et al*, 2014) of the m⁶A-bound state confirmed a high degree of conservation of the key residues required for m⁶A-RNA binding and overall fold of the YTH domain of ECT1/9/11, in agreement with the partial functionality observed in our chimeric constructs (Fig. 4B). However, we also detected a few non-conservative amino acid substitutions specific for ECT1/9/11 (Figs. 5A and S11), preferentially located on the surface of the protein but far from the RNA-binding groove (Fig. S12). These non-conservative substitutions are prime candidates to explain the minor differences in functionality, a scenario that implies biological functions of YTH domains other than mere m⁶A-binding capacity.

The IDRs of ECT1/9/11 have biophysical properties distinct from ECT2/3/4/5/6/7/8/10

We next focused on the N-terminal regions of *ECT1/9/11.* Because protein disorder predictions using MobiDB (Piovesan *et al*, 2023) confirmed that they are all disordered (Fig. S13), we used approaches suitable for the study of IDRs. Prediction of short linear motifs (SLiMs) that may mediate interaction with effector proteins gave many possibilities that did not follow any clear pattern when compared between the different ECT classes (Fig. S13). Hence, we decided to study other properties known to be important in IDRs and focused on the propensity to form liquid condensates, the amino acid composition, and the distribution of charge. ECT2 can form condensates *in vitro* (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2018), and localizes *in vivo* to distinct foci upon stress (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2018; Scutenaire *et al.*, 2018), identified as stress granules (Scutenaire *et al.*, 2018). Similar properties have been reported for human YTHDFs, which engage in liquid-liquid phase transition when concentrated on polyvalent m⁶A-modified target RNA *in vitro* (Fu & Zhuang, 2020; Gao *et al*, 2019; Ries *et al*, 2019; Wang *et al*, 2020). To determine whether the distinct functional classes of ECTs differed in their propensity to phase separate, we employed a recently developed coarse-grained model of IDRs with residue-specific parameters estimated from experimental observations of many IDRs (Tesei *et al*, 2021) to simulate their tendency to remain in the condensed phase or disperse in solution. As control, we used the well-studied IDR of the human RNA-binding protein Fused in Sarcoma (FUS) (Kato *et al*, 2012; Kato & McKnight, 2021; Patel *et al*, 2015; Schwartz *et al*, 2013). The results showed that the IDR of ECT2 has a clear propensity to remain in the condensed phase (Fig. 5B-C and Movie S1) with a highly favorable Gibb's free

energy change for the transition from dilute aqueous solution to condensed phase (Fig. 5D),

comparable to, albeit not as pronounced as for the IDR of FUS (Fig. 5B-D). While the IDRs of

most ECT proteins behaved comparably to ECT2, the IDRs of ECT1 and ECT11 were clear

outliers (Figs. 5B-D and S14A). Compared to all other ECTs, the IDR of ECT1 showed a much

stronger propensity to phase separate, consistent with the spontaneous granule formation of

ECT1-TFP *in vivo* (Figs. 3F and 4B-D, and Movie S2). On the contrary, the IDR of ECT11

dispersed into solution much more readily (Fig. 5B-D and Movies S3). Thus, the IDRs of ECT1

and ECT11 have markedly different biophysical properties from those of ECT2/3/4/5/6/7/8/10,

perhaps contributing to their different functionality *in vivo*. In contrast, the IDR of ECT9 did not

stand out from the rest in the simulations of phase separation propensity. We also note that

the different phase separation propensity among the ECTs is driven, in the main, by their

different content of sticky residues as defined by the CALVADOS model (Tesei *et al.*, 2021)

(Fig. S14B). In this context, it is potentially of interest that ECT1, ECT9 and ECT11 all have a

higher content of Phe residues than the nearly Phe-depleted IDRs of ECT2/3/4/5/6/7/8/10 (Fig.

S14C). For ECT1, whose Tyr and Trp enrichment is comparable to that of ECT2/3/4/5/6/7/8/10

(Fig. S14C), the additional enrichment of the similarly sticky Phe may contribute to its more

pronounced phase separation propensity, but it is unclear what, if any, the functional

consequence of Phe enrichment in the Tyr/Trp-poor IDRs of ECT9 and ECT11 may be.

We finally analyzed the charge distribution, as this may dictate properties such as

compactness and shape of IDR conformations (Bianchi *et al*, 2022; Das *et al*, 2016). We found

that the IDRs of ECT2/3/4/5/6/7/8/10 show a recurrent pattern with accumulation of net

negative charge towards the N-terminus, and recovery to near-neutrality closer to the YTH

domain (Figs. 5E and S14D). The IDRs of ECT1, ECT9 and ECT11 differ from this pattern,

but in distinct ways: ECT1 does not show a pronounced patterning of the charged residues,

while ECT9 increasingly accumulates negative charge (Figs. 5E) and ECT11 increasingly

accumulates positive charge (Fig. S14D). It is an interesting possibility, therefore, that charge

separation in the IDR is a requirement to fulfill the molecular functions of ECTs to accelerate

growth in primordial cells.

The ability to complement ect2/3/4 does not simply follow affiliation with phylogenetic clades

We next compared the functional groups of YTHDF proteins defined by our complementation

assays with the YTHDF phylogeny. Strikingly, the ability to rescue defective timing of leaf

emergence does not follow the defined phylogenetic clades, because both high and low/null

complementation capacities are present in the same clades. For example, ECT2, ECT5 and

ECT8 in clades DF-A, -B and -C respectively present high ECT2/3/4-like functionality, while

ECT1, ECT9 and ECT11 in these same clades do not (Figs. 1B and 2C-H). It is noteworthy,

however, that there is a clear trend for non-complementors to be the most highly divergent

proteins in each group, as revealed by the length of the branches in the phylogenetic tree (Fig. 1B). Indeed, the longest branches in both our tree (highlighted in red in Fig. 1B) and the one in the study by Scutenaire et al. (2018) correspond to ECT1, ECT9, and ECT11, which also have the highest number of amino acid substitutions compared to the only YTHDF protein of the liverwort *Marchantia polymorpha* (*Mpo* YTHDF) (Bowman *et al*, 2017) (Fig. 6A). These results suggest that the common ancestor of YTHDF proteins in land plants may have had a molecular function related to that of the modern arabidopsis ECT2/3/4, and that this function has been conserved in the least-divergent members of the DF-A/B/C/D clades. Subsequent duplication and neofunctionalization may have driven the rapid evolution of highly-divergent YTHDF proteins (ECT11, ECT1, and ECT9 in Arabidopsis) that have lost their primary function and perhaps fulfill different molecular roles in the plant m^6A pathway.

The molecular function of ECT2/3/4 was present in the first land plants

To test whether the common ancestor of plant YTHDF proteins indeed had a molecular function similar to that of the modern *Arabidopsis* ECT2/3/4, we subjected *Mpo* YTHDF (Fig. 2A) to our functional assay, as bryophytes are the earliest-diverging taxon of land plants (Fig. 1A, (Harris *et al.*, 2020; Li *et al.*, 2020; One Thousand Plant Transcriptomes, 2019; Puttick *et al.*, 2018; Su *et al.*, 2021; Zhang *et al.*, 2020b)). The result showed a partial, but clear capacity of two different splice forms of *Mpo* YTHDF to complement the delay in leaf emergence and morphology defects of arabidopsis *te234* plants (Figs. 6B, S3D and S15A,B). Although the complementation scores were low (Fig. 6B), a thorough inspection of the fluorescence intensity in all primary transformants revealed that the transgene was only expressed very weakly in a reduced subpopulation of plants, possibly be due to the tendency to trigger silencing upon heterologous expression of a long cDNA from a distant plant species (Wang & Roossinck, 2006). We therefore introduced the best-complementing isoform into *rdr6-12/te234* mutants. This approach yielded a much higher complementation score of 52% (Fig. 6C), and plants very similar to those expressing ECT2 in the same background (Figs. 6D and S6B). Gratifyingly, the simulations of the behavior of the IDR of *Mpo* YTHDF showed phase separation propensity and charge pattern similar to the ECT2/3/4/5/6/7/8/10 group, further substantiating that these IDR characteristics correlate with the ability to fulfill ECT2/3/4 function in leaf formation (Fig. 6E-H), Hence, our results demonstrate that the core molecular activity of *Ath* ECT2/3/4 was present in the first land plants, and suggest that stimulating proliferation of primed stem cells is the ancestral YTHDF molecular function in plants.

Heterologous expression of animal YTHDFs enhances the phenotype caused by loss of ECT2/3/4 in Arabidopsis

Finally, we subjected *Hs* YTHDF2 and *Drosophila melanogaster* (*Dm*) YTHDF (Fig. 2A) to our functional assay to test whether they could function molecularly like plant YTHDFs. While we did not observe complementation of the delayed leaf emergence of *te234* plants in any of the transformants (Fig. 6B), several *Hs* YTHDF2 lines showed more acute developmental defects compared to *te234* (Fig. S15B). Although these defects were not observed among *Dm* YTHDF lines, no expression could be detected in these plants either. Hence, we repeated the transformation in the *rdr6-12/te234* background, this time obtaining numerous transformants of both *Dm* YTHDF and *Hs* YTHDF2 with strong fluorescence (Figs. 6C and S6B). These plants showed aberrant morphology comparable to the effect caused by expression of ECT9 and C-9/2, with resemblance to arabidopsis mutants with severe depletion of m^{6}A (Růžička *et al.*, 2017; Shen *et al.*, 2016) (Figs. 6D and S6B). Thus, expression of metazoan YTHDFs in arabidopsis *ECT2/3/4*-deficient plants exacerbates their developmental phenotype. This result is in agreement with the generally accepted idea that m^{6}A/YTHDF2 destabilize mRNA in mammals (Herzog *et al*, 2017; Ke *et al*, 2017; Sommer *et al*, 1978; Wang *et al.*, 2014a; Wang *et al*, 2014b) while m^{6}A/ECT2/3/4 do the opposite in plants (Anderson *et al*, 2018; Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2021b; Parker *et al*, 2020; Shen *et al.*, 2016; Wei *et al*, 2018). However, an analogous molecular mechanism between plant and animal YTHDFs cannot be completely ruled out, because a different cellular context may be hampering the molecular activity of metazoan YTHDFs in plant cells, and simple competition for targets with remaining ECTs could be the cause of the enhanced phenotype. Nonetheless, we note that the IDRs of *Hs* YTHDF2 and *Dm* YTHDF had much weaker phase separation propensity and different charge distribution compared to ECT2 (Fig. 6E-G), perhaps contributing to the lack of ECT2/3-like function *in planta*.

Discussion

Functional versus biological redundancy

Our study reveals that most YTHDF proteins in higher plants can perform, essentially, the same molecular functions that allow ECT2/3/4 to promote stem cell proliferation and control organogenesis. We anticipate that this molecular function may be used in specific biological contexts by ECT5/6/7/8/10 due to different expression patterns and response to stimuli, thereby achieving biological specialization with respect to ECT2/3/4. Such variability can already be inferred from available RNA-Seq data in the arabidopsis eFP Browser (BAR.toronto.ca) that show, for example, that ECT8 is primarily expressed during senescence-associated processes, perhaps in connection to re-growth after reversible proliferative arrest (Gan, 2003; Wuest *et al*, 2016). In addition to redundancy, there is a clear pattern of lineage-specific specialization in fast-evolving YTHDF proteins from different clades, exemplified in arabidopsis by ECT1, ECT11, and most prominently ECT9. Whether these

proteins act to counteract the ECT2/3/4-like function by competing for m^{6}A-containing

transcripts, perhaps halting growth upon stress, or whether they perform independent

functions in different tissues or cell types, is open for new investigations.

ECT1 is a newly evolved gene in a Brassicaceae lineage

Surprisingly, the only member of the DF-A clade not yet characterized as m^{6}A reader, ECT1,

scored low in our functional assay and indeed, inactivation of *ECT1* does not enhance the

phenotype caused by loss of *ECT2/3/4* despite expression of *ECT1* in the same cell types and

subcellular compartment as the other DF-A paralogs. We note that a previous description of

nuclear and cytoplasmic fluorescence of a *35Sp:ECT1-GFP* fusion (Ok *et al.*, 2005) may be

due to the fact that the authors used epifluorescence instead of confocal fluorescence

microscopy for the analyses. Because that technique does not distinguish between inside or

around the nucleus, the signal observed may have been perinuclear, e.g. from the

endoplasmic reticulum. A thorough look at phylogenetic analyses from Scutenaire *et al.* (2018)

reveals that *ECT1* is only present in species of the 'lineage I' of Brassicaceae such as *A.*

thaliana and *Capsella rubella* (*Cru*) (Nikolov *et al*, 2019). The closely related *Brassica oleracea*

('lineage II') (Nikolov *et al.*, 2019) has a clear homolog of *Ath/Cru ECT3*, but not *ECT1*

(Scutenaire *et al.*, 2018), while other dicots outside *Brassicaceae* encode *ECT3/1* orthologs

in a separate cluster (Scutenaire *et al.*, 2018). Therefore, *ECT1* is the product of a recent

duplication and neofunctionalization event of the *ECT3/1* gene in a lineage of *Brassicaceae,*

that diverged more rapidly than any other DF-A clade member in *Arabidopsis* (Fig. 1*B*,

(Scutenaire *et al.*, 2018)). This agrees with our overall conclusion that most YTHDFs in early

angiosperms possessed *Mpo* YTHDF/*Ath* ECT2/3/4 molecular functions, and only late events

resulted in specialization of a few YTHDF proteins. For ECT1, this occurred late in a small

subgroup of dicots. We note that such rapid neofunctionalization appears to result primarily

from changes in the IDR. We were able to identify two biophysical properties of the IDR of

ECT1, a stronger predicted propensity to phase-separate and its charge distribution, that are

distinct from the ECT2/3/4/5/6/7/8/10 group, but note that additional changes, for example in

SLiMs mediating interaction with regulatory factors, may also contribute to the different

functionality.

522
The diversity of plant YTHDF proteins and the need for many YTHDFs

The observation that a few fern YTHDF proteins cluster in the angiosperm clade DF-D points

to an early diversification of plant YTHDFs, while the fact that some fern and gymnosperm

YTHDFs define an independent clade (DF-F) suggests that complex plants may need many

different YTHDFs, well surpassing the three paralogs found in most vertebrates (Patil *et al.*,

2018) or in any other types of eukaryotes (Balacco & Soller, 2019; Stoilov *et al.*, 2002). But

why? The need for many YTHDFs of considerable variability is all the more puzzling given our demonstration here that the majority of them retains the same molecular functions. Robustness is a commonly given explanation for redundancy, but the same argument could apply to methyltransferase subunits, and *Arabidopsis* has maintained only one copy of *MTA*, *MTB*, *FIP37*, *VIR* and *HAKAI* (Balacco & Soller, 2019). Therefore, the answer should probably be sought elsewhere. It is clear now that the m^{6}A/YTHDF axis controls cellular proliferation and organ growth in plants (Arribas-Hernández & Brodersen, 2020; Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2020), and a principal difference between animals and plants is the extreme plasticity of plant growth. Because growth and stress responses are also tightly intertwined, it is possible that plants use a plethora m^{6}A-YTHDF growth-stimulators in different organs, responsive to different stresses and developmental cues, to shape plant architecture in response to stimuli. The answer to the paradox may be in the details: plant YTHDFs responsive to different environmental cues may fine-tune growth programs through slightly different performance and target-binding capacity in partly overlapping expression domains, where they are known to compete for targets (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2021b).

Materials and Methods

Plant material and growth conditions

All the used lines are in the *A. thaliana* Columbia-0 (Col-0) ecotype. The T-DNA insertion lines *rdr6-12* (Peragine *et al.*, 2004), *ect1-1* (SAIL_319_A08), *ect1-2* (GK-547H06), and *ect1-3* (SALK_059722) were obtained from Nottingham Arabidopsis Stock Centre. The mutants *ect2-3*, *ect3-2*, *ect2-3/ect3-2* (*Gde23*), *ect2-3/ect3-2/ect4-2* (*Gte234*) and *ect2-1/ect3-1/ect4-2* (*te234*) used for genetic crosses or as background to produce transgenic lines, and the primers for genotyping the corresponding alleles, have been previously described (Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2018; Arribas-Hernández *et al.*, 2020). The standard growing conditions used are detailed in Supplementary Information (SI) Materials and Methods.

Phylogenetic analysis

Amino acid sequences of selected YTH-domain proteins were downloaded from UniProt (Apweiler et al., 2004), TAIR (www.arabidopsis.org), phytozome (Goodstein *et al*, 2012) or GinkgoDB (Gu *et al*, 2022) and trimmed from their N-termini to discard intrinsically disordered regions with poor sequence conservation, thereby retaining only the regions with conservation to those structured in human YTHDF1 (Xu *et al.*, 2015) (SI Protein Sequences, Dataset S1). Trimmed sequences were aligned with MUSCLE (Edgar, 2004a, b) with default parameters (Dataset S2). Evolutionary analyses were conducted using IQ-Tree 2 (Minh *et al*, 2020; Nguyen *et al*, 2015) from the CIPRES Science Gateway v. 3.3 (https://www.phylo.org/index.php/) to infer a phylogenetic tree using maximum likelihood. The

model based on revised JTT Matrix (Kosiol & Goldman, 2005) JTTDCMut+R5 was determined as best-fit using the built-in tool ModelFinder (Kalyaanamoorthy *et al*, 2017) according to Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) scores, and used for the analysis. *Mpo* YTHDF was selected as outgroup and drawn as root. Measures of branch supports by approximate Likelihood Ratio Test [aLRT] (Shimodaira & Hasegawa, 1999) (SH-aLRT, %) were calculated, and the resulting values were used for color-coding the nodes with the tool FigTree (https://github.com/rambaut/figtree/). The precise SH-aLRT values of all nodes in newick format and additional information can be found in Dataset S3.

Estimates of evolutionary divergence between sequences were obtained computing pairwise distances among the full length sequences of the same proteins (Dataset S4), aligned in the same manner (Dataset S5) using the Equal Input model (Tajima & Nei, 1984) in MEGA11 (Tamura *et al*, 2021). The positions containing gaps and missing data were eliminated (complete deletion option), resulting a total of 180 positions in the final dataset.

Cloning, plant transformation and line selection

We employed the scar-free USER cloning method (Bitinaite & Nichols, 2009) to produce *uS7Bp:cYTHDF(X)-mCherry-OCSter* and *ECT1p:gECT1-FLAG-TFP-ECT1ter* constructs by gluing PCR-amplified DNA fragments into the pCAMBIA3300-U plasmid (Nour-Eldin *et al*, 2006) that provides resistance to glufosinate in plants. Cloning of the trial *ECT2p:gECT1-mCherry-ECT2ter* and *ECT2p:gECT4-mCherry-ECT2ter* constructs was done by GreenGate (Lampropoulos *et al*, 2013). The detailed cloning, transformation and line selection strategy for each construct, as well as the specific details of T1 selections for the complementation assay, are explained in SI Materials and Methods.

IDR modeling and simulations

We carried out coarse-grained simulations of protein IDRs using the implicit-solvent CALVADOS 2 forcefield (Tesei & Lindorff-Larsen, 2022; Tesei *et al.*, 2021). In CALVADOS, amino-acid residues are mapped to single beads corresponding to their amino-acid type. Neighboring residues are linked using harmonic bonds with an equilibrium distance of 0.38 nm and force constant of 8033 kJ mol^{-1}nm^{-2}. Nonbonded interactions are modeled with a hydropathy amino-acid "stickiness" model using λ-parameters from CALVADOS 2 (Tesei & Lindorff-Larsen, 2022). Salt-screened electrostatic interactions are accounted for with a truncated (r_c = 4 nm) and shifted Debye-Hückel potential; non-electrostatic interactions were truncated at 2 nm (Tesei & Lindorff-Larsen, 2022). We used a Langevin integrator with friction coefficient γ = 0.01 ps^{-1} to propagate the simulation in 0.01 ps timesteps. All simulations were carried out at T = 293 K.

We performed slab simulations of IDRs of the following proteins: ECT1-ECT11, *Mpo* YTHDF, *Hs* YTHDF2, *Dm* YTHDF1, and *Hs* FUS, using a previously described procedure (Dignon *et al*, 2018; Tesei & Lindorff-Larsen, 2022). IDR sequences are detailed in SI Protein Sequences. Briefly, we simulated 100 copies of each IDR (one type of IDR at a time) in a simulation slab of dimensions 25 nm x 25 nm x 300 nm (ECT2, ECT4, ECT5, *Mpo* YTHDF, *Hs* YTHDF2, *Dm* YTHDF), 17 nm x 17 nm x 300 nm (ECT1, ECT3, ECT6-ECT11), or 15 nm x 15 nm x 150 nm (*Hs* FUS), accounting for the different IDR sequence lengths. We simulated each system for 7500 ns and recorded configurations at 1 ns intervals. The first 2000 ns of each simulation were considered as equilibration and not used for analysis. We centered the protein condensates in the z-dimension of the simulation box during post-processing. We determined concentrations of the dense phase and dilute phase by fitting the concentration profiles to a hyperbolic function, as described by Tesei et al. (2021). Excess transfer free energies were calculated from the dilute and dense phase equilibrium concentrations via $\Delta G_{trans} = RT \ln (c_{dilute} / c_{dense})$ (Benayad *et al*, 2021).

Charges (q) were added along the IDR sequences to obtain cumulative charge plots. Arg and Lys residues were assigned charges of q = +1; Glu and Asp residues were assigned charges of q = -1; other residue types, including His, were assigned charges of q = 0. The average 'stickiness' of a given IDR sequence was determined by calculating the mean hydrophobicity λ of the IDR amino acid composition, using the CALVADOS 2 hydrophobicity scale reported in (Tesei & Lindorff-Larsen, 2022).

Additional standard methods including DNA and cDNA obtention, genotyping, fluorescence microscopy, qPCR, RNA and protein blotting, and the characterization of YTH domains, are described in SI Materials and Methods.

Acknowledgements and funding sources

We thank Lena Bjørn Johansson, Sergio D'Anna and Tobias Lahti for technical assistance, Theo Bølsterli and his team for plant care, and the Danish National Life Science Supercomputing Center Computerome and the core facility for biocomputing at the Department of Biology (University of Copenhagen) for the use of computational resources. We acknowledge the constructive criticism of Rupert Fray as a reviewer on previous publications, as his suggestion to use the *ect2/ect3/ect4* triple mutant phenotype to test ECT molecular function by systematic ectopic expression in the ECT2 expression domain inspired us to embark on the present project. This work was supported by the Novo Nordisk Foundation through a Hallas-Møller Ascending Investigator 2019 grant NNF19OC0054973 to P.B. and an NNF18OC0033950 grant to K.L.-L. via the PRISM (Protein Interactions and Stability in

638 Medicine and Genomics) center, and by the Independent Research Fund Denmark through a

639 Research Project2 grant (9040-00409B) from to P.B.

References

Anderson SJ, Kramer MC, Gosai SJ, Yu X, Vandivier LE, Nelson ADL, Anderson ZD, Beilstein MA, Fray RG, Lyons E *et al* (2018) N(6)-Methyladenosine Inhibits Local Ribonucleolytic Cleavage to Stabilize mRNAs in Arabidopsis. *Cell Rep* 25: 1146-1157

Arribas-Hernández L, Bressendorff S, Hansen MH, Poulsen C, Erdmann S, Brodersen P (2018) An m6A-YTH Module Controls Developmental Timing and Morphogenesis in Arabidopsis. *Plant Cell* 30: 952-967

Arribas-Hernández L, Brodersen P (2020) Occurrence and functions of m6A and other covalent modifications in plant mRNA. *Plant Physiol* 182: 79-96

Arribas-Hernández L, Rennie S, Köster T, Porcelli C, Lewinski M, Staiger D, Andersson R, Brodersen P (2021a) Principles of mRNA targeting via the Arabidopsis m6A-binding protein ECT2. *eLife* 10: e72375

Arribas-Hernández L, Rennie S, Schon M, Porcelli C, Enugutti B, Andersson R, Nodine MD, Brodersen P (2021b) The YTHDF proteins ECT2 and ECT3 bind largely overlapping target sets and influence target mRNA abundance, not alternative polyadenylation. *eLife* 10: e72377

Arribas-Hernández L, Simonini S, Hansen MH, Paredes EB, Bressendorff S, Dong Y, Østergaard L, Brodersen P (2020) Recurrent requirement for the m6A-ECT2/ECT3/ECT4 axis in the control of cell proliferation during plant organogenesis. *Development* 147: dev189134

Balacco DL, Soller M (2019) The m6A Writer: Rise of a Machine for Growing Tasks. *Biochemistry* 58: 363-378

Benayad Z, von Bülow S, Stelzl LS, Hummer G (2021) Simulation of FUS Protein Condensates with an Adapted Coarse-Grained Model. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* 17: 525-537

Bergeron-Sandoval L-P, Safaee N, Michnick Stephen W (2016) Mechanisms and Consequences of Macromolecular Phase Separation. *Cell* 165: 1067-1079

Bianchi G, Mangiagalli M, Barbiroli A, Longhi S, Grandori R, Santambrogio C, Brocca S (2022) Distribution of Charged Residues Affects the Average Size and Shape of Intrinsically Disordered Proteins. *Biomolecules* doi: 10.3390/biom12040561 [PREPRINT]

Biasini M, Bienert S, Waterhouse A, Arnold K, Studer G, Schmidt T, Kiefer F, Cassarino TG, Bertoni M, Bordoli L *et al* (2014) SWISS-MODEL: modelling protein tertiary and quaternary structure using evolutionary information. *Nucleic Acids Res* 42: W252-W258

Bitinaite J, Nichols NM (2009) DNA cloning and engineering by uracil excision. *Curr Protoc Mol Biol* Chapter 3: Unit 3 21

Bodi Z, Zhong S, Mehra S, Song J, Graham N, Li H, May S, Fray RG (2012) Adenosine methylation in Arabidopsis mRNA is associated with the 3' end and reduced levels cause developmental defects. *Front Plant Sci* 3: 48

Boo SH, Ha H, Lee Y, Shin M-K, Lee S, Kim YK (2022) UPF1 promotes rapid degradation of m6A-containing RNAs. *Cell Rep* 39: 110861

Borcherds W, Bremer A, Borgia MB, Mittag T (2021) How do intrinsically disordered protein regions encode a driving force for liquid–liquid phase separation? *Curr Opin Struct Biol* 67: 41-50

Bowman JL, Kohchi T, Yamato KT, Jenkins J, Shu S, Ishizaki K, Yamaoka S, Nishihama R, Nakamura Y, Berger F *et al* (2017) Insights into Land Plant Evolution Garnered from the Marchantia polymorpha Genome. *Cell* 171: 287-304.e215

Brodsky S, Jana T, Mittelman K, Chapal M, Kumar DK, Carmi M, Barkai N (2020) Intrinsically
Disordered Regions Direct Transcription Factor *In Vivo* Binding Specificity. *Mol Cell*
79: 459-471.e454

Dalmay T, Hamilton A, Rudd S, Angell S, Baulcombe DC (2000) An RNA-dependent RNA polymerase
gene in Arabidopsis is required for posttranscriptional gene silencing mediated by a transgene but not
by a virus. *Cell* 101: 543-553

Das RK, Huang Y, Phillips AH, Kriwacki RW, Pappu RV (2016) Cryptic sequence features within the
disordered protein p27Kip1 regulate cell cycle signaling. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 113: 5616-5621

Dignon GL, Zheng W, Kim YC, Best RB, Mittal J (2018) Sequence determinants of protein phase
behavior from a coarse-grained model. *PLOS Computational Biology* 14: e1005941

Dominissini D, Moshitch-Moshkovitz S, Schwartz S, Salmon-Divon M, Ungar L, Osenberg S, Cesarkas
K, Jacob-Hirsch J, Amariglio N, Kupiec M *et al* (2012) Topology of the human and mouse m6A RNA
methylomes revealed by m6A-seq. *Nature* 485: 201-206

Du H, Zhao Y, He J, Zhang Y, Xi H, Liu M, Ma J, Wu L (2016) YTHDF2 destabilizes m6A-containing
RNA through direct recruitment of the CCR4–NOT deadenylase complex. *Nat Commun* 7: 12626

Edgar RC (2004a) MUSCLE: a multiple sequence alignment method with reduced time and space
complexity. *BMC Bioinformatics* 5: 113

Edgar RC (2004b) MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high throughput.
Nucleic Acids Res 32: 1792-1797

Fagard M, Vaucheret H (2000) (TRANS)GENE SILENCING IN PLANTS: How Many Mechanisms?
Annu Rev Plant Physiol Plant Mol Biol 51: 167-194

Fray RG, Simpson GG (2015) The Arabidopsis epitranscriptome. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* 27: 17-21

Fu Y, Zhuang X (2020) m6A-binding YTHDF proteins promote stress granule formation. *Nat Chem Biol*
16: 955-963

Gan S (2003) Mitotic and Postmitotic Senescence in Plants. *Science of Aging Knowledge Environment*
2003: re7-re7

Gao Y, Pei G, Li D, Li R, Shao Y, Zhang QC, Li P (2019) Multivalent m6A motifs promote phase
separation of YTHDF proteins. *Cell Res* 29: 767-769

Geula S, Moshitch-Moshkovitz S, Dominissini D, Mansour AA, Kol N, Salmon-Divon M, Hershkovitz V,
Peer E, Mor N, Manor YS *et al* (2015) m6A mRNA methylation facilitates resolution of naïve pluripotency
toward differentiation. *Science* 347: 1002-1006

Goodstein DM, Shu S, Howson R, Neupane R, Hayes RD, Fazo J, Mitros T, Dirks W, Hellsten U,
Putnam N *et al* (2012) Phytozome: a comparative platform for green plant genomics. *Nucleic Acids Res*
40: D1178-D1186

Gu K-J, Lin C-F, Wu J-J, Zhao Y-P (2022) GinkgoDB: an ecological genome database for the living
fossil, Ginkgo biloba. *Database* 2022: baac046

Harris BJ, Harrison CJ, Hetherington AM, Williams TA (2020) Phylogenomic Evidence for the
Monophyly of Bryophytes and the Reductive Evolution of Stomata. *Current Biology* 30: 2001-
2012.e2002

Haussmann IU, Bodi Z, Sanchez-Moran E, Mongan NP, Archer N, Fray RG, Soller M (2016) m6A
potentiates Sxl alternative pre-mRNA splicing for robust Drosophila sex determination. *Nature* 540: 301

Herzog VA, Reichholf B, Neumann T, Rescheneder P, Bhat P, Burkard TR, Wlotzka W, von Haeseler
A, Zuber J, Ameres SL (2017) Thiol-linked alkylation of RNA to assess expression dynamics. *Nat Meth*
14: 1198

Ivanova I, Much C, Di Giacomo M, Azzi C, Morgan M, Moreira PN, Monahan J, Carrieri C, Enright AJ,
O'Carroll D (2017) The RNA m6A reader YTHDF2 is essential for the post-transcriptional regulation of
the maternal transcriptome and oocyte competence. *Mol Cell* 67: 1059-1067

Jumper J, Evans R, Pritzel A, Green T, Figurnov M, Ronneberger O, Tunyasuvunakool K, Bates R,
Žídek A, Potapenko A *et al* (2021) Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature*
596: 583-589

Kalyaanamoorthy S, Minh BQ, Wong TKF, von Haeseler A, Jermiin LS (2017) ModelFinder: fast model
selection for accurate phylogenetic estimates. *Nat Meth* 14: 587-589

Kato M, Han TW, Xie S, Shi K, Du X, Wu LC, Mirzaei H, Goldsmith EJ, Longgood J, Pei J *et al* (2012)
Cell-free formation of RNA granules: low complexity sequence domains form dynamic fibers within
hydrogels. *Cell* 149: 753-767

Kato M, McKnight SL (2021) The low-complexity domain of the FUS RNA binding protein self-
assembles via the mutually exclusive use of two distinct cross-β cores. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 118:
e2114412118

Ke S, Pandya-Jones A, Saito Y, Fak JJ, Vågbø CB, Geula S, Hanna JH, Black DL, Darnell JE, Darnell
RB (2017) m6A mRNA modifications are deposited in nascent pre-mRNA and are not required for
splicing but do specify cytoplasmic turnover. *Genes Dev* 31: 990-1006

Kontur C, Jeong M, Cifuentes D, Giraldez AJ (2020) Ythdf m6A Readers Function Redundantly during
Zebrafish Development. *Cell Rep* 33: 108598

Kosiol C, Goldman N (2005) Different Versions of the Dayhoff Rate Matrix. *Mol Biol Evol* 22: 193-199

Lampropoulos A, Sutikovic Z, Wenzl C, Maegele I, Lohmann JU, Forner J (2013) GreenGate - A Novel,
Versatile, and Efficient Cloning System for Plant Transgenesis. *PLOS ONE* 8: e83043

Lan T, Xiong W, Chen X, Mo B, Tang G (2022) Plant cytoplasmic ribosomal proteins: an update on
classification, nomenclature, evolution and resources. *Plant J* 110: 292-318

Lasman L, Krupalnik V, Viukov S, Mor N, Aguilera-Castrejon A, Schneir D, Bayerl J, Mizrahi O, Peles
S, Tawil S *et al* (2020) Context-dependent functional compensation between Ythdf m6A reader proteins.
Genes Dev 34: 1373-1391

Lence T, Akhtar J, Bayer M, Schmid K, Spindler L, Ho CH, Kreim N, Andrade-Navarro MA, Poeck B,
Helm M *et al* (2016) m6A modulates neuronal functions and sex determination in Drosophila. *Nature*
540: 242

Li A, Chen Y-S, Ping X-L, Yang X, Xiao W, Yang Y, Sun H-Y, Zhu Q, Baidya P, Wang X *et al* (2017)
Cytoplasmic m6A reader YTHDF3 promotes mRNA translation. *Cell Res* 27: 444

Li D, Zhang H, Hong Y, Huang L, Li X, Zhang Y, Ouyang Z, Song F (2014a) Genome-wide identification,
biochemical characterization, and expression analyses of the YTH domain-containing RNA-binding
protein family in Arabidopsis and rice. *Plant Mol Biol Report* 32: 1169-1186

Li F, Zhao D, Wu J, Shi Y (2014b) Structure of the YTH domain of human YTHDF2 in complex with an
m6A mononucleotide reveals an aromatic cage for m6A recognition. *Cell Res* 24: 1490-1492

Li F-W, Nishiyama T, Waller M, Frangedakis E, Keller J, Li Z, Fernandez-Pozo N, Barker MS, Bennett
T, Blázquez MA *et al* (2020) Anthoceros genomes illuminate the origin of land plants and the unique
biology of hornworts. *Nature plants* 6: 259-272

Li M, Zhao X, Wang W, Shi H, Pan Q, Lu Z, Perez SP, Suganthan R, He C, Bjørås M *et al* (2018)
Ythdf2-mediated m6A mRNA clearance modulates neural development in mice. *Genome biology* 19:
69

Liu N, Dai Q, Zheng G, He C, Parisien M, Pan T (2015) N6-methyladenosine-dependent RNA structural
switches regulate RNA-protein interactions. *Nature* 518: 560-564

Luo S, Tong L (2014) Molecular basis for the recognition of methylated adenines in RNA by the
eukaryotic YTH domain. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 111: 13834-13839

Magallón S, Hilu KW, Quandt D (2013) Land plant evolutionary timeline: Gene effects are secondary to
fossil constraints in relaxed clock estimation of age and substitution rates. *Am J Bot* 100: 556-573

Minh BQ, Schmidt HA, Chernomor O, Schrempf D, Woodhams MD, von Haeseler A, Lanfear R (2020)
IQ-TREE 2: New Models and Efficient Methods for Phylogenetic Inference in the Genomic Era. *Mol Biol
Evol* 37: 1530-1534

Mourrain P, Beclin C, Elmayan T, Feuerbach F, Godon C, Morel J-B, Jouette D, Lacombe A-M, Nikic
S, Picault N *et al* (2000) *Arabidopsis SGS2* and *SGS3* genes are required for posttranscriptional gene
silencing and natural virus resistance. *Cell* 101: 533-542

Nguyen L-T, Schmidt HA, von Haeseler A, Minh BQ (2015) IQ-TREE: A Fast and Effective Stochastic
Algorithm for Estimating Maximum-Likelihood Phylogenies. *Mol Biol Evol* 32: 268-274

Nikolov LA, Shushkov P, Nevado B, Gan X, Al-Shehbaz IA, Filatov D, Bailey CD, Tsiantis M (2019)
Resolving the backbone of the Brassicaceae phylogeny for investigating trait diversity. *New Phytol* 222:
1638-1651

Nour-Eldin HH, Hansen BG, Norholm MH, Jensen JK, Halkier BA (2006) Advancing uracil-excision
based cloning towards an ideal technique for cloning PCR fragments. *Nucleic Acids Res* 34: e122

Ok SH, Jeong HJ, Bae JM, Shin JS, Luan S, Kim KN (2005) Novel CIPK1-associated proteins in
Arabidopsis contain an evolutionarily conserved C-terminal region that mediates nuclear localization.
Plant Physiol 139: 138-150

One Thousand Plant Transcriptomes I (2019) One thousand plant transcriptomes and
the phylogenomics of green plants. *Nature* 574: 679-685

Park OH, Ha H, Lee Y, Boo SH, Kwon DH, Song HK, Kim YK (2019) Endoribonucleolytic Cleavage of
m6A-Containing RNAs by RNase P/MRP Complex. *Mol Cell* 74: 494-507.e498

Parker MT, Knop K, Sherwood AV, Schurch NJ, Mackinnon K, Gould PD, Hall AJW, Barton GJ,
Simpson GG (2020) Nanopore direct RNA sequencing maps the complexity of Arabidopsis mRNA
processing and m6A modification. *eLife* 9: e49658

Patel A, Lee Hyun O, Jawerth L, Maharana S, Jahnel M, Hein Marco Y, Stoynov S, Mahamid J, Saha
S, Franzmann Titus M *et al* (2015) A Liquid-to-Solid Phase Transition of the ALS Protein FUS
Accelerated by Disease Mutation. *Cell* 162: 1066-1077

Patil DP, Pickering BF, Jaffrey SR (2018) Reading m6A in the Transcriptome: m6A-Binding Proteins.
Trends Cell Biol 28: 113-127

Peragine A, Yoshikawa M, Wu G, Albrecht HL, Poethig RS (2004) SGS3 and SGS2/SDE1/RDR6 are
required for juvenile development and the production of trans-acting siRNAs in Arabidopsis. *Genes Dev*
18: 2368-2379

Piovesan D, Del Conte A, Clementel D, Monzon Alexander M, Bevilacqua M, Aspromonte Maria C,
Iserte Javier A, Orti FE, Marino-Buslje C, Tosatto Silvio CE (2023) MobiDB: 10 years of intrinsically
disordered proteins. *Nucleic Acids Res* 51: D438-D444

Pires ND, Dolan L (2012) Morphological evolution in land plants: new designs with old genes.
Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 367: 508-518

Puttick MN, Morris JL, Williams TA, Cox CJ, Edwards D, Kenrick P, Pressel S, Wellman CH, Schneider
H, Pisani D *et al* (2018) The Interrelationships of Land Plants and the Nature of the Ancestral
Embryophyte. *Current Biology* 28: 733-745.e732

Ries RJ, Zaccara S, Klein P, Olarerin-George A, Namkoong S, Pickering BF, Patil DP, Kwak H, Lee
JH, Jaffrey SR (2019) m6A enhances the phase separation potential of mRNA. *Nature* 571: 424-428

Roost C, Lynch SR, Batista PJ, Qu K, Chang HY, Kool ET (2015) Structure and Thermodynamics of
N6-Methyladenosine in RNA: A Spring-Loaded Base Modification. *J Am Chem Soc* 137: 2107-2115

Růžička K, Zhang M, Campilho A, Bodi Z, Kashif M, Saleh M, Eeckhout D, El-Showk S, Li H, Zhong S
et al (2017) Identification of factors required for m6A mRNA methylation in Arabidopsis reveals a role
for the conserved E3 ubiquitin ligase HAKAI. *New Phytol* 215: 157-172

Schwartz Jacob C, Wang X, Podell Elaine R, Cech Thomas R (2013) RNA Seeds Higher-Order
Assembly of FUS Protein. *Cell Rep* 5: 918-925

Scutenaire J, Deragon J-M, Jean V, Benhamed M, Raynaud C, Favory J-J, Merret R, Bousquet-
Antonelli C (2018) The YTH Domain Protein ECT2 Is an m6A Reader Required for Normal Trichome
Branching in Arabidopsis. *Plant Cell* 30: 986-1005

Scutenaire J, Plassard D, Matelot M, Villa T, Zumsteg J, Libri D, Séraphin B (2022) The S. cerevisiae
m6A-reader Pho92 promotes timely meiotic recombination by controlling key methylated transcripts.
Nucleic Acids Res: gkac640

Shen L, Liang Z, Gu X, Chen Y, Teo Zhi Wei N, Hou X, Cai Weiling M, Dedon Peter C, Liu L, Yu H
(2016) N6-methyladenosine RNA modification regulates shoot stem cell fate in Arabidopsis. *Dev Cell*
38: 186-200

Shi H, Wang X, Lu Z, Zhao BS, Ma H, Hsu PJ, Liu C, He C (2017) YTHDF3 facilitates translation and
decay of N6-methyladenosine-modified RNA. *Cell Res* 27: 315-328

Shi H, Zhang X, Weng Y-L, Lu Z, Liu Y, Lu Z, Li J, Hao P, Zhang Y, Zhang F *et al* (2018) m6A facilitates
hippocampus-dependent learning and memory through YTHDF1. *Nature* 563: 249-253

Shimodaira H, Hasegawa M (1999) Multiple Comparisons of Log-Likelihoods with Applications to
Phylogenetic Inference. *Mol Biol Evol* 16: 1114-1114

Sommer S, Lavi U, Darnell JE (1978) The absolute frequency of labeled N-6-methyladenosine in HeLa
cell messenger RNA decreases with label time. *Journal of Molecular Biology* 124: 487-499

Spitale RC, Flynn RA, Zhang QC, Crisalli P, Lee B, Jung J-W, Kuchelmeister HY, Batista PJ, Torre EA,
Kool ET *et al* (2015) Structural imprints in vivo decode RNA regulatory mechanisms. *Nature* 519: 486-
490

Stoilov P, Rafalska I, Stamm S (2002) YTH: a new domain in nuclear proteins. *Trends Biochem Sci* 27:
495-497

Su D, Yang L, Shi X, Ma X, Zhou X, Hedges SB, Zhong B (2021) Large-Scale Phylogenomic Analyses
Reveal the Monophyly of Bryophytes and Neoproterozoic Origin of Land Plants. *Mol Biol Evol* 38: 3332-
3344

Tajima F, Nei M (1984) Estimation of evolutionary distance between nucleotide sequences. *Mol Biol*
Evol 1: 269-285

Tamura K, Stecher G, Kumar S (2021) MEGA11: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis Version 11.
Mol Biol Evol 38: 3022-3027

Tesei G, Lindorff-Larsen K, 2022. Improved Predictions of Phase Behaviour of Intrinsically Disordered
Proteins by Tuning the Interaction Range. bioRxiv.

Tesei G, Schulze TK, Crehuet R, Lindorff-Larsen K (2021) Accurate model of liquid-liquid phase
behavior of intrinsically disordered proteins from optimization of single-chain properties. *Proc Natl Acad*
Sci USA 118: e2111696118

Theler D, Dominguez C, Blatter M, Boudet J, Allain FH (2014) Solution structure of the YTH domain in
complex with N6-methyladenosine RNA: a reader of methylated RNA. *Nucleic Acids Res* 42: 13911-
13919

Varadi M, Anyango S, Deshpande M, Nair S, Natassia C, Yordanova G, Yuan D, Stroe O, Wood G,
Laydon A *et al* (2022) AlphaFold Protein Structure Database: massively expanding the structural
coverage of protein-sequence space with high-accuracy models. *Nucleic Acids Res* 50: D439-D444

Varier RA, Sideri T, Capitanchik C, Manova Z, Calvani E, Rossi A, Edupuganti RR, Ensinck I, Chan
VWC, Patel H *et al* (2022) N6-methyladenosine (m6A) reader Pho92 is recruited co-transcriptionally
and couples translation to mRNA decay to promote meiotic fitness in yeast. *eLife* 11: e84034

Wang C, Zhu Y, Bao H, Jiang Y, Xu C, Wu J, Shi Y (2016) A novel RNA-binding mode of the YTH
domain reveals the mechanism for recognition of determinant of selective removal by Mmi1. *Nucleic*
Acids Res 44: 969-982

Wang J, Wang L, Diao J, Shi YG, Shi Y, Ma H, Shen H (2020) Binding to m6A RNA promotes YTHDF2-
mediated phase separation. *Protein & Cell* 11: 304-307

Wang L, Roossinck MJ (2006) Comparative analysis of expressed sequences reveals a conserved
pattern of optimal codon usage in plants. *Plant Mol Biol* 61: 699-710

Wang X, Lu Z, Gomez A, Hon GC, Yue Y, Han D, Fu Y, Parisien M, Dai Q, Jia G *et al* (2014a) N6-
methyladenosine-dependent regulation of messenger RNA stability. *Nature* 505: 117-120

Wang X, Zhao Boxuan S, Roundtree Ian A, Lu Z, Han D, Ma H, Weng X, Chen K, Shi H, He C (2015)
N6-methyladenosine modulates messenger RNA translation efficiency. *Cell* 161: 1388-1399

Wang Y, Li Y, Toth JI, Petroski MD, Zhang Z, Zhao JC (2014b) N6-methyladenosine modification
destabilizes developmental regulators in embryonic stem cells. *Nature cell biology* 16: 191-198

Wei L-H, Song P, Wang Y, Lu Z, Tang Q, Yu Q, Xiao Y, Zhang X, Duan H-C, Jia G (2018) The m6A
Reader ECT2 Controls Trichome Morphology by Affecting mRNA Stability in Arabidopsis. *Plant Cell* 30:
968-985

Weijers D, Franke-van Dijk M, Vencken R-J, Quint A, Hooykaas P, Offringa R (2001) An Arabidopsis
Minute-like phenotype caused by a semi-dominant mutation in a RIBOSOMAL PROTEIN S5 gene.
Development 128: 4289-4299

Wuest SE, Philipp MA, Guthörl D, Schmid B, Grossniklaus U (2016) Seed Production Affects Maternal
Growth and Senescence in Arabidopsis *Plant Physiol* 171: 392-404

Xu C, Liu K, Ahmed H, Loppnau P, Schapira M, Min J (2015) Structural Basis for the Discriminative
Recognition of N6-Methyladenosine RNA by the Human YT521-B Homology Domain Family of
Proteins. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 290: 24902-24913

Xu C, Wang X, Liu K, Roundtree IA, Tempel W, Li Y, Lu Z, He C, Min J (2014) Structural basis for
selective binding of m6A RNA by the YTHDC1 YTH domain. *Nat Chem Biol* 10: 927-929

Zaccara S, Jaffrey SR (2020) A Unified Model for the Function of YTHDF Proteins in Regulating m(6)A-
Modified mRNA. *Cell* 181: 1582-1595.e1518

Zhang H, Zhang F, Yu Y, Feng L, Jia J, Liu B, Li B, Guo H, Zhai J (2020a) A Comprehensive Online
Database for Exploring ~20,000 Public Arabidopsis RNA-Seq Libraries. *Molecular Plant* 13: 1231-1233

Zhang J, Fu X-X, Li R-Q, Zhao X, Liu Y, Li M-H, Zwaenepoel A, Ma H, Goffinet B, Guan Y-L *et al*
(2020b) The hornwort genome and early land plant evolution. *Nature plants* 6: 107-118

Zhang Z, Theler D, Kaminska KH, Hiller M, de la Grange P, Pudimat R, Rafalska I, Heinrich B, Bujnicki
JM, Allain FHT *et al* (2010) The YTH domain is a novel RNA binding domain. *The Journal of biological
chemistry* 285: 14701-14710

Zhong S, Li H, Bodi Z, Button J, Vespa L, Herzog M, Fray RG (2008) MTA is an Arabidopsis messenger
RNA adenosine methylase and interacts with a homolog of a sex-specific splicing factor. *Plant Cell* 20:
1278-1288

Zhu T, Roundtree IA, Wang P, Wang X, Wang L, Sun C, Tian Y, Li J, He C, Xu Y (2014) Crystal structure
of the YTH domain of YTHDF2 reveals mechanism for recognition of N6-methyladenosine. *Cell Res*
24: 1493-1496
909

911
Fig. 1. Phylogenetic analysis of YTHDF proteins in land plants. (*A*) Schematic representation of land
plant evolution and relative position of the species used in this study. The architecture of the diagram
and the age (million years, My) indicated on some nodes are a simplified version of the tree from Su et
al. (Su *et al.*, 2021). The length of the branches has been adjusted for illustrative purposes. (*B*)
Phylogenetic tree of YTHDF proteins in land plants based on the sequence alignment of regions with
homology to the structured regions of the metazoan orthologs (Xu *et al.*, 2015) (Datasets S1, S2).
Marchantia polymorpha (Mpo) YTHDF is chosen as outgroup. *Arabidopsis thaliana* (*Ath*) YTHDF
proteins are named after the original nomenclature for proteins containing an Evolutionarily Conserved
C-Terminal Region (ECT) established by Ok et al. (Ok *et al.*, 2005). Proteins from other plant species
adhere to the nomenclature established by Scutenaire et al. (Scutenaire *et al.*, 2018), with small
variations reflecting additional clades (DF-E, -F) and the split of the original DF-C clade into -C and -D.
Statistical support is calculated as approximate likelihood-ratio test (aLRT) and indicated by colour-
coded spheres on all nodes, but the most relevant values are specified. The length of the branches
represents the evolutionary distance in number of amino acid substitutions per site relative to the scale
bar. Color-coding and abbreviations of species as in *A*. Dotted lines highlight weakly supported
affiliations to clades.

Fig. 2. Most but not all arabidopsis YTHDF proteins can replace ECT2/3/4-function. (*A*) Diagram showing the relative length of the N-terminal IDRs of *Arabidopsis thaliana* (*Ath*) YTHDF proteins (ECT1-ECT11) together with *Marchantia polymorpha* (*Mpo*) YTHDF, *Homo sapiens* (*Hs*) YTHDF2, and *Drosphila melanogaster* (*Dm*) YTHDF. Numbers indicate the length of the proteins in amino acids (aa). (*B*) Strategy followed for the functional assay. *uS7Bp:cECT(X)-mCherry* constructs are introduced in *ect2-1/ect3-1/ect4-2* (*te234*) plants, and complementation rates are estimated by the percentage of primary transformants (T1) whose first true leaves have a size (s) exceeding 0.5 mm after 10 days of growth. The *construct uS7Bp:mCherry* is used as negative control. Examples of T1 seedlings expressing control and ECT2 constructs are shown. Dashed outlines are magnified below to show mCherry fluorescence in emerging leaves. (*C*) Weighed averages of the complementation percentages observed for each *uS7Bp:cECT(X)-mCherry* construct in 2-5 independent transformations (I.T.). Letters between parenthesis indicate the DF- clade assigned to each protein. Coloring highlights ECT2 (reference) and proteins with low or negligible complementation capacity (ECT1/9/11) for fast identification along the manuscript. Low transformation efficiency (T.E.) for ECT9 can be infered by the low number of transformants (n) highlighted in red, but detailed T.E. and raw complementation rates in each transformation can be found in Figs. S5 and S3A respectively. Additional data regarding this assay is shown in Fig. S4. (*D*) Same as C on a single transformation using the *rdr6-12/te234* background. (*E-H*) Rosette phenotype of 32-day old T1s bearing *uS7Bp:cECT(X)-mCherry* constructs in the *rdr6-12/te234* background, sorted according to their degree of complementation in three panels: *F* (high), *G* (residual) and *H* (non-complementation and enhancement). Different genetic backgrounds and control transformants (mCherry) are shown in *E* as a reference. The scalebar (5 cm) applies to all plants in the four panels.

Fig. 3. Endogenous ECT1 has negligible ECT2/3/4-like function, despite similar expression pattern and subcellular localization. (*A-D*) Expression pattern of *ECT1p:gECT1-TFP* (gDNA) in aerial organs (*A*), main root (*B*), lateral root primordia (*C*) and emerging lateral roots (*D*) of 10-day-old seedlings. The expression mimics the pattern observed for ECT2/3/4 (Arribas-Hernández et al., 2020). (*E-F*) Intracellular localization of ECT1-TFP in meristematic cells of root tips in unchallegended conditions. Although the cytoplasmic signal is largely homogenous (*E*), sporadic foci (*F*) are frequently observed. Fig. S10A shows the integrity of the fluorescently tagged protein in independent transgenic lines assessed by protein blot. (*G*) Schematic representation of the *ECT1* locus. Exons are represented as boxes and introns as lines. The positions and identifiers of the T-DNA insertions assigned to the *ect1-1*, *ect1-2* and *ect1-3* alleles are marked, and the location of qPCR amplicons and hybridization probes (P) for analyses is indicated below. (*H*) Expression analysis of *ECT1* mRNA in wild type and T-DNA insertion lines by qPCR. Northern blot using the probe (P) marked in G detects *ECT1-TFP* mRNA, but not the endogenous *ECT1* transcript (Fig. S10B). (*I*) Morphological appearance of seedlings with or without *ECT1* in the different backgrounds indicated. Alternative allele combinations are shown in Fig. S10D. DAG, days after germination. Scale bars are: 1 cm in A, 1 mm in B, 100 µm in C, 10 µm in D-F, 1 mm in upper panels of I, and 1 cm in the lower panels.

990
Fig. 4. Dissection of ECT1/9/11 functional regions. (*A*) Schematic representation of the strategy
followed to express chimeras with N-terminal IDR and YTH domains of different ECT proteins. (*B*)
Weighed averages of the complementation rates observed for each chimeric construct measured as in
Fig. 2B,C. The raw   complementation rates and transformation efficiencies of each independent
transformation (I.T.) can be found in Figs. S3B and S5 respectively, and photographs of the scored 10-
day-old T1 seedlings with mCherry fluorescence are shown in Fig. S8. (*C*) 10-day-old primary
transformants of *rdr6-12/te234* with the indicated transgenes. Dashed outlines are magnified below to
show mCherry fluorescencece. (*D*) Same genotypes as in C at 26 days after germination. Additional
independent transgenic lines, developmental stages and controls for *C* and *D* can be found in Fig. S6.
All transgenes are expressed from the *uS7B* promoter and contain mCherry fused to the C-terminus.
1001

1002

1003
Fig. 5. Analysis of ECT1/9/11 functional regions. (*A*) Topology of the YTH domain of *Homo sapiens*
(*Hs*) YTHDF1 with secondary structure elements drawn in pink (Xu *et al.*, 2015). The two grey helices
represent the only structural elements outside the YTH domain (as defined by Stoilov et al. (Stoilov *et*
al., 2002)): α0 immediately upstream, and α4 at the C-terminus of the protein. Superimposed on the
diagrams are the amino acids in ECT1, ECT9 and ECT11 that constitute non-conservative substitutions
compared to the majority of ECTs (see alignment in Fig. S11). The localization of these amino acids in
the predicted 3D structures, predominantly on the surface, and the spatial integrity of the aromatic cage
in the homology models of ECT1/9/11 can be found in Fig. S12. (*B*) Slab simulations of the IDRs of the
indicated proteins showing their tendency to remain in condensed phase or disperse in solution. (*C*)
Time-averaged density profiles for a selected group of the slab simulations shown in B. The remaining
proteins are shown in Fig. S14A. (*D*) Calculated free energy change for the transition between aqueous
solution and condensed phase ($\Delta G_{trans} = RT \ln (c_{dilute} / c_{dense})$) for the IDRs of the indicated proteins. (*E*)
Cumulative charge distribution of the IDRs of the indicated proteins. The length in amino acids (aa) is
at scale. The same analysis for all ECTs can be found in Fig. S14D.

1018

1019

1020
Fig. 6. Heterologous expression of *Marchantia polymorpha* (*Mpo*) YTHDF in arabidopsis rescues loss
of ECT2/3/4 function, while *Homo sapiens* (*Hs*) or *Drosophila melanogaster* (*Dm*) YTHDF proteins
aggravates it. (*A*) Evolutionary divergence among ECT proteins estimated by pairwise comparison of
the proteins analyzed in Fig. 1B. (*B*) Weighed averages of the complementation rates observed for
each of the indicated constructs (cDNA fused to mCherry under the control of the *uS7B* promoter) as
in Fig. 2C in the te234 background. S (short) and L (long) refer to the two different YTHDF spliceforms
found among *M. polymorpha* cDNAs. Transformation efficiencies and raw complementation rates in
each transformation can be found in Figs. S5 and S3 respectively. (*C*) Same as in B but from one
transformation in the *rdr6-12/te234* background. (*D*) 32-day-old primary transformants of *rdr6-12/te234*
expressing the heterologous transgenes. Additional controls and developmental stages are shown in
Fig. S6. (*E*) Slab simulations of the IDRs of the indicated proteins as in Fig. 5B. (*F*) Time-averaged
density profiles for the slab simulations in *E*. (*G*) Calculated free energy change for the IDRs of the
indicated proteins as in Fig. 5D. (*H*) Cumulative charge distribution of the IDRs of the indicated proteins
as in Fig. 5E. The same analysis for all arabidopsis ECTs and animal YTHDFs can be found in Fig.
S14D.
1036
1037