Transcriptional analysis in multiple barley varieties identifies signatures of waterlogging response

Alexandra Miricescu[1,2,#], Ailbhe Jane Brazel[1,#,*], Joseph Beegan[3], Frank Wellmer[3], and Emmanuelle Graciet[1,4,*]

[1] Maynooth University, Department of Biology, Maynooth, Co. Kildare, Ireland

[2] Current address: Pesticide Registration Division, Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine, Backweston Campus, Celbridge, Co.Kildare, W23X3PH, Ireland

[3] Smurfit Institute of Genetics, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

[4] Kathleen Lonsdale Institute for Human Health Research, Maynooth University, Maynooth, Co. Kildare, Ireland

[#] Equal contribution

[*] Corresponding authors

E-mail addresses of all authors (in order of authorship):
Dr. Alexandra Miricescu: miricescu_alexandra@yahoo.co.uk
Dr. Ailbhe Jane Brazel: Ailbhe.Brazel@mu.ie (co-corresponding author)
Mr. Joseph Beegan: obeachs@tcd.ie
Prof. Frank Wellmer: wellmerf@tcd.ie
Dr. Emmanuelle Graciet: Emmanuelle.graciet@mu.ie (corresponding author)

Running title: Transcriptional signatures for barley waterlogging response

Abstract

Waterlogging leads to major crop losses globally, particularly for waterlogging sensitive crops such as barley. Waterlogging reduces oxygen availability and results in additional stresses, leading to the activation of hypoxia and stress response pathways that promote plant survival. Although certain barley varieties have been shown to be more tolerant to waterlogging than others and some tolerance-related QTLs have been identified, the molecular mechanisms underlying this trait are mostly unknown. Transcriptomics approaches can provide very valuable information for our understanding of waterlogging tolerance. Here, we surveyed 21 barley varieties for the differential transcriptional activation of conserved hypoxia-response genes under waterlogging, and selected five varieties with different levels of induction of core hypoxia-response genes. We further characterized their phenotypic response to waterlogging in terms of shoot and root traits. RNA-sequencing to evaluate the genome-wide transcriptional responses to waterlogging of these selected varieties led to the identification of a set of 98 waterlogging-response genes common to the different datasets. Many of these genes are orthologs of the so-called 'core hypoxia response genes', thus highlighting the conservation of plant responses to waterlogging. Hierarchical clustering analysis also identified groups of genes with intrinsic differential expression between varieties prior to waterlogging stress. These genes could constitute interesting candidates to study 'predisposition' to waterlogging tolerance or sensitivity in barley.

Keywords

Waterlogging; barley; *Hordeum vulgare*; transcriptomics; RNA-seq

Abbreviations

ACO: 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylate oxidase 1-like
ADH: alcohol dehydrogenase
AGOUEB: association genetics of UK elite Barley
bHLH: basic helix-loop-helix
DEG: differentially expressed gene
ERF-VII: group VII ethylene response factor
GABA-T: γ-aminobutyric acid transaminase
GO: gene ontology
Golden P. /GP: Golden Promise

GWAS: genome-wide association studies
HB: hemoglobin
Hv: *Hordeum vulgare*
Inf: Infinity
MAPK: mitogen-activated protein kinase
NAC: NAM (no apical meristem), ATAF1 and −2, and CUC2 (cup-shaped cotyledon)
Pas: Passport
PCA: principal component analysis
PCO: plant cysteine oxidase
PDC: pyruvate decarboxylase
Pil: Pilastro
QTL: quantitative trait locus
RBOH: respiratory burst oxidase
Reg: Regina
ROS: reactive oxygen species
VST: variance stabilising transformations
86
87
88

Introduction

Waterlogging (*i.e.*, the saturation of soil with water) and flooding-related stresses are the cause of major crop losses worldwide. They are predicted to worsen in some countries as a consequence of seasonal increases in rainfall resulting from global climate change (Bailey-Serres *et al.*, 2012a; Bailey-Serres *et al.*, 2012b; Kaur *et al.*, 2020; Langan *et al.*, 2022). Waterlogging and flooding alter biological, physical and chemical parameters in a plant's environment. These combined changes affect negatively different aspects of plant growth, but at the same time, they contribute to the onset of a multi-faceted response. One of the most important changes caused by waterlogging is the reduction in oxygen availability (hypoxia) to roots, and also to shoots in the case of flooding (Bailey-Serres *et al.*, 2012a; Bailey-Serres *et al.*, 2012b; Sasidharan *et al.*, 2017). Other parameters that change and may affect plants negatively upon waterlogging and flooding include the release of toxic chemical compounds in the soil (*e.g.,* iron) (Setter and Waters, 2003), reduced availability of important nutrients such as nitrates (Setter and Waters, 2003), changes in the soil microbiome (Hartman and Tringe, 2019; Wang *et al.*, 2017), or a decrease in light availability because of flood water turbidity.

In recent years, the study of waterlogging stress and of the resulting hypoxic stress has led to the discovery of essential and conserved oxygen-sensing mechanisms in plants (reviewed in (Doorly and Graciet, 2021; Hammarlund *et al.*, 2020; Holdsworth and Gibbs, 2020)). An important oxygen-sensing pathway in plants requires a set of oxygen-dependent PLANT CYSTEINE OXIDASE (PCO) enzymes that oxidize the N-terminus of proteins starting with a cysteine residue (Weits *et al.*, 2014; White *et al.*, 2018; White *et al.*, 2017), including a set of group VII ETHYLENE RESPONSE FACTOR (ERF-VII) transcription factors (White *et al.*, 2018; White *et al.*, 2017) that act as master regulators of the hypoxia response program (reviewed in (Giuntoli and Perata, 2018)). Under normal oxygen conditions, these ERF-VII transcription factors are targeted for degradation by the ubiquitin-dependent N-degron pathway, following oxidation of their N-terminal cysteine residue by PCO enzymes (Gibbs *et al.*, 2011; Licausi *et al.*, 2011; Weits *et al.*, 2014). In contrast, under hypoxic conditions, the activity of PCOs is inhibited, thus preventing the oxidation of ERF-VIIs' N-terminal cysteine and their subsequent N-degron-mediated degradation. As a result, under hypoxic conditions, ERF-VIIs accumulate in the nucleus, where they bind to *cis*-regulatory elements

to activate the hypoxia response program. Notably, the promoters of conserved hypoxia

response gene families are not only enriched for *cis*-regulatory elements bound by

transcription factors of the ERF-VII family (*e.g.*, the HRPE motif (Gasch *et al.*, 2016)), but also

for motifs bound by basic helix-loop-helix (bHLH), MYB and WRKY transcription factors

(Reynoso *et al.*, 2019), thus suggesting the involvement of other families of transcription

factors in the regulation of the hypoxia response program (Lee and Bailey-Serres, 2021). This

is in agreement with the up-regulation of transcription factor-coding genes belonging to the

different families mentioned above as part of hypoxia response in plants (Mustroph *et al.*,

2010). Cross-comparisons of transcriptomic datasets from different plant species further

allowed the identification of core genes of the hypoxia response program (Mustroph *et al.*,

2010; Mustroph *et al.*, 2009; Reynoso *et al.*, 2019). These include genes involved in (i) the

regulation of carbon metabolism in order to facilitate ATP production *via* glycolysis and

NAD+ regeneration through fermentation pathways; (ii) the regulation of important

signaling pathways (*e.g.*, MAPK signaling) and molecules (*e.g.*, reactive oxygen species

(ROS)) to promote plant tolerance and survival upon hypoxia.

Numerous transcriptomic analyses using either flooding or waterlogging treatments

have been conducted with the model plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* (see list in (Brazel and

Graciet, 2023)). These studies revealed that core aspects of the transcriptional

reprogramming upon waterlogging or flooding are shared with the response to hypoxia (Lee

et al., 2011; van Veen *et al.*, 2016). Furthermore, the transcriptomic comparison of 8

different natural accessions of Arabidopsis, which had been previously identified as being

either sensitive or tolerant to flooding (Vashisht *et al.*, 2011), indicated that the

transcriptional response of roots and shoots differ (van Veen *et al.*, 2016). This work

identified sets of shoot or root-expressed genes that might contribute to the flooding

tolerance phenotype of some natural Arabidopsis accessions (van Veen *et al.*, 2016), which

could be relevant to improve crop tolerance to waterlogging/flooding. Notably, the

transcriptional reprogramming in response to hypoxia and flooding is also accompanied by

other genome-wide regulatory mechanisms such as epigenetic changes, chromatin

remodelling (Reynoso *et al.*, 2019), and changes in translation (Lee and Bailey-Serres, 2019;

Reynoso *et al.*, 2019).

Waterlogging is an important source of crop losses, however, not all crops are

equally affected (de San Celedonio *et al.*, 2014; Kaur *et al.*, 2020). Barley is particularly

sensitive to waterlogging with reported crop losses of up to 20-25% (Byrne *et al.*, 2022; de

San Celedonio *et al.*, 2016; de San Celedonio *et al.*, 2014; Liu *et al.*, 2020; Miricescu *et al.*,

2021; Setter and Waters, 2003). These losses are particularly severe if waterlogging occurs

at the heading stage (de San Celedonio *et al.*, 2016; de San Celedonio *et al.*, 2014; Liu *et al.*,

2020; Setter and Waters, 2003), but also at early developmental stages (de San Celedonio *et

al.*, 2016; de San Celedonio *et al.*, 2014). The multifaceted nature of waterlogging stress, as

well as the complexity of plant responses to this stress, have made it difficult to identify

marker genes of waterlogging tolerance, as well as target genes that could be modified to

improve crop tolerance to waterlogging. Nevertheless, in recent years, genetic approaches,

as well as linkage mapping and genome-wide association studies (GWAS), have led to the

identification of potential QTLs and target genes to improve barley tolerance to

waterlogging (Bertholdsson *et al.*, 2015; Borrego-Benjumea *et al.*, 2020; Broughton *et al.*,

2015; Gill *et al.*, 2019; Li *et al.*, 2008; Manik *et al.*, 2022; Zhang *et al.*, 2017; Zhang *et al.*,

2016; Zhou, 2011). In agreement with the complex response to waterlogging, these QTLs

have been identified based on a wide range of phenotypic traits, including leaf yellowing,

chlorophyll fluorescence, yield traits, adventitious root formation, aerenchyma formation

and ROS levels. QTLs relating to root traits, including the ability to form adventitious roots

and aerenchyma under waterlogged conditions (Manik *et al.*, 2022; Zhang *et al.*, 2016), may

be of particular relevance considering their known roles in facilitating water and nutrient

uptake as well as in oxygen distribution during waterlogging (Zhang *et al.*, 2015).

Despite the recent progress made in the identification of QTLs for waterlogging

tolerance and the realization that transcriptomics may be used to identify potential

candidate genes relevant to waterlogging tolerance (Lee *et al.*, 2011; Reynoso *et al.*, 2019;

van Veen *et al.*, 2016), only few such studies have been conducted with barley. Recent

studies have characterized the transcriptomic response of waterlogging-tolerant and

sensitive varieties (Borrego-Benjumea *et al.*, 2020; Luan *et al.*, 2022). From these datasets,

the authors identified a handful of genes that could be of importance for waterlogging

tolerance mechanisms in barley (Luan *et al.*, 2022). In another study, a comparative

proteomic analysis of one waterlogging-sensitive and one waterlogging-tolerant variety

identified proteins that accumulate differently in waterlogging sensitive or tolerant

germplasms (Luan *et al.*, 2018a; Luan *et al.*, 2018b).

Here, to dissect the transcriptomic response of barley to waterlogging, we selected

two 2-row and two 6-row winter barley varieties based on the differential expression of

known hypoxia response marker genes after waterlogging treatment. These varieties were

chosen from the Association Genetics Of UK Elite Barley (AGOUEB) population (Thomas *et*

al., 2014) and from the list of recommended barley varieties in Ireland (where the study was

conducted; list at the time the experiments were carried out). Our transcriptomic study

focused on roots because of their central role in mediating waterlogging tolerance (Zhang *et*

al., 2015). We also included the model spring barley variety *Golden Promise* to provide a

reference dataset to the community (this variety is widely used to target specific genes

using molecular approaches). We identified sets of common genes that are consistently

differentially expressed in barley in response to waterlogging. Hierarchical clustering

identified groups of genes with intrinsic differential expression between varieties prior to

waterlogging stress. Low or elevated expression of some of these genes could 'predispose'

some varieties to waterlogging tolerance or sensitivity. In sum, the datasets presented serve

as an additional reference for the study of waterlogging response in barley and provide

insights into potential avenues of research to improve waterlogging tolerance in this crop.

Materials and Methods

Plant material

Cultivars used in this study (Supp. Table S1) included winter varieties that originated from

the 'Association Genetics of UK Elite Barley' (AGOUEB) population of barley (Thomas *et al.*,

2014), as well as the model spring variety *Golden Promise* and a winter variety, *Infinity*,

which was on the recommended list of barley varieties in Ireland (where the study was

conducted) at the time of the initial field trial whose results were taken into account for

varietal selection (Byrne *et al.*, 2022). Selected varieties for further characterization,

including transcriptome profiling, were *Golden Promise* (spring variety, 2-row), *Regina* and

Infinity (winter varieties, 2-row), *Passport* and *Pilastro* (winter varieties, 6-row).

Plant growth conditions

Plants were grown in a plant growth room under long-day conditions (16 h light/8 h dark) at 15°C (constant temperature), approximately 45% relative humidity. Light intensity was determined to be ~138 µmol/m^2/s and was provided by LED bulbs (Philipps LED tubes High Output, T8 20W/865).

Soil preparation and seed germination

Commercial John Innes N°2 (Vitax; UK) soil was soaked in water after filling round pots of 9-cm diameter and 9-cm height without compressing the soil. Untreated seeds were sown directly in soil at a depth of 2 cm. The sown seeds were stratified in the dark for 14 d at 4°C to ensure homogenous germination. After cold treatment, the pots were transferred to the plant room for germination and growth.

Waterlogging

Plants were grown as indicated above for ten days (corresponding to L1/L2 stage) for transcriptomic experiments, and for 10-14 d (corresponding to L1/L2 stage) for phenotypic characterization. The pots were then transferred to a large tub, which was subsequently filled with tap water up to 1 cm above soil level. The water level was kept constant throughout the duration of the experiment (Figure 1A). The plants were kept in the same growth conditions and were treated for 15 d for phenotypic characterization, or for shorter periods of time, as indicated in the text. Control plants were left in the same growth conditions but received normal watering (every two days, avoiding any standing water in the trays). For the recovery period, plants were taken out of the water and kept in the same growth conditions with a normal watering regime.

Height measurements

Plant height was taken from the soil surface to the tip of the tallest leaf at the indicated time points.

Total RNA extraction

Roots of plants grown under control conditions or subjected to waterlogging for were rinsed under running tap water, and frozen in liquid nitrogen. The tissue was ground in liquid nitrogen and total RNA was extracted using Spectrum™ Plant Total RNA kit (Sigma-Aldrich).

Reverse transcription coupled to quantitative PCR (RT-qPCR)

Total RNA was reverse transcribed using an oligo(dT)$_{18}$ primer and the RevertAid reverse transcriptase (Thermo) according to the manufacturer's instructions. For reverse transcription reactions, 1 µg of total RNA was used. cDNA obtained was used for qPCR with a Lightcycler 480 (Roche). Each PCR reaction mix contained 5 µL of 2x SYBR green master 1 (Roche), 1 µL cDNA, 1 µL of 10 µM primers and 3 µL of molecular biology grade water. LightCycler melting curves were obtained to check for single peak melting curves for all amplification products. The second derivative maximum method was used to analyze the amplification data. The resulting Cp values were converted into relative expression values using the comparative Ct method (Livak and Schmittgen, 2001). All primer sequences are provided in Supp. Table S2. One reference gene (Hv*ACTIN*) was used to normalize the RT-qPCR data following the screening of a set of reference genes during waterlogging (Supp. Fig. S1).

Next-generation sequencing of RNA samples

For RNA-seq analysis, waterlogging treatment was applied as outlined above for 24 h. For each independent replicate and each condition (waterlogged or untreated), the root systems of 3 plants were pooled prior to grinding for total RNA extraction. Following RNA extraction, RNA integrity was assessed using an Agilent 2100 Bioanalyzer (Agilent). All RNA samples had RIN values > 7.0. Library preparation and single ended 50 bp next-generation sequencing was performed by BGI Genomics (Hong Kong) using the DNBseq sequencing platform.

Analysis of RNA-seq data

The third release (Morex V3) of the Morex barley genome was downloaded from e!DAL -

Plant Genomics and Phenomics Research Data Repository (PGP) (https://edal-pgp.ipk-

gatersleben.de/) (Mascher, 2021). Raw RNA-sequencing reads were aligned to Morex V3

using *bowtie2* (v2.4.5) (Langmead and Salzberg, 2012). Files were converted from .sam to

.bam files and indexed using *samtools* (v1.15.1) (Danecek *et al.*, 2021). Gene abundance was

estimated using *stringtie* (v2.1.7) (Pertea *et al.*, 2015) (Supp. Table S3). Differential gene

expression analysis was performed using the Bioconductor package *DeSeq2* (Love *et al.*,

2014) in *R* (Team, 2022) using a design in which the factors Variety and Treatment were

combined into a single factor to model multiple condition effects. The results of multiple

comparisons were extracted and filtered by adjusted *p*-value < 0.05 (Supp. Table S4).

Principal component analysis (PCA) was performed using *pcaExplorer* (v2.20.2) (Marini and

Binder, 2019) in *RStudio* (v2022.02.0+443). Gene ontology (GO) analysis was performed

using *ShinyGO* (v0.75c) (Ge *et al.*, 2020). Read count values were transformed by variance

stabilising transformations (VST) to normalise for library size and composition (Supp. Table

S5). Venn diagrams were generated using InteractiVenn (Heberle *et al.*, 2015).

The means of VST read counts from 3 independent replicates generated from

DeSeq2 were filtered for *k*-means clustering as follows. *Deseq2* DEG analysis was performed

and results for the 25 comparisons shown in Supp. Fig S6A were extracted. A list of all

11,613 DEGs filtered by adjusted *p*-value < 0.05 was generated by combining DEGs from

waterlogged to control samples from the same variety, DEGs from each control to every

other control sample and DEGs from each waterlogged to every other waterlogged sample.

Next, the DEGs with a mean of <10 normalised reads were removed leaving 10,882 genes

for clustering analysis. Clustering analysis was performed using the *k*-means function in *R*

(v3.6.2) with the arguments centers=25, nstart = 1000, iter.max = 300 and algorithm =

"Lloyd" (gene cluster assignment annotated in (Supp. Table S4)). Clustering heatmaps were

generated using *ComplexHeatmap* (v2.10.0) (Gu *et al.*, 2016) in *R*. Plots were generated

using *ggplot2* (v3.3.6) (Wickam, 2016) and modified for style in Adobe Illustrator 2022.

To compare the datasets obtained to a previously published RNA-seq dataset, raw sets were

downloaded from NCBI's Gene Expression Omnibus (GSE144077) (Borrego-Benjumea *et al.*,

2020) and Sequence Read Archive (PRJNA889532) (Luan *et al.*, 2022). Raw RNA-sequencing

reads were aligned to Morex V3 as described above. Differential gene expression analysis of

waterlogging vs control for each variety was performed on 0 h control and 24 h

waterlogging datasets for the varieties Franklin and TX9425 from Luan *et al.* as described

above. The same differential gene expression analysis was also performed on 72 h control

and 72 h waterlogging datasets for the varieties Deder 2 and Yerong from Borrego-

Benjumea *et al.*.

Results

Characterization of the transcriptional response of different barley varieties using hypoxia response marker genes

The previous characterization of 403 varieties from the AGOUEB collection under

waterlogged and control conditions in the field (Byrne *et al.*, 2022) provided some

information on the differential physiological response of these varieties to waterlogging,

while also highlighting the difficulties associated with the study of waterlogging tolerance

under field conditions. Based on this initial study, we selected a subset of 20 varieties that

behaved differently under waterlogged conditions, with the aim to assess their

transcriptional response to waterlogging under controlled conditions. The variety *Golden*

Promise was also included as a model (spring) barley variety that is widely used to generate

targeted mutations through *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation. After identifying

Hv*ACTIN* as a suitable reference gene in waterlogged roots (Supp. Figure S1A), we first

carried out a time course experiment with four selected varieties and determined the

relative expression of *HEMOGLOBIN1 (HB)*, *ALCOHOL DEHYDROGENASE 1 (ADH1)* and

PYRUVATE DECARBOXYLASE 1 (PDC1). These genes are hypoxia response markers commonly

used to monitor waterlogging response (Loreti *et al.*, 2020; Mendiondo *et al.*, 2016;

Mustroph *et al.*, 2010). This initial analysis indicated that (i) the expression of these three

hypoxia response genes peaked around 24 h after the onset of the waterlogging treatment;

and (ii) there were differences between the four varieties in terms of the amplitude of the

transcriptional up-regulation (Supp. Figure S1B). For example, at 24 h after the beginning of

the waterlogging treatment, Hv*HB* was expressed at higher levels in *Pilastro* compared to

Arma, *Tapir* and *Masquerade*. In addition, the up-regulation of Hv*HB* and Hv*ADH1* was

stronger than that of Hv*PDC1*, possibly making these first two genes more suitable to

identify varieties with differential transcriptional regulation of the hypoxia response program.

We next tested the expression of Hv*HB*, Hv*ADH1* and Hv*PDC1* at 24 h of waterlogging in the set of 21 barley varieties we selected based on (Byrne *et al.*, 2022) (Figure 1A). As expected, under normal watering conditions, most varieties had low levels of expression for each of the hypoxia response genes, with the exception of *Pilastro*, which exhibited higher Hv*HB* expression (Figures 1B, 1C and Supp. Figure S2). Waterlogging stress triggered the up-regulation of the hypoxia response genes in all varieties tested, but some differences in their response were observed. As previously, differences were more marked with Hv*HB* and Hv*ADH1* (Figure 1B-D) than with Hv*PDC1* (Supp. Figure S2), making these first two genes more suitable to identify varieties with a differential transcriptional response to waterlogging. After 24 h of waterlogging, some varieties reached higher expression levels than the average relative expression observed for these genes in the population of 21 varieties. These included *Pilastro* and *Regina* for both Hv*HB* and Hv*ADH1*, as well as *Dura*, *Vesuvius*, *Siberia*, *Mahogany* and *Tamaris* for Hv*ADH1*. In contrast, some varieties showed reduced up-regulation of hypoxia response genes compared to the population average. For example, varieties such as *Golden Promise*, *Passport*, *Isa*, *Louise* and *Retriever* had lower expression levels of both Hv*HB* and Hv*ADH1* compared to the average of the population. Other varieties, such as *Infinity*, had average expression levels of Hv*HB* and Hv*ADH1*.

Based on these results, *Pilastro* and *Regina* were chosen as representative 6-row and 2-row varieties, respectively, that potentially exhibit a stronger transcriptional response to waterlogging, while *Passport* was selected as a 6-row variety that had a more dampened transcriptional response. We also included *Infinity* as a 2-row variety for further characterization because it is on the recommended list in Ireland (where this study was carried out) and has an average transcriptional response to waterlogging. As highlighted above, *Golden Promise* was included as a reference variety.

Effect of waterlogging on the growth of selected varieties

The growth of the five selected varieties was characterized under controlled conditions following a 2-week waterlogging treatment, and a 6-week recovery period with normal

watering. Height measurement showed that the growth of *Infinity* and *Passport* was more affected by waterlogging than that of *Pilastro*, *Regina* and *Golden Promise*, whose height was mostly unaffected by the treatment (Figure 2A). In addition, *Golden Promise*, *Infinity* and *Pilastro* produced fewer tillers, whereas *Regina*'s tiller number was largely unaffected (Figure 2B). Because root traits have been shown to be important for waterlogging tolerance (Zhang *et al.*, 2015), we determined the length of the primary root, as well as the number of seminal roots after 2 weeks of waterlogging. The length of the primary root was reduced upon waterlogging stress for all varieties except *Regina* (Figure 2C), while the number of seminal roots increased in all varieties and the difference was statistically significant for all except *Infinity* (Figure 2D). This phenotypic characterization suggests that a variety such as *Regina*, which has a stronger transcriptional response for Hv*ADH1* and Hv*HB*, appears to be less impacted by waterlogging than other varieties.

Overview of transcriptional responses to waterlogging in root tissue of selected varieties

To determine the transcriptional responses of *Pilastro*, *Regina*, *Passport*, *Infinity* and *Golden Promise* to waterlogging, we subjected these varieties to waterlogging for 24 h. This time point was chosen based on the time course experiment described above that showed peak expression of Hv*HB*, Hv*ADH1* and Hv*PDC1* at 24 h of waterlogging. Total RNA was extracted from roots for RNA-seq analysis. Reads obtained were aligned to the Morex barley genome (version 3; Supp. Table S3 and Supp. Figure S3A-C) and differential gene expression (adjusted *p*-value < 0.05) was determined for each of the waterlogged varieties relative to the corresponding untreated variety (Supp. Table S4). A Principal Component Analysis (PCA) indicated that the samples separated based on (i) the treatment (PC1: 35.82% variance) (Figure 3A); (ii) whether they were winter or spring varieties (PC2: 15.64% variance; Supp. Figure S3D); or (iii) whether they were 2-row or 6-row varieties (PC3: 11.34% variance; Supp. Figure S3E). In this analysis, the varieties *Golden Promise*, *Infinity* and *Passport* could also be separated from *Pilastro* and *Regina* (Figure S3F; PC4: 9.92% variance). This suggests that there are underlying differences between these two groups of varieties that are not explained by a known variable.

The number of differentially expressed genes (DEGs) identified in the different varieties varied considerably: for *Golden Promise* and *Passport* we identified 220 and 592

DEGs (respectively), while *Infinity*, *Pilastro* and *Regina* had a substantially higher number of

DEGs (1,307; 1,512; and 1,233, respectively). In all varieties tested, the proportion of up-

regulated genes was higher than that of down-regulated genes (Figure 3B). We verified in

our datasets the expression of the Hv*HB*, Hv*ADH1* and Hv*PDC1* genes whose up-regulation

was initially used to monitor the transcriptional response of the different varieties to

waterlogging by RT-qPCR (Figure 1). Induction of all three genes upon waterlogging was

found (Figure 3C). We further identified additional homologs of Hv*ADH1* and Hv*HB* and

confirmed that these homologs were also up-regulated in response to waterlogging (Supp.

Figure S4).

Genome-wide transcriptional reprogramming of barley in response to waterlogging

Our RNA-seq experiment identified 2,865 genes that were differentially expressed in at least

one variety under waterlogged conditions compared to control plants (Supp. Table S4). The

variety with the highest proportion of unique DEGs was *Pilastro* (>50% unique DEGs), while

the majority of DEGs identified for *Golden Promise* and *Passport* were shared with other

varieties (Figure 4A) (<25% unique DEGs in these 2 varieties). Among the 2,865 DEGs, 1,078

genes were called as differentially expressed in more than one variety. Except for 7 genes,

the directionality of gene expression change was the same in all varieties, thus further

highlighting the similarities in the response of these varieties to waterlogging. As expected

based on the transcriptional response of Arabidopsis to waterlogging, Gene Ontology (GO)

analysis of the 1,811 DEGs that were up-regulated in at least one variety identified over-

represented terms related to hormone and stress responses, oxidoreductase activity, kinase

activity, as well as carbohydrate metabolic processes (Figure 4B and D). GO analysis of the

1,061 DEGs that were down-regulated in response to waterlogging identified terms related

to lipid and carbohydrate metabolism, transmembrane transporter activities and cell

periphery, as well as oxidoreductase activity and proteolysis (Figure 4C and E). All of these

terms are consistent with functional GO categories known to be central to the

transcriptional response of plants to waterlogging.

A total of 98 genes were detected as differentially expressed in the five varieties

(Figure 4A), and their directionality of expression change was the same across all datasets.

The majority of these genes were up-regulated in response to waterlogging (82 genes;

Figure 4B and Supp. Table S4) and included homologs of known core hypoxia response

genes in Arabidopsis (Mustroph *et al.*, 2009) such as *ADH1* (HORVU.MOREX.r3.4HG0345760,

HORVU.MOREX.r3.1HG0082960 and HORVU.MOREX.r3.4HG0345740), *PDC1*

(HORVU.MOREX.r3.4HG0384560), *HB1* (HORVU.MOREX.r3.4HG0394960,

HORVU.MOREX.r3.7HG0715010) and a respiratory burst oxidase (*RBOH*)

(HORVU.MOREX.r3.5HG0444960). Furthermore, this set included homologs of ERF-VII

transcription factors, such as *HRE1* (HORVU.MOREX.r3.4HG0405650 and

HORVU.MOREX.r3.4HG0405650), *HRE2* (HORVU.MOREX.r3.5HG0497970) and *RAP2.3*,

(HORVU.MOREX.r3.1HG0060770). This result is in agreement with the central role of ERF-VII

transcription factors as master regulators of hypoxia and waterlogging response. Sixteen

DEGs common to all datasets were down-regulated in response to waterlogging (Figure 4C),

including three peroxidase genes (HORVU.MOREX.r3.2HG0215440,

HORVU.MOREX.r3.2HG0119650, HORVU.MOREX.r3.2HG0119630) a nitrate transporter

(HORVU.MOREX.r3.7HG0700030), and an aldehyde dehydrogenase

(HORVU.MOREX.r3.2HG0173750). GO analysis of the set of 98 common DEGs (Figure 4F)

revealed largely similar terms to those identified for all up-regulated DEGs (Figure 4D),

including GO terms such as oxidoreductase activity, carbohydrate metabolic process, and

hormone-mediated signaling.

We next compared our RNA-seq results to two recently published RNA-seq datasets.

Luan et al. analyzed the transcriptomic response of 4-leaf stage Franklin and TX9425 barley

roots to waterlogging for 24 or 72 h (Luan *et al.*, 2022). These were two-row spring varieties,

with Franklin showing sensitivity and TX9425 showing tolerance to waterlogging (Luan *et al.*,

2022). In addition, Borrego-Benjumea *et al*. analyzed the transcriptomic response of

waterlogged barley roots in 2-week-old *Yerong* and *Deder2* for 72 or 120 h (Borrego-

Benjumea *et al.*, 2020). Both varieties had been chosen because of their tolerance to

waterlogging (Li *et al.*, 2008; Takeda, 1989). Raw RNA-seq data were analyzed using the

same pipeline as for our datasets. PCA analysis of all datasets showed that most of the

variation was due to the origin of the dataset (Figure S5A; PC1: 68.39% variance), likely

because waterlogging stress is known to vary considerably based on experimental

differences, such as soil type. As expected, the different samples could also be separated

based on treatment (Figure S5A; PC2: 17.03% variance). To facilitate the comparison

between the different datasets, we selected the most similar timepoints to those of our

study (*i.e.*, 0 h control and 24 h waterlogged for Luan *et al.*; and 72 h control and

waterlogged for Borrego-Benjumea *et al.*). Despite the differences in barley varieties, age of

the plants and duration of the waterlogging treatment, a statistically significant overlap was

observed between both the up and down-regulated genes in our datasets and in those

recently published datasets DEGs (Supp. Figure S5B and S5C) (Borrego-Benjumea *et al.*,

2020; Luan *et al.*, 2022). GO analysis of the 448 DEGs that were up-regulated in all datasets

identified terms related to metabolism and oxidoreductase activity (Supp. Figure S5F), again

in agreement with known key aspects of plant responses to waterlogging. Genes associated

with transporter activity were found among the 309 shared down-regulated genes (Supp.

Figure S5G).

Identification of unique expression signatures between varieties

To compare the responses to waterlogging between the 5 varieties used in this study, *k*-

means clustering was performed on 10,882 genes identified as differentially expressed in: (i)

at least one variety when comparing waterlogged to control samples for each variety, or (ii)

between the control samples (*i.e.*, these have intrinsic differential expression between at

least 2 varieties in the absence of waterlogging), or (iii) between the waterlogged samples

from different varieties (*i.e.*, genes that are differentially expressed between at least 2

varieties under waterlogging) (Supp. Figure S6A). Clustering analysis revealed distinct gene

expression patterns between samples (Figure 5A). A number of clusters contained genes

that were up-regulated in multiple varieties in response to waterlogging compared to

untreated plants (*i.e.*, clusters 4, 7, 8, 14, and 21). The largest cluster (#14) comprised 802

genes (Supp. Table S4) with a centroid expression that was higher in all varieties in response

to waterlogging (Figure 5B and Supp. Figure S6). Cluster 14 included homologs of known

hypoxia response genes such as those described above in the common set of 82 up-

regulated DEGs in barley (Figure 4B), as well as homologs of Arabidopsis *RAP2.12*

(HORVU.MOREX.r3.5HG0481240), additional homologs of *RAP2.3*,

(HORVU.MOREX.r3.2HG0112960), and homologs of *ADH1* (HORVU.MOREX.r3.2HG0115170,

HORVU.MOREX.r3.3HG0252910) (Supp. Figure S4A and B). Furthermore, transcription

factors (TFs) from the ERF, bHLH, bZIP (basic leucine zipper), NAC (NAM, ATAF1,2, CUC2) and

WRKY families were also identified in cluster 14 (Supp. Table S4), all of which belong to

families with established and conserved roles in the regulation of hypoxia response genes

(Lee and Bailey-Serres, 2021; Mustroph *et al.*, 2010; Reynoso *et al.*, 2019). GO analysis of

the 802 genes in cluster 14 identified terms related to hormone and stress responses,

oxidoreductase and kinase activity and metabolism (Figure 5C).

In contrast, clusters 5, 9, 13, 15, 20 and 24 comprised genes that were down-

regulated in response to waterlogging in multiple varieties. Cluster 9 contained 435 genes

that were down-regulated in response to waterlogging (Figure 5D and Supp. Figure S6),

including 14 of the 16 genes that were down-regulated in waterlogged samples from all

varieties (Figure 4C and Supp. Table S4). Among these genes was an aminotransferase

(HORVU.MOREX.r3.2HG0190680), whose top-scoring Arabidopsis homolog is γ-

aminobutyric acid transaminase (GABA-T; AT3G22200). In Arabidopsis, the expression of this

gene is also reduced in response to hypoxia (Branco-Price *et al.*, 2008). Another member of

cluster 9 whose expression was downregulated in all varieties in response to waterlogging is

a cation exchanger (HORVU.MOREX.r3.3HG0266310). In Arabidopsis, the closely related

Ca^{2+}/proton exchanger 11 (CAX11) is important to maintain cytosolic Ca^{2+} homeostasis and

was shown to be down-regulated in response to hypoxia and waterlogging (Wang *et al.*,

2016). Multiple transcription factors from the heat-shock and MYB transcription factor

families were also found in cluster 9. This is consistent with the observation that

differentially expressed MYB transcription factors were predominantly found to be down-

regulated in response to waterlogging in *Yerong* and *Deder2* (Borrego-Benjumea *et al.*,

2020). GO analysis of the 435 genes in cluster 9 showed an enrichment for terms related to

lipid and carbohydrate metabolism, transmembrane transporter activities and cell periphery

(Figure 5E), similarly to the GO terms identified in all genes down-regulated in response to

waterlogging (Figure 4E).

Clustering analysis also identified gene expression signatures that were specific to

individual varieties: cluster 1 (257 genes) contained genes whose expression was highest in

the barley varieties *Golden Promise* and *Infinity* and intermediate in *Passport*. In contrast,

the expression of these genes was markedly lower in the varieties *Pilastro* and *Regina*

(Figure 5F and Figure S6). GO analysis of genes in cluster 1 identified terms related to

catabolic and metabolic processes (Figure 5G), which could be relevant to waterlogging

tolerance/sensitivity. In contrast, genes in cluster 16 (359 genes) had an opposite behavior,

in that they were more highly expressed in *Pilastro* and *Regina*, but were only expressed at

low levels in the other varieties (Figure 5H and Figure S6). GO analysis of genes in cluster 16

revealed an enrichment for genes associated with diverse processes found in other clusters

or sets of genes, except the term 'nicotianamine metabolic process' which was only found in

the GO analysis of cluster 16 genes. This GO term relates to metal (including iron)

homeostasis, which could be of relevance to waterlogging stress tolerance because of the

increased uptake of metals and their toxicity to plants in waterlogged conditions. Notably,

genes in clusters 1 and 16 were not differentially expressed in response to waterlogging.

Instead, it is their intrinsic (or varietal-specific) expression level that differs between the

samples.

Discussion

Maintaining yields in the context of global climate change is a challenge, as crops are likely

to experience a wider range of stresses simultaneously or sequentially. Accordingly, efforts

are now made to improve crop resilience to multiple abiotic and biotic stresses, as opposed

to tolerance to a specific stress. At the same time, the trade-off between the gain of new

traits and yield also requires careful consideration (Bailey-Serres *et al.*, 2019). Waterlogging

in particular causes important crop losses and will become more prevalent in some regions.

Several QTLs have been identified with genes that could be targeted to improve crop

tolerance to waterlogging, but the role of candidate genes often needs to be validated, as

well as their suitability to improve crop tolerance to waterlogging. Alternatively, targeted

mutations in genes coding for key hypoxia response components, such as genes of the N-

degron protein degradation pathway, have yielded Arabidopsis and barley lines that are

more tolerant to waterlogging and other abiotic stresses (Mendiondo *et al.*, 2016; Vicente *et*

al., 2017), albeit with a potential trade-off on their ability to resist infection by some

pathogens (de Marchi *et al.*, 2016; Gravot *et al.*, 2016; Vicente *et al.*, 2019).

Barley is an essential crop that exhibits varietal differences in its sensitivity to

waterlogging. The identification of potential candidate genes that can be targeted or used

as markers to identify waterlogging tolerant varieties would be of importance. One

approach to identifying candidate targets and markers is the comparison of genome-wide

transcriptional responses of different varieties to waterlogging. Here, after identifying a time point (24 h) at which the expression of well-known hypoxia response marker genes peaked, we screened a subset of 20 winter varieties to identify some with a differential transcriptional response to waterlogging. Based on this analysis, we determined the genome-wide transcriptional response to waterlogging of 4 winter barley varieties and of the model spring variety *Golden Promise*. In agreement with previous transcriptional studies with a range of plants and crops (Borrego-Benjumea *et al.*, 2020; Lee *et al.*, 2011; Lee and Bailey-Serres, 2021; Luan *et al.*, 2022; Luan *et al.*, 2023; Mustroph *et al.*, 2010; Reynoso *et al.*, 2019; van Veen *et al.*, 2016), our RNA-seq datasets indicate that the transcriptional reprogramming that accompanies the onset of waterlogging response in barley involves cellular processes such as carbohydrate metabolic processes, regulation of oxidative stress, and metal homeostasis. Many of the up and down-regulated genes identified in this study had also been shown to be differentially expressed in two other datasets generated using distinct barley varieties and different experimental conditions (Borrego-Benjumea *et al.*, 2020; Luan *et al.*, 2022; Luan *et al.*, 2023). This overlap, together with the results of GO and RT-qPCR analyses validate our datasets. We also identified a set of 98 waterlogging response genes that were common to the five datasets generated in this study. Many of these common DEGs are homologs of 'core hypoxia response genes' that were identified across a range of plant species (Mustroph *et al.*, 2009) and that are involved in processes such as cell wall metabolism, ethylene biosynthesis and signalling, carbohydrate metabolism and ROS regulation. Multiple transcription factors belonging to the ERF, bHLH, and WRKY families, which are known to be important for the onset of the waterlogging response program, are also among these 98 common DEGs. Hence, our data indicate that, as expected, the gene regulatory network that controls waterlogging response is conserved amongst monocots and dicots (Mustroph *et al.*, 2010; Tamura and Bono, 2022).

Clustering analysis of the different DEGs identified groups of genes that behave similarly between the 5 varieties in response to waterlogging (*e.g.*, all genes in clusters 14 and 9 are up or down-regulated, respectively). This analysis also revealed genes that are differentially expressed between the varieties in the absence of treatment (see clusters 1 and 16 (Figures 5F and 5H)). While their expression does not typically change in response to waterlogging, it is possible that either the low or high intrinsic expression of some of these genes may 'predispose' certain varieties to either sensitivity or tolerance to waterlogging. In

other words, these genes could constitute variety-specific waterlogging susceptibility or

tolerance factors. Validating this possibility would require (i) an in-depth characterization of

the physiological responses and yield losses of a large number of varieties that would be

first grouped based on the intrinsic expression level of genes of interest; (ii) dissecting the

function of these genes, many of which have paralogs in barley; and (iii) generating barley

plants that are mutated or that constitutively express these different genes, followed by a

detailed characterization of the physiological response and yield under waterlogged

conditions. Potential trade-offs on other traits of agronomic relevance and on resilience to

other abiotic and biotic stresses would also need to be assessed. Considering the variety of

gene functions present in clusters 1 and 16, it is however difficult to predict which genes (or

gene families) are most likely to be of potential relevance to crop improvement. Their

association with GWAS and QTL identification would most likely help to pinpoint the best

candidates.

Acknowledgements

The authors are thankful to William Thomas for sharing seeds of the AGOUEB population, and to Susanne Barth and Carl Ng for helpful discussions. We also thank Daniel Daly for technical assistance with some of the waterlogging experiments

Author contributions

AM, AJB and EG conducted experiments; AJB, AM, JB, FW and EG analyzed RNA-seq datasets and wrote the manuscript.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Funding

This research was supported by a Research Stimulus Grant (VICCI - Grant No:14/S/819) funded the Irish Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine (DAFM) to EG and FW. AJB was funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement No 897783. JB was supported by a Trinity College Provost Project award. FW was supported by Science Foundation Ireland and the Environmental Protection Agency (grant 16/IA/4559).

Data availability

The datasets supporting the results of this article are included within the article (and its supplemental files). RNA-seq data have been deposited with the Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) repository (at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/) under GSE220532. *Note to reviewers*: the data has been submitted and the authors are waiting for publication before release.

References

Bailey-Serres J, Fukao T, Gibbs DJ, Holdsworth MJ, Lee SC, Licausi F, Perata P, Voesenek LA, van Dongen JT. 2012a. Making sense of low oxygen sensing. Trends in Plant Science **17**, 129-138.

Bailey-Serres J, Lee SC, Brinton E. 2012b. Waterproofing crops: effective flooding survival strategies. Plant Physiology **160**, 1698-1709.

Bailey-Serres J, Parker JE, Ainsworth EA, Oldroyd GED, Schroeder JI. 2019. Genetic strategies for improving crop yields. Nature **575**, 109-118.

Bertholdsson NO, Holefors A, Macaulay M, Crespo-Herrera LA. 2015. QTL for chlorophyll fluorescence of barley plants grown at low oxygen concentration in hydroponics to simulate waterlogging. Euphytica **201**, 357-365.

Borrego-Benjumea A, Carter A, Tucker JR, Yao Z, Xu W, Badea A. 2020. Genome-Wide Analysis of Gene Expression Provides New Insights into Waterlogging Responses in Barley (Hordeum vulgare L.). Plants (Basel) **9**.

Branco-Price C, Kaiser KA, Jang CJ, Larive CK, Bailey-Serres J. 2008. Selective mRNA translation coordinates energetic and metabolic adjustments to cellular oxygen deprivation and reoxygenation in Arabidopsis thaliana. Plant Journal **56**, 743-755.

Brazel AJ, Graciet E. 2023. Complexity of Abiotic Stress Stimuli: Mimicking Hypoxic Conditions Experimentally on the Basis of Naturally Occurring Environments. Methods Mol Biol **2642**, 23-48.

Broughton S, Zhou G, Teakle NL, Matsuda R, Zhou M, O'Leary RA, Colmer TD, Li C. 2015. Waterlogging tolerance is associated with root porosity in barley (Hordeum vulgare L.). Molecular Breeding **35**, 27.

Byrne T, Grant J, Kock-Appelgren P, Förster L, Michel T, Miricescu A, Thomas WTB, Graciet E, Spink J, Ng C, Barth S. 2022. Improving phenotyping in winter barley cultivars towards flooding tolerance by combining field with controlled growth condition experiments. European Journal of Agronomy **133**, 126432.

Danecek P, Bonfield JK, Liddle J, Marshall J, Ohan V, Pollard MO, Whitwham A, Keane T, McCarthy SA, Davies RM, Li H. 2021. Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools. Gigascience **10**.

de Marchi R, Sorel M, Mooney B, Fudal I, Goslin K, Kwasniewska K, Ryan PT, Pfalz M, Kroymann J, Pollmann S, Feechan A, Wellmer F, Rivas S, Graciet E. 2016. The N-end rule pathway regulates pathogen responses in plants. Sci Rep **6**, 26020.

de San Celedonio RP, Abeledo LG, Brihet JM, Miralles DJ. 2016. Waterlogging Affects Leaf and Tillering Dynamics in Wheat and Barley. Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science **202**, 409-420.

de San Celedonio RP, Abeledo LG, Miralles DJ. 2014. Identifying the critical period for waterlogging on yield and its components in wheat and barley. Plant and Soil **378**, 265-277.

Doorly CM, Graciet E. 2021. Lessons from Comparison of Hypoxia Signaling in Plants and Mammals. Plants (Basel) **10**.

Gasch P, Fundinger M, Muller JT, Lee T, Bailey-Serres J, Mustroph A. 2016. Redundant ERF-VII Transcription Factors Bind to an Evolutionarily Conserved cis-Motif to Regulate Hypoxia-Responsive Gene Expression in Arabidopsis. Plant Cell **28**, 160-180.

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

Gibbs DJ, Lee SC, Isa NM, Gramuglia S, Fukao T, Bassel GW, Correia CS, Corbineau F,
Theodoulou FL, Bailey-Serres J, Holdsworth MJ. 2011. Homeostatic response to hypoxia is
regulated by the N-end rule pathway in plants. Nature **479**, 415-418.
Gill MB, Zeng F, Shabala L, Zhang G, Yu M, Demidchik V, Shabala S, Zhou M. 2019.
Identification of QTL Related to ROS Formation under Hypoxia and Their Association with
Waterlogging and Salt Tolerance in Barley. Int J Mol Sci **20**.
Giuntoli B, Perata P. 2018. Group VII Ethylene Response Factors in Arabidopsis: Regulation
and Physiological Roles. Plant Physiology **176**, 1143-1155.
Gravot A, Richard G, Lime T, Lemarie S, Jubault M, Lariagon C, Lemoine J, Vicente J,
Robert-Seilaniantz A, Holdsworth MJ, Manzanares-Dauleux MJ. 2016. Hypoxia response in
Arabidopsis roots infected by Plasmodiophora brassicae supports the development of
clubroot. BMC Plant Biology **16**, 251.
Gu Z, Eils R, Schlesner M. 2016. Complex heatmaps reveal patterns and correlations in
multidimensional genomic data. Bioinformatics **32**, 2847-2849.
Hammarlund EU, Flashman E, Mohlin S, Licausi F. 2020. Oxygen-sensing mechanisms across
eukaryotic kingdoms and their roles in complex multicellularity. Science **370**.
Hartman K, Tringe SG. 2019. Interactions between plants and soil shaping the root
microbiome under abiotic stress. Biochemical Journal **476**, 2705-2724.
Heberle H, Meirelles GV, da Silva FR, Telles GP, Minghim R. 2015. InteractiVenn: a web-
based tool for the analysis of sets through Venn diagrams. BMC Bioinformatics **16**, 169.
Holdsworth MJ, Gibbs DJ. 2020. Comparative Biology of Oxygen Sensing in Plants and
Animals. Current Biology **30**, R362-R369.
Kaur G, Singh G, Motavalli PP, Nelson KA, Orlowski JM, Golden BR. 2020. Impacts and
management strategies for crop production in waterlogged or flooded soils: A review.
Agronomy Journal **112**, 1475-1501.
Langan P, Bernad V, Walsh J, Henchy J, Khodaeiaminjan M, Mangina E, Negrao S. 2022.
Phenotyping for waterlogging tolerance in crops: current trends and future prospects.
Journal of Experimental Botany **73**, 5149-5169.
Langmead B, Salzberg SL. 2012. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. Nature Methods
9, 357-359.
Lee SC, Mustroph A, Sasidharan R, Vashisht D, Pedersen O, Oosumi T, Voesenek LA, Bailey-
Serres J. 2011. Molecular characterization of the submergence response of the Arabidopsis
thaliana ecotype Columbia. New Phytologist **190**, 457-471.
Lee TA, Bailey-Serres J. 2019. Integrative Analysis from the Epigenome to Translatome
Uncovers Patterns of Dominant Nuclear Regulation during Transient Stress. Plant Cell **31**,
2573-2595.
Lee TA, Bailey-Serres J. 2021. Conserved and nuanced hierarchy of gene regulatory
response to hypoxia. New Phytologist **229**, 71-78.
Li H, Vaillancourt R, Mendham N, Zhou M. 2008. Comparative mapping of quantitative trait
loci associated with waterlogging tolerance in barley (Hordeum vulgare L.). BMC Genomics
9, 401.
Licausi F, Kosmacz M, Weits DA, Giuntoli B, Giorgi FM, Voesenek LA, Perata P, van Dongen
JT. 2011. Oxygen sensing in plants is mediated by an N-end rule pathway for protein
destabilization. Nature **479**, 419-422.
Liu K, Harrison MT, Ibrahim A, Manik SMN, Johnson P, Tian X, Meinke H, Zhou M. 2020.
Genetic factors increasing barley grain yields under soil waterlogging. Food and Energy
Security **9**, e238.

Livak KJ, Schmittgen TD. 2001. Analysis of relative gene expression data using real-time
quantitative PCR and the 2(-Delta Delta C(T)) Method. Methods **25**, 402-408.

Loreti E, Betti F, Ladera-Carmona MJ, Fontana F, Novi G, Valeri MC, Perata P. 2020.
ARGONAUTE1 and ARGONAUTE4 Regulate Gene Expression and Hypoxia Tolerance. Plant
Physiology **182**, 287-300.

Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. 2014. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for
RNA-seq data with DESeq2. Genome Biol **15**, 550.

Luan H, Chen C, Yang J, Qiao H, Li H, Li S, Zheng J, Shen H, Xu X, Wang J. 2022. Genome-
wide association scan and transcriptome analysis reveal candidate genes for waterlogging
tolerance in cultivated barley. Front Plant Sci **13**, 1048939.

Luan H, Guo B, Pan Y, Lv C, Shen H, Xu R. 2018a. Morpho-anatomical and physiological
responses to waterlogging stress in different barley (Hordeum vulgare L.) genotypes. Plant
Growth Regulation **85**, 399-409.

Luan H, Li H, Li Y, Chen C, Li S, Wang Y, Yang J, Xu M, Shen H, Qiao H, Wang J. 2023.
Transcriptome analysis of barley (Hordeum vulgare L.) under waterlogging stress, and
overexpression of the HvADH4 gene confers waterlogging tolerance in transgenic
Arabidopsis. BMC Plant Biology **23**, 62.

Luan H, Shen H, Pan Y, Guo B, Lv C, Xu R. 2018b. Elucidating the hypoxic stress response in
barley (Hordeum vulgare L.) during waterlogging: A proteomics approach. Sci Rep **8**, 9655.

Manik SMN, Quamruzzaman M, Zhao C, Johnson P, Hunt I, Shabala S, Zhou M. 2022.
Genome-Wide Association Study Reveals Marker Trait Associations (MTA) for Waterlogging-
Triggered Adventitious Roots and Aerenchyma Formation in Barley. Int J Mol Sci **23**.

Marini F, Binder H. 2019. pcaExplorer: an R/Bioconductor package for interacting with RNA-
seq principal components. BMC Bioinformatics **20**, 331.

Mascher M. 2021. Pseudomolecules and annotation of the third version of the reference
genome sequence assembly of barley cv. Morex [Morex V3]. e!DAL - Plant Genomics and
Phenomics Research Data Repository (PGP), IPK Gatersleben, Seeland OT Gatersleben,
Corrensstraße 3, 06466, Germany.

**Mendiondo GM, Gibbs DJ, Szurman-Zubrzycka M, Korn A, Marquez J, Szarejko I,
Maluszynski M, King J, Axcell B, Smart K, Corbineau F, Holdsworth MJ**. 2016. Enhanced
waterlogging tolerance in barley by manipulation of expression of the N-end rule pathway
E3 ligase PROTEOLYSIS6. Plant Biotechnology Journal **14**, 40-50.

Miricescu A, Byrne T, Doorly CM, Ng CKY, Barth S, Graciet E. 2021. Experimental
comparison of two methods to study barley responses to partial submergence. Plant
Methods **17**, 40.

**Mustroph A, Lee SC, Oosumi T, Zanetti ME, Yang H, Ma K, Yaghoubi-Masihi A, Fukao T,
Bailey-Serres J**. 2010. Cross-kingdom comparison of transcriptomic adjustments to low-
oxygen stress highlights conserved and plant-specific responses. Plant Physiology **152**, 1484-
1500.

**Mustroph A, Zanetti ME, Jang CJ, Holtan HE, Repetti PP, Galbraith DW, Girke T, Bailey-
Serres J**. 2009. Profiling translatomes of discrete cell populations resolves altered cellular
priorities during hypoxia in Arabidopsis. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A **106**, 18843-18848.

Pertea M, Pertea GM, Antonescu CM, Chang TC, Mendell JT, Salzberg SL. 2015. StringTie
enables improved reconstruction of a transcriptome from RNA-seq reads. Nature
Biotechnology **33**, 290-295.

**Reynoso MA, Kajala K, Bajic M, West DA, Pauluzzi G, Yao AI, Hatch K, Zumstein K,
Woodhouse M, Rodriguez-Medina J, Sinha N, Brady SM, Deal RB, Bailey-Serres J**. 2019.

Evolutionary flexibility in flooding response circuitry in angiosperms. Science **365**, 1291-
1295.

Sasidharan R, Bailey-Serres J, Ashikari M, Atwell BJ, Colmer TD, Fagerstedt K, Fukao T,
Geigenberger P, Hebelstrup KH, Hill RD, Holdsworth MJ, Ismail AM, Licausi F, Mustroph A,
Nakazono M, Pedersen O, Perata P, Sauter M, Shih MC, Sorrell BK, Striker GG, van Dongen
JT, Whelan J, Xiao S, Visser EJW, Voesenek L. 2017. Community recommendations on
terminology and procedures used in flooding and low oxygen stress research. New
Phytologist **214**, 1403-1407.

Setter TL, Waters I. 2003. Review of prospects for germplasm improvement for
waterlogging tolerance in wheat, barley and oats. Plant and Soil **253**, 1-34.

Takeda K. 1989. Varietal variation of flooding tolerance in barley seedlings, and its diallel
analysis. Jpn. J. Breed. **39**, 174-175.

Tamura K, Bono H. 2022. Meta-Analysis of RNA Sequencing Data of Arabidopsis and Rice
under Hypoxia. Life (Basel) **12**.

Team RC. 2022. R: A language and environment for statistical computing (https://www.R-
project.org/). R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

Thomas W, Comadran J, Ramsay L, Shaw P, Marshall D, Newton A, O'Sullivan D, Cockram
J, Mackay I, Bayles R, White J, Kearsey M, Luo Z, Wang M, Tapsell C, Harrap D, Werner P,
Klose S, Bury P, Wroth J, Argilier O, Habgood R, Glew M, Bochard A-M, Gymer P, Vequaud
D, Christerson T, Allvin B, Davies N, Broadbent R, Brosnan J, Bringhurst T, Booer C, Waugh
R. 2014. Association genetics of UK elite barley (AGOUEB). Final Project Report to HGCA, No
528, 125pp.

van Veen H, Vashisht D, Akman M, Girke T, Mustroph A, Reinen E, Hartman S, Kooiker M,
van Tienderen P, Schranz ME, Bailey-Serres J, Voesenek LA, Sasidharan R. 2016.
Transcriptomes of Eight Arabidopsis thaliana Accessions Reveal Core Conserved, Genotype-
and Organ-Specific Responses to Flooding Stress. Plant Physiology **172**, 668-689.

Vashisht D, Hesselink A, Pierik R, Ammerlaan JM, Bailey-Serres J, Visser EJ, Pedersen O,
van Zanten M, Vreugdenhil D, Jamar DC, Voesenek LA, Sasidharan R. 2011. Natural
variation of submergence tolerance among Arabidopsis thaliana accessions. New Phytologist
190, 299-310.

Vicente J, Mendiondo GM, Movahedi M, Peirats-Llobet M, Juan YT, Shen YY, Dambire C,
Smart K, Rodriguez PL, Charng YY, Gray JE, Holdsworth MJ. 2017. The Cys-Arg/N-End Rule
Pathway Is a General Sensor of Abiotic Stress in Flowering Plants. Current Biology **27**, 3183-
3190 e3184.

Vicente J, Mendiondo GM, Pauwels J, Pastor V, Izquierdo Y, Naumann C, Movahedi M,
Rooney D, Gibbs DJ, Smart K, Bachmair A, Gray JE, Dissmeyer N, Castresana C, Ray RV,
Gevaert K, Holdsworth MJ. 2019. Distinct branches of the N-end rule pathway modulate the
plant immune response. New Phytologist **221**, 988-1000.

Wang F, Chen ZH, Liu X, Colmer TD, Zhou M, Shabala S. 2016. Tissue-specific root ion
profiling reveals essential roles of the CAX and ACA calcium transport systems in response to
hypoxia in Arabidopsis. Journal of Experimental Botany **67**, 3747-3762.

Wang Y, Uchida Y, Shimomura Y, Akiyama H, Hayatsu M. 2017. Responses of denitrifying
bacterial communities to short-term waterlogging of soils. Sci Rep **7**, 803.

Weits DA, Giuntoli B, Kosmacz M, Parlanti S, Hubberten HM, Riegler H, Hoefgen R, Perata
P, van Dongen JT, Licausi F. 2014. Plant cysteine oxidases control the oxygen-dependent
branch of the N-end-rule pathway. Nat Commun **5**, 3425.

White MD, Kamps J, East S, Taylor Kearney LJ, Flashman E. 2018. The plant cysteine
oxidases from Arabidopsis thaliana are kinetically tailored to act as oxygen sensors. Journal
of Biological Chemistry **293**, 11786-11795.
White MD, Klecker M, Hopkinson RJ, Weits DA, Mueller C, Naumann C, O'Neill R, Wickens
J, Yang J, Brooks-Bartlett JC, Garman EF, Grossmann TN, Dissmeyer N, Flashman E. 2017.
Plant cysteine oxidases are dioxygenases that directly enable arginyl transferase-catalysed
arginylation of N-end rule targets. Nat Commun **8**, 14690.
Wickam H. 2016. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*: Springer-Verlag New York.
Zhang X, Fan Y, Shabala S, Koutoulis A, Shabala L, Johnson P, Hu H, Zhou M. 2017. A new
major-effect QTL for waterlogging tolerance in wild barley (H. spontaneum). Theoretical and
Applied Genetics **130**, 1559-1568.
Zhang X, Shabala S, Koutoulis A, Shabala L, Johnson P, Hayes D, Nichols DS, Zhou M. 2015.
Waterlogging tolerance in barley is associated with faster aerenchyma formation in
adventitious roots. Plant and Soil **394**, 355-372.
Zhang X, Zhou G, Shabala S, Koutoulis A, Shabala L, Johnson P, Li C, Zhou M. 2016.
Identification of aerenchyma formation-related QTL in barley that can be effective in
breeding for waterlogging tolerance. Theoretical and Applied Genetics **129**, 1167-1177.
Zhou M. 2011. Accurate phenotyping reveals better QTL for waterlogging tolerance in
barley. Plant Breeding **130**, 203-208.
824

Figures

Figure 1: Differential expression of selected hypoxia response genes in 21 different barley varieties. (A) Experimental design of waterlogging experiments (see Materials and Methods for details). (B) Hv*HB* expression relative to *ACTIN* in untreated (open symbols; normal

watering) and waterlogged (blue symbols) plants after 24 h of treatment. The dashed line

corresponds to the average relative expression of Hv*HB* for waterlogged samples of all

varieties and replicates. (C) Hv*ADH1* expression relative to *ACTIN* in untreated (open

symbols) and waterlogged (blue symbols) plants after 24 h of treatment. The dashed line

corresponds to the average relative expression of Hv*ADH1* for waterlogged samples of all

varieties and replicates. (D) *p*-value results of two-way ANOVA analysis of the data

presented in (B) and (C), and in Supp. Figure S2. Data shown in (B) and (C) are from three

independent replicates, except for *Golden Promise* for which 4 independent replicates were

used. Errors bars indicate SEM. Each independent replicate was obtained by pooling the

root systems from 3 plants prior to grinding for RNA extraction. Note: expression values for

Infinity shown in (B) and (C) were published in (Miricescu *et al.*, 2021).

Figure 2: Effect of waterlogging on shoot and root growth. (A) Plant height after 14 d of

waterlogging and a 6-week recovery period. For *Golden Promise*, *Passport* and *Pilastro*,

three independent replicates (4 plants per replicate) were carried out. For *Regina* and

Infinity, two independent replicates (4 plants per replicate) and 3 independent replicates (4

to 9 plants per replicate) were carried out, respectively. (B) Number of tillers after 14 d of

waterlogging and a 6-week recovery period. Three independent replicates were carried out

with at least 4 plants per replicate. (C) Length of the primary root after 14 d of waterlogging.

For *Golden Promise*, *Passport*, *Pilastro* and *Regina*, three independent replicates with 2 to 7

plants each were carried out. For *Infinity*, 5 independent replicates were carried out with 3

to 4 plants per replicate. (D) Number of seminal roots after 14 d of waterlogging. For *Golden*

Promise, *Passport*, and *Pilastro*, three independent replicates (2 to 4 plants per replicate)

were carried out. For *Regina*, 2 independent replicates were conducted (4 plants per

replicate). For *Infinity*, 4 independent replicates were carried out (4 plants per replicate). In

(A-D), data from different replicates is color coded. Error bars correspond to standard

deviations. Statistical analysis: multiple unpaired t-test with multiple comparison correction

(Holm-Sidak method). Asterisks: * p≤ 0.05; ** p≤0.01; *** p≤0.001; **** p≤0.0001; ns: not

statistically significant.

Figure 3: Results of RNA-seq experiments. (A) PCA plot showing Principal Component 2

(PC2) *versus* PC1 with ellipses showing sample grouping by treatment. (B) Absolute number

of DEGs (filtered by adjusted *p*-value<0.05) in waterlogged *versus* control samples for each

variety. (C) Box plots showing variance stabilised transformed (VST) read counts for Hv*HB*

(HORVU.MOREX.r3.4HG0394960), Hv*ADH1* (HORVU.MOREX.r3.4HG0345760.1) and Hv*PDC1*

(HORVU.MOREX.r3.4HG0384560) in control and waterlogged samples (*Golden Promise* (GP),

Infinity (Inf), *Passport* (Pas), *Pilastro* (Pil) and *Regina* (Reg)).

Figure 4: Comparison of *waterlogging* response genes in barley. (A) Overlap between the
DEGs identified in the different varieties. (B) Overlap analysis of genes up-regulated in
waterlogged samples compared to control samples for each variety. (C) Overlap between
datasets for genes that are down-regulated in waterlogged samples compared to the
controls in each variety. (D) The 30 most highly enriched GO terms among the 1,811 DEGs
that are up-regulated in at least one variety in response to waterlogging. (E) The 30 most
highly enriched GO terms enriched among the 1,061 DEGs that are down-regulated in any

879   variety in response to waterlogging. (F) The 20 most enriched GO terms among the 98 DEGs

880   common to all varieties when comparing waterlogged to control samples for each variety.

Figure 5: Clustering analysis of DEGs in waterlogged compared to control samples. (A)

Heatmap showing the results of *k*-means clustering (*k*=25) of 10,882 DEGs (see Supp. Figure

S6A for selection criteria). Image generated using *ComplexHeatmap* in *R*. (B) Plot of centroid

expression for genes in cluster 14. (C) The 20 most highly enriched GO terms among the 802

genes identified in cluster 14. (D) Plot of centroid expression for DEGs in cluster 9. (E) The 20

most highly enriched GO terms among the 435 genes identified in cluster 9. (F) Plot of

centroid expression for genes in cluster 1. (G) The 20 most highly enriched GO terms among

891   the 257 genes from cluster 1. (H) Plot of centroid expression for genes in cluster 16. (I) The

892   20 most highly enriched GO terms among the 359 genes from cluster 16.