Title: Distinct function of SPL genes in age-related resistance in *Arabidopsis*

Lanxi Hu[1], Peng Qi[2], Alan Peper[1], Feng, Kong[1], Yao Yao[3], Li Yang[1]*

Affiliations**:**

1. Department of Plant Pathology, College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences,

University of Georgia, Athens, GA, 30602, USA

2. Department of Plant Biology, Franklin College of Arts and Sciences, University of

Georgia, Athens, GA, 30602, USA

3. Department of Animal and Diary Sciences, College of Agricultural & Environmental

Sciences, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, 30602, USA

* corresponding author

Abstract:

In plants, age-related resistance (ARR) refers to a gain of disease resistance during

shoot or organ maturation. ARR associated with vegetative phase change, a

transition from juvenile to adult stage, is a widespread agronomic trait affecting

resistance against multiple pathogens. How innate immunity in a plant is differentially

regulated during successive stages of shoot maturation is unclear. In this work, we

found that *Arabidopsis thaliana* showed ARR against its bacterial pathogen

Pseudomonas syringae pv. tomato DC3000 during vegetative phase change. The

timing of the ARR activation was associated with a temporal drop of miR156 level. A

systematic inspection of the loss- and gain-of-function mutants of 11 *SPL* genes

revealed that a subset of *SPL* genes, notably *SPL2*, *SPL10*, and *SPL11,* activated

ARR in adult stage. The immune function of SPL10 was independent of its role in

morphogenesis. Furthermore, the SPL10 mediated an age-dependent augmentation

of the salicylic acid (SA) pathway partially by direct activation of *PAD4*. Disrupting SA

biosynthesis or signaling abolished the ARR against *Pto* DC3000. Our work

demonstrated that the miR156-SPL10 module in *Arabidopsis* is deployed to operate

immune outputs over developmental timing.

Significance

Age-associated change of immunity is a widespread phenomenon in animals and plants. How organisms integrate immune maturation into a developmental clock is a fundamental question. Heterochronic microRNAs are key regulators of developmental timing. We found that a conserved heterochronic microRNA (miRNA) in *Arabidopsis*, microRNA156, regulates the timing of age-related resistance associated with a transition from the juvenile to the adult vegetative phase. The coordination between developmental maturation and gain of disease resistance is achieved through miR156-controlled SPL transcription factors with distinct functions. A subset of SPL transcription factors promoted resistance by directly activating key genes in defense signaling. This work bridges the knowledge gap between vegetative development and age-related resistance. Pinpointing mechanisms of the developmental regulation on immunity may pave a way for unlocking the age limit on plant immunity and lay a foundation to applications in the precision agriculture.

Introduction

Both animals and plants suffer from infectious diseases, particularly at a young age (1-3). The function of their immune systems can be enhanced with the progression of organismal maturation. In many plant species, a gain of disease resistance against certain pathogens during shoot maturation is termed age-related resistance (ARR). Plant ARR can launch robust and wide spectrum resistance against a variety of pathogens, and such trait is often selected in breeding (4).

Age-associated disease resistance is often coupled with successive developmental transitions, such as germination (5) and vegetative phase change (6) and flowering (7, 8). The heterogeneity of host age, maturing stage of infected organs and virulence of causal pathogens suggest that multiple layers of signaling are intertwined between aging and immunity (4, 9). ARR-associated juvenile-to-adult vegetative phase change (hereafter ARR_{VPC}) has been observed among economically important vegetables, crops and fruits, such as tomato, rice and grapevine (10). The juvenile and adult phases refer to vegetative development prior to floral induction, and predicable changes of morphological and physiological traits are associated with this transition (11-13). Several factors were speculated to impact ARR_{VPC}. Compared to juveniles, adult plants are exposed to environmental conditions that are not optimal for disease development (such as high UV) (3); adult tissues may carry tough physical barriers (e.g., cell wall components, cuticle) (14); and leaves of adult stage are primed by previous exposure to pathogens (3). Such factors complicate the investigation of intrinsic molecular mechanisms governing the onset of ARR_{VPC}. Nevertheless, accumulating evidence suggests that intrinsic signaling pathways govern ARR (4, 15).

MicroRNA156s (miR156), a conserved microRNA family (11), regulates the onset of vegetative phase change (11, 16). MiR156 targets genes encoding SPLs (SQUAMOSA PROMOTER BINDING PROTEIN-LIKE) transcription factors, which

contains a SQUAMOSA promoter binding protein (SBP) box for nuclear import and

DNA binding (17-19). In *Arabidopsis*, leaves generated in the juvenile shoot, e.g.,

juvenile leaves (usually leaves 1-7 under a short-day condition) accumulate high level

of miR156 (20, 21). Throughout the expansion of juvenile leaves, they maintain the

morphological (e.g. no abaxial trichome) and molecular identities (e.g., high miR156

level) of the juvenile fate. A temporal decline of miR156 level, followed by the high

expression of *SPL*s, initiates the vegetative phase change (19-22). SPLs have

overlapping yet distinct functions to promote adult traits such as adult leaf

morphogenesis, floral induction, and reduced rooting (23-25). A total of 11 *SPL* genes

encoded in *Arabidopsis* Columbia-0 (Col-0) ecotype are suppressed by miR156 via

mRNA cleavage and/or translational repression (19, 26). Recent studies showed that

the miR156-SPL pathway involved in plant immunity. Disrupting miR156 function in

Arabidopsis by mutating SQUINT (SQN), an *Arabidopsis* orthologue of cyclophilin 40,

compromised jasmonic acid signaling and disease resistance against necrotrophic

pathogen *Botrytis cinerea* (27). Furthermore, overexpressing miR156-targeted *SPL9*

in juvenile plants enhanced accumulation of reactive oxygen species and induced

salicylic acid (SA) signaling, leading to enhanced resistance of *Arabidopsis* against

bacterial pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae* (28). Yet, a systematic dissection of the

link between ARR and miR156-SPL signaling pathway is still lacking.

Here, we systemically analyzed the miR156-SPLs module in ARR_{VPC}. We

demonstrated that the ARR to *Pseudomonas syringae pv. tomato* DC3000 (*Pto*

DC3000) in *Arabidopsis* is associated with vegetative phase change. Altering the

temporal expression of miR156-SPL pathway was sufficient to change the timing of

ARR_{VPC} onset. A sub-class of SPL transcription factors (SPL2/10/11) promoted

disease resistance in adult stage, and such function was independent of their roles in

leaf morphology. Transcriptomic analysis unveiled multiple mechanisms that

collectively contribute to ARR_{VPC}, including priming, activating adult-specific defense

programs, and strengthening juvenile defense after infection. Finally, we found SPL10

strengthened SA signaling in the adult stage by directly enhancing the transcription of

PAD4. Our work provides molecular insights into the intrinsic clock that coordinates

disease resistance outcomes with developmental timing.

Results

The age-related resistance to *Pto* DC3000 is associated with a reduction of

miR156 level

To assess the ARR_{VPC}, we measured the multiplication of *Pto* DC3000 in juvenile

(without abaxial trichomes) and adult (with abaxial trichomes) leaves of *Arabidopsis*

thaliana Col-0 ecotype. During the expansion of an individual leaf, defense gene is

differentially expressed (SI Appendix, Fig. S1), which is known as ontogenic

resistance (5, 29-32). Ontogenic resistance occurs during the maturation of both

juvenile and adult leaves (SI Appendix, Fig. S1). Because juvenile leaves are

produced in early shoot development, juvenile and adult leaves on a same plant are

always at different ontogenic age (SI Appendix, Fig. S1). To avoid the impact of

ontogenic resistance, we sampled fully expanded juvenile leaves (leaves 1-4) and

adult leaves (leaves 8) from 5-, 6- and 7-week-old plants, respectively. To avoid the

influence of flowering-associated ARR (33, 34), plants were grown in a

short-day condition and bolting was not observed before 10 weeks after

planting. Bacterial multiplication in leaves 8 was lower than that in leaves 1, 2, 3 and 4

(Fig. 1 A and B, and SI Appendix Table S2). No significant differences were observed

between leaves 1-2 and 3-4 (Fig. 1 B). We concluded that the increased resistance to

Pto DC3000 was associated with vegetative phase change in Col-0.

Since miR156 level in fully expanded leaves drops from the juvenile to adult transition

(35), we hypothesized that a high level of miR156 suppresses immunity in juvenile

stage. We compared bacterial growth in adult leaves (leaves ≥ 8) from Col-0 and

leaves at the same position from transgenic plants overexpressing *MIR156A* under a

constitutive 35S promoter from TMV (*35S::MIR156A*). Expressing *MIR156A* in adult

leaves led to accelerated production of juvenile leaves, marking the prolonged

juvenile phase as previously reported (20, 21) (Fig. 1 C). Interestingly, it also led to an

increase in bacterial growth when compared with leaves at the same position in Col-0

(Fig. 1 D). Consistently, knocking down miR156 activity by a target mimicry,

35S::*MIM156* (36) (*MIM156*) displayed enhanced disease resistance (Fig. 1 E and

F). These evidences suggests that high accumulation of miR156 suppresses

resistance to *Pto* DC3000 in the juvenile phase.

miR156-regulated SPL10 promotes ARR in adult phase.

To test which miR156-targeted *SPL* contributes to ARR$_{VPC}$, we first screened disease

phenotype in the gain-of-function mutants among 9 available (out of 11)

miR156-targeted SPLs (Fig. 2 A and SI Appendix, Table S2). We examined the

disease phenotype in juvenile leaves expressing individual miR156-resistant *SPL*

gene under its own native promoter (*rSPLs*) (24). Low levels of endogenous *SPL*

transcripts in juvenile leaves provided a sensitized background to test the function of

rSPLs. We found that leaves 1-2 from *rSPL2*, *10*, *9* and *13* showed increasing

resistance compared to wild type, but *rSPL3*, *4*, *6*, *11* and *15* did not change

resistance to *Pto* DC3000 (Fig. 2 A and SI Appendix, Table S2 and Figure S2). Thus,

a subset of miR156-regulated SPLs was sufficient to enhance immunity in juveniles.

To check the necessity of SPLs in adult conferred immunity, we tested disease

phenotypes in adult leaves with loss of function *spl* combinatorial mutants based on

amino acid sequence similarity (Fig. 2 A; SI Appendix, Table S2 and Figure S2).

There are 5 phylogenic clades for miR156-targeted *SPL* genes, *SPL3/4/5*, *SPL6*,

SPL2/10/11, *SPL9/15*, and *SPL13A/13B* (Fig. 2 A) (26, 37). In Col-0 background,

SPL10 and *SPL11* (78% amino acid identity) reside in a 1.6 kb tandem duplication

(26). S*pl2/10/11* showed enhanced susceptibility to *Pto* DC3000 (Fig. 2 A). While the

phenotypes of *spl2 and spl10* single mutants were wild type-like, *spl10/11* mildly

reduced disease resistance (SI Appendix, Table S2), indicating that *SPL2, 10* and *11*

redundantly contributed to immunity in adult leaves. Importantly, although *rSPL10*

carried a higher resistance than wild type in juvenile leaves (Fig. 2 A and B), the

difference between the two genotypes was much smaller in the adult stage (Fig. 2 B),

supporting that SPL10 enhanced resistance is age dependent. *Spl3/4/5* triple or *spl6*

single mutations did not alter resistance to *Pto* DC3000 (Fig. 2 A; SI Appendix, Table

S2). The lack of disease phenotypes against *Pto* DC3000 in the gain- and

loss-of-function mutants of *SPL6* is consistent with a previous report (38). *rSPL9*

enhanced resistance, but the *spl9/15* double mutant displayed unstable phenotypes,

which may be resulted from redundancy among other SPL members (Fig. 2 A and SI

Appendix, Table S2). Altogether, the data confirmed the specialized function of SPLs

in ARR$_{VPC}$.

To further determine whether the disease phenotypes of *SPL10* mutants were

pleiotropic effects caused by SPL10-mediated leaf morphogenesis, we assayed

bacteria multiplication in transgenic plants expressing either estradiol inducible *rSPL3*,

rSPL10 or *MIM156* (Fig. 2 C). Transgenic plants growing on ½ MS medium

supplemented with estradiol showed typically early phase change phenotypes,

indicating that the transgenes were functional (24, 39). In line with the data above (Fig.

2A), applying estradiol 12 hrs before inoculation suppressed bacterial multiplication in

juvenile leaves of inducible *rSPL10* and inducible *MIM156* lines, but not for that from

inducible *rSPL3* plants (Fig. 2 D). Notably, the leaf morphology was comparable

between wild type and estradiol induced plants (Fig. 2 C), indicating that

miR156-SPL10 controlled disease resistance and leaf morphology can be decoupled.

The basal expression of defense genes is high in the adult stage.

To explore the transcriptional signature of ARR_{VPC}, we performed RNA sequencing to

compare juvenile (leaves 1-2) and adult (leaves ≥ 8) transcriptomes at 3 hours after

mock treatment or *Pto* DC3000 infection (Fig. 3 A). An early time point was chosen

because change of chromatin accessibility could be detected at 3 hrs post *Pto*

infection (40). Under mock treatment, we identified 2002 and 2320 genes that were

respectively up- or down-regulated in adult leaves compared with juvenile leaves,

hereafter $Adu_{no\ infection\ (nof)}$ (LFC = 0.58, padj < 0.05) (Fig. 3 B, and SI Appendix, Table

S3 and Figure S3 C and S3 D). As expected, *SPL3/4/5* were up-regulated in adult

samples (SI Appendix, Table S3). In addition, the Gene Ontology (GO) enrichment

analysis revealed that vegetative phase change related GOs, such as adaxial/abaxial

axis specification (41) were enriched in the Adu_{nof} DEGs (Fig. 3 D and SI Appendix,

Table S6.1), confirming that our juvenile and adult samples represented two distinct

developmental phases (SI Appendix, Fig S3 A-B and SI Appendix, Table S3).

Intriguingly, we observed that immunity related GOs were also enriched in the

up-regulated Adu_{nof} DEGs, including defense response to bacterium/fungus and

response to SA (Fig. 3 D). Here, jasmonic acid (JA) signaling-mediated defense was

downregulated, coinciding with the antagonistic interaction between JA and SA in

plant immunity (42). The enrichment of pro-defense genes in up-regulated Adu_{nof}

indicated that adult plants had primed defense signaling.

For defense induction state, we investigated genes that were differentially

induced/suppressed by infection in juvenile and adult stages. *Pto* treatment triggered

3027 and 4728 DEGs in juvenile and adult leaves, respectively (SI Appendix, Table

S3-S4 and Fig S3 C and S3 D). Among the 2163 *Pto*-triggered DEGs shared between

juvenile and adult leaves (2163 = 239 + 1924 in Fig. 3 C and SI Appendix, Table

S3-S4 and Fig S3 C and S3 D), the shared up-regulated DEGs were enriched with

well-characterized defense responses such as respiratory burst, defense response to

bacterium and response to salicylic acid (Fig. 3 D). Meanwhile, photosynthesis and

light harvesting signaling pathways were enriched in down-regulated DEGs, indicating

that a pathogen-induced transcriptomic reprogramming switched from development to

defense regardless of plant age (Fig. 3 D, SI Appendix, Table S6.1). A total of 864

DEGs were only induced/repressed by *Pto* in the juvenile stage, and there are 2565

DEGs were adult-specific (Fig. 3 C). Cutin biosynthetic and wax biosynthetic

processes were enriched in adult-specific *Pto*-induced DEGs, consistent with a

previously suggested consolidation of constitutive defense in ARR (43) (SI Appendix,

Table S6.2).

We noticed that a portion of genes specifically induced in the adult stage did not

eventually have higher transcription level than those in juvenile stage. It is arguable

whether inducibility of a gene alone contributes to ARR. So, we further searched for

genes whose absolute expression levels were different between juvenile and adult

leaves after *Pto* DC3000 treatment (hereafter Adu$_{pto}$). Genes that were specifically

induced/repressed by infection in the adult stage count for 20.6% (934 out of 4528, SI

Appendix, Table S3) of the Adu$_{pto}$ (Fig. 3 C). There, cellular response to hypoxia,

defense response to bacterium and response to heat were over-represented,

indicating an age-dependent *Pto* response that may cope with abiotic stresses (Fig. 3

D). A 5.3% (239 out of 4528, SI Appendix, Table S3) of Adu$_{pto}$ were also triggered by

Pto in the juvenile stage, but the amplitude of change was preferentially higher in the

adult stage (Fig. 3 C). Thus, ARR$_{VPC}$ strengthened a sector of juvenile-defense

regulon as well as activated adult-specific defense genes. In addition, 38% (1722 out

of 4528) of Adu$_{pto}$ were not *Pto*-triggered but already had differential expression

between juvenile and adult leaves before infection (Fig. 3 B, SI Appendix, Table S3).

Of the 38%, GOs pertaining to defense, such as SA signaling, together with

adult-related developmental pathways were enriched (Fig. 3 D, SI Appendix, Table

S6.1). Finally, 20.1% Adu_{Pto} (910 out of 4528) was not induced either by infection or

age alone. These DEGs could be resulted from a synergistic interaction between age

and infection (Fig. S3 C and SI Appendix, Table S3). Taken together, we discovered

that ARR transcriptome changes could contribute to the elevation of defense signaling

at non-infected state, the adult-specific inducible defense as well as the strengthened

juvenile defense.

Overexpressing SPL10 recapitulates the ARR transcriptomic landscape in

juvenile leaves.

To delineate the contribution of SPL10 to ARR at the transcriptomic level, we

investigated the *rSPL10 (r10)* induced DEGs at non-infected and *Pto*-infected states

(Fig. 3 A). A total of 3211 genes (1859 up-regulated and 1352 down-regulated) were

differentially expressed in leaves 1-2 between Col-0 and *r10* at non-infected state

($r10_{nof}$). Among them, 936 out of 3211 $r10_{nof}$ DEGs were co-regulated in adult leaves,

attributing to 21.7% (936/4322) of the Adu_{nof}, being consistent with the function of

SPL10 in specifying adult fate (Fig. 4 A, SI Appendix, Table S5). GO terms associated

with immune signaling including systemic acquired resistance were enriched in the

936 co-upregulated DEGs between $r10_{nof}$ and Adu_{nof} ($Adu/r10_{nof}$) (Fig. 4 C, SI

Appendix, Table S6.3). After bacterial infection, we identified 2621 DEGs between

leaves 1&2 from *r10* and Col-0. 604 of those DEGs were also Adu_{pto}, occupying

13.3% (604/4528) of total Adu_{pto} ($Adu/r10_{Pto}$) (Fig. 4 B, SI Appendix, Table S5).

Defense-related GOs were enriched in those co-regulated DEGs (Fig. 4 C, SI

Appendix, Table S6.3). The observations support that SPL10 activated a sector of

adult immune response to *Pto* DC3000.

Disrupting SA signaling compromised the SPL10-mediated ARR.

Since SA-related GO terms were enriched in the co-upregulated Adu/$r10_{nof}$ (Fig. 4 C),

we first measured the age- and SPL10- effects on SA signaling. We assembled a core

SA regulon by overlapping DEGs induced by SA and its synthetic inducer

benzothiadiazole (BTH) (44, 45) (Fig. 5 A). 81.3% of the core SA regulon (527

activated and 239 repressed genes) were detected in our sequencing data.

SA-activated (199/527) and -repressed (50/239) markers were enriched in Adu_{nof} (Fig.

5 B and SI Appendix, Information S6). SA-activated genes were also enriched in $r10_{nof}$

(Fig 5 B and SI Appendix, Information S6), denoting that SPL10 contributed to

enhancing SA signaling in the adult phase. Consistently, accumulation of Salicylic

acid beta-glucoside (SAG) (an inactive SA form, stored in vacuole) was higher in adult

than that in juvenile leaves (Fig. 5 C and SI Appendix, Table S2). The accumulation of

free SA showed a similar trend (Fig. 5 C and SI Appendix, Table S2). Next, we sought

to validate whether elevated SA response in adult phase depended on the temporal

expression of *SPL10*. We selected four age-dependent SA-activated genes,

AT3G60470, BG3, ATLTP4.4 and *PR5*. Their expressions were compromised in the

adult leaves of *spl2/10/11* (Fig. 5 D). Noticeably, the upregulation of the four SA

responsive genes were also observed in adult or *r10* leaves when plants were grown

on sterile plates (Fig. 5 E). In conclusion, the age-related increase of SA response in

leaves required *SPL10*, and was not primed by pre-exposure to microbes. The

EDS1-PAD4 protein complex is essential for SA-mediated defense signaling (46). We

found that both genes were upregulated in adults and *r10* (Fig. 4 A). Furthermore, a

significant overlap was found between the EDS1-PAD4 core regulon (EP-core, (46)

and genes co-upregulated by adults and *r10* (Fig. 5 F), implying that the EDS1-PAD4

mediated SA signaling pathway could be differentially activated in juvenile and adult

stage due to the temporal expression of SPL10.

Out of the 936 DEGs co-regulated by adult stage and *rSPL10* (Fig. 4 A), 400 of them

were associated with SPL10-binding sites identified in a ChIP-seq experiment of

SPL10 by Ye *et al* (Fig. 6 A) (25), indicating that these genes are likely direct targets

of SPL10. A de novo motif discovery algorism identified potential SPL-binding sites in

203 of the co-up-regulated DEGs (Fig. 6 A), but not in the 197 down-regulated genes.

In addition, experimentally validated SPL TF binding sites (47) were enriched in the

promoter of the 203 genes (SI Appendix, Fig S5 A). Interestingly, the promoter region

and gene body of *PAD4* contains two potential SPL10-binding GTAC-containing

motifs (Fig. 6 B) (25). We generated a genomic reporter line of SPL10

(*proSPL10::rSPL10-YFP*). The transgenic line showed similar early phase change

phenotypes observed in the *proSPL10::rSPL10-GUS* line, indicating that the fusion

had a normal SPL10 function (SI Appendix, Fig S5 B). Using ChIP-qPCR, we

validated that the motif 1 (M1, 186-182 bp away from the TSS), but not motif 2 was

associated with SPL10 at uninfected state (Fig. 6 B). Furthermore, the transcript level

of *PAD4* was reduced only in the *spl2/10/11* adult leaves but not in the juvenile leaves

(Fig. 6 C), indicating that the temporal expression of *PAD4* depends on SPL10. Taken

together, these observations suggest that SPL10 directly promotes *PAD4* expression

in the adult stage.

To probe the genetic interactions of SA signaling and the miR156-SPL10 mediated

ARR, we first tested the ARR$_{VPC}$ phenotype in the mutant of *SALICYLIC ACID*

INDUCTION DEFICIENT 2 (*sid2-1*, defective in pathogen-induced SA biosynthesis)

and *NONEXPRESSER OF PR GENES 1* (*npr1-1*, defective in SA perception)

mutants. Neither of those mutants altered the timing of vegetative phase change. As

expected, both mutants in adult stage were more susceptible than Col-0 (Fig. 7 A).

The difference of bacterial growth between wild type and the mutants in juvenile stage

was less pronounced (Fig. 7 A), in agreement with the age-dependency of

SA-mediated disease resistance. We then introduced *sid2-1* mutation into *MIM156*

background (SI Appendix, Fig. S5 A). Although precocious morphological traits were

shared between *MIM156* and *MIM156/sid2-1*, the bacteria level in *MIM156/sid2-1*

phenocopied that of *sid2-1* (Fig. 7 B), suggesting that *SID2* acts downstream of

miR156. Similarly, loss of function mutation of *EDS1* reversed the enhanced disease

resistance phenotype in *r10* plants (Fig. 7 C, SI Appendix, Fig. S5 B). The leaf

morphology phenotype of *r10* plants was not changed by *eds1.2*, which further

confirmed that age-associated leaf morphology and disease resistance can be

decoupled (Fig. 7 C). Consistent with the molecular evidence that SPL10 binds to the

promoter of *PAD4*, the ARR$_{VPC}$ phenotype was compromised in *pad4-1* and *eds1.2*

mutant (Fig. 7 D). In essence, miR156-SPL10 promoted resistance through *SID2* and

EDS1-PAD4-dependent SA signaling.

Discussion

In this research, we uncovered an ARR mechanism regulated by the miR156-SPL

pathway, linking immune maturation to an intrinsic aging mechanism (SI Appendix,

Fig. S6). In plants, ARR occurs during predicable developmental transitions that are

often accompanied by morphological changes. Our research provides a potential

mechanism for the temporally coordinated change of immunity and morphogenesis,

where the same molecular clock, miR156, controls different *SPL* genes to specify

immune and developmental traits. For instance, SPL2/10/11, but not SPL3/4/5/6, are

required for resistance against *Pto* DC3000 (Fig. 2 A). Interestingly, NbSPL6 is

required in the N-mediated TMV resistance in tobacco (38). The homologue

of *NbSPL6* in *Arabidopsis*, *AtSPL6*, is necessary to the full ETI response triggered

by *Pseudomonas syringae* effector AvrRps4, but not basal resistance to *Pto* DC3000

(38) (Fig. 2 A). It is possible that the broad spectrum of resistance associated with

ARR requires multiple SPL family members to activate different defense pathways. As

rSPL10 only influenced 21.7% of Adu$_{nof}$ and 13.3% of Adu$_{pto,}$ other SPLs may

contribute to the rest of adult defense to *Pto* and/or to other pathogens (Fig. 4 A and 4

B). Alternatively, the coordinated maturation of development and immune system may

be achieved by functional switch of the same SPL protein. In rice plants, *Ideal plant*

architecture 1 (*IPA1*)/*OsSPL14* and *OsSPL7* promote growth in a non-infection status.

It binds to an alternative cis-regulatory element to activate defense when challenged

by the bacterial pathogen *Xanthomonas oryzae pv. Oryzae* (*Xoo*) (48, 49).

In *Nicotiana benthamiana* and tomato plants, temporal reduction of miR6019/6020

allows its target, *N* gene, to mediate age-dependent resistance to tobacco mosaic

virus (TMV) (50). The temporal expression pattern of miR6019/6020 mimics that of

miR156 in tobacco. It would be interesting to explore the genetic relationship between

those two miRNAs in regulating ARR.

We showed that defense GO terms were enriched in up-regulated $rSPL10_{nof}$ and

Adu_{nof}. Among those, components of SA pathway, such as *SID2* and *NPR1* were

required for ARR_{VPC} (Fig. 6). We observed the up-regulation of SA response

accompanied by a reduction of JA response in both Col-0 adults and the *rSPL10* line

(Fig. 3 and 4). JA and SA often act antagonistically to fine-tune immune response to

multiple pathogens. Our ARR transcriptome results showed that the antagonism also

occurred in an age-dependent manner (Fig 3 C). Upregulation of SA production and

response have also been observed during vegetative-floral transition in both tomato

and tobacco plants (51). In *Arabidopsis*, *SVP* and *SOC1* genes regulating floral

induction also transcriptionally promote age-dependent increase of SA, independent

from flowering traits (52, 53). We did not observe differential expression of *SVP* or

SOC1 in juvenile *vs* adult transcriptome, suggesting the *SVP-SOC1* module may not

act in the ARR_{VPC} of *Arabidopsis*. On the other hand, we found that ARR_{VPC} was

NPR1-dependent (Fig. 6 A), which is different from an age- and SA-associated but

NPR1-independent gain of resistance observed before (54). It is likely that there are

parallel aging pathways strengthen SA signaling during plant maturation.

In co-upregulated Adu/$r10_{pto}$ DEGs, we noticed that cellular response to hypoxia was

enriched (Fig. 4 D). Response to hypoxia of plants has been reported for

counteracting submergence and waterlogging stress (55). Respiratory burst, as part

of immune responses, is oxygen dependent. At the site of *Botrytis cinerea* infection,

hypoxic response was induced, leading to the stabilization of subgroup VII of

ETHYLENE RESPONSE FACTOR (ERF-VII) (46). Members in the ERF-VII can

activate defense gene as well as hypoxic response (46). SPL10 may upregulate

genes that react to low-oxygen environment when reactive oxygen species

accumulates or respiration increases. How hypoxia response contributes to ARR

against biotrophs and necrotrophs remains to be seen.

Plant innate immunity shares similarities to human innate immunity, ranging from

structures and functionality of innate immune receptors and their downstream

signaling cascades (56, 57). Our discovery of miR156-SPL signaling in ARR_{VPC}

provides further evidence that heterochronic miRNAs coordinate aging and immunity

in planta. In *Caenorhabditis elegans*, *let-7* family microRNAs are well-characterized

regulators of developmental timing by specifying stage-specific cell fates in the

hypodermal seam cell lineages (58, 59). Interestingly, let-*7-fam* miRNAs also repress

the worm's resistance to *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, an opportunistic human pathogen

(60). The dual function of *let-7-fam* in developmental timing and immunity is fulfilled

through integrating downstream heterochronic genes and the p38 MAPK pathway

(60). Thus, deploying heterochronic microRNAs pathway can be a cross-kingdom

strategy to integrate immunity and developmental timing. It will be exciting to further

dissect the genetic components and regulatory architecture of coordinated maturation

of immunity and development.

Material and methods

Plant material and growth conditions

Arabidopsis wild type, transgenic lines and mutants used in this study were in a

Columbia-0 (Col-0) genetic background unless mentioned otherwise. The genetic

cross of *MIM156/sid2-1* and *r10/eds1.2* were generated from this research and

progenies from F3 or F4 generation were used for phenotypic test. Information for

mutants and transgenic lines can be found in SI Appendix, Table S1. Juvenile leaves

were fully expanded leaves 1-2, or 3-4 from soil-grown 5-week-old plants. Adult

leaves were fully expanded leaves that derived from 7-week-old plants. The adult

phase of a leaf was confirmed by appearance of abaxial trichomes (41). Plants were

sown on Fafard #3 Mix propagation soil. The planted seeds were then placed under

4 °C for 2 days and transferred to a growth room under 23°C/19°C day/night and with

45% humidity. Nine hours light and 15 hours dark photoperiod with

180 µmol m^{-2}s^{-1} was used as short-day condition. Lighting was made through a 5:3

combination of white (USHIO F32T8/741) and red-enriched (interlectric F32/T8/WS

Gro-Lite) fluorescent lights. Plant age was counted from the first day when seeds

transferred to the growth room. Only plants used for Fig 5 E were grown on ½ MS

plates in 24h with continuous light.

Sampling strategy for studying ARR$_{VPC}$

In our short-day growth condition, plants produced 50-60 leaves before bolting. The

ontogenic age of a leaf influenced defense gene expression (SI Appendix, Fig. S1 A).

To minimize the influence of ontogenic age of individual leaves (SI Appendix, Fig. S1

B), we measured the expansion rate of juvenile and adult leaves and harvested fully

expanded juvenile and adult leaves from plants of different ages (SI Appendix, Fig. S1

C). Fully expanded leaves 1-4 derived from a 4- or 5-weeks old plants were sampled

as juvenile leaves; fully expanded leaves (range from 8-13 depending on variations in

plants) from 7-weeks old plants were sampled as adult leaves. Adult leaves showed

characteristic abaxial trichome(s), blade serration and elongated petiole (21). Plants

475 for adult samples were planted 2-3 weeks earlier than those for juvenile leaves.

476 Juvenile and adult samples were collected at the same time for disease assay and

477 transcriptome analysis.

479 Bacterial growth assay

Pto DC3000 strain was grown under 28°C on King's B solid medium (40 g/L proteose,

20 g/L glycerol and 15 g/L agar). The medium contained rifamycin for selection and

cycloheximide to inhibit fungi growth. Glycerol stock of the bacterial strains stored

under -80°C. Bacterial stock was streaked on plate for a 2-day growth and was

re-streaked one day before inoculation. For infiltration, bacteria were collected from

the plate and suspended in 10 mM $MgCl_2$ solution. Bacterial suspension with

concentration of 1 x 10^5 CFU/mL was infiltrated in *Arabidopsis* leaves with a needless

syringe. After inoculation, plants were covered by transparent lids for one hour. Day 0

samples were collected immediately after removing lids. Each sample contained four

leaf discs that were derived from four individual leaves. Leaf samples were collected

using the corer (the same size for all plants) and ground with homogenizer (OMNI

International) and diluted serially. KB plates with 10 µL of bacteria suspension per

sample were placed under room temperature for 2 days. Colony forming units were

counted manually and normalized according to inside area of the corer. Day 2

samples were collected as described above two days post-infiltration (dpi).

496 RNA sequencing and analysis

Pto DC3000 (1 x 10^8 CFU/mL suspended in 10mM $MgCl_2$) was infiltrated into juvenile

and adult wild type (Col-0) leaves and leaves 1-2 from *rSPL10* plants. 10 mM $MgCl_2$

was used as the mock treatment. Three hours after inoculation, 20 leaf discs with

comparable size from 5-10 individual plants were cored and collected as one biological

repeat per genotype per treatment. Three biological repeats were prepared for each

genotype/treatment. For RNA isolation, plant tissues were flash-frozen in liquid

nitrogen and then ground to fine powders using homogenizer (OMNI International).

Total RNAs were extracted using E.Z.N.A. Total RNA kit (Omega BIO-TEK). RNA

quality was assessed with a 2100 Bioanalyzer instrument (Agilent, RIN score ≥ 7,

28S/18S ≥ 1). RNA concentration was measured using a Nanodrop

spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific, RNA concentration ≥ 50 ng/μL, 260/280 ~2.0).

RNA samples were sequenced at BGI San Jose lab. Oligo dT based mRNA

enrichment was followed by random N6 primer based reverse transcription. The

synthesized DNA nanoballs were then sent for strand-specific mRNA sequencing

(PE100) on a DNA Nanoball Sequencing (DNBseq) platform. The data was filtered

using SOAPnuke software in BGI. ~48 M clean reads with average Q30 ≥ 88.81% per

sample were obtained.

Files of RNA-seq raw reads together with processed data were uploaded to NCBI with

access No. GSE208657. The clean RNA-seq data were aligned against the TAIR10

reference genome using HiSAT2 (v.2.1.0, (61)) with following parameters, hisat2 -p 4

-x TAIR10indexed -1 sample_strand1.fq.gz -2 sample_strand2.fq.gz -S

aligned_sample.sam. The aligned reads were assembled into transcripts according to

the TAIR10 annotation (62, 63) using Stringtie (64). ~ 99% overall alignment rate was

reached for each sample. Differential expression analysis was done by comparing

transcript levels between pairwise normalized samples using DEseq2 package in R

(LFC ≥ ±0.58, padj ≤ 0.05) (65). Gene ontology was analyzed first against the whole

Arabidopsis genome at TAIR Gene Ontology terms website, http://geneontology.org/

(66, 67), and which was then confirmed using total detected 22,622 (covers 88.7% of

known genes in *Arabidopsis* genome) genes of the RNA-seq results on agriGO

website http://systemsbiology.cau.edu.cn/agriGOv2/# (68). Figures were generated in

R, with ComplexHeatmap package that was specifically used for Figure 3 B-D and 4

(69). Complete R scripts are available at SI Appendix, information S6.

Motif discovery and enrichment analysis

The de novo motif discovery analysis was carried on the website

(https://www.arabidopsis.org/tools/bulk/motiffinder/index.jsp). Frequencies of 6-mer

motifs were compared between 1000 bp upstream sequences of each input gene and

the current *Arabidopsis* genomic sequence set (33518 sequences). A total of 15

motifs containing the consensus SPL binding site, GTAC, were identified. A

frequency-based sequence logo was generated through the weblogo,

(https://weblogo.berkeley.edu/logo.cgi). To assess the enrichment of experimentally

validated TF binding sites, we used the SEA (https://meme-suite.org/meme/tools/sea).

1000 bp upstream sequences of the 203 Adu/*r10* co-upregulated DEGs (Fig. 6 A)

were extracted from TAIR. Shuffled input sequences were chosen as control

sequences. The DAP motif database (47) were selected to identify the enriched

motifs.

qRT-PCR

Bacterial suspension with 1 x 10^8 CFU/mL was infiltrated in *Arabidopsis* leaves. Leaf

samples were harvested at 3 hours hpi. Each sample had 16-20 leaf discs derived

from 6-10 individual plants. The leaf age of plants in soil was measured following the

same standard as the above. For plants on ½ MS plates, 15-20 leaves were

harvested per genotype per treatment as one biological rep. leaves 8-13 from

45-day-old of Col-0 with abaxial trichomes were used as adult leaves, leaves 1-2 from

18-day-old Col-0 were used as juvenile leaves. In comparison, leaves 1-2 from

21-day-old of *rSPL10* were used. For each bio-rep, three to six technical

replicates were used in one qPCR run. RNA extraction was performed

using Omega biotek EZNA plant RNA kit. The qPCR was performed in

the Applied Biosystems QuantStudio 1 Real-Time PCR system with SYBR Green

master mix (Applied Biosystems). PCR conditions were set as follows: 95°C for 5

mins, 40 cycles of 95°C for 15s, 56°C for 30s and 72°C for 20-30s. *SAND*

(*AT2G28390*) or *TUB2* (*AT5G62690*) was used as reference genes. The relative

expression was calculated using relative standard curve methods. Delta-delta CT was

also used for calculation when knowing that the PCR efficiency for the primers was at

least more than 95% in previous standard curve results. The oligonucleotides used

here can be found in SI Appendix, Table 1.

Estradiol-induced gene expression

The estradiol-inducible *MIM156* and *rSPL3* was constructed using a Gateway

compatible version of the XVE system, as described by Brand et al., (70).

The *MIM156* and *rSPL3* sequence were cloned into pMDC160. Transgenic plants

were crossed to plants containing pMDC150-35S (70) and generated homozygous.

The estradiol-inducible *rSPL10* was generated by cloning *rSPL10* into a modified

pMDC7 vector tagged with Citrine and HA.

HPLC-MS

Ten to sixty leaves 1-2 of Col-0 and *r10* each and three adult Col-0 leaves (plants

sawn in soil) were collected as one biological repeat for each genotype or a

developmental stage. 3 to 6 biological replicates from five (for adult tissues) to thirty

(for juvenile tissues) individual plants were collected in total. The leaves were then

lyophilized, powdered, and weighted for getting a comparable dry weight for all

samples (weighting error $\leq$ 0.1 mg). Metabolites from 1.5 mg or 8.5 mg (in separate

experimental repeats) of dry tissue of each biological replicate were extracted and

were detected under Liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (HPLC-MS). Amount

of salicylic acid beta-glucoside (SAG) and salicylic acid (SA) were measured and

calculated in the unit of nmole metabolite per gram of dry weight (nmole/g DW).

ChIP-qPCR assay

The procedure and the preparation of reagents were modified from protocols (71-73) .

In brief, 1 gram of non-treated fully expanded adult leaf tissues were collected from

the pro*SPL10::rSPL10-YFP* line. Leaves from 2-3 plants were harvested as one

biological sample. Three biological replicates in total from two independent

experiments were used. The tissue was crosslinked, and the chromatin was extracted

and sonicated using nuclei extraction buffers and a bioruptor UCD-200 with chilling

pump. 15 µL of post-sonicating chromatin solution was saved as the input. The

remaining chromatin solution was immunoprecipitated by using GFP-trap Magnetic

Agarose (ChromoTek, cat no. gtma). Diluted input and DNA eluted after IP were used

for qPCR using primers at the indicated positions (Fig. 6 B; SI Appendix, Table 1). We

used the following formula to calculate the estimated CT value for adjusting CT values

of input and IP samples, ΔCt [normalized ChIP] = (Ct [Input] – Log2 (dilution factor for

Input)) – ((Ct [ChIP] – Log2 (dilution factor for ChIP)), and the final output % input =

100 * 2 ^ (ΔCt [normalized ChIP] (73).

GUS staining assay

Plants carrying pro*PR2*::GUS were harvested at six week after planting. The GUS

solution was prepared as following and was vacuum infiltrated into plants, 0.1 M

$NaPO_4$, pH 7.0, 10 mM EDTA. 0.1% Triton X-100, 1 mM $K_3Fe(CN)_6$, 2 mM X-Gluc

(X-Gluc was dissolved in N ,N-DMF and made fresh). After 24 h incubation at 37°C, the

staining solution was replaced with 70% ethanol. Tissues were washed several times

with 70% ethanol until the chlorophyll in leaves was cleared. The GUS-stained leaves

were imaged using a dissecting microscope (VWR).

Acknowledgement

We thank Scott Poethig from University of Pennsylvania to provide *rSPL* and *spl*

mutants. We thank Khadijeh Mozaffari, Scott Harding and Chung-Jui Tsai of the Plant

Metabolomics Laboratory at the University of Georgia for analytical assistance. We

thank Jovana Mijatovic for providing feedback on the manuscript. Y.L. conceptualized

the project. Y.L. and H.L. designed experiments. H.L. performed experiments. P.A.

and K.F. participated repeating experiments in Figure 2 A and Figure 6 B, respectively.

H.L., Q.P. Y.Y and Y.L. analyzed data. H.L. and Y.L. wrote the manuscript. Funding for

the UPLC-Q-TOF was provided by the United States Department of Agriculture,

National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Equipment Grant Program award no.

2021-70410-35297. This project is supported by NIH R35GM143067 to Y.L.

Figure 1. MiR156 suppressed age-related resistance to *Pto* DC3000 in

***Arabidopsis*. A**, developmental phenotype of a 4-week (left) and 7-week (right) Col-0

plant grown under short-day conditions. Arrows point to leaves 1,2,3,4 and leaf 8 in

the left and right plants, respectively. **B**, *Pto* DC3000 bacterial growth in juvenile and

adult leaves of Col-0. **C**, developmental phenotype of a 7-week Col-0 and

35S::MIR156A plant. Arrows indicate an adult leaf of Col-0 or a leaf from a similar

position in *35S::MIR156A*. **D**, bacterial growth in adult leaves of Col-0 and

35S::MIR156A. **E**, developmental phenotype of a 4-week Col-0 and *35S::MIM156*

plant. Arrows indicate leaves 1 and 2 on each plant. **F**, *Pto* DC3000 bacterial growth

in juvenile Col-0 and *MIM156* leaves 1-2 on Day 0 and Day 2. Scale bar = 1 cm. Day 0,

the day of *Pto* infection. Day 2, two days post-infection. CFU/cm^2, bacterial colony

forming unit per square centimeter of a leaf. Juv, juvenile leaves, Adu, adult leaves.

The student t-test was used for statistical analysis. Each genotype was compared with

Col-0, ns, not significant, *, $p < 0.05$, **, $p < 0.01$. The same annotation is used for

bacterial growth dot-box plots shown in Figures 2 and 7. Repeats of bacterial growth

are presented in SI Appendix, Table S2.

Figure 2. MiR156-targeted SPL10 promoted resistance to *Pto* DC3000. A, disease

phenotype of *Pto* DC3000 in *SPL* gain and loss-of function mutants. NA, not available.

B, bacterial growth in leaves 1-2 and leaves 11 from Col-0 and *rSPL10*. **C**,

developmental phenotype of Col-0, and early phase change phenotypes of transgenic

plants expressing stable *MIM156*, *rSPL10* and *rSPL3* on ½ MS plate (top panel);

developmental phenotype of Col-0, *estradiol-inducible(in)MIM156*, *inrSPL10* and

inrSPL3 at 3 days after estradiol treatment (bottom panel). **D**, bacterial growth in

leaves 1-2 from 4 -week-old Col-0, *inMIM156*, *inrSPL10* and *inrSPL3* on Day 0 and

Day 3. Emmeans package in R was used for statistical analysis in 2 A and 2 B. The

student t test was used for statistical analysis in 2 A and 2 C, and each genotype was

compared with Col-0 wild type, ns, not significant, *, $p < 0.05$, **, $p < 0.01$. Repeats for

the experiments here are shown in SI Appendix, Table S2.

Figure 3. Basal transcript level of defense genes were heightened over

vegetative phase change. A, experimental settings of RNA-seq. Non-infected state

and challenged (3 hours after *Pto* inoculation) transcriptomes from leaf 1-2 (Col-0 and

rSPL10) and leaf 11 (Col-0) were compared. * indicates examples of leaf samples that

were collected for RNA-seq. Green: juvenile leaves; brown: adult leaves. **B**, an

expression profiling of DEGs identified in mock-treated adults against mock-treated

juvenile leaves. DEGs, differently expressed genes with LFC ≥ ±0.58 and padj ≤ 0.05.

LFC, log2 fold change of gene expression. Padj, adjusted p value. Color-codes in the

heatmap, blue is for down-regulated DEGs and red is for up-regulated DEGs.

Euclidean distance was used for calculating distance. Complete linkage was applied

to structure the hierarchical clustering. Expressing profiles of DEGs derived from

Adu-M/Juv-M are mapped in the first column of the map. The expressing profiles of

those DEGs in Adu-*P*/Juv-*P* are shown in the second column of the map. Genes that

were DEGs in both Adu-M/Juv-M and Adu-*P*/Juv-*P* are marked by the black bar on

the right. 38% indicates the percentage of those overlapping DEGs in Adu$_{pto}$. **C**, a

profile of *Pto*-triggered DEGs came from Juv-*P*/Juv-M and Adu-*P*/Adu-M.

Adult-specifically *Pto*-triggered DEGs (dark red), Juvenile-specifically triggered (light

brown), adult preferentially triggered (deep blue), and commonly triggered in both

adults and juveniles, i.e., shared (light grey) are marked by the first column of bars on

the right. The percentages (20.6%, 3.4%, 5.3%, 12.6%) and corresponding black bars

indicate the proportion of each DEG category that overlaps with Adu$_{pto}$. **D**,

representative GO terms enriched in DEGs of Adu$_{nof}$, DEGs triggered by *Pto* DC3000

in both adult and juvenile leaves (the Shared) and DEGs specifically triggered by *Pto*

in adult phase within the total Adu$_{pto}$ (20.6%). Red and blue color blocks refer to GOs

enriched in up- and down-regulated DEGs, respectively. Only GO terms with FDR <

0.05 were deemed as enriched here. Fold enrichment was based on hypergeometric

tests within the range of the DEG set used for each GO analysis relative to

Arabidopsis genome. The analysis was done using the TAIR Gene ontology website

(geneontology.org). The same GO analysis and color-coding are used for Figure 4 C.

Figure 4. *rSPL10* transcriptomes resembled that of adult leaves. A, an

expression profiling of co-regulated DEGs by adult and *rSPL10* leaves at non-infected

state compared with juvenile leaves. *EDS1* and *PAD4* were identified as Adu/*r10*

co-upregulated DEGs under non-infected state, which are indicated in the heatmap

with arrows. **B**, expressing profiles of co-regulated DEGs by adult and *rSPL10* from

Adu-*P* or *r10-P* against Juv-*P*. For the clustered heatmaps in 4 A and B, blue

represents down-regulated DEGs and red is for up-regulated DEGs. Euclidean

distance was used for calculating distance in the partition around medoids (PAM)

clustering (k=4). **C**, GO enrichment of co-regulated adult and *r10 vs* juvenile DEGs in

non-infected and *Pto*-infection states.

Figure 5, Salicylic acid (SA) biosynthesis and signaling were enhanced by

SPL10 in adult phase. A, 672 up-regulated core SA markers were defined via

overlapping DEGs pools from Ding Y *et al.*, 2018 (dark circle) and Yang L *et al.*, 2017

(light circle). **B**, expression patterns of 527 detected (out of 672) up-regulated core SA

markers in adult and *r10* leaves, under non-infected and *Pto* infection states. Four

random pools of detected genes (450 genes per set) derived from each pair-wise

comparison exhibits here were chosen as negative controls. Up, upregulated. No, no

change. Down, downregulated. Y axis shows the negative logarithm transformed

adjusted p value, -log10(padj). X axis displays the value of Log2 fold change (LFC) of

gene expressions. M, mock. *P, Pto* DC3000. P < 0.0001 (Hypergeometric test, done

by GeneOverlap R package) was reproducibly output from each overlap between

core upregulated SA markers and Adu_{nof}, Adu_{pto}, $r10_{nof}$ and $r10_{pto}$ (SI Appendix,

information S6). The P values for 3 out of 4 random controls were not significant (SI

Appendix, information S6). **C**, endogenous SAG and free SA accumulation in juvenile,

r10 and adult leaves at non-infected state. DW, dry weight. Repeats for the

experiment are shown in SI Appendix, Table S2. **D**, age-associated expression of four

SA markers in adult leaves from Col-0 and in comparable leaves of *spl2/10/11*.

Similar results were seen two times. **E**, the qPCR of the four SA marker genes in

juvenile, *r10* and adult leaves on sterile 1/2 MS plates. Similar results were seen three

times. **F**, overrepresentation of EDS1-PAD4 core regulon (EP core) in $Adu/r10_{nof}$ and

$Adu/r10_{pto}$. The EP core markers were defined in Cui *et al.,* 2017 (46). 127/155 of the

EP core markers were detected in this work. Randomly selected 127 genes from our

RNA-seq dataset were used as controls.

Figure 6, *PAD4* was a direct target of SPL10. A, Overlap between $Adu/r10_{nof}$

co-regulated genes and potential SPL10 targets defined according to ChIP-seq data

from *Ye et al*. (upper panel). A motif discovery and enrichment analysis of the 203

$Adu/r10_{nof}$ co-upregulated DEGs (lower panel). **B**, SPL10 bound to a

GTAC-containing motif upstream of *PAD4*. qPCR following chromatin

immunoprecipitation of *rSPL10*-YFP for motifs (M1 and M2) and negative control sites

(nc1 and nc2) are at least 600 bp away from M1 and M2 at the *PAD4* genomic region.

Three primer sets (p1-p3) were used to amplify the M1 site. Relative locations of ChIP

peaks (dark grey) derived from *Ye et al*, primers (arrow pairs) and the tested sites

(color blocks) were indicated in the schematic diagram. The student t test was

performed to compare and indicate the significance of difference between the sites. **C**,

qPCR of *PAD4* transcripts level in juvenile (Juv) and adult (Adu) leaves of Col-0 and

spl2/10/11. The student t test, ns, not significant, *, $p < 0.05$, **, $p < 0.01$.

Figure 7, SA biosynthesis and signaling components were required for the

SPL10 regulated ARR$_{VPC}$. A, a comparison of *Pto* DC3000 growth between the

juvenile and adult leaves (ARR phenotype) of Col-0, *sid2-1* and *npr1-1*. **B**,

developmental phenotype (top) and the bacterial growth (bottom) in 4-week-old

leaves 1 and 2 from Col-0, *sid2-1*, *MIM156* and *MIM156/sid2-1*. **C**, developmental

phenotype of 4-week-old Col-0, *eds1.2, r10* and *r10 /eds1.2*. Note the similar leaf

shape between *r10* and *r10/eds1.2;* (bottom panel) bacterial multiplication in leaves 1

and 2 derived from Col-0, *eds1.2*, *r10* and *rSPL10/eds1.2*. Arrows indicate leaves 1-2.

D, the ARR phenotyping of *eds1.2* and *pad4-1* infected with *Pto* DC3000. Emmeans

package in R was used for statistical analysis in 7 A and D. The student t test was

used for statistical analysis in 7 B-C, and each genotype was compared with Col-0

wild type, ns, not significant, *, $p < 0.05$, **, $p < 0.01$.

Figure S1, Ontogenic change of SA response and sampling approach for

examining ARR$_{vpc}$. A, ontogenic-associated promoter activities of pro*PR2*::GUS in

an uninfected plant. Note the high activity in fully expanded juvenile leaves (1-7) and

low in young adult leaves (12-13). The indicated leaf numbers were based on the

order of the leaves on shoot. **B**, the incremental expression of *PR2* gene spanning the

expansion of juvenile and adult leaves. I, premature leaves. II, intermediate premature

leaves. III, mature leaves. **C**, An outline of the ontogenic maturation of a juvenile leaf

and an adult leaf. The boxed region indicates distinct ontogenic age of juvenile and

adult leaves from the same plant; asteroids indicate juvenile and adult leaves of the

same ontogenic age. **D,** The quantified leaf expansion rate in juvenile and adult

leaves. Leaf areas were quantified and normalized through Fiji software. **E**, a cartoon

depiction of shoot development and leaf maturation that are concurrent during the

vegetative phase change.

Figure S2. Developmental phenotypes of *rSPLs* and *spl* mutants. A and D,

arrows indicate leaf 1-2 of juvenile Col-0 and *rSPLs*. **B-C**, arrows indicate

representative adult leaves of Col-0 and *spl* mutants.

Figure S3. Quality control of RNA-seq datasets and Venn diagrams of adult *vs*

juvenile DEGs. A, principal component analysis showed that the effect of age and

genotype likely explained 52% variance of the samples, and *Pto* infection effect likely

explained 17% variance of the samples. **B**, the sample-to-sample distance matrix

showed that biological replicates (Mock1-3 and *Pto*1-3) were well correlated (in close

distance) within per genotype per treatment. The column names of the matrix are in

the same order as the row names--from the "Adu-Mock1" (the first on the left) to the

"r10-Pto3" (the first on the right). **C**, venn diagrams of Adu-DEGs generated from the

indicated pair-wise comparisons. Color-coding of numbers, adult-specifically

Pto-triggered DEGs (red), Juvenile-specifically triggered (brown), commonly triggered

in both adults and juveniles, i.e., shared (grey), and overlap DEGs between Adu_{nof}

and Adu_{pto} (black). Green numbers indicate the 20.1% synergistic DEGs that

mentioned in the main text. Blue numbers refer to DEGs that were Adu_{nof} but not

Adu_{pto}. Adult preferentially *Pto*-triggered DEGs are listed in SI Appendix Table S3.

Figure S4. Expression of *SPL3* and *SPL10* in *MIM156/sid2-1* and *r10/eds1.2*.

A, *SPL3* was used as an indicator of *MIM156* function. No difference was observed in

MIM156 and *MIM156/sid2-1.* B, *SPL10* was expressed at comparable level in *rSPL10*

and *rSPL10/eds1.2.* Student t test, ns, not significant, *, $p < 0.05$, **, $p < 0.01$.

Figure S5. A table of enriched SPL-binding motifs within the upregulated 203

and plant phenotype of *proSPL10::rSPL10-YFP*. A. Adu/*r10*$_{nof}$ co-regulon*.

Frequency-based DNA logos are shown for each enriched motif. The analysis was

performed in the simple enrichment analysis-MEME Suite. Details were described in

the method section. **B.** plant phenotype of proSPL10::rSPL10-YFP. Note the

elongated leaves 1 and 2 in the transgenic plant.

Figure S6. A model of miR156-SPL10 regulated age-related resistance during

the vegetative phase change. In brief, miR156 suppressed the resistance in juvenile

phase through inhibiting SPL10. The increased expression of *SPL10* followed by the

decline of miR156 level gives rise to a high immune output in adult phase. That is

achieved via promoting the expression of *PAD4* as well as enhancing expressions of

components in SA biosynthesis and signaling pathways.

Reference

1. R. Solana, G. Pawelec, R. Tarazona, Aging and innate immunity. *Immunity* **24**, 491-494 (2006).
2. R. Solana *et al.*, Innate immunosenescence: effect of aging on cells and receptors of the innate immune system in humans. *Semin Immunol* **24**, 331-341 (2012).
3. M. P. Develey-Rivière, E. Galiana, Resistance to pathogens and host developmental stage: a multifaceted relationship within the plant kingdom. *New Phytologist* **175**, 405-416 (2007).
4. L. Hu, L. Yang, Time to fight: Molecular mechanisms of age-related resistance. *Phytopathology* **109**, 1500-1508 (2019).
5. Y. Zou *et al.*, Transcriptional regulation of the immune receptor FLS2 controls the ontogeny of plant innate immunity. *The Plant Cell* **30**, 2779-2794 (2018).
6. M. Chandler, W. Tracy, Vegetative phase change among sweet corn (Zea mays L.) hybrids varying for reaction to common rust (Puccinia sorghi Schw.). *Plant breeding* **126**, 569-573 (2007).
7. C. Rusterucci *et al.*, Age-related resistance to Pseudomonas syringae pv. tomato is associated with the transition to flowering in Arabidopsis and is effective against Peronospora parasitica. *Physiological and molecular plant pathology* **66**, 222-231 (2005).
8. S. Glander *et al.*, Assortment of flowering time and immunity alleles in natural Arabidopsis thaliana populations suggests immunity and vegetative lifespan strategies coevolve. *Genome biology and evolution* **10**, 2278-2291 (2018).
9. S. R. Paludan, T. Pradeu, S. L. Masters, T. H. Mogensen, Constitutive immune mechanisms: mediators of host defence and immune regulation. *Nat Rev Immunol* **21**, 137-150 (2021).
10. S. Panter, D. A. Jones, Age-related resistance to plant pathogens. (2002).
11. R. S. Poethig, "Vegetative phase change and shoot maturation in plants" in Current topics in developmental biology. (Elsevier, 2013), vol. 105, pp. 125-152.
12. R. A. Brink, Phase change in higher plants and somatic cell heredity. *The Quarterly Review of Biology* **37**, 1-22 (1962).
13. R. S. Poethig, Phase change and the regulation of shoot morphogenesis in plants. *Science* **250**, 923-930 (1990).
14. S. A. Alzohairy, R. Hammerschmidt, M. K. Hausbeck, Changes in winter squash fruit exocarp structure associated with age-related resistance to Phytophthora capsici. *Phytopathology* **110**, 447-455 (2020).
15. P. Carella, D. C. Wilson, R. K. Cameron, Some things get better with age: differences in salicylic acid accumulation and defense signaling in young and mature Arabidopsis. *Frontiers in plant science* **5**, 775 (2015).
16. J.-W. Wang *et al.*, miRNA control of vegetative phase change in trees. *PLoS Genet* **7**, e1002012 (2011).

17. R. P. Birkenbihl, G. Jach, H. Saedler, P. Huijser, Functional dissection of the
plant-specific SBP-domain: overlap of the DNA-binding and nuclear
localization domains. *Journal of molecular biology* **352**, 585-596 (2005).

18. X. Liang, T. J. Nazarenus, J. M. Stone, Identification of a consensus
DNA-binding site for the Arabidopsis thaliana SBP domain transcription factor,
AtSPL14, and binding kinetics by surface plasmon resonance. *Biochemistry* **47**,
3645-3653 (2008).

19. M. W. Rhoades *et al.*, Prediction of plant microRNA targets. *Cell* **110**, 513-520
(2002).

20. G. Wu, R. S. Poethig, Temporal regulation of shoot development in
Arabidopsis thaliana by miR156 and its target SPL3. *Development* **133**,
3539-3547 (2006).

21. G. Wu *et al.*, The sequential action of miR156 and miR172 regulates
developmental timing in Arabidopsis. *Cell* **138**, 750-759 (2009).

22. M. Gandikota *et al.*, The miRNA156/157 recognition element in the 3' UTR of
the Arabidopsis SBP box gene SPL3 prevents early flowering by translational
inhibition in seedlings. *The Plant Journal* **49**, 683-693 (2007).

23. H. Wang, H. Wang, The miR156/SPL module, a regulatory hub and versatile
toolbox, gears up crops for enhanced agronomic traits. *Molecular plant* **8**,
677-688 (2015).

24. M. Xu *et al.*, Developmental functions of miR156-regulated SQUAMOSA
PROMOTER BINDING PROTEIN-LIKE (SPL) genes in Arabidopsis thaliana. *PLoS*
genetics **12**, e1006263 (2016).

25. B.-B. Ye *et al.*, AP2/ERF transcription factors integrate age and wound signals
for root regeneration. *The Plant Cell* **32**, 226-241 (2020).

26. G. Cardon *et al.*, Molecular characterisation of the Arabidopsis SBP-box genes.
Gene **237**, 91-104 (1999).

27. T. Sun *et al.*, SQUINT Positively Regulates Resistance to the Pathogen Botrytis
cinerea via miR156–SPL9 Module in Arabidopsis. *Plant and Cell Physiology* **0**
(2022).

28. H. Yin *et al.*, miR156/SPL9 Regulates Reactive Oxygen Species Accumulation
and Immune Response in Arabidopsis thaliana. *Phytopathology* **109**,
PHYTO-08-18-0306-R (2019).

29. M. L. Berens *et al.*, Balancing trade-offs between biotic and abiotic stress
responses through leaf age-dependent variation in stress hormone cross-talk.
Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A **116**, 2364-2373 (2019).

30. A. Kanojia *et al.*, Developmentally controlled changes during Arabidopsis leaf
development indicate causes for loss of stress tolerance with age. *Journal of*
experimental botany **71**, 6340-6354 (2020).

31. B. N. Mansfeld, M. Colle, Y. Kang, A. D. Jones, R. Grumet, Transcriptomic and
metabolomic analyses of cucumber fruit peels reveal a developmental
increase in terpenoid glycosides associated with age-related resistance to
Phytophthora capsici. *Horticulture research* **4** (2017).

32. B. N. Mansfeld, M. Colle, C. Zhang, Y.-C. Lin, R. Grumet, Developmentally
regulated activation of defense allows for rapid inhibition of infection in
age-related resistance to Phytophthora capsici in cucumber fruit. *BMC*
genomics **21**, 1-25 (2020).

33. D. C. Wilson, P. Carella, M. Isaacs, R. K. Cameron, The floral transition is not
the developmental switch that confers competence for the Arabidopsis
age-related resistance response to Pseudomonas syringae pv. tomato. *Plant*
molecular biology **83**, 235-246 (2013).
34. J. L. Carviel *et al.*, Forward and reverse genetics to identify genes involved in
the age-related resistance response in Arabidopsis thaliana. *Molecular plant*
pathology **10**, 621-634 (2009).
35. J. He *et al.*, Threshold-dependent repression of SPL gene expression by
miR156/miR157 controls vegetative phase change in Arabidopsis thaliana.
PLoS Genet **14**, e1007337 (2018).
36. J. M. Franco-Zorrilla *et al.*, Target mimicry provides a new mechanism for
regulation of microRNA activity. *Nature genetics* **39**, 1033 (2007).
37. A.-Y. Guo *et al.*, Genome-wide identification and evolutionary analysis of the
plant specific SBP-box transcription factor family. *Gene* **418**, 1-8 (2008).
38. M. S. Padmanabhan *et al.*, Novel positive regulatory role for the SPL6
transcription factor in the N TIR-NB-LRR receptor-mediated plant innate
immunity. *PLoS pathogens* **9**, e1003235 (2013).
39. A. Yamaguchi *et al.*, The microRNA-regulated SBP-Box transcription factor
SPL3 is a direct upstream activator of LEAFY, FRUITFULL, and APETALA1.
Developmental cell **17**, 268-278 (2009).
40. P. Ding *et al.*, Chromatin accessibility landscapes activated by cell-surface and
intracellular immune receptors. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **72**,
7927-7941 (2021).
41. A. Telfer, K. M. Bollman, R. S. Poethig, Phase change and the regulation of
trichome distribution in Arabidopsis thaliana. *Development* **124**, 645-654
(1997).
42. J. S. Thaler, P. T. Humphrey, N. K. Whiteman, Evolution of jasmonate and
salicylate signal crosstalk. *Trends in plant science* **17**, 260-270 (2012).
43. K. Ando, K. M. Carr, M. Colle, B. N. Mansfeld, R. Grumet, Exocarp Properties
and Transcriptomic Analysis of Cucumber (Cucumis sativus) Fruit Expressing
Age-Related Resistance to Phytophthora capsici. *PLoS One* **10**, e0142133
(2015).
44. L. Yang *et al.*, Pseudomonas syringae Type III Effector HopBB1 Promotes Host
Transcriptional Repressor Degradation to Regulate Phytohormone Responses
and Virulence. *Cell Host Microbe* **21**, 156-168 (2017).
45. Y. Ding *et al.*, Opposite roles of salicylic acid receptors NPR1 and NPR3/NPR4
in transcriptional regulation of plant immunity. *Cell* **173**, 1454-1467. e1415
(2018).
46. H. Cui *et al.*, A core function of EDS1 with PAD4 is to protect the salicylic acid
defense sector in Arabidopsis immunity. *New Phytologist* **213**, 1802-1817
(2017).
47. R. C. O'Malley *et al.*, Cistrome and epicistrome features shape the regulatory
DNA landscape. *Cell* **165**, 1280-1292 (2016).
48. M. Liu *et al.*, Inducible overexpression of Ideal Plant Architecture1 improves
both yield and disease resistance in rice. *Nature plants*, 1 (2019).
49. J. Wang *et al.*, A single transcription factor promotes both yield and immunity
in rice. *Science* **361**, 1026-1028 (2018).

50. Y. Deng *et al.*, A role for small RNA in regulating innate immunity during plant
growth. *PLoS pathogens* **14**, e1006756 (2018).
51. N. Yalpani, V. Shulaev, I. Raskin, Endogenous salicylic acid levels correlate
with accumulation of pathogenesis-related proteins and virus resistance in
tobacco. *Phytopathology* **83**, 702-708 (1993).
52. D. C. Wilson, C. J. Kempthorne, P. Carella, D. K. Liscombe, R. K. Cameron,
Age-Related Resistance in Arabidopsis thaliana Involves the MADS-Domain
Transcription Factor SHORT VEGETATIVE PHASE and Direct Action of Salicylic
Acid on Pseudomonas syringae. *Mol Plant Microbe Interact* **30**, 919-929
(2017).
53. D. C. Wilson, P. Carella, M. Isaacs, R. K. Cameron, The floral transition is not
the developmental switch that confers competence for the Arabidopsis
age-related resistance response to Pseudomonas syringae pv. tomato. *Plant*
Mol Biol **83**, 235-246 (2013).
54. J. V. Kus, K. Zaton, R. Sarkar, R. K. Cameron, Age-related resistance in
Arabidopsis is a developmentally regulated defense response to
Pseudomonas syringae. *The Plant Cell* **14**, 479-490 (2002).
55. T. Fukao, B. E. Barrera-Figueroa, P. Juntawong, J. M. Pena-Castro,
Submergence and Waterlogging Stress in Plants: A Review Highlighting
Research Opportunities and Understudied Aspects. *Front Plant Sci* **10**, 340
(2019).
56. J. D. Jones, R. E. Vance, J. L. Dangl, Intracellular innate immune surveillance
devices in plants and animals. *Science* **354**, aaf6395 (2016).
57. Y. Rossez, E. B. Wolfson, A. Holmes, D. L. Gally, N. J. Holden, Bacterial flagella:
twist and stick, or dodge across the kingdoms. *PLoS pathogens* **11**, e1004483
(2015).
58. B. J. Reinhart *et al.*, The 21-nucleotide let-7 RNA regulates developmental
timing in Caenorhabditis elegans. *nature* **403**, 901-906 (2000).
59. A. L. Abbott *et al.*, The let-7 MicroRNA family members mir-48, mir-84, and
mir-241 function together to regulate developmental timing in
Caenorhabditis elegans. *Developmental cell* **9**, 403-414 (2005).
60. Z. Ren, V. R. Ambros, Caenorhabditis elegans microRNAs of the let-7 family
act in innate immune response circuits and confer robust developmental
timing against pathogen stress. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
Sciences **112**, E2366-E2375 (2015).
61. D. Kim, J. M. Paggi, C. Park, C. Bennett, S. L. Salzberg, Graph-based genome
alignment and genotyping with HISAT2 and HISAT-genotype. *Nat Biotechnol*
37, 907-915 (2019).
62. P. Lamesch *et al.*, The Arabidopsis Information Resource (TAIR): improved
gene annotation and new tools. *Nucleic Acids Res* **40**, D1202-1210 (2012).
63. D. Swarbreck *et al.*, The Arabidopsis Information Resource (TAIR): gene
structure and function annotation. *Nucleic Acids Res* **36**, D1009-1014 (2008).
64. M. Pertea, D. Kim, G. M. Pertea, J. T. Leek, S. L. Salzberg, Transcript-level
expression analysis of RNA-seq experiments with HISAT, StringTie and
Ballgown. *Nat Protoc* **11**, 1650-1667 (2016).
65. M. I. Love, W. Huber, S. Anders, Moderated estimation of fold change and
dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol* **15**, 550 (2014).

66.   K. Dolinski *et al.*, Gene ontology: tool for the unification of biology. The Gene
995   Ontology Consortium. *Nat Genet* **25**, 2529Attri (2000).
996   67.   Anonymous, The Gene Ontology resource: enriching a GOld mine. *Nucleic*
997   *acids research* **49**, D325-D334 (2021).
998   68.   T. Tian *et al.*, agriGO v2.0: a GO analysis toolkit for the agricultural
999   community, 2017 update. *Nucleic Acids Res* **45**, W122-W129 (2017).
1000   69.   Z. Gu, R. Eils, M. Schlesner, Complex heatmaps reveal patterns and
1001   correlations in multidimensional genomic data. *Bioinformatics* **32**, 2847-2849
1002   (2016).
1003   70.   L. Brand *et al.*, A versatile and reliable two-component system for
1004   tissue-specific gene induction in Arabidopsis. *Plant Physiol* **141**, 1194-1204
1005   (2006).
1006   71.   W. A. Ricci, L. Levin, X. Zhang, "Genome-Wide Profiling of Histone
1007   Modifications with ChIP-Seq" in Cereal Genomics. (Springer, 2020), pp.
1008   101-117.
1009   72.   N. Yamaguchi *et al.*, PROTOCOLS: Chromatin immunoprecipitation from
1010   Arabidopsis tissues. *The Arabidopsis book/American Society of Plant*
1011   *Biologists* **12** (2014).
1012   73.   X. Lin, L. Tirichine, C. Bowler, Protocol: Chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP)
1013   methodology to investigate histone modifications in two model diatom
1014   species. *Plant methods* **8**, 1-9 (2012).
1015

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

A No infection

LFC
−10 −5 0 5 10

r10 vs Juv

1895
1316
3006

Adu *vs* Juv

EDS1
PAD4

464 up   472 down

936 co-regulated Adu$_{nof}$/r10$_{nof}$

B *Pto* infection

r10 vs Juv

1615
1006
3522

Adu *vs* Juv

275 up   329 down

604 co-regulated Adu$_{pto}$/r10$_{pto}$

C Co-regulated in Adu/*r10*

No   *Pto*
infection   infection

Fold enrichment
−10 −5 0 5 10

Response to salicylic acid
Defense response to fungus
Systemic acquired resistance
Response to molecule of bacterial origin
Regulation of immune system process
Response to chitin
Cellular response to hypoxia
Regulation of salicylic acid mediated signaling pathway
Salicylic acid mediated signaling pathway
Response to oomycetes
Meristem development
Developmental growth involved in morphogenesis
Response to jasmonic acid
Response to wounding

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7

Figure S1

A

B **PR2**, no infection
Relative expression
6000 6000
5000 5000
3000 3000
1500 1500
1000 1000
500 500
I II III   I II III
Juv Adu

C * Fully expanded   Senescence
Adult leaf
Juvenile leaf
1w 2w 3w 4w 5w 6w 7w 8w 9w 10w 11w

D Leaf area (cm²)
1.25
1.00
0.75
0.50
0.25
0.00
Two Three Four Five Six Seven
Weeks
Leaf 8
Leaf 1

E Mature Adu
Pre-mature Adu
Pre-mature Juv
Mature Juv
Senescence Juv
Adult leaves: ≥ 8
Transition leaves: 5-7
Juvenile leaves: 1-4
Cotyledon (C)
2w 3-5w 6-8w

Figure S2

Figure S3

Figure S4

Figure S5

A

Alt ID	P-value	E-value	Q-value (FDR)	TP (Primary seq Match to the motif)	FP (% control seq match to the motif)	Enrichment Ratio (Primary relative to control)	Threshold (set TP/FP)
SPL1	2.60e-4	2.27e-1	6.95e-3	25/183 (13.7%)	6/183 (3.3%)	3.71	12.56

| SPL5 | 2.40e-3 | 2.1e0 | 2.69e-2 | 24/183 (13.1%) | 8/183 (4.4%) | 2.78 | 12.38 |

| SPL15 | 3.69e-3 | 3.22e0 | 3.60e-2 | 29/183 (15.8%) | 12/183 (6.6%) | 2.31 | 9.14 |

B

Col-0

proSPL10::rSPL10-YFP

Figure S6

A working model of programming the age-related resistance.