Cell-specialized chloroplast signaling orchestrates photosynthetic and

extracellular reactive oxygen species for stress responses

Estee E. Tee[1,5], Stephen J. Fairweather[1], Hanh M. Vo[1,6], Chenchen Zhao[2,7], Andrew Breakspear[3],

Sachie Kimura[4,8], Melanie Carmody[4,9], Michael Wrzaczek[4,10], Stefan Broer[1], Christine Faulkner[3],

Jaakko Kangasjärvi[4], Zhong-Hua Chen[2], Barry J. Pogson[1*], Kai Xun Chan[1*]

[1]Research School of Biology, Australian National University, 2601 Canberra, Australia

[2]School of Science, Western Sydney University, 2753 Sydney, Australia

[3]Cell and Developmental Biology, John Innes Centre, NR4 7UH Norwich, United Kingdom

[4]Organismal and Evolutionary Biology, Viiki Plant Science Centre, University of Helsinki, 00014

Helsinki, Finland

[5]Present address: Cell and Developmental Biology, John Innes Centre, NR4 7UH Norwich, United

Kingdom

[6]Present address: School of Natural Sciences, University of Tasmania, 7001 Hobart, Australia

[7]Present address: Tasmanian Institute of Agriculture, University of Tasmania, 7250 Launceston,

Australia

[8]Present address: NAPIGEN, Inc., 19803 Delaware, United States of America

[9]Present address: Synthetic Biology Future Science Platform, Commonwealth Scientific and

Industrial Research Organisation, 2601 Canberra, Australia

[10]Present address: Institute of Plant Molecular Biology, Czech Academy of Sciences, 370 05 České

Budějovice, Czech Republic

*** Authors for Correspondence:** kai.chan@anu.edu.au and barry.pogson@anu.edu.au

Author Contributions: E.E.T., S.J.F., S.K., M.C., M.W., S.B., C.F., J.K., Z.H.C., B.J.P. and K.X.C.

designed research; E.E.T., S.J.F., H.M.V., C.Z., and A.B. performed research; E.E.T., S.J.F.,

H.M.V. analyzed data; E.E.T., B.J.P., and K.X.C. wrote the paper with contribution from all authors.

Competing Interest Statement: No competing interests to declare.

Classification: Biological Sciences; Plant Biology

Keywords: Chloroplast, ROS, retrograde signaling, stomata, calcium dependent protein kinase

This PDF file includes:

32   Main Text

33   Figures 1 to 4

Abstract

Cellular responses to abiotic stress involve multiple secondary messengers including reactive oxygen species (ROS), Ca^{2+}, phytohormones such as abscisic acid (ABA) and chloroplast-to-nucleus retrograde signals such as 3'-phosphoadenosine 5'-phosphate (PAP). Mechanism(s) by which these messengers, produced in different subcellular compartments, intersect for cell regulation remain enigmatic. Here we demonstrate a mechanistic link enabling ABA and the chloroplast retrograde signal PAP to coordinate both chloroplast and plasma membrane ROS production. In whole leaves, PAP alters various ROS-related processes including plasmodesmal permeability as well as responses to ozone and the bacterial elicitor flg22, but largely quenches ROS during oxidative stress. Conversely, in guard cells, both PAP and ABA induce a ROS burst in both chloroplasts via photosynthetic electron transport, and the apoplast via the RESPIRATORY BURST OXIDASE HOMOLOG (RBOH). Both subcellular ROS sources were necessary for ABA- and PAP-mediated stomatal closure. However, PAP signaling diverges from ABA by activating RBOHD, instead of RBOHF, for apoplastic ROS production. We identify calcium-dependent protein kinases (CPKs) transcriptionally induced by PAP as the post-translational activators of RBOHD-mediated ROS production. CPK13, CPK32, and CPK34 concurrently activate RBOHD and the slow anion channel SLAC1 by phosphorylating two Serine (S) residues, including S120 which is also targeted by the core ABA signaling kinase OPEN STOMATA 1 (OST1). Consequently, overexpressing the PAP-induced CPKs rescues stomatal closure in *ost1.* Our data identify chloroplasts, as sources and mediators of ROS and retrograde signals such PAP, to be critical environmental sensors and focal node in the multifaceted cellular stress response network.

Significance Statement

The chloroplast is an important node to coordinate multiple plant signaling pathways in response to stresses such as drought. However, how does it function in specialized cells for which carbon fixation is secondary? Here we show that the chloroplast retrograde signal 3'-phosphoadenosine 5'-phosphate (PAP) plays multiple roles in reactive oxygen species (ROS) signaling and

homeostasis. While PAP suppresses ROS in photosynthetic tissue, surprisingly PAP induces ROS

in chloroplasts and extracellular space of guard cells to induce stomatal closure. We decipher how

PAP-induced proteins activate both extracellular ROS production and anion channels for stomatal

closure, thus providing a mechanism by which chloroplasts provide a strategic complement to

canonical hormonal pathways in regulating plant physiological responses in specialized cells.

Main Text

Introduction

Plant cell responses to abiotic and biotic stresses involve a suite of coordinated cellular signaling

cascades. These involve multiple messenger molecules including reactive oxygen species (ROS),

calcium ions (Ca^{2+}), phytohormones such as abscisic acid (ABA), and organelle-to-nucleus

retrograde signals, defined as signals from an organelle (i.e., the chloroplast or mitochondria) that

regulate nuclear gene expression (1–3). While each of the aforementioned messengers have been

extensively studied, their spatio-temporal intersections remain enigmatic. For example, both

apoplastic ROS and organelle-to-nucleus retrograde signals occur concurrently, yet it is unclear

how these two classes of signals interact and are coordinated in specialized cells.

ROS are crucial signaling molecules produced in diverse subcellular compartments including

chloroplasts and the apoplast. Several types of ROS exist in plant cells and distinct ROS types play

different signaling roles (1–3), but herein we refer to chloroplast and apoplast "ROS" as an

encompassing term for three ROS types formed via similar mechanisms at these subcellular

locations: superoxide (O_2^-), its dismutation product hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2), and hydroxyl radical

($OH\cdot$); with H_2O_2 being the most stable (1). ROS generated from photosystem I (PSI) in chloroplasts

participates in chloroplast-to-nucleus retrograde signaling, both by triggering production of

retrograde signals via H_2O_2-responsive redox regulation (4) and by itself acting as a retrograde

signal (5). Silencing the chloroplastic H_2O_2 scavenging enzyme, thylakoid membrane-bound

ascorbate peroxidase (tAPX), increased chloroplastic H_2O_2 leading to the up-regulation of multiple

stress-associated genes, including pathogen-responsive genes in photosynthetic tissues (6). High

light stress increases H_2O_2 production in leaf chloroplasts; the chloroplasts in close physical

association with the nucleus can transfer their H_2O_2 into the nucleus, potentially representing a

direct means for H_2O_2 to act as a retrograde signal to induce nuclear gene expression (5). However,

the nuclear target(s) of the chloroplast sourced H_2O_2 are still unknown.

In contrast to chloroplast PSI ROS, apoplastic superoxide and H_2O_2 are known to act as secondary

messengers in dynamic signaling cascades. A well characterized pathway that utilizes apoplastic

and cellular ROS as a secondary messenger is abscisic acid (ABA)-mediated stomatal closure. In

a response to an accumulation of ABA under stress conditions such as drought, a simplified guard

cell process occurs as follows: ABA forms a complex with PYRABACTIN RESISTANCE 1/PYR1-

LIKE/REGULATORY COMPONENTS OF ABA RECEPTORS, with ABSCISIC ACID-

INSENSITIVE 1 (ABI1) PP2C phosphatase then binding to the complex (7, 8). This removes the

inhibition of SUCROSE NON-FERMENTING-1 RELATED PROTEIN KINASE (SnRK) 2.6 (SnRK

2.6)/SRK2E/OPEN STOMATA 1 (OST1), which can auto-phosphorylate (9, 10). OST1 interacts

with RESPIRATORY BURST OXIDASE HOMOLOG F (RBOHF) (11) and RBOHD (12), leading to

RBOH-mediated ROS (superoxide and H_2O_2) production. OST1 also directly regulates the activity

of multiple ion channels by phosphorylation, including activation of SLOW ANION CHANNEL 1

(SLAC1) and rapid type anion channel ALMT12 (12–14), and inhibiting inward rectifying

POTASSIUM CHANNEL (KAT1) (15). While OST1 has the capacity to directly act on the channels,

both ROS and cytosolic Ca^{2+} are required for stomatal closure with H_2O_2 activating Ca^{2+} channels

to induce the influx of Ca^{2+} and release of Ca^{2+} from vacuoles and other organelles to the cytosol

(16–18).

ROS production via RBOHs is regulated by a suite of different kinases at the whole leaf, tissue,

cellular and organellar levels. The Ca^{2+} sensor CALCINEURIN B-LIKE proteins (CBL1; CBL9)

interact with CBL-INTERACTING PROTEIN KINASE (CIPK11; CIPK26) to activate RBOHF (19).

In contrast, RBOHD is the primary apoplastic ROS generator in response to biotic stimuli and

mechanical wounding (20, 21). Regulators of RBOHD activity include several immunity-associated

protein kinases (22–24), and calcium protein kinases (CPKs). CPK1, CPK2, CPK4, CPK5, CPK6

and CPK11 can activate both RBOHD and RBOHF in an immunocomplex kinase assay (25), and

at least for CPK5, a direct interaction and activation of RBOHD has been confirmed (26). In guard

cells, OST1 activating RBOHF is thought to be the primary pathway for apoplastic ROS production

(11, 18). However, the links between ROS production and CPKs as well as the interaction with

retrograde signals and the production of apoplastic ROS in guard cells remain elusive, if not illogical

from a spatial context.

The aforementioned leaf chloroplast PSI ROS can trigger other chloroplast-to-nucleus retrograde

signaling pathways such as the SAL1-PAP (3'phosphoadenosine 5'phosphate) retrograde

signaling pathway that functions in drought and high light stress. These abiotic stresses promote

chloroplast PSI ROS and redox poise which inhibit plastidial SAL1 activity (4), thus allowing

accumulation of its catabolic substrate PAP in the cell. In the nucleus, PAP inhibits 5' to 3'

exoribonucleases to alter RNA polymerase II function. This leads to read through accumulation of

downstream genes in tandem repeats, resulting in accumulation of stress-responsive transcripts

including H_2O_2 scavengers (27, 28). Consequently, *sal1* mutants with constitutively over-

accumulated PAP show lower foliar ROS levels, particularly in the vascular bundle (29).

In guard cells, the SAL1-PAP pathway functions in parallel to the canonical ABA signaling

(RCAR/PYL-OST1-PP2C) pathway to induce stomatal closure, at least in part via transcriptional

upregulation of CPKs which converge upon, and activate, OST1 target proteins such as the SLAC1

anion channel (30). Intriguingly, PAP appears to have contrasting effects on ROS in different cell

types. While constitutive PAP accumulation leads to decreased ROS in vascular bundles,

exogenous PAP application induces a ROS burst in guard cells, perhaps via RBOHs as indicated

by chemical inhibitor experiments (30). Constitutively accumulated PAP also rescues ABA-induced

ROS burst in *ost1 sal1* guard cells (30). However, the mechanism was not investigated, beyond

establishing that most canonical ABA signaling components were activated by PAP in *ost1* mutants.

These contrasting roles for PAP as an initiator and repressor of ROS signaling raise the hypothesis

tested herein that chloroplasts and their retrograde signals can function differently depending on

cellular context. Further, despite the parallels in chloroplast-sourced retrograde ROS signaling and

apoplast-sourced secondary messenger ROS signaling, there is a distinct lack of knowledge how

these two processes are intertwined in stress signaling. In this work we explore how SAL1-PAP

retrograde signaling intersects with whole-leaf ROS responses such as basal plasmodesmal

permeability, flg22-induced ROS responses and tolerance to ozone-derived apoplastic ROS. To

define how PAP, and consequently chloroplastic signals, can intersect with ROS signaling, we use

the guard cell as a model to study the specializations of each pathway. This includes considerations

of the sites of ROS bursts, phosphorylation targets of CPKs and the extent to which ABA-mediated

and PAP-mediated signaling require chloroplast functionality as well as retrograde signaling for

stomatal closure.

Results

Subcellular guard cell ROS compartmentalization is mediated by retrograde signaling for stomatal

closure

Previously, we showed that ROS signaling was restored by PAP in ABA signaling mutants, but we

did not determine the cellular source of ROS nor its regulation (30). Herein we examined the spatial

distribution of ROS in response to exogenous PAP application and observed that PAP elevated

ROS in multiple subcellular compartments, with a notable and significant increase in chloroplasts

as indicated by fluorescence of H$_2$DCFDA, which detects primarily H$_2$O$_2$ and to a lesser extent

superoxide and hydroxyl radicals (30) (Fig. 1A, B). ABA treatment also induced chloroplastic ROS

in wild type guard cells, albeit to a lower extent than the PAP treatment (Fig. 1B). To test whether

the effect of PAP on chloroplast ROS requires ABA, we investigated the PAP treatment in an *ost1-*

2 background which is deficient in ABA signaling and does not show ABA-induced stomatal closure

(30, 31). PAP still induced chloroplast ROS in *ost1-2* (Fig. 1C) while ABA did not, suggesting that

PAP acts independently of ABA in the induction of chloroplast ROS.

Given PAP is reported to lower, not raise, chloroplast ROS in photosynthetic tissues we

investigated further the interaction between PAP and chloroplastic ROS using biochemical and

genetic tools. The chloroplast photosynthetic electron transport chain is a major source of ROS in

chloroplasts (1). Therefore, we attempted to attenuate the chloroplastic ROS burst using different

concentrations of the photosynthesis inhibitor 3-(3-4,-dichlorophenyl)-1,1-dimethylurea (DCMU) on

Arabidopsis thaliana (*Arabidopsis*) epidermal peels. As expected, we observed incremental

reduction of the effective PSII quantum yield (Y(II)) of mesophyll tissue in response to the

increasing concentrations of DCMU (Fig. S1); whereas Y(II) in the guard cells was below the

detection threshold. We used this decrease of Y(II) in the mesophyll to infer that Y(II) was similarly

decreased in the chloroplasts of guard cells given the similarity of chloroplast photosynthesis in

both cell types (32, 33). Inhibition of guard cell photosynthesis and chloroplastic ROS production at

10 µM DCMU decreased both ABA- and PAP-induced ROS accumulation in guard cells and guard

cell chloroplasts (Fig. 1B). This decreased ROS correlated with impaired ABA- or PAP-induced

stomatal closure when co-treated with a range of DCMU concentrations (Fig. 1D, S2). Intriguingly,

this PAP-induced ROS burst driven by the light reactions of photosynthesis was not associated

with any changes to the low light regime; that is, there was no requirement for co-treatment with

high light as would be typically expected for a chloroplast ROS burst.

To further test if chloroplastic PSI ROS contributes to PAP-mediated stomatal closure, we utilized

a thylakoid ascorbate peroxidase (tAPX) over-expressor (tAPX-OE) line (34). This transgenic line

has high levels of tAPX activity for catalyzing the reduction of chloroplastic H_2O_2 to water.

We hypothesized that increased scavenging of chloroplastic PSI ROS prevents PAP-mediated

stomatal closure. Indeed, PAP-mediated stomatal closure was inhibited in tAPX-OE in comparison

to wild type (Fig. 1E).

As chloroplast-nuclear proximity and H_2O_2 transfer between these compartments in photosynthetic

tissues have been proposed as a key signaling mechanism (5), we examined these processes in

the context of PAP signaling in specialized guard cells. Of the three to six chloroplasts per single

guard cell, one or two chloroplasts were typically associated with the junction between two guard

cells, two to three chloroplasts with the nucleus, and one or none in neither location (classed as

'other', Fig. S3). The number of chloroplasts associated at the junction, nucleus or 'other' location

was not affected by PAP treatment (Fig. S3). Significantly, PAP induced ROS to a similar extent in

all guard cell chloroplasts, including those associated with the nucleus (Fig. S4). We next examined

whether PAP also induces ROS accumulation in nuclei of guard cells. We found that PAP also

induced a ROS burst in the nucleus, to a higher degree than even the chloroplasts (Fig. 1C). Taken

together, our results indicate that PAP induces ROS production in guard cell chloroplasts, with the

ROS capable of accumulating to high levels in the nucleus and the theoretical possibility of it

occurring via chloroplast-to-nucleus H_2O_2 transfer.

Apoplastic ROS production by RBOHD is required for PAP-mediated signaling processes

While apoplastic ROS is required for stomatal closure mediated by ABA (35) the role and genetic

components for this process have not been identified for PAP-mediated stomatal closure. We found

that the double mutant *rbohDrbohF* (*rbohDF*) did not close in response to PAP and had the

expected impaired ABA-mediated stomatal closure (36) (Fig. 2A). Interestingly, we found

that single knockout *rbohF* mutant was responsive to PAP but had completely impaired ABA-

mediated stomatal closure (i.e., no different to the control). In contrast, ABA induced stomatal

closure in *rbohD*, but PAP could not. Indeed, while ABA induced a significant increase in ROS

of *rbohD* guard cells, PAP treatment on *rbohD* did not (Fig. 2B); this was also the case for when

chloroplastic ROS was specifically measured (Fig. 2B). This indicates that ABA induces ROS

via RBOHF whereas PAP acts through RBOHD, which marks an important delineation between

ABA- and PAP-mediated stomatal closure.

The requirement of RBOHD for PAP-induced chloroplastic ROS (Fig. 2B) would suggest that

production of plastidial ROS is initiated by extracellular ROS in this signaling cascade. We then

tested the reverse hypothesis, that is, apoplastic ROS production requires chloroplastic ROS.

Given the difficulty in distinguishing apoplastic ROS from cytosolic ROS of guard cells using

confocal microscopy images, we explored whether chloroplastic ROS contributed to other

apoplastic ROS processes influenced by PAP levels such as flg22-induced ROS. There was no

significant difference between wild type and the tAPX-OE line in response to flg22 (Fig. S5);

suggesting that chloroplastic ROS may not directly influence apoplastic ROS, at least for flg22-

associated ROS processes.

PAP-induced CPKs activate RBOHD and SLAC1 thereby simultaneously impacting ROS and anion

currents in stomatal closure

The induction of RBOHD activity for ROS production is thought to occur both by calcium transients

and protein kinase activation. Intracellular calcium binds to the EF-hand motifs of RBOH, while the

calcium influx can lead to the activation of several kinases such as the CPKs, which can

phosphorylate RBOHD at the N terminus (26). Considering PAP requires RBOHD to initiate

stomatal closure, we investigated potential CPK candidates shown to be transcriptionally up-

regulated by PAP (30) as enhancers of RBOHD-mediated ROS production.

To determine whether these candidate CPKs could enhance the ROS-producing activity of

RBOHD, we used the heterologous expression of human embryonic kidney 293T (HEK293T) cells,

which do not have endogenous NADPH oxidases (37). Measurement of ROS in these cells by

luminol-amplified chemiluminescence showed that the single transfections of CPKs alone did not

differ significantly to the non-transfection control, indicating that the CPKs alone could not

induce ROS production (Fig. S6). HEK293T cells were then co-transfected with *3FLAG-*

RBOHD and either *CPK-3Myc*, or *3Myc-GFP* as a negative control (Fig. 3A).

RBOHD protein levels were homogenous between co-transfections, indicating that any differences

in ROS production would be due to an additional protein partner (Fig. S6). Co-transfection

with CPK12, CPK28, CPK32 and CPK34 significantly enhanced RBOHD-mediated ROS

production in comparison to the control (Fig. 3A). CPK13 did not induce significantly different ROS

production compared to the control, despite CPK13 being expressed to higher levels than CPK28

or CPK32 in the HEK293T cells (Fig. S7). Overall, these results demonstrate that multiple, yet

specific, CPKs that are transcriptionally up-regulated by PAP can activate RBOHD for PAP-

mediated ROS functions.

Interestingly, the RBOHD-activating kinases include CPK32 and CPK34, which we have previously

identified as CPKs capable of activating SLAC1 in *Xenopus laevis* oocytes (30). This raises the

question of which, amongst the repertoire of PAP-upregulated CPKs, might target RBOHD and

SLAC1 together or individually. We therefore tested CPK8, CPK12, CPK13 and CPK28 for SLAC1

activation using the *Xenopus* heterologous expression system (Fig. 3B, S8-10). CPK12 could not

activate SLAC1 in oocytes, consistent with findings by Brandt et al. (38), nor could CPK28 elicit

SLAC1 anion currents. However, both CPK8 and CPK13 could elicit SLAC1 anion currents, albeit

to varying degrees in four independent experiments. Overall, different members of the PAP-induced

CPKs target RBOHD and SLAC1 either individually or collectively (Table S1).

Different kinases phosphorylate different serine sites on SLAC1 (13, 38, 39). Serine 120 (S120) is

phosphorylated by OST1, while CPK6 phosphorylates S59 (39). To define whether some of our

identified CPK candidates target these phosphorylation sites, S59 and S120 of SLAC1 were

individually or both mutated to alanine. SLAC1 S59A and SLAC1 S120A were individually co-

expressed in oocytes with CPK13, CPK32 and CPK34 (Fig. 3C, S10). Contrary to published

literature on OST1 and CPKs phosphorylating distinct sites on SLAC1, either one of the S59A or

S120A mutations in SLAC1 on its own led to a reduction in anion currents for CPK32 and CPK34.

When we mutated both serine sites (i.e., SLAC1-S59A:S120A), this led to a further reduction in

anion currents for CPK13 (Fig. S10). We validated these findings *in planta* by testing whether

different *Arabidopsis* SLAC1 mutants responded to PAP. As expected, PAP and ABA did not close

stomata of *slac1-4* lacking the SLAC1 protein (Fig. S11). Importantly, the *slac1-S59A/S120A*

double mutant which expresses SLAC1 containing mutated serine sites, did not close stomata

when treated with PAP (Fig. 3D).

Considering these PAP-related CPKs could activate both RBOHD and the anion channel SLAC1

individually, or both, thereby simultaneously impacting ROS and anion currents in stomatal closure,

we wanted to determine whether they could compensate for the lack of OST1, an important kinase

that activates SLAC1 and potentially RBOHF (11, 12). We expressed the different CPKs in the *ost1*

background and performed a water-loss assay on excised individual leaves of these transgenic

lines. We included CPK23, which is a known activator of SLAC1 (40) involved in the ABA signaling

pathway but not transcriptionally PAP-induced; expressing CPK23 in *ost1* did not alter the water-

loss rate when compared to the empty-vector *ost1* control (Fig. 3E). In contrast, the overexpression

of PAP-induced CPKs in *ost1* could reduce the water loss in comparison to empty-vector *ost1* to

varying degrees (Fig. 3E). This indicates that PAP-induced CPKs, and in particular for CPK32 and

CPK34, can at least partially replace the function of OST1 *in vivo* by modulating RBOHD and/or

SLAC1 activity (Table S1).

PAP intersects with ROS signaling across diverse cell types and processes

ROS, in particular H_2O_2, are critical secondary messengers in many cell types and cellular

processes. Therefore, we explored the extent to which PAP might intersect with ROS beyond the

guard cell. First, we investigated whether the characteristic ROS production induced by the

pathogen elicitor flg22 (20–22) is altered in *sal1* leaves as a whole, given that both flg22 and now

PAP (Fig. 2A) have been shown to act via RBOHD in guard cells. Flg22 induced a much more

pronounced 'initial' ROS burst in *sal1* in comparison to wild type (Fig. 4A), while the negative control

rbohD did not produce any ROS.

Ozone enters leaves via stomata, and is readily converted to secondary ROS including H_2O_2, super

oxide and hydroxyl radical in the apoplast (41). The whole-leaf response to ozone requires

functional OST1 (42) and perturbation of this response can result in excessive damage to vascular

tissue (43). Considering our previous finding that constitutive PAP signaling via *sal1* restores

stomatal closure in *ost1* (30), we investigated whether *ost1 sal1*-6 has restored ozone tolerance.

The ozone-tolerant wild type (ecotype Col-0) and ozone-sensitive *ost1* plants showed the expected

phenotypes, with lesions formed in the midrib of all leaves of *ost1* (Fig. S12). Interestingly, fewer

lesions developed on *ost1 sal1*-6; the lesions were primarily contained to the older leaves in the

lower part of the rosette. In accordance with this, whole plant electrolyte measurements showed

that the significantly greater extent of ozone-induced ion leakage in *ost1* was decreased to wild

type levels in *ost1 sal1-6* (Fig. 4B), indicating that PAP accumulation restores ozone tolerance, and

thereby ROS responses, in whole leaves lacking OST1.

We finally examined the effect of constitutive PAP accumulation on another cellular process which

utilize ROS production and/or signaling; namely cell-to-cell permeability via plasmodesmata, as

their aperture can be dynamically regulated by ROS in roots treated with exogenous H_2O_2 (44).

The *sal1* mutant alleles *sal1*-6 and *sal1*-8 showed more open plasmodesmata in comparison to

wild type, as indicated by greater diffusion of green fluorescent protein (GFP) from the initial particle

bombardment site into neighboring cells (Fig. 4C). Interestingly we identified several genes related

to plasmodesmata aperture regulation that were also differentially expressed in *sal1*-8 compared

to wild type (Table S2). Collectively, these results suggest the potential for PAP to intersect with

ROS signaling and homeostasis in diverse cellular processes.

Discussion

Unanswered questions in the fields of ROS and retrograde signaling revolve around functional

redundancy versus specificity of signals, as well as a second less commonly considered quandary

which is the spatio-temporal intersection and neofunctionalization of the different signals in

specialized cells. For instance, if chloroplastic H_2O_2 itself is exported to the nucleus for signaling

roles (5), why do plant cells require other H_2O_2-triggered retrograde signals? Furthermore, signaling

roles for chloroplastic and apoplastic ROS have conventionally been considered separately; thus,

whether and how they intersect has remained unclear. A more fundamental question is if retrograde

signaling is an important cellular mechanism from an evolutionary perspective, how does it intersect

with other stress signaling pathways? Does this differ in specialized cells, such as guard cells

versus established roles in mesophyll cells or vasculature bundles (one of the proposed sites for

sensory plastids), as is the case for hormones and secondary messages?

The induction of chloroplast PSI ROS in guard cells by PAP (Fig. 1) was initially surprising, since

PAP contributes to a reduction in ROS in vascular bundles. This is consistent with PAP being a

chloroplast ROS-triggered signal in foliar tissue (4) that leads to the quenching of excess ROS via

up-regulation of the H_2O_2 scavenger *APX2* in this tissue type (29). However, given that ABA also

induced guard cell chloroplastic ROS (Fig. 1, (45)), our observations could reflect cell type-specific

functionalization of chloroplasts. Interestingly, guard cells obtain energy and carbohydrates via

different routes from mesophyll chloroplasts for stomatal opening regulation, even though

chloroplasts from both cell types are photosynthetically competent (32, 33, 46). Guard cells also

have a higher proportion of chloroplasts associated with the nucleus (Fig. S3) compared to

mesophyll cells, where direct H_2O_2 transfer from chloroplasts to the nucleus was reported (5).

Perturbing increases in chloroplastic PSI ROS whether by DCMU or tAPX over-expression, also

prevents stomatal closure (Fig. 1B, D, E, S2). Taken together, it seems that chloroplastic PSI ROS

and photosynthesis *per se* play important roles in guard cell signaling, with PAP, ABA and

apoplastic ROS among the triggers for a burst in photosynthetic-generated ROS. More generally,

the chloroplast is necessary for the continual propagation of ROS signals across the leaf in

wounding responses (47); and the enhanced flg22 ROS burst in *sal1-6* (Fig. 4C) suggests

chloroplast signaling via PAP could be involved in leaf-level ROS propagation. Overall, our findings

are consistent with, and contribute to, the model of the sensory plastid, which proposes specialized

environmental-sensing roles for chloroplasts that differ by cell type (48).

How could chloroplast-sourced ROS affect stomatal closure? We would assume a synergistic

interaction with RBOH ROS facilitating the calcium release, thereby promoting activation of ion

channels via CPKs (49, 50). Of note, we also observed a concurrent increase in nuclear ROS in

response to PAP (Fig. 1C), which is consistent with an emerging understanding of a role for

transcription in stomatal function (30, 51). While well beyond the scope of this study one can

speculate that chloroplast-sourced ROS oxidizing guard cell nuclear proteins may alter protein

interactions, trafficking, conformation and function (52, 53). Mining of recent proteomics studies

identifying proteins with H_2O_2-sensitive cysteine residues (53, 54) revealed several nuclear proteins

involved in stomatal regulation (55, 56). This list includes CO_2 INSENSITIVE 1 (CIS1) which is

required for elevated intracellular bicarbonate-induced activation of S-type anion channel currents

for CO_2-induced stomatal closure (57). The diversity of these proteins opens new research avenues

for understanding chloroplastic ROS signaling.

Apart from direct ROS/retrograde signaling targets, an outstanding question remains; how does

chloroplastic ROS intersect with apoplastic ROS? We found that PAP cannot induce ROS

accumulation in the chloroplasts of *rbohD* (Fig. 2B), indicating that apoplastic ROS is required for

chloroplastic ROS accumulation, at least for stomatal closure. This is consistent with other findings,

where chloroplasts are a site of ROS accumulation in guard cells in response to ozone which

mimics apoplastic ROS (47). The inhibition of PAP-induced stomatal closure by DCMU (Fig. 1D)

identifies PSI as the likely origin of the chloroplastic ROS required for stomatal closure. It is unclear

how apoplastic ROS leads to perturbation of the photosynthetic electron transport chain, but one

possible pathway is via Ca^{2+}. We previously observed Ca^{2+} influx in guard cells treated with PAP

(58). Activation of the HPCA kinase by apoplastic ROS leads to influx of Ca^{2+} (18) which can

influence the activity of several PSI proteins and photoprotection mechanisms such as cyclic

electron flow, limiting photosynthetic ROS accumulation (59, 60) Identifying and understanding the

(likely complex) interactions and processes required for the activation and requirement for

chloroplastic ROS will be a significant future challenge.

Interestingly, some of the PAP-induced CPKs have multiple functions in the guard cell i.e.,

activating both RBOHD and SLAC1 (Table S1). While CPK13 could not activate RBOHD, it has

been shown to inhibit KAT1 and KAT2 inward potassium channels (61). Notably, the PAP-induced

CPKs activate SLAC1 through at least two phosphorylation sites, S59 and S120 (Fig. 3C, S10)

unlike the previously reported specificity of other CPKs for S59 and OST1 for S120 (39). The

multiplicity in target proteins and phosphosites of PAP-induced CPKs may translate to an additive

effect for stomatal regulation, since the CPKs identified to have multiple targets (i.e., CPK13,

CPK32 and CPK34) provided the greatest degree of complementation in preventing leaf water loss

when expressed in the *ost1* mutant background (Fig. 3E). The upregulation of these different CPKs

that are distinct to those involved in ABA signaling identifies PAP as a node that connects the

chloroplast, ROS and calcium signaling with ion channel activity for stomatal regulation.

Our finding that the induction of stomatal closure by PAP occurs via RBOHD but not RBOHF, while

ABA acts via RBOHF (Fig. 2) or RBOHD in some instances (64) provides a distinct delineation

between these two drought-induced signaling molecules and their downstream pathways.

However, this finding again raises the question of functional redundancy versus specificity of

cellular signals: why do guard cells utilize a chloroplast signaling pathway to close stomata, when

ABA is very effective at doing so? We previously showed that PAP accumulation compensates for

deficiency in ABA signaling; for example PAP closes stomata in otherwise ABA-insensitive mutants

such as *ost1* and *abi1*, as well as enhancing the effect of ABA-mediated seed germination

repression (30). Intriguingly, plants under prolonged water stress have reduced stomatal sensitivity

to ABA, which is exacerbated the longer the water stress (i.e. 24 hours vs 14 days) (62). During

drought in *Arabidopsis*, ABA accumulates rapidly (~1-3 days) compared to the slower buildup of

PAP (~7-9 days) (29). This temporal separation of ABA and PAP accumulation may be relevant. It

could lead to ABA activating particular CPKs and OST1 to produce ROS, Ca^{2+} and activate SLAC1

to close stomata in the earlier stages of drought. With prolonged drought stress, subsequent PAP

accumulation activates the parallel CPK-RBOHD-SLAC1 pathways described herein to maintain

stomatal closure. Taken together, this suggests that chloroplasts, via signals such as PAP, co-

regulate the same proteins targeted by ABA to provide a time-gated reinforcement mechanism for

stomatal regulation.

Analogous mechanisms for the intersection of chloroplast, ROS and Ca^{2+} signaling most likely exist

in multiple leaf cell types and across different cellular processes, since we observed enhanced

ROS production in response to flg22 in *sal1* with constitutively accumulated PAP (Fig. 4A). While

these observations may be explained by PAP-upregulated CPKs capable of accentuating the

RBOHD-mediated ROS burst, such a mechanism is unlikely to explain the effect of PAP

accumulation on increased plasmodesmal permeability (Fig. 4C), nor the aforementioned

decreased ROS in vascular bundles (29).

Our results herein contribute towards resolving enigmas pertaining to cell specialization. PAP

induces accumulation of both chloroplastic and apoplastic ROS; with both subcellular sources of

ROS being necessary for stomatal closure (Fig. 1–2). We establish the epistatic hierarchy of

signaling across the cell, with PAP-induced transcriptional up-regulation of CPKs enabling

activation of RBOHD for the apoplastic ROS burst, which in turn is required for the chloroplastic

ROS burst and stomatal closure (Fig. 3). The PAP-induced CPKs can target both RBOHD and the

anion channel SLAC1, including a SLAC1 phosphosite previously considered to be OST1-specific,

thus enabling bypass of the ABA-OST1 pathway for stomatal closure (Fig. 3). Finally, the effect of

PAP extends beyond guard cells as it intersects with ROS in diverse cell types and processes (Fig.

4). In conclusion we illustrate how chloroplast retrograde signals can intersect with and influence

multiple signaling pathways to regulate plant processes in a cell type-dependent manner.

Materials and Methods

Extended Methods and Materials are available in *SI Appendix*.

Plant material

Arabidopsis thaliana wild type used in this study is Columbia-0 (Col-0). Mutants and transgenic

lines are in the Col-0 background except for *ost1*-2, which is in the Landsberg erecta background.

Lines used in this study are *sal1*-6 (SALK_020882(29)); *sal1*-8 (CS66977; (29)); tAPX OE (34);

ost1-2 (*ost1*-2,(31)); *rbohD* (CS9555, (20)); *rbohF* (CS9557, (20)); *rbohDF* (CS9558, (20)); *slac1*-4

(SALK_137265, (43)); *slac1*-S59A/S120A (SLAC1 S59A/S120A; (39)), *ost1* (SALK_008068, (63)).

Candidate CPKs were transformed in the Col-0 *ost1* mutant using the agrobacterium transformation

floral dip method (64) and hygromycin screen (65), for candidates cloned in the pMDC32 binary

vector (66) with the cauliflower mosaic virus 35S promoter replaced with the guard cell promoter

pGC1 (67). For stomatal aperture, flg22 ROS and water-loss assays, *Arabidopsis* plants were

grown on soil with 16 h light at 22 °C, except for the *rboh* mutants and the respective Col-0 control,

which were grown at 12 h light. For confocal microscopy and ozone treatment assays, *Arabidopsis*

plants were grown on soil in 12 h light. For bombardment assays, *Arabidopsis* plants were grown

on soil with 10 h light at 22 °C.

Microprojectile bombardment assays

Bombardment assays of cytosolic GFP endoplasmic reticulum RFP (red fluorescent protein) were

performed as described in (68). Bombardment sites were imaged 16 hours after bombardment

using a confocal microscope (LSM Zeiss 800) with a 20× water dipping objective (W N-Achroplan

20×/0.5). GFP was excited with a 488 nm argon laser and collected at 505-530 nm, while RFP was

excited with a 561 nm DPSS laser and collected at 600-640 nm.

Flg22-induced chemiluminescence ROS assay

Chemiluminescence ROS assays were performed as described in (69). See extended methods.

Ozone treatment

Three-week-old *Arabidopsis* plants were exposed to 50 ppb ozone for six hours from 9:00 to 15:00.

Plants were then transferred back into the growth chamber, with damage visually being scored and

photographed 24 hours post exposure. For electrolyte leakage measurements, whole rosettes were

collected after the end of the ozone exposure (both ozone treated and those in the control condition,

i.e., plants left in the growth chamber at <20 ppb ozone) and placed into 20 mL of MilliQ H_2O.

Samples were measured using a Mettler conductivity meter (Model FE30) to obtain ion readings

24 hours post the initial ozone exposure. Samples were frozen completely, defrosted, and then

measurements were taken again to obtain total ion content, with values plotted as a % total ion

lost.

Stomatal aperture assay

Stomatal aperture assays were performed as per (30). See extended methods.

Confocal microscopy

Quantification of ROS in guard cells of epidermal peels was measured using 20 µM 2',7'-

dichlorodifluorescein diacetate (H_2DCFDA; Invitrogen) according to (30), with epidermal peels

treated as per (30). Fluorescence images were taken using a Leica inverted confocal microscope

using a 496-nm excitation line of an argon multiline laser. H_2DCFDA fluorescence emission was

detected at 505-525 nm, while chloroplast auto-fluorescence was detected at 680-700 nm. Images

were quantified using Fiji (NIH), with relative change in fluorescence of ROS determined with

images before and after treatment.

HEK293T RBOHD ROS assay

A prepared 96-well plate with HEK293T cells transfected with genes of interest (see extended

methods for cloning specifics, transfection protocol, and protein extraction and western blot

associated, adapted from (70)) was gently washed with 100 µL Hank's Balanced Salt Solution

[HBSS, with Ca^{2+} and Mg^+; ThermoFisher Scientific], and then 100 µL of the assay buffer [29.9 mL

HBSS, with Ca^{2+} and Mg^+, 90 µL of 0.002 g horseradish peroxidase dissolved in 100 µL HBSS

solution, 18.8 µL of 0.4 M luminol] was added to each well. The plate was put into a plate reader

capable of polarization mode dispersion to measure luminescence at 37 °C. First, luminescence

was measured for 15 minutes for cells only in the assay buffer [measurement time 1 s/well, interval

1 min/well], then 50 µL of 3 µM ionomycin solution dissolved in the assay buffer was dispensed in

each well and measured for another 15 minutes.

Electrophysiology

SLAC1-mediated anion currents in oocytes were performed as per (30). See extended methods.

Statistical analyses

Data presented as boxplots have the middle line marking the median, the box indicating the upper

and lower quartiles, and the whiskers showing the minimum and maximum values within 1.5×

interquartile range. Data were analyzed using RStudio 2021.09.01 Build 351/R version 4.0.3. See

extended methods for specifics.

Acknowledgments

We thank Professor Julian Schroeder for kindly providing the seeds of *slac1-S59A/S120A*. We

thank the Western Sydney University Confocal Bio-Imaging Facility for usage of the confocal

microscope. We thank Professor Wah Soon Chow (ANU) for guidance on usage of the DCMU

inhibitor. We received financial support from the ARC Laureate Fellowship (FL190100056 to BJP);

ANU scholarships (EET); ARC Discovery Early Career Researcher Award (DE210100466 to KXC);

ARC Future Fellowship (FT210100366 to ZHC); European Research Council (grant agreement

References

1. C. Waszczak, M. Carmody, J. Kangasjärvi, Reactive Oxygen Species in Plant Signaling. *https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-042817-040322* **69**, 209–236 (2018).

2. S. R. Cutler, P. L. Rodriguez, R. R. Finkelstein, S. R. Abrams, Abscisic Acid: Emergence of a Core Signaling Network. *https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-042809-112122* **61**, 651–679 (2010).

3. K. X. Chan, S. Y. Phua, P. Crisp, R. McQuinn, B. J. Pogson, Learning the Languages of the Chloroplast: Retrograde Signaling and Beyond. *Annu Rev Plant Biol* **67**, 25–53 (2016).

4. K. X. Chan, *et al.*, Sensing and signaling of oxidative stress in chloroplasts by inactivation of the SAL1 phosphoadenosine phosphatase. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **113**, E4567–E4576 (2016).

5. M. Exposito-Rodriguez, P. P. Laissue, G. Yvon-Durocher, N. Smirnoff, P. M. Mullineaux, Photosynthesis-dependent H2O2 transfer from chloroplasts to nuclei provides a high-light signalling mechanism. *Nature Communications 2017 8:1* **8**, 1–11 (2017).

6. T. Maruta, *et al.*, H2O2-triggered Retrograde Signaling from Chloroplasts to Nucleus Plays Specific Role in Response to Stress. *J Biol Chem* **287**, 11717 (2012).

7. S. Y. Park, *et al.*, Abscisic acid inhibits type 2C protein phosphatases via the PYR/PYL family of START proteins. *Science* **324**, 1068–1071 (2009).

8. Y. Ma, *et al.*, Regulators of PP2C phosphatase activity function as abscisic acid sensors. *Science* **324**, 1064–1068 (2009).

9. C. Belin, *et al.*, Identification of Features Regulating OST1 Kinase Activity and OST1 Function in Guard Cells. *Plant Physiol* **141**, 1316–1327 (2006).

10. R. Yoshida, *et al.*, The regulatory domain of SRK2E/OST1/SnRK2.6 interacts with ABI1 and integrates abscisic acid (ABA) and osmotic stress signals controlling stomatal closure in Arabidopsis. *J Biol Chem* **281**, 5310–5318 (2006).

11. C. Sirichandra, *et al.*, Phosphorylation of the Arabidopsis AtrbohF NADPH oxidase by OST1 protein kinase. *FEBS Lett* **583**, 2982–2986 (2009).

12. B. R. Acharya, B. W. Jeon, W. Zhang, S. M. Assmann, Open Stomata 1 (OST1) is limiting in abscisic acid responses of Arabidopsis guard cells. *New Phytol* **200**, 1049–1063 (2013).

13. D. Geiger, *et al.*, Activity of guard cell anion channel SLAC1 is controlled by drought-stress
signaling kinase-phosphatase pair. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **106**, 21425–21430 (2009).

14. D. Imes, *et al.*, Open stomata 1 (OST1) kinase controls R-type anion channel QUAC1 in
Arabidopsis guard cells. *Plant J* **74**, 372–382 (2013).

15. A. Sato, *et al.*, Threonine at position 306 of the KAT1 potassium channel is essential for
channel activity and is a target site for ABA-activated SnRK2/OST1/SnRK2.6 protein
kinase. *Biochem J* **424**, 439–448 (2009).

16. Z. M. Pei, *et al.*, Calcium channels activated by hydrogen peroxide mediate abscisic acid
signalling in guard cells. *Nature 2000 406:6797* **406**, 731–734 (2000).

17. Y. Wang, Z. H. Chen, B. Zhang, A. Hills, M. R. Blatt, PYR/PYL/RCAR Abscisic Acid Receptors
Regulate K+ and Cl− Channels through Reactive Oxygen Species-Mediated Activation of
Ca2+ Channels at the Plasma Membrane of Intact Arabidopsis Guard Cells. *Plant Physiol*
163, 566–577 (2013).

18. F. Wu, *et al.*, Hydrogen peroxide sensor HPCA1 is an LRR receptor kinase in Arabidopsis.
Nature 2020 578:7796 **578**, 577–581 (2020).

19. M. M. Drerup, *et al.*, The Calcineurin B-like calcium sensors CBL1 and CBL9 together with
their interacting protein kinase CIPK26 regulate the Arabidopsis NADPH oxidase RBOHF.
Mol Plant **6**, 559–569 (2013).

20. M. A. Torres, J. L. Dangl, J. D. G. Jones, Arabidopsis gp91phox homologues Atrbohd and
Atrbohf are required for accumulation of reactive oxygen intermediates in the plant
defense response. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **99**, 517–522 (2002).

21. J. Morales, Y. Kadota, C. Zipfel, A. Molina, M. A. Torres, The Arabidopsis NADPH oxidases
RbohD and RbohF display differential expression patterns and contributions during plant
immunity. *J Exp Bot* **67**, 1663–1676 (2016).

22. L. Li, *et al.*, The FLS2-Associated Kinase BIK1 Directly Phosphorylates the NADPH Oxidase
RbohD to Control Plant Immunity. *Cell Host Microbe* **15**, 329–338 (2014).

23. M. Zhang, *et al.*, The MAP4 Kinase SIK1 Ensures Robust Extracellular ROS Burst and
Antibacterial Immunity in Plants. *Cell Host Microbe* **24**, 379-391.e5 (2018).

24. D. H. Lee, *et al.*, Regulation of reactive oxygen species during plant immunity through
phosphorylation and ubiquitination of RBOHD. *Nat Commun* **11** (2020).

25. X. Gao, *et al.*, Bifurcation of Arabidopsis NLR Immune Signaling via Ca2+-Dependent
Protein Kinases. *PLoS Pathog* **9**, e1003127 (2013).

26. U. Dubiella, *et al.*, Calcium-dependent protein kinase/NADPH oxidase activation circuit is
required for rapid defense signal propagation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **110**, 8744–8749
(2013).

27.   P. A. Crisp, *et al.*, RNA Polymerase II Read-Through Promotes Expression of Neighboring
593   Genes in SAL1-PAP-XRN Retrograde Signaling. *Plant Physiol* **178**, 1614–1630 (2018).

594   28.   P. A. Crisp, *et al.*, Rapid Recovery Gene Downregulation during Excess-Light Stress and
595   Recovery in Arabidopsis. *Plant Cell* **29**, 1836–1863 (2017).

596   29.   G. M. Estavillo, *et al.*, Evidence for a SAL1-PAP Chloroplast Retrograde Pathway That
597   Functions in Drought and High Light Signaling in Arabidopsis. *Plant Cell* **23**, 3992–4012
598   (2011).

599   30.   W. Pornsiriwong, *et al.*, A chloroplast retrograde signal, 3'phosphoadenosine 5'-
600   phosphate, acts as a secondary messenger in abscisic acid signaling in stomatal closure
601   and germination. *Elife* **6** (2017).

602   31.   A. C. Mustilli, S. Merlot, A. Vavasseur, F. Fenzi, J. Giraudat, Arabidopsis OST1 protein
603   kinase mediates the regulation of stomatal aperture by abscisic acid and acts upstream
604   of reactive oxygen species production. *Plant Cell* **14**, 3089–3099 (2002).

605   32.   T. Lawson, K. Oxborough, J. I. L. Morison, N. R. Baker, The responses of guard and
606   mesophyll cell photosynthesis to CO_2, O_2, light, and water stress in a range of species are
607   similar. *J Exp Bot* **54**, 1743–1752 (2003).

608   33.   T. Lawson, S. Lefebvre, N. R. Baker, J. I. L. Morison, C. A. Raines, Reductions in mesophyll
609   and guard cell photosynthesis impact on the control of stomatal responses to light and
610   CO_2. *J Exp Bot* **59**, 3609 (2008).

611   34.   I. Murgia, *et al.*, Arabidopsis thaliana plants overexpressing thylakoidal ascorbate
612   peroxidase show increased resistance to Paraquat-induced photooxidative stress and to
613   nitric oxide-induced cell death. *Plant J* **38**, 940–953 (2004).

614   35.   O. Rodrigues, *et al.*, Aquaporins facilitate hydrogen peroxide entry into guard cells to
615   mediate ABA- and pathogen-triggered stomatal closure. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **114**,
616   9200–9205 (2017).

617   36.   J. M. Kwak, *et al.*, NADPH oxidase AtrbohD and AtrbohF genes function in ROS-
618   dependent ABA signaling in Arabidopsis. *EMBO J* **22**, 2623–2633 (2003).

619   37.   B. Bánfi, *et al.*, A Ca^{2+}-activated NADPH Oxidase in Testis, Spleen, and Lymph Nodes.
620   *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **276**, 37594–37601 (2001).

621   38.   B. Brandt, *et al.*, Reconstitution of abscisic acid activation of SLAC1 anion channel by
622   CPK6 and OST1 kinases and branched ABI1 PP2C phosphatase action. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
623   *U S A* **109**, 10593–10598 (2012).

624   39.   B. Brandt, *et al.*, Calcium specificity signaling mechanisms in abscisic acid signal
625   transduction in Arabidopsis guard cells. *Elife* **4**, e03599 (2015).

626   40.   D. Geiger, *et al.*, Guard cell anion channel SLAC1 is regulated by CDPK protein kinases
627   with distinct Ca^{2+} affinities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **107**, 8023
628   LP – 8028 (2010).

41. J. P. Vainonen, J. Kangasjärvi, Plant signalling in acute ozone exposure. *Plant Cell Environ*
38, 240–252 (2015).

42. T. Vahisalu, *et al.*, Ozone-triggered rapid stomatal response involves the production of
reactive oxygen species, and is controlled by SLAC1 and OST1. *The Plant Journal* **62**, 442–
453 (2010).

43. T. Vahisalu, *et al.*, SLAC1 is required for plant guard cell S-type anion channel function in
stomatal signalling. *Nature* **452**, 487 (2008).

44. H. L. Rutschow, T. I. Baskin, E. M. Kramer, Regulation of Solute Flux through
Plasmodesmata in the Root Meristem. *Plant Physiol* **155**, 1817–1826 (2011).

45. S. Iwai, *et al.*, Guard cell photosynthesis is crucial in abscisic acid-induced stomatal
closure. *Plant Direct* **3**, 1–10 (2019).

46. S. L. Lim, *et al.*, Arabidopsis guard cell chloroplasts import cytosolic ATP for starch
turnover and stomatal opening. *Nature Communications 2022 13:1* **13**, 1–13 (2022).

47. J. H. Joo, S. Wang, J. G. Chen, A. M. Jones, N. V. Fedoroff, Different signaling and cell
death roles of heterotrimeric G protein alpha and beta subunits in the Arabidopsis
oxidative stress response to ozone. *Plant Cell* **17**, 957–970 (2005).

48. S. A. Mackenzie, P. M. Mullineaux, Plant environmental sensing relies on specialized
plastids. *J Exp Bot* **73**, 7155–7164 (2022).

49. V. Demidchik, S. Shabala, Mechanisms of cytosolic calcium elevation in plants: the role of
ion channels, calcium extrusion systems and NADPH oxidase-mediated "ROS-Ca2+ Hub."
Funct Plant Biol **45**, 9–27 (2018).

50. M. Sierla, C. Waszczak, T. Vahisalu, J. Kangasjärvi, Reactive Oxygen Species in the
Regulation of Stomatal Movements. *Plant Physiol* **171**, 1569–1580 (2016).

51. F. Simeoni, *et al.*, The AtMYB60 transcription factor regulates stomatal opening by
modulating oxylipin synthesis in guard cells. *Scientific Reports 2022 12:1* **12**, 1–12 (2022).

52. J. Couturier, K. Chibani, J. P. Jacquot, N. Rouhier, Cysteine-based redox regulation and
signaling in plants. *Front Plant Sci* **4**, 105 (2013).

53. B. Wei, *et al.*, Identification of Sulfenylated Cysteines in Arabidopsis thaliana Proteins
Using a Disulfide-Linked Peptide Reporter. *Front Plant Sci* **11**, 777 (2020).

54. J. Huang, *et al.*, Mining for protein S-sulfenylation in Arabidopsis uncovers redox-
sensitive sites. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **116**, 20256–20261 (2019).

55. K. Tõldsepp, *et al.*, Mitogen-activated protein kinases MPK4 and MPK12 are key
components mediating CO2-induced stomatal movements. *The Plant Journal* **96**, 1018–
1035 (2018).

56. Q. Chen, *et al.*, COP1 promotes ABA-induced stomatal closure by modulating the
abundance of ABI/HAB and AHG3 phosphatases. *New Phytologist* **229**, 2035–2049
(2021).

57. J. He, *et al.*, The BIG protein distinguishes the process of CO2-induced stomatal closure
from the inhibition of stomatal opening by CO2. *New Phytologist* **218**, 232–241 (2018).

58. C. Zhao, *et al.*, Evolution of chloroplast retrograde signaling facilitates green plant
adaptation to land. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **116** (2019).

59. A. K. Hochmal, S. Schulze, K. Trompelt, M. Hippler, Calcium-dependent regulation of
photosynthesis. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Bioenergetics* **1847**, 993–1003
(2015).

60. Q. Wang, S. Yang, S. Wan, X. Li, The Significance of Calcium in Photosynthesis. *Int J Mol*
Sci **20** (2019).

61. E. Ronzier, *et al.*, CPK13, a noncanonical Ca2+-dependent protein kinase, specifically
inhibits KAT2 and KAT1 shaker K+ channels and reduces stomatal opening. *Plant Physiol*
166, 314–326 (2014).

62. Z. Y. Peng, J. D. B. Weyers, Stomatal sensitivity to abscisic acid following water deficit
stress. *J Exp Bot* **45**, 835–845 (1994).

63. R. Yoshida, *et al.*, ABA-Activated SnRK2 Protein Kinase is Required for Dehydration Stress
Signaling in Arabidopsis. *Plant Cell Physiol* **43**, 1473–1483 (2002).

64. S. J. Clough, A. F. Bent, Floral dip: a simplified method for Agrobacterium-mediated
transformation of Arabidopsis thaliana. *Plant J* **16**, 735–743 (1998).

65. S. J. Harrison, *et al.*, A rapid and robust method of identifying transformed Arabidopsis
thaliana seedlings following floral dip transformation. *Plant Methods* **2**, 1–7 (2006).

66. M. D. Curtis, U. Grossniklaus, A Gateway Cloning Vector Set for High-Throughput
Functional Analysis of Genes in Planta. *Plant Physiol* **133**, 462 (2003).

67. Y. Yang, A. Costa, N. Leonhardt, R. S. Siegel, J. I. Schroeder, Isolation of a strong
Arabidopsis guard cell promoter and its potential as a research tool. *Plant Methods* **4**, 1–
15 (2008).

68. E. E. Tee, S. Samwald, C. Faulkner, Quantification of Cell-to-Cell Connectivity Using
Particle Bombardment. 263–272 (2022).

69. M. Albert, M. Butenko, R. Aalen, G. Felix, M. Wildhagen, Chemiluminescence Detection
of the Oxidative Burst in Plant Leaf Pieces. *Bio Protoc* **5** (2015).

70. S. Kimura, H. Kaya, K. Hashimoto, M. Wrzaczek, K. Kuchitsu, Quantitative Analysis
for ROS-Producing Activity and Regulation of Plant NADPH Oxidases in HEK293T
Cells. *Methods in Molecular Biology* **2526**, 107–122 (2022).

Figures and Tables

Figure 1. Subcellular compartmentalization of ROS intersects with retrograde PAP signaling

(A) Localization of ROS within guard cells with arrows indicating ROS at chloroplasts. Scale bars

= 10 µM. (B) and (E) show relative change in fluorescence (compared to control) in different parts

of the stomata after treatment (100 µM ABA or 100 µM PAP). Fluorescence is an indication of ROS

levels as per the ROS dye H$_2$DCFDA. (B) shows the relative change in fluorescence in whole guard

cells or guard cell chloroplasts after treatments with or without 10 µM DCMU. Each condition

contains a minimum of three wild type plants with n ≥ 49 stomata per treatment combination. For

'Whole', factors 'DCMU' and 'Treatment' significantly impacted fluorescence with a significant

interaction between the two (ANOVA; F =59.6, df=1, p<0.001; F=12.0, df=2, p<0.001; F = 7.3, df=2,

p<0.001). Significant differences from the respective control denoted by a and b. For 'Chloroplast',

factors 'DCMU' and 'Treatment' significantly impacted fluorescence, with a significant interaction

between the two (ANOVA; F =32.7, df=1, p<0.001; F=23.7, df=2, p<0.001; F=11.6, df=2, p<0.001).

Significant differences from the respective control denoted by a, b or c. For (C), each

treatment/subcellular component combination contains a three *ost1*-2 plants with a minimum of n

≥ 40 stomata. 'Treatment' and 'Part' significantly impacted fluorescence (ANOVA; F=68.8, df=2,

p<0.001 and F=13.4, df=2 p<0.001), with a significant interaction between the two (ANOVA; F=3.2,

df=4, p<0.05). Significant differences denoted by a, b and c. (D) Stomatal aperture in response to

100 µM ABA or 100 µM PAP with 0 or 10 µM DCMU, fold change relative to DCMU control (i.e., 0

DCMU or 10 µM DCMU). Each condition contains a minimum of three wild type plants with a

minimum of n ≥ 27 stomata per treatment combination. 'DCMU' and 'Treatment' significantly

impacted closure (ANOVA; F=7.7, df=1, p<0.01; F=4.2, df=2, p<0.05), with significant differences

from respective control determined denoted by *, p < 0.05. (E) Stomatal closure in response to 100

µM PAP in tAPX OE. Each condition contains a minimum of three biological replicates with a

minimum of n ≥ 41 stomata per treatment combination. 'Genotype' significantly impacted closure

(ANOVA; F= 5.4, df=1, p<0.05), with a significant interaction between 'Genotype' and 'Treatment'

(ANOVA; F=4.9, df=1, p<0.05). Significant differences from the genotype control denoted by *,

p<0.05.

Figure 2. *rboh* mutants are differentially perturbed in ABA and PAP-mediated stomatal closure

(A) Stomatal closure of *rboh* mutants in response to 100 µM ABA or 100 µM PAP. Each condition contains a minimum of three biological replicates with a minimum of n ≥ 34 stomata per treatment combination. 'Genotype' and 'Treatment' significantly impacted closure with an interaction between the two (ANOVA; F=15.8, df=3, p<0.001; F=38.6, df=2, p<0.001; F=18.1, df=6, p<0.001). Significant differences to the respective genotype control denoted by a or b. (B) Relative change in fluorescence in whole or chloroplasts of *rbohD* guard cells as an indication of ROS levels. Each condition contains a minimum of three biological replicates with a minimum of n ≥ 38 stomata per treatment combination. 'Treatment' significantly impacted fluorescence in both 'whole' and 'chloroplasts' datasets (ANOVA; F=16.5, df=2, p<0.01; F=7.4, df=2, p<0.05), with significant differences from the controls denoted by *, p<0.05.

Figure 3. Different PAP-induced CPKs enhance RBOHD-mediated ROS production and SLAC1 anion currents

(A) ROS production of HEK293T cells transiently expressing CPKs with RBOHD. After 15 min 1 μM ionomycin was added to the medium. Values represent mean ± SEM for either three non-

transfected replicates (shown in black), RBOHD co-transfected with GFP (control) or designated

CPK. The experiment was repeated in at least four independent experiments with similar results;

boxplot shows average max emitted light with data pooled from separate experiments. Control n =

24, CPK12 n = 18, CPK13, 28, 32, and 34 n = 12. Factor 'Gene' expressed with RBOHD

significantly impacted the max emitted light after ionomycin was added (ANOVA; F=32.3, df=5,

p<0.001), with significant differences from the control denoted as * for p<0.05 or *** for p<0.0001.

(B) CPK8, CPK12, CPK13 and CPK28 activation of SLAC1 anion channel in oocytes. Values are

means of four to eight oocytes ± SEM. Anion channel activity shown as steady state currents

activated at -130 mV, with significant differences between injected combinations (ANOVA; F=3.5,

df=5, p<0.01), denoted by a, b and c. Experiment was repeated on positive candidates in two other

batches of oocytes. See Fig. S7 for full trace. (C) Anion currents of mutated phosphosites in SLAC1

when co-expressed with CPK13, CPK32 and CPK34 in oocytes. Values are from a minimum of five

oocytes per combination ± SEM. Factors 'Type of SLAC1 expressed' and 'CPK' expressed

significantly impacted the anion currents, with a significant interaction between the two (ANOVA;

F=70.8, df=3, p<0.001; F=33.5, df=3, p<0.001; F=16.8, df=9, p<0.001). Significant differences with

a given CPK expressed denoted by a, b and c. (D) Stomatal aperture of *slac1-S59A/S120A* mutant

in response to 100 µM PAP. Each has a minimum of three biological replicates with a minimum of

n ≥ 31 stomata per genotype/treatment combination. Factors 'Genotype' and 'Treatment'

significantly impacted closure with a significant interaction between the two (ANOVA; F=6.3, df=1,

p<0.05; F=6.4, df=1, p<0.05; F = 5.5, df=1, p<0.05). Significant differences from the genotype

control denoted by **, p<0.01. (E) Water loss assay in excised leaves of *ost1* complemented with

guard-cell promoter expressed CPKs. Independent transgenics lines, where n = 8, 17, 14, 9, 13, 6,

14 and 11 respectively for *ost1*-pmdc32, *ost1*-GC::CPK8, *ost1*-GC::CPK12, *ost1*-GC::CPK13, *ost1*-

GC::CPK23, *ost1*-GC::CPK32, *ost1*-GC::CPK34, and wild type.

772

773 **Figure 4. Altered cellular ROS processes in *sal1 mutant*.**

774 (A) Flg22 chemiluminescence response kinetics in Arabidopsis *sal1* mutant leaf discs. Average of

775 five-week-old plants ± SEM (eight per genotype and treatment), with data combined from two

776 separate experiments (n=16). Boxplot shows total emitted light over 60 minutes for wild type, *sal1*-

777 6 and *sal1*-8 and *rbohD* in response to flg22. Independent factor 'Genotype' was determined as

778 significant (ANOVA; F=36.6, df=3, p<0.001); significant differences between genotypes denoted by

779 a, b and c. (B) Electrolyte leakage measurements from plants harvested after six-hour exposure to

780 ozone, 24 hours after start of ozone exposure. Values are plotted as a % total ion lost, with n = 5

781 per genotype and treatment. Factors 'Genotype' and 'Treatment' had a significant impact on total

782 ion lost (ANOVA; F=4.7, df=3, p<0.01 and F=25.5, df=1, p<0.001), with significant differences

783 between treatments within a genotype denoted by ***, p<0.001. (C) Microprojectile bombardment

784 into leaf tissue of *sal1*-6, *sal1*-8 and wild type show *sal1* mutants have more GFP movement to

785 neighboring cells than wild type. Number of bombardment sites counted ≥84 per genotype, three

786 leaves × three different plants per genotype. Experiment repeated with similar significant trends

787 found. Significance differences between genotypes indicated by a and b.