Kingdom-wide evolutionary characterization of RNA editing factors in Archaeplastida

Ming Chen[1, 2, 3], Zhang Zhang[1, 2, 3, *]

[1]National Genomics Data Center, China National Center for Bioinformation, Beijing, China

[2]Beijing Institute of Genomics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

[3]University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

*Corresponding author: Zhang Zhang (zhangzhang@big.ac.cn)

Abstract

RNA editing, a post-transcriptional modification in plant mitochondria and plastids, is essential for plant terrestrialization. Editosome, mediating RNA editing, comprises nuclear-encoded factors, primarily including pentatricopeptide repeat (PPR), multiple organelle RNA editing factor (MORF), organelle RNA recognition motif-containing (ORRM), and organelle zinc finger (OZ) proteins. However, the origin, evolution, and diversification of these editing factors largely remain enigmatic. Here, we analyze 364 high-quality proteomes spanning Archaeplastida to identify 212,779 PPR, 2,759 MORF, 7,760 ORRM and 829 OZ proteins, and chart their evolutionary landscapes. We find that PPR genes in terrestrial plants undergo substantial expansions, mainly driven by dispersed duplication and retroposition. Further analysis shows that DYW subgroup PPR genes, encoding RNA-editing enzymes, are largely transferred from plants to rotifers, potentially enhancing ultraviolet irradiation resistance of these recipients. Meanwhile, we find that MORF proteins, accessory factors of PPR proteins, are restricted to seed plants. Notably, their hallmark MORF domains share sequence and structural similarity with peptidase S8 propeptide/proteinase inhibitor I9 domains that mediate pro-enzyme folding, implying MORFs regulate PPR folding. Additionally, we reclassify MORF, ORRM, and OZ proteins based on domain architecture, revealing hallmark domain fusions occur among them and with PPR proteins, except between MORF and OZ. Collectively, our findings shed light on the evolution of plant RNA editing factors.

Key words: PPR; MORF; ORRM; OZ; evolution

Introduction

RNA editing, a post-transcriptional modification primarily involving cytidine-to-uridine (C-to-U) and uridine-to-cytidine (U-to-C) alterations in plant organelle (mitochondria and plastid), is essential for adaptation to terrestrial environments[1-4], as well as various physiological processes[5], including development[6], growth[7], flowering[8], fruit ripening[9], and resistance to stresses[10,11]. Editing factors, a group of nuclear-encoded proteins, are assembled into an editing complex to mediate RNA editing[4]. Given the diversity of editing factors in plants, therefore, deciphering their origin, evolution, and diversification is critical for understanding the machinery underlying RNA editing[1,12-14].

Over the past decades, great efforts have been made to identify RNA editing factors, primarily including Pentatricopeptide Repeat (PPR), Multiple Organelle RNA Editing Factor (MORF) (also known as RNA Editing Factor Interacting Protein, RIP), Organelle RNA Recognition Motif-containing (ORRM), and Organelle Zinc (OZ) finger proteins[12], each defined by their hallmark domains/motifs that contribute distinctly to RNA editing[15]. Among them, PPR proteins are essential editing factors, specifically binding RNA bases through their P/PLS motif tracts and catalyzing C-to-U and U-to-C editing via their carboxyl-terminal (C-terminal) DYW and DW:KP domains, respectively[16,17]. Furthermore, PPR proteins are classified into two subfamilies, P and PLS, with the PLS subfamily further divided into PLS, E, E+, and DYW subgroups[15]. PPRs' accessory proteins, MORF, ORRM, and OZ, named after their hallmark MORF, RRM, Ran Binding Protein 2 (RanBP2) type Zinc finger (Znf) domains, respectively, interact with PPR proteins to coordinate RNA editing[4,8,18-25]. In addition to their hallmark domains, these proteins also incorporate diverse

additional domains, such as Glycine-Rich (GR) domain in MORF proteins[26-28]

and PPR, MORF, or CRM domains in ORRM protein[29].

Building on these advances, studies have increasingly focused on the origin,

evolution, and diversification of PPR, MORF, ORRM, and OZ genes[4,12,13,30,31].

The PPR gene family is one of the largest gene families in plants[17], ranging

from tens of members in early-diverging aquatic chlorophytes to hundreds or

thousands in terrestrial plants[2,4] and thereby reflecting massive expansions of

the PPR family[2,32]. Besides, PPR genes are also present beyond plants, with P

subfamily members widespread in eukaryotes and occasionally in

prokaryotes[33,34]. Notably, DYW subgroup PPR genes have also been detected

in multiple non-plant eukaryotes[35-38], including Amoebozoa, Discoba, Fungi,

Metazoa, and Malawimonadidae, presumably resulting from horizontal gene

transfer (HGT)[39]. In contrast, MORF genes have been found only in

angiosperms and gymnosperms[32], ORRM genes occur across Viridiplantae

lineages including chlorophytes, mosses, liverworts, and angiosperms[29], and

OZ genes are sporadically distributed across gymnosperms, mosses, and

lycophytes, but absent from chlorophytes[23]. Despite this, the origin, evolution,

and diversification of these RNA editing factors across Archaeplastida remain

poorly understood, particularly without systematic association with the

expansion driver of PPR genes, evolutionary trajectory of PPR genes between

plants and non-plants, and types of MORFs, ORRMs, and OZs.

Toward this end, we collect a comprehensive list of genomes across

Archaeplastida, systematically identify PPR, MORF, ORRM, and OZ genes,

and construct an evolutionary landscape of RNA editing factors in plants. Based

on the landscape, we perform phylogenetic and comparative genomic analyses

to explore mechanisms driving PPR expansions, scale and impact of HGT in

DYW subgroup PPR genes, evolution and function of MORF domains, and

reclassification and hallmark domain/motif fusion among PPR, MORF, ORRM,

and OZ proteins, which collectively provide new insights into the plant RNA

editing machinery.

Results

Evolutionary landscape of PPR, MORF, ORRM, and OZ genes across Archaeplastida

To systematically investigate the evolution of PPR, MORF, ORRM, and OZ

genes, we obtain a total of 364 high-quality genomes across Archaeplastida

that span early-diverging aquatic algae to highly derived terrestrial plants (for

details see Materials and Methods), including glaucophytes (n=1), rhodophytes

(n=7), prasinodermophytes (n=1), chlorophytes (n=33), charophytes (n=7),

hornworts (n=22), mosses (n=13), liverworts (n=4), lycophytes (n=6), ferns

(n=5), gymnosperms (n=13), and angiosperms (n=262) (Supplementary Table

1). Based on these genomes, we first identify 138 single-copy orthologous gene

families (Supplementary Table 2) and then build a plant phylogenetic tree

(Figure 1A and Supplementary Figure 1) that is topologically congruent with

previous studies[40,41]. Next, we systematically identify 212,779 PPR, 2,759

MORF, 7,760 ORRM, and 829 OZ genes (Supplementary Tables 3 and 4), and

evolutionarily characterize these genes in the phylogenetic tree as built above.

Noticeably, we find that PPR genes are scarcely present in glaucophytes,

rhodophytes, prasinodermophytes, chlorophytes, and charophytes, ranging

only from 8 to 182 (Figure 1B and Supplementary Table 4). In contrast,

hundreds to thousands of PPR genes are detected in terrestrial plants,

particularly some hornworts, mosses, and lycophytes, followed by

gymnosperms, ferns, and angiosperms. Remarkably, two lycophytes, namely,

Selaginella moellendorffii and *Isoetes sinensis*, have the highest number of

PPR genes (n=3,861 and n=3,256, respectively) among the 364 Archaeplastida species in our study (Supplementary Table 4). On the contrary, liverworts are short of PPR genes, less than 100 in count (Supplementary Table 4).

Compared to PPR genes, the other three types of genes present distinct patterns. Specifically, MORF genes are found only in seed plants, including angiosperms and gymnosperms (Figure 1C), in agreement with a previous study[32]. Additionally, seed plants generally harbor about 10 MORF genes, whereas some species, such as *Brassica napus*, *Pogostemon cablin*, and *Cissus rotundifolia*, have more MORF genes (n=40, 39, and 37, respectively; Supplementary Table 4). Conversely, ORRM genes are ubiquitous across Archaeplastida and exhibit a gradual increase from glaucophytes to angiosperms, indicating their ancient origin (Figure 1D). Albeit much lower in count than the rest three types of genes, OZ genes are enriched in angiosperms, with a minor presence in chlorophytes, hornworts, mosses, liverworts, lycophytes, ferns, and gymnosperms (Figure 1E). Interestingly, some angiosperms, such as *Pogostemon cablin*, simultaneously possess numerous MORF, ORRM, and OZ genes, as well as PPR genes (Figure 1 and Supplementary Table 4). Overall, PPR genes exhibit dramatic expansions in terrestrial plants, in contrast to MORF, ORRM, and OZ genes.

Dispersed duplication and retroposition driving PPR gene expansions in early terrestrial plants

To explore the underlying mechanisms of PPR gene expansions following plant terrestrialization, we select high-quality chromosome-level genomes, including four hornworts (*Anthoceros agrestis*, 2,308 PPRs; *Notothylas orbicularis*, 1,772 PPRs; *Paraphymatoceros pearsonii*, 1,583 PPRs; and *Phymatoceros phymatodes*, 1,627 PPRs), one moss (*Takakia lepidozioides*, 2,016 PPRs), and

two lycophytes (*I. sinensis*, 3,256 PPRs; and *Huperzia asiatica*, 1,583 PPRs)

(Supplementary Table 4). In addition, we choose a charophyte, *Zygnema*

circumcarinatum (67 PPRs), as a phylogenetic outgroup. It is known that gene

expansion can be achieved by gene duplication with four different modes[42-44],

viz., whole genome duplication (WGD), tandem duplication (TD), proximal

duplication (PD) and dispersed duplication (DD). To determine genomic loci of

PPR genes and investigate the contribution of the four duplication modes to

their expansions, we retain PPR genes annotated on chromosomes,

accordingly accounting for 93.40~100% of our identified PPR genes in each

genome (Supplementary Table 5; for details see Materials and Methods).

Furthermore, we find that 90.04~95.89% of these chromosomal PPR genes

form duplicate gene pairs, each comprising a PPR gene and its duplicate

(Supplementary Table 5). Before exploring causes of duplicated PPR genes in

these pairs, we infer WGDs of these selected plants through comprehensive

analyses of gene synteny and synonymous substitution rates (Ks) between

homologous genes (see Materials and Methods). We observe that *Z.*

circumcarinatum and four selected hornworts are absent from WGD, whereas

T. lepidozioides and *I. sinensis* are detected to experience one WGD, and *H.*

asiatica undergoes two rounds of WGD (Supplementary Figures 2-9). These

results are consistent with previous studies[3,45-49], except that *I. sinensis* has

been reported to experience two WGDs based solely only on Ks distributions[50].

We examine genomic loci of PPR genes in these duplicate pairs (for details see

Materials and Methods), and find that DD is primarily responsible for PPR gene

expansions in the selected species, followed by WGD in *I. sinensis* and *H.*

asiatica (Figure 2A and Supplementary Table 5).

It has been reported that DD is related to retroposition[42,44], a process that the

complementary DNA transcript of a gene is inserted back into the genome, thus

producing a retrogene copy[51]. Generally, retrogene features intron loss, a

polyadenylic acid (polyA) tail, and flanking short direct repeats (e.g.

transposable element, TE)[51,52]. Thus, we examine these features of DD PPR

genes as indicators of retroposition. First, we compare intron counts of PPR

genes in each dispersed duplicate pair, and find that 74.78~93.21% of DD PPR

gene pairs in hornworts and lycophytes are intronless, followed by the moss *T.*

lepidozioides with 51.98% (Supplementary Table 6 and Figure 2B).

Furthermore, we investigate polyA tails downstream of the 3' untranslated

regions (3'UTRs) of intronless DD PPR genes and observe that 75.22~88%

have polyA tails in lycophytes, 44.29~62.45% in hornworts, and 61.66% in the

moss *T. lepidozioides* (Figure 2C), implying that polyA tails are partially

degenerated in hornworts and *T. lepidozioides*, followed by lycophytes.

Meanwhile, we search for TEs within 20,000 base pairs upstream and

downstream of intronless DD PPR gene pairs, and show that 70.52~99.93% of

them are flanked by TEs in lycophytes, 26.56~68.31% in hornworts, and 80.11%

in *T. lepidozioides* (Figure 2D). In addition, the majority of these TEs belong to

long terminal repeats (LTRs), including LTR/Copia, LTR/Gypsy, and

LTR/unknown (Supplementary Table 7). Furthermore, we provide two examples

that intronless PPR genes in one DD pair are flanked by the same type of LTR

with high sequence similarity, viz., *HaA01G1373* and *HaA43G0090* in *H.*

asiatica flanked by LTR/Copia (96.43% upstream and 100% downstream)

(Figure 2E), and *Tle3c03864.1* and *Tle3c03878.1* in *T. lepidozioides* by

LTR/Gypsy (99.86% upstream, 100% downstream) (Figure 2F). Collectively,

these results indicate that PPR gene expansions following plant

terrestrialization mainly result from DD and retroposition.

Horizontal transfer of DYW subgroup PPR genes from plants to

non-plants

As PPR genes consist of the P and PLS subfamilies, we explore their

phylogenetic patterns by constructing an evolutionary landscape across
Archaeplastida (Supplementary Figure 10). We find that the P subfamily PPR
genes are ubiquitously distributed in Archaeplastida, with their numbers
progressively increasing from early-diverging glaucophytes to derived
angiosperms. Conversely, the PLS subfamily, including PLS, E, E+, DYW, and
DYW:KP subgroups, is confined to terrestrial plants, with an absence in
liverworts and some mosses. In addition, the PLS and E subgroup PPR genes
are numerous in lycophytes, while the E+ subgroup is exclusively enriched in
hornworts. The DYW subgroup is most abundant in the moss *T. lepidozioides*,
with 750 homologs in count; its variant, the DYW:KP subgroup, is restricted to
hornworts, lycophytes, and ferns (Supplementary Table 3 and Supplementary
Figure 10), conforming well with a previous study[32].

Inspired by findings that the DYW subgroup PPR genes have also been
detected in non-plants by previous studies[35,39], we next explore the evolutionary
trajectory of the DYW and DYW:KP subgroup PPR genes in plants and non-
plants. Given that repetitive and variable PLS motif triplets may hinder reliable
phylogenetic inference and the DYW/DYW:KP domains serve as the core
functional region of PPR proteins[53], we extract 6,646 DYW and 3,761 DYW:KP
domains of 68 terrestrial plants as representatives of DYW/DYW:KP subgroup
proteins (Supplementary Table 8). We further search for their homologs in 40
non-plant lineages spanning eukaryotes, prokaryotes, and viruses
(Supplementary Table 9). As a result, we detect 1,666 DYW and 6 DYW:KP
domain homologs in Metazoa, 31 DYW in Rhizaria, 22 DYW and 1 DYW:KP in
Discoba, 15 DYW in Fungi, 9 DYW in Alveolata, 3 DYW in Haptista, and 1 DYW
in Amoebozoa (Supplementary Table 10), exhibiting 21.21~80% protein
sequence similarity to DYW/DYW:KP domains (Supplementary Table 11). To
minimize the domain redundancy, we further select 1,151 DYW and 356

DYW:KP domains from 6 species for phylogenetic tree construction, including
P. pearsonii (hornwort), *T. lepidozioides* (moss), *I. sinensis* (lycophyte),
Alsophila spinulosa (fern), *Gnetum montanum* (gymnosperm), and *Amborella*
trichopoda (angiosperm) along with all DYW/DYW:KP domain homologs
(Supplementary Table 10). As a result, four non-plant DYW/DYW:KP homolog
clusters are interspersed by plant DYW/DYW:KP domains, implying that
multiple waves of HGT have occurred from plants to non-plants (Figure 3).
Furthermore, we randomly select one DYW domain homolog from each non-
plant lineage and compare sequences and structures of these homologs to
those of their plant-derived counterparts. On the one hand, most of these
homologs contain HxE(x)nCxxC, while PG-boxes (approximately 15 amino acid
residues (aa) beginning with proline and glycine[54]) and DYW tripeptides are
variable in both plant DYW domains and their non-plant homologs (Figure 4A
and 4B; Supplementary Figure 11). On the other hand, structures of these
homologs are significantly similar with those of their plant donors (Root Mean
Square Deviation, RMSD ≤ 2.5Å[55]), such as the DYW domain in the moss *T.*
lepidozioides and its homologs in the *Adineta vaga* from Metazoa (Figure 4B
and Supplementary Figure 11).
251
Furthermore, to explore potential biological functions of DYW domains in non-
plants, we analyze expressions of DYW subgroup PPR genes in Metazoa,
obtaining the most DYW domains from plants (Figure 3). Surprisingly, all of
DYW domains in Metazoa are derived from rotifers, including *A. vaga*, *Adineta*
ricciae, *Adineta steineri*, *Didymodactylos carnosus*, *Philodina roseola*, *Rotaria*
magnacalcarata, *Rotaria socialis*, *Rotaria sordida*, *Rotaria sp. Silwood1*,
Rotaria sp. Silwood2, which are resistant to ultraviolet (UV) irradiation and
colonize in a variety of habitats, such as mosses, lichens, soils, and deserts[56,57].
Specifically, we find that *A. vaga* has lots of PPR genes (*n*=191), nearly one

third of which (*n*=60) fall into the DYW subgroup (Supplementary Table 11).

Importantly, the majority of these DYW subgroup PPR genes (58/60) are

expressed, indicating their potential importance in biological processes (Figure

4C). Coincidentally, the moss *T. lepidozioides*, a potential donor of DYW

subgroup PPR genes in *A. vaga*, is also resistant to UV irradiation, and its DYW

subgroup PPR genes present elevated expressions after UV irradiation

treatment (Figure 4D and Supplementary Table 12), indicating the importance

of DYW subgroup PPR genes in response to UV irradiation. Taken together,

these results suggest that rotifers, such as *A. vaga*, may inhabit mosses like *T.*

lepidozioides and obtain the DYW subgroup PPR genes as an adaptation to

high UV irradiation (Figure 4E).

Evolutionary conservation and diversification of MORF

domains

MORF proteins, essential for PPR-mediated RNA editing and exclusive to seed

plants (gymnosperms and angiosperms) (Figure 1C), are defined by their

hallmark MORF domains (MORF1~9) and a C-terminal Glycine-Rich (GR)

domain[26-28]. To explore the evolutionary conservation and diversification of

MORF domains, we extract 334 instances from 33 representative seed plants

(Supplementary Table 13) and search for their homologs across 45 lineages

spanning eukaryotes, prokaryotes, and viruses (Supplementary Table 9). We

find that MORF domains are homologous to peptidase S8

propeptide/proteinase inhibitor I9 domains (also known as PA domain[26]) in

metazoa, fungi, bryophytes, lycophytes, and ferns (Figure 5A and

Supplementary Table 14). Furthermore, we select MORF domains and their PA

domain homologs with the highest sequence similarity within the above five

lineages and compare their structures. We find that although they have lower

sequence similarity (33.33~41.94%), their structures are significantly similar

(RMSD ≤ 2.5Å), with RMSD values varying from 0.705~1.039Å (Figure 5B, 5C

and Supplementary Figure 12). Notably, MORF3 and MORF8 domains share

the same α-helix and β-strand architecture as PA domains (Figure 5C and

Supplementary Figure 12). As PA domain is important in assisting fold

zymogens or mature peptidases[58,59], these results imply that MORF3 and

MORF8 domains potentially help fold nascent PPR proteins to regulate RNA

editing.

To investigate the evolutionary diversifications of MORF domains, we classify

them into MORF1 to MORF9 as identified in *A. thaliana* and survey PA domains

across our collected 364 high-quality Archaeplastida proteomes. Interestingly,

PA domains are ubiquitous in glaucophytes, charophytes, mosses, liverworts,

hornworts, lycophytes, ferns, gymnosperms, and angiosperms (Supplementary

Figure 13). We choose five PA domains from non-seed plants with the highest

similarity to MORF domains as outgroups for phylogenetic tree construction and

reveal the early origins of MORF2, MORF5, and MORF6 (Figure 5D).

Additionally, to investigate potential biological functions of MORF domains in

seed plants, we analyze the expression of genes containing only MORF

domains across multiple tissues of the gymnosperm *Torreya grandis* and the

angiosperm *A. thaliana*. Interestingly, genes only containing MORF8 and

MORF9 are highly expressed in reproductive tissues (Supplementary Figure

14), including inflorescence axis tissue, carpel, flower, male and female cone,

ovule, and stigmatic tissue. Intriguingly, their expression pattern resembles that

of *de novo* genes, which are also preferentially expressed in reproductive

tissues[60,61].

Diversity and hallmark domain fusions of MORF, ORRM, and OZ proteins

Although over 3,000 genomes from more than 1,000 plant species have been sequenced[62], MORF proteins are restricted to only nine members MORF1~MORF9, defined by the hallmark MORF domain in *A. thaliana*. In reality, however, MORF proteins can also contain additional domains, such as GR and RRM[22,27], alongside MORF domains, emphasizing the need for a more precise classification. Thus, based on domain compositions, we reclassify our identified 2,759 MORF proteins into four groups: (1) Single-Pure MORF (SP-MORF), containing a single MORF domain; (2) Single-Mixed MORF (SM-MORF), containing a single MORF domain plus one or more non-MORF domains; (3) Multiple-Pure MORF (MP-MORF), containing multiple MORF domains; and (4) Multiple-Mixed MORF (MM-MORF), containing multiple MORF domains plus one or more non-MORF domains (Figure 6A). Consequently, those 2,759 MORF proteins are classified into 1,916 SP-MORF, 544 SM-MORF, 42 MP-MORF, and 257 MM-MORF (Supplementary Table 16). Among them, 493 SM-MORF and 9 MM-MORF proteins feature a GR domain co-occurring with MORF domains (MORF1~6, 8, 9), a combination previously observed only in MORF1, MORF4, and MORF8[27]. To explore the evolutionary distribution of our reclassified MORF proteins, we construct their phylogenetic landscapes across 262 angiosperms and 13 gymnosperms (Figure 6B). Specifically, SP-MORF proteins are widespread in gymnosperms and angiosperms, whereas SM-MORF proteins are abundant in angiosperms but rare in gymnosperms. Conversely, MP-MORF proteins occur sparsely in both lineages and MM-MORF proteins are only observed in angiosperms. Surprisingly, we find that MORF domains and P motifs are fused in two SM-MORF proteins, viz., *AY_017782_RA* in the angiosperm *Aquilaria yunnanensis* and KAH9320946.1 in the gymnosperm *Taxus chinensis* (Supplementary Table

16). Meanwhile, MORF domain and the hallmark RRM domain of ORRM, are

fused in SM- and MM-MORF proteins in angiosperms. Collectively, these

domains' fusions are observed to fall into four types: 1-MORF & 1-RRM (n=23),

1-MORF & 3-RRM (n=1), 2-MORF & 1-RRM (n=246), 3-MORF & 1-RRM (n=3)

(Supplementary Figure 15 and Supplementary Table 16), where the leading

number indicates the copy number of each corresponding domain. Notably, the

most abundant fused protein, 2-MORF & 1-RRM, has been identified as the

RNA editing factor ORRM1[63].

ORRM proteins, specifically, ORRM1 to ORRM6, have been found in several

angiosperms as mediators of RNA editing[21,64]. To investigate their diversity,

likewise, we reclassify our identified 7,760 ORRM proteins into SP-ORRM

(n=2,689), SM-ORRM (n=1,751), MP-ORRM (n=2,948), and MM-ORRM

(n=372) (Supplementary Table 17), and build their evolutionary landscapes

covering 364 species in Archaeplastida. In addition to previously identified

ORRM1 to ORRM6 with a single RRM domain, MP-ORRM proteins, such as

CP29A, CP31A, and CP31B, each containing two RRM domains, also affect

RNA editing[21]. Intriguingly, RRM domain and motifs/domains (P, E, and DYW)

of PPR proteins are fused in SM- and MM-ORRMs across Archaeplastida

(Supplementary Figure 17). Specifically, angiosperms have 171 SM-ORRMs,

featuring a fusion of RRM and P motifs, far more than any other fusions

observed in other lineages (Supplementary Table 17). In addition, RRM domain

and RanBP2 Znf domain, the hallmark of OZ proteins, are fused in RRM

domain-containing proteins that are not localized to mitochondria or plastids

(Supplementary Table 18).

Similarly, we reclassify OZ proteins and explore their evolutionary distribution

based on the same methods used for MORF and ORRM proteins. As a result,

we identify 829 OZ proteins, with MP-OZ (*n*=761) overwhelmingly predominant,

followed by MM-OZ (*n*=61), SP-OZ (*n*=6), and SM-OZ (*n*=1) (Supplementary

Table 19). Based on their evolutionary landscapes across Archaeplastida, we

find that these reclassified OZ proteins are enriched in angiosperms, including

725 MP-OZ, 60 MM-OZ, 6 SP-OZ, and 1 SM-OZ members (Supplementary

Figure 18). Besides, a few MP-OZ proteins are found in chlorophytes (*n*=3),

mosses (*n*=14), liverworts (*n*=3), lycophytes (*n*=6), ferns (*n*=6), and

gymnosperms (*n*=4), with a single MM-OZ present in hornworts. Interestingly,

RanBP2 Znf domains are also fused with motifs/domains (P and E) of PPR

proteins in four angiosperm proteins, despite these proteins not being localized

to mitochondria or plastids (Supplementary Table 20). Collectively, our results

indicate that hallmark motifs/domains of PPR, MORF, ORRM, and OZ proteins

can be fused with more diverse patterns than previously thought, with the

exception of MORF and OZ (Figure 6C).

385   Discussion

Here, we systematically identify PPR, MORF, RRM, and RanBP2 Znf domain-

containing proteins and construct their evolutionary landscapes across

Archaeplastida. Furthermore, we find that PPR genes greatly expand in

hornworts, mosses, lycophytes, mainly due to dispersed duplications and

retroposition. Considering the key role of DYW subgroup PPR proteins in

mediating RNA editing and their presence in plants and certain non-plant

lineages, we investigate their evolutionary trajectories and find extensive

horizontal transfer from plants to rotifers, exhibiting sequence and structure

similarities, and high expressions. Next, we find that MORF proteins are

restricted to seed plants with high expression in reproductive tissues, and their

hallmark MORF domains exhibit sequence and structure similarity to PA domain,

helping folding proteins. Furthermore, we reclassify MORF, ORRM, and OZ

proteins, and find that hallmark domain fusions occur among them and PPR

proteins, with the exception of MORF and OZ. Based on these results, we

propose a model for the evolution of plant RNA editosomes: RNA editosome,

comprised of PPR, MORF, ORRM, OZ, and other proteins, has evolved through

diversification of its components in terrestrial plants, (Figure 7), potentially

enhancing RNA editing efficiency[65].

High-quality genome is the key to accurately estimate the size and evolution of

gene families. We use BUSCO to estimate the completeness of gene sets and

obtain 364 high-quality genomes of Archaeplastida, paving the way for

analyses of the evolutionary dynamics of RNA editing factors. For instance, the

genome of *T. lepidozioides* indicates that moss harbors numerous PPR genes[3],

whereas previously only a few PPR genes have been found in mosses[4,32].

However, this example also indicates that more high-quality genomes in

Archaeplastida are urgently to be deciphered, especially for non-seed plants,

which is the key to depict the more precise evolutionary landscape of RNA

editing factors and elucidate their molecular mechanisms.

PPR proteins, the primary RNA editing factor and one of the largest gene

families in terrestrial plants, significantly expand in hornworts, mosses, and

lycophytes. We select four hornworts (*A. agrestis*, *N. orbicularis*, *P. pearsonii*,

and *P. phymatodes*), one moss (*T. lepidozioides*), and two lycophytes (*H.*

asiatica and *I. sinensis*) to explore the mechanisms of expansions of PPR

genes, and find they are mainly driven by DD in these six plants, followed by

WGD in *H. asiatica* and *I. sinensis*. Furthermore, DD PPR genes are likely

related to retroposition, characterized by intron loss, the presence of polyA tails,

and flanked LTRs. However, WGD in *T. lepidozioides* is scarcely responsible

for expansions of PPR genes (Figure 2A) and approximately half of DD PPR

pairs experience intron loss (Figure 2B), which potentially results from its

ancient WGD event and large-scale gene fractionation[66], and a partial

contribution from retroposition. In addition, polyA tails occur at relatively low

frequencies in intronless DD PPR genes of *P. pearsonii*, *A. agrestis*, and *N.*

orbicularis (44.29%-48.25%; Figure 2C), and LTRs flanking intronless DD PPR

genes of *N. orbicularis* are rarer (26.56%), suggesting that polyA tails and LTRs

are largely degenerated in some hornworts.

Given that DYW domains in PPR proteins are responsible for catalyzing RNA

editing[67], we explore their evolutionary dynamics, and find they are largely

transferred from plants to non-plants, including Metazoa (rotifers), Alveolata,

Amoebozoa, Discoba, Fungi, Haptista, and Rhizaria (Figure 3A), implying C-to-

U RNA editing occur in these non-plants and regulated by PPR proteins.

Accordingly, RNA editing events has been found in rotifers and Discoba[39,68,69].

Interestingly, we find that rotifers and their DYW domain donors, such as *T.*

lepidozioides, possess highly expressed DYW domains and high resistance to

UV-irradiation, implying that RNA editing mediated by DYW domains repairs

damaged DNA at the RNA level. Furthermore, DYW subgroup PPR genes have

been found to play a key role for plants in adapting to high/low temperatures

and drought[70-72], and rotifers also have these traits[56], suggesting that DYW

domain is also important for rotifers in adapting to these extreme environments.

In addition, DYW subgroup PPR genes in plants have been proposed to

originate via HGT[36] and one member has been found in the chlorophyte *N.*

hyalina[35]; however, our results do not support the hypothesis or finding,

highlighting the need for more high-quality genomes from ancient organisms.

We find MORF domains, the hallmarks of PPR accessory proteins, only exist

in seed plants and are homologous to PA domains based on sequence and high

structure similarity (Figure 5A, 5B, and 5C; Supplementary Figure 8), helping

fold proteins. On the contrary, MORF domain has been found to share the

highest structure similarities with N-terminal ferredoxin-like domains, rather

than PA domains[26]. The difference is likely attributable to domain alignment,

with MORF3 domain and more similar PA domains in Metazoa identified in our

study differing from MORF1 domain and PA domains in human described in the

previous study. Furthermore, these results also indicate that MORF domains

fulfill multiple functions in the regulation of RNA editing. Interestingly, we find

that MORF genes in seed plants are highly expressed in reproductive tissues

and share the same expression pattern with *de novo* genes[60,61,73], suggesting

their *de novo* generation.

As studies of non-PPR editing factors, including MORF, ORRM, and OZ

proteins, are limited in a few angiosperms, we reclassify these proteins based

on domain compositions and explore their evolution dynamics across

Archaeplastida (Figure 6B; Figure Supplementary 13 and 15). Importantly,

these reclassified proteins, in addition to the previously identified editing factors,

are potential candidates to participate in the regulation of RNA editing. Besides,

we also observe other domains also are fused with PPR, MORF, ORRM, and

OZ proteins (Supplementary Table 16, 17, and 19). As protein functions and

interactions are related to gene/domain fusions[74,75], proteins composed of

these fused domains are likely to provide valuable resources to discovering new

RNA editing factors.

Materials and Methods

Collection and quality control of Archaeplastida genomes

To estimate the numbers of PPR, MORF, ORRM, and OZ genes and construct

their evolutionary landscapes, 364 Archaeplastida high-quality genomes were

retrieved from public databases (Supplementary Table 1). To ensure accurate

gene counts, only the longest protein isoform of each gene was retained. The

completeness of annotated gene sets was estimated by Benchmarking

Universal Single-Copy Orthologue (BUSCO) (version 5.8.2) with three lineage

datasets chlorophyta_odb10, viridiplantae_odb10, and eukaryota_odb10[76]. As

these datasets contain many sequences of chlorophytes and angiosperms,

genomes in these two lineages with BUSCO scores ("complete") greater than

90% were retained. For other lineages, chromosome-level genomes with

BUSCO scores ("complete") greater than 85%; otherwise, the top 20%

genomes with the highest BUSCO scores within one lineage were retained.

Phylogenetic tree construction of Archaeplastida

To construct the phylogenetic tree of 364 Archaeplastida, single-copy

orthologous gene families were inferred by OrthoFinder (version 3.0.1b1)[77], and

138 single-copy orthologous gene families covering at least 75% species were

retained. These single-copy orthologous gene families were aligned by MAFFT

(version 7.453)[78] with the parameter "--auto", and poorly aligned regions were

identified and trimmed by BMGE (version 1.12) with BLOSUM30[79]. Gene trees

were constructed by IQ-TREE (version 2.1.2)[80] with parameters "-B 1000 -bnni

-m MFP -T AUTO -ntmax 20" and merged. Taking *Cyanophora paradoxa* as an

outgroup, the species tree was inferred by ASTRAL (version 5.7.8)[81].

Identification of PPR, MORF, ORRM, and OZ proteins

The hallmark domains/motifs of PPR (P, P1, P2, S1, S2, SS, L1, L2, E1, E2,

E+, DYW, and DYW:KP), MORF (MORF), ORRM (RRM), and OZ (RanBP2 Znf)

proteins were identified using hmmsearch in HMMER (version 3.2.1)[82] with

corresponding domain/motif profiles. PPR hallmark domain/motif profiles were

obtained from a previous study[32]. PPR hallmark domains/motifs were searched

using hmmsearch with parameters "--domtblout -noali -E 0.1". All hmmsearch

scores for P, P1, P2, S1, S2, L1, L2, E1, E2, and E+ domains/motifs were

greater than 0, with SS motif greater than 10 and DYW/DYW:KP domain greater

than 30. As most PPR hallmark domain/motif-containing proteins are localized

to mitochondria and/or plastids[17,83], they are defined as PPR proteins. In

addition, PPR proteins were required to contain at least three of P, P1, P2, L1,

L2, or SS motifs, unless they contained a DYW or DYW:KP domain.

The MORF domain profile was constructed using hmmbuild in HMMER (version

3.2.1) with nine MORF domains from *A. thaliana*. MORF domain was searched

using hmmsearch with parameters "--domtblout -noali -E 1e-10". As MORF

domain is similar to PA domain, only hits with hmmsearch score greater than

36 were kept. The RRM profile was obtained from PF00076.26 in Pfam[84]. RRM

domain was searched using hmmsearch with parameters "--domtblout -noali -

E 1e-10", and the hmmsearch score was greater than 0. As some MORF and

RRM domain-containing proteins harbor a GR domain, it was defined as

containing at least 8 glycines within a 20-amino-acid sliding window. The

RanBP2 Znf profile was obtained from PF00641.22 in Pfam. RanBP2 Znf

domain was searched using hmmsearch with the same parameters as used for

RRM domain.

The domain composition of MORF, RRM, and RanBP2 Znf domain-containing

proteins were identified using InterPro (https://www.ebi.ac.uk/interpro)[85].

Furthermore, these proteins localized to mitochondrion and/or plastids were

defined as MORF, ORRM, and OZ proteins, respectively. The subcellular

localization was predicted using DeepLoc (version 2.1)[86] with "Accurate" mode,

TargetP (version 2)[87], Plant-mSub[88] (https://bioinfo.usu.edu/Plant-mSubP), and

LOCALIZER[89] (https://localizer.csiro.au). Only localization results supported by

at least two tools were retained.

WGD Inference

To infer WGD of a plant, intra-genome alignment was conducted using BLASTP in the Basic Local Alignment Search Tool (BLAST, version 2.12.0+)[90] with an E-value cutoff of 1e-5. Based on the alignment results, homologous dotplots were generated using WGDI[91], and synteny blocks were inferred from the same alignments using MCScanX[92]. Ks values of homologs in synteny blocks were calculated using KaKs_Calulator (version 3.0)[93] and ParaAT (version 2.0)[94] with parameters "-p proc -m mafft -f axt -g -k". Next, the median Ks value for each synteny block was calculated. Collectively, Ks peak counts and synteny blocks in the homologous dotplot were used to infer the number of WGD events.

Identification and classification of gene duplicate pairs

To identify gene duplicates, all protein sequences within a genome were aligned by BLASTP (BLAST, version 2.12.0+) with an E-value cutoff of 1e-5. Furthermore, the best alignment hit of a gene was considered a duplicate pair. If the alignment covered more than 60% of the longer gene (query or subject) and the sequence similarity should exceed 20%. Alternatively, if the alignment covered less than 60% of the longer gene, the alignment had to span at least 105 amino acids and the sequence similarity exceeded 40%. Otherwise, the query and subject genes were regarded as singletons. Based on genomic locations, gene duplicate pairs were classified into four categories: tandem duplicate pair (adjacent genes), proximal duplicate pair (within 10 genetic loci on the same chromosome), dispersed duplicate pair (more than10 gene loci apart on the same chromosome or on different chromosomes), and WGD duplicate pair (located in synteny blocks).

TE annotation

TEs were identified by a combination of *ab initio* and homology-based methods. For *ab initio* prediction, a consensus sequence library was built by

RepeatModeler (version 2.0.6)[95] with parameters "-LTRStruct". LTR_Finder

(version 1.07)[96] / LTR_FINDER_parallel (version 1.1)[97], LTRharvest (version

1.6.6)[98] with parameters "-minlenltr 100 -maxlenltr 7000", and LTR_retriever

(version 2.9.0)[99] were used to build an LTR library. Both libraries were used to

annotate TEs by RepeatMasker (version 4.1.8)[100]. For homology-based

detection, Dfam (version 3.9)[101] was used to identify TEs by RepeatMasker

(version 4.1.8). Collectively, TE annotations obtained from the two methods

above were combined.

Retroposition inference

Evidence for retroposition-mediated gene duplication included intron loss,

polyA enrichment downstream of the 3'UTR, and TEs flanking duplicate pairs.

First, intron loss should satisfy one of following criteria: (1) both genes in

dispersed duplicate pair had no intron; (2) one gene had no intron, while the

other had at least one intron; (3) considering intron retention, one gene had one

intron, while the other had at least one intron; (4) both genes had more than

one intron, differing by more than 10 introns. Second, polyA enrichment

downstream of the 3'UTR (or polyT enrichment upstream of the 5'UTR) was

defined as the presence of at least 8 adenines within each 10-base window.

Genomic annotations were used to detect polyA/T enrichment, considering

regions extending 1,000 base pairs (bp) downstream of the 3'UTR (or upstream

of the 5'UTR). If the 3'UTR (or 5'UTR) of a gene was not annotated, the shortest

3'UTR (or 5'UTR) in the genome was used. If no 3'UTR (or 5'UTR) was

annotated in the genome, the 100-bp region downstream of the stop codon was

taken as the 3'UTR (or the 100-bp region upstream of the start codon was taken

as the 5'UTR). Third, genes with TEs located within 20,000 bp upstream and

downstream were considered flanked by TEs.

Identification of DYW/DYW:KP domain homologs and inference of HGT

To explore HGT of plant DYW/DYW:KP domains, 10,407 protein sequences (hmmsearch score ≥ 30, length ≥ 130 aa) of 68 representative species were obtained (Supplementary Table 8). The NCBI Non-redundant Protein Sequence Database (NR) (acquisition date: 2025.01.19) was used to search these DYW/DYW:KP domain homologs by BLASTP (BLAST, version 2.12.0+) with an E-value cutoff of 1e-5. The searched protein sequences in NR came from 40 lineages (Supplementary Table 9). Homologs exhibiting greater than 20% similarity with plant DYW/DYW:KP domains were retained. To avoid contamination, homologs were required to occur in at least two species of the corresponding lineage. Otherwise, a homolog found in only one species of the lineage had to be found in at least one additional genome assembly.

To construct the phylogenetic tree of plant DYW/DYW:KP domains and their homologs, DYW/DYW:KP domains of six representative species (*P. pearsonii*, *T. lepidozioides*, *I. sinensis*, *A. spinulosa*, *G. montanum*, and *A. trichopoda*) were further selected. DYW domains and their homologs were aligned by MAFFT (version 7.525), and the poor aligned regions were trimmed by trimAl (version 1.5.rev0)[102] with parameters "-gt 0.7 -cons 60 -st 0.1". The phylogenetic tree was inferred by IQ-TREE (version 2.1.2) with parameters "-B 1000 -bnni -m MFP -T AUTO --safe" and visualized by iTOL (version 7)[103]. In addition, multiple sequence alignment of DYW domains from plants and non-plants was conduct by MEGA (version 11)[104] and visualized by Jalview (version 2.11.4.0)[105].

Identification of MORF domain homologs

To identify homologs of plant MORF domains, 334 protein sequences (hmmsearch score ≥ 0, length ≥ 86 aa) from 33 representative species were

obtained (Supplementary Table 13). The NCBI NR was used to search these

MORF domain homologs by BLASTP (BLAST, version 2.12.0+) with an E-value

cutoff of 1e-5. The searched protein sequences in NR came from 45 lineages

(Supplementary Table 9). Homologs exhibiting greater than 20% similarity to

plant MORF domains were retained. The MORF domains and their homologs

were aligned by MAFFT (version 7.525), and the phylogenetic tree was

constructed by FastTree[106] with parameters "-pseudo -gamma", and visualized

by iTOL (version 7).

Phylogenetic analysis of MORF domains

To construct the phylogenetic tree of MORF domains, all MORF domains of

gymnosperms and angiosperms were selected. These domains were aligned

to MORF1~MORF9 in *A. thaliana* to determine their types. Five MORF domain

homologs from non-plants (Dicom.22G070000.1.p, HaB36G042,

Phcar.S3G189600.t1, Phsp.C2G192800.t1, XP_024533311.1), which exhibited

the highest similarity to MORF domains, were used as the outgroup. All MORF

domains, along with the outgroup sequences, were aligned by MAFFT (version

7.525). The phylogenetic tree was inferred with IQ-TREE (version 2.1.2) using

the parameters "-B 1000 -bnni -m MFP -T AUTO" and visualized by iTOL

(version 7)[103].

Analysis of PPR and MORF gene expression

To calculate gene expression, reference genome indexes were built by hisat2-

build in HISAT2 (version 2.0.5)[107] and rsem-prepare-reference in RSEM

(version 1.3.1)[108]. Raw RNA sequencing data were cleaned by fastp (version

0.20.1)[109] with parameters "-q 20 -u 40 -l 15 -g -x -r -W 4 -M 20 -w 12". Strand

specificity was inferred by infer_experiment.py in RSeQC (version 2.6.4)[110].

Reads mapping was conducted by STAR (version 2.7.1a)[111]. Gene expression

matrix was generated by rsem-calculate-expression in RSEM (version 1.3.1)

with parameters "--keep-intermediate-files --time --star --append-names --

output-genome-bam --sort-bam-by-coordinate".

Protein structure prediction and alignment

Protein structures were predicted by ColabFold

(https://colab.research.google.com/github/sokrypton/ColabFold)[112], and

different protein structures were aligned by "Matchmaker" of ChimeraX (version

1.9)[113].

Code availability

Computational scripts for evolutionary analyses of plant RNA editing factors are

available at GitHub (https://github.com/Bioinfo-Ming/PlantEditosomeEvolution).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

These authors would like to thank Shuhui Song, Lina Ma, Zhao Li, Yang Zhang,

Tongtong Zhu, Xing Zheng, Yue Qi, Xinyu Zhou, Yuxin Qin, Zhixiang Yuan and

Zhenxian Han for discussions and advice. This work was supported by grants

from National Natural Science Foundation of China [T2425005 and 32030021]

and International Partnership Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences

[153F11KYSB20160008].

CONTRIBUTOR INFORMATION

Z.Z. conceived, initiated and supervised this study. M.C. wrote the manuscript.

M.C. collected and analyzed the data.

FUNDING

Conflict of interest statement. None declared.

REFERENCES

Takenaka, M., Zehrmann, A., Verbitskiy, D., Haertel, B. & Brennicke, A. RNA editing in plants and its evolution. *Annual Review of Genetics* **47**, 335-352 (2013).

Fujii, S. & Small, I. The evolution of RNA editing and pentatricopeptide repeat genes. *New Phytologist* **191**, 37-47 (2011).

Hu, R. *et al.* Adaptive evolution of the enigmatic Takakia now facing climate change in Tibet. *Cell* **186**, 3558-3576. e3517 (2023).

Small, I. D., Schallenberg‑Rüdinger, M., Takenaka, M., Mireau, H. & Ostersetzer‑Biran, O. Plant organellar RNA editing: what 30 years of research has revealed. *The Plant Journal* **101**, 1040-1056 (2020).

Wang, Y. *et al.* Empty Pericarp21 encodes a novel PPR-DYW protein that is required for mitochondrial RNA editing at multiple sites, complexes I and V biogenesis, and seed development in maize. *PLoS Genetics* **15**, e1008305 (2019).

Sun, Y. K., Gutmann, B., Yap, A., Kindgren, P. & Small, I. Editing of chloroplast rps14 by PPR editing factor EMB2261 is essential for Arabidopsis development. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **9**, 841 (2018).

Li, J. *et al.* The Pentatricopeptide Repeat Protein OsPPR674 Regulates Rice Growth and Drought Sensitivity by Modulating RNA Editing of the Mitochondrial Transcript ccmC. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* **26**, 2646 (2025).

Shi, X., Germain, A., Hanson, M. R. & Bentolila, S. RNA recognition motif-containing protein ORRM4 broadly affects mitochondrial RNA editing and impacts plant development and flowering. *Plant Physiology* **170**, 294-309 (2016).

Yang, Y. *et al.* The RNA editing factor SlORRM4 is required for normal fruit

ripening in tomato. *Plant Physiology* **175**, 1690-1702 (2017).

10   Luo, Z. *et al.* Pentatricopeptide repeat gene-mediated mitochondrial RNA
editing impacts on rice drought tolerance. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **13**,
926285 (2022).

11   Yuan, H. & Liu, D. Functional disruption of the pentatricopeptide protein
SLG1 affects mitochondrial RNA editing, plant development, and
responses to abiotic stresses in Arabidopsis. *The Plant Journal* **70**, 432-
444 (2012).

12   Sun, T., Bentolila, S. & Hanson, M. R. The unexpected diversity of plant
organelle RNA editosomes. *Trends in Plant Science* **21**, 962-973 (2016).

13   Wang, T. & Takenaka, M. The molecular basis and evolution of the
organellar RNA editosome by complementary DYW deaminases in seed
plants. *Plant Physiology* **197**, kiaf142 (2025).

14   Knoop, V. C-to-U and U-to-C: RNA editing in plant organelles and beyond.
Journal of Experimental Botany **74**, 2273-2294 (2023).

15   Yan, J., Zhang, Q. & Yin, P. RNA editing machinery in plant organelles.
Science China Life Sciences **61**, 162-169 (2018).

16   Ichinose, M. & Sugita, M. RNA editing and its molecular mechanism in plant
organelles. *Genes* **8**, 5 (2016).

17   Wang, Y. & Tan, B.-C. Pentatricopeptide repeat proteins in plants: Cellular
functions, action mechanisms, and potential applications. *Plant*
Communications **6** (2025).

18   Yan, J. *et al.* MORF9 increases the RNA-binding activity of PLS-type
pentatricopeptide repeat protein in plastid RNA editing. *Nature Plants* **3**, 1-
8 (2017).

19   Wang, Y. *et al.* Maize PPR-E proteins mediate RNA C-to-U editing in
mitochondria by recruiting the trans deaminase PCW1. *The Plant Cell* **35**,
529-551 (2023).

20 Yang, Y.-Z. *et al.* GRP23 plays a core role in E-type editosomes via interacting with MORFs and atypical PPR-DYWs in Arabidopsis mitochondria. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **119**, e2210978119 (2022).

21 Shi, X., Bentolila, S. & Hanson, M. R. Organelle RNA recognition motif-containing (ORRM) proteins are plastid and mitochondrial editing factors in Arabidopsis. *Plant Signaling & Behavior* **11**, 294-309 (2016).

22 Sun, T. *et al.* An RNA recognition motif-containing protein is required for plastid RNA editing in Arabidopsis and maize. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **110**, E1169-E1178 (2013).

23 Sun, T. *et al.* A zinc finger motif-containing protein is essential for chloroplast RNA editing. *PLoS Genetics* **11**, e1005028 (2015).

24 Gipson, A. B., Hanson, M. R. & Bentolila, S. The RanBP2 zinc finger domains of chloroplast RNA editing factor OZ1 are required for protein–protein interactions and conversion of C to U. *The Plant Journal* **109**, 215-226 (2022).

25 Wang, Z. *et al.* OsOZ1, a zinc finger motif-containing protein, is essential for chloroplast development through RNA editing and intron splicing in rice. *Plant Growth Regulation* **105**, 449-461 (2025).

26 Haag, S. *et al.* Crystal structures of the Arabidopsis thaliana organellar RNA editing factors MORF1 and MORF9. *Nucleic Acids Research* **45**, 4915-4928 (2017).

27 Li, J., Yuan, J., Jing, Y. & Lin, R. MORF proteins: A small family regulating organellar RNA editing and beyond. *Journal of Integrative Plant Biology* (2025).

28 Takenaka, M. *et al.* Multiple organellar RNA editing factor (MORF) family proteins are required for RNA editing in mitochondria and plastids of plants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **109**, 5104-5109 (2012).

29 Sugita, M., Uchiyama, H. & Ichinose, M. RRM and PPR proteins network

as a global regulator for plastid RNA metabolism. *Endocytobiosis Cell Res.*

27, 41-44 (2016).

30 Baudry, K., Monachello, D., Castandet, B., Majeran, W. & Lurin, C.

Dissecting the molecular puzzle of the editosome core in Arabidopsis

organelles. *Plant Science* **344**, 112101 (2024).

31 Shikanai, T. RNA editing in plant organelles: machinery, physiological

function and evolution. *Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences CMLS* **63**, 698-

708 (2006).

32 Gutmann, B. *et al.* The expansion and diversification of pentatricopeptide

repeat RNA-editing factors in plants. *Molecular plant* **13**, 215-230 (2020).

33 Manna, S. An overview of pentatricopeptide repeat proteins and their

applications. *Biochimie* **113**, 93-99 (2015).

34 Manna, S. & Barth, C. Identification of a novel pentatricopeptide repeat

subfamily with a C-terminal domain of bacterial origin acquired via ancient

horizontal gene transfer. *BMC Research Notes* **6**, 525 (2013).

35 Schallenberg-Rüdinger, M., Lenz, H., Polsakiewicz, M., Gott, J. M. & Knoop,

V. A survey of PPR proteins identifies DYW domains like those of land plant

RNA editing factors in diverse eukaryotes. *RNA Biology* **10**, 1549-1556

(2013).

36 Knoop, V. & Rüdinger, M. DYW-type PPR proteins in a heterolobosean

protist: plant RNA editing factors involved in an ancient horizontal gene

transfer? *FEBS Letters* **584**, 4287-4291 (2010).

37 Schaap, P. *et al.* The Physarum polycephalum genome reveals extensive

use of prokaryotic two-component and metazoan-type tyrosine kinase

signaling. *Genome Biology and Evolution* **8**, 109-125 (2016).

38 Manna, S., Brewster, J. & Barth, C. Identification of pentatricopeptide

repeat proteins in the model organism Dictyostelium discoideum.

International Journal of Genomics **2013**, 586498 (2013).

39   Fu, C.-J., Sheikh, S., Miao, W., Andersson, S. G. & Baldauf, S. L. Missing

genes, multiple ORFs, and C-to-U type RNA editing in Acrasis kona

(Heterolobosea, Excavata) mitochondrial DNA. *Genome Biology and*

Evolution **6**, 2240-2257 (2014).

40   Puttick, M. N. *et al.* The interrelationships of land plants and the nature of

the ancestral embryophyte. *Current Biology* **28**, 733-745. e732 (2018).

41   Wu, W. *et al.* Genomic convergence in terrestrial root plants through

tandem duplication in response to soil microbial pressures. *Cell Reports* **43**

(2024).

42   Panchy, N., Lehti-Shiu, M. & Shiu, S.-H. Evolution of gene duplication in

plants. *Plant Physiology* **171**, 2294-2316 (2016).

43   Freeling, M. Bias in plant gene content following different sorts of

duplication: tandem, whole-genome, segmental, or by transposition.

Annual Review of Plant Biology **60**, 433-453 (2009).

44   Wang, X. *et al.* A recent burst of gene duplications in Triticeae. *Plant*

Communications **3** (2022).

45   Feng, X. *et al.* Genomes of multicellular algal sisters to land plants

illuminate signaling network evolution. *Nature Genetics* **56**, 1018-1031

(2024).

46   Zhang, J. *et al.*   (2020).

47   Li, F.-W. *et al.* Anthoceros genomes illuminate the origin of land plants and

the unique biology of hornworts. *Nature Plants* **6**, 259-272 (2020).

48   Schafran, P. *et al.* Pan-phylum genomes of hornworts reveal conserved

autosomes but dynamic accessory and sex chromosomes. *Nature Plants*

11, 49-62 (2025).

49   Li, C. *et al.* Extraordinary preservation of gene collinearity over three

hundred million years revealed in homosporous lycophytes. *Proceedings*

804  *of the National Academy of Sciences* **121**, e2312607121 (2024).

805 50 Cui, J. *et al.* Chromosome-level reference genome of tetraploid Isoetes

806   sinensis provides insights into evolution and adaption of lycophytes.

807   *GigaScience* **12**, giad079 (2023).

808 51 Zhang, C., Gschwend, A. R., Ouyang, Y. & Long, M. Evolution of gene

809   structural complexity: an alternative-splicing-based model accounts for

810   intron-containing retrogenes. *Plant Physiology* **165**, 412-423 (2014).

811 52 Schrader, L. & Schmitz, J. The impact of transposable elements in adaptive

812   evolution. *Molecular Ecology* **28**, 1537-1549 (2019).

813 53 Wu, C. S. & Chaw, S. M. Evolution of mitochondrial RNA editing in extant

814   gymnosperms. *The Plant Journal* **111**, 1676-1687 (2022).

815 54 Hayes, M. L., Giang, K., Berhane, B. & Mulligan, R. M. Identification of two

816   pentatricopeptide repeat genes required for RNA editing and zinc binding

817   by C-terminal cytidine deaminase-like domains. *Journal of Biological*

818   *Chemistry* **288**, 36519-36529 (2013).

819 55 Bolhuis, P. Sampling kinetic protein folding pathways using all-atom models.

820   *Lecture Notes in Physics*, 703, 393-433 (2006).

821 56 Hespeels, B. *et al.* Back to the roots, desiccation and radiation resistances

822   are ancestral characters in bdelloid rotifers. *BMC Biology* **21**, 72 (2023).

823 57 Wang, W., Yang, Y., Örstan, A., He, Z. & Wang, Q. Species diversity of

824   bdelloid rotifer (Rotifera, Bdelloidea) in different areas in China, with a

825   description of two new species. *ZooKeys* **1229**, 1 (2025).

826 58 Jain, S. C., Shinde, U., Li, Y., Inouye, M. & Berman, H. M. The crystal

827   structure of an autoprocessed Ser221Cys-subtilisin E-propeptide complex

828   at 2.0 Å resolution. *Journal of Molecular Biology* **284**, 137-144 (1998).

829 59 Li, Y., Hu, Z., Jordan, F. & Inouye, M. Functional Analysis of the Propeptide

830   of Subtilisin E as an Intramolecular Chaperone for Protein Folding:

831   Refolding And Inhibitory Abilities of Propeptide Mutants (∗). *Journal of*

Biological Chemistry **270**, 25127-25132 (1995).

60 Arendsee, Z. W., Li, L. & Wurtele, E. S. Coming of age: orphan genes in
plants. *Trends in Plant Science* **19**, 698-708 (2014).

61 Li, L. *et al.* Identification of the novel protein QQS as a component of the
starch metabolic network in Arabidopsis leaves. *The Plant Journal* **58**, 485-
498 (2009).

62 Xie, L. *et al.* Technology-enabled great leap in deciphering plant genomes.
Nature Plants **10**, 551-566 (2024).

63 Searing, A. M., Satyanarayan, M. B., O′Donnell, J. P. & Lu, Y. Two
organelle RNA recognition motif proteins affect distinct sets of RNA editing
sites in the Arabidopsis thaliana plastid. *Plant Direct* **4**, e00213 (2020).

64 Shi, X., Hanson, M. R. & Bentolila, S. Two RNA recognition motif-containing
proteins are plant mitochondrial editing factors. *Nucleic Acids Research* **43**,
3814-3825 (2015).

65 Lombana, J. M., Hanson, M. R. & Bentolila, S. Deciphering the role of
accessory proteins in Arabidopsis chloroplast editosomes via interaction
with a synthetic PPR-PLS factor in E. coli. *Nucleic Acids Research* **53**,
gkaf483 (2025).

66 Liang, Z. & Schnable, J. C. Functional divergence between subgenomes
and gene pairs after whole genome duplications. *Molecular Plant* **11**, 388-
397 (2018).

67 Takenaka, M. *et al.* DYW domain structures imply an unusual regulation
principle in plant organellar RNA editing catalysis. *Nature catalysis* **4**, 510-
522 (2021).

68 Rüdinger, M., Fritz-Laylin, L., Polsakiewicz, M. & Knoop, V. Plant-type
mitochondrial RNA editing in the protist Naegleria gruberi. *RNA* **17**, 2058-
2062 (2011).

69 Yang, J., Harding, T., Kamikawa, R., Simpson, A. G. & Roger, A. J.

Mitochondrial genome evolution and a novel RNA editing system in deep-
branching heteroloboseids. *Genome Biology and Evolution* **9**, 1161-1174
(2017).

70 Su, H.-G. *et al.* Genome-wide analysis of the DYW subgroup PPR gene
family and identification of GmPPR4 responses to drought stress.
International Journal of Molecular Sciences **20**, 5667 (2019).

71 Cui, X. *et al.* The RNA editing factor DUA 1 is crucial to chloroplast
development at low temperature in rice. *New Phytologist* **221**, 834-849
(2019).

72 Huang, C. *et al.* The PPR protein RARE1-mediated editing of chloroplast
accD transcripts is required for fatty acid biosynthesis and heat tolerance
in Arabidopsis. *Plant Communications* **4** (2023).

73 Zhang, L. *et al.* Rapid evolution of protein diversity by de novo origination
in Oryza. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **3**, 679-690 (2019).

74 Enright, A. J., Iliopoulos, I., Kyrpides, N. C. & Ouzounis, C. A. Protein
interaction maps for complete genomes based on gene fusion events.
Nature **402**, 86-90 (1999).

75 Marcotte, E. M., Pellegrini, M., Thompson, M. J., Yeates, T. O. & Eisenberg,
D. A combined algorithm for genome-wide prediction of protein function.
Nature **402**, 83-86 (1999).

76 Manni, M., Berkeley, M. R., Seppey, M., Simão, F. A. & Zdobnov, E. M.
BUSCO update: novel and streamlined workflows along with broader and
deeper phylogenetic coverage for scoring of eukaryotic, prokaryotic, and
viral genomes. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **38**, 4647-4654 (2021).

77 Emms, D. M. & Kelly, S. OrthoFinder: phylogenetic orthology inference for
comparative genomics. *Genome Biology* **20**, 1-14 (2019).

78 Katoh, K. & Standley, D. M. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software
version 7: improvements in performance and usability. *Molecular Biology*

and Evolution **30**, 772-780 (2013).

79   Criscuolo, A. & Gribaldo, S. BMGE (Block Mapping and Gathering with
Entropy): a new software for selection of phylogenetic informative regions
from multiple sequence alignments. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* **10**, 1-21
(2010).

80   Minh, B. Q. *et al.* IQ-TREE 2: new models and efficient methods for
phylogenetic inference in the genomic era. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*
37, 1530-1534 (2020).

81   Mirarab, S. *et al.* ASTRAL: genome-scale coalescent-based species tree
estimation. *Bioinformatics* **30**, i541-i548 (2014).

82   Eddy, S. Sequence analysis using profile hidden Markov models.
http://hmmer. wustl. edu (2004).

83   Meng, L. *et al.* PPR proteins in plants: Roles, mechanisms, and prospects
for rice research. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **15**, 1416742 (2024).

84   Mistry, J. *et al.* Pfam: The protein families database in 2021. *Nucleic Acids*
Research **49**, D412-D419 (2021).

85   Blum, M. *et al.* InterPro: the protein sequence classification resource in
2025. *Nucleic Acids Research* **53**, D444-D456 (2025).

86   Ødum, M. T. *et al.* DeepLoc 2.1: multi-label membrane protein type
prediction using protein language models. *Nucleic Acids Research* **52**,
W215-W220 (2024).

87   Armenteros, J. J. A. *et al.* Detecting sequence signals in targeting peptides
using deep learning. *Life Science Alliance* **2** (2019).

88   Sahu, S. S., Loaiza, C. D. & Kaundal, R. Plant-mSubP: a computational
framework for the prediction of single-and multi-target protein subcellular
localization using integrated machine-learning approaches. *AoB Plants* **12**,
plz068 (2020).

89   Sperschneider, J. *et al.* LOCALIZER: subcellular localization prediction of

both plant and effector proteins in the plant cell. *Scientific Reports* **7**, 44598

(2017).

90 Camacho, C. *et al.* BLAST+: architecture and applications. *BMC*

Bioinformatics **10**, 1-9 (2009).

91 Sun, P. *et al.* WGDI: a user-friendly toolkit for evolutionary analyses of

whole-genome duplications and ancestral karyotypes. *Molecular Plant* **15**,

1841-1851 (2022).

92 Wang, Y. *et al.* MCScanX: a toolkit for detection and evolutionary analysis

of gene synteny and collinearity. *Nucleic Acids Research* **40**, e49-e49

(2012).

93 Zhang, Z. KaKs_Calculator 3.0: calculating selective pressure on coding

and non-coding sequences. *Genomics, Proteomics and Bioinformatics* **20**,

536-540 (2022).

94 Zhang, Z. *et al.* ParaAT: a parallel tool for constructing multiple protein-

coding DNA alignments. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research*

Communications **419**, 779-781 (2012).

95 Flynn, J. M. *et al.* RepeatModeler2 for automated genomic discovery of

transposable element families. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*

Sciences **117**, 9451-9457 (2020).

96 Xu, Z. & Wang, H. LTR_FINDER: an efficient tool for the prediction of full-

length LTR retrotransposons. *Nucleic Acids Research* **35**, W265-W268

(2007).

97 Ou, S. & Jiang, N. LTR_FINDER_parallel: parallelization of LTR_FINDER

enabling rapid identification of long terminal repeat retrotransposons.

Mobile DNA **10**, 48 (2019).

98 Ellinghaus, D., Kurtz, S. & Willhoeft, U. LTRharvest, an efficient and flexible

software for de novo detection of LTR retrotransposons. *BMC*

Bioinformatics **9**, 1-14 (2008).

99 Ou, S. & Jiang, N. LTR_retriever: a highly accurate and sensitive program

for identification of long terminal repeat retrotransposons. *Plant Physiology*

176, 1410-1422 (2018).

100 Chen, N. Using RepeatMasker to identify repetitive elements in genomic

sequences. *Current Protocols in Bioinformatics* **5**, 4.10. 11-14.10. 14 (2004).

101 Storer, J., Hubley, R., Rosen, J., Wheeler, T. J. & Smit, A. F. The Dfam

community resource of transposable element families, sequence models,

and genome annotations. *Mobile DNA* **12**, 2 (2021).

102 Capella-Gutiérrez, S., Silla-Martínez, J. M. & Gabaldón, T. trimAl: a tool for

automated alignment trimming in large-scale phylogenetic analyses.

Bioinformatics **25**, 1972-1973 (2009).

103 Letunic, I. & Bork, P. Interactive Tree of Life (iTOL) v6: recent updates to

the phylogenetic tree display and annotation tool. *Nucleic Acids Research*

52, W78-W82 (2024).

104 Tamura, K., Stecher, G. & Kumar, S. MEGA11: molecular evolutionary

genetics analysis version 11. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **38**, 3022-

3027 (2021).

105 Procter, J. B. *et al.* Alignment of biological sequences with Jalview. *Methods*

in Molecular Biology **2231**, 203-224 (2021).

106 Price, M. N., Dehal, P. S. & Arkin, A. P. FastTree 2–approximately

maximum-likelihood trees for large alignments. *PloS One* **5**, e9490 (2010).

107 Kim, D., Paggi, J. M., Park, C., Bennett, C. & Salzberg, S. L. Graph-based

genome alignment and genotyping with HISAT2 and HISAT-genotype.

Nature Biotechnology **37**, 907-915 (2019).

108 Li, B. & Dewey, C. N. RSEM: accurate transcript quantification from RNA-

Seq data with or without a reference genome. *BMC Bioinformatics* **12**, 1-

16 (2011).

109 Chen, S., Zhou, Y., Chen, Y. & Gu, J. fastp: an ultra-fast all-in-one FASTQ

preprocessor. *Bioinformatics* **34**, i884-i890 (2018).

110 Wang, L., Wang, S. & Li, W. RSeQC: quality control of RNA-seq

experiments. *Bioinformatics* **28**, 2184-2185 (2012).

111 Dobin, A. *et al.* STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics*

29, 15-21 (2013).

112 Mirdita, M. *et al.* ColabFold: making protein folding accessible to all. *Nature*

Methods **19**, 679-682 (2022).

113 Meng, E. C. *et al.* UCSF ChimeraX: Tools for structure building and analysis.

Protein Science **32**, e4792 (2023).

Figures

Figure 1

 Figure 1 The evolutionary landscape of PPR, MORF, ORRM, and OZ genes

 across Archaeplastida. (A) Species tree of 364 Archaeplastida, including

 glaucophytes (*n*=1), rhodophytes (*n*=7), prasinodermophytes (*n*=1),

987   chlorophytes (n=33), charophytes (n=7), hornworts (n=22), mosses (n=13),

988   liverworts (n=4), lycophytes (n=6), ferns (n=5), gymnosperms (n=13), and

989   angiosperms (n=262). Distribution of **(B)** PPR, **(C)** MORF, **(D)** ORRM, and **(E)**

990   OZ gene counts across Archaeplastida lineages. *P. cablin* simultaneously

991   possess numerous MORF, ORRM, and OZ genes, as well as PPR genes.

Figure 2

Figure 2. Mechanisms of PPR gene expansions. (A) Numbers of PPR genes
(original and duplicated) arising from WGD, TD, PD, and DD in seven
representative species (*A. agrestis*, *N. orbicularis*, *P. pearsonii*, *P. phymatodes*,
T. lepidozioides, *I. sinensis*, and *H. asiatica*) and one outgroup (*Z.
circumcarinatum*). One red five-pointed star denotes one whole genome
duplication. WGD: Whole Genome Duplication, TD: Tandem Duplication, PD:
Proximal Duplication, DD: Dispersed Duplication. **(B)** Percentage of intronless
DD PPR gene pairs. Numbers to the left and right of the colon indicate intron

1003 DD PPR genes in each pair. Categories "0:0", "0:n", "1:n", and "n:n (difference >

1004 10)" denote intron loss in DD PPR gene pairs. Percentages of intronless DD

1005 PPR gene pairs with **(C)** polyA tails and **(D)** flanked by LTRs. Examples of **(E)**

1006 E2 and **(F)** DYW subgroup DD PPR gene pairs flanked by highly similar

1007 LTR/Copia and LTR/Gypsy, respectively.

1008

1009   **Figure 3**

Non-plant cluster 2 (Metazoa: rotifers)

Non-plant cluster 3

1,151 DYW and 356 DYW:KP domains in plants

1,754 homologs in non-plants

Non-plant cluster 4 (Metazoa: rotifers)

Non-plant cluster 1

Non-plant	Alveolata	Amoebozoa	Discoba	Fungi	Haptista	Metazoa	Rhizaria
Plant	Mosses	Hornworts	Lycophytes	Ferns	Gymnosperms	Angiosperms	
DYW type	DYWs	DYW:KPs	Homologs				

1010

1011   **Figure 3. Phylogenetic tree of DYW and DYW:KP domains in plants and**

1012   **their non-plant homologs.**

1013

Figure 4

Figure 4. Comparison, expression, and HGT of DYW domains and their

non-plant homologs. (A) Sequence alignments between DYW domains and

their non-plant homologs. Amino acid residues in rectangles denote PG box,

HxE(x)nCxxC, and DYW tripeptide. **(B)** Protein structure alignment between

DYW domain (protein ID: Tle1c03524.1) in *T. lepidozioides* and its homolog

(protein ID: UJR34389.1) in the rotifer *A. vage*. **(C)** Expression of PPR genes

in whole tissues of *A. vage*. TPM: Transcripts Per Million. **(D)** Expression of

DYW subgroup PPR genes in *T. lepidozioides* under control condition, and after

2-hour UV irradiation treatment with 0, 6, 12, and 24-hour recovery. **(E)**

Proposed model of DYW subgroup PPR gene transfer from mosses (e.g. *T.*

lepidozioides) to rotifers (e.g. *A. vage*).

1027

1028 **Figure 5**

1029

Figure 5. Homology between MORF and PA domains and MORF domain

phylogeny. (A) Phylogenetic tree of MORF and PA domains. **(B)** Sequence

and **(C)** structure alignments between MORF3 domain (protein ID:

Pd03G21970A) of *Pinus densiflora* and its homolog PA domain (protein ID:

XP_018897422.1) of *B. tabaci*. **(D)** Phylogenetic tree of MORF1~MORF9

domains in angiosperms and gymnosperms. Five PA domains (protein IDs:

Dicom.22G070000.1.p, HaB36G042, Phcar.S3G189600.t1,

Phsp.C2G192800.t1, and XP_024533311.1) showing highest similarity to

MORF domains are used as outgroups.

1039

1040   **Figure 6**

1041

Figure 6. Reclassification and diversification of PPR accessory proteins.

(A) Reclassified MORF proteins based on domain compositions. Blue and

green bars represent MORF1~MORF9 and other domains, respectively. SP-

MORF: Single-Pure MORF, SM-MORF: Single-Mixed MORF; MP-MORF:

Multiple-Pure MORF; MM-MORF: Multiple-Mixed MORF. **(B)** Phylogenetic tree

of reclassified MORF proteins in angiosperms and gymnosperms. **(C)** Fusions

among PPR, MORF, RRM, and RanBP2 Znf domains/motifs. Numbers in

parentheses indicate domain counts. The proteins marked with solid and

dashed arrows are localized to mitochondria/plastids and other subcellular

compartments, respectively.

1052

1053 **Figure 7**

1054 Low   High

1055 **Figure 7. Proposed model for the evolutionary diversification of plant RNA**

1056 **editosome.** Editosome composition varies from hornworts to angiosperms,

1057 driving increased RNA editing efficiency.