Expression of *SULTR2;2* in the Arabidopsis bundle sheath is mediated by a highly conserved positive regulator

Sandra Kirschner[1*], Helen Woodfield[2*], Katharina Prusko[1], Maria Koczor[1], Udo Gowik[1#], Julian M. Hibberd[2§], Peter Westhoff[1§]

[1]Institute for Plant Molecular and Developmental Biology, Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, Universitätsstraße 1, D-40225 Düsseldorf, Germany.

[2]Department of Plant Sciences, University of Cambridge, Downing Street, Cambridge CB2 3EA, United Kingdom.

[#]Present Address: Institute for Biology and Environmental Science (IBU), Plant Evolutionary Genetics, Carl von Ossietzky University Oldenburg, Germany

[*] Joint first authors

[§] For correspondence

Email addresses:

SK - sandra.kirschner@hhu.de

HW - hkwoodfield@gmail.com

KP - katharina.prusko@hhu.de

MK - maria.koczor@hhu.de

UG - udo.gowik@uni-oldenburg.de

JMH - jmh65@cam.ac.uk

PW - west@hhu.de

Keywords: *SULTR2.2*, Bundle sheath, gene expression, C_3 photosynthesis, *Arabidopsis thaliana*, *Flaveria bidentis*

Abstract

The bundle sheath provides a conduit linking veins and mesophyll cells. In C_3 *Arabidopsis thaliana*

it also plays important roles in oxidative stress and sulphur metabolism. However, the mechanisms

responsible for the patterns of gene expression that underpin these metabolic specialisations are

poorly understood. Here we used the *A. thaliana SULTR2;2* gene as a model to better understand

mechanisms that restrict expression to the bundle sheath. Deletion analysis indicated that the

SULTR2;2 promoter contains a short region necessary for expression in the bundle sheath. This

sequence acts as a positive regulator and is tolerant to multiple consecutive deletions indicating

considerable redundancy in the *cis*-elements involved. It is highly conserved in *SULTR2;2* genes of

the Brassicaceae and is functional in the distantly related C_4 species *Flaveria bidentis* that belongs

to the Asteraceae. We conclude that expression of *SULTR2;2* in the bundle sheath is underpinned

by a highly redundant sequence that likely represents an ancient and conserved mechanism found

in families as diverse as the Asteraceae and Brassicaceae.

Introduction

The evolution of multicellularity is associated with individual cell-types being able to undertake

specialised roles within a tissue. In leaves, bundle sheath (BS) cells form a wreath-like structure

around the vasculature that appears analogous to the endodermis of roots (Esau, 1965). The role of

BS cells is best characterized in C_4 species that partition photosynthesis between the BS and

mesophyll cells. In most C_4 plants, after HCO_3^- is initially fixed into C_4 acids by phospho*enol*pyruvate

carboxylase in mesophyll cells, these C_4 acids then diffuse to the BS where CO_2 is released and

refixed by Ribulose-1,5-Bisphosphate Carboxylase/Oxygenase (RuBisCO). Decarboxylation of C_4

acids in the BS generates a high concentration of CO_2 around RuBisCO that suppresses the

oxygenase activity of the enzyme and in so doing reduces photorespiration (Hatch, 1987). Thus, in

C_4 species, the BS is specialized to allow efficient fixation of CO_2 in the Calvin-Benson-Bassham

cycle. In some C_4 plants, the BS is also modified in terms of light capture. For example, in maize and

sorghum Photosystem II does not fully assemble in the BS (Kubicki *et al.*, 1994) but components of

cyclic electron transport are more abundant in the BS compared with mesophyll cells (Takabayashi

et al., 2005). In addition to these changes associated with photosynthesis, the C_4 BS is also modified

to preferentially undertake starch synthesis and degradation, as well as the initial steps of sulphur

assimilation (Friso *et al.*, 2004).

In C_3 plants, the role of the BS is less clearly defined. It is thought to help maintain hydraulic

integrity of the xylem (Sade *et al.*, 2014), regulate flux of metabolites in and out of the leaf (Leegood,

2008) and act as a starch store (Miyake and Maeda, 1976). The C_3 BS is less important for

photosynthesis than that of C_4 species. However, although only around 15% of all chloroplasts of

the C_3 leaf are found in bundle sheath cells (Kinsman and Pyke, 1998), reducing photosynthesis in

these cells compromises growth and seed production (Janacek *et al.*, 2009). Thus, although less

photosynthetic than the C_4 BS, this physiological analysis indicates that the BS of C_3 plants is also

specialized. This notion is consistent with analysis of gene expression in this cell type. For example

quantification of transcripts available for translation indicate that the *A. thaliana* BS is likely important

in sulphur metabolism, glucosinolate biosynthesis, trehalose metabolism and detoxification of active

oxygen species (Aubry *et al.*, 2014). In summary, in both C_3 and C_4 plants mechanisms must operate

to restrict the expression of some genes to BS cells.

To date, most studies of the mechanisms responsible for preferential gene expression in the BS

have occurred in C_4 species (Hibberd and Covshoff, 2010). In the C_4 dicotyledon *Flaveria trinervia*

the glycine decarboxylase P-subunit (*GLDPA*) gene contains two promoters, one proximal to the

coding region, and the other more distal. Activity of the distal promoter is high but not cell-type

specific. However, in the presence of the proximal promoter, transcripts derived from the distal

promoter are degraded in mesophyll cells by nonsense-mediated RNA decay of incompletely spliced

transcripts (Engelmann *et al.*, 2008; Wiludda *et al.*, 2012). Despite the phylogenetic distance

between the Brassicaceae and the Asteraceae the *GLDPA* promoter from *F. trinervia* is able to

generate BS-specific activity in C_3 *A. thaliana* (Engelmann *et al.*, 2008; Wiludda *et al.*, 2012). In

Amaranthus hybridus 5' and 3' untranslated regions of the *RbcS1* gene act to restrict accumulation

of the glucoronidase (GUS) reporter to the BS of C_4 *F. bidentis* and appear to function as enhancers

of translation (Patel *et al.*, 2006). Lastly, in C_4 *Gynandropsis gynandra* preferential expression of

NAD-ME1&2 genes in the BS is associated with coding sequence rather than UTRs or promoter

elements (Brown *et al.*, 2011). The motifs underpinning this regulation are a pair of duons that play

a dual role in coding for amino acids as well as the spatial patterning of gene expression associated

with the C_4 leaf. Although these duons are present in C_3 *A. thaliana* and many other land plants they

do not act to generate cell-specific expression in the ancestral C_3 state (Brown *et al.*, 2011; Reyna-

Llorens *et al.*, 2016). In summary, current evidence indicates that gene expression in the BS of C_4

species is controlled by a variety of mechanisms, some of which involve regulatory codes that are

derived from the ancestral C_3 state.

However, our understanding of how gene expression is restricted to the BS in C_3 species is poor.

A small number of promoters including *SHORT-ROOT* (Dhondt *et al.*, 2010), *SCARECROW*

(Wysocka-Diller *et al.*, 2000) and *SULTR2;2* (Takahashi *et al.*, 2000) have been reported to drive

BS specific expression in *A. thaliana,* but the molecular nature of *cis*-regulatory elements controlling

their expression is unclear. An increased understanding of these processes would not only advance

our understanding of mechanisms underpinning cell specific gene expression in multicellular leaves,

but also provide insight into whether C_4 gene expression is built on pre-existing mechanisms found

in C_3 species.

To better understand mechanisms associated with gene expression in BS cells of C_3 *A. thaliana*

we analysed the *SULTR2;2* gene that encodes a low-affinity sulphur transporter (Takahashi *et al.*,

2000). Elements in the promoter sequence that regulate the spatial patterning, and the strength of

gene expression were identified. Specifically, preferential expression in the BS is mediated by a

repetitive region that is highly conserved within orthologous genes from species of the Brassicaceae.

This region acts to enhance expression in the BS rather than repressing expression in mesophyll

cells. Furthermore, the *SULTR2;2* promoter from *A. thaliana* generates BS specificity in the C_4

species *F. bidentis* that belongs to the Asteraceae. The most parsimonious explanation for this

finding is that a common transcription factor is shared by these phylogenetically dispersed species,

and that it functions in both the C_3 and C_4 BS.

Results

Nucleotides -2815 to +123 relative to the predicted *SULTR2;2* translational start site have

previously been reported to generate expression in the BS of *A. thaliana* (Takahashi *et al.*, 2000).

We confirmed this finding (Figure 1A-C). To test if sequence after the predicted start codon is

required for expression in the BS a construct that terminated at nucleotide -1 relative to the predicted

translational start was generated (Figure 1D). Staining showed that each construct led to strong

accumulation of GUS in the BS of mature rosette leaves (Figure 1B,C,E,F). Staining was evident in

vascular tissue as well as the BS but there was no evidence that GUS accumulated in mesophyll or

epidermal cells from either construct (Figure 1B,C,E,F). Promoter activity was quantified using the

MUG fluorimetric assay. GUS activity driven by the construct that contained 603 fewer base pairs at

the 5' end but an additional 123 nucleotides of coding sequence was about tenfold higher (Figure

1G). This difference could either be due to a negative regulator located between -3418 and -2185

nucleotides, or a positive regulator in sequence downstream of the predicted translational start site.

A translational fusion between the yellow fluorescent protein (YFP) and the nuclear localized Histone

2B protein under control of the *SULTR2;2* promoter (Figure 1H) labelled nuclei of BS cells and

vascular tissue (Figure 1I) and indicated that the presence of GUS in the BS was due to gene

expression and not diffusion of the dye outwards from to vascular tissue. Consistent with previous

reports (Chytilova *et al.*, 1999) it was noticeable that vascular nuclei were elongated and rod-like

compared with the more spherical ones in the BS (Figure 1I). We conclude that elements between

nucleotides -2815 and the translational start site of *SULTR2;2* are sufficient to drive gene expression

in vascular and BS cells of *A. thaliana*.

A short region that is necessary and sufficient to activate gene expression in the BS

To better understand the sequences responsible for generating expression in BS cells, a 5'

deletion series was generated (Figure 2A). Each of the deleted regions are hereafter referred to as

regions 1 to 5. Removal of region 1 had no significant effect on either activity or spatial accumulation

of GUS (Figure 2A&C) indicating that no essential *cis*-regulatory elements are located within this

section. Deletion of region 2 resulted in total loss of GUS activity and staining (Figure 2A&D), and

removal of regions 3 and 4 had no further effect (Figure 2A, E&F). These data therefore indicate that

nucleotides in region 1 do not impact on promoter activity, but that region 2 is necessary for BS

expression in mature leaves. A separate deletion series involving slightly smaller regions supported

this conclusion, with expression in the BS being lost once nucleotides between -1813 and -1335

were deleted (Supplementary Figure 1).

The lack GUS accumulation in the BS and loss of promoter activity once region 2 is removed

could be because this region contains *cis*-elements that generate expression specifically in BS cells

or because it drives ubiquitous expression but regions 3 to 5 contain elements that restrict activity to

the BS. To investigate this possibility, 5' rapid amplification of cDNA ends was first used to define

the transcriptional start site of *SULTR2;2* (Supplemental Figure 2). No single strong transcription

start site was detected but rather multiple transcripts were initiated from position -125 onwards

(Supplementary Figure 2). Nucleotides spanning -349 to -1 were therefore considered likely to be

sufficient for transcriptional initiation and are hereafter referred to as the core promoter. Fusion of

region 2 to this core promoter led to MUG conversion that was comparable to that from the full-length

promoter (Figure 3A and Figure 2A) and was also sufficient to direct accumulation of GUS to veins

and the BS (Figure 3B). To exclude the possibility that the core promoter includes *cis*-elements

necessary for BS-specific expression, region 2 was also fused to the minimal CaMV35S promoter

which does not drive significant expression. Although this led to fourfold lower GUS activity than the

full-length promoter (Figure 3A) GUS accumulation was still restricted to veins and the BS (Figure

3C). We conclude that although nucleotides -349 to -1 are not able to generate expression in the BS

(Figure 2F), they likely represent the core promoter of *SULTR2;2*. In contrast, nucleotides -2053 to

-1312 are sufficient to restrict expression to the BS and vascular tissue of *A. thaliana*.

***AtSULTR2;2* contains multiple redundant sequences mediating BS expression**

Having established that nucleotides -2053 to -1312 relative to the predicted translational start

site are both necessary and sufficient for BS expression, an unbiased approach to further dissect

this region was adopted. Ten consecutive deletions were made to this region and each fused to the

core promoter of *SULTR2;2* (Figure 4A). Strikingly, none of these deletions resulted in total loss of

GUS activity (Figure 4A), nor was GUS staining lost from the BS (Figure 4B-K) indicating that despite

an absence of repeated *cis*-elements in this region significant functional redundancy in regulatory

elements must mediate BS-specific expression. However, it was notable that GUS activity declined

to varying degrees compared with the intact region (Figure 4A), suggesting that either these

redundant *cis*-elements act additively, or that this region contains quantitative elements regulating

gene expression.

To better understand the extent to which *cis*-elements in this section of the promoter act

redundantly, larger deletions were made from position -2053 (Figure 5A). This generated five

regions, hereafter referred to as sub-regions 2.1 to 2.5. Deletion of sub-region 2.1 resulted in a strong

reduction of GUS activity (Figure 5A) but BS-specific accumulation of GUS was maintained (Figure

5C). This finding implies that sub-region 2.1 contains a quantitative enhancer element. Deleting sub-

region 2.2 had no clear additional impact on either BS-specificity or activity (Figure 5A&D). However,

the subsequent deletion of sub-regions 2.3 and 2.4 caused loss of GUS activity and also loss of

GUS staining in BS and vascular tissue (Figure 5A,E&F). These data indicate that *cis*-regulatory

elements mediating BS expression are situated in sub-region 2.3, or that quantitative elements in

this region mask qualitative elements in distal sub-regions. To address these options, 3' deletions of

region 2 were also created (Figure 5G). As sub-regions 2.1 and 2.2 had little impact on BS

expression, the last three sub-regions were fused to the minimal CaMV35S promoter. Expression

from each of these three constructs was low (Figure 5G) however BS expression could be observed

from the construct containing sub-regions 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 (Figure 5H). Removal of sub-region 2.5

resulted in loss of GUS in rosette leaves although cotyledons still showed patchy staining restricted

to the BS and vascular tissue (Figure 5I). Once sub-region 2.4 was removed GUS activity was further

reduced and GUS staining was no longer detectable even in seedlings (Figure 5G&J). We conclude

that sub-regions 2.3 and 2.4, which contain a total of 350 base pairs, contain *cis*-regulatory elements

necessary for BS expression of *AtSULTR2;2*.

The *cis*-regulatory elements necessary for BS-specific expression of *AtSULTR2;2* appear to be

located in a 350 nucleotide region of the promoter. As finer-scale deletions had failed to identify the

exact *cis*-elements responsible for this phenotype (Figure 4) a phylogenetic approach was

undertaken. Orthologues of *AtSULTR2;2* were identified from seven species of the Brassicaceae.

Alignments of sequences 5 kb upstream of each orthologue indicated that with the exception of *A.*

lyrata that contains a 446 nucleotide insertion, region 2 is highly conserved (Figure 6). However, no

short sequences or motifs within this sequence that may restrict expression to the BS could be

identified (Figure 6). Although the results of this alignment therefore do not identify a specific *cis-*

element that could be bound by a transcription factor responsible for generating BS expression, they

do support the functional analysis and implicate the whole of region 2 as a critical component of the

SULTR2;2 promoter for BS expression.

The *AtSULTR2;2* promoter is capable of driving BS specific expression in C$_4$ *Flaveria bidentis*

As the *GLDPA* promoter from the C$_4$ species *F. trinervia* is able to confer BS specific expression

in C$_3$ *A. thaliana* (Engelmann *et al.*, 2008) we next tested whether the *A. thaliana SULTR2;2* promoter

would lead to BS expression in C$_4$ *F. bidentis*. GUS activity in transgenic *F. bidentis* plants was about

fourfold higher than that in *A. thaliana* (Figure 7A&B). However, histochemical analysis of mature

leaves revealed a very similar expression pattern to that in *A. thaliana* with strong GUS accumulation

in BS and vascular tissue but not in mesophyll cells (Figure 7C*)*. This indicates that transcription

factors from *F. bidentis* recognise BS *cis*-regulatory elements from the Brassicaceae. The most

parsimonious explanation for this finding is that these sequences represent part of an ancient and

conserved mechanism that restricts gene expression to BS cells of dicotyledenous leaves.

Discussion

***SULTR2;2* contains a short region that activates expression in the bundle sheath**

SULTR2;2 encodes a low affinity transporter that facilitates movement of sulphate from the

vascular bundle to palisade cells in the leaf (Takahashi *et al.*, 2000). Consistent with this function,

analysis of both GUS and the histone2B::YFP fusion indicated that the *SULTR2;2* promoter directs

expression to veins as well as to BS cells. It was notable that none of the various deletions we made

to this promoter led to expression being restricted to either veins or bundle sheath cells. The *GLDPA*

promoter from *F. trinervia* also drives expression in both veins and BS cells of *A. thaliana*

(Engelmann *et al.*, 2008). These findings therefore imply that the *SULTR2;2* and *GLDP* genes may

be controlled by gene regulatory networks that are shared by these cell-types. It is possible that

these cell-types share some gene regulatory networks because they are derived from the same

lineage (Dengler and Nelson, 1999; Soros and Dengler, 2001).

Within the *SULTR2;2* promoter, one specific region that impacted on gene expression in the BS

was identified. This sequence, consisting of 350 nucleotides, is both necessary and sufficient for

restricting expression to this cell-type. Small consecutive deletions within this region failed to abolish

this spatial patterning implying that multiple contiguous elements act redundantly to generate strong

and stable expression in the BS. The only detectable impact of deleting any part of this region was

for strength of expression to be reduced. We therefore propose that either multiple independent BS

modules contained within this region act additively, or that distinct quantitative elements are co-

located, and at least partially overlapping with, *cis*-elements that determine this cell-specificity.

Redundancy of this sort has previously been reported for the promoter of *Phenylalanine Ammonia*

*Lyase*2 that drives xylem-specific expression in tobacco (Leyva *et al.*, 1992; Hatton *et al.*, 1995),

DORNRÖSCHEN-LIKE of *A. thaliana* that contains three functionally redundant enhancers (Comelli

et al., 2016), and *EVEN-SKIPPED (EVE)* from *Drosophila melanogaster* where a minimal enhancer

is sufficient to direct expression of *EVE* to the second stripe, but surrounding binding sites increase

the robustness of this patterning during genetic and environmental perturbations (Ludwig *et al.*,

2011). Thus, although the exact role of redundancy in the regulation of *SULTR2;2* in the BS is

unclear, it may also increase robustness in the control of gene expression during environmental

perturbations, and/or increase patterning precision (Barolo, 2012; Payne and Wagner, 2015).

Compared with other examples of elements that restrict gene expression to BS cells of C_3

species, this single block of sequence from *SULTR2;2* that acts as a positive regulator of

transcription appears to operate via relatively simple mechanisms. For example, the *F. trinervia*

GLDPA generates BS-specific expression (Engelmann *et al.*, 2008) because of a complex interplay

between transcriptional and post-transcriptional processes. These are mediated by distal and

proximal sequences relative to the translational start site, leading to repression of *GLDP* expression

in mesophyll cells (Wiludda *et al.*, 2012). We therefore propose that the positive regulator located

upstream of *SULTR2;2* could be used as a synthetic module to manipulate or engineer processes

in BS of *A. thaliana*.

The bundle sheath element of *SULTR2;2* is conserved in the Brassicaceae and functional in

the Asteraceae

Alignment of *SULTR2;2* promoters from multiple species of the Brassicaceae did not reveal an

individual shared *cis*-element but rather highlighted sequence that was conserved across the whole

of region 2. This sequence conservation argues for relatively strong purifying selection compared

with the rest of the *SULTR2;2* promoter and also implies that this region may function as part of a

widely conserved positive regulator of gene expression in the BS of the Brassicaceae. Consistent

with this proposal and indicating that these regulatory elements may be even more ancient, when

the *SULTR2;2* promoter was placed into the phylogenetically distant C_4 species *F. bidentis* it was

also recognized by *trans*-factors that restricted gene expression to the C_4 BS. This is analogous to

the behavior of the *GLDPA* promoter from C_4 *F. trinervia* which is able to restrict expression to the

BS of *A. thaliana* (Engelmann *et al.*, 2008; Wiludda *et al.*, 2012). Currently, the crown ages of the

rosids and asterids are estimated to be 108-117 and 107-117 million years ago (Sanderson *et al.*,

2004; Wikström *et al.*, 2001) indicating that these clades diverged in the Early Cretaceous. Whilst

for both *SULTR2;2* and *GLDP* it is possible that different mechanisms lead to BS specific expression

in species of the Brassicaceae and Asteraceae it seems more likely that expression of each gene is

determined by ancient and highly conserved *cis*-regulatory codes that that have been maintained

since these clades diverged from their last common ancestor. Although the plant vasculature is

thought to have started to evolve from 450 to 430 million years ago (Furuta *et al.*, 2014; Ye, 2002)

274 to our knowledge there are no clear estimates of when the BS originated. It would be intriguing if

275 regulatory networks operating in both the veins and BS cells are uncovered that can be associated

276 with the evolution of the vasculature in early diverging lineages of land plants.

Materials and methods

Cloning of promoter-reporter gene constructs and 5' Rapid Amplification of cDNA ends

All DNA fragments created by PCR were confirmed by DNA sequencing. Generation of full-length

promoter construct via PCR was constructed with *Arabidopsis thaliana* Columbia-0 (Col-0) genomic

DNA. Subsequent constructs were generated using this as a template. Restriction sites were added

to the respective fragments by PCR and fragments were inserted into pBI121 or a partially modified

pBI121. Region 2 with internal deletions were synthesised by GenScript and swapped with the full-

length region 2 of 2::5.2::*GUS* to generate the internal deletion constructs. Total RNA from leaves of

wild type *A. thaliana* Col-0 plants was extracted, DNase I treated and purified with the RNeasy®

Plant Mini Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). cDNA was generated from 1 µg RNA and then 5' RACE-

PCR performed using the Advantage® 2 DNA Polymerase Mix (Clontech Laboratories, Mountain

View, USA) or Phusion® HF DNA Polymerase (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, USA). Two

nested 3' oligonucleotides, AtSultr2;2-11 and AtSultr2;2-13, both binding in the cDNA of

AtSULTR2;2, were used. PCR products were cloned and confirmed via colony PCR. Correct clones

were subjected for plasmid preparation and sequencing.

Transformation and plant growth

A. thaliana ecotype Col-0 was transformed using floral dipping (Clough and Bent, 1998;

Logemann *et al.*, 2006) using *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* strain AGL1. *F. bidentis* was transformed

as described previously (Chitty *et al.*, 1999). Successful transformations of *A. thaliana* or *F. bidentis*

were tested by PCR. Before transplanting to soil, positive transformants of *A. thaliana* were selected

on kanamycin. Seeds were sterilized by washing twice for 5 min with 20 % (v/v) DanKlorix (Colgate-

Palmolive, New York City, USA) and 0.02 % (v.v) Triton-X 100 (Fluka Analyticals, Buchs,

Switzerland) and four times with sterile water. Stratification of seeds was performed at 4 °C for 48

hours prior to spreading them on ½ MS pH 5.7 containing 10 g l^{-1} (w/v) sucrose (Sigma-Aldrich, St.

Louis, USA), 0.5 g l^{-1} MES (Biomol, Hamburg, Germany), 2.13 g/l (w/v) Murashige-Skoog basal salts

(Duchefa Biochemie, Haarlem, Netherlands), 0.75 % agar (SERVA Electrophoresis, Heidelberg,

Germany), 50 µg ml^{-1} kanamycin (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, USA) and 100 mg l^{-1} Cefotaxim

(Fresenius Kabi Deutschland, Bad Homburg, Germany). Plants were transferred to 14 h light/10 h

dark and temperatures of 23 °C day and 20 °C night and a light intensity of 90 µmol m^{-2} s^{-1}.

Visual and quantitative analysis of reporter genes

To take account of effects caused by transgene insertion into different genomic locations at

between nine and forty-one independent T_0 plants were analysed for each construct. Histochemical

analysis was performed as described previously (Engelmann *et al.*, 2008). For *A. thaliana* either

three to four-week old rosette leaves or ten to fourteen-day old seedlings and for *F. bidentis* the sixth

leaves of 40-50 cm tall plants were used. Transverse sections were prepared manually using a razor

blade. Stained leaves were imaged using light microscopy. Quantification of GUS activity was

performed via fluorimetric assay (Jefferson *et al.*, 1987) using two to four leaves of three- to four-

week old T_0 *A. thaliana* plants or the fifth leave of 40-50 cm tall T_0 *F. bidentis* plants, respectively.

The Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine statistical differences between datasets. Imaging

of H2B::YFP was performed on a Zeiss LSM 780 confocal laser-scanning microscope, and YFP

fluorescence excited at 514 nm and emission detected between 517 and 569 nm.

Acknowledgments: Work performed in PWs laboratory (SK, KP, MK, UG) was supported by the

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through the Cluster of Excellence in Plant Sciences

Duesseldorf-Cologne (EXC 1028). HW supported by a BBSRC PhD studentship. We thank the

Center for Advanced imaging (HHU Düsseldorf) for provision and technical assistance of the Zeiss

LSM 780 laser-scanning microscope.

References

Aubry, S., Smith-Unna, R.D., Boursnell, C.M., Kopriva, S. and Hibberd, J.M. (2014) Transcript

residency on ribosomes reveals a key role for the Arabidopsis thaliana bundle sheath in sulfur

and glucosinolate metabolism. *Plant J.*, **78**, 659–673.

Barolo, S. (2012) Shadow enhancers: Frequently asked questions about distributed cis-regulatory

information and enhancer redundancy. *BioEssays*, **34**, 135–141.

Brown, N.J., Newell, C.A., Stanley, S., Chen, J.E., Perrin, A.J., Kajala, K. and Hibberd, J.M.

(2011) Independent and Parallel Recruitment of Preexisting Mechanisms Underlying C_4

Photosynthesis. *Science* **331**, 1436–1439.

Chitty, J.A., Furbank, R.T., Marshall, J.S., Chen, Z. and WC, T. (1999) Genetic transformation of

the C_4 plant, *Flaveria bidentis*. *Plant J.*, **6**, 949–956.

Chytilova, E.V.A., Macas, J. and Galbraith, D.W. (1999) Green Fluorescent Protein Targeted to

the Nucleus, a Transgenic Phenotype Useful for Studies in Plant Biology. *Ann. Bot.*, **83**, 645–

654.

Clough, S.J. and Bent, A.F. (1998) Floral dip: a simplified method for Agrobacterium-mediated

transformation of Arabidopsis thaliana. *Plant J.*, **16**, 735–743.

Comelli, P., Glowa, D., Chandler, J.W. and Werr, W. (2016) Founder-cell-specific transcription of

the DORNRÖSCHEN-LIKE promoter and integration of the auxin response. *J. Exp. Bot.*, **67**,

143–155.

Dengler, N. and Nelson, T. (1999) Leaf structure and development In C_4 plants. In R. F. Sage and

R. K. Monson, eds. *C_4 Plant Biology*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Dhondt, S., Coppens, F., Winter, F. De, Swarup, K., Merks, R.M., Inze, D., Bennett, M.J. and

Beemster, G.T. (2010) SHORT-ROOT and SCARECROW regulate leaf growth in

Arabidopsis by stimulating S-phase progression of the cell cycle. *Plant Physiol*, **154**, 1183–

1195.

Engelmann, S., Wiludda, C., Burscheidt, J., et al. (2008) The gene for the P-subunit of glycine

decarboxylase from the C_4 species *Flaveria trinervia*: analysis of transcriptional control in

transgenic *Flaveria bidentis* (C_4) and *Arabidopsis* (C_3). *Plant Physiol.*, **146**, 1773–1785.

Esau, K. (1965) *Plant Anatomy* 2nd Ed., New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Friso, G., Giacomelli, L., Ytterberg, A.J., Peltier, J.B., Rudella, A., Sun, Q. and Wijk, K.J.

(2004) In-depth analysis of the thylakoid membrane proteome of Arabidopsis thaliana

chloroplasts: new proteins, new functions, and a plastid proteome database. *Plant Cell*, **16**,

478–499.

Furuta, K.M., Hellmann, E. and Helariutta, Y. (2014) Molecular Control of Cell Specification and

Cell Differentiation During Procambial Development. *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.*, **65**, 607–638.

Hatch, M.D. (1987) C_4 photosynthesis: a unique blend of modified biochemistry, anatomy and

ultrastructure. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, **895**, 81–106.

Hatton, D., Sablowski, R., Yung, M.-H., Smith, C., Schuch, W. and Bevan, M. (1995) Two

classes of *cis*-sequences contribute to tissue-specific expression of a *PAL2* promoter in

transgenic tobacco. *Plant J.*, **7**, 859–876.

Hibberd, J.M. and Covshoff, S. (2010) The Regulation of Gene Expression Required for C_4

Photosynthesis. *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.*, **61**, 181–207.

Higo, K., Ugawa, Y., Iwamoto, M. and Korenaga, T. (1999) Plant cis-acting regulatory DNA

elements (PLACE) database: 1999. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **27**, 297–300.

Janacek, S.H., Trenkamp, S., Palmer, B., et al. (2009) Photosynthesis in cells around veins of

the C_3 plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* is important for both the shikimate pathway and leaf

senescence as well as contributing to plant fitness. *Plant J.*, **59**, 329–343.

Jefferson, R.A., Kavanagh, T.A. and Bevan, M.W. (1987) GUS fusions: ß-Glucuronidase as a

sensitive and versatile gene fusion marker in higher plants. *EMBO J.*, **6**, 3901–3907.

Kinsman, E.A. and Pyke, K.A. (1998) Bundle sheath cells and cell-specific plastid development in

Arabidopsis leaves. *Development*, **125**, 1815–1822.

Kubicki, A., Steinmuller, K. and Westhoff, P. (1994) Differential transcription of plastome-

encoded genes in the mesophyll and bundle-sheath chloroplasts of the monocotyledonous

NADP-malic enzyme-type C_4 plants maize and sorghum. *Plant Mol. Biol.*, **25**, 669–679.

Leegood, R.C. (2008) Roles of the bundle sheath cells in leaves of C_3 plants. *J. Exp. Bot.*, **59**,

1663–1673.

Leyva, A., Liang, X., Pintor-Toro, J.A., Dixon, R.A. and Lamb, C.J. (1992) *cis*-element

combinations determine phenylalanine ammonia-lyase gene tissue-specific expression

patterns. *Plant Cell*, **4**, 263–271.

Logemann, E., Birkenbihl, R.P., Ülker, B. and Somssich, I.E. (2006) An improved method for

preparing Agrobacterium cells that simplifies the Arabidopsis transformation protocol. *Plant*

Methods, **2**, 16.

Ludwig, M.Z., Manu, Kittler, R., White, K.P. and Kreitman, M. (2011) Consequences of

Eukaryotic Enhancer Architecture for Gene Expression Dynamics, Development, and Fitness.

PLOS Genet., **7**, e1002364.

Miyake, H. and Maeda, E. (1976) Development of bundle sheath chloroplasts in rice seedlings.

Can. J. Bot., **54**, 556–565.

Patel, M., Siegel, A.J. and Berry, J.O. (2006) Untranslated regions of *FbRbcS1* mRNA mediate

bundle sheath cell-specific gene expression in leaves of a C_4 plant. *J. Biol. Chem.*, **281**,

25485–25491.

Payne, J.L. and Wagner, A. (2015) Mechanisms of mutational robustness in transcriptional

regulation. *Front. Genet.*, **6**, 322.

Reyna-Llorens, I., Burgess, S.J., Williams, B.P., Stanley, S., Boursnell, C. and Hibberd, J.M.

(2016) Ancient coding sequences underpin the spatial patterning of gene expression in C_4

leaves. *bioRxiv*, doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/085795.

Sade, N., Shatil-Cohen, A., Attia, Z., et al. (2014) The role of plasma membrane aquaporins in

regulating the bundle sheath-mesophyll continuum and leaf hydraulics. *Plant Physiol.,* **166,**

1609-20. doi:10.1104/pp.114.248633.

Sanderson, M.J., Thorne, J.L., Wikström, N. and Bremer, K. (2004) Molecular evidence on

plant divergence times. *Am. J. Bot.*, **91**, 1656–1665.

Soros, C.L. and Dengler, N.G. (2001) Ontogenetic derivation and cell differentiation in

photosynthetic tissues of C_3 and C_4 Cyperaceae. *Am J Bot*, **88**, 992–1005.

Takabayashi, A., Kishine, M., Asada, K., Endo, T. and Sato, F. (2005) Differential use of two

cyclic electron flows around photosystem I for driving CO_2 concentration mechanism in C_4

photosynthesis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **102**, 16898–16903.

Takahashi, H., Watanabe-Takahashi, A., Smith, F.W., Blake-Kalff, M., Hawkesford, M.J. and

Saito, K. (2000) The roles of three functional sulphate transporters involved in uptake and

415 translocation of sulphate in Arabidopsis thaliana. *Plant J.*, **23**, 171–182.

416 **Wikström, N., Savolainen, V. and Chase, M.W.** (2001) Evolution of the angiosperms: calibrating

417 the family tree. *Proc. R. Soc. London. Ser. B Biol. Sci.*, **268**, 2211 LP-2220.

418 **Wiludda, C., Schulze, S., Gowik, U., Engelmann, S., Koczor, M., Streubel, M., Bauwe, H. and**

419 **Westhoff, P.** (2012) Regulation of the photorespiratory *GLDPA* gene in C$_4$ *Flaveria*: an

420 intricate interplay of transcriptional and posttranscriptional processes. *Plant Cell*, **24**, 137–151.

421 **Wysocka-Diller, J.W., Helariutta, Y., Fukaki, H., Malamy, J.E. and Benfey, P.N.** (2000)

422 Molecular analysis of SCARECROW function reveals a radial patterning mechanism common

423 to root and shoot. *Development*, **127**, 595–603.

424 **Ye, Z.-H.** (2002) VASCULAR TISSUE DIFFERENTIATION AND PATTERN FORMATION IN

425 PLANTS. *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.*, **53**, 183–202.

Figure legends

Figure 1: The *SULTR2;2* promoter drives expression in veins and bundle sheath cells of

***Arabidopsis thaliana*. (A-C)** Nucleotides -2185 to +123 of *SULTR2;2* are sufficient to generate

preferential accumulation of the GUS reporter in bundle sheath cells. **(D-F)** Nucleotides -2185 to

+123 of *SULTR2;2* are sufficient to generate preferential accumulation of the GUS reporter in bundle

sheath cells. **(G)** Quantitative analysis of expression from each construct based on the GUS activity

assay. **(H)**. Schematic of the *A. thaliana SULTR2;2* full-length promoter fused to *H2B::YFP* that

targets YFP to the nucleus. **(I)** H2B::YFP fusion marks nuclei from the larger bundle sheath exhibits

(white arrowhead) as well as the smaller more elongated nuclei of the vasculature (red arrowhead).

Data from GUS activity assays include the median (M) indicated by red lines and the number (n) of

independent lines. Histological GUS assays were allowed to proceed for 23 h (B), 16 h (C) and 5 h

(E) 6 h (F). Scale bars represent 500 (C) or 50 µm (D,E,F).

Figure 2: A 715 nucleotide region in the *SULTR2;2* promoter that is necessary for bundle

sheath expression. (A) Schematic of the 5' deletion series (left) with GUS activities (right). **(B-F)**

GUS accumulation from each deletion. Deletion of region 2 abolished accumulation of GUS. Data

from GUS activity assays include the median (M) indicated by red lines and the number (n) of

independent lines. Histological GUS assays were conducted on leaves for 23 h (B), 4 h (C) and 6

days. Histological GUS assays were allowed to proceed for 23 h (B), 4 h (C) and 6 days (E&F). Scale

bars represent 50 µm.

Figure 3: The *SULTR2;2* promoter contains a region that is sufficient to activate expression

in bundle sheath cells. (A) Schematic of constructs containing nucleotides -2053 to -1312

combined with either the core promoter of *SULTR2;2* or the minimal CaMV35S promoter (left) and

quantitative analysis of expression from each construct based on the GUS activity assay (right).

Orange arrowheads within the core promoter indicate transcription start sites obtained by 5'-RACE.

(B-C) Both constructs are sufficient to generate GUS accumulation in the bundle sheath. Data from

GUS activity assays include the median (M) indicated by red lines and the number (n) of independent

lines. Histological GUS assays were allowed to proceed for 5 h (B) and 22 h (C). Scale bars represent

50 µm.

Figure 4: *SULTR2;2* contains a region with multiple redundant regions capable of directing

bundle sheath expression. (A) Schematic of internal deletion series constructs (left) and

quantitative analysis of expression from each construct based on the GUS activity assay (right).

Except for the last deletion representing 66 base pairs, each construct lacks consecutive 75 base

pair sequences. These internal deletions modify the GUS activity **(A)**, but none abolish accumulation

of GUS in the bundle sheath **(B-K)**. Data from GUS activity assays include the median (M) indicated

by red lines and the number (n) of independent lines. Histological GUS assays were allowed to

proceed for 23 h (B), 16 h (C), 48 h (D), 23 h (E), 48 h (F), 8 h (G), 3 h (H), 7 h (I), 3 h (J) and 19 h

(K). Scale bars represent 50 µm.

Figure 5: A short region of the *SULTR2;2* promoter that is necessary for expression in the

bundle sheath. (A) Schematic of deletions made to region 2 of the *SULTR2;2* promoter (left) and

quantitative analysis of expression from each construct based on the GUS activity assay (right).

Activity was no longer detectable when subregions 4 and 5 were removed. **(B-F)** Histochemical

staining of leaves indicated that subregion 3 is required for expression in the bundle sheath. **(G)**

Schematic of 3' deletion constructs placed upstream of the minimal CaMV35S promoter (left) and

quantitative analysis of expression from each construct based on the GUS activity assay (right). **(H-**

I) Nucleotides from -1845 to -1495 are sufficient to drive expression in the bundle sheath of leaves

(H) and cotyledons (I) respectively. **(J)** Deletion of nucleotides -1692 to 1312 abolishes accumulation

of GUS in the BS. Data from GUS activity assays include the median (M) indicated by red lines and

the number (n) of independent lines. Histological GUS assays were allowed to proceed for 4 h (B),

47 h (C), 4 h (D) 6 d (E, F), 5 d (H), 2 d (I) and 29 h (J). Scale bars represent 50 µm.

Figure 6: The region necessary for BS expression of *SULTR2;2* is highly conserved in the

Brassicaceae. The promoter of *AtSULTRT2;2* was aligned against sequences ~5 kb upstream of

genes from seven additional species of the *Brassicaceae*. With the exception of *Arabidopsis lyrata*,

which contains a 446 bp insertion, region 2 is highly conserved. Black boxes indicate strong similarity

of sequences, grey boxes sequences not matching the consensus sequence and black lines gaps.

The level of similarity is also indicated on top of the alignment. High peaks in green mark strong

similarity, low red peaks poor similarity.

Figure 7: The *A. thaliana SULTR2;2* promoter generates strong bundle sheath expression in

the C$_3$ species *Flaveria bidentis*. (A) Schematic of the sequence placed into *Flaveria bidentis*. **(B)**

Quantitative analysis of expression from each construct based on the GUS activity assay. To

facilitate comparison GUS data from the same construct in C$_3$ *A. thaliana* are included. **(C)**

Representative image of transverse section of *Flaveria bidentis* after histochemical staining for GUS.

Data from GUS assays include the median (M) indicated by red lines and the number (n) of

independent lines. Histological GUS assays were allowed to proceed for 4 h. Scale bar represents

50 µm.

Supplemental Figure 1: Additional deletion series generated for *SULTRT2;2*. (A) Schematics

illustrating each deletion (left) and quantitative analysis of expression from each construct based on

the GUS activity assay (right). The series was designed to remove around 400 bp each time and to

avoid *cis*-regulatory elements predicted by the software PLACE (Higo *et al.*, 1999). Deletion of region

II resulted in a decline in GUSactivity and deletion of region III lead to a total loss of expression. **(B-**

H) Representative images after histological staining for GUS indicating that deleting region III led to

loss of GUS in the bundle sheath. Data from GUS activity assays include the median (M) indicated

by red lines and the number (n) of independent lines. Histological GUS assays were allowed to

proceed for 6 h. Scale bars each 50 µm.

Supplemental Figure 2: Alignment of 5' ends of cDNAs obtained via 5' Rapid amplification of cDNA

ends. No distinct transcription start site was found. The top line shows the template used for

alignment. Predicted translational start sites are marked in blue (annotated in TAIR Accession

1009028759) and red (from Takahashi *et al.* (2000)). A TATA box motif found by the PLACE

database (Higo *et al.*, 1999) is underlined. The black arrowhead marks the TAIR annotated

transcription start site (TAIR Accession 1009028759).

B 1-5::*GUS* **C** 2-5::*GUS* **D** 3-5::*GUS* **E** 4-5::*GUS* **F** 5::*GUS*

Figure 2

A

B 2::5.2::GUS

C 2::minCaMV35S::GUS

Figure 3

A

−2053

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|2a|2b|2c|2d|2e|2f|2g|2h|2i|2j|5.2|GUS|

M = 0.336 n = 38

|2b|2c|2d|2e|2f|2g|2h|2i|2j|5.2|GUS|

M = 0.038 n = 20

|2a| |2c|2d|2e|2f|2g|2h|2i|2j|5.2|GUS|

M = 0.165 n = 21

|2a|2b| |2d|2e|2f|2g|2h|2i|2j|5.2|GUS|

M = 0.069 n = 21

|2a|2b|2c| |2e|2f|2g|2h|2i|2j|5.2|GUS|

M = 0.073 n = 20

|2a|2b|2c|2d| |2f|2g|2h|2i|2j|5.2|GUS|

M = 0.017 n = 20

|2a|2b|2c|2d|2e| |2g|2h|2i|2j|5.2|GUS|

M = 0.153 n = 20

|2a|2b|2c|2d|2e|2f| |2h|2i|2j|5.2|GUS|

M = 0.210 n = 20

|2a|2b|2c|2d|2e|2f|2g| |2i|2j|5.2|GUS|

M = 0.020 n = 22

|2a|2b|2c|2d|2e|2f|2g|2h| |2j|5.2|GUS|

M = 0.127 n = 20

|2a|2b|2c|2d|2e|2f|2g|2h|2i| |5.2|GUS|

M = 0.218 n = 20

0.0   0.5   1.0   1.5   2.0
nmol MU/(mg protein*min)

B 2Δa::5.2::*GUS* **C** 2Δb::5.2::*GUS* **D** 2Δc::5.2::*GUS* **E** 2Δd::5.2::*GUS* **F** 2Δe::5.2::*GUS*

G 2Δf::5.2::*GUS* **H** 2Δg::5.2::*GUS* **I** 2Δh::5.2::*GUS* **J** 2Δi::5.2::*GUS* **K** 2Δj::5.2::*GUS*

Figure 4

A

−2053   −1312

M = 0.427 n = 18

−1886
M = 0.038 n = 40

−1845
M = 0.087 n = 37

−1692
M = 0.002 n = 37

−1495
M = 0.002 n = 38

nmol MU/(mg protein*min)

B 2.1-2.5::*GUS*

C 2.2-2.5::*GUS*

D 2.3-2.5::*GUS*

E 2.4-2.5::*GUS*

F 2.5-2.5::*GUS*

G

−1845   −1312
M = 0.008 n = 19

−1845   −1495
M = 0.005 n = 21

−1845   −1692
M = 0.004 n = 22

nmol MU/(mg protein*min)

H 2.3-2.5::*min CaMV35S ::GUS*

I 2.3-2.4::*min CaMV35S ::GUS*

J 2.3::*min CaMV35S::GUS*

Figure 5

Figure 6

A

−3418   −1

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | GUS |

B

M = 0.399 n = 26

A. thaliana

M = 1.479 n = 20

F. bidentis

0   2   4   6   8   10
nmol MU/(mg protein*min)

C

Figure 7