Title

Shade suppresses wound-induced leaf repositioning through a mechanism involving *PHYTOCHROME KINASE SUBSTRATE (PKS)* genes.

Short title

Shade suppresses downwards leaf repositioning triggered by wounding.

Authors

Anne-Sophie Fiorucci^{1,3}, Olivier Michaud¹, Emanuel Schmid-Siebert^{2,4}, Martine Trevisan¹, Laure Allenbach Petrolati¹, Yetkin Çaka Ince^{1,5} and Christian Fankhauser¹

Affiliations

1. Faculty of Biology and Medicine, Centre for Integrative Genomics, University of Lausanne, Génopode Building, Lausanne CH-1015, Switzerland.
2. SIB-Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, University of Lausanne, CH, Lausanne, Switzerland.
3. Present address: Université Paris-Saclay, CEA, CNRS, Institute for Integrative Biology of the Cell (I2BC), 91198, Gif-sur-Yvette, France.
4. Present address: JRS-NGSAI, Route de la Corniche 3, Phenyl building, 1066 Epalinges, Switzerland.
5. Present address, Department of Plant and Microbial Biology University of Zürich Zollikerstrasse 107. CH-8008 Zürich, Switzerland.

Corresponding author: Christian Fankhauser, Christian.fankhauser@unil.ch

Abstract

Shaded plants challenged with herbivores or pathogens prioritize growth over defense. However, most experiments have focused on the effect of shading light cues on defense responses. To investigate the potential interaction between shade-avoidance and wounding-induced Jasmonate (JA)-mediated signaling on leaf growth and movement, we used repetitive mechanical wounding of leaf blades to mimic herbivore attacks. Phenotyping experiments with combined treatments on *Arabidopsis thaliana* rosettes revealed that shade strongly inhibits the wound effect on leaf elevation. By contrast, petiole length is reduced by wounding both in the sun and in the shade. Thus, the relationship between the shade and wounding/JA pathways varies depending on the physiological response, implying that leaf growth and movement can be uncoupled. Using RNA-sequencing, we identified genes with expression patterns matching the hyponastic response (opposite regulation by both stimuli, interaction between treatments with shade dominating the wound signal). Among them were genes from the *PKS* (Phytochrome Kinase Substrate) family, which was previously studied for its role in phototropism and leaf positioning. Interestingly, we observed reduced shade suppression of the wounding effect in *pks2pks4* double mutants while a *PKS4* overexpressing line showed constitutively elevated leaves and was less sensitive to wounding. Our results indicate a trait-specific interrelationship between shade and wounding cues on *Arabidopsis* leaf growth and positioning. Moreover, we identify *PKS* genes as integrators of external cues in the control of leaf hyponasty further emphasizing the role of these genes in aerial organ positioning.

43 **Author summary**

44 Plants face different types of stressful situations without the ability to relocate to favorable environments.
 45 For example, increasing plant density reduces access to sunlight as plants start to shade each other. Foliar
 46 shading represents a stress that many plants cope with by changing their morphology. This includes
 47 elongation of stem-like structures and repositioning of leaves to favor access to unfiltered sunlight. Plants
 48 also defend themselves against various pathogens including herbivores. Defense mechanisms include the
 49 production of deterrent chemical and morphological adaptations such as stunted growth and downwards
 50 leaf repositioning. Here we studied the morphological response of plants when simultaneously facing shade
 51 and herbivore stress. When facing both stresses petiole growth was intermediate between the shade-
 52 enhanced and wound-repressed response. In contrast, the shade cue overrides the wounding cue leading to
 53 a similar upwards leaf repositioning in the combined treatments or in the response to shade alone. Using
 54 gene expression analyses and genetics we identified two members of the Phytochrome Kinase Substrate
 55 family as playing a signal integration role when plants simultaneously faced both stresses. This contributes
 56 to our understanding of the mechanisms underlying plant morphological adaptations when facing multiple
 57 stresses.

Introduction

Plants constantly adjust their growth and development in response to variations in abiotic and biotic environmental parameters. Under competition for light resources encountered in dense communities, shade-avoiding plants initiate a series of developmental changes known as the shade-avoidance syndrome (SAS). At the vegetative stage, this response is characterized by elongation of aerial organs like hypocotyls, petioles and stems and upward leaf positioning, also known as hyponasty (1). SAS-associated phenotypes help plants overtop competitors, get better access to sunlight and are ultimately associated with better fitness (1,2). Detection of competitive neighbors occurs through a change in light quality reaching the plant. Indeed, because of the spectral properties of leaves, plants reflect far-red (FR) wavebands, which leads to an increased amount of FR and a decrease of the red (R) to FR ratio (low R/FR) (2). Changes in the R/FR ratio are perceived by phytochrome photoreceptors, especially phyB, and serve as a primary signal of vegetation proximity. Under low R/FR conditions, phyB is converted from the active Pfr to the inactive Pr form. Phytochrome photoconversion to the Pr form allows the stabilization and/or activation of transcription factors from the PIF family (Phytochrome-Interacting Factors) (3). PIFs, especially PIF4, PIF5 and PIF7, play a major role in the reprogramming of gene expression during shade-avoidance, notably by inducing genes controlling auxin homeostasis (4). At the rosette stage, these three PIFs control shade-induced petiole elongation (5) and hyponasty (6,7).

Herbivore attack induces an array of defense mechanisms depending on the Jasmonate (JA) pathway (8). JA is a lipid-derived hormone synthesized from α -linolenic acid. Increased JA levels are perceived by the SCF_{COI1}-JAZ co-receptor. This leads to the degradation of JAZs repressors by the 26S proteasome, which releases the activity of downstream transcription factors from the MYC family, especially MYC2, as well as MYC3 and MYC4 (9). MYCs are responsible for a large part of JA-dependent transcriptional reprogramming. Interestingly, JA-induced defenses are activated both in the eaten organ and in distal tissues. In rosettes, information about an ongoing attack is transmitted to vascularly-connected leaves through propagation of electrical signals (10,11), warning and preparing intact tissues for a potential aggression. Mechanical leaf

wounding, using toothed forceps for example, mimics the effect of chewing by herbivores and is sufficient to induce JA production and the induction of defense mechanisms, both in harmed and distal tissues (12). Induction of JA-dependent defense comes with a strong inhibition of growth (13), at least partly due to an inhibition of cell proliferation in leaves (14,15). The effect of JA or wounding on leaf position is less understood, but several studies suggest that wound-response signaling inhibits circadian leaf movements (16,17).

Plants often face multiple challenges and have to integrate this information to respond accordingly. For example, in the growth-defense tradeoff shaded plants challenged with pathogens prioritize growth over defense, making them more susceptible to biotic stresses (4,18). This tradeoff was long thought to be based on resource allocation but it can also be explained by tightly controlled antagonistic transcriptional networks (19,20). Indeed, it is possible to genetically uncouple growth and defense and obtain plants that are able to both grow and defend to high levels (21,22). The uncoupling of growth and defense depends on the level of defense (23). In the case of shade conditions, various mechanisms contribute to the attenuation of JA-dependent defense. Low R/FR ratios favor the stability of JAZ repressors through degradation of DELLA proteins (24), and also decrease the stability of MYC transcription factors (25). In parallel, shade signals directly decrease the production of active JA through the PIF-dependent induction of *ST2a*, which codes for a sulfotransferase responsible for reducing the pool of precursors of active JAs (26).

While the impact of shading conditions on JA-dependent defense responses has been extensively studied, our current knowledge of how plants integrate these two pathways at the level of growth remains limited. A previous study showed that exogenous methyl-jasmonate (MeJA) application does not prevent low R/FR-induced petiole elongation (27). In contrast, shade-mimicking conditions suppressed MeJA-dependent inhibition of hypocotyl growth in young *Arabidopsis* seedlings (24). These observations indicate a complex relationship between shade and the JA pathway during growth regulation. Moreover, how shade and jasmonate regulate leaf movements remains unknown. Understanding the potential interaction between shade-avoidance and the JA pathway on leaf growth and hyponasty can provide new information about these

112 fundamental growth processes. Here we aimed at understanding how plants integrate environmental signals
113 with opposing effects on leaf growth and movement, using shade and wounding as opposite cues.

114 **Results**

115

116 **Shade suppresses the wounding effect on leaf elevation but not on elongation**

117

118 We first defined precise protocols for shade and wounding treatments. For shade treatment, we used
 119 previously described conditions (5), with shade (or control light) treatment applied for three days to 17-day-
 120 old, long-day grown plants. Our shade conditions were a reduction in the red to far-red ratio (low R/FR), while
 121 maintaining PAR constant (5). In these conditions, leaves 3 and 4 show pronounced petiole elongation upon
 122 exposure to shade, whereas leaves 1 and 2 barely respond to shade (5). In parallel, we chose repetitive
 123 mechanical wounding to induce JA production in a systemic way. We used toothed forceps to crush the apical
 124 half of a leaf blade (11). In 4-week-old, short-day-grown plants, one such wound on leaf 8 is sufficient to
 125 induce the JA pathway in leaves connected by the vasculature, that is leaves 5, 11, 13 and 16 (11). In our
 126 growth conditions, we observed that wounding of leaf 1 rapidly induced expression of the JAZ10p:GUSPlus
 127 (JGP) reporter (28) in all leaves, especially leaves 3, 4 and 5 (S1A Fig), as well as other JA-marker genes in leaf
 128 4 (S1B Fig). We thus concluded that at this developmental stage, we could induce the JA pathway in all intact
 129 leaves by wounding leaf 1. Previous studies have shown that serial wounding of different rosette leaves was
 130 efficient to trigger a growth defect of all leaves (13), especially on petioles (29). We therefore used an
 131 adapted serial wounding protocol, with three successive wounds on leaf 1, 2, 3 at one-day intervals and
 132 measured leaf position and petiole growth of leaf 4 (Fig 1A).

133

134 **Fig1** (legend below)

Fig 1: Shade suppresses the wounding effect on leaf elevation but not on elongation.

A) Schematic of the experimental procedure. Wounds are performed individually on leaf 1, then leaf 2 and the shade treatment starts following wounding of leaf 3. We measured elevation angle of leaf 4 at the end of day 18 on pictures of each individual plant and petiole length of the same leaf at the end of the treatments (day 21). See details in Material & Methods. **B)** Leaf angle and petiole length phenotype of wt Col-0 and *aos* mutant plants (n=10 plants/genotype/condition). Representative experiment from 3 biological replicates. **C)** Leaf angle and petiole length phenotype of wt Col-0 and *yuc2589* mutant plants (n=10 plants/genotype/condition). Representative experiment from 2 biological replicates. **D)** Elevation angle of leaf 4 in unwounded and wounded wt Col-0 plants either kept in normal light conditions (left panel) or shifted to shade after the third wound (right panel). Grey vertical bars represent night periods. Each graph corresponds to a representative experiment from 2 biological replicates (n>35 plants/genotype/condition). In B) and C), graphs are represented as violin plots, which present a combination of a box plot and a kernel density plot. In each box plot, the white dot represents the median, black boxes extend from the 25th to the 75th percentile, while the vertical black line extends to 1.5 times the interquartile range of the lower and upper quartiles, respectively. A rotated kernel density plot surrounds each side of the box plot. Different letters indicate significant differences (Tukey's HSD test following a three-way ANOVA, $P < 0.05$).

To determine whether wounding influences shade-induced leaf growth and movement, we pre-treated plants with wounding and then started shade treatment right after the 3rd wound (Fig 1A). We compared the effect of wounding, low R/FR and the combined treatments. We measured the elevation angle of the first intact leaf (leaf 4) at the end of day 18, and petiole length of the same leaf after 3 days (Fig 1A). As shown by histochemical detection of cyclin activity, there was barely any cell division occurring in leaf 4 at the start of the wounding treatment (S1C Fig). Therefore, leaf 4 petiole growth mainly depended on cell elongation in these experimental conditions. As expected, the shade treatment induced both leaf elevation and petiole elongation in wild-type plants (Fig 1B). In contrast, wounded plants showed a significantly lower leaf position and shorter petioles, which is consistent with previous reports (13,15,17,22,29). The effect of wounding was largely diminished in an *aos* (Allene Oxide Synthase) mutant background (Fig 1B), which is deficient in JA production (30). The wounding effect on leaf growth and movement observed here was thus jasmonate-dependent. Upon combined treatments, we did not observe any interaction on petiole elongation (Light x Wound interaction term in a two-way ANOVA on wt plants was not significant). This result is consistent with a previous study on petiole elongation combining shade and exogenous MeJA application (27). We changed the timing of wounding versus shade (either started at the same time or one day after the start of shade treatment) and observed the same trend (S2 Fig). We concluded that there is no interaction between shade and wounding in these conditions, which contrasts with the inhibition of defense responses by shade-avoidance. However, we observed that the negative effect of wounding on leaf elevation angle was largely

suppressed in shade-treated wild type plants (Fig 1B&C). In contrast to petiole elongation, there was an interaction between shade and wounding on the regulation of leaf hyponasty (Fig 1B&C), similar to the inhibition of defense responses by shade-avoidance (Light x Wound interaction term in a two-way ANOVA on wt plants was significant, with p-value < 2.10^{-16}). Consistent with our data in the wild type, in a *phyB* mutant, which displays a constitutive shade-avoidance phenotype under sun-mimicking conditions, wounding diminished petiole growth but not leaf hyponasty (S3 Fig). Shade-induced hyponasty depends on *YUCCA* genes (6), which code for the rate-limiting enzymes of auxin biosynthesis. In particular, *YUC2*, *YUC5*, *YUC8* and *YUC9* are up-regulated in low R/FR conditions (31) and the corresponding quadruple *yuc2589* mutant is unresponsive to shade (6,31). We observed no suppression of the wounding effect on hyponasty by shade in the *yuc2589* background (Fig 1C). This indicates that YUC activity upon shade perception is necessary to suppress the wounding effect on leaf hyponasty. Collectively, these data indicate that low R/FR (shade) suppressed the effect of wounding on leaf hyponasty, while both treatments affected growth in an additive way. Moreover, the effect of wounding on hyponasty depend on JA signaling, while low R/FR-induced auxin production was required to suppress the wounding effect.

Because the measure of leaf elevation was done at a defined time (ZT11), we could not rule out the possibility that wounding delays the circadian leaf movement instead of suppressing it. To study the kinetics of the hyponastic response we took advantage of a phenotyping system allowing the determination of leaf elevation with high temporal resolution (6,32). By applying the same protocol as before (Fig 1A), we first observed that wounding inhibits the diurnal circadian movement of distal leaf 4 under normal light conditions (Fig 1D, left panel). However, leaf 4 recovered a normal movement one day after the last wound, suggesting that the impact of wounding on leaf elevation is transient. As observed previously, shade rapidly triggered an upwards repositioning of leaf 4 (Fig 1D) (6). Moreover, in low R/FR, wounding hardly affected the hyponastic response (Fig 1D, right panel). Taken together our phenotyping experiments revealed that leaf growth and leaf movement can be at least partially uncoupled in the context of combined shade and wounding treatments.

197 **Shade and wounding lead to contrasted gene expression reprogramming**

198

199 We analyzed the gene expression pattern of petioles from leaf 4 in single and combined treatments, with the
200 experimental design based on our phenotyping tests (Fig 1A). Samples for genome-wide gene expression
201 analysis using RNA-sequencing were collected on day 18, 1.5h and 4h after the start of the treatments
202 (wound/mock & high/low R/FR). Both time points were chosen according to the kinetics of movement as
203 determined by the phenotyping experiments (Fig 1D). To distinguish jasmonate-dependent effects, the
204 experiment was conducted on wild-type Col-0 and *aos* mutant plants.

205

206 We first looked for differentially expressed genes (DEGs) upon shade treatment by comparing low R/FR-
207 treated to high R/FR-treated samples in the different conditions (Fig 2). We observed that most of the
208 variation in gene expression is visible at the second time-point (Time 2, 4h, Fig 1A), as seen by the number of
209 DEGs (Fig 2A) and the stronger fold change observed in the hierarchical clustering (Fig 2B). This result is
210 consistent with previous studies done on young seedlings (31). Overall, there was no major difference in the
211 total number of shade-regulated genes between wounded or unwounded plants (Fig 2A). However, at each
212 time-point the wounded Col-0 sample showed a divergent pattern compared to the three others (Fig 2B).
213 These experiments showed that the wounding treatment altered shade-induced gene expression
214 reprogramming in a JA-dependent manner.

Fig 2: Shade-regulated gene expression in petioles

A) Number of genes significantly differentially regulated by shade in the different conditions: genotypes (Col-0 and *aos*), timepoints (Time 1 and Time 2) and wounding treatment (unwounded in blue, wounded in orange). Genes are considered differentially expressed when $|\log_2 \text{fold change}| > 1$ and $p\text{val} < 0.05$. **B)** Hierarchical clustering of significantly differentially regulated genes by shade in the different conditions (same genes as in A). **C)** Schematic representation of the successive criteria applied to find candidate genes involved in the shade-wounding interaction on hyponasty. Numbers of genes are indicated on the left.

215

216 We then analyzed the effect of wounding on gene expression (S4 Fig). As expected, in the *aos* mutant there
 217 was almost no response to wounding at the gene expression level. Therefore, most of the wound-dependent
 218 gene regulation in this context was JA-dependent. The wound response showed faster kinetics compared to
 219 the shade response, with a high number of DEGs already at Time 1 (S4A Fig). Interestingly, the shade
 220 treatment had a major impact on wound-regulated gene expression with: (1) a lower number of DEGs in
 221 shade compared to sun conditions (S4A Fig) and (2) an altered pattern of expression in shade vs sun at both
 222 time-points (S4B Fig). By looking at all the wound response DEGs at Time 1 and/or Time 2, we confirmed that

41% of wound-DEG in sun were not significantly differentially regulated by wounding in shade conditions (890 genes, S4C Fig). Besides, for those that were still regulated in shade (1278 genes), they tended to be regulated to a lesser extent compared to sun conditions (S4D Fig). Therefore, under shade-mimicking conditions, there was a global attenuation effect of the wound-regulated gene expression program, which is consistent with the inhibition of defense by shade as well as the suppression of the wounding effect on leaf elevation.

***PKS* genes regulate leaf hyponasty during combined shade-wounding treatments**

We hypothesized that genes with an expression pattern similar to the hyponastic response pattern (opposite regulation by both stimuli, interaction between treatments with shade dominating the wound signal) may be important for the regulation of leaf movement and possibly the interaction between shade and wounding. We thus made a list of genes matching the following criteria: (1) significant interaction between shade and wounding at least at one time point (450 genes), (2) opposite regulation by the individual treatments (200 genes), (3) wounding effect suppressed by shade upon combined treatments (157 genes) and (4) significant effects of individual shade and wounding treatments (64 genes) (Fig 2C). This final list contains many genes involved in auxin, GA or brassinosteroids biosynthesis and signaling pathways (S1 Table).

One gene in the shortlist seemed particularly interesting to test as a candidate: *PKS4* (Phytochrome Kinase Substrate 4, At5g04190). Indeed, *PKS4* is induced by shade, repressed by wounding and its expression level was similar to shade alone upon combined treatments (S5A Fig). *PKS4* belongs to a family of four genes which have been mostly studied for their role in phototropin signaling, and *PKS1*, the founding member of this family, was first shown to interact with phytochromes (33–39). Using a *PKS4*::GUS reporter line, we confirmed the induction of *PKS4* expression by shade in 3-week-old rosettes (S5B Fig). Interestingly, *PKS4* was mostly expressed in the petioles of younger leaves as well as in the mid-vein. However, a *pks4* loss-of-function mutant was not significantly different from the wild type during shade, wounding or combined treatments both for leaf angle and petiole length (S5C Fig).

250

251 Among the three other genes of the family, *PKS2* showed a similar expression pattern but was not present in
 252 the list of candidates because it did not reach the threshold of significance for the interaction (S6A Fig).
 253 Interestingly, *PKS2* was shown to be important for leaf positioning (33). Whereas a *pks2* single mutant
 254 showed wild-type phenotypes (S6B Fig), we observed reduced shade suppression of wounding-triggered leaf
 255 elevation in a *pks2pks4* double mutant (Fig 3A). In contrast, responses to individual shade or wounding
 256 treatments were similar to the wild type, as well as petiole length phenotypes in all tested conditions (Fig
 257 3A). *PKS2* and *PKS4* therefore act to control hyponasty during combined shade and wounding treatments. It
 258 is noteworthy that petiole length responses were not affected in this mutant background, suggesting that
 259 the effect of *PKS* genes is indeed specific to leaf movement. We confirmed these results in another *pks2 pks4*
 260 allelic combination (S7 Fig). We then tested a quadruple *pks1234* mutant (40). In this background, there was
 261 even less suppression by shade of the wounding effect on leaf position than in the double mutant,
 262 highlighting redundancy among *PKS* genes (Fig 3B). However, this mutant also showed reduced petiole
 263 elongation in all tested conditions (Fig 3B). Finally, a *PKS4* overexpressing line showed constitutively elevated
 264 leaves and was less sensitive to wounding (Fig 3C). Taken together these results confirm that *PKS4* and *PKS2*
 265 are required for shade-induced suppression of the wound-triggered inhibition of leaf hyponasty. In contrast,
 266 in the conditions tested, these genes were not required for the response to separate treatments.

Fig 3: PKS genes regulate the shade-wounding interaction on hyponasty

A) Leaf angle and petiole length phenotype of wt Col-0 and *pks2-1pks4-1* mutant plants (n=10 plants/genotype/condition). Representative experiment from 3 biological replicates. **B)** Petiole angle and petiole length phenotype of wt Col-0 and *pks1-1pks2-1pks3-9pks4-1* (*pks1234*) mutant plants (n=10 plants/genotype/condition). Representative experiment from 2 biological replicates. **C)** Leaf angle and petiole length phenotype of wt Col-0, *PKS2OE* and *PKS4OE* plants (n=10 plants/genotype/condition). Representative experiment from 2 biological replicates. All experiments were done as described on Fig 1A. Different letters indicate significant differences (three-way ANOVA with Tukey's HSD test, $P < 0.05$). All graphs are represented as violin plots, which present a combination of a box plot and a kernel density plot. In each box plot, the white dot represents the median, black boxes extend from the 25th to the 75th percentile, while the vertical black line extends to 1.5 times the interquartile range of the lower and upper quartiles, respectively. A rotated kernel density plot surrounds each side of the box plot.

279 ***PKS* genes are induced by shade in a PIF-dependent manner**

280

281 Next, we aimed at understanding the pattern of expression of *PKS4* and *PKS2* in response to shade. Because
 282 PIFs are (1) the main transcription factors involved in the regulation of gene expression upon response to
 283 shade and (2) required for a proper shade-induced hyponasty (6,7), we tested the induction of *PKS* genes by
 284 shade in a *pif457* triple mutant (5). In response to 1h30 shade treatment, *PKS4* and *PKS2* were both
 285 significantly induced in leaf 4 of 3-week-old wild-type rosettes, but not in the *pif457* background (Fig 4A).
 286 Expression of *YUC8* was used as a positive control for this experiment. Thus PIF4, 5 and/or 7 are required for
 287 the induction of *PKS4* and *PKS2* by shade. By browsing published ChIP-seq datasets, we found that the *PKS4*
 288 promoter is bound by PIF4 in various experimental conditions (41,42) in a region containing a PBE-box (Fig
 289 4B). To test whether PIF4 directly regulates *PKS4* expression under low R/FR conditions, we performed a
 290 ChIP-qPCR experiment using a PIF4-HA tagged line (43). We observed that PIF4-HA was bound to the *PKS4*
 291 promoter region after 2h of shade treatment in 10-day-old seedlings, although to a lower extent than to *PIL1*,
 292 a known PIF-target (Fig 4B). This might be due to the restricted expression of *PKS4* in shade-treated seedlings
 293 (S5A Fig). We therefore conclude that PIF4 directly regulates the induction of *PKS4* upon shade treatment.
 294 To determine whether the PIFs are required for the shade-induced suppression of the wounding effect on
 295 leaf position, we analyzed petiole length and hyponasty in the *pif457* triple mutant. Consistent with previous
 296 publications *pif457* mutant plants did not elevate their leaves in response to shade treatments (Fig 4C) (6,7).
 297 However, the *pif457* mutant responded similarly to the wild type to the wound treatment (Fig 4C). Moreover,
 298 in *pif457* the inhibition of leaf elevation by wounding was still visible upon combined treatment. This shows
 299 that PIFs and YUCs are required for the shade-induced suppression of the wounding effect on hyponasty (Figs
 300 4C and 1C).

Fig 4: *PKS4* and *PKS2* are induced by shade in a PIF-dependent manner

A) Relative expression of *YUC8*, *PKS4* and *PKS2* evaluated in entire leaf 4 from 18-d-old wt Col-0 and *pif457* mutants either kept in high R/FR (sun) or transferred to low R/FR (shade) at ZT3 for 90 minutes; samples in sun and shade were harvested at the same ZT. Gene expression values were calculated as fold induction relative to a Col-0 sample in high R/FR. $n = 3$ (biological) with three technical replicas for each RNA sample. Data are means $\pm$ 2 SE. Different letters indicate significant differences ($P < 0.05$). B) PIF4-HA binding to the promoter of *PIL1* and *PKS4* evaluated by ChIP-qPCR in 10-d-old seedlings either kept in high R/FR or transferred for 2 h to low R/FR at ZT2. Input and immunoprecipitated DNA were quantified by qPCR using primers shown on the schematic representation of the genes with 'Peak' indicating where PIF4 binding was identified before (top panel). PIF4-HA enrichment is presented as IP/Input and error bars show standard deviation from three technical replicas. Different letters indicate significant differences ($P < 0.05$). Data from one representative experiment out of two biological replicates are shown. C) Leaf angle and petiole length phenotype of wt Col-0 and *pif457* mutant plants ($n=10$ plants/genotype/condition). Representative experiment from 2 biological replicates. All experiments were done as described on Fig 1A. Different letters indicate significant differences (three-way ANOVA with Tukey's HSD test, $P < 0.05$). Graphs are represented as violin plots, which present a combination of a box plot and a kernel density plot. In each box plot, the white dot represents the median, black boxes extend from the 25th to the 75th percentile, while the vertical black line extends to 1.5 times the interquartile range of the lower and upper quartiles, respectively. A rotated kernel density plot surrounds each side of the box plot.

319 ***PKS4* and *PKS2* are repressed by MYCs in response to wounding**

320

321 To understand how *PKS* genes were regulated by wounding, we looked at their expression in the *aos* mutant
 322 from our RNAseq dataset. We observed that the repression of both *PKS4* and *PKS2* by wounding under sun-
 323 mimicking conditions was not visible in the *aos* mutant (S8 Fig). We thus conclude that the impact of
 324 wounding on *PKS* expression depends on the jasmonate pathway. Since MYCs are the main transcription
 325 factors responsible for JA-dependent gene expression, we tested the expression of *PKS4* and *PKS2* upon
 326 wounding treatment in a *myc234* triple mutant (44). As observed in our RNA-sequencing results, both genes
 327 were expressed at a lower level in the petiole of wounded wild types, although the difference was significant
 328 only for *PKS2* (Fig 5A). This may be explained by the modest repression of *PKS4* expression by wounding
 329 compared to *PKS4* induction by shade (S5A Fig). The repression of *PKS* genes expression by wounding was
 330 abolished in *myc234* petioles (Fig 5A), showing that MYCs are required for the repression of *PKS4* and *PKS2*
 331 upon wounding. To determine the phenotypic consequences of MYC-regulated transcriptional changes we
 332 characterized the *myc234* triple mutant (Fig 5B). The *myc234* mutant looked similar to the *aos* mutant in
 333 terms of leaf angle (Fig 1B), showing that the inhibition of leaf elevation by wounding depended on MYCs (Fig
 334 5B). As reported previously (13), *aos* plants had longer petioles than the wt (Fig 1B), whereas *myc234* plants
 335 displayed similar petiole lengths to the wild type in all conditions (Fig 5B). We conclude that reduced *PKS2*
 336 and *PKS4* expression in response to wounding depends on JA production and MYC transcription factors.
 337 Moreover, JA and MYCs contribute to wound-regulated leaf hyponasty (Fig 1B, 5).

Fig 5: *PKS4* and *PKS2* are repressed by MYCs in response to wounding

A) Relative expression of *JAZ10*, *PKS4* and *PKS2* in leaf 4 petiole from 18-d-old wt Col-0 and *myc234* mutants either unwounded or wounded 3 times at ZT3 for 90 minutes; samples in sun and shade were harvested at the same ZT. Gene expression values were calculated as fold induction relative to a Col-0 sample in high R/FR. $n = 3$ (biological) with three technical replicates for each RNA sample. Data are means ± 2 SE. Different letters indicate significant differences ($P < 0.05$). B) Leaf angle and petiole length phenotype of wt Col-0 and *myc234* mutant plants ($n=10$ plants/genotype/condition). Representative experiment from 2 biological replicates. All experiments were done as described for Fig 1A. Different letters indicate significant differences (three-way ANOVA with Tukey's HSD test, $P < 0.05$). Graphs are represented as violin plots, which present a combination of a box plot and a kernel density plot. In each box plot, the white dot represents the median, black boxes extend from the 25th to the 75th percentile, while the vertical black line extends to 1.5 times the interquartile range of the lower and upper quartiles, respectively. A rotated kernel density plot surrounds each side of the box plot.

Discussion

In this study, we focused on the morphological consequences of combined shade and wounding treatments. In our experiments, shade and wounding did not show the same relationship for leaf hyponasty and petiole elongation. We observe that shade-mimicking conditions strongly inhibit downwards leaf repositioning induced by wounding (Fig. 1). In contrast to leaf position, both signals act largely independently in the regulation of petiole length (Fig 1). This is consistent with earlier observations of wild-type petioles treated with low R/FR and MeJA (27) and with MeJA-treated *phyB* mutant plants (22). However, our results contrast with the observation that a low R/FR treatment completely suppressed MeJA-induced inhibition of hypocotyl elongation (24). Differences in developmental stages, experimental conditions or timing of the treatments might account for this discrepancy. In seedlings, MYCs directly regulate photomorphogenesis by inducing *HY5* expression (45), although further studies are needed to fully understand the interplay between MYCs and *HY5* (46). Recent phenotypic analyses of high-order *pif* and *myc* mutants coupled to transcriptomics also suggested that PIF and MYC transcription factors regulate petiole growth independently (47). Under combined shade/wounding treatments, we interpret the difference between hyponasty and elongation as a partial uncoupling of growth and movement. Arabidopsis plants grown under different light regimes also show partially distinct growth and movement patterns (32). Collectively, these findings imply that differential growth in petioles is not the only mechanism underlying leaf positioning.

The interaction between wounding and hyponasty is similar to defense responses with the shade response strongly attenuating the wound response (Fig 1). We observed that wounding transiently inhibits leaf elevation systemically in a JA-dependent manner. Moreover, the wound response was also strongly impaired in the *myc234* mutant (Fig. 1, 5). This is consistent with earlier reports showing that MeJA treatments and insect feeding trigger downward leaf movements (16,17). This could be an indirect consequence of growth inhibition, but because of the partial uncoupling between growth and movement in our experiments, this seems unlikely (Fig 1). Another hypothesis comes from recent updates on the growth-defense tradeoff hypothesis. Indeed, extensive growth is thought to be detrimental to the plant under a pathogen attack

because the plant might be more exposed (48). We propose that this may also be the case for leaf movements. Transiently suppressing leaf circadian movements may be part of a visual apparency strategy limiting herbivore attack. If this were true, the suppression of this protection by shade would be another example of prioritizing light capture in suboptimal conditions over defense. We found that the suppression of the wounding effect by shade depends on classical signaling elements of shade-induced hyponasty, including phyB, PIFs and YUCs (6,7) (Figs 1C, 4C, S3). Interestingly, in tomato, wounding was reported to inhibit elevated temperature-induced leaf hyponasty in a COI1-dependent manner (49). In that case, under higher ambient temperatures, JA production and signaling upon wounding lead to increased leaf temperatures, decreased photosynthesis and leaf growth. This indicates that even if shade-avoidance and thermomorphogenesis share many signaling components and phenotypic outputs (50,51), they might interact differently with JA/wounding pathways.

Previous studies have shown that shaded plants challenged with herbivores, or more generally with pathogens, prioritize growth over defense (18,52). As reported by others, we also observed a dampening of the JA-dependent wounding response by low R/FR at the gene expression levels (S4D Fig). Under shade-mimicking conditions, less genes were differentially regulated by wounding and among regulated genes many were regulated to a reduced extent compared to control sun condition (S4D Fig). This is consistent with previous studies comparing low R/FR and MeJA treatments (27,53). For example, genes like *LOX2* or *VSP1*, which are classically induced by herbivores or wounding (54,55), were induced to a lower extent under shade conditions (S4D Fig) (26).

Our transcriptomic approach identified *PKS* genes and especially *PKS4*, as regulators of leaf elevation acting at the interface of shade and wounding pathways (Fig 3, S5, S6, S7). *PKS4* expression depends on PIFs upon shade treatment, whereas it is downregulated upon wounding in a MYC-dependent manner (Fig 4, 5). Interestingly, the *PKS4* promoter was bound by GFP-tagged MYC2 upon MeJA treatment in a published ChIP-seq dataset (56). The binding region corresponds to the same one we identified as a PIF4 binding region (“peak” region containing a PBE-box) (Fig 4B). This observation suggests that *PKS4* is regulated differentially

405 by several transcription factors depending on the environmental conditions. Upon combined shade and
 406 wounding treatments, there might be a competition between PIFs and MYCs for *PKS4* promoter binding.
 407 Since MYC stability is negatively affected by low R/FR (25) and JA signaling is generally attenuated (4), PIFs
 408 may have higher chances to bind the *PKS4* promoter in shade conditions explaining why in the combined
 409 shade and wound treatment the regulation of *PKS4* expression is dominated by the shade cue (Fig S5). We
 410 hypothesize that *PKS4* expression is coordinately regulated by MYCs and PIFs to respond to complex
 411 environmental situations.

412

413 *PKS* genes function in different light-regulated processes including phototropism (37), hypocotyl growth and
 414 orientation (38), leaf positioning and flattening (33,40). This work identifies a new role of *PKS* genes by
 415 showing their specific involvement in the regulation of leaf hyponasty during combined shade and wound
 416 treatments. All these responses are based on asymmetric growth. Phototropic bending is a textbook example
 417 of differential growth between both sides of a stem/hypocotyl (57,58). Upward leaf movements have also
 418 been proposed to result from differential cell elongation between both sides of the petiole. This hypothesis
 419 is notably based on (1) cell length measurements on abaxial vs adaxial sides of hyponastic petioles after
 420 ethylene or waterlogging treatment (59,60) and (2) the observation of differential auxin responses between
 421 petiole sides in response to low R/FR (7) or elevated temperature (61). Circadian leaf movements under sun
 422 conditions also decrease when leaves age and stop growing (62), therefore strongly linking movement to
 423 growth. Interestingly, in seedlings *PKS4* is expressed in the hypocotyl elongation zone (38), where bending
 424 occurs upon unidirectional illumination. Here, we show that in rosettes, *PKS4* is also expressed where
 425 differential growth is predicted to happen, that is in the petioles of young growing leaves (Fig S5), which are
 426 the ones showing the largest movements at a given developmental stage (32). Therefore, *PKS4* expression
 427 pattern correlates with its functions as a regulator of differential growth processes. Although a model
 428 explaining hyponasty strictly based on growth is attractive, we note that hyponasty and growth can be
 429 partially uncoupled (Fig 1). We previously showed that auxin signaling was particularly important in the
 430 vasculature for shade-induced hyponasty (6). The *PKS4* expression pattern is also consistent with strong
 431 expression in the vasculature (Fig S5). Moreover, propagation of the wounding signals (both electrical and

432 Ca^{2+} -dependent) also appear to rely on both phloem and xylem, especially in variations of pressure inside
433 these tissues (10,16,63). Variations in leaf hydraulics in response to environmental cues could thus be a
434 tempting candidate mechanism to explain leaf movements. How this may relate to PKS function requires
435 future studies.

436 **Material and methods**

437

438 **Plant material**

439 All Arabidopsis lines used in this study are in the Col-0 background, except the original *yuc5* allele which was
 440 in La-er (31,64). The following mutants were described previously: *aos* (30), *myc2myc3myc4* (44), *phyB-9*
 441 (65), *pif4pif5pif7* (5), *pks1-1* and *pks2-1* (66), *pks3-9* (40), *pks4-1* and *pks4-2* (37), *yuc2-1yuc5-3yuc8-1yuc9-1*
 442 (31,64). The transgenic lines *CYCB1;1:GUS* (Col-0/*CYCB1;1pro::NterCycB1;1-GUS*) (67), *JGP* (Col-
 443 0/*JAZ10::GUSplus*) (28), *PIF4-HA* (*pif4-101/PIF4::PIF4-3xHA*) (43), *PKS2-OX* (Col-0/*35S::PKS2*) (66), *PKS4-OX*
 444 (Col-0/*35S::PKS4*) and *PKS4:GUS* (Col-0/*pPKS4::GUS*) (38) were also already described. Higher order *pks*
 445 mutants were obtained by crosses.

446

447 **Construction of CRISPR mutant alleles**

448 *pks2-3* mutant allele was obtained by using the CRISPR-Cas9 system as described in (68) but using a modified
 449 version of the CRISPR vector in which the hygromycin selection marker was replaced by a seed-specific GFP
 450 expression. This plasmid called pEC1.2/EC1.1-SpCas9-GFP is deposited at <https://www.addgene.org/161933/>
 451 In details, the *pks2-3pks4-2* double mutant was directly obtained by mutating *PKS2* in *pks4-2* plants using
 452 two sgRNA directed against *PKS2* genomic sequence: 5'-AGTGATCCAGACTCACCAGA-3' and 5'-
 453 GCAAAGCTCGAAGAATTCCT-3'. The selected mutation corresponds to a 617 bp deletion inside the CDS
 454 (starting at base 361 bp after start codon). Genotyping primers sequences are the following: forward primer
 455 MT111 5'-CCCAGAAGAACCTAATGAGTGGTATC-3' and reverse primer CF330 5'-
 456 AGCTCGGTGTTCTGTTCATG-3'.

457

458 **Growth conditions and phenotyping analyses**

459 All experiments were performed under long-day conditions (16h day/8h night). Absolute light intensities
 460 were measured with an IL1400A radiometer ([https://www.intl-lighttech.com/product-group/light-](https://www.intl-lighttech.com/product-group/light-measurement-optical-filters)
 461 [measurement-optical-filters](https://www.intl-lighttech.com/product-group/light-measurement-optical-filters)) supplemented with a combination of a white diffuser filter and a PAR filter (69).
 462 The R (640–700 nm)/FR (700–760 nm) ratio was measured with an Ocean Optics USB2000+ spectrometer.

Temperature was monitored with Thermochron iButtons (Maxim Integrated Products). Seeds were surface sterilized, sown on soil and stratified for 4 days in the dark at 4°C. Plants were grown for 14 days in a culture chamber under 120 $\mu\text{mol.m}^{-2}.\text{s}^{-1}$ of PAR and 23°C day/18°C night temperature cycles. On day 9, seedlings at the same developmental stage (stage 1.02 (70)) were transferred to individual pots overtopped by a dome of soil. On day 15, plants at stage 1.06 (70) were moved to an E36-L Percival incubator and acclimatized for 1 day to 60 $\mu\text{mol.m}^{-2}.\text{s}^{-1}$ PAR (R/FR ratio=1.4) and constant 20°C. Leaves were numbered and wounded from the oldest to the youngest. Wounding treatments on leaves 1, 2, and 3 were performed from day 16 to 18 at ZT3, one leaf per day, by crushing half of the blade with toothed metal forceps. On day 18 at ZT3, the lower shelf was supplemented with FR light (14 $\mu\text{mol.m}^{-2}.\text{s}^{-1}$) to trigger a low R/FR treatment (R/FR ratio=0.2). Silhouette images of leaf 4 were taken on day 18 at ZT11 with a Canon EOS 550D camera and elevation angles were measured as previously described (6). For all genotypes, we represented elevation angle as tip elevation angle (6,32), except for the quadruple *pks1234* mutant, for which we measured only the petiole angle because the extreme leaf flattening defect (40) made it difficult to position leaf tip. Petiole length of leaf 4 was measured on day 21 as described (5). For time-lapse experiments, elevation angle of leaf 4 was assessed as described (6).

Statistical analyses

For leaf angle and petiole length phenotypes, three-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by Tukey's Honest Significance Differences (HSD) test were performed using R software (<https://www.r-project.org/>) (AGRICOLAE package with default parameters).

GUS staining

PKS4::GUS rosettes were grown and treated as described above and harvested at ZT9. High R/FR-grown *CYCB1;1::GUS* rosettes were harvested at ZT7.5 on days 15 to 17. High R/FR-grown *JGP* rosettes at day 15 were wounded on leaf 1 at different ZT (ZT2, ZT3, ZT4 or ZT5) and all harvested at ZT6. Samples were incubated in 90% acetone overnight at -20 °C. Plants were washed twice in 50 mM sodium phosphate buffer (pH 7.2) and then were vacuum infiltrated for 20 min in 5-bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl- β -glucuronide (X-gluc)

buffer [50 mM NaPO₄ (pH 7.2), 0.1% Triton X-100, 0.5 mM K₃[Fe(CN)₆], and 2 mM X-gluc] and subsequently were incubated at 37 °C for 16 h. Rosettes were cleared overnight in 70% ethanol at 4 °C before being photographed with a Canon EOS 550D camera.

RT-qPCR

RNA extraction and quantitative RT-PCR were performed as previously described (71). Gene-specific oligonucleotides used for qPCR reactions are listed in S2 Table.

ChIP-qPCR

10-d-old PIF4-HA seedlings grown on MS/2 plates in LD, high R/FR, at 21°C were either kept in high R/FR or shifted at ZT2 to low R/FR for 2h before harvesting in liquid nitrogen. Chromatin extraction and immunoprecipitation were performed as described previously (72). The qPCR was done in triplicates on input and immunoprecipitated DNA. Oligonucleotides are listed in S2 Table.

RNA-sequencing and bioinformatics

The quality of the sequencing data was first assessed using *fastqc* (v0.11.2; <https://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/>) and *MultiQC* (v1.0) (73). They were trimmed using *trimGalore* (v0.4.0, q 30 --length 40; https://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/trim_galore/) which is a wrapper for *cutadapt* (v1.11) (74) and again verified using *fastqc* and *MultiQC*. The paired reads were mapped onto the TAIR10 genome with *STAR* (v2.5.0b, -- outFilterMismatchNmax 4) (75) and reads/gene directly counted using the integrated *STAR* function “GeneCounts” based on the TAIR10 gene annotation.

Differential gene expression analysis was conducted in *R* (v3.4.1) using *limma* (v3.32.5) (76). Genes which had an average logCPM of < -0.5 CPM were removed to reduce noise and samples normalized using the TMM (trimmed mean of M-values) method from *edgeR* (v3.18.1) (77) prior *limma*'s differential gene expression analysis. Further analysis and comparisons were all conducted in *R* (<https://www.r-project.org/>). Heatmaps

were generated with *ComplexHeatmap* (v1.14.0, clustering_distance_rows = "pearson") (78). Venn diagrams were generated using the VENNY 2.1 webtool (<https://bioinfogp.cnb.csic.es/tools/venny/>).

Acknowledgements

We thank Mieke de Wit for her great help on the starting of this project. Edward Elliston Farmer (University of Lausanne) and people from his lab for fruitful discussions, technical advice to perform wounding experiments, input on the project as well as for providing *aos* and *JGP* seeds. We thank Philippe Reymond (University of Lausanne) for providing *myc234* seeds. We thank members of the Lausanne Genomic Technologies Facility (GTF) from the University of Lausanne (Switzerland) for performing RNA-sequencing. This project was funded by the University of Lausanne and the Swiss National Science Foundation (grants no. CRSII3_154438, 310030_200318 and 310030B_179558 to C.F.). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Data Availability

RNA-seq data reported in this article have been deposited in NCBI's Gene Expression Omnibus and are accessible through GEO Series accession number GSE133252.

Contributions

Conceptualization: Anne-Sophie Fiorucci, Christian Fankhauser.

Data Curation: Emanuel Schmid-Siebert.

Formal Analysis: Emanuel Schmid-Siebert, Anne-Sophie Fiorucci, Olivier Michaud.

Funding Acquisition: Christian Fankhauser.

Investigation: Anne-Sophie Fiorucci, Olivier Michaud, Emanuel Schmid-Siebert, Martine Trevisan, Laure Allenbach Petrolati, Yetkin Çaka Ince.

543 Methodology: Anne-Sophie Fiorucci, Emanuel Schmid-Siebert, Christian Fankhauser.

544 Project Administration: /

545 Resources: Christian Fankhauser.

546 Software: /

547 Supervision: Christian Fankhauser.

548 Validation: Anne-Sophie Fiorucci.

549 Visualization: Olivier Michaud, Emanuel Schmid-Siebert.

550 Writing – Original Draft Preparation: Anne-Sophie Fiorucci.

551 Writing – Review & Editing: Anne-Sophie Fiorucci, Christian Fankhauser.

552

553

554 **References**

555

- 556 1. Huber M, Nieuwendijk NM, Pantazopoulou CK, Pierik R. Light signalling shapes plant–plant interactions
557 in dense canopies. *Plant, Cell & Environment*. 2021;44(4):1014–29.
- 558 2. Fiorucci A-S, Fankhauser C. Plant Strategies for Enhancing Access to Sunlight. *Current Biology*. 2017 Sep
559 11;27(17):R931–40.
- 560 3. Cheng M-C, Kathare PK, Paik I, Huq E. Phytochrome Signaling Networks. *Annu Rev Plant Biol*. 2021 Jun
561 17;72:217–44.
- 562 4. Fernández-Milmanda GL, Ballaré CL. Shade Avoidance: Expanding the Color and Hormone Palette.
563 *Trends Plant Sci*. 2021 May;26(5):509–23.
- 564 5. de Wit M, Ljung K, Fankhauser C. Contrasting growth responses in lamina and petiole during neighbor
565 detection depend on differential auxin responsiveness rather than different auxin levels. *New Phytol*.
566 2015 Oct;208(1):198–209.
- 567 6. Michaud O, Fiorucci A-S, Xenarios I, Fankhauser C. Local auxin production underlies a spatially restricted
568 neighbor-detection response in *Arabidopsis*. *PNAS*. 2017 Jul 11;114(28):7444–9.
- 569 7. Pantazopoulou CK, Bongers FJ, Küpers JJ, Reinen E, Das D, Evers JB, et al. Neighbor detection at the leaf
570 tip adaptively regulates upward leaf movement through spatial auxin dynamics. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S*
571 *A*. 2017 Jul 11;114(28):7450–5.
- 572 8. Wang J, Wu D, Wang Y, Xie D. Jasmonate action in plant defense against insects. *Journal of Experimental*
573 *Botany*. 2019 Jul 5;70(13):3391–400.
- 574 9. Wasternack C, Song S. Jasmonates: biosynthesis, metabolism, and signaling by proteins activating and
575 repressing transcription. *Journal of Experimental Botany*. 2017 Mar 1;68(6):1303–21.

- 576 10. Farmer EE, Gao Y-Q, Lenzoni G, Wolfender J-L, Wu Q. Wound- and mechanostimulated electrical signals
577 control hormone responses. *New Phytol.* 2020 Aug;227(4):1037–50.
- 578 11. Mousavi SAR, Chauvin A, Pascaud F, Kellenberger S, Farmer EE. GLUTAMATE RECEPTOR-LIKE genes
579 mediate leaf-to-leaf wound signalling. *Nature.* 2013 Aug 22;500(7463):422–6.
- 580 12. Koo AJK, Gao X, Jones AD, Howe GA. A rapid wound signal activates the systemic synthesis of bioactive
581 jasmonates in Arabidopsis. *Plant J.* 2009 Sep;59(6):974–86.
- 582 13. Yan Y, Stolz S, Chételat A, Reymond P, Pagni M, Dubugnon L, et al. A downstream mediator in the
583 growth repression limb of the jasmonate pathway. *Plant Cell.* 2007 Aug;19(8):2470–83.
- 584 14. Noir S, Bömer M, Takahashi N, Ishida T, Tsui T-L, Balbi V, et al. Jasmonate controls leaf growth by
585 repressing cell proliferation and the onset of endoreduplication while maintaining a potential stand-by
586 mode. *Plant Physiol.* 2013 Apr;161(4):1930–51.
- 587 15. Zhang Y, Turner JG. Wound-induced endogenous jasmonates stunt plant growth by inhibiting mitosis.
588 *PLoS One.* 2008;3(11):e3699.
- 589 16. Kurenda A, Nguyen CT, Chételat A, Stolz S, Farmer EE. Insect-damaged Arabidopsis moves like wounded
590 *Mimosa pudica*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2019 Dec 17;116(51):26066–71.
- 591 17. Ritsema T, van Zanten M, Leon-Reyes A, Voeselek LACJ, Millenaar FF, Pieterse CMJ, et al. Kinome
592 profiling reveals an interaction between jasmonate, salicylate and light control of hyponastic petiole
593 growth in Arabidopsis thaliana. *PLoS One.* 2010 Dec 8;5(12):e14255.
- 594 18. Pierik R, Ballaré CL. Control of Plant Growth and Defense by Photoreceptors: From Mechanisms to
595 Opportunities in Agriculture. *Mol Plant.* 2021 Jan 4;14(1):61–76.
- 596 19. Guo Q, Major IT, Howe GA. Resolution of growth-defense conflict: mechanistic insights from jasmonate
597 signaling. *Curr Opin Plant Biol.* 2018 Aug;44:72–81.
- 598 20. Züst T, Agrawal AA. Trade-Offs Between Plant Growth and Defense Against Insect Herbivory: An
599 Emerging Mechanistic Synthesis. *Annu Rev Plant Biol.* 2017 Apr 28;68:513–34.
- 600 21. Campos ML, Yoshida Y, Major IT, de Oliveira Ferreira D, Weraduwa SM, Froehlich JE, et al. Rewiring
601 of jasmonate and phytochrome B signalling uncouples plant growth-defense tradeoffs. *Nat Commun.*
602 2016 Aug 30;7:12570.
- 603 22. Cerrudo I, Caliri-Ortiz ME, Keller MM, Degano ME, Demkura PV, Ballaré CL. Exploring growth-defence
604 trade-offs in Arabidopsis: phytochrome B inactivation requires JAZ10 to suppress plant immunity but
605 not to trigger shade-avoidance responses. *Plant Cell Environ.* 2017 May;40(5):635–44.
- 606 23. Major IT, Guo Q, Zhai J, Kapali G, Kramer DM, Howe GA. A Phytochrome B-Independent Pathway
607 Restricts Growth at High Levels of Jasmonate Defense. *Plant Physiol.* 2020 Jun;183(2):733–49.
- 608 24. Leone M, Keller MM, Cerrudo I, Ballaré CL. To grow or defend? Low red : far-red ratios reduce
609 jasmonate sensitivity in Arabidopsis seedlings by promoting DELLA degradation and increasing JAZ10
610 stability. *New Phytol.* 2014 Oct;204(2):355–67.
- 611 25. Chico J-M, Fernández-Barbero G, Chini A, Fernández-Calvo P, Díez-Díaz M, Solano R. Repression of
612 Jasmonate-Dependent Defenses by Shade Involves Differential Regulation of Protein Stability of MYC
613 Transcription Factors and Their JAZ Repressors in Arabidopsis. *Plant Cell.* 2014 May;26(5):1967–80.

- 614 26. Fernández-Milmanda GL, Crocco CD, Reichelt M, Mazza CA, Köllner TG, Zhang T, et al. A light-dependent
615 molecular link between competition cues and defence responses in plants. *Nature Plants*. 2020
616 Mar;6(3):223–30.
- 617 27. de Wit M, Spoel SH, Sanchez-Perez GF, Gommers CMM, Pieterse CMJ, Voosenek LACJ, et al. Perception
618 of low red:far-red ratio compromises both salicylic acid- and jasmonic acid-dependent pathogen
619 defences in Arabidopsis. *Plant J*. 2013 Jul;75(1):90–103.
- 620 28. Acosta IF, Gasperini D, Chételat A, Stolz S, Santuari L, Farmer EE. Role of NINJA in root jasmonate
621 signaling. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2013 Sep 17;110(38):15473–8.
- 622 29. Yang T-H, Lenglet-Hilfiker A, Stolz S, Glauser G, Farmer EE. Jasmonate Precursor Biosynthetic Enzymes
623 LOX3 and LOX4 Control Wound-Response Growth Restriction. *Plant Physiol*. 2020 Oct;184(2):1172–80.
- 624 30. Park J-H, Halitschke R, Kim HB, Baldwin IT, Feldmann KA, Feyereisen R. A knock-out mutation in allene
625 oxide synthase results in male sterility and defective wound signal transduction in Arabidopsis due to a
626 block in jasmonic acid biosynthesis. *Plant J*. 2002 Jul;31(1):1–12.
- 627 31. Kohnen MV, Schmid-Siegert E, Trevisan M, Petrolati LA, Sénéchal F, Müller-Moulé P, et al. Neighbor
628 Detection Induces Organ-Specific Transcriptomes, Revealing Patterns Underlying Hypocotyl-Specific
629 Growth. *Plant Cell*. 2016 Dec;28(12):2889–904.
- 630 32. Dornbusch T, Michaud O, Xenarios I, Fankhauser C. Differentially phased leaf growth and movements
631 in Arabidopsis depend on coordinated circadian and light regulation. *Plant Cell*. 2014 Oct;26(10):3911–
632 21.
- 633 33. de Carbonnel M, Davis P, Roelfsema MRG, Inoue S-I, Schepens I, Lariguet P, et al. The Arabidopsis
634 PHYTOCHROME KINASE SUBSTRATE2 protein is a phototropin signaling element that regulates leaf
635 flattening and leaf positioning. *Plant Physiol*. 2010 Mar;152(3):1391–405.
- 636 34. Demarsy E, Schepens I, Okajima K, Hersch M, Bergmann S, Christie J, et al. Phytochrome Kinase
637 Substrate 4 is phosphorylated by the phototropin 1 photoreceptor. *EMBO J*. 2012 Aug 15;31(16):3457–
638 67.
- 639 35. Fankhauser C, Yeh KC, Lagarias JC, Zhang H, Elich TD, Chory J. PKS1, a substrate phosphorylated by
640 phytochrome that modulates light signaling in Arabidopsis. *Science*. 1999 May 28;284(5419):1539–41.
- 641 36. Kami C, Allenbach L, Zourelidou M, Ljung K, Schütz F, Isono E, et al. Reduced phototropism in pks
642 mutants may be due to altered auxin-regulated gene expression or reduced lateral auxin transport.
643 *Plant J*. 2014 Feb;77(3):393–403.
- 644 37. Lariguet P, Schepens I, Hodgson D, Pedmale UV, Trevisan M, Kami C, et al. PHYTOCHROME KINASE
645 SUBSTRATE 1 is a phototropin 1 binding protein required for phototropism. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*.
646 2006 Jun 27;103(26):10134–9.
- 647 38. Schepens I, Boccalandro HE, Kami C, Casal JJ, Fankhauser C. PHYTOCHROME KINASE SUBSTRATE4
648 modulates phytochrome-mediated control of hypocotyl growth orientation. *Plant Physiol*. 2008
649 Jun;147(2):661–71.
- 650 39. Schumacher P, Demarsy E, Waridel P, Petrolati LA, Trevisan M, Fankhauser C. A phosphorylation switch
651 turns a positive regulator of phototropism into an inhibitor of the process. *Nat Commun*. 2018 Jun
652 19;9(1):2403.

- 653 40. Legris M, Szarzynska-Erden BM, Trevisan M, Allenbach-Petrolati L, Fankhauser C. Phototropin-mediated
654 perception of light direction in leaves regulates blade flattening. *Plant Physiology* [Internet]. 2021 Sep
655 4; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/plphys/kiab410>
- 656 41. Oh E, Zhu J-Y, Wang Z-Y. Interaction between BZR1 and PIF4 integrates brassinosteroid and
657 environmental responses. *Nat Cell Biol*. 2012 Aug;14(8):802–9.
- 658 42. Pedmale UV, Huang S-SC, Zander M, Cole BJ, Hetzel J, Ljung K, et al. Cryptochromes Interact Directly
659 with PIFs to Control Plant Growth in Limiting Blue Light. *Cell*. 2016 Jan 14;164(1–2):233–45.
- 660 43. Zhang B, Holmlund M, Lorrain S, Norberg M, Bakó L, Fankhauser C, et al. BLADE-ON-PETIOLE proteins
661 act in an E3 ubiquitin ligase complex to regulate PHYTOCHROME INTERACTING FACTOR 4 abundance.
662 *Elife*. 2017 Aug 22;6:e26759.
- 663 44. Fernández-Calvo P, Chini A, Fernández-Barbero G, Chico J-M, Gimenez-Ibanez S, Geerinck J, et al. The
664 Arabidopsis bHLH transcription factors MYC3 and MYC4 are targets of JAZ repressors and act additively
665 with MYC2 in the activation of jasmonate responses. *Plant Cell*. 2011 Feb;23(2):701–15.
- 666 45. Ortigosa A, Fonseca S, Franco-Zorrilla JM, Fernández-Calvo P, Zander M, Lewsey MG, et al. The JA-
667 pathway MYC transcription factors regulate photomorphogenic responses by targeting HY5 gene
668 expression. *Plant J*. 2020 Apr;102(1):138–52.
- 669 46. Chakraborty M, Gangappa SN, Maurya JP, Sethi V, Srivastava AK, Singh A, et al. Functional interrelation
670 of MYC2 and HY5 plays an important role in Arabidopsis seedling development. *The Plant Journal*.
671 2019;99(6):1080–97.
- 672 47. Li C, Nozue K, Maloof JN. MYCs and PIFs Act Independently in Arabidopsis Growth Regulation. *G3*
673 (Bethesda). 2020 May 4;10(5):1797–807.
- 674 48. Ballaré CL, Austin AT. Recalculating growth and defense strategies under competition: key roles of
675 photoreceptors and jasmonates. *Journal of Experimental Botany*. 2019 Jul 5;70(13):3425–34.
- 676 49. Havko NE, Das MR, McClain AM, Kapali G, Sharkey TD, Howe GA. Insect herbivory antagonizes leaf
677 cooling responses to elevated temperature in tomato. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2020 Jan
678 28;117(4):2211–7.
- 679 50. Balcerowicz M. PHYTOCHROME-INTERACTING FACTORS at the interface of light and temperature
680 signalling. *Physiol Plant*. 2020 Jul;169(3):347–56.
- 681 51. Legris M, Nieto C, Sellaro R, Prat S, Casal JJ. Perception and signalling of light and temperature cues in
682 plants. *The Plant Journal*. 2017;90(4):683–97.
- 683 52. Ballaré CL. Light regulation of plant defense. *Annu Rev Plant Biol*. 2014;65:335–63.
- 684 53. Cerrudo I, Keller MM, Cargnel MD, Demkura PV, de Wit M, Patitucci MS, et al. Low red/far-red ratios
685 reduce Arabidopsis resistance to Botrytis cinerea and jasmonate responses via a COI1-JAZ10-
686 dependent, salicylic acid-independent mechanism. *Plant Physiol*. 2012 Apr;158(4):2042–52.
- 687 54. Bell E, Mullet JE. Characterization of an Arabidopsis Lipoxygenase Gene Responsive to Methyl
688 Jasmonate and Wounding. *Plant Physiol*. 1993 Dec 1;103(4):1133–7.
- 689 55. Berger S, Bell E, Sadka A, Mullet JE. Arabidopsis thaliana Atvsp is homologous to soybean VspA and
690 VspB, genes encoding vegetative storage protein acid phosphatases, and is regulated similarly by
691 methyl jasmonate, wounding, sugars, light and phosphate. *Plant Mol Biol*. 1995 Mar;27(5):933–42.

- 692 56. Wang H, Li S, Li Y, Xu Y, Wang Y, Zhang R, et al. MED25 connects enhancer-promoter looping and MYC2-
693 dependent activation of jasmonate signalling. *Nat Plants*. 2019 Jun;5(6):616–25.
- 694 57. Harmer SL, Brooks CJ. Growth-mediated plant movements: hidden in plain sight. *Curr Opin Plant Biol*.
695 2018 Feb;41:89–94.
- 696 58. Legris M, Boccaccini A. Stem phototropism toward blue and ultraviolet light. *Physiol Plant*. 2020
697 Jul;169(3):357–68.
- 698 59. Polko JK, van Zanten M, van Rooij JA, Marée AFM, Voesenek LACJ, Peeters AJM, et al. Ethylene-induced
699 differential petiole growth in *Arabidopsis thaliana* involves local microtubule reorientation and cell
700 expansion. *New Phytol*. 2012 Jan;193(2):339–48.
- 701 60. Rauf M, Arif M, Fisahn J, Xue G-P, Balazadeh S, Mueller-Roeber B. NAC Transcription Factor SPEEDY
702 HYPONASTIC GROWTH Regulates Flooding-Induced Leaf Movement in *Arabidopsis*[W]. *Plant Cell*. 2013
703 Dec;25(12):4941–55.
- 704 61. Park Y-J, Lee H-J, Gil K-E, Kim JY, Lee J-H, Lee H, et al. Developmental Programming of Theronastic
705 Leaf Movement. *Plant Physiol*. 2019 Jun;180(2):1185–97.
- 706 62. Mullen JL, Weinig C, Hangarter RP. Shade avoidance and the regulation of leaf inclination in *Arabidopsis*.
707 *Plant Cell Environ*. 2006 Jun;29(6):1099–106.
- 708 63. Farmer EE, Gasperini D, Acosta IF. The squeeze cell hypothesis for the activation of jasmonate synthesis
709 in response to wounding. *New Phytol*. 2014 Oct;204(2):282–8.
- 710 64. Müller-Moulé P, Nozue K, Pytlak ML, Palmer CM, Covington MF, Wallace AD, et al. YUCCA auxin
711 biosynthetic genes are required for *Arabidopsis* shade avoidance. *PeerJ*. 2016;4:e2574.
- 712 65. Reed JW, Nagpal P, Poole DS, Furuya M, Chory J. Mutations in the gene for the red/far-red light receptor
713 phytochrome B alter cell elongation and physiological responses throughout *Arabidopsis* development.
714 *Plant Cell*. 1993 Feb;5(2):147–57.
- 715 66. Lariguet P, Boccalandro HE, Alonso JM, Ecker JR, Chory J, Casal JJ, et al. A growth regulatory loop that
716 provides homeostasis to phytochrome a signaling. *Plant Cell*. 2003 Dec;15(12):2966–78.
- 717 67. Marrocco K, Thomann A, Parmentier Y, Genschik P, Criqui MC. The APC/C E3 ligase remains active in
718 most post-mitotic *Arabidopsis* cells and is required for proper vasculature development and
719 organization. *Development*. 2009 May;136(9):1475–85.
- 720 68. Wang Z-P, Xing H-L, Dong L, Zhang H-Y, Han C-Y, Wang X-C, et al. Egg cell-specific promoter-controlled
721 CRISPR/Cas9 efficiently generates homozygous mutants for multiple target genes in *Arabidopsis* in a
722 single generation. *Genome Biol*. 2015 Dec;16(1):1–12.
- 723 69. Boccaccini A, Legris M, Krahmer J, Allenbach-Petrolati L, Goyal A, Galvan-Ampudia C, et al. Low Blue
724 Light Enhances Phototropism by Releasing Cryptochrome1-Mediated Inhibition of PIF4 Expression.
725 *Plant Physiol*. 2020 Aug;183(4):1780–93.
- 726 70. Boyes DC, Zayed AM, Ascenzi R, McCaskill AJ, Hoffman NE, Davis KR, et al. Growth stage-based
727 phenotypic analysis of *Arabidopsis*: a model for high throughput functional genomics in plants. *Plant*
728 *Cell*. 2001 Jul;13(7):1499–510.
- 729 71. Galvão VC, Fiorucci A-S, Trevisan M, Franco-Zorilla JM, Goyal A, Schmid-Siebert E, et al. PIF transcription
730 factors link a neighbor threat cue to accelerated reproduction in *Arabidopsis*. *Nature Communications*.
731 2019 Sep 5;10(1):4005.

732 72. Fiorucci A-S, Galvão VC, Ince YÇ, Boccaccini A, Goyal A, Petrolati LA, et al. PHYTOCHROME INTERACTING
733 FACTOR 7 is important for early responses to elevated temperature in Arabidopsis seedlings. New
734 Phytologist. 2020;226(1):50–8.

735 73. Ewels P, Magnusson M, Lundin S, Käller M. MultiQC: summarize analysis results for multiple tools and
736 samples in a single report. Bioinformatics. 2016 Oct 1;32(19):3047–8.

737 74. Martin M. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads.
738 EMBnet.journal. 2011 May 2;17(1):10–2.

739 75. Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, et al. STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq
740 aligner. Bioinformatics. 2013 Jan 1;29(1):15–21.

741 76. Ritchie ME, Phipson B, Wu D, Hu Y, Law CW, Shi W, et al. limma powers differential expression analyses
742 for RNA-sequencing and microarray studies. Nucleic Acids Res. 2015 Apr 20;43(7):e47.

743 77. Robinson MD, McCarthy DJ, Smyth GK. edgeR: a Bioconductor package for differential expression
744 analysis of digital gene expression data. Bioinformatics. 2010 Jan 1;26(1):139–40.

745 78. Gu Z, Eils R, Schlesner M. Complex heatmaps reveal patterns and correlations in multidimensional
746 genomic data. Bioinformatics. 2016 Sep 15;32(18):2847–9.

747

748 **Supporting information**

749

750 Supplementary tables:

751

752 **S1 Table: List of 64 candidate genes.**

753 **S2 Table: Oligos used in the study.**

754

755 Supplementary figures:

756

757 **S1 Figure: Description of the experimental system.**

758 **S2 Figure: Shade and wounding do not interact on petiole elongation.**

759 **S3 Figure: Suppression of wounding effect in a *phyB* background.**

760 **S4 Figure: Wounding-induced gene expression programs.**

761 **S5 Figure: *PKS4* expression is regulated by shade and wounding.**

762 **S6 Figure: A single *pks2* mutant displays a wild-type elevation response to shade and wounding.**

763 **S7 Figure: The double *pks2-3pks4-2* mutant displays similar responses to shade and wounding than the**
764 **other allelic combination.**

765 **S8 Figure: Expression of *PKS2* and *PKS4* is repressed by wounding in a JA-dependent manner.**

A

B

C

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

S1 Fig: Description of the experimental system.

A) Time-course GUS activity in rosettes of the *JAZ10::GUS* reporter line upon wounding of leaf 1. 15-day-old rosettes grown in long days under high R/FR conditions were harvested at different times after wounding. Red arrow: wounded leaf. **B)** RT-qPCR analysis of JA-induced genes (*JAZ10*, *LOX2*, *VSP2*) in entire leaf 4 of unwounded and wounded *JAZ10::GUS* plants. 16-day-old rosettes grown in LD, high R/FR, were either touched (control, unwounded) or wounded on leaf 1 at ZT3 and leaves 4 were harvested 3h after treatment. For each gene, expression levels are given relative to housekeeping genes and expression in unwounded plants is arbitrarily set to 1. Error bars correspond to SD from 3 biological replicates. **C)** GUS activity in the *CYCB1;1::GUS* reporter line as a marker for dividing cells. Rosettes grown in long days under high R/FR conditions were harvested from day 15 to 17 after sowing. Leaves are numbered from the oldest to the youngest. Scale bar, 2 mm.

S2 Fig: Shade and wounding do not interact on petiole elongation.

Petiole lengths of Col-0 with 3 different protocols of shade vs wounding treatments. Top: Schematic of the different experimental procedures. Wounds are performed individually on leaf 1, then leaf 2 and then leaf 3. The shade treatment either starts at the same time as the first wound (left), at the same time as the third wound (middle, see Fig 1A) or one day before the first wound (right). We measured petiole length of leaf 4 at the end of the treatments (day 21). Bottom: Petiole length phenotype of wt Col-0 plants (n = 12-15 plants/genotype/condition). For each protocol, a representative experiment from 3 biological replicates is presented. Different letters indicate significant differences (Tukey's HSD test following a two-way ANOVA, $P < 0.05$).

S3 Fig: Suppression of wounding effect in a *phyB* background.

Leaf angle and petiole length phenotype of wt Col-0 and *phyB-9* mutant plants grown in high R/FR (n=10 plants/genotype/condition). As described on Fig 1A, wounds are performed individually on leaf 1 (day 16), then leaf 2, then leaf 3 and plants are then kept in sun condition. We measured elevation angle of leaf 4 at the end of day 18 on pictures of each individual plant and petiole length of the same leaf at the end of the treatments (day 21). Representative experiment from 3 biological replicates. Graphs are represented as violin plots, which present a combination of a box plot and a kernel density plot. In each box plot, the white dot represents the median, black boxes extend from the 25th to the 75th percentile, while the vertical black line extends to 1.5 times the interquartile range of the lower and upper quartiles, respectively. A rotated kernel density plot surrounds each side of the box plot. Different letters indicate significant differences (Tukey's HSD test following a two-way ANOVA, $P < 0.05$).

S4 Fig: Wounding-induced gene expression programs.

A) Number of genes significantly differentially regulated by wounding in the different conditions: genotypes (Col-0 and *aos*), timepoints (Time 1 and Time 2) and shade treatment (sun in beige, shade in dark red). Genes are considered differentially expressed when $|\log_2 \text{fold change}| > 1$ and $p\text{val} < 0.05$. **B)** Heatmap with hierarchical clustering of significantly differentially regulated genes by wounding in the different conditions (same genes as in A). **C)** Venn diagram comparing wound-regulated genes (at Time 1 and/or Time 2) in sun vs shade. **D)** Scatterplots of expression (Log2 FC) of wound-regulated genes in sun vs shade at Time 1 (left graph) or Time 2 (right graph). Blue line represents the linear regression of shown data points (equation and regression coefficient are added on the right). Dotted grey line represents $y=x$.

S5 Fig: *PKS4* expression is regulated by shade and wounding.

A) *PKS4* expression in RNA-seq dataset (at Time 1, 1h30, wt samples). Values correspond to average log CPM from the three biological replicates. **B)** *PKS4* expression in *PKS4::GUS* reporter line subjected to shade treatment. Rosettes grown in long days under high R/FR conditions were either kept in high R/FR or subjected to low R/FR for 6 hours starting at ZT3 and harvested on day 18 after sowing. Scale bar, 3.6 mm. **C)** Leaf angle and petiole length phenotype of wt Col-0 and *pks4-2* mutant plants (n=10 plants/genotype/condition). Representative experiment from 2 biological replicates. Experiments were done as described on Fig 1A. Graphs are represented as violin plots, which present a combination of a box plot and a kernel density plot. In each box plot, the white dot represents the median, black boxes extend from the 25th to the 75th percentile, while the vertical black line extends to 1.5 times the interquartile range of the lower and upper quartiles, respectively. A rotated kernel density plot surrounds each side of the box plot. Different letters indicate significant differences (Tukey's HSD test following a three-way ANOVA, $P < 0.05$).

A

B

822

823 **S6 Fig: A single *pks2* mutant displays a wild-type elevation response to shade and wounding.**

824 **A)** *PKS2* expression in RNA-seq dataset (left at Time 1, right at Time 2, wt samples). Values correspond to average log
825 CPM from the three biological replicates. **B)** Leaf angle and petiole length phenotype of wt *Col-0* and *pks2-1* mutant
826 plants (n=10 plants/genotype/condition). Representative experiment from 2 biological replicates. Experiments were
827 done as described on Fig 1A. Graphs are represented as violin plots, which present a combination of a box plot and a
828 kernel density plot. In each box plot, the white dot represents the median, black boxes extend from the 25th to the 75th
829 percentile, while the vertical black line extends to 1.5 times the interquartile range of the lower and upper quartiles,
830 respectively. A rotated kernel density plot surrounds each side of the box plot. Different letters indicate significant
831 differences (Tukey's HSD test following a three-way ANOVA, P < 0.05).

832

S7 Fig: The double *pks2-3pks4-2* mutant displays similar responses to shade and wounding than the other allelic combination.

Leaf angle and petiole length phenotype of wt Col-0 and *pks2-3pks4-2* mutant plants (n=10 plants/genotype/condition). Representative experiment from 2 biological replicates. Experiments were done as described on Fig 1A. Graphs are represented as violin plots, which present a combination of a box plot and a kernel density plot. In each box plot, the white dot represents the median, black boxes extend from the 25th to the 75th percentile, while the vertical black line extends to 1.5 times the interquartile range of the lower and upper quartiles, respectively. A rotated kernel density plot surrounds each side of the box plot. Different letters indicate significant differences (Tukey's HSD test following a three-way ANOVA, P < 0.05).

843

844

845

846

S8 Fig: Expression of *PKS2* and *PKS4* is repressed by wounding in a JA-dependent manner.

Comparison *PKS2* (A, B) or *PKS4* (C, D) expression in *wt* and *aos* samples under sun conditions at Time 1 (A, C) or Time 2 (B, D). Values correspond to average log CPM from the three biological replicates.