The Arabidopsis Eukaryotic Translation Initiation Factor eIF5A-2 Regulates Root Protoxylem Development by Modulating Cytokinin Signaling[™]

Bo Ren,^{a,1} Qingguo Chen,^{a,b,1} Sulei Hong,^{a,b} Wenming Zhao,^{a,b} Jian Feng,^{a,b} Haizhong Feng,^a and Jianru Zuo^{a,2}

a State Key Laboratory of Plant Genomics and National Plant Gene Research Center, Institute of Genetics and Developmental Biology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100101, China

^b University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

The phytohormone cytokinin regulates various aspects of plant growth and development, including root vascular development. In Arabidopsis thaliana, mutations in the cytokinin signaling components cause misspecification of protoxylem cell files. Auxin antagonizes cytokinin-regulated root protoxylem differentiation by inducing expression of ARABIDOPSIS PHOSPHOTRANSFER PROTEIN6 (AHP6), a negative regulator of cytokinin signaling. However, the molecular mechanism of cytokinin-regulated protoxylem differentiation is not fully understood. Here, we show that a mutation in Arabidopsis FUMONISIN B₁-RESISTANT12 (FBR12), which encodes a eukaryotic translation initiation factor 5A, causes defective protoxylem development and reduced sensitivity to cytokinin. FBR12 genetically interacts with the cytokinin receptor CYTOKININ RESPONSE1 (CRE1) and downstream AHP genes, as double mutants show enhanced phenotypes. FBR12 forms a protein complex with CRE1 and AHP1, and cytokinin regulates formation of this protein complex. Intriguingly, ahp6 partially suppresses the fbr12 mutant phenotype, and the fbr12 mutation causes increased expression of AHP6, indicating that FBR12 negatively regulates AHP6. Consistent with this, ectopic expression of FBR12 in the CRE1-expressing domain partially rescues defective protoxylem development in fbr12, and overexpression of AHP6 causes an fbr12-like phenotype. These results define a regulatory role of the highly conserved FBR12 in cytokinin-mediated root protoxylem specification.

INTRODUCTION

In higher plants, the radial pattern of a root contains, from outside to inside, the epidermis, the cortex, the endodermis, the pericycle, and the central vascular cylinder. The root vascular bundles consist of xylem and phloem with intervening procambial cells and surrounding pericycle cells. The root vascular tissue forms from undifferentiated procambial cells during embryogenesis and differentiates as the phloem and xylem strands (Steeves and Sussex, 1989; Dolan et al., 1993). In the mature zone of an Arabidopsis thaliana root, the xylem axis contains two opposite-oriented protoxylem cells adjacent to the pericycle layer. Protoxylem has a characteristic helical, thickened cell wall. Across the central axis, metaxylem forms at the inner side of protoxylem at a later developmental stage, and the phloem cell files form perpendicular to the xylem axis. Xylem and phloem are separated by intervening procambial cell files, which form cambium during secondary development by periclinal cell divisions (Steeves and Sussex, 1989; Dolan et al., 1993; Fukuda, 2004).

¹ These authors contributed equally to this work.

2Address correspondence to jrzuo@genetics.ac.cn.

The author responsible for distribution of materials integral to the findings presented in this article in accordance with the policy described in the Instructions for Authors ([www.plantcell.org\)](http://www.plantcell.org) is: Jianru Zuo ([jrzuo@](mailto:jrzuo@genetics.ac.cn) [genetics.ac.cn](mailto:jrzuo@genetics.ac.cn)).

^W Online version contains Web-only data.

www.plantcell.org/cgi/doi/10.1105/tpc.113.116236

The phytohormone cytokinin plays a key role in the complex mechanism regulating root xylem development (Mähönen et al., 2000, 2006b; Bishopp et al., 2011a, 2011b). Cytokinin signaling is mediated by a two-component system, involving in a phosphorelay that functions by sequential transfer of phosphoryl groups from receptors to downstream components (Hwang and Sheen, 2001; To and Kieber, 2008; Werner and Schmülling, 2009; Hwang et al., 2012). Arabidopsis has three characterized cytokinin receptors, the His kinases, CYTOKININ RESPONSE1 (CRE1)/WOODEN LEG (WOL)/ARABIDOPSIS HISTIDINE KINASE4 (AHK4), AHK2, and AHK3. Downstream of these receptors, phosphotransfer proteins (ARABIDOPSIS PHOSPHOTRANSFER PROTEIN1 [AHP1] through AHP5) transfer the phosphoryl group from the receptor to the downstream targets. Transfer of the phosphoryl group from AHPs activates the type-B response regulators (ARRs), a group of MYB-class transcription factors, which then promote the expression of type-A ARRs and other targets. Type-A ARRs, in turn, negatively regulate the phosphorelay, thus forming a feedback regulatory loop. Interestingly, the CRE1 receptor has kinase activity when bound to cytokinin, but in the absence of cytokinin, CRE1 acts as a phosphatase on AHPs (Mähönen et al., 2006a). The stability of type-B ARR proteins is negatively regulated by the 26S proteasomal degradation machinery, mediated by an F-box E3 ubiquitin ligase KISS ME DEADLY (Kim et al., 2012, 2013).

Mutations in several components of the cytokinin signaling pathway cause impaired vascular development. In particular, the wol mutation and the ahk2 ahk3 ahk4 triple receptor mutations result in the transformation of all cell files of the root vascular cylinder into protoxylem (Mähönen et al., 2000, 2006b; Higuchi et al., 2004; Nishimura et al., 2004). Defective xylem development was also observed in an ahp1,2,3,4,5 quintuple mutant (Hutchison et al., 2006) and, in a lesser extent, in an arr1 arr10 arr12 triple mutant of type-B ARR genes (Argyros et al., 2008; Ishida et al., 2008). Consistent with these observations, tissue-specific depletion of endogenous cytokinins in the CRE1/ AHK4-expressing domain causes a similar phenotype (Mähönen et al., 2006b). Conversely, mutations in AHP6, which encodes a pseudophosphotransfer protein that acts as a negative regulator of cytokinin signaling, cause reduced protoxylem cell files (Mähönen et al., 2006b). These observations led to the proposal that reciprocal interactions of the phosphorelay and AHP6 modulate cell proliferation and cell differentiation during root vascular development. Vascular cell fate determination in the absence of cytokinin signaling may default to protoxylem formation (Mähönen et al., 2006b).

The interaction between cytokinin and auxin coordinates root growth and development in response to environmental and internal cues (Müller and Sheen, 2008; Bishopp et al., 2011a, 2011b). In particular, auxin and cytokinin form a mutually-inhibitory feedback loop, in which cytokinin modulates the bisymmetric distribution of the PIN-FORMED (PIN) auxin efflux proteins, and auxin, in turn, promotes AHP6 transcription, which terminates the loop. This reciprocal inhibition between auxin and cytokinin plays an important role in specifying vascular pattern in the root meristem (Bishopp et al., 2011a, 2011b).

In addition to signaling mediated by phytohormones, several transcription factors also regulate protoxylem specification. Overexpression of VASCULAR-RELATED NAC-DOMAIN7 (VND7) causes the transformation of stele cells into protoxylem by regulating expression of genes for xylem vessel formation (Kubo et al., 2005; Yamaguchi et al., 2011). Moreover, mutations in LONESOME HIGHWAY (LHW), a helix-loop-helix transcription factor gene expressed in the root meristem, result in fewer cells inside the stele and the production of only one strand of xylem and phloem cell files (Ohashi-Ito and Bergmann, 2007). This phenotype, however, does not fit with the model that cytokinin promotes cell divisions of the stele and inhibits protoxylem differentiation, thus raising the possibility that LHW may act independent from cytokinin signaling (Ohashi-Ito and Bergmann, 2007).

In this study, we revealed a regulatory role of eukaryotic translation initiation factor 5A-2 (eIF5A-2) in root protoxylem development. eIF5A was initially identified as a translation initiation factor from rabbit reticulocyte lysates, and eIF5A proteins are highly conserved in eukaryotes and archaea (Kemper et al., 1976). Several studies suggest that in vivo protein synthesis does not require eIF-5A (Kang and Hershey, 1994; Park et al., 1997), but recent studies imply that eIF-5A proteins function in the elongation step of translation, rather than in the initiation step as originally proposed (Saini et al., 2009; Ma et al., 2010). In addition, eIF5A plays a role in the regulation of RNA stability and the transport of RNA between the nucleus and the cytoplasm (Bevec and Hauber, 1997; Zuk and Jacobson, 1998; Rosorius et al., 1999; Schrader et al., 2006). The eIF5A proteins also interact with several proteins, likely involved in intracellular trafficking of RNA or proteins (Rosorius et al., 1999; Lipowsky et al., 2000; Hofmann et al., 2001; Thompson et al., 2003; Li et al., 2004). Therefore, eIF5A was proposed to be a bimodular protein capable of binding to both RNA and proteins, thus playing multiple roles in distinctive cellular activities (Thompson et al., 2003; Jao and Chen, 2006). The precise biochemical activity of eIF5A remains to be fully elucidated.

As a highly conserved housekeeping gene, eIF5A plays a critical role in growth and development by regulating cell division, cell expansion, cell differentiation, and cell death in a variety of organisms (Thompson et al., 2004). The Arabidopsis genome contains three eIF5A genes, eIF5A-1, eIF5A-2, and eIF5A-3 (Thompson et al., 2004), of which eIF5A-2, also known as FUMONISIN B_1 -RESISTANT12 (FBR12), represents the major activity of this small gene family (Feng et al., 2007). Mutations in eIF5A-2 cause severe defects in plant growth and development and eventually seedling lethality (Feng et al., 2007). In addition, eIF5A genes regulate stress responses, programmed cell death, stem xylem development, and leaf senescence (Thompson et al., 2004; Feng et al., 2007; Hopkins et al., 2008; Liu et al., 2008b; Ma et al., 2010). In particular, Arabidopsis eIF5A-1 and FBR12/eIF5A-2 genes affect stem xylem development (Feng et al., 2007; Liu et al., 2008b). Moreover, a pumpkin (Cucurbita maxima) eIF5A occurs in the phloem sap and interacts with phloem proteins, implying a possible role in the regulation of the sieve tube system (Ma et al., 2010). Here, we report a specific activity of FBR12/eIF5A-2 in root vascular development by modulating cytokinin signaling.

RESULTS

eIF5A Genes in Root Protoxylem Development

The fbr12 mutant carries a T-DNA insertion in eIF5A-2 and has no detectable FRB12 mRNA or FBR12 protein (Feng et al., 2007) (see [Supplemental Figure 1](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). We identified a second mutant allele CS852785 in the Columbia-0 (Col-0) background, which showed a similar phenotype (see [Supplemental Figures 1 and 2](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). Accordingly, we renamed the original mutant as fbr12-1 (in the Wassilewskija [Ws] background) and CS852785 as fbr12-2. The data presented below were generated based on fbr12-1, and we refer to fbr12-1 as fbr12 hereafter, unless otherwise indicated.

The *fbr12* mutants had significantly shorter primary roots than wild-type seedlings (Figure 1A). Analysis of the transverse sections of the roots revealed relatively normal cell files in the epidermis and the cortex of the fbr12 root, compared with the wild-type root. However, the cell linage in the fbr12 root vascular cylinder was disorganized and had fewer cells and reduced cell files of the intervening procambial cells (Figures 1B and 1C). The phloem cell files remained relatively normal, but extra protoxylem cell files were observed in nearly half of fbr12 roots (46.9%; Figures 1D and 1E), suggesting that fbr12 root protoxylem development is impaired by fbr12. These developmental defects were fully rescued by an FBR12 (Feng et al., 2007) or an FBR12- FLAG transgene driven by an FBR12 promoter, but not by an FBR12K51S transgene (see [Supplemental Figure 3](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). The highly conserved Lys-51 residue of eIF5A is posttranslationally modified by hypusination, which converts Lys into the amino acid

Figure 1. Altered Vascular Development in fbr12 Roots.

(A) Left: Seedlings of the wild type (WT) and fbr12. Right, measurement of the primary root length shown at the left side. The means of three replicates $(n = 30) \pm$ sp are shown. Bar = 1 cm.

(B) Transverse sections of wild-type and fbr12 roots. Bars = 40 μ m.

(C) The cell number of different tissues in wild-type and fbr12 roots $(n = 40)$. Asterisk indicates statistically significant difference (analysis of variance, $P < 0.01$). Bars denote sp.

(D) Protoxylem development in wild-type and fbr12 roots. (Top) Transverse sections. (Bottom) Longitudinal images of xylems stained with basic Fuchsin red and visualized under a confocal microscope. Arrows denote protoxylem cell files. Bars = $20 \mu m$.

(E) Quantitative analysis of the extra protoxylem phenotype in wild-type and fbr12 roots ($n = 40$).

Eight-day-old seedlings were used in all the experiments.

hypusine. This unique modification is essential for the activity of eIF5A proteins (Park et al., 1997; Thompson et al., 2004).

To explore the possible roles of the three Arabidopsis eIF5A genes in root xylem development, we first analyzed their expression patterns by generating transgenic plants carrying promoter:GUS (ß-glucuronidase) reporter genes. We detected weak expression of eIF5A-1:GUS in the vascular tissue of the maturation zone of the root and the anther (Figure 2A). In the eIF5A-2/FBR12:GUS transgenic plants, we detected GUS activity in most organs and tissues (Figure 2B). The root showed most GUS activity inside the stele of the mature zone, where the maturation of protoxylem occurs (Figures 2B). We confirmed this expression pattern by immunostaining root transverse sections using an anti-FBR12 polyclonal antibody. Similar to the FBR12: GUS expression pattern, we detected FBR12 protein in the stele of mature zone of the root and in an extended domain in the elongation zone (Figure 2C). The relatively specific expression pattern of FBR12 in the root is consistent with the fbr12 mutant

Figure 2. Characterization of Arabidopsis eIF5A Genes.

(A) Analysis of eIF5A-1:GUS expression. Bars = 0.5 cm.

(B) Analysis of eIF5A-2/FBR12:GUS expression. Left, a 4-d-old seedling. Middle, enlarged views of the highlighted region at the left. Right, transverse sections of the matured zone (top) and the elongation zone (bottom) of the highlighted region shown in the middle. Bars = 5 mm (left), 60 μ m (middle), and $20 \mu m$ (right).

(C) Immunodetection of FBR12 protein using an anti-FBR12 antibody in transverse sections of the roots derived from 4-d-old seedlings. + and -, with or without an anti-FBR12 antibody, respectively. WT, wild type. Bars = 20 μ m.

(D) Analysis of eIF5A-3:GUS expression. The middle of the panel shows a primary root and the adjacent lateral root. Bars = 0.5 cm.

(E) Analysis of protoxylem development in the eif5a mutants ($n > 35$).

Various staining times were used in the GUS reporter assay due to different expression levels of these three eIF5A genes. Usually, 6 to 8 h, 5 to 10 min, and 2 to 3 h were used for eIF5A-1, -2, and -3:GUS transgenic lines, respectively.

phenotype in root vascular development. eIF5A-3 expression was substantially lower than that of FBR12/eIF5A-2 (see [Supplemental Figures 4A and 4B](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online), and we detected eIF5A-3:GUS mainly in the vascular tissues (Figure 2D), suggesting that it may play an important role in vascular development. The GUS reporter results were consistent with the microarray data from the Arabidopsis electronic fluorescent pictograph browser (Schmid et al., 2005; Winter et al., 2007) (see [Supplemental Figure 4A](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online).

In addition to our characterization of fbr12 mutants, which affect eIF5A-2, we also identified and characterized the eif5a-1 and eif5a-3 mutants (see [Supplemental Figure 4C](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). The expression of eIF5A-3 was undetectable by quantitative RT-PCR (qRT-PCR) in the eif5a-3 mutant (see [Supplemental Figure](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) [4D](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online), indicating that the T-DNA insertion causes a null mutation. eIF5A-1 expression was not detected in both wildtype and eif5a-1 mutant seedlings by qRT-PCR, presumably owing to its extremely low expression level. Under normal growth conditions, eif5a-1 and eif5a-3 showed no apparent abnormalities (see [Supplemental Figure 4E](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). However, a close examination of root vascular development revealed that both eif5a-1 and eif5a-3 had extra protoxylem cell files with a lower phenotypic penetrance than fbr12-2 (Figure 2E). The fbr12-2 eif5a-3 double mutant showed a significantly enhanced phenotype (73.9%; Figure 2E), suggesting that these two loci function redundantly in specifying protoxylem development. Because FBR12/eIF5A-2 shows the highest expression level and the fbr12 mutants display strongest phenotype, we focus on the analysis of fbr12 hereafter.

Involvement of FBR12 in Cytokinin Signaling and Cytokinin-Regulated Protoxylem Development

Because defective root protoxylem development in fbr12 resembles that observed in the cytokinin mutants, we first analyzed the response of fbr12 roots to exogenous cytokinin. Treatment with benzyladenine (BA) eliminated protoxylem differentiation in wild-type roots, but protoxylem remained unaltered in fbr12 roots (Figures 3A and 3B), indicating that cytokinin-regulated protoxylem specification requires FBR12.

We next examined the cytokinin response of fbr12 in several other assays. Cytokinin inhibited primary root growth in wildtype plants, and this inhibitory effect was reduced in fbr12 (Figure 3C). In a shoot formation assay, fbr12 explants showed substantially reduced sensitivity to cytokinin compared with wild-type explants (Figure 3D). Moreover, we analyzed the cytokinin-induced expression of all type-A ARR genes in wildtype and fbr12 roots by qRT-PCR. Among the 10 type-A ARR genes, expression of most members in fbr12 roots showed a similar pattern as in wild-type roots (see [Supplemental Figure](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) [5](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). However, the cytokinin-induced expression of ARR15 and ARR16 was reduced in fbr12 roots (Figure 3E), suggesting that FBR12 may specifically regulate the cytokinin-induced expression of ARR15 and ARR16. Notably, whereas ARR15 and ARR16 show a reduced expression level in cre1 (Kiba et al., 2002), ARR15 has an expanded expression domain in ahp6 (Mähönen et al., 2006b), suggestive of possible roles of ARR15 and ARR16 in CRE1/AHK4-mediated root xylem development.

To explore the possible function of ARR15 and ARR16, we identified and characterized arr15 and arr16 mutants (see

Figure 3. Reduced Cytokinin Sensitivity in fbr12.

(A) Cytokinin-regulated protoxylem development at the elongation zone of wild-type (WT) and fbr12 roots derived from 8-d-old seedlings.

(B) Cytokinin-regulated protoxylem development at the mature zone of wild-type and fbr12 roots. Eight-day-old seedlings germinated and grown with (100 nM) or without (0 nM) BA were analyzed for the protoxylem cell files.

In (A) and (B), arrows and arrowheads indicate protoxylem and metaxylem, respectively. Bars = 20 μ m.

(C) The primary root length of wild-type and fbr12 seedlings germinated and grown on one-half-strength Murashige and Skoog medium containing various concentrations of BA as indicated. The root length in the absence of BA was set as 100% for each genotype. The means of three independent experiments ($n = 30$) \pm sp are shown.

(D) The capacity of shoot formation of wild-type and fbr12 hypocotyl explants. Hypocotyl explants derived from 4-d-old seedlings were used for the shoot regeneration assay. Representative calli or shoots were photographed after cultured for 3 weeks on the regeneration medium. At least 60 explants of each genotype were used in each experiment. The experiment was repeated three times, and similar results were obtained. Bar = 1 cm. (E) Expression of cytokinin responsive genes ARR15 and ARR16 in wild-type and fbr12 roots. Seedlings were treated with DMSO (control) or 5 µM BA for 30 min. Data presented are mean values of three independent experiments. Error bars denote sp.

[Supplemental Figures 6A and 6B](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). Whereas the arr15 and arr16 single mutants did not have detectable abnormality in root xylem development, the arr15 arr16 double mutant showed extra protoxylem cell files (see [Supplemental Figure 6C](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). An arr15 arr16 fbr12 triple mutant showed a similar phenotype as fbr12 in protoxylem development (see [Supplemental Figure](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) [6C](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). The relatively weak phenotype of the arr15 arr16 double mutant was presumably caused by functional redundancy among type-A ARR genes, as an arr3,4,5,6,8,9 hextuple mutant and the overexpression of all type-A ARR genes did not have detectable effects on root xylem development (To et al., 2004; Ren et al., 2009). Collectively, these results indicate that FBR12 plays an important role in the regulation of the cytokinin response.

Previous studies showed that VND7 is a key regulator of root xylem development (Kubo et al., 2005; Yamaguchi et al., 2011). We found that neither the expression level nor the expression domain of VND7 was affected by the fbr12 mutation (see [Supplemental Figures 7A and 7B](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). PIN-modulated polar auxin transport plays an important role in the regulation of protoxylem differentiation, in which PIN1, PIN3, and PIN7 play a major role (Bishopp et al., 2011b). We found that the expression domains and the expression levels of PIN1-GFP (for green fluorescent protein), PIN3-GFP, and PIN7-GFP remained largely unaltered in the fbr12 root compared with that of the wild type (see [Supplemental Figures 8A and 8B online](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1)). In addition, the expression pattern and the expression level of DR5:GUS, a reporter gene used for monitoring auxin distribution (Ulmasov et al., 1997), was not altered by the fbr12 mutation (see [Supplemental Figure 8C](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). The expression level and the expression pattern of IAA2:GUS, a reporter gene of auxin signaling, in the fbr12 root were similar to that in the wild type (see [Supplemental Figure 8D](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). Auxin is also known to induce the expression of AHP6 to regulate protoxylem specification (Bishopp et al., 2011b). We found that the fbr12 mutation did not affect the ability of auxin to induce AHP6 expression (see [Supplemental Figure 8E](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). These results suggest that auxin may not be directly involved in the regulation of FBR12 modulated root protoxylem development. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that auxin affects other developmental processes mediated by FBR12.

FBR12 Genetically Interacts with the Cytokinin Receptor Gene CRE1/WOL/AHK4 and AHP Genes

The data presented above indicate that fbr12 shows reduced sensitivity to cytokinin, and we reasoned that FBR12 might genetically interact with key components in the cytokinin signaling pathway. To test this possibility, we performed a doublemutant analysis (Figures 4A and 4B). The cytokinin receptor mutant cre1-2 has no apparent abnormalities, including the primary root length (Inoue et al., 2001). However, the cell number inside the stele was slightly reduced, and extra protoxylem cell files were observed in cre1-2 roots (46.3%, $n = 41$; Figures 4C to 4E). A similar phenotype was also observed in an additional mutant allele, cre1-13 (see [Supplemental Figures 9A to 9C](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online), suggesting that mutations in CRE1 cause abnormal development of protoxylem. The cre1-2 fbr12 double mutant displayed a phenotype similar to fbr12 in the primary root length and the cell number inside the stele (Figures 4A to 4D). However, the cre1-2 fbr12 double mutant showed increased penetrance of the extra protoxylem phenotype. Compared with its parents, fbr12 (44.7%) and cre1-2 (46.3%), the double mutant (78.0%) had significantly higher percentage of extra protoxylem cell files (Figure 4E). In the most severe case, nearly half of cells inside the stele were transformed into protoxylem cells in the cre1-2 fbr12 double mutant (Figure 4F). These results indicate that cre1-2 and fbr12 enhance the penetrance and the severity of the mutant phenotype during protoxylem development.

To confirm the genetic interaction between these loci, we further analyzed the wol fbr12 double mutant. The wol mutant carries a point mutation in the hormone-binding domain, rendering it incapable of binding cytokinin, and thus exerts a dominant-negative effect, resembling the phenotype of ahk2 ahk3 cre1/ahk4 triple mutants (Mähönen et al., 2000, 2006a, 2006b). The wol fbr12 double mutant displayed a phenotype stronger than both fbr12 and wol, including shorter primary roots, fewer cells inside the stele, and the transformation of all stele cells into protoxylem cells (Figures 4A to 4D). Note that, because a cre1-12 ahk2-2tk ahk3-3 triple mutant displayed a stronger phenotype than the wol mutant allele (Mähönen et al., 2006a), FBR12 may also genetically interact with AHK2 and AHK3. Together, these results indicate that FBR12 genetically interacts with CRE1/WOL/AHK4 to regulate protoxylem development.

We next examined possible genetic interactions between FBR12 and AHPs. Whereas mutations in single AHP genes do not have apparent phenotype, different combinations of ahp mutants show a variety of abnormalities (Hutchison et al., 2006). Among these, the ahp2,3,5 triple mutant or multiple mutants containing ahp2, ahp3, and ahp5 showed defects in primary root growth and root xylem development (Hutchison et al., 2006). We therefore generated and analyzed an ahp2,3,5 fbr12 quadruple mutant. The ahp2,3,5 fbr12 mutant had shorter primary roots compared with fbr12 and ahp2,3,5 (Figures 4G and 4H). In xylem development, the ahp2,3,5 fbr12 mutant showed an ahp1,2,3,5 like phenotype with the increased number of protoxylem cells (Figure 4I). These results suggest that FBR12 genetically interacts with AHPs to regulate root protoxylem development.

FBR12 Physically Interacts with CRE1 and AHP1

The cytokinin receptors mainly localize to the endoplasmic reticulum (Caesar et al., 2011; Wulfetange et al., 2011), and AHP1-5 proteins are distributed in the cytoplasm and the nucleus (Punwani et al., 2010; Feng et al., 2013). An immunostaining experiment using a polyclonal anti-FBR12 antibody revealed that FBR12 localized in the cytoplasm and the nucleus and was more abundant in the cytoplasm (see [Supplemental Figure 10](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). Together with the observation that fbr12 enhances the cre1, wol, and ahp2,3,5 phenotype, the similar subcellular localization of these protein implies that FBR12 may function in a protein complex containing CRE1 and AHP. To test this possibility, we examined whether FBR12 physically interacted CRE1 or AHP proteins. In a protein pull-down assay, His-FBR12 recombinant protein was readily precipitated by glutathione S-transferase (GST)-AHP1, but barely by GST-AHP2 and GST-

Figure 4. FBR12 Genetically Interacts with CRE1/WOL and AHPs.

(A) Eight-day-old seedlings of the wild type (WT) and different mutants with the indicated genotypes. Bar = 1 cm.

(B) Quantitative analysis of the primary root length of wild-type and mutant seedlings shown in (A). Data presented are means \pm sp obtained from three independent experiments $(n = 30)$.

(C) Transverse sections of wild-type and mutant roots at the mature zone. Bars = 20 μ m.

(D) The cell number inside the stele of wild-type and mutant roots. Data presented were obtained from the analysis of transverse sections of the mature zone of roots $(n = 24)$.

(E) The penetrance of the extra protoxylem phenotype in wild-type and mutant roots with the indicated genotypes ($n > 35$).

(F) Transverse sections of cre1-2 fbr12 roots derived from an 8-d-old seedling. Bar = 20 μ m.

(G) Eight-day-old seedlings of the wild type and mutants with the indicated genotypes. Bar = 5 mm.

(H) The primary root length of the wild type and mutants with the indicated genotypes shown in (G). Data presented are means \pm so obtained from three independent experiments ($n = 30$).

(I) FBR12 and AHPs genetically interact to regulate root protoxylem development. (Top) Roots derived from 8-d-old seedlings were stained with basic Fuchsin red and analyzed by confocal microscopy (n > 30). (Bottom) The transverse sections of roots of 8-d-old seedlings. Bar = 10 μ m.

The cre1-2 allele was used in all experiments. In (C), (F), and (I), yellow arrows and arrowheads indicate protoxylem and metaxylem, respectively. Asterisks in (B), (D), and (H) indicate statistically significant difference (analysis of variance, $P < 0.01$).

AHP5 recombinant proteins (Figure 5A). In a reverse reaction, His-FBR12 recombinant protein efficiently pulled down GST-AHP1 and pulled down GST-AHP2 and GST-AHP5 with weaker affinities (Figure 5A). In a firefly luciferase complementation imaging assay (Chen et al., 2008), the physical interaction between FBR12 and AHP1 was specifically detected when transiently expressed in tobacco (Nicotiana tabacum) leaves (Figure 5B).

We next explored the possible interactions among CRE1, AHP1, and FBR12 in planta. To this end, we generated antibodies against FBR12, CRE1, and AHP1, which specifically

Figure 5. FBR12, CRE1, and AHP1 Compose a Cytokinin-Regulated Complex.

(A) Analysis of the interaction between FBR12 and AHP1 by the protein pull-down assay. The GST- or His-resin–retained proteins were analyzed by immunoblotting using an anti-FBR12 antibody (left) or an anti-GST (right) antibody. Input was examined by Coomassie blue staining. (B) Analysis of the interaction between FBR12 and AHP1 by luciferase complementation imaging assay. The data shown are representative of three independent experiments.

(C) Gel filtration chromatography of the protein extracts prepared from wild-type roots. Eluted fractions (indicated on the top of the panel) were collected and analyzed by immunoblotting using specific antibodies shown at the right side of the panel. The experiment was repeated three times, and representative results are shown. The approximate molecular mass of the eluted fractionations is shown at the bottom.

(D) through (G) Analysis of the interactions among FBR12, CRE1, and AHP1 by coimmunoprecipitation. The protein extracts were prepared from the roots of 3-week-old seedlings treated with $(+)$ or without $(-)$ 5 μ M BA for 30 min and then immunoprecipitated with an anti-FLAG antibody. The precipitated samples were analyzed by immunoblotting using the appropriate antibodies as indicated at the right side of the blots. Two independent transgenic lines were analyzed in each experiment. At the right side of each panel, quantitative analysis of the relative level of the coimmunoprecipitation recognized the target proteins with minimal cross reactivity (see [Supplemental Figures 1, 9B, and 11A](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online) (Feng et al., 2013). We also generated transgenic plants carrying FBR12:FBR12- FLAG and AHP1:AHP1-FLAG transgenes, which fully rescued the fbr12 and ahp1,2,3,4,5 mutant phenotype, respectively (see [Supplemental Figures 3 and 11B](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). In a gel filtration chromatographic experiment, FBR12, CRE1, and AHP1 proteins eluted in fractions with molecular mass higher than their actual sizes, and their fractionation profiles partially overlapped in the absence or the presence of cytokinin (Figure 5C; see [Supplemental Figure 12](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). In particular, all three proteins coeluted in fraction #3, with an approximate molecular mass of 660 kD (Figure 5C), suggesting that these proteins are potentially present in a same protein complex. Moreover, FBR12 and AHP1 also coeluted in fractions #8 through #10, with approximate molecular masses of 29 to 75 kD, which were significantly larger than the expected size of these two proteins (\sim 17 kD; Figure 5C), suggesting that FBR12 and AHP1 may form homooligomers or be present in a complex in the absence of CRE1 or form complexes with other unknown proteins. The fractionation profiles of CRE1 and AHP1 reproducibly displayed a discontinuous pattern, and the reason for this pattern remains to be resolved.

In a coimmunoprecipitation assay, FBR12 was efficiently precipitated using an anti-FLAG antibody in protein extracts from AHP1-FLAG transgenic plants (Figure 5D). Conversely, AHP1 was also precipitated in protein extracts from FBR12-FLAG transgenic plants with an anti-FLAG antibody (Figure 5E). In both cases, CRE1 was detected with an anti-CRE1 antibody in the anti-FLAG–immunoprecipitated complexes derived from the AHP1-FLAG or the FBR12-FLAG transgenic plants (Figures 5F and 5G). Notably, the treatment with RNaseA did not have detectable effects on the stability of the FBR12-CRE1-AHP1 complex (see [Supplemental Figure 13](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online), thus ruling out the possibility that the interaction of FBR12 with CRE1 and AHP1 is RNA dependent. Taken together, these results demonstrate that FBR12, CRE1, and AHP1 occur in a complex in planta.

The fbr12 mutation did not have detectable effects on the CRE1-AHP1 interaction and subcellular localization of CRE1- GFP and AHP1-GFP (see [Supplemental Figures 14 to 16](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). However, treatment with cytokinin reduced the interactions of FBR12-CRE1 and FBR12-AHP1 but enhanced the interaction of AHP1-CRE1 (Figures 5D to 5G). This result suggests that cytokinin regulates the formation of the CRE1-AHP1-FBR12 complex.

Ectopic Expression of FBR12 in the CRE1-Expressing Domain Partially Rescues the fbr12 Mutant Phenotype

Given that FBR12 genetically interacts with CRE1 and AHPs and that FBR12 protein forms a complex with CRE1 and AHP1, it is reasonable to assume that these interactions play an important role in the regulation of protoxylem specification. To test this hypothesis, we placed FBR12 under the control of the CRE1

promoter and then transformed the CRE1:FBR12 transgene into $fbr12/+$ heterozygous plants ($fbr12/-$ homozygous plants are seedling lethal; Feng et al., 2007). We then identified T3 transgenic plants in the wild-type (fbr12/+ or $FBR12(+)$ or fbr12/mutant background for further analysis.

In the CRE1:FBR12 transgenic plants, FBR12 was mainly expressed in roots at a level comparable with that of CRE1 (Figure 6A). We found that the CRE1:FBR12 transgene did not rescue most developmental defects of fbr12, including the seedling-lethal phenotype (Figure 6B). Because CRE1 is mainly expressed in the root (Higuchi et al., 2004; Nishimura et al., 2004), whereas FBR12 is ubiquitously expressed in most tissues/organs (Feng et al., 2007), it is expected that the CRE1: FBR12 transgene was unable to rescue the fbr12 mutant phenotype. However, the CRE1:FBR12 transgene partially rescued the defects in protoxylem specification of fbr12, by reducing the penetrance of the extra protoxylem phenotype from 46.9 to \sim 12.5% (four independent transgenic lines were analyzed) in the transgenic lines (Figure 6C). Notably, the CRE1:FBR12 transgene did not restore the primary root length of the transgenic seedlings to that of the wild type (Figure 6D), suggesting that FBR12 plays a relatively specific role in cytokinin-regulated protoxylem specification.

The fbr12 Mutant Phenotype Is Partially Suppressed by ahp6

The pseudophosphotransfer protein AHP6, a negative regulator of cytokinin signaling, plays a critical role in root protoxylem specification (Mähönen et al., 2006b; Bishopp et al., 2011b). Because CRE1 genetically interacts with AHP6 (Mähönen et al., 2006b) and FBR12, we then asked whether AHP6 also genetically interacted with FBR12 to regulate protoxylem differentiation. To this end, we constructed and analyzed an ahp6 fbr12 double mutant. The primary root of the ahp6 fbr12 double mutant was longer than fbr12 but shorter than ahp6 (Figures 7A and 7B), indicating that ahp6 partially suppresses the fbr12 mutant phenotype. Compared with fbr12, the ahp6 fbr12 double mutant also had an increased cell number inside the stele (Figure 7C). Moreover, the extra protoxylem cell file in the fbr12 roots (41.5%) was significantly reduced in the ahp6 fbr12 double mutant (5.6%) (Figures 7D and 7E). However, the incomplete protoxylem cell file remained nearly unaltered in the fbr12 ahp6 double mutant compared with that in ahp6 (Figure 7F), indicating that the fbr12 mutation does not rescue the ahp6 phenotype. These results suggest that the ahp6 mutation specifically suppresses the fbr12 mutant phenotype in protoxylem development.

FBR12 Negatively Regulates the Expression of AHP6

The observation that fbr12 displays a phenotype opposite to that of ahp6 and that FBR12 genetically acts upstream of AHP6 implies that FBR12 might negatively regulate AHP6. To test this

Figure 5. (continued).

samples (the means of four independent experiments \pm so) are shown. Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences compared with control (analysis of variance, $P < 0.01$). WT, wild type.

Figure 6. A CRE1:FBR12 Transgene Partially Rescues the fbr12 Phenotype in Root Protoxylem Development.

(A) Expression of CRE1 and FBR12 in wild-type (WT), fbr12, and CRE1: FBR12 transgenic seedlings. Total RNA was prepared from roots and shoots of the indicated genotypes and then used for qRT-PCR. In the transgenic samples, wild-type- and fbr12-like segregants were derived from self-pollinated fbr12/+ plants homozygous for the CRE1:FBR12 transgene. Numbers refer to the transgenic lines. The expression level of CRE1 in wild-type roots was set as 1.0. The means of three replicates \pm sp are shown.

(B) Eight-day-old seedlings of the wild type and the fbr12 mutants with or without a CRE1:FBR12 transgene. Bar = 1 cm.

(C) Analysis of the extra protoxylem phenotype in the roots of 8-d-old seedlings with the indicated genotypes ($n > 35$).

(D) The relative length of the primary roots of 8-d-old seedlings with the indicated genotypes. For each genotype, the primary root length in the wild-type background was set as 100% ($n = 30$). The means of three replicates \pm sp are shown.

possibility, we analyzed AHP6 expression in fbr12 roots. A qRT-PCR analysis revealed that the AHP6 expression was approximately threefold higher in fbr12 than in the wild type (Figure 8A). The expression level of AHP1 through AHP5 in fbr12 was similar to that in the wild type (see [Supplemental Figure 17](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online), indicating that the FBR12-repressed expression is specific to AHP6. Moreover, the expression level and the expression domain of an AHP6:GFP reporter (Mähönen et al., 2006b) were substantially increased in fbr12 roots compared with wild-type

roots (Figures 8B and 8C). Immunostaining of transverse sections of the AHP6:GFP roots also revealed that the AHP6 expression domain expanded (Figure 8D), similar to cre1 akh3 double mutants (Mähönen et al., 2006b). The expanded expression domain of AHP6 paralleled the formation of extra protoxylem cells in the fbr12 root. These results suggest that FBR12 specifically represses AHP6 expression.

Cytokinin also represses AHP6 expression (Mähönen et al., 2006b; Bishopp et al., 2011b). However, the cytokinin repression of AHP6 expression was remarkably alleviated in the fbr12 root (Figures 8A and 8B). Intriguingly, AHP6 expression was detectable in the *fbr12* root treated with a relatively high concentration of cytokinin (500 nM BA) but was completely repressed by a lower concentration of cytokinin (100 nM BA) in wild-type roots (Figure 8B). eIF5A proteins regulate RNA stability (Bevec and Hauber, 1997; Zuk and Jacobson, 1998; Rosorius et al., 1999; Schrader et al., 2006); therefore, it is possible that the reduced AHP6 mRNA level was caused by its reduced stability mediated by FBR12. Compared with AHP1 mRNA (half-life $[t1/2] = 109$ min in the wild type), $AHP6$ mRNA was relatively short-lived with an approximate half-life of 55 min. However, the turnover rate of AHP6 mRNA was comparable in wild-type and fbr12 seedlings (see [Supplemental](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) [Figure 18](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online), thus ruling out the possibility that FBR12 directly regulates AHP6 mRNA stability. These results suggest that FBR12 negatively regulates expression of AHP6 and that cytokinin-repressed expression of AHP6 depends, at least partly, on FBR12.

Overexpression of AHP6 Mimics the fbr12 Mutant Phenotype in Protoxylem Specification

The data presented above indicate that FBR12 negatively regulates AHP6 expression. In particular, the observation that ahp6 partially suppresses the fbr12 mutant phenotype implies that derepression of AHP6 expression by fbr12 might cause the misspecification of protoxylem cell files in fbr12 roots. To test this possibility, we generated transgenic plants overexpressing AHP6 by the transformation of a 35S:AHP6 transgene into FBR12/fbr12 heterozygous plants. The wild-type and fbr12 transgenic segregants were identified and analyzed.

We identified multiple transgenic lines with different increases in AHP6 transgene expression levels (Figure 8E). Under normal growth conditions, the 35S:AHP6 transgenic seedlings did not show apparent abnormalities (see [Supplemental Figure 19A](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). When treated with cytokinin, these 35S:AHP6 plants showed a similar response as wild-type plants in a root elongation assay (see [Supplemental Figure 19B](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online). However, the cytokinin-induced expression of ARR15 and ARR16, but not that of ARR7, was reduced in the roots of the 35S:AHP6 transgenic plants (Figure 8F), a phenotype similar to that observed in fbr12 roots (Figure 3E).

Similar to the fbr12 mutant, all the examined 35S:AHP6 transgenic plants had extra protoxylem in roots, ranging from 23.1 to 52.9% (Figures 8G and 8H). In the fbr12 mutant background, the overexpression of AHP6 substantially increased the phenotypic penetrance of the extra protoxylem compared with that in the wild-type background (Figures 8H and 8I), suggestive

Figure 7. ahp6 Partially Suppresses the fbr12 Mutant Phenotype.

(A) Eight-day-old seedlings of the wild type (WT) and mutants with the indicated genotypes. Bar = 1 cm.

(B) Analysis of the primary root length of wild-type and mutant seedlings shown in (A). Data presented are mean values from three independent experiments $(n = 30)$.

(C) The cell number inside the stele. Data presented were obtained from the analysis of transverse sections of the mature zone of the root ($n = 30$). (D) Protoxylem development in the ahp6 fbr12 double mutant. Note that fbr12 shows a phenotype of extra protoxylem (see Figures 1D, 3A, and 3B), and this phenotype is partially suppressed by the ahp6 mutation. Bars = 20 μ m.

(E) and (F) Quantitative analysis of the extra protoxylem cell file (E) and the incomplete protoxylem file (F) in the roots of the wild type and mutants with the indicated genotypes $(n = 36)$.

of the additive effect of fbr12 and the overexpression of AHP6 during root protoxylem development.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we present genetic, cell biology, and biochemical studies demonstrating that FBR12/eIF5A-2 is involved in cytokinin signaling to directly regulate root protoxylem specification. First, root vascular development in fbr12 is similar to that of cytokinin mutants cre1, wol, ahp1,2,3,4,5, and arr1,10,12, characteristic of the formation of extra protoxylem cell files, indicating that FBR12 is involved in xylem development. In agreement with this view, FBR12 preferentially accumulates in root vascular tissues. Second, FBR12 genetically interacts with CRE1/WOL and AHP2,3,5, suggesting an important role of FBR12 in cytokinin signaling. The genetic interactions of FBR12 with the cytokinin signaling components are best shown by their synergistic effects on cell division and cell differentiation in root vascular development. Intriguingly, ectopic expression of FBR12 in the CRE1-expressing domain partially rescues the fbr12 mutant phenotype in protoxylem development. This result mirrors a previous observation that the depletion of cytokinin in the CRE1-expressing domain transform all cell files of the root vascular cylinder into protoxylem (Mähönen et al., 2006b), suggesting that FBR12 is specifically involved in the cytokininregulated protoxylem development. Third, fbr12 showed substantially reduced sensitivity to cytokinin, including primary root growth, root protoxylem differentiation, and shoot regeneration in vitro as well as the altered expression of ARR15, ARR16, and AHP6 in response to cytokinin. Fourth, FBR12 physically interacts with CRE1 and AHP1 in an RNase-insensitive manner, implying a regulatory role of the complex in cytokinin signaling,

Figure 8. FBR12 Negatively Regulates the Expression of AHP6.

(A) Expression of AHP6 in wild-type (WT) and fbr12 roots. Total RNA was prepared from the root derived from 8-d-old seedlings treated with or without 100 nM BA for 3 h and analyzed by qRT-PCR. The means of three replicates \pm sp are shown.

(B) Analysis of expression of the AHP6:GFP reporter gene in wild-type and fbr12 roots by confocal microscopy. The samples were treated with or without (control) BA for 12 h. Bars = 20 μ m.

(C) Confocal sections of AHP6:GFP in wild-type and fbr12 roots. The transverse images were reconstructed by collection of Z stacks scanning. Arrows and asterisks denote protoxylem and the protoxylem-adjacent pericycle cells, respectively. Bar = $20 \mu m$.

(D) Immunodetection of AHP6:GFP expression using an anti-GFP antibody in transverse sections prepared from the root tip derived from 4-d-old wildtype and fbr12 seedlings. $+$ and $-$, preparations incubated with and without an anti-GFP antibody, respectively. Bars = 20 μ m.

(E) Analysis of AHP6 expression in 8-d-old 35S:AHP6 transgenic seedlings by qRT-PCR. The relative expression level in the wild type was set as 1.0. The means of three replicates \pm sp are shown.

(F) Analysis of expression of type-A ARRs in 35S:AHP6 transgenic plants. Eight-day-old seedlings were treated with or without 100 nM BA for 30 min. Total RNA was prepared from the roots and then used for qRT-PCR. For each target gene, the relative expression level in untreated wild type was set as 1.0. The means of three replicates \pm sp are shown.

(G) Analysis of protoxylem development in the root of 35S:AHP6 seedlings (8 d old). The sample was stained with basic Fuchsin red, and the xylem phenotype was analyzed and scored under a confocal microscope $(n > 50)$.

(H) Quantitative analysis of the extra protoxylem in the root of 8-d-old seedlings with the indicated genotypes ($n > 50$). All 35S:AHP6 transgenic seedlings were segregants derived from self-pollinated fbr12/+ plants homozygous for the 35S:AHP6 transgene, showing a wild-type-like or fbr12 phenotype. Numbers refer to transgenic lines.

(I) Confocal scanning microscopy of root xylem development in 35S:AHP6 transgenic seedlings as described in (H). Representative images with various defects in protoxylem development are shown. Arrows denote protoxylem. Bar = 20 μ m.

which might not be directly involved in protein translation. Lastly, FBR12 specifically represses expression of AHP6, a negative regulator of cytokinin signaling. Taken together, these observations reveal an important role of FBR12 in regulating cytokinin signaling, in particular in cytokinin-regulated xylem development.

The fbr12 mutant shows a pleiotropic phenotype with severe defects in growth and development (Feng et al., 2007), raising the possibility that the involvement of FBR12 in cytokininregulated protoxylem development is nonspecific. Although fbr12 displays a reduced response to cytokinin in nearly all the analyzed phenotypes, cytokinin-induced expression of most type-A ARR genes is relatively normal. Remarkably, ARR15 and ARR16, two type-A ARR genes implied in CRE1/AHK4-meidated signaling in roots (Kiba et al., 2002; Mähönen et al., 2006b), show the reduced induction by cytokinin in the fbr12 roots, suggesting that FBR12 specifically modulates the expression of these two genes, but not other type-A ARRs. Similarly, expression of AHP6, but not other AHP genes, is specifically altered by the fbr12 mutation, thus disfavoring an argument that the altered expression of these genes is caused by a pleiotropic effect. Intriguingly, the pleiotropic phenotype of fbr12 is partially suppressed by ahp6, demonstrating the specificity of the genetic interaction between these two loci. Moreover, whereas the reciprocal inhibition of auxin and cytokinin plays a critical role in root vascular patterning (Bishopp et al., 2011a, 2011b), fbr12 shows relatively normal auxin signaling in protoxylem development, further supporting a specific role of FBR12 in cytokinin-regulated protoxylem specification.

The fbr12 mutant showed a remarkably reduced response to cytokinin, similar to that of the cytokinin signaling mutants in many aspects. Two models can explain the FBR12 function in cytokinin signaling. First, because of the enhanced phenotype of fbr12 cre1, fbr12 wol, and fbr12 ahp2,3,5 mutants, FBR12 may function in a pathway independent from CRE1-AHP–mediated signaling. This scenario is similar to the observation made in a previous study, in which LHW and WOL were proposed to function independently to regulate cell division in the stele (Ohashi-Ito and Bergmann, 2007). Alternatively, FBR12 may function in a complex with CRE1 and AHP proteins. Consistent with this notion, our results demonstrate that FBR12 forms a complex with CRE1 and AHP1 in planta. Notably, FBR12 does not appear to affect the stability, the subcellular localization, and the interaction of CRE1 and AHP1 proteins, and we therefore speculate that FBR12 may regulate the phosphorelay activity. In this regard, FBR12 may be a bifunctional molecule that enhances phosphorelay by stabilizing the CRE1-AHP1 complex and also antagonizes the inhibitory effect of AHP6 on the phosphorelay, thereby positively regulating cytokinin signaling. In support of this notion, the CRE1–AHP1 interaction is enhanced by cytokinin, which, in turn, promotes the release of FBR12 from the CRE1-AHP1-FBR12 complex. It will be of great interest to test this hypothesis upon the development of an in vivo assay for phosphorelay activity and, in a more general sense, to understand the precise biochemical function of FBR12 in regulating of the CRE1-AHP1-FBR12 complex.

The conventional cytokinin-mediated phosphorelay is involved in the sequential transfer of a phosphoryl group from the receptor to downstream AHPs (AHP1 through AHP5) and ARRs (To and Kieber, 2008; Hwang et al., 2012). Whereas this linear pathway is negatively regulated by AHP6, which competitively inhibits phosphotransfer from the kinase domain to the receiver domain of the cytokinin receptors and from AHP1 to ARR1 (Mähönen et al., 2006b), the expression of AHP6 is promoted by auxin, through which auxin antagonizes the action of cytokinin in root vascular patterning (Bishopp et al., 2011b). The discovery that FBR12 genetically acts upstream of AHP6 to repress its expression, possibly in an auxin-independent manner, identifies an additional regulatory mechanism in cytokinin-regulated root protoxylem development. Because an AHP6:GFP reporter gene shows an increased expression level and an expanded expression domain in the fbr12 root, FBR12-regulated AHP6 expression may occur mainly at the transcriptional level, but not at the posttranscriptional level such as eIF5A-regulated RNA stability (Zuk and Jacobson, 1998; Valentini et al., 2002). The expression of AHP6 is negatively regulated by cytokinin at the transcriptional level in a cytokinin receptor–dependent manner (Mähönen et al., 2006b). However, the molecular mechanism of this regulation remains elusive. We speculate that the CRE1- AHP1-FBR12 complex coordinates the input of cytokinin signaling, whereas the cytokinin-repressed expression of AHP6 represents a major output signal, which, in turn, negatively regulates cytokinin signaling. Presumably, the expression of AHP6 is regulated by a transcription repressor that can be inactivated by cytokinin through the CRE1-AHP1-FBR12 complex. The identification and characterization of this putative repressor will be a key toward full understanding the molecular mechanism of the cytokinin-regulated protoxylem development.

The evolutionarily conserved eIF-5A proteins have long been proposed to modulate cell division, cell differentiation, and cell death by the regulation of protein translation initiation, RNA turnover, and RNA trafficking, in spite of limited biochemical evidence available for the proposed activities. In Arabidopsis, eIF5A proteins, including FBR12, have been associated with diverse physiological and pathological processes, including leaf senescence, fruit ripening, stem xylem development, the stress response, and the hypersensitive response (Wang et al., 2001, 2005; Feng et al., 2007; Hopkins et al., 2008; Liu et al., 2008b; Ma et al., 2010). The fbr12 mutant was originally identified as an anti–cell-death mutant (Feng et al., 2007), and the discovery made in this study identifies FBR12/eIF5A-2 as a key regulator of root protoxylem development by modulating cytokinin signaling, thus adding a component in the framework of cytokinin signaling and cytokinin-regulated protoxylem development. In summary, the results presented in this study define a specific cellular activity of the highly conserved eIF5A proteins during growth and development of higher plants, which should also provide useful information for functional studies of eIF5A in other eukaryotes.

METHODS

Plant Materials and Growth Conditions

The wild type Arabidopsis thaliana Ws and Col-0 accessions were used in this study. The fbr12 mutant is in the Ws background (Feng et al., 2007), and all other mutants and transgenic lines are in the Col-0 background. The fbr12-2, ahp1-1, cre1-13, arr15, arr16, eif5a-1, and eif5a-3 mutant seeds were obtained from the ABRC or GABI-KAT. For the double mutant analysis, the segregated wild-type progenies in F2 or F3 populations were used as controls in all experiments.

Seeds were sterilized and sown on GM medium (one-half-strength Murashige and Skoog salts, 1% Suc, $1 \times B5$ vitamin, 0.05% MES-KOH, and 0.3% Phytagel), stratified in the dark at 4°C for 2 d, and germinated and grown at 22°C under the continuous white light (120 mmol $m^{-2} s^{-1}$) for appropriate time. The root elongation and the shoot formation assays were performed as described previously (Deng et al., 2010).

Microscopy

To prepare transverse sections of mature roots, approximate 1-cm-long segments in the root hair zone adjacent to the root tip side were hand dissected. The samples were fixed overnight in PBS containing 4% glutaraldehyde and embedded in Leica Historesin. Serial semithin sections (1 μ m) were made on a Leica RM6625 rotary microtome, stained by toluidine blue (0.1% [w/v]), and analyzed under a microscope. For each sample, at least two to three sections were analyzed, and sections that contained more than two or less than two protoxylem cells were defined as extra protoxylem or incomplete protoxylem files, respectively. Basic Fuchsin red staining was performed according to Mähönen et al. (2000).

Preparation of Antibodies and Immunoblot Analysis

The anti-AHP1 polyclonal antibody has been previously described (Feng et al., 2013). To prepare anti-FBR12 and anti-CRE1 antibodies, the full-length FBR12 cDNA fragments and a fragment encoding amino acid residues 749 to 994 of CRE1 were used to produce recombinant proteins tagged with 6X His and GST, respectively. The purified 6X His-tagged recombinant proteins were used to immunize rabbits, and the resulting antisera were affinity purified using the GST-tagged recombinant protein as a ligand. Immunoblotting was performed as described previously (Ren et al., 2009).

Immunostaining and GUS Assay

Immunostaining was performed as described (Sessions et al., 2000) with minor modifications. Blocking and all subsequent reactions were performed in TBST buffer (150 mM NaCl, 20 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0, 0.05% [v/v] Tween 20, and 0.3% [v/v] Triton 100) containing 5% nonfat milk. Primary (anti-FBR12) and secondary (goat anti-rabbit IgG-conjugated with alkalinephosphatase; Pierce Biotechnology) antibodies were diluted 1:100 and 1:200, respectively, in the reactions. The preparations were developed with nitro blue tetrazolium/5-bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl phosphate for 2 h. The staining without the primary antibody was used as a negative control. Under the assay conditions, no signal was observed in sections of fbr12 roots.

Whole-mount immunofluorescence staining was performed as described (Sauer et al., 2006). The sample was incubated with the primary (anti-FBR12) and the secondary (Alexa Fluor 585 goat anti-rabbit IgG; Invitrogen) antibodies. Nuclei were stained by 4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole. After washing and mounting, the sample was analyzed under an Olympus Fluoview1000 confocal laser scanning microscope.

GUS activity was analyzed as described previously (Jefferson et al., 1987).

Protein Pull-Down Assay

GST- and His-tagged recombinant proteins were prepared and purified in the pGEX (Amersham Pharmacia) and pQE (Qiagen) vectors according to the manufacturers' instructions.

Protein pull-down assay was performed as described (Liu et al., 2008a) with modifications. Briefly, purified GST, GST fusion proteins, and His-FBR12 protein were immobilized on Glutathione Sepharose 4B and 3Snitrilotriacetic acid resin, respectively. Immobilized Sepharose beads containing 2 μ g GST- or His-tagged fusion proteins were mixed with 1 μ g His-FBR12 or GST-tagged proteins and then incubated at 4°C for 1 h. After centrifugation at 800 rpm 4°C for 1 min, the supernatant was removed, and the beads were washed six times with precooled washing buffer (25 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl, 0.1% Triton X-100, and 1 mM phenylmethanesulfonyl fluoride). The sample was then analyzed by immunoblotting.

Coimmunoprecipitation Experiments

The coimmunoprecipitation experiment was performed according to Liu et al. (2008a) with modifications. The sample was prepared by grinding root materials $(\sim0.5 \text{ g})$ in liquid nitrogen and immediately extracting with grinding buffer (50 mM Tris, pH 7.5, 150 mM NaCl, 10 mM $MgCl₂$, 10% glycerol, 0.1% Nonidet P-40, 1 mM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride, and $1\times$ Protease Inhibitor Cocktail [Sigma-Aldrich]). After preclearing with Protein A-Agarose (Sigma-Aldrich), 1.5 mg of total protein for each sample was incubated with 50 µL of anti-FLAG M2 Affinity Agarose beads (Sigma-Aldrich) at 4°C for 4 h. The pellets were washed with the grinding buffer for six times and then used for immunoblotting.

Gel Filtration Chromatography

Gel filtration chromatography was performed as previously described (Saini et al., 2009; Ma et al., 2010). Total protein prepared from the roots of 3-week-old seedlings was loaded on a Superdex 10/300 GL prepacked Tricorn column (GE Healthcare), and the collected fractions (1 mL per fraction) were analyzed by immunoblotting using anti-AHP1, anti-CRE1, and anti-FBR12 antibodies. The molecular mass standards were a mixture of Gel Filtration LMW calibration kit (17 to 75 kD; GE Healthcare) and Gel Filtration HMW calibration kit (43 to 669 kD; GE Healthcare).

Molecular Manipulations

All molecular cloning was done by standard methods (Sambrook and Russell, 2001). To make FBR12:GUS, a 0.9-kb genomic fragment containing the putative FBR12 promoter region and the entire 5'-untranslated region was PCR amplified (see [Supplemental Table 1](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) online for primers used in this study). A similar fragment was used in the genetic complementation experiment (Feng et al., 2007). This fragment was inserted into the HindIII and BamHI sites of pBI101 (Clontech) to generate the FBR12:GUS reporter gene, in which the sequence encoding the first seven amino acid residues of FBR12 was in-frame fused to the GUS coding sequence. The FBR12 and AHP1 genomic sequences containing the promoter and coding regions were PCR amplified, and the stop codons were removed during PCR. The PCR fragments were fused in frame to a $1\times$ FLAG tag and then inserted into a pER8 vector (Zuo et al., 2000). The resulting transgenes fully rescued the fbr12 and ahp1,2,3,4,5 mutant phenotypes, respectively. An AHP6 genomic DNA fragment was amplified by PCR and inserted into a pCAMBIA 2300 vector under the control of a cauliflower mosaic virus 35S promoter. The Lys-51–to–Ser-51 mutation was made by a PCR-based method using appropriate primers spanning the mutated site. A BamHI site was introduced in the mutated region, which was used for genotyping of the transgene.

Total RNA was prepared using the RNeasy plant mini kit (Qiagen) and then treated with the RNase-free DNase set (Qiagen) for 15 min at room temperatures. Real-time qRT-PCR was performed as described (Deng et al., 2010). Real-time PCR was performed using the UltraSYBR mixture (CWBIO) according to the manufacturer's instructions, and the reactions were run in a CFX96TM real-time PCR detection system (Bio-Rad).

Accession Numbers

Sequence data from this article can be found in the Arabidopsis Genome Initiative or GenBank/EMBL databases under the following accession numbers: ACT7 (AT5G09810), AHP1 (AT3G21510), AHP2 (AT3G29350), AHP3 (AT5G39340), AHP4 (AT3G16360), AHP5 (AT1G03430), AHP6 (AT1G80100), ARR3 (AT1G59940), ARR4 (AT1G10470), ARR5 (AT3G48100), ARR6 (AT5G62920), ARR7 (AT1G19050), ARR8 (AT2G41310), ARR9 (AT3G57040), ARR15 (AT1G74890), ARR16 (AT2G40670), ARR17 (AT3G56380), CRE1/WOL (AT2G01830), eIF5A-1 (AT1G13950), eIF5A-2/ FBR12 (AT1G26630), and eIF5A-3 (AT1G69410).

Supplemental Data

The following materials are available in the online version of this article.

[Supplemental Figure 1.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Analysis of FBR12 Protein in Wild-Type and the fbr12 Mutant Plants.

[Supplemental Figure 2.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) The fbr12-2 Mutant Phenotype.

[Supplemental Figure 3.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Rescue of the fbr12 Mutant by FBR12 **Transgenes**

[Supplemental Figure 4.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Characterization of the eIF5A Gene Family.

[Supplemental Figure 5.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Analysis of the Expressions Level of Type-A ARR Genes.

[Supplemental Figure 6.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Analysis of Protoxylem Development in arr15 and arr16 Mutants.

[Supplemental Figure 7.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Analysis of the Expression level and the Expression Pattern of VND7 in fbr12.

[Supplemental Figure 8.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) FBR12 May Act Independently from the Auxin Pathway to Regulate Protoxylem Development.

[Supplemental Figure 9.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Characterization of the cre1-13 Mutant Allele.

[Supplemental Figure 10.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Analysis of Subcellular Localization of FBR12 Protein by Immunofluorescence Staining.

[Supplemental Figure 11.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Characterization of Anti-AHP1 Antibody and the AHP1:AHP1-FLAG Transgenic Plants.

[Supplemental Figure 12.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Gel-Filtration Chromatography of CRE1, AHP1, and FBR12.

[Supplemental Figure 13.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) The Interaction of FBR12 with CRE1 and AHP1 Is RNA Independent.

[Supplemental Figure 14.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Analysis of the CRE1-AHP1 Interaction in Wild-Type and fbr12 Plants.

[Supplemental Figure 15.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Characterization of the CRE1:CRE1-GFP Transgenic Plants.

[Supplemental Figure 16.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Characterization of the AHP1:AHP1-GFP Transgenic Plants.

[Supplemental Figure 17.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Analysis of the Expression Level of AHP Genes in fbr12.

[Supplemental Figure 18.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Analysis of the RNA Turnover Rate of AHP6 mRNA.

[Supplemental Figure 19.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Characterization of the 35S:AHP6 Transgenic Plants.

[Supplemental Table 1.](http://www.plantcell.org/cgi/content/full/tpc.113.116236/DC1) Primers Used in This Study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the ABRC, the Nottingham Arabidopsis Stock Centre, Tatsuo Kakimoto, Ykä Helariutta, Thomas Schmülling, Joseph Kieber, Shouyi Chen, Jinsong Zhang, Taku Demura, and Jianwei Pan for providing mutant and transgenic seeds. This work was supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation (NSFC 90817107 and 91217302) and the State Key Laboratory of Plant Genomics (2011B0525-02).

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

B.R., Q.C., and J.Z. designed the research, analyzed the results, and wrote the article. B.R. and Q.C. performed the majority of the experiments, assisted by S.H., W.Z., J.F., and H.F.

Received July 16, 2013; revised September 4, 2013; accepted October 6, 2013; published October 25, 2013.

REFERENCES

- Argyros, R.D., Mathews, D.E., Chiang, Y.-H., Palmer, C.M., Thibault, D.M., Etheridge, N., Argyros, D.A., Mason, M.G., Kieber, J.J., and Schaller, G.E. (2008). Type B response regulators of Arabidopsis play key roles in cytokinin signaling and plant development. Plant Cell 20: 2102–2116.
- Bevec, D., and Hauber, J. (1997). Eukaryotic initiation factor 5A activity and HIV-1 Rev function. Biol. Signals 6: 124–133.
- Bishopp, A., Benková, E., and Helariutta, Y. (2011a). Sending mixed messages: Auxin-cytokinin crosstalk in roots. Curr. Opin. Plant Biol. 14: 10–16.
- Bishopp, A., Help, H., El-Showk, S., Weijers, D., Scheres, B., Friml, J., Benková, E., Mähönen, A.P., and Helariutta, Y. (2011b). A mutually inhibitory interaction between auxin and cytokinin specifies vascular pattern in roots. Curr. Biol. 21: 917–926.
- Caesar, K., Thamm, A.M.K., Witthöft, J., Elgass, K., Huppenberger, P., Grefen, C., Horak, J., and Harter, K. (2011). Evidence for the localization of the Arabidopsis cytokinin receptors AHK3 and AHK4 in the endoplasmic reticulum. J. Exp. Bot. 62: 5571–5580.
- Chen, H., Zou, Y., Shang, Y., Lin, H., Wang, Y., Cai, R., Tang, X., and Zhou, J.-M. (2008). Firefly luciferase complementation imaging assay for protein-protein interactions in plants. Plant Physiol. 146: 368–376.
- Deng, Y., Dong, H., Mu, J., Ren, B., Zheng, B., Ji, Z., Yang, W.-C., Liang, Y., and Zuo, J. (2010). Arabidopsis histidine kinase CKI1 acts upstream of histidine phosphotransfer proteins to regulate female gametophyte development and vegetative growth. Plant Cell 22: 1232–1248.
- Dolan, L., Janmaat, K., Willemsen, V., Linstead, P., Poethig, S., Roberts, K., and Scheres, B. (1993). Cellular organisation of the Arabidopsis thaliana root. Development 119: 71–84.
- Feng, H., Chen, Q., Feng, J., Zhang, J., Yang, X., and Zuo, J. (2007). Functional characterization of the Arabidopsis eukaryotic translation initiation factor 5A-2 that plays a crucial role in plant growth and development by regulating cell division, cell growth, and cell death. Plant Physiol. 144: 1531–1545.
- Feng, J., Wang, C., Chen, Q., Chen, H., Ren, B., Li, X., and Zuo, J. (2013). S-nitrosylation of phosphotransfer proteins represses cytokinin signaling. Nat Commun 4: 1529.
- Fukuda, H. (2004). Signals that control plant vascular cell differentiation. Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol. 5: 379–391.
- Higuchi, M., et al. (2004). In planta functions of the Arabidopsis cytokinin receptor family. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 101: 8821–8826.
- Hofmann, W., Reichart, B., Ewald, A., Müller, E., Schmitt, I., Stauber, R.H., Lottspeich, F., Jockusch, B.M., Scheer, U., Hauber, J., and Dabauvalle, M.C. (2001). Cofactor requirements for

nuclear export of Rev response element (RRE)- and constitutive transport element (CTE)-containing retroviral RNAs. An unexpected role for actin. J. Cell Biol. 152: 895–910.

- Hopkins, M.T., Lampi, Y., Wang, T.-W., Liu, Z., and Thompson, J.E. (2008). Eukaryotic translation initiation factor 5A is involved in pathogen-induced cell death and development of disease symptoms in Arabidopsis. Plant Physiol. 148: 479–489.
- Hutchison, C.E., Li, J., Argueso, C., Gonzalez, M., Lee, E., Lewis, M.W., Maxwell, B.B., Perdue, T.D., Schaller, G.E., Alonso, J.M., Ecker, J.R., and Kieber, J.J. (2006). The Arabidopsis histidine phosphotransfer proteins are redundant positive regulators of cytokinin signaling. Plant Cell 18: 3073–3087.
- Hwang, I., and Sheen, J. (2001). Two-component circuitry in Arabidopsis cytokinin signal transduction. Nature 413: 383–389.
- Hwang, I., Sheen, J., and Müller, B. (2012). Cytokinin signaling networks. Annu. Rev. Plant Biol. 63: 353–380.
- Inoue, T., Higuchi, M., Hashimoto, Y., Seki, M., Kobayashi, M., Kato, T., Tabata, S., Shinozaki, K., and Kakimoto, T. (2001). Identification of CRE1 as a cytokinin receptor from Arabidopsis. Nature 409: 1060–1063.
- Ishida, K., Yamashino, T., Yokoyama, A., and Mizuno, T. (2008). Three type-B response regulators, ARR1, ARR10 and ARR12, play essential but redundant roles in cytokinin signal transduction throughout the life cycle of Arabidopsis thaliana. Plant Cell Physiol. 49: 47–57.
- Jao, D.L.-E., and Chen, K.Y. (2006). Tandem affinity purification revealed the hypusine-dependent binding of eukaryotic initiation factor 5A to the translating 80S ribosomal complex. J. Cell. Biochem. 97: 583–598.
- Jefferson, R.A., Kavanagh, T.A., and Bevan, M.W. (1987). GUS fusions: Beta-glucuronidase as a sensitive and versatile gene fusion marker in higher plants. EMBO J. 6: 3901–3907.
- Kang, H.A., and Hershey, J.W. (1994). Effect of initiation factor eIF-5A depletion on protein synthesis and proliferation of Saccharomyces cerevisiae. J. Biol. Chem. 269: 3934–3940.
- Kemper, W.M., Berry, K.W., and Merrick, W.C. (1976). Purification and properties of rabbit reticulocyte protein synthesis initiation factors M2Balpha and M2Bbeta. J. Biol. Chem. 251: 5551–5557.
- Kiba, T., Yamada, H., and Mizuno, T. (2002). Characterization of the ARR15 and ARR16 response regulators with special reference to the cytokinin signaling pathway mediated by the AHK4 histidine kinase in roots of Arabidopsis thaliana. Plant Cell Physiol. 43: 1059–1066.
- Kim, H.J., Chiang, Y.-H., Kieber, J.J., and Schaller, G.E. (2013). SCF(KMD) controls cytokinin signaling by regulating the degradation of type-B response regulators. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 110: 10028–10033.
- Kim, K., Ryu, H., Cho, Y.-H., Scacchi, E., Sabatini, S., and Hwang, I. (2012). Cytokinin-facilitated proteolysis of ARABIDOPSIS RESPONSE REGULATOR 2 attenuates signaling output in two-component circuitry. Plant J. 69: 934–945.
- Kubo, M., Udagawa, M., Nishikubo, N., Horiguchi, G., Yamaguchi, M., Ito, J., Mimura, T., Fukuda, H., and Demura, T. (2005). Transcription switches for protoxylem and metaxylem vessel formation. Genes Dev. 19: 1855–1860.
- Li, A.-L., et al. (2004). A novel eIF5A complex functions as a regulator of p53 and p53-dependent apoptosis. J. Biol. Chem. 279: 49251–49258.
- Lipowsky, G., Bischoff, F.R., Schwarzmaier, P., Kraft, R., Kostka, S., Hartmann, E., Kutay, U., and Görlich, D. (2000). Exportin 4: A mediator of a novel nuclear export pathway in higher eukaryotes. EMBO J. 19: 4362–4371.
- Liu, H., Yu, X., Li, K., Klejnot, J., Yang, H., Lisiero, D., and Lin, C. (2008a). Photoexcited CRY2 interacts with CIB1 to regulate transcription and floral initiation in Arabidopsis. Science 322: 1535–1539.
- Liu, Z., Duguay, J., Ma, F., Wang, T.-W., Tshin, R., Hopkins, M.T., McNamara, L., and Thompson, J.E. (2008b). Modulation of eIF5A1 expression alters xylem abundance in Arabidopsis thaliana. J. Exp. Bot. 59: 939–950 10.1093/jxb/ern1017.
- Mähönen, A.P., Bonke, M., Kauppinen, L., Riikonen, M., Benfey, P.N., and Helariutta, Y. (2000). A novel two-component hybrid molecule regulates vascular morphogenesis of the Arabidopsis root. Genes Dev. 14: 2938–2943.
- Mähönen, A.P., Higuchi, M., Törmäkangas, K., Miyawaki, K., Pischke, M.S., Sussman, M.R., Helariutta, Y., and Kakimoto, T. (2006a). Cytokinins regulate a bidirectional phosphorelay network in Arabidopsis. Curr. Biol. 16: 1116–1122.
- Mähönen, A.P., Bishopp, A., Higuchi, M., Nieminen, K.M., Kinoshita, K., Törmäkangas, K., Ikeda, Y., Oka, A., Kakimoto, T., and Helariutta, Y. (2006b). Cytokinin signaling and its inhibitor AHP6 regulate cell fate during vascular development. Science 311: 94–98.
- Müller, B., and Sheen, J. (2008). Cytokinin and auxin interaction in root stem-cell specification during early embryogenesis. Nature 453: 1094–1097.
- Ma, Y., Miura, E., Ham, B.-K., Cheng, H.-W., Lee, Y.-J., and Lucas, W.J. (2010). Pumpkin eIF5A isoforms interact with components of the translational machinery in the cucurbit sieve tube system. Plant J. 64: 536–550.
- Nishimura, C., Ohashi, Y., Sato, S., Kato, T., Tabata, S., and Ueguchi, C. (2004). Histidine kinase homologs that act as cytokinin receptors possess overlapping functions in the regulation of shoot and root growth in Arabidopsis. Plant Cell 16: 1365–1377.
- Ohashi-Ito, K., and Bergmann, D.C. (2007). Regulation of the Arabidopsis root vascular initial population by LONESOME HIGHWAY. Development 134: 2959–2968.
- Park, M.H., Lee, Y.B., and Joe, Y.A. (1997). Hypusine is essential for eukaryotic cell proliferation. Biol. Signals 6: 115–123.
- Punwani, J.A., Hutchison, C.E., Schaller, G.E., and Kieber, J.J. (2010). The subcellular distribution of the Arabidopsis histidine phosphotransfer proteins is independent of cytokinin signaling. Plant J. 62: 473–482.
- Ren, B., Liang, Y., Deng, Y., Chen, Q., Zhang, J., Yang, X., and Zuo, J. (2009). Genome-wide comparative analysis of type-A Arabidopsis response regulator genes by overexpression studies reveals their diverse roles and regulatory mechanisms in cytokinin signaling. Cell Res. 19: 1178–1190.
- Rosorius, O., Reichart, B., Krätzer, F., Heger, P., Dabauvalle, M.-C., and Hauber, J. (1999). Nuclear pore localization and nucleocytoplasmic transport of eIF-5A: Evidence for direct interaction with the export receptor CRM1. J. Cell Sci. 112: 2369–2380.
- Saini, P., Eyler, D.E., Green, R., and Dever, T.E. (2009). Hypusinecontaining protein eIF5A promotes translation elongation. Nature 459: 118–121.
- Sambrook, J., and Russell, D.W. (2001). Molecular Cloning: A Laboratory Manual. (Cold Spring Harbor, NY: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press).
- Sauer, M., Paciorek, T., Benková, E., and Friml, J. (2006). Immunocytochemical techniques for whole-mount in situ protein localization in plants. Nat. Protoc. 1: 98–103.
- Schmid, M., Davison, T.S., Henz, S.R., Pape, U.J., Demar, M., Vingron, M., Schölkopf, B., Weigel, D., and Lohmann, J.U. (2005). A gene expression map of Arabidopsis thaliana development. Nat. Genet. 37: 501–506.
- Schrader, R., Young, C., Kozian, D., Hoffmann, R., and Lottspeich, F. (2006). Temperature-sensitive eIF5A mutant accumulates transcripts targeted to the nonsense-mediated decay pathway. J. Biol. Chem. 281: 35336–35346.
- Sessions, A., Yanofsky, M.F., and Weigel, D. (2000). Cell-cell signaling and movement by the floral transcription factors LEAFY and APETALA1. Science 289: 779–782.
- Steeves, T.A., and Sussex, I.M. (1989). Patterns in Plant Development. (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press).
- Thompson, G.M., Cano, V.S., and Valentini, S.R. (2003). Mapping eIF5A binding sites for Dys1 and Lia1: in vivo evidence for regulation of eIF5A hypusination. FEBS Lett. 555: 464–468.
- Thompson, J.E., Hopkins, M.T., Taylor, C., and Wang, T.W. (2004). Regulation of senescence by eukaryotic translation initiation factor 5A: Implications for plant growth and development. Trends Plant Sci. 9: 174–179.
- To, J.P.C., Haberer, G., Ferreira, F.J., Deruère, J., Mason, M.G., Schaller, G.E., Alonso, J.M., Ecker, J.R., and Kieber, J.J. (2004). Type-A Arabidopsis response regulators are partially redundant negative regulators of cytokinin signaling. Plant Cell 16: 658–671.
- To, J.P.C., and Kieber, J.J. (2008). Cytokinin signaling: Twocomponents and more. Trends Plant Sci. 13: 85–92.
- Ulmasov, T., Murfett, J., Hagen, G., and Guilfoyle, T.J. (1997). Aux/ IAA proteins repress expression of reporter genes containing natural and highly active synthetic auxin response elements. Plant Cell 9: 1963–1971.
- Valentini, S.R., Casolari, J.M., Oliveira, C.C., Silver, P.A., and McBride, A.E. (2002). Genetic interactions of yeast eukaryotic translation initiation factor 5A (eIF5A) reveal connections to poly(A) binding protein and protein kinase C signaling. Genetics 160: 393–405.
- Wang, T.-W., Lu, L., Wang, D., and Thompson, J.E. (2001). Isolation and characterization of senescence-induced cDNAs encoding deoxyhypusine synthase and eucaryotic translation initiation factor 5A from tomato. J. Biol. Chem. 276: 17541–17549.
- Wang, T.-W., Zhang, C.-G., Wu, W., Nowack, L.M., Madey, E., and Thompson, J.E. (2005). Antisense suppression of deoxyhypusine synthase in tomato delays fruit softening and alters growth and development. Plant Physiol. 138: 1372-1382.
- Werner, T., and Schmülling, T. (2009). Cytokinin action in plant development. Curr. Opin. Plant Biol. 12: 527–538.
- Winter, D., Vinegar, B., Nahal, H., Ammar, R., Wilson, G.V., and Provart, N.J. (2007). An "Electronic Fluorescent Pictograph" browser for exploring and analyzing large-scale biological data sets. PLoS ONE 2: e718.
- Wulfetange, K., Lomin, S.N., Romanov, G.A., Stolz, A., Heyl, A., and Schmülling, T. (2011). The cytokinin receptors of Arabidopsis are located mainly to the endoplasmic reticulum. Plant Physiol. 156: 1808–1818.
- Yamaguchi, M., Mitsuda, N., Ohtani, M., Ohme-Takagi, M., Kato, K., and Demura, T. (2011). VASCULAR-RELATED NAC-DOMAIN7 directly regulates the expression of a broad range of genes for xylem vessel formation. Plant J. 66: 579–590.
- Zuk, D., and Jacobson, A. (1998). A single amino acid substitution in yeast eIF-5A results in mRNA stabilization. EMBO J. 17: 2914–2925.
- Zuo, J., Niu, Q.W., and Chua, N.H. (2000). Technical advance: An estrogen receptor-based transactivator XVE mediates highly inducible gene expression in transgenic plants. Plant J. 24: 265–273.