



REPLY TO JIN AND ZHU:

PINOID-mediated COP1 phosphorylation matters in photomorphogenesis in *Arabidopsis*

Dongqing Xu^{a,1} and Xing Wang Deng^{a,b,1}

We thank Jin and Zhu for their comments (1). Our study in PNAS focuses on the molecular role for PINOID (PID) and PID-mediated CONSTITUTIVELY PHOTOMORPHOGENIC 1 (COP1) phosphorylation in the regulation of seedling development in *Arabidopsis* (2). Not only hypocotyl elongation but also apical hook maintenance and cotyledon aperture are phenotypic readouts for photomorphogenesis in *Arabidopsis* (3, 4). Transgenic and phenotypic analyses clearly suggest that phosphomimic COP1 (YFP-COP1 S20D) possesses weaker activity in maintaining the apical hook and promoting hypocotyl elongation in *Arabidopsis* (2). Extensive studies have uncovered that multiple factors and regulators contribute to precise modulation of COP1 abundance and activity (5). It is therefore reasonable that PID-mediated phosphorylation of COP1 does not cause a dramatic effect on seedling development. As we assume in the paper (2), the non-altered ELONGATED HYPOCOTYL 5 (HY5) protein abundance and HY5-regulated gene expression in dark-grown *PID* overexpressors are likely due to the already extremely low HY5 level, as COP1 is enriched in the nucleus and directly targets HY5 for ubiquitination and degradation in darkness (6).

In the various light conditions tested, *pid-15 cop1-6* exhibits intermediated hypocotyl length, indicating that COP1 and PID may work synergistically in regulating photomorphogenesis in the light (2). In darkness, *pid-15* is epistatic to *cop1-6*, but we cannot rule out the possibility that *PID* might act upstream of *COP1*, as *cop1-6* is a weak allele, not a null mutant (7). *PID* directly interacts with and targets *COP1* for phosphorylation (2). Thus, our biochemical findings

support that *PID* acts upstream of *COP1*. The *cop1-6* produces a functional *COP1-6* mutant protein with five novel amino acids (Cys-Leu-Val-Leu-Trp) inserted in-frame between Glu301 and Phe302 of the wild-type protein at a lower level (7, 8). Suppression of constitutively photomorphogenic phenotype of *cop1-6* is indeed caused by the disruption of *PID* as demonstrated by the complementation assays (2). *PID* likely has no effect on the *COP1* abundance and its nucleocytoplasmic partitioning. However, phosphomimic *COP1* exhibits weaker activity in repressing enlargement of the apical hook unfolding angle and promoting hypocotyl growth in *Arabidopsis* (2). Thus, it appears that suppression of *cop1-6* by *pid-15* might, at least in part, be attributed to the loss of *PID*-mediated phosphorylation of *COP1*. We also clearly point out that “*PID*-mediated phosphorylation is only partially responsible for the repression of *COP1* activity...” in our discussion (2).

COP1 does not regulate *PID* abundance in plants (2). Despite extensive efforts, we have been unable to show that *COP1* affects *PID* activity. *PID* is a key player in auxin signaling and targets auxin efflux carriers for phosphorylation (9–11). Our data clearly demonstrate that *PID* is a positive regulator of photomorphogenesis (2). Together, these facts indicate that cross-talk between light and auxin signaling and the interplay between *PID* and *COP1* might play a critical role in directional auxin transport, auxin distribution, auxin biosynthesis, or auxin signaling pathways. We agree with Jin and Zhu (1) in their perspective that the role of *PID*–*COP1* in the integration of light and auxin signaling awaits further detailed investigation.

1 Jin H, Zhu Z (2017) Role of PINOID-mediated COP1 phosphorylation in *Arabidopsis* photomorphogenesis is overemphasized. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 114:E8134–E8135.

2 Lin F, et al. (2017) Phosphorylation and negative regulation of CONSTITUTIVELY PHOTOMORPHOGENIC 1 by PINOID in *Arabidopsis*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 114:6617–6622.

3 Sullivan JA, Deng XW (2003) From seed to seed: the role of photoreceptors in *Arabidopsis* development. *Dev Biol* 260:289–297.

^aDepartment of Biology, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen 518055, China; and ^bState Key Laboratory of Protein and Plant Gene Research, Peking-Tsinghua Center for Life Sciences, School of Advanced Agriculture Sciences and School of Life Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

Author contributions: D.X. and X.W.D. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

¹To whom correspondence may be addressed. Email: deng@pku.edu.cn or xudq@sustc.edu.cn.

