# SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Figs S1–S12: Ancestral character-state reconstruction of DEF- and GLO-like protein interactions. S1–S4, S7 and S8: phylogenetic trees are based on the gene phylogenies. Figs S5, S6, S9–S12: phylogenetic trees were manually drawn based on the species phylogeny. For details of the labelling, see Figure 5. Fig. S1. Heterodimerization of DEF- with GLO-like proteins.





#### Fig. S2: Homodimerization of DEF-like proteins.



Fig. S3. Heterodimerization of GLO- with DEF-like proteins.



Fig. S4: Homodimerization of GLO-like proteins.



Fig. S5 and S7. Heterodimerization of DEF-like with AGL6/LOFSEP/SEP3-like proteins. Fig. S5:

#### DEF-AGL6/LOFSEP/SEP3



Fig. S5 and S7. Heterodimerization of DEF-like with AGL6/LOFSEP/SEP3-like proteins. Fig. S7:

### DEF-AGL6/LOFSEP/SEP3



Fig. S6 and S8. Heterodimerization of GLO-like with AGL6/LOFSEP/SEP3-like proteins. Fig. S6:

# GLO-AGL6/LOFSEP/SEP3



Fig. S6 and S8. Heterodimerization of GLO-like with AGL6/LOFSEP/SEP3-like proteins. Fig. S8:

## GLO-AGL6/LOFSEP/SEP3



#### Fig. S9. Homodimerization of DEF-like proteins, comparing yeast two-hybrid (Y2H) and EMSA data.



#### Fig. S10. Heterodimerization of DEF- with GLO-like proteins, comparing Y2H with EMSA data.



**DEF-GLO** 

#### Fig. S11: Homodimerization of GLO-like proteins, comparing Y2H and EMSA data.



#### GLO-GLO

#### Fig. S12. Heterodimerization of GLO- with DEF-like proteins, comparing Y2H with EMSA data.



#### **GLO-DEF**

Fig. S13. Representative yeast two-hybrid results for MADS-domain proteins from *L. tulipifera*. For details of the labelling, see Figure 2.

pGBKT7	DEF-like	GLC	)-like	SEP3-like		
pGADT7	LtAP3	LtPI	LtPI2	LltuAGL9	Δ	
LtAP3		• • •	• • • *	- · / ·	and that	
LtPI		3. 1973		our ?		
LtPI2	<ul> <li>● ● ● </li> </ul>				4 g	
LltuAGL9	6-9					
Δ		Lat. a		Jan . Ma		

Fig. S14. Representative yeast two-hybrid results for MADS-domain proteins from *N. advena*. For details of the labelling, see Figure 2.

pGBKT7 DEF-like		-like	GLO-like		AG-like	AGL6-like		LOFSEP-like	
pGADT7	Nu.ad.AP3.1	Nu.ad.AP3.2	Nu.ad.PI1	Nu.ad.PI2	Nu.ad.AG	Nu.ad.AGL6.1	Nu.ad.AGL6.2	Nu.ad.AGL2	Δ
Nu.ad.AP3.1	6 1 1 1	6				10 1 X (1)	0		2 1 2 8
Nu.ad.AP3.2	20.24	6			5 6 2 1	0.2 1 1			6 7 F 8
Nu.ad.PI1	\$ @ @ \$		0.0.1	4	8 4 1 1 1	0 : 6	0002	0.0.0	0 1 1 1
Nu.ad.PI2		• •	3 10 1 1	2	6 3- 3 - 4-	8 1 5 2		9 A 1	4 7 7 6
Nu.ad.AG		2 2 X X	9 . · · ·	10 1 1 N		3 - K - K	6 0	2 3 5 1	1 1 1 1 2
Nu.ad.AGL6.1		0.4	0.3	0		0.5.7		<b>4</b> 0 1	a section
Nu.ad.AGL6.2	781 6 80 9	1 1 1 A		$0 \to +\infty$		009%		<b>8</b> 3 4	4.104.102.10
Nu.ad.AGL2	18 41 E X				y k k de		6 6 K K	0.0 1 1	5 1 K K
Δ		s a x k	10 4 4 4	2. 2. 1. 1		74.5	6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	an tagan tagan ta



100— **(** bp

-



Nu.ad.AG Nu.ad.AG/Nu.ad.PI1∆C



**Supplementary Figure 15:** EMSA results for MADS-domain proteins from *N. advena* and *L. tulipifera*. Band and lane labelling is as in Figure 3. For reasons not entirely clear, some heteromeric complexes have an reduced electrophoretic mobility when compared to each of the corresponding homomeric complexes (compare LtAP3ΔC and LtPI with LtAP3ΔC/LtPI, for example). Also for reasons not clear, Nu.ad.PI2- and Nu.ad.PI2ΔC-DNA complexes have almost identical electrophoretic mobilities. Beyond the expected homomeric protein-DNA complex, an additional band of very high electrophoretic mobility was resolved for Nu.ad.AGL6.1; the nature of this band is unknown.