

Supplemental Figure S1. Expressions of soybean J-domain proteins in leaf and root

under salt stress. Expression data were extracted from a previous study on the soybean cultivar C08 (Liu et al., 2019). The expressions of genes annotated with PF00226 (DnaJ domain) were retrieved. In total, there were 224 DnaJ domain-containing genes found in the Williams 82 genome. FPKM values of 213 expressed genes corresponding to 205 J domain-containing genes were extracted from the Williams 82 database. The heatmap was generated with the pheatmap package of R.



Supplemental Figure S2. Predicted 3D structure of GmDNJ1. The 3D structure was predicted using the web tool IntFOLD 5.0 (McGuffin et al., 2018;McGuffin et al., 2019), using a colour gradient from blue to red to represent the prediction accuracy from high to low. The predicted structure was presented and coloured with the software CCP4mg (McNicholas et al., 2011). The arrows indicate the two β -barrel structures.



Supplemental Figure S3. Biological replicate of the expression study of *GmDNJ1* under abiotic stress treatments. First-trifoliate seedlings of *G. max* cultivar C01 were treated with (A-E) 9% NaCl for 4 h, (F-J) 5% PEG for 24 hr to induce osmotic stress, (K-O) 50 mM NaHCO₃ at pH 8.5 for 24 h, (P-T) 10 mM paraquat for 4 h to induce oxidative stress, and (D) heat stress at 42 °C for 4 h. Expressions of *GmDNJ1* and other stress responsive genes in leaves and roots were analyzed by RT-qPCR. The expressions of *GmDNJ1* in the treated tissues were normalized to those in the respective untreated tissues. *α-tubulin* was used as the housekeeping gene for normalizing RNA input. Relative gene expression was calculated by the $2^{-\Delta\Delta CT}$ method. The error bar represents the standard deviation of three technical repeats. Two-tailed student's t-test was adopted to compare the expressions between untreated and treated samples. *, **, and *** indicates a significant difference at p<0.05, p<0.01, and p<0.001, respectively. *ns* means that there was no statistically significant difference.



Supplemental Figure S4. Expressions of *GmDNJ1* under heat treatment in Williams 82. Two-week-old seedlings of *G. max* cultivar Williams 82 were heat-treated at 45 °C for various durations. (a) Expressions of *GmDNJ1* in the leaf upon heat treatment. (b) Expressions of *GmDNJ1* in the root upon heat treatment. *Elf1b* was used as the housekeeping gene (Ma et al., 2013) for normalizing RNA input. Relative gene expression was calculated by the $2^{-\Delta\Delta CT}$ method. The error bar represents the standard deviation of four technical repeats.



Supplemental Figure S5. Biological replicate of growth performance and chlorophyll

contents of *Gmdnj1* **mutant lines.** (A) Photos showing two-week-old *Gmdnj1* mutant plants treated at 45 °C/28 °C (heat-treated) and 28 °C/28 °C (untreated) following the 16 h/8 h light-dark cycle for 4 days. (B) Chlorophyll contents of the mutant lines with or without heat treatment. Data were assessed with one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's post hoc test. Different letters above the bars indicate means that were significantly different at p<0.05. N \geq 4. Errors bars: SEM.







Supplemental Figure S7. Biological replicate experiment for ROS contents and expressions of genes encoding ROS-scavenging enzymes in *Gmdnj1* mutant lines. The ROS contents in leaf (A) and root (B) of untreated plants, and in leaf (C) and root (D) of heat-treated plants were compared by measuring the H2DCFCA fluorescence per unit protein in the extract. Expressions of *HsfA2* (E), heat shock element containing superoxide dismutase-encoding genes (F), and heat shock element containing ascorbate peroxidase-encoding genes (G) in root of *Gmdnj1* mutant were monitored. The data in A-D were analyzed with one-way ANOVA followed by LSD test. Different letters above the bars indicate means that are significantly different at p<0.05. N ≥ 4. Error bar: S.E.M. The data in (E-G) were analyzed with one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's test. Different letters above the bars indicate means that are significantly different at p<0.05. N ≥ 3. Error bar: standard deviation.

Supplemental Table 1. Primer information

Primer Name	Primer description	Primer Sequence (5'->3')
Tub-F	α-tubulin RT-qPCR forward primer	GAAGGCCTACCATGAACAGC
Tub-R	α -tubulin RT-qPCR reverse primer	GTGACGAGGATCACACTTGG
DNJ1-F	GmDNJ1 RT-qPCR forward primer	TAAGACATCTTGGCCCATCC
DNJ1-R	GmDNJ1 RT-qPCR reverse primer	CACAACCTTCTCTCCCTTGC
HSFA2-F	Glyma.04G052000 HsfA2 RT-qPCR forward primer	ACAGTCACACGAGGGAGGAAGT
HSFA2-R	Glyma.04G052000 HsfA2 RT-qPCR reverse primer	TCCCTCGAGTTGTGCTGTTGT
GmRD22-F	GmRD22 RT-qPCR forward primer	GCCACAAGCAGAACTACCCTTATG
GmRD22-R	GmRD22 RT-qPCR reverse primer	CACTGCTACCGCTTTAACCCTAAC
GmCHX20a-F	<i>GmCHX20a</i> RT-qPCR forward primer (Jia et al., 2020)	CGTATGCATCATCTTCTTTGG
GmCHX20a-R	GmCHX20a RT-qPCR reverse primer	GGTCATCCTTTTCAACAAACC
GsCHX19.3-F	<i>GsCHX19.3</i> RT-qPCR forward primer (Jia et al., 2017)	ACCCCTCAGACAACCCCG
GsCHX19.3-R	GsCHX19.3 RT-qPCR reverse primer	TACGACGAATCGCACGCAT
SOD-F	Glyma.11G192700, Glyma.12G081300 Superoxide dismutase RT-qPCR forward primer	CGTCGCCACTCTCATCCAAGAA
SOD-R	Glyma.11G192700, Glyma.12G081300 Superoxide dismutase RT-qPCR reverse primer	AAACCATGAAGCCCCGGAGT
APX-F	Glyma.11G107200, Glyma.12G032300 L-Ascorbate peroxidase RT-qPCR forward primer	GGCGGCTTCCTGATGCTAAA
APX-R	Glyma.11G107200, Glyma.12G032300 L-Ascorbate peroxidase RT-qPCR reverse primer	TCCGTCCAAGGGCCATCAAA
Elf1b-F	GmELF1B forward primer	CCACTGCTGAAGAAGATGATGATG
Elf1b-R	GmELF1B reverse primer	AAGGACAGAAGACTTGCCACTC

References

- Jia, B.W., Sun, M.Z., Duanmu, H.Z., Ding, X.D., Liu, B.D., Zhu, Y.M., et al. (2017). GsCHX19.3, a member of cation/H⁺ exchanger superfamily from wild soybean contributes to high salinity and carbonate alkaline tolerance. *Sci Rep-Uk* 7, 10.1038/s41598-41017-09772-41593.
- Jia, Q., Li, M.W., Zheng, C.W., Xu, Y.Y., Sun, S., Li, Z., et al. (2020). The soybean plasma membrane-localized cation/H⁺ exchanger GmCHX20a plays a negative role under salt stress. *Physiol Plantarum*, 10.1111/ppl.13250.
- Liu, A.L., Xiao, Z.X., Li, M.W., Wong, F.L., Yung, W.S., Ku, Y.S., et al. (2019). Transcriptomic reprogramming in soybean seedlings under salt stress. *Plant Cell Environ* 42, 98-114.
- Ma, S.H., Niu, H.W., Liu, C.J., Zhang, J., Hou, C.Y., and Wang, D.M. (2013). Expression Stabilities of Candidate Reference Genes for RT-qPCR under Different Stress Conditions in Soybean. *Plos One* 8, e75271.
- Mcguffin, L.J., Adiyaman, R., Maghrabi, A.H.A., Shuid, A.N., Brackenridge, D.A., Nealon, J.O., et al. (2019). IntFOLD: an integrated web resource for high performance protein structure and function prediction. *Nucleic Acids Res* 47, W408-W413.
- Mcguffin, L.J., Shuid, A.N., Kempster, R., Maghrabi, A.H.A., Nealon, J.O., Salehe, B.R., et al. (2018). Accurate template-based modeling in CASP12 using the IntFOLD4-TS, ModFOLD6, and ReFOLD methods. *Proteins* 86, 335-344.
- Mcnicholas, S., Potterton, E., Wilson, K.S., and Noble, M.E.M. (2011). Presenting your structures: the CCP4mg molecular-graphics software. *Acta Crystallogr D* 67, 386-394.