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Abstract

The aim of this project was to define the link between developmental patterning and auxin response in the *Arabidopsis thaliana* root epidermis. The root epidermis was used as a model to understand the interaction of patterning mechanisms, such as those that define the hair and non-hair producing epidermal cells, and auxin. According to data published before this project began the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network are two independent aspects of plant growth. However the results detailed within this thesis have highlighted that this view is too simplistic, and they actually interact at multiple levels.

Having established the presence of a repressive auxin response regime in the non-hair cells of the root epidermis, analysis of the *gl2-1* mutant allowed us to further understand the functional significance of this. Results were consistent with *ARF10* and/or *ARF16* functioning to restrict root hair growth. In order to place the spatial control of auxin response in the current knowledge of the epidermal patterning mechanism, analysis of mutant and marker line crosses was carried out. These indicated that members of both pathways were involved in promoting and inhibiting the expression of components of the other pathway, thereby indicating the presence of multiple interactions, with both positive and negative feedback loops existing between the two. Specifically the non-hair promoting components *WER* and *MYB23* were observed to promote the expression of the repressive ARF, *ARF10*. In turn *ARF10* was observed to promote the expression of *WER* and *GL2*, but inhibit the expression of *MYB23*. Finally analysis of constructs that blocked the down-regulation of *MYB23* by auxin highlighted the possibility that auxin mediated root hair elongation may function via the down-regulation of the epidermal patterning component *MYB23*, thus indicating a potentially novel role for an epidermal patterning component that has previously been considered to be somewhat insignificant.
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1 : General Introduction
1.1 **Auxin**

The phytohormone auxin is a versatile regulator of many growth and developmental processes (Chapman and Estelle, 2009; Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011; Goh *et al.*, 2014). Auxin is the term given for a class of structurally diverse small molecules, which elicit a qualitatively similar response in plants, to that observed as a result of treatment with the naturally occurring auxin indole-3-acetic acid (IAA) (Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011; Ljung, 2014). IAA is a weak acid derivative of tryptophan, a carboxylic acid in which the carboxyl group is attached through a methylene group to the C3 position of an indole ring (Figure 1-1) (Robert and Friml, 2009; Abel and Theologis, 2010; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010). Several synthetic auxins are also used both scientifically and commercially. These include 1-naphthaleneacetic acid (NAA) which, in contrast to IAA can enter cells without the involvement of auxin influx transporters and 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D), which can be readily transported into, but not out of, cells (Delbarre, 1994; Walsh *et al.*, 2006; Grossmann, 2007).

A combination of homeostatic mechanisms including, coordinated and directional transport, de novo synthesis, degradation and reversible conjugation create the patterns of auxin distribution throughout the plant that regulate numerous, diverse aspects of development (Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011; Overvoorde *et al.*, 2010; Kieffer *et al.*, 2010; Pencík *et al.*, 2013). An important component of auxin’s versatility as a developmental regulator arises from the existence of context-specific responses to auxin. For example, the generation of an auxin maximum in the root tip positions and maintains the stem cell niche, whilst auxin accumulation in xylem-pole pericycle cells initiates lateral root growth (Péret *et al.*, 2009; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010). It has been suggested that these context-dependent responses to auxin arise from cell and tissue-specific patterns of expression of auxin signalling components, although this hypothesis remains to be substantiated (Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011).
Figure 1-1: The chemical structure of synthetic and naturally occurring auxins. (Adapted from Walsh et al., 2006, Figure 6). Auxins are a variety of structurally diverse molecules. This figure indicates the chemical structure of the naturally occurring IAA and two synthetic auxins 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic Acid (2,4-D) and 1-napthaleneacetic acid (NAA).
1.2 Auxin transport

The coordinated and directional manner in which IAA is transported is one of the primary reasons auxin is such a remarkable regulator of growth and development (Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010). Unique intercellular and directional transport systems enable differential IAA distribution and result in reliable establishments of auxin gradients and maxima (Robert and Friml, 2009; Peer et al., 2014; Eckardt, 2014). IAA is transported via two methods, long distance via the phloem and short distance via the highly regulated polar cell-to-cell system (Robert and Friml, 2009; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010).

A significant amount of IAA is transported via the phloem, allowing the bulk movement of IAA in a root-ward direction. Although this transport route is efficient and reasonably rapid, achieving speeds of up 7 cm per hour, it can not be finely regulated (Overvoorde et al., 2010). Despite the polar cell-to-cell IAA transport method being much slower, only achieving a speed of up to 10 mm per hour, it is able to be finely regulated by the coordinated activities of auxin influx and efflux transporters (Overvoorde et al., 2010).

The short-distance cell-to-cell movement of IAA is described by the chemiosmotic model (Robert and Friml, 2009). Due to the acidic pH (5.5) of the apoplast, extracellular IAA is partially protonated. The lipophilic characteristics and small size of protonated IAA means that it can diffuse across the plasma membrane into the cell (Robert and Friml, 2009). Once inside the cell the neutral pH of the cytoplasm means that IAA is almost completely deprotonated and therefore unable to diffuse out of the cell passively (Jones et al., 2009; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010). Despite efficient passive transport of protonated IAA into cells, the auxin influx transporters AUXIN RESISTANT 1 (AUX1) and three LIKE AUXIN RESISTANT1 (LAX) proteins also play an important role in cellular
homeostasis because they allow the uptake of deprotonated IAA (Robert and Friml, 2009; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010).

The active transport of auxin out of cells is mediated by two families of membrane proteins, the *PIN-FORMED (PIN)* and *B-type ATP-BINDING CASSETTE (ABCB)* families of auxin efflux transporters (Robert and Friml, 2009). The *ABCB* family consists of phosphoglycoproteins (PGP), PGP1,4 and 19 have been identified as mediating auxin efflux and have been shown to exhibit complex interactions with PIN proteins (Robert and Friml, 2009). PINs are known for their importance in facilitating the directionality of auxin transport via their coordinated expression and asymmetric localisation in the plasma membrane (Jones *et al.*, 2009). In the root, due to this dynamic coordinated expression and orientation of the pin proteins, IAA is transported in a root-ward direction in the stele and a shoot-ward direction in the epidermis and lateral root cap (Robert and Friml, 2009; Jones *et al.*, 2009). It is hypothesised that the *ABCB/PGP* proteins influence how much auxin is available for the PIN directed transport, however PIN and *ABCB/PGP* proteins have been observed to act in both a synergistic and antagonistic manner, thus allowing for the fine tuning of auxin distribution in many developmental processes (Cho *et al.*, 2007; Robert and Friml, 2009). Using the root hair as a model for auxin response, in 2007 Cho *et al* highlighted the importance of auxin transporters in influencing auxin related phenotypes, overexpression of PGP4 resulted in shorter root hairs whilst overexpression of AUX1 resulted in longer root hairs.
1.3 **Auxin signalling**

In *Arabidopsis thaliana* (hereafter referred to as *Arabidopsis*) three protein families form part of a dynamic interaction network that brings about a transcriptional response to auxin. These are the TRANSPORT INHIBITOR RESPONSE1/ AUXIN RELTED F-BOX (SCF$^{TIR1/AFB}$) family of auxin receptors, and two families of transcription factors, the Aux/IAA’s and the AUXIN RESPONSE FACTORS (ARFs) (Lokerse and Weijers, 2009; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010). ARFs bind to AUXIN RESPONSE ELEMENTS (AuxRE) located in the promoter region of auxin response genes (Guilfoyle and Hagen, 2007). Once bound the ARF can either activate or repress the transcription of the targeted gene. ARFs also form dimers with the Aux/IAA repressor proteins, which in turn recruit members of the TOPLESS (TPL) co-repressor protein family, to bring about a repressed chromatin state at the targeted locus (Szemenyei *et al*., 2008). Auxin affects transcriptional activity at ARF-targeted loci by facilitating the interaction between Aux/IAA repressor proteins and the auxin receptor complex SCF$^{TIR1/AFB}$, thereby promoting the ubiquitination and proteolysis of Aux/IAAs and the derepression of ARF-regulated genes (Figure 1-2) (Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011).

### 1.3.1 Auxin receptors

There are six members of the SCF$^{TIR1/AFB}$ auxin receptor family, *TIR1* and *AFB1*-5 (Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011). TIR1 and the AFBs are F-Box proteins, which are subunits of the SKP1-CULLIN1-F-BOX ubiquitin ligase complex (Lokerse and Weijers, 2009; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010; Kieffer *et al*., 2010). The F-Box protein components are responsible for the specific recruitment of Aux/IAAs for polyubiquitination by the core catalytic components of the SCF complex (Kepinski, 2007; Lokerse and Weijers, 2009; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010; Kieffer *et al*., 2010).
Three key protein families form part of a dynamic interaction network that brings about a transcriptional response to auxin. When auxin interacts with the SCFTIR1/AFB receptors the Aux/IAA proteins are recruited away from interacting with ARFs and co-repressors like TOPLESS (TPL), this results in proteasomal degradation of the Aux/IAAs, thus leaving the ARFs free to activate or repress auxin response gene expression. In Arabidopsis there are 29 Aux/IAAs, 23 ARFs and 6 TIR1/AFB receptors.
Auxin binding the complex acts to stabilise the association between SCF$^{\text{TIR1}/\text{AFB}}$ and the Aux/IAA, thereby promoting the polyubiquitination and subsequent proteolysis of the Aux/IAA in the 26s proteasome (Lokerse and Weijers, 2009; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010; Hua and Vierstra, 2011). Differences have been observed between these F-box proteins, for example, AFB4 and AFB5 have long amino-terminal extensions and whilst a loss of function in TIR1 and AFB1-3 results in resistance to exogenous auxin, the same mutation in AFB5 results in slight hypersensitivity to exogenous auxin (Yu et al., 2013).

### 1.3.2 Aux/IAAs

In *Arabidopsis* the Aux/IAA family of repressor proteins consists of 29 members, IAA1-20 and IAA26-34 (Tiwari *et al.*, 2004; Guilfoyle and Hagen, 2007; Overvoorde *et al.*, 2010). The Aux/IAA genes encode 18- to 35- kD proteins that are localised in the nuclei and have short half-lives (Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010). The transcription of most of these Aux/IAAs is up-regulated by auxin, resulting in a feedback loop that facilitates tight regulation of auxin response (Kieffer *et al.*, 2010).

Most of the Aux/IAAs have four domains with individual functions (Figure 1-3) (Lokerse and Weijers, 2009; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010; Overvoorde *et al.*, 2010). Domain I facilitates transcriptional repression by recruiting co-repressors like TPL and TOPLESS-RELATED (TRP) (Szemenyi et al., 2008; Tiwari *et al.*, 2001). These transcriptional co-repressors do not bind DNA directly, but are recruited via associations with DNA binding transcription factors (Szemenyi *et al.*, 2008). Within Domain I conserved leucine residues have been shown to be important for effective Aux/IAA repression (Tiwari *et al.*, 2004).
**Figure 1-3: A schematic representation of Aux/IAA and ARF protein structures.**

(Re-drawn from Kepinski and Leyser, 2002, Figure 2.) The shared homology in the C-terminal Domains III and IV of the ARFs and Aux/IAAs mediates homo and heterodimerisation. The ARFs have an N-terminal DNA binding domain (DBD) which binds to AuxRE’s in the promoter regions of auxin response genes, whilst the composition of the middle region determines if the ARF is activating or repressing. Protein stability of the Aux/IAAs is determined by Domain II.
Domain II is required for the Aux/IAAs characteristic instability, it contains the residues that interact with the SCF$^{TIR1/AFB}$ receptor complex, thus acting as a so-called degron motif (Kepinski and Leyser, 2002). This results in a range of half-lives from a little as 6 minutes to in excess of 80 minutes (Kepinski and Leyser, 2002). Mutations in Domain II result in accumulation of the Aux/IAA protein, interestingly these mutants exhibit varying phenotypes, in IAA7 mutants gravitropic defects are observed whereas the same mutation in IAA14 results in the loss of lateral root development (Tiwari et al., 2001; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010; Overvoorde et al., 2010).

Domains III and IV are within the Aux/IAAs C-terminal region, and are also known as the C-terminal interaction domain (CTD) (Lokerse and Weijers, 2009). The CTD mediates homotypic and heterotypic interactions between the Aux/IAAs and the ARFs (Lokerse and Weijers, 2009; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010). In some of the Aux/IAAs a mutation in Domain III has resulted in a reversal of the repression of auxin response genes (Rouse, 1998; Tiwari et al., 2001).

There are three non-canonical Aux/IAAs that do not exhibit this four domain structure (Dreher et al., 2006). IAA20, 30 and 31 all either completely or partially lack a Domain II meaning they exhibit little or no degradation in response to auxin (Dreher et al., 2006).

### 1.3.3 Auxin response factors

**AUXIN RESPONSE FACTORS (ARFs)** bind to auxin response elements (AuxREs) in the promoter regions of auxin response genes (Overvoorde et al., 2010). In *Arabidopsis* there are 23 members of the ARF family (Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010). Unlike the Aux/IAAs they are not generally induced by auxin and are relatively stable proteins that have a three domain structure.
(Figure 1-3) (Guilfoyle and Hagen, 2007; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010; Kieffer et al., 2010). The majority of the ARFs have a DNA-binding domain (DBD), a middle region (MR) and a C-terminal dimerization domain (CTD), which is structurally similar to the Aux/IAA CTD (Tiwari et al., 2003, Guilfoyle and Hagen, 2007).

The ARFs CTD enables a variety of hetero and homo-dimer formations with both other ARFs and Aux/IAAs, whilst the DBD binds to AuxREs in the promoter regions of auxin response genes (Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011). AuxREs are generally characterised by a TGTCNC sequence (Tiwari et al., 2003; Guilfoyle and Hagen, 2007; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010). Tromas et al 2009 hypothesised that the distribution and sequence context of the AuxREs may regulate the degree of response to auxin at that locus, and could therefore function as the first level of complexity in the transcriptional regulation of auxin response genes.

When ARFs interact with these AuxREs they can be either activators or repressors of gene expression, a characteristic that is determined by the MR composition (Guilfoyle and Hagen, 2007). Generally ARFs with a glutamine, serine and/or leucine rich MR are activators, whilst those with a serine, proline and/or glycine rich MR are repressors (Tiwari et al., 2003; Guilfoyle and Hagen, 2007). Within the ARF family ARF5-8 and 19 are activators (ARF+) whilst the remaining 18 are repressors (ARF-) (Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011). Although interactions between Aux/IAAs and ARF- may appear insignificant, they have been observed in both in vivo and in vitro assays, however they have appeared to be fewer and weaker that Aux/IAA-ARF+ interactions (Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010; Overvoorde et al., 2010; Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011). Hypotheses for ARF- function currently include competition between ARF+ and ARF- for AuxRE binding sites, and the idea that some ARF+ may function better as dimers, the formation of which may be blocked by ARF- interactions (Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010; Overvoorde et al., 2010; Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011).
The *Arabidopsis* ARF family consists of 22 full length ARFs and one putative partial length pseudogene, *ARF23*, which has a stop codon in its binding domain (Guilfoyle and Hagen, 2007). Phylogenetic analysis of this family has established that the ARFs fall into related pairs and one triplet (Guilfoyle and Hagen, 2007). These are *ARFs 1* and *2*, *ARFs 3* and *4*, *ARFs 6* and *8*, *ARFs 7* and *19*, *ARFs 11* and *18* and *ARFs 10*, *16* and *17* (Guilfoyle and Hagen, 2007). The roles in these related pairs are likely to be redundant as double mutants of both pair members usually have much stronger phenotypes than a single mutant (Guilfoyle and Hagen, 2007).

Thus the auxin response network is a complex system that enables the capacity for fine control. Differential expression of the pathway components, specific interactions between certain members and protein characteristics may all contribute to the versatility of auxin response in multiple developmental contexts (Knox *et al*., 2003; Overvoorde *et al*., 2010).
1.4 Root development

1.4.1 Arabidopsis root morphology

In *Arabidopsis* the root structure is highly uniform with radial organisation (Figure 1-4) (Yu *et al.*, 2010). In the centre is the stele, which contains the xylem and phloem. Adjacent to this is the endodermis and cortex layer and on the outer side is the epidermal layer (Schiefelbein *et al.*, 2009; Overvoorde *et al.*, 2010). The epidermal layer is composed of two cell types trichoblasts (hereafter referred to as hair cells) and atrichoblasts (hereafter referred to as non-hair cells) (Schiefelbein *et al.*, 2009). The tissues in the root arise from a repetitive process of cell division and expansion of four types of stem cell initials, which are adjacent to the quiescent centre (Overvoorde *et al.*, 2010). The collumella initials give rise to the central area of the root cap and the epidermal / lateral root cap initials produce to the lateral root cap and the epidermis (Overvoorde *et al.*, 2010). The cortex / endodermal initials support the formation of the ground tissue, whilst the vascular initials sustain the vascular tissue and pericycle (Overvoorde *et al.*, 2010).

The root can be divided into a series of distinct developmental zones along its length (Figure 1-5) (Ishikawa and Evans, 1995; van den Berg *et al.*, 1995). From the tip these consist of the meristematic zone, the elongation zone and the differentiation zone (Overvoorde *et al.*, 2010). At the convergence of the meristematic and elongation zones is the transition zone which has, in the past, also been referred to as the ‘distal elongation zone’ (Baluska *et al.*, 2010; Overvoorde *et al.*, 2010).
Figure 1-4: A simplified representation of the *Arabidopsis* root.

Figure taken from (Overvoorde *et al.*, 2010, Figure 1). Many tissue layers combine to form the *Arabidopsis* root. Here two cross sections highlight the circumferential and radial organisation of the root and the position dependent formation of hair (trichoblast) and non-hair (atrichoblast) epidermal cells.
The meristematic zone contains the four types of initial cells and the dividing cells of the root, in this zone random cell division occurs (Hayashi et al., 2013). In the elongation zone endoreduplication occurs and the cells elongate substantially (Hayashi et al., 2013). From the basal half of the meristem the increase of cell size is gradual but this rapidly increases once cells enter the elongation zone (Hayashi et al., 2013). The concept of a transition zone arose from the fact that cells leaving the meristematic zone needed a transitional stage of cyto-architectural rearrangement in order to be able to perform the rapid cell elongation required in the elongation zone (Baluška et al., 1990; Baluska et al., 1996; Baluska et al., 1997). Cells in the transition zone have important sensorial and functional properties, Darwin himself identified that in Zea mays 1.0-1.5 mm from the tip was the most sensitive zone of the root apex with respect to reaction to stimuli, this position corresponds with the location of the transition zone in this species (Baluska et al., 2010). Apart from tip growing cells like root hairs, the transition zone cells have the highest rate of vesicle recycling and in addition to this their auxin transport shows the highest degree of activity (Tian and Reed, 1999; Růzicka et al., 2007). In the differentiation zone elongated cells mature and root hairs are initiated (Foreman, 2001). During this project the transition zone was defined as the point where the cells began to elongate. Auxin plays an important role in root morphology, including the auxin transport dependent positioning of the stem cell niche and the maintenance of the meristematic zone (Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011). Within the root the principal flow of auxin is located within the central vascular tissues, moving root-ward towards the root tip and then out through the root cap and back up in a shoot-ward direction through the epidermal layer (Jones et al., 2009). At the transition zone a proportion of the auxin flow is refluxed laterally, back into the central root-ward flow, thus reinforcing a high auxin concentration in the meristematic zone (Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011).

Auxin also plays a role in gravitropic and cell elongation responses (Marchant et al., 1999). Treatment with high concentrations of exogenous auxin results in significantly shorter primary roots and in addition to other responses PIN
The developing Arabidopsis root can be classified into distinct zones. Beyond the quiescent centre in the root tip is the meristematic zone, a shift from this zone to the elongation zone is covered by the transition zone. Shortly after the elongation begins the differentiation zone is apparent and root hairs are initiated. During this project the transition zone was defined as the point where the cells began to elongate.

Figure 1-5: Zonal classification of the developing Arabidopsis root.
proteins have been observed to relocate due to a change in gravity (Scott and Allen, 1999; Kleine-Vehn et al., 2010).

1.4.2 Root hairs

Root hairs are tip growing tubular shaped extensions produced by the hair cells in the root epidermis (Datta et al., 2011; Park and Nebenführ, 2013; Ketelaar, 2014). They function to increase root surface area, nutrient uptake and plant anchorage (Datta et al., 2011; Ichikawa et al., 2014; Zhao et al., 2014). In crop species higher root hair densities are considered an advantage (Datta et al., 2011; Müller and Bartelheimer, 2013).

There are two main stages to root hair growth, initiation and elongation (Datta et al., 2011). In Arabidopsis root hairs emerge toward the basal end of the hair cells (here the basal end of the cell is defined as the one closest to the root tip), the precise positioning being affected by auxin (Foreman, 2001; Grebe et al., 2002; Cho, 2002). In the ROOT HAIR DEFECTIVE6 mutant (rhd6) root hairs arise in a more apical position, but this can be partially rescued with exogenous auxin treatment (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1994). In addition to this a reduced response to auxin in the axr2-1 mutant also results in an apical shift in root hair position and the formation of more than one hair per root hair cell (Fischer et al., 2007). It is hypothesised that root hair position is orientated towards the auxin concentration maximum in the root tip, when this is disrupted in AUX1 mutants an apical shift is also observed (Fischer et al., 2007).

Once the site of root hair initiation has been established a bulge forms, this coincides with a decrease in pH, which is thought to be associated with the production of EXPANSINS (Ikeda et al., 2009; Datta et al., 2011). Both
EXPANSIN 7 and EXPANSIN 8 are up-regulated by auxin treatment, and both are involved in root hair elongation (Cho, 2002).

Root hair elongation occurs via tip growth, once this process has begun the nucleus relocates to the root hair where it remains at a constant distance from the growing tip, if the nucleus moves away from this point elongation is blocked (Ketelaar, 2002). At the tip of the elongating root hair is dense cytoplasm and a large number of secretory vesicles that contain cell wall and membrane components (Datta et al., 2011). Next to this is an organelle rich area containing the golgi body, mitochondria and endoplasmic reticulum, these synthesise and transport the macromolecules required in the growing tip (Datta et al., 2011). The basal region of the root hair cell is vacuolated (Datta et al., 2011).

Downstream of RHD6, several genes promote hair elongation, these include, ROOT HAIR DEFECTIVE 6 LIKE 4 (RSL4) and LJRHL-I-LIKE 3 (LRL3) (Datta et al., 2011). RSL4 in particular is interesting because whilst loss-of-function mutants result in shorter root hairs, over expression mutants result in root hairs that grow continuously (Yi et al., 2010). In addition to root hair initiation auxin also plays a role in root hair elongation (Pitts et al., 1998). Treatment with exogenous auxin results in significant root hair elongation, whilst auxin signalling mutants like axr3-1 result in short or glabrous root hair phenotypes (Pitts et al., 1998). Auxin also positively regulates the expression of RSL4 and in addition to this, RSL4 is required for auxin-stimulated root hair growth (Yi et al., 2010; Datta et al., 2011).

Interestingly, mutations in different components of the auxin response network result in different root hair phenotypes. Whilst semi-dominant Domain II stabilising mutations in IAA17 result in a greatly reduced number of root hairs, the same mutation in IAA2 results in an increase in root hair length (Knox et al., 2003). In addition to this when driven by the same inducible promoter, IAA17 still blocks root hair production whilst IAA2 results in much longer root hairs, indicating that
these Aux/IAAs are likely to be interacting with different ARFs, which in turn may be targeting distinct auxin response genes (Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011).

Nutrient and water uptake are two of the most important functions of root hairs. Root hairs have influx channels and transporters for a vast array of substances including; phosphate, sulphate, peptides, calcium, urea, ammonium, water and potassium (Datta et al., 2011). In addition to enhancing acquisition of these compounds, root hair development is affected by nutrient availability; deficiencies in phosphate, nitrate, potassium and iron all result in various forms of increased root hair growth. For example, under phosphate deficient conditions root hair density is increased and they can reach up to three times their normal length (Datta et al., 2011).

Root hairs are also required for secretion and plant anchorage (Datta et al., 2011). They have been shown to modify the rhizosphere by exuding organic compounds like organic acids that function to aid various processes, including nutrient mobilisation and growth inhibition of pathogens and/or neighbouring plants (Gahoonia and Nielsen, 2003; Yan et al., 2004; Datta et al., 2011).
1.5 Root epidermal patterning

The root epidermis is made of two cell types, hair cells and non-hair cells (Schiefelbein et al., 2009). In *Arabidopsis* these arise in a position dependent manner in relation to the underlying cortex cells thereby resulting in an alternating pattern of hair and non-hair files that transverse the length of the root (Figure 1-6) (Schiefelbein et al., 2009; Datta et al., 2011). The positional signalling that results in this arrangement is hypothesised to provide continuous input, as late changes in a cell position often also result in a change of cell fate (Costa and Shaw, 2006; Costa and Shaw, 2007; Schiefelbein et al., 2009). In addition to producing or not-producing a root hair these two cell types also differ in size, cell division, vacuolation and cytoplasmic density (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2007; Schiefelbein et al., 2009).

In different species root epidermal cells are patterned differently. For example, in some species any cell can develop as a hair, whilst in others they develop in an alternating manner along the length of the root (Figure 1-6) (Datta et al., 2011).

1.5.1 Positional signalling

One benefit of using the root epidermis to study the relationship between developmental patterning and auxin response is these two cell types, another is that the genetic network which patterns this tissue is well characterised
**Figure 1-6: Root epidermal cell patterning in different species**

Adapted from Datta *et al.*, 2011, a combination of scanning electron microscope images (left) and schematic diagrams (right) indicate the epidermal cell arrangement in different species. A: Any cell can develop as a hair cell i.e. *Oryza sativa*. B: Hair and non-hair cells develop alternately along a cell file i.e. *Brachypodium distachyon*. C: Hair cells develop according to the underlying cortex cells i.e. *Arabidopsis*. 
The location of hair and non-hair cells is determined by positional signalling. Hair cells arise over the junction between two underlying cortical cells while non-hair cells occur where there is not a junction. In the cortex layer \textit{JACKDAW (JDK)} promotes the expression of \textit{SCRAMBLED (SCM)} in the space between two cortex cells (Figure 1-7) (Hassan et al., 2010). In this position \textit{SCM} then inhibits the expression of \textit{WEREWOLF (WER)}. Thus in cells with no underlying cortical cell junction, the expression of \textit{WER} is not inhibited and a non-hair cell is formed (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008; Kang et al., 2009).

\textit{1.5.2 Lateral inhibition}

A further method to reinforce the correct positioning of hair and non-hair cells is lateral inhibition. Several components of the epidermal patterning mechanism are produced in either the hair or non-hair cells and then move across into the adjacent cell of a different type (Figure 1-7) (Schiefelbein et al., 2009; Kang et al., 2009). For example although the expression of \textit{CAPRICE (CPC)} is promoted in the non-hair cells it then moves across into the hair cells where it functions by inhibiting the formation of the non-hair promoting complex (Kurata et al., 2005). This results in very ordered and regulated patterning of the root epidermis, so much so that if \textit{SCM} gene function is lost in a knock out mutant, hair and non-hair cells often continue to develop in an alternating pattern (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2007). Indicating that root epidermal cell patterning is dependent on the mutual support of both cell types, in particular the movement of CPC and GL3 has been highlighted as important (Savage et al., 2008).
The epidermal patterning mechanism according to the most recently published data. Regulation of the development of a hair or non-hair cell starts in the underlying cortex layer. The strength of signal from JDK promotes the expression of SCM in the gap between two cortex cells. In this position SCM inhibits the expression of WER and thereby promoting the formation of a hair cell. In the cells where there is not an underlying cortical cell junction WER expression is not inhibited and WER works in conjunction with GL3, EGL3, MYC1 and TTG1 to promote the expression of MYB23, GL2, CPC, ETC1 and TRY. Whilst MYB23 and GL2 both promote the non-hair cell fate, CPC, ETC1 and TRY move into adjacent hair cells and promote the hair cell fate by inhibiting formation of the non-hair promoting complex. Downstream of GL2 RLS4 and RHD6 promote root hair production. Recently described WRKY75, functions to both inhibit and promote components of the epidermal patterning mechanism and the hair promoting component RHD6. It is worth remembering that this schematic representation doesn’t indicate the different developmental time points in which these genes are expressed, and therefore relative amounts of the genes indicated here may vary depending on the stage of root development. Solid lines indicate promotion (arrow head) or inhibition (flat head), dashed lines indicate movement in the direction of the arrow head. Letters next to the arrows indicate the published source of the interaction. (a) (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008) (b) (Hassan et al., 2010) (c) (Rishmawi et al., 2014) (d) (Simon et al., 2007) (e) (Kang et al., 2009) (f) (Yi et al., 2010) (g) (Jones et al., 2009) (h) (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996) (i) Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann 2010.
1.5.3 Key root epidermal patterning components

As detailed previously in the hair cells SCM inhibits the expression of the MYB type transcription factor WEREWOLF (WER) (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2007; Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008). In epidermal cells that are not positioned over a cortical cell junction WER transcription is not inhibited leading to the formation of a non-hair cell. In the non-hair cells WER interacts with TRANSPARENT TESTA GLABRA1 (TTG1), GLABRA3 (GL3), MYC1 and ENHANCER OF GLABRA3 (EGL3) to form a key non-hair promoting transcription factor complex (Ohashi et al., 2003; Schiefelbein et al., 2009). This complex promotes the non-hair cell fate via the positive regulation of GLABRA2 (GL2), which in turn represses the transcription of root hair promoting genes such as RHD6 (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1994). This complex also positively regulates the expression of MYB23, which undergoes a positive feedback loop with itself and WER, thus reinforcing the non-hair cell fate (Kang et al., 2009). In myb23-1 mutants the epidermal cells are less likely to adopt the correct cell fate in positional changes that occur later in the root development, this is clearest when a T-Junction occurs (Kang et al., 2009). A T-Junction is observed when a longitudinal anticlinal cell division occurs and a change in position can result in a change of cell fate, known as transdifferentiation (Costa and Shaw, 2006; Costa and Shaw, 2007; Schiefelbein et al., 2009). Under wild-type circumstances cells quickly and reliably adopt the correct new epidermal cell identity, however in a myb23-1 mutant the cell identity is often incorrect (Figure 1-8) (Kang et al., 2009).

In addition to promoting the non-hair cell fate the non-hair promoting complex also promotes the expression of several one repeat MYB genes that promote the hair cell specification, these are CAPRICE (CPC), TRIPTYCHON (TRY) and ENHANCER OF TRIPTYCHON1 (ETC1) (Ryu et al., 2005; Schiefelbein et al., 2009; Pesch et al., 2013). Despite being produced in the non-hair cells these proteins relocate to the adjacent hair cells, where they function to repress the
non-hair complex formation and thereby promote the hair cell fate (Savage et al., 2008).

It is likely that a similar patterning mechanism plays a role throughout the entire plant. With the exception of SCM, the majority of the root epidermal patterning components also affect patterning in other areas of the plant (Schiefelbein et al., 2009). For example, in a cpc-1 try-82 double mutant excessive trichome production is observed, whilst GL2 and TTG1 are also known to affect trichome formation (Schiefelbein et al., 2009; Kang et al., 2009; Seo et al., 2011). In addition to this recently published findings have indicated that WER has a role in floral development (Schiefelbein et al., 2009; Kang et al., 2009; Seo et al., 2011).
Figure 1-8: *pGL2::GUS* expression in the *myb23-1* in comparison to the wild-type.

Figure adapted from Kang et al., 2009, Figure 8. *pGL2::GUS* highlights non-hair files. Expression in wild-type and *myb23-1* mutant roots indicates altered cell patterning in a *myb23-1* mutant when a T-junction occurs. Instead of the tightly controlled differentiation into a hair or non-hair file, as is observed in the wild-type, the cell identity appears more random. Asterisks indicate the hair cell files. Scale bar represents 20 µm.
1.6 Auxin response in the root epidermis

The concept of a differential auxin response between the hair and non-hair files of the root epidermis is apparent in both published and unpublished data. In 2009 Jones et al investigated the expression of the pDR5::GFP marker in the root epidermis. pDR5::GFP consists of 7 AuxREs driving a green fluorescent protein (GFP) and is a reporter of auxin signalling output. In 2009 Jones et al described a higher level of pDR5::GFP signal in the non-hair files of the root epidermis (Jones et al., 2009). This was consistent with an interesting pattern of expression of the auxin influx carrier AUX1, Jones et al found that a translational pAUX1::AUX1-YFP reporter was expressed almost exclusively in the non-hair cells (Jones et al., 2009). Because auxin is known to affect root hair growth and therefore, ultimately, hair cells, pDR5::GFP expression in the root epidermis was investigated further (Figure 1-9). This unpublished analysis carried out by Dr Martin Kieffer indicated that whilst pDR5::GFP expression was initially higher in the non-hair cells, at the transition zone expression equalises between all of the files and after this point it persists with greater strength in the hair files as they transit the elongation and differentiation zone.

In order to consider the impact of the differential AUX1 expression on these results the pDR5::GFP marker was treated with the synthetic auxin 2,4-D. Jones et al, predicted that due to the preferential localisation of AUX1 in the non-hair files the auxin concentration in these cells maybe up to ten fold of that present in the hair cells (Jones et al., 2009). Treatment with 2,4-D was informative because whilst 2,4-D is efficiently transported into cells via auxin influx proteins, it is a poor substrate for the auxin efflux carriers (Delbarre, 1994). Thus 2,4-D treatment of pDR5::GFP plants would be predicted to result in higher GFP signal in non-hair cells relative to hair cells. The fact that higher levels of GFP signal were observed in hair cells compared to neighbouring non-
Figure 1-9: Expression of the pDR5::GFP marker in the root epidermis.

The pDR5::GFP marker indicates auxin signalling output. A: In the root epidermis pDR5::GFP expression is initially higher in the non-hair cells, at the transition zone this differential expression is lost and after this point it persists with greater strength in the hair cells. B: To investigate the effect of auxin concentration on this differential expression roots were treated with the synthetic auxin 2,4-D. 2,4-D is unable to leave epidermal cells therefore over a period of prolonged treatment the level of auxin in the root epidermis equalises. The differential expression of pDR5::GFP was still apparent after 2,4-D treatment indicating that the hair and non-hair cells in the root epidermis have a different capacity to respond to auxin. Images and analysis courtesy of Dr Martin Kieffer. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files.
hair cells indicates that these two cell types of the root epidermis have a different inherent capacity to respond to auxin.

In addition to this, unpublished transcriptomic data of Dr Matrin Kieffer’s also indicated that some components of the auxin response network were expressed differentially between the hair and non-hair cells. Two key genes displaying significant differences in expression levels between hair and non-hair cells were the Aux/IAA repressor protein *IAA17* and the repressing ARF, *ARF10*. In order to confirm this differential expression, GFP transcriptional and translational marker lines for both genes were produced and analysed.

Analysis of the *IAA17* marker by Dr Martin Kieffer indicated that *IAA17* expression begins earlier and stronger in the non-hair files of the root epidermis (Figure 1-10). Around eight cells later expression reaches a similar level in the hair files. *ARF10* expression was found to be consistently stronger in the non-hair files from the root tip (Figure 1-11). Taken in conjunction with the high DR5 expression in the hair files after the transition zone these data indicated the potential of a repressive auxin response regime in the non-hair files of the root epidermis.

How these differences in auxin response in the root epidermis are patterned remains poorly understood. In addition, the functional significance of these are unclear. Although both the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network are well characterised in has long been accepted that auxin acts downstream of the epidermal patterning mechanism. In 1996 a paper published by Masucci *et al* first looked the concept of these two pathways working together. One of their primary experiments used the *rhd6*, *ttg1-1* and *gl2-1* mutants. Whilst the *rhd6* mutant exhibits significantly fewer root hairs this can be rescued by exogenous auxin treatment but the *gl2-1* and *ttg1-1* mutants produce root hairs from every root epidermal cell (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996). In order to establish the relationship between these two pathways they
Figure 1-10: Expression of the pIAA17::GFP marker in the root epidermis.

The pIAA17::GFP transcriptional marker indicates differential expression of IAA17 in the hair and non-hair files of the root epidermis. IAA17 expression begins around the start of the transition zone in the non-hair cells and then approximately eight cells later it reaches a similar fluorescence level in the hair files. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files.
Figure 1-11: Expression of the \textit{pARF10::GFP} marker in the root epidermis

The \textit{pARF10::GFP} transcriptional maker indicates differential expression of \textit{ARF10} in the hair and non-hair files of the root epidermis. Strong \textit{ARF10} expression in the non-hair cells is apparent from the tip. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files.
generated double \textit{ttg1-1 rhd6} and \textit{gl2-1 rhd6} mutants (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996). As auxin was able to rescue the \textit{rhd6} mutant phenotype in these double mutants they concluded that auxin did not act through a pathway that required the \textit{GL2} or \textit{TTG1} gene products and therefore must act downstream of this epidermal patterning mechanism (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996). Since 1996 understanding of the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network has increased, however this proposed separate method of action has remained consistent.

In addition to the apparent repressive auxin response regime in the non-hair files, unpublished microarray data generated in the Kepinski lab before this project began indicated that auxin down-regulated both \textit{MYB23} and \textit{GL2}. This preliminary data indicated that the relationship between the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network in the root epidermis had the potential to be more complex than was currently accepted.
1.7 Project aims

Against the background detailed, the overall aim of this project was to define the links between epidermal patterning and auxin responsiveness in the root epidermis of *Arabidopsis*. In order to do this the following objectives were considered:

1) To establish the functional significance of the apparent repressive auxin response regime in the non-hair cells of the root epidermis.

2) To place the spatial control of auxin response in the current knowledge of the epidermal patterning mechanism.

3) To investigate feedback loops and direct links between components of the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network.

4) To investigate the role of auxin-mediated down-regulation of *GL2* and *MYB23*.
2 : Materials and Methods
2.1 **Plant lines and sources**

Various *Arabidopsis* lines were used during this project (Table 2-1). Some were acquired from the National Arabidopsis Stock Centre (NASC) and the Leeds University Plant Growth Suite (PGS), the majority were produced during this project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabidopsis Line</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col, WT</td>
<td>PGS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ler, WT          | Dr Josh Neve  
|                  | Kepinski Lab Member |
| Ws-0, WT         | NASC  
|                  | (National Arabidopsis Stock Centre) |
| cpc-1-1 try-82, pWER-1::GFP | Professor Claire Grierson,  
|                  | Bristol University |
| gl2-1, pWER-1::GFP | Professor Claire Grierson,  
|                  | Bristol University |
| cpc-1-1 try-82   | Professor Claire Grierson,  
|                  | Bristol University |
| gl2-1-1          | Dr Martin Kieffer  
|                  | Kepinski Lab Member |
| cpc-1-1          | Dr Martin Kieffer  
|                  | Kepinski Lab Member |
| wer-1-1          | Dr Martin Kieffer  
|                  | Kepinski Lab Member |
| ttg1-1           | NASC   |
| gl3-1 egl3-1     | NASC   |
| myb23-1-1        | NASC   |
| wer-1-1 myb23-1-1| Produced During This Project |
| pARF10::ARF10-GFP| Dr Martin Kieffer  
|                  | Kepinski Lab |
| pIAA17::IAA17-GFP| Dr Martin Kieffer  
|                  | Kepinski Lab |
| pARF10::GFP      | Dr Martin Kieffer  
|                  | Kepinski Lab Member |
| pAUX1::AUX1-YFP  | Professor Claire Grierson,  
<p>|                  | Bristol University |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct or Trait</th>
<th>Producer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>plAA17::GFP</td>
<td>Dr Martin Kieffer Kepinski Lab Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pDR5::GFP</td>
<td>Dr Martin Kieffer Kepinski Lab Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arf10-3 arf016-2</td>
<td>Dr Mata Del Bianco Kepinski Lab Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gl2-1,DR5::GFP (L3-2)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT,DR5::GFP (CTRL7-2)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cpc-1,DR5::GFP (L2-2)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT,DR5::GFP (CTRL4-3)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gl2-1,pARF10::GFP (X1)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT,pARF10::GFP (CTRL1)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cpc-1,pARF10::GFP (L1-8)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT,pARF10::GFP (CTRL12)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col WS</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Ler</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ler Col</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myb23-1,DR5::GFP (X5)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT,DR5::GFP (CTRL8)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myb23-1,plAA17::GFP(C1-2)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT,plAA17::GFP(CTRL)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myb23-1,pAUX1::AUX1-YFP()</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT,pAUX1::AUX1-YFP (CTRL1)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myb23-1,pARF10::GFP (C3-1)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT,pARF10::GFP (CTRL)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain</td>
<td>Constructs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cpc-1, pIAA17::IAA17-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(X4)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>WT, pIAA17::IAA17-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(CTRL5)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gl2-1, pIAA17::IAA17-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(X6)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>WT, pIAA17::IAA17-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(CTRL12)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wer-1, pIAA17::IAA17-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(X8)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>WT, pIAA17::IAA17-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(CTRL1)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>aux1-22, pIAA17::IAA17-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(X6)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>WT, pIAA17::IAA17-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(CTRL9)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>aux1-7, pIAA17::IAA17-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(X4)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>WT, pIAA17::IAA17-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(CTRL6)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>myb23-1, pARF10::ARF10-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(x8-2)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>WT, pARF10::ARF10-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(CTRL)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cpc-1, pARF10::ARF10-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(X7)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>WT, pARF10::ARF10-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(CTRL2)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cpc-1 try-82, pARF10::ARF10-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(X9)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>WT, pARF10::ARF10-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(CTRL9)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gl2-1, pARF10::ARF10-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(X4)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>WT, pARF10::ARF10-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(CTRL5)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wer-1, pARF10::ARF10-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(X22)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(WT), pARF10::ARF10-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(CTRL16)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>aux1-22, pARF10::ARF10-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(X4)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(WT), pARF10::ARF10-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(CTRL5)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>aux1-7, pARF10::ARF10-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(X5)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(WT), pARF10::ARF10-GFP</em>&lt;sup&gt;(CTRL12)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pGL2::GFP,arf10-3\ arf16-2 \ (X1)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pGL2::GFP,WT \ (CTRL11)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pWER::GFP,arf10-3\ arf16-2 \ (X1)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pWER::GFP,WT \ (CTRL4)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pWER::WER-GFP,arf10-3\ arf16-2 \ (X3-2)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pWER-1::WER-1-GFP,WT\ (CTRL11)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myb23-1 gl2-1 \ (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT \ (CTRL3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myb23-1 arf10-3\ arf16-2 \ (x8-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT \ (CTRL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wer-1 myb23-1,pIAA17::IAA17-GFP\ (x6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT,pIAA17::IAA17-GFP\ (CTRL6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gl2-1 axr3-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT \ (CTRL 11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$DR5::GFP,arf10-3\ arf16-2 \ (x1)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$DR5::GFP,\ (WT) \ (CTRL5)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>axr3-10,DR5::GFP\ (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT,DR5::GFP \ (CTRL9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux1-104,pARF10::GFP \ (X1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WT),pARF10::GFP \ (CTRL3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux1-21,pARF10::GFP\ (X5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux1-21,pARF10::GFP\ (CTRL4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux1-104,pARF10::ARF10-GFP\ (X1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux1-104,pARF10::ARF10-GFP(CTRL10)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux1-21,pARF10::ARF10-GFP(X1)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux1-104,pARF10::ARF10-GFP(CTRL6)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wer-1 myb23-1, pDR5::GFP (x2)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WT),DR5::GFP (CTRL2-5)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wer-1 myb23-1,pARF10::GFP (x6)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WT),pARF10::GFP (CTRL)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wer-1 myb23-1,plAA17::GFP (x1-6)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WT),plAA17::GFP (CTRL7-6)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wer-1 myb23-1,pARF10::ARF10-GFP(x1)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WT),pARF10::ARF10-GFP(CTRL1)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cpc-1 try-82,DR5::GFP (X2)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WT),DR5::GFP (CTRL1)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux1-22,DR5::GFP(X3)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WT),DR5::GFP (CTRL5)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cpc-1 myb23-1 (x3-1)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT (CTRL4)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gl2-1 arf10-3 arf16-2 (x3)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT(CTRL7-12)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pWER-1::MYB23-1,wer-1</td>
<td>Professor John Schiefelbein, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pWER-1::MYB23-1,cpc-1</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pWER-1::MYB23-1,gl2-1</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>pWER-1::MYB23-1,myb23-1</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>aux1-7,DR5::GFP (X5)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>WT,DR5::GFP (CTRL11)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>gl2-1,plAA17::GFP(X1)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>(WT),plAA17::GFP (CTRL2)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>cpc-1,plAA17::GFP(X1)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>(WT),plAA17::GFP(CTRL5)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>cpc-1 try-82,plAA17::GFP(X2)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>(WT),plAA17::GFP(ctl6)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>aux1-22,plAA17::GFP(X2-10)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>(WT),plAA17::GFP(CTRL2-4)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>aux1-7,plAA17::GFP(X3)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>(WT),plAA17::GFP(CTRL1)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>cpc-1 try-82,pAUX1::AUX1-YFP(X1)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>(WT),pAUX1::AUX1-YFP(CTRL4)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wer-1,pARF10::GFP (X2)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>(WT),pARF10::GFP (CTRL9-1)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>cpc-1 try-82,pARF10::GFP (X2)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>(WT),pARF10::GFP (CTRLC4)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>aux1-22,pARF10::GFP (X8-2)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>(WT),pARF10::GFP (CTRL4-2)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>aux1-7,pARF10::GFP (X5)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>(WT),pARF10::GFP (CTRL3)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wer-1,DR5::GFP(X2)</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WT), DR5::GFP (CTRL5-1)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wer-1, pIAA17::GFP (X2)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WT), pIAA17::GFP (CTRL2)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wer-1, pAUX1::AUX1-YFP (X4)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WT), pAUX1::AUX1-YFP (CTRL3)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pARF10F1 Promoter Truncation</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pARF10F2 Promoter Truncation</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pARF10F3 Promoter Truncation</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pEXP7::MYB23-1</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pCOBL9::MYB23-1</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pMYB23-1::MYB23-1-GFP</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pGL2-1::GFP, gl2-1 (x3)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pGL2-1::GFP, WT (C1)</td>
<td>Produced During This Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pGL2-1::GFP</td>
<td>NASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pWER-1::MYB23-1 wer-1 (Segregating)</td>
<td>Professor John Schiefflebein University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pWER-1::MYB23-1, wer-1(8)</td>
<td>Homozygote line selected during this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-1: *Arabidopsis thaliana* lines used in this project and the source from whence they were acquired.
2.2 **Plant growth conditions**

Plants were grown under long day conditions (16 hours light / 8 hours dark) at a temperature of 20-22 °C. Variations in these conditions included the following:

2.2.1 *Growth rooms*

Sterile seeds were sown on circular Sarstedt 92 x 16 mm petri dishes with 30 ml of growth media or square Greiner Bio-One 120 x 120 x 17 mm petri dishes with 50 ml of growth media. Plates were sealed with two layers of micro porous tape.

2.2.2 *Walk-ins*

Plants were grown in a controlled light intensity of 200 µmol m-2 s-1 on circular Sarstedt 92 x 16 mm petri dishes with 30 ml of growth media or square Greiner Bio-One 120 x 120 x 17 mm petri dishes with 50 ml of growth media. Plates were sealed with two layers of micro porous tape.

2.2.3 *Greenhouses*

Plants were grown in a 3:1 soil to sand mix. They were planted in trays with 12 individual cells measuring 55 x 50 x 55 mm or individual plastic plant pots measuring 90 x 90 x 95 mm. Unsterilised seeds were sown on damp soil and covered with a propagator hood with aluminium foil and cold treated for 1-3 days at 4 °C. They were then relocated to the greenhouses and the aluminium foil and propagator hoods were removed.
2.3 Seed sterilisation methods and plant growth media

Seeds were sterilised using various methods and grown on different media depending on the particular requirement of the different assays.

2.3.1 Gas sterilisation

Cleaned seeds were placed in open 0.5 ml eppendorfs. They were sterilised with chlorine gas, which was created by adding 3 ml of Hydrochloric Acid (HCL) to 100 ml of household bleach in a sealed glass container. Seeds were left in these conditions for 3 hours before being put onto growth media and cold treated at 4 °C overnight or ventilated for 1 hour and stored at room temperature until required.

2.3.2 Liquid sterilisation

For liquid sterilisation the cleaned seeds were immersed in 70 % ethanol for 2 minutes, followed by 10 % bleach at room temperature for 30 minutes. After washing with sterile water at least 5 times, the seeds were either put onto growth media or kept at 4 °C in sterile water for up to one week.

2.3.3 Sterile growth media

Plants were grown on Arabidopsis Thaliana Salts (ATS) growth media; 5 mM KNO₃, 2.5 mM KH₂PO₄, 2 mM MgSO₄, 2 mM Ca(NO₃)₂, 20 mM Fe-EDTA, 1 ml/L of Micronutrients (70 mM H₃BO₃, 14 mM MnCl₂, 0.5 mM CuSO₄, 1 mM ZnSO₄, 0.2 mM NaMoO₄, 10 mM NaCl, 0.01 mM CoCL₂), 0.8 % plant agar and 1 % sucrose. The ATS was autoclaved and cooled to approximately 60 °C before
being poured into plates under sterile conditions in the PGS laminar flow hoods. The media was allowed to ‘dry’ for approximately 20 minutes before seeds were sown. Seeds were either sown individually using autoclaved cocktail sticks or suspended in autoclaved water and pipetted in dense lines. If the media was not required immediately it was stored for up to two weeks at 4°C. Occasionally variations to this basic ATS media were used, Table 2-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variations</th>
<th>Method Alterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With IAA</td>
<td>Preparation method as above with IAA was added before pouring. If not used immediately these plates were stored at 4 °C for a maximum of 48 hours before seeds were added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With 2,4D</td>
<td>Preparation method as above with 2,4D was added before pouring. If not used immediately these plates were stored at 4 °C for a maximum of 48 hours before seeds were added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High/Low Phosphorus</td>
<td>Prepared as detailed above with 0.8% phytagel instead of agar. The low phosphate media contained 0.2% of the KH₂PO₄ with the remaining volume (99.8%) added in the form of KCL. Plates were used immediately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytigel</td>
<td>Phytigel was in assays designed to measure root hair length. 0.6% phytigel was added instead of plant agar whilst the liquid was in motion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-2: Variations in ATS growth media.
2.4 **Root data collection techniques**

### 2.4.1 Root hair length and density measurements

Plants were grown on sterile ATS (with phytagel) in PGS walk-in's for a period of 6-8 days. Plates (with lids removed) were then analysed using a Leica M165C microscope. Images were taken and used to measure root hair length and density using Media Cybernetics Image-Pro Plus computer software.

A minimum of three plates were used for each assay, with controls and the lines of interest grown on the same plates. Roots were selected randomly across all of the plates and a minimum of 30 root hairs measured for each individual root. These 30 (or more) measurements were then averaged and an overall average from all of the roots analysed was generated.

When measuring root hair data the plants were grown on phytagel and in the walk-in’s under low light conditions to minimise stress. Each assay was repeated at least three times before any conclusions were drawn.

### 2.4.2 Ectopic root hairs

Plants were grown on sterile ATS (with phytagel) in PGS walk-in's for a period of 6-8 days. Plates (with lids removed) were then analysed using a Leica M165C microscope.

A minimum of three plates were used for each assay, with controls and the lines of interest grown on the same plates. Roots were selected randomly across all of the plates and a minimum of 100 root hairs were counted for each individual root.
These 100 (or more) measurements were then averaged and an overall average from all of the roots analysed was generated.

In order to assess the number of ectopic root hairs the number of hairs that appeared in a file next to another hair would be counted as 1 ectopic hair. Measurements started at the tip and 100 root hairs or bumps were counted up the root from that point.

2.4.3 Primary root length

Plants were grown on sterile ATS (with phytage) in PGS walk-ins under strict light control (200 µmol m-2 s-1) for a period of 6-8 days. Root hair lengths were then measured using a transparent ruler through the media whilst the plates remained sealed. Plants were grown across a minimum of three plates and all of the roots were measured.

2.4.4 Root gravitropic response measurements (over 24 hours)

Plants were grown on sterile ATS (with phytage) in PGS growth rooms for a period of 5 days, on day 5 the plates were rotated by 135 °. After 24 hours the plates were scanned using a HP Scanjet G4050 scanner, the images were increased by 200% and printed using a HP Laserjet 1320n. A transparent protractor was used to measure the angle change as a result of the 135 ° rotation.
2.4.5 Root gravitropic response measurements (continuous)

Plants were grown on sterile ATS (with phytagel) in PGS growth rooms for a period of 5 days, on day 5 a constant mark was placed next to the plant root on the media and the plates were rotated by 90°. Using the Leica M165C microscope in conjunction with the Media Cybernetics Image-Pro Plus computer software a photograph was taken of the root at regular intervals (length depended on assay and ranged from every 10 to 30 minutes) up until a period of approximately 10 hours. The angle change of the root in these images was then calculated using Image J computer software.

2.4.6 Confocal microscopy

Confocal microscopy was used to observe fluorescence levels in the root epidermis. The analysis was carried out using an Upright Zeiss LSM 510 META Axioplan 2 Microscope, with Argon (477 nm) and HeNe1 (543 nm) lasers. Propidium Iodide (1 mg/ml) was used to stain the cell walls of the root epidermis and images were captured using both the 20 x (dry) and 40 x (oil) lenses. Different confocal settings were used for different marker lines, these were as follows:

- pARF10::GFP, pIAA17::IAA17::GFP and pIAA17::GFP (Master gain FITC Ch2 633 / Rhod Ch3 676, Digital gain FITC Ch2 1.00 / Rhod Ch3 1.00, Digital Offset FITC Ch2 0.00 / Rhod Ch3 0.00.)

- pDR5::GFP and pARF10::ARF10-GFP (Master gain FITC Ch2 1119 / Rhod Ch3 766, Digital gain FITC Ch2 1.00 / Rhod Ch3 1.00, Digital Offset FITC Ch2 0.00 / Rhod Ch3 -0.14.)

- pGL2::GFP (Master gain FITC Ch2 1081 / Rhod Ch3 896, Digital gain FITC Ch2 1.00 / Rhod Ch3 1.00, Digital Offset FITC Ch2 0.00 / Rhod Ch3 0.00.)

- pWER::GFP and pWER::WER-GFP (Master gain FITC Ch2 1081 / Rhod Ch3 766, Digital gain FITC Ch2 1.00 / Rhod Ch3 1.00, Digital Offset FITC Ch2 0.00 / Rhod Ch3 0.00.)
- pARF10::GFP promoter truncation lines (Master gain FITC Ch2 782 / Rhod Ch3 706, Digital gain FITC Ch2 1.00 / Rhod Ch3 1.00, Digital Offset FITC Ch2 0.00 / Rhod Ch3 -0.07.)

Images presented during this thesis are raw unless otherwise stated in figure legends.
2.5 Crossing techniques

2.5.1 Crossing

*Arabidopsis* lines were crossed soon after the plants had first bolted. When crosses consisted of a fluorescent marker line being crossed with a non-fluorescent mutant line, the non-fluorescent line was always used as the female line. When two mutant lines were crossed then the male and female line were chosen at random.

In the female line buds were selected just before they were about to open and the sepal, petals and stamens were removed using a MEIJI EMT 2248 microscope and Ideal-tek 5.SA forceps. Approximately 4 or 5 buds would be prepared in this way and the rest of the flowers and siliques removed. From the male line an open flower would be chosen and the stamen removed using the Ideal-tek 5.SA forceps, these would then be used to brush pollen onto the prepared female line using the MEIJI EMT 2248 microscope to ensure accurate pollen transfer. This would be repeated the following day, the stigma’s would then be left to develop into a mature siliques.

2.5.2 Selection of an F1 generation

If a fluorescent marker was used seedlings were sown on sterile plates and checked for fluorescent expression using an Olympus SZX12 GFP Microscope. Those with fluorescent expression were selected and transferred to soil to self-fertilise and produce the F2 generation.

If no fluorescent marker was used F1 seeds would be chosen at random and sown on soil to produce an F2 generation.
2.5.3 Selection of an F2 generation

If the lines crossed had a visible phenotype or fluorescent expression they were sown on sterile plates and selected for 12 of the best cross and 12 of the best control candidates. These were then transferred to soil to produce the F3 generation.

If there were no easily identifiable phenotypes F2 seeds were sown directly onto soil in preparation for genotyping. The numbers sown would be determined by the chance of getting a perfect homozygote line, i.e. in a triple mutant this would be 1/64. These were then genotyped using the Edwards Prep DNA extraction method and PCR.

If every case it was necessary to select not only for a homozygote cross but also a homozygote control. This was essential for accurate analysis as it ensured that different backgrounds were not influencing fluorescence expressions or phenotypes.

2.5.4 Selection of an F3 generation

Lines that were selected on the basis of phenotypes were sown on sterile plates and analysed for homozygote lines. For example, in the gl2-1,pDR5::GFP cross I would need a homozygote line in which every plant carried the gl2-1 mutation and pDR5::GFP marker and a homozygote control line in which every plant was wild-type but also carried the pDR5::GFP marker.
If a homozygote line was not apparent at this point plants from the F2 generation would be reselected or F3 plants self-fertilised to produce an F4 generation if a partial line was present, i.e. homozygote for one mutation but segregating the second.

2.5.5 BASTA selection

BASTA selection was used under various circumstances. Some lines supplied to me by other research groups and Kepinski lab members were BASTA (D-phosphinothricin, Melford®) resistant. In order to establish homozygote lines seeds were grown on ATS with BASTA included in the media at a concentration of 10 µg/ml.

BASTA was also used as a selection during the making of constructs in which the fluorescent seed coat marker could not be used. In this instance BASTA was sprayed onto the plants at a concentration of 100 mg/L just after the seeds germinated and then again after possible positives have been selected.
2.6 DNA extraction and amplification

DNA extraction, amplification and analysis were used at many points throughout this project. These included genotyping for mutations where no visible phenotype was apparent and generating fragments for cloning.

2.6.1 Edwards prep DNA extraction from leaf tissue

Plant material was collected using a 1.5 ml eppendorf cap. 400 µl of extraction buffer (200 mM Tris-HCL pH 7.5, 250 mM NaCl, 25 mM EDTA, 0.5 % SDS) was added and the sample ground for 15 seconds. A phenol extract (one volume of phenol:chloroform:isoamyl alcohol 24:24:1) was performed and the supernatant transferred to a fresh tube. The sample was then precipitated with 300 µl isopropanol and centrifuged for 20 minutes. After the supernatant was discarded the pellet was then washed with 100 µl of 70% ethanol, centrifuged for 1 minute and the supernatant removed. The pellet was re-suspended in 20 µl TE Buffer (10Mm Tris-Cl, pH7.5, 1mM EDTA) and RNAase A (20 mg/ml).

2.6.2 Polymerase chain reaction (PCR)

PCR conditions varied depending on which DNA polymerase was used. The typical reaction components and cycle conditions are detailed in Table 2-3 and Table 2-4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Components</th>
<th>Phusion 1 µl</th>
<th>Velocity 0.5 µl</th>
<th>Red Taq 2 µl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(20-50 ng) Genomic DNA</td>
<td>1 µl</td>
<td>1 µl</td>
<td>2 µl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 µM Forward Primer</td>
<td>5 µl</td>
<td>5 µl</td>
<td>5 µl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 µM Reverse Primer</td>
<td>5 µl</td>
<td>5 µl</td>
<td>5 µl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer</td>
<td>20 µl</td>
<td>20 µl</td>
<td>10 µl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 mM dNTP</td>
<td>10 µl</td>
<td>10 µl</td>
<td>10 µl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterile Water</td>
<td>58 µl</td>
<td>58.5 µl</td>
<td>63 µl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 mM MgCl₂</td>
<td>2-4 µl if not working</td>
<td>2-4 µl if not working</td>
<td>3 µl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMSO</td>
<td>3-10 µl if not working</td>
<td>3-10 µl if not working</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-3: PCR mixture components with different DNA polymerases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Polymerase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Denaturation</td>
<td>98 °C 2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denaturation</td>
<td>98 °C 30''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primer Annealing</td>
<td>Primer Dependant Temperature 30''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elongation</td>
<td>72 °C (30''/KB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Elongation</td>
<td>72 °C3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle End</td>
<td>10 °C5'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-4: PCR reaction cycles.
2.6.3 Agarose gel electrophoresis

Gels were used at various concentrations depending on the specific requirements. These concentrations ranged from 1.1-3.5% and were made by dissolving agarose in 1xTE buffer (10 mM Tris-Cl, pH 7.5, 1 mM EDTA) once cooled ethidium bromide (1 µl/100 ml) or SYBR safe (5 µl/100 ml) was added. Samples were loaded with orange 6x loading dye (0.08 g Orange G, 12 ml 100% Glycerol, 4.8 ml 0.5 M EDTA, 22.12 ml H₂O) and a 1 Kb Invitrogen DNA ladder was used. Samples were run at 70-90 V for 20-40 minutes in 1 x TE buffer in Bio-Rad gel tanks and bands were visualised using a UV Transilluminator.

2.6.4 Restriction digests

Diagnostic digests were carried out to check for the presence of a particular mutation and for cloning purposes.

To check for mutations 2-10 µl of DNA was added to 2 µl of 10 x NEB Restriction Enzyme Buffer, 1 µl of NEB Restriction Enzyme and made up to total volume of 20 µl with sterile water. Digests were incubated at 37 °C for 60 – 90 minutes.

Digests that were carried out for cloning were done at slightly different volumes. 30 µl of Column Purified PCR was added to, 1 µl of NEB Restriction Enzyme, 1 µl of NEB Restriction Enzyme 2, 5 µl of 10X NEB Restriction Enzyme Buffer and made up to a total volume of 50 µl with sterile water. Digests were incubated at 37 °C for 60 – 120 minutes.

2.6.5 Primers
Various primers were used throughout this project to identify mutations and create new constructs (Table 2-5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primer</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pAUX1-22F</td>
<td>CAGGGATTATTCTTTGCACTTTAACC</td>
<td>Mt band (300 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pAUX1-22R</td>
<td>TGCCATTAGCTTTAACTTAAATAGTAATTCAAC</td>
<td>WT band (334 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pAux1-7F</td>
<td>TGGCTAGATTGCGCTTGAGTC</td>
<td>1021 bp band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pAux1-7R</td>
<td>ACATTGGTAACACTTGGCAGAGAT</td>
<td>when point mutation present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux1 (WT)R</td>
<td>ACATTGGTAACACTTGGCAGAGAC</td>
<td>1021 bp band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gl2mtF</td>
<td>TCAAGGTAATGTATATCTGAG</td>
<td>Mt band (295 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gl2mtR</td>
<td>TGAAGCCTGCAAGGTAG</td>
<td>WT band (310 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux1-22F</td>
<td>CTTGGGAATGACCACCTACCCCG</td>
<td>Mt band (323 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aux1-22R</td>
<td>AATGGGTTCACACTTCCGCC</td>
<td>WT band (357 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wer-1FW</td>
<td>TAGGTTAAAGAGATGGGAAAG</td>
<td>Sau3A1 Digest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wer-1Re</td>
<td>ACCATTGCTCTGTGTTGG</td>
<td>Mt bands (bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(247/95/92/27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WT bands (bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(339/95/27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myb23-1F</td>
<td>TGTGTGTTGTTGTCGGTTG</td>
<td>WT band (744 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myb23-1R</td>
<td>CTAAATTTAAGAAGAAAATTTACGATGTTAG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARF16.2F</td>
<td>CCTCGGGCGTCACTTCTACTTCA</td>
<td>WT band (884 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARF16.2R</td>
<td>TCCGCTACTGCTTTCTACTCTACACTAACC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBA1</td>
<td>ATGGTTCAGTGGTGGAAGCCATC</td>
<td>MT band (1000 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARF10.3F</td>
<td>ACTATGGCATTTGTGCAAGAGAT</td>
<td>WT band (798 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARF10.3R</td>
<td>TCCGCTACTGCTTTCTACTCTACACTAACC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GabiTDNA</td>
<td>GTGGATGGATGGATATCTCC</td>
<td>MT band (500 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1pARF10 F1</td>
<td>GGGGACAAAGTTTGTAACAAAAAGACAGGGCTAA AACTTAGGCCTTAGATGGGAATCTT</td>
<td>Promoter Truncation Band (2078 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1pARF10 F2</td>
<td>GGGGACAAAGTTTGTAACAAAAAGACAGGGCTAT TTACCATGGGTTTTAACCTATTTCTTG</td>
<td>Promoter Truncation Band (850 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1pARF10 F3</td>
<td>GGGGACAAAGTTTGTAACAAAAAGACAGGGCTGG TTTGTATCTGGTCAAGCATGG</td>
<td>Promoter Truncation Band (710 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pARF10rb2</td>
<td>GGGGACCACTTTTGTAACAAAAAGCTGGGTAC TAGACGAAGTTTGCTAACCCTAAAAATTCT</td>
<td>Coding Region For MYB23 Constructs (1679 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attB5MYB2 3F</td>
<td>GGGGACCACTTTTGTAACAAAAAGCTGGGTAT CAAAGGCAATACCCATTAGTAAAATC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attB2MYB2 3R</td>
<td>GGGGACCACTTTTGTAACAAAAAGCTGGGTAT CAAAGGCAATACCCATTAGTAAAATC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA17A3</td>
<td>AGAAAGATTTCAATAACAGTAATAGGAATAAAC</td>
<td>WT Band (1000 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seq17R2</td>
<td>TGGAAAGAGCTGAACATGTCGG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da5'la</td>
<td>ACGGTCGGGAAACTAGCTCTAC</td>
<td>Mt Band (600 bp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpARF10 F8</td>
<td>TTCTGATTAGTTGGGTGGGAAT</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Section A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpARF10 R7</td>
<td>CCTACCACGAGATTGGTTGAATTG</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Section A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpARF10 F9</td>
<td>ATGTCACTATTTTGATGAGTACGC</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Section B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpARF10 R8</td>
<td>TTGTATGTTTTGGAAGCTTTTGAGC</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Section B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpARF10 F6</td>
<td>TAATGCAAGACAACCCACCCA</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Section C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpARF10 R5</td>
<td>TTGACATGGCTAGAAAAGAACAGA</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Section C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpARF10 F10</td>
<td>ACTGAAAACCCATGAAAGCTG</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Section D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primer ID</td>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>qPCR Reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpARF10 R9</td>
<td>GATTCGCAAAACAGATTAGTCACA</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Section D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpARF10 F2</td>
<td>CACTCCAATCTCCACAATCC</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Section E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpARF10 R2</td>
<td>GGTTGACCCGAGAGATGAAA</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Section E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpARF10 F5</td>
<td>AAATGAGGTGAAATGAGGGAAT</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Section F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpARF10 R4</td>
<td>AAATTTGACGTTATGCCTACC</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Section F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpARF10 F1</td>
<td>TACGATGGTCTTGTCCTACC</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Section G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpARF10 R1</td>
<td>GAAGAAGAGAGAGATAGAGAGATGC</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Section G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QARF10 F2</td>
<td>GCAACTAAACGGCTAACAATCA</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Control (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QARF10 R2</td>
<td>ATCCACGTCCTATGCAAACC</td>
<td>qPCR, ARF10 Control (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpGL2 F</td>
<td>CAAGCAATTAGGGTTCCATGT</td>
<td>qPCR, GL2 Positive Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpGL2 R</td>
<td>GGGACTCTGGGAGAAGCATA</td>
<td>qPCR, GL2 Positive Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QGL2 F2</td>
<td>CGTATGAGTCGGTGGTGGTA</td>
<td>qPCR, GL2 Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QGL2 R2</td>
<td>AGCTGTGTCTGTTATATCTACGG</td>
<td>qPCR, GL2 Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpMYB23 F4</td>
<td>CTAGTTGGGTTGATCTGAAAGTAAG</td>
<td>qPCR, MYB23 Section A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpMYB23 R4</td>
<td>AGATTATAGCTTCCACTTGATTTAGC</td>
<td>qPCR, MYB23 Section A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpMYB23 F3</td>
<td>TTGACATATCTTAGCTGGATGAGC</td>
<td>qPCR, MYB23 Section B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpMYB23 R3</td>
<td>CCCTTGGGATAGACAGTAGGC</td>
<td>qPCR, MYB23 Section B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpMYB23 F2</td>
<td>CCACAACGTCTCCTCTCAT</td>
<td>qPCR, MYB23 Section C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpMYB23 R2</td>
<td>TGGTTTGAGTTTGGATTCGTC</td>
<td>qPCR, MYB23 Section C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpMYB23 F1</td>
<td>AAGAATGTAGGGATTGACTTTACCAT</td>
<td>qPCR, MYB23 Section D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QpMYB23 R1</td>
<td>TGTTTGCTGTTGCTCTCCAA</td>
<td>qPCR, MYB23 Section D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMYB23 F1</td>
<td>ATTGAATTAAGAGACCAC</td>
<td>qPCR, MYB23 Control (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMYB23 R1</td>
<td>TTTCTTGCTGAGATGTGT</td>
<td>qPCR, MYB23 Control (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-5: Primers during this project. Bold highlights indicate the Gateway attB flanking sequences used.
2.7 Cloning

Constructs produced during this project were generated using both the classical cloning method and the Invitrogen® GATEWAY® system.

2.7.1 Invitrogen® GATEWAY® vectors

Various vectors were used during this project: pDONR207 (Figure 2-1) pDONR221 (Figure 2-2), pFP101 (Figure 2-3), and pJTG01 (Figure 2-4) were used for GAREWAY cloning. pDONR207 contains the attL1 and attR1 recombination sites for incorporation of DNA sequences. It contains gentamycin resistance for positive selection and the ccdB gene, toxic to bacteria, which is excised upon recombination (Figure 2-1)
pDONR221 contains the \textit{attP5} and \textit{attP2} recombination sites for incorporation of DNA sequences. It contains kanamycin resistance for positive selection and the \textit{ccdB} gene, toxic to bacteria, which is excised upon recombination (Figure 2-2).

The pFP101 vector was first described by Bensmihen et al., 2004. The original pFP100 vector was generated using the \textit{At2S3} promoter and a GFP sequence with a 35S terminator in pZP200 (Bensmihen et al., 2004). To generate pFP101 a double enhanced 35S promoter-NOS terminator cassette was inserted in pFP100 (Bensmihen et al., 2004) (Figure 2-3). This vector allows selection based on GFP fluorescence. The vector contains the coding sequence of an endoplasmic reticulum targeted GFP under the control of the \textit{At2S3} promoter (Bensmihen et al., 2004). The GATEWAY® recombination cassette allows insertion of cDNAs in frame with a triple HA tag and VP16-AD (Bensmihen et al., 2004).
The pJTG01 vector was used as a destination vector to make ARF10 promoter truncations. The GATEWAY® recombination cassette allows insertion of cDNAs and the GFP sequences enable visualisation of the truncations in root epidermis. This vector contains kanamycin resistance for positive selection and the ccdB gene, toxic to bacteria, which is excised upon recombination (Figure 2-4). This vector allows selection based on BASTA resistance.

Figure 2-3: Vector pFP101. Figure adapted from (Bensmihen et al., 2004)

The pJTG01 vector was used as a destination vector to make ARF10 promoter truncations. The GATEWAY® recombination cassette allows insertion of cDNAs and the GFP sequences enable visualisation of the truncations in root epidermis. This vector contains kanamycin resistance for positive selection and the ccdB gene, toxic to bacteria, which is excised upon recombination (Figure 2-4). This vector allows selection based on BASTA resistance.

Figure 2-4: Vector map for pJTG01.
2.7.2 Invitrogen® GATEWAY® BP reaction

In the Invitrogen GATEWAY system the BP reaction generates the gateway entry clone using a destination vector and your region of interest amplified with appropriate gateway attB extensions (Figure 5-2).

![Diagram of Gateway Entry Clone]

**Figure 2-5: Generation of the Gateway Entry Clone**

In a 1.5 ml eppendorf attB-PCR product (≥10 ng/ul), donor vector (150 ng/µl) and TE buffer (10Mm Tris-Cl, pH7.5, 1mM EDTA, pH 8.0) were added to a total volume of 8 µl. BP Clonase II Enzyme Mix was thawed on ice and 2 µl was added to each sample. Samples were then briefly vortexed and the reactions incubated at 25 °C for 1 hour. 1 µl of Proteinase K solution was then added to each sample to terminate the reaction. Samples were vortexed briefly and incubated at 37 °C for 10 minutes.
2.7.3 Invitrogen® GATEWAY® LR reaction

The LR reaction generates the gateway expression clone from your previously generated entry clone and a destination vector (Figure 2-6).

In a 1.5 ml eppendorf entry clone (50-150 ng), destination vector (150 ng/μl) and TE buffer, pH 8.0 were added to a total volume of 8 μl. LR Clonase II Enzyme Mix was thawed on ice and 2 μl was added to each sample. Samples were then briefly vortexed and the reactions incubated at 25 °C for 1 hour. 1 μl of Proteinase K solution was then added to each sample to terminate the reaction. Samples were vortexed briefly and incubated at 37 °C for 10 minutes.
2.7.4 Classical cloning vectors

The pGreen0029 vector (Figure 2-7) was used with classical cloning methods to generate the pMYB23::MYB23-GFP construct. pGreen0029 is a compact agrobacterium binary vector, it has kanamycin resistance genes for bacterial and plant transformation.

Figure 2-7: Vector pGreen0029, Image produced by snapgene.
2.7.5 Classical cloning construct generation

The pMYB23::MYB23-GFP line was generated using classical cloning methods. Three fragments were generated using PCR, appropriate restriction sites were added via primer sequences (Figure 2-8). The first fragment was 4.7 kb long and consisted of the MYB23 promoter and genomic DNA, it was flanked by KPN1 and EcoRV restriction sites. The second fragment was 717 bp long and consisted of the green fluorescent protein (GFP), this fragment was flanked by EcoRV and Not1 restriction sites. The final fragment was 1kb long and consisted of the MYB23 3’ sequence, flanked by two Not1 restriction sites.

In order to construct this line the pGreen0029 vector was digested with appropriate restriction sites and then three successive ligations were performed with the fragments detailed above. The construct was checked with sequencing before being transformed into Agrobacterium for plant transformation.
2.7.6 Ligation reactions

For ligation reactions 1.5 µl of linearised vector (50 ng/µl) was added to 3 µl of 10 x NEB T4 Buffer, 1.5 µl of NEB T4 DNA Ligase and the fragment added at a ratio of 3:1 (see equation below for further details). The reaction was made up to a total volume of 10 µl with sterile water and incubated overnight at 16 or 4°C, depending on if the restriction sites are blunt or sticky ends.

Fragment to be inserted at 3:1 ratio to vector,

\[
\text{Vector size bp} = \frac{\text{fragment size (bp)} \times 50(\text{conc. of vector}) \times 3}{\text{Vector size bp}}
\]

2.7.7 Estimation of DNA concentrations

DNA concentrations were estimated using a Nano Drop ND-1000, with 1 µl at a wavelength of 260 nm.

2.7.8 Plasmid miniprep - alkaline lysis method

A culture from a single colony was grown o/n in 5 ml LB with appropriate antibiotic selection. 1.5 ml of this was transferred to an eppendorf and centrifuged for 1 minute. The pellet was then re-suspended in 150 µl of solution 1 (50 mM glucose, 10 mM EDTA, 25 mM Tris pH 8, stored at 4 °C) and 200 µl of freshly made solution 2 (0.2 M NaOH, 1 % SDS). The solution was mixed gently and left to stand for 5 minutes. 150 µl of solution 3 (3 M KAc, pH4.4, stored at 4 °C) was then added and mixed to allow the formation of a precipitate. The sample was then centrifuged for 10 minutes and the supernatant transferred to a fresh tube.
A phenol extract (one volume of phenol:chloroform:isoamyl alcohol 24:24:1) was performed and the aqueous phase recovered. Two volumes of ethanol were added and the sample centrifuged for 20 minutes. The supernatant was removed and the pellet washed with 150 µl of 70% ethanol and centrifuged for 3 minutes. The supernatant was removed and the pellet allowed to dry before being re-suspended in 50 µl of sterile water with 0.5 µl of RNAase A (20mg/ml).

2.7.9 Plasmid miniprep - QIAprep spin miniprep kit (QIAGEN)

Pelleted bacterial cells were re-suspended in 205 µl of Buffer PI and transferred to a micro centrifuge tube. 200 µl of buffer P2 was added and the solution mixed thoroughly by inverting the tube 6 times. 350 µl buffer N3 was added and the solution mixed immediately and thoroughly by inverting the tube 4-6 times. The sample was then centrifuged for 10 minutes at 13,000 rpm and the supernatant applied to the QIA spin column. This was then centrifuged for 30-60 seconds and the flow through discarded. The QIA spin column was washed by adding 0.75 ml buffer PE and centrifuged for 30-60 seconds. The flow through was discarded and the column centrifuged for an additional minute. To elute the DNA, the QIA spin column was placed in a clean 1.5 ml micro centrifuge tube and 50 µl of Elution Buffer was added. This was then left to stand for 1 minute and then centrifuged for 1 minute.

2.7.10 QIAEX II gel extraction (QIAGEN)

When the PCR product was confirmed bands were cut from agarose electrophoresis gel and purified by adding Buffer QX1 (volume was dependant on fragment size and band size). The QIAEX II beads were resuspended by vortexing for 30 seconds and 10 µl added to the solution. This was then incubated for 10 minutes at 50 °C, whilst vortexing every 2 minutes to keep the QIAEX II beads in suspension. The sample was then centrifuged for 30 seconds and the
supernatant removed with a pipette and the pellet washed with 500 µl of Buffer QX1. After the pellet had been resuspended it was centrifuged for 30 seconds and the supernatant removed. The pellet was then washed twice with 500 µl of Buffer PE and then air-dried for 10-15 minutes until it became white. To elute the DNA 20 µl of TE Buffer (10Mm Tris-Cl, pH7.5, 1mM EDTA) was added and the pellet resuspended by vortexing. The solution was then incubated between 5 and 10 minutes (temperature and length dependant on fragment size) and the centrifuged for 30 seconds. The supernatant now contained the DNA and was extracted carefully and stored in a fresh tube.

2.7.11 QIAquick PCR purification kit

5 volumes of Buffer PB was added to 1 volume of the PCR (or ChIP) solution and mixed. The solution was then placed in a 2 ml column that was in a collection tube and centrifuged for 30 seconds. 750 µl of Buffer PE was then added to the column and it was once again centrifuged for 30 seconds. The column was then placed in a clean eppendorf and 50 µl of Elution Buffer added. The column was centrifuged for 60 seconds and then discarded. The eluted solution was stored at -20 °C until required.

2.7.12 Bacterial strains and growth conditions

For the propagation of plasmid DNA the *E.coli* strain DH5α was used. The *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* strain GV3101 was used for Arabidopsis transformation. *E.coli* was grown at 37 °C on solid or liquid LB media (10 mM NaCl, 2 % Tryptome, 0.5 % Yeast (± 2 % agar)) whilst the *Agrobacterium* was grown on the same medium at 28 °C. When grown on liquid media the cultures were grown whilst shaking at 200 rpm. Appropriate antibiotic selections were used where necessary (Table 2-6: Antibiotic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibiotic</th>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>Concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanamycin</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>40 µg/ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentamycin</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>10 µg/ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifampicin</td>
<td>DMSO</td>
<td>100 µg/ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectinomycin</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>40 µg/ml</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-6: Antibiotic selection conditions and concentrations.

### 2.7.13 Transformation of bioline DH5α competent cells

A 50 µl aliquot of Bioline α-Select Chemically Competent Cells was thawed on wet ice. DNA was added to the (≤5 µl per 50 µl cells) cell suspension and the mixture was gently swirled then incubated on ice for 30 minutes. The samples were then placed in a 42 °C water bath for 30 to 45 seconds and then replaced on ice for 2 minutes. They were then diluted by making up to 1 ml with liquid LB (10 mM NaCl, 2 % Tryptome, 0.5 % Yeast) and the tubes shaken at ~200 rpm for 60 minutes at 37 °C. The samples were then spread on LB agar (as above with 2 % agar) plates containing appropriate antibiotic and incubate over night at 37°C.

### 2.7.14 Preparation and transformation of competent agrobacterium tumefaciens cells

LB agar plates were prepared with rifampicin as detailed in Table 2-6. The cells were then streaked from a glycerol stock onto these and incubated for two days at 28 °C. A single colony was selected and used to inoculate 50 ml of liquid LB. This culture was grown until an optical density (OD) of 0.5-1 was reached at 600 nm. At this point the culture was transferred to a pre-chilled 50 ml falcon tube and spun at 3500 rpm for 20 minutes, 4 °C. The supernatant was removed and the pellet re-suspended in 1 ml of 20 mM CaCl$_2$. This was then dispensed into 100 µl aliquots and frozen in liquid nitrogen. These were then stored at -80 °C.
For Agrobacterium transformation 1 µg of plasmid DNA was added to one of the frozen 100 µl aliquots. These were then incubated at 37 °C for 5 minutes. Liquid LB was added up to a volume of 1 ml and shaken at 28 °C for 2-4 hours. This was then spread on LB agar plates containing suitable antibiotics and incubated at 28 °C for two days.

2.7.15 Floral dipping transformation

Seven seedlings were grown in square 6 cm pots until inflorescence meristems became visible. A minimum of three 6 cm pots were used per construct. Three days before floral dipping was scheduled the stems of the plants were cut therefore allowing new stems to grow.

A single Agrobacterium colony containing the appropriate construct was used to inoculate a 5 ml liquid LB culture with appropriate selection. This culture was grown overnight and then 2 ml of this was used to inoculate a 2 L flask with 500 ml LB plus antibiotics. This was also grown overnight and then centrifuged for 12 minutes at 12,000 rpm at room temperature. The pellet was re-suspended in 250 ml of floral dipping solution (5 % w/v sucrose, 10 mM MgCl₂.6H₂O, 25 µl Silwett ® Vac-in stuff ®).

Each pot of seedlings was dipped into the transformation solution for 2 to 3 minutes. The plants were then enclosed in an autoclave bag overnight to maintain a high level of humidity. The following day the bag was removed and the siliques allowed to mature. Plants were then bagged as normal and the seeds collected.

Homozygote lines were selected using a florescent seed coat marker or BASTA resistance depending upon which destination vector was used. BASTA was sprayed onto the plants at a concentration of 80 mg/L just after the seeds had germinated and then again after possible positives had been selected. For constructs with a fluorescent seed coat marker initially fluorescent seeds were
selected from the T1 generation using an Olympus SZX12 GFP Microscope. The T2 generation was then analysed for lines which exhibited a 3:1 fluorescent to non-fluorescent ratio to check for multiple inserts and then reselected again at the T3 generation for a homozygote line.
2.8 Chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP)

ChIP was used to look for a direct interaction between ARF10, WEREWOLF and MYB23. Using two marker lines and qPCR, ChIP enabled us to look for an interaction between pWER::WER-GFP and pMYB23::MYB23-GFP and the ARF10 promoter region. ChIP works by initially crosslinking proteins and DNA and then shearing the DNA, with the proteins still attached, via sonication. Using the GFP antibody the proteins are then immunoprecipitated and the associated DNA is isolated. The cross link is then reversed and the DNA analysed (Figure 2-9). The ChIP protocol took place over several days. Initially plants were grown in dense lines on ATS covered with autoclaved mesh (13 square plates per line, 4 rows per plate, grown for 5-6 days).

When the plants reached an appropriate age MC Buffer was freshly prepared (10 mM Sodium Phosphate pH7, 50 mM NaCl, 0.1 M Sucrose) and a scalpel blade was used to cut away the section of root required. These sections were collected in a 50 ml falcon tube (with a small amount of MC Buffer in to prevent it freezing) kept on ice. In a flow hood the falcon tube was filled with 25 ml MC Buffer and 1 % Formaldehyde was added. This was then vacuum infiltrated for 4 minutes, after this 2.5 ml of 1.25 % glycine was added to stop the reaction.

The root material was then washed three times with MC buffer and ground into a fine powder using liquid nitrogen. The powder was stored overnight at -80 °C.

The following day buffers were freshly prepared as follows:

- M1 buffer (10 mM Sodium Phosphate, pH7, 0.1 M NaCl, 1 M 2-methyl-2.4-pentanediol, 10 mM 2-mercaptoethanol, complete protease inhibitor cocktail (roche)).
Chromatin Immunoprecipitation was used to look for an interaction between ARF10 and WEREWOLF and/or MYB23. It works by cross linking the proteins and DNA then immunoprecipitating the proteins, thus allowing the associated DNA to be analysed.
- **M2 buffer** (10 mM Sodium Phosphate, pH 7, 0.1 M NaCl, 1 M 2-methyl-2.4-pentanediol, 10 mM 2-mercaptoethanol, 10 mM MgCl₂, 0.5% Triton-x-100, complete protease inhibitor cocktail (roche)).
- **M3 buffer** (10 mM Sodium Phosphate, pH 7, 0.1 M NaCl, 10 mM 2-mercaptoethanol, complete protease inhibitor cocktail (roche)).

20 ml of M1 buffer was added to the root powder and the slurry filtered through a 50 µm fabric mesh and centrifuged for 20 minutes at 1000 g, 4 °C. The pellet was then washed five times with 5 ml of buffer M2 and once with 5 ml of buffer M3. After every wash the solution was centrifuged for 10 minutes.

After the final wash the pellet was resuspended in 1 ml of sonic buffer (10 mM Sodium Phosphate, pH 7, 0.1 M NaCl, 0.5 % Sarkozyl, 10 mM EDTA, Complete protease inhibitor cocktail) and 42 µl of 25 x protease inhibitor. This was then sonicated for 14 minutes with 15 seconds of sonication interspersed with 45 seconds of cooling until the DNA was sheared to approximately 300-500 bp. An agarose electrophoresis gel was run to check this.

After sonication the solution was centrifuged three times for ten minutes at 4 °C to remove any debris. At this stage a 100 µl input sample was taken. To the remaining solution 1 ml of IP Buffer (50 mM Hesper, pH7.5, 150 mM NaCl, 5 mM MgCl₂, 10 µM ZnSO₄, 1 % Triton- x -100, 0.05 % SDS) was added along with 50 µl of Miltenyi paramagnetic GFP beads. The solution was the incubated for an hour on a rotating device at 4 °C.

The columns containing the paramagnetic beads were placed in the magnetic field and 200 µl of IP Buffer was applied. The solution that had been incubated at
4 °C was then applied to the column and the lysate allowed to run through. Multiple washes were then applied to the column as follows:

- Three times 400 µl IP Buffer,
- One times 200 µl IP Buffer,
- Two times 200 µl High Salt Buffer (500 mM NaCl, 0.1% SDS, 1% Triton - x-100, 2 mM EDTA, 20 mM Tris-HCL pH8),
- Two times 200 µl LiCl Buffer (10 mM Tris-HCL pH8, 1Mm EDTA, 1 % NP-40, 1 % sodium deoxychelate (Sigma D-6750), 0.25 M LiCl)
- Two times 200 µl TE Buffer (10 mM Tris-Cl, pH7.5, 1 mM EDTA)

After these washes were complete 20 µl of hot (95 °C) Elution Buffer (1 % SDS, 50 mM Tris-HCL pH8, 10 mM EDTA, 50 mM DTT) was added to the column and left to incubate for 5 minutes. 3 x 50 µl of hot elution buffer was then added to the column and the eluted solution collected in a clean eppendorf. 100 µl of TE Buffer (10 mM Tris-Cl, pH7.5, 1 mM EDTA) and 11.25 µl of Proteinase K (20 mg/ml) was added to the eppendorf and the solution was incubated overnight at 37 °C. 150 µl of TE and 11.25 µl of Proteinase K was also added to the previously taken input sample and this was also incubated overnight at 37 °C.

The following day 11.25 µl of Proteinase K was added to both the input and immunoprecipitated sample and they were incubated at 65 °C for 6 hours. After this time they were removed from the heat, allowed to cool and then transferred to ice. The samples were then ethanol precipitated (2.5 vol EtOH, 1/10 vol 3 M Sodium Acetate, 3 µl Glycogen (5 mg/ml, Ambion) and incubated overnight at -20 °C.

The following day both samples were centrifuged for 30 minutes at full speed and the pellet was then resuspended in 100 µl of ultrapure water. The samples were then purified using a QIAquick kit (as detailed previously) and eluted in 50 µl of Elution Buffer. Samples were then stored at -20 °C until RT- qPCR was carried out.
2.9 Buffer summary

2.9.1 Arabidopsis thaliana salts

- 5 mM KNO₃
- 2.5 mM KH₂PO₄
- 2 mM MgSO₄
- 2 mM Ca(NO₃)₂
- 20 mM FE-EDTA

1 ml/L of Micronutrients (70 mM H₃BO₃, 14 mM MnCl₂, 0.5 mM CuSO₄, 1 mM ZnSO₄, 0.2 mM NaMoO₄, 10 mM NaCl, 0.01 mM CoCl₂)

- 0.8 % plant agar
- 1 % sucrose

2.9.2 Edwards prep extraction buffer

- 200 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5
- 250 mM NaCl
- 25 mM EDTA
- 0.5 % SDS

2.9.3 TE buffer

- 10 mM Tris-Cl, pH7.5,
- 1 mM EDTA
2.9.4 Alkaline lysis mini prep solution 1

50 mM glucose
10 mM EDTA,
25 mM Tris pH 8

2.9.5 Alkaline lysis mini prep solution 2

0.2 M NaOH,
1 % SDS

2.9.6 Alkaline lysis mini prep solution 3

3 M KaC pH4.4

2.9.7 Lysogeny broth

10 mM NaCl
2 % Tryptome
0.5 % Yeast
± 2 % agar
2.9.8  **Floral dipping solution**

- 5% w/v sucrose
- 10 mM MgCl$_2$·6H$_2$O
- 25 μl Silwett® Vac-in stuff®

2.9.9  **ChIP MC buffer**

- 10 mM Sodium Phosphate pH7
- 50 mM NaCl
- 0.1 M Sucrose

2.9.10  **ChIP M1 buffer**

- 10 mM Sodium Phosphate, pH7,
- 0.1 M NaCl,
- 1 M 2-methyl-2.4-pentanediol,
- 10 mM 2-mercaptoethanol,

  Complete protease inhibitor cocktail (roche)
2.9.11  ChIP M2 buffer

10 mM Sodium Phosphate, pH 7
0.1 M NaCl
1 M 2-methyl-2.4-pentanediol
10 mM 2-mercaptoethanol
10 mM MgCl$_2$
0.5 % Triton-x-100
Complete protease inhibitor cocktail (roche)

2.9.12  ChIP M3 buffer

10 mM Sodium Phosphate, pH 7
0.1 M NaCl
10 mM 2-mercaptoethanol
Complete protease inhibitor cocktail (roche)

2.9.13  ChIP sonic buffer

10 mM Sodium Phosphate, pH 7
0.1 M NaCl
0.5 % Sarkozyl
10 mM EDTA
Complete protease inhibitor cocktail (roche)
2.9.14  

*ChIP IP buffer*

- 50 mM Hepes, pH7.5
- 150 mM NaCl
- 5 mM MgCl₂
- 10 µM ZnSO₄
- 1 % Triton-x-100
- 0.05 % SDS

2.9.15  

*ChIP high salt buffer*

- 500 mM NaCl
- 0.1% SDS
- 1% Triton-x-100
- 2 mM EDTA
- 20 mM Tris-HCL pH8

2.9.16  

*ChIP LiCl buffer*

- 10 mM Tris-HCL pH8
- 1 mM EDTA
- 1 % NP-40
- 1 % sodium deoxychelate (Sigma D-6750)
- 0.25 M LiCl
2.9.17  *ChIP elution buffer*

1 % SDS

50 mM Tris-HCL pH8

10 mM EDTA

50 mM DTT
3 : Establishing the Functional Significance of the Apparent Non-Hair Repressive Auxin Response Regime
3.1 **Introduction**

The phytohormone auxin is a remarkably versatile regulator of many developmental and growth processes, including lateral root production and root hair growth (Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011). In this work the root epidermis in *Arabidopsis thaliana* was used as a model to understand the interaction of patterning mechanisms, such as those that define hair and non-hair producing epidermal cells, and auxin. An advantage of using this particular tissue is that it is made up of just two cell types, cells that produce root hairs (hair cells) and cells that do not (non-hair cells) (Ishida *et al*., 2008). In addition to this the location of these two cell types is governed by a well characterised patterning mechanism resulting in the production of files of distinct hair and non-hair cells along the length of the root (Figure 1-7).

Data published by Jones *et al* in 2009, indicated that the auxin influx transporter AUX1 is expressed in a highly specific pattern, it is almost exclusively confined to the non-hair cells, which results in a predicted 10 fold increase in the auxin concentration in the non-hair files (Jones *et al*., 2009). In conjunction with this, their analysis of the pDR5::GFP marker indicated a higher level of auxin signalling output in the non-hair cells (Jones *et al*., 2009). However because the root hair growth response to auxin must ultimately occur within hair cells rather than non-hair cells, before this research project began the expression pattern of the pDR5::GFP marker was examined in greater detail. This analysis showed that although the expression is indeed initially higher in the non-hair cells, at the transition zone, where root hairs begin to initiate, the GFP expression equalises between the two cell types and then persists with greater strength in the hair files (Figure 1-9). Treatment with the synthetic auxin 2,4D, which is readily transported into cells, but can not be exported, results in the proposed differences in auxin concentration being removed. The fact that the pDR5::GFP differential expression pattern persisted after this treatment (Figure 1-9), indicated that the hair and non-hair cells have an underlying difference in their capacity to respond to auxin.
Transcriptomic data generated by Dr Martin Kieffer before this work began, indicated that some auxin response network components were expressed differentially in the hair and non-hair files. In particular the transcription of two components that have been shown to be negative regulators of auxin response, \textit{ARF10} and \textit{IAA17}, were present in higher abundance in the non-hair files. These expression differences were further confirmed with the analysis of transcriptional and translational GFP marker lines for these two genes (Figure 1-10/11). Taken in conjunction with the \textit{pDR5::GFP} data these results were consistent with there being a lower or reduced auxin response in the non-hair files.

The functional significance of this contrasting auxin response regime between hair and non-hair files was not known. Two non-mutually exclusive hypotheses were considered, firstly that this repressive auxin response was part of the mechanism that restricted hair growth, and secondly that it may facilitate an auxin transport superhighway via the non-hair cells, to enabled a sustained and reliable delivery of auxin to the hair cells, as was first described by Jones \textit{et al} in 2009.
3.2 Epidermal patterning mutants

In addition to there only being two cell types, another advantage of using the root epidermis to study the developmental patterning of auxin responsiveness, is that the root epidermal patterning mechanism is well characterised and therefore mutants for the majority of the components are readily available (Figure 3-1) (Koornneef, 1981; Tanaka et al., 2014). Given the apparent differences in auxin response between the hair and non-hair files, the existence of an extensive genetic framework is a distinct advantage.

In order to investigate if the apparent repressive auxin response regime functions to prevent the growth of root hairs in the non-hair cells, the *GLABRA 2* loss-of-function mutant, *gl2-1* was utilised (Koornneef, 1981). Within the root epidermal patterning mechanism GL2 functions primarily in the non-hair cells and inhibits the production of root hairs (Ohashi et al., 2003). Within this mechanism the expression of *GL2* is promoted by an upstream non-hair cell complex which encompasses WER, TTG1, GL3, MYC1 and EGL3 (Kang et al., 2009). In addition to its root epidermal function the *GL2* gene, which encodes a homeodomain-containing protein, has been shown to be required for trichome formation and seed mucilage production (Koornneef, 1981; Rerie et al., 1994; Masucci et al., 1996). The *GL2* mutant utilised during this study was the *gl2-1* mutant, which is in the *Landsberg erecta* background and is a fast neutron induced mutant allele that results in a 19 base pair deletion (Koornneef et al., 1982; Masucci et al., 1996). Approximately 50% of its non-hair cells produce root hairs, but other cellular differences between the hair and non-hair cells, for example cell size and cytoplasmic density, remain unaffected, (Masucci et al., 1996). In the shoot the number of trichomes is reduced (Masucci et al., 1996). In this instance the fact that approximately 50% of the *gl2-1* mutants non-hair cells also produce root hairs makes it particularly useful, since these ectopically produced hairs facilitate a direct means of investigating how the repressive auxin response regime may be influencing root hair growth.
Figure 3-1: Mutant phenotypes of epidermal patterning mutants used during this project.

The root epidermal patterning mechanism is well characterised with multiple mutant lines available for many of the patterning components. These give a range of phenotypes from roots that produce no root hairs to roots that produce hairs from every epidermal cell. There are also intermediate phenotypes like gl2-1 and myb23-1 that have approximately 50% and 5% ectopic root hairs respectively. Generally CAPRICE and TRIPTYCHON promote the production of root hairs whilst WEREWOLF, GLABRA 2 and MYB23 inhibit the production of root hairs. Photographs Sharpened 50%, Brightness +20%, Contrast +40%.
3.3 **Analysis of the auxin response regime in the gl2-1 mutant background**

In order to examine if the patterning of auxin response was affected by the loss of GL2 function, the gl2-1 mutant was crossed with the aforementioned ARF10 and IAA17 transcriptional and translational markers for ARF10 and IAA17: pIAA17::GFP, pIAA17::IAA17-GFP, pARF10::GFP, pARF10::ARF10-GFP and the pDR5::GFP auxin signalling output reporter (Figure 3-2).

In the gl2-1 mutant background the transcriptional and translational markers for the repressive ARF, ARF10, indicate that as is observed in the wild-type the gene is expressed strongly in the non-hair cells from the root tip and at a much lower level in the hair cell files (Figure 3-2 B). Thus indicating that ARF10 is still highly expressed in the non-hair files despite approximately 50% of the cells producing root hairs (Masucci et al., 1996).

Other markers used to indicate a repressed response to auxin were the transcriptional and translational GFP markers for the Aux/IAA repressor IAA17. In the root epidermis IAA17 expression as indicated by both the transcriptional pIAA17::GFP and translational pIAA17::IAA17-GFP markers begins around the transition zone in the non-hair files and approximately eight cells later in the hair files (Figure 1-10). When these markers were crossed into the gl2-1 mutant background they both retained this distinct expression pattern (Figure 3-2 A). Thus indicating that this aspect of the repressive auxin response regime is also still apparent in the non-hair files of the gl2-1 mutant.

The final marker looked at was pDR5::GFP auxin signalling output marker. As described previously the expression in this marker indicates a high level of auxin response in the non-hair files near the root tip, but at the transition zone this evens out across all of the files and then becomes stronger in the hair files from this
point forward (Figure 1-9). In the gl2-1 mutant background this expression pattern persists, (Figure 3-2 C), indicating that the overall auxin response in the hair and non-hair files remains unaltered from that of the wild-type.

As the expression pattern of all of these markers in the gl2-1 mutant background was the same as that observed in the wild-type controls, this indicated that any ectopic root hairs produced by the non-hair cells in the gl2-1 mutant would be subject to the repressive auxin response regime observed there. These data are consistent with the hypothesis that despite some of the cells in the non-hair files producing root hairs, in terms of location in relation to the underlying cortex and cell characteristics in terms of cell size, the non-hair cell identity is maintained (Masucci et al., 1996). Therefore by analysing these ectopic root hairs further the hypothesis that this repressive auxin response regime is functioning to prevent the growth of root hairs could be considered.
Figure 3-2: Markers for IAA17, ARF10 and pDR5::GFP in the gl2-1 mutant.

A: pIAA17::GFP and pIAA17::IAA17-GFP markers in the gl2-1 mutant and wild-type control backgrounds. B: pARF10::GFP and pARF10::ARF10-GFP markers in the gl2-1 mutant and wild-type control backgrounds. C: pDR5::GFP marker in the gl2-1 mutant and wild-type control backgrounds. Photographs: Sharpened 50%, Brightness +20%, Contrast -20%. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings.
3.4 Analysis of the root hairs in the *gl2-1* mutant

The *gl2-1* mutant produces root hairs in approximately 50% of its non-hair cells (Masucci et al., 1996). In order to begin to explore the significance of the apparent repressive auxin response regime in the non-hair cells, the root hair length profile of this mutant was characterised. It was hypothesised that if a repressive auxin response regime was affecting root hair growth in these mutants, it should be detectable in root hair length data, owing to the large number of ectopic root hairs in this background.

Root hairs in the *gl2-1* mutant were compared to the wild-type line *Landsberg erecta* (Figure 3-3). The root hair phenotype of the *gl2-1* mutant corroborated published data, in that the density of root hairs was significantly higher than the wild-type (Supplementary Data Figure 9-1). In addition to this whereas the wild-type root hairs were more uniform in length the root hair lengths in the *gl2-1* mutant appeared to be more variable (Figure 3-3 A).

Preliminary root hair data was measured from plants grown across several plates to account for any variability in environmental conditions (e.g. humidity), and the average root hair lengths were compared (Figure 3-3 B). The wild-type consistently and reproducibly had a significantly longer (P<0.005, T-Test) root hair length average than the *gl2-1* mutant (Figure 3-3 B).

In order to establish if the *gl2-1* mutant root hair length average was lower because of a uniform reduction in root hair length, or because some of the root hairs were unusually short and therefore bringing the average value down, the root hair length frequency profile was analysed. To do this root hairs were measured using the same methods and techniques that were used to assess the average root hair length, but instead of averaging the data the root hair lengths
were grouped into root hair length categories and the overall root hair length profile was assessed (Figure 3-3 C).

The root hair length frequency profile comparison indicated that the shorter average root hair length observed in the gl2-1 mutant was due to the fact that the mutant had significantly more (P<0.005, ANOVA) shorter root hairs than the wild-type line *Landsberg erecta.*
Figure 3-3: Analysis of the *gl2-1* mutant root hair length.

A: Root hairs in the *gl2-1* mutant are noticeably less uniform in length and much denser than the wild-type *Landsberg erecta*. B: The average root hair length of the *gl2-1* mutant is significantly shorter (P<0.005, T-Test) than that of the wild-type. C: Root hair length frequency analysis indicates that the *gl2-1* mutant has a significantly higher (ANOVA, P<0.005) number of shorter root hairs (less than 150 µm) than the wild-type. All root hair analysis was carried out on roots taken from several plates to account for differences in conditions, e.g. humidity, in addition to this all assays were repeated a minimum of three times before conclusions were drawn. Error bars represent standard error values.
3.5 **Does the loss of aux1 in the gl2-1 mutant influence the short root hair phenotype?**

One hypothesis to account for these short root hairs was that they may be those produced ectopically by the non-hair cells. However before this could be explored further it was necessary to consider AUX1 expression. A previous cross produced in the Kepinski lab, gl2-1,pAUX1::AUX1-YFP indicated that AUX1 expression was lost in a gl2-1 mutant (Supplementary Data Figure 9-2). This is consistent with previous results discussed in the Jones *et al.* 2009 paper, whereby pAUX1::AUX1-YFP expression was lost in the wer-1 myb23-1 double mutant. Both WER and MYB23 promote the expression of GL2 (Kang *et al*., 2009; Schiefelbein *et al*., 2009). In addition to this, published data has indicated that auxin transport in the root is important for successful root hair elongation (Jones *et al*., 2009). In order to evaluate if the short root hairs in the gl2-1 mutant were a consequence of the loss of AUX1, the root hair profile of the gl2-1 mutant was compared to that of two AUX1 knockout mutants, aux1-7 and aux1-22 (Figure 3-4).

The aux1-7 mutant produces a missense protein that is translated and transported but is not functionally active, whereas as aux1-22 is a null mutation whereby the protein is subject to nonsense mediated degradation (Marchant and Bennett, 1998; Swarup *et al*., 2004; Ugartechea-Chirino *et al*., 2010). In previous publications missense and null mutations in AUX1 have elicited different responses, therefore both mutants were compared during this assay in order to account for that possibility (Marchant and Bennett, 1998; Swarup *et al*., 2004; Ugartechea-Chirino *et al*., 2010).

In comparison to both the aux1-7 and aux1-22 mutant lines the gl2-1 mutant exhibited significantly more (P<0.005, ANOVA) shorter root hairs (Figure 3-4). This indicates that whilst the disruption of auxin influx transport in the non-hair...
cells of the *gl2-1* mutant may result in more shorter root hairs, the loss of *AUX1* function in the *gl2-1* background is not the principal cause of the higher frequency of shorter root hairs observed.

In order to confirm this further the *gl2-1* mutant was treated with the synthetic NAA (Figure 3-5). NAA is particularly useful in this instance as it is a synthetic auxin that does not require AUX1 influx transporters in order to enter cells (Delbarre, 1994). Therefore any phenotype due to the loss of AUX1 should be negated during these assays.

The *gl2-1* root hair length frequency profiles indicated that after treatment with 0.1 µM NAA a population of short root hairs was still apparent (Figure 3-5 B). These data indicated that restoring effective auxin transport by circumventing the requirement for AUX1 did not rescue the *gl2-1* short root hair phenotype. Further confirming that other factors are influencing the lack of root hair elongation in the *gl2-1* mutant.
Figure 3-4: Analysis of the *gl2-1* mutant in comparison to the *aux1-7* and *aux1-22* mutants.

In a *gl2-1* background AUX1 is lost in the root epidermis. Both the *aux1-7* and *aux1-22* mutants have been characterised to have shorter root hairs. To establish that the shorter root hairs observed in the *gl2-1* background were not solely due to the loss of AUX1 the root hair length profiles of all the mutants were compared. This frequency data indicated that whilst *aux1-22* and *aux1-7* did have a higher number of shorter root hairs (less than 150 µm), the *gl2-1* mutant had significantly more (ANOVA, P<0.005). Photographs: Sharpened 50%, Brightness +40%, Contrast -20%.
Figure 3-5: Treatment of the gl2-1 mutant with NAA.

After treatment with NAA, which does not require the AUX1 influx transporter to enter cells, the gl2-1 short root hair profile persisted. Photographs: Sharpened 50%.
3.6 Are these shorter root hairs less responsive to auxin?

The NAA treatment assay highlighted the fact that rather than all, or none of the root hairs in the *gl2-1* mutant elongating in response to treatment with NAA, two distinct populations were apparent. Whilst the majority of the root hairs elongated normally like the wild-type to more than double their original length, a population of shorter root hairs, which had not elongated as much were still clearly apparent. Whilst these results were consistent with the hypothesis that the short root hairs in the *gl2-1* mutant were not due to the loss of AUX1, they also indicated that these shorter root hairs may in fact be less responsive to auxin in terms of root hair elongation. To check that this was not just a phenomenon of NAA treatment the assay was repeated with the naturally occurring form of auxin, IAA (Figure 3-6).

When treated with IAA a population of shorter root hairs in the *gl2-1* mutant was still apparent; however these do appear to have elongated slightly more than was seen with NAA treatment.

These results were consistent with the *gl2-1* mutant having a larger population of shorter root hairs than the wild-type due to factors other than the loss of *AUX1*. In addition to this the *gl2-1* mutant has a population of root hairs, potentially these shorter root hairs, which elongate significantly less than root hairs in the wild-type when treated with auxin.
Figure 3-6: Treatment of the \textit{gl2-1} mutant with IAA.

Treatment with the naturally occurring auxin Indole-3 Acetic Acid corroborated the phenomenon observed with NAA. A population of shorter root hairs, which appear to respond less to auxin are highlighted in red.
3.7 Are these shorter root hairs those produced by the non-hair cells?

In order to establish if this short root hair population were the root hairs produced by the non-hair cells, and therefore subject to the repressive auxin response regime present there, it was necessary to develop a method of individually identifying the hairs that were being produced by the non-hair and hair cells respectively.

In order to identify the ectopic root hairs, initially the *pARF10::GFP* gl2-1 cross was analysed further. As the *ARF10* marker is nuclear localised and brighter in the non-hair cells it was hypothesised that identification of fluorescent nuclei in root hairs would indicate ectopically produced root hairs. However, although this worked in practice on the confocal microscope (Supplementary Data Figure 9-3) to measure enough root hairs to get any meaningful data whole root imaging was required on the less powerful Olympus SZX12 GFP Microscope. Unfortunately due to the small size of the nuclei it was difficult to tell if they were present in the root hairs. Typically you would expect nuclei to be at the tip of the root hair and false positives were common due to the root tip touching the growth media creating a root tip “glowing effect”.

Therefore in order to investigate this more reliably a new line was produced by crossing the *gl2-1* mutant with the *pGL2::GFP* marker line. The *pGL2::GFP* marker was a better choice because like *ARF10* it is preferentially expressed in the non-hair files, but unlike *ARF10* the fluorescence is expressed throughout the cytoplasm and at a very strong level (Kang et al., 2009) (Figure 3-7 A).

Although the GL2 protein is not functional in the *gl2-1* mutant background the *pGL2::GFP* marker is still active as only GL2 promoter activity is required. In
addition to that, in the gl2-1 background the pGL2::GFP marker appears to undergo some form of additional positive feedback, or lack of negative feedback, which results in the GFP level being higher than the wild-type.

The pGL2::GFP fluorescence in the gl2-1 mutant background successfully marked the ectopic root hairs and therefore made it possible to measure their length in comparison to the non-fluorescent root hairs that were produced by the hair cells (Figure 3-7 B/C). The root hairs produced by the non-hair cells, and thus subject to the repressive auxin response regime were significantly shorter (P<0.005, T-Test) than those produced by hair cells.

These results were consistent with the hypothesis that the negative auxin response regime in the non-hair cells may be functioning to repress root hair growth in the non-hair position.
Figure 3-7: Expression of the \textit{pGL2::GFP} marker in the \textit{gl2-1} mutant.

A: The \textit{pGL2::GFP} marker is preferentially expressed in the non-hair cells. C-D: By crossing the \textit{pGL2::GFP} marker into the \textit{gl2-1} mutant ectopically produced root hairs were visible. B: Measurement of fluorescent root hairs indicated that those produced ectopically by the non-hair cells (fluorescent) were significantly shorter (T-TEST, \(P<0.005\)) than those produced by the hair cells (non-fluorescent). Photographs: Brightness +40\%, Contrast -20\%. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings. Error bars represent standard error values.
3.8 Does removing the repressive ARFs, ARF10 and ARF16, restore the ectopic root hair length?

In order to further confirm if the repressive auxin response regime in the non-hair cells was affecting root hair elongation, the gl2-1 mutant was crossed with the arf10-3 arf16-2 double mutant. The arf10-3 arf16-2 double mutant knocks out two repressing ARFs within the same clade (Finet et al., 2013). In this clade ARF10 and ARF16, along with ARF17 all share high amino acid sequence similarities, and all contain an additional stretch of amino acids in the DNA binding domain (Wang et al., 2005). The double arf10-3 arf16-2 mutant was used in this study because the high sequence similarities, coupled with overlapping expression patterns between ARF10 and ARF16 imply a functional redundancy (Wang et al., 2005). Both the arf10-3 and arf16-2 mutants carry a T-DNA insertion and as a double mutant the plants exhibit a severely agravitropic phenotype (Wang et al., 2005). In addition to this a high number of ectopic root hairs are observed. The gl2-1 arf10-3 arf16-2 triple mutant was produced to assess if the removal of the function of these ARFs, which elicit a repressive auxin response, resulted in the loss of the shorter and the less responsive root hairs observed in the gl2-1 mutant.

Analysis of the triple gl2-1 arf10-3 arf16-2 mutant indicated that in comparison to the high frequency of short root hairs observed in the gl2-1 mutant, the triple mutant did not exhibit significantly more shorter root hairs than the wild-type (Figure 3-8 C/D). In addition to this when the triple mutant was treated with auxin all of the root hairs elongated significantly (Figure 3-8 B). In contrast to gl2-1, the root hairs in the triple mutant elongated significantly more than the wild-type at a concentration of 0.1 µM IAA. This was also observed in the arf10-3 arf16-2 double mutant (Figure 3-8 C/D).
Figure 3-8: Analysis of the gl2-1 arf10-3 arf16-2 triple mutant.

A: The root hairs of the arf10-3 arf16-2 gl2-1 triple mutant in comparison to associated mutants and wild-types. B: When the gl2-1 arf10-3 arf16-2 triple mutant was treated with 0.1 µM IAA all of the root hair population elongated. C/D: Without auxin treatment the gl2-1 arf10-3 arf16-2 triple mutant did not exhibit the significantly higher percentage of short root hairs seen in the gl2-1 mutant. Compared to the wild-type the arf10-3 arf16-3 gl2-1 triple mutant has fewer short (less than 150 µm) root hairs. Photographs: Sharpened 50%, Brightness +20%, Contrast +20%. Error bars represent standard error values.
3.9 Discussion

To investigate the functional significance of the apparent repressive auxin response regime in the non-hair cells, two non-mutually exclusive hypotheses were considered. Firstly that the repressive auxin response is part of the mechanism that restricts root hair growth and secondly that it may facilitate an auxin superhighway via the non-hair cells, to enable a reliable and sustained delivery of auxin to the hair cells. In order to investigate this the *gl2-1* loss of function mutant was used (Koornneef, 1981; Ohashi et al., 2003). By crossing this mutant with markers for *ARF10* and *IAA17* confirmation that the repressive auxin response was still apparent in the non-hair cells was achieved, despite up to 50% of them producing root hairs (Masucci et al., 1996). Subsequent analysis of these ectopic root hairs indicated that the *gl2-1* mutant had significantly more shorter root hairs, analysis of the pGL2::GFP marker confirmed that these shorter root hairs were those produced by the non-hair cells. To discount the effect of the loss of *AUX1* on the *gl2-1* mutant root hair length, comparisons with *AUX1* null and missense mutants, and treatment with the synthetic auxin NAA was tested. The NAA assays also highlighted that the *gl2-1* mutant has a population of root hairs that were less responsive to auxin, a phenomenon that was later additionally confirmed with IAA assays.

To assess if these short root hairs were lost when some of the repressive auxin response components were removed, the *arf10-3 arf16-2 gl2-1* triple mutant was produced and analysed. In this mutant the shorter root hairs typical of the *gl2-1* mutation were lost, in addition to this all of the root hairs elongated significantly when treated with auxin. These results were consistent with the repressive auxin response regime in the non-hair cells functioning as part of the mechanism that restricts root hair growth (Figure 3-9). It also highlighted the possibility that *ARF10* and/or *ARF16* may play a role in root hair elongation, knocking out both of these repressing ARFs resulted in significantly more root hair elongation in response to auxin treatment in comparison to the wild-type.
Figure 3-9: ARF10 and/or ARF16 inhibit root hair growth.

Analysis of the short ectopic root hairs in the gl2-1 mutant and the subsequent lack of them in the arf10-3 arf16-2 gl2-1 triple mutant indicated that ARF10 and/or ARF16 may play a role in inhibiting root hair growth. Solid lines indicate promotion (arrow head) or inhibition (flat head), dashed lines indicate movement in the direction of the arrow head. Letters next to the arrows indicate the published source of the interaction. (a) (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008) (b) (Hassan et al., 2010) (c) (Rishmawi et al., 2014) (d) (Simon et al., 2007) (e) (Kang et al., 2009) (f) (Yi et al., 2010) (g) (Jones et al., 2009) (h) (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996) (i) Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann 2010. (*) indicates interactions identified during this project.
4 : Placing Spatial Control of Auxin Response in Current Knowledge of the Epidermal Patterning Mechanism
4.1 Introduction

Two well characterised pathways within plant growth are the auxin response network and the root epidermal patterning mechanism. In 1996 a paper by Masucci et al first looked the concept of these two pathways working together. As auxin was able to rescue the rhd6 mutant phenotype in double gl2-1 rhd6 and ttg1-1 rhd6 mutants, they concluded that auxin did not act through a pathway that requires the GL2 or TTG1 gene products, and therefore must act downstream of this epidermal patterning mechanism (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996).

4.1.1 The epidermal patterning mechanism

Since this data was published, understanding of the epidermal patterning mechanism has progressed. Via a complex but well characterised mechanism it is now understood that in Arabidopsis hair and non-hair cells arise in a position dependent manner, whereby hair cells are produced over the anticlinal wall of two underlying cortical cells, and non-hair cells are produced over the periclinal wall (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2007a; Schiefelbein et al., 2009).

In the hair cells SCM inhibits the expression of a MYB type transcription factor WER (Figure 1-7) (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2007a). In epidermal cells that are not positioned over a cortical cell junction WER transcription is not inhibited (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008). WER interacts with TTG1, GL3, MYC1 and EGL3 to form a key non-hair promoting transcription factor complex (Ohashi et al., 2003; Schiefelbein et al., 2009). This complex promotes the non-hair cell fate via the positive regulation of GL2, which in turn represses the transcription of root hair promoting genes like RHD6 (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1994). It also positively
regulates the expression of \textit{MYB23}, which undergoes a positive feedback loop with itself and \textit{WER}, thus reinforcing the non-hair cell fate (Kang et al., 2009).

In addition to promoting the non-hair cell fate this complex also promotes the expression of several one repeat MYB genes that promote the hair cell specification, these are \textit{CPC}, \textit{TRY} and \textit{ETC1} (Ryu et al., 2005; Schiefelbein et al., 2009). Despite being produced in the non-hair cells these proteins relocate to adjacent hair cells, where they function to repress the non-hair complex formation, thereby promoting the hair cell fate (Savage et al., 2008). In a \textit{scm-1} mutant, hair and non-hair cells often continue to develop in an alternating manner due to this lateral inhibition (Savage et al., 2008).

\textbf{4.1.2 The auxin response network}

The auxin response network is made up of three key protein families that form part of a dynamic interaction network (Figure 1-2) (Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011). This network brings about a transcriptional response to auxin, as the repression of auxin response gene expression is reduced (Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011). These three families consist of the \textit{SCF}^{TIR1/AFB} family of auxin receptors and two families of transcription factors, the Aux/IAA’s and the \textit{ARFs} (Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010).

Auxin promotes the proteasomal degradation of the Aux/IAA repressor proteins, thus allowing the ARFs to activate or repress the auxin response genes they are interacting with (Figure 1-2) (Tiwari et al., 2001; Tiwari et al., 2004; Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011). Although the majority of ARFs are considered to be activating, five members are also thought to be repressing, these are hypothesised to function by competing with activating ARFs for auxin response elements in the promoter regions of auxin response genes (Lokerse and Weijers, 2009; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010).
Although understanding of the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network has increased since the Masucci et al data was originally published, the concept of auxin acting downstream of the epidermal patterning mechanism has remained consistent. Unpublished microarray data obtained in the Kepinski lab before this project began highlighted that auxin treatment downregulates the expression of two epidermal patterning components \textit{MYB23} and \textit{GL2} (Supplementary Data Figure 9-5), indicating that this view is too simplistic and the relationship between these two important aspects of plant growth may be more complex. Therefore in order to place the spatial control of auxin response in the current knowledge of the epidermal patterning mechanism, markers of auxin response were crossed into epidermal patterning mutants.
4.2 Is *WEREWOLF* patterning auxin response in the root epidermis?

*WER* expression is regulated in a position dependent manner due to inhibition by *SCM*, resulting in higher *WER* expression in the non-hair cells (Ryu *et al*., 2005). This asymmetric localisation of *WER* results in the formation of a non-hair transcription factor complex and the promotion of the non-hair cell fate (Masucci *et al*., 1996; Ohashi *et al*., 2003).

The *WER* gene encodes a MYB-related protein containing R2 and R3 repeats (Lee and Schiefelbein, 1999; Ryu *et al*., 2005; Ishida *et al*., 2007; Wang *et al*., 2008). The MYB transcription factor family is one of the largest known transcription factor families in the *Arabidopsis* genome (Riechmann *et al*., 2000). This *Arabidopsis* family has around 339 MYB genes, which encode one to three repeats of the MYB domain (Rosinski and Atchley, 1998). The MYB domain is approximately 50 amino acids in length and exhibits regularly spaced tryptophan residues, these are DNA binding domains that form helix-turn-helix structures and are associated with transcriptional regulation (Rosinski and Atchley, 1998; Lee and Schiefelbein, 1999). The WER amino acid sequence reveals a 203 residue protein, 23.5 kDa in size, with two MYB domains in its N-terminal region (Lee and Schiefelbein, 1999).

There are three WER mutants characterised: *wer*-1, *wer*-2 and *wer*-3 (Lee and Schiefelbein, 1999). These differ in their wild-type *Arabidopsis* backgrounds but all contain a single base substitution resulting in a non-sense mutation within the second MYB domain (Lee and Schiefelbein, 1999). The product from each of these mutants is a truncated WER protein that is non-functional (Lee and Schiefelbein, 1999). All of these mutants produce an excessively hairy root phenotype.
Many of the genetic components involved in the root epidermal patterning mechanism are also involved in the patterning of trichomes in the shoot (Wang et al., 2007). Studying the interaction between the root epidermal patterning mechanism and auxin response also enables us to consider the link between epidermal patterning and auxin response more broadly. To some extent WER is an exception to this as it is primarily expressed in the roots, however there is another R2R3 MYB-type transcription factor involved in trichome production, GLABRA1, with which WER is functionally interchangeable (Kellogg, 2001; Wang et al., 2007). In addition to this, recently published data has also indicated that WER is expressed in aerial parts of the plant and may play an important role in the regulation of flowering time (Seo et al., 2011). Whilst the patterning of root hairs and trichomes essentially shares the same ‘genetic tool kit,’ providing good evidence that trichomes and root hairs are evolutionary homologous this new data indicates a functional divergence in WER activity (Seo et al., 2011).

In order to establish if WER is patterning auxin response in the root epidermis, auxin response markers were crossed into the wer-1 mutant (Figure 4-1). To ensure reliable comparisons control lines were selected alongside every cross produced during this project. Homozygote lines were established via genetic and phenotypic analysis. The fluorescent marker was always crossed into the mutant background.

In the wild-type and control backgrounds the pDR5::GFP marker of auxin signalling output is initially observed at a higher level in the non-hair files, this then evens out across all of the files at the transition zone and proceeds to be stronger in the hair files from that point forward (Figure 1-9). In the wer-1 mutant all of the cells produce root hairs and every file exhibits pDR5::GFP expression that mirrors that of a typical hair file (Figure 4-1 A). These results were consistent with WER inhibiting auxin responsiveness in the hair files after the
Figure 4-1: Markers for auxin response in the wer-1 mutant background.

A: The pDR5::GFP marker of auxin signalling output in the wer-1 mutant background. B: Transcriptional and translational markers for repressing auxin response factor ARF10 in the wer-1 mutant background. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files. Photographs: Sharpened 50%, Brightness +40%. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings.
transition zone, and support the hypothesis that WER plays a role in patterning auxin response in the root epidermis.

The wer-1 mutant was also crossed with both the transcriptional and translational markers for the repressing auxin response factor, ARF10. In the wild-type and control backgrounds ARF10 is preferentially expressed in the non-hair files from the root tip (Figure 1-11). In the wer-1 mutant ARF10 expression is almost entirely lost in the root epidermis, this occurs with both the translational and transcriptional markers (Figure 4-1 B).

The final markers analysed in the wer-1 background were the transcriptional and translational markers for the Aux/IAA repressor IAA17. In the control and wild-type backgrounds both the translational and transcriptional markers indicate that IAA17 expression in the root epidermis begins around the transition zone in the non-hair cells and approximately eight cells later in the hair files (Figure 1-10). In the wer-1 mutant the differential start of IAA17 expression is lost, and expression begins in all of the files at the same time, at a position in the root epidermis that mirrors the eight cell delay typical of the hair files (Figure 4-2).

Results from the analysis of auxin response markers in the wer-1 mutant background were consistent with WER promoting the repressive auxin response regime in the root epidermis. Specifically that WER promotes both the expression of ARF10 and the early expression of IAA17 (Figure 4-3).
Figure 4-2: Markers for auxin response in the wer-1 background.

A: The transcriptional marker for the Aux/IAA repressor protein in the wer-1 mutant background. B: The translational marker for the Aux/IAA repressor protein in the wer-1 mutant background. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files. Photographs: Sharpened 50%, Brightness +40%, Contrast +20%. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings.
Figure 4-3: WER promotes the expression of ARF10 and IAA17 in the non-hair cells.

Results from analysis of auxin response markers in the wer-1 mutant background were consistent with WER promoting the repressive auxin response regime in the root epidermis. Specifically that WER promotes both the expression of ARF10 and the early expression of IAA17. Solid lines indicate promotion (arrow head) or inhibition (flat head), dashed lines indicate movement in the direction of the arrow head. Letters next to the arrows indicate the published source of the interaction. (a) (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008) (b) (Hassan et al., 2010) (c) (Rishmawi et al., 2014) (d) (Simon et al., 2007) (e) (Kang et al., 2009) (f) (Yi et al., 2010) (g) (Jones et al., 2009) (h) (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996) (i) Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann 2010. (*) indicates interactions identified during this project.
4.3 Does AUX1 pattern expression of the auxin response components in the root epidermis?

Data published by Jones et al. in 2009 indicated that in the wer-1 myb23-1 double mutant background, expression of the auxin influx transporter AUX1 was lost. In order to investigate if the altered auxin response expression patterns of IAA17 in wer-1 were due to the loss of AUX1 expression in the root epidermis, the wer-1 plAA17::GFP transcriptional cross was treated with the synthetic auxin NAA. NAA is transported into cells without the assistance of the AUX1 influx transporter, meaning any phenotype due to the loss of AUX1 should be negated (Delbarre, 1994). The wer-1 plAA17::GFP cross and control lines were grown on increasing NAA concentrations in order to see if the wild-type expression pattern was restored (Figure 4-4). Although the level of fluorescence level did increase, which is consistent with previously published data, the expression pattern of the IAA17 marker remained unchanged (Ouellet et al., 2001).

These results were consistent with AUX1 not affecting the patterning of IAA17 in the root epidermis. This was further confirmed by crossing the ARF10 and IAA17 transcriptional and translational markers with aux1 mutant lines (Figure 4-5/4-6). Initially two aux1 mutants were used, the aux1-7 knockout mutant that produces a missense protein, which is still translated and transported but is not functionally active, and the aux1-22 mutant, which has a null mutation whereby the protein is subject to nonsense mediated degradation (Swarup et al., 2004).

The IAA17 transcriptional and translational markers were crossed into the aux1-7 and aux1-22 mutant backgrounds. Homozygote cross and control lines were selected in the manner detailed previously and the fluorescent expression pattern for IAA17 in each of these backgrounds was observed (Figure 4-5). In the aux1 mutant backgrounds both the transcriptional and translational markers for IAA17 retained their wild-type expression patterns and did not differ significantly from
the control lines. These results indicated that the loss of *aux1* was not affecting the patterning of *IAA17* in the root epidermis.

In order to confirm if *AUX1* was patterning *ARF10* expression, the transcriptional *ARF10* marker was crossed into the *aux1*-7 and *aux1*-22 mutant backgrounds (Figure 4-6 A). Whilst the wild-type preferential expression of *ARF10* in the non-hair files was maintained in the *aux1*-22 mutant, in the *aux1*-7 mutant *ARF10* expression was observed to be present in all of the epidermal cells. Whilst initially confusing, further investigation indicated similar occurrences in other data that had been published. In particular a paper published by Yamel *et al* in 2010 observed *AUX1* missense mutations to affect root cap cell patterning but no effect in the *AUX1* null alleles. The authors hypothesised that the absence of *AUX1* in null mutants like *aux1*-22, may trigger the redundant function of other related proteins, such as LAX1, and partially rescue the phenotype (Ugartechea-Chirino *et al*., 2010; Ugartechea-Chirino *et al*., 2010). To investigate if *AUX1* was patterning *ARF10*, but this was only apparent when other functionally redundant proteins did not rescue the phenotype, additional *AUX1* mutants were crossed with the *ARF10* markers (Figure 4-6 B). These were *aux1*-21, which like *aux1*-22 is a null mutation subject to nonsense mediated decay and *aux1*-104, which like *aux1*-7 is a missense mutation which produces a non-functional protein (Ugartechea-Chirino *et al*., 2010). Both the *aux1*-104 and the *aux1*-21 mutants had a wild-type patterning of *ARF10* expression that did not differ significantly from the control lines. Indicating that the changes observed in the *aux1*-7 mutant background were not typical of a missense mutation. In order to further explore this phenomenon the *AUX1* mutants were crossed with the translational *ARF10* marker (Figure 4-7). In this case the expression pattern of *ARF10* remained unaltered in all of the *AUX1* mutants including *aux1*-7, indicating that despite the unusual *aux1*-7 *pARF10::GFP* result, *AUX1* is unlikely to be patterning the expression of *ARF10* in the root epidermis.
Figure 4-4: *pIAA17::IAA17-GFP* expression in the *wer-1* mutant when treated with NAA.

Homozygote lines for the transcriptional *IAA17* marker in the *wer-1* background were treated with increasing concentrations of the synthetic auxin NAA. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files. Photographs: Sharpened 50%, Brightness +40%, Contrast -40%. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings.
Figure 4-5: IAA17 markers in the AUX1 mutant backgrounds.

Translational and transcriptional markers for the Aux/IAA repressor IAA17 were crossed into two different AUX1 mutant backgrounds. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files. Photographs: Sharpened 50%, Brightness +40%, Contrast -20%. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings.
Figure 4-6: ARF10 markers in the AUX1 mutant backgrounds

A: The transcriptional marker for the repressive auxin response factor ARF10 was crossed into mutants for the auxin influx transporter AUX1. B: The ARF10 transcriptional marker crossed into additional null and missense AUX1 mutants. Like aux1-22, aux1-21 is a null mutant, whilst aux1-104, like aux1-7 is a missense mutant. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files. Photographs: Sharpened 50%. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings.
Figure 4-7: The translational ARF10 marker in the AUX1 mutant backgrounds.

The translational marker for ARF10 crossed into all of the previously described AUX1 mutants. ARF10 is patterned like the wild-type in all of these background regardless of if they are a null or missense mutations. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files. Photographs: Sharpened 50%. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings.
4.4 How is auxin response patterned in a *wer-1 myb23-1* double mutant?

To investigate if the *wer-1 myb23-1* double mutant patterned auxin response in the root epidermis differently to the *wer-1* single mutant, the double mutant was also crossed with the auxin response markers.

Like *WER, MYB23* is a MYB domain transcription factor (Kang *et al*., 2009). MYB domain transcription factors are involved in the regulation of growth and development in plants via many processes including; secondary metabolism, cellular morphogenesis and stress response. *WER, MYB23* and the aforementioned *GLABRA1* are all members of the same MYB sub group number 15. They share a conserved 19 amino acid motif in the putative transcription activation domain at the C-terminal end (Matsui *et al*., 2005; Tominaga-Wada *et al*., 2012).

*MYB23* is an interesting component of the epidermal patterning mechanism because it forms a positive feedback loop with itself that reinforces the non-hair cell fate (Kang *et al*., 2009). Knockout mutants for other epidermal patterning components display variable *MYB23* transcript levels, reduced levels are observed in *WER, TTG1, GL3* and *EGL3* mutants (Kang *et al*., 2009). In a *GL2* mutant background the *MYB23* transcript level is not significantly altered from that of the wild-type, however in a *CPC* mutant there is a significant increase, indicating that whilst *MYB23* expression is promoted by *WER, TTG1, GL3* and *EGL3* it is inhibited by *CPC* and functions upstream of *GL2* (Kirik *et al*., 2001; Kang *et al*., 2009; Roeder *et al*., 2011). Conversely in a *myb23-1* mutant relative transcript levels of *GL2, WER, CPC, GL3, EGL3* and *TTG1* are not significantly altered (Kang *et al*., 2009). In addition to this GUS and GFP marker lines for these genes are not significantly altered, which is consistent with the proposed published hypothesis that *MYB23* plays a minor role in the normal establishment
of the cell pattern and gene regulatory activities in the developing root epidermis (Kang et al., 2009).

In a dominant negative form of MYB23, which utilises the modified repressor domain of SUPERMAN (SRDX; LDLDLELRLGFA) (Hiratsu et al., 2003) in frame to the 3’ end of the MYB23 coding region, a significant reduction in the expression of GL2, MYB23 and CPC was observed (Kang et al., 2009). WER however remains unchanged, suggesting that MYB23 participates in the regulation of its own gene expression as well as GL2 and CPC (Kang et al., 2009). Interestingly this construct and also a previously published p35S::MYB23-SDRX line both resulted in all of the epidermal cells adopting the hair cell fate (Matsui et al., 2005; Kang et al., 2009). Published GUS reporter lines and GFP translational markers have indicated that MYB23 is preferentially expressed in the non-hair files, and the pWER::MYB23 wer-1 construct has indicated that MYB23 is able to functionally substitute for WER and rescue the wer-1 hairy root phenotype (Kang et al., 2009).

Although the role of MYB23 may be considered minor in terms of early cell patterning, the positive feedback loop that MYB23 has with itself is proposed to reinforce the existing cell fate decision (Kang et al., 2009). This can be observed under conditions where the cell specification is compromised; for example where a longitudinal cell division occurs, one cell divides the wrong way resulting in the production of two new files, also known as a T junction (Figure 1-8). This occurs commonly in the root epidermis and the cells are usually robust at adopting the correct new cell fate dependent on their new position in relation to the underlying cortex. However in a myb23-1 mutant approximately five times more of the ‘new cells’ adopt the incorrect cell fate (Kang et al., 2009). This is likely to account for the five percent increase in ectopic root hairs that are observed in this mutant, as it preferentially occurs in the non-hair files the roots appear less able to direct the non-hair cell fate (Kang et al., 2009).
The MYB23 mutant used during these crosses was the myb23-1 allele from the SALK T-DNA insertion collection (Kang et al., 2009). The myb23-1 mutant has a T-DNA insertion in its second intron and has no detectable MYB23 transcripts (Kirik et al., 2005). As with the wer-1 mutant the wer-1 myb23-1 double mutant produces root hairs from all of its cells. In order to assess if knocking out MYB23 enhances any differences in the patterning of auxin response in the root epidermis, the double mutant was crossed with the auxin response markers.

Initially crossed with the pDR5::GFP marker, which indicates auxin signalling output, the wer-1 myb23-1 double mutant was observed to exhibit the same expression pattern that was present in the wer-1 mutant (Figure 4-8). This was also true with both the ARF10 and IAA17 markers, indicating that knocking out MYB23 did not result in any additive effects to the phenotype observed in the wer-1 single mutant, with regards to patterning auxin response in the root epidermis (Figure 4-8/Figure 4-9).
Figure 4-8: The \textit{pDR5::GFP} and \textit{ARF10} transcriptional and translational markers in the \textit{wer-1 myb23-1} mutant background.

A: \textit{pDR5::GFP} expression in the \textit{wer-1 myb23-1} mutant background. B: In the \textit{wer-1 myb23-1} mutant background \textit{ARF10} expression was almost completely lost in the root epidermis. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files. Sharpened 50%. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings.
Figure 4-9: Transcriptional and Translational markers for IAA17 in the wer-1 myb23-1 double mutant background.

A: The pIAA17::GFP in the wer-1 myb23-1 mutant background. B: The pIAA17::IAA17-GFP translational marker in the wer-1 myb23-1 mutant background. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files. Sharpened 50%. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings.
4.5 Is MYB23 patterning auxin response in the root epidermis?

Although no additive effects were observed in the wer-1 myb23-1 double mutant, the auxin response markers were also crossed into the single myb23-1 mutant. As WER expression remains unchanged in both the myb23-1 mutant background and the MYB23 SRDX line, it is possible that MYB23 may be regulating auxin response in the root epidermis independently of WER, and this could not be observed in the wer-1 myb23-1 double mutant because auxin response patterning changes in the wer-1 background were already strong.

Initially myb23-1 was crossed with the pDR5::GFP marker (Figure 4-10 A). In both the wer-1 and wer-1 myb23-1 mutants the patterning of pDR5::GFP alters so that all of the files adopt a higher level of GFP after the transition zone, as is observed in the hair files of wild-type roots. However in the myb23-1 single mutant the expression pattern remains unchanged in comparison to the wild-type and control lines.

To see if MYB23 was patterning ARF10 expression, the ARF10 transcriptional and translational markers were crossed with the myb23-1 mutant (Figure 4-10 B). Fluorescence levels in both the transcriptional and translational makers were lower in the myb23-1 mutant background. In order to assess if the level of fluorescence was significantly lower than the control, the fluorescence for the transcriptional marker was measured using Image J software and corrected for background levels and area. The fluorescence was measured using a circular drawing tool to specifically select the fluorescent nuclei, a minimum of ten were measured at the transition zone on each root, a minimum of ten roots were compared to get the average results. These measurements indicated that the fluorescence level for ARF10 in the myb23-1 background was significantly lower (P<0.005, T-Test) than the control lines (Figure 4-10 C). These results were
consistent with MYB23 positively regulating ARF10 expression in the non-hair files.

Finally the transcriptional marker for IAA17 was crossed into the myb23-1 mutant background (Figure 4-11). No significant changes in the expression pattern were observed in comparison to the wild-type or the control line, indicating that MYB23 is not patterning the expression of IAA17 in the root epidermis.

Although the majority of these auxin response markers remained unchanged in the myb23-1 mutant, results from the ARF10 marker crosses were consistent with MYB23 patterning the expression of ARF10 in the non-hair files of the root epidermis (Figure 4-12).
Figure 4-10: Markers for auxin response in the *myb23-1* mutant background.

A: The *pDR5::GFP* marker remained unchanged in the *myb23-1* background. B/C: Expression of both the ARF10 transcriptional and translational markers in the *myb23-1* background was significantly reduced (T-Test, P<0.005). Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings. Error bars represent standard error values.
Figure 4-11: The transcriptional marker for *IAA17* in the *myb23-1* mutant background.

Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings.
Figure 4-12: MYB23 positively regulates the expression of ARF10.

Results from crossing myb23-1 with transcriptional and translational markers for ARF10 indicated that MYB23 positively regulates the expression of ARF10 in the root epidermis. Solid lines indicate promotion (arrow head) or inhibition (flat head), dashed lines indicate movement in the direction of the arrow head. Letters next to the arrows indicate the published source of the interaction. (a) (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008) (b) (Hassan et al., 2010) (c) (Rishmawi et al., 2014) (d) (Simon et al., 2007) (e) (Kang et al., 2009) (f) (Yi et al., 2010) (g) (Jones et al., 2009) (h) (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996) (i) Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann 2010. (*) indicates interactions identified during this project.
4.6 Is **CAPRICE** patterning auxin response in the root epidermis?

So far the patterning of auxin response in the root epidermis has been studied using the knockout mutants for non-hair promoting components of the epidermal patterning mechanism. **CAPRICE** (*CPC*) is a hair cell promoting component (Schiefelbein *et al.*, 2009). *CPC* is an interesting component of the epidermal patterning mechanism as it is involved in a complex system of lateral inhibition. Whereby it moves between different cell types in the root and negatively regulates the non-hair cell fate (Schellmann *et al.*, 2002; Schiefelbein *et al.*, 2009). The *CPC* gene encodes a nuclear localised R3-type MYB transcription factor which lacks a transactivation domain (Schellmann *et al.*, 2002). Whilst preferentially transcribed in the non-hair and stele cells, *CPC* then accumulates in the nuclei of hair cells (Kang *et al.*, 2013). It is hypothesised that CPC moves between cell types via the plasmodesmata in a tissue specific mode. In 2005 Kurata *et al* identified a single domain within CPC that is necessary for the cell-to-cell movement. Within this domain are the N-terminal region and a section of the MYB domain (Kurata *et al.*, 2005). W76 and M78 in this MYB domain were identified as being critical for targeted transport and W76 in particular is important for CPC nuclear accumulation (Kurata *et al.*, 2005).

*CPC* is positively regulated by WER and MYB23 (Schiefelbein *et al.*, 2009), and itself inhibits *MYB23* expression in a negative feedback loop (Kang *et al.*, 2009). The mutant allele used in this study was *cpc-1*, which is in the *Arabidopsis* Wassilewskija (WS) wild-type background and was first described in 1997 (Wada *et al.*, 1997). The *cpc-1* mutant was isolated from a population of transfer DNA tagged lines, it was selected due to its reduced number of root hairs and named **CAPRICE** due to the irregular distribution of these root hairs (Wada *et al.*, 1997). Although there is a significant reduction in the number of root hairs produced,
those that do grow are ‘normal’ in terms of morphology in comparison to the wild-type (Wada et al., 1997).

In order to see if CPC is patterning auxin response in the root epidermis, the auxin response markers were crossed into the cpc-1 mutant background. Initially the cpc-1 mutant was crossed with the pDR5::GFP marker of auxin signalling output (Figure 4-13 A). In the cpc-1 mutant background, despite the mutant still producing some root hairs, the differential DR5 expression pattern was lost and all of the files adopted a non-hair like expression of pDR5::GFP. In a cpc-1 background expression of pDR5::GFP is initially strong before the transition zone in all of the files, and is then reduced from that point forwards.

When the ARF10 transcriptional and translational markers were crossed into the cpc-1 mutant, ARF10 expression was observed in all of the cell files (Figure 4-13 B). However the level of fluorescence was variable between cells, this was not observed in the control or wild-type backgrounds. Finally the transcriptional and translational markers for the Aux/IAA repressor IAA17 were crossed into the cpc-1 mutant background (Figure 4-14). The expression pattern of IAA17 that is observed in the wild-type and control backgrounds is disrupted in the cpc-1 mutant. Both the transcriptional and translational markers exhibit expression of IAA17 in all the epidermal files around the earlier non-hair cell type patterning position. This is clearer in the transcriptional marker, the translational marker is still disrupted, but not as consistently.

These results were consistent with CPC negatively regulating the repressive auxin response components ARF10 and IAA17 (Figure 4-15).
Figure 4-13: Markers for auxin response crossed into the cpc-1 mutant background.

A: The pDR5::GFP marker of auxin signalling output in the cpc-1 mutant background. B: The transcriptional and translational markers for ARF10 in the cpc-1 mutant background. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings.
Figure 4-14: Transcriptional and translational markers for IAA17 in the cpc-1 mutant.

A: The IAA17 transcriptional marker in the cpc-1 mutant background. B: The IAA17 translational marker in the cpc-1 mutant background. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings.
Figure 4-15: CPC inhibits the expression of ARF10 and IAA17.

Crosses with transcriptional and translational markers for ARF10 and IAA17 indicated that CPC functions to repress ARF10 and IAA17 expression in the root epidermis. Solid lines indicate promotion (arrow head) or inhibition (flat head), dashed lines indicate movement in the direction of the arrow head. Letters next to the arrows indicate the published source of the interaction. (a) (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008) (b) (Hassan et al., 2010) (c) (Rishmawi et al., 2014) (d) (Simon et al., 2007) (e) (Kang et al., 2009) (f) (Yi et al., 2010) (g) (Jones et al., 2009) (h) (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996) (i) Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann 2010. (*) indicates interactions identified during this project.
4.7 How is auxin response patterned in the *cpc-1 try-82* double mutant?

Although the patterning of auxin response is altered in a *cpc-1* mutant the changes were sometimes variable, this could be due to the fact that some of the cells are still producing root hairs. In order to look at the patterning of auxin response in a mutant where no root hairs are produced the *cpc-1 try-82* double mutant was used.

*TRIPTYCHON* (*TRY*) is a homolog of *CPC*, and like *CPC* in addition to having a role in root hair growth it is also a negative regulator of trichome development (Schellmann *et al.*, 2002). Also similar to *CPC*, *TRY* encodes a R3 MYB protein that is missing a domain which activates transcription (Ishida *et al.*, 2007). Within the epidermal patterning mechanism it is proposed that CPC and TRY work to compete for binding with the basic helix-loop-helix transcription factors and thereby inhibit the formation of the non-hair transcription factor complex in the hair cells (Ishida *et al.*, 2007).

The *try-82* mutant allele used in this study is a base substitution that results in a non-sense mutation (Hülskamp *et al.*, 1994). The *cpc-1 try-82* mutant results in a phenotype whereby no root hairs are produced (Schellmann *et al.*, 2002). Interestingly in the shoot this same double mutant results in excessive trichome production (Kellogg, 2001; Ishida *et al.*, 2008).

The makers used to assess auxin response were crossed into this double mutant background (Figure 4-16). As was observed in *cpc-1* single mutant, in the *cpc-1 try-82* double mutant the *pDR5::GFP* marker adopts the wild-type non-hair file expression pattern in all of the cell files.
Expression of the *ARF10* translational and transcriptional markers is observed in all of the epidermal cells, but the strength of the fluorescence signal is more consistent than that which was observed in the *cpc-1* single mutant. In addition to this the *IAA17* translational marker has a less variable starting point, which mirrors that of the non-hair files in the wild-type and control backgrounds (Figure 4-16).

These results are consistent with *CPC* and *TRY* acting redundantly to inhibit the expression of *ARF10* and *IAA17* in the root epidermis (Figure 4-17).
Figure 4-16: Markers of auxin response in the cpc-1 try-82 mutant.

A: The pDR5::GFP marker in the cpc-1 try-82 mutant background. B: The ARF10 transcriptional and translational markers in the cpc-1 try-82 mutant background. C: The IAA17 transcriptional marker in the cpc-1 try-82 mutant background. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files whilst Orange * indicate non-hair files. Photographs: Sharpened 50%, Brightness +40%, Contrast -40%. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings.
Figure 4-17: CPC and TRY act redundantly to inhibit the expression of ARF10 and IAA17

Crosses indicate that CPC and TRY act redundantly to inhibit the expression of ARF10 and IAA17 in the Arabidopsis root epidermis. Solid lines indicate promotion (arrow head) or inhibition (flat head), dashed lines indicate movement in the direction of the arrow head. Letters next to the arrows indicate the published source of the interaction. (a) (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008) (b) (Hassan et al., 2010) (c) (Rishmawi et al., 2014) (d) (Simon et al., 2007) (e) (Kang et al., 2009) (f) (Yi et al., 2010) (g) (Jones et al., 2009) (h) (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996) (i) Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann 2010. (*) indicates interactions identified during this project.
4.8 Discussion

4.8.1 Auxin signalling output

The \textit{pDR5::GFP} marker gives an indication of auxin signalling output. It is constructed of seven auxin response elements driving the expression of a green fluorescent protein (Jones \textit{et al.}, 2009). Within the root epidermis it was initially published that DR5 expression was higher in the non-hair files, but further investigation established that this differential expression is lost around the transition zone and then persists with greater strength in the hair files from that point forward (Figure 1-9). Not only is this of interest, but it is also consistent with the fact that the root hair growth response to auxin must ultimately be affecting hair cells, rather than non-hair cells.

A variety of \textit{pDR5::GFP} expression patterns were observed when this marker was crossed into epidermal patterning mutants with more or fewer root hairs. These are summarised schematically in Figure 4-18. In the mutants where all or none of the cells produced root hairs, all of the files adopted either the hair or non-hair wild-type expression pattern for \textit{pDR5::GFP}, i.e. \textit{wer-1} and \textit{cpc-1 try-82}. These results were consistent with auxin response being patterned by a file being either a hair or non-hair file, dictated by if they do or do not produce a hair rather than their location with regards to the underlying cortex. However in the mutants with more intermediate ectopic root hair phenotypes, i.e. \textit{gl2-1} and \textit{myb23-1}, the overall expression pattern of \textit{pDR5::GFP} remained unchanged, indicating that simply producing a root hair was not sufficient to alter the overall auxin response of a cell or file. The \textit{cpc-1} mutant result was interesting because although all of the files adopted the wild-type non-hair file \textit{pDR5::GFP} expression pattern, it still has distinct hair files which produced fewer, but ‘normal’ root hairs. Overall these results were consistent with the hypothesis that auxin response in the \textit{Arabidopsis} root epidermis, quantified here as auxin
Figure 4-18: A summary of the patterning of auxin signalling output, as indicated by the \( pDR5::GFP \) marker, in a range of epidermal patterning mutants.

Here hair and non-hair files are identified as such due to the majority of the cells producing or not producing root hairs. The mutants with the most obvious phenotypes in which 100% or 0% of epidermal cells produce root hairs, \( \text{wer-1} \) and \( \text{cpc-1 try-82} \) respectively, saw all of the files adopting the expression pattern observed in either the hair or non-hair cells of the wild-type. The intermediate mutants which feature an increase in the amount of ectopic hairs they produce, \( \text{gl2-1} \) and \( \text{myb23-1} \), both retain the wild-type expression pattern of \( pDR5::GFP \). However the \( \text{cpc-1} \) mutant, which produces significantly fewer but ‘normal’ root hairs, adopts the non-hair \( pDR5::GFP \) expression pattern in all of its files.
signalling output, is patterned upstream of GL2, and WER, CPC and TRY are likely to play a role in determining this.

4.8.2 IAA17 expression

Transcriptomic analysis indicated that the Aux/IAA repressor protein IAA17 was expressed at a higher level in the non-hair files. This was also confirmed with transcriptional and translational GFP markers (Figure 1-10). In addition to this IAA17 has been shown to be important for root hair growth as semi dominant domain two stabilising mutations in the axr3-1 mutant result in a significant reduction in root hair production (Leyser et al., 1996; Knox et al., 2003). Although the differential patterning of IAA17 in the root epidermis may appear to be less severe than the obvious changes observed with the ARF10 marker, the eight cell difference between IAA17 expression beginning in the hair and non-hair files may be important for root hair growth.

A variety of expression patterns were observed when markers for IAA17 were crossed into epidermal patterning mutants with more or fewer root hairs. These are summarised schematically in Figure 4-19. As was observed with the pDR5::GFP marker, the mutants with all or no root hairs had the strongest change in expression patterns, with a significant reduction in the number of cells between the starting points of IAA17 expression in the different files. The IAA17 expression began at the same point observed in either the hair or non-hair files of the wild-type, for example in a cpc-1 try-82 double mutant IAA17 expression began early in all of the epidermal files, this corresponded to the same position as where expression begins in the non-hair files of the wild-type and control lines. In the excessively hairy wer-1 mutant IAA17 expression began late, as occurs in the hair files of the wild-type and control lines. Like pDR5::GFP, patterning of IAA17 in the gl2-1 and myb23-1 mutants remained unaltered from that of the wild-type. In cpc-1 there was a significant drop in the differential start point of expression point between the hair and non-hair files, however not as much as was observed in wer-1 and cpc-1 try-82 mutants. These results were
Figure 4-19: A summary of the patterning of IAA17 in the root epidermis.

Here hair and non-hair files are identified as such due to the majority of the cells producing or not producing root hairs. The *wer-1 and cpc-1 try-82* mutants exhibited the strongest loss in terms of differential patterning. In gl2-1 and myb23-1 the patterning of IAA17 remained unchanged whilst *cpc-1* showed a partial but significant reduction in the differential expression. The * indicate a significant difference in comparison to the wild-type (ANOVA, P<0.005). Error bars represent standard error values.
consistent with *IAA17* expression being patterned upstream of *GL2*. As with the *pDR5::GFP* marker it was clear that producing or not producing a root hair was not sufficient to alter *IAA17* expression and results indicated that whilst *CPC* and *TRY* inhibit the early expression of *IAA17* in the root epidermis, *WER* promotes it.

### 4.8.3 ARF10 expression

The role of the repressing ARFs as competitors for binding sites with activating ARFs, adds an additional level of control to the already complex and finely tuned system of auxin response (Lokerse and Weijers, 2009). *ARF10* expression in the root epidermis is differential between the hair and non-hair files, initially this was identified by transcriptomic data and later confirmed with GFP marker lines (Figure 1-11). Expression of the repressing *ARF10* begins early in the non-hair files and is similar to the expression patterns of a lot of the non-hair epidermal patterning components, like *WER* and *GL2* (Kang *et al.*, 2009).

A variety of expression patterns were observed when markers for *ARF10* were crossed into epidermal patterning mutants with more or fewer root hairs. These are summarised schematically in (Figure 4-20). The most obvious changes were observed in the *wer-1* and *cpc-1 try-82* mutants where all or none of the cells had strong *ARF10* expression. Like *pDR5::GFP* and *IAA17* no change was observed in the *gl2-1* mutant, but unlike the previous markers a significant reduction in *ARF10* expression was observed in the *myb23-1* mutant. *ARF10* was also expressed everywhere in a *cpc-1* mutant, however there did appear to be greater variability in expression level between the cells in comparison to the *cpc-1 try-82* double mutant.

These results were consistent with *ARF10* expression being patterned upstream of *GL2*. As with the *pDR5::GFP* and *IAA17* markers producing or not
Here *hair* and *non-hair* files are identified as such due to the majority of the cells producing or not producing root hairs. The mutants with the strongest phenotypes in terms of all or no root hairs exhibited the strongest alteration in ARF10 patterning with all or none of the cells having strong *ARF10* expression. An unexpected result here was the reduction of *ARF10* expression in the *myb23-1* background.
producing a root hair alone was not sufficient to alter ARF10 expression, the results indicated that whilst CPC and TRY inhibit the expression of ARF10, WER and MYB23 promote it.

The results from these crosses indicated that in the root epidermis auxin response, specifically the expression of IAA17 and ARF10 are patterned upstream of the epidermal patterning component GL2. In addition to this they highlighted that producing or not producing a root hair was insufficient to alter the auxin response of an epidermal cell, suggesting that auxin response is not dependent on root hair producing genes. However it is important to keep in mind that the results discussed previously in Chapter 3 indicated that the auxin response profile of a particular epidermal cell or file is likely to some extent to determine the growth of a root hair from that cell.

Finally these crosses indicated that although MYB23 does not regulate pDR5::GFP or IAA17 expression it does significantly promote the expression of ARF10. This result was unusual in that the majority of the other changes observed in auxin response patterning, occurred alongside a change in file identity in terms of producing or not producing a root hair. For example in the wer-1 and wer-1 myb23-1 mutants all of the cells produce root hairs and all of the auxin response patterning mirrors that of a hair file in a wild-type root. However in the myb23-1 background a down-regulation in ARF10 is observed without a switch in cell file identity. To some extent this was also observed in a cpc-1 mutant, where cells adopted the non-hair cell identity in terms of auxin response but still produced some ‘normal’ root hairs.
4.8.4 Cell size

In addition to producing or not producing root hairs epidermal hair and non-hair cells also differ in other aspects, like cell size and cytoplasmic density (Masucci et al., 1996). In a gl2-1 mutant these differences are maintained between the files despite the fact that approximately 50% of the non-hair cells produce root hairs (Masucci et al., 1996). However in other epidermal patterning mutants, particularly those upstream of GL2, published data has suggested that these differences, specifically the cell size is lost (Galway et al., 1994).

During this chapter hair and non-hair cells have been considered in terms of if they do or do not produce a root hair. However in order to see if the changes in the patterning of auxin response may be linked to changes in cell size, the cell sizes of the hair and non-hair cells for each of the mutants were quantified (Figure 4-21).

Confocal microscopy images of the epidermal cells were stained with propidium iodide, which specifically highlights cell walls. Using these images cells sizes in hair and non-hair files were measured. In every mutant studied there was still an obvious difference in cell size between adjacent hair and non-hair files. However the roots do differ in morphology between lines, for example wer-1 has significantly shorter (ANOVA, P<0.005) primary roots, whilst cpc-1 try-82 has significantly longer (ANOVA, P<0.005) primary roots (Supplementary Data Figure 9-4). As the different lines were known to exhibit growth variation, measurements were taken for the first twenty cells counting up from the tip, for both the hair and non-hair files. These were then compared to get the hair to non-hair cell size ratio (Figure 4-21 B).

The calculated ratios indicated that although there was variation in the ratio values between the lines, it was not significantly different from the wild-type in any of the mutants. Indicating that every mutant maintained a difference in cell
Figure 4-21: Cell size differences between hair and non-hair cells in epidermal patterning mutants.

Epidermal hair and non-hair cells differ in size in addition to making or not making a root hair. A: Confocal microscopy indicated that although there are morphological differences between the lines looked at in this study in terms of primary root growth etc, there was still a clear difference in size between the hair and non-hair cells. B: This was quantified by measuring the first twenty hair and non-hair cells and the ratio compared across several roots, indicating that although there was variation in this ratio value between lines, none were significantly different from the wild-type. Photographs: Brightness -20%, Contrast +20%. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings. Error bars represent standard error values.
size between the hair and non-hair, regardless of it they did or did not produce a root hair. Therefore the patterning of auxin response in the root epidermis is likely to be independent of both cell size and of if a cell does or does not produce a root hair.

4.8.5 Summary

The results discussed during this chapter are consistent with auxin response in the root epidermis being patterned upstream of GL2. WER, which promotes the non-hair cell identity, is also likely to promote a higher level of auxin response before the transition zone, early expression of IAA17 and high ARF10 expression in the non-hair cells. Conversely CPC and TRY, which promote the hair cell identity, are likely to promote higher auxin response after the transition zone, late expression of IAA17 and inhibit the expression of ARF10.

MYB23 is an interesting as although it does not appears to have an impact on the overall auxin response patterning as indicated by pDR5::GFP, or the patterning of IAA17, it does significantly promote the expression of ARF10.

Finally the cell size data indicates that the changes observed in auxin patterning are occurring independently of changes in epidermal cell size. Overall these crosses indicate that key members of the epidermal patterning mechanism are patterning auxin response in the root epidermis, by either direct or indirect regulation of certain members of the auxin response network, including but probably not limited to IAA17 and ARF10 (Figure 4-22).
Figure 4-22: A summary of interactions brought about by the crossing of these epidermal mutants with markers of auxin response.

Epidermal patterning components that promote the non-hair fate upstream of GL2 also promote the negative auxin response regime in the root epidermis. On the other hand, epidermal patterning components that promote the hair fate upstream of GL2 repress this repressive auxin response regime. MYB23 is an interesting exception to this as whilst it does not affect IAA17 or pDR5::GFP expression is does positively regulate the expression of ARF10 in the non-hair files. Solid lines indicate promotion (arrow head) or inhibition (flat head), dashed lines indicate movement in the direction of the arrow head. Letters next to the arrows indicate the published source of the interaction. (a) (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008) (b) (Hassan et al., 2010) (c) (Rishmawi et al., 2014) (d) (Simon et al., 2007) (e) (Kang et al., 2009) (f) (Yi et al., 2010) (g) (Jones et al., 2009) (h) (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996) (i) Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann 2010. (*) indicates interactions identified during this project.
5: Establishing Feedback Loops and Direct Links between the Epidermal Patterning Mechanism and the Auxin response network
5.1 Introduction

The results detailed so far have been consistent with the hypothesis that the repressive auxin response regime in the non-hair files might contribute to the repression of root hair growth at the non-hair position. In addition to this, crosses between mutants and marker lines discussed in the previous chapter, indicated that this differential auxin response is patterned by components of the epidermal patterning mechanism upstream of GL2. In this chapter feedback loops between the auxin response network and the epidermal patterning mechanism are investigated. In addition to this potential direct links between the two pathways are explored further.

5.2 Does WER or MYB23 bind to the ARF10 promoter?

A range of transcription factors direct the non-hair cell fate, these include the TTG1 WD repeat protein, GL3 and EGL3 which are basic helix-loop-helix transcription factors, the GL2 homeodomain leucine zipper transcription factor and the WER and MYB23 MYB type transcription factors (Bruex et al., 2012). Results discussed in the previous chapter indicated that the MYB type transcription factors, WER and potentially MYB23, promote the expression of ARF10. In order to assess if this regulation involves a direct interaction, the ARF10 promoter was analysed for potential MYB binding sites. In order to identify these, confirmed interactions between WER, MYB23 and other epidermal patterning components were considered, one of these was CPC. CPC transcription is reduced in wer-1 mutants, suggesting an interaction between the two, and in 2005 Koshino-Kimura et al identified two putative MYB binding sites in the CPC promoter, which they termed CPCMBS1 (CTCCAACT) and CPCMBS2 (ACAACCGGC) (Figure 5-1 A). Base substitutions in these sites resulted in the loss of GUS expression in the CPC reporter lines, thus indicating their importance for CPC transcription in the non-hair cells of the root epidermis.
(Koshino-Kimura et al., 2005). They also examined two putative MYB binding sites in the GL2 promoter, GL2MSB1 and GL2MSB2 (Figure 5-1 A). As a result of their analysis they identified the following octameric sequence, C(C/T)AACNG, as a WER binding consensus sequence (Koshino-Kimura et al., 2005). Their conclusions were supported by the fact that this proposed consensus sequence was similar to other previously reported MYB binding sites, including those for the maize P1 protein CC(T/A)ACC (Grotewold et al., 1994; Williams and Grotewold, 1997) and the vertebrate MYB protein v-MYB (T/A)AACGG (Howe and Watson, 1991; Weston, 1992).

Another group identified two other putative MYB binding sites in the CPC promoter, called WBSI and WBSII (Figure 5-1 B) (Ryu et al, 2005). One of these was located nearer to the CPC ATG, than the binding sites described by Koshino-Kimura et al, and the other encompassed the CPCMBS1 site. Interestingly using in vitro assays they concluded that WER had much stronger affinity for the earlier binding site, WBSI, and proposed ANNNGTTN as a potential WER binding sequence. However Koshino-Kimura et al also produced promoter truncation lines, which identified a region that did not contain the WSB1 site as important for CPC expression in the root epidermis (Figure 5-2). These truncations ranged from -1252 to -394 base pairs (Figure 5-2 A), and produced a range of GUS expression patterns. The truncations with promoters larger than -681 base pairs had GUS staining in the non-hair epidermal cells, stele and trichomes but with shorter fragments, i.e -492 base pairs, staining in the epidermis was lost near the root tip. In promoters with -423 base pairs or less, GUS staining was only observed in the stele (Koshino-Kimura et al., 2005). Using this data they concluded that the region between -492 and -681 base pairs of the CPC promoter was required for CPC transcription in the early stages of the root epidermis, specifically a 69 base pair region between -492 and -423 base pairs was required for transcription in the non-hair cells, Figure 5-2 B (Koshino-Kimura et al., 2005).
Figure 5-1: Published WER binding sites.

A: MYB binding sites identified in the promoter regions of CPC and GL2. Derived from (Koshino-Kimura et al., 2005). Upon analysis of these binding sites a consensus sequence was constructed, C(C/T)AACNG. B: Alternative MYB binding sites (highlighted in yellow) identified in the CPC promoter by Ryu et al., 2005. They also identified a WER binding sequence, ANNGTTTN. (Diagrams are not to scale).
Figure 5-2: Promoter truncation analysis. 

A: Several promoter truncation lines were reported by Koshino-Kimura et al. These ranged from 1252 bp to 394 bp. B: Lines featuring these truncations identified a 69 base pair region between -492 bp and -423 bp, which is required for epidermis specific transcription of CPC in the non-hair cells. This 69 base pair region does not include the WBS1 binding site identified by Ryu et al.
In order to confirm the function of this 69 base pair region an eight fold tandem repeat was fused to a 35S promoter to drive the reporter gene GUS, this line resulted in GUS staining in the non-hair cells. In addition to this when the same promoter was fused to the CPC coding region it complemented the cpc-1 mutant phenotype (Koshino-Kimura et al., 2005).

Based on these studies, 4500 base pairs of promoter sequence upstream of the ARF10 gene translational start were analysed for potential MYB binding sites (Figure 5-3). The sequence was searched for several alternative binding sites and those identified included: the same MYB binding site sequence identified in the GL2 promoter, similar to the WBSI binding site and also the CPCMB1S1/2 binding sites, matching the Koshino-Kimura consensus sequence and finally matching the Ryu et al binding sequence. From this analysis several potential binding sites were established and two particular regions of interest (termed A and B) due to overlapping matches from different sources were identified (Figure 5-3). A exhibited the same sequence as the MYB binding site in the GL2 promoter and was also similar to the CPCMBs binding sites, whilst B had the same sequence as the MYB binding site in the GL2 promoter and matched the Koshino-Kimura consensus sequence. These points were concluded to be those most likely to interact with WER. Interestingly Kang et al, published a paper in 2009 where using the WSBI and CPCMBs binding sites they identified four WER binding sites (WBSI-L1, WBSI/II-L1, WBSII-L1 and WBSII-L2) within the MYB23 gene promoter. These potential binding sites were confirmed using electrophoretic mobility shift assays (EMSA) and are located -1130, -630, -570 and -430 base pairs upstream of the MYB23 translation start (Kang et al., 2009). In addition to this, using EMSA they also confirmed that MYB23 specifically binds to all four of these binding sites in the same manner as WER, indicating that the potential binding sites identified in the ARF10 promoter may also interact with either of the MYB proteins (Kang et al., 2009). In order to assess the importance of these potential binding sites Chromatin Immunoprecipitation (ChIP) and ARF10 promoter truncation analysis was performed.
Figure 5-3: Potential MYB binding sites within the *ARF10* promoter.

Analysis highlighted two regions (A and B) where separate sources identified potential MYB binding sites, indicating that the chance of MYB transcription factors binding there was strong.
5.2.1 Chromatin immunoprecipitation

To further investigate the potential for direct interactions between the *ARF10* promoter and the WER and/or MYB23 proteins, ChIP analysis was carried out. This was done using the pWER::WER-GFP translational marker line that was readily available.

Using the previously identified potential MYB binding sites (Figure 5-3), in addition to data published on MYB binding sites in the *GL2* promoter (Figure 5-1), primers were designed with the aid of Dr Martin Kieffer. These primers encompassed the potential MYB binding sites in the *ARF10* promoter (Figure 5-4 A) and the published binding site GL2MBS2 in the *GL2* promoter to act as a positive control (Figure 5-4 B).

Analysis of the ChIP samples via qPCR, was unable to detect evidence of ARF10 promoter binding activity (Figure 5-5). In order to further investigate this interaction ARF10 promoter truncation lines were also produced.
Figure 5-4: Primer location for ChIP analysis of the \textit{ARF10} promoter.

A: Primer pairs were designed to encompass the previously identified potential MYB binding sites in the \textit{ARF10} promoter, Figure 5-3. The design and the subsequent RT-qPCR analysis were carried out with the help of Dr Martin Kieffer. B: Using published data primers were also designed for the \textit{GL2} promoter to be used as a positive control of \textit{WER} binding.
Figure 5-5: ChIP analysis of the ARF10 promoter.

Various primer pairs were tested as detailed in Figure 5-4 A. The fold change was relative to control primer pair H. These results indicated no evidence of ARF10 promoter binding activity. Error bars represent standard error values.
5.2.2 ARF10 promoter truncations

Three ARF10 promoter truncation constructs were made using the pGTJ01 vector following the Invitrogen® GATEWAY® approach. Starting from the 2078 base pair promoter sequence that was used to construct the \( pARF10::ARF10-GFP \) line, the largest truncation, truncation 1, encompassed both of the predicted binding sites A and B. Truncation 2 encompassed only binding site B alone, whilst the final truncation, truncation 3 omitted both A and B (Figure 5-6 A).

Analysis of these promoter truncation lines indicated that the differential expression of ARF10 in the hair and non-hair cells of the root epidermis persisted in all of the lines (Figure 5-6 B). Thus indicating that the potential MYB binding sites A and B are unlikely to be of importance for ARF10 expression in the root epidermis, regardless of if they do or do not interact with either WER and/or MYB23. An additional interesting pattern of expression observed was in the smallest truncation line, truncation 3, ARF10 expression was lost at the very tip of the root epidermis (Figure 5-6 C).

These results were consistent with the first 710 base pairs of the ARF10 promoter being important for the differential expression of ARF10 in the late root epidermis development. Unfortunately the ChIP analysis did not confirm or dismiss the hypothesis that the positive regulation of ARF10 by WER and MYB23 was direct. A reliable homozygote line for \( pMYB23::MYB23-GFP \) was not produced before the submission of this thesis, however the ChIP analysis will be performed as soon as sufficient homozygous seed is obtained.
Figure 5-6: ARF10 promoter truncation analysis.

A: Promoter truncations were generated to include both, A and B, B alone or neither A or B, potential MYB binding sites in the ARF10 promoter. B: All of the truncation lines retained their differential hair/non-hair expression patterns. C: The smallest truncation, Truncation 3, did lose ARF10 expression in the tip of the epidermis. Photographs:
5.3 **Do feedback loops exist between the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network?**

It was not possible to establish if there was a direct interaction between *ARF10*, *MYB23* and *WER*. Results detailed in the previous chapter indicated that epidermal patterning components upstream of *GL2*, pattern both auxin response, and the auxin response network members in the root epidermis. In particular the expression of *ARF10* is promoted by two non-hair inducing epidermal patterning components, *WER* and *MYB23*, and inhibited by two hair cell promoting components, *CPC* and *TRY*.

Multiple feedback loops are apparent in both the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network. For example, in the auxin response network whilst the majority of the Aux/IAA proteins are degraded in an auxin dependent manner, for many, like IAA17, their expression is also up-regulated by auxin treatment, thus resulting in a feedback loop that enables tight regulation of this pathway (Ouellet *et al*., 2001; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010; Kieffer *et al*., 2010).

The epidermal patterning mechanism in particular is heavily dependent on feedback loops, for example *MYB23* is involved in both positive and negative feedback loops (Kang *et al*., 2009). Whilst *MYB23* promotes the expression of *CPC*, in turn *CPC* represses the expression of *MYB23*, thereby creating a negative feedback loop (Kang *et al*., 2009). In contrast to this *MYB23* promotes
the expression of itself, thereby forming a positive feedback loop (Kang et al., 2009).

5.3.1 Do ARF10 and/or ARF16 regulate WER expression?

In order to assess possible feedback regulation between the auxin response network and the epidermal patterning mechanism, transcriptional and translational markers for WER were crossed into the arf10-3 arf16-2 double mutant (Figure 5-7). WER was selected because there was a loss of ARF10 expression in the wer-1 background and it is upstream of GL2, which is where interactions were observed in the previous crosses.

The arf10-3 arf16-2 double loss of function mutant encompasses two repressing ARFs within the same clade (Finet et al., 2013). In this clade, ARF10 and ARF16, along with ARF17 all share high amino acid sequence similarities and all contain an additional stretch of amino acids in the DNA binding domain (Wang et al., 2005). The arf10-3 arf16-2 double mutant was used in this study because of the known genetic redundancy in Arabidopsis implying a functional redundancy (Wang et al., 2005). Both the arf10-3 and arf16-2 mutants carry T-DNA insertions, the double mutant exhibits a severely agravitropic phenotype (Wang et al., 2005). In addition to this a high number of ectopic root hairs are observed (Figure 5-7 B).

In the arf10-3 arf16-2 mutant background the expression level of the pWER::GFP transcriptional marker was significantly reduced (T-Test, P<0.005) (Figure 5-7 C). This result indicates that in addition to WER positively regulating ARF10 (Figure 4-3), ARF10 and/or ARF16 are positively regulating WER expression in the root epidermis (Figure 5-8). These results are consistent with ARF10 and WER being part of a positive feedback loop. This result was confirmed by analysis of the
pWER::WER-GFP translational marker in the arf10-3 arf16-2 double mutant background (Figure 5-9). Again the fluorescence level was significantly reduced in this background (T-Test, P<0.005) (Figure 5-9 B).

Figure 5-7: Expression of the transcriptional marker for WER in the arf10-3 arf16-2 mutant background.

A: pWER::GFP expression in the arf10-3 arf16-2 background. B: In the arf10-3 arf16-2 mutant background the epidermal patterning is abnormal, root hair cells arise in adjacent files and a large frequency of ectopic root hairs are observed. C: The fluorescence level for the pWER::GFP line in the arf10-3 arf16-2 mutant background is significantly lower (T-TEST, P<0.005) than the control. pWER::GFP was measured in the transition zone. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files, Orange * indicate non-hair files, Blue * indicate that the file identity is unclear. Photographs: Sharpened 50%, Brightness +40%, Contrast -20%. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings. Error bars represent standard error values.
Figure 5-8: **ARF10 and/or ARF16 promote the expression of WER.**

Analysis of the \( pWER::GFP \) and \( pWER::WER-GFP \) markers in the \( arf10-3 \ arf16-2 \) double mutant indicated that **ARF10 and/or ARF16 promote the expression of WER.** Solid lines indicate promotion (arrow head) or inhibition (flat head), dashed lines indicate movement in the direction of the arrow head. Letters next to the arrows indicate the published source of the interaction. (a) (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008) (b) (Hassan et al., 2010) (c) (Rishmawi et al., 2014) (d) (Simon et al., 2007) (e) (Kang et al., 2009) (f) (Yi et al., 2010) (g) (Jones et al., 2009) (h) (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996) (i) Tomas and Perrot-Rechenmann 2010. (*) indicates interactions identified during this project.
Figure 5-9: The translational marker for WER in the *arf10-3 arf16-2* background.

The translational marker for WER crossed into the *arf10-3 arf16-2* mutant background is weaker, and the differential expression between the files is lost. A: *pWER::WER-GFP* expression in the *arf10-3 arf16-2* mutant background. B: The fluorescence level in the *arf10-3 arf16-2* mutant was significantly lower than the control (T-Test, P<0.05). Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files, Orange * indicate non-hair files, Blue * indicate that the file identity is unclear. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings. Error bars represent standard error values.
In the cross involving the translational fusion marker it was also apparent that the differential expression of WER, which in the wild-type is preferentially expressed in the non-hair cells, was lost in the arf10-3 arf16-2 mutant. This indicates a potential role for ARF10 and ARF16 in epidermal patterning.

5.3.3 Do ARF10 and/or ARF16 regulate GL2 expression?

Thus far all of the interactions between the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network has been restricted to those occurring upstream of GL2; In order to check if ARF10 also regulates GL2 expression, the pGL2::GFP marker was crossed into the arf10-3 arf16-2 mutant (Figure 5-10).

The fluorescence level of pGL2::GFP was significantly reduced in the arf10-3 arf16-2 mutant background (Figure 5-10 C). Indicating that ARF10 is a positive regulator of GL2 expression, this is likely to be via effects on WER expression (Figure 5-11 A). In addition to this, as observed with the WER marker, it was also clear that the differential pGL2::GFP expression in the non-hair files is lost (Figure 5-10 B).

5.3.4 Do ARF10 and/or ARF16 regulate MYB23 expression?

RT-qPCR analysis carried out by Dr Martin Kieffer confirmed that WER and GL2 expression levels are significantly reduced in the arf10-3 arf16-2 double mutant background, Supplementary Data (Figure 9-5). Interestingly this data also indicated that MYB23 expression levels are significantly increased in an arf10-3 arf16-2 mutant. A result that is consistent with ARF10 and/or ARF16 repressing MYB23 expression (Figure 5-11 B).
Figure 5-10: Expression of pGL2::GFP in the arf10-3 arf16-2 mutant background.

A: The transcriptional maker pGL2::GFP crossed into the arf10-3 arf16-2 mutant background. B: In the arf10-3 arf16-2 mutant background the differential expression of GL2 is lost. C: The expression of pGL2::GFP in the arf10-3 arf16-2 mutant background is significantly lower (T-TEST, P<0.005) than the control. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. White * indicate hair files, Orange * indicate non-hair files, Blue * indicate that the file identity is unclear. Photographs: Brightness +40%, Contrast -20%. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings. Error bars represent standard error values.
Figure 5-11: *ARF10* and/or *ARF16* promote the expression of *GL2* and inhibit the expression of *MYB23*.

A: Analysis of the pGL2::GFP marker in the *arf10-3 arf16-2* mutant indicated that *ARF10* and/or *ARF16* promote the expression of *GL2*. B: RT-qPCR data also indicated that *ARF0* and/or *ARF16* down-regulate *MYB23* expression. Solid lines indicate promotion (arrow head) or inhibition (flat head), dashed lines indicate movement in the direction of the arrow head. Letters next to the arrows indicate the published source of the interaction. (a) (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008) (b) (Hassan et al., 2010) (c) (Rishmawi et al., 2014) (d) (Simon et al., 2007) (e) (Kang et al., 2009) (f) (Yi et al., 2010) (g) (Jones et al., 2009) (h) (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996) (i) Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann 2010. (*) indicates interactions identified during this project.
5.4 Does ARF10 directly bind to the MYB23 promoter?

Results thus far have indicated that both WER and MYB23 are part of a feedback loop with ARF10 and/or ARF16. Whilst WER and MYB23 both promote the expression of ARF10, ARF10 and/or ARF16 promote the expression of WER, forming a positive feedback loop, and inhibit the expression of MYB23, thereby forming a negative feedback loop. In order to assess if this negative regulation of MYB23 is direct, the promoter region of MYB23 was analysed for Auxin Response Elements (AuxRE’s). AuxREs have been characterised by various sequences, including, TGTCNC, TGTCGG and TGTCNN (Tiwari et al., 2003; Guilfoyle and Hagen, 2007; Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010). Analysis of the MYB23 promoter region indicated several potential AuxRE’s. Primers were designed to encompass these potential AuxRE binding sites and ChIP assays carried out using the pARF10::ARF10-GFP marker line (Figure 5-12 A). The ChIP assay indicated there was no evidence of promoter binding activity (Figure 5-12 B).
Figure 5-12: ChIP analysis of the *MYB23* promoter.

A: Primers were designed to encompass the potential AuxRE's in the *MYB23* promoter. B: Fold change enrichment relative to control DNA region E. These results show no evidence of ARF10 promoter binding.
5.5 Discussion

The results presented in this chapter indicated that ARF10 and/or ARF16 promote and inhibit the expression of several epidermal patterning mechanism components, thereby facilitating the formation of both positive and negative feedback loops between these two important aspects of plant growth (Figure 5-13).

Despite a well-designed experiment, due to the positive control failing to show any evidence of promoter binding activity, it was not possible to reliably conclude if there was or was not a direct interaction between the components in the ChIP assays. However results from the promoter truncation assays were consistent with the first 710 base pairs of the ARF10 promoter being important for the differential expression of ARF10 in the root epidermis.

A reliable homozygote line for pMYB23::MYB23-GFP was not produced before the submission of this thesis, however ChIP analysis will be performed as soon as sufficient homozygous seed is obtained.

Future work including; further promoter truncations, a more reliable positive control and ChIP analysis of the pMYB23::MYB23-GFP marker line, would give a better understanding of the direct and/or indirect nature of the regulation between these epidermal patterning mechanism and auxin response network members.
Figure 5-13: Interactions identified during this chapter.

A: A summary of the interactions discussed and identified in this chapter. B: The positive (green) and negative (red) feedback loops identified during this chapter. Solid lines indicate promotion (arrow head) or inhibition (flat head), dashed lines indicate movement in the direction of the arrow head. Letters next to the arrows indicate the published source of the interaction. (a) (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008) (b) (Hassan et al., 2010) (c) (Rishmawi et al., 2014) (d) (Simon et al., 2007) (e) (Kang et al., 2009) (f) (Yi et al., 2010) (g) (Jones et al., 2009) (h) (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996) (i) Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann 2010. (*) indicates interactions identified during this project.
6 The Role of the Auxin Mediated Down-Regulation of *GL2* and *MYB23* on Root Hair Growth
6.1 Introduction

Before this project began microarray data indicated that two epidermal patterning components, GL2 and MYB23, are down-regulated by auxin treatment. During the course of this project this was confirmed by Dr Martin Kieffer using RT-qPCR assays (Supplementary Data Figure 9-5). The functional significance of auxin-mediated down-regulation of GL2 and MYB23 on root hair growth is not clear. Whilst GL2's role in the production of root hairs has long been well established, MYB23 affecting root hair growth hasn't been previously considered.

GL2 functions primarily in the non-hair cells and downstream of the epidermal patterning components WER and CPC. GL2 encodes a homeodomain leucine-zipper transcription factor protein, and negatively regulates key root hair growth related genes like RHD6 (Bruex et al., 2012). Downstream of GL2, proteins controlling cell wall biosynthesis, cytoskeletal activities and production and trafficking of extracellular material influence later morphogenesis events in the epidermal cells (Bruex et al., 2012).

MYB23's role appears to be very different. Via positive regulation of its own promoter, MYB23 is proposed to stabilise the epidermal establishment of hair and non-hair cells (Figure 1-7) (Kang et al., 2009). In addition to this whilst the gl2-1 knockout mutant results in excessive root hair production, the myb23-1 knock out mutant results in only a small increase in ectopic root hairs (Figure 3-1). Thus indicating that a significant role for MYB23 in root hair growth may be unlikely (Kang et al., 2009). As it has long been established that auxin plays an important role in root hair growth, the impact of the down-regulation of these two epidermal patterning components was considered further.

6.2 Further clarification of auxin down-regulation of epidermal patterning components
In order to clarify this apparent regulation of GL2 and MYB23 further, visualisation of the proposed auxin down-regulation was carried out using the pGL2::GFP marker. The pGL2::GFP marker was treated with auxin and PEO-IAA, an auxin antagonist (Figure 6-1) (Hayashi et al., 2008). A significant decrease (ANOVA, P<0.005) in fluorescence was observed when treated with auxin and a significant increase (ANOVA, P<0.005) when treated with PEO-IAA. The existing microarray and RT-qPCR data measured mRNA whilst the pGL2::GFP marker measured promoter activity, thus indicating that auxin is not regulating GL2 expression in a post transcriptional manner.

6.2.1 Does auxin down-regulate GL2 and MYB23 independently of one another?

Having further clarified this relationship, experiments were carried out to establish if GL2 was down-regulated independently of MYB23. GL2 expression is located downstream of the epidermal patterning mechanism and therefore downstream of MYB23. In order to establish if GL2 expression was decreased as a result of MYB23 levels decreasing, the pGL2::GFP marker was crossed into the myb23-1 mutant (Figure 6-2).

In the myb23-1 mutant background the fluorescence pattern of pGL2::GFP does not differ significantly from that observed in the wild-type (Figure 6-2 B). This result is consistent with transcriptomic data published by Kang et al, 2009, which shows no significant change in GL2 transcript levels in a myb23-1 mutant background. In addition, when treated with auxin the pGL2::GFP fluorescence level in the myb23-1 mutant is still significantly reduced (ANOVA, P<0.005) (Figure 6-2 B). Indicating that auxin down regulates GL2 and MYB23, at least partly, independently of one another (Figure 6-3).
Figure 6-1: *pGL2::GFP* marker treated with IAA and PEO-IAA.

The *pGL2::GFP* marker was treated with 0.1 μM IAA and 0.1 μM PEO-IAA. See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings. Scale bars are labelled accordingly.
Figure 6-2: Analysis of the pGL2::GFP marker in the myb23-1 background.

The pGL2::GFP marker was crossed into the myb23-1 mutant background. A: The clear differential pattern of pGL2::GFP between the hair and non-hair files was retained in the myb23-1 background. B: Measured fluorescent levels with and without auxin treatment indicated a significant decrease in the pGL2::GFP myb23-1 line when it was treated with auxin (ANOVA, P<0.005). See 2.4 Confocal Microscopy for microscope settings. Error bars represent standard error values. Scale bars are labelled accordingly.
Analysis of the pGL2::GFP marker in both the wild-type and myb23-1 mutant backgrounds indicated that auxin down-regulates MYB23 and GL2 independently of one another. Solid lines indicate promotion (arrow head) or inhibition (flat head), dashed lines indicate movement in the direction of the arrow head. Letters next to the arrows indicate the published source of the interaction. (a) (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008) (b) (Hassan et al., 2010) (c) (Rishmawi et al., 2014) (d) (Simon et al., 2007) (e) (Kang et al., 2009) (f) (Yi et al., 2010) (g) (Jones et al., 2009) (h) (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996) (i) Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann 2010. (*) indicates interactions identified during this project.
6.3 Does MYB23 and/or GL2 down-regulation by auxin affect root hair initiation?

Adding auxin to a wild-type plant does not result in increased root hair initiation. The non-hair cell is very resistant to auxin and other repression mechanisms may hide the effect of a reduction in MYB23 and/or GL2 transcript. Therefore to assess if the down-regulation of MYB23 or GL2 by auxin could increase root hair initiation an epidermal patterning system, which was already compromised and highly favouring the non-hair cell fate was selected. The cpc-1 and cpc-1 try-82 mutants, producing fewer or no root hairs respectively, were treated with auxin (Figure 6-4).

When these non-hair favouring mutants were treated with 0.01 µM of auxin no significant increase in root hair production was observed (Figure 6-4 A). Initially the auxin concentration was kept low to avoid any significant changes in the primary root length, (Alarcón et al., 2014), which can affect the reliability of root hair density measurements (Figure 6-4 B). To assess if no response was observed because the auxin concentration was too low, both the cpc-1 and cpc-1 try-82 mutants were then grown on increasing auxin concentrations up to a final concentration of 1 µM IAA (Figure 6-4 C). Again no significant change in root hair density was observed in either background. These results were consistent with the down-regulation of GL2 and MYB23 in these backgrounds being insufficient to result in increased root hair production.
Figure 6-4: Analysis of root hairs in the *cpc-1* and *cpc-1 try-82* mutants.

A: No significant change in root hair density was observed when the *cpc-1* and *cpc-1 try-82* mutants were treated with auxin. B: No significant change in primary root length was observed upon treatment with low concentrations of auxin. The primary root length was measured to assess if increases in density may be due to a shortening of the primary root. C: The *cpc-1* and *cpc-1 try-82* double mutants were treated with higher concentrations of auxin, none of the treatments resulted in any root hair density increases. D: Regardless of increasing auxin concentrations the *cpc-1 try-82* double mutant did not produce any root hairs. Photographs: Sharpened 50%, Brightness +40%, Contrast +20%. Error bars represent standard error values. Scale bars are labelled accordingly.
6.3.1 *Does auxin down-regulation of MYB23 in the gl2-1 mutant have an effect on root hair initiation?*

The experiments above indicated that down-regulation of *MYB23* and/or *GL2* by auxin did not result in increased root hair production in a mutant background where the hair cell identity was compromised. In order to assess if the down-regulation of *MYB23* can result in increased root hair production in a mutant where the non-hair cell identity is compromised, the *gl2-1* knockout mutant was used (Figure 6-5).

In the *gl2-1* mutant approximately 50% of non-hair cells produce root hairs, meaning there is still the potential for further increase (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996). As the *gl2-1* knockout does not result in 100% root hair production, as is observed in the *wer-1* mutant, it is logical to assume that other factors may also be controlling root hair initiation. Although the down-regulation of *MYB23* and/or *GL2* in the hairless mutants was insufficient to result in increased root hair production, it was hypothesised that in a system which was already compromised in terms of hair production a different result may be observed.

The root hair density of the *gl2-1* mutant was observed consistently and reproducibly to significantly increase by approximately 12 root hairs per 500 \( \mu \text{m} \) on plants treated with auxin. As with the previous assay the auxin concentration was kept low in order to avoid any significant shortening of the primary root (Figure 6-5). Whilst it is reasonable to hypothesise that this increase in root hair density could be due to the down-regulation of *MYB23*, it was also possible that the changes could be caused by a disruption of the auxin response machinery. To test this hypothesis the *pARF10::GFP, gl2-1* and *pIAA17::GFP, gl2-1* lines initially discussed in Chapter 3, were treated with auxin in order to assess if any significant changes in expression patterns or levels was observed (Figure6-6).
A small but significant increase in root hair density was observed in the gl2-1 mutant when it was treated with auxin (ANOVA, P<0.005). There was no significant change in primary root length, therefore the significant increase in root hair density was due to the production of more root hairs, rather than a shortening of the primary root. Error bars represent standard error values.

Figure 6-5: Root hair density in the gl2-1 mutant.
Figure 6-6: Changes in ARF10 and IAA17 expression in the gl2-1 mutant when treated with auxin.

When treated with auxin a significant increase (ANOVA, P<0.005) in fluorescence was observed in the pIAA17::GFP marker in both the wild-type (not pictured) and the gl2-1 mutant background. No significant changes were observed in ARF10 fluorescence in the gl2-1 mutant background when treated with auxin. Error bars represent standard error values. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. Significant differences in data sets are indicated by different letters.
When treated with auxin a significant increase (ANOVA, P<0.005) in the fluorescence level for the IAA17 marker was observed in the gl2-1 mutant background, a response consistent with published data (Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010). In addition to this, no significant change in the expression level of ARF10 was observed in the gl2-1 mutant when it was treated with auxin. As the auxin response machinery in gl2-1 did not differ significantly from that of the wild-type, these results were consistent with the hypothesis that altered ARF10 or IAA17 expression in the gl2-1 mutant due to auxin treatment was not a factor in this small but significant increase in root hair density.

6.3.2 Root hair initiation in the myb23-1 gl2-1 double mutant

In order to confirm if this increase in root hair density was due to the down-regulation of MYB23 by auxin, the myb23-1 gl2-1 double mutant was created by crossing the two single mutant lines together (Figure 6-7). When treated with auxin the myb23-1 gl2-1 double mutant did not exhibit the significant increase in root hair density that was observed in the gl2-1 single mutant. A result consistent with the hypothesis that the down-regulation of MYB23 by auxin plays a role in root hair initiation, thus indicating the possibly of a parallel pathway to GL2.
Figure 6-7: Analysis of root hairs in the gl2-1 myb23-1 double mutant.

The gl2-1 myb23-1 double mutant did not exhibit the significant increase in root hair density when treated with auxin that was observed in the gl2-1 single mutant (ANOVA, $P<0.005$). Error bars represent standard error values. * Indicates a significant difference between the two identified data sets before and after auxin treatment.
6.4 Does MYB23 and/or GL2 down-regulation by auxin affect root hair elongation?

During this project all of the epidermal patterning mutants and some AUX1 mutants were assessed for auxin responsiveness in several ways, these included primary root length and root hair elongation (Supplementary Data Figure 9-4). During these assays it was found that some of the mutants had root hairs that elongated more in response to auxin treatment, whilst others had root hairs that elongated less (Figure 6-8). For example the wer-1 and myb23-1 mutants had root hairs that elongated significantly more (ANOVA, P<0.005) than the wild-type, whilst the root hairs in cpc-1 elongated significantly less (ANOVA, P<0.005). The gl2-1 mutant had an average root hair length that was significantly shorter than the wild-type without auxin treatment, previously discussed in Chapter 3 (Figure 3-6), but this was not significantly different from the wild-type after treatment with 0.1 µM IAA.

The possibility that the mutants with more hair cells may be more responsive to auxin was considered. However this idea was quickly dismissed as repeated assays indicated that the myb23-1 mutant consistently and reproducibly displayed one of the strongest increased elongation phenotypes, despite retaining the majority of its non-hair cells (Kang et al., 2009). In addition to this, there is no immediate logical reason to expect the auxin responsiveness of hair cells to be affected by neighbouring non-hair cells. Therefore other differences in the mutant backgrounds were considered.

As both the myb23-1 and wer-1 mutants had root hairs that consistently elongated more in response to auxin treatment than the wild-type, and it is well documented that these two components work closely to promote the non-hair cell fate, relative transcript levels of these two components were considered in
When treated with 0.1 μM of auxin wer-1 and myb23-1 elongated significantly more than the wild-type (WT) (ANOVA, P<0.005), whilst the root hairs in the cpc-1 mutant elongated significantly less than the wild-type (T-Test, P<0.005). Previously the gl2-1 mutant has been shown to have a population of shorter root hairs that do not elongate in response to auxin, however with 0.1 μM IAA treatment the average root hair length is not considered to be significantly different to the wild-type, although a broader standard error value was observed. * Indicate significant differences between mutant and wild-type lines after treatment with 0.1 μM IAA. Error bars represent standard error values.
all of the affected backgrounds. In 2009 Kang et al confirmed that whilst WER levels are significantly reduced in the wer-1 mutant they were not significantly changed in the myb23-1 single mutant, thus indicating that WER expression is unlikely to be affecting root hair elongation in this instance. However in both the wer-1 and myb23-1 backgrounds, they found that the MYB23 transcript level was significantly reduced. In addition to that, in the cpc-1 mutant, where the root hairs elongate significantly less than the wild-type, the MYB23 transcript level is 156% of that observed in the wild-type (Kang et al., 2009). These data indicated a potential role for MYB23 in root hair elongation in response to auxin treatment; a hypothesis further strengthened by previous results showing that auxin down-regulation of MYB23 has a significant role in root hair initiation.

6.4.1 Does blocking down-regulation of MYB23 by auxin have an impact on root hair elongation?

Using the pWER::MYB23 construct in the wer-1 line, originally published and kindly supplied by Professor John Schiefelbein (Table 2-1), the effect of blocking the auxin transcriptional down-regulation of MYB23 could be examined (Figure 6-9). The microarray data analysed before this project, indicated that auxin’s effect on WER expression is minimal (Supplementary Data Figure 9-5). Therefore by driving MYB23 from the WER promoter some of auxin’s repression of MYB23 expression was removed. Confirmation that the protein was functional came from the rescue of the wer-1 hairy root phenotype, a result that had been previously reported (Kang et al, 2009).

When the auxin repression of MYB23 transcription was reduced, root hair elongation in response to auxin was significantly reduced in comparison to the wild-type Arabidopsis line Colombia (ANOVA, P<0.005) (Figure 6-9). Without auxin treatment there was
Driving the MYB23 protein from the *WER* promoter blocks the down-regulation of *MYB23* by auxin. Under these conditions root hairs in the *pWER::MYB23, wer-1* line were still able to elongate significantly (ANOVA, *P* < 0.005) compared to root hairs with no auxin treatment but this elongation was significantly less (ANOVA, *P* < 0.005) than the wild-type. Photographs: Sharpened 50%, Contrast -40%. Error bars represent standard error values. Scale bars are labelled accordingly. Different letters indicate a significant difference between data sets.
no significant difference in root hair length between the mutant line and the wild-type. Although these results were consistent with the hypothesis that the auxin down-regulation of *MYB23* may be affecting root hair elongation, a further possibility with this line was that by driving *MYB23* from the *WER* promoter it was being expressed in the hair cells at a much higher level than it usually would. Given that *MYB23* is known to promote the non-hair cell fate, this ectopic expression of *MYB23* in the hair cells, may be affecting root hair growth in general, rather than by blocking any auxin mediated down-regulation.

6.4.2 *Is the ectopic expression of MYB23 in the hair cells affecting root hair elongation in response to auxin?*

In order to establish if blocking the auxin down-regulation of *MYB23*, or the ectopic expression of *MYB23* in the hair cells, was responsible for the reduced root hair elongation response, two new constructs were produced, *pEXP7::MYB23* and *pCOBL9::MYB23* (Figure 6-10). The *EXPANSIN7* (*EXP7)* and *COBRA LIKE 9* (*COBL9*) promoters were chosen because of their specific expression in the hair cells of the root epidermis (Cho, 2002; Jones *et al.*, 2006; Schiefelbein *et al.*, 2009). In addition to this whilst *COBL9* is down-regulated by auxin treatment, *EXP7* is up-regulated (Supplementary Data Figure 9-5). This experiment addressed three questions. Firstly does ectopic expression of *MYB23* in the hair cells affect root hair growth? Secondly if *MYB23* is up-regulated by auxin how does this affect root hair elongation? Finally if *MYB23* is down-regulated by auxin how does this affect root hair elongation?

With no auxin treatment the root hairs in both the *pEXP7::MYB23* and *pCOBL9::MYB23* lines are significantly shorter (ANOVA, P<0.005) than those observed in the wild-type (Figure 6-10 A/B). This was observed consistently across multiple homozygote lines selected for both constructs. This result is
consistent with ectopic expression of *MYB23* in the hair cells resulting in reduced root hair growth.

Furthermore when the *pEXP7::MYB23* line was treated with auxin, therefore up-regulating the *MYB23* transcription, the root hairs did elongate significantly more compared to untreated plants, but they were still significantly shorter than the root hairs observed in the wild-type. In comparison to this when the *pCOBL9::MYB23* line was treated with auxin and therefore MYB23 expression was down-regulated, the root hairs elongated to a length that was not significantly different to the wild-type (Figure 6-10 B). These results were consistent with auxin down-regulation of *MYB23* playing a role in root hair elongation in response to auxin.
Figure 6-10: Root hair phenotypes in the pCOBL9::MYB23 and pEXP7::MYB23 constructs.

A: Without auxin treatment root hairs in the pEXP7::MYB23 line are significantly shorter (ANOVA, P<0.005) than the wild-type. Although the root hairs in the pEXP7::MYB23 lines do elongate in response to auxin treatment, they are still significantly shorter than the wild-type (ANOVA, P<0.005). B: Without auxin treatment root hairs in the pCOBL9::MYB23 line are significantly shorter (ANOVA, P<0.005) than the wild-type. When treated with auxin the root hairs in the pCOBL9::MYB23 lines elongate to a length that is not significantly different to the wild-type (ANOVA, P<0.005). Different letters indicate a significance difference between data sets. Photographs: Sharpened 50%, Brightness +20%. Error bars represent standard error values. Scale bars are labelled accordingly.
6.5 Discussion

Analysis of the pGL2::GFP marker in the myb23-1 mutant background indicated that GL2 and MYB23 are down-regulated by auxin independently of one another. Whilst this down-regulation was insufficient to result in increased root hair production in the cpc-1 or cpc-1 try-82 mutants, a significant increase in root hair density was observed in the gl2-1 mutant. Published data indicates that in the cpc-1 mutant background the MYB23 transcript level may be as high as 156% of that observed in the wild-type, potentially indicating why an increase in root hair production in this mutant was not observed (Kang et al., 2009).

6.5.1 The role of MYB23 on root hair initiation

The hypothesis that the down-regulation of MYB23 is playing a role in root hair initiation is consistent with a number of published results. The small but significant increase in root hair density observed in the gl2-1 mutant when treated with auxin was consistent with the small but significant increase in ectopic root hairs observed in a myb23-1 mutant (Kang et al., 2009). In addition to this whilst the cpc-1 mutant has around 21% of the hairs observed in a wild-type line, in the cpc-1 myb23-1 double mutant root hair initiation is partially rescued, with the phenotype developing 40% of the hairs observed in the wild-type (Kang et al., 2009).

Two dominant negative forms of MYB23, which utilise the modified repressor domain of SUPERMAN (SRDX; LDLDLELRLGFA) in frame to the 3’ end of the MYB23 coding region: pMYB23::MYB23SRDX produced by Kang et al., 2009 and p35S::MYB23SRDX produced by Matsui et al., 2005, both resulted in root hairs being produced from all of the epidermal cells. Interestingly expression of MYB23 from the cauliflower mosaic virus (CaMV) 35S promoter, which is published to result in expression of the associated gene everywhere, resulted in little change in root hair density in comparison to the wild-type, indicating that
potentially the location of MYB23 expression may not play an important role in root hair initiation (Kirik et al., 2001; Kang et al., 2009). This was further supported by subsequent analysis of the pEXP7::MYB23 line, which promoted up to a 30 fold increase in MYB23 expression in the hair cells, but did not result in a significant change in root hair density in comparison to the wild-type (Supplementary Data Figure 9-8).

6.5.2 Root hair elongation

Some of the epidermal patterning mutants had root hairs that elongated significantly more, or significantly less than the wild-type. Whilst wer-1 and myb23-1 elongated significantly more in response to auxin treatment, cpc-1 and a population of root hairs in the gl2-1 mutant elongated significantly less. When auxin down-regulation of MYB23 was blocked in the pWER::MYB23 wer-1 line, root hair elongation in response to auxin treatment was significantly reduced.

The results discussed during this chapter were consistent with several hypotheses; firstly that auxin down-regulation of MYB23 has the potential to play a role in both root hair initiation and elongation. Root hair elongation in response to auxin treatment was significantly reduced in both the pWER::MYB23 wer-1 line, which is not down regulated by auxin, and the pEXP7::MYB23 line, which is up-regulated by auxin. In addition to this root hair elongation in response to auxin treatment was strong in the pCOBL9::MYB23 line, whose promoter induces down-regulation of MYB23 by auxin. Secondly these results indicated that the ectopic expression of MYB23 in the hair cells does not have a significant impact on root hair initiation, but does result in significantly shorter root hairs in comparison to the wild-type with no auxin treatment.

Interestingly these shorter root hairs were not observed in the pWER::MYB23 wer-1 line. This could be due to the fact that in the hair cells WER expression is
subject to significant inhibition from the cortex layer via SCM. In comparison both COBL9 and EXP7 are actively promoted in the hair cells. Therefore MYB23 expression may be much higher in the hair cells in these two constructs. If this is the case it is interesting that the pWER::MYB23 wer-1 line still has significantly reduced root hair elongation in response to auxin treatment in the hair cells, even if potentially it is not expressed there. Indicating that MYB23 may mediate this response from the non-hair cells position, maybe via promotion or inhibition of a component that can travel between the two cells types? Considering the results discussed in previous chapters a potential candidate for this may be ARF10.

6.5.3 The role of MYB23 on root hair elongation

In order to assess if loss of MYB23 expression alone was sufficient to restore root hair elongation in the mutants where a significant reduction in elongation in response to auxin treatment occurred, single mutants were crossed to create the cpc-1 myb23-1 and gl2-1 myb23-1 double mutants.

Analysis of the double cpc-1 myb23-1 mutant indicated that although the root hair density was partially rescued, a result consistent with data previously published by Kang et al, 2009, the root hair elongation in response to auxin treatment was not (Figure 6-11). Analysis of the gl2-1 myb23-1 double mutant indicated that the distinct population of short root hairs observed in the gl2-1 single mutant was lost (Figure 6-12). In addition to this all of the root hairs in the gl2-1 myb23-1 double mutant were able to elongate normally, with no significant difference from the wild-type in response to auxin treatment. These results indicated that removing MYB23 expression alone was insufficient to fully rescue the reduced root hair elongation in response to auxin treatment phenotype.
The results presented during this chapter have indicated a role for auxin mediated regulation of \textit{MYB23} expression in both root hair initiation and elongation.
Figure 6-11: Analysis of the *cpc-1 myb23-1* double mutant.

The *cpc-1 myb23-1* mutant partially rescues the single *cpc-1* hair loss phenotype. However it does not rescue the reduced root hair elongation in response to auxin treatment. Photographs: Sharpened 50%, Brightness +20%, Contrast +20%. Error bars represent standard error values. Different letters indicate a significant difference between data sets (ANOVA, P<0.005). Scale bars are labelled accordingly.
Figure 6-12: Analysis of root hair length in the gl2-1 myb23-1 double mutant.

Unlike the gl2-1 single mutant (Figure 3-6), the gl2-1 myb23-1 double mutant does not possess a population of shorter root hairs that do not elongate as much as the wild-type in response to auxin. In addition to this the gl2-1 myb23-1 double mutant does not have significantly more shorter root hairs than the wild-type. Photographs: Sharpened 50%, Brightness +20%, Contrast +20%. Scale bars are labelled accordingly.
7 : General Discussion
During this project the root epidermis of the model species Arabidopsis was used to develop our understanding of auxin’s role in the developmental patterning and growth of root hairs. According to data published before this project began, the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network were seen as two independent components of development (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996). However the data presented in this thesis have shown that the transcription factor networks mediating epidermal patterning and auxin response interact at multiple levels (Figure 7-1).

7.1.1 The functional significance of the repressive auxin response regime in the non-hair cells

Research carried out in the Kepinski lab before this project began introduced the concept of a differential auxin response between the hair and non-hair cells of the root epidermis, with differentiating hair cells having a greater inherent capacity to respond to auxin. This contrasts with published data highlighting differential auxin transport between the hair and non-hair files of the root epidermis, which suggested auxin response was higher in the meristematic non-hair cells (Jones et al., 2009). Here, the identification and detailed analysis of ARF10 and IAA17 expression patterns revealed an apparent repressive auxin response regime in non-hair cells, which is consistent with the data on auxin responsiveness from both Jones et al., 2009 and the Kepinski lab.

Investigation of the functional significance of this repressive auxin response regime in the non-hair cells was carried out using the gl2-1 loss of function mutant (Koornneef, 1981; Ohashi et al., 2003). The concept of auxin and the root epidermal patterning mechanism working together was first considered by Masucci et al in 1996. Their paper concluded that auxin response and the epidermal patterning mechanism were two independent aspects of plant growth, and that auxin acts downstream of the non-hair promoting component GL2 (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996). A combination of background data and data
collected during this project has indicated that this view is too simplistic. In order to clarify the relationship between these two mechanisms and place the spatial control of auxin response in the current knowledge of the epidermal patterning mechanism, the auxin response marker lines were crossed with several epidermal patterning mutants. By crossing the \textit{gl2-1} mutant with auxin response markers it was possible to confirm that the repressive auxin response regime was still functional in the non-hair cells, despite up to 50\% of them producing root hairs (Masucci \textit{et al.}, 1996). Subsequent root hair analysis indicated that the \textit{gl2-1} mutant had significantly more shorter root hairs, and these shorter root hairs were those produced by the non-hair cells (Figure 3-3). Treatment with the synthetic auxin NAA and the naturally occurring auxin IAA, showed that the \textit{gl2-1} mutant also had a population of root hairs that were less responsive to auxin, (Figure 3-5). These results were consistent with the repressive auxin response regime in the non-hair cells functioning as part of the mechanism that restricts root hair growth. This result was further corroborated by the analysis of the \textit{gl2-1 arf10-3 arf16-2} triple mutant (Figure 3-8). The disruption of these key repressing ARFs in conjunction with the \textit{gl2-1} mutation, resulted in all of the root hairs elongating, without auxin treatment, to a length that was not significantly different from the wild-type. In addition to this all of the root hairs elongated significantly in response to auxin treatment.

When considering these results it was important to keep in mind the \textit{arf10-3 arf16-2} double mutant phenotype. The double mutant is severely agravitropic and the root tip is misshaped, therefore analysis of these mutants on media is challenging (Wang \textit{et al.}, 2005). In addition to this analysis of the \textit{pGL2::GFP arf10-3 arf16-2} line (Figure 5-10) highlighted that the hair and non-hair patterning of the epidermal cells is disrupted. Another important factor to consider is that the \textit{gl2-1 arf10-3 arf16-2} triple mutant produces significantly fewer root hairs than the \textit{gl2-1} single mutant (Supplementary Data Figure 9-7 B). It is therefore possible that the excessive short root hair production in this background was lost because in the triple mutant there is less ectopic root hair production overall. Although the triple mutant does have significantly fewer
Figure 7-1: A summary of the interactions identified between the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network during this project.

Solid lines indicate promotion (arrow head) or inhibition (flat head), dashed lines indicate movement in the direction of the arrow head. Letters next to the arrows indicate the published source of the interaction. (a) (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008) (b) (Hassan et al., 2010) (c) (Rishmawi et al., 2014) (d) (Simon et al., 2007) (e) (Kang et al., 2009) (f) (Yi et al., 2010) (g) (Jones et al., 2009) (h) (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996) (i) Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann 2010. (*) indicates interactions identified during this project.
ectopic root hairs than \textit{gl2-1}, it still has significantly more than both the wild-type and the \textit{arf10-3 arf16-2} double mutant (Supplementary Data Figure 9-7 A). Whilst these data indicate that the triple mutant is still producing ectopic root hairs, the fact that the epidermal patterning is disrupted, means that although root hairs may appear ectopic, i.e. produced in a non-hair cell position, the cell identity may be essentially ‘hair’ in terms of all but position. In order to clarify the hair cell identity under these circumstances the use of a marker like \textit{pGL2::GFP} would be informative. Unfortunately in an \textit{arf10-3 arf16-2} mutant background the expression of this marker is significantly reduced (Figure 5-10), therefore although visualisation on the confocal microscope is possible, analysis with the GFP microscope suitable for collecting root hair data would be very challenging.

With regards to the repressive auxin response regime functioning as part of the mechanism that inhibits root hair growth, the results presented in Chapter 3 were consistent with this hypothesis. Considered alone data from the \textit{gl2-1 arf10-3 arf16-2} triple mutant could not reliably indicate a role for the repressing auxin response regime in root hair growth. However, when considered in conjunction with additional data detailed in subsequent chapters, for example, the significant decrease in root hair elongation in response to auxin in mutants with more \textit{ARF10} present (Figure 6-8), and the lack of root hair elongation when \textit{ARF10} is expressed ectopically in the hair cells (Supplementary Data Figure 9-6), a strong argument for the repressing ARFs playing an important role in root hair growth repression in the non-hair cells is evident. Potential for the repressing auxin response regime functioning in parallel to \textit{GL2} is also apparent.

7.1.2 \textit{Spatial control of auxin response in the epidermal patterning mechanism}
To analyse further the position of the auxin response repression regime in relation to the epidermal patterning mechanism, several auxin response maker lines were crossed into epidermal patterning mutants.

Crossing epidermal patterning mutants with the pDR5::GFP marker gave an indication of auxin signalling output, (Figure 4-18). In the wild-type the pDR5::GFP expression pattern initially begins stronger in the non-hair files, at the transition zone the fluorescence level evens out across all of the files and then persists with greater strength in the hair files. In mutants where all or none of the cells produced root hairs, all of the files adopted either the hair or non-hair wild-type pDR5::GFP pattern. These results initially appeared to be consistent with auxin response being patterned by a file being either a hair or non-hair file, dictated by if they did or did not produce root hairs. However as was discussed in Chapter 3, in the gl2-1 mutant, which produces root hairs from approximately 50% of it’s non-hair cells, the expression pattern of pDR5::GFP remains unchanged (Figure 3-2). This was also true of the myb23-1 background discussed in Chapter 4 (Figure 4-10). This indicates that the production of a root hair does not alter the overall auxin response of a cell or file. Expression of pDR5::GFP in the cpc-1 mutant was also interesting, although all of the files adopted the wild-type non-hair file pDR5::GFP expression pattern, this line retains distinct hair files which produce root hairs. Indicating an apparent uncoupling of DR5 patterning and root hair production.

A range of expression patterns were also observed when the transcriptional and translational IAA17 markers were crossed into the same epidermal patterning mutants. In summary, the expression of IAA17 in these backgrounds mirrored the changes observed in the pDR5::GFP marker. The mutants producing all hair or all non-hair cells lost the differential start point of IAA17 expression, and expression began in all of the files at a point either corresponding to the wild-type hair or non-hair file position, (Figure 4-19). Expression in myb23-1 and gl2-1 again did not differ significantly from the wild-type or control lines, but a slight variability in the starting position of IAA17 expression was observed in the cpc-1
mutant. These results were consistent with WER promoting the early expression of IAA17 in the root epidermal cell files, and CPC and TRY inhibiting it.

Analysis of the ARF10 transcriptional and translational markers in these epidermal patterning mutants indicated that ARF10 expression was almost completely lost in mutants with all hair cells, and expressed in all of the epidermal cells in mutants with no hair cells, (Figure 4-20). In the gl2-1 mutant the expression did not differ significantly from the wild-type, and although ARF10 was expressed in all of the cells in the cpc-1 mutant, the expression level was variable between cells. One of the most interesting results from this marker was the cross with the myb23-1 mutant, which indicated a significant reduction in ARF10 expression in this background, (Figure 4-12). These results were consistent with ARF10 expression being promoted by WER and MYB23, and inhibited by CPC and TRY.

Analysis of these markers in the myb23-1 and cpc-1 mutant backgrounds indicated that expression of repressive auxin response components like ARF10, could be up or down-regulated in the root epidermis without a switch in cell identity. However results discussed subsequently in Chapter 6 highlighted that this does have an impact on root hair elongation.

Quantification of the epidermal cell size in all of the epidermal mutant backgrounds, indicated that the ratio of hair to non-hair cell size did not differ significantly from the wild-type (Figure 4-21). Therefore the patterning of auxin response in the root epidermis is likely to be independent of both cell size and of if a cell does or does not produce a root hair.

The results from these crosses were consistent with auxin response, specifically the expression of IAA17 and ARF10, being patterned upstream of the epidermal patterning component GL2, but downstream of WER and CPC. WER, which
promotes the non-hair cell identity, also promotes the repressive auxin response regime in the root epidermis. As WER is primarily expressed in the non-hair files, this is consistent with the repressive auxin response regime also being present there. Conversely CPC and TRY, which promote the hair cell identity, inhibit the expression of the repressive auxin response components like IAA17 and ARF10. Mutants with the more intermediate phenotypes indicated that the relationship between auxin response and epidermal cell type can be complex, and that the production of hairs from cells at non-hair positions is not always accompanied by a reduction in auxin response repression at that location and vice versa.

7.1.3 Feedback loops and direct links between the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network

Positive and negative feedback loops are common in both the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network. For example, the expression of the activating ARF, ARF19, is itself up-regulated by auxin while the auxin-induced expression of Aux/IAA repressor proteins creates a negative feedback loop thereby enforcing tight regulation of auxin-induced gene expression (Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010; Kieffer et al., 2010). Within the epidermal patterning mechanism MYB23 promotes the expression of CPC, whilst CPC inhibits the expression of MYB23 (Kang et al., 2009). MYB23 also promotes the expression of itself and WER, thereby forming two positive feedback loops (Kang et al., 2009).

In order to establish if feedback regulation exists between the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network, GFP markers for WER and GL2 were crossed into the arf10-3 arf16-2 double mutant, (Figure 5-9 / 5-10). These crosses indicated that in this background both WER and GL2 expression was significantly reduced, a result which implies that ARF10 and/or
ARF16 may be promoting the expression of WER and GL2. Whilst this interaction, taken in conjunction with the wer-1 pARF10-GFP cross result discussed in Chapter 4 (Figure 4-1) was consistent with a positive feedback loop existing between ARF10 and WER, the relationship between ARF10 and GL2 was more unexpected, as relationships identified previously had all occurred upstream of GL2.

The interactions initially identified in these genetic experiments were later confirmed by a RT-qPCR analysis of GL2 and WER expression in the arf10-3 arf16-2 double mutant carried out with Dr Martin Kieffer (Supplementary Data Figure 9-5). This experiment also revealed a possible negative feedback loop between ARF10, ARF16 and MYB23. A result that will be investigated further upon completion of a pMYB23::MYB23-GFP marker line, by introducing it in the arf10-3 arf16-2 background.

Taken together with the genetic data presented in Chapter 4, the results reported in Chapter 5 support the idea that feedback loops between the auxin response network and the epidermal patterning mechanism might contribute to the control for developmental patterning and auxin response in the root epidermis. In order to establish if this control was achieved via direct interactions between the auxin response network and epidermal patterning mechanism components, ChIP and promoter truncation analysis was carried out. Initially ChIP analysis was carried out using the pWER::WER-GFP translational marker, to see if WER bound directly to any of the potential MYB binding sites identified in the ARF10 promoter. This assay was unable to detect any promoter binding activity, (Figure 5-5). There were several potential reasons this may have occurred. Firstly, there is the possibility that WER does not bind directly to the ARF10 promoter. Secondly, since the GL2 positive control did not show enrichment following pWER::WER:GFP ChIP, it is possible that there were technical problems with the assay or else, the published data about the MYB binding sites in the GL2 promoter may be incorrect. Thirdly, it is also possible that assays were focused on the wrong region of the ARF10 promoter. Subsequent analysis of a number of
different ARF10 promoter truncation lines indicated that the first 710 base pairs in the promoter region were sufficient to drive expression of *ARF10* in the root epidermis, (Figure 5-6) the majority of the ChIP assays were focused upstream of this region. Finally, it is also possible that MYB23 binds to some of the identified MYB binding sites while WER does not. In order to test this interaction the *pMYB23::MYB23-GFP* marker was also produced during this project. Unfortunately a reliable homozygote line was not generated before the submission of this thesis, however ChIP analysis will be performed as soon as sufficient homozygous seed is obtained.

Analysis of the *myb23-1 pARF10::GFP* cross in Chapter 4 indicated that *MYB23* may promote the expression of *ARF10*, and the RT-qPCR data indicated that *ARF10* and/or *ARF16* may inhibit the expression of *MYB23*. Therefore the *MYB23* promoter was analysed for potential AuxREs and ChIP analysis was carried out using the *pARF10::ARF10-GFP* translational marker. As with the previous ChIP assays there was no evidence of direct promoter binding, (Figure 5-12) indicating that the ChIP assay may not be functioning correctly or *ARF10* may regulate the expression of *MYB23* indirectly. A number of results support this latter hypothesis: the disruption of the hair and non-hair cell epidermal patterning in the *arf10-3 arf16-2* double mutant, may result in the function of other epidermal patterning components that would usually repress *MYB23* expression, like *CPC*, being disrupted. Further support for this hypothesis is evident in the *cpc-1* mutant, where strong *ARF10* expression was observed in every epidermal cell, (Figure 4-13) however there is also a significant increase in *MYB23* transcript levels (Kang *et al.*, 2009). Thus indicating that CPC is likely to be regulating *MYB23* expression independently of ARF10, and potentially more significantly than *ARF10*. Another apparent paradox arises in the idea that *MYB23* might be directly regulated by a repressing ARF while also being down-regulated in response to auxin treatment (Figure 6-3). If ARF10 is binding directly to the *MYB23* promoter then this down-regulation by auxin could be achieved via an up-regulation of the repressive *ARF10*, however observations from assays during this project have not found any evidence of a regulation of *ARF10* expression by auxin.
Overall the results presented in Chapter 5 indicated that whilst positive and negative feedback loops are apparent between the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network, the specific interactions occurring in order to achieve these relationships are complex. Further clarification could be achieved via analysis of \( pMYB23::MYB23\text{-GFP} \) ChIP assays, production of additional promoter truncation lines within the first 710 base pair region of the \( ARF10 \) promoter and identification of putative intermediate components that facilitate the complex relationship between \( MYB23, ARF10 \) and auxin using yeast two hybrid studies. Whilst to some extent inconclusive, the results detailed during Chapter 5 highlighted that the complex and tight regulation observed individually within the auxin response network and the epidermal patterning mechanism extends beyond these to link these two important aspects of plant growth together.

### 7.1.4 Auxin mediated down-regulation of GL2 and MYB23

Analysis of the \( pGL2::GFP \) marker in the \( myb23-1 \) mutant background indicated that \( GL2 \) and \( MYB23 \) are down-regulated by auxin independently of one another, (Figure 6-2). Results indicated that the down-regulation of \( MYB23 \) was important for both root hair initiation and elongation.

Treatment of the \( gl2-1 \) mutant with auxin resulted in a small but significant increase in root hair density, a result which was not observed in the \( gl2-1\ myb23-1 \) double mutant, (Figure 6-5 / 6-7). This indicates that the down-regulation of \( MYB23 \) by auxin may play a role in root hair initiation. Published data supports the hypothesis of a role for \( MYB23 \) in root hair initiation. In a \( cpc-1\ myb23-1 \) double mutant the reduced root hair phenotype is partially restored, and in the dominant negative \( MYB23\text{-SRDX} \) lines, root hairs are produced from every epidermal cell (Matsui et al., 2005; Kang et al., 2009). Interestingly, ectopic
expression of MYB23 in the p35S::MYB23 and pEXP7::MYB23 lines did not result in significant changes in root hair density in comparison to the wild-type, indicating that ectopic expression of MYB23 does not significantly impact root hair initiation (Supplementary Data Figure 9-8), (Kirik et al., 2001).

Root hair elongation in response to auxin treatment was significantly reduced by expressing MYB23 from promoters that were not down-regulated by auxin. Expressing MYB23 ectopically in the hair cells resulted in two phenotypes. Firstly, without auxin treatment the root hairs in these constructs were significantly shorter than the wild-type, (Figure 6-10). This phenotype persisted in changing environmental conditions, such as alterations in temperature and humidity (Supplementary Data Figure 9-10). Although the root hairs were able to elongate in response to these conditions they were always significantly shorter than the wild-type. These results were consistent with MYB23 functioning to inhibit root hair elongation in the hair cells without auxin treatment.

Secondly when treated with auxin, in lines where MYB23 was up-regulated by auxin (pEXP7::MYB23,) root hair elongation was significantly less than in the wild-type, and in lines where MYB23 was down-regulated by auxin (pCOBL9::MYB23,) root hair elongation did not differ significantly from the wild-type, (Figure 6-10). These results are consistent with the idea that the down-regulation of MYB23 by auxin is playing an important role in root hair elongation in response to increased auxin levels.

Interestingly the shorter root hairs observed in both the pEXP7::MYB23 and pCOBL9::MYB23 constructs without auxin treatment, were not observed in the pWER::MYB23 wer-1 line, despite the root hair elongation in response to auxin also being inhibited, (Figure 6-9). This could be due to the fact that in the hair cells WER expression is subject to significant inhibition from the cortex layer via SCM. In comparison both COBL9 and EXP7 are actively promoted. Therefore MYB23 expression in the hair cells could be higher in these two constructs. If this
is the case it is interesting that the pWER::MYB23 wer-1 line still has significantly reduced root hair elongation in response to auxin treatment in the hair cells, since it may not be expressed in these cells. This result highlighted the concept that MYB23 may be able to mediate this reduced elongation in response to auxin treatment from the non-hair cell position, via promotion or inhibition of a component that can travel between the two cell types. Considering the results discussed in previous chapters a potential candidate for this is ARF10.

The myb23-1, pARF10::GFP cross discussed in Chapter 4 (Figure 4-10) indicated that MYB23 promotes the expression of ARF10. ARF10 is a key component of the repressive auxin response regime present in the non-hair cells and results discussed in Chapter 3 indicated that this repressive auxin response regime functions as part of the mechanism that restricts root hair growth. The key indicators of this were the populations of short ectopic root hairs and less responsive to auxin root hairs, observed in the gl2-1 mutant (Figure 3-3). This can be compared to the short root hair phenotype observed when MYB23 was expressed ectopically in the hair cells using the EXP7 and COBL9 promoters. In the gl2-1 mutant when some of the repressive auxin response regime was alleviated in the gl2-1 arf10-3 arf16-2 triple mutant these short root hairs were lost, (Figure 3-8). The same phenotype was observed in the gl2-1 myb23-1 double mutant (Figure 6-7), a result consistent with this potential relationship between ARF10 and MYB23 functioning to repress root hair growth.

In addition to ARF10 playing a role in root hair growth without auxin treatment, in the epidermal patterning mutants, which have root hairs that elongate significantly more or less than the wild-type in response to auxin treatment, they also have a corresponding high or low level of ARF10 expression. For example myb23-1 elongates significantly more than the wild-type (Figure 6-8) and has significantly lower levels of ARF10 expression (Figure 4-10). Whilst cpc-1 elongates significantly less than the wild-type (Figure 6-8) but has significantly more ARF10 expression (Figure 4-13). In addition to this the arf10-3 arf16-2
mutant also has root hairs that elongate significantly more than the wild-type in response to auxin treatment (Figure 3-9).

Considered together, these results indicate that there is potential for MYB23 and ARF10 to be working together to regulate root hair elongation both with and without auxin treatment. However, RT-qPCR analysis has indicated that ARF10 and ARF16 expression are not significantly up-regulated in the pEXP7::MYB23 construct (Supplementary Data Figure 9-11). Therefore the short root hairs observed in the pEXP7::MYB23 and pCOBL9::MYB23 constructs are not likely to be due to an increase in ARF10 levels in the hair cells. This indicates that these root hair are likely to be subject to a different mechanism of regulation, in comparison to the short root hairs observed in the gl2-1 mutant.

Overall these results demonstrate the existence of two new mechanisms of root hair growth regulation in addition the established pathway acting via GL2. The work presented here has highlighted the complex regulation mechanism of root hair growth upstream of GL2 which involves members of the auxin response network. Although a simple pathway in which MYB23 regulates root hair growth via promotion of ARF10 must be considered, the fact that root hair elongation is not restored in the cpc-1 myb23-1 double mutant, and without auxin treatment the cpc-1 single mutant has root hairs that grow to a length that do not differ significantly from the wild-type despite having high MYB23 and ARF10 levels indicates that the regulation at work here is complex and still not fully understood.

7.2 Conclusions

The aim of this project was to define the link between developmental patterning and auxin response in the Arabidopsis thaliana root epidermis. The root epidermis was used as a model to understand the interaction of patterning
mechanisms, such as those that define the hair and non-hair producing epidermal cells, and auxin. Having established the presence of a putative repressive auxin response regime in the non-hair cells of the root epidermis, analysis of the *gl2-1* mutant allowed us to further understand the functional significance of this repressive response regime. Data from the *gl2-1 arf10-3 arf16-2* triple mutant, the *gl2-1 myb23-1* double mutant, and analysis of the pCOBL9::ARF10 line, supported the hypothesis that the repressive auxin response regime in the non-hair files functions as part of the control mechanism for root hair growth. These results were consistent with *ARF10* and/or *ARF16* functioning to restrict root hair growth.

Subsequent analysis of crosses between mutants and markers for both the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network, indicated a complex relationship of promotion and inhibition between these two key components of plant growth. Positive and negative feedback loops between these two mechanisms were identified and the patterning of auxin response was placed upstream of *GL2*, with non-hair promoting components like *WER* and *MYB23* promoting and reinforcing the repressive auxin response regime present in the non-hair files.

The analysis of a potential differential auxin response between different epidermal patterning mutants, indicated a relationship between the presence of *ARF10, MYB23* and the ability of root hairs to elongate both with and without auxin treatment. This identified a previously unknown mechanism whereby auxin mediated root hair elongation, occurs to some extent via the auxin mediated down-regulation of the epidermal patterning mechanism component, *MYB23*.

The data presented during this thesis has been consistent with the relationship between the auxin response network and the epidermal patterning mechanism being much more complex than was originally thought. It has highlighted two additional potential mechanisms of control for root hair growth, via *MYB23* and
ARF10, potentially both working together and independently, in addition to the known pathway downstream of GL2. The fact that the gl2-1 mutant only has 50% of its non-hair cells producing root hairs, indicates that the suppression of hair growth at the non-hair position depends upon more than the regulation of GL2 levels. The results discussed here have shed light on what is an incredibly complex, robust, and tightly regulated system of control, which almost certainly also encompass components downstream of GL2 such as RHD6 and RSL4, which are also regulated by auxin (Yi et al., 2010). In addition to this the versatility of the root epidermis in terms of response to other phytohormones, nutrients, environmental conditions and different species hasn’t yet been considered, thus there is broad scope for this area of research to expand further, (Savage et al., 2013; Kazan, 2013; Marzec et al., 2014; Tominaga-Wada and Wada, 2014; Cheng et al., 2014; Bishopp and Bennett, 2014).

The results presented in this thesis have increased our understanding of auxin’s role in the developmental patterning of the root epidermis. It is now apparent that the relationship is much more complex than the originally proposed hypothesis of auxin functioning solely downstream of GL2 (Figure 7-2). Whilst the cell type of a root epidermal cell is patterned by components of the epidermal patterning mechanism, the results presented during this thesis have indicated that this is reinforced via interactions with members of the auxin response network. For example, the positive feedback loop between WER and ARF10 promote both the non-hair cell fate and the repressive auxin response regime present in this cell type. Whilst WER functions to promote GL2 thus inhibiting root hair growth, the repressive auxin response regime functions to inhibit root hair growth via ARF10. ARF10 in turn also promotes GL2 expression in addition to inhibiting root hair growth independently of GL2. This level of complexity indicates the tight regulation of root hair growth and hints at how the root epidermis may be able to achieve such a range of plasticity when responding to environmental conditions such as nutrient shortage (Farquharson, 2008).
Auxin-mediated root hair elongation functioning via the down-regulation of MYB23 has highlighted a potentially novel role for an epidermal patterning component as a regulator of hair growth per se. In addition to this, the results presented have shed further light on the potential functions of repressing ARFs, the regulatory roles of which are still is not fully understood (Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann, 2010; Overvoorde et al., 2010; Del Bianco and Kepinski, 2011).

Published data indicated WER as the primary controller of the non-hair cell identity, with GL2 functioning to inhibit the growth of root hairs after the cell fate decision had been made, and MYB23 playing a minor role in patterning stabilisation via its positive feedback loops (Kang et al., 2009). ARF10 hadn’t been previously considered in any non-hair cell identity or root hair growth role. However the results presented during this thesis have highlighted that establishment of the non-hair cell identity is likely to occur via the parallel and co-ordinated action of WER, MYB23, ARF10 and GL2. They have also indicated the potential for these components to control root hair development at different time points and possibly other developmental aspects like cell size and vacuolation.
The results presented during this thesis have identified multiple interactions between components of the epidermal patterning mechanism and the auxin response network. Epidermal patterning components that promote the non-hair cell fate, for example *WER* and *MYB23*, also promote the expression of repressive auxin response components such as *IAA17* and *ARF10*. Conversely components that promote the hair cell fate, like *CPC* and *TRY* inhibit the expression of *IAA17* and *ARF10*. Overall, the data presented demonstrates a much more complex relationship between these two important regulatory systems in plant growth than was previously thought. Solid lines indicate promotion (arrow head) or inhibition (flat head), dashed lines indicate movement in the direction of the arrow head. Letters next to the arrows indicate the published source of the interaction. (a) (Kwak and Schiefelbein, 2008) (b) (Hassan et al., 2010) (c) (Rishmawi et al., 2014) (d) (Simon et al., 2007) (e) (Kang et al., 2009) (f) (Yi et al., 2010) (g) (Jones et al., 2009) (h) (Masucci and Schiefelbein, 1996) (i) Tromas and Perrot-Rechenmann 2010. (*) indicates interactions identified during this project.

**Figure 7-2**: A summary of the current published knowledge of the epidermal patterning mechanism in conjunction with the additional interactions identified during this project.
The impact of this work has the potential to extend beyond this specific tissue to encompass many areas of plant growth and developmental patterning, an example could be the patterning of trichome production in the shoots (Wang and Chen, 2014). In addition to this, from an agricultural prospective auxin is already widely used, a better understanding of the relationship between this phytohormone and plant growth can only be advantageous (Mithila et al., 2011; Brown et al., 2013). Further benefit can also be gained from the potential for improvement of root function, particularly in terms of nutrient uptake with the aim of reducing fertiliser input. With an ever expanding population, harvests worldwide are threatened by numerous factors. The scientific challenges in ensuring sufficient food supply are substantial, and in order to achieve this, continuing to increase our knowledge and understanding of plant growth, as has been presented here, is vital.
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Figure 9-1: Root hair density in the gl2-1 single mutant.

The gl2-1 mutant has a significantly higher root hair density compared to the wild-type (P<0.005, T-Test).
Figure 9-2: Analysis of the *pAUX1::AUX1-YFP* marker in the *gl2-1* background.

Analysis of the *pAUX1::AUX1-YFP* marker in the *gl2-1* background indicated that *AUX1* expression was lost when the *GL2* gene function was knocked out. This result was consistent with the published report of *pAUX1::AUX-YFP* expression also being lost in the *wer-1 myb23-1* double mutant, Jones et al, 2009. These results were consistent with *GL2* functioning to promote the expression of *AUX1* in the non-hair cells of the root epidermis. Data and pictures provided by Dr Martin Kieffer.
Initially the *pARF10::GFP* marker was used to identify ectopic root hairs produced by the non-hair cells in the *gl2-1* mutant. However whilst these were identifiable, it could only be reliably done using the confocal microscope and by layering multiple images so the entire root hair was in focus. Therefore this was not a practical or reliable method of measuring the length of these root hairs.
High concentrations of exogenous auxin result in shorter primary roots. Each mutant is positioned alongside its associated *Arabidopsis* wild-type line on the left hand side. Wild-type lines are coloured green, whilst mutants are coloured white. Particularly interesting results are circled. The red circle indicates that the *wer-1* mutant has a short root length phenotype without any auxin treatment, possibly indicating an increased sensitivity to auxin. Conversely the *cpc-1 try-82* mutant, circled in blue has a much longer primary root that it’s associated wild-type. The *aux1-22* and *aux1-7* mutants primary root does not shorten as much as the wild-type when treated with exogenous auxin, purple circle. This is not particularly surprising as the loss of AUX1 would mean that the IAA was not readily transported into the cells.
RT-qPCR analysis carried out by Dr Martin Kieffer confirmed that WER and GL2 expression levels were significantly reduced in the arf10-3 arf16-2 double mutant background. It also confirmed that both MYB23 and GL2 expression levels were significantly reduced upon auxin treatment. Interestingly this data also indicated that MYB23 expression levels are significantly increased in an arf10-3 arf16-2 mutant background, a result that is consistent with ARF10 and ARF16 repressing MYB23 expression. Importantly this data also confirmed that EXP7 is significantly up-regulated with auxin treatment whilst COBL9 is significantly down-regulated by auxin.
Figure 9-6: Analysis of root hairs in the pCOBL9::ARF10 construct.

Expressing ARF10 ectopically in the hair cells using the pCOBL9 promoter results in a loss of root hair elongation. Root hair initiation bumps are still apparent.
Figure 9-7: Analysis of root hair density and ectopic root hairs in the arf10-2,arf16-2,gl2-1 mutant in comparison to the wild-type and single mutants.

A: The arf10-3 arf16-2 gl2-1, arf10-3 arf16-2 and gl2-1 mutants all have significantly more (ANOVA, P<0.005) ectopic root hairs than the wild-type. B: The arf10-3 arf16-2 gl2-1, arf10-3 arf16-2 and gl2-1 mutants all have a significantly higher (ANOVA, P<0.005) density than the wild-type.
Figure 9-8: Root hair density in the $pEXP7::MYB23$ construct.

A: The root hair density in the $pEXP7::MYB23$ construct did not differ significantly from the wild-type, with or without auxin treatment. B: Analysis of the root hair elongation window indicated no significant difference between the $pEXP7::MYB23$ line and the wild-type.
Figure 9-9: Ectopic root hairs in the pEXP7::MYB23 construct.

The pEXP7::MYB23 construct has a small but significant increase in ectopic root hair production in comparison to the wild-type. (T-Test, P<0.005).
Figure 9-10: Root hair length frequencies in the *pEXP7::MYB23* construct.

A/B Root hairs in the *pEXP7::MYB23* line were able to elongate to reasonably long lengths under differing environmental conditions, i.e temperature/humidity etc, however they were always significantly shorter (T-TEST, P<0.005) than the wild-type. C: Analysis of the root hair length frequency profile indicated that the *pEXP7::MYB23* line had an overall population of shorter root hairs in comparison to the wild-type, rather than some very short individuals bringing the average length down.
Figure 9-11: Changes in expression level of putative MYB23 target genes in *pEXP7::MYB23* plants.