


Temperature and Plant Development

EDITED BY

Keara A. Franklin and Philip A. Wigge



WILEY Blackwell

Temperature and Plant Development

Temperature and Plant Development

Edited by

KEARA A. FRANKLIN

PHILIP A. WIGGE

WILEY Blackwell

This edition first published 2014 © 2014 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Editorial Offices

1606 Golden Aspen Drive, Suites 103 and 104, Ames, Iowa 50010, USA
The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by Blackwell Publishing, provided that the base fee is paid directly to the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license by CCC, a separate system of payments has been arranged. The fee codes for users of the Transactional Reporting Service are ISBN-13: 978-1-1183-0820-2/2014.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names, service marks, trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and author(s) have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. It is sold on the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services and neither the publisher nor the author shall be liable for damages arising herefrom. If professional advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Temperature and plant development / edited by Keara A. Franklin, Philip A. Wigge.
pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-118-30820-2 (cloth)

I. Plants—Effect of temperature on. 2. Plants—Development. I. Franklin, Keara A.
II. Wigge, Philip A.

QK755.T455 2014

581.3—dc23

2013033686

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

Cover design by Matt Kuhns.

Set in 10.5/12pt TimesNewRoman by SPi Publisher Services, Pondicherry, India

Contents

Contributors	xi
Preface	xiii
1 Temperature sensing in plants	1
Steven Penfield and Dana MacGregor	
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Passive and active temperature responses in plants	1
1.3 Temperature sensing during transcriptional regulation	3
1.4 Sensing cold: A role for plasma membrane calcium channels in plants	8
1.5 A role for membrane fluidity as an upstream temperature sensor?	11
1.6 Temperature sensing by proteins	12
1.7 Summary	14
2 Plant acclimation and adaptation to cold environments	19
Bob Baxter	
2.1 Introduction	19
2.2 Chilling and freezing injury	20
2.3 Freezing avoidance and tolerance at the structural and physiological level	21
2.3.1 Freezing avoidance	21
2.3.2 Freezing point depression, supercooling, deep supercooling, and extracellular and extraorgan freezing	23
2.3.3 Ice nucleation and structural and thermal ice barriers	23
2.3.4 Glass transition (vitrification)	25
2.3.5 Antifreeze factors	25
2.4 Freezing tolerance	26
2.4.1 Cold acclimation (hardening)	26
2.4.2 Genes and regulatory mechanisms in cold acclimation	27
2.4.3 Dehydrins	30
2.4.4 Heat shock proteins	30
2.4.5 Enzymatic and metabolic response in cryoprotection	30
2.4.6 The role of hormones in low-temperature acclimation	31

2.5	Cold deacclimation (dehardening) and reacclimation (rehardening)	32
2.6	Spatial and temporal considerations of plant responses to low temperature	34
2.6.1	Interactions between cold and light: Winter dormancy	35
2.6.2	Interactions between cold and environmental drought	36
2.6.3	Interactions between cold and light: Photosynthesis, photoinhibition, and reactive oxygen species in cold environments	36
2.7	The survival of cold and freezing stress in a changing climate	38
2.8	Plant cold acclimation and adaptation in an agricultural context	42
2.9	Summary	42
3	Plant acclimation and adaptation to warm environments	49
	Martijn van Zanten, Ralph Bours, Thijs L. Pons, and Marcel C.G. Proveniers	
3.1	Introduction	49
3.2	Implications of high temperature for agriculture and natural ecosystems	51
3.3	Temperature perception and signaling pathways	52
3.4	Photosynthesis	53
3.5	Respiration and carbon balance	57
3.6	Growth and allocation of biomass	58
3.7	Architectural changes in response to high temperature	58
3.7.1	Heat-induced hyponastic growth in <i>Arabidopsis</i> and hormonal and light control	59
3.7.2	High-temperature-induced hypocotyl elongation in <i>Arabidopsis</i>	60
3.7.3	PIF4 as central regulator of high-temperature acclimation in <i>Arabidopsis</i>	61
3.8	Hormonal regulation of thermotolerance	62
3.9	Functional implications of plant architectural changes to high temperature	63
3.10	Interactions between drought and high temperature	64
3.11	Carbohydrate status control of plant acclimation to high temperature	65
3.12	Thermoperiodic effects on plant growth and architecture	66
3.13	High-temperature effects on the floral transition	68

4	Vernalization: Competence to flower provided by winter	79
	Dong-Hwan Kim and Sibum Sung	
4.1	Introduction	79
4.2	Vernalization requirement in <i>Arabidopsis</i>	80
4.2.1	Molecular basis of <i>FRI</i> -mediated <i>FLC</i> activation	81
4.2.2	Mutations in autonomous pathway genes: Another route to confer vernalization requirement	82
4.2.3	Other chromatin-remodeling complexes required for <i>FLC</i> activation	83
4.3	The molecular mechanism of vernalization	84
4.3.1	Vernalization-mediated epigenetic repression of <i>FLC</i>	84
4.3.2	The dynamics of PRC2 and TRX at <i>FLC</i> chromatin	86
4.3.3	Mechanisms underlying PRC2 recruitment to <i>FLC</i> chromatin by vernalization	87
4.4	Resetting of <i>FLC</i> repression during meiosis	88
4.5	Vernalization in other plant species	89
4.5.1	<i>Arabis alpina</i>	89
4.5.2	Cereals (wheat and barley)	90
4.5.3	Sugar beet (<i>Beta vulgaris</i>)	90
4.6	Concluding remarks	91
5	Temperature and light signal integration	97
	Harriet G. McWatters, Gabriela Toledo-Ortiz, and Karen J. Halliday	
5.1	Introduction	97
5.2	Convergence points for light and temperature sensing	101
5.3	Phytochrome-Interacting Factors as signal integrators	102
5.4	ELONGATED HYPOCOTYL 5 (HY5): A cool operator	105
5.5	Light and temperature converge at the circadian oscillator	107
5.6	Photoperiodic and thermal control of flowering	113
5.7	Light-dependent circadian gating of cold-acclimation responses	115
5.8	Temperature and light regulation of cell membrane fatty acid composition	117
5.9	Concluding thoughts: Implications for a changing future	118
6	Temperature and the circadian clock	131
	Kathleen Greenham and C. Robertson McClung	
6.1	Introduction	131
6.2	Temperature compensation	136

6.3	Temperature entrainment	142
6.4	Cold tolerance	146
6.5	Splicing	150
6.6	Concluding remarks	151
7	Temperature and plant immunity	163
	Jian Hua	
7.1	Introduction	163
7.2	Plant immunity	164
7.2.1	Immunity against microbial pathogens	164
7.2.2	Immunity against necrotrophic pathogens	166
7.2.3	Immunity against herbivorous insects	166
7.2.4	Immunity against viruses	167
7.3	Temperature effects on plant disease resistance	167
7.3.1	High-temperature suppression of disease resistance	168
7.3.2	Low-temperature inhibition of plant immunity	169
7.3.3	Disease resistance induced by high and low temperatures	169
7.4	The molecular basis for temperature sensitivity in plant immunity	170
7.4.1	Heat-sensitive NB-LRR R proteins	170
7.4.2	Involvement of NB-LRR R proteins in heat-sensitive immune responses	172
7.4.3	Enhancement of immunity by ABA deficiency at high temperatures	173
7.4.4	Cold sensitivity in RNA silencing-mediated immunity	173
7.5	Evolution of the temperature sensitivity of immunity	174
7.5.1	Coevolution with pathogens	175
7.5.2	Competition between biotic and abiotic responses	176
7.6	Concluding remarks	176
8	Temperature, climate change, and global food security	181
	Robert J. Redden, Jerry L. Hatfield, P.V. Vara Prasad, Andreas W. Ebert, Shyam S. Yadav, and Garry J. O'Leary	
8.1	Introduction	181
8.2	Climate change on a global basis	181
8.3	The impact of temperature on crop water relations	183
8.4	The influence of high temperature on crop physiology and yield processes	186

8.5	The interaction of climate change factors on crop development	188
8.5.1	The interaction of rising temperature and CO ₂	188
8.5.2	The interaction of high-temperature and drought stress	189
8.6	The impact of global climate change on food quality and plant nutrient demand	190
8.7	Breeding high-temperature stress tolerance using crop wild relatives	190
8.8	Global food production and food security	191
8.8.1	Wheat production	192
8.8.2	Rice production	192
8.8.3	Potato production	192
8.8.4	Maize production	193
8.8.5	Sorghum production	193
8.8.6	Cassava production	193
8.8.7	Pulse production	193
8.8.8	Predicted impacts of climate change on global crop production	194
8.9	Crop nutritional content	194
8.10	Discussion	196
8.11	Conclusions	197
	Index	203

Color plate section is located between pages 130 and 131.

Contributors

Bob Baxter	School of Biological and Biomedical Sciences, Durham University, Durham, UK
Ralph Bours	Laboratory of Plant Physiology, Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands
Andreas W. Ebert	AVRDC – The World Vegetable Center, Shanhua, Tainan, Taiwan
Kathleen Greenham	Department of Biological Sciences, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH, USA
Karen J. Halliday	School of Biological Sciences, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
Jerry L. Hatfield	USDA-ARS National Laboratory for Agriculture and the Environment, Ames, IA, USA
Jian Hua	Department of Plant Biology, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA
Dong-Hwan Kim	Section of Molecular Cell and Developmental Biology, Institute for Cellular and Molecular Biology, the University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA
Dana MacGregor	Biosciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK
C. Robertson McClung	Department of Biological Sciences, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH, USA
Harriet G. McWatters	School of Biological Sciences, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
Garry J. O’Leary	Department of Primary Industries, Horsham, Victoria, Australia

- Steven Penfield** Biosciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK
- Thijs L. Pons** Plant Ecophysiology, Institute of Environmental
Biology, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The
Netherlands
- P. V. Vara Prasad** Department of Agronomy, Kansas State
University, Manhattan, KS, USA
- Marcel C. G. Proveniers** Molecular Plant Physiology, Institute of
Environmental Biology, Utrecht University,
Utrecht, The Netherlands
- Robert J. Redden** Department of Primary Industries, Horsham,
Victoria, Australia
- Sibum Sung** Section of Molecular Cell and Developmental
Biology, Institute for Cellular and Molecular
Biology, the University of Texas at Austin,
Austin, TX, USA
- Gabriela Toledo-Ortiz** School of Biological Sciences, The University of
Edinburgh, , Edinburgh, UK
- Shyam S. Yadav** Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation & Livestock,
Government of Islamic Republic of Afghanistan,
Kabul, Afghanistan
- Martijn van Zanten** Molecular Plant Physiology, Institute of
Environmental Biology, Utrecht University,
Utrecht, The Netherlands

Preface

Temperature is a key environmental signal regulating plant growth and development. Small changes in ambient temperature can affect a wide range of processes throughout the plant lifecycle, from seed germination and plant architecture through to flowering and reproductive development. Prolonged low-temperature treatment can act as a seasonal cue, signaling the onset of winter to prime flowering and seedling development the following spring. In addition to providing important environmental information, exposure to temperature extremes can adversely affect plant survival. The evolution of developmental adaptations to withstand prolonged cold or heat has enabled some species to exploit ecological niches in adverse habitats. In more temperate regions, many plants have evolved acclimation responses to minimize cellular damage associated with freezing and heat stress.

Plants can detect temperature changes as small as 1°C. Despite the importance of temperature in controlling plant growth and survival, our current understanding of how temperature signals are perceived is rudimentary. Suggested thermosensory mechanisms include changes in membrane fluidity, activation of membrane transport channels, altered protein activity, and the direct regulation of gene expression through altered DNA accessibility. Molecular dissection of plant temperature responses has revealed significant crosstalk with light and circadian signaling pathways. The integration of temperature and photoperiod signals provides plants with accurate seasonal information, priming adaptive responses to adverse conditions while preventing the wasteful allocation of resources in milder climates. In natural environments, plants are subject to multiple environmental signals simultaneously, resulting in trade-offs between different stress responses. It is perhaps, therefore, not surprising that temperature has significant effects on plant immunity and defense signaling.

Climate change presents major challenges for global agriculture and the preservation of ecosystems and biodiversity. Current climate models predict future increases in global temperature, with potentially devastating effects on crop production. Relatively moderate increases in ambient temperature (<6°C) can invoke dramatic changes in plant development, reducing harvest yield. Increased temperature additionally accelerates flowering, promoting floral development out of synchronization with pollinator lifecycles. Indirect

impacts of elevated temperature on plant development include increased pathogen susceptibility and enhanced water use. The latter may promote leaf cooling in well-watered environments but would have severe consequences in drought conditions. Conversely, exposure to sudden frost can lead to catastrophic crop losses in nonacclimated species. Understanding how plants perceive, integrate, and respond to temperature signals may provide novel molecular targets for the production of crops resilient to climate change and inform predictions as to the impact of global warming on plant ecology and biodiversity. Enhanced knowledge of plant temperature responses could additionally lead to more energy-efficient horticultural production. The stature and flowering time of glasshouse crops are commonly controlled through manipulations of light and temperature. Understanding how plants perceive and respond to small temperature changes at different times of day in diverse light environments will greatly facilitate the design of optimal growth management regimes.

This volume is designed to provide a comprehensive and up-to-date account of the role of temperature in plant development. It is aimed at all students and teachers of modern plant biology, academics with an interest in the environmental regulation of development, and policy makers working in the area of climate change, ecology, and global food security.

Keara A. Franklin,
University of Bristol, UK
Philip A. Wigge,
Sainsbury Laboratory,
University of Cambridge, UK

1 Temperature sensing in plants

Steven Penfield and Dana MacGregor

1.1 Introduction

Plants are subjected to considerable variations in temperature, both daily and annually, and are surprisingly temperature-sensitive organisms: it has been shown that levels of cytosolic calcium in plant cells can respond to as little as a 1°C temperature shift, and a 4°C diurnal temperature cycle is sufficient to entrain the circadian clock (Knight and Knight 2000; McClung et al. 2002). Developmental processes such as seed germination can be completely inhibited by 1–2°C temperature rises (Argyris et al. 2011). Despite the experimentally described responsiveness of plant physiology and development to temperature, no thermosensory molecule has yet been unequivocally identified.

1.2 Passive and active temperature responses in plants

Since the nineteenth century, it has been suggested that temperature affects the rates of biological reactions according to the thermodynamic principles that govern chemical reactions more generally. In this scenario, the rate of reactions whose activation energy is significantly greater than a given temperature will increase proportionally to the exponent of the temperature rise. As a guiding principle, the free energy change normally dictates that for biological reactions in biologically-relevant temperature ranges, rates will increase roughly twofold to threefold with a 10°C rise in temperature. This figure, known as the temperature coefficient or Q_{10} , became popular during the twentieth century following its popularization after the work of Van't Hoff (1896) and Arrhenius (1889). Thus, specific biological processes, from the growth of bacteria to the respiration of plants, were shown to have a Q_{10} of approximately 2–3 within a range often described as 'room temperature' (Běhrádek 1930). This law has even been applied to developmental biology and plant growth, a good example of which is the study of seed germination

Temperature and Plant Development, First Edition. Edited by Keara A. Franklin and Philip A. Wigge.

© 2014 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Published 2014 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.




Figure 1.1 Speed of germination in seeds often shows a relationship indicative of a passive temperature response. In the lab (left) and in the field (right), carrot seeds germinate at a rate with a linear relationship with temperature, with a Q_{10} of around 2. Redrawn from Hegarty (1973).

by Hegarty (1973). Here it was shown that the speed of germination of many common vegetable seeds showed a dependency on temperature consistent with that expected by the passive effects of temperature in biochemical reactions (Figure 1.1). In a complex biological event such as seed germination, requiring respiration, cell division, and cell elongation, it was postulated that temperature affects the rate of a single, vital rate-limiting reaction in the process. Where Q_{10} s were found to differ dramatically from 2 to 3, it was suggested that this might be due to a complex effect of temperature on many reactions with unpredictable consequences (Běhrádek 1930).

Many types of biomolecule are expected to be subject to these types of ‘passive’ temperature effects including the fluidity of lipid bilayer membranes, the conformations of proteins, and the behavior of nucleic acids. Clearly, organisms need to be able to control their physiology to maintain performance of vital functions over a range of possible biochemical reaction rates. However, among this sea of events that must continue to function equivalently at multiple temperatures, one or more are used as temperature sensors by biological organisms. Here we will advance a broad definition of a temperature sensor as a *passive temperature-controlled change in configuration of a molecule or assembly of molecules that is integrated with downstream signal transduction in order to create an active signal regulating a process of adaptive significance*. Such signaling pathways are referred to as ‘active’ temperature responses because during signal transduction, the effects can be amplified or buffered such that the temperature coefficient may differ significantly from 2 to 3. Plants use temperature information to allow them to synchronize their life -history with the seasons or to adapt their physiology to different temperature environments.

1.3 Temperature sensing during transcriptional regulation

Steady-state (SS) transcript levels of many plant genes are highly sensitive to temperature, and there are several documented cases where these changes are essential for known adaptive responses. In seeds, a 10°C temperature variation causes changes in approximately 10-fold more expressed genes than in seedlings (Kendall et al. 2011), showing that different plant tissues have different innate sensitivities of transcription rates to temperature. In prokaryotes, thermodynamic effects of temperature affect gene expression through the control of chromosomal supercoiling and by conformational changes in topoisomerases that control the supercoiling process. In thermophilic bacteria, the enzyme reverse gyrase acts to induce tight supercoiling even at extreme temperatures (>80°C), and the action of this enzyme appears to keep the DNA context in a configuration that permits a reasonable speed of transcription (Forterre et al. 1996). Therefore, key to understanding the temperature-control of transcription in eukaryotes will be an analysis of how DNA interacts with its environment to control transcription rate and how this varies over temperature.

A well-studied example of the importance of temperature signaling in development is vernalization, the requirement for a prolonged cold period before plants are able to respond to floral-inductive signals. In *Arabidopsis*, the vernalization pathway acts through downregulation of the floral repressor *FLOWERING LOCUS C (FLC)* (reviewed in Amasino, 2010, and discussed further in Chapter 4, Sheldon et al. 1999; Michaels and Amasino 1999). In vernalization-requiring accessions, stable repression of *FLC* is achieved after several weeks of cold exposure. Here we will focus on the primary steps in responding to temperature at the *FLC* locus, of which there are two key points. The first of these is that after 2 weeks of cold, the accumulation of the repressive mark trimethylated histone 3 lysine residue 7 (H3K27) begins at the *FLC* locus. This begins to appear around the transcription start site and its presence correlates with the downregulation of *FLC* expression (Bastow et al. 2004). A second repressive mark, dimethylation of H3K9, also appears upstream of the transcription start site, and both marks are necessary for the maintenance of *FLC* repression upon transfer to cold. H3K27me3 modifications require the activity of the Polycomb Repression Complex 2 (PRC2), and mutations of several subunits of these have been identified in forward genetic screens for *Arabidopsis* mutants unable to induce or maintain the vernalized state. These mutants share a common phenotype in that the repression of *FLC* is initiated in the cold, but is not maintained upon transfer to the warm (Gendall et al. 2001; Sung and Amasino 2004; Greb et al. 2007). One of these, *VERNALIZATION INSENSITIVE3 (VIN3)*, is itself upregulated at the transcript level by prolonged low-temperature exposure, suggesting that the temperatureregulation of *VIN3* expression is a

primary event during vernalization. However, although *VIN3* is necessary for the stable repression of *FLC* after vernalization, expression of *VIN3* alone cannot confer a vernalization-like response on unvernallized plants (Sung and Amasino 2004), showing that control of *VIN3* and by extension PRC2 complex abundance is unlikely to be the primary temperature signal for vernalization. How temperature controls *VIN3* expression is not known.

Recently it has been suggested that the observed quantitative repression of *FLC* by increasing durations of cold reflects a bistable switch in *FLC* repression occurring in ever greater numbers of cells during vernalization (Angel et al. 2011). In support of this, non-saturating vernalization exposures result in a cell autonomous response in which some cells are silenced for *FLC:GUS* expression, while many cells continue to express at high levels. After 2 weeks of cold, H3K27me3 levels begin to increase around the transcription start site of *FLC* full-length transcript, suggesting this is a primary response to cold in the vernalization pathway (Angel et al. 2011). The dynamics of this increase correlate well with the timing of the increase in *VIN3* expression, suggesting that the *VIN3* protein might play a role in the targeting of the PRC2 complex to the H3K27me3 nucleation site. However, the lack of any predicted or known sequence specificity of *VIN3* for any DNA sequence and the inability of *VIN3* overexpression to induce a vernalization response suggest that H3K27me3 modification in response to *VIN3* cannot alone explain the temperature responsiveness of *FLC* transcript SS levels.

The *FLC* locus also produces at least two noncoding RNAs that appear to have a role in the vernalization process. The first, designated *COOLAIR*, is a long antisense transcript that covers the entire *FLC* locus and has a promoter that can independently confer cold responsiveness to a reporter gene independently of gene context (Swiezewski et al. 2009). This latter observation appears to tie temperature responsiveness to transcriptional control, rather than RNA stability. Importantly, *COOLAIR* expression occurs in *vin3* mutants and was also shown to confer downregulation of the sense *FLC* transcript, suggesting that cold responsiveness is *VIN3* independent. However, *COOLAIR* is unlikely to be solely responsible for the downregulation of sense *FLC* expression in *Arabidopsis*, since T-DNA insertion mutants lacking the *COOLAIR* transcript but expressing a functional *FLC* protein continue to show a robust vernalization response (Helliwell et al. 2011). More recently, a second noncoding but this time sense transcript-designated *COLDAIR* has been identified with a role in the vernalization response (Heo and Sung 2011). The *COLDAIR* transcript is transcribed from the first intron, a region of *FLC* long known to have a role in the control of vernalization, and has as part of its promoter an approximately 300bp sequence known as the vernalization response element (VRE; Sung et al. 2006). *COLDAIR* knockdown lines show reduced repression of *FLC* by vernalization. It is therefore suggested that

the *COLDAIR* transcript controls H3K27me3 nucleation at the *FLC* coding transcription start site (Heo and Sung 2011). All this activity occurs long before *VIN3* expression increases, suggesting that activity surrounding the transcriptional promotion of *COLDAIR* is a key primary step in responding to temperature during vernalization. A key question for future vernalization response remains understanding the mechanism of how temperature regulates *FLC* expression.

In wheat, a key player in the vernalization response is the MADS-box transcription factor VERNALIZATION1 (*VRN1*, see Trevaskis et al. 2007). Instead of cold conferring transcriptional repression, expression of *VRN1* is activated during vernalization to promote flowering. Repression of *VRN1* expression also requires the first intron (Fu et al. 2005; Cockram et al. 2007), but cold activation appears to be primarily driven by elements in the *VRN1* promoter. So, in wheat, the first intron is again required for repression, but not for cold activation. The similarities and differences between *Arabidopsis FLC* and wheat *VRN1* regulation are striking and highlight how much of our understanding of these processes reflects the transcriptional regulatory processes downstream of the temperature-sensing pathways and much less is known of how temperature signals are sensed. In addition, it is still completely unknown how vernalization integrates temperature signaling with time in order to measure the duration of the cold signal during winter.

The complex kinetics of the control of *FLC* expression has led to the search for alternative models for studying the control of transcription by temperature. Several plant genes seem to have quantitative responses of SS mRNA levels to environmental temperature over a wide temperature range. Good examples of these in *Arabidopsis* are *HEAT SHOCK PROTEIN 70 (HSP70)* and *COLD-REGULATED 15a (COR15a)*, which increase transcript abundance in response to increasing and decreasing temperatures, respectively (Penfield 2008; Kumar and Wigge 2010). A genetic screen for *HSP70* mis-regulation has been used to identify genes necessary for correct temperature responses in the ambient temperature range (between about 12°C and 27°C) (Kumar and Wigge 2010). The first mutants characterized were novel alleles of *ACTIN-RELATED PROTEIN6 (ARP6)*, encoding a component of the plant SWR1 complex required for the deposition of the histone 2A variant H2A.Z into chromatin (Mizuguchi et al. 2004). ARP6 is necessary for coordinating the temperature transcriptome, since the warm-temperature transcriptome is constitutively expressed at lower temperatures in *arp6* alleles, lacking H2A.Z incorporation. Consistent with this observation, H2A.Z nucleosomes are evicted from chromatin at higher temperatures, enabling RNA Pol II to transcribe genes such as *HSP70* that are induced at higher temperatures (Kumar and Wigge 2010).

An interesting feature of H2A.Z biology is that the effect of H2A.Z nucleosomes on transcription appears to be locus specific, since, for example, in the case of *FLC*, H2A.Z deposition is correlated with transcription of the gene (Deal et al. 2005), while in the case of *HSP70*, and genes involved in the phosphate starvation response, H2A.Z loss results in upregulation of expression (Smith et al. 2010). When H2A.Z occupancy is analyzed by chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP), higher temperatures result in a decrease in occupancy (Kumar and Wigge 2010), and this effect appears to be independent of the transcriptional status of the gene, suggesting that eviction of H2A.Z occurs in response to warmer temperature, independent of effects on transcription (Franklin 2010; Kumar and Wigge 2010). For SS mRNA levels to rise with increasing temperature, transcription rates must increase at a rate exceeding that of mRNA degradation rates. If it is assumed that mRNA degradation rates follow a simple Arrhenius–Van’t Hoft relationship with temperature, additional mechanisms in addition to changes in nucleosome occupancy may be required to cause a gain in SS transcript levels. An increase in SS levels may require a positive feedback loop, either induction of an activator of transcription (Figure 1.2) or a factor which stabilizes mRNA. Larger effects of increasing




Figure 1.2 Control of SS transcript abundance by the temperature-dependent association of H2A.Z-containing nucleosomes with transcription start sites. (1) A passive effect alone does not produce an increase in SS levels, because mRNA degradation rates too are affected. (2) The eviction of H2A.Z allows an activator to bind. The abundance of this may also be temperature-controlled or a positive feedback through autoactivation. (3) Eviction allows a repressor to bind, allowing nucleosome eviction to depress transcription rates. After Kumar and Wigge (2010) and Franklin (2010). RNA Pol II—RNA polymerase II. For color detail, please see color plate section.

temperature on decay rates may act to lower SS RNA levels even in the presence of increasing transcription. It seems likely that H2A.Z nucleosome eviction is likely tied to other processes in order to drive temperature-regulated changes in SS mRNA levels.

While H2A.Z nucleosomes are required for the normal behavior of the ambient temperature transcriptome, it has not been demonstrated directly that they are themselves thermosensors. To fulfil our definition of a temperature sensor, we must also show that our sensor is linked by a signal transduction pathway to processes of adaptive significance. Have plants exploited the temperature responsiveness of the association of DNA and H2A.Z nucleosomes to confer thermosensitivity to important developmental or physiological processes? As we are primarily concerned with temperature regulation of transcription, the imperative is to discover temperature- and *arp6*-dependent changes in gene expression that underlie plant adaptation to variable environments. *arp6* mutants do indeed show phenotypes that suggest they are compromised in their ability to regulate important temperature-controlled plant processes, such as the timing of flowering and hypocotyl elongation (Deal et al. 2005; Kumar and Wigge 2010). In *arp6*, flowering is earlier than wild type in long days and short days. If H2A.Z nucleosomes are rate limiting for the expression of key flowering regulators, such as *FT*, then higher temperatures could cause flowering by triggering H2A.Z eviction. Supporting this hypothesis, the transcription factor PIF4 directly activates *FT* in a temperature-dependent manner, and the ability of PIF4 to bind to the *FT* promoter is temperature dependent (Kumar et al. 2012). However, in short days shifting *arp6* plants from 22°C to 27°C results in a large decrease in flowering time, demonstrating that a substantial portion of the thermosensory response is ARP6 independent. This suggests that other components alongside SWR1 and H2A.Z have an important role in thermosensation controlling flowering time. Taken together, these results suggest that chromatin accessibility appears to be temperature regulated, but whether this is a direct response to temperature or controlled by a temperature-regulated chromatin modifying pathway remains to be seen.

Warm temperatures increase *Arabidopsis* hypocotyl elongation in an auxin-dependent manner (Gray et al. 1998). This process requires the activity of the PIF4 transcription factor (Koini et al. 2009), and the binding of PIF4 to auxin biosynthesis genes has been shown to be temperature regulated, supporting a role for temperature-mediated changes in chromatin accessibility in controlling this process (Franklin et al. 2011). Consistent with this, *arp6* have elongated hypocotyls (Kumar and Wigge 2010). In a close parallel to the role of ARP6 in the control of flowering time, *arp6* hypocotyls do elongate in response to temperature but show a reduced response. This appears to reinforce the idea that this pathway must function redundantly with others to control ambient temperature responses in plants.

1.4 Sensing cold: A role for plasma membrane calcium channels in plants

In animals, it is now well established that voltage-dependent action transporters in the TRP family of potassium channels are necessary for sensing temperature (Peier et al. 2002). Plants do not contain conserved relatives of these proteins, suggesting that the mechanism for temperature sensing is not shared. However, electrophysiological evidence suggests that plant cell membranes depolarize with a decrease in temperature and that this depolarization is accompanied by an influx of calcium in to the cytosol (Minorsky 1989; Knight et al. 1991, 1996). The degree of depolarization and increase in cytosolic calcium is dependent not only on the degree of cooling but also on the rate (Plieth et al. 1999). This type of response has parallels with the downstream transcriptional activation of the C-repeat binding factor (CBF) family, involved in plant cold acclimation (discussed in Chapter 2). For instance, when plants are shifted from a growth temperature of 20–10°C, the corresponding increase in *CBF* transcript levels is less than that resulting from the larger change in temperature from 20°C to 4°C (Zarka et al. 2003). For *Arabidopsis* grown at 20°C, a shift to 14°C or lower is sufficient to induce *CBF* transcripts to detectable levels, and plants acclimated to growth at 4°C will induce a *CBF* response when shifted below 0°C (Zarka et al. 2003). Interestingly, daily calcium oscillations also modulate the responsiveness of cytosolic free calcium concentrations ($[Ca^{2+}]^{cyt}$) to cold, providing a potential mechanism for circadian gating (Dodd et al. 2006). Calcium influx after cold appears to cause the depolarization rather than be a response to it, because calcium channel blockers such as lanthanum also block cold-induced membrane depolarization (Lewis and Spalding 1998). This shows that extracellular calcium influx is a primary plant response to cold and cooling. Despite many efforts to identify the types of channel responding to the cold stimulus, none have been found, possibly indicating a high degree of genetic redundancy. Given that these responses occur within a minute or so of a cold pulse, it is likely that these are early signaling events in the detection of a cold stimulus. Ion influx is an attractive system for generating an active temperature signal since work has previously been done to establish the resting membrane potential, enabling a large response to be achieved by simply opening the channel, exploiting the resting potential to amplify the temperature signal. The next question to answer is whether these cold-induced oscillations in $[Ca^{2+}]^{cyt}$ led to a downstream signal transduction cascade.

Efforts to determine transcriptional responses to elevated $[Ca^{2+}]^{cyt}$ have helped to identify an ongoing cold signal transduction influencing gene expression (summarized in Figure 1.3). Experiments which have involved the pharmacological manipulation of $[Ca^{2+}]^{cyt}$ showed that elevations




Figure 1.3 Schematic of our current understanding of cold perception and signaling in plants, showing possible signal transduction pathways from cytosolic free calcium increases to transcriptional control. For abbreviations see main text. For color detail, please see color plate section.

in $[Ca^{2+}]^{cyt}$ led to the activation of transcription of genes with ABA RESPONSE ELEMENTS (ABREs) in their promoters (Galon et al. 2010). If a LUCIFERASE reporter gene driven by ABREs is transformed into tobacco, luciferase activity displays $[Ca^{2+}]^{cyt}$ sensitivity. This analysis was extended by Whalley et al. (2011) who developed an elegant system in which $[Ca^{2+}]^{cyt}$ oscillations were induced by applying voltages to seedlings floating in cuvettes. Here it was found that genes containing several types of cis-elements in their promoters were induced by $[Ca^{2+}]^{cyt}$, including ABREs, CAMTA-binding elements, C-repeats, and TCP-binding sites. Many of the induced genes have previously been shown to be cold responsive (Zarka et al. 2003). Together this work shows convincingly that changes in $[Ca^{2+}]^{cyt}$ can be transduced as a signal to promoters and affect gene expression. Carpaneto et al. (2007) showed that mutants deficient in cold signaling components were not deficient in the control of $[Ca^{2+}]^{cyt}$ oscillations, suggesting that $[Ca^{2+}]^{cyt}$ oscillations are truly upstream of all known signal transduction. This leaves us with the problem of elucidating the elements of the signal transduction pathway between cold-induced calcium oscillations and gene expression.