

Ectopic Expression of Rubisco Subunits in Maize Mesophyll Cells Does Not Overcome Barriers to Cell Type-Specific Accumulation^{1[C][W][OA]}

Katia Wostrikoff*, Aimee Clark, Shirley Sato, Tom Clemente, and David Stern

Boyce Thompson Institute for Plant Research, Ithaca, New York 14853 (K.W., A.C., D.S.); Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique/Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Unité Mixte de Recherche 7141, Institut de Biologie Physico-Chimique, 75005 Paris, France (K.W.); and Department of Agronomy and Horticulture, Center for Biotechnology, Center for Plant Science Innovation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68588 (S.S., T.C.)

In maize (*Zea mays*), Rubisco accumulates in bundle sheath but not mesophyll chloroplasts, but the mechanisms that underlie cell type-specific expression are poorly understood. To explore the coordinated expression of the chloroplast *rbcl* gene, which encodes the Rubisco large subunit (LS), and the two nuclear *RBCS* genes, which encode the small subunit (SS), RNA interference was used to reduce *RBCS* expression. This resulted in Rubisco deficiency and was correlated with translational repression of *rbcl*. Thus, as in C3 plants, LS synthesis depends on the presence of its assembly partner SS. To test the hypothesis that the previously documented transcriptional repression of *RBCS* in mesophyll cells is responsible for repressing LS synthesis in mesophyll chloroplasts, a ubiquitin promoter-driven *RBCS* gene was expressed in both bundle sheath and mesophyll cells. This did not lead to Rubisco accumulation in the mesophyll, suggesting that LS synthesis is impeded even in the presence of ectopic SS expression. To attempt to bypass this putative mechanism, a ubiquitin promoter-driven nuclear version of the *rbcl* gene was created, encoding an epitope-tagged LS that was expressed in the presence or absence of the *Ubi-RBCS* construct. Both transgenes were robustly expressed, and the tagged LS was readily incorporated into Rubisco complexes. However, neither immunolocalization nor biochemical approaches revealed significant accumulation of Rubisco in mesophyll cells, suggesting a continuing cell type-specific impairment of its assembly or stability. We conclude that additional cell type-specific factors limit Rubisco expression to bundle sheath chloroplasts.

C4 photosynthesis is characterized by an increased CO₂ assimilation efficiency of Rubisco, which improves plant production under stress conditions such as water limitation (Ghannoum, 2009). One defining character of C4 plants such as maize (*Zea mays*) is the cell type specificity of Rubisco. In maize, the primary fixation of inorganic carbon (as HCO₃⁻) takes place in mesophyll (M) chloroplasts, through its incorporation into the C4 precursor oxaloacetate by

phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase (PEPC), which is followed by a reduction into malate by malate dehydrogenase (MDH). Malate is transported to bundle sheath (BS) chloroplasts and decarboxylated by malic enzyme (ME) to release NADPH and CO₂, the latter of which is used for secondary carbon fixation by Rubisco into sugar precursors. The C4 pathway depends on the strict localization of Rubisco to BS chloroplasts, a process that occurs during the differentiation of basal C3 cells into dimorphic C4 cells in dicot plants, and is mainly triggered by light-induced differentiation in maize (for review, see Patel and Berry, 2008). Ultimately, Rubisco expression is promoted in BS cells and repressed in M cells.

Higher plant Rubisco is a hexadecamer composed of eight chloroplast-encoded large subunits (LS) and eight nucleus-encoded small subunits (SS). LS is encoded by the *rbcl* gene and SS by the *RBCS* gene family, which in maize includes two members strongly expressed in similar patterns, *RBCS1* and *RBCS2* (Ewing et al., 1998), as well as a probable minor member in terms of its expression (Sheen and Bogorad, 1986). The light- and tissue-specific regulation of *RBCS* and other Rubisco-related genes has been reviewed in detail (Patel and Berry, 2008). In maize, *rbcl* is expressed in both M and BS cells in the dark, but upon illumination, it rapidly becomes BS specific (Sheen and Bogorad, 1985). Since in

¹ This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, National Research Initiative (grant no. 2009-35318-05012 to D.S. and K.W.), by the Nebraska Research Initiative and Center for Plant Science Innovation (to T.C.), and by the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (Projet International de Coopération Scientifique award no. 5462 to K.W.).

* Corresponding author; e-mail katia.wostrikoff@ibpc.fr.

The authors responsible for distribution of materials integral to the findings presented in this article in accordance with the policy described in the Instructions for Authors (www.plantphysiol.org) are: David Stern (ds28@cornell.edu) for seeds and Tom Clemente (tclemente1@unl.edu) for plasmids.

[C] Some figures in this article are displayed in color online but in black and white in the print edition.

[W] The online version of this article contains Web-only data.

[OA] Open Access articles can be viewed online without a subscription.

www.plantphysiol.org/cgi/doi/10.1104/pp.112.195677

green tissues of maize *rbcL* is transcribed in both cell types (Kubicki et al., 1994), RNA stability regulation is likely to contribute to its cell type specificity, as it does in the C4 plant *Amaranthus hypochondriacus*; Boinski et al., 1993).

RBCS transcripts are also restricted to BS cells in light-grown maize (Sheen and Bogorad, 1986, 1987). Transient expression assays revealed that both promoter and 3' untranslated region (UTR) elements confer this specificity (Viret et al., 1994), and a stably transformed maize transgene consisting of the *RBCS* promoter, 5' UTR, transit peptide, and 3' UTR, fused to a maize codon-optimized yellow fluorescent protein (YFP) coding region, is expressed in BS but not M chloroplasts (Sattarzadeh et al., 2010). Both the 5' and 3' UTRs of one *RBCS* family member, *RBCS-m3*, have binding sites for Transcription Repressor-Maize1 (TRM1), a zinc-finger protein that may repress *RBCS* expression in M cells, although *TRM1* expression itself does not appear to be cell type specific (Xu et al., 2001).

Whatever the underlying mechanism, repression of SS transcription in M cells would be sufficient, in principle, to ensure cell type specificity of Rubisco accumulation. Furthermore, we have previously shown using tobacco (*Nicotiana tabacum*) that in the absence of SS, LS is subject to translational repression, most likely through an interaction of unassembled LS with its encoding *rbcL* transcript (Wostrikoff and Stern, 2007). If this occurs in maize, it would coordinate the repression of SS and LS synthesis. In this study, we test whether LS is indeed subject to translational repression in M cells and attempt to overcome both SS and LS repression in the M using a transgenic approach. The results show that additional barriers exist to Rubisco accumulation, perhaps at the level of Rubisco complex assembly.

RESULTS

LS Is a Controlled Epistasy of Synthesis Subunit in Maize

It is known that Rubisco LS translation is inhibited in the absence of SS in both algae (*Chlamydomonas reinhardtii*) and tobacco (Khrebtkova and Spreitzer, 1996; Rodermel et al., 1996). In tobacco, it was shown that this translational repression is an autoregulatory mechanism called control by epistasy of synthesis (CES), mediated by residual unassembled LS (Wostrikoff and Stern, 2007). We reasoned that the previously documented down-regulation of *RBCS* transcription in M cells (Viret et al., 1994) could similarly result in decreased LS translation in M cells. Indeed, a reduced LS translation rate in maize M versus BS cells has previously been observed using in organello pulse labeling (Meierhoff and Westhoff, 1993). *rbcL* mRNA accumulation is also decreased in M cells (Langdale et al., 1988a), perhaps as a consequence of decreased translation.

To confirm these data, we separated M and BS cells, isolated RNA, and used gel-blot analysis and quantitative reverse transcriptase (qRT)-PCR to gauge mRNA abundance (Fig. 1A). As expected, these analyses showed

that both *RBCS* and *rbcL* mRNAs accumulated to much higher levels in the BS. In addition, *RBCS* transcripts were barely detectable in M cells, whereas *rbcL* transcripts accumulated to about 30% of the level observed in BS extracts. As controls for cell type cross-contamination, *MDH* was used as an M-specific transcript and *ME* as a BS-enriched transcript, and their levels were normalized to the validated control membrane protein P1A10.07c (Manoli et al., 2012), which is similarly expressed in BS and M cells based on laser-capture microdissection (Li et al., 2010). The M-to-BS ratio was found to average 3% for *ME* and 435% for *MDH* (Fig. 1C; data not shown), levels comparable to the laser-capture microdissection values of 11% and 475%, respectively. This shows that for M cell purification, the protoplast isolation method yields extracts with low cross-contamination.

To test the translational status of *rbcL* mRNA, polysome analysis was performed. Extracts from M protoplasts or total cellular material were sedimented through a Suc gradient under native conditions, where ribosome association with transcripts is preserved. The sedimentation rates of RNAs will generally be proportional to their mass, thus reflecting the number of ribosomes bound to each message. To assess the translational status of a given RNA, its distribution pattern across the gradient is determined through the isolation of light to heavy fractions, with untranslated RNA remaining in the lighter, nonpolysomal fractions.

Figure 1B shows distribution patterns of *rbcL* and a control chloroplast mRNA, *psaB*. While the profile for *psaB* was similar in M and total RNA samples, the *rbcL* hybridization signal was not only weaker in M polysomes, reflecting its decreased abundance, but its distribution also differed, as the mRNA was concentrated near the top of the gradient and thus not engaged in translation. Therefore, in M cells, where *RBCS* is poorly transcribed, *rbcL* mRNA is poorly translated. These data are consistent with the interpretation that Rubisco LS is a CES protein in maize, as it is in tobacco and algae.

To test the correlation between *RBCS* expression and LS translation with an independent method, we first tried to identify mutations in the maize *RBCS1* and *RBCS2* genes by PCR-based screening of the Photosynthetic Mutant Library (<http://pml.uoregon.edu/photosyntheticml.html>). However, this approach was unsuccessful. We then created an RNA interference (RNAi) construct, *ZmsiSS*, designed to silence all the endogenous *RBCS* genes, as diagrammed in Figure 2A. Regeneration of six independent events from *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*-mediated transformation yielded multiple pale-green plantlets that could be maintained in vitro on medium supplemented with Suc as well as wild-type-appearing plants.

Seven plantlets were shown by PCR to have integrated the full silencing cassette (data not shown) and were further characterized. Three of them showed the pale-green phenotype typically observed in Rubisco-deficient mutants such as *Bundle Sheath Defective2* (*bsd2*), while the remaining four appeared as the wild




Figure 1. *rbcL* transcript accumulation and translation in M and BS cells. A, In the top panel, total RNA (1 μ g or the indicated dilution) was isolated from T43 wild-type total tissue (T), M protoplasts (M), BS strands (BS), or stressed tissue (TS), and gel blots were hybridized with the probes indicated at right. The ethidium bromide stain (EtBr) is provided as a loading control. In the bottom panel, relative fold change in *rbcL* and *RBCS* transcript accumulation and the purity of cell type extracts were quantified by qRT-PCR from three averaged technical replicates, following normalization to an internal reference gene (*MEP*). Transcripts from the total tissue sample were assigned a reference value of 1. a.u., Arbitrary units. B, Polysome analysis was performed from M protoplasts (M) or the mock control (TS) following sedimentation through a 15% to 55% Suc gradient. An equal proportion of RNA isolated from each fraction was analyzed by gel blot with the indicated probes. C, Assessment of M cross-contamination by BS, as revealed by *ME* transcript accumulation in M extracts, quantified by qRT-PCR. Samples were analyzed in triplicate, with five and three biological replicates for M and BS extracts, respectively. Error bars represent SD.

type. Reverse transcription (RT)-PCR was conducted using primers that would amplify both *RBCS1* and *RBCS2* complementary DNAs (cDNAs). As shown in Figure 2B, green plantlets (control) had normal *RBCS* transcript accumulation, whereas ZmsiSS pale-green plantlets displayed strongly reduced *RBCS* transcript accumulation. The reduced *RBCS* transcript accumulation was correlated with Rubisco deficiency, as revealed by the immunoblot shown in Figure 2C. Figure 2, B and C, presents the characterization of one of three ZmsiSS pale-green transgenics with similar expression data, along with an unsilenced plantlet.

We next investigated the translational status of the *rbcL* transcript in the silenced lines by polysome analysis. The results depicted in Figure 3 show a shift in *rbcL* transcript polysome association when the ZmsiSS line is compared with the unsilenced control. In ZmsiSS, the transcript is mostly nonpolysomal and found in fractions 3 to 6, whereas the largest peak of *rbcL* mRNA in the unsilenced control is found in fractions 8 to 10. This indicates that maize LS, as in tobacco

and algae, is a CES subunit whose translation is controlled by its assembly state: in the absence of SS, LS translation is decreased.

Steps Limiting Rubisco Accumulation in M Cells: a Working Hypothesis

The data shown in Figures 1 to 3, along with previously published results, led us to formulate a working model for differential Rubisco accumulation in BS versus M cells (Fig. 4). In M cells, *RBCS* transcription is down-regulated, leading to the absence of SS in M chloroplasts. LS, being a CES subunit, therefore represses its own synthesis. We hypothesized that down-regulation of LS synthesis leads to *rbcL* transcript destabilization, thereby accounting for limited *rbcL* mRNA accumulation in M cells (Fig. 1A). In BS cells, *RBCS* is expressed, avoiding any repression of LS synthesis. The model in Figure 4 assumes no differential presence of Rubisco chaperones in the two cell types, allowing us to derive several experimentally testable predictions.




Figure 2. Characterization of *RBCS* RNAi lines. A, Construct targeting *RBCS* genes. An *RBCS* inverted repeat, separated by the rice waxy intron, is flanked by the cauliflower mosaic virus (CaMV) 35S promoter and the octopine synthase (*ocs*) 3' UTR. B, *RBCS* mRNA accumulation in a representative ZmsiSS transgenic line. One-step semiquantitative RT-PCR was conducted on total RNA isolated from the wild type (WT; grown on soil) or the indicated dilutions and on transformed plantlets grown in vitro either expressing the ZmsiSS construct (ZmsiSS) or not (control). Total *RBCS* transcript accumulation was revealed by amplification with the primers hpRBCS cod1 and rev1, which are complementary to both *RBCS1* and *RBCS2* transcripts, for 25 cycles. Amplification of ubiquitin (25 cycles) is presented as a loading control. C, Rubisco LS accumulation in a representative ZmsiSS transgenic plantlet revealed by immunoblot of total proteins extracted from in vitro-grown plantlets. Cytochrome *f* was used as a loading control.

First, this model assumes that the primary control over differential Rubisco accumulation is through the transcriptional regulation of *RBCS*. Second, the model assumes that there is a link between *rbcl* transcript stability and translational status. We then set out to test these two predictions.

Ectopic Expression of SS Does Not Lead to Rubisco Accumulation in M Cells

According to our working model, the repression of *RBCS* transcription alone could be responsible for the lack of Rubisco accumulation in M cells. To test this, we decided to force *RBCS* transcription in M cells. If the model were correct, the presence of SS in M cells should derepress LS translation, leading to *rbcl* transcript stabilization. The availability of both LS and SS should then result in Rubisco assembly and accumulation, assuming that all necessary chaperones were present.

To create an appropriate transformation cassette, we relied on previous work that had established, using

transient assays, the *RBCS* cis-elements that are required for transcriptional repression in the M (Viret et al., 1994). This work suggested that both promoter/5' UTR and 3' UTR elements contributed to this regulation. Therefore, we replaced both these elements to generate the *UbiSSnos* construct shown in Figure 5A. This chimeric gene includes the native *RBCS* coding region and chloroplast transit peptide, driven by the ubiquitin promoter, flanked by the *nos* 3' UTR. We have previously used the *UBI-nos* combination to drive a *RBCS* transit peptide-*yfp* fusion, which was expressed in all leaf cells (Sattarzadeh et al., 2010).

UbiSSnos transformants were generated, and qRT-PCR results from a representative experiment are shown in Figure 5B. We found that the *UbiSSnos* transgene transcripts accumulated in both M and BS preparations, with no signal as expected in the untransformed (wild-type) control. When primers were used that amplify collectively all *RBCS* transcripts, expression was limited to the BS in the wild type but occurred in both cell types in the transgenic. Primers specific for the endogenous *RBCS1* gene showed BS-restricted expression in both genotypes (data not shown). As a control, the cross-contamination level of the M extracts by BS was assessed by the M-to-BS ratio of *ME* transcript. A low level, similar in both wild-type and *UbiSS* lines, was observed, indicating that the transgene indeed was expressed in M cells and was not detected in M preparations as the result of cross-contamination. Thus, the transgene engendered cell type-independent expression of *RBCS* mRNA.

We then analyzed the accumulation of Rubisco using anti-LS and anti-SS antibodies (Fig. 5C). As expected, LS and SS were abundant in both BS samples. In the wild-type control, some LS signal was seen in the M sample,




Figure 3. Rubisco LS translation is repressed in the absence of the SS. Polysome analysis was conducted on an *RBCS*-silenced plantlet (ZmsiSS) and an unsilenced control grown in vitro. Total leaf extract was sedimented through a 15% to 55% Suc gradient. An equal proportion of RNA extracted from each fraction was analyzed by gel blot. Ethidium bromide staining (EtBr) is shown to reflect the similar sedimentation of ribosomal RNAs.




Figure 4. Working model for differential Rubisco accumulation in BS versus M cells. Simplified BS (top) and M (bottom) cells are shown with their nuclei (filled circles) and a chloroplast (shaded ovals). In BS, the nuclear *RBCS* genes express Rubisco SS, which is imported into the chloroplast. The chloroplast *rbcL* gene is transcribed, and its mRNA is loaded onto polysomes and translated. Folding of nascent LS may be facilitated by the BSD2 chaperone. Finally, LS and SS assemble to yield the L_8S_8 holoenzyme. In M cells, the *RBCS* genes are not transcribed (crossed out), and the *rbcL* transcript is not polysome loaded, perhaps leading to its instability. The small amount of translated LS is not assembled, thereby further inhibiting *rbcL* translation due to the CES process.

resulting from contamination by BS proteins and possibly weak Rubisco expression in M cells, as suggested by the relatively high *rbcL* transcript accumulation, which is higher than the cross-contamination level (Fig. 1A). The profile was indistinguishable in the transgenic sample, where the M cross-contamination by BS protein was estimated to be similar to the wild-type level, as gauged by the BS-specific ME marker. This suggests that Rubisco does not accumulate to a significant level in UbiSSnos M chloroplasts even though the *RBCS* transcript accumulates. To assess whether the ectopically expressed *RBCS* mRNA is translated, we used gel blots to assess *UbiSSnos* transcript distribution on M polysomes, using an *RBCS* probe that detects both native and transgenic *RBCS* sequences. Figure 5D shows that *RBCS* mRNA is polysome associated in transgenic M samples. The absence of a *RBCS* hybridization signal in wild-type M polysomes (data not shown) allows us to attribute the signal observed in M transgenic cells to the *UbiSSnos* transgene. The lack of a detectable amount of SS protein in M cells, therefore, can be attributed to a defect in Rubisco assembly, as it is known that unassembled SS undergoes rapid proteolysis (Schmidt and Mishkind, 1983). Taken together, these results demonstrate that

strong expression of SS at the transcriptional level in M cells is insufficient to promote stable Rubisco accumulation. Moreover, *RBCS* expression did not induce LS translation, as the distribution of the *rbcL* transcript in polysome analysis was similar in the UbiSSnos transgenic line as compared with the wild type; nor did it have a consequence on *rbcL* transcript stability (data not shown). Our working model was thereby refuted.


Recoding and Expression of LS as a Nuclear Gene Product

Since ectopic expression of *RBCS* in M cells did not lead to Rubisco accumulation, we considered other negative regulatory mechanisms that might need to be overcome. Two obvious candidates were repression of LS translation and/or an inability to fold LS in M chloroplasts. As documented above, *rbcL* mRNA is of low abundance and poorly translated in M cells, and M expression of the *UbiSSnos* transcript did not alter this (data not shown). Failed LS folding would be possible if a key chaperone were not present in the M. The one reported Rubisco-specific chaperone, BSD2, however, is found in both cell types (Friso et al., 2010).

If translational repression or protein folding were problematic, they could in principle be overcome by expressing LS from the nucleus, where RNA stability regulation would likely be cell type independent and where the protein would be expected to be normally refolded after chloroplast import via the same machinery that imports and refolds SS and many other proteins. To create the appropriate LS expression cassette, *rbcL* was recoded as a nuclear gene with the appropriate codon bias and named *RBCL_N*. A Flag epitope tag was added at the C terminus to enable distinction between LS of nuclear origin and chloroplast-encoded LS. This chimeric coding region was then put in the same context as the *UbiSSnos* transgene (i.e. flanked by the ubiquitin promoter, SS transit peptide, and *nos* terminator; Fig. 6A, UbiLS_Nnos). In a second transgenic line, UbiLS_Nnos was introduced along with UbiSSnos, creating plants that expressed both LS and SS under control of the ubiquitin promoter (Fig. 6A, UbiSS-LS_N).

We analyzed the double transformants to address the key issue of whether nucleus-encoded LS could be properly imported into chloroplasts and incorporated into Rubisco. This was tested by immunoblot analysis of total stromal proteins extracted under native conditions, using either an anti-LS antibody or an anti-Flag antibody for the nucleus-encoded version. As shown in Figure 6B (left panel), Rubisco is the dominant stained band. The center panel shows that total Rubisco migrated at the same position as this stained band, which represents the 550-kD hexadecamer. The quantity did not seem to differ substantially between the wild-type control and UbiSS-LS_N, a conclusion that is further substantiated below. When the anti-Flag antibody was

Figure 5. Ectopic expression of *RBCS* transcripts in M cells. **A**, Schematics of the endogenous *RBCS* genes (top) and the *UbiSSnos* transgenic construct (bottom). Gray and white arrows, *RBCS* and ubiquitin promoters, respectively; horizontal stripes, SS transit peptide (TP); gray rectangles, exons; lines, introns; black and diagonally striped rectangles, *RBCS* and nopaline synthase 3' UTRs, respectively. **B**, Quantitative RT-PCR determination of *UbiSSnos* transgene expression, and total *RBCS* transcript abundance from M cells or BS strands of wild-type (WT) and UbiSS T1 progeny grown in soil. The fold change in expression in this representative qRT-PCR result with three technical replicates was normalized to the *MEP* reference gene and scaled to the sample with the highest expression level for each tested gene, which was defined as 1. *ME* and *MDH* transcript abundance are presented as M-to-BS ratios to assess cell separation purity. **C**, Total proteins were analyzed by immunoblot after BS/M cell separation. RCA, Rubisco activase. PEPC is expected to be enriched in M, while Rubisco activase and ME are enriched in BS. A scan of the Ponceau S-stained membrane (stain) is presented to show loading. **D**, M extracts from the UbiSS line were fractionated through a 15% to 55% Suc gradient, and RNA was extracted to reveal polysome association by northern blot using an *RBCS* probe. Ethidium bromide staining (EtBr) is presented to visualize the ribosomal RNA fractionation profile. [See online article for color version of this figure].



used (right panel), the control showed two faint cross-reacting bands, one at the size of the Rubisco holoenzyme. However, a strong signal was seen for the transgenic, as expected. In addition, all of the signal was at the position of assembled Rubisco. While we cannot exclude that some amount of nucleus-encoded LS is subject to proteolysis, either because it does not enter the chloroplast or because it does not fold correctly after import, these data demonstrate that nucleus-encoded LS can assemble into presumably functional Rubisco. A similar conclusion was reached in an earlier study where LS was expressed from the nucleus in tobacco (Kanevski and Maliga, 1994).

Localization and Expression of Nucleus-Encoded LS

The immunoblot data in Figure 6 indicated that nucleus-encoded LS assembles into Rubisco. To see whether any of this Rubisco was in M cells, we examined the double transformant UbiSS-LS_N, reasoning that without *RBCS* expression in M cells, Rubisco accumulation would certainly not occur. M RNA preparations were made from the wild type and the transformant and analyzed by qRT-PCR, as shown in Figure 7A. This analysis showed that both SS and LS transgenes were expressed at the RNA level in M cells, well above the cross-contamination level as assessed by *ME* quantification. Next, we used immunoblot analysis to explore whether the product of the nuclear LS gene

was present in M cells (Fig. 7B). To judge cross-contamination between M and BS proteins, PEPC was used as an M-specific protein and ME and Rubisco activase as BS-enriched markers. After accounting for differential loading based on the AtpB immunoblot, representing a chloroplast protein whose accumulation is roughly equal between BS and M (Majeran et al., 2008), we concluded that the BS preparations were only slightly contaminated with M proteins, whereas a similar level of BS contamination was found in M preparations from both control and transformant samples. To examine Rubisco, we used anti-Flag, anti-LS, and anti-SS antibodies. The latter two antibodies detect all Rubisco, which appeared to exhibit a similar ratio of M to BS signal in the wild type and the transgenic line. Again, the LS M-to-BS ratio is higher than that of the cross-contamination control ME, suggesting that a small amount of LS does accumulate in M cells, but not in a transgene-specific manner. As observed in Figure 6, a slight cross-reaction was observed when using the anti-Flag antibody with wild-type proteins. In Figure 7B, a BS-enriched protein that migrates just above Rubisco LS was immunodecorated in both wild-type and UbiSS-LS_N samples. As expected, though, anti-Flag gave a major signal in the transformant at the position of LS. The ratio of M to BS signal was similar to that seen with anti-LS, suggesting that Flag-tagged LS was predominantly accumulating in BS cells. These and other blots suggested that if LS were accumulating




Figure 6. Transgenic lines combining ectopic expression of the Rubisco SS and LS. A, Transgenic constructs. Symbols are as described for Figure 5; the speckled box represents sequences encoding the Flag epitope. UbiLS_N-nos directs the expression of nucleus-encoded LS, whereas UbiSS-LS_N is a single construct containing two transgenes under the control of the ubiquitin promoter. B, Proteins from the wild type (WT) or UbiSS-LS_N were extracted under native conditions from chloroplast stromal extracts. Proteins (30 μ g for the Rubisco immunoblot and 50 μ g for the Flag immunoblot) were separated on native 6% to 15% gradient acrylamide gels and transferred to nitrocellulose, followed by staining with Ponceau S (left), and probing with anti-LS or anti-Flag antibodies. [See online article for color version of this figure.]

in M cells of the transgenic line, this accumulation was minimal and no different from that in the wild type.

To ensure that the ectopic transcripts are actively translated in M cells of the double transformant, polysome analysis was performed. A probe directed against the *RbcL_N* transcript gave a signal in polysome-associated transcripts of the M of the UbiSS-LS_N transgenic line (Fig. 7C), and the *UbiSSnos* transgene was similarly detected with an *RBCS* probe. This showed that both *RbcL_N* and *UbiSSnos* mRNAs are largely loaded onto polysomes, as was the case for the latter transcript in the single transgenic line (Fig. 5D). These results suggest that both Rubisco subunits are produced in M cells of the double transgenic line but that Rubisco assembly does not occur.

As an independent approach to detecting Rubisco in M cells, we used immunofluorescence in leaf cross-sections, as shown in Figure 8A. First, an anti-Flag antibody was used to localize nucleus-encoded LS (two left columns). As expected, a strong signal was seen in transgenic material expressing LS_N, corresponding to BS cells. We also noted punctate staining in the M and epidermal layers; however, similar staining was seen in the two negative controls (wild type and UbiSS). Therefore, these data support the conclusion obtained using immunoblots.

We also used an anti-LS antibody to visualize total Rubisco (two right columns). A strong green signal indicated a BS localization, and no obvious staining was seen in M cells.

As an indication of whether nucleus-encoded LS could accumulate in M chloroplasts under any conditions, we analyzed etiolated tissues in which Rubisco expression is not yet cell type specific (Langdale et al., 1988b). Figure 8B (top row) shows two examples in which the anti-Flag antibody was able to detect LS in a cell type-independent manner in these samples, while no significant staining was observed in the wild-type control (Fig. 8B, bottom row). Thus, the LS_N protein can be imported into M plastids and is not inherently unstable in this context.

While we were certain that nucleus-encoded LS was being expressed, it was unclear whether Ubi-LS_N expression influenced the overall level of Rubisco accumulation and whether LS_N constitutes a significant proportion of total Rubisco in the transgenic lines. To address the first question, immunoblot analysis of total protein was performed, as shown in Figure 9, A and B. When the wild-type control was set to 100%, the three transgenic lines accumulated 80% to 100% of this level, as compared with the cytochrome *f* control. Thus, overall Rubisco accumulation is not significantly modified in these lines, in agreement with the result shown for UbiSS-LS_N shown in Figure 6B.

We next used immunoblots to estimate the contribution of Flag-tagged LS to the total Rubisco population. To do this, we used protein standards either for the anti-Flag antibody or for the anti-LS antibody. We compared the signals using known amounts of these standards with several dilutions of total protein from plants expressing either UbiSS-LS_N or Ubi-LS_N. Multiple repetitions were carried out, with representative blots shown in Figure 9C. While it proved difficult to obtain statistically significant data, the results clearly show that LS_N makes a strong contribution to the overall Rubisco population. Based on the Flag and LS standards, we estimate that nucleus-encoded LS represents between 25% and 60% of total LS, depending on the transgenic event and sample analyzed.


In summary, we conclude that both the nuclear and chloroplast versions of *rbcL* are robustly expressed in the transgenic plants and that both are incorporated into Rubisco. This suggests that the C-terminal Flag tag is not detrimental to LS synthesis, import, or assembly. The fact that overall Rubisco levels did not rise in BS chloroplasts suggests that another protein is limiting, presumably either SS or a chaperone, or that homeostasis limits Rubisco accumulation through mechanism(s) that remain to be identified.

DISCUSSION

Overcoming Barriers to Rubisco Accumulation in M

The work presented here describes attempts to engender Rubisco accumulation in maize M chloroplasts, which normally lack this enzyme. It has long been

Figure 7. Rubisco accumulation and gene expression in UbiSS-LS_N transgenic plants. **A**, qRT-PCR analysis of *UbiSSnos* and *RbcL_N* transgene expression and of *RBCS* total accumulation in extracts isolated from M cells of wild-type T43 (WT) and the T1 progeny of UbiSS-LS_N transformants grown in soil. The fold change in expression in this representative qRT-PCR result with three technical replicates was normalized to the *MEP* reference gene and scaled to the sample with the highest expression level for each tested gene, which was defined as 1. *ME* and *MDH* transcript abundance are presented as M-to-BS ratios to assess cell separation purity. **B**, Immunoblot analysis of M or BS total proteins, using the antibodies shown at right. The bottom panel is a Ponceau S-stained membrane, for which the image has been vertically compressed. **C**, Polysome analysis of an M extract from UbiSS-LS_N F1 progeny by northern analysis, with the probes indicated at right. EtBr, Ethidium bromide.



known that *RBCS* genes are transcriptionally repressed in M cells of light-grown maize (Sheen and Bogorad, 1986). In other C₄ systems, such as *Flaveria* and amaranth, posttranscriptional regulation has also been highlighted, as lack of *RBCS* accumulation in M depends on the UTR of the transcripts (Patel et al., 2004, 2006; for review, see Hibberd and Covshoff, 2010). *RBCS* gene expression is then a commonly regulated target to establish C₄ Rubisco patterning. The regulator itself has not definitely been determined. While TRM1 remains a candidate, other candidates might be found among the genes differently expressed between closely related C₃ and C₄ species in recent transcriptomic studies (Bräutigam et al., 2011; Gowik et al., 2011). If *RBCS* transcriptional regulation were the sole regulatory point in maize, bypassing this repression would lead to Rubisco assembly, especially given that *rbcL* mRNA accumulates in M chloroplasts, albeit at a reduced level relative to BS (Sheen and Bogorad, 1985). Ectopic expression of *RBCS* mRNA, however, did not lead to Rubisco accumulation in M, suggesting that additional regulatory barriers were present.

Whether *RBCS* expression is only one limitation to cell type-specific Rubisco accumulation in other C₄ systems remains to be determined. Nonetheless, the

regulation of *rbcL* at posttranscriptional levels, such as transcript stability and translation, has also been observed in other C₄ species, including sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor*; Kubicki et al., 1994) and amaranth (Boinski et al., 1993). In the case of amaranth, an RNA-binding protein whose binding might be involved in *rbcL* mRNA activation in BS chloroplasts was identified (McCormac et al., 2001). Together, this indicates that *rbcL* posttranscriptional regulation is another primary checkpoint in C₄ establishment. Therefore, we expressed LS from the nuclear genome to bypass *rbcL* mRNA instability and the repression of chloroplast LS translation or the absence of an LS-specific translational activator. While the *RBCL_N* transgene was expressed at the protein level and this protein could assemble into Rubisco in both BS chloroplasts and etiolated M plastids, no or very little Rubisco accumulated in differentiated M chloroplasts. To the extent that our results with LS can be generalized, they suggest that while ectopic expression of BS genes in M cells is possible, the movement of entire pathways between cell types is likely to be challenging. This is particularly likely given that M expression of Rubisco, an enzyme with only two structural genes, could not be achieved.




Figure 8. Immunolocalization of Flag-tagged and total LS. A, Differentiated tissue (tip of the third leaf) from the genotypes indicated at left were analyzed by thin sectioning and immunodetection of the Flag epitope (red false color) and Rubisco (green false color). Fluorescence signals were overlaid on differential interference contrast images to show their positions relative to leaf structures. For Flag immunodetection, chlorophyll autofluorescence was minimal, as it is not strongly excited at 594 nm. For LS immunolocalization, LS was imaged from 498 to 517 nm, and chlorophyll autofluorescence was imaged from 659 to 740 nm (red false color). B, Immunolocalization of LS_N in etiolated plants using anti-Flag antibody. The confocal images are an overlay of the 616- to 634-nm fluorescence signal with bright-field images. WT, Wild type.

RBCS Expression in M Cells

The basis for the differential expression of *RBCS* transcripts in BS and M cells appears to include multiple mechanisms. Early transient expression assays showed that *RBCS* promoter sequences alone did not confer cell type-specific expression (Bansal et al., 1992), and a 3' UTR element was subsequently found to be important for transcriptional repression in M cells (Viret et al., 1994). Repression requires sequence elements that bind the zinc finger protein TRM1 (Xu et al., 2001). Maize *RBCS* also appears to be regulated post-transcriptionally, and examination of *RBCS* cell type-specific expression in other C4 species also suggests both transcriptional and posttranscriptional mechanisms (for review, see Hibberd and Covshoff, 2010). To overcome all of these barriers, we placed the SS coding

region under the control of alternative promoter and 3' elements, using the ubiquitin promoter that we had previously shown to drive high-level YFP expression in M chloroplasts when YFP was fused to the SS transit peptide (Sattarzadeh et al., 2010). This led to a strong expression of *RBCS* in M cells (Fig. 5B), with around an 8- to 10-fold enrichment of *RBCS* transcripts in M of the transgenic lines as compared with wild-type M cells.




Figure 9. Overall Rubisco accumulation in transgenic lines. A, Immunoblot analysis of total proteins from the genotypes indicated at the top, with cytochrome *f* as a loading control. B, Quantification of Rubisco LS, relative to cytochrome *f*, as measured by at least three biological replicates, with SE values shown. WT, Wild type. C, Immunoblot analysis was performed on total proteins from the genotypes indicated at left or on purchased protein standards for LS or a Flag epitope-containing protein. Protein standard amounts are shown in pmol, and total protein amounts are shown in μ L. Amounts from the two transgenic lines cannot be compared directly because the total protein samples are of different concentrations.

Evidence that the ectopically expressed *RBCS* mRNA is efficiently translated in M cells was obtained through polysome analysis (Figs. 5D and 7C). Thus, SS is likely produced in M cells of the transgenic plants. It was more difficult to assess whether SS is imported into M chloroplasts, given its failure to assemble into Rubisco. As mentioned above, however, the SS transit peptide directs the import of YFP into M chloroplasts. Therefore, it is very likely that UbiSS transgenic plants import significant amounts of SS into M chloroplasts, which is degraded due to its failure to assemble (Schmidt and Mishkind, 1983). Furthermore, we note that although some earlier studies posited that *RBCS* transcripts might be subject to degradation in M (for review, see Hibberd and Covshoff, 2010), this is clearly not the case in UbiSS, which lacks the native 3' UTR of *RBCS*. Our results also are in contrast with those for *ME*, whose BS-specific cis-element lies within the coding region (Brown et al., 2011). Clearly, C4-specific RNA patterns arise through multiple mechanisms, as regulatory targets for transcriptional or posttranscriptional regulation have been found in the promoter region, such as the MEM1 element in the *Flaveria* PEPC promoter (Gowik et al., 2004), 5' UTR regions of the amaranth and *Flaveria* *RBCS* genes (Patel et al., 2004, 2006), and also the coding region (*ME*; Brown et al., 2011) and 3' UTR (*RBCS*; Xu et al., 2001).

Overcoming Barriers to LS Accumulation in M Chloroplasts

Having determined that SS expression in M cells did not lead to Rubisco accumulation, we considered whether LS was also subject to forms of repression. It is known from several studies where SS expression was down-regulated that LS and SS accumulation are concerted (Furbank et al., 1996; Makino et al., 1997; Rodermel et al., 1988). One mechanism underlying this phenomenon that has been described in tobacco is the translational repression of LS in the absence of its assembly partner (Rodermel et al., 1996). Subsequent work showed that this repression acts through the CES mechanism, in which unassembled LS is believed to act as an autoregulator (Wostrickoff and Stern, 2007). Where such negative autoregulation of chloroplast translation has been dissected in detail, it relies on the binding of unassembled proteins, most likely in concert with tertiary effectors, to the 5' UTRs of the targeted mRNAs (Boulouis et al., 2011). In maize, *rbcl* mRNA is primarily in nonpolysomal fractions in M chloroplasts (Fig. 1B), consistent with this mechanism and also with earlier results showing that purified M chloroplasts synthesize very low amounts of LS during pulse labeling, as compared with BS chloroplasts (Meierhoff and Westhoff, 1993).

To test whether LS is subject to a CES-like mechanism in maize M chloroplasts, we reduced SS expression using RNAi. In these silenced ZmsiSS lines, lacking the SS in both M and BS cells, the *rbcl* profile is comparable

to that observed for wild-type M cells: *rbcl* mRNA is shifted toward the nonpolysomal fractions. We note that these profiles do not completely overlap (compare Figs. 1B and 3), a phenomenon we tentatively attribute to the fact that the experiment in Figure 1 requires a 3-h incubation to isolate M protoplasts, during which there is likely to be some polysomal runoff. Nevertheless, it is clear from our data that the transgenic lines deficient for SS exhibit translational repression of *rbcl*, a hallmark of a CES subunit. Therefore, we speculate that reduced *rbcl* M polysomal association in wild-type cells also results from the inability of LS to assemble. Support for LS autoregulation in the M comes from the *bsd2* mutant phenotype. As shown for tobacco, *bsd2* down-regulation leads to LS instability, which removes the possibility of it repressing its own synthesis in the absence of SS (Wostrickoff and Stern, 2007). In the maize *bsd2* mutant, *rbcl* mRNA polysome association increases in M cells (Brutnell et al., 1999), again suggesting that LS must accumulate to a minimal level in order to mediate translational autoregulation.

Another set of observations incorporated into our hypothesis (Fig. 4) is that translational repression of *rbcl* mRNA leads to its instability. In maize, M-localized *rbcl* mRNA has been shown to be unstable (Kubicki et al., 1994), and several maize mutants exhibit a correlation between general translational defects and *rbcl* mRNA instability (Barkan, 1993; Schultes et al., 2000), the opposite of what was observed with *bsd2*, where in the M, both polysome loading and accumulation of *rbcl* mRNA increased. Our data from ZmsiSS, however, did not show any evidence for *rbcl* mRNA instability when measured in the context of total RNA; M protoplasts could not be isolated due to the fragile nature of the transformants and their lethality. Furthermore, a 2-h treatment of M protoplasts with lincomycin, which inhibits translation elongation shortly after initiation (Kim et al., 1994), did not lead to *rbcl* mRNA instability (data not shown). We conclude that the translational status and stability of *rbcl* mRNA are not inextricably linked.

Our strategy for expressing LS in the M was to relocate the gene to the nucleus, after optimizing codon usage. A previous approach in tobacco combined deletion of the *rbcl* gene through chloroplast transformation with expression of that same sequence under the control of nuclear cis-elements (Kanevski and Maliga, 1994). This led to the accumulation of approximately 10% of the wild-type level of Rubisco. Similarly, a *psbA* gene expressed in the nucleus yielded low amounts of protein relative to its endogenous counterpart (Cheung et al., 1988). We reasoned that codon optimization might increase the production of nucleus-encoded LS. While we did not compare optimized and nonoptimized versions directly, Flag epitope-tagged LS_N was readily detectable and in various experiments appeared to constitute as much as half of the total LS in transformants (Fig. 9; data not shown). Furthermore, based on native gel electrophoresis, all accumulating LS_N is incorporated into Rubisco (Fig. 6), suggesting that LS assembly does not require its intraplastidial synthesis.

Because we do not know precisely how much LS_N is initially produced, we cannot ascertain the efficiency of its assembly relative to the endogenous protein or whether there is any effect of the C-terminal nine-amino acid Flag epitope.

Limitations to Rubisco Accumulation in Maize

Our approach could have led both to ectopic accumulation of Rubisco in M chloroplasts and to an overaccumulation of Rubisco in BS, where transgenic lines expressed both LS and SS under the control of the ubiquitin promoter. Given that Rubisco accounts for only 5% to 9% of leaf nitrogen in C4 plants (Sage et al., 1987), as opposed to a much higher figure in C3 plants (for review, see Feller et al., 2008), nitrogen availability would not appear a priori to be a limitation to increasing the Rubisco level, especially given that a 30% increase was achieved on a leaf area basis through *RBCS* overexpression in rice (*Oryza sativa*; Suzuki et al., 2007), which is C3. Our results, however, suggested that none of the transgenic lines accumulated more Rubisco than the wild type (Fig. 9B), and in transgenic wheat (*Triticum aestivum*), Ubi-*RBCS* expression failed to yield an increased Rubisco amount (Mitchell et al., 2004). On the other hand, we did not initially screen transformants for overexpression; rather, we sought lines with single insertions that correctly expressed the transgenes.

Many explanations are possible for the failure to overaccumulate Rubisco. For example, limiting amounts of one or more chaperones might be responsible, since imported Rubisco subunits would compete for the machinery that refolds proteins following their translocation into the chloroplast. Alternatively, high Rubisco accumulation could trigger specific proteolytic mechanisms, such as those that degrade the enzyme during plant senescence (Feller et al., 2008). Limitation of one or more Rubisco-specific chaperones could also be at play, as we propose below to explain the lack of M chloroplast Rubisco accumulation in transgenic lines. The absence of such a dedicated chaperone could result either from a physiological need to actively prevent Rubisco accumulation in M chloroplasts or from the absence of evolutionary pressure leading to its loss in M chloroplasts.

In M cells, ectopic expression of LS and SS was clearly insufficient to produce Rubisco accumulation at a level detectable above background, whether analyzed by immunoblot (Fig. 7B) or immunolocalization (Fig. 8A). This suggests either that an active mechanism degrades transiently assembled Rubisco in this cell type or that the ectopically expressed subunits cannot assemble into a stable form. While we cannot readily distinguish between these two alternatives, it is important to consider whether known Rubisco assembly factors are present in both M and BS. At the time our studies were under way, the most probable key players in this respect were BSD2 and RBCX. BSD2 is found in both M and BS chloroplasts, and its amount appears to be similar in the two cell types (Friso et al.,

2010). This raises the question of BSD2 function in M chloroplasts, where it conceivably functions as a repressor of Rubisco expression, in contrast to its proposed role in the BS as a cotranslational chaperone for LS (Roth et al., 1996; Brutnell et al., 1999). As a preliminary test of the latter hypothesis, we placed the *UbiLS_Nnos* transgene into a *bsd2* mutant background. Our results showed that the nuclear transgene neither rescued the seedling-lethal phenotype of the *bsd2* mutant nor increased the small amount of LS that accumulates in *bsd2* (data not shown). Thus, BSD2 may act posttranslationally rather than cotranslationally.

RBCX has a demonstrated essential Rubisco assembly function only in certain cyanobacteria (Onizuka et al., 2004), and its function in plants is unknown, although the *Arabidopsis* (*Arabidopsis thaliana*) RBCX proteins can increase the solubility of cyanobacterial LS when expressed in *Escherichia coli* (Kolesiński et al., 2011). In maize, the two RBCX genes are both expressed in BS and M cells. Transcripts of the more strongly expressed locus, *RBCX2*, are found equally in BS and M, whereas *RBCX1* is expressed at a 2-fold higher level in BS cells but only 25% as strongly overall as *RBCX2* (Li et al., 2010). This suggests that RBCX proteins are present in both cell types.

Very recently, a new candidate has emerged as a limiting factor for Rubisco accumulation in M chloroplasts. This protein, Rubisco Accumulation Factor1 (RAF1), was identified from a maize photosynthetic mutant collection among strains that specifically lack Rubisco (Feiz et al., 2012). RAF1, as judged by proteomics and transcriptome analysis, is highly enriched in the BS, and mutant analysis suggests that it is required for the assembly of LS into multimers and/or the subsequent assembly of LS and SS. Whether adding ectopic expression of RAF1 to the SS- LS_N transgenic lines would lead to M Rubisco accumulation is currently being explored.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Plant Culture

Maize (*Zea mays*) plants were grown in soil in greenhouse conditions under 16-h-day/8-h-night conditions at 23°C, unless otherwise specified. For some transgenic plants, analyses were performed on material grown in vitro on Suc-containing Murashige and Skoog 0 dicamba (no growth regulator) medium. Etiolated plants were grown for 10 d in the dark on vermiculite.

Transgenics

Maize transformation was carried as described (Sattarzadeh et al., 2010). Transgenic explants were recovered on the basis of paromomycin resistance conferred by the *npHII* gene present in the binary vectors and confirmed via an npHII ELISA test (Agdia). Primary transformants were backcrossed to a wild type, the Hi II transformation recipient in most cases, which is a hybrid between inbreds A188 and B73. F1 transgenic progeny were identified by PCR genotyping on tissue extracted as the first leaf emerged, using a modified cetyl-trimethyl-ammonium bromide extraction protocol (Ahern et al., 2009), with the *RBCS* cod2 and nos RT rev2 primers for the UbiSS construct and NuLS fw2 and NuLS rev2 primers for the nucleus-encoded *RBCL* gene. All primer sequences are given in Supplemental Table S1.

Plant Transformation Constructs

RNAi Silencing Cassette

A 347-bp fragment of *ZmRBCS1* (ZmGDB accession no. GRMZM2G140016) was cloned as an inverted repeat separated by the rice (*Oryza sativa*) waxy intron in the vector pMCG161 (http://www.chromdb.org/rnai/vector_info.html) and subcloned into the binary vector pPZP212 (Hajdukiewicz et al., 1994). As the sequence used is highly homologous to the *ZmRBCS2* sequence (ZmGDB accession no. GRMZM2G1113033), it was anticipated to lead to efficient silencing of both *RBCS* genes. Further subcloning introduced the 4.2-kb *ScaI* fragment of the hpRBCS plasmid into *SmaI*-digested pPZP212, yielding the plasmid pPTN425 used for maize transformation.

UbiSSnos Cassette

The complete *ZmRBCS1* coding sequence (677 bp) was amplified from T43 DNA with primers adding *HindIII* and *Clal* restriction sites (*RBCS1* AUG-*HindIII* and *RBCS1* rev *Clal*) using Platinum Pfx DNA polymerase and its enhancer solution (Invitrogen). The PCR product was cloned in the pGemT-easy vector after adding an A overhang by a 10-min incubation at 72°C with Taq polymerase (Promega) in the *Escherichia coli* strain GM2163 *dam⁻ dcm⁻*, yielding the *RBCS* HC-pGemT plasmid. Sequencing of the PCR product revealed a T-to-A mutation in the intron at position 269. The 272-bp *nos* terminator was amplified from the plasmid pPTN458 (Sattarzadeh et al., 2010) using primers adding *Clal* and *ApaI* restriction sites at its ends (*nos-Clal* and *nos-ApaI*) and inserted into the *Clal-ApaI*-digested *RBCS* HC-pGemT, yielding the plasmid pHcnos. The *RBCS*-*nos* sequences were further subcloned following *HindIII-ApaI* digestion of pHcnos and ligation into *HindIII-ApaI*-digested pBluescript SK-, yielding the plasmid HCnos-pBS. The *RBCS*-*nos* sequences were placed downstream of the maize ubiquitin promoter (Christensen et al., 1992) by subcloning the *HindIII-KpnI* fragment of HCnos-pBS into the pUBI4 plasmid, kindly provided by Dr. A.B. Cahoon (Middle Tennessee State University), yielding the plasmid pUbiHCnos. Further subcloning into the binary vector pPZP212 yielded the pPTN438 plasmid that was used for maize transformation.

LS_N Construct

The maize *rbcl* chloroplast gene (GenBank accession no. NC001666) was recoded for efficient expression in the maize nuclear genome (Geneart). The 5' sequences corresponding to part of the maize *RBCS* sequences encoding the SS transit peptide, as well as a *BamHI* restriction site and 3' sequences encoding the Flag epitope and a *Clal* restriction site, were added by PCR using the *ZmRBCSTP*-NuRbcL.F and ZmNuRbcL flag tag.R primers. The *BamHI-Clal* product was inserted into the pHcnos δ Bam plasmid, obtained after site-directed mutagenesis destroying the *BamHI* site in the multicloning site using the HCnos-pBS δ Bam QC1 and QC2 primers (Quickchange mutagenesis; Stratagene), yielding the plasmid *RBCSTP*-NuRbcL-*nos*. The *HindIII-KpnI* fragment was then excised and inserted into the plasmid pUBI4 (see above), yielding the plasmid Ubi-*RBCSTP*-NuRbcLFlag-*nos*. Further subcloning into pPZP212 yielded the plasmid pPTN618. To construct pPTN728, the plasmid Ubi-*RBCSTP*-NuRbcLFLag-*nos* was further subcloned into pPTN438 plasmid.

M/BS Extraction

BS and M extractions were performed on 2 to 5 g of leaves as described (Markelz et al., 2003), except that BS strand isolations were carried out entirely at 4°C to minimize degradation. TS represents tissue incubated as for the preparation of M protoplasts but where cellulase and macerase were omitted (mock treatment). Purity of the extracts was tested either by qRT-PCR on isolated RNA and/or by immunoblot analysis using known transcripts or proteins highly enriched in either fraction. For qRT-PCR, primers designed against the M-enriched *MDH* gene (Zm-qMDH F1 and R1; GenBank accession no. X16084.1), the BS-enriched *ME* mRNA (ZmqME F1 and R1; GenBank accession no. J05130.1), and membrane protein PB1A10.07c (MEP) transcripts (ZM-qMEP F1 and R1; accession no. GRMZM2G018103) were used. For protein characterization, anti-PEPC (Agrisera), anti-Rubisco activase (a kind gift of Dr. Michael Salvucci, U.S. Arid-Land Agricultural Research Center), and anti-ME antibody (a kind gift of Dr. Timothy Nelson, Yale University) were used as markers for M or BS purity.

RNA Characterization

Total RNA was extracted from 150 mg of second or third leaves using Tri-Reagent (Molecular Research) and analyzed by gel-blot hybridization at 65°C using modified (0.1% bovine serum albumin [BSA]) Church and Gilbert buffer (Church and Gilbert, 1984). The *rbcl*, *psaB*, *RBCS*, *ME*, *MDH*, and *RBCL_N* probes were PCR products amplified with primers given in Supplemental Table S1.

For classical RT-PCR experiments, the Access RT-PCR system (Promega) was used for one-step RT-PCR, starting from 100 ng of RNA. RT and PCR were conducted as specified, with a RT step of 45 min at 48°C, followed by a 2 min of denaturation at 94°C, and the stated number of cycles of 30 s at 94°C, 45 s at the appropriate annealing temperature, and 30 s at 68°C for primer pairs designed to amplify ubiquitin and total *RBCS* cDNA (with the hpRBCS cod1 and rev1 primer pair annealing to both *RBCS1* and *RBCS2* cDNAs).

For qRT-PCR, 5 μ g of mRNA was treated with DNase I and purified using the DNA-free RNA kit (Zymo Research). Subsequently, 2 μ g of mRNA was reverse transcribed using random hexamers and SuperScript III (Invitrogen) according to the manufacturer's instructions. qRT-PCR was performed using the FastStart SYBR Green Master Mix (Roche) in a 20- μ L reaction in the Rotorgene 3000 (Qiagen). Classical three-step amplification was performed (annealing at 60°C), and fluorescence acquisition was realized at different temperatures depending on the primer used. Data analysis was carried out with the Rotor Gene Q Series software, and the Pfaffl method was used for quantification (Pfaffl, 2001).

Polysomes were prepared by grinding 150 mg of tissue in 1 mL of polysome extraction buffer as described (Barkan, 1998), except that centrifugation was performed at 40,000 rpm at 4°C either for 90 min in a SW-50Ti rotor or for 108 min in an MLS-50 rotor.

Protein Characterization

A total of 7.5 to 50 μ g of proteins, extracted as described (Wostrikoff and Stern, 2007), was separated through SDS gels and blotted onto nitrocellulose or Hybond C membranes (GE Healthcare). Immunodecoration was performed using standard protocols. Antibodies raised against LS (1:50,000 dilution), SS (1:20,000 dilution), and PEPC (1:20,000 dilution) were purchased from Agrisera. Anti-cytochrome *f* and anti-ME were used at 1:10,000 dilution, anti-AtpB at 1:60,000 dilution, and anti-Rubisco activase at 1:30,000 dilution. Primary antibodies were incubated overnight at 4°C in Tris-buffered saline plus 0.1% Tween, and an anti-rabbit secondary antibody (1:20,000 dilution) was incubated for 1 h. An anti-Flag M2 antibody conjugated to horseradish peroxidase was purchased from Sigma and used at 1:40,000 dilution. The reaction was revealed using the ECL kit (Amersham) either on x-ray film or using a CCD imaging system (Chemidoc; Bio-Rad).

Immunolocalization

Thin cross-sections were manually made and fixed in 4% formaldehyde, 5% dimethyl sulfoxide, and 1 \times PME (for 50 mM Pipes, 5 mM MgSO₄, and 10 mM EGTA) for 2 h, as adapted from a published method (Harrison et al., 2002). Vacuum was applied for the first 1 h of incubation. Sections were secured on coverslips with 0.75% agarose and treated for 20 min with cellulytic enzymes (1% cellulase RS, 0.01% pectolyase; Phytotechlab) and 0.1% BSA in 1 \times PME buffer. After three washes with 1 \times phosphate-buffered saline (PBS), the sections were saturated with 1% BSA in 1 \times PBS for 90 min.

The anti-Flag (F1804; Sigma) and anti-LS were added, and incubation was carried out with 1:400 and 1:1,000 dilutions, respectively, overnight at room temperature in a humid chamber. After 1 \times PBS washes, secondary antibodies (an AlexaFluor 594 goat anti-mouse antibody for flag detection [A21125] and an AlexaFluor 488 goat anti-rabbit antibody [A11008] for Rubisco detection [Molecular Probes, Invitrogen]) were incubated at a 1:100 dilution for 2 h in a humid chamber. After washes in 1 \times PBS, sections were mounted in Mowiol's medium.

Images were collected on a TCS-SP5 confocal microscope (Leica Microsystems) at the Boyce Thompson Institute Plant Cell Imaging Center using a HCX PL APO CS 40.0 \times 1.25 oil UV immersion objective, zoom 1.7. For Rubisco immunolocalization, AF488 and chlorophyll autofluorescence were excited with a blue argon ion laser (488 nm), and emitted light was collected for channel 1 between 498 and 517 nm and for channel 2 between 659 and 740 nm. For Flag immunolocalization, AF594 was excited with an orange helium-neon laser (594 nm), and emitted light was collected from 616 to

634 nm to minimize chlorophyll autofluorescence. Differential interference contrast or bright-field images were collected simultaneously using the transmitted light detector and were overlaid with the fluorescence images to reveal the shape of the cross-section. Images were processed using Leica LAS-AF software (version 1.8.2) and Adobe Photoshop CS2 version 9.0.2.

Supplemental Data

The following materials are available in the online version of this article.

Supplemental Table S1. List of primers used in this study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the Arabidopsis Biological Resource Center for supplying the pMCG161 plasmid (CD3-459); Dr. Bruce Cahoon (Middle Tennessee State University) for providing pUbi4; Geneart for synthesis of the nucleus-encoded *rbcl* gene; Nicole Markelz and Tom Brutnell (Boyce Thompson Institute) for help with M and BS extraction and for the *MDH*, *ME*, *UBL*, and *RBCS2* primer sequences; and Suzanne Belcher and Alice Barkan (University of Oregon) for attempting a reverse genetic screen for *RBCS* mutants. Dr. Mike Salvucci (U.S. Department of Agriculture) and Drs. Tim Nelson and Lori Tausta (Yale University) are gratefully acknowledged for sharing and distributing the Rubisco activase and ME antibodies, respectively. We thank the Boyce Thompson Institute Plant Cell Imaging Center for assistance with confocal microscopy.

Received February 15, 2012; accepted June 26, 2012; published June 28, 2012.

LITERATURE CITED

- Ahern KR, Deewatthanawong P, Schares J, Muszynski M, Weeks R, Vollbrecht E, Duvick J, Brendel VP, Brutnell TP (2009) Regional mutagenesis using Dissociation in maize. *Methods* **49**: 248–254
- Bansal KC, Viret JF, Haley J, Khan BM, Schantz R, Bogorad L (1992) Transient expression from *cab-m1* and *rbcs-m3* promoter sequences is different in mesophyll and bundle sheath cells in maize leaves. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **89**: 3654–3658
- Barkan A (1993) Nuclear mutants of maize with defects in chloroplast polysome assembly have altered chloroplast RNA metabolism. *Plant Cell* **5**: 389–402
- Barkan A (1998) Approaches to investigating nuclear genes that function in chloroplast biogenesis in land plants. *Methods Enzymol* **297**: 38–57
- Boinski JJ, Wang JL, Xu P, Hotchkiss T, Berry JO (1993) Post-transcriptional control of cell type-specific gene expression in bundle sheath and mesophyll chloroplasts of *Amaranthus hypochondriacus*. *Plant Mol Biol* **22**: 397–410
- Boulouis A, Raynaud C, Bujaldon S, Aznar A, Wollman FA, Choquet Y (2011) The nucleus-encoded trans-acting factor MCA1 plays a critical role in the regulation of cytochrome *f* synthesis in *Chlamydomonas* chloroplasts. *Plant Cell* **23**: 333–349
- Bräutigam A, Kajala K, Wullenweber J, Sommer M, Gagneul D, Weber KL, Carr KM, Gowik U, Mass J, Lercher MJ, et al (2011) An mRNA blueprint for C4 photosynthesis derived from comparative transcriptomics of closely related C3 and C4 species. *Plant Physiol* **155**: 142–156
- Brown NJ, Newell CA, Stanley S, Chen JE, Perrin AJ, Kajala K, Hibberd JM (2011) Independent and parallel recruitment of preexisting mechanisms underlying C4 photosynthesis. *Science* **331**: 1436–1439
- Brutnell TP, Sawers RJ, Mant A, Langdale JA (1999) BUNDLE SHEATH DEFECTIVE2, a novel protein required for post-translational regulation of the *rbcl* gene of maize. *Plant Cell* **11**: 849–864
- Cheung AY, Bogorad L, Van Montagu M, Schell J (1988) Relocating a gene for herbicide tolerance: a chloroplast gene is converted into a nuclear gene. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **85**: 391–395
- Christensen AH, Sharrock RA, Quail PH (1992) Maize polyubiquitin genes: structure, thermal perturbation of expression and transcript splicing, and promoter activity following transfer to protoplasts by electroporation. *Plant Mol Biol* **18**: 675–689
- Church GM, Gilbert W (1984) Genomic sequencing. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **81**: 1991–1995
- Ewing RM, Jenkins GI, Langdale JA (1998) Transcripts of maize *RbcS* genes accumulate differentially in C3 and C4 tissues. *Plant Mol Biol* **36**: 593–599
- Feiz L, Williams-Carrier R, Wostrickoff K, Belcher S, Barkan A, Stern DB (2012) Rubisco Accumulation Factor 1 is required for holoenzyme assembly in maize. *Plant Cell* (in press)
- Feller U, Anders I, Mae T (2008) Rubiscolytics: fate of Rubisco after its enzymatic function in a cell is terminated. *J Exp Bot* **59**: 1615–1624
- Friso G, Majeran W, Huang M, Sun Q, van Wijk KJ (2010) Reconstruction of metabolic pathways, protein expression, and homeostasis machineries across maize bundle sheath and mesophyll chloroplasts: large-scale quantitative proteomics using the first maize genome assembly. *Plant Physiol* **152**: 1219–1250
- Furbank RT, Chitty JA, Von Caemmerer S, Jenkins C (1996) Antisense RNA inhibition of *RbcS* gene expression reduces Rubisco level and photosynthesis in the C4 plant *Flaveria bidentis*. *Plant Physiol* **111**: 725–734
- Ghannoum O (2009) C4 photosynthesis and water stress. *Ann Bot (Lond)* **103**: 635–644
- Gowik U, Bräutigam A, Weber KL, Weber AP, Westhoff P (2011) Evolution of C4 photosynthesis in the genus *Flaveria*: how many and which genes does it take to make C4? *Plant Cell* **23**: 2087–2105
- Gowik U, Burscheidt J, Akyildiz M, Schlue U, Koczor M, Streubel M, Westhoff P (2004) *cis*-Regulatory elements for mesophyll-specific gene expression in the C4 plant *Flaveria trinervia*, the promoter of the C4 phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase gene. *Plant Cell* **16**: 1077–1090
- Hajdukiewicz P, Svab Z, Maliga P (1994) The small, versatile pPZP family of *Agrobacterium* binary vectors for plant transformation. *Plant Mol Biol* **25**: 989–994
- Harrison MJ, Dewbre GR, Liu J (2002) A phosphate transporter from *Medicago truncatula* involved in the acquisition of phosphate released by arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *Plant Cell* **14**: 2413–2429
- Hibberd JM, Covshoff S (2010) The regulation of gene expression required for C4 photosynthesis. *Annu Rev Plant Biol* **61**: 181–207
- Kanevski I, Maliga P (1994) Relocation of the plastid *rbcl* gene to the nucleus yields functional ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase in tobacco chloroplasts. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **91**: 1969–1973
- Khrebttukova I, Spreitzer RJ (1996) Elimination of the *Chlamydomonas* gene family that encodes the small subunit of ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase/oxygenase. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **93**: 13689–13693
- Kim J, Eichacker LA, Rudiger W, Mullet JE (1994) Chlorophyll regulates accumulation of the plastid-encoded chlorophyll proteins P700 and D1 by increasing apoprotein stability. *Plant Physiol* **104**: 907–916
- Kolesinski P, Piechota J, Szczepaniak A (2011) Initial characteristics of *RbcX* proteins from *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Plant Mol Biol* **77**: 447–459
- Kubicki A, Steinmüller K, Westhoff P (1994) Differential transcription of plastome-encoded genes in the mesophyll and bundle-sheath chloroplasts of the monocotyledonous NADP-malic enzyme-type C4 plants maize and sorghum. *Plant Mol Biol* **25**: 669–679
- Langdale JA, Rothermel BA, Nelson T (1988a) Cellular pattern of photosynthetic gene expression in developing maize leaves. *Genes Dev* **2**: 106–115
- Langdale JA, Zelitch I, Miller E, Nelson T (1988b) Cell position and light influence C4 versus C3 patterns of photosynthetic gene expression in maize. *EMBO J* **7**: 3643–3651
- Li P, Ponnala L, Gandotra N, Wang L, Si Y, Tausta SL, Kebrom TH, Provart N, Patel R, Myers CR, et al (2010) The developmental dynamics of the maize leaf transcriptome. *Nat Genet* **42**: 1060–1067
- Majeran W, Zybailov B, Ytterberg AJ, Dunsmore J, Sun Q, van Wijk KJ (2008) Consequences of C4 differentiation for chloroplast membrane proteomes in maize mesophyll and bundle sheath cells. *Mol Cell Proteomics* **7**: 1609–1638
- Makino A, Shimada T, Takumi S, Kaneko K, Matsuoka M, Shimamoto K, Nakano H, Miyao-Tokutomi M, Mae T, Yamamoto N (1997) Does decrease in ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase by antisense *RbcS* lead to a higher N-use efficiency of photosynthesis under conditions of saturating CO2 and light in rice plants? *Plant Physiol* **114**: 483–491
- Manoli A, Sturaro A, Trevisan S, Quaggiotti S, Nonis A (2012) Evaluation of candidate reference genes for qPCR in maize. *J Plant Physiol* **169**: 807–815
- Markelz NH, Costich DE, Brutnell TP (2003) Photomorphogenic responses in maize seedling development. *Plant Physiol* **133**: 1578–1591
- McCormac DJ, Litz H, Wang J, Gollnick PD, Berry JO (2001) Light-associated and processing-dependent protein binding to 5' regions of *rbcl* mRNA in the chloroplasts of a C4 plant. *J Biol Chem* **276**: 3476–3483
- Meierhoff K, Westhoff P (1993) Differential biogenesis of photosystem II in mesophyll and bundle-sheath cells of monocotyledonous NADP-malic enzyme-type C4 plants: the non-stoichiometric abundance of the

- subunits of photosystem II in the bundle-sheath chloroplasts and the translational activity of the plastome-encoded genes. *Planta* **191**: 23–33
- Mitchell RAC, Joyce PA, Rong H, Evans VJ, Madgwick PJ, Parry MAJ** (2004) Loss of decreased-Rubisco phenotype between generations of wheat transformed with antisense and sense *rbcs*. *Ann Appl Biol* **145**: 209–216
- Onizuka T, Endo S, Akiyama H, Kanai S, Hirano M, Yokota A, Tanaka S, Miyasaka H** (2004) The *rbcs* gene product promotes the production and assembly of ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase/oxygenase of *Synechococcus* sp. PCC7002 in *Escherichia coli*. *Plant Cell Physiol* **45**: 1390–1395
- Patel M, Berry JO** (2008) Rubisco gene expression in C4 plants. *J Exp Bot* **59**: 1625–1634
- Patel M, Corey AC, Yin LP, Ali S, Taylor WC, Berry JO** (2004) Untranslated regions from *C₄ amaranth AhRbcS1* mRNAs confer translational enhancement and preferential bundle sheath cell expression in transgenic *C₄ Flaveria bidentis*. *Plant Physiol* **136**: 3550–3561
- Patel M, Siegel AJ, Berry JO** (2006) Untranslated regions of *FbRbcS1* mRNA mediate bundle sheath cell-specific gene expression in leaves of a C4 plant. *J Biol Chem* **281**: 25485–25491
- Pfaffl MW** (2001) A new mathematical model for relative quantification in real-time RT-PCR. *Nucleic Acids Res* **29**: e45
- Rodermel S, Haley J, Jiang CZ, Tsai CH, Bogorad L** (1996) A mechanism for intergenomic integration: abundance of ribulose bisphosphate carboxylase small-subunit protein influences the translation of the large-subunit mRNA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **93**: 3881–3885
- Rodermel SR, Abbott MS, Bogorad L** (1988) Nuclear-organelle interactions: nuclear antisense gene inhibits ribulose bisphosphate carboxylase enzyme levels in transformed tobacco plants. *Cell* **55**: 673–681
- Roth R, Hall LN, Brutnell TP, Langdale JA** (1996) *bundle sheath defective2*, a mutation that disrupts the coordinated development of bundle sheath and mesophyll cells in the maize leaf. *Plant Cell* **8**: 915–927
- Sage RF, Pearcy RW, Seemann JR** (1987) The nitrogen use efficiency of C(3) and C(4) plants. III. Leaf nitrogen effects on the activity of carboxylating enzymes in *Chenopodium album* (L.) and *Amaranthus retroflexus* (L.). *Plant Physiol* **85**: 355–359
- Sattarzadeh A, Fuller J, Moguel S, Wostrickoff K, Sato S, Covshoff S, Clemente T, Hanson M, Stern DB** (2010) Transgenic maize lines with cell-type specific expression of fluorescent proteins in plastids. *Plant Biotechnol J* **8**: 112–125
- Schmidt GW, Mishkind ML** (1983) Rapid degradation of unassembled ribulose 1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase small subunits in chloroplasts. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **80**: 2632–2636
- Schultes NP, Sawers RJ, Brutnell TP, Krueger RW** (2000) Maize high chlorophyll fluorescent 60 mutation is caused by an Ac disruption of the gene encoding the chloroplast ribosomal small subunit protein 17. *Plant J* **21**: 317–327
- Sheen JY, Bogorad L** (1985) Differential expression of the ribulose bisphosphate carboxylase large subunit gene in bundle sheath and mesophyll cells of developing maize leaves is influenced by light. *Plant Physiol* **79**: 1072–1076
- Sheen JY, Bogorad L** (1986) Expression of the ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase large subunit gene and three small subunit genes in two cell types of maize leaves. *EMBO J* **5**: 3417–3422
- Sheen JY, Bogorad L** (1987) Differential expression of C4 pathway genes in mesophyll and bundle sheath cells of greening maize leaves. *J Biol Chem* **262**: 11726–11730
- Suzuki Y, Ohkubo M, Hatakeyama H, Ohashi K, Yoshizawa R, Kojima S, Hayakawa T, Yamaya T, Mae T, Makino A** (2007) Increased Rubisco content in transgenic rice transformed with the ‘sense’ *rbcs* gene. *Plant Cell Physiol* **48**: 626–637
- Viret JF, Mabrouk Y, Bogorad L** (1994) Transcriptional photoregulation of cell-type-preferred expression of maize *rbcs-m3*: 3′ and 5′ sequences are involved. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **91**: 8577–8581
- Wostrickoff K, Stern D** (2007) Rubisco large-subunit translation is auto-regulated in response to its assembly state in tobacco chloroplasts. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **104**: 6466–6471
- Xu T, Purcell M, Zucchi P, Helentjaris T, Bogorad L** (2001) TRM1, a YY1-like suppressor of *rbcs-m3* expression in maize mesophyll cells. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **98**: 2295–2300