

1

2

3 **Massive tandem proliferation of ELIPs supports convergent evolution of desiccation**

4 **tolerance across land plants**

5

6 Robert VanBuren^{1,2*}, Jeremy Pardo^{2,3}, Ching Man Wai^{1,2}, Sterling Evans¹, Dorothea Bartels⁴

7

8 ¹Department of Horticulture, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA

9 ²Plant Resilience Institute, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

10 ³Department of Plant Biology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

11 ⁴IMBIO, University of Bonn, Kirschallee 1, D-53115 Bonn, Germany

12 *Corresponding author: bobvanburen@gmail.com

13

14 **Short title:** Desiccation tolerance arose via ELIP duplication

15

16 **One-sentence summary: A recurrent gene duplication event is found in all surveyed**

17 **resurrection plant genomes supporting convergent evolution of this trait.**

18

19 **Author Contributions:** R.V. designed and conceived research; R.V., J.P., C.M.W., S.E., and

20 D.B. analyzed data; R.V. wrote the paper. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

21

22 **Abstract**

23 Desiccation tolerance was a critical adaptation for the colonization of land by early non-vascular

24 plants. Resurrection plants have maintained or rewired these ancestral protective mechanisms

25 and desiccation-tolerant species are dispersed across the land plant phylogeny. Though common

26 physiological, biochemical, and molecular signatures are observed across resurrection plant

27 lineages, features underlying the recurrent evolution of desiccation tolerance are unknown. Here

28 we used a comparative approach to identify patterns of genome evolution and gene duplication

29 associated with desiccation tolerance. We identified a single gene family with dramatic

30 expansion in all sequenced resurrection plant genomes and no expansion in desiccation-sensitive

31 species. This gene family of early light-induced proteins (ELIPs) expanded in resurrection plants

32 convergent through repeated tandem gene duplication. ELIPs are universally highly expressed

33 during desiccation in all surveyed resurrection plants and may play a role in protecting against

34 photooxidative damage of the photosynthetic apparatus during prolonged dehydration.
35 Photosynthesis is particularly sensitive to dehydration and the increased abundance of ELIPs
36 may help facilitate the rapid recovery observed for most resurrection plants. Together, these
37 observations support convergent evolution of desiccation tolerance in land plants through tandem
38 gene duplication.

39

40 **Key words:** convergent evolution, desiccation tolerance, land plants, tandem duplication, ELIP

41

42

43 **Introduction**

44 The ability to survive near complete anhydrobiosis is ubiquitous and desiccation tolerance is
45 observed in prokaryotes, protists, fungi, plants, and even animals. The origin of desiccation
46 tolerance in plants is unknown, but its prevalence throughout land plants and green algae suggest
47 it is ancestral. Desiccation tolerance was essential during the transition from water to land, and
48 these ancestral protective mechanisms are retained in some bryophytes, lycophytes, and ferns
49 (Proctor, 1990; Oliver et al., 2005; Porembski, 2011). Early vegetative desiccation tolerance
50 mechanisms likely formed the basis of pollen and seed desiccation pathways in angiosperms, as
51 core abscisic acid-regulated pathways have conserved functions in seed and non-seed plants
52 (Eklund et al., 2018). Plants with vegetative desiccation tolerance are broadly termed
53 ‘resurrection plants’ because of their revival from typically lethal, prolonged dehydration.
54 Vegetative desiccation tolerance in angiosperms arose more recently, and mounting evidence
55 suggests it evolved through rewiring pathways leading to desiccation tolerance in seeds (Oliver
56 et al., 2000; Illing et al., 2005; Farrant and Moore, 2011; Costa et al., 2017; VanBuren et al.,
57 2017). Desiccation tolerance evolved independently in at least 13 lineages of angiosperms and
58 over 300 diverse resurrection plant species have been identified to date across all major plant
59 taxa outside of gymnosperms (Bewley and Krochko, 1982; Oliver et al., 2000; Oliver et al.,
60 2005). This is likely an underestimation, as many desiccation tolerant fern and fern allies are
61 uncharacterized (Porembski, 2011).

62 The successful induction of desiccation tolerance requires the coordinated expression of
63 complex pathways with thousands of genes, and the deployment of physiological and
64 biochemical safeguards to protect cellular macromolecules and machinery. The photosynthetic
65 machinery is particularly sensitive to dehydration and must be maintained intact or repaired
66 quickly after rehydration (Challabathula et al., 2016). Desiccation-associated responses are well
67 characterized and a core set are conserved across all resurrection plants. These include
68 accumulation of osmoprotectants, reactive oxygen species (ROS) scavengers, and late
69 embryogenesis abundant (LEA) proteins as well as changes in cell structure and other physical
70 properties (Illing et al., 2005; Zhang and Bartels, 2018). These conserved molecular signatures
71 suggest desiccation tolerance evolved convergently through rewiring similar, preexisting
72 pathways across independent lineages (Bewley, 1979; Gaff, 1997). This hypothesis is now

73 testable given the wealth of genomic resources for desiccation-tolerant species. The genomes of
74 several model resurrection plants have been sequenced including *Boea hygrometrica* (Xiao et al.,
75 2015), *Oropetium thomaeum* (VanBuren et al., 2015), *Xerophyta viscosa* (Costa et al., 2017),
76 *Lindernia brevidens* (VanBuren et al. 2018b), *Selaginella lepidophylla* (VanBuren et al., 2018c),
77 and *Selaginella tamariscina* (Xu et al., 2018). Genomes are also available for the abscisic acid
78 (ABA)-inducible desiccation tolerant bryophytes *Physcomitrella patens* (Rensing et al., 2008)
79 and *Marchantia polymorpha* (Bowman et al., 2017). Despite abundant genomic resources, large-
80 scale comparisons of desiccation-related genes and pathways between these species are limited.

81 Gene duplications drive innovation and facilitate rapid adaptation to abiotic stresses
82 (Hanada et al., 2008). Tandem gene duplicates in *O. thomaeum* (VanBuren et al., 2017), *S.*
83 *lepidophylla* (VanBuren et al., 2018c), and *X. viscosa* (Costa et al., 2017) are enriched in
84 functions related to dehydration stress and desiccation. Though similar enrichment patterns are
85 observed across these taxa, overlap of duplicated orthologous genes has not been analyzed
86 between independent resurrection plant lineages. Here, we identified patterns of gene
87 duplication and gene family expansion associated with the evolution of desiccation tolerance.
88 We identified a single gene family uniquely expanded in all sequenced resurrection plants. This
89 gene family expansion is driven primarily by tandem duplication and genes in this family are
90 universally highly expressed in all surveyed resurrection plants. Similar duplication patterns
91 despite ~475 million years of separation (Smith et al., 2010) supports convergent evolution of
92 desiccation tolerance.

93

94 **Results**

95 *Patterns of gene family dynamics in resurrection plant genomes*

96 The evolution of desiccation tolerance may occur through recurrent duplication of shared genes
97 and pathways across independent lineages of resurrection plants. Duplication of these common
98 features could increase the abundance of important osmoprotectants and end-point metabolites,
99 or facilitate high-level pathway rewiring through regulatory neo or subfunctionalization. To test
100 if conserved gene duplication events are contributing to desiccation tolerance, we surveyed
101 changes in gene family composition across diverse desiccation-tolerant and sensitive land-plant
102 genomes. Orthogroups were identified using OrthoFinder (Emms and Kelly, 2015) for nine
103 monocot, six eudicot, two bryophyte and two lycophyte genomes (Supplemental Table S1).
104 Three desiccation-tolerant angiosperms (*Lindernia brevidens*, *Oropetium thomaeum*, and
105 *Xerophyta viscosa*) and two bryophytes with ABA-induced desiccation tolerance (*P. patens* and
106 *M. polymorpha*) were included for analysis. In total, 26,406 orthogroups were identified across
107 the 19 species and 456,776 (78.8%) of the input genes were assigned to orthogroups. Of these,
108 4,625 orthogroups had representatives from all 19 species. This subset of conserved orthogroups
109 was used to identify gene families that were expanded in all resurrection plant genomes but
110 showed no expansion in desiccation-sensitive plants. Three orthogroups have expanded in all
111 resurrection plants compared to desiccation-sensitive species: OG0212, OG1697, and OG2512.
112 The *Arabidopsis* (*Arabidopsis thaliana*) orthologs in OG2512 include the glycine-rich domain

113 protein AtGRDP1, which has a role in seed germination and ABA signaling (Rodríguez-
114 Hernández et al., 2014). The *AtGRDP1* null mutant has higher sensitivity to salt and osmotic
115 stress, and overexpression increases stress tolerance (Rodríguez-Hernández et al., 2014).
116 OG1697 contains orthologs related to the rice (*Oryza sativa*) domestication gene *SH4*, which is
117 involved in in seed shattering and development of the seed abscission layer (Li et al., 2006).
118 OG0212 contains the early light-induced proteins (ELIPs), which have a well-defined role in
119 protection against photooxidative damage under high light conditions (Hutin et al., 2003).
120 Together, this supports gene duplication-mediated rewiring of seed-related processes in
121 resurrection plants, consistent with previous hypotheses (Bewley, 1979; Illing et al., 2005; Costa
122 et al., 2017; VanBuren et al., 2017). *P. patens* and *M. polymorpha* require exogenous ABA to
123 induce desiccation tolerance and are not classified as true resurrection plants. Excluding these
124 two lineages from enrichment tests identified a single expanded orthogroup (OG0212; ELIPs)
125 common to all surveyed resurrection plants. The number of ELIPs in this orthogroup ranged
126 from 10-26 for resurrection plants and 1-8 for desiccation-sensitive lineages. Gene family
127 dynamics, evolutionary history, and expression patterns of ELIPs were further characterized
128 across land plants and green algae.

129

130 *ELIP gene family dynamics across land plants and green algae*

131 We expanded the analysis of ELIP composition to seventy-five sequenced land plant and
132 Chlorophyta genomes to test if the dramatic expansion we observed is universally unique to
133 desiccation-tolerant species. ELIPs were identified using a homology-based approach with
134 BLAST and classified as singletons or tandem duplicates based on their physical proximity in the
135 genomes (see methods). All desiccation-sensitive land plants have less than ten ELIPs with an
136 average of 3.1 per genome, compared to an average of 20.7 in desiccation-tolerant species
137 (Figure 1). Desiccation-sensitive (DS) monocots tend to have more ELIPs than DS eudicots (avg.
138 3.7 vs 3.0) but the difference is not significant (Wilcoxon rank-sum, $P=0.09$). Desiccation-
139 sensitive grasses (family Poaceae) have an enrichment of ELIPs compared to all angiosperms,
140 with an average of 5.0 per genome (Wilcoxon rank-sum, $P<0.05$). The only Charophyte genome
141 used in this study (*Chara braunii*) has one ELIP. Chlorophyta have considerably more ELIPs
142 than DS land plants (avg. 7.5) but fewer than resurrection plants. The high copy number of
143 ELIPs may help combat rapid changes in light intensity and the increased ultraviolet radiation-
144 mediated photobleaching that green algae experience in dynamic aquatic or exposed
145 environments.

146 Expansion of ELIPs was previously reported in the genomes of *Boea hydrometrica* (Xiao
147 et al., 2015), *Selaginella lepidophylla* (VanBuren et al., 2018c), and *Lindernia brevidens*
148 (VanBuren et al. 2018b). No such enrichment of ELIPs was reported in the resurrection plants
149 *Oropetium thomaeum* (VanBuren et al., 2015), *Xerophyta viscosa* (Costa et al., 2017), or
150 *Selaginella tamariscina* (Xu et al., 2018), suggesting a role for ELIPs in desiccation tolerance is
151 not universal. The *O. thomaeum* genome was recently updated and reassembled, and the *O.*
152 *thomaeum* V2 assembly has 22 newly annotated ELIPs (VanBuren et al., 2018a). Only one ELIP
153 was reported in *Selaginella tamariscina* (Xu et al., 2018), but BLAST against the genome

154 identified 74 complete or partial unannotated ELIPs (Supplemental Table S2). Because these
155 ELIPs were not annotated in the *S. tamariscina* genome, this species was excluded from the
156 expression analysis. Numerous ‘clusters of desiccation-associated genes’ (CoDAGs) were
157 described in the *X. viscosa* genome (Costa et al., 2017), but the ten annotated ELIPs were not
158 classified as CoDAGs. This is surprising given the tandemly duplicated nature of the ELIPs, and
159 their high expression during desiccation in *X. viscosa*.

160 Gene duplications can arise in mass during whole-genome duplication events, or at the
161 single-gene level through tandem or retrotransposon-mediated duplication. We further
162 characterized the origin of ELIPs to identify the mechanism driving the large-scale duplication
163 observed in resurrection plants. Tandemly duplicated ELIPs were identified using a syntenic
164 approach based on their physical proximity within the genome. Most ELIPs in desiccation-
165 sensitive species are dispersed randomly across the genome as singletons (Figure 1). All ELIPs
166 from plants within the Brassicales are singletons, and species from other angiosperm orders have
167 a mix of singleton and tandem gene copies. In contrast, most ELIPs in resurrection plants (74%;
168 111 out of 149) are found in large tandem arrays. All ELIPs in *O. thomaeum* and *X. viscosa* are
169 tandemly duplicated and other resurrection plants have a mix of singletons and tandem
170 duplicates. *B. hydrometrica* has the lowest number of tandemly duplicated ELIPs among
171 resurrection plants, but this may be an artifact of the fragmented nature of the genome assembly
172 (Xiao et al., 2015). Desiccation-induced accumulation of ELIP transcripts was also observed in
173 the model moss *Syntrichia* (Zeng et al., 2002; Oliver et al., 2004), but the number of ELIPs in the
174 genome is unknown.

175 *O. thomaeum* has the largest tandem array of ELIPs, with 22 copies on chromosome 8
176 (Figure 2). Despite a high degree of gene-level collinearity between *O. thomaeum* and the C4
177 panicoid grasses sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor*) and Setaria (*Setaria italica*), ELIPs from the *O.*
178 *thomaeum* tandem array have no syntenic orthologs (Figure 2a). The ELIP array in *O.*
179 *thomaeum* is divided into two segments of eleven copies split by a 60 kb region spanning nine
180 genes (Figure 2a and 2b). *O. thomaeum* genes that flank and bisect the ELIP tandem array are
181 collinear with Sorghum and Setaria. Several *O. thomaeum* ELIPs contain fragments of, or are
182 flanked by intact retrotransposons (Figure 2b). These closely associated Ty3-gypsy
183 retrotransposons may have facilitated repeated gene duplication.

184

185 *Expression of ELIP genes during desiccation and rehydration*

186 The repeated duplication of ELIPs across resurrection plants suggests a conserved role in
187 desiccation tolerance. To test for desiccation-related expression, we re-analyzed available
188 RNAseq data from *O. thomaeum* (VanBuren et al., 2017), *B. hydrometrica* (Xiao et al., 2015), *S.*
189 *lepidophylla* (VanBuren et al., 2018c), *L. brevidens* (VanBuren et al. 2018b), *X. viscosa* (Costa et
190 al., 2017), and the moss *B. argenteum* (Gao et al., 2015). Expression data was processed using
191 the same pipeline for each species, to more accurately compare patterns across experiments. A
192 genome for *B. argenteum* is not available, so a set of representative transcripts was assembled

193 using the RNAseq data with Trinity (Haas et al., 2013). Eight ELIP transcripts were identified in
194 *B. argenteum*, but this may not represent the total number of ELIPs in the genome.

195 ELIPs are consistently among the highest expressed genes in resurrection plants during
196 varying dehydration and rehydration timecourses (Figure 3). Each of the surveyed dehydration
197 and rehydration timecourses were sampled at different relative water contents, different length
198 and severity of water deficit, and different times post rehydration. Because of this, we broadly
199 classified timepoints into three groups to facilitate cross-species comparisons: well-watered
200 (green), dehydrating/desiccating (yellow), and rehydration (blue). ELIPs have low or
201 undetectable expression under well-watered conditions in all surveyed tolerant and sensitive
202 species. ELIPs have the highest expression in desiccated tissues, and expression increases
203 throughout the progression of dehydration stress. The high expression of ELIPs is generally
204 maintained during early rehydration (>24 hours), with expression decreasing as plants return to
205 normal relative water content. ELIP downregulation during rehydration is reflected by the rate of
206 recovery. *B. argenteum* is able to recover in > 1 hour post rehydration, and ELIP expression
207 returns to basal levels in less than 24 hours. Recovery in *X. viscosa* and *L. brevidens* occurs more
208 slowly, and ELIPs are highly expressed during all of the sampled rehydration timepoints.

209 Drought-induced expression of ELIPs is not unique to resurrection plants and ELIPs are
210 upregulated under water deficit in desiccation-sensitive species (Figure 4). Tandem duplication
211 in resurrection plants may increase the absolute transcript abundance of ELIPs and improve
212 photoprotective capacity. We surveyed the combined expression of ELIPs under the most
213 desiccated timepoint for each species and compared this to drought samples from Arabidopsis (9
214 days drought, RWC 60%) (Crisp et al., 2017), maize (*Zea mays*, soil water content 40%), and *L.*
215 *subracemosa*. ELIPs have, on average, 622-fold higher expression abundance in resurrection
216 plants than desiccation-sensitive species under water deficit (Figure 4; Wilcoxon ran sum
217 p=0.023). *O. thomaeum* and *L. brevidens* have the highest absolute expression of ELIPs and *X.*
218 *viscosa* has the lowest expression among resurrection plants.

219

220 Discussion

221 Resurrection plants span all major taxa outside of gymnosperms and independent desiccation-
222 tolerant lineages diverged up to 475 MYA (Smith et al., 2010). Despite this ancient divergence,
223 all resurrection plants seem to utilize a set of conserved molecular mechanisms to combat the
224 damages associated with desiccation. This phenotypic convergence could arise through
225 independent co-option of selection-constrained pathways or through rewiring of non-overlapping
226 (independent) pathways. Based on genome-scale comparisons of desiccation-tolerant and
227 sensitive species, we identified a single gene family that has expanded in all sequenced
228 resurrection plant genomes. Given the wide taxonomic sampling, we can infer expansion of the
229 ELIP gene family occurred independently in each desiccation-tolerant lineage. The rapid and
230 dramatic expansion arose through repeated tandem gene duplication, and ELIPs are found in
231 large arrays ranging in size from 10 to 22 copies. Desiccation-sensitive species typically have 1-
232 5 ELIPs with high collinearity across plant genomes. The ELIP tandem array in *O. thomaeum*

233 has recently been translocated to a different chromosome, and is non-syntenic with orthologous
234 ELIPs in other grass genomes. Several ELIPs in *O. thomaeum* are nested around intact or
235 fragmented retrotransposons, providing a source for their duplication and translocation. Taken
236 together, repeated ELIP duplication supports convergent evolution of desiccation tolerance
237 across land plants.

238 Desiccation induces tremendous stress on the macromolecules and molecular machinery
239 of the cell. Photosynthesis is inhibited in desiccated tissues, and homoochlorophyllous
240 (chlorophyll retaining) resurrection plants are susceptible to increased photoinhibition and
241 oxidative damage from unbound chlorophyll or unstable light harvesting complexes (LHC).
242 ELIPs are induced under high light stress and protect against photooxidative damage via
243 chlorophyll binding and stabilization of photosynthetic complexes (Hutin et al., 2003). ELIPs
244 accumulate in photosynthetic tissue under other abiotic stresses including cold, drought, heat,
245 and low nutrients (Bartels et al., 1992; Beator et al., 1992; Levy et al., 1993; Adamska and
246 Kloppstech, 1994; Montané et al., 1997), though their role in some of these stresses is unknown.
247 ELIPs are also induced under other conditions where chlorophyll is degraded such as
248 chromoplast biogenesis in tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*), suggesting a broader role of
249 photoprotection during thylakoid restructuring (Bruno and Wetzel, 2004). Overexpression of a
250 *Medicago truncatula* ELIP in *Nicotiana benthamiana* increased resistance to freezing, chilling,
251 osmotic stress, and high light (Araújo et al. 2013).

252 ELIPs were among the earliest desiccation-related proteins identified, and ELIPs have a
253 conserved role during desiccation in *Craterostigma plantagineum* (Bartels et al., 1992; Alamillo
254 and Bartels, 2001) and *Syntrichia ruralis* (Zeng et al., 2002). ELIPs are also highly expressed
255 during desiccation in *Haberlea rhodensis* (Gechev et al., 2013) and *Sporobolus stapfianus* (Yobi
256 et al., 2017), but these lineages lack reference genomes, so they were not included in this study.
257 The two ELIPs in Arabidopsis are functionally redundant, and overexpression of either is
258 sufficient to rescue the photosensitivity in the pleiotropic *chaos* mutant (Hutin et al., 2003).
259 ELIPs in resurrection plants likely maintain their ancestral photoprotective role, but the repeated
260 tandem duplication increases their relative abundance. ELIPs are among the most highly
261 expressed genes in desiccating leaf tissues and the proteins accumulate in the thylakoid of
262 desiccating *C. plantagineum* (Bartels et al., 1992; Alamillo and Bartels, 2001). ELIP
263 accumulation in *C. plantagineum* was hypothesized to bind free chlorophyll and stabilize the
264 thylakoid to reduce photooxidative damage during prolonged desiccation. Outside of this single
265 study in *C. plantagineum*, ELIP abundance and localization has not been surveyed in
266 resurrection plants, and the link between duplication, transcript accumulation, and protein
267 production remains to be tested. Overexpression of a *C. plantagineum* ELIP in *Medicago*
268 *truncatula* increased drought tolerance and recovery, supporting a potential role in desiccation
269 tolerance (Araújo et al., 2013).

270 Excess light is a pervasive challenge in desiccated leaf tissue. Poikilochlorophyllous
271 resurrection plants dismantle their photosynthetic apparatus during desiccation to mitigate light-
272 associated damage. In contrast, homoochlorophyllous resurrection plants retain thylakoids and
273 chlorophyll during desiccation, but recover more quickly upon rehydration. Photosystem II has

274 negligible activity in desiccated tissues of *C. pumilum*, but near normal maximum quantum yield
275 of PSII (Fv/Fm) is observed only 18 hours post rehydration (Charuvi et al., 2015). Recovery in
276 mosses is even faster and Fv/Fm reaches two-thirds the well-watered ratio in less than 40
277 minutes post rehydration (Proctor and Smirnoff, 2000). Homiochlorophyllous resurrection plants
278 have considerably more ELIPs (avg. 21) than poikilochlorophyllous species and this is likely
279 reflective of the increased photooxidative damage resulting from maintaining the photosynthetic
280 apparatus during desiccation. The increased relative abundance of ELIPs in the thylakoid of
281 homiochlorophyllous resurrection plants may protect and stabilize PSII complexes and facilitate
282 more rapid neutralization and degradation of unbound chlorophyll.

283 *X. viscosa* has the lowest number of ELIPs (10) among resurrection plants, and it is the
284 only poikilochlorophyllous species with a sequenced genome. The comparatively low number of
285 ELIPs may reflect the alternative strategy of dismantling photosynthetic machinery then
286 degrading chlorophyll to reduce photooxidative damage. High expression of ELIPs in *X. viscosa*
287 is maintained throughout rehydration. This species takes several days to fully recover and to
288 resynthesize chlorophyll, therefore ELIPs may have a protective role during chlorophyll
289 synthesis, similar to greening seedlings. Sequences of additional resurrection plant genomes are
290 needed to further test this link between ELIP copy number and strategies for mitigating damage
291 from excess light.

292 ELIP duplication supports convergent evolution. ELIPs, together with other abundantly
293 expressed protective proteins such as LEA proteins, are likely central components of the
294 desiccation response. Desiccation pathways typically associated with seeds are induced during
295 vegetative desiccation, suggesting this trait evolved through pathway rewiring (Illing et al., 2005;
296 Farrant and Moore, 2011; Costa et al., 2017; VanBuren et al., 2017). Transcription factors are
297 under strict dosage constraints, and no conserved duplications of genes encoding seed-related
298 transcription factors such as ABI3 and ABI5 (Lopez-Molina et al., 2001) were identified in this
299 study. This suggests either independent lineages duplicated and neofunctionalized different
300 genes to induce seed-associated desiccation pathways, or existing genes were rewired via *cis*-
301 regulatory elements as previously shown (Giarola et al., 2018). This remains to be tested but will
302 be possible with additional genomes and genome-scale analysis of *cis*-elements and transcription
303 factor binding sites. Taken together, we hypothesize rewired-desiccation pathways enabled
304 plants to withstand prolonged drying and the duplication of ELIPs allowed plants to withstand
305 excessive light in the absence of water.

306

307

308

309 **Methods**

310 *Orthogroup identification and enrichment patterns*

311 Orthologous genes across a subset of 19 land plant species were analyzed to identify gene
312 families that are expanded in desiccation tolerant lineages. The gene family analysis included

313 nine monocot (*Ananas comosus*, *Brachypodium distachyon*, *Oryza sativa*, *Oropetium thomaeum*,
 314 *Panicum virgatum*, *Sorghum bicolor*, *Setaria italic*, *Xerophyta viscosa*, *Zostera marina*), six
 315 eudicot (*Lindernia brevidens*, *L. subracemosa*, *Arabidopsis thaliana*, *Medicago truncatula*,
 316 *Solanum lycopersicum*, *Vitis vinifera*), two bryophyte (*Marchantia polymorpha* and
 317 *Physcomitrella patens*) and two lycophyte genomes (*Selaginella lepidophylla* and *S.*
 318 *moellendorffii*). This includes three desiccation-tolerant angiosperms and two bryophytes with
 319 ABA-induced desiccation tolerance. The predicted protein sequences for each species were first
 320 clustered into orthologous groups using Orthofinder (v2.2.6) (Emms and Kelly, 2015). Diamond
 321 (v0.9.24) (Buchfink, et al. 2014). was used to conduct pairwise protein alignments and all other
 322 parameters were set to defaults. The resulting 26,406 orthogroups were filtered to include only
 323 the 4,625 groups with at least one ortholog in all 19 species. For each orthogroup, the following
 324 values were calculated: the proportion of genes in that orthogroup among the 7 desiccation
 325 tolerant plants, the proportion of genes in that orthogroup among the 14 desiccation sensitive
 326 plants, and the combined proportion using the following formulas:

327

$$328 p_{dt} = \frac{\sum_{dt \text{ species } i}^{dt \text{ species } 1} \# \text{ genes in orthogroup}}{\sum_{dt \text{ species } i}^{dt \text{ species } 1} \text{ total } \# \text{ of genes in any orthogroup}}$$

329

$$330 p_{ds} = \frac{\sum_{ds \text{ species } i}^{ds \text{ species } 1} \# \text{ genes in orthogroup}}{\sum_{ds \text{ species } i}^{ds \text{ species } 1} \text{ total } \# \text{ of genes in any orthogroup}}$$

331

$$332 p = \frac{\sum_{species \text{ } i}^{species \text{ } 1} \# \text{ genes in orthogroup}}{\sum_{species \text{ } i}^{species \text{ } 1} \text{ total } \# \text{ of genes in any orthogroup}}$$

333 The two proportions were then compared using a z-score calculated as follows:

334

$$335 Z = \frac{(p_{dt} - p_{ds})}{\sqrt{p(1-p) \left(\frac{1}{n_{dt}} + \frac{1}{n_{ds}} \right)}}$$

336 A 1-sided hypothesis test was calculated by comparing the Z-score to a normal distribution. The
 337 resulting p-value was then adjusted using the Benjamini & Hochberg procedure (Benjamini and
 338 Hochberg, 1995) to obtain q-values. Orthogroups with a q-value of less than 0.05 were
 339 considered to be significantly enriched.

340

341 *Identification of ELIPs*

342 Based on orthogroup enrichment, the analysis of ELIPs was extended to 72 land plant and green
343 algae genomes downloaded from Phytozome (V12;
344 <https://phytozome.jgi.doe.gov/pz/portal.html>). ELIPs were also annotated in the Charophyte
345 *Chara braunii* (Nishiyama et al., 2018). ELIPs were identified using BLASTp with the
346 Arabidopsis ELIP1 (AT3G22840.1) as a query and an e-value cutoff of 1e-15 for land plants and
347 1e-6 for green algae. ELIPs were further classified as singleton or tandemly duplicated based on
348 their physical proximity in the genome (< 5 genes separating ELIPs).

349

350 *Expression analysis*

351 Illumina RNAseq data from *O. thomaeum* (VanBuren et al., 2017), *Boea hydrometrica*(Xiao et
352 al., 2015), *Selaginella lepidophylla* (VanBuren et al., 2018c), *Lindernia brevidens* (VanBuren et
353 al., 2018b), *Lindernia subracemosa* (VanBuren et al., 2018b), *Xerophyta viscosa* (Costa et al.,
354 2017), Arabidopsis (Crisp et al., 2017), maize (PRJNA419326), and the moss *Bryum argenteum*
355 (Gao et al., 2015) was downloaded from the NCBI sequence read archive (SRA) and reanalyzed.
356 Raw Illumina reads were trimmed using TRIMOMATIC (v0.33)(Bolger et al., 2014) with
357 default parameters to remove adapters and low quality bases. A summary of the RNAseq data
358 used in this study along with the relative water content and designation for each sample can be
359 found in Supplemental Table S3. A set of representative transcripts for *B. argenteum* was
360 assembled using Trinity (Haas et al., 2013) with the available RNAseq data (Gao et al., 2015).
361 Expression levels were quantified using Kallisto (v0.44.0)(Bray et al., 2016) against the
362 respective set of gene models for each species and the Trinity-based transcripts for *B. argenteum*.
363 Parameters for Kallisto were left as default and 100 bootstraps were run per sample. Expression
364 was quantified in Transcript Per Million (TPM), and a mean across all of the replicates was used
365 to compare expression of ELIPs in each species. Log2 transformed TPM expression values of
366 ELIPs were plotted. Samples were clustered into three groups (well-watered, desiccating, and
367 rehydrating) to compare expression between species.

368

369 *Grass comparative genomics*

370 Syntenic gene pairs between the *Oropetium thomaeum* (VanBuren et al., 2015; VanBuren et al.,
371 2018a), *Setaria italica* (Zhang et al., 2012), and *Sorghum bicolor* (Paterson et al., 2009) genomes
372 were identified using the python version of MCSCAN toolkit (V1.1) (Wang et al., 2012). Gene
373 models from the three genomes were aligned using LAST and hits were filtered using default
374 parameters to find the best syntenic blocks. A microsyntenic dotplot of the region containing the
375 ELIP tandem array in Oropetium was constructed using MCScan.

376

377 **Accession Numbers**

378 Genomes and gene models were downloaded from Phytozome (V12;
379 <https://phytozome.jgi.doe.gov/pz/portal.html>. Illumina RNAseq data was downloaded from the

380 [NCBI SRA under the following BioProjects: *Oropetium thomaeum* \(PRJNA286116\) *Boea*](#)

381 [hydrometrica](#) (PRJNA277046), [Selaginella lepidophylla](#) (PRJNA420971), [Lindernia brevidens](#)

382 (PRJNA488068), [Lindernia subracemosa](#) (PRJNA488068), [Xerophyta viscosa](#) (PRJNA295811),

383 [Arabidopsis](#) (PRJNA391262), maize (PRJNA419326), and the moss [Bryum argenteum](#)

384 (PRJNA272646),

385

386 **Supplemental Data**

387 Supplemental Table S1. Summary of orthologous gene family clustering

388 Supplemental Table S2. Annotation of ELIPs in the *Selaginella tamariscina* genome.

389 Supplemental Table S3. Summary of expression and physiology data used in this study.

390

391 **Figure Legends**

392 **Figure 1. ELIP composition in sequenced land plant and Chlorophyta genomes.** The number
393 of ELIPs are plotted for 72 genomes. Tandemly duplicated ELIPs are plotted in red and single
394 copy or interspersed ELIPs are plotted in blue. Desiccation-tolerant species are highlighted in
395 orange.

396 **Figure 2. Unique tandem array of ELIPs in *O. thomaeum*.** (a) Microsynteny plot of the
397 syntentic region flanking the ELIP array in *O. thomaeum*, Sorghum, and Setaria. Genes in the
398 forward orientation are shown in yellow and blue genes are in reverse orientation. Syntetic
399 orthologs between the three genomes are denoted by connecting gray lines. The region
400 containing ELIPs is highlighted in brown. (b) Expanded view of the ELIP tandem array in *O.*
401 *thomaeum*. ELIPs are shown in blue and other genes are shown in gray. Long terminal repeat
402 (LTR) retrotransposons are shown in red.

403

404 **Figure 3. Desiccation related expression of ELIPs across divergent resurrection plants.**

405 Log2 transformed expression of ELIPs is plotted using RNAseq data from six resurrection
406 plants. Colors in violin plots correspond to hydration state: green are well-watered, yellow are
407 dehydrating/desiccated, and blue are rehydrating. Stages are defined in Supplemental Table S3.

408 **Figure 4. Total expression of ELIPs in desiccation tolerant and sensitive species.** The Log2
409 transformed, summed TPM of ELIPs from each species are plotted for drought/desiccation
410 timepoints (yellow) and comparable well-watered or rehydrated timepoints (green and blue
411 respectively).

412

413

414 **Acknowledgements:** This work is supported in part by funding from the National Science
415 Foundation (NSF-MCB 1817347 to R.V.).

416

417

418 **Competing Financial Interests:** The authors declare no competing financial interests.

419 **References:**

420 **Adamska, I., and Kloppstech, K.** (1994). Low temperature increases the abundance of early light-
421 inducible transcript under light stress conditions. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **269**, 30221-
422 30226.

423 **Alamillo, J.M., and Bartels, D.** (2001). Effects of desiccation on photosynthesis pigments and the ELIP-
424 like dsp 22 protein complexes in the resurrection plant *Craterostigma plantagineum*. *Plant*
425 *Science* **160**, 1161-1170.

426 **Araújo, S., Duque, A., Silva, J., Santos, D., Silva, A., and Fevereiro, P.** (2013). Water deficit and
427 recovery response of *Medicago truncatula* plants expressing the ELIP-like DSP22. *Biologia*
428 *plantarum* **57**, 159-163.

429 **Bartels, D., Hanke, C., Schneider, K., Michel, D., and Salamini, F.** (1992). A desiccation-related Elip-
430 like gene from the resurrection plant *Craterostigma plantagineum* is regulated by light and ABA.
431 *The EMBO journal* **11**, 2771-2778.

432 **Beator, J., Pötter, E., and Kloppstech, K.** (1992). The effect of heat shock on morphogenesis in barley:
433 Coordinated circadian regulation of mRNA levels for light-regulated genes and of the capacity
434 for accumulation of chlorophyll protein complexes. *Plant physiology* **100**, 1780-1786.

435 **Benjamini, Y., and Hochberg, Y.** (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful
436 approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the royal statistical society. Series B (Methodological)*,
437 **57**, 289-300.

438 **Bewley, J., and Krochko, J.** (1982). Desiccation-tolerance. In *Physiological plant ecology II* (Springer),
439 pp. 325-378.

440 **Bewley, J.D.** (1979). Physiological aspects of desiccation tolerance. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology*
441 **30**, 195-238.

442 **Bolger, A.M., Lohse, M., and Usadel, B.** (2014). Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina
443 sequence data. *Bioinformatics*, **30**, 2114-2120.

444 **Bowman, J.L., Kohchi, T., Yamato, K.T., Jenkins, J., Shu, S., Ishizaki, K., Yamaoka, S., Nishihama,**
445 **R., Nakamura, Y., and Berger, F. et al.** (2017). Insights into land plant evolution garnered from
446 the *Marchantia polymorpha* genome. *Cell* **171**, 287-304. e215.

447 **Bray, N.L., Pimentel, H., Melsted, P., and Pachter, L.** (2016). Near-optimal probabilistic RNA-seq
448 quantification. *Nature biotechnology* **34**, 525.

449 **Bruno, A.K., and Wetzel, C.M.** (2004). The early light-inducible protein (ELIP) gene is expressed
450 during the chloroplast-to-chromoplast transition in ripening tomato fruit. *Journal of Experimental*
451 *Botany* **55**, 2541-2548.

452 **Buchfink, B., Xie, C., and Huson, D.H.** (2014). Fast and sensitive protein alignment using
453 DIAMOND. *Nature Methods*, **12**, 59-60.

454 **Challabathula, D., Puthur, J.T., and Bartels, D.** (2016). Surviving metabolic arrest: photosynthesis
455 during desiccation and rehydration in resurrection plants. *Annals of the New York Academy of*
456 *Sciences* **1365**, 89-99.

457 **Charuvi, D., Nevo, R., Shimoni, E., Naveh, L., Zia, A., Adam, Z., Farrant, J.M., Kirchhoff, H., and**
458 **Reich, Z.** (2015). Photoprotection conferred by changes in photosynthetic protein levels and
459 organization during dehydration of a homiochlorophyllous resurrection plant. *Plant Physiology*,
460 pp. 114.255794.

461 **Costa, M., Artur, M., Maia, J., Jonkheer, E., Derkx, M., Nijveen, H., Williams, B., Mundree, S.G.,**
462 **Jiménez-Gómez, J.M., and Hesselink, T.** (2017). A footprint of desiccation tolerance in the
463 genome of *Xerophyta viscosa*. *Nature Plants* **3**, 17038.

464 **Crisp, P.A., Ganguly, D., Smith, A.B., Murray, K.D., Estavillo, G.M., Searle, I.R., Ford, E.,**
465 **Bogdanović, O., Lister, R., and Borevitz, J.O. et al.** (2017). Rapid recovery gene
466 downregulation during excess-light stress and recovery in *Arabidopsis*. *The Plant Cell*, **29**, 1836-
467 1863.

468 **Eklund, D.M., Kanei, M., Flores-Sandoval, E., Ishizaki, K., Nishihama, R., Kohchi, T., Lagercrantz,**
469 **U., Bhalerao, R.P., Sakata, Y., and Bowman, J.L.** (2018). An Evolutionarily Conserved
470 Abscisic Acid Signaling Pathway Regulates Dormancy in the Liverwort *Marchantia polymorpha*.
471 Current Biology.

472 **Emms, D.M., and Kelly, S.** (2015). OrthoFinder: solving fundamental biases in whole genome
473 comparisons dramatically improves orthogroup inference accuracy. Genome Biology **16**, 157.

474 **Farrant, J.M., and Moore, J.P.** (2011). Programming desiccation-tolerance: from plants to seeds to
475 resurrection plants. Current opinion in plant biology **14**, 340-345.

476 **Gaff, D.** (1997). Mechanisms of desiccation tolerance in resurrection vascular plants. In Mechanisms of
477 environmental stress resistance in plants. Harwood Academic Publishers (Amsterdam,
478 Netherlands) 43-58.

479 **Gao, B., Zhang, D., Li, X., Yang, H., Zhang, Y., and Wood, A.J.** (2015). De novo transcriptome
480 characterization and gene expression profiling of the desiccation tolerant moss *Bryum argenteum*
481 following rehydration. BMC Genomics **16**, 416.

482 **Gechev, T.S., Benina, M., Obata, T., Tohge, T., Sujeeeth, N., Minkov, I., Hille, J., Temanni, M.-R.,**
483 **Marriott, A.S., and Bergström, E. et al.** (2013). Molecular mechanisms of desiccation tolerance
484 in the resurrection glacial relic *Haberlea rhodopensis*. Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences **70**,
485 689-709.

486 **Giarola, V., Jung, N.U., Singh, A., Satpathy, P., and Bartels, D.** (2018). Analysis of pcC13-62
487 promoters predicts a link between cis-element variations and desiccation tolerance in
488 Linderniaceae. Journal of Experimental Botany, **69**, 3773-3784.

489 **Haas, B.J., Papanicolaou, A., Yassour, M., Grabherr, M., Blood, P.D., Bowden, J., Couger, M.B.,**
490 **Eccles, D., Li, B., and Lieber, M.** (2013). De novo transcript sequence reconstruction from
491 RNA-seq using the Trinity platform for reference generation and analysis. Nature Protocols **8**,
492 1494.

493 **Hanada, K., Zou, C., Lehti-Shiu, M.D., Shinozaki, K., and Shiu, S.-H.** (2008). Importance of lineage-
494 specific expansion of plant tandem duplicates in the adaptive response to environmental stimuli.
495 Plant Physiology **148**, 993-1003.

496 **Hutin, C., Nussaume, L., Moise, N., Moya, I., Kloppstech, K., and Havaux, M.** (2003). Early light-
497 induced proteins protect Arabidopsis from photooxidative stress. Proceedings of the National
498 Academy of Sciences **100**, 4921-4926.

499 **Illing, N., Denby, K.J., Collett, H., Shen, A., and Farrant, J.M.** (2005). The signature of seeds in
500 resurrection plants: a molecular and physiological comparison of desiccation tolerance in seeds
501 and vegetative tissues. Integrative and Comparative Biology **45**, 771-787.

502 **Levy, H., Tal, T., Shaish, A., and Zamir, A.** (1993). Cbr, an algal homolog of plant early light-induced
503 proteins, is a putative zeaxanthin binding protein. Journal of Biological Chemistry **268**, 20892-
504 20896.

505 **Li, C., Zhou, A., and Sang, T.** (2006). Rice domestication by reducing shattering. Science **311**, 1936-
506 1939.

507 **Lopez-Molina, L., Mongrand, S., and Chua, N.-H.** (2001). A postgermination developmental arrest
508 checkpoint is mediated by abscisic acid and requires the ABI5 transcription factor in Arabidopsis.
509 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **98**, 4782-4787.

510 **Montané, M.-H., Dreyer, S., Triantaphylides, C., and Kloppstech, K.** (1997). Early light-inducible
511 proteins during long-term acclimation of barley to photooxidative stress caused by light and cold:
512 high level of accumulation by posttranscriptional regulation. Planta **202**, 293-302.

513 **Nishiyama, T., Sakayama, H., de Vries, J., Buschmann, H., Saint-Marcoux, D., Ullrich, K.K., Haas,**
514 **F.B., Vanderstraeten, L., Becker, D., and Lang, D.** (2018). The chara genome: Secondary
515 complexity and implications for plant terrestrialization. Cell **174**, 448-464. e424.

516 **Oliver, M.J., Tuba, Z., and Mishler, B.D.** (2000). The evolution of vegetative desiccation tolerance in
517 land plants. Plant Ecology **151**, 85-100.

518 **Oliver, M.J., Velten, J., and Mishler, B.D.** (2005). Desiccation tolerance in bryophytes: a reflection of
519 the primitive strategy for plant survival in dehydrating habitats? *Integrative and Comparative*
520 *Biology* **45**, 788-799.

521 **Oliver, M.J., Dowd, S.E., Zaragoza, J., Mauget, S.A., and Payton, P.R.** (2004). The rehydration
522 transcriptome of the desiccation-tolerant bryophyte *Tortula ruralis*: transcript classification and
523 analysis. *BMC Genomics* **5**, 89.

524 **Paterson, A.H., Bowers, J.E., Bruggmann, R., Dubchak, I., Grimwood, J., Gundlach, H., Haberer,**
525 **G., Hellsten, U., Mitros, T., and Poliakov, A.** (2009). The *Sorghum bicolor* genome and the
526 diversification of grasses. *Nature* **457**, 551.

527 **Porembski, S.** (2011). Evolution, diversity, and habitats of poikilohydrous vascular plants. In *Plant*
528 *desiccation tolerance* (Springer), pp. 139-156.

529 **Proctor, M.** (1990). The physiological basis of bryophyte production. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean*
530 *Society* **104**, 61-77.

531 **Proctor, M.C., and Smirnoff, N.** (2000). Rapid recovery of photosystems on rewetting desiccation-
532 tolerant mosses: chlorophyll fluorescence and inhibitor experiments. *Journal of Experimental*
533 *Botany* **51**, 1695-1704.

534 **Rensing, S.A., Lang, D., Zimmer, A.D., Terry, A., Salamov, A., Shapiro, H., Nishiyama, T.,**
535 **Perroud, P.-F., Lindquist, E.A., and Kamisugi, Y. et al.** (2008). The *Physcomitrella* genome
536 reveals evolutionary insights into the conquest of land by plants. *Science* **319**, 64-69.

537 **Rodríguez-Hernández, A.A., Ortega-Amaro, M.A., Delgado-Sánchez, P., Salinas, J., and Jiménez-**
538 **Bremont, J.F.** (2014). AtGRDP1 Gene encoding a glycine-rich domain protein is involved in
539 germination and responds to ABA signalling. *Plant Molecular Biology Reporter* **32**, 1187-1202.

540 **Smith, S.A., Beaulieu, J.M., and Donoghue, M.J.** (2010). An uncorrelated relaxed-clock analysis
541 suggests an earlier origin for flowering plants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
542 **107**, 5897-5902.

543 **VanBuren, R., Wai, C.M., Keilwagen, J., and Pardo, J.** (2018a). A chromosome scale assembly of the
544 model desiccation tolerant grass *Oropetium thomaeum*. *Plant Direct* **2**, 96.

545 **VanBuren, R., Wai, C.M., Pardo, J., Giarola, V., Ambrosini, S., Song, X., and Bartels, D.** (2018b).
546 Desiccation tolerance evolved through gene duplication and network rewiring in *Lindernia*. *The*
547 *Plant Cell*. tpc.00517.2018

548 **VanBuren, R., Wai, J., Zhang, Q., Song, X., Edger, P.P., Bryant, D., Michael, T.P., Mockler, T.C.,**
549 **and Bartels, D.** (2017). Seed desiccation mechanisms co-opted for vegetative desiccation in the
550 resurrection grass *Oropetium thomeaum*. *Plant, Cell & Environment*, **40**, 2292-2306.

551 **VanBuren, R., Wai, C.M., Ou, S., Pardo, J., Bryant, D., Jiang, N., Mockler, T.C., Edger, P., and**
552 **Michael, T.P.** (2018c). Extreme haplotype variation in the desiccation-tolerant clubmoss
553 *Selaginella lepidophylla*. *Nature communications* **9**, 13.

554 **VanBuren, R., Bryant, D., Edger, P.P., Tang, H., Burgess, D., Challabathula, D., Spittle, K., Hall,**
555 **R., Gu, J., and Lyons, E.** (2015). Single-molecule sequencing of the desiccation-tolerant grass
556 *Oropetium thomaeum*. *Nature*.

557 **Wang, Y., Tang, H., DeBarry, J.D., Tan, X., Li, J., Wang, X., Lee, T.-h., Jin, H., Marler, B., and**
558 **Guo, H. et al.** (2012). MCScanX: a toolkit for detection and evolutionary analysis of gene
559 synteny and collinearity. *Nucleic Acids Research* **40**, e49-e49.

560 **Xiao, L., Yang, G., Zhang, L., Yang, X., Zhao, S., Ji, Z., Zhou, Q., Hu, M., Wang, Y., and Chen, M.**
561 **et al.** (2015). The resurrection genome of *Boea hygrometrica*: A blueprint for survival of
562 dehydration. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**, 5833-5837.

563 **Xu, Z., Xin, T., Bartels, D., Li, Y., Gu, W., Yao, H., Liu, S., Yu, H., Pu, X., and Zhou, J. et al.**
564 (2018). Genome analysis of the ancient tracheophyte *Selaginella tamariscina* reveals
565 evolutionary features relevant to the acquisition of desiccation tolerance. *Molecular Plant* **11**,
566 983-994.

567 **Yobi, A., Schlauch, K.A., Tillett, R.L., Yim, W.C., Espinoza, C., Wone, B.W., Cushman, J.C., and**
568 **Oliver, M.J.** (2017). *Sporobolus stapfianus*: Insights into desiccation tolerance in the resurrection
569 grasses from linking transcriptomics to metabolomics. *BMC Plant Biology* **17**, 67.

570 **Zeng, Q., Chen, X., and Wood, A.J.** (2002). Two early light-inducible protein (ELIP) cDNAs from the
571 resurrection plant *Tortula ruralis* are differentially expressed in response to desiccation,
572 rehydration, salinity, and high light. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **53**, 1197-1205.

573 **Zhang, G., Liu, X., Quan, Z., Cheng, S., Xu, X., Pan, S., Xie, M., Zeng, P., Yue, Z., and Wang, W.**
574 (2012). Genome sequence of foxtail millet (*Setaria italica*) provides insights into grass evolution
575 and biofuel potential. *Nature Biotechnology* **30**, 549.

576 **Zhang, Q., and Bartels, D.** (2018). Molecular responses to dehydration and desiccation in desiccation-
577 tolerant angiosperm plants. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **69**, 3211-3222.

578