




Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/ybbrc](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/ybbrc)

## Genetic modification, intercellular communication, and epigenetic regulation in plants: An outlook

Vitaly Citovsky

Department of Biochemistry and Cell Biology, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY, 11794-5215, USA



### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 10 August 2022

Accepted 14 August 2022

Available online 17 August 2022

Photosynthetic plants have a special place in living nature as they generate unbelievable amounts of carbohydrates, i.e., ca.  $150 \times 10^{12}$  kg on a global scale per year, and they are responsible for the production of the molecular oxygen in the Earth's atmosphere. Thus, historically, studies of plants have been associated in the minds of scientists and laypeople alike with agriculture and related biotechnology fields. However, it is very far from reality. Already decades ago, plants joined the ranks of other higher model organisms, such as insects and animals, both from the standpoint of conceptual and technical sophistication of experimental approaches as well as their influence on our advances in the knowledge of biology.

Unlike most other organisms, plants as individuals have no capacity for travel and thus are unable to escape their surroundings. Along the eons of their evolution therefore plants have accumulated many biological capabilities to adapt to the changing biotic and abiotic environments. For example, plants can alter the degree of lipid unsaturation in their cellular membranes, and, therefore, alter the membrane fluidity, depending on the ambient temperature, i.e., increase it in the cold and decrease it in the heat [1]. Or, plants, in which the outside access to the cell membrane is limited due to the cell walls that encase the individual cells, have evolved intercellular connections, termed plasmodesmata [2], which are gateable and allow cell-to-cell transport of macromolecules and macromolecular structures, from nucleic acids to proteins to sub-viral particles [3–6]. Whereas the plasmodesmata were discovered more than 120 years ago [7], the concept of macromolecule/particle transport through intercellular connections emerged only 20 years ago with the discovery of membrane tunneling nanotubes (TNTs) [8], and since then TNTs have been shown to traffic large

macromolecules and viruses [9–14], translating the concept developed in plants to the animal organisms. Even the discovery of viruses and, consequently, the science of virology began with the Tobacco mosaic virus (TMV), a plant RNA virus [15,16]. This cell-to-cell movement of plant viruses through plasmodesmata was one of the two biological (and, at the time, largely enigmatic) processes that attracted me to plant biology. Another process historically studied in plant systems is genetic engineering. In nature, diverse species of plants are genetically modified by a bacterial pathogen *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* which transfers to plants and integrates into their genome a segment of its plasmid DNA, termed T-DNA; the genes contained in the T-DNA induce neoplastic cell growth as well as biosynthesis of opines, amino acid derivatives that are secreted by the tumor cells into the environment and are used by *Agrobacterium* as carbon and nitrogen sources. In the laboratory, the native T-DNA is replaced by the sequences of interest and used to produce transgenic plants [17–22]. Like *Agrobacterium*, many human pathogenic bacteria, e.g., *Bartonella*, *Legionella*, *Helicobacter*, and *Shigella*, have evolved to export their virulence effector proteins into the host cells using the type 4 secretion system (T4SS) machinery [23], and, at least one of these bacterial species, *Bartonella henselae*, was reported to export and integrate into a human cell genome a plasmid reporter DNA [24,25], although it remains unknown whether *Bartonella* exports its own, endogenous DNA and genetically transform its human host cells *in vivo*, during the course of infection.

The field of plant biology continues to provide excitement and intellectual and technical challenges to all involved. This is a very broad field of science that encompasses all aspects of living nature as they occur in plants. I am especially interested in three molecular aspects of the plant life cycle—genetic modification, intercellular communication, and epigenetic regulation—which include the


E-mail address: [vitaly.citovsky@stonybrook.edu](mailto:vitaly.citovsky@stonybrook.edu).

transport of biologically active nucleic acids, i.e., transgenes and viral genomes, and transcriptional regulation of their expression (Fig. 1). In these areas, as in many others in plant research, I look forward to the increased involvement of synthetic biology. Generally, synthetic biology principles and techniques allow manipulation and refactoring, i.e., replacement of endogenous regulation of natural gene circuits with synthetic, orthogonal regulatory elements, many aspects of eukaryotic or prokaryotic cells, including orthogonal control of gene expression, genetic toggle switches, and logic gates as means to control gene expression with precision, and computationally designed control of cell and tissue-specific expression [26–29]. For example, orthogonal systems, i.e., engineered biologically active molecules that cooperate to provide a specific biological function without affecting or being affected by the corresponding endogenous cellular systems [27,28], would allow the conversion of living cells with particular natural capabilities into nanomachines dedicated solely to that specific set of capabilities, e.g., refactoring *Agrobacterium* into a dedicated genetic transformation nanomachine. Because *Agrobacterium* can genetically modify a wide range of eukaryotic cells, from plant to yeast to human [19], under laboratory conditions, the refactored *Agrobacterium* cells could be adapted to specific target cells/organisms, facilitating their genetic modification for medical, research, and biotechnological purposes. Furthermore, the optimal molecular composition of the refactored *Agrobacterium* would also shed new light on the cellular mechanisms involved in the genetic transformation process.

*Agrobacterium* preferentially integrates its T-DNA into the double-stranded DNA breaks (DSBs) in the plant genome, presumably using the cellular DNA repair mechanisms [30–33]. Thus, our investigation of plant genetic transformation by *Agrobacterium* represents an aspect of the broader field of studies of the plant DNA

damage response pathways. Collectively, future advances in these studies should facilitate elucidation of perhaps the most important of the remaining enigmatic steps of the *Agrobacterium*-mediated genetic transformation: the identity of the cellular proteins and the bacterial effectors that participate in T-DNA integration, the molecular interactions between these factors, and the temporal sequence of these interactions that culminates with the integration event. Similarly, I anticipate important advances in our understanding of the molecular reactions and sequential steps of targeting protein and nucleoprotein cargos to plasmodesmata, increase in plasmodesmal permeability, transit of the plasmodesmal channel by the cargo molecules, and the energy sources for this active transport. Detailed proteomic characterization of plasmodesmata, which has already begun [34–36], will facilitate the mechanistic studies by identifying and characterizing the complement of proteins associated with plasmodesmata. For example, by analogy to the dynamic composition of the nuclear pore complex [37], plasmodesmal proteins that are early in plasmodesmata assembly and stable in their residence time are likely structural in function whereas those that are late in the assembly and transient in the residence time are likely directly involved in the cell-to-cell transport process.

Both plant genetic transformation and, in many cases, plasmodesmal transport of viral and endogenous nucleoprotein complexes ultimately lead up to the expression of the transferred nucleic acid molecules, i.e., transgenes, viral genomic DNA or RNA, or non-cell-autonomous transcripts. One major factor in regulating the expression and/or formation of these molecules is the post-translational modification of histones, which determines the active or inactive state of the chromatin. These modifications, which together determine the transcriptional outcomes [38,39], are dynamic, effected by writers and erasers, i.e., histone modifying



**Fig. 1.** Schematic illustration of three biological processes—plant genetic engineering, plant virus cell-to-cell movement, and epigenetic regulation of plant gene expression—which involve the transmembrane transport of biologically active nucleic acids molecules and represent the focus of this Commentary.

enzymes that add or remove the specific functional groups [40]. In plant cells, one major class of important, yet relatively sparsely characterized, erasers are histone deubiquitinases that have been implicated in diverse aspects of physiology, growth, and development [41–47]. Only about 10% of all 50 deubiquitinases encoded by the *Arabidopsis* genome [48] have been proposed to target histones and participate in epigenetic regulation [46,47,49–56]. Of these, two histone deubiquitinases, UBP26 and OTLD1, participate both in transcriptional repression and activation of their target gene expression [46,47,51,53,54], with the dual function of OTLD1 likely to be direct [46,47]. Future understanding of how deubiquitylation of the same type of histone by the same histone deubiquitinase can elicit two opposing effects on transcription of the direct target genes may help will define a potential junction in chromatin remodeling pathways leading to transcriptional repression or activation.

This short Commentary reflects my own specific and relatively narrow scientific interests. Yet, it illustrates how plant-centered model systems contribute to our understanding of diverse and fundamental aspects of life.

### Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Vitaly Citovsky reports financial support was provided by National Institutes of Health. Vitaly Citovsky reports financial support was provided by National Science Foundation. Vitaly Citovsky reports financial support was provided by United States Israel Binational Agricultural Research and Development Fund.

### Acknowledgment

The work in the V.C. laboratory is supported by grants from NIH, NSF, USDA/NIFA, and BARD to V.C.

### References

- [1] D.L. Falcone, J.P. Ogas, C.R. Somerville, Regulation of membrane fatty acid composition by temperature in mutants of *Arabidopsis* with alterations in membrane lipid composition, *BMC Plant Biol* 4 (2004) 17, <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2229-4-17>.
- [2] A.W. Robards, W.J. Lucas, Plasmodesmata, *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Biol.* 41 (1990) 369–419.
- [3] A.J. Gibbs, Viruses and plasmodesmata, in: B.E.S. Gunning, A.W. Robards (Eds.), *Intercellular Communication in Plants: Studies on Plasmodesmata*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976, pp. 149–164.
- [4] K.J. Oparka, Plasmodesmata, *Annual Plant Reviews*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, 2005, p. 311.
- [5] V. Citovsky, Probing plasmodesmal transport with plant viruses, *Plant Physiol* 102 (1993) 1071–1076.
- [6] T. Tzfira, Y. Rhee, M.H. Chen, V. Citovsky, Nucleic acid transport in plant-microbe interactions: the molecules that walk through the walls, *Annu. Rev. Microbiol.* 54 (2000) 187–219.
- [7] E. Strasburger, Ueber Plasmaverbindungen pflanzlicher Zellen, *Jahrb. Wiss. Bot.* 36 (1901) 493–601.
- [8] F.A. Ramirez-Weber, T.B. Kornberg, Cytonemes: cellular processes that project to the principal signaling center in *Drosophila* imaginal discs, *Cell* 97 (1999) 599–607.
- [9] S. Abounit, E. Delage, C. Zurzolo, Identification and characterization of tunneling nanotubes for intercellular trafficking, *Curr. Protoc. Cell Biol.* 67 (2015), 12.10.11–12.10.21.
- [10] S. Abounit, J.W. Wu, K. Duff, G.S. Victoria, C. Zurzolo, Tunneling nanotubes: a possible highway in the spreading of tau and other prion-like proteins in neurodegenerative diseases, *Prion* 10 (2016) 344–351.
- [11] A. Kumar, J.H. Kim, P. Ranjan, M.G. Metcalfe, W. Cao, M. Mishina, S. Gangappa, Z. Guo, E.S. Boyden, S. Zaki, I. York, A. Garcia-Sastre, M. Shaw, S. Sambhara, Influenza virus exploits tunneling nanotubes for cell-to-cell spread, *Sci. Rep.* 7 (2017), 40360.
- [12] M. Panasiuk, M. Rychlowski, N. Derewońko, K. Bieńkowska-Szewczyk, Tunneling nanotubes (TNT) as a novel route of cell-to-cell spread of herpesviruses, *J. Virol.* 92 (2018) e00090-00018.
- [13] D. Cordero Cervantes, C. Zurzolo, Peering into tunneling nanotubes. The path forward, *EMBO J* 40 (2021), e105789, <https://doi.org/10.15252/emboj.2020105789>.
- [14] G. Haimovich, S. Dasgupta, J.E. Gerst, RNA transfer through tunneling nanotubes, *Biochem. Soc. Trans.* 49 (2021) 145–160, <https://doi.org/10.1042/BST20200113>.
- [15] V. Citovsky, Tobacco mosaic virus: a pioneer of cell-to-cell movement, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B* 354 (1999) 637–643.
- [16] A.N.H. Creager, K.B.G. Scholthof, V. Citovsky, H.B. Scholthof, Tobacco mosaic virus: pioneering research for a century, *Plant Cell* 11 (1999) 301–308.
- [17] E.W. Nester, *Agrobacterium*: nature's genetic engineer, *Front. Plant Sci.* 5 (2015) 730.
- [18] J. Zupan, T.R. Muth, O. Draper, P.C. Zambryski, The transfer of DNA from *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* into plants: a feast of fundamental insights, *Plant J* 23 (2000) 11–28.
- [19] B. Lacroix, T. Tzfira, A. Vainstein, V. Citovsky, A case of promiscuity: *Agrobacterium*'s endless hunt for new partners, *Trends Genet.* 22 (2006) 29–37.
- [20] B. Lacroix, V. Citovsky, Pathways of DNA transfer to plants from *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* and related bacterial species, *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 57 (2019) 231–251.
- [21] B. Lacroix, V. Citovsky, Genetically modified organisms, plant transformation by *Agrobacterium*, in: J. Treffl (Ed.) *Discoveries in Modern Science: Exploration, Invention, Technology*, Farmington Hills: Macmillan 2015, pp. 425–431.
- [22] B. Lacroix, V. Citovsky, Genetic factors governing bacterial virulence and host plant susceptibility during *Agrobacterium* infection, *Adv. Genet.* (2022) in press.
- [23] P.J. Christie, K. Atmakuri, V. Krishnamoorthy, S. Jakubowski, E. Cascales, Biogenesis, architecture, and function of bacterial type IV secretion systems, *Annu. Rev. Microbiol.* 59 (2005) 451–485.
- [24] G. Schröder, R. Schuelein, M. Quebatte, C. Dehio, Conjugative DNA transfer into human cells by the VirB/VirD4 type IV secretion system of the bacterial pathogen *Bartonella henselae*, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 108 (2011) 14643–14648.
- [25] E. Fernández-González, H.D. de Paz, A. Alperi, L. Agúndez, M. Faustmann, F.J. Sangari, C. Dehio, M. Llosa, Transfer of R388 derivatives by a pathogenesis-associated type IV secretion system into both bacteria and human cells, *J. Bacteriol.* 193 (2011) 6257–6265.
- [26] D. Endy, Foundations for engineering biology, *Nature* 438 (2005) 449–453.
- [27] A. Costello, A.H. Badran, Synthetic biological circuits within an orthogonal central dogma, *Trends Biotechnol.* 39 (2021) 59–71, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2020.05.013>.
- [28] C.C. Liu, M.C. Jewett, J.W. Chin, C.A. Voigt, Toward an orthogonal central dogma, *Nat. Chem Biol* 14 (2018) 103–106, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nchembio.2554>.
- [29] Y. Qian, W. Kong, T. Lu, Precise and reliable control of gene expression in *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 118 (2021) 3962–3972, <https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.27872>.
- [30] H. Puchta, Repair of genomic double-strand breaks in somatic plant cells by one-sided invasion of homologous sequences, *Plant J* 13 (1998) 77–78.
- [31] M.D. Chilton, Q. Que, Targeted integration of T-DNA into the tobacco genome at double-strand breaks: new insights on the mechanism of T-DNA integration, *Plant Physiol* 133 (2003) 956–965.
- [32] T. Tzfira, L. Frankmen, M. Vaidya, V. Citovsky, Site-specific integration of *Agrobacterium* T-DNA via double-stranded intermediates, *Plant Physiol* 133 (2003) 1011–1023.
- [33] L.E.M. Kralemann, S. de Pater, H. Shen, S.L. Kloet, R. van Schendel, P.J.J. Hooykaas, M. Tijsterman, Distinct mechanisms for genomic attachment of the 5' and 3' ends of *Agrobacterium* T-DNA in plants, *Nat. Plants* 8 (2022) 526–534, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41477-022-01147-5>.
- [34] R. He, M.A. Bernards, A. Wang, Purification of plasmodesmata-enriched fraction for proteomic analyses, *Methods Mol. Biol.* 2400 (2022) 115–123, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-0716-1835-6\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-0716-1835-6_12).
- [35] P. Kirk, S. Amsbury, L. German, R. Gaudioso-Pedraza, Y. Benitez-Alfonso, A comparative meta-proteomic pipeline for the identification of plasmodesmata proteins and regulatory conditions in diverse plant species, *BMC Biol* 20 (2022) 128, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-022-01331-1>.
- [36] M.S. Salmon, E.M. Bayer, Dissecting plasmodesmata molecular composition by mass spectrometry-based proteomics, *Front. Plant Sci.* 3 (2012) 307.
- [37] M. Raices, M.A. D'Angelo, Nuclear pore complex composition: a new regulator of tissue-specific and developmental functions, *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* 13 (2012) 687–699, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm3461>.
- [38] J.S. Lee, E. Smith, A. Shilatifard, The language of histone crosstalk, *Cell* 142 (2010) 682–685.
- [39] T. Suganuma, J.L. Workman, Crosstalk among histone modifications, *Cell* 135 (2008) 604–607.
- [40] M. Yun, J. Wu, J.L. Workman, B. Li, Readers of histone modifications, *Cell Res* 21 (2011) 564–578.
- [41] C. Bourbousse, I. Ahmed, F. Roudier, G. Zabulon, E. Blondet, S. Balzergue, V. Colot, C. Bowler, F. Barneche, Histone H2B monoubiquitination facilitates the rapid modulation of gene expression during *Arabidopsis* photomorphogenesis, *PLOS Genet* 8 (2012), e1002825.
- [42] D. Fleury, K. Himanen, G. Cnops, H. Nelissen, T.M. Boccardi, S. Maere, G.T. Beemster, P. Neyt, S. Anami, P. Robles, J.L. Micol, D. Inzé, M. Van Lijsebettens, The *Arabidopsis thaliana* homolog of yeast BRE1 has a function in cell cycle regulation during early leaf and root growth, *Plant Cell* 19 (2007)

- 417–432.
- [43] X. Gu, D. Jiang, Y. Wang, A. Bachmair, Y. He, Repression of the floral transition via histone H2B monoubiquitination, *Plant J* 57 (2009) 522–533.
  - [44] K. Himanen, M. Woloszyńska, T.M. Boccardi, S. De Groeve, H. Nelissen, L. Bruno, M. Vuylsteke, M. Van Lijsebettens, Histone H2B monoubiquitination is required to reach maximal transcript levels of circadian clock genes in *Arabidopsis*, *Plant J* 72 (2012) 249–260.
  - [45] Y. Liu, M. Koornneef, W.J.J. Soppe, The absence of histone H2B monoubiquitination in the *Arabidopsis hub1 (rdo4)* mutant reveals a role for chromatin remodeling in seed dormancy, *Plant Cell* 19 (2007) 433–444.
  - [46] I. Keren, V. Citovsky, The histone deubiquitinase OTLD1 targets euchromatin to regulate plant growth, *Sci. Signal.* 9 (2016) ra125.
  - [47] I. Keren, V. Citovsky, Activation of gene expression by histone deubiquitinase OTLD1, *Epigenetics* 12 (2017) 584–590.
  - [48] E. Isono, M.K. Nagel, Deubiquitylating enzymes and their emerging role in plant biology, *Front. Plant Sci.* 5 (2014) 56.
  - [49] M. Derkacheva, S. Liu, D.D. Figueiredo, M. Gentry, I. Mozgova, P. Nanni, M. Tang, M. Mannervik, C. Köhler, L. Hennig, H2A deubiquitinases UBP12/13 are part of the *Arabidopsis* polycomb group protein system, *Nat. Plants* 2 (2016), 16126.
  - [50] D.F. Suen, Y.H. Tsai, Y.T. Cheng, R. Radjacommaré, R.N. Ahirwar, H. Fu, W. Schmidt, The deubiquitinase OTU5 regulates root responses to phosphate starvation, *Plant Physiol* 176 (2018) 2441–2455.
  - [51] R.J. Schmitz, Y. Tamada, M.R. Doyle, X. Zhang, R.M. Amasino, Histone H2B deubiquitination is required for transcriptional activation of *FLOWERING LOCUS C* and for proper control of flowering in *Arabidopsis*, *Plant Physiol* 149 (2009) 1196–1204.
  - [52] V.V. Sridhar, A. Kapoor, K. Zhang, J. Zhu, T. Zhou, P.M. Hasegawa, R.A. Bressan, J.K. Zhu, Control of DNA methylation and heterochromatic silencing by histone H2B deubiquitination, *Nature* 447 (2007) 735–738.
  - [53] M. Luo, M.Z. Luo, D. Buzas, J. Finnegan, C. Helliwell, E.S. Dennis, W.J. Peacock, A. Chaudhury, UBIQUITIN-SPECIFIC PROTEASE 26 is required for seed development and the repression of *PHERES1* in *Arabidopsis*, *Genetics* 180 (2008) 229–236.
  - [54] A. Krichevsky, B. Lacroix, A. Zaltsman, V. Citovsky, Involvement of KDM1C histone demethylase-OTLD1 otubain-like histone deubiquitinase complexes in plant gene repression, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 108 (2011) 11157–11162.
  - [55] M.S.V. Phan, I. Keren, P.T. Tran, M. Lapidot, V. Citovsky, *Arabidopsis* LSH10 transcription factor interacts with the co-repressor histone deubiquitinase OTLD1 to recruit it to the target promoters, *bioRxiv* (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.30.502139>.
  - [56] I. Keren, B. Lacroix, A. Kohrman, V. Citovsky, Histone deubiquitinase OTU1 epigenetically regulates *DA1* and *DA2*, which control *Arabidopsis* seed and organ size, *iScience* 23 (2020), 100948.