Genome of the long-living sacred lotus (Nelumbo nucifera Gaertn.)

Ray Ming (rming@life.uiuc.edu)
Robert VanBuren (bob.vanburen@gmail.com)
Yanling Liu (liuyanling@wbgcas.cn)
Mei Yang (yangmei815815@gmail.com)
Yuepeng Han (yphan@wbgcas.cn)
Lei-Ting Li (lileiting@gmail.com)
Qiong Zhang (qiongzhang2009@gmail.com)
Min-Jeong Kim (mjkim93@gmail.com)
Michael C Schatz (michael.schatz@gmail.com)
Michael Campbell (mcampbell@genetics.utah.edu)
Jingping Li (jli4@uga.edu)
John E Bowers (jebowers@uga.edu)
Haibao Tang (tanghaibao@gmail.com)
Eric Lyons (ericlyons@email.arizona.edu)
Ann A Ferguson (armeniaa@msu.edu)
Giuseppe Narzisi (gnarzisi@cshl.edu)
David R Nelson (drnelson1@gmail.com)
Crysten E Blaby-Haas (cblaby@chem.ucla.edu)
Andrea R Gschwend (agschwe3@illinois.edu)
Yuannian Jiao (yxj129@psu.edu)
Joshua P Der (jpd18@psu.edu)
Fanchang Zeng (fczeng@illinois.edu)
Jennifer Han (johan@illinois.edu)
Xiang Jia Min (xmin@ysu.edu)
Karen A Hudson (kkaczoro@purdue.edu)
Ratnesh Singh (Ratnesh.Singh@ag.tamu.edu)
Aleel K Grennan (agrennan@illinois.edu)
Steven J Karpowicz (skarp@chem.ucla.edu)
Jennifer R Watling (jennifer.watling@adelaide.edu.au)
Kikukatsu Ito (kikuito@iwate-u.ac.jp)
Sharon A Robinson (sharonr@uow.edu.au)
Matthew E Hudson (mhudson@illinois.edu)
Qingyi Yu (QYu@ag.tamu.edu)
Todd C Mockler (tmockler@danforthcenter.org)
Andrew Carroll (awcarroll@lbl.gov)
Yun Zheng (mincloud@gmail.com)
Ramanjulu Sunkar (ramanjulu.sunkar@okstate.edu)
Ruizong Jia (reasonspare@gmail.com)
Nancy Chen (jungc@hawaii.edu)
Jie Arro (jiearro@gmail.com)

Genome Biology

Ching Man Wai (cmwai@illinois.edu)
Eric Wafula (ewafula@gmail.com)
Ashley Spence (spence4@illinois.edu)
Yanni Han (hynhyn1229@126.com)
Liming Xu (xuliming@wbgcas.cn)
Jisen Zhang (zjisen@gmail.com)
Rhiannon Peery (peery1@illinois.edu)
Miranda J Haus (neuhausmj@gmail.com)
Wenwei Xiong (xiongwenwei@gmail.com)
James A Walsh (jawalsh2@illinois.edu)
Jun Wu (wujun@njau.edu.cn)
Ming-Li Wang (mwang@harc-hspa.com)
Yun J Zhu (jzhu@harc-hspa.com)
Robert E Paull (paull@hawaii.edu)
Anne B Britt (abbritt@ucdavis.edu)
Chunguang Du (duc@mail.montclair.edu)
Stephen R Downie (sdownie@life.uiuc.edu)
Mary A Schuler (maryschu@uiuc.edu)
Todd P Michael (todd.p.michael@monsanto.com)
Steve P Long (slong@illinois.edu)
Donald R Ort (d-ort@life.uiuc.edu)
J .William Schopf (schopf@ess.ucla.edu)
David R Gang (gangd@wsu.edu)
Ning Jiang (jiangn@msu.edu)
Mark Yandell (myandell@genetics.utah.edu)
Claude W dePamphilis (cwd3@psu.edu)
Sabeeha S Merchant (merchant@chem.ucla.edu)
Andrew H Paterson (paterson@plantbio.uga.edu)
Bob B Buchanan (view@berkeley.edu)
Shaohua Li (shhli@wbgcas.cn)
Jane Shen-Miller (shenmiller@lifesci.ucla.edu)

Genome of the long-living sacred lotus (*Nelumbo nucifera* Gaertn.)

Ray Ming[1,2,*,†], Robert VanBuren[2*], Yanling Liu[1,*], Mei Yang[1,*], Yuepeng Han[1], Lei-Ting Li[2,3], Qiong Zhang[1,2], Min-Jeong Kim[4], Michael C Schatz[5], Michael Campbell[6], Jingping Li[7], John E Bowers[8], Haibao Tang[9], Eric Lyons[10], Ann A Ferguson[11], Giuseppe Narzisi[5], David R Nelson[12], Crysten E Blaby-Haas[13], Andrea R Gschwend[2], Yuannian Jiao[7,14], Joshua P Der[14], Fanchang Zeng[2], Jennifer Han[2], Xiang Jia Min[15], Karen A Hudson[16], Ratnesh Singh[17], Aleel K Grennan[2], Steven J Karpowicz[18], Jennifer R Watling[19], Kikukatsu Ito[20], Sharon A Robinson[21], Matthew E Hudson[22], Qingyi Yu[17], Todd C Mockler[23], Andrew Carroll[24], Yun Zheng[25], Ramanjulu Sunkar[26], Ruizong Jia[27], Nancy Chen[28], Jie Arro[2], Ching Man Wai[2], Eric Wafula[14], Ashley Spence[2], Yanni Han[1], Liming Xu[1], Jisen Zhang[29], Rhiannon Peery[2], Miranda J Haus[2], Wenwei Xiong[30], James A Walsh[2], Jun Wu[3], Ming-Li Wang[27], Yun J Zhu[27,31], Robert E Paull[28], Anne B Britt[32], Chunguang Du[30], Stephen R Downie[2], Mary A Schuler[2,33], Todd P Michael[34], Steve P Long[2], Donald R Ort[2,35], J William Schopf[36], David R Gang[4], Ning Jiang[11], Mark Yandell[6], Claude W dePamphilis[14], Sabeeha S Merchant[13], Andrew H Paterson[7], Bob B Buchanan[37], Shaohua Li[1†], Jane Shen-Miller[36†]

[1] Key Laboratory of Plant Germplasm Enhancement and Specialty Agriculture, Wuhan Botanical Garden, The Chinese Academy of Sciences, Lumo Road, Wuhan 430074, China
[2] Department of Plant Biology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1201 W. Gregory Dr, Urbana, IL 61801, USA
[3] College of Horticulture, Nanjing Agricultural University, 1 Weigang Road, Nanjing 210095, China
[4] Institute of Biological Chemistry, Washington State University, Clark Hall, 100 Dairy Road, Pullman, WA 99164, USA
[5] Simons Center for Quantitative Biology, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, One Bungtown Road, Cold Spring Harbor, NY 11724, USA
[6] Eccles Institute of Human Genetics, University of Utah, 15 North 2030 East, Salt Lake City, UT 84112, USA
[7] Plant Genome Mapping Laboratory, University of Georgia, 111 Riverbend Road, Athens GA, 30602, USA
[8] Department of Crop and Soil Sciences, University of Georgia, 120 Carlton Street, Athens, GA 30602, USA
[9] J Craig Venter Institute, 9704 Medical Center Dr, 20850 Rockville, MD, USA
[10] School of Plant Sciences, iPlant Collaborative Bio5 Institute, University of Arizona, 1657 E Helen St, Tucson, AZ 85745, USA
[11] Department of Horticulture, Michigan State University, A288 Plant and Soil Sciences Building, 1066 Bogue Street, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA
[12] Department of Microbiology, Immunology and Biochemistry, University of Tennessee Health Science Center, 858 Madison Ave Suite G01, Memphis, TN 38163, USA
[13] Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry and Institute for Genomics and Proteomics, University of California, Los Angeles, 607 Charles E Young Drive East, CA 90095, USA

[14] Department of Biology and Intercollege Graduate Program in Plant Biology, The Pennsylvania State University, 201 Life Sciences Bldg, University Park, PA 16802, USA

[15] Center for Applied Chemical Biology, Department of Biological Sciences, Youngstown State University, 1 University Plaza, Youngstown, OH, 44555, USA

[16] USDA-ARS, Purdue University, 915 West State Street, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA

[17] Texas A&M AgriLife Research, Department of Plant Pathology & Microbiology, Texas A&M University System, 17360 Coit Road, Dallas, TX 75252, USA

[18] Department of Biology, University of Central Oklahoma, 100 North University Drive, Edmond, OK 73034, USA

[19] School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Adelaide, North Terrace, Adelaide, 5005, Australia

[20] Cryobiofrontier Research Center, Faculty of Agriculture, Iwate University, Ueda 3-18-8, Morioka, Iwate 020–8550, Japan

[21] Institute for Conservation Biology, The University of Wollongong, Northfields Avenue, Wollongong, NSW 2522, Australia

[22] Department of Crop Sciences, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1101 West Peabody Drive, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

[23] Donald Danforth Plant Science Center, 975 North Warson Road, St. Louis, MO 63132, USA

[24] Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, 1 Cyclotron Road Berkeley Emeryville, CA 94720, USA

[25] Institute of Developmental Biology and Molecular Medicine & School of life Sciences, Fudan University, 220 Handan Road, Shanghai, 200433, China

[26] Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, 246 Noble Research Center, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078, USA

[27] Hawaii Agriculture Research Center, 94-340 Kunia Road, Waipahu, HI 96797, USA

[28] Department of Tropical Plant and Soil Sciences, University of Hawaii at Manoa, 3190 Maile Way, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA

[29] Fujian Normal University, Qishan campus, Minhou, Fuzhou, 350117, China

[30] Department of Biology and Molecular Biology, Montclair State University, 1 Normal Ave, Montclair, NJ 07043, USA

[31] Institute of Tropical Biosciences and Biotechnology, China Academy of Tropical Agricultural Sciences, 4 Xueyuan Road, Haikou, Hainan 571101, China

[32] Department of Plant and Microbial Biology, University of California, 1 Shields Ave, Davis CA, 95161, USA

[33] Department of Cell and Developmental Biology, University of Illinois, 1201 W Gregory Dr, Urbana IL, 61801, USA

[34] The Genome Analysis Center, Monsanto, St. Louis, MO 63167, USA

[35] Global Change and Photosynthesis Research Unit, Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 1206 W Gregory Dr, Urbana, IL, USA

[36] IGPP Center for the Study of Evolution and Origin of Life, Geology Building, Room 5676, University of California, Los Angeles, 595 Charles E. Young Drive East, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1567, USA

[37] Department of Plant and Microbial Biology, University of California, 411 Koshland

Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

* These authors contributed equally to this work.
† To whom correspondence should be addressed (rming@life.uiuc.edu; shhli@wbgcas.cn; shenmiller@lifesci.ucla.edu)

Abstract

Background

Sacred lotus is a basal eudicot with agricultural, medicinal, cultural, and religious importance. It was domesticated in Asia about 7,000 years ago, and cultivated for its rhizomes and seeds as a food crop. It is particularly noted for its 1,300-year seed longevity and exceptional water repellency, known as the lotus effect. The latter property is due to the nanoscopic closely-packed protuberances of its self-cleaning leaf surface, which have been adapted for the manufacture of a self-cleaning industrial paint, Lotusan

Research

The genome of the China Antique variety of the sacred lotus was sequenced with Illumina and 454 technologies, at respective depths of 101x and 5.2x. The final assembly has a contig N50 of 38.8 kbp and a scaffold N50 of 3.4 Mbp, and covers 86.5% of the estimated 929 Mbp total genome size. The genome notably lacks the paleo-triplication observed in other eudicots, but reveals a lineage-specific duplication. The genome has evidence of slow evolution, with a 30% slower nucleotide mutation rate than observed in grape. Comparisons of the available sequenced genomes suggest a minimum gene set for vascular plants of 4,223 genes. Strikingly, the sacred lotus has sixteen COG2132 multi-copper oxidase family proteins with root specific expression; these are involved in root meristem phosphate starvation, reflecting adaptation to limited nutrient availability in an aquatic environment.

Conclusions

The slow nucleotide substitution rate makes the sacred lotus a better resource than the current standard, grape, for reconstructing the pan-eudicot genome, and should therefore accelerate comparative analysis between eudicots and monocots.

Background

Sacred lotus, so named because of its religious significance in both Buddhism and Hinduism, belongs to the small plant family Nelumbonaceae, with only one genus, *Nelumbo*, and two species: *N. nucifera* (Asia, Australia, Russia) and *N. lutea* (eastern and southern North America) [1]. Lotus is in the eudicot order Proteales, which lies outside of the core eudicots (See Additional file 1, Figure S1); its closest relatives are shrubs or trees belonging to the families Proteaceae and Platanaceae. Lotus was a land plant that has adapted to aquatic environments.

Used as a food for over 7,000 years in Asia, lotus is cultivated for its edible rhizomes, seeds, and leaves. Its buds, flowers, anthers, stamens, fruits, leaves, stalks, rhizomes and roots have been used as herbal medicines for treatment of cancer, depression, diarrhea, heart problems, hypertension, and insomnia [2,3]. Its seeds have exceptional longevity, remaining viable for as long as 1300 years, and its vegetative rhizomes remain healthy for more than 50 years [1,2]. The nanoscopic closely-packed protuberances of its self-cleaning leaf surface have been adapted in Europe for the manufacture of a "self-cleaning" industrial paint, *Lotusan*. The use of this paint results in the so-called "*Lotus Effect*" that is now widely advertised for "self-cleaning" automobiles, buildings, and fabrics.

Here we report the sequencing and analysis of the sacred lotus genome from the most ancient lineage of angiosperm. We studied the genome evolutionary history and genes involved in relevant processes governing the unique features of sacred lotus, including adaptation to aquatic environment of an ancient land plant.

Results

Genome sequencing and assembly

We sequenced the genome of the sacred lotus variety 'China Antique' with 94.2 Gb (101x) Illumina and 4.8 Gb (5.2x) 454 sequences. The final assembly includes 804 Mb, 86.5% of the estimated 929 Mb lotus genome [4]. The contig N50 is 38.8 kbp and the scaffold N50 is 3.4 Mbp (See Additional file 1, Table S1). The largest 429 scaffolds account for 94.8% of the assembled genome and 98.0% of the annotated genes. Among the 39 plant genomes published to date, the median N50 scaffold length is about 1.3 Mb, making lotus the 8th best assembled genome (See Additional file 1, Table S2). We constructed a high-density genetic map using 3,895 sequence based restriction associated DNA sequencing (RADseq) markers and 156 simple sequence repeat (SSR) markers [5]. The 3,895 RADseq markers were sorted into 562 co-segregating bins and a total of 698 informative markers were mapped into 9 linkage groups for the eight lotus chromosomes with one gap remaining between two linkage groups (See Additional file 1, Table S3). The nine anchored megascaffolds have a combined size of 543.4 Mb, accounting for 67.6% of the genome assembly, and they are mostly proportional to the karyotype of the lotus chromosomes (See Additional file 1, Figure S2, S3). The high quality of the lotus genome assembly is largely due to the unexpected homozygosity of the 'China Antique' variety. Although lotus is an out-crossing plant, its cultivation and vegetative propagation via rhizomes over the past 7,000 years may have imposed a narrow genetic bottleneck. This could be partly the consequence of its unique feature - seed longevity, which might have further reduced the number of generations in its evolutionary history in addition to

vegetative propagation. The estimated heterozygosity in 'China Antique' is 0.03%, lower than the 0.06% of the sequenced papaya cultivar 'SunUp' after 25 generations of inbreeding [6]. The estimated heterozygosity in the American lotus *N. lutea* 'AL1' variety is 0.37%, also low.

Repeat content of the sacred lotus genome

Repetitive sequences account for 57% of the assembled genome including 47.7% recognizable transposable elements (TEs) (See Additional file 1, Table S4). Unlike most plants, which exhibit relatively inconsequential non-LTR retrotransposons (~1% of the genome) [7, 8, 9], such non-LTR retrotransposons contribute 6.4% to the lotus genome. Differing from other plants that usually have more Gypsy-like elements [9, 10], Copia and Gypsy-like elements are comparable in copy number and genomic fraction in lotus. Most major DNA transposon families are detected in sacred lotus (occupying 16% of the lotus genome), albeit with more than 10-fold variation in relative abundance. An exception, the *Tc1/Mariner* super-family is absent from both the lotus and grape genomes [7], suggesting the frequent loss of this family of elements. Surprisingly, *hAT* (*Ac/Ds* like) elements contribute to nearly 7% of the lotus genome, represented by more than 100,000 copies, more than in any other sequenced plant genome. Of these, CACTA elements are least abundant (0.4%) while *MULE*, *PIF* and *Helitron* elements have amplified to a moderate degree (2.5%, 2.7%, and 3.6%, respectively). The lotus genome further includes 1,447 Pack-MULEs, Mutator-like elements that carry genes or gene fragments [11]. Analysis using ESTs indicated that at least 10 Pack-MULEs are expressed, suggesting that they may play functional roles.

Genome annotation and gene expression

Following repeat-masking and annotation, we inferred 26,685 protein coding genes in lotus, including all 458 core eukaryotic proteins [12]; 82% of the genes have similarity to proteins in SwissProt as identified by BLAST (E < 0.0001). The average gene length is 6,561 bp with median exon and intron lengths of 153 bp and 283 bp, respectively (See Additional file 1, Table S1). The average gene density is one gene per 30 kb, with genes spread more evenly over the assembled genome than in many other plant genomes (See Additional file 1, Figure S2), which are characterized by gene-rich regions often found at the distal regions of chromosomes arms. A total of 12,344 ESTs were aligned to 11741 gene models, and 174 alternative splicing events were identified from 164 genes involving 380 EST contigs (See Additional file 1, Table S5). Of the annotated genes in lotus, 22,803 (85.5%) show expression in rhizomes, roots, leaves, or petioles based on RNAseq data (See Additional file 1, Figure S4). Expression of the remaining genes is likely confined to seeds, flowers, and other unsurveyed tissues. 3,094 protein coding genes are expressed in a tissue-specific manner, including 1,910 genes showing expression only in rhizomes and 841 only in roots. 14,477 genes are expressed across all tissues surveyed. Of the 1,910 rhizome specific genes, we found several AP2-like ethylene-responsive TFs, BTB/POZ domain-containing proteins, heat shock proteins, homeobox TFs, kinesins, and pentatricopeptide repeat-containing proteins (PPRs) (See Additional file 1, Table S6). 544 genes were annotated as PPRs in lotus, with 201 of these were expressed in the four tissues tested, and 199 were only expressed in the rhizome. PPRs have been identified as a group of RNA-binding proteins involved in

RNA processing, stability, editing, maturation and translation in plants. Although the molecular mechanism of their function has not yet been elucidated, their broad expression in lotus rhizome is notable.

Ortholog classification and ancestral gene content in eudicots

The protein coding gene sets from lotus and 16 other sequenced angiosperm species were used to identify putative orthologous gene clusters with Proteinortho v4.20 [13] A total of 529,816 non-redundant genes were classified into 39,649 orthologous gene clusters (orthogroups) containing at least two genes (See Additional file 1, Table S7). Of the 26,685 protein-coding genes in lotus, 21,427 (80.3%) were classified into 10,360 orthogroups, of which 317 contained only lotus genes.

From this gene classification, we estimate a minimum gene set of 7,165 genes in 4,585 orthogroups for eudicots (See Additional file 1, Table S7). The minimum gene set for core-eudicots (7,559 genes in 4,798 orthogroups) is only slightly larger than the eudicot-wide set, suggesting that the minimal gene set of the eudicot-monocot ancestor (6,423 genes in 4,095 orthogroups) would add at least 490 orthogroups associated with the eudicots as a whole.

We reconstructed the ancestral gene content at key nodes of the evolutionary series, as well as the adaptational changes occurring along the branches leading to these nodes; the greatest changes observed in orthogroup presence/absence are specific to terminal lineages (See Additional file 1, Tables S8 and S9, Figure 1). More than three times as many orthogroup gains occur in the lineage leading to all eudicots, as compared

to core-eudicots (See Additional file 1, Figure S5), an increase second only to that of the grasses.

Synteny and genome evolution

A major evolutionary force shaping genome architecture in angiosperms is whole genome duplication (WGD) [14, 15]. This process is followed by the 'diploidization' of genome organization through rearrangement, and of gene content through 'fractionation,' or homeologous gene loss. Intragenomic analysis of lotus indicates that it has experienced at least one WGD (paleo-tetraploidy, See Additional file 1, Figure S6), named λ, but implies that the *Nelumbo* lineage did not experience γ, the paleohexaploidy ('triplication') event around 125 million years ago detected in all other sequenced eudicot genomes [6, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20]. Using lotus as a reference, as many as three post-γ grape subgenomic copies are equally evident, the syntenic regions of which show extensive collinearity of homologous genes (Figure 2). Among the 87.1% of the lotus genic regions retained from this duplication, 5279 (33.3%) are singletons, 8578 (54.1%) are duplicated; and 2007 (12.6%) have more than three homeologs, implying there may have been additional paleo-duplications (See Additional file 1, Table S10).

Based on three lines of evidence, the lineage nucleotide substitution rate in lotus is about 30% slower than that of grape, widely used in angiosperm comparative genomics due to its basal phylogenetic position in rosids, slow mutation rate, and lack of reduplication. First, while phylogenetic evidence firmly dates the lotus-grape divergence before the pan-eudicot gamma triplication affecting only grape, synonymous substitution rates (Ks) between genome-wide lotus-grape syntelog pairs (See Additional file 1, Figure

S7) are smaller than those among triplicated grape genes. Second, the lotus lineage mutation rate also appears slower (about 29.26% slower) than that of Vitis based on a maximum-likelihood tree of 83 plastid genes [21] and expert dating of the respective speciation events [22] using the r8s program [23] with penalized likelihood. Third, the lotus genome has retained more ancestral loci following its lineage-specific WGD. Lotus is a basal eudicot, and its genome is the one from the most ancient lineage of angiosperm sequenced to date (See Additional file 1, Figure S1). Lotus represents an even better model than grape for inferences about the common ancestor of eudicots.

The remarkably slow mutation rate in lotus complicates the dating of the λ duplication. λ-duplicated lotus genes have a median synonymous substitution rate (Ks) of 0.5428, corresponding to an age of 27 million years ago (MYA) on the basis of average rates in plants [24] or 54 MYA on the basis of the grape lineage rate (See Additional file 1, Figure S7). Because lotus diverged from its closest sister lineage at 135-125 MYA [21], before the γ triplication, this suggests that the mutation rate in lotus is much lower than that in grape, and that the lotus-specific WGD event occurred at about 65 MYA with a range between 76 and 54 MYA. This date coincides with the Cretaceous-Tertiary mass extinction which led to the loss of roughly 60% of plant species [25]. Polyploidization has been associated with increased adaptation and survivability, and the numerous plant species inferred to have undergone polyploidy within this time-frame suggests a possible advantage to polyploid lineages during the K-Pg transition, an interpretation supported by the λ duplication in lotus.

By tracing the phylogenetic histories of 688 pairs of grape genes in 528 orthogroups from each of the γ duplication blocks [26], we tested the timing of the

γ paleohexaploid event that has been observed in the genomes of *Vitis* (7), papaya (6), *Populus* (20) and other core-eudicot species (14, 17). About 50% of the resolved trees support the timing of the γ event to have occurred "core-eudicot wide" after the divergence of lotus, consistent with synteny analysis. In contrast, gene family phylogenies for about half of the γ block duplications include lotus genes (See Additional file 1, Table S11), although in rare cases duplicated monophyletic groups contain both lotus and "eudicot-wide" genes. This is consistent with an earlier phylogenomic analysis using data from numerous plant genomes and basal eudicot transcriptomes suggesting that 18-28% of γ block duplications were eudicot-wide [26], even though the signal is primarily observed in core eudicots (Figure 3).

Such data suggest that a relatively large amount of genetic novelty is specifically associated with eudicots as a whole, even though the core eudicots shared a genome triplication after divergence from the basal eudicots. In contrast, in monocots it appears that the evolution of the grass family specifically, rather than the earlier node comprised of grasses (Poales) and palms (Arecales), was associated with relatively large gains in gene family number and size.

Adaptation to an aquatic environment

Submersed plant growth presents unique physiological challenges. Lotus has had to evolve novel features to cope with its aquatic lifestyle. Possible adaptations include an astonishing number of putative copper-dependent proteins, of which 63 proteins contain at least one COX2 domain, 55 contain a "Cu-binding-like" domain and four polyphenol

oxidases. The abundance of Cu proteins in lotus compared to other plants is attributed to expansions in COG2132, a family of multi-copper oxidases. Most plant genomes encode one or two members of COG2132, while lotus has at least sixteen members due to WGD and repeated tandem duplications (Figure 4, See Additional file 1, Figure S8). The only COG2132 members in Arabidopsis, LPR1 and LPR2, are involved in phosphate starvation signaling in root meristems. Similarly in lotus, expression of COG2132 family members is confined largely to the roots (Figure 4). The lotus-specific expansion appears to form a separate phylogenetic clade from the LPR1/2-like proteins, suggesting a novel function not found in Arabidopsis (Figure 4, See Additional file 1, Figure S8).

Adaptation to phosphate starvation in lotus is also evidenced by expansion of the UBC24 family and the miR399 family that regulates it (See Additional file 1, Table S12). The miR169 family, implicated in adaptation to drought stress in Arabidopsis [27], also shows expansion in lotus, totaling 22 members. The fact that lotus grows aquatically and may rarely be subjected to drought suggests that the miR169 family is involved in other physiological processes.

Several other gene families also show unusual compositions that may reflect adaptation to aquatic lifestyles. The bHLH family, implicated in light responses including germination, control of flowering and de-etiolation, and root and flower development, lacks three of its 20 subfamilies in lotus: Va, implicated in brassinosteroid signaling, and VIIIc2 and XIII, implicated in root hair and root meristem development, respectively [28]. The largest families of bHLH factors in lotus are XII, involved in developmental processes including control of petal size, brassinosteroid signaling and floral initiation and Ia, implicated in stomatal development and patterning.

The PRR1/TOC1 circadian clock family, which coordinates internal biology with daily light/dark cycles and is highly conserved across many plant species, includes three predicted members in lotus compared to the one or two present in other plant genomes. The fact that PRR proteins have key roles in modulating light and temperature input into the circadian clock suggests that lotus may require more sensitive adjustments to its environment than other plants. Consistent with this, the CRY family of blue light photoreceptors is also increased with five (2 CRY1, 2 CRY2, 1 CRY3) compared to three in Arabidopsis and four in poplar (See Additional file 1, Table S13). Similar expansion in the CRY family was also noted in another aquatic organism *Ostreococcus*, a micro green algae. Lotus is adapted to both temperate and tropical climates and day lengths with a wide range of flowering times, perhaps associated with increased numbers of flowering time and circadian clock-associated genes.

Discussion

Paleopolyploids are widespread among eukaryotes and particularly common in angiosperms [14, 15]. Lotus diverged from other eudicots early in eudicot history, prior to the γ genome-triplication characteristic of most members of the group [14, 15, 17, 26], and provides insight into the timing and nature of this event associated with a rapid radiation of the large eudicot lineages.   When plant genomes of high paleopolyploidy levels are compared, differentiated gene loss (fractionation) among several homologous subgenomes tends to diminish the signals of synteny. In such cases, genomes with few paleopolyploidy events (such as those of grape or papaya) can be used to take advantage of the smaller evolutionary distances between orthologous segments. Extensive

collinearity within itself, as well as with other plant genomes such as those of *Arabidopsis*, grape, rice, and sorghum, makes the lotus genome not only a eudicot evo-genomic reference (See Additional file 1, Figure S9), but also a better resource for reconstructing the pan-eudicot genome and facilitating comparative analysis between eudicots and monocots.

Surprisingly, the phylogenomic analysis of gene families associated with the γ include a substantial fraction of "eudicot-wide" duplications, suggesting the possibility of a two-step model that involved genetic material from a lineage that branched off earlier than the core eudicots (Figure 3A). A substantial fraction of eudicot-wide gene duplications was also observed in phylogenomic analyses that contained large collections of transcriptome data from early branching basal eudicots such as *Platanus*, *Aquilegia*, and poppies [26]. Eudicot-wide duplications were detected only rarely in another phylogenomic analysis that introduced transcriptome data from the basal eudicots *Gunnera* and *Pachysandra* [29]. The 34 unigenes available from that study were used to populate five MADS box orthogroups with larger taxon sampling in this study. Phylogenies of these orthogroups identify (at boostrap >50%) 1 eudicot-wide and 3 core eudicot-wide duplications (results included in Additional file 1, Table S11), consistent with the rest of the findings in the present study.

In contrast to the phylogenomic results, syntenic comparison showed one lotus region matched with up to three *Vitis* homologous regions, indicating that the lotus genome did not share the gamma event. We propose that the gamma event occurred after the separation of the lotus lineage (Proteales), and involved hybridization with a now extinct species that branched off around the same time (Figure 3A, AA at position #2), or

even earlier than lotus (Figure 3A, AA at position #3). This model explains why the phylogenomic analyses could identify some gamma duplications occurring before the divergence of lotus, but not observable as a triplication in the lotus genome structure. A similar two-step model was suggested by Lyons et al [30] on the basis of fractionation patterns seen in *Vitis,* and evidence for a two-step hexaploid process is clearly observed in the much more recent paleohexaploid *Brassica rapa* [31]. Additional whole plant genome sequences from lineages close to the gamma event, especially ones without the confounding effects of lineage specific genome-duplications, may also help to clarify genome-wide patterns of fractionation among the three gamma sub-genomes, which could provide further evidence bearing on the timing and event(s) associated with the gamma paleohexaploidy event that is associated with what is arguably one of the most important radiations in angiosperm history.

The higher homeolog retention rate in lotus than most other genomes studied provided an opportunity to study subfunctionalization [32], a major driving force affecting fates of duplicated genes following paleopolyploidy. Most pairs of lotus homeologs have no difference in PFAM domain families, while 453 (11.6% of) pairs differ by up to 5 domains. The unshared domains have mean length 17aa with a range of 0~890aa. Between homeologous lotus gene pairs, their mRNA length (excluding 5' and 3' UTRs), CDS length, and intron length differences all follow geometric-like distributions (See Additional file 1, Figure S10), consistent with independent accumulation of small InDels. The changes of length in exonic and intronic regions seem uncorrelated, implying that subfunctionalization affects gene regulation at multiple transcriptional and post-transcriptional levels.

When divergence of lineages is followed by WGD, one predicts similar divergence of the paralogs in one species' genome from a shared ortholog in the other species, confirmed in previous studies [33, 16]. Comparison of paired λ paralogs and their grape ortholog generally fit this prediction (See Additional file 1, Figure S11), however comparisons to cereal (sorghum) orthologs show consistent differentiation in branch lengths. This discrepancy in the lotus-cereal comparison could be explained by fast evolutionary rates in cereal genomes and/or λ being older than it appears, due to the slow *Nelumbo* evolutionary rate. Alternatively, this is also consistent with structural compartmentalization, with genes within the same genome undergoing different evolutionary trajectories [33]. Wider taxa sampling at neighboring branches will help better distinguish the possibilities.

The extraordinary seed longevity and vegetative propagation via rhizomes are likely the causes of the slow evolutionary rate. The 'China Antique' has a highly homozygous genome, yielding arguably the best assembled genome using next generation sequencing technologies with pseudo-molecules proportional to its karyotype. The lotus genome provides the foundation for revealing the molecular basis of its many distinguishing biological properties, including seed longevity, adaptation to aquatic environment, the distinctive superhydrophobicity and self-cleaning property of its leaves, and the thermogenesis that is thought to enhance its pollination success.

Sacred lotus is the first true aquatic plant to be sequenced and comparative genomics reveal unique gene family expansions that may have contributed to its adaptations to an aquatic environment. Submersed soils are largely hypoxic and have a decreased reduction-oxidation potential, causing heavy metal precipitation and reduced

nutrient availability. Lotus has a dramatic expansion of the COG2132 family, a group of multi-copper oxidases involved in phosphate starvation in root meristems. A role in root-specific processes is supported by the expression of these unique genes in root tissue. Adaptation to phosphate starvation can also be seen in an expansion of the UBC24 family and the miR399 family that regulates it. Lotus lacks four bHLH subfamilies involved in iron uptake and root hair and root meristem development, suggesting novel root growth and iron regulation. These gene family expansions and preferential retention of duplicated genes reflect the challenges of aquatic growth.

Conclusions

Sacred lotus has many unique biological features, most noticeable seed longevity and the lotus effect, in addition to its agricultural and medicinal importance. The purpose of sequencing the lotus genome is to facilitate research in these areas and on agronomic and horticultural traits such as rhizome development and flowering time. The assembly of the lotus genome is surprisingly high quality, largely due to the high level of homozygosity resulted from domestication and vegetative propagation. The lotus genome has a lineage specific whole genome duplication event occurred about 65 MYA, but shows no structural evidence for the gamma ancient hexaploid event shared among core eudicot species. The lotus genome has 30% slower nucleotide mutation rate than that of grape, contributing in part to the outstanding genome assembly using next generation sequencing technologies. Analysis of sequenced plant genomes yielded a minimum gene set for vascular plants of 4223 genes. Strikingly, lotus has sixteen COG2132 multi-copper oxidase family proteins with root specific expression. COG2132 members are involved in root meristem phosphate starvation, reflecting lotus' adaptation to limited nutrient

availability in an aquatic environment. The slow nucleotide substitution rate and the lack of the triplication event make lotus genome as excellent reference for reconstructing the pan-eudicot genome and for accelerating comparative analysis between eudicots and monocots. The lotus genome will accelerate the identification of genes controlling rhizome yield and quality, seed size and nutritional profile, flower morphology, and flowering time for crop improvement.

Materials and methods

Illumina (Illumina HiSeq 2000) libraries were generated from purified N. nucifera 'China Antique' nuclear DNA with inserts of 180bp, 500bp, 3.8kb and 8kb and assembled using ALLPATHS-LG. 454/Roche (GSFLX pyrosequencing platform) 20kb mate pair reads were used for scaffolding. RNAseq data generated from various lotus tissues were used for annotation and RNAseq differential gene expression analysis using CLC Genomics Workbench 5.0 (CLC Bio, Aarhus, Denmark). MAKER version 2.22 was used in combination with the assembled RNAseq data to annotate 26,685 genes in the lotus genome. Detailed methods for genome assembly, annotation and analyses are provided in the SI appendix.

Data access:

The assembled *Nelumbo nucifera* genome was submitted to GenBank (AQOG00000000 ;

PID PRJNA168000, http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Traces/wgs/?val=AQOG01).

WGS raw reads are deposited under SRA study: SRP021228

(http://trace.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Traces/sra/?study=SRP021228). The raw

RNAseq data are deposited under BioProject 196884

(http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bioproject/196884).

Abbreviations:

bHLH basic helix loop helix
CRY cryptochrome
EST expressed sequence tags
K-Pg Cretaceous-Paleogene extinction event
LTR long terminal repeat
Mbp millions of base pairs
MYA million years ago
PPR pentatricopeptide repeat-containing proteins
RADseq restriction associated DNA sequencing
SSR simple sequence repeat
TF transcription factor
TL transposable elements
WGD Whole genome duplication
WGS Whole genome shotgun

Acknowledgements

References

1. Shen-Miller J: **Sacred lotus, the long-living fruits of China Antique.** *Seed Sci Res* 2002*,* **12**:131–143.

2. Shen-Miller J, Schopf JW, Harbottle G, Cao RJ, Ouyang S, Zhou KS, Southon JR, Liu GH: **Long-living lotus: germination and soil g-irradiation of centuries-old fruits, and cultivation, growth, and phenotypic abnormalities of offspring.** *Am J Bot* 2002, **89**:236–247.

3. Duke JA, Bogenschutz-Godwin MJ, duCellier J, Duke AK: *Handbook of medicinalherbs.* Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2002.

4. Diao Y, Chen L, Yang G, Zhou M, Song Y, Hu Z, Lin JY: **Nuclear DNA C-values in 12 species in Nymphaeales.** *Caryologia 2006,* **59**:25–30.

5. Yang M, Han Y, VanBuren R, Ming R, Xu L, Han Y, Liu Y: **Genetic linkage mapsfor Asian and American lotus constructed using novel SSR markers derived from the genome of sequenced cultivar.** *BMC genomics* 2012, **13**:653.

6. Ming R, Hou S, Feng Y, Yu Q, Dionne-Laporte A, Saw JH, Senin P, Wang W, Ly BV, Lewis KL, Salzberg SL, Feng L, Jones MR, Skelton RL, Murray JE, Chen C, Qian W, Shen J, Du P, Eustice M, Tong E, Tang H, Lyons E, Paull RE, Michael TP, Wall K, Rice DW, Albert H, Wang ML, Zhu YJ, **et al**.: **The draft genome of the transgenic tropical fruit tree papaya** (Carica papaya **Linnaeus). Nature** 2008, **452:**991-996.

7. Jaillon O, Aury JM, Noel B, Policriti A, Clepet C, Casagrande A, Choisne N, Aubourg S, Vitulo N, Jubin C, Vezzi A, Legeai F, Hugueney P, Dasilva C, Horner

D, Mica E, Jublot D, Poulain J, Bruyere C, Billault A, Segurens B, Gouyvenoux M, Ugarte E, Cattonaro F, Anthouard V, Vico V, Del Fabbro C, Alaux M, Di Gaspero G, Dumas V, et al**.: The grapevine genome sequence suggests ancestral hexaploidization in major angiosperm phyla. Nature** 2007, **449:**463-467.

8. Paterson AH, Bowers JE, Bruggmann R, Dubchak I, Grimwood J, Gundlach H, Haberer G, Hellsten U, Mitros T, Poliakov A, Schmutz J, Spannagl M, Tang H, Wang X, Wicker T, Bharti AK, Chapman J, Feltus FA, Gowik U, Grigoriev IV, Lyons E, Maher CA, Martis M, Narechania A, Otillar RP, Penning BW, Salamov AA, Wang Y, Zhang L, Carpita NC, et al.: **The Sorghum bicolor genome and the diversification of grasses.** *Nature* 2009, **457**:551–556.

9. Schnable PS, Ware D, Fulton RS, Stein JC, Wei F, Pasternak S, Liang C, Zhang J, Fulton L, Graves TA, Minx P, Reily AD, Courtney L, Kruchowski SS, Tomlinson C, Strong C, Delehaunty K, Fronick C, Courtney B, Rock SM, Belter E, Du F, Kim K, Abbott RM, Cotton M, Levy A, Marchetto P, Ochoa K, Jackson SM, Gillam B, et al: **The B73 Maize Genome: Complexity, diversity, and dynamics.** *Science* 2009, **326**:1112–1115.

10. Schmutz J, Cannon SB, Schlueter J, Ma J, Mitros T, Nelson W, Hyten DL, Song Q, Thelen JJ, Cheng J, Xu D, Hellsten U, May GD, Yu Y, Sakurai T, Umezawa T, Bhattacharyya MK, Sandhu D, Valliyodan B, Lindquist E, Peto M, Grant D, Shu S, Goodstein D, Barry K, Futrell-Griggs M, Abernathy B, Du J, Tian Z, Zhu L, et al: **Genome sequence of the palaeopolyploid soybean.** *Nature* 2010, **463**:178–183.

11. Jiang N, Bao Z, Zhang X, Eddy S-R, Wessler S-R **Pack-MULE transposable elements mediate gene evolution in plants.** *Nature* 2007*,* **431**:569–573.

12. Parra G, Bradnam K, Korf I: **CEGMA: a pipeline to accurately annotate core genes in eukaryotic genomes.** *Bioinformatics* 2007, **23**:1061–1067.

13. Lechner M, Findeiss S, Steiner L, Marz M, Stadler PF, Prohaska SJ: **Proteinortho: Detection of (Co-)orthologs in large-scale analysis.** *BMC Bioinformatics* 2011, **12**:124.

14. Paterson AH, Freeling M, Tang H, Wang X: **Insights from the comparison of plant genome sequences.** *Annu Rev Plant Biol* 2010, **61**:349–372.

15. Soltis DE, Albert VA, Leebens-Mack J, Bell CD, Paterson AH, Zheng C, Sankoff D, dePamphilis CW, Wall PK, Soltis PS: **Polyploidy and angiosperm diversification. Am J Bot** 2009, **96:**336-348.

16. Tang H, Bowers JE, Wang X, Ming R, Alam M, Paterson AH: **Synteny and collinearity in plant genomes. Science** 2008, **320:**486-488.

17. Tang H, Wang X, Bowers JE, Ming R, Alam M, Paterson AH: **Unraveling ancient hexaploidy through multiply-aligned angiosperm gene maps. Genome Res** 2008, **18:**1944-1954.

18. The Arabidopsis Genome Initiative: Analysis of the genome sequence of the flowering plant Arabidopsis thaliana. *Nature* 2000, **408**:796-815.

19. International Rice Genome Sequencing Project: **The map-based sequence of the rice genome.** *Nature* 2005, **436**:793-800

20. Tuskan GA, DiFazio S, Jansson S, Bohlmann J, Grigoriev I, Hellsten U, Putnam N, Ralph S, Rombauts S, Salamov A, Schein J, Sterck L, Aerts A, Bhalerao RR, Bhalerao RP, Blaudez D, Boerjan W, Brun A, Brunner A, Busov V, Campbell M, Carlson J, Chalot M, Chapman J, Chen GL, Cooper D, Coutinho PM, Couturier J,

Covert S, Cronk Q, **et al**.: **The genome of black cottonwood,** Populus trichocarpa
(Torr. & Gray). Science 2006, **313:**1596-1604.

21. Moore M, Soltis PS, Bell CD, Burleigh JG, Soltis DE: **Phylogenetic analysis of
83 plastid genes further resolves the early diversification of eudicots.** *Proc Natl
Acad Sci USA* 2010, **107**:4623-28.

22. Hedges SB, Dudley J, Kumar S: **TimeTree: a public knowledge-base of
divergence times among organisms.** *Bioinformatics* 2006, **22**:2971-2972.

23. Sanderson MJ: **r8s: inferring absolute rates of molecular evolution and
divergence times in the absence of a molecular clock. Bioinformatics** 2003,
19:301-302.

24. Wolfe KH, Sharp PM, Li WH: **Rates of synonymous substitution in plant
nuclear genes**. *J Mol Evol* 1989, **29**:208.

25. Fawcett JA, Maere S, Van de Peer Y: **Plants with double genomes might have
had a better chance to survive the Cretaceous-Tertiary extinction event.** *Proc
Natl Acad Sci USA* 2009, **106:**5737-5742.

26. Jiao Y, Leebens-Mack J, Ayyampalayam S, Bowers JE, McKain MR, McNeal J,
Rolf M, Ruzicka DR, Wafula E, Wickett NJ, Wu X, Zhang Y, Wang J, Zhang Y,
Carpenter EJ, Deyholos MK, Kutchan TM, Chanderbali AS, Soltis PS, Stevenson
DW, McCombie R, Pires JC, Wong GK, Soltis DE, dePamphilis CW: **A genome
triplication associated with early diversification of the core eudicots.** *Genome
Biol* 2012, **13**:R3.

27. Li W-X, Oono Y, Zhu J, He XJ, Wu JM, Iida K, Lu XY, Cui X, Jin H, Zhu JK:
The Arabidopsis NFYA5 transcription factor is regulated transcriptionally

and post transcriptionally to promote drought resistance. *Plant Cell* 2008, **20**:2238–2251.

28. Pires N, Dolan L: **Origin and diversification of basic-helix-loop-helix proteins in plants.** *Mol Biol Evol* 2010, **27**:862–874.

29. Vekemans D, Proost S, Vanneste K, Coenen H, Viaene T, Ruelens P, Maere S, Van de Peer Y, Geuten K: **Gamma paleohexaploidy in the stem lineage of core eudicots: significance for MADS-box gene and species diversification.** *Mol Biol Evol* 2012, **29**:3793-3806.

30. Lyons E, Pedersen B, Kane J, Freeling M: **The value of nonmodel genomes and an example using SynMap within CoGe to dissect the hexaploidy that predates the rosids.** *Tropical Plant Biol* 2008 **1**:181-190.

31. Tang H, Woodhouse MR, Cheng F, Schnable JC, Pedersen BS, Conant G, Wang X, Freeling M, Pires JC: **Altered patterns of fractionation and exon deletions in *Brassica rapa* support a two-step model of paleohexaploidy.** *Genetics* 2012: **90**:1563-1574.

32. Lynch M, Force AG: **The origin of interspecific genomic incompatibility via gene duplication. Am Nat** 2000, **156:**590-605.

33. Wang X, Wang H, Wang J, Sun R, Wu J, Liu S, Bai Y, Mun JH, Bancroft I, Cheng F, Huang S, Li X, Hua W, Freeling M, Pires JC, Paterson AH, Chalhoub B, Wang B, Hayward A, Sharpe AG, Park BS, Weisshaar B, Liu B, Li B, Tong C, Song C, Duran C, Peng C, Geng C, Koh C, **et al**.: **The genome of the mesopolyploid crop species** Brassica rapa**. Nat Genet** 2011, **43:**1035-1039.

Figure legend

Figure 1. Orthogroup dynamics in lotus and other angiosperm genomes. Ancestral gene content and gene family (orthogroup) dynamics in lotus and other eudicot and monocot genomes identify expansion of the number of gene families and gene content associated with the ancestral eudicot.

Figure 2. High resolution analysis of syntenic regions of *Nelumbo nucifera* (Nn1/Nm2) and *Vitis vinifera* (Vv1/Vv2/Vv3). Synteny regions were identified from Additional file 1, Figure S5. Gene models are arrays in middle of each panel; Colored boxes and lines connect regions of sequence similarity (LastZ) for protein coding sequences between pair-wise comparisons.

Figure 3. **Polyploidy events in the history of angiosperm evolution.** (A) Summary of polyploidy events in the history of angiosperm evolution, with a focus on the possible phylogenetic origins of the three subgenomes comprising the gamma paleohexaploidy event in core-eudicots. Synteny analysis of the *Nelumbo* genome indicates that gamma is shared only within the core-eudicots, however, phylogenomic analysis suggests a more complex history since around half of the gamma pairs were duplicated core-eudicot wide and the other half eudicot wide (See Additional file 1, Table S10). AA, BB, and CC are three subgenomes of the ancestral hexaploidy. Three possible phylogenetic origins of the ancestral AA genome involved in gamma are denoted by 1, 2, and 3. λ is defined as the most recent polyploidy event in the evolutionary history of *Nelumbo*. All the other Greek

28

symbols are well-known polyploidy events in the evolutionary history of angiosperms. Gamma: genome triplication (hexaploid) event in core eudicot genomes [7, 23]; Sigma and rho: genome duplications detected in grass genomes [8]; Epsilon: angiosperm-wide duplication detected in large-scale gene family phylogenies. Based on gene tree phylogenomics, we hypothesis that the triplication event involved a tetraploid event (BBCC red star) first, then subgenome AA combined with BBCC to form hexaploidy AABBCC (blue dashed line). (B) Predicted gene tree topologies of hypothetical origins of the AA subgenome of the gamma paleohexaploidy. A, B, C indicates surviving genes inherited from AA, BB, CC subgenomes of the AABBCC ancestral hexaploidy. N indicates genes of *Nelumbo*.

Figure 4. Lotus specific expansion in LPR1/LPR2 proteins. (A) The number of LPR1/LPR2 homologs in land plants. Homologs detected by BLAST against the genomes of land plants are represented by a box. A protein similarity network of those proteins is also shown; lotus proteins are represented as purple nodes, Arabidopsis proteins (LPR1 and LPR2) are represented as green nodes and other land plant proteins are represented as grey nodes. (B) Heatmap of COG2132 gene family member expression in lotus. RPKM values were log2 transformed, where blue correlates to high expression, and yellow to low expression. (C) A Maximum Likelihood tree of LPR1/LPR2-like lotus proteins. Branch support was calculated using an Approximate Likelihood-Ratio Test. Lotus ohnologs are connected with a dashed bracket, while proteins whose genes are found in tandem on the genome are connected with a solid bracket. A detailed phylogeny of COG2132 members can be found in See Additional file 1, Figure S8.

Asymmetric Wagner reconstruction
■ Orthogroup gains
■ Orthogroup losses
■ Orthogroup expansions
■ Orthogroup contractions

Number of ancestral orthogroups
Single gene / Multigene

Asterids
9688 / 3969

Core-Eudicots
9452 / 3620

Brassicaceae
10118 / 4416

Brassicales
9678 / 3496

Malvids
9822 / 3666

Eurosids
9833 / 3734

Eudicots
9143 / 3449

Rosids
9623 / 3734

Fabids
9986 / 4071

Fabaceae
10041 / 4990

Angiosperms
8061 / 2861

Monocots
8363 / 3376

Poaceae
9874 / 4479

Solanum tuberosum
Solanum lycopersicum
Mimulus guttatus
Arabidopsis thaliana
Thelungiella parvula
Carica papaya
Theobroma cacao
Populus trichocarpa
Fragaria vesca
Medicago trunculata
Glycine max
Vitis vinifera
Nelumbo nucifera
Sorghum bicolor
Zea mays
Oryza sativa
Phoenix dactylifera
Selaginella moellendorfii

Vv1 — Vitis vinifera (grape) (French National Sequence Center v2, unmasked) GSVIVG01009368001 (chr: 18 7744718-7941608)

Nn1 — Nelumbo nucifera (sacred lotus) (Michael Schatz v2, unmasked) Megascaffolds (chr: megascaffold_6 31873096-32840801) Reverse Complement

Nn2 — Nelumbo nucifera (sacred lotus) (Michael Schatz v2, unmasked) Megascaffolds**2** (chr: megascaffold_1 106168750-107246597) Reverse Complement

Vv2 — Vitis vinifera (grape) (French National Sequence Center v2, unmasked) chr.fa (chr: 7 15587224-15863987)

Vv3 — Vitis vinifera (grape) (French National Sequence Center v2, unmasked) chr.fa**2** (chr: 3 6701821-7104451) Reverse Complement

Top Strand
LASTZ hits
Gene models
Bottom strand

A

N. nucifera
E. grandis
O. sativa
M. domestica
S. italica
S. bicolor
A. thaliana
A. lyrata
C. rubella
B. rapa
T. halophila
C. papaya
C. sinensis
C. clementina
G. max
M. esculenta
V. vinifera
C. sativus
P. vulgaris
P. trichocarpa
L. usitatissimum
R. communis
P. persica
Z. mays
A. coerulea
M. guttatus

B

rhizome tip
rhizome elongation zone
rhizome internode
leaf
root
petiole

log$_2$ value

-6 -4 -2 0 2 4 6

NNU_021372
NNU_023592
NNU_021389
NNU_021390
NNU_023607
NNU_023608
NNU_023908
NNU_000098
NNU_023910
NNU_023909
NNU_015163
NNU_015162
NNU_010196
NNU_021371

C

1   NNU_000097
    NNU_023906
0.062   NNU_023592
    NNU_021372
1   NNU_015163
    NNU_015162
0.91   NNU_010196
1   NNU_023909
0.97   NNU_023910
0.91   NNU_000098
0.97   NNU_023908
1   NNU_023608
0.91   NNU_021390
0.99   NNU_021389
0.83   NNU_023607

0.2

33

Additional files provided with this submission:

Additional file 1: Lotus Supplement 4-26-13.doc, 4860K
http://genomebiology.com/imedia/4481795059828940/supp1.doc