UNIVERSITY of York

This is a repository copy of *Distinctive phytohormonal and metabolic profiles of Arabidopsis thaliana and Eutrema salsugineum under similar soil drying*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/141366/

Version: Accepted Version

Planta

Distinctive phytohormonal and metabolic profiles of Arabidopsis thaliana and Eutrema salsugineum under similar soil drying

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Full Title:	Distinctive phytohormonal and metabolic profiles of Arabidopsis thaliana and Eutrema salsugineum under similar soil drying
Article Type:	Original Article
Corresponding Author:	Carla Pinheiro Universidade Nova de Lisboa Instituto de Tecnologia Quimica e Biologica PORTUGAL
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Universidade Nova de Lisboa Instituto de Tecnologia Quimica e Biologica
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Carla Pinheiro
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Carla Pinheiro
	Elizabeth Dickinson
	Andrew Marriott
	Isa Catarina Ribeiro
	Marta Pintó-Marijuan
	Carla António
	Olfa Zarrouk
	Maria Manuela Chaves
	Ian Catarina Dodd
	Sergi Munné-Bosch
	Jane Thomas-Oates
	Julie Wilson
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	

Funding Information:	Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia	PhD Carla António PhD Olfa Zarrouk
	Daphne Jackson Trust	PhD Elizabeth Dickinson
	Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council	PhD Andrew Marriott
	ITQB NOVA R&D GREEN-it (UID/Multi/04551/2013)	Not applicable
	Northern Way Initiative	Not applicable
	Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EP/K039660/1; EP/M028127/1)	Not applicable

| Abstract: | Although plants perceive and respond to soil drying via a series of concurrent physiological and molecular events, drought tolerance differs greatly within the plant kingdom. While Eutrema salsugineum (formerly Thellungiella salsuginea) is regarded |

as more stress tolerant than its close relative Arabidopsis thaliana, their responses to soil water deficit have not been compared. To ensure a similar rate of soil drying for the two species, daily soil water depletion was controlled to 5-10 % of the soil water content. While partial stomatal closure occurred earlier in Arabidopsis (Day 4) than Eutrema (from Day 6 onwards), thereafter both species showed similar stomatal sensitivity to drying soil. Nonetheless, both targeted and untargeted metabolite analysis showed larger responses in Arabidopsis in both early/mild drought (Days 1, 3, 5 – no significant change in leaf relative water content, RWC) and late/severe drought (Day 12 – circa 80 % decrease in leaf RWC). Arabidopsis (but not Eutrema) showed early peaks in foliar abscisic acid (ABA), jasmonic acid (JA) and salicylic acid (SA) contents. Arabidopsis showed greater metabolic adjustment than Eutrema during both early drought stress (428 versus 35 variables significantly changing) and severe drought (607 versus 171 variables significantly changing). Different sugar profiles between species were accompanied by opposing patterns in the bioactive cytokinin profile responses. The distinctive metabolic responses of each species during early drought, which occurred prior to leaf water status declining, were apparently independent of later stomatal closure in response to drought. These biochemical differences can have implications in regulating transpiration, since Eutrema reduced whole plant water use very early (Day 3) while this occurred later (Day 6 onwards) in Arabidopsis. Arabidopsis provides a promising model to evaluate the mechanisms responsible for stress-induced growth inhibition under the mild/moderate soil drying that crop plants are typically exposed to.

Suggested Reviewers:	THIERRY SIMONNEAU thierry.simonneau@inra.fr
	Bertand Muller muller@supagro.inra.fr
	Radka Vankova UEB Prague Vankova@ueb.cas.cz
	Vicent Arbona UJI, Castellon arbona@uji.es

Distinctive phytohormonal and metabolic profiles of *Arabidopsis thaliana* and *Eutrema salsugineum* under similar soil drying

Carla Pinheiro[1,2,*], Elizabeth Dickinson[3], Andrew Marriott[3], Isa C. Ribeiro[1], Marta Pintó-Marijuan[1,5], Carla António[1,3], Olfa Zarrouk[1], Maria Manuela Chaves[1], Ian C. Dodd[6], Sergi Munné-Bosch[5], Jane Thomas-Oates[3], Julie Wilson[3,4#].

[1] Instituto de Tecnologia Química e Biológica, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Av. da República, EAN, 2781-901 Oeiras, Portugal

[2] DCV - Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, 2829-516 Caparica, Portugal

[3] Department of Chemistry, University of York, Heslington, York YO10 5DD, United Kingdom

[4] Department of Mathematics, University of York, Heslington, York YO10 5DD, United Kingdom

[5] Department of Evolutionary Biology, Ecology and Environmental Sciences, Facultat de Biologia, Universitat de Barcelona, Avinguda Diagonal 643, 08028 Barcelona, Spain

[6] The Lancaster Environment Centre, Lancaster University, Lancaster, United Kingdom

* Corresponding author: pinheiro@itqb.unl.pt

Corresponding author: julie.wilson@york.ac.uk

Running title: **Arabidopsis and Eutrema responses to soil drying**

Abstract

Although plants perceive and respond to soil drying via a series of concurrent physiological and molecular events, drought tolerance differs greatly within the plant kingdom. While *Eutrema salsugineum* (formerly *Thellungiella salsuginea*) is regarded as more stress tolerant than its close relative *Arabidopsis thaliana*, their responses to soil water deficit have not been compared. To ensure a similar rate of soil drying for the two species, daily soil water depletion was controlled to 5-10 % of the soil water content. While partial stomatal closure occurred earlier in Arabidopsis (Day 4) than Eutrema (from Day 6 onwards), thereafter both species showed similar stomatal sensitivity to drying soil. Nonetheless, both targeted and untargeted metabolite analysis showed larger responses in Arabidopsis in both early/mild drought (Days 1, 3, 5 – no significant change in leaf relative water content, RWC) and late/severe drought (Day 12 – circa 80 % decrease in leaf RWC). Arabidopsis (but not Eutrema) showed early peaks in foliar abscisic acid (ABA), jasmonic acid (JA) and salicylic acid (SA) contents. Arabidopsis showed greater metabolic adjustment than Eutrema during both early drought stress (428 *versus* 35 variables significantly changing) and severe drought (607 *versus* 171 variables significantly changing). Different sugar profiles between species were accompanied by opposing patterns in the bioactive cytokinin profile responses. The distinctive metabolic responses of each species during early drought, which occurred prior to leaf water status declining, were apparently independent of later stomatal closure in response to drought. These biochemical differences can have implications in regulating transpiration, since Eutrema reduced whole plant water use very early (Day 3) while this occurred later (Day 6 onwards) in Arabidopsis. Arabidopsis provides a promising model to evaluate the mechanisms responsible for stress-induced growth inhibition under the mild/moderate soil drying that crop plants are typically exposed to.

Keywords: bioactive cytokinins; rewatering; redox state; stomatal conductance; unsupervised multivariate analysis

2

Introduction

In view of climate change, a major goal for the plant biology community is to understand the mechanisms that allow some plants to withstand drought or hot weather. Knowledge of how plants survive and reproduce in challenging environmental conditions can allow novel targets to be tested in crop-breeding programs. The well-known model species *Arabidopsis thaliana* provides information that can be applied to crop systems (Piquerez *et al.*, 2014; Gilliham *et al.*, 2017). Using the Columbia accession (Col-0) and its mutants has allowed many stress regulatory and responsive pathways to be deciphered (Koornneef and Meinke, 2010; Osakabe *et al.*, 2014), although its stress resilience has not been fully established. Despite wide ecotypic variation (Montesinos-Navarro *et al.*, 2011; Clauw *et al.*, 2016), Arabidopsis is not expected to cope well in extreme environments (Zhu *et al.*, 2015). Instead, Arabidopsis relatives such as *Eutrema salsugineum* have been proposed as stress-tolerant models (Orsini *et al.*, 2010; Zhu *et al.*, 2015). Eutrema seems prepared for stress, as its stress-related genes are upregulated in comparison to Arabidopsis even when grown under optimal conditions (Taji *et al.,* 2004; Gong *et al.,* 2005). As in *Arabidopsis*, *Eutrema salsugineum* ecotypes from different geographical regions show significant genetic variation (Lee *et al.,* 2016). However, physiological and metabolic responses of Arabidopsis and its stress tolerant relatives to soil water deficit have not been directly compared.

Physiological responses to water deficit are modulated by the intensity, duration, and rate of progression of imposed drought (Pinheiro and Chaves, 2011). Extensive research on the stomatal regulation of water loss demonstrates a trade-off between carbon assimilation, efficient water use and leaf cooling capacity (Chaves *et al.*, 2016). Plants can be grouped according to whether they avoid heat (keeping their stomata open for longer) or use water efficiently (closing their stomata sooner, a typical drought-avoidance strategy). However, if plants can avoid the deleterious effects of heat by keeping their stomata open for longer, while maintaining a favourable water status by extracting more water (e.g. by having deep roots), this strategy benefits carbon uptake in addition to the cooling effect. Under drought, Arabidopsis Col-0 closes its stomata at higher soil moisture levels than other Arabidopsis genotypes (Meyre *et al.,* 2001). The two well-studied ecotypes of Eutrema, Shandong and Yukon, can grow under limited soil water availability (Xu *et al.,* 2014; Macleod *et al.,* 2015), but their drought performance, relative to Arabidopsis, is unknown.

The two plant species seemingly have distinct water consumption strategies, although it may

87 be difficult to separate species *versus* accession variation. Arabidopsis (Col-0) had relatively

88 higher total transpiration than Eutrema (Shandong) under non-challenging conditions, which

89 was related to its higher relative growth rate (Orsini *et al.*, 2010). Salinity decreased

90 transpiration to a larger extent in Arabidopsis than Eutrema. In addition to these different

91 water consumption strategies, Eutrema and Arabidopsis also had different biochemical

92 composition under non-challenging growth conditions, with foliar sucrose and glucose

93 content higher in Eutrema, while the hormones salicylic acid (SA) and jasmonic acid (JA)

94 were higher in Arabidopsis (Arbona *et al.*, 2010; Pilarska *et al.*, 2016). Furthermore, Eutrema

95 expressed more stress and defence genes than Arabidopsis under non-challenging conditions,

96 which is described as stress priming (e.g. Zhu *et al.*, 2015; Lee *et al.*, 2016). It is uncertain

97 whether these biochemical differences regulate differences in transpiration, and consequently

98 different rates of soil water depletion.

99 However, the metabolic features associated with the initial stages of soil drying are not clear.

100 In Arabidopsis, soil drying partially closes the stomata well before any decrease in carbon

101 assimilation rate (Hummel *et al.*, 2010; Bechtold *et al.*, 2016) or any significant increase in

102 foliar abscisic acid (ABA) content (Bechtold *et al.*, 2016). ABA is described as the main

103 driver controlling plant performance under limited water availability since it induces stomatal

104 closure, but more comprehensive recent studies demonstrated that most of the plant hormones

105 are involved in stress signalling (Müller and Munné-Bosch, 2015). In addition, during the

106 very early stages of water limitation, effects on carbon metabolism (CO_2 assimilation, and

107 sucrose and starch formation and allocation) may be decoupled from stomatal closure

108 (Pinheiro *et al.*, 2011; Bechtold *et al.*, 2016). Many players are involved in stress perception

109 and signal transduction leading to large alterations in carbon metabolism, and in the

110 transcription program (Golldack *et al.*, 2014; Urano *et al.*, 2017). The metabolic balance

111 between several molecules triggers adjustment mechanisms, and when several thresholds are

112 achieved, physiological responses to drought occur (Pinheiro *et al.*, 2011). The integration of

113 multiple environmental signals by sugars, hormones, and reactive oxygen species (ROS)

114 adjusts plant growth and determines whether plants survive or perish under given

115 environmental conditions (Pinheiro and Chaves, 2011; Osakabe *et al.*, 2014). The precise

116 chain of events is not yet defined, and although some pathways and interactions are

117 understood, others are more elusive (Rivas-San Vicente and Plasencia, 2011; Munné-Bosch

118 and Müller, 2013; Ruan, 2014; Considine and Foyer, 2014; de Ollas and Dodd, 2016).

119 Although recent reports highlight that stomatal closure is one of the initial events in response

4

120　to soil drying, many other metabolic adjustments also take place.

121　This work aimed to explore the metabolic adjustments prior to significant stomatal closure in
122　Arabidopsis (Col-0) and Eutrema (Shandong) responding to slowly-imposed soil water
123　deficit. Our working hypothesis is that Arabidopsis and Eutrema show distinctive responses
124　to progressive and slow soil drying. In addition, untargeted analysis of LC-MS metabolite
125　data was used to detect similarities and differences between these two species.

126

Materials and Methods

128　*Arabidopsis thaliana* (Col-0) and *Eutrema salsugineum* (Shandong) seeds were soaked and
129　stratified at 4 ℃ for 4 or 14 days, respectively. *Eutrema salsugineum* is the current
130　designation of *Thellungiella salsuginea* (Integrated Taxonomic Information System on-line
131　database, www.itis.gov; The International Plant Names Index, www.ipni.org). Seeds were
132　then transferred to pots (300 mL) containing a 1:1 mixture of coarse sand and peat
133　(Shamrock). Plants were grown under controlled conditions, under a 12 h photoperiod,
134　temperatures ranging from 20 to 24 ˚C, with a 60-70 % relative humidity and
135　photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) of 250-300 μmol m^{-2} s^{-1} (SON-T Agro 400w,
136　Phillips). Plants were watered every day with demineralized water to 85 % of soil water
137　content (SWC). SWC was monitored daily and is defined as: SWC = [(pot weight − pot
138　weight with totally dried substrate)] / [(pot weight at drained capacity − pot weight with
139　totally dried substrate)] x 100. Drought stress treatments were imposed when plants had 8 to
140　10 fully expanded leaves (40 days for Eutrema and 36 days for Arabidopsis) and had covered
141　the surface of the pots (thereby minimising evaporation from the soil). During the experiment
142　plant growth increased, on average by 2.9 g fresh weight (FW) for Arabidopsis and 2.5 g FW
143　for Eutrema, corresponding to less than 0.8 % error in estimating SWC (Fig. 1).

144　Preliminary drought experiments, in which water was withheld, showed faster soil water
145　depletion and more rapid stomatal closure in Arabidopsis (supplementary Fig. S1). Similarly,
146　higher transpiration rates of Arabidopsis were previously reported (Orsini *et al.* 2010).
147　Stomatal conductance of the two species was differentially sensitive to soil drying
148　(supplementary Fig. S1B and C). Within the 45-55 % SWC range, Arabidopsis showed
149　greater stomatal closure than Eutrema, but below 40 % SWC both species showed similar
150　stomatal sensitivity to soil water deficit and were severely affected by drought. However,

151 analysis of covariance demonstrating no significant species x SWC interaction, both species

152 showed a similar relationship between % gs *vs* soil water content, with (supplementary Fig

153 S1C).

154 To compare stress duration and intensity effects on plant responses, the rate of soil water

155 depletion was controlled to 5-10 % of the SWC per day by pre-dawn irrigation (Fig. 1). Even

156 when controlling the SWC, Arabidopsis consumed more water than Eutrema, as indicated by

157 the greater divergence between SWC measured at maximum soil water deficit (symbols) and

158 the SWC to which the pot was re-turned to pre-dawn ("stress" line in Fig 1). This greater

159 water use of Arabidopsis was most prominent between Days 3 and 7.

160 Plants were harvested 0 (last day of watering), 1, 3, 5 and 12 days after the beginning of the

161 assay, corresponding to 75 %, 66 %, 45 %, and 12 % SWC, respectively. Samples were also

162 taken the day after re-watering (1 d). Six biological replicates were obtained at each time-

163 point, except for Day 1 controls for which there were only five biological replicates,

164 providing 65 samples of each plant species. At the beginning of the assay, the most recently

165 expanded two-three leaflets were identified and used for physiological and water status

166 measurements. For the biochemical analysis, and when analysing severe drought and early

167 rewatering, only non-senescent leaflets were used, i.e. the younger leaflets. Samples for

168 biochemical (hormone, carbohydrate, pigment and oxidative status) analysis were

169 immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen and kept at -80 ℃ until further extraction and analysis.

170 Samples for osmotic potential and for RWC were then collected.

171 ***Leaf conductance, water status and osmotic adjustment***

172 Stomatal conductance was measured 2-3 h after the beginning of the photoperiod in five

173 plants per treatment using a portable gas exchange photosynthesis system coupled to a 6400-

174 15 chamber (1 cm^2 diameter cuvette, Li-6400, Li-Cor, Lincoln, Nebraska, USA). Three to

175 five measurements were made per plant on the most recently expanded leaf.

176 Leaf and root samples were taken 4 h after the beginning of the photoperiod. Leaf discs (3

177 mm diameter) and total roots were weighed to obtain fresh weight (FW), placed in darkened

178 petri dishes containing distilled water for 2 h to fully hydrate, then re-weighed to obtain

179 turgid weight (TW), and then dried at 80 ℃ for 48 h to obtain dry weight (DW). Leaf

180 (LRWC) and root (RRWC) relative water content were calculated as: RWC = [(FW – DW) x

181 100 / (TW – DW)].

182 Leaf osmotic potential (ψs) was evaluated from leaf disks (8 mm, n = 5–6), frozen and stored

183 at -80 ºC. The leaf osmotic potential was measured with an HR-33T dew point

184 microvoltmeter and C-52 sample chambers (Wescor, Inc., Logan, UT, USA). The osmotic

185 potential was adjusted to the LRWC to calculate the osmotic potential at full turgor (OP100),

186 and the osmotic adjustment was calculated as previously described (Turner *et al.*, 2007).

187 *Phytohormone quantification via LC-MS targeted analysis*

188 Freeze-dried shoots (50 mg) were used to extract and quantify the following hormones

189 (Müller and Munné-Bosch, 2011): auxin (indole-3-acetic acid: IAA), gibberellins (GA1, 4, 9,

190 19, 20, 24), cytokinin (CK) compounds (trans-zeatin: Z; trans-zeatin riboside: ZR; 2-

191 isopentenyl adenine: 2iP; isopentenyl adenosine: IPA; dihydrozeatin: DHZ; dihydrozeatin

192 riboside: DHZR), and stress-related phytohormones (ABA; JA; SA; and ethylene precursor

193 1-amino-cyclopropane-1-carboxyic acid: ACC).

194 Extraction was performed in methanol solutions containing 1 % glacial acetic acid, using the

195 following standards: d_5-IAA, d_6-2-isopentenyl adenine (d_6-2iP), d_6-IPA, d_6-ABA, d_5-JA, d_4-

196 SA, d_4-ACC, d_2-GA$_1$, d_2-GA$_4$, d_2-GA$_9$, d_2-GA$_{19}$, d_2-GA$_{20}$ and d_2-GA$_{24}$; d_5-Z and d_5-ZR were

197 used as standards for Z, DHZ, ZR, and DHZR. After adding 170 μL of the extraction solution

198 and 30 μL of a solution containing 100 ppm of the standards in the same solvent, the

199 materials were mixed in a vortex mixer for 5 s and exposed to ultrasound for 30 min,

200 followed by centrifugation at 9,500 *g* for 10 min. The supernatant was removed and the

201 residue was washed twice with 100 μL of the solvent solution. The supernatant and washes

202 were combined and filtered through PTFE 0.22 μm filter paper (Waters, Milford, MA) and 5

203 μL aliquots were analysed using a UPLC-ESI-MS/MS (Acquity UPLC System from Waters,

204 Milford, MA) and tandem MS/MS experiments were performed on an API 3000 triple

205 quadrupole mass spectrometer (PE Sciex, Concord, Ont., Canada) using a HALO™ C18

206 column (2.1 × 75 mm, 2.7 μm) (Advanced Materials Technology, Inc. Wilmington, DE) and

207 a binary mobile phase system composed of (A) water modified with 0.05 % glacial acetic

208 acid and (B) acetonitrile modified with 0.05 % glacial acetic acid. Quantification was

209 performed by preparing a calibration curve including each of the analysed compounds and

210 calculating the compound/standard ratio using Analyst™ software (Applied Biosystems, Inc.,

211 Foster City, CA). The results were expressed on a dry weight (DW) basis.

212 *Ascorbate oxidative status*

7

213 Ascorbate reduced and oxidized forms were determined by a plate-reader method (Queval
214 and Noctor, 2007) with slight modifications. Briefly, lyophilised leaves (20 mg DW) were
215 placed in a microcentrifuge tube with two tungsten balls and ground under liquid nitrogen in
216 a Retsch MM300 Bead Mill Cell Disrupter (Retsch GmbH & Co Haan Germany).
217 Subsequently, 1 mL of extraction buffer (6 % meta-phosphoric acid) was added, vortexed for
218 1 min and clarified by centrifugation at 10,000 g (10 min, 4ºC). Finally, extracts were
219 neutralized and adequately diluted before spectrophotometric readings on a 96 well quartz
220 microplate (Hellma Hispania SL, Badalona, Spain). The levels of ascorbate (AscA) (reduced)
221 and dehydroascorbate (DHA) (oxidized) were determined using ascorbate oxidase (AO) and
222 dithiothreitol (DTT), respectively (Foyer *et al.*, 1983). AO specifically oxidizes all AscA in
223 the sample. Therefore, the decrease in O.D. at 265 nm is related to AscA content.
224 Alternatively, when the samples are incubated with DTT, DHA is reduced to AscA and the
225 increase in O.D. is proportional to the initial DHA content. The ascorbate oxidative status
226 was estimated as DHA/(DHA + AscA).

Photosynthetic pigments quantification

228 For pigment extraction, lyophilised leaf samples (15 mg DW) were placed in a
229 microcentrifuge tube with two tungsten balls, ground under liquid nitrogen in a Retsch
230 MM300 Bead Mill Cell Disrupter (Retsch GmbH & Co Haan Germany), and extracted with
231 ice-cold 80 % acetone (v/v). After centrifuging at 6,500 g for 10 min at 4 °C, the supernatant
232 was collected and the pellet was re-extracted with the same solvent until it was colourless.
233 Then, supernatants were pooled and analysed spectrophotometrically. Specific absorption
234 coefficients in 80 % acetone previously reported were used to quantify chlorophyll a,
235 chlorophyll b and carotenoids (Lichtenthaler and Buschmann, 2001).

Extraction of water soluble carbohydrates and starch

237 Water-soluble carbohydrates were extracted from freeze-dried leaf material following a
238 chloroform:methanol method previously described (Antonio *et al.*, 2008). Briefly, 50 mg DW
239 of leaf material was ground in liquid nitrogen and extracted with 250 μL ice-cold chloroform:
240 methanol (3:7, v/v), vortex-mixed and incubated at -20 ºC for 2 h. After incubation, samples
241 were extracted twice with ice-cold water, and after centrifugation at 17,900 g at 4 ºC for 10
242 min, the upper phases were collected and pooled. The combined supernatants containing the
243 water-soluble carbohydrates were evaporated to dryness using a centrifugal concentrator
244 (Savant SpeedVac Plus SC110A, Thermo Electron Corporation, Runcorn, UK). Samples

were reconstituted in 100 µL water and centrifuged at 6,800 *g* at 20 ˚C for 30 min, followed by LC-MS analysis.

For starch analysis, the pellet resulting from the chloroform:methanol extraction was washed twice with water. Ten volumes of water were added to the pellet, boiled for 3 min, and autoclaved at 130 ˚C for 1 h. After cooling, samples were incubated with 6 U amyloglucosidase (Roche Applied Science, Amadora, Portugal) for 2 h at pH 4.8 and 60 ˚C. Starch was quantified in the supernatant using a starch enzymatic quantification kit (nº 10207748035, R-Biopharm Aktiengesellschaft, Darmstadt, Germany) and by making use of the Hatterscheid and Willenbrink modification as previously described (Pinheiro *et al.*, 2001).

Untargeted LC-MS analysis of the water-soluble carbohydrate fraction

Arabidopsis and Eutrema samples were analysed as separate cohorts. In each case, samples were randomized and run in batches of eight or nine with the injection of a pooled sample between batches for quality control (QC). LC-MS analyses were performed on a Dionex U3000 2D HPLC system coupled to a Bruker maXis UHR-Q-TOF MS with an ESI interface. Analytes were detected in the negative ion mode using the following MS parameters: capillary voltage, 4500 V; nebulizer gas, 2 Bar; drying gas, 8.0 L/min; drying temperature, 200 ºC, and collision energy, -10.0 eV. Mass spectra were acquired over the scan range *m/z* 50-1000. Chromatographic separation was carried out using a porous graphitic carbon (PGC) Hypercarb^{TM} column (5 µm, 100 mm × 4.6 mm; Thermo Electron, Runcorn, Cheshire, UK) at a flow rate of 600 µL min^{-1}. All samples were reconstituted with 500 µL deionised water with a further 50-fold dilution in deionised water to prevent signal saturation and to minimise matrix effects. The sample injection volume was 20 µL and the PGC column was used at ambient temperature (25 ºC). The binary mobile phase was composed of (A) water modified with 0.1 % (v/v) formic acid (FA) and (B) acetonitrile modified with 0.1 % FA. The gradient elution was as follows: 0-4 min maintained at 2 % B; 4-7 min, 2 to 8 % B; 7-10 min 8-25 % B and maintained for 3 min, followed by column regeneration and re-equilibration: 13-19 min, 25 to 40 % B; 19-19.5 min, 40 to 50 % B held for 1 min; 20.5-21 min 50 to 99 % B held for 2 min; 23-25 min 99 to 2 % B and maintained for 10 min. All solvents were purchased from Fisher Scientific except FA, which was purchased from Sigma Aldrich.

Statistical analysis

9

Raw LC-MS data were pre-processed using Progenesis QI (Nonlinear Dynamics, Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK). Mass spectra were aligned by retention time and normalized to the same total ion count before peak picking was performed to provide a matrix of potential metabolites for each observation, annotated by the accurate mass (m/z between 50 and 1000) and retention time (between 1 and 30 min) of the corresponding peak. In total, 53208 and 33032 peaks were recorded for Arabidopsis and Eutrema, respectively, and were used as variables in multivariate and univariate analyses.

When the Eutrema data were scaled to unit variance to allow smaller variables to contribute to the analysis, differences between batches became apparent, with the last two batches differing substantially from the rest (supplementary Fig. S2A). Liquid chromatography-mass spectra are often acquired batch-wise to allow necessary calibrations and cleaning of the instrument. However, this may introduce further sources of variation, such as differences in the conditions under which data for individual batches is acquired. Quality control (QC) samples are frequently employed to both judge and correct for this variation.

However, batch correction using the QC observations increased inter-batch variation as the change in observations between batches was often not well-represented by the change in corresponding QCs. Therefore, background correction for each variable was performed (Rusilowicz *et al.*, 2016; Wehrens *et al.*, 2016). This method identifies a background trend, using experimental observations as well as the QCs, with which to adjust the intensities. The run order for data collection was randomized, but by chance a disproportionate number of early-stress observations occurred in batch 3 and several late-stress observations in batch 4. With the exception of these two batches, which were combined, we used a separate trend for each batch, obtained as a moving median with a window width of 5 observations. The effectiveness of batch correction was assessed using the Bhattacharrya distance (Wehrens *et al.*, 2016). In addition, an outlier that dominated the variance after scaling was removed before calculating the trend. Control correction was also performed on each variable to remove differences due to growth. For each day of harvest, this was achieved by subtracting the median over the six control replicates from the corresponding variable in the water-stressed observations for that day. The Arabidopsis data showed no obvious differences between batches (supplementary Fig. S3), and therefore, batch correction was deemed unnecessary but control correction was performed to prevent differences due to growth from masking early-stress characteristics.

Principal components analysis (PCA) was used for unsupervised multivariate analysis with both unscaled data and after scaling to unit variance to prevent high content metabolites dominating the analysis. To identify patterns in metabolites over time, k-means cluster analysis was performed with the control-corrected time-series for both datasets. The obtained initial clusters were filtered using the sum of squared values to remove the time-series for metabolites that did not differ appreciably between drought and control observations, i.e. where all values in the control-corrected time-series were close to zero. Cluster analyses of the remaining time-series (with various values of k) showed the largest cluster to consist of less interesting time-series and an iterative filtering process was used to reduce the number of time-series, leaving only those with the most interesting patterns. In each iteration, k-means clustering with $k = 15$ was performed and the largest cluster removed before the next analysis. After four iterations, 46 time-series remained and were clustered using k-means with $k = 9$.

Univariate analyses were performed using the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U-test with Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparisons (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995). Three-way group comparisons were carried out (early stress/late stress/rewatered and Days 1, 3 and 5 for each species) with one-way ANOVA and Tukey's honest significant difference (HSD) correction for multiple pairwise testing. Data correction methods were implemented using C code written in-house and statistical analyses were performed in the R platform, version 2.13.1 (R Core Team, 2016) or in Matlab (The MathWorks Inc., Natick, MA, USA).

Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) discriminated possible species difference in stomatal sensitivity to drying soil.

Results and discussion

Stomatal sensitivity to drying soil and plant water status

Under well-watered conditions, stomatal conductance (gs) of both species exceeded 0.11 mol m^{-2} s^{-1} (supplementary Fig S4A). Since gs of well-watered plants varied from day to day, gs of plants in drying soil was normalised according to the average well-watered values of each species. As the soil dried (Fig. 2), partial stomatal closure of Arabidopsis and Eutrema was detected on Days 4 and 6, respectively (Fig. 2). Within the 45-55 % SWC range, Arabidopsis showed greater stomatal closure than Eutrema, but below 40 % SWC both species showed

11

similar stomatal sensitivity to soil water deficit and were severely affected by drought. Stomatal conductance responded sluggishly to re-watering, with limited recovery (supplementary Fig S4A). Across the entire experiment, both species showed a similar relationship between % gs *vs* soil water content, with analysis of covariance demonstrating no significant species x SWC interaction (supplementary Fig S4B). Thus, both species showed similar stomatal sensitivity to drying soil.

Initial stomatal closure was not associated with decreased leaf water status, i.e. lower cell volume did not trigger early stomatal closure (Sack *et al.*, 2018). On imposing soil water deficit, no significant differences in Eutrema leaf (and root) RWC were detected until Day 5 (supplementary table S2). In Arabidopsis, leaf RWC transiently decreased on Day 3 (supplementary table S1). Although statistically significant (at the 95% confidence level), its small magnitude (~4%) could be within the method error or due to daily fluctuations.

In contrast to plant water status, the water consumption patterns changed very early on, but were not temporally correlated with stomatal closure. Compared with its well-watered control, Eutrema started to lose less water from Day 3 onwards (3 days before any significant stomatal closure), as indicated by the slope of the soil RWC% line for plants in drying soil (Fig. 1). In contrast, Arabidopsis started to use less water on Day 6 onwards (two days after partial stomatal closure occurred). This suggests that earlier growth inhibition of Eutrema, decreased whole plant water loss independent of changes in plant water status.

By Day 12, leaf RWC of both species had declined to very low values (< 20 %) and leaflets selected for water status measurements (those most recently expanded at the onset of the assay) were severely wilted and exhibited senescence symptoms. Lower leaf chlorophyll fluorescence (Fv/Fm) and lower chlorophyll a content indicated photo-inhibition and/or leaf senescence (Kalaji *et al.*, 2016).

Despite the severity of the stress imposed, root water status of both species recovered within 24 h of re-watering. Root RWC of Eutrema was similar to those of the well-watered controls, while the root RWC of Arabidopsis was ~90 % of that of the controls. However, leaf RWC remained low, only ~50 % and ~40 % of the well-watered control values in Eutrema and Arabidopsis respectively (supplementary tables S1 and S2). In addition, Fv/Fm tended to increase in Eutrema, but values were unaffected in Arabidopsis (supplementary tables S1 and S2).

370 Traditionally, it has been argued that only resurrection plants can survive such severe

371 drought, i.e. recover from leaf RWC values below 20% (Dinakar and Bartels, 2013). Since

372 leaf RWC was determined in the most recently expanded leaves at the beginning of the assay

373 (see Material and Methods), these older leaves were severely wilted and senescent after 12

374 days, while younger leaves visually maintained turgor. Several reports indicate that

375 Arabidopsis Col-0 plants are able to recover from severe drought, with 30% of Col-0 plants

376 surviving exposure to 15% SWC and severe wilting (Sun et al. 2013) while 20% of severely

377 wilted Col-0 plants survived SWCs < 20% (Zhao *et al.* 2016). Moreover, Col-0 plants with

378 40-50% leaf RWC recovered from drought (Meyre *et al.* 2001; Tran *et al.* 2007; Kosma *et al.*

379 2009; Koffler *et al.* 2014) while some plants recovered from 20% leaf RWC although the

380 survival percentage was very low (Lü *et al.* 2012; Nguyen *et al.* 2016). In contrast to

381 Arabidopsis, Shandong was able to recover from drought if the leaf RWC declined to 50%,

382 but not 30% (Dedrick 2007). Since our measurements were made only 1 Day after rewatering

383 and no plants were available to evaluate long-term recovery, irreversible damage cannot be

384 ruled out.

385 As small changes in soil water content (10-15 %) affect not only leaf conductance but also

386 plant metabolism (Davies *et al.*, 1990; Pinheiro *et al.*, 2011), both untargeted metabolite

387 analysis and targeted metabolite/biochemical analysis aimed to determine the impact of

388 gradually declining soil water availability on leaf metabolism. This approach aimed to detect

389 species differences in metabolism when plant water status was not affected (up to Day 5).

390

Untargeted metabolite analysis

392 The responses to soil water depletion in Arabidopsis and Eutrema were analysed via

393 untargeted LC-MS, making use of the water-soluble fraction. After batch correction of the

394 Eutrema data, PCA of the control corrected and scaled data grouped according to drought-

395 stress duration for both species (Fig. 3). Moreover, PCA of unscaled data showed that most

396 of the variance is due to large differences between early-stress (Days 1, 3 and 5) and late-

397 stress (Days 12 and 13) observations. Statistical separation of late-stress effects was not

398 related to differing sample water content, since comparable dry weights were used and the

399 resulting data normalised before statistical analysis.

400 When considering only the early-stress observations, the PCA scores plot shows clear

401   grouping of the observations by stress duration for both plant species (Fig. 4). Distinctive

402   metabolic signatures were obtained even for early days with limited soil drying (< 20 %

403   change in SWC at Day 3). The PCA loadings identified variables that most influenced the

404   separation between Days 1, 3 and 5, and early- and late-stress observations. In addition, an

405   iterative k-means algorithm filtered out the largest clusters to leave those comprising more

406   unusual, and potentially more informative, patterns (supplementary Fig. S5). Hierarchical

407   clustering with the 46 time-series selected by the k-means analysis (Fig. 5; supplementary

408   Fig. S6) allowed the similarities (or differences) between the associated metabolites to be

409   visualised.

410

Severe drought causes larger metabolic alterations in Arabidopsis than in Eutrema

412   Late-stress markers for both Arabidopsis and Eutrema included peaks that were identified as

413   the carbohydrates sucrose and raffinose, by comparison with authentic standards of these

414   molecules. Sucrose significantly increased and raffinose significantly decreased ($p < 0.001$)

415   in late stress (Day 12) and on re-watering (Day 13). A significant decrease was found for

416   features with *m/z* values of 341 and 387, most probably a hexose disaccharide. A feature with

417   *m/z* 711, also decreasing significantly, is tentatively assigned to stachyose, known to co-elute

418   with raffinose (Antonio *et al.*, 2008). Sucrose (detected in a range of ionic forms) observed at

419   high levels in the leaf blade tissue (Table 1) was not unexpected. Drought stress upregulated

420   sucrose synthesis in different resurrection plants (Peters *et al.*, 2007; Whittaker *et al.*, 2007;

421   Gechev *et al.*, 2013) as well as in herbaceous and woody plants (e.g Antonio *et al.*, 2008;

422   Pinheiro and Chaves, 2011; Granda and Camarero, 2017). Although stress downregulated

423   raffinose synthesis in several resurrection plants (Muller *et al.*, 1997; Moyankova *et al.*,

424   2014), raffinose is typically described as being upregulated under stress (Elsayed *et al.*,

425   2014), including in Arabidopsis (Taji *et al.*, 2002). Soil water deficit significantly ($p <$

426   0.00001) decreased two co-eluting features (with *m/z* 191 and *m/z* 405) in both plant species

427   The feature with *m/z* 191 was assigned to citric acid, following tandem mass spectrometry

428   (MS^2) analysis and comparison of the fragmentation pattern in both METLIN

429   (www.metlin.scripps.edu) and PRIMe (www.prime.psc.riken.jp) metabolomics databases.

430   The co-eluting feature at *m/z* 405.0019 on MS^2 produced a single fragment at *m/z* 191.0185,

431   that was tentatively assigned as the [2M−2H+Na]$^-$ charge-sharing dimer of citric acid

432   (accurate mass 405.0287). Univariate analyses (after multiple test correction) indicated that

433 607 variables significantly ($p < 0.0001$) differed between late-stress observations and controls

434 in Arabidopsis, in comparison to just 171 in Eutrema, suggesting that Arabidopsis more

435 extensively adjusts its metabolism. An alternative view is that larger changes in Arabidopsis

436 indicate less active metabolism, since metabolites accumulate because the plant has no

437 capacity to use them.

438 In the cluster analysis, three clusters tend to decrease over time, including the response of

439 raffinose (supplementary Fig. S5C, S5D, S5G), which was more extreme in Arabidopsis than

440 Eutrema, therefore occurring in a different cluster. Severe drought stress decreased the levels

441 of raffinose in lupins, although this was preceded by a transient increase during early stress

442 (Antonio *et al.*, 2008; Pinheiro *et al.*, 2011). Although the different ionic forms of citric acid

443 from both Arabidopsis and Eutrema group together in cluster D, a difference in the trend

444 between the two different plant species can be seen, with Eutrema showing an early increase

445 before the overall decrease. Citric acid decreased in response to late and severe drought, as

446 previously observed in lupin and Eutrema (Pinheiro *et al.*, 2004; MacLeod *et al.*, 2015). The

447 final two clusters (Fig. S5H and S5I) show the response profiles of (unknown) compounds

448 that are significantly greater than or lower than the controls throughout the time-series,

449 notably all from Arabidopsis, and are good candidates for further studies.

450 In contrast, four clusters tended to increase rapidly in late drought; the scale of the response

451 accounts for the difference between these four clusters. They mostly comprise the differing

452 ionic forms of sucrose. In Arabidopsis, unknown compounds with *m/z* 133 and *m/z* 288

453 exhibited a very similar pattern to sucrose (supplementary Fig. S5A, S5B, S5E and S5F). The

454 most extreme responses result in separate clusters consisting of just one or two observations

455 (Fig. S5E-F). For each sucrose ionic species, the response for Days 12 and 13 is more

456 extreme for Arabidopsis than for Eutrema. In both plant species, a further unknown with *m/z*

457 195 also clusters with sucrose, and re-watering causes a greater response than during late

458 stress.

459

460 ***Severe drought causes larger biomass reduction in Eutrema than in Arabidopsis***

461 Although severe drought decreased the biomass of both species, Arabidopsis (22% decrease)

462 was less sensitive than Eutrema (38% decrease) (supplementary tables S1 and S2). The

463 mechanisms that limit biomass accumulation are poorly understood (Pinheiro and Chaves,

15

464 2011; Skirycz *et al.*, 2011). Under drought, the higher availability of sugars indicates that
465 CO_2 assimilation is not limited as much as growth, with carbon being available but plants
466 unable to use it, termed "sink limitation" (Wiley and Helliker 2012; Granda and Camarero,
467 2017). This also supports the concept of passive accumulation. On the other hand, higher
468 sugar content may reflect their use in osmoregulation, maintaining cell integrity and
469 providing readily available carbon to resume growth (active reserve storage concept; Granda
470 and Camarero, 2017). Although osmotic adjustment was detected under severe drought and
471 rewatering in Eutrema (supplementary table S2), it was only detected in Arabidopsis on
472 rewatering (supplementary table S1). The growth reduction was accompanied by starch
473 remobilization, supporting the hypothesis of carbon reserve reallocation. A regulatory
474 mechanism that integrates carbon availability and its use within the plant (Smith and Stitt,
475 2007; Pinheiro and Chaves, 2011) partitions photoassimilates to other biochemical pathways
476 (than growth) to withstand severe drought and/or resume growth whenever possible. To
477 determine whether sucrose accumulation represents an active or passive process, it would be
478 necessary to determine if and how carbon limits growth (Wiley and Helliker 2012). A better
479 understanding of these mechanisms is crucial to select genotypes with more stable growth
480 under stress. In that sense, a favourable ideotype will depend on where the plant is to be
481 grown. Higher survival, largely due to conservative water consumption can be the most
482 relevant selection criterion in arid or semi-arid regions. On the other hand, in moderate
483 climates with milder droughts, plant production can be boosted if stress has little impact on
484 growth (Skirycz *et al.*, 2011; Tardieu, 2012). Higher stomatal conductance is a positive trait
485 when plants are under moderate/mild drought since it favors growth maintenance (Tardieu,
486 2012). In that scenario, Arabidopsis can provide a suitable model for biomass production
487 under moderate drought.

488

Severe drought decreased ascorbate content of both species

490 Under severe stress, some parameters, including ascorbic acid (AscA), leaf chlorophyll
491 fluorescence (Fv/Fm) and chlorophyll a (Chla), have similar patterns in the two species.
492 Lower Fv/Fm indicates a lower photochemical harvest, with a larger proportion of photons
493 being diverted to non-photochemical quenching (heat and ROS production). Although two
494 hormones (IAA and SA) are proposed to up-regulate ROS production (Rivas-San Vicente
495 and Plasencia, 2011; Considine and Foyer, 2014; Khokon *et al.*, 2017), severe drought

16

significantly decreased SA content but did not alter IAA content. Thus, these hormones are unlikely to promote ROS accumulation. Water deficit has variable effects on carotenoid content (Koffler *et al.*, 2014; Uarrota *et al.*, 2018), but we did not detect quantitative alterations. However, decreased chlorophyll a content indicates that chlorophyll degrades faster than carotenoids (Lichtenthaler and Buschmann, 2001). A higher carotenoid to chlorophyll content can favour photo-protection per amount of light received. On the other hand, non-photochemical quenching via carotenoids requires ascorbate for correct function (Koffer et al. 2014). Severe drought significantly decreased ascorbate content (43% in Eutrema; 24% in Arabidopsis), which could have compromised such quenching. Noctor *et al.* (2014) state that ascorbate content is only significantly decreased by drought when stress-induced senescence processes are activated. Although the sampled leaves did not show visible symptoms of senescence, their ascorbate levels suggest senescence programs were already activated. Under drought, both Arabidopsis Col-0 and Col-0 mutants with lower ascorbate content show senescence symptoms (Koffler *et al.*, 2014), with some mutant leaves showing necrosis. Rewatering further decreased the ascorbate content (55% in Eutrema; 52% in Arabidopsis), indicating the senescence program is still active. Changes in ascorbate reduction status can also modulate signalling pathways, affecting stress-response mechanisms (Considine and Foyer, 2014).

Arabidopsis and Eutrema are metabolically distinct

To characterize in more detail the responses to soil water depletion in Arabidopsis and Eutrema, various biochemical parameters (Table 2) were measured during early drought. Some metabolites showed minimal (< two-fold) differences between species, while starch, JA and ZR were more abundant in Arabidopsis, and IAA and DHA were more abundant in Eutrema (supplementary tables S1 and S2). Distinctive phyothormone profiles n under non-challenging conditions were previously reported (Arbona *et al.*, 2010; Pilarska *et al.*, 2016).

To remove the effects of differential growth between species, data were control-corrected by subtracting the median control value from the measurements for each day. PCA analysis with all biochemical parameters for both species (supplementary Fig. S7) showed the greatest source of variance to be the separation of late/severe drought and re-watered (RW) observations, as in the untargeted analyses. Without variable scaling, loadings plots showed a large influence of the variables with the greatest mean values (leaf RWC, osmotic potential

17

528 (OP) and starch) in the total variance. After scaling to unit-variance, the separation of late

529 stress/re-watered observations is still seen along the first principal component, although

530 accounting for far less of the total variance. In Arabidopsis, variables from re-watered

531 samples were closer to those from early-day observations. In Eutrema, the difference between

532 late stress and re-watering is only apparent along the second component, which represents

533 less variance and more similar metabolic status. These findings suggest: 1) Arabidopsis

534 responds faster to soil water availability; and/or 2) Eutrema requires prolonged stimulus to

535 reprogram its metabolism. However, whole plant water use of Eutrema is more conservative

536 than Arabidopsis (with soil drying decreasing water use after 3 and 6 days respectively – Fig

537 1) in spite of an opposite stomatal response (with soil drying decreasing gs after 4 and 6 days

538 in Arabidopsis and Eutrema respectively – Fig. 2). Thus vegetative growth and stomatal

539 closure seem independently regulated, with Eutrema reacting faster to soil water availability

540 and Arabidopsis requiring prolonged stimulus. The "optimistic" strategy of Arabidopsis Col-

541 0 maintains biomass production under mild stress and/or under deficit irrigation (Skirycz *et*

542 *al.*, 2011). An alternative hypothesis could be that Eutrema slows its metabolism much earlier

543 while Arabidopsis reprograms metabolism in a different way. It will be important to

544 determine whether growth is maintained, both above and below ground, and if reserves are

545 reallocated.

546

Eutrema responds with small changes to early drought

548 In both Arabidopsis and Eutrema, inspection of the PCA loadings showed that many

549 variables contribute to the separation of each of the early stress days (Fig. 4). Thus metabolic

550 separation between sampling dates is due to the cumulative changes arising from small

551 contributions of many metabolites. However, the two species react differently to similar

552 decrease in the soil water availability. More metabolites responded to early drought stress in

553 Arabidopsis, with 428 variables showing statistically significant differences between Days 1,

554 3 and 5 ($p < 0.01$; 36 with $p < 0.001$) in comparison to 35 in Eutrema ($p < 0.01$; 4 with $p <$

555 0.001). However, none of the variables that consistently differed between the early days

556 corresponded to those identified as late-stress markers (such as sucrose), showing different

557 metabolism during early and late drought.

558 The larger changes in Arabidopsis suggest different metabolic strategies to deal with the

559 progressive decline in soil water availability. This is consistent with greater stomatal closure

18

560 of Arabidopsis than Eutrema on Day 5 (Fig. 2), supporting a drought avoidance strategy for

561 Arabidopsis. Partial stomatal closure can limit carbon assimilation and carbon availability for

562 respiration and growth (Pinheiro and Chaves, 2011). Acclimation of Arabidopsis to optimise

563 carbon use (Smith and Stitt, 2007) would increase carbon storage (e.g. via changes in starch

564 synthesis and turnover) and adjust the growth rate. It could be that the changing conditions

565 did not achieve the threshold required to induce the acclimatory response as, although

566 stomata were starting to close, plant water status was not yet affected. A similar rationale can

567 be used for Eutrema although its perception as a drought avoider (MacLeod *et al.*, 2015),

568 suggests a different soil water availability threshold for acclimation. Transpiration data

569 indicate more conservative water use in Eutrema than Arabidopsis (Fig. 1) although

570 Arabidopsis had greater and stomatal sensitivity to drying soil (Fig. 2). Together, these data

571 suggest species differences in regulating water consumption, implying distinct integration of

572 environmental signals to limit vegetative growth in Eutrema and induce stomatal closure in

573 Arabidopsis

574

Species-dependent hormonal responses during early stress

576 ABA, JA, SA and GA profiles clearly discriminated the plant species between Days 1 and 5

577 (Table 3; Fig. 5 and supplementary Fig. S8). Despite daily irrigation to ensure a similar rate

578 of soil drying in the two species, soil water deficit increased foliar ABA content of

579 Arabidopsis, but not Eutrema, on Day 5 (Fig. 6). Although daily irrigation increases leaf

580 water status and decreases ABA accumulation of plants exposed to reduced soil water

581 availability (Puértolas *et al.*, 2017), significantly higher water consumption of Arabidopsis

582 between Days 3 and 7 (Fig. 1) enhanced foliar ABA accumulation, potentially mediating

583 stomatal closure. Nevertheless, temporal decoupling of foliar ABA accumulation from

584 stomatal closure (Pinheiro *et al.*, 2011; Bechtold *et al.*, 2016) suggests that ABA

585 quantification at the guard cell level (Harris and Outlaw, 1991) is needed to better understand

586 the regulation of stomatal conductance. Alternatively, direct hydraulic regulation of stomatal

587 conductance (that was not detected in RWC measurements), or water-deficit stimulation of

588 localised foliar ABA accumulation (that was not detected in bulk leaf ABA measurements)

589 provide alternative hypotheses for stomatal closure.

590 Also, increased JA content may stimulate stomatal closure (Daszkowska-Golec and Szarejko,

591 2013), either independently or in association with ABA accumulation (de Ollas and Dodd,

19

2016). Foliar JA content transiently increased on Day 3 only in Arabidopsis, preceding increased ABA accumulation on Day 5 (Fig. 6, supplementary Fig. S8). Transient increases in foliar JA accumulation preceded ABA accumulation in *Solanum lycopersicum* leaves (Muñoz-Espinoza *et al.*, 2015) and Arabidopsis (Arbona *et al.*, 2010). Thus, transient JA accumulation may be necessary to induce ABA accumulation thereby contributing to stomatal closure.

Similarly to JA, SA content transiently increased on Day 3 in Arabidopsis (Fig. 6). In Arabidopsis, SA promotes ROS production and accumulation, and activates S-type anion channels in guard cells involved in stomatal closure (Khokon *et al.*, 2017). SA-mediated stomatal closure is considered to be ABA-independent, but a positive cross-talk is also accepted (Rivas-San Vicente and Plasencia, 2011; Miura and Tada, 2014). On the other hand, SA has also been proposed to modulate redox homeostasis, by regulating antioxidant enzymes (Rivas-San Vicente and Plasencia, 2011).

In Eutrema, changes in leaf RWC and ABA occurred after Day 5, with foliar ABA accumulation in Eutrema occurring below 45 % SWC. Species differences could be associated with the osmotic potential (OP) and the redox state regulation, as significant changes were observed in Eutrema, but not in Arabidopsis (Fig. 7 and supplementary Fig. S8). Decreased OP in Eutrema at Day 3 may maintain turgor, thereby removing the stimulus for ABA synthesis (Sack *et al.*, 2018). The opposing trends seen in AscA and DHA for Days 3 and 5 in Eutrema may induce signalling patterns that prevented ABA accumulation. In Arabidopsis, ABA increased at Day 5, but there were no significant changes in AscA or DHA until Day 5. Diminished stomatal closure of Eutrema may be related to its limited metabolic response to soil drying (Fig. 2), since hormonal activation of stomatal closure may require specific metabolic thresholds to be achieved. On the other hand, since Eutrema limits whole plant water consumption earlier than Arabidopsis, its limited metabolic response can be related to slower metabolism, reflecting stress avoidance (Tardieu, 2012). Altered GA metabolism also supports the hypothesis that Arabidopsis responds differently than Eutrema to soil water availability. Two precursors of the bioactive GA4 (GA24, GA9; Fig. 6&7, Table 3) showed altered profiles in Arabidopsis but not in Eutrema; with increased GA24 and GA9 contents at Day 5 indicating GA4 deactivation, a growth inhibitory signal.

Despite similar stomatal response to drying soil, phytohormonal responses substantially differed between the two species. The multiplicity of possible stomatal effectors suggests that

the most parsimonious stomatal regulation is via leaf hydraulics (Tardieu, 2016), yet until Day 5 there was scant evidence that soil drying altered leaf water status, at least in Eutrema. Redundancy in stomatal regulation between closely-related species may confer an evolutionary advantage under specific environmental conditions.

Severe drought and rewatering induce opposite ACC and CK profiles in the two species

With the exception of SA, hormone responses to soil drying are quite distinct in the two species (Table 2). Severe drought increased content of the ethylene precursor ACC by 70 % in Eutrema, but had no effect in Arabidopsis, suggesting ethylene-independent stomatal closure as both species showed similar stomatal sensitivity to drying soil. In contrast, re-watering Eutrema returned ACC levels to well-watered values, while profoundly increasing ACC content in Arabidopsis. Enhanced foliar ethylene emission following re-watering has been attributed to additional root ACC export (Gomez-Cadenas *et al.*, 1996) and may be involved in citrus leaf abscission. Moreover, assuming these increases in foliar ACC content are coincident with enhanced ethylene emission, they may also be involved in growth regulation.

Several CK species including ZR and 2-iP, long distance translocation forms of CKs (Kieber and Schaller, 2014), as well as the 2-iP precursor IPA accumulated in Arabidopsis but not in Eutrema during late stress (Fig. 8; supplementary Fig. S9). In contrast, re-watering returned content of these CKs to well-watered values in Arabidopsis, while stimulating their accumulation in Eutrema. IPA and 2-iP are precursors of Z, one of the most active CK forms (Jameson, 2017). However, the mobilization (metabolism and/or transport) of these CKs in Arabidopsis was not reflected in higher Z levels. Decreased levels of bioactive CKs due to severe and prolonged drought stress have been associated with better performance under drought, in mutants with decreased levels of bioactive CKs achieved via overexpression of *CKX* genes or by inactivating *IPT* genes (Ha *et al.*, 2012). Since these mutant lines show reduced growth under optimal conditions, it can be argued that their water requirements are lower than those of the WT. However, while lower evapotranspiration is described for some *CKX* mutants (Farber *et al.*, 2016), *ipt* mutants show similar water consumption (Nishiyama *et al.*, 2011). On the other hand, senescence-induced *IPT* overexpression, maintained bioactive CK content as the soil dries (Rivero *et al.*, 2007; Xu *et al.*, 2017), without reducing growth (Rivero *et al.*, 2007). Nevertheless, re-watering increased bioactive CKs in these

21

656 drought-tolerant transgenics (Rivero *et al.*, 2007). Although differential CK profiles may
657 mediate plant drought stress responses, the two species showed similar stomatal sensitivity to
658 soil drying and re-watering, suggesting CK-independent stomatal regulation.

659

Conclusions

661 Arabidopsis and Eutrema responded physiologically (stomatal closure) and metabolically
662 with temporal differences to slowly imposed drought. Following soil drying (Days 1 to 5),
663 Arabidopsis rapidly increased JA and SA content (Day 3) and later increased ABA levels
664 (Day 5), whereas in Eutrema, ABA levels did not change until Day 5. Untargeted metabolite
665 analysis demonstrated larger responses in Arabidopsis than in Eutrema. In contrast, greater
666 soil drying was needed to initiate partial stomatal closure in Eutrema (Day 6), although
667 decreased water use (when compared to controls) was observed earlier than in Arabidopsis.
668 We hypothesise that growth inhibition is a first response to water deficit in Eutrema. With
669 severe and prolonged drought, conserved metabolic responses (increased sucrose and
670 decreased raffinose and citric acid in both species) co-occurred with near-complete stomatal
671 closure in both species. The different physiological and metabolic responses and their timing
672 allow these species to utilise alternative pathways to physiologically adjust to soil drying,
673 likely reflecting adaptations to their respective niches.

674

22

References

692 Antonio C, Pinheiro C, Chaves MM, Ricardo CP, Ortuño MF, Thomas-Oates J. (2008).

693   Analysis of carbohydrates in *Lupinus albus* stems on imposition of water deficit, using

694   porous graphitic carbon liquid chromatography-electrospray ionization mass spectrometry.

695   Journal of Chromatography A 1187: 111-18.

696 Arbona V, Argamasilla R, Gómez-Cadenas A.(2010). Common and divergent physiological,

697   hormonal and metabolic responses of *Arabidopsis thaliana* and *Thellungiella halophila* to

698   water and salt stress. Journal of Plant Physiology 167: 1342-50.

699 Bechtold U, Penfold CA, Jenkins DJ, *et al.* (2016). Time-series transcriptomics reveals that

700   AGAMOUS-LIKE22 affects primary metabolism and developmental processes in drought-

701   stressed Arabidopsis. The Plant Cell 28: 345-66.

702 Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. (1995). Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and

703   powerful approach to multiple testing. Source Journal of the Royal Statistical Society,

704   Series B (Methodological). 57: 289–300.

705 Chaves MMM, Costa JMM, Zarrouk O, Pinheiro C, Lopes CMM, Pereira JSS. (2016).

706   Controlling stomatal aperture in semi-arid regions - The dilemma of saving water or being

707   cool? Plant Science 251: 54–64.

708 Clauw P, Coppens F, Korte A, et al. (2016). Leaf growth response to mild drought: natural

709   variation in Arabidopsis sheds light on trait architecture. The Plant Cell 28: 2417-34.

710 Considine MJ, Foyer CH. (2014). Redox regulation of plant development. Antioxidants &

711   Redox Signaling 21: 1305-26.

712 Daszkowska-Golec A, Szarejko I. (2013). Open or close the gate – stomata action under the

713   control of phytohormones in drought stress conditions. Frontiers in Plant Science 4: 138.

714 Davies WJ, Mansfield TA, Hetherington AM. (1990). Sensing of soil water status and the

715   regulation of plant growth and development. Plant, Cell and Environment 13: 709–19.

716 de Ollas C, Dodd IC. (2016). Physiological impacts of ABA-JA interactions under water-

717   limitation. Plant Molecular Biology. 91: 641–650.

718 Dedrick J. (2007). Physiological and biochemical responses of Yukon and Shandong

23

719   *Thellungiella* to water deficits. Master of Science Thesis presented to McMaster University.

720   Dinakar C, Bartels B. (2013) Desiccation tolerance in resurrection plants: new insights from

721   transcriptome, proteome, and metabolome analysis. Frontiers in Plant Science 4: 482.

722   Elsayed AI, Rafudeen MS, Golldack D. (2014). Physiological aspects of raffinose family

723   oligosaccharides in plants: Protection against abiotic stress. Plant Biology 16: 1–8.

724   Farber M, Attia Z, Weiss D. (2016). Cytokinin activity increases stomatal density and

725   transpiration rate in tomato. Journal of Experimental Botany 67:6351-62.

726   Foyer C, Rowell J, Walker D. (1983). Measurement of the ascorbate content of spinach leaf

727   protoplasts and chloroplasts during illumination. Planta 157: 239–44.

728   Gechev TS, Benina M, Obata T, et al. (2013). Molecular mechanisms of desiccation

729   tolerance in the resurrection glacial relic *Haberlea rhodopensis*. Cellular and Molecular Life

730   Sciences 70: 689–709.

731   Gilliham M, Able JA, Roy SJ. (2017). Translating knowledge about abiotic stress tolerance to

732   breeding programmes. Plant Journal 90: 898-917.

733   Golldack D, Li C, Mohan H, Probst N. (2014). Tolerance to drought and salt stress in plants:

734   Unraveling the signaling networks. Frontiers in Plants Science 5:151.

735   Gomez-Cadenas A, Tadeo F, Talon M, Primo-Millo E. (1996). Leaf abscission induced by

736   ethylene in water-stressed intact seedlings of cleopatra mandarin requires previous abscisic

737   acid accumulation in roots. Plant Physiology 112: 401–08.

738   Gong Q, Li P, Ma S, Indu Rupassara S, Bohnert HJ. (2005). Salinity stress adaptation

739   competence in the extremophile *Thellungiella halophila* in comparison with its relative

740   *Arabidopsis thaliana*. The Plant Journal 44: 826-39.

741   Granda E, Camarero JJ. (2017). Drought reduces growth and stimulates sugar accumulation:

742   new evidence of environmentally driven non-structural carbohydrate use. Tree Physiology

743   37: 997-1000.

744   Ha S, Vankova R, Yamaguchi-Shinozaki K, Shinozaki K, Tran L-SP. (2012). Cytokinins:

745   metabolism and function in plant adaptation to environmental stresses. Trends in Plant

746   Science 17: 172-79.

747   Harris MJ, Outlaw WH. (1991). Rapid adjustment of guard-cell abscisic acid levels to current

748   leaf-water status. Plant Physiology. 95: 171-73.

749   Hummel I, Pantin F, Sulpice R, Piques M, Rolland G, Dauzat M, Christophe A, Pervent M,

750   Bouteillé M, Stitt M, Gibon Y, Mulle B. (2010). Arabidopsis plants acclimate to water

751 deficit at low cost through changes of carbon usage: an integrated perspective using growth,

752 metabolite, enzyme, and gene expression analysis. Plant Physiology 154: 357-72.

753 Jameson PE. (2017). Cytokinins. In: Thomas B (ed), Murray BG (ed), Murphy DJ (ed).

754 Encyclopedia of Applied Plant Sciences, 2nd edn, Academic Press and Elsevier, Oxford, Vol

755 1, pp391–402.

756 Kalaji HM, Schansker G, Brestic M, *et al.* (2017). Frequently asked questions about

757 chlorophyll fluorescence, the sequel. Photosynthesis Research 132: 13-66

758 Khokon MAR, Salam MA, Jammes F, Ye W, Hossain MA, Okuma E, Nakamura Y, Mori IC,

759 Kwak JM, Murata Y. (2017). MPK9 and MPK12 function in SA-induced stomatal closure

760 in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Bioscience, Biotechnology, and Biochemistry 81:1394-1400.

761 Kieber JJ, Schaller GE. (2014). Cytokinins. The Arabidopsis Book 12: e0168.

762 Koffler BE, Luschin-Ebengreuth N, Stabentheiner E, Müller M, Zechmann B. (2014).

763 Compartment specific response of antioxidants to drought stress in Arabidopsis. Plant

764 Science 227: 133-44

765 Koornneef M, Meinke D. (2010). The development of Arabidopsis as a model plant. The

766 Plant Journal 61: 909-21.

767 Kosma DK, Bourdenx B, Bernard A, Parsons EP, Lü S, Joubès J, Jenks MA. (2009). The

768 impact of water deficiency on leaf cuticle lipids of Arabidopsis. Plant Physiology 151:

769 1918-29

770 Lee YP, Funk C, Erban A, Kopka J, Köhl KI, Zuther E, Hincha DK. (2016). Salt stress

771 responses in a geographically diverse collection of *Eutrema/Thellungiella* spp. accessions.

772 Functional Plant Biology 43: 590-606.

773 Lichtenthaler HK, Buschmann C. (2001). Chlorophylls and Carotenoids: Measurement and

774 Characterization by UV-VIS Spectroscopy. Current Protocols in Food Analytical

775 Chemistry. F:F4:F4.3

776 Lü S, Zhao H, Marais DLD, et al. (2012). Arabidopsis *ECERIFERUM9* involvement in

777 cuticle formation and maintenance of plant water status. Plant Physiology 159: 930-44.

778 MacLeod MJ, Dedrick J, Ashton C, Sung WW, Champigny MJ, Weretilnyk EA. (2015).

779 Exposure of two *Eutrema salsugineum* (*Thellungiella salsuginea*) accessions to water

780 deficits reveals different coping strategies in response to drought. Physiologia Plantarum

781 155: 267-80.

782 Meyre D, Leonardi A, Brisson G, Vartanian N. (2011). Drought-adaptive mechanisms

783 involved in the escape/tolerance strategies of Arabidopsis Landsberg *erecta* and Columbia

25

784   ecotypes and their F1 reciprocal progeny. Journal of Plant Physiology 158: 1145-52.

785 Miura K, Tada Y. (2014). Regulation of water, salinity, and cold stress responses by salicylic

786   acid. Frontiers in Plant Science 5: 4.

787 Montesinos-Navarro A, Wig J, Xavier Pico F, Tonsor SJ. (2011). *Arabidopsis thaliana*

788   populations show clinal variation in a climatic gradient associated with altitude. New

789   Phytologist 189: 282-94.

790 Moyankova D, Mladenov P, Berkov S, Peshev D, Georgieva D, Djilianov D. (2014).

791   Metabolic profiling of the resurrection plant *Haberlea rhodopensis* during desiccation and

792   recovery. Physiologia Plantarum 152: 675-87.

793 Muller J, Sprenger N, Bortlik K, Boller T, Wiemken A. (1997). Desiccation increases sucrose

794   levels in *Ramonda* and *Haberlea*, two genera of resurrection plants in the Gesneriaceae.

795   Physiologia Plantarum 100: 153–158.

796 Müller M, Munné-Bosch S. (2011). Rapid and sensitive hormonal profiling of complex plant

797   samples by liquid chromatography coupled to electrospray ionization tandem mass

798   spectrometry. Plant Methods 7: 37.

799 Müller M, Munné-Bosch S. (2015). Ethylene response factors: A key regulatory hub in

800   hormone and stress signaling. Plant Physiology 169: 32-41.

801 Munné-Bosch S, Müller M. (2013). Hormonal cross-talk in plant development and stress

802   responses. Frontiers in Plant Science 4 :529.

803 Muñoz-Espinoza VA, López-Climent MF, Casaretto JA, Gómez-Cadenas A. (2015). Water

804   stress responses of tomato mutants impaired in hormone biosynthesis reveal abscisic acid,

805   jasmonic acid and salicylic acid interactions. Frontiers in Plant Science 6: 997.

806 Nguyen KH, Ha CV, Nishiyama R, et al. (2016). *Arabidopsis* type B cytokinin response

807   regulators ARR1, ARR10, and ARR12 negatively regulate plant responses to drought.

808   Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 113: 3090-95.

809 Nishiyama R, Watanabe Y, Fujita Y, Le DT, et al. (2011). Analysis of cytokinin mutants and

810   regulation of cytokinin metabolic genes reveals important regulatory roles of cytokinins in

811   drought, salt and abscisic acid responses, and abscisic acid biosynthesis. The Plant Cell 23:

812   2169-83.

813 Noctor G, Mhamdi A, Foyer CH. (2014). The roles of reactive oxygen metabolism in

814   drought: Not so cut and dried. Plant Physiology 164: 1636-48.

815 Orsini F, D'Urzo MP, Inan G, Serra S, Ha Oh D, Mickelbart MV, Consiglio F, Li X, Jeong

816   JC, Yun DJ, Bohnert HJ, Bressan RA, Maggio1 A. (2010). A comparative study of salt

817 tolerance parameters in 11 wild relatives of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Journal of Experimental
818 Botany 61: 3787-98.

819 Osakabe Y, Osakabe K, Shinozaki K, Tran L-SP. (2014). Response of plants to water stress.
820 Frontiers in Plant Science 5: 86.

821 Peters S, Mundree SG, Thomson JA, Farrant JM, Keller F. (2007). Protection mechanisms in
822 the resurrection plant *Xerophyta viscosa* (Baker): both sucrose and raffinose family
823 oligosaccharides (RFOs) accumulate in leaves in response to water deficit. Journal of
824 Experimental Botany 58: 1947-56.

825 Pilarska M, Wiciarz M, Ivan Jajić I, Kozieradzka-Kiszkurno M, Dobrev P, Vanková R,
826 Niewiadomska E. (2016). A different pattern of production and scavenging of reactive
827 oxygen species in halophytic *Eutrema salsugineum* (*Thellungiella salsuginea*) plants in
828 comparison to *Arabidopsis thaliana* and its relation to salt stress signaling. Frontiers in
829 Plant Science 7: 1179.

830 Pinheiro C, Antonio C, Ortuno MF, Dobrev PI, Hartung W, Thomas-Oates J, Ricardo CP,
831 Vankova R, Chaves MM, Wilson JC. (2011). Initial water deficit effects on *Lupinus albus*
832 photosynthetic performance, carbon metabolism, and hormonal balance: metabolic
833 reorganization prior to early stress responses. Journal of Experimental Botany 62: 4965-74.

834 Pinheiro C, Chaves MM, Ricardo CP. (2001). Alterations in carbon and nitrogen metabolism
835 induced by water deficit in the stems and leaves of *Lupinus albus* L. Journal of
836 Experimental Botany 52: 1063-70.

837 Pinheiro C, Chaves MM. (2011). Photosynthesis and drought: Can we make metabolic
838 connections from available data? Journal of Experimental Botany 62: 869-82.

839 Pinheiro C, Passarinho JA, Ricardo CP. (2004). Effect of drought and rewatering on the
840 metabolism of *Lupinus albus* organs. Journal of Plant Physiology 161: 1203-10.

841 Piquerez SJM, Harvey SE, Beynon JL, Ntoukakis V. (2014). Improving crop disease
842 resistance: lessons from research on Arabidopsis and tomato. Frontiers in plant science 5:
843 671.

844 Puértolas J, Larsen EK, Davies WJ, Dodd IC. (2017). Applying 'drought' to potted plants by
845 maintaining suboptimal soil moisture improves plant water relations. Journal of
846 Experimental Botany 68: 2413-24.

847 Queval G, Noctor G. (2007). A plate reader method for the measurement of NAD, NADP,
848 glutathione, and ascorbate in tissue extracts: Application to redox profiling during
849 Arabidopsis rosette development. Analytical Biochemistry 363: 58–69.

850 R Core Team. 2016. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
851   for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

852 Rivas-San Vicente M, Plasencia J. (2011). Salicylic acid beyond defence: its role in plant
853   growth and development. Journal of Experimental Botany 62: 3321-38.

854 Rivero RM, Kojima M, Gepstein A, Sakakibara H, Mittler R, Gepstein S, Blumwald E.
855   (2007). Delayed leaf senescence induces extreme drought tolerance in a flowering plant.
856   Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 104: 19631-36.

857 Ruan YL. (2014). Sucrose metabolism: gateway to diverse carbon use and sugar signaling.
858   Annual Review of Plant Biology 65: 33-67.

859 Rusilowicz M, Dickinson M, Charlton A, O'Keefe S, Wilson J. (2016). A batch correction
860   method for liquid chromatography–mass spectrometry data that does not depend on quality
861   control samples. Metabolomics 12: 56.

862 Sack L, John GP, Buckley TN. (2018). ABA accumulation in dehydrating leaves is
863   associated with decline in cell volume not turgor pressure. Plant Physiology 176: 489-95.

864 Skirycz A, Vandenbroucke K, Clauw P, et al. (2011). Survival and growth of Arabidopsis
865   plants given limited water are not equal. Nat Biotechnology 29: 212-14.

866 Smith A, Stitt M (2007) Coordination of carbon supply and plant growth. Plant Cell &
867   Environment 30: 1126–49.

868 Sun X, Luo X, Sun M, et al. (2014). A *Glycine soja* 14-3-3 protein GsGF140 participates in
869   stomatal and root hair development and drought tolerance in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Plant
870   and Cell Physiology 55: 99-118.

871 Taji T, Ohsumi C, Iuchi S, Seki M, Kasuga M, Kobayashi M, Yamaguchi-Shinozaki K,
872   Shinozaki K. (2002). Important roles of drought- and cold-inducible genes for galactinol
873   synthase in stress tolerance in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. The Plant Journal 29: 417-26.

874 Taji T, Seki M, Satou M, Sakurai T, Kobayashi M, Ishiyama K, Narusaka Y, Narusaka M,
875   Zhu JK, Shinozaki K. (2004). Comparative genomics in salt tolerance between Arabidopsis
876   and Arabidopsis-related halophyte salt cress using Arabidopsis microarray. Plant
877   Physiology 135: 1697-709.

878 Tardieu F. (2012). Any trait or trait-related allele can confer drought tolerance: just design
879   the right drought scenario. Journal of Experimental Botany 63: 25-31.

880 Tardieu F. (2016). Too many partners in root-shoot signals. Does hydraulics qualify as the
881   only signal that feeds back over time for reliable stomatal control? New Phytologist 212:
882   802-04.

883 Tran LSP, Urao T, Qin F, Maruyama K, Kakimoto T, Shinozaki K, Yamaguchi-Shinozaki K.
884   (2007). Functional analysis of AHK1/ATHK1 and cytokinin receptor histidine kinases in
885   response to abscisic acid, drought, and salt stress in *Arabidopsis*. Proceedings of the
886   National Academy of Sciences 104: 20623-28.

887 Turner NC, Abbo S, Berger JD, Chaturvedi SK, French RJ, Ludwig C, et al. (2007). Osmotic
888   adjustment in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) results in no yield benefit under terminal
889   drought. Journal of Experimental Botany 58: 187-94.

890 Uarrota VG, Stefen DLV, Leolato LS, Gindri DM, Nerling D. (2018). Revisiting carotenoids
891   and their role in plant stress responses: From biosynthesis to plant signaling mechanisms
892   during stress. In: Gupta D., Palma J., Corpas F. (eds) Antioxidants and Antioxidant
893   Enzymes in Higher Plants. Springer, Cham

894 Urano K, Maruyama K, Jikumaru Y, Kamiya Y, Yamaguchi-Shinozaki K, Shinozaki K.
895   (2017). Analysis of plant hormone profiles in response to moderate dehydration stress. The
896   Plant Journal 90: 17-36.

897 Wehrens R, Hageman JA, van Eeuwijk F, Kooke R, Flood PJ, Wijnker E, Keurentjes JJ,
898   Lommen A, van Eekelen HD, Hall RD, Mumm R. (2016). Improved batch correction in
899   untargeted MS-based metabolomics. Metabolomics 12: 88.

900 Whittaker A, Martinelli T, Farrant JM, Bochicchio A, Vazzana C. (2007). Sucrose phosphate
901   synthase activity and the co-ordination of carbon partitioning during sucrose and amino acid
902   accumulation in desiccation-tolerant leaf material of the C4 resurrection *plant Sporobolus*
903   *stapfianus* during dehydration. Journal of Experimental Botany 58: 3775-87.

904 Wiley E, Brent Helliker B. (2012). A re- evaluation of carbon storage in trees lends greater
905   support for carbon limitation to growth. The New Phytologist 195: 285-89.

906 Xu X, Feng J, Lü S, Lohrey GT, An H, Zhou Y, Jenks MA. (2014). Leaf cuticular lipids on
907   the Shandong and Yukon ecotypes of saltwater cress, *Eutrema salsugineum* , and their
908   response to water deficiency and impact on cuticle permeability. Physiologia Plantarum
909   151: 446-58.

910 Xu Y, Burgess P, Huang B. (2017). Transcriptional regulation of hormone-synthesis and
911   signaling pathways by overexpressing cytokinin-synthesis contributes to improved drought
912   tolerance in creeping bentgrass. Physiologia Plantarum 161: 235-56

913 Zhao Y, Chan Z, Gao J, et al. (2016). ABA receptor PYL9 promotes drought resistance and
914   leaf senescence. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 113: 1949-54

915 Zhu J-K. (2015). The Next Top Models: Extreme Farming. Cell 163: 18–20.

916

29

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Soil water content (SWC, %) after imposing water deficit and on re-watering (shaded area). SWC is shown before (symbols) and after (dotted lines) partial water replacement (to regulate the rate of soil water depletion). Data show the means ± standard error of 6 pots (except Day 1 with 5 pots). For pre-irrigation SWC, significance levels were calculated using the Mann–Whitney U test. Data differing significantly from Day 0 are denoted by asterisks (* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$).

Figure 2. Leaf stomatal conductance (as a % of the control plants) plotted against SWC. Mean values (of 3 to 5 biological replicates) are shown with only positive standard errors for clarity. Significant results, as determined by Mann-Whitney U test, are denoted by asterisks (* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$). ANCOVA for each main effect (treatment and species) and their interaction is presented in supplementary Fig S4B.

Figure 3. PCA plots showing the scores for the first two principal components obtained for the untargeted metabolomic analysis coloured by experimental group and the day of harvest, for (A) Arabidopsis and (B) Eutrema. For both plant species, the data have been scaled to unit variance and control corrected. In the case of Eutrema only, batch correction has also been performed.

Figure 4. PCA scores plots for the first two principal components obtained from scaled early-stress observations (Days 1, 3 and 5) in the untargeted analysis after control correction for (A) Arabidopsis and (B) Eutrema. The observations are coloured according to the day of harvest, showing that the clustering of observations is related to drought duration.

Figure 5. Dendrogram obtained from hierarchical clustering of the 46 time-series selected by the iterative k-means analysis of the metabolite data. The clusters are coloured and annotated A-I according to the clusters identified in the k-means analysis (supplementary Fig S5). Metabolites within clusters are labelled as follows: S= sucrose; R = raffinose; St = stachyose; CA = citric acid; U = unassigned hexose disaccharide.

Figure 6. Biochemical parameters with a statistically significant change in early drought stress in Arabidopsis but not in Eutrema. The mean difference from well-watered plants for leaf RWC and the hormones ABA, JA, SA and GA24 are shown with error bars representing the standard error. The mean values after control correction (i.e. the mean value for the controls has been subtracted) are represented. Arabidopsis: dark grey; Eutrema: light grey. Significant results are shown in Table 3.

Figure 7. Biochemical parameters with a significant change in early stress in Eutrema but not in Arabidopsis. The mean measurement for osmotic potential, DHA, AscA, 2iP and GA9 are shown with error bars representing the standard error of the observations. The mean values after control correction (i.e. the mean value for the controls has been subtracted) are represented. Arabidopsis: dark grey; Eutrema: light grey. Significant results are shown in Table 3.

Figure 8. Cytokinins during early (Days 1, 3, 5) and late (Day 12) stress and on re-watering (Day 13). Mean values and ± standard error of 6 biological replicates (except for Day 1 where n=5). The mean values after control correction (i.e. the mean value for the controls has been subtracted) are represented. In Arabidopsis, ZR, 2iP and IPA peak at late stress and decrease on re-watering. However, in Eutrema, these hormones show a slight decrease in late stress and increase dramatically on re-watering. Arabidopsis: dark grey; Eutrema: light grey. Significant results are shown in Table 2.

964

Supplementary table S1. Biochemical parameters for both control (WW) and stressed (WD) observations in Arabidopsis. Data are the means ± standard error of 6 biological replicates, except for day 1 (n = 5). Asterisks in the third row show parameters with a significant difference between WW and WD for a particular day (obtained using Mann-Whitney tests). Asterisks in the final column for each day show days that are significantly different from earlier days (using Tukey's HSD test) with the specific days given in parentheses. Here, asterisks denote *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$ and * $p < 0.05$.

Supplementary table S2. Biochemical parameters for both control (WW) and stressed (WD) observations in Eutrema. Data are the means ± standard error of 6 biological replicates, except for day 1 (n = 5). Asterisks in the third row show parameters with a significant difference between WW and WD for a particular day (obtained using Mann-Whitney tests). Asterisks in the final column for each day show days that are significantly different from earlier days (using Tukey's HSD test) with the specific days given in parentheses. Here, asterisks denote *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$ and * $p < 0.05$.

Supplementary table S3. Biochemical parameters for both control (WW) and stressed (WD) observations in Arabidopsis. Samples were control-corrected (see Methods section). Data shown are the means ± standard error of 6 biological replicates, except for day 1 (n = 5).

Supplementary table S4. Biochemical parameters for both control (WW) and stressed (WD) observations in Eutrema. Samples were control corrected (see). Data shown are the means ± standard error of 6 biological replicates, except for day 1 (n = 5).

Supplementary Figure S1. Preliminary drought assay. **A** - Soil water content (SWC, %) progression during the assay for Eutrema and Arabidopsis; **B** - Leaf stomatal conductance (% of the control gs) as a function of the SWC. For controls, percentage gs was calculated relative to day 0; for treatments, percentage gs was calculated relative to the control for the same day. The 80 % gs level was achieved on different days: by day 4 in Arabidopsis and by day 6 in Eutrema; **C** - Regression line fit % gs vs soil water content. Each point represents a single measurement and p-values were determined by ANCOVA for each main effect (treatment and species) and their interaction (ns: not significant; #: $p < 0.1$; ***: $p < 0.001$).

Supplementary Figure S2. PCA plots showing the scores for the first two principal components obtained for the Eutrema data after scaling to unit variance with the observations coloured by batch. **A**- Before batch correction, clustering within batches can be seen and, in particular, batches 7 and 8 cluster separately. **B**- After batch correction, differences between batches are no longer apparent.

Supplementary Figure S3. PCA scores for the first two principal components obtained for the Arabidopsis data after scaling to unit variance. The observations are coloured by data collection batch and no obvious differences between batches can be seen, so that batch correction is not necessary.

Supplementary Figure S4. **A** - Leaf stomatal conductance of Arabidopsis and Eutrema after imposing water deficit and on re-watering (shaded area); **B** - Regression line fitting % gs vs soil water content. Each point represents a single measurement and p-values were determined by ANCOVA for each main effect (treatment and species) and their interaction (ns: not significant; ***: $p < 0.001$).

Supplementary Figure S5. The nine clusters obtained with k-means analysis of the 46 time-series remaining after iterative filtering of the metabolite data. Cluster A and cluster B include several sucrose species. Cluster C includes raffinose and cluster D includes citric acid.

Supplementary Figure S6. Heatmap showing the similarity of the 46 time-series selected by iterative k-means analysis of the metabolite data. Metabolites are labelled as follows: S= sucrose; R = raffinose; St = stachyose; CA = citric acid; U = unassigned hexose disaccharide.

Supplementary Figure S7. PCA plots of the biochemical parameters for both control (WW) and treatment (WD) observations in Arabidopsis and Eutrema after control correction. (A) unscaled variables; (B) scaled variables.

Supplementary Figure S8. Line plots showing physiological and biochemical parameters in early-drought stress (days 1, 3 and 5) after control correction. Error bars show the standard error between observations (n = 6 biological replicates, except for day 1, n = 5). Dark grey: Arabidopsis; light grey: Eutrema. ANOVA results are presented in Table 3.

Supplementary Figure S9. Bar charts showing physiological and biochemical parameters in

early- (days 1, 3 and 5) and late-drought stress and on re-watering (day 13) after control correction. Error bars show the standard error between observations (n = 6 biological replicates, except for day 1, n = 5). Dark grey: Arabidopsis; light grey: Eutrema. ANOVA results are presented in Table 2.

Figure3

Figure4

Figure5

Figure6

Figure7

Table1

Table 1: Molecular forms assigned to sucrose, raffinose and citric acid that were significantly different ($p < 0.001$) between late drought-stressed and rewatering observations (days 12 or 13) and the corresponding controls.

Compound	Molecular form	*m/z*
sucrose	[M-H]$^-$	341.087
sucrose	[M+HCOO]$^-$	387.092
sucrose	[M-2H+2Na+HCOO]$^-$	431.092
sucrose	[2M-H]$^-$	683.181
sucrose	[2M-HCOO]$^-$	729.186
raffinose	[M-H]$^-$	503.126
raffinose	[M-HCOO]$^-$	549.131
raffinose	[M+HCOONa+HCOO]$^-$	617.119
citric acid	[M-H]$^-$	191.006
citric acid	[2M-2H+Na]$^-$	405.002

Table 2. Representation of ANOVA results after Tukey's HSD correction for pairwise testing between early stress (combined days 1, 3 and 5), late stress (day 12) and re-watered (day 13) observations. Separate ANOVA models were obtained for each species. Light green represents $p < 0.05$, mid-green $p < 0.01$ and dark green $p < 0.001$. White cells indicate no significant difference at the 95 % confidence level. Carotenoids, DHA, IAA, DHZ DHZR, GA19, GA20 and GA24 were measured, but omitted from the table as no significant difference between groups was found for either plant species. Arrows denote an increase (↑) or decrease (↓) in measurement.

Variable	Species	Early – late	Late – rewatered
Biomass	At	↓	
	Th	↓	
Root RWC	At	↓	↑
	Th	↓	↑
Leaf RWC	At	↓	↑
	Th	↓	↑
Starch	At	↓	
	Th	↓	↑
OP	At	↓	
	Th	↓	
OA	At		↓
	Th	↑	↓
OP100	At		↓
	Th	↑	↓
PSII	At	↓	
	Th	↓	↑
Chla	At	↓	↑
	Th	↓	
Chlb	At		
	Th		↓
AscA	At	↓	↓
	Th	↓	
ABA	At		
	Th	↑	
IAA	At		
	Th		
IPA	At	↑	↓
	Th		↑
2-IP	At	↑	↓
	Th		↑
ZR	At	↑	↓
	Th		↑
Z	At		
	Th		↑
DHZ	At		
	Th		
JA	At	↓	
	Th	↓	
SA	At	↓	↓
	Th	↓	↓
ACC	At		
	Th	↑	↓

Table3

Table 3. Representation of ANOVA results after Tukey's HSD correction for pairwise testing between early stress observations. Light green represents $p < 0.05$, mid-green $p < 0.01$ and dark green $p < 0.001$. White cells indicate no significant difference at the 95% confidence level. Variables that were measured, but for which no significant difference between groups was found for either plant species were omitted from the table. Arrows denote an increase (↑) or decrease (↓) in measurement. Plots are shown in Fig. 7 and 8 and supplementary Fig. S7.

Variable	Species	Day 1 - day 3	Day 3 - day 5
Leaf RWC	At	↓	↑
	Th		
ABA	At		↑
	Th		
JA	At		↓
	Th		
SA	At		↓
	Th		↓
OP100	At	↑	
	Th		
OP	At		
	Th	↓	
DHA	At		
	Th		↓
AscA	At		
	Th	↓	↑
2-IP	At		
	Th	↑	↓
GA24	At		↑
	Th		
GA9	At	↓	↑
	Th		

Click here to access/download
**Supplementary Material**
SF1HR_20180909.tiff

Click here to access/download
**Supplementary Material**
SF2HR.tiff

Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
SF3HR.tiff

Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
SF4HR_20180907.tiff

Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
SF5HR.tiff

Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
SF6HR.tiff

Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
SF7HR.tiff

Click here to access/download
**Supplementary Material**
SF8HR.tiff

Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
SF9HR.tiff

Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
tables S1 & S2_MannW_v9.xlsx

Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
sup tables S3 & S4_v3.xlsx