Report

The AP2/ERF Transcription Factor WIND1 Controls Cell Dedifferentiation in *Arabidopsis*

Akira Iwase,^{1,2} Nobutaka Mitsuda,¹ Tomotsugu Koyama,^{1,3} Keiichiro Hiratsu,^{1,4} Mikiko Kojima,² Takashi Arai,⁵ Yasunori Inoue,⁵ Motoaki Seki,² Hitoshi Sakakibara,² Keiko Sugimoto,^{2,*} and Masaru Ohme-Takagi^{1,*} ¹Bioproduction Research Institute, National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST), Tsukuba 305-8562, Japan

²RIKEN Plant Science Center, Yokohama 230-0045, Japan
³Division of Integrated Life Science, Graduate School of Biostudies, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan
⁴Department of Applied Chemistry, National Defense Academy of Japan, Yokosuka 239-8686, Japan
⁵Department of Applied Biological Science, Tokyo University of Science, Noda 278-8510, Japan

Summary

Many multicellular organisms have remarkable capability to regenerate new organs after wounding. As a first step of organ regeneration, adult somatic cells often dedifferentiate to reacquire cell proliferation potential, but mechanisms underlying this process remain unknown in plants. Here we show that an AP2/ERF transcription factor, WOUND INDUCED DEDIFFERENTIATION 1 (WIND1), is involved in the control of cell dedifferentiation in Arabidopsis. WIND1 is rapidly induced at the wound site, and it promotes cell dedifferentiation and subsequent cell proliferation to form a mass of pluripotent cells termed callus. We further demonstrate that ectopic overexpression of WIND1 is sufficient to establish and maintain the dedifferentiated status of somatic cells without exogenous auxin and cytokinin, two plant hormones that are normally required for cell dedifferentiation [1]. In vivo imaging of a synthetic cytokinin reporter [2] reveals that wounding upregulates the B-type ARABIDOPSIS RESPONSE REGULATOR (ARR)-mediated cytokinin response and that WIND1 acts via the ARR-dependent signaling pathway to promote cell dedifferentiation. This study provides novel molecular insights into how plants control cell dedifferentiation in response to wounding.

Results and Discussion

WIND1 Expression Is Rapidly Induced by Wounding

Cellular dedifferentiation, in which adult somatic cells change from differentiated to less differentiated states and regain cellular proliferative competence, occurs widely in multicellular organisms. Recent studies in mammals have demonstrated that forced expression of defined transcription factors can induce pluripotent stem cells from adult somatic cells [3], indicating that cell dedifferentiation is a genetically controlled process. One of the most profound examples of cell dedifferentiation is provoked by wounding and is vital to promoting regeneration of new tissues and organs [4]. Wound-induced cell

*Correspondence: sugimoto@psc.riken.jp (K.S.), m-takagi@aist.go.jp (M.O.-T.)

dedifferentiation is widespread in various organisms including fish, amphibians, mammals, and plants, but it remains to be determined whether these naturally occurring dedifferentiation events are also stimulated by transcription factors. Compared to animals, plants have a remarkable capacity to change their cell fate, and the first examples of in vitro plant cell dedifferentiation, unorganized cell proliferation to form callus, were reported as early as the 1930s [5]. It was later discovered that the ratio of two plant growth regulators, auxin and cytokinin, is critical to promote dedifferentiation and subsequent redifferentiation of plant explants [1]. It is well established in Arabidopsis, for instance, that auxin-rich medium promotes callus formation whereas subsequent culture of callus on high-auxin or high-cytokinin medium permits regeneration of roots and shoots, respectively [6]. Similar physiological manipulation of cell dedifferentiation and redifferentiation has been employed extensively in other plant species [7], but surprisingly little is known about how plants regulate cell dedifferentiation at the molecular level [8-10].

As reported for many other plants, Arabidopsis seedlings undergo cell dedifferentiation and form callus in response to wounding (Figure 1A). To identify key regulators mediating plant cell dedifferentiation, we previously isolated a set of genes differentially expressed between Arabidopsis seedlings and cultured cell lines [11]. Among them, WOUND INDUCED DEDIFFERENTIATION 1 (WIND1), a putative AP2/ERF-family transcription factor previously called RAP2.4 (At1g78080) [12], is preferentially expressed in cultured cells [11]. To explore the possibility that WIND1 is involved in woundinduced cell dedifferentiation, we first tested whether the WIND1 expression is induced by wounding. Previous microarray experiments implicated WIND1 as a wound-responsive gene [13], and consistent with this, transgenic plants carrying WIND1 promoter-driven β-glucuronidase (Pro_{WIND1}:GUS) and green fluorescent protein (Prowind:GFP) showed highest promoter activity at the wound site, whereas in intact plants, its activity was visible only in some cell types such as root pericycle and meristematic stem cell niche (Figures 1A and 1B; see also Figure S1 available online). Quantitative RT-PCR analyses of 30-day-old wild-type leaves revealed that WIND1 transcript levels were increased up to 3-fold within a few hours after wounding (Figure S1). Consistently, the Prowind:GFP marker showed that WIND1 promoter activity was strongly enhanced within several hours after wounding (Figure 1D). WIND1 expression persisted in pericycle and surrounding cells beyond the first 24 hr and was also detected in proliferating callus cells (Figures 1A and 1C). Similarly, the WIND1-GFP fusion proteins, expressed under the WIND1 promoter, accumulated within the nucleus of cells close to the wound site (Figure S1). These data clearly demonstrate that WIND1 is rapidly induced at the wound site and is constitutively expressed during postwounding callus development.

Overexpression of WIND1 Is Sufficient to Induce Unorganized Cell Proliferation and to Maintain the Dedifferentiated State

To further investigate the involvement of *WIND1* in cell dedifferentiation, we ectopically expressed *WIND1* under the



Figure 1. WIND1 Expression Is Rapidly Induced at the Wound Site

(A) Wounding induces callus formation in etiolated hypocotyls (upper panels), displaying strong *Pro_{WIND1}:GFP* expression (green, middle panels). Lower panels show wild-type control visualized using a filter set to remove red autofluorescence from chlorophyll. Images of representative hypocotyls at 1 to 14 days (d) after wounding are shown.

(B and C) *Pro_{WIND1}:GUS* marks *Arabidopsis* leaf cells at the wound site (B) and proliferating callus cells (C, lower panel). A light micrograph (C, upper panel) shows corresponding callus.

(D) *Pro_{WIND1}:GFP* is upregulated within several hours after wounding. Images of representative roots at 0 to 24 hr (h) after wounding are shown. Confocal optical sections show upregulation of *Pro_{WIND1}:GFP* in pericycle (upper panels) and surrounding cells (lower panels). Cellular boundaries are highlighted by propidium iodide (PI, red).

Scale bars represent 500 μm in (A), 1 mm in (B), 5 mm in (C), and 50 μm in (D). See also Figure S1.

control of the cauliflower mosaic virus 35S (35S) promoter (Figure S2A). Among the 106 transformants we recovered, plants with the most severe morphological alterations (type III, ~20% of all transformants) aborted normal postembryonic development within a few days after germination and initiated callus-like unorganized cell proliferation around the shoot meristem (Figures 2A, 2D, and 2E; Figure 4C). When these masses of cells were excised and transferred to fresh Murashige-Skoog (MS) medium, they continued to proliferate

vigorously in the absence of exogenous auxin and cytokinin (Figures S2C and S2D). Similarly, ~60% of seedlings displayed strong morphological defects with severely stunted leaves (type II; Figure 2C; Figure 4C), and when these plants were incubated further on MS medium, they formed calluslike structures from various parts of plants including hypocotyls and roots (Figures 2F and 2G). Around 20% of plants displayed only mild distortion of leaf shapes (type I; Figure 2B; Figure 4C), but compared to wild-type, their T3 progenies formed callus at higher rates after wounding (Figure 3A). We found that these morphological defects correlated positively with the level of WIND1 transcripts (Figure S2B). The overall morphology of 35S:WIND1 cells strongly resembled that of callus cells induced by exogenous auxin (2.2 μM 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid [2,4-D]) (Figures S2E and S2F), and the gene expression profile of 35S:WIND1 overlapped significantly with that of 2,4-D-induced callus and another auxin (1-naphthalene acetic acid [NAA])-induced T87 callus [14] $(p < 2.2^{-16}; Figures 2O and 2P; Tables S1 and S2).$

When WIND1 expression is induced by 17β-estradiol in 21day-old seedlings transformed with the LexA-VP16-estrogen receptor (XVE)-WIND1 construct [15], callus-like cell masses are formed in mature shoots and roots (Figures S2G-S2J), indicating that elevated WIND1 expression in postembryonic tissues is sufficient to promote unorganized cell proliferation. Recent work by Atta et al. [16] and Sugimoto et al. [17] has demonstrated that callus, induced by auxin-rich callusinducing medium (CIM) [6], is formed via activation of stem cell-like pericycle cells rather than dedifferentiation of adult somatic cells. In contrast, both confocal and light microscopy of individual cells in XVE-WIND1 plants germinated and incubated on 17_β-estradiol-containing medium for 4 to 8 days revealed an induction of callus-like cells from the epidermal cell layer of roots, hypocotyls, and cotyledons whereas cells in XVE-WIND1 plants grown on control medium continued to undergo differentiation (Figures 2H-2N). These morphological alterations were already visible within a few days after 17β -estradiol treatment (data not shown), suggesting that upon WIND1 activation, adult somatic cells withdraw from normal differentiation programs and start developing unorganized masses of cells. In addition, we found that callus-like cells induced from XVE-WIND1 root explants by 17β-estradiol redifferentiated into both roots and shoots after transfer to 17β-estradiol-free MS medium (Figures S2K and S2L), indicating that WIND1-overexpressing cells have reacquired pluripotency, the competence to develop into more than one type of mature organs. Together, these results demonstrate that WIND1 promotes cell dedifferentiation in Arabidopsis.

WIND1 Controls Wound-Induced Cell Dedifferentiation In Vivo

WIND1 and five other closely related genes form a small subfamily of the AP2/ERF transcription factors, and the expression of these homologs was also wound responsive (Figures S3A and S3B). Furthermore, 35S-driven expression of *WIND2* (*At1g22190*), *WIND3* (*At1g36060*), and *WIND4* (*At5g65130*), but not of *At4g39780* and *At2g22200*, caused extensive cell proliferation (Figure S3B), suggesting that these three genes also promote cell dedifferentiation. To further explore the function of *WIND* homologs in vivo, we identified their T-DNA insertion lines, all of which except *WIND4* were complete null mutants (Figures S3C–S3E). It turned out, however, that none of the single mutants nor the quadruple *wind1,2,3,4* mutant were defective in wound-induced callus formation (data not



Figure 2. Ectopic *WIND1* Expression Promotes Cell Dedifferentiation in the Absence of Exogenous Phytohormones

(A–D) 21-day-old wild-type (WT, A) and *35S:WIND1* seedlings (B–D) grown on phytohormone-free MS medium displaying weak (type I, B), intermediate (type II, C), and strong (type III, D) levels of morphological alterations.

(E-G) 48- to 60-day-old *35S:WIND1* seedlings forming callus-like structures at shoots (E), hypocotyls (F), and roots (G).

shown), suggesting higher levels of functional redundancies exerted, for instance, by other close homologs. To overcome this, we employed chimeric repressor gene-silencing technology [18] and dominantly repressed WIND1 function by expressing WIND1-SRDX (SUPERMAN repression domain) chimeric proteins under the *WIND1* promoter. As expected, *WIND1-SRDX* plants showed reduced levels of woundinduced callus formation from hypocotyls (Figure 3A) and of exogenous hormone-induced callus formation from hypocotyl explants (Figure 3B), whereas they displayed no other obvious developmental defects under our standard growth conditions. These data clearly demonstrate that WIND1, together with other functionally redundant factors, controls cell dedifferentiation in vivo.

WIND1 Promotes B-Type ARR-Mediated Cytokinin Responses

Given that the balance between auxin and cytokinin is critical to promote callus formation in vitro [1], WIND1 may control this process by modulating their biosynthesis and/or signaling. This idea was supported by the finding that 35S:WIND1 hypocotyl explants displayed increased cytokinin responses, for instance developing callus at low and intermediate cytokinin levels (0.23-2.3 µM kinetin) whereas wildtype explants formed hardly any callus (Figure 3B). High cytokinin-to-auxin ratios promote shoot regeneration in vitro [1, 6], and we observed extensive shoot regeneration from 35S:WIND1 explants (Figure 3B), further suggesting that 35S:WIND1 plants are hypersensitive to cytokinin. Conversely, WIND1-SRDX explants resembled those of arr1,12 double mutants defective in B-type ARR-mediated cytokinin signaling [19], with strong suppression of callus formation at all tested hormone concentrations (Figure 3B). Low cytokinin-to-auxin ratios promote root regeneration [1, 8], and like arr1,12 mutants, WIND1-SRDX explants tended to form roots even in high-cytokinin conditions (Figure 3B), suggesting that cytokinin response is compromised in WIND1-SRDX plants.

Our results so far suggested that wounding induces local *WIND1* transcription, which then enhances endogenous cytokinin responses to promote cell dedifferentiation. Previous physiological experiments implied that cytokinin responses are elevated in wounded plant tissues [20], and a synthetic reporter, two-component-output sensor (*TCS*):*GFP* [2], indeed revealed that the B-type ARR-mediated cytokinin response was elevated within 24 hr in pericycle and surrounding cells close to the wound site (Figure 4A; Figure S4A). High levels of *TCS:GFP* and chlorophyll autofluorescence, another physiological indicator of cytokinin response [21], were retained beyond the first 24 hr in wild-type hypocotyls and roots, but these signals were strongly repressed

Scale bars represent 3 mm in (A)–(G); 100 μ m in (H), (I), (K), and (L); 250 μ m in (J) and (M); and 20 μ m in (N). See also Figure S2.

⁽H–M) XVE-WIND1 seedlings germinated on phytohormone-free MS medium without (H–J) or with 10 μ M 17 β -estradiol (K–M). Images of representative 6-day-old roots (H and K), hypocotyls (I and L), and 8-day-old cotyledons (J and M) are shown.

⁽N) Confocal optical sections of PI-labeled epidermal cells in 4- and 7-dayold *XVE-WIND1* hypocotyls (upper panels) and cross-sections generated from confocal Z stacks (lower panels). *XVE-WIND1* seedlings were germinated in the absence (–) or presence (+) of 10 μ M 17 β -estradiol.

⁽O and P) Gene expression profiles in *35S:WIND1* type III callus-like tissue overlap significantly with those of 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D)-induced callus and 1-naphthalene acetic acid (NAA)-induced T87 callus.

⁽O) Clustering analysis of 1161 genes upregulated (left, fold change > 5) and 1238 genes downregulated (right, fold change < 0.2) in 35S:WIND1 compared to wild-type.

⁽P) Venn diagrams showing overlapping genes among different data sets. p values and odds ratios, representing number of overlapping genes/ number of genes expected by chance, are listed for each data set comparison.



Figure 3. *WIND1* Controls Cell Dedifferentiation In Vivo

(A) Expression of a WIND1 chimeric repressor impedes wound-induced callus formation. Upper ends of WT, 35S:WIND1 (type I), and Prowind: WIND1-SRDX etiolated hypocotyls were excised, and remaining seedlings were cultured on phytohormone-free MS medium (see also Experimental Procedures). Error bars represent standard deviation (SD). *p < 0.01 by t test. (B) Compared to WT, 35S:WIND1 displays increased sensitivity to cytokinin (dashed gray and white boxes). In contrast, the chimeric repressor ProWIND1:WIND1-SRDX shows compromised cytokinin responses (dashed white boxes) similar to arr1,12. Magnified views of hypocotyl explants marked by the dashed white boxes are shown in the bottom four panels. Etiolated hypocotyl explants were cultured on MS medium containing different levels of auxin (NAA) and cytokinin (kinetin). See also Figure S3.

indirect consequence of WIND1 activation, these data imply that WIND1 may also activate cytokinin production.

We also explored the possibility that WIND1 influences auxin signaling. To our surprise, however, neither the overall accumulation level of endogenous auxin, indole-3-acetic acid (IAA), nor cellular auxin response as visualized by DR5:GUS [22] was elevated in 35S:WIND1 (Figures 4G-4J). In agreement with this, 35S:WIND1 hypocotyl explants failed to regenerate roots under auxin-free culture conditions whereas auxin-overproducing yucca1D (yuc1D) mutants [23] developed roots (Figure 4K). WIND1 does not appear to act downstream of auxin or cytokinin signaling pathways, because WIND1 expression was not modified by application of exogenous auxin or cytokinin (Figures S4C and S4D).

WIND1 as a Master Regulator of Cell Dedifferentiation in Plants

This study demonstrates that the AP2/ERF transcription factor WIND1 functions as a key molecular switch triggering cell dedifferentiation in *Arabidopsis*. Our model predicts that wound-induced WIND1 (and its functional homologs) activate the local cytokinin response, which in turn promotes

in *WIND1-SRDX* plants (Figures 4A and 4B; Figure S4B). In agreement with these observations, *WIND1*-induced cell dedifferentiation was severely compromised in *arr1,12* mutants (Figures 4C–4E; Figure S4E), further substantiating that WIND1 functions through the ARR-dependent cytokinin signaling pathway. We found that endogenous levels of an active cytokinin, *trans*-zeatin, and its precursors were increased at least by 2-fold in *35S:WIND1* (Figure 4F). Although we cannot rule out the possibility that these changes reflect an

cell dedifferentiation. Given that callus formation is promoted by auxin-rich CIM in *Arabidopsis* [6], the link between WIND1 and cytokinin signaling appears surprising. Previous reports, however, have demonstrated that an excess cytokinin-related response also induces unorganized cell proliferation in *Arabidopsis* [16, 24, 25], illustrating that normal differentiation programs in planta can be altered by multiple physiological conditions with varying ratios of auxin and cytokinin. It is interesting in this context that *ENHANCER OF SHOOT*



Figure 4. WIND1 Promotes Cell Dedifferentiation via Cytokinin Signaling Pathways

(A and B) TCS:GFP (A and B, green) and chlorophyll autofluorescence (B, red) indicate elevated cytokinin responses in wounded hypocotyls. Both TCS:GFP and chlorophyll autofluorescence are strongly repressed in Pro_{WIND1}:WIND1-SRDX. Photos shown were taken at 0, 24, and 108 hr (A) and 14 days (B) after wounding.

(C–E) *arr1,12* mutations strongly suppress *WIND1*-induced cell dedifferentiation in T1 seedlings grown on MS medium (C) and T3 hypocotyl explants incubated on MS medium containing auxin (0.53 µM NAA) and cytokinin (0.22 µM 6-benzylaminopurine [BA]) (D and E). Phenotypic severity was scored according to the description in Figures 2B–2D. (n = 106 for WT; n = 37 for *arr1,12*.)

(F) Endogenous levels of *trans*-zeatin (*tZ*) and its precursors are increased in 35S:*WIND1* type I plants. The following abbreviations are used: iPRMP, isopentenyladenine riboside 5'-monophosphate; *tZRMP*, *trans*-zeatin riboside 5'-monophosphate; iPR, isopentenyladenine riboside; *tZR*, *trans*-zeatin riboside; iP, isopentenyladenine; VC, vector control. Error bars represent SD (n = 3). *p < 0.05 by t test.

(G) Endogenous levels of indole-3-acetic acid (IAA) are not altered in 35S:WIND1 type I plants. Error bars represent SD (n = 3).

(H–J) Ectopic WIND1 overexpression does not modify cellular auxin responses as visualized by the auxin responsive DR5:GUS reporter.

(H and I) Empty vectors and 35S:WIND1 vectors were introduced into the DR5:GUS reporter line, and the resulting double-transgenic plants were incubated on MS medium with (H, VC plants) or without auxin and cytokinin (I, 35S:WIND1 plants).

(J) GUS expression is visible in 35S:WIND1 callus transferred to MS medium with auxin (2.2 μ M 2,4-D).

(K) Cytokinin response assay of WT, 35S:WIND1 type I, and yucca1D (yuc1D). Hypocotyl explants were harvested from 7-day-old etiolated seedlings and cultured on MS medium containing different levels of BA.

Scale bars represent 200 μ m in (A) and (B), 0.5 mm in (D) and (E), and 2 mm in (H)–(J). See also Figure S4.

REGENERATION 1 [25], implicated in cytokinin signaling, is one of the genes highly activated in WIND1-overexpressing cells (Table S1). Intriguingly, our transcriptome analysis detected significant overlaps between genes misexpressed in WIND1-induced callus and those differentially expressed in auxin-induced callus (Figures 20 and 2P), suggesting that these two types of callus have some common characteristics, e.g., being able to proliferate and regenerate new organs. We also noted that the expression of *TUMOROUS SHOOT DEVELOPMENT 1* (*TSD1*)/*KORRIGAN* and *TSD2* genes [26, 27], whose loss of function causes callus-like cell formation, was not markedly modified in WIND1-overexpressing cells (Tables S1 and S2), suggesting that TSD1 and TSD2 do not participate in WIND1-induced callus formation.

Recent studies have shown that CIM-induced Arabidopsis callus generated at nonwounded sites of plant explants is not dedifferentiated to a ground state and adopts root meristem organization irrespective of its tissue origin [17] (Figure S1I). In contrast, callus induced at the wound site does not display organized expression of root cell markers such as J0121 [28], *Pro_{SCR}:GFP-ER* [29], and *Pro_{WOX5}:GFP-ER* [30] (Figures S1H and S1I). Our data further reveal that, unlike CIM-induced callus formation at nonwounded sites [17], callus formation at the wound site is not disturbed in *solitary root* (*slr*) mutants [31] defective in lateral root initiation (Figures S1J). These results suggest that wounding induces callus formation through pathways different from those employing the lateral root differentiation program and that resulting callus possesses different levels of cell differentiation and/or dedifferentiation compared to callus at the nonwounded site.

This study shows that the differentiated status of plant somatic cells can change to a less differentiated state by ectopic expression of transcription factors. It is becoming increasingly clear that there are multiple levels of cellular dedifferentiation status in many multicellular organisms [32, 33]. Although our data clearly show that WIND1 promotes dedifferentiation of relatively young root, hypocotyl, and cotyledon epidermal cells, it remains to be resolved in future studies how far WIND1 can force dedifferentiation, e.g., whether WIND1 can drive dedifferentiation of highly differentiated cells such as trichomes and root hairs. Previous studies have shown that ectopic expression of other AP2/ERF proteins, such as BABY BOOM and PLETHORA, can change cell fate in plants [34, 35]. Our data thus support a role for AP2/ERF proteins in controlling plant cell fate specification, although precise functions of individual AP2/ERF proteins are probably diverse. Putative WIND1 homologs are present in various land plants (data not shown); thus, similar mechanisms might operate to mediate cellular reprogramming in other plant species. In mice, wounding induces expression of the transcription factor Msx1, which then stimulates dedifferentiation of various digit mesenchymal cells [36]. It is therefore plausible that the transcriptional control of cell dedifferentiation represents a general principle underpinning wound-induced organ regeneration across animal and plant kingdoms. Discovery of WIND1 provides a new molecular basis to further dissect how transcriptional regulators reprogram cellular differentiation status.

Experimental Procedures

Plant Material, Growth Condition, and Transformation

Wild-type, J0121 [28], *ProWOX5:GFP-ER* [30], *TCS:GFP* [2], *DR5:GUS* [21], *arr1*, *12* [18], *yuc1D* [22], *slr* [28], and all other transgenic plants used in this study (except *ProSCR:GFP-ER* [29], which was in the Ws background) were in the Columbia background. T-DNA insertion lines for *WIND1* (SALK_020767), *WIND2* (SALK_139727), *WIND3* (SALK_091212), and *WIND4* (SALK_099481) were obtained from the Arabidopsis Biological Resource Center (ABRC). Plants were grown on soil at 22°C with a photoperiod of 16 hr light/8 hr dark. For plant transformation, we introduced T-DNA vectors carrying an appropriate construct into *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* strain GV3101 by electroporation, and the resultant *Agrobacterium* was infiltrated into *Arabidopsis* by the floral dip method [37].

To induce callus by exogenous phytohormones, we incubated plant explants on MS medium supplemented with Gamborg's B5 vitamin, 2% glucose, 0.05% 2-(N-morpholino)ethanesulfonic acid (MES), 0.8% phytoagar, and various concentrations of auxin and cytokinin. To induce callus formation by wounding, we dissected 7-day-old etiolated seedlings with microscissors at approximately 7 mm from the root-hypocotyl junction, removing an upper end of hypocotyls and cotyledons. Remaining seedlings were incubated on phytohormone-free MS medium supplemented with 0.05% MES, 0.5% sucrose, and 0.8% phytoagar. Callus formation, defined as generation of at least two new cells at the wound site, was scored after 4 days using a Leica M165 C stereomicroscope. An average rate of callus formation was calculated from seven independent experiments, and more than 100 hypocotyls per genotype were tested in each experiment.

Accession Numbers

Microarray data from this study have been deposited at the NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus with the accession number GSE21631.

Supplemental Information

Supplemental Information includes four figures, three tables, and Supplemental Experimental Procedures and can be found with this article online at doi:10.1016/j.cub.2011.02.020.

Acknowledgments

We thank Nam-Hai Chua for providing XVE vectors, Yunde Zhao for yuc1D seeds, George Eric Schaller for arr1,12 seeds, Jen Sheen for TCS:GFP

seeds, Thomas J. Guilfoyle for *DR5:GUS* plasmids, Hidehiro Fukaki for *slr* seeds, and ABRC for T-DNA insertion mutant seeds. We are grateful to the members of the Ohme-Takagi and Sugimoto laboratories for helpful discussions and technical assistance. This work was supported by grants from the Japanese government's New Energy and Industrial Technology Development (NEDO) program to M.O.-T. and the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (20061028 and 20687004) to K.S. A.I. was supported by the RIKEN Special Postdoctoral Researchers Program.

Received: January 7, 2011 Revised: February 15, 2011 Accepted: February 16, 2011 Published online: March 10, 2011

References

- Skoog, F., and Miller, C.O. (1957). Chemical regulation of growth and organ formation in plant tissue cultured in vitro. Symp. Soc. Exp. Biol. 54, 118–130.
- Müller, B., and Sheen, J. (2008). Cytokinin and auxin interaction in root stem-cell specification during early embryogenesis. Nature 453, 1094– 1097.
- Takahashi, K., and Yamanaka, S. (2006). Induction of pluripotent stem cells from mouse embryonic and adult fibroblast cultures by defined factors. Cell 126, 663–676.
- Stappenbeck, T.S., and Miyoshi, H. (2009). The role of stromal stem cells in tissue regeneration and wound repair. Science 324, 1666–1669.
- Gautheret, R.J. (1934). Culture du tissus cambial. C. R. Hebd. Seances Acad. Sci. 198, 2195–2196.
- Valvekens, D., Montagu, M.V., and Van Lijsebettens, M. (1988). Agrobacterium tumefaciens-mediated transformation of Arabidopsis thaliana root explants by using kanamycin selection. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 85, 5536–5540.
- Thorpe, T.A. (2007). History of plant tissue culture. Mol. Biotechnol. 37, 169–180.
- Che, P., Lall, S., Nettleton, D., and Howell, S.H. (2006). Gene expression programs during shoot, root, and callus development in Arabidopsis tissue culture. Plant Physiol. 141, 620–637.
- Xu, J., Hofhuis, H., Heidstra, R., Sauer, M., Friml, J., and Scheres, B. (2006). A molecular framework for plant regeneration. Science 311, 385–388.
- Birnbaum, K.D., and Sánchez Alvarado, A. (2008). Slicing across kingdoms: Regeneration in plants and animals. Cell 132, 697–710.
- Iwase, A., Ishii, H., Aoyagi, H., Ohme-Takagi, M., and Tanaka, H. (2005). Comparative analyses of the gene expression profiles of *Arabidopsis* intact plant and cultured cells. Biotechnol. Lett. 27, 1097–1103.
- Okamuro, J.K., Caster, B., Villarroel, R., Van Montagu, M., and Jofuku, K.D. (1997). The AP2 domain of APETALA2 defines a large new family of DNA binding proteins in *Arabidopsis*. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 94, 7076–7081.
- Delessert, C., Wilson, I.W., Van Der Straeten, D., Dennis, E.S., and Dolferus, R. (2004). Spatial and temporal analysis of the local response to wounding in *Arabidopsis* leaves. Plant Mol. Biol. 55, 165–181.
- Axelos, M., Curie, C., Mazzolini, L., Bardet, C., and Lescure, B. (1992). A protocol for transient gene expression in *Arabidopsis thaliana* protoplasts isolated from cell suspension culture. Plant Physiol. Biochem. 30, 123–128.
- Zuo, J., Niu, Q.W., and Chua, N.H. (2000). Technical advance: An estrogen receptor-based transactivator XVE mediates highly inducible gene expression in transgenic plants. Plant J. 24, 265–273.
- Atta, R., Laurens, L., Boucheron-Dubuisson, E., Guivarc'h, A., Carnero, E., Giraudat-Pautot, V., Rech, P., and Chriqui, D. (2009). Pluripotency of Arabidopsis xylem pericycle underlies shoot regeneration from root and hypocotyl explants grown *in vitro*. Plant J. 57, 626–644.
- Sugimoto, K., Jiao, Y., and Meyerowitz, E.M. (2010). *Arabidopsis* regeneration from multiple tissues occurs via a root development pathway. Dev. Cell 18, 463–471.
- Hiratsu, K., Matsui, K., Koyama, T., and Ohme-Takagi, M. (2003). Dominant repression of target genes by chimeric repressors that include the EAR motif, a repression domain, in *Arabidopsis*. Plant J. 34, 733–739.
- Mason, M.G., Mathews, D.E., Argyros, D.A., Maxwell, B.B., Kieber, J.J., Alonso, J.M., Ecker, J.R., and Schaller, G.E. (2005). Multiple type-B

response regulators mediate cytokinin signal transduction in *Arabidopsis*. Plant Cell 17, 3007–3018.

- Crane, K.E., and Ross, C.W. (1986). Effects of wounding on cytokinin activity in cucumber cotyledons. Plant Physiol. 82, 1151–1152.
- Stetler, D.A., and Laetsch, W.M. (1965). Kinetin-induced chloroplast maturation in cultures of tobacco tissue. Science 149, 1387–1388.
- Ulmasov, T., Murfett, J., Hagen, G., and Guilfoyle, T.J. (1997). Aux/IAA proteins repress expression of reporter genes containing natural and highly active synthetic auxin response elements. Plant Cell 9, 1963–1971.
- Cheng, Y., Dai, X., and Zhao, Y. (2006). Auxin biosynthesis by the YUCCA flavin monooxygenases controls the formation of floral organs and vascular tissues in *Arabidopsis*. Genes Dev. 20, 1790–1799.
- Sakai, H., Honma, T., Aoyama, T., Sato, S., Kato, T., Tabata, S., and Oka, A. (2001). ARR1, a transcription factor for genes immediately responsive to cytokinins. Science 294, 1519–1521.
- Banno, H., Ikeda, Y., Niu, Q.W., and Chua, N.H. (2001). Overexpression of Arabidopsis ESR1 induces initiation of shoot regeneration. Plant Cell 13, 2609–2618.
- Krupková, E., Immerzeel, P., Pauly, M., and Schmülling, T. (2007). The TUMOROUS SHOOT DEVELOPMENT2 gene of Arabidopsis encoding a putative methyltransferase is required for cell adhesion and co-ordinated plant development. Plant J. 50, 735–750.
- Krupková, E., and Schmülling, T. (2009). Developmental consequences of the *tumorous shoot development1* mutation, a novel allele of the cellulose-synthesizing KORRIGAN1 gene. Plant Mol. Biol. 71, 641–655.
- Laplaze, L., Parizot, B., Baker, A., Ricaud, L., Martinière, A., Auguy, F., Franche, C., Nussaume, L., Bogusz, D., and Haseloff, J. (2005). GAL4-GFP enhancer trap lines for genetic manipulation of lateral root development in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. J. Exp. Bot. 56, 2433–2442.
- Wysocka-Diller, J.W., Helariutta, Y., Fukaki, H., Malamy, J.E., and Benfey, P.N. (2000). Molecular analysis of SCARECROW function reveals a radial patterning mechanism common to root and shoot. Development *127*, 595–603.
- Blilou, I., Xu, J., Wildwater, M., Willemsen, V., Paponov, I., Friml, J., Heidstra, R., Aida, M., Palme, K., and Scheres, B. (2005). The PIN auxin efflux facilitator network controls growth and patterning in *Arabidopsis* roots. Nature *433*, 39–44.
- Fukaki, H., Tameda, S., Masuda, H., and Tasaka, M. (2002). Lateral root formation is blocked by a gain-of-function mutation in the SOLITARY-ROOT/IAA14 gene of Arabidopsis. Plant J. 29, 153–168.
- Cobaleda, C., Jochum, W., and Busslinger, M. (2007). Conversion of mature B cells into T cells by dedifferentiation to uncommitted progenitors. Nature 449, 473–477.
- Jopling, C., Sleep, E., Raya, M., Martí, M., Raya, A., and Belmonte, J.C. (2010). Zebrafish heart regeneration occurs by cardiomyocyte dedifferentiation and proliferation. Nature 464, 606–609.
- Boutilier, K., Offringa, R., Sharma, V.K., Kieft, H., Ouellet, T., Zhang, L., Hattori, J., Liu, C.M., van Lammeren, A.A., Miki, B.L., et al. (2002). Ectopic expression of BABY BOOM triggers a conversion from vegetative to embryonic growth. Plant Cell 14, 1737–1749.
- Aida, M., Beis, D., Heidstra, R., Willemsen, V., Blilou, I., Galinha, C., Nussaume, L., Noh, Y.S., Amasino, R., and Scheres, B. (2004). The PLETHORA genes mediate patterning of the Arabidopsis root stem cell niche. Cell *119*, 109–120.
- Han, M., Yang, X., Farrington, J.E., and Muneoka, K. (2003). Digit regeneration is regulated by Msx1 and BMP4 in fetal mice. Development 130, 5123–5132.
- Clough, S.J., and Bent, A.F. (1998). Floral dip: A simplified method for *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Plant J. 16, 735–743.