

**Regulated expression of an isopentenyltransferase gene (*IPT*) in peanut significantly improves drought tolerance and increases yield under field conditions**

Hua Qin<sup>1</sup>, Qiang Gu<sup>2</sup>, Junling Zhang<sup>3</sup>, Li Sun<sup>2</sup>, Sundaram Kuppu<sup>2</sup>, Yizheng Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Mark Burow<sup>3</sup>, Paxton Payton<sup>4</sup>, Eduardo Blumwald<sup>5</sup>, and Hong Zhang<sup>2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> College of Life Sciences, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan Province, China

<sup>2</sup> Department of Biological Sciences, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409, USA

<sup>3</sup> Texas AgriLife Research Center, Texas A&M University, Lubbock, TX 79403, USA

<sup>4</sup> USDA-ARS Cropping Systems Research Laboratory, Lubbock, TX 79415, USA

<sup>5</sup> Department of Plant Sciences, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA

\*Corresponding author (Phone: 806-742-3722 ext. 277; Fax: 806-742-2963; e-mail, [hong.zhang@ttu.edu](mailto:hong.zhang@ttu.edu))

© The Author 2011. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of Japanese Society of Plant Physiologists. All rights reserved. For Permissions, please e-mail: [journals.permissions@oup.com](mailto:journals.permissions@oup.com)

## Abstract

Isopentenyltransferase (IPT) is a critical enzyme in the cytokinin biosynthetic pathway. The expression of *IPT* under the control of a maturation- and stress-induced promoter was shown to delay stress-induced plant senescence that resulted in an enhanced drought tolerance in both monocot and dicot plants. This report extends the earlier findings in tobacco and rice to peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.), an important oil crop and protein source. Regulated expression of *IPT* in peanut significantly improved drought tolerance in both laboratory and field conditions.

Transgenic peanut plants maintained higher photosynthetic rates, higher stomatal conductance, and higher transpiration than wild-type control plants under reduced irrigation conditions. More importantly, transgenic peanut plants produced significantly higher yields than wild-type control plants in the field, indicating a great potential for the development of crops with improved performance and yield in water limited areas of the world.

**Key words:** crop improvement, drought resistance, isopentenyltransferase, P<sub>SARK</sub>, peanut, transgenic plants

## Introduction

Environmental stresses such as drought, salinity, and extreme temperatures are major factors that cause significant losses in agricultural productivity worldwide (Boyer, 1982; Boyer and Westgate, 2004; Barnabas et al., 2008). Water availability is the major limiting factor for food production in many countries with agriculture consuming about 75% of water in developed countries and close to 90% of water in many developing countries (Boyer, 1982; Pennisi, 2008). The expected increase in human population with the concomitant demands in food and urban water use, the increased weather variability due to global climate change, will require a more efficient production of food crops under limited input farming systems (Long and Ort, 2010; Pennisi, 2008; Battisti and Naylor, 2009; FAOUN, 2010). The primary challenge in agricultural sciences today is to develop technologies that will increase food production and the sustainability of agriculture under environmentally limiting conditions.

Over the last 10 years, many genes that display altered expression patterns in response to environmental stresses have been identified (Bray, 2004; Shinozaki and Yamaguchi-Shinozaki, 2007) and the functions of some of these genes have been studied in detail (Vinocur and Altman, 2005; Lemaux, 2008 and 2009; Mittler and Blumwald, 2010). Several genes that confer drought tolerance have been tested in the field for many years and a few are waiting for the approval of commercial release at US federal regulatory agencies (Castiglioni et al., 2008; Yang et al., 2010).

The first group of genes selected for biotechnological application include genes encoding transcription factors that control gene expression under stress conditions (Century et al., 2008). For example, overexpression of a maize gene, i.e. *ZmDREB2A*, in *Arabidopsis* led to increased drought and heat tolerance in transgenic plants (Qin et al., 2007), because DREB2A regulates

expression of both dehydration-inducible genes and heat-shock-related gene (Sakuma et al., 2006). This gene appears to have great value in developing heat- and drought-tolerant crops in the future. In addition to the DREB/CBF class of transcription factors, of which ZmDREB2A is a member (Liu et al., 1998), other class of transcription factors were also found to be effective in conferring drought tolerance (Shinozaki and Yamaguchi-Shinozaki, 2007; Umezawa et al., 2006; Yang et al., 2010). For example, overexpression of a stress inducible gene, *SNAC1*, significantly improved drought tolerance in transgenic rice and increased seed yields by 23-34% under severe drought conditions in the field (Hu et al., 2006). Overexpression of a maize transcription factor gene, *ZmNF-YB2*, conferred increased drought tolerance in transgenic corn plants in the field as well (Nelson et al., 2007). The *ZmNF-YB2*-overexpressing plants demonstrated improved performance in photosynthesis and stomatal conductance, and maintained higher chlorophyll content and lower leaf temperatures under water-deficit conditions (Nelson et al., 2007).

Besides progress made in expressing stress-related transcription factor genes in transgenic plants, overexpressing genes that are involved in stress signal transduction pathways or overexpressing functional protein genes also resulted in increased drought tolerance in transgenic plants (Lemaux, 2008 and 2009). For example, overexpression of a tobacco protein kinase gene *NPK1* led to significantly increased tolerance against freezing, heat, and salt in transgenic plants (Kovtum et al., 2000). The constitutive expression of the kinase domain of *NPK1* could improve drought tolerance in transgenic maize (Shou et al., 2004). Furthermore, when a rice ortholog of *NPK1* was expressed under the control of a water-deficit inducible promoter, it improved yield production by 23% under rain-free field conditions (Xiao et al., 2009). Another example of manipulating stress signaling pathways to increase drought tolerance in plants is to increase the sensitivity of plants to the plant stress hormone abscisic acid (ABA).

Wang et al. (2005, 2009) demonstrated that down-regulation of farnesyltransferase activity by antisense or RNAi-silencing led to increased sensitivity to ABA, inducing smaller stomatal apertures under drought conditions, which led to reduced water loss and increased drought tolerance (Wang et al., 2005 and 2009).

Several reports have indicated that changes in hormone homeostasis, brought about by the expression of *IPT* (isopentenyltransferase, a key enzyme in the biosynthesis of cytokinin), under the control of  $P_{SARK}$ , a maturation- and stress-induced promoter, resulted in enhanced drought tolerance (Rivero et al., 2007, 2009, 2010). Increased cytokinin levels led to increased drought tolerance in tobacco plants (Rivero et al., 2007), enhanced photorespiration (Rivero et al., 2009) and the protection of the photosynthetic apparatus under stress (Rivero et al., 2010). The notion of a cytokinin-induced change in hormone homeostasis during stress with a concomitant enhanced drought tolerance was supported recently in transgenic rice plants expressing  $P_{SARK}::IPT$  (Peleg et al., 2011). The transgenic rice plants displayed relatively low levels of yield penalty after the plants were exposed to a severe drought episode during flower development, the most stress-sensitive developmental stage.

Although the beneficial role of cytokinin production during stress has been demonstrated both in dicot (Rivero et al., 2007) and monocot plants (Peleg et al., 2011), these studies were conducted in greenhouse conditions. Here we present evidence of the role of enhanced cytokinin in protecting plants against the deleterious effects of water deficit under field conditions. We show that transgenic peanut plants expressing  $P_{SARK}::IPT$  are significantly more drought-tolerant than wild-type control plants growing under restricted water conditions in the field. The transgenic peanut plants produced between 51% and 65% more seeds than wild-type controls when tested in two consecutive years under field conditions. Our data support the notion that the

production of cytokinins offers an effective strategy for the production of drought resistant plants with improved yield under stress.

## Results

### Introduction of *IPT* into peanut

The  $P_{SARK}::IPT$  construct (Rivero et al. 2007) was introduced into the peanut genome (New Mexico Valencia A variety) by using the *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation method described by Sharma and Anjaiah (2000). Transgenic peanut plants were identified by PCR amplification of the *IPT* transgene using genomic DNA isolated from leaves of putative transgenic plants ( $T_1$  generation). Approximately 50% of the more than 60 independent lines tested contained the *IPT* transgene (Fig. 1A). Plants that were positive in the PCR analysis were subjected to a mild drought stress for 5 days to induce expression of the *IPT* transgene through the action of the drought-inducible *SARK* promoter (Peleg et al., 2011). The presence of the *IPT* transcript was detected by RNA blot analysis (Fig. 1B). Genomic DNAs from four transgenic lines were isolated and subjected to DNA blot analysis. Because the restriction enzyme *Hind* III does not cut within the *IPT* transgene and only one band was found in these four lines (Fig. 1C), we concluded that these four lines were all single insertion transgenic lines. These single insertion lines were used for comparative study in the laboratory and in the field.

### Expression of *IPT* in peanuts enhances drought tolerance

Under full irrigation conditions, wild-type controls and three independent transgenic lines (3, 7, and 11) displayed no significant differences in biomass (Fig. 2) or in photosynthetic

performance (Fig. 3) after these plants were grown in growth chamber for 2 months. To test if *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT* transgenic peanut plants are more drought tolerant, we conducted reduced irrigation experiments in growth chambers. Wild-type controls and the three independent transgenic lines were first grown under normal growth conditions for 15 days, and during this period, all plants were roughly the same size and did not display phenotypic differences (Fig. 4A). Watering was then stopped for 15 days. On day 31, plants were watered every 6 days with only 1/4 of the water amounts used normally (a prior experiment determined that 600 ml of water would completely soak the 11-liter pot without water leaking out of the pot). Following 45 more days of growth under the reduced irrigation condition, *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-peanut plants were bigger and bushier than the wild-type plants (Fig. 4B). The root systems of the *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-peanut plants were larger than that of wild-type peanut plants (Fig. 4C). The fresh shoot weight and the fresh root weight of the *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-plants were significantly higher than that of control plants (84% and 188%, respectively, Figs. 5A and 5B). Similar results were obtained for dry shoot weight and dry root weight (61% and 124% increase, respectively, Figs. 5C & 5D).

The phenotypic differences displayed by wild-type and *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-peanut plants grown under water limiting conditions suggested dramatic differences in plant growth and development between the two genotypes under drought. The photosynthetic performance of wild-type and *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-plants under reduced irrigation conditions was measured. The photosynthetic data were collected after the plants were grown under reduced irrigation condition for 45 days. *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-plants displayed photosynthetic rates that were at least 2-fold higher than those of the wild-type plants (Fig. 6A). The transpiration rates of *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-plants were also significantly higher than that of control plants (about 2 times higher as well, Fig. 6B), probably due to the higher stomatal conductance of the transgenic plants (60% higher, Fig. 6C).

The water-deficit treatment caused considerable biomass reductions among all plants, but the penalty was significantly more severe in wild-type plants than that in *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-peanut plants (81% reduction in wild-type vs 65% reduction in *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-peanut plants). In comparing the photosynthetic performance of these two genotypes, the water-deficit treatment also caused bigger penalty in wild-type plants than in *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-peanut plants (77.5% reduction vs 36.4% reduction, respectively). It is clear that the higher photosynthetic rates observed in *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-peanut plants are responsible for bigger biomass in all *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-peanut plants.

### **Growth of *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-peanut plants under water-limiting conditions in the field**

To analyze the performance of the *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-peanut plants in the field under water-limiting conditions, wild-type and three independent *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-peanut lines 3, 7 and 11 were grown at the USDA-ARS Experimental Farm in Lubbock, Texas in the summer of 2009. These plants were treated as grown under dryland conditions, and were flood-irrigated when a long period of no rain condition occurred. No effort was made to measure gas exchange parameters with these plants except genomic DNAs were prepared from each plant for PCR analysis and the final yield data were collected at the end of the growth season. In 2010, two more lines were tested in addition to the four lines tested one year earlier: a non-transgenic line (regenerated from tissue-culture) and another independent transgenic plant line (i.e. 13) at the USDA-ARS Experimental Farm in Lubbock, Texas. These plants were treated differently: reduced irrigation (19 mm per week, low irrigation group) and regular irrigation (38 mm per week, high irrigation group). Photosynthetic performance of the plants in the low irrigation group was analyzed in the middle of August. Our data indicated that the photosynthetic rates of the transgenic plants were generally higher than that of control plants (Fig. 7A), but the differences, although significant,



were smaller than what was observed for these plants under reduced irrigation condition in growth chamber. Similar data were obtained for transpiration rates and stomatal conductance (Figs. 7B and 7C).

The transgenic peanut plants in the low irrigation group grew faster after germination and quickly established a larger area within 2 months after planting in the field (Fig. 8A). This difference stayed until the end of the growth season because the upground dry biomass from transgenic plants was significantly higher than that of wild-type controls (Fig. 8B). In 2009, we observed yield increases between 35% to 80% from the three independent  $P_{SARK}::IPT$ -peanut lines with an average increase of 65% (Fig. 9A); whereas in 2010, we found that the transgenic plants in the low irrigation group produced 35% to 79% more peanuts than wild-type plants with an average increase of 51% (Fig. 9B). No statistical differences in yield between the wild-type and transgenic lines were observed when the plants were grown under high irrigation condition (Fig. 9C). The low irrigation-induced yield penalties were 62% in the wild-type plants and 45%, 30%, 52% and 46% in transgenic lines 3, 7, 11, and 13, respectively. Although field conditions differed considerably between 2009 and 2010 (Tab. 1), our results showed that the transgenic plants grown under low irrigation conditions outperformed the wild-type plants in both years.

There were no differences in the oil content between wild-type control and transgenic peanut plants (Table 2). The contents of major fatty acids in peanut, palmitic acid ( $C_{16:0}$ ), oleic acid ( $C_{18:1}$ ), and linoleic acid ( $C_{18:2}$ ) were also similar between wild-type control and transgenic peanut plants (Table 2). The minor fatty acids such as stearic acid, gadoleic acid, and behenic acid varied a little between wild-type control and transgenic peanut plants, however, this difference in minor amino acid composition was also found between wild-type and tissue culture

regenerated line as well (Table 2). It is clear that *IPT*-expression in peanut does not affect oil content and major fatty acid composition in peanut.

## Discussion

We have shown that expression of  $P_{SARK}::IPT$  under reduced irrigation conditions improves drought tolerance in transgenic peanut plants, which is consistent with what Rivero et al. (2007) and Peleg et al. (2011) had demonstrated in tobacco and rice plants, respectively. The *IPT*-expressing peanut plants are visibly much larger in size than wild-type plants under reduced irrigation in growth chamber (Fig. 4B) and in dryland conditions in the field (Fig. 8A). Their biomass is also significantly higher than wild-type plants in both growth chamber and field conditions (Fig. 5 and Fig. 8B). These differences are likely due to higher photosynthetic rates observed with the *IPT*-expressing peanut plants in these conditions (Fig. 6 and Fig. 7). The higher yields in the transgenic peanut plants correlate well with the increases in photosynthesis, stomatal conductance and transpiration, supporting the notion of a cytokinin-mediated protection of photosynthesis in the transgenic plants (Rivero et al., 2009, 2010). This report is the first example that *IPT*-expressing transgenic plants could produce significantly higher yields (58% more seeds on average based on two years data) in dryland conditions in the field (Fig. 9), indicating the potential that this approach can be used to improve crop production in water limited areas of the world.

During the peanut transformation, we observed a higher rate of abnormal young seedlings in tissue culture with the  $P_{SARK}::IPT$  construct, an indication that the *IPT* gene was likely expressed during the regeneration process, which affected auxin/cytokinin ratio and led to

abnormal seedlings that could not grow into fertile plants. However, when transgenic plants were obtained from tissue culture, most of them looked normal and behaved like wild-type plants under normal growth conditions, suggesting that the  $P_{SARK}::IPT$  construct does not affect transgenic peanut plants in negative ways. The *IPT* gene under the control of a senescence-inducible promoter from a gene called *SAG12* (Gan and Amasino, 1995) was introduced into wheat, but no grain yield increase was observed (Sýkorová et al., 2008). The *IPT*-expressing wheat plants did display delayed leaf senescence, increased cytokinin content, nitrate influx, and nitrate reductase. It is interpreted that the delayed senescence by the *SAG12::IPT* construct might also delay metabolite translocation from leaves to developing grains, which in turn affects grain yield (Sýkorová et al., 2008). Zhang et al. (2010) recently reported that the *SAG12::IPT* construct was introduced into cassava, and they observed increased drought tolerance and delayed senescence in the transgenic cassava plants. Again, no increased yield was observed, perhaps due to similar reason as is the case in wheat. Other studies with *SAG12::IPT* transgenic plants did not report significant improvement in yields as well (Ma, 2008). It is clear that the promoters used in these experiments play a critical role in the impact of overexpression of *IPT* on the yield of transgenic plants.

Bhatnagar-Mathur et al. (2007) introduced the Arabidopsis drought inducible transcription factor gene *AtDREB1A* into peanut and observed increased transpiration efficiency under drought conditions. However, the report did not show whether the drought inducible *AtDREB1A*-expression in peanut plants could improve peanut yield under water-deficit or reduced irrigation conditions in the field or in laboratory conditions. The *AtDREB1A*-expressing peanut plants displayed reduced stomatal conductance under drought conditions, which is in contrast to our data that all *IPT*-expressing peanut plants have higher stomatal conductance (Figs.

6 and 7). Perhaps this is due to different mechanisms that impact drought tolerance in transgenic plants. The DREB1A transcription factor functions in ABA-independent signaling pathways, which regulates expression of genes that are involved in drought, salt and cold stresses (Shinozaki and Yamaguchi-Shinozaki, 2007), whereas the expression of *IPT* driven by the *SARK* promoter leads to altered hormone metabolisms, especially increased expression of brassinosteroid-related genes and repression of jasmonate-related genes (Rivero et al., 2010; Peleg et al., 2011). This differential expression of genes resulted in hormonal crosstalk and robust root development [i.e. 2 to 3 times more root biomass in transgenic peanut plants (Fig. 5)], which could increase the water-absorbing capacity of transgenic plants, allowing higher stomatal conductance even under drought conditions that ensures higher CO<sub>2</sub> supply to leaf tissues and therefore higher photosynthetic rate. Consequently, *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-peanut plants outperform wild-type plants under reduced irrigation conditions and in the field conditions. The seeds from *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-peanut plants are normal in oil content and composition (Table 2), indicating that no negative changes have been introduced into transgenic peanut and the nutritional value of transgenic peanut seeds is still the same. In summary, we have shown that regulated expression of *IPT* can indeed significantly improve drought tolerance in transgenic peanut plants and *IPT* can be an excellent gene for engineering other crops for increased drought tolerance.

## **Materials and Methods**

### **Peanut transformation**

The *Agrobacterium* strain EHA104 harboring the binary vector *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT* (Rivero et al., 2007) was used for peanut transformation. A single colony of the *Agrobacterium* strain was

grown overnight at 28 °C in LB medium (pH 7.2) containing 100 mg L<sup>-1</sup> rifampicin, 50 mg L<sup>-1</sup> streptomycin and 50 mg L<sup>-1</sup> kanamycin, to late log phase (OD<sub>600</sub> = 1.0 to 1.5). Bacteria cells were collected by centrifugation and resuspended in fresh MS medium (Murashige and Skoog, 1962) and left on the shaker for at least 1 h. Mature seeds of peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L., New Mexico Valencia A) were surface-sterilized by rinsing with 70% (v/v) ethanol for 1 min and 10 min with 0.1% (w/v) aqueous mercuric chloride followed by several washes in sterile water. Seeds were left in sterile water for 2 h before use. The seed coat and embryo axis were removed and each cotyledon was cut into halves vertically to obtain the cotyledon explants. Freshly prepared cotyledon explants were placed in the Agrobacterium cell suspension for 10 min, and then air dried briefly. Agrobacterium-inoculated explants were blotted dry, and incubated on shoot induction medium [SIM, i.e. MS medium supplemented with 10 mg L<sup>-1</sup> N<sup>6</sup>-benzyladenine (BA) and 1 mg L<sup>-1</sup> 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D), 30 g L<sup>-1</sup> sucrose, 2 g L<sup>-1</sup> phytigel, pH 5.8] for 3 days at 28 °C in darkness.

Inoculated explants were transferred to fresh SIM medium supplemented with 300 mg L<sup>-1</sup> cefotaxime, and cultured at a 16 h photoperiod with a light intensity of 200 μmol photons m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> for additional 2 weeks. Explants displaying multiple shoot buds were subcultured onto SIM with 250 mg L<sup>-1</sup> cefotaxime and 125 mg L<sup>-1</sup> kanamycin for 2 weeks to initiate selection and enrichment of transformed cells. Subsequently, proximal parts of the explants containing multiple adventitious shoot buds were excised and transferred to shoot elongation medium (MS medium supplemented with 0.5 mg L<sup>-1</sup> BA, 30 g L<sup>-1</sup> sucrose, 2 g L<sup>-1</sup> phytigel, pH 5.8) with 250 mg L<sup>-1</sup> cefotaxime and 125 mg L<sup>-1</sup> kanamycin for two to three subcultures of 3-week duration each for further shoot development and proliferation. Elongated shoots were cut and rooted on

root induction medium [MS medium supplemented with 1 mg L<sup>-1</sup> 1-naphthaleneacetic acid, 30 g L<sup>-1</sup> sucrose, 2 g L<sup>-1</sup> phytagel, pH 5.8].

### **Plant growth conditions in growth chamber**

Seeds of wild-type and *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*- plants were sown directly in 11-L pots filled with pro-mix BX peat moss, perlite, and vermiculite that was well watered (Premier Brands, New Rochelle, NY, USA), and germinated in a growth chamber under controlled conditions (25 °C, 500 μmol photons m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, 16 h photoperiod) for 15 d and grown for another 15 d without irrigation. After that, half of the wild-type and transgenic plants were selected to receive 300 mL of water every 3 d (designated as optimal watering conditions), whereas the other half of plants received 150 mL of water every 6 d (reduced irrigation conditions). Plants were grown for another 45 d. No water drained out of pots in these treatments. After the above-mentioned reduced-irrigation treatments were finished, biomass was determined by measuring fresh weight and dry weight. The fresh weight of each individual whole plant was measured immediately after harvest. Dry weight was measured after 48 h at 60 °C in an air oven.

### **Molecular analysis of transgenic peanut plants**

**PCR and DNA blot analysis.** Genomic DNA was isolated from fresh peanut leaves using the PowerPlant<sup>TM</sup> DNA Isolation Kit (Mo Bio Laboratories, Inc., CA, USA). PCR was performed to screen for putative transformants for the presence of the *SARK* promoter/IPT cassette with oligonucleotides pSARK-F1 and IPT-R1 (the 19-nucleotide primer pSARK-F1 is specific for the *SARK* promoter and the 20-nucleotide primer IPT-R1 is specific for *IPT*). The amplification reaction was carried out in a total volume of 25 μL containing 100 ng of purified

genomic DNA as template, 1 unit of GoTaq DNA polymerase (Promega Corporation, Madison, WI, USA ), 0.4  $\mu$ M of each forward and reverse primer. Cycling conditions comprised an initial denaturation at 95 °C for 4 min, followed by 35 cycles of 95 °C for 30 s, 56 °C for 30 s, 72 °C for 40 s and a final extension of 10 min at 72 °C. The amplified products were electrophoresed on 1.2% agarose gels and visualized in the presence of ethidium bromide with a gel documentation system.

Aliquots of 10  $\mu$ g DNA were digested overnight with 20 units of *Hind* III, electrophoresed in a 0.8% agarose gel and transferred onto a Biotrans<sup>TM</sup> nylon membrane (MP Biomedicals, Inc., Irvine, CA, USA). The membrane was hybridized with a <sup>32</sup>P-labelled *IPT* cDNA fragment (50 ng) that was amplified by PCR using the oligonucleotides IPT-F2 and IPT-R2. The probe was made through random priming using a kit (DECA Prime<sup>TM</sup> II Kit, Ambion Inc., Austin, TX, USA). The conditions for hybridization and washing were described in Church and Gilbert (1984). The sequences of the oligonucleotides used are shown below:

pSARK-F1    5'-GGTCATTGGCTTAGGGTTC-3'  
IPT-R1        5'-TCGTTCCCTTTCAGTTCTTCC-3'  
IPT-F2        5'- CCAACTTGCACAGGAAAGAC-3'  
IPT-R2        5'-CTAATACATTCCGAACGGATGAC-3'

**RNA blot analysis.** Total RNAs were isolated from the fifth leaves using the Spectrum<sup>TM</sup> Plant Total RNA Kit (Sigma-Aldrich, Inc., St. Louis, MO, USA ). Twelve micrograms of total RNAs per sample were electrophoresed in 1% (w/v) formaldehyde-agarose gels, and transferred onto a Biotrans<sup>TM</sup> nylon membrane (MP Biomedicals, Inc., Irvine, CA, USA). RNA blot analysis was carried out following the protocol of Church and Gilbert (1984).

## Gas-exchange measurements

Gas-exchange measurements were conducted on the third nodal leaf using a Licor LI-6400 infrared gas exchange analyzer (Licor, Inc., Lincoln, NE, USA). Leaf-to-air vapor pressure deficit was set to ambient conditions, block temperature was 25 °C, and CO<sub>2</sub> concentration was set at 400 μmol mol<sup>-1</sup>) and maintained for all measurements across pots. Irradiance was set to 1500 μmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> using a light-emitting diode (Licor LI-6400-002). Leaves were first equilibrated in the chamber for at least 5 min prior to logging measurements of gas-exchange. Field measurements of photosynthesis were taken under an irradiance of 2,000 μmol photons m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> using a light-emitting diode (Licor LI-6400-002) and 370 μmol mol<sup>-1</sup> CO<sub>2</sub> in the leaf chamber of Li-Cor 6400. Leaf temperature was maintained at 25 °C. Gas-exchange measurements were carried out in the middle of August, starting at 9:00 am and continuing until 12:00 noon.

## Field trial experiments

The wild-type controls and transgenic lines were planted at the Experimental Farm of the USDA-ARS Cropping Systems Research Laboratory in Lubbock, Texas, in the middle of May in both 2009 and 2010 (wild-type and three transgenic lines 3, 7, and 11 were used in 2009 and wild-type, a non transgenic line from tissue culture, and four transgenic were lines 3, 7, 11, and 13 were used in 2010). In 2009, one treatment was tested: dryland with occasional flood irrigation. In 2010, two treatments were tested: reduced irrigation (19 mm per week) and high irrigation group (38 mm per week). Seeds were sown into 2 meter rows at a density of 20 seeds per meter and a 100 cm row spacing in a 16 row block in 2009 and a 24 row block in 2010.



Individual plants were randomly selected each time from *IPT*-containing peanut lines for gas exchange analysis, and other physiological data such as weight of peanut seeds and dry weight of above-ground biomass were collected at the end of experiments.

### **Peanut oil analysis**

***Oil content analysis.*** TD-NMR experiments were carried out on a Bruker Minispec MQ10 NMR Analyzer (Bruker, Rheinstetten, Germany) with a tube of 25-mm diameter. The temperature was maintained at 40 °C. Data were acquired using the Minispec software (Bruker), and the data oil program (Bruker). The weighed peanut samples (about 10 g) were filled to the tube for analysis. The 90° and 180° pulse length were 11.62 and 23.44 μs respectively. For each run, 16 scans were collected with a recycle delay of 2.00 s. The gain was set to 60 dB. The TDNMR instrument was calibrated by eight pure peanut oil calibration standards in the concentration of 0%, 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, 60% and 70%.

***Fatty acid composition analysis.*** Peanut seeds were cut and powdered into hexane. The solvent was evaporated in nitrogen gas and resulting fatty acids were converted to their methyl esters using boron trifluoride as a catalyst in methanol-toluene mixture at 95 °C. The methyl esters were extracted into hexane and analyzed by HP 5890 gas chromatography (GC) with a flame ionization detector (FID) and a capillary column (DB-Wax, 30 m length, 0.53 mm i.d., 0.50 μm film thickness). Helium was used as the carrier gas at 30 psi. A temperature program was used with an initial temperature of 200 °C held for 1 min. The temperature was increased to 230 °C at 3 °C /min, then being held another 3 min at the final temperature. The injector was heated to 200 °C and the split flow was 4 psi. The detector temperature was 320 °C. Fatty acids

were identified by comparison with fatty acid methyl ester standards (68A) purchased from Nu-Chek Prep, Inc. (Elysian, MN). Fatty acids were quantified by using the peak area percent as a ratio to the total area of all methyl esters present.

### **Statistical analysis**

Reduced irrigation experiments in growth chamber were performed three times with 3 to 4 independent lines and 6-8 plants for each line each time. Means of one representative experiment are presented. Statistical significance of differences in the mean values of the examined parameters between the transgenic and wild-type plants was determined using the student *t*-test (\*  $P < 0.05$ , \*\*  $P < 0.01$ ).

### **Acknowledgments**

This research was supported by grants from Texas Peanut Producers Board, National Peanut Producers Board, and Texas Department of Agriculture. We thank Guoxin Shen, Xunlu Zhu, Neelam Mishra, Rongbin Hu, Jian Chen, Yinfeng Zhu, Gang Pan, Saranya Ganapathy, and Jaswanth Kanumuri for harvesting peanut seeds in the field or shelling the peanut pods. Hua Qin thanks the China Scholarship Council for a one-year fellowship to Texas Tech University.

## References


- Barnabas, B., Jager, K., and Feher, A. (2008). The effect of drought and heat stress on reproductive processes in cereals. *Plant Cell Environ.* 31, 11–38.
- Battisti, D.S., and Naylor, R.L. (2009). Historical warnings of future food insecurity with unprecedented seasonal heat. *Science* 323, 240–244.
- Bhatnagar-Mathur, P., Devi, M.J., Reddy, D.S., Lavanya, M., Vadez, V., Serraj, R., Yamaguchi-Shinozaki, K., and Sharma, K.K. (2007). Stress-inducible expression of *AtDREB1A* in transgenic peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) increases transpiration efficiency under water-limiting conditions. *Plant Cell Rep.* 26, 2071–2082.
- Boyer, J.S. (1982). Plant productivity and environment. *Science* 218, 443–448.
- Boyer, J.S., and Westgate, M.E. (2004). Grain yields with limited water. *J. Exp. Bot.* 55, 2385–2394.
- Bray, E. A. (2004). Genes commonly regulated by water-deficit stress in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *J. Exp. Bot.* 55, 2331–2341.
- Castiglioni, P., Warner, D., Bensen, R.J., Anstrom, D.C., Harrison, J., Stoecker, M., Abad, M., Kumar, G., Salvador, S., D'Ordine, R., Navarro, S., Back, S., Fernandes, M., Targolli, J., Dasgupta, S., Bonin, C., Luethy, M.H., and Heardet, J.E. (2008). Bacterial RNA chaperones confer abiotic stress tolerance in plants and improved grain yield in maize under water-limited conditions. *Plant Physiol.* 147, 446–455.

- Century, K., Reuber, T.L., Ratcliffe, O.J. (2008). Regulating the regulators: the future prospects for transcription-factor-based agricultural biotechnology products. *Plant Physiol.* 147, 20-29.
- Church, G.M. and Gilbert, W. (1984). Genomic sequencing. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 81, 1991-1995.
- FAO, 2010. Food Security statistics (<http://www.fao.org/economic/ess/food-security-statistics/en/>).
- Gan, S., and Amasino, R.M. (1995). Inhibition of leaf senescence by autoregulated production of cytokinin. *Science* 270, 1986-1988.
- Hu, H., Dai, M., Yao, J., Xiao, B., Li, X., Zhang, Q., and Xiong, L. (2006). Overexpressing a NAM, ATAF, and CUC (NAC) transcription factor enhances drought resistance and salt tolerance in rice. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 103, 12987–12992.
- Kovtun, Y., Chiu, W.L., Tena, G., and Sheen, J. (2000). Functional analysis of oxidative stress-activated mitogen-activated protein kinase cascade in plants. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 97, 2940–2945.
- Lemaux, P.G. (2008). Genetically engineered plants and foods: a scientist's analysis of the issues (Part I). *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.* 59, 771–812.
- Lemaux, P.G. (2009). Genetically engineered plants and foods: a scientist's analysis of the issues (Part II). *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.* 60, 511–59.
- Liu, Q., Kasuga, M., Sakuma, Y., Abe, H., Miura, S., Yamaguchi-Shinozaki, K., and Shinozaki, K. (1998). Two transcription factors, DREB1 and DREB2, with an EREBP/AP2 DNA binding domain separate two cellular signal transduction pathways in drought and low-

- temperature-responsive gene expression, respectively, in Arabidopsis. *Plant Cell* 10, 1391–1406.
- Long, S.P. and Ort, D.R. (2010). More than taking the heat: crops and global change. *Curr. Opin. Plant Biol.* 13, 241-248.
- Ma, Q.H. (2008). Genetic engineering of cytokinins and their application to agriculture. *Crit. Rev. Biotechnol.* 28, 213–232.
- Mittler, R., and Blumwald, E. (2010). Genetic engineering for modern agriculture: challenges and perspectives. *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.* 61, 443–462.
- Murashige, T., and Skoog, F. (1962). A revised medium for rapid growth and bioassays with tobacco tissue culture. *Plant Physiol.* 15, 473-497.
- Nelson, D.E., Repetti, P.P., Adams, T.R., Creelman, R.A., Wu, J., Warner, D.C., Anstrom, D.C., Bensen, R.J., Castiglioni, P.P., Donnarummo, M.G., Hinchey, B.S., Kumimoto, R.W., Maszle, D.R., Canales, R.D., Krolikowski, K.A., Dotson, S.B., Gutterson, N., Ratcliffe, O.J., and Heard, J.E. (2007). Plant nuclear factor Y (NF-Y) B subunits confer drought tolerance and lead to improved corn yields on water-limited acres. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 104, 16450–16455.
- Peleg, Z., Reguera, M., Walia, H., and Blumwald, E. (2011). Cytokinin mediated source-sink modifications improve drought tolerance and increases grain yield in rice under water stress, *Plant Biotech. J.* In press.
- Pennisi, E. (2008). The blue revolution, drop by drop, gene by gene. *Science* 320, 171–173.
- Qin, F., Kakimoto, M., Sakuma, Y., Maruyama, K., Osakabe, Y., Tran, L.S., Shinozaki, K., and Yamaguchi-Shinozaki, K. (2007). Regulation and functional analysis of ZmDREB2A in response to drought and heat stresses in *Zea mays* L. *Plant J.* 50, 54–69.


- Rivero, R.M., Kojima, M., Gepstein, A., Sakakibara, H., Mittler, R., Gepstein, S., and Blumwald, E. (2007). Delayed leaf senescence induces extreme drought tolerance in a flowering plant. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 104, 19631-19636.
- Rivero, R.M., Shulaev, V., and Blumwald, E. (2009). Cytokinin-dependent photorespiration and the protection of photosynthesis during water deficit. *Plant Physiol.* 150, 1380-1393.
- Rivero, M., Walia, H., and Blumwald, E. (2010). Cytokinin-dependent protection of photosynthetic protein complexes during water deficit. *Plant Cell Physiol.* 51, 1929-1941.
- Sakuma, Y., Maruyama, K., Osakabe, Y., Qin, F., Seki, M., Shinozaki, K., and Yamaguchi-Shinozaki, K. (2006). Functional analysis of an Arabidopsis transcription factor, DREB2A, involved in drought-responsive gene expression. *Plant Cell* 18, 1292–1309.
- Sharma, K., and Anjaiah, V. (2000). An efficient method for the production of transgenic plants of peanut (*Arachis Hypogaea* L.) through *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*-mediated genetic transformation. *Plant Sci.* 159, 7-19.
- Shinozaki, K., and Yamaguchi-Shinozaki, K. (2007). Gene networks involved in drought stress response and tolerance, *J. Exp. Bot.* 58, 221–227.
- Shou, H., Bordallo, P., and Wang, K. (2004). Expression of the Nicotiana protein kinase (NPK1) enhanced drought tolerance in transgenic maize. *J. Exp. Bot.* 55, 1013–1019.
- Sýkorová, B., Kurešová, G., Daskalova, S., Trčková, M., Hoyerová, K., Raimanová, I., Motyka, V., Trávníčková, A., Elliott, M.C., and Kamínek, M. (2008). Senescence-induced ectopic expression of the *A. tumefaciens IPT* gene in wheat delays leaf senescence, increases cytokinin content, nitrate influx, and nitrate reductase activity, but does not affect grain yield. *J. Exp. Bot.* 59, 377-387.

- Umezawa, T., Fujita, M., Fujita, Y., Yamaguchi-Shinozaki, K., and Shinozaki, K. (2006). Engineering drought tolerance in plants: discovering and tailoring genes to unlock the future. *Cur. Opin. Biotechnol.* 17,113–122.
- Vinocur, B., and Altman, A. (2005). Recent advances in engineering plant tolerance to abiotic stress: achievements and limitations. *Curr. Opin. Biotechnol.* 16, 123–132.
- Wang, Y., Ying<sup>1</sup>, J., Kuzma<sup>1</sup>, M., Chalifoux, M., Sample, A., McArthur, C., Uchacz, T., Sarvas, C., Wan, J., Dennis, D. T., McCourt P., and Huang, Y. (2005). Molecular tailoring of farnesylation for plant drought tolerance and yield protection. *Plant J.* 43, 413–424.
- Wang, Y., Beath, M., Chalifoux, M., Ying, J., Uchacz, T., Sarvas, C., Griffiths, R., Kuzma, M., Wan, J., and Huang, Y. (2009). Shootspecific down-regulation of protein farnesyltransferase ( $\alpha$ -subunit) for yield protection against drought in canola. *Mol. Plant* 2, 191–200.
- Xiao, B.Z., Chen, X., Xiang, C.B., Tang, N., Zhang, Q.F., and Xiong, L.Z. (2009). Evaluation of seven function-known candidate genes for their effects on improving drought resistance of transgenic rice under field conditions. *Mol. Plant* 2, 73–83.
- Yang, S., Vanderbeld, B., Wang, J., and Huang, Y. (2010). Narrowing down the targets: towards successful genetic engineering of drought-tolerant crops. *Mol. Plant* 3, 469–490.
- Zhang, P., Wang, W.Q., Zhang, G.L., Kaminek, M., Dobrev, P., Xu, J. and Gruiissem, W. (2010). Senescence-inducible expression of isopentenyl transferase extends leaf life, increases drought stress resistance and alters cytokinin metabolism in cassava. *J. Integr. Plant Biol.* 52, 653–669.




**Fig. 1.** Molecular analysis of transgenic peanut plants. **A.** PCR analysis of transgenic plants. WT, wild-type; lanes A to M, 13 independent putative transgenic peanut plants. **B.** RNA blot analysis of transgenic plants. Lanes 1 to 15, transgenic peanut plants that tested positive in PCR experiment. The 18S rRNA was used as the RNA loading control. **C.** DNA blot analysis of four transgenic peanut plants. Lanes WT, 3, 7, 11, and 13, wild-type and four independent transgenic lines.







**Fig. 2.** Biomass analysis of growth chamber-grown peanut plants under normal irrigation conditions for 60 days. **A.** Fresh shoot weight of wild-type and transgenic peanut plants. **B.** Fresh root weight of peanut plants. **C.** Dry shoot weight of peanut plants. **D.** Dry root weight of peanut plants. WT, wild-type; 3, 7, and 11, three independent transgenic peanut plants. Bar, standard error; n = 6 for each line.




**Fig. 3.** Photosynthetic performance of growth chamber-grown peanut plants under normal irrigation conditions for 60 days. **A.** Photosynthetic rates of wild-type and transgenic peanut plants. **B.** Transpiration rates of wild-type and transgenic peanut plants. **C.** Stomatal conductance of wild-type and transgenic peanut plants. WT, wild-type; 3, 7, and 11, three independent transgenic peanut plants. Bar, standard error; n = 6 for each line.




**Fig. 4.** Phenotypes of transgenic plants before and after drought treatment in growth chamber. **A.** Fifteen days old peanut plants under normal growth condition. **B.** Peanut plants under reduced irrigation condition for 60 days. **C.** Root phenotype of peanut plants under reduced irrigation condition for 60 days. WT, wild-type; 3, 7 and 11, three independent transgenic plants.




**Fig. 5.** Biomass analysis of growth chamber-grown peanut plants under reduced irrigation conditions for 60 days. **A.** Fresh shoot weight of wild-type and transgenic peanut plants. **B.** Fresh root weight of peanut plants. **C.** Dry shoot weight of peanut plants. **D.** Dry root weight of peanut plants. WT, wild-type; 3, 7, and 11, three independent transgenic peanut plants. Bar, standard error; \*\*, significant at 1%; n = 6 for each line.






**Fig. 6.** Photosynthetic performance of growth chamber-grown peanut plants under reduced irrigation conditions for 60 days. **A.** Photosynthetic rates of wild-type and transgenic peanut plants. **B.** Transpiration rates of wild-type and transgenic peanut plants. **C.** Stomatal conductance of wild-type and transgenic peanut plants. WT, wild-type; 3, 7, and 11, three independent transgenic peanut plants. Bar, standard error; \*, significant at 5%; \*\*, significant at 1%; n = 6 for each line.



**Fig. 7.** Photosynthetic performance of field-grown peanut plants under field conditions. **A.** Photosynthetic rates of controls and transgenic peanut plants. **B.** Transpiration rates of controls and transgenic peanut plants. **C.** Stomatal conductance of controls and transgenic peanut plants. WT, wild-type; NT, non-transgenic line coming from tissue culture; 3, 7, 11, and 13, four independent transgenic peanut plants. Bar, standard error; \*, significant at 5%; \*\*, significant at 1%; n = 12 for each line.



**Fig. 8.** Phenotype and biomass of wild-type and transgenic peanut plants under field conditions. **A.** Phenotype of wild-type and transgenic peanut plants in the field. **B.** Biomass of wild-type and transgenic peanut plants in the field at the end of growth season. WT, wild-type; NT, non-transgenic line coming from tissue culture; 3, 7, 11, and 13, four independent transgenic peanut plants. Bar, standard error; \*\*, significant at 1%; n = 40 for each line.

**A. 2009 Field Trial (dryland)****B. 2010 Field Trial (low irrigation)****C. 2010 Field Trial (high irrigation)**

**Fig. 9.** Peanut yields from wild-type, non-transgenic, and transgenic peanut plants in the field conditions. **A.** Yields from 2009 field trial. **B.** Yields from low irrigation group in 2010 field trial. **C.** Yields from high irrigation group in 2010 field trial. WT, wild-type; NT, non-transgenic line coming from tissue culture; 3, 7, 11 and 13, four independent transgenic peanut plants. Bar, standard error; \*, significant at 5%; \*\*, significant at 1%; n = 40 for each line.



**Table 1.** Weather information for Lubbock area in 2009 and 2010. Average rain fall and temperature change from May to November.

<b>Time</b>	<b>2009</b>		<b>2010</b>	
	<b>Rain Fall (inches)</b>	<b>Temperature (F) (high // low)</b>	<b>Rain Fall (inches)</b>	<b>Temperature (F) (high // low)</b>
<b>May</b>	0.68	82.7 // 55.7	1.14	82.5 // 56.5
<b>June</b>	2.44	92.9 // 66.2	2.55	93.9 // 68.0
<b>July</b>	1.69	93.7 // 68.5	7.14	86.5 // 68.2
<b>August</b>	0.47	94.6 // 67.2	1.33	93.2 // 67.3
<b>September</b>	2.46	83.3 // 57.5	0.93	87.9 // 61.8
<b>October</b>	0.78	72.0 // 44.3	2.61	79.4 // 47.9
<b>November</b>	0.13	69.2 // 36.2	0.07	66.9 // 34.7

**Table 2.** The oil content and fatty acid composition of wild-type and *P<sub>SARK</sub>::IPT*-transgenic peanut plants grown under irrigated condition in 2010. WT, wild-type; NT, non-transgenic peanut coming from tissue culture; 3, 7, 11, and 13, four independent IPT-transgenic peanut plants. Oil content and fatty acid composition are in percent (%). C<sub>16:0</sub>, palmitic acid; C<sub>18:0</sub>, stearic acid; C<sub>18:1</sub>, oleic acid; C<sub>18:2</sub>, linoleic acid; C<sub>20:0</sub>, arachidic acid; C<sub>20:1</sub>, gadoleic acid; C<sub>22:0</sub>, behenic acid; C<sub>24:0</sub>, linoceic acid. Standard error is used. \* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%; n = 5 seeds for each line.

Sample	Oil content	C <sub>16:0</sub>	C <sub>18:0</sub>	C <sub>18:1</sub>	C <sub>18:2</sub>
WT	47.77±0.90	10.70±0.26	2.82±0.35	38.90±1.46	39.46±1.60
NT	47.59±1.14	10.39±0.36	2.19±0.18 *	39.29±1.53	39.86±1.74
3	46.76±0.51	11.17±0.18 *	2.78±0.16	39.04±0.87	39.81±0.75
7	47.98±0.44	10.81±0.58	2.31±0.29 *	40.07±1.23	38.93±1.06
11	47.26±0.54	10.85±0.39	3.29±0.47	40.25±0.80	37.92±1.59
13	47.74±0.55	10.52±0.52	2.55±0.26	41.40±2.11	39.93±2.63

Sample	C <sub>20:0</sub>	C <sub>20:1</sub>	C <sub>22:0</sub>	C <sub>24:0</sub>
WT	1.51±0.15	1.29±0.07	3.51±0.36	1.52±0.18
NT	1.41±0.05	1.56±0.15 **	3.79±0.48	1.98±0.40 *
3	1.41±0.08	1.27±0.12	2.49±0.29 **	1.71±0.25
7	1.31±0.12 *	1.34±0.03	3.08±0.33	1.89±0.21 *
11	1.58±0.20	1.17±0.03 *	2.96±0.34 *	1.75±0.12 *
13	1.40±0.17	1.39±0.10	3.30±0.48	1.46±0.13