

**Title:** The Past, Present, and Future of Plant Stress Research

**Authors:** Eugene Koh<sup>1</sup>, Rohan Shawn Sunil<sup>1</sup>, Hilbert Yuen In Lam<sup>1</sup>, Malavika

SujaMdharan<sup>2</sup>, Monika Chodasiewicz<sup>2</sup>, Marek Mutwil<sup>1\*</sup>

1 School of Biological Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, Singapore

2 Biological and Environmental Science & Engineering Division (BESE), King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), Thuwal, Saudi Arabia

## **Abstract**

Life finds a way. For sessile organisms like plants, the need to adapt to changes in the environment is even more poignant. For humanity, the need to develop crops that can grow in diverse environments and feed our growing population is an existential one. The development of fast-growing, high-yielding crop varieties sparked the Green Revolution, and the advent of the genomics era enabled the development of customized transgenic crops enhanced for specific traits or resistances. Today, the proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI) allows scientists to rapidly screen through massive and complex datasets to uncover elusive patterns in the data, enabling us to create more robust and faster models for prediction and hypothesis generation in a bid to develop more stress-resilient plants. This review aims to provide an overview of the evolution of environmental stress research across the plant kingdom over the past fifty years. It will cover historical landmark concepts and discoveries that were seminal in advancing the field, provide a global snapshot of our current scientific progress, and conclude with a discussion on the advent of AI tools that would help accelerate scientific discovery.

## **Introduction**

The intricate relationship between plants and their environment forms the bedrock of ecological balance and sustenance. In the face of evolving climatic patterns, burgeoning

populations, and environmental degradation, understanding how plants respond to stress has become paramount (Verslues et al., 2023). Environmental stress, encompassing abiotic and biotic factors, poses formidable challenges to plant life, affecting growth, productivity, and overall ecological resilience. The repercussions of these stressors extend beyond individual plants, influencing entire ecosystems and, consequently, the global environment (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), 2023). As we navigate an era marked by climate change and global ecological shifts, the ability to discern how various plant species adapt and thrive—or falter—under diverse stress conditions is pivotal. This understanding informs sustainable agricultural practices and holds the key to preserving biodiversity, ensuring ecosystem resilience, and, ultimately, securing our planet's environmental well-being (Patrick, 2022).

Plant stress research has uncovered a plethora of interconnected layers comprising hormone signalling, phosphorylation cascades, phase separation, reactive oxygen signalling, and other topics that warrant a review on their own. Here, we summarise recent progress in plant stress studies fueled by ongoing molecular biology approaches and accumulating omics data and offer perspective on future research directions, with a focus on artificial intelligence. Because of limited space, we will only cover the most critical discoveries but guide the readers to specialized reviews covering different topics.

## Past

### **Key concepts in plant stress research**

The quest to understand how plants perceive and respond to the environment was the efforts of thousands of scientists over the past few decades. These efforts introduced key paradigms such as phosphorylation signalling cascades, hormone signalling, reactive oxygen species signalling, retrograde signalling, plant immunity, long range / systemic signalling, stress memory and phase separation. In addition, the bioinformatics tools and

databases that have been instrumental in the integration and large-scale analysis of exponentially growing biological data are discussed briefly here.

### *Phosphorylation signalling cascades*

Protein phosphorylation is a common and critical event in the signal transduction pathways downstream to environmental perturbations (Zhang et al., 2022). Phosphorylation is a reversible modification which can affect the structure, enzymatic activity, cellular localisation and binding of the protein, its effects dependent on the biological role of the protein in the cell (Nishi et al., 2014). Early work in Arabidopsis and also other crops such as rice and maize showed that members of the type 2C protein phosphatase family and SnRK2 protein kinase subfamily play essential roles in the regulation of stress signalling cascades (Y. Ma et al., 2009; M. K. Min et al., 2019; S.-Y. Park et al., 2009). Cross-interactions with hormones such as ABA mediate important physiological responses such as stomatal closure in response to salt, drought, and other hyperosmotic stress-inducing conditions (Z. Lin et al., 2020; Takahashi et al., 2020). Besides SnRKS, RLK and MAPK kinase signalling cascades are also key stress signal transduction pathways. For instance, the Arabidopsis MEKK1–MKK2–MPK4/6 cascade was demonstrated to transduce salinity and cold stress signals (Teige et al., 2004), while Sucrose non-fermenting 1 (SNF1)-related kinases (SnRK1, SnRK2 and SnRK3) have been demonstrated to function in various stresses and ABA responses (Fujii & Zhu, 2009; Umezawa et al., 2009). Phosphorylation also plays a major role in immune signalling, where the detection of pathogenic molecules such as flagellin activates a signalling cascade containing multiple kinases and transcription factors that culminates in a conserved defence response (Asai et al., 2002; C. J. Park et al., 2012).

Target of Rapamycin (TOR) is a Ser/Thr protein kinase that is evolutionarily conserved among eukaryotes, including fungi, plants, and animals (Fu et al., 2020). In plants, TOR signalling acts as a central hub to integrate various energy, hormone and environmental signals, and modulates a whole array of cellular functions, such as cell

growth, transcription and translation, metabolism, nutrient assimilation and transport, and plays a key role in various complex signalling networks. Plants with TOR dysfunctions behave as if they are stressed, even in the absence of a stressor. TOR knockdown lines show significant perturbation of stress- and autophagy-related genes that are commonly observed under stress conditions such as high light, nutrient starvation, cold, drought, and high salt (Caldana et al., 2013; Deprost et al., 2007; Xiong et al., 2013). Inhibition of TOR signalling by the chemical inhibitor AZD-8055 also induces stress hormone (e.g. ethylene, jasmonic acid, and abscisic acid [ABA]) signalling pathways (P. Dong et al., 2015).

### *Hormone signalling*

Phytohormones such as abscisic acid (ABA), auxin, brassinosteroid, cytokinin, ethylene (ET), gibberellin, jasmonate (JA), salicylic acid (SA) and, strigolactone encompass a group of structurally varied small molecules which act distally to influence plant growth, development, and responses to the environment (reviewed in (Waadt et al., 2022)). Many hormone biosynthetic and signalling pathways have been characterised using the model plant *Arabidopsis*. Hormone perception is mediated by specific receptors which recognise and bind to their respective hormones, and trigger distinct downstream signalling pathways (Santner & Estelle, 2009). There are two major design themes of hormone signalling pathways (reviewed in (McSteen & Zhao, 2008)). The first is via membrane bound receptors which recognise the hormone and transduce a signal to downstream effectors, usually by phosphorylation, which finally mediate transcriptional changes in the nucleus. Hormones such as cytokinin, brassinosteroid, and ethylene belong to this first group. The second group consists of hormones like auxin, JA, SA, and gibberellins (GA), in which the binding of a hormone to their cognate receptor (usually an F-box-containing E3 ubiquitin ligase protein) promotes the ubiquitination and proteasomal degradation of transcription factors such as Aux/IAA, DELLA, and JAZ proteins in the auxin, GA, and JA signalling pathways respectively.

The action of ABA is one of the most studied topics in abiotic stress response research (Hirayama & Shinozaki, 2007; Wasilewska et al., 2008). ABA is well-known for its role in the acquisition of desiccation tolerance and dormancy during seed maturation and also in mediating stomatal closure to prevent water loss by transpiration under drought stress (Wasilewska et al., 2008). ABA is the key hormone that confers drought and salinity resistance and has been investigated as a potential means to enhance drought resistance in crops (Schroeder et al., 2001). The SA pathway was found to be heavily involved in immune signalling via genetic screens in *Arabidopsis* using pathogenesis-responsive genes or physiological screens for enhanced disease susceptibility (Cao et al., 1994; Dewdney et al., 2000). *Arabidopsis* genetics was also instrumental in deciphering the role of the SA master regulator NPR1 in SA-mediated immune signalling (Cao et al., 1994). Ethylene is a gaseous hormone that is well-known for its role in stimulating fruit maturation, and regulates a variety of other developmental and stress responses (reviewed in (Binder, 2020)). One of the classical responses to ethylene is called the ‘triple response’. This response is characterised by a shortened root, thickened hypocotyl, and an exaggerated apical hook. This phenotype proved useful in genetic screens to identify components of the ethylene-signalling pathway. Jasmonic acid and its derivatives such as methyl jasmonate are synthesised from linolenic acid, which mediate transcriptional responses to wounding, herbivory and pathogenesis (Wasternack & Song, 2017).

While each hormone pathway has its distinct regulatory mechanisms, it has been found that there is a significant amount of cross-regulation (or ‘crosstalk’) between them (Fujita et al., 2006; Grant & Jones, 2009; Pieterse et al., 2009). Master regulators such as transcription factors AtMYC2 and ERF1 have also been shown to be the convergent points of JA/ABA or JA/ET signals, respectively (Lorenzo & Solano, 2005). These interactions can be synergistic or antagonistic and are closely intertwined with  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  and ROS signalling (Ku et al., 2018). Some pathogens have even evolved means to hijack existing hormone machinery to further their own ends. Normally, detection of the

pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae* triggers SA- & ABA-mediated responses, which signal stomatal closure to prevent the pathogen entry into the plant. However, a virulent strain of *Pseudomonas syringae* produces the phytotoxin coronatine (COR), which mimics the action of JA, causing the re-opening of the stomata (Schulze-Lefert & Robatzek, 2006). The hormone regulation of stress signalling is still a subject of intense study, and many questions on the relationship between stress perception and downstream signalling remain to be answered.

### *Reactive Oxygen Species Signalling*

The production of reactive oxygen species (ROS) is an unavoidable aspect of aerobic metabolism. Initially thought to be a detrimental byproduct of metabolism or cellular dysfunction under stress, it is now widely accepted that ROS play a key role in cellular homeostasis and the stress signalling response (Sies & Jones, 2020). The collective term ROS describes a group of oxygen-based compounds, of which some are radicals, like superoxide ( $O_2^-$ ), hydroxyl ( $\cdot OH$ ), peroxy (ROO $\cdot$ ), and also non-radicals such as hydrogen peroxide ( $H_2O_2$ ), singlet oxygen ( $^1O_2$  or  $^1\Delta_g$ ) and ozone ( $O_3$ ) (Halliwell & Gutteridge, 2015). Some of the earliest efforts in studying ROS in plants were focused on the production of ROS during plant stress and in photosynthetic electron transport (Asada, 2006; Elstner & Osswald, 1994). The existence of a water–water cycle in chloroplasts as a system of scavenging ‘active oxygens’ and dissipating excess photons was proposed (Asada, 1999; Foyer & Halliwell, 1976). This pathway, comprising the twin cycles of ascorbate and glutathione reduction-oxidation processes which help to dissipate the ROS accumulated in various metabolic processes, was coined the Foyer–Halliwell–Asada cycle, and is a crucial mechanism for the maintenance of redox poise in both animals and plants (Asada, 2000). Redox poise, which is the balance between the reductive and oxidative components in the cell, is mediated by a variety of enzymes such as ascorbate or glutathione peroxidases and reductases which interconvert components of the redox machinery (such as ascorbate and glutathione) between their respective

oxidised and reduced forms, and also catalases which reduce H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> to water (Halliwell & Gutteridge, 2015). The redox state of the cell affects the formation of disulphide bonds in proteins, altering their structure and function and, in certain cases, their translocation to the nucleus. A well-known example is the sensitivity of the transcription factor NPR1, a master regulator of immune signalling, to redox poise. Under oxidative conditions, NPR1 oligomers are formed as a result of intermolecular disulphide bridges forming between NPR1 monomers, which dissociate to their respective monomers under reductive conditions. The monomeric form of NPR1 is able to translocate to the nucleus to elicit downstream signalling genes, while the oligomeric form remains in the cytosol (Mou et al., 2003).

ROS was also found to be produced by plasma membrane-localised NADPH oxidases termed respiratory burst oxidase homologs (RBOHs) (Sagi & Fluhr, 2006), that respond to many different stresses, driving the formation of ROS signatures at the apoplast (Miller et al., 2009). These signatures were recently observed to propagate systemically under wounding stress like that observed for calcium signalling (Fichman et al., 2019, 2023). Other sources of ROS can come from metabolic reactions occurring in the chloroplasts, mitochondria, and peroxisomes, as well as enzymes known as peroxidases, which play important roles in mediating cellular redox state, as well as through oxidation modification of various intracellular biomolecules (reviewed in (Mittler et al., 2022)). Although most ROS activity is derived from the production of superoxide and H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> production, photodynamic reactions occurring in the chloroplasts can also produce copious amounts of the ROS singlet oxygen (<sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub>) which can result in the production of signalling intermediates that induce stress responses in the nucleus (Dogra et al., 2019; Ramel et al., 2012; Triantaphylidès & Havaux, 2009). In addition, it was recently found that chlorophyll metabolites could leak out from the chloroplast to the cytoplasm under stress conditions, generating singlet oxygen and causing the attenuation of ribosomal translation, stimulating the induction of stress signalling genes (Koh et al., 2021, 2022).

### *Retrograde signalling*

As eukaryotic life evolved, the requirement for intra-cellular coordination between the nucleus with organelles such as the chloroplast and the mitochondria drove the development of many signalling intermediates, allowing the cell to respond rapidly to the environment. Signal flow from the nucleus to the organelles is termed anterograde signalling and vice versa for retrograde signalling. Energy homeostasis and the balance of NAD/NADH, FAD/FADH and ATP regulated by the mitochondria is the most well-known form of retrograde signalling (reviewed in (Dourmap et al., 2020)). Another major category of retrograde signals is derived from the production of ROS from both the chloroplast and mitochondria. Under normal conditions, the balance of redox poise is provided by the balance of superoxide / H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and the various scavengers and detoxification pathways in the cell, such as the ascorbate-glutathione cycle mentioned previously (Asada, 2000). Under stress conditions, ROS production is significantly dysregulated, and the excess ROS can contribute to the oxidation and modification of various biomolecules, such as proteins, lipids, and DNA/RNA, which alters their function. ROS oxidation can also produce various signalling intermediates such as β-cyclocitral, 2-C-methyl-D-erythritol-2,4-cyclodiphosphate (MecPP), 3'-phosphoadenosine 5'-phosphate (PAP) and intermediates of the tetrapyrrole biosynthesis pathway (reviewed in Crawford et al., 2018). Many of these signalling pathways can be triggered by abiotic stresses that disturb the energy homeostasis of the cell, and although much work has gone into identifying specific stress sensors and signalling intermediates, there is still no clear mechanism which can explain how these signals induce changes in nuclear transcription.

Biotic stresses have been known to target more specific receptors and signalling mechanisms which will be discussed below. One major outcome of biotic stress in plants is a phenomenon known as the hypersensitive response (HR), which is a controlled oxidative burst that results in cell death in a localised portion of the plant tissue (Allan &

Fluhr, 1997; Cvetkovska & Vanlerberghe, 2012). Although its exact mechanism has not been fully elucidated, several lines of evidence suggest that ROS generated from mitochondria and chloroplasts play a crucial role in regulating HR (Balint-Kurti, 2019). Apoptosis is another important form of programmed cell death (PCD) driven by retrograde signalling, where changes in mitochondrial membrane permeability and the leakage of cytochrome c triggers a cascade of cell death signalling pathways (Kagan et al., 2009). Although well-studied in animal systems, apoptosis is not well-understood in plants, where major components of the pathway, such as the caspases, do not have functional orthologues in plants (Dickman et al., 2017).

### *Plant Immunity*

The use of *Arabidopsis* as a model species to study plant-pathogen interactions was not an intuitive one, as it was thought that it was a non-host to some of the crop pathogens of interest at the time (Keen, 1990). Cauliflower Mosaic Virus and the bacterial pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae* were some of the first pathogens found to infect *Arabidopsis* (Balazs & Lebeurier, 1981). Several inbred accessions of *Arabidopsis* were observed to have varying disease resistance and susceptibility to *Pseudomonas syringae*. It was found that this variation was due to the recognition of specific bacterial avirulence genes, *avrRpt2* and *avrRpm1* (Debener et al., 1991; Whalen et al., 1991). This was a key step in corroborating the key genetic paradigm of plant pathology, the gene-for-gene hypothesis, which postulated that resistance (R) genes in plants confer recognition of cognate avirulence (Avr) proteins in the pathogen, resulting in an immune response (Flor, 1947). Using *Arabidopsis*, this was quickly followed by the characterisation of the first resistance genes (or R-genes), the intracellular immune system receptors RPS2 and RPM1 (Bent et al., 1994; Mindrinos et al., 1994).

Over time, the field coalesced around an understanding that a key basis of plant immunity was mediated by a superfamily of related proteins, now called NB-LRR proteins (or NLR proteins), that acted as molecular receptors for pathogenic molecules (or

PAMPs, for Pathogen Associated Molecular Patterns). PAMPs were, in general, conserved molecules found across large classes of viruses, bacteria or fungi that could trigger an immune response termed the ‘Hypersensitive Response’ (HR), which was characterised by necrotic lesions of cells that prevented further spread of the pathogen (Heath, 1998). A compelling hypothesis at the time was that at least a subset of the large LRR-RLK class of proteins could encode a variety of PAMP receptors. A seminal discovery was the identification of FLS2 as a flagellin (a bacterial peptide) receptor (Gómez-Gómez & Boller, 2000), which was rapidly followed by the characterisation of EFR1 and CERK1, the receptors for bacterial EF-Tu and fungal chitin respectively (Miya et al., 2007; Zipfel et al., 2006). It was also found that many pathogens produce their own virulence effectors which they delivered by various mechanisms into plant cells to disrupt immune system signalling (Gopalan et al., 1996; Leister et al., 1996). However, plants themselves also evolved means of detecting these effector molecules and triggering an immune response towards them. The immune responses produced by PAMPs and effector molecules have similar outcomes (i.e. upregulated stress response, HR and cell death), but are regulated by distinct signalling pathways, and were termed as Pattern-triggered Immunity (PTI) and Effector-triggered Immunity (ETI) respectively (reviewed in (Jones & Dangl, 2006). The development of new effectors by pathogens to evade host defences and the corresponding evolution of new ways to detect invading pathogens by the hosts is a fierce and ongoing process, suggesting an evolutionary arms race between pathogen and host (Nishimura & Dangl, 2010).

#### *Long-range and systemic signalling*

The vascular system in plants allows for long-range transport of materials such as water and minerals from the root to the shoot, and sugar made in the leaves to the rest of the plant. Over time, it was found that biomolecules such as RNA, peptides and hormones were being transported as well, which was responsible for regulating plant development and growth, as well as defence responses. Hormones such as auxins, cytokinins,

brassinosteroids, gibberellins and strigolactones have been well studied for their effects to promote growth and development, while SA, ABA, JA and ethylene have been more associated with stress response (reviewed in (Lacombe & Achard, 2016)). The long-range signalling afforded by the vascular system allows for systemic defence responses to occur upon stress. Perhaps the most well-studied hormone-mediated systemic signalling response, known as systemic acquired resistance (SAR) (Ross, 1961), is the induction of SA synthesis in local and systemic tissues as a result of PTI or ETI signalling discussed in the section above (reviewed in (An & Mou, 2011)). The production of SA triggers an immune response in local and distal tissues through its binding to various metabolic enzymes, redox regulators, and transcription cofactors (Spoel & Dong, 2024), leading to increased resistance to future pathogenic attack (J.-M. Zhou & Zhang, 2020). Other hormones such as ABA can be transported from the roots to the leaves in response to drought stress to influence stomatal closure (Seo & Koshiba, 2011). The ethylene precursor aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic acid (ACC) can also undergo root to shoot transport in response to hypoxia (Bradford & Yang, 1980), while ethylene itself is a gaseous molecule that can freely diffuse through the air as demonstrated by the use of ethylene in fruit ripening (Burg & Burg, 1962).

Systemin was the first peptide found to mediate systemic signalling in response to wounding stress in tomato (Pearce et al., 1991). Following that, a whole suite of different peptide families, such as CLAVATA 3, CLAVATA3/EMBRYO SURROUNDING REGION-RELATED (CLEs), and defensins, that mediate various plant developmental and stress responses were characterised (Hu et al., 2021; Narasimhan & Simon, 2022). These peptides could be processed from larger protein precursors or by small open reading frames (“ $\mu$ ORFs”) within both coding or non-coding RNA regions (reviewed in (Hsu & Benfey, 2018)). The presence of RNA existing in the phloem sap was known since the 1970s but was generally considered a contaminant (Kollmann et al., 1970), but nowadays, it has been accepted that various RNAs such as mRNA, microRNAs, siRNAs, lncRNAs and the like can be transported within the vascular system. They are typically

transported in association with specific RNA-binding proteins in vesicles or phase-separated condensates to mediate plant growth and development or in response to environmental perturbations (reviewed in (Ham & Lucas, 2017; Zhao et al., 2022)). It is not clear if the peptide hormones would be processed from the site of perturbation and then transported distally or produced *in situ* from transported RNA.

$\text{Ca}^{2+}$  is one of plants' most important second messengers in response to extracellular stimuli. The discovery of calcium as an intracellular messenger, the elucidation of calcium-specific ion channels, and their association with membrane action potential changes observed in contractile muscles or in response to external perturbations all took place in animal systems (reviewed in (Petersen et al., 2005)). Since then, there has been an explosion of activity across multiple fields, including plants, in which characterisation of a myriad of  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ -specific membrane channels and pumps, binding proteins, intracellular storage organs and signal transduction pathways have given rise to a vision of an extremely well-coordinated signalling mechanism across eukaryotic life (reviewed in (Luan & Wang, 2021)). In combination with signal molecules such as inositol trisphosphate (IP3), diacylglycerol, inositol hexaphosphate (IP6), cADP-ribose, hormones or ROS, these components act in concert to produce unique calcium signalling profiles measured by voltage gradients (reviewed in (White & Broadley, 2003)).

$\text{Ca}^{2+}$  signalling was closely coupled with the perception of pathogenic elicitors (generally classed as PAMPs). The  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  signal generated showed variances in peak shape, amplitude and duration in response to different types and dosages of PAMPs (reviewed in (P. Yuan et al., 2017)). Wounding of the plant caused by insect or animal herbivory was also shown to generate a distinct  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  wave, which propagated from the site of wounding to distal parts of the part in a manner reminiscent of the nervous system observed in animals (Toyota et al., 2018). Calcium signalling has also been observed to manifest itself under various abiotic stress, such as heat, cold, salinity, drought, salt, heavy metal and hypoxia (reviewed in (Lindberg et al., 2012)), or even rainfall (Matsumura et al., 2022). One of the key unsolved mysteries in the field now is how to decode these

distinct calcium signals that the cell emanates under different perturbations, and how this translates to transcriptomic and metabolomic changes occurring in the plant.

### *Stress memory*

An interesting concept that has arisen in the recent couple of decades is the idea that plants are able to retain memory of previous stresses, and become more resistant to future periods of stress in a process referred to as hardening, priming, conditioning, or acclimation (Crisp et al., 2016). This process may occur due to the accumulation of key signalling metabolites or defence-related proteins, which allow the plant to acclimate to various stress conditions including cold, heat, drought, salt, flooding, excess light and UV (Charng et al., 2023; Conrath, 2011). Plant memory usually results in a heightened response against subsequent stresses, resulting in a stronger, faster or more efficient transcriptional response (Crisp et al., 2016). Stress memory in the form of a systemic defence response induced against local perturbations can be termed as systemic acquired resistance or systemic acquired acclimation, depending on whether the stresses are biotic or abiotic, respectively (Mittler & Blumwald, 2015). Transmission of the stress signal from the local to distal parts of the plant can occur via the vascular transport of signalling molecules like hormones, peptides, RNA, or long-range transmission of ROS and  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  signals discussed previously.

The persistence of a longer-term memory usually occurs as a result of changes in chromatin such as histone modifications or DNA methylation, which allow for specific genomic regions to be silenced or accessible to RNA polymerase for transcription (Avramova, 2015). A common example is that of the process of vernalization, which is a process in plants where exposure to a period of cold temperatures induces or accelerates the transition from the vegetative to the reproductive phase. It was found that a key regulator of floral development, FLOWERING LOCUS C (FLC), is transcriptionally repressed by cold exposure, with the degree of repression of FLC reflecting the length of the cold exposure (Berry & Dean, 2015; Sheldon et al., 2000). This altered gene

expression state is "remembered" by the plant, and when temperatures become favourable, flowering is triggered. Stress memory in a parent plant can also be transmitted to its progeny in a process termed transgenerational memory. One of the most intuitive examples is that of seed provisioning, where environmental stresses faced by the maternal plant affect the composition of resources that are packaged into seeds, which directly affect germination and early seedling growth (Herman & Sultan, 2011). Other instances of the inheritance of epigenetic traits, such as methylation (Kooke et al., 2015) or via stress-induced transposon insertions, have been noted (Ito et al., 2011), which suggest possible mechanisms for the transmission of stress memory.

### *Phase separation*

Phase separation, a phenomenon known for creating spatial organisation within cells, has emerged as a pivotal aspect of cellular dynamics in plants. Phase separation allows the condensation of biomolecules, forming two distinct phases, a dense and dilute phase to co-exist stably, through the interdependence of concentration and the identities of the biomolecules (Banani et al., 2017; Hyman et al., 2014). The condensation and stable co-existence of the two phases are highly dependent on intracellular environmental factors such as pH, temperature, salt concentration and more. The existence of phase-separating biomolecules allows an organism to combat environmental changes and regulate and enhance prominent biochemical functionalization, gene expression, cell signalling and mRNA biogenesis (Fare et al., 2021; Londoño Vélez et al., 2022). Research in phase separating biomolecules and their molecular behaviour have been vastly studied in mammalian and fungi cellular systems, enabling a multitude of breakthroughs in understanding cellular stress response and disease mechanisms. However, the role of phase-separating biomolecules in plants has been largely understudied (Emenecker et al., 2020, 2021). The presence of biomolecular condensates that have been reported to localize to the nucleus (Kalinina et al., 2018), cytoplasm (Kearly et al., 2024; Kosmacz et al., 2019), chloroplasts (in planta, (Chodasiewicz et al., 2020)) and most of them

participate in phase separation. They are predominantly associated as key players in stress response due to their ability to swiftly organise pertinent biomolecules in cells to form membrane-less “resistance teams” as defined by Liu and co-workers (Liu et al., 2023). At the heart of phase separation in plants lies membrane-less organelles such as processing bodies (P-bodies) and stress granule (SG) foci that are able to undergo a dynamic assembly and disassembly invoked upon cellular needs and stress perception respectively (reviewed in (Solis-Miranda et al., 2023)). These dynamic structures act as hubs for the sequestration of specific proteins, RNA and metabolites (Maruri-Lopez & Chodasiewicz, 2023), allowing for the post-transcriptional and translational machinery to be regulated and protected from stress inducing circumstances. Research of phase separating proteins mention key characteristics that enable them to be targets of this phenomenon. The presence of low-complexity domains (LCDs), RNA-binding domains (RBDs), prion-like domains (PLDs) or intrinsically disordered regions (IDRs), often, are found to be a recurring property of phase separating proteins (Zhu et al., 2022). Likewise, posttranslational modifications (PTMs) have been denoted to be a critical component in phase separation of some proteins, by altering the steric properties, charge and hydrophobicity of protein, thereby influencing the localisation, protein-protein interactions and more (Luo et al., 2021).

Recent findings suggest the prominent involvement of phase separation in the formation of these biomolecule condensates upon exposure to an array of stress-inducing factors (Zhu et al., 2022). They are arbitrarily classified into entities that can sense temperature changes and biomolecular condensates that protect transcripts (Liu et al., 2023). A study conducted by Jung and colleagues (Jung et al., 2020) showcased the ability of EARLY FLOWERING 3 (ELF3), a thermoreceptor in *Arabidopsis* to undergo dynamic and reversible phase separation upon exposure to high temperature. ELF3’s under heat stress forms “deactivated droplets” and undergoes diffusion upon eradication of stress stimuli. Its distinctive prion-like domain, containing repeats of polyglutamine, is said to play a crucial role in its phase separation as well as thermo-sensing capabilities

(Jung et al., 2020). Furthermore, stress response proteins that have transcript protective properties such as acetylation lowers binding affinity (ALBA 4/5/6) were identified to undergo phase separation under heat stress to sequester heat shock transcription factors (HSF) and heat shock proteins (HSP) mRNA, whose expression enables thermotolerance, to protect against thermal mediated degradation by exoribonuclease XRN4 (Tong et al., 2022). Similarly, two RNA-binding proteins, RNA-binding glycine-rich D2 (RBGD2) and RNA-binding glycine-rich D4 (RBGD4), have a characteristic LCD and can undergo phase transition to be condensed into heat-induced SGs (Zhu et al., 2022). Beyond the advancing realm of abiotic stress-induced condensates, phase separation is actively involved in plant immune response. A noteworthy study by Zavaliev and colleagues explores the phase separation of non-expressers of pathogenesis-related (PR)1 (NPR1) (Zavaliev et al., 2020). NPR1, with its characteristic redox-sensitive intrinsically disordered regions (RDRs), undergo salicylic acid-induced phase separation to the cytoplasm, recruiting the cullin 3 (CRL3) machinery into these condensates necessary for mediating protein homeostasis. Additionally, these condensates were observed to be highly enriched in stress response proteins such as nucleotide-binding leucine-rich repeat (NB-LRR) and oxidative/DNA-damage response proteins, attenuating the sequestration of NPR1 condensates as an integral player in cell death or survival decisions in plant immunity (Zavaliev et al., 2020).

While substantial research on phase separation has been conducted in *Arabidopsis thaliana*, there is a discernible shift towards investigations in crops, indicating a rising interest in translational applications for agriculture (Liu et al., 2023). Notably, phase separation has been implicated in DNA repair, with plant-specific protein MtSUVR2 driving the phase separation of MtRAD51 at DNA damage sites, thereby promoting double-strand break (DSB) repair (Liu et al., 2022). Another noteworthy study by (Huang et al., 2022) explores the phase separation of Terminating flower (TMF) and TMF family members (TFAM) in tomato cells, forming heterotypic condensates in the nucleus. This study suggests a molecular link between variations in prion-like intrinsically disordered

regions (IDRs) of paralogous proteins and robust transcriptional control of stem cell fate transition in plants, particularly in flowering regulation. The recent strides in understanding phase separation in plants unveil its multifaceted roles in stress response, immune modulation, and crucial cellular processes.

### *Large-scale data analysis*

In tandem with the above advances, a wide variety of bioinformatic tools were developed that utilise the genomic, epigenomic, transcriptomic, proteomic, and other ‘-omic’ data (Cantó-Pastor et al., 2021). For genomics, the 1001 Genomes Project capturing natural variation data allows the exploration of 462 phenotypes across 1496 accessions in *Arabidopsis thaliana* (Alonso-Blanco et al., 2016). One of the most widely used portals, TAIR (<http://www.arabidopsis.org>), (Reiser et al., 2017), provides detailed information about gene functions and maintains a ‘super-portal’ to keep track of and categorise various *Arabidopsis* tools (<https://conf.arabidopsis.org/display/COM/Resources>). Databases, such as Ensembl Plants (Kersey et al., 2018), PLAZA (Van Bel et al., 2018) and PANTHER (Mi et al., 2010), allow the exploration of gene families and gene trees. Epigenomic DNA modifications from numerous sequencing experiments can be viewed in the EPIC-CoGe Browser (Nelson et al., 2018) and the 1001 Epigenomes Browser (Kawakatsu et al., 2016), giving the researchers unprecedented means to study the epigenetic regulation of genes.

Transcriptomic tools allow the analysis of expression profiles across publicly available transcriptomic data comprised of RNA-sequencing and microarrays (Julca et al., 2023), and is accessible through sites such as the eFP browser (<http://bar.utoronto.ca/efp/cgi-bin/efpWeb.cgi>) (Winter et al., 2007), Arabidopsis RNA-Seq database (<http://ipf.sustech.edu.cn/pub/athrna>, (Zhang et al., 2020)), Plant Single Cell RNA-Sequencing Database (<https://www.zmbp-resources.uni-tuebingen.de/timmermans/plant-single-cell-browser/>; (X. Ma et al., 2020)) and CoNekT (<https://conekt.sbs.ntu.edu.sg/>, (Proost & Mutwil, 2018)). Since genes with similar

expression patterns (co-expression) can be functionally related, several tools that explore co-expression networks for Arabidopsis and other species are available. The tools include ATTED-II (<https://atted.jp/>, (Obayashi et al., 2018)), CoNekT (<https://conekt.sbs.ntu.edu.sg/>, (Proost & Mutwil, 2018)), Expression Angler (<https://bar.utoronto.ca/ExpressionAngler/>, (Austin et al., 2016)), and others.


Proteomic tools range from methods that study protein subcellular localisation (<https://version4legacy.suba.live/>, (Hooper et al., 2017)), protein modifications, such as phosphorylation, acetylation, methylation, nitrosylation, ubiquitination and glycosylation (<http://p3db.org>, <http://www.psb.ugent.be/PlantPTMViewer>, (Willems et al., 2019; Yao et al., 2014)). Since interacting proteins are also likely functionally related, tools to visualise protein-protein interactions, such as BAR's Arabidopsis Interactions Viewer 2 (<https://bar.utoronto.ca/interactions2/>, (S. Dong et al., 2019)) and AtPID (<http://www.megabionet.org/atpid/>, (Li et al., 2011)). Finally, with the advances in AI, accurate protein structures can be predicted (<https://alphafold.ebi.ac.uk/entry/F4HVG8>, (Jumper et al., 2021)), opening new possibilities for structure-function studies.

## Present

### **Kingdom-level overview of genomic and transcriptomic plant stress studies**

Genomic and transcriptomic data are invaluable to understanding gene functions and how organisms respond to the changing environment. Databases such as the Sequence Read Archive (SRA) and Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) play pivotal roles in conducting meta-analyses of environmental stress studies across the plant kingdom (Edgar, 2002; Leinonen et al., 2011). These repositories serve as invaluable reservoirs of high-throughput sequencing data, transcriptomic profiles, and other omics datasets, providing researchers with access to a wealth of information derived from diverse experimental setups (Julca et al., 2023). The SRA, housing raw sequencing data, enables the extraction of detailed molecular insights, while GEO, a comprehensive resource for gene expression data, facilitates the integration of transcriptomic analyses. Besides the

biological data present in these databases, plentiful metadata also exists to provide a broader overview of the progress of plant stress research, to identify specific research trends which may be useful for funding bodies and policymakers. Furthermore, we also develop an in-house LLM-based method to conduct a meta-analysis of experimental and bioinformatic analyses used in these studies, visualising for the first time a network graph linking these plant stress research methods.



**Figure 1. Overview of stress related BioProject IDs in the SRA database for genomic and transcriptomic studies.** BioProjects were classified based on the

sequencing type used, and cumulative number of BioProjects over the years based on stress type and country of origin.


To derive a global overview of the data available from stress studies across the plant kingdom, we began by querying for the term ‘Viridiplantae’ within the SRA database, which encompasses two major clades: Streptophyta, which contains streptophyte algae and land plants (embryophytes), and Chlorophyta, which includes all remaining green algae (with exception of Prasinodermophyta, which split before the divergence of Streptophyta and Chlorophyta). We observed that the SRA houses a total of 537,149 transcriptomic and 1,317,905 genomic accessions for Viridiplantae at the time of writing (October 2023), and we performed a preliminary grouping of this data into their respective unique BioProject accessions. The BioProject database is a comprehensive and centralised repository managed by the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) that serves as a platform for the organisation and dissemination of information related to biological research projects. Each BioProject entry includes detailed information about the project's objectives, experimental design, and data sources. Metadata available at this step allowed us to determine the types of experimental procedures performed to obtain the respective genomic and transcriptomic data. As expected, whole genome sequencing (WGS) and RNA-Seq were the most common methods used to obtain genomic and transcriptomic data (Figure 1). Amplicon sequencing, Chromatin-Immunoprecipitation (ChIP) sequencing, Bisulfite sequencing and targeted-capture sequencing were the next most popular methods for genome sequencing; and microRNA (miRNA) sequencing, noncoding RNA (ncRNA) sequencing, full-length cDNA (FL-cDNA) sequencing and small RNA sequencing were the next most popular methods for transcriptomic data. We noticed that there was a significant number of unannotated or incorrectly annotated entries, for instance, RNA-Seq or miRNA-Seq (coloured in red) being tagged in genomic data or unclassified samples (NA), WGS and Amplicon sequencing being tagged in transcriptomic data.

## **Drought, salt, heat, cold and pathogen stress dominate the stress study landscape**

Next, to understand which stresses are most studied, we plotted the number of unique BioProject IDs annotated with specific stress-related keywords. We observed that drought, salt, heat, cold and pathogen stress were the top five most common stress types for transcriptomic (Figure 1C) and genomic (Figure 1D) data. Of note is the observation that most of the genomic and transcriptomic data present in the SRA originated around 2010-2012, where next-generation sequencing technologies such as RNA-Seq came to the fore, supplanting the previous generation of transcriptomic technologies such as microarrays. Transcriptomic data derived from microarrays were previously stored in repositories such as ArrayExpress and the Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) databases but are not represented in our chart.

## **Two nations produce >80% of all available data**


The metadata present in our dataset also allows us to plot the progress of scientific investment into plant stress research in a country-specific manner, using the submitting institutions as a proxy (Figure 1). From the charts, we observed that the United States, China and India were the top three drivers of plant stress research, with the United States having led for close to a decade but has been recently overtaken by China. The interest shown by both superpowers in understanding the mechanisms involved in plant stress signalling is an encouraging sign for the field and is extremely timely considering the looming effects of climate change affecting global food security. Other members of note include developed countries in Europe and Asia such as Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, Japan and South Korea. Of note are the obvious absences of developing countries and those from the global South, which hints at a potential widening divide between the rich and poor nations of the world in preparation for the incoming climate shifts.



**Figure 2. Distribution of top 10 species per stress studied across stress-related BioProject IDs for genomic data.** The counts of different species studied across the BioProject IDs for each stress type are represented in a (A) log-scale heat map normalised within each species, and in (B) bar charts showing the top few species. Some stresses contained <10 species studied.

### Species- and stress-specific research trends

Next, we investigated how the various species were used for stress research. To that end, we identified the top 10 species per stress type that were studied by genomic (Figure 2) and transcriptomic (Figure 3) approaches and divided the species based on their uses (e.g., crop, model, ornamental). Overall, food crops were most comprehensively represented (27 out of 82 species), followed by model plants (18 out of 82) and timber crops (10 out of 82). For transcriptomic data, heat, cold, salt, drought and pathogen stress were the most abundant (>100 accessions), followed by UV, heavy metal and flooding stress (50-100 accessions), and high light and herbivory stress (<50 accessions, Figure 3).




**Figure 3. Distribution of top 10 species per stress studied across stress related BioProject IDs for transcriptomic data.** The counts of different species studied across the BioProject IDs for each stress type are represented in a (A) log-scale heat map normalised within each species, and in (B) bar charts showing the top few species.

It was unsurprising to note that the model plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* dominated for most stress types, except for drought stress, where *Brachypodium distachyon* and *Brassica napus* led the field; and herbivory, where *Zea mays* came in slightly ahead of *Arabidopsis* (Figure 3). Since *Arabidopsis* contained the highest number of samples, we decided to identify species coming in second to fifth places to reveal current research efforts. We observed that the crop plants *Triticum aestivum*, *Oryza sativa*, *Solanum lycopersicum*, *Glycine max* and *Nicotiana tabacum* were strongly represented in the majority of the stress types for genomic (Figure 2) and transcriptomic (Figure 3) data. Of interest was the presence of *Kalanchoe fedtschenkoi* in second place in heat/cold stress and *Panicum virgatum* in fifth place in drought stress but with still more than 50 BioProject accessions.

Kalanchoe is a common ornamental houseplant (Smith et al., 2019), while Panicum is used as cattle feedstock (Griffin & Jung, 2019) or also as ground cover to prevent soil erosion (E. Wang et al., 2020). The rise in atypical species such as these is an encouraging sign that scientific knowledge, interests and importantly resources are percolating through the system and leading to more translational discoveries.

High-light research was conducted mostly on *Arabidopsis* (Figure 2-3), but this stress was surprisingly not studied in crop plants, and only a few datasets were present in other model organisms. On the other hand, UV research was also dominated by *Arabidopsis*, but with several common crop plants like *Prunus persica*, *Malus domestica*, *Camellia sinensis* and even *Ginkgo biloba*, known for its medicinal properties, also in the mix. Climate change can come with changing rainfall patterns and consequently decreased cloud cover, while geographical locations at risk of desertification are also exposed to such stresses (Barnes et al., 2023). High intensities or prolonged duration of visible or UV light can cause significant Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS) production, resulting in damage to various biomolecules such as DNA/RNA, proteins and lipids, resulting in cellular dysfunction and the accumulation of mutations (Cooke et al., 2003). Increasing focus on these relatively neglected areas of research would be pivotal in understanding the chronic biological effects of these stresses.

For genomic data, other than heat stress, which had >50 accessions, we found <30 accessions for the remaining stress types, with there being even fewer (<5 accessions) for high light, flooding and herbivory stress in particular (Figure 2). Overall, this showcases considerably fewer stress-related genomic studies than those utilising transcriptomic data. From a fundamental standpoint, this makes sense, as gene expression changes would be one of the main focuses for studies investigating the effect of various stresses on plants. Again, *Arabidopsis thaliana* was a key contributor to 7 stress types in terms of genomic data, with *Zea mays* being the most studied for cold stress and *Oryza sativa* for salt and drought stress.



**Figure 4. Categorisation of analyses performed across transcriptomic studies. (A)**

Stress-related BioProject accessions with transcriptomic data were used to obtain their associated research articles. All the performed analyses that were stated in the articles were classified into broader supergroups using a series of prompts with the OpenAI API, as further detailed in (B). The accuracy of LLM1 was validated with 50 random articles, by manually cross-checking whether each analysis generated was mentioned in the article. The percentage of correct analyses generated by LLM1 can be seen in (C), giving a mean accuracy value of 99.3%.

### **LLM-assisted literature mining and data analysis**


While genomic and transcriptomic approaches are invaluable, these approaches are typically used in combination with other methods. To better understand how the different methods are combined in research papers, we performed a large language model-based analysis of methods appearing in the papers that generated the stress-related genomic and transcriptomic data. The advent of AI tools provides a unique opportunity to rapidly mine the burgeoning scientific literature which was previously performed through arduous manual curation. Recently, we deployed the text mining capacities of Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) to process over 100,000 plant biology abstracts, revealing nearly 400,000 functional relationships between a wide array of biological entities - genes, metabolites, tissues, and others, with a remarkable accuracy of over 85% (Fo et al., 2023), and have further applied this tool across multiple species, such as yeast (Arulprakasam et al., 2024). Here, we used GPT to perform a relational analysis of the experimental tools and methods commonly used in the study of plant stress, in a bid to create a knowledge network for use in building an AI plant scientist in the future.

A typical research paper comprises several methods that are used to generate data to answer a scientific question. To explore which methods are typically employed in articles that use high throughput data, and which methods tend to be used together, we performed a Large Language Model (LLM)-based analysis of ~2,000 articles associated with the total set of BioProject accessions discussed in the previous section for transcriptomic data, representing all plant stress studies recorded in the SRA (Figure 4A). To this end, we queried both the PubMed Central (PMC) and GEO databases where these BioProject accessions were referenced and obtained PubMed IDs for downloading the relevant research articles. Not all BioProject accessions have an associated PubMed ID, so in total, 2041 articles (1769 full-text, 272 abstract only) were downloaded from a starting list of 4323 unique stress BioProject IDs. Using the OpenAI API, we designed 4 LLM agents to help us parse and categorise the various research methods used in the

plant stress literature (Figure 4B). In our workflow, LLM1 was tasked to recognise and list the various experimental and bioinformatic methods performed in the ‘Methods’ section of our list of full-text articles. As LLMs are prone to hallucinating, we manually checked the accuracy of the LLM output for 50 random papers against their respective texts to ensure that no superfluous terms were listed. This quality control check showed that LLM1 had an accuracy value of 99.3% at its task (Figure 4C). LLM2 and LLM3 were designed to take the output lists and iteratively categorise them into groups and supergroups respectively. Finally, LLM4 was tasked to group the original full-text derived lists into the supergroups obtained by LLM3. Of the 4 LLMs, we adjusted the temperature of LLM1 and LLM4 to 0 to reduce hallucination but provided LLM2 and LLM3 (responsible for supergroup assignment) with a temperature of 0.5 to allow greater flexibility and creativity. In total, LLM1 identified 50,560 experimental approaches (e.g., alignment of protein sequences using MAFFT, Screening of differentially expressed genes using DESeq2), LLM2 combined every 500 approaches into 15-50 groups (e.g., MicroRNA (miRNA) Analysis, Read Quality Control - FASTX), and LLM3 further condensed these groups into 106 supergroups. Finally, LLM4 reclassified the 50,560 approaches into the 106 supergroups.

Finally, in order to plot a knowledge graph of the analyses used in the plant stress literature, we plotted counts of supergroups as nodes, where the size of the node denotes the number of articles each supergroup was found in, and the edge width represents a normalised count for the number of articles in which the two supergroups appear (Figure 5). As we expected, the most common analyses performed across these papers were RNA extraction, RNA-Seq analysis and quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR). These tend to be predominantly performed alongside sample preparation as well as phenotypic data analysis. This reveals a standard methodological pathway for typical transcriptomic studies aiming to investigate gene expression levels. Other analyses that are more specific to individual studies would include metabolite or

protein analysis, phylogenetic analysis, and more in-depth characterization of gene properties and interactions.



**Figure 5. LLM-assisted meta-analysis of methods present in the plant stress literature for transcriptomic studies.** (A) All methods/analyses performed across all full-text articles were categorised under 106 supergroups. These supergroups were connected based on the number of articles in which they appeared together. (B) Some supergroups of interest were extracted to better visualise their connectivity with one another.

This information provides an overview of the various methods commonly and uncommonly used by researchers around the world. Indeed, while scientific methods and protocols are relatively well-described in the literature, the connections between them were previously only known intuitively and passed on from teacher to student by word of mouth. These connections have now been visualised in our graph, which will be valuable in training an AI plant scientist. Such endeavours have been rapidly gaining steam in diverse fields such as agriculture (Potamitis, 2023), finance (Araci, 2019), biomedical research (Cai et al., 2023) and materials chemistry (Zheng et al., 2023), and have proven

effective at rapidly and accurately distilling the scientific literature to its salient points. While we have demonstrated here only the use of LLMs for categorisation in a relatively small subset of the scientific literature, the detection of patterns and trends across these diverse datasets brings out the real strength of using LLMs in such analyses. LLMs can identify emerging trends and repeated patterns within the data, providing a richer understanding of how different plant species react to environmental stresses. Such insights are crucial for evolving strategies to boost plant resistance to environmental challenges and for designing new studies in this domain.

In summary, the review of environmental stress studies across the plant kingdom has greatly benefited from the application of LLMs, NLP and text mining techniques. By efficiently decoding, categorising and summarising data, these powerful tools provide an invaluable contribution to our understanding of plant stress physiology. This, in turn, could accelerate the development of innovative strategies to improve plant resilience amid changing environmental conditions.

## Future

### *Applications of AI in plant stress biology*

Advances in artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) have significantly impacted various fields and have the potential to revolutionise how researchers study plants, improve crop resilience, and address challenges in agriculture and food security (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), 2023).

With the rise of self-supervised deep learning models for DNA and protein sequences, such as ESM-2 (Z. Lin et al., 2023), DNABERT-2 (Z. Zhou et al., 2024) and MSA transformer (Rao et al., 2021), it is possible to extract previously unknown insights on structure, function and evolution of proteins and DNA sequences (reviewed in (Lam et al., 2024)). In these deep learning models, labelled data is not required, and the model self-learns from raw sequences alone the fundamental properties of the input sequence without any further human guidance. ESM-2 itself is trained on the UniRef dataset, and

is primarily trained by masking out certain regions of the protein sequence and training the model to “fill in the gaps” for said masked regions (Z. Lin et al., 2023). This allows the model to fundamentally understand the evolutionary “language” of proteins by inferring amino acid sequence from neighbours, and the model can then be finetuned into specific tasks (Z. Lin et al., 2023). Advances in this field have allowed the accurate gene ontology prediction from protein sequences alone, allowing for elucidation of the three main groupings in gene ontology: biomolecular processes, molecular functions, cellular components. An example of such a tool is NetGO3, which uses the ESM model to provide state-of-the-art predictions into gene ontology (S. Wang et al., 2023). The accurate prediction of GO terms can in turn provide leads that can guide further laboratory validation, in a typical gene function prediction approach (Rhee & Mutwil, 2014). Furthermore, tools such as AlphaFold2 and conformational subsampling can provide structural insights into how proteins related to plant stress bind and interact with each other (del Alamo et al., 2022). In essence, by sampling the multiple sequence alignment inputs into AlphaFold2, it is possible to find out what are the possible conformations of a certain protein and better understand the differing functions in different conformations (del Alamo et al., 2022). The latest work has also enabled the *ab initio* prediction of the three-dimensional structure of ligands embedded in proteins, allowing for *de novo* design of binding molecules and cofactors (Krishna et al., 2024).

AI in biology is growing at a rapid pace, as exemplified by methods that can design proteins with desired properties by diffusion models (Watson et al., 2023) and predict protein-protein interactions (Bryant et al., 2022). These advances are made possible by the increased ease of generating high-throughput data, more powerful and affordable computer hardware and more capable AI/ML methods (reviewed in (Lam et al., 2024)).

#### *High-throughput phenotyping*

High-throughput phenotyping (HTP) in the field allows the breeders to rapidly investigate the potential yield of different cultivars and identification of desired traits such as biotic

and abiotic stress resilience (Hunt et al., 2020). For example, HTP allowed the rapid measurement of plant maturity, seed size, and yield at early stages in 2551 genotypes of soybean (*Glycine max*) (W. Yuan et al., 2019), and identification of desired traits in wheat and barley (Barker et al., 2016; Escalante et al., 2019). AI technologies, particularly ML and computer vision, have been pivotal in automating the process of phenotyping (Ashourloo et al., 2014; K. Lin et al., 2019; Peña et al., 2015; Ramcharan et al., 2019; Raza et al., 2015; Sandhu et al., 2021). High-throughput phenotyping platforms that utilise drone and satellite imagery now employ AI to rapidly analyse plant traits such as growth patterns, stress responses, and disease resistance across large numbers of plants (Gill et al., 2022). ML's greatest success involves inferring trends from the collected data and generalising the results by training models that can e.g., predict consequences of non-ideal environmental conditions and crop yield (van Klompenburg et al., 2020). However, traditional ML approaches require manual definition of relevant features (e.g., definition of specific spectral ranges), a significant effort requiring expertise in computation and image analysis. Fortunately, deep learning (DL) incorporates the benefits of advanced computing power and massive datasets and allows for hierarchical data learning, allowing the models to infer the most relevant features from the data independently (LeCun et al., 2015; S. Min et al., 2017). These approaches will be instrumental in monitoring plant responses and rapidly selecting plants with desired traits (Yağ & Altan, 2022).

#### *Predicting stress resilience and responses from omics data*

Predicting stress resilience that integrates genomic (genotype-to-phenotype (G2P)), transcriptomic, metabolomic and phenomic data could help us understand the molecular basis for stress resilience and engineer more resilient plants. As the variation of complex traits is subject to complex regulatory circuits acting on the level of DNA, RNA, proteins and metabolites (Harfouche et al., 2019), genomic signatures that can underpin stress resilience are often difficult to pinpoint, highlighting a need to improve current G2P methods. Integration of various types of omics data is known to improve the performance

of models. For example, by integrating transcriptomics and metabolomics, yield and phenotypes of maize could be predicted with an increased accuracy (Cruz et al., 2020). Abiotic stress tolerant crop phenotypes were similarly identified by integrating genomics, transcriptomics and proteomics (Jogaiah et al., 2013). Interestingly, a recent study showed that gene expression in combined stresses (e.g., heat and high light) could be predicted with high accuracy by regression approaches (Tan et al., 2023), showing that stress responses can be predicted even in more complex environments.

While integrating various types of data can improve the performance of predictive models, generating and analysing such data is still difficult and out of reach for most researchers. Fortunately, recent advances in computer science and AI have made it possible to perform new types of analyses that can predict gene expression from DNA sequences. Enformer (a portmanteau of enhancer and transformer) was built to predict gene expression and chromatin states in humans and mice from DNA sequences only (Avsec et al., 2021). While this approach has not been applied to plants yet, such an AI model could be used to predict the expression of stress resilience-conferring genes from DNA sequence, thus enabling new means to identify resilient crops. This goal could be also achieved with AI models that can predict the outcomes of genetic perturbations on gene expression. For example, the Geneformer model trained on DNA and scGPT model trained on single cell RNA-sequencing data were able to predict the consequences of genetic perturbations (Theodoris et al., 2023). We envision that such approaches will be increasingly used to perform *in silico* mutational experiments to identify stress-resilient plants.

### **Conclusions and perspectives**

Plant stress research is essential to develop crops that can thrive in more challenging environments. As outlined above, stress responses comprise an intertwined network of hormonal signalling, phosphorylation cascades, redox signalling, calcium signalling, retrograde signalling and phase separation events, eventually leading to gene expression

regulation and other components of biological systems. Biological systems are robust and reproducible despite comprising millions of components interacting in ways that have evolved over billions of years of selection. The resulting systems are marvellously complex and are beyond current human comprehension (Batzoglou, 2023). To be able to model biological systems, we have to resort to simplistic rules that might result in digestible but incomplete narratives. However, rapidly accumulating biological data and more capable AI methods could be used to connect the different types of data and identify unknown and possibly unimaginable patterns in biological data.

The democratisation of AI-assisted tools heralds a revolution in biology and medicine. Previously the domain of specialised professions, LLM-based AI agents such as ChatGPT, Mistral, Claude, Gemini and others have virtually taken over the world in diverse industries from agriculture ([Artificial Intelligence | Syngenta](#)) to zoology ([How AI is decoding the animal kingdom \(ft.com\)](#)) (Love et al., 2024). From decoding the secrets of the plant genome to understanding animal language, LLMs are opening up completely new vistas in previously intractable fields, and the only limits are of our imagination and creativity in finding new problems to solve. The harnessing of this new technological wave promises a significant acceleration of our efforts to understand more about plants and how they respond to diverse stresses across the plant kingdom. These developments have arrived at a critical juncture where humanity is faced with the looming threat of climate change and a rapidly growing population.

The AI approaches often require copious amounts of data that need to be organised and machine-readable. The scarcity and inconsistency of proper annotation within databases like the Sequence Read Archive (SRA) and Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) pose significant challenges for researchers seeking to exploit the abundant wealth of data stored therein. The effectiveness of these databases in facilitating comprehensive meta-analyses is hindered by the lack of standardised and thorough annotations accompanying the datasets (Gonçalves & Musen, 2019). In many instances, essential information such as experimental conditions, plant species and stress types is either

inadequately documented or absent. This inconsistency hampers the ability to precisely categorise and compare studies, resulting in missed opportunities to extract comprehensive insights due to incomplete contextual information. Thus, these databases must prioritise and enforce standardised annotation practices (Brazma et al., 2001; Wilkinson et al., 2016). Improved annotation would enhance the usability of these valuable resources and expedite the progress of scientific inquiry by enabling researchers to extract meaningful patterns and trends from the available data.

Addressing the impending challenges of climate change and global food security demands a concerted and collaborative effort from the global scientific community. Scientists play a crucial role in developing innovative, sustainable and resilient solutions to mitigate the impacts of climate change on agriculture and enhance global food security. Scientists should prioritise research aimed at developing climate-resilient crop varieties, sustainable agricultural practices and efficient water management strategies. Embracing advanced technologies such as precision agriculture, remote sensing, and genetic engineering can contribute to the creation of climate-smart agricultural systems. Facilitating knowledge exchange and collaboration between scientists across borders is essential. Building the capacity of researchers, especially in developing countries, can empower local communities to adapt to changing climate conditions and implement sustainable agricultural practices. This can be achieved through international partnerships, collaborative projects and open-access sharing of research findings.

The widening gap between richer and poorer countries in their ability to address climate change and food security requires a collective commitment to global equity. International collaborations, technology transfer and fair distribution of resources can contribute to narrowing this gap, ensuring that vulnerable populations have the means to adapt to changing climates and secure their food supply. As scientists contribute their expertise and advocate for inclusive policies, they play a pivotal role in fostering a more sustainable and equitable future for global food security.

## References

- Allan, A. C., & Fluhr, R. (1997). Two Distinct Sources of Elicited Reactive Oxygen Species in Tobacco Epidermal Cells. *The Plant Cell*, 9(9), 1559–1572.  
<https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.9.9.1559>
- Alonso-Blanco, C., Andrade, J., Becker, C., Bemm, F., Bergelson, J., Borgwardt, K. M., Cao, J., Chae, E., Dezwaan, T. M., & Ding, W. (2016). 1,135 genomes reveal the global pattern of polymorphism in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Cell*, 166(2), 481–491.
- An, C., & Mou, Z. (2011). Salicylic Acid and its Function in Plant Immunity. *Journal of Integrative Plant Biology*, 53(6), 412–428. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7909.2011.01043.x>
- Araci, D. (2019). Finbert: Financial sentiment analysis with pre-trained language models. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:1908.10063*.
- Arulprakasam, K. R., Toh, J. W. S., Foo, H., Kumar, M. R., Kutevska, A.-N., Davey, E. E., Mutwil, M., & Thibault, G. (2024). Harnessing full-text publications for deep insights into *C. elegans* and *Drosophila* connectomes (p. 2024.04.13.588993). bioRxiv.  
<https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.13.588993>
- Asada, K. (1999). THE WATER-WATER CYCLE IN CHLOROPLASTS: Scavenging of Active Oxygens and Dissipation of Excess Photons. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology*, 50, 601–639. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.arplant.50.1.601>
- Asada, K. (2000). The Water-Water Cycle as Alternative Photon and Electron Sinks. *Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences*, 355(1402), 1419–1431.
- Asada, K. (2006). Production and scavenging of reactive oxygen species in chloroplasts and their functions. *Plant Physiology*, 141(2), 391–396.  
<https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.106.082040>

- Asai, T., Tena, G., Plotnikova, J., Willmann, M. R., Chiu, W.-L., Gomez-Gomez, L., Boller, T., Ausubel, F. M., & Sheen, J. (2002). MAP kinase signalling cascade in *Arabidopsis* innate immunity. *Nature*, 415(6875), 977–983. <https://doi.org/10.1038/415977a>
- Ashourloo, D., Mobasher, M. R., & Huete, A. (2014). Evaluating the Effect of Different Wheat Rust Disease Symptoms on Vegetation Indices Using Hyperspectral Measurements. *Remote Sensing*, 6(6), Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs6065107>
- Austin, R. S., Hiu, S., Waese, J., Ierullo, M., Pasha, A., Wang, T. T., Fan, J., Foong, C., Breit, R., Desveaux, D., Moses, A., & Provart, N. J. (2016). New BAR tools for mining expression data and exploring Cis-elements in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *The Plant Journal: For Cell and Molecular Biology*, 88(3), 490–504. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tpj.13261>
- Avramova, Z. (2015). Transcriptional “memory” of a stress: Transient chromatin and memory (epigenetic) marks at stress-response genes. *The Plant Journal: For Cell and Molecular Biology*, 83(1), 149–159. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tpj.12832>
- Avsec, Ž., Agarwal, V., Visentin, D., Ledsam, J. R., Grabska-Barwinska, A., Taylor, K. R., Assael, Y., Jumper, J., Kohli, P., & Kelley, D. R. (2021). Effective gene expression prediction from sequence by integrating long-range interactions. *Nature Methods*, 18(10), 1196–1203. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-021-01252-x>
- Balazs, E., & Lebeurier, G. (1981). *Arabidopsis* is a host of cauliflower mosaic virus. *Arabidopsis Inf. Serv*, 18, 130–134.
- Balint-Kurti, P. (2019). The plant hypersensitive response: Concepts, control and consequences. *Molecular Plant Pathology*, 20(8), 1163–1178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mpp.12821>
- Banani, S. F., Lee, H. O., Hyman, A. A., & Rosen, M. K. (2017). Biomolecular condensates:

Organizers of cellular biochemistry. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology*, 18(5), 285–298. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm.2017.7>

- Barker, J., Zhang, N., Sharon, J., Steeves, R., Wang, X., Wei, Y., & Poland, J. (2016). Development of a field-based high-throughput mobile phenotyping platform. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 122, 74–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2016.01.017>
- Barnes, P. W., Robson, T. M., Zepp, R. G., Bornman, J. F., Jansen, M. A. K., Ossola, R., Wang, Q.-W., Robinson, S. A., Foereid, B., Klekociuk, A. R., Martinez-Abaigar, J., Hou, W.-C., Mackenzie, R., & Paul, N. D. (2023). Interactive effects of changes in UV radiation and climate on terrestrial ecosystems, biogeochemical cycles, and feedbacks to the climate system. *Photochemical & Photobiological Sciences*, 22(5), 1049–1091. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43630-023-00376-7>
- Batzoglou, S. (2023, June 2). *Large Language Models in Molecular Biology*. Medium. <https://towardsdatascience.com/large-language-models-in-molecular-biology-9eb6b65d8a30>
- Bent, A. F., Kunkel, B. N., Dahlbeck, D., Brown, K. L., Schmidt, R., Giraudat, J., Leung, J., & Staskawicz, B. J. (1994). RPS2 of *Arabidopsis thaliana*: A Leucine-Rich Repeat Class of Plant Disease Resistance Genes. *Science*, 265(5180), 1856–1860. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.8091210>
- Berry, S., & Dean, C. (2015). Environmental perception and epigenetic memory: Mechanistic insight through FLC. *The Plant Journal: For Cell and Molecular Biology*, 83(1), 133–148. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tpj.12869>
- Binder, B. M. (2020). Ethylene signaling in plants. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 295(22), 7710–7725. <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.REV120.010854>

- Bradford, K. J., & Yang, S. F. (1980). Xylem Transport of 1-Aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic Acid, an Ethylene Precursor, in Waterlogged Tomato Plants 1. *Plant Physiology*, 65(2), 322–326.
- Brazma, A., Hingamp, P., Quackenbush, J., Sherlock, G., Spellman, P., Stoeckert, C., Aach, J., Ansorge, W., Ball, C. A., Causton, H. C., Gaasterland, T., Glenisson, P., Holstege, F. C. P., Kim, I. F., Markowitz, V., Matese, J. C., Parkinson, H., Robinson, A., Sarkans, U., ... Vingron, M. (2001). Minimum information about a microarray experiment (MIAME)—Toward standards for microarray data. *Nature Genetics*, 29(4), 365–371.  
<https://doi.org/10.1038/ng1201-365>
- Bryant, P., Pozzati, G., Zhu, W., Shenoy, A., Kundrotas, P., & Elofsson, A. (2022). Predicting the structure of large protein complexes using AlphaFold and Monte Carlo tree search. *Nature Communications*, 13(1), 6028. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-33729-4>
- Burg, S. P., & Burg, E. A. (1962). Role of ethylene in fruit ripening. *Plant Physiology*, 37(2), 179.
- Cai, X., Geng, Y., Du, Y., Westerman, B., Wang, D., Ma, C., & Vallejo, J. J. G. (2023). Utilizing ChatGPT to select literature for meta-analysis shows workload reduction while maintaining a similar recall level as manual curation. *medRxiv*, 2023–09.
- Caldana, C., Li, Y., Leisse, A., Zhang, Y., Bartholomaeus, L., Fernie, A. R., Willmitzer, L., & Giavalisco, P. (2013). Systemic analysis of inducible target of rapamycin mutants reveal a general metabolic switch controlling growth in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *The Plant Journal: For Cell and Molecular Biology*, 73(6), 897–909. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tpj.12080>
- Cantó-Pastor, A., Mason, G. A., Brady, S. M., & Provart, N. J. (2021). Arabidopsis bioinformatics: Tools and strategies. *The Plant Journal: For Cell and Molecular Biology*, 108(6), 1585–1596. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tpj.15547>

- Cao, H., Bowling, S. A., Gordon, A. S., & Dong, X. (1994). Characterization of an Arabidopsis Mutant That Is Nonresponsive to Inducers of Systemic Acquired Resistance. *The Plant Cell*, 6(11), 1583–1592. <https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.6.11.1583>
- Charng, Y. Y., Mitra, S., & Yu, S. J. (2023). Maintenance of abiotic stress memory in plants: Lessons learned from heat acclimation. *Plant Cell*, 35(1), 187–200. <https://doi.org/10.1093/plcell/koac313>
- Chodasiewicz, M., Sokolowska, E. M., Nelson-Dittrich, A. C., Masiuk, A., Beltran, J. C. M., Nelson, A. D., & Skirycz, A. (2020). Identification and characterization of the heat-induced plastidial stress granules reveal new insight into Arabidopsis stress response. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 11, 595792.
- Conrath, U. (2011). Molecular aspects of defence priming. *Trends in Plant Science*, 16(10), 524–531.
- Cooke, M. S., Evans, M. D., Dizdaroglu, M., & Lunec, J. (2003). Oxidative DNA damage: Mechanisms, mutation, and disease. *The FASEB Journal*, 17(10), 1195–1214.
- Crisp, P. A., Ganguly, D., Eichten, S. R., Borevitz, J. O., & Pogson, B. J. (2016). Reconsidering plant memory: Intersections between stress recovery, RNA turnover, and epigenetics. *Science Advances*, 2(2), e1501340. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1501340>
- Cruz, D. F., De Meyer, S., Ampe, J., Sprenger, H., Herman, D., Van Hautegem, T., De Block, J., Inzé, D., Nelissen, H., & Maere, S. (2020). Using single-plant-omics in the field to link maize genes to functions and phenotypes. *Molecular Systems Biology*, 16(12), Article 12. <https://doi.org/10.15252/msb.20209667>
- Cvetkovska, M., & Vanlerberghe, G. C. (2012). Coordination of a mitochondrial superoxide burst during the hypersensitive response to bacterial pathogen in Nicotiana tabacum. *Plant*,

*Cell & Environment*, 35(6), 1121–1136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.2011.02477.x>

Debener, T., Lehnackers, H., Arnold, M., & Dangl, J. L. (1991). Identification and molecular mapping of a single *Arabidopsis thaliana* locus determining resistance to a phytopathogenic *Pseudomonas syringae* isolate. *The Plant Journal: For Cell and Molecular Biology*, 1(3), 289–302. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-313X.1991.t01-7-00999.x>

del Alamo, D., Sala, D., Mchaourab, H. S., & Meiler, J. (2022). Sampling alternative conformational states of transporters and receptors with AlphaFold2. *eLife*, 11, e75751. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.75751>

Deprost, D., Yao, L., Sormani, R., Moreau, M., Leterreux, G., Nicolaï, M., Bedu, M., Robaglia, C., & Meyer, C. (2007). The *Arabidopsis* TOR kinase links plant growth, yield, stress resistance and mRNA translation. *EMBO Reports*, 8(9), 864–870. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.embor.7401043>

Dewdney, J., Reuber, T. L., Wildermuth, M. C., Devoto, A., Cui, J., Stutius, L. M., Drummond, E. P., & Ausubel, F. M. (2000). Three unique mutants of *Arabidopsis* identify eds loci required for limiting growth of a biotrophic fungal pathogen. *The Plant Journal: For Cell and Molecular Biology*, 24(2), 205–218. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-313x.2000.00870.x>

Dickman, M., Williams, B., Li, Y., de Figueiredo, P., & Wolpert, T. (2017). Reassessing apoptosis in plants. *Nature Plants*, 3(10), 773–779.

Dogra, V., Li, M., Singh, S., Li, M., & Kim, C. (2019). Oxidative post-translational modification of EXECUTER1 is required for singlet oxygen sensing in plastids. *Nature Communications*,

10(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-10760-6>

Dong, P., Xiong, F., Que, Y., Wang, K., Yu, L., Li, Z., & Ren, M. (2015). Expression profiling and functional analysis reveals that TOR is a key player in regulating photosynthesis and phytohormone signaling pathways in *Arabidopsis*. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 6, 677.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2015.00677>

Dong, S., Lau, V., Song, R., Ierullo, M., Esteban, E., Wu, Y., Sivieng, T., Nahal, H., Gaudinier, A., Pasha, A., Oughtred, R., Dolinski, K., Tyers, M., Brady, S. M., Grene, R., Usadel, B., & Provart, N. J. (2019). Proteome-wide, Structure-Based Prediction of Protein-Protein Interactions/New Molecular Interactions Viewer. *Plant Physiology*, 179(4), 1893–1907.  
<https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.18.01216>

Dourmap, C., Roque, S., Morin, A., Caubrière, D., Kerdiles, M., Béguin, K., Perdoux, R., Reynoud, N., Bourdet, L., Audebert, P.-A., Moullec, J. L., & Couée, I. (2020). Stress signalling dynamics of the mitochondrial electron transport chain and oxidative phosphorylation system in higher plants. *Annals of Botany*, 125(5), 721–736.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcz184>

Edgar, R. (2002). Gene Expression Omnibus: NCBI gene expression and hybridization array data repository. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 30(1), 207–210.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/30.1.207>

Elstner, E. F., & Osswald, W. (1994). Mechanisms of oxygen activation during plant stress. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Section B: Biological Sciences*, 102, 131–154. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0269727000014068>

Emenecker, R. J., Holehouse, A. S., & Strader, L. C. (2020). Emerging Roles for Phase Separation in Plants. *Developmental Cell*, 55(1), 69–83.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.devcel.2020.09.010>

Emenecker, R. J., Holehouse, A. S., & Strader, L. C. (2021). Biological Phase Separation and Biomolecular Condensates in Plants. *Annual Review of Plant Biology*, 72, 17–46.

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-081720-015238>

Escalante, H. J., Rodríguez-Sánchez, S., Jiménez-Lizárraga, M., Morales-Reyes, A., De La Calleja, J., & Vazquez, R. (2019). Barley yield and fertilization analysis from UAV imagery: A deep learning approach. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 40(7), 2493–2516. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01431161.2019.1577571>

Fare, C. M., Villani, A., Drake, L. E., & Shorter, J. (2021). Higher-order organization of biomolecular condensates. *Open Biology*, 11(6), 210137.

Fichman, Y., Miller, G., & Mittler, R. (2019). Whole-Plant Live Imaging of Reactive Oxygen Species. *Molecular Plant*, 12(9), 1203–1210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molp.2019.06.003>

Fichman, Y., Rowland, L., Oliver, M. J., & Mittler, R. (2023). ROS are evolutionary conserved cell-to-cell stress signals. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(31), e2305496120. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2305496120>

Flor, H. (1947). *Inheritance of reaction to rust in flax*.

Fo, K., Chuah, Y. S., Foo, H., Davey, E. E., Fullwood, M., Thibault, G., & Mutwil, M. (2023). *PlantConnectome: Knowledge networks encompassing >100,000 plant article abstracts* (p. 2023.07.11.548541). bioRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.11.548541>

Foyer, C. H., & Halliwell, B. (1976). The presence of glutathione and glutathione reductase in chloroplasts: A proposed role in ascorbic acid metabolism. *Planta*, 133(1), 21–25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00386001>

Fu, L., Wang, P., & Xiong, Y. (2020). Target of Rapamycin Signaling in Plant Stress

Responses1[OPEN]. *Plant Physiology*, 182(4), 1613–1623.

<https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.19.01214>

Fujii, H., & Zhu, J.-K. (2009). Arabidopsis mutant deficient in 3 abscisic acid-activated protein

kinases reveals critical roles in growth, reproduction, and stress. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(20), 8380–8385.

<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0903144106>

Fujita, M., Fujita, Y., Noutoshi, Y., Takahashi, F., Narusaka, Y., Yamaguchi-Shinozaki, K., &

Shinozaki, K. (2006). Crosstalk between abiotic and biotic stress responses: A current view from the points of convergence in the stress signaling networks. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*, 9(4), 436–442. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2006.05.014>

Gill, T., Gill, S. K., Saini, D. K., Chopra, Y., de Koff, J. P., & Sandhu, K. S. (2022). A

Comprehensive Review of High Throughput Phenotyping and Machine Learning for Plant Stress Phenotyping. *Phenomics*, 2(3), 156–183. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43657-022-00048-z>

Gómez-Gómez, L., & Boller, T. (2000). FLS2: An LRR receptor-like kinase involved in the

perception of the bacterial elicitor flagellin in Arabidopsis. *Molecular Cell*, 5(6), 1003–1011. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1097-2765\(00\)80265-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1097-2765(00)80265-8)

Gonçalves, R. S., & Musen, M. A. (2019). The variable quality of metadata about biological

samples used in biomedical experiments. *Scientific Data*, 6(1), 190021.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2019.21>

Gopalan, S., Bauer, D. W., Alfano, J. R., Loniello, A. O., He, S. Y., & Collmer, A. (1996).

Expression of the *Pseudomonas syringae* avirulence protein AvrB in plant cells alleviates its dependence on the hypersensitive response and pathogenicity (Hrp)

- secretion system in eliciting genotype-specific hypersensitive cell death. *The Plant Cell*, 8(7), 1095–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.8.7.1095>
- Grant, M. R., & Jones, J. D. G. (2009). Hormone (dis)harmony moulds plant health and disease. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 324(5928), 750–752. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1173771>
- Griffin, J., & Jung, G. (2019). *Yield and forage quality of Panicum virgatum*. 491–494.
- Halliwell, B., & Gutteridge, J. M. C. (2015). *Free Radicals in Biology and Medicine*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198717478.001.0001>
- Ham, B.-K., & Lucas, W. J. (2017). Phloem-Mobile RNAs as Systemic Signaling Agents. *Annual Review of Plant Biology*, 68, 173–195. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-applant-042916-041139>
- Harfouche, A. L., Jacobson, D. A., Kainer, D., Romero, J. C., Harfouche, A. H., Mugnozza, G. S., Moshelion, M., Tuskan, G. A., Keurentjes, J. J. B., & Altman, A. (2019). Accelerating Climate Resilient Plant Breeding by Applying Next-Generation Artificial Intelligence. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 37(11), 1217–1235.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2019.05.007>
- Heath, M. C. (1998). Apoptosis, programmed cell death and the hypersensitive response. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*, 104(2), 117–124.  
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008645520976>
- Herman, J. J., & Sultan, S. E. (2011). Adaptive Transgenerational Plasticity in Plants: Case Studies, Mechanisms, and Implications for Natural Populations. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 2, 102. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2011.00102>
- Hirayama, T., & Shinozaki, K. (2007). Perception and transduction of abscisic acid signals: Keys to the function of the versatile plant hormone ABA. *Trends in Plant Science*, 12(8), 343–

351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2007.06.013>

Hooper, C. M., Castleden, I. R., Tanz, S. K., Aryamanesh, N., & Millar, A. H. (2017). SUBA4: The interactive data analysis centre for Arabidopsis subcellular protein locations. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 45(D1), D1064–D1074. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkw1041>

Hsu, P. Y., & Benfey, P. N. (2018). Small but mighty: Functional peptides encoded by small ORFs in plants. *Proteomics*, 18(10), 1700038.

Hu, X.-L., Lu, H., Hassan, M. M., Zhang, J., Yuan, G., Abraham, P. E., Shrestha, H. K., Villalobos Solis, M. I., Chen, J.-G., Tschaplinski, T. J., Doktycz, M. J., Tuskan, G. A., Cheng, Z.-M. M., & Yang, X. (2021). Advances and perspectives in discovery and functional analysis of small secreted proteins in plants. *Horticulture Research*, 8(1), 130. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41438-021-00570-7>

Huang, X., Xiao, N., Zou, Y., Xie, Y., Tang, L., Zhang, Y., Yu, Y., Li, Y., & Xu, C. (2022). Heterotypic transcriptional condensates formed by prion-like paralogous proteins canalize flowering transition in tomato. *Genome Biology*, 23, 78. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-022-02646-6>

Hunt, C. H., Hayes, B. J., van Eeuwijk, F. A., Mace, E. S., & Jordan, D. R. (2020). Multi-environment analysis of sorghum breeding trials using additive and dominance genomic relationships. *TAG. Theoretical and Applied Genetics. Theoretische Und Angewandte Genetik*, 133(3), 1009–1018. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00122-019-03526-7>

Hyman, A. A., Weber, C. A., & Jülicher, F. (2014). Liquid-liquid phase separation in biology. *Annual Review of Cell and Developmental Biology*, 30, 39–58. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-cellbio-100913-013325>

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (Ed.). (2023). Technical Summary. In

*Climate Change 2022 – Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability: Working Group II Contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (pp. 37–118). Cambridge University Press; Cambridge Core.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009325844.002>

Ito, H., Gaubert, H., Bucher, E., Mirouze, M., Vaillant, I., & Paszkowski, J. (2011). An siRNA pathway prevents transgenerational retrotransposition in plants subjected to stress.

*Nature*, 472(7341), 115–119. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09861>

Jogaiah, S., Govind, S. R., & Tran, L.-S. P. (2013). Systems biology-based approaches toward understanding drought tolerance in food crops. *Critical Reviews in Biotechnology*, 33(1), 23–39. <https://doi.org/10.3109/07388551.2012.659174>

Jones, J. D. G., & Dangl, J. L. (2006). The plant immune system. *Nature*, 444(7117), Article 7117. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05286>

Julca, I., Tan, Q. W., & Mutwil, M. (2023). Toward kingdom-wide analyses of gene expression. *Trends in Plant Science*, 28(2), 235–249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2022.09.007>

Jumper, J., Evans, R., Pritzel, A., Green, T., Figurnov, M., Ronneberger, O., Tunyasuvunakool, K., Bates, R., Žídek, A., Potapenko, A., Bridgland, A., Meyer, C., Kohl, S. A. A., Ballard, A. J., Cowie, A., Romera-Paredes, B., Nikolov, S., Jain, R., Adler, J., ... Hassabis, D. (2021). Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature*, 596(7873), 583–589. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03819-2>

Jung, J.-H., Barbosa, A. D., Hutin, S., Kumita, J. R., Gao, M., Derwort, D., Silva, C. S., Lai, X., Pierre, E., & Geng, F. (2020). A prion-like domain in ELF3 functions as a thermosensor in Arabidopsis. *Nature*, 585(7824), 256–260.

Kagan, V. E., Bayir, H. A., Belikova, N. A., Kapralov, O., Tyurina, Y. Y., Tyurin, V. A., Jiang, J.,

- Stoyanovsky, D. A., Wipf, P., Kochanek, P. M., Greenberger, J. S., Pitt, B., Shvedova, A. A., & Borisenko, G. (2009). Cytochrome c/cardiolipin relations in mitochondria: A kiss of death. *Free Radical Biology & Medicine*, 46(11), 1439–1453.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.freeradbiomed.2009.03.004>
- Kalinina, N. O., Makarova, S., Makhotenko, A., Love, A. J., & Taliantsky, M. (2018). The Multiple Functions of the Nucleolus in Plant Development, Disease and Stress Responses. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 9. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/plant-science/articles/10.3389/fpls.2018.00132>
- Kawakatsu, T., Huang, S.-S. C., Jupe, F., Sasaki, E., Schmitz, R. J., Urich, M. A., Castanon, R., Nery, J. R., Barragan, C., He, Y., Chen, H., Dubin, M., Lee, C.-R., Wang, C., Bemm, F., Becker, C., O'Neil, R., O'Malley, R. C., Quarless, D. X., ... Ecker, J. R. (2016). Epigenomic Diversity in a Global Collection of *Arabidopsis thaliana* Accessions. *Cell*, 166(2), 492–505. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2016.06.044>
- Kearly, A., Nelson, A. D. L., Skirycz, A., & Chodasiewicz, M. (2024). Composition and function of stress granules and P-bodies in plants. *Seminars in Cell & Developmental Biology*, 156, 167–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semcdcb.2022.11.008>
- Keen, N. T. (1990). Gene-for-gene complementarity in plant-pathogen interactions. *Annual Review of Genetics*, 24, 447–463. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ge.24.120190.002311>
- Kersey, P. J., Allen, J. E., Allot, A., Barba, M., Boddu, S., Bolt, B. J., Carvalho-Silva, D., Christensen, M., Davis, P., Grabmueller, C., Kumar, N., Liu, Z., Maurel, T., Moore, B., McDowall, M. D., Maheswari, U., Naamati, G., Newman, V., Ong, C. K., ... Yates, A. (2018). Ensembl Genomes 2018: An integrated omics infrastructure for non-vertebrate species. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 46(D1), D802–D808.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkx1011>

Koh, E., Brandis, A., & Fluhr, R. (2022). Plastid and cytoplasmic origins of 1O<sub>2</sub>-mediated transcriptomic responses. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 13, 982610.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2022.982610>

Koh, E., Cohen, D., Brandis, A., & Fluhr, R. (2021). Attenuation of cytosolic translation by RNA oxidation is involved in singlet oxygen-mediated transcriptomic responses. *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 44(11), 3597–3615. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.14162>

Kollmann, R., Dörr, I., & Kleinig, H. (1970). Protein filaments-structural components of the phloem exudate: I. Observations with Cucurbita and Nicotiana. *Planta*, 95(1), 86–94.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00431123>

Kooke, R., Johannes, F., Wardenaar, R., Becker, F., Etcheverry, M., Colot, V., Vreugdenhil, D., & Keurentjes, J. J. B. (2015). Epigenetic basis of morphological variation and phenotypic plasticity in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *The Plant Cell*, 27(2), 337–348.

<https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.114.133025>

Kosmacz, M., Gorka, M., Schmidt, S., Luzarowski, M., Moreno, J. C., Szlachetko, J., Leniak, E., Sokolowska, E. M., Sofroni, K., Schnittger, A., & Skirycz, A. (2019). Protein and metabolite composition of *Arabidopsis* stress granules. *New Phytologist*, 222(3), 1420–1433. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.15690>

Krishna, R., Wang, J., Ahern, W., Sturmels, P., Venkatesh, P., Kalvet, I., Lee, G. R., Morey-Burrows, F. S., Anishchenko, I., Humphreys, I. R., McHugh, R., Vafeados, D., Li, X., Sutherland, G. A., Hitchcock, A., Hunter, C. N., Kang, A., Brackenbrough, E., Bera, A. K., ... Baker, D. (2024). Generalized biomolecular modeling and design with RoseTTAFold All-Atom. *Science*, 384(6693), eadl2528.

<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adl2528>

- Ku, Y.-S., Sintaha, M., Cheung, M.-Y., & Lam, H.-M. (2018). Plant Hormone Signaling Crosstalks between Biotic and Abiotic Stress Responses. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 19(10), Article 10. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms19103206>
- Lacombe, B., & Achard, P. (2016). Long-distance transport of phytohormones through the plant vascular system. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*, 34, 1–8.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2016.06.007>
- Lam, H. Y. I., Ong, X. E., & Mutwil, M. (2024). Large Language Models in Plant Biology. *ArXiv*, *abs/2401.02789*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:266818259>
- LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. *Nature*, 521(7553), Article 7553.  
<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14539>
- Leinonen, R., Sugawara, H., & Shumway, M. (2011). The sequence read archive. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 39(SUPPL. 1). <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkq1019>
- Leister, R. T., Ausubel, F. M., & Katagiri, F. (1996). Molecular recognition of pathogen attack occurs inside of plant cells in plant disease resistance specified by the Arabidopsis genes RPS2 and RPM1. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 93(26), 15497–15502. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.93.26.15497>
- Li, P., Zang, W., Li, Y., Xu, F., Wang, J., & Shi, T. (2011). AtPID: The overall hierarchical functional protein interaction network interface and analytic platform for arabidopsis. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 39(SUPPL. 1), D1130-3. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkq959>
- Lin, K., Gong, L., Huang, Y., Liu, C., & Pan, J. (2019). Deep Learning-Based Segmentation and Quantification of Cucumber Powdery Mildew Using Convolutional Neural Network. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 10, 155. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2019.00155>

- Lin, Z., Akin, H., Rao, R., Hie, B., Zhu, Z., Lu, W., Smetanin, N., Verkuil, R., Kabeli, O., Shmueli, Y., dos Santos Costa, A., Fazel-Zarandi, M., Sercu, T., Candido, S., & Rives, A. (2023). Evolutionary-scale prediction of atomic-level protein structure with a language model. *Science*, 379(6637), 1123–1130. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adc2574>
- Lin, Z., Li, Y., Zhang, Z., Liu, X., Hsu, C.-C., Du, Y., Sang, T., Zhu, C., Wang, Y., Satheesh, V., Pratibha, P., Zhao, Y., Song, C.-P., Tao, W. A., Zhu, J.-K., & Wang, P. (2020). A RAF-SnRK2 kinase cascade mediates early osmotic stress signaling in higher plants. *Nature Communications*, 11(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-14477-9>
- Lindberg, S., Kader, M. A., & Yemelyanov, V. (2012). Calcium signalling in plant cells under environmental stress. *Environmental Adaptations and Stress Tolerance of Plants in the Era of Climate Change*, 325–360.
- Liu, Q., Liu, P., Ji, T., Zheng, L., Shen, C., Ran, S., Liu, J., Zhao, Y., Niu, Y., Wang, T., & Dong, J. (2022). The histone methyltransferase SUVR2 promotes DSB repair via chromatin remodeling and liquid–liquid phase separation. *Molecular Plant*, 15(7), 1157–1175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molp.2022.05.007>
- Liu, Q., Liu, W., Niu, Y., Wang, T., & Dong, J. (2023). Liquid–liquid phase separation in plants: Advances and perspectives from model species to crops. *Plant Communications*.
- Londoño Vélez, V., Alquraish, F., Tarbiyyah, I., Rafique, F., Mao, D., & Chodasiewicz, M. (2022). Landscape of biomolecular condensates in heat stress responses. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2022.1032045>
- Lorenzo, O., & Solano, R. (2005). Molecular players regulating the jasmonate signalling network. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*, 8(5), 532–540. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2005.07.003>

- Love, P., Arenas, I. de la T., Learner, S., & London, S. J. in. (2024, January 18). *How AI is decoding the animal kingdom*. <https://ig.ft.com/ai-animals/>
- Luan, S., & Wang, C. (2021). Calcium Signaling Mechanisms Across Kingdoms. *Annual Review of Cell and Developmental Biology*, 37, 311–340. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-cellbio-120219-035210>
- Luo, Y.-Y., Wu, J.-J., & Li, Y.-M. (2021). Regulation of liquid–liquid phase separation with focus on post-translational modifications. *Chemical Communications*, 57(98), 13275–13287.
- Ma, X., Denyer, T., & Timmermans, M. C. (2020). PscB: a browser to explore plant single cell RNA-sequencing data sets. *Plant Physiology*, 183(2), 464–467.
- Ma, Y., Szostkiewicz, I., & Korte, A. (2009). Regulators of PP2C phosphatase activity function as abscisic acid sensors. *Science*, 324(5930), 1064–1068.  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1172408>
- Maruri-Lopez, I., & Chodasiewicz, M. (2023). Involvement of small molecules and metabolites in regulation of biomolecular condensate properties. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*, 74, 102385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2023.102385>
- Matsumura, M., Nomoto, M., Itaya, T., Aratani, Y., Iwamoto, M., Matsuura, T., Hayashi, Y., Mori, T., Skelly, M. J., & Yamamoto, Y. Y. (2022). Mechanosensory trichome cells evoke a mechanical stimuli–induced immune response in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Nature Communications*, 13(1), 1216.
- McSteen, P., & Zhao, Y. (2008). Plant hormones and signaling: Common themes and new developments. *Developmental Cell*, 14(4), 467–473.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.devcel.2008.03.013>
- Mi, H., Dong, Q., Muruganujan, A., Gaudet, P., Lewis, S., & Thomas, P. D. (2010). PANTHER

version 7: Improved phylogenetic trees, orthologs and collaboration with the Gene Ontology Consortium. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 38(Database issue), D204-210.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkp1019>

Miller, G., Schlauch, K., Tam, R., Cortes, D., Torres, M. A., Shulaev, V., Dangl, J. L., & Mittler, R. (2009). The plant NADPH oxidase RBOHD mediates rapid systemic signaling in response to diverse stimuli. *Science Signaling*, 2(84), ra45.  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/scisignal.2000448>

Min, M. K., Choi, E.-H., Kim, J.-A., Yoon, I. S., Han, S., Lee, Y., Lee, S., & Kim, B.-G. (2019). Two clade a phosphatase 2Cs expressed in guard cells physically interact with abscisic acid signaling components to induce stomatal closure in rice. *Rice*, 12, 1–13.

Min, S., Lee, B., & Yoon, S. (2017). Deep learning in bioinformatics. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 18(5), 851–869. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbw068>

Mindrinos, M., Katagiri, F., Yu, G. L., & Ausubel, F. M. (1994). The *A. thaliana* disease resistance gene RPS2 encodes a protein containing a nucleotide-binding site and leucine-rich repeats. *Cell*, 78(6), 1089–1099. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-8674\(94\)90282-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-8674(94)90282-8)

Mittler, R., & Blumwald, E. (2015). The roles of ROS and ABA in systemic acquired acclimation. *The Plant Cell*, 27(1), 64–70. <https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.114.133090>

Mittler, R., Zandalinas, S. I., Fichman, Y., & Van Breusegem, F. (2022). Reactive oxygen species signalling in plant stress responses. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology*, 23(10), Article 10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41580-022-00499-2>

Miya, A., Albert, P., Shinya, T., Desaki, Y., Ichimura, K., Shirasu, K., Narusaka, Y., Kawakami, N., Kaku, H., & Shibuya, N. (2007). CERK1, a LysM receptor kinase, is essential for

- chitin elicitor signaling in Arabidopsis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(49), 19613–19618. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0705147104>
- Mou, Z., Fan, W., & Dong, X. (2003). Inducers of plant systemic acquired resistance regulate NPR1 function through redox changes. *Cell*, 113(7), 935–944.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/s0092-8674\(03\)00429-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0092-8674(03)00429-x)
- Narasimhan, M., & Simon, R. (2022). Spatial range, temporal span, and promiscuity of CLE-RLK signaling. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 13. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/plant-science/articles/10.3389/fpls.2022.906087>
- Nelson, A. D. L., Haug-Batzell, A. K., Davey, S., Gregory, B. D., & Lyons, E. (2018). EPIC-CoGe: Managing and analyzing genomic data. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*, 34(15), 2651–2653. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty106>
- Nishi, H., Shaytan, A., & Panchenko, A. R. (2014). Physicochemical mechanisms of protein regulation by phosphorylation. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 5.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2014.00270>
- Nishimura, M. T., & Dangl, J. L. (2010). Arabidopsis and the Plant Immune System. *The Plant Journal : For Cell and Molecular Biology*, 61(6), 1053–1066.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-313X.2010.04131.x>
- Obayashi, T., Aoki, Y., Tadaka, S., Kagaya, Y., & Kinoshita, K. (2018). ATTED-II in 2018: A Plant Coexpression Database Based on Investigation of the Statistical Property of the Mutual Rank Index. *Plant & Cell Physiology*, 59(1), e3.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/pcp/pcx191>
- Park, C. J., Caddell, D. F., & Ronald, P. C. (2012). Protein phosphorylation in plant immunity: Insights into the regulation of pattern recognition receptor-mediated signaling. *Frontiers*

*in Plant Science*, 3, 29384.

- Park, S.-Y., Fung, P., Nishimura, N., Jensen, D. R., Fujii, H., Zhao, Y., Lumba, S., Santiago, J., Rodrigues, A., & Chow, T. F. (2009). Abscisic acid inhibits type 2C protein phosphatases via the PYR/PYL family of START proteins. *Science*, 324(5930), 1068–1071.
- Patrick, S. (2022). *To Prevent the Collapse of Biodiversity, the World Needs a New Planetary Politics*.
- Pearce, G., Strydom, D., Johnson, S., & Ryan, C. A. (1991). A polypeptide from tomato leaves induces wound-inducible proteinase inhibitor proteins. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 253(5022), 895–897. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.253.5022.895>
- Peña, J. M., Torres-Sánchez, J., Serrano-Pérez, A., de Castro, A. I., & López-Granados, F. (2015). Quantifying efficacy and limits of unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) technology for weed seedling detection as affected by sensor resolution. *Sensors (Basel, Switzerland)*, 15(3), 5609–5626. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s150305609>
- Petersen, O. H., Michalak, M., & Verkhratsky, A. (2005). Calcium signalling: Past, present and future. *Cell Calcium*, 38(3–4), 161–169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ceca.2005.06.023>
- Pieterse, C. M. J., Leon-Reyes, A., Van der Ent, S., & Van Wees, S. C. M. (2009). Networking by small-molecule hormones in plant immunity. *Nature Chemical Biology*, 5(5), Article 5. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nchembio.164>
- Potamitis, I. (2023). ChatGPT in the context of precision agriculture data analytics. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2311.06390*.
- Proost, S., & Mutwil, M. (2018). CoNekT: An open-source framework for comparative genomic and transcriptomic network analyses. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 46(W1), W133–W140. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gky336>

- Ramcharan, A., McCloskey, P., Baranowski, K., Mbilinyi, N., Mrisho, L., Ndalahwa, M., Legg, J., & Hughes, D. P. (2019). A Mobile-Based Deep Learning Model for Cassava Disease Diagnosis. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 10, 272. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2019.00272>
- Ramel, F., Birtic, S., Cuiné, S., Triantaphylidès, C., Ravanat, J.-L., & Havaux, M. (2012). Chemical quenching of singlet oxygen by carotenoids in plants. *Plant Physiology*, 158(3), 1267–1278. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.111.182394>
- Rao, R. M., Liu, J., Verkuil, R., Meier, J., Canny, J., Abbeel, P., Sercu, T., & Rives, A. (2021). MSA Transformer. In M. Meila & T. Zhang (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning* (Vol. 139, pp. 8844–8856). PMLR. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/rao21a.html>
- Raza, S.-A., Prince, G., Clarkson, J. P., & Rajpoot, N. M. (2015). Automatic detection of diseased tomato plants using thermal and stereo visible light images. *PLoS One*, 10(4), e0123262. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0123262>
- Reiser, L., Subramaniam, S., Li, D., & Huala, E. (2017). Using the Arabidopsis Information Resource (TAIR) to Find Information About Arabidopsis Genes. *Current Protocols in Bioinformatics*, 60, 1.11.1-1.11.45. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpbi.36>
- Rhee, S. Y., & Mutwil, M. (2014). Towards revealing the functions of all genes in plants. *Trends in Plant Science*, 19(4), Article 4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2013.10.006>
- Ross, A. F. (1961). Systemic acquired resistance induced by localized virus infections in plants. *Virology*, 14(3), 340–358. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0042-6822\(61\)90319-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0042-6822(61)90319-1)
- Sagi, M., & Fluhr, R. (2006). Production of reactive oxygen species by plant NADPH oxidases. *Plant Physiology*, 141(2), 336–340. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.106.078089>
- Sandhu, K. S., Mihalyov, P. D., Lewien, M. J., Pumphrey, M. O., & Carter, A. H. (2021).

Combining Genomic and Phenomic Information for Predicting Grain Protein Content and Grain Yield in Spring Wheat. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 12, 613300.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2021.613300>

Santner, A., & Estelle, M. (2009). Recent advances and emerging trends in plant hormone signalling. *Nature*, 459(7250), 1071–1078. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08122>

Schroeder, J. I., Kwak, J. M., & Allen, G. J. (2001). Guard cell abscisic acid signalling and engineering drought hardiness in plants. *Nature*, 410(6826), 327–330.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/35066500>

Schulze-Lefert, P., & Robatzek, S. (2006). Plant pathogens trick guard cells into opening the gates. *Cell*, 126(5), 831–834. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2006.08.020>

Seo, M., & Koshiba, T. (2011). Transport of ABA from the site of biosynthesis to the site of action. *Journal of Plant Research*, 124(4), 501–507. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10265-011-0411-4>

Sheldon, C. C., Rouse, D. T., Finnegan, E. J., Peacock, W. J., & Dennis, E. S. (2000). The molecular basis of vernalization: The central role of FLOWERING LOCUS C (FLC). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 97(7), 3753–3758.

<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.97.7.3753>

Sies, H., & Jones, D. P. (2020). Reactive oxygen species (ROS) as pleiotropic physiological signalling agents. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology*, 21(7), 363–383.

Smith, G. F., Figueiredo, E., & Van Wyk, A. E. (2019). *Kalanchoe (Crassulaceae) in Southern Africa: Classification, biology, and cultivation*. Academic Press.

Solis-Miranda, J., Chodasiewicz, M., Skirycz, A., Fernie, A. R., Moschou, P. N., Bozhkov, P. V., & Gutierrez-Beltran, E. (2023). Stress-related biomolecular condensates in plants. *The*

*Plant Cell*, 35(9), 3187–3204.

Spoel, S. H., & Dong, X. (2024). Salicylic acid in plant immunity and beyond. *The Plant Cell*, koad329. <https://doi.org/10.1093/plcell/koad329>

Takahashi, Y., Zhang, J., Hsu, P.-K., Ceciliato, P. H. O., Zhang, L., Dubeaux, G., Munemasa, S., Ge, C., Zhao, Y., Hauser, F., & Schroeder, J. I. (2020). MAP3Kinase-dependent SnRK2-kinase activation is required for abscisic acid signal transduction and rapid osmotic stress response. *Nature Communications*, 11(1), Article 1.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13875-y>

Tan, Q. W., Lim, P. K., Chen, Z., Pasha, A., Provart, N., Arend, M., Nikoloski, Z., & Mutwil, M. (2023). Cross-stress gene expression atlas of Marchantia polymorpha reveals the hierarchy and regulatory principles of abiotic stress responses. *Nature Communications*, 14(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-36517-w>

Teige, M., Scheikl, E., Eulgem, T., Dóczsi, R., Ichimura, K., Shinozaki, K., Dangl, J. L., & Hirt, H. (2004). The MKK2 pathway mediates cold and salt stress signaling in Arabidopsis. *Molecular Cell*, 15(1), 141–152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2004.06.023>

Theodoris, C. V., Xiao, L., Chopra, A., Chaffin, M. D., Al Sayed, Z. R., Hill, M. C., Mantineo, H., Brydon, E. M., Zeng, Z., Liu, X. S., & Ellinor, P. T. (2023). Transfer learning enables predictions in network biology. *Nature*, 618(7965), 616–624.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06139-9>

Tong, J., Ren, Z., Sun, L., Zhou, S., Yuan, W., Hui, Y., Ci, D., Wang, W., Fan, L.-M., & Wu, Z. (2022). ALBA proteins confer thermotolerance through stabilizing HSF messenger RNAs in cytoplasmic granules. *Nature Plants*, 8(7), 778–791.

Toyota, M., Spencer, D., Sawai-Toyota, S., Jiaqi, W., Zhang, T., Koo, A. J., Howe, G. A., &

- Gilroy, S. (2018). Glutamate triggers long-distance, calcium-based plant defense signaling. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 361(6407), 1112–1115.  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat7744>
- Triantaphylidès, C., & Havaux, M. (2009). Singlet oxygen in plants: Production, detoxification and signaling. *Trends in Plant Science*, 14(4), 219–228.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2009.01.008>
- Umezawa, T., Sugiyama, N., Mizoguchi, M., Hayashi, S., Myouga, F., Yamaguchi-Shinozaki, K., Ishihama, Y., Hirayama, T., & Shinozaki, K. (2009). Type 2C protein phosphatases directly regulate abscisic acid-activated protein kinases in Arabidopsis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(41), 17588–17593.  
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0907095106>
- Van Bel, M., Diels, T., Vancaester, E., Kreft, L., Botzki, A., Van De Peer, Y., Coppens, F., & Vandepoele, K. (2018). PLAZA 4.0: An integrative resource for functional, evolutionary and comparative plant genomics. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 46(D1), D1190–D1196.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkx1002>
- van Klompenburg, T., Kassahun, A., & Catal, C. (2020). Crop yield prediction using machine learning: A systematic literature review. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 177, 105709. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2020.105709>
- Verslues, P. E., Bailey-Serres, J., Brodersen, C., Buckley, T. N., Conti, L., Christmann, A., Dinneny, J. R., Grill, E., Hayes, S., Heckman, R. W., Hsu, P.-K., Juenger, T. E., Mas, P., Munnik, T., Nelissen, H., Sack, L., Schroeder, J. I., Testerink, C., Tyerman, S. D., ... Wigge, P. A. (2023). Burning questions for a warming and changing world: 15 unknowns in plant abiotic stress. *The Plant Cell*, 35(1), 67–108.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/plcell/koac263>

- Waadt, R., Seller, C. A., Hsu, P.-K., Takahashi, Y., Munemasa, S., & Schroeder, J. I. (2022). Plant hormone regulation of abiotic stress responses. *Nature Reviews. Molecular Cell Biology*, 23(10), 680–694. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41580-022-00479-6>
- Wang, E., Cruse, R. M., Sharma-Acharya, B., Herzmann, D. E., Gelder, B. K., James, D. E., Flanagan, D. C., Blanco-Canqui, H., Mitchell, R. B., & Laird, D. A. (2020). Strategic switchgrass (*Panicum virgatum*) production within row cropping systems: Regional-scale assessment of soil erosion loss and water runoff impacts. *GCB Bioenergy*, 12(11), 955–967. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcbb.12749>
- Wang, S., You, R., Liu, Y., Xiong, Y., & Zhu, S. (2023). NetGO 3.0: Protein Language Model Improves Large-scale Functional Annotations. *Genomics, Proteomics & Bioinformatics*, 21(2), 349–358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gpb.2023.04.001>
- Wasilewska, A., Vlad, F., Sirichandra, C., Redko, Y., Jammes, F., Valon, C., Frei dit Frey, N., & Leung, J. (2008). An update on abscisic acid signaling in plants and more. *Molecular Plant*, 1(2), 198–217. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mp/ssm022>
- Wasternack, C., & Song, S. (2017). Jasmonates: Biosynthesis, metabolism, and signaling by proteins activating and repressing transcription. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 68(6), 1303–1321. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erw443>
- Watson, J. L., Juergens, D., Bennett, N. R., Trippe, B. L., Yim, J., Eisenach, H. E., Ahern, W., Borst, A. J., Ragotte, R. J., Milles, L. F., Wicky, B. I. M., Hanikel, N., Pellock, S. J., Courbet, A., Sheffler, W., Wang, J., Venkatesh, P., Sappington, I., Torres, S. V., ... Baker, D. (2023). De novo design of protein structure and function with RFdiffusion. *Nature*, 620(7976), 1089–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06415-8>

Whalen, M. C., Innes, R. W., Bent, A. F., & Staskawicz, B. J. (1991). Identification of *Pseudomonas syringae* Pathogens of *Arabidopsis* and a Bacterial Locus Determining Avirulence on Both *Arabidopsis* and Soybean. *The Plant Cell*, 3(1), 49–59.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/3869199>

White, P. J., & Broadley, M. R. (2003). Calcium in plants. *Annals of Botany*, 92(4), 487–511.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcg164>

Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, IJ. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., Blomberg, N., Boiten, J.-W., da Silva Santos, L. B., Bourne, P. E., Bouwman, J., Brookes, A. J., Clark, T., Crosas, M., Dillo, I., Dumon, O., Edmunds, S., Evelo, C. T., Finkers, R., ... Mons, B. (2016). The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific Data*, 3(1), 160018.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18>

Willems, P., Horne, A., Van Parys, T., Goormachtig, S., De Smet, I., Botzki, A., Van Breusegem, F., & Gevaert, K. (2019). The Plant PTM Viewer, a central resource for exploring plant protein modifications. *The Plant Journal: For Cell and Molecular Biology*, 99(4), 752–762. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tpj.14345>

Winter, D., Vinegar, B., Nahal, H., Ammar, R., Wilson, G. V., & Provart, N. J. (2007). An “Electronic Fluorescent Pictograph” browser for exploring and analyzing large-scale biological data sets. *PloS One*, 2(8), e718. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0000718>

Xiong, Y., McCormack, M., Li, L., Hall, Q., Xiang, C., & Sheen, J. (2013). Glucose–TOR signalling reprograms the transcriptome and activates meristems. *Nature*, 496(7444), Article 7444. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12030>

Yağ, İ., & Altan, A. (2022). Artificial Intelligence-Based Robust Hybrid Algorithm Design and

Implementation for Real-Time Detection of Plant Diseases in Agricultural Environments.

*Biology*, 11(12). <https://doi.org/10.3390/biology11121732>

Yao, Q., Ge, H., Wu, S., Zhang, N., Chen, W., Xu, C., Gao, J., Thelen, J. J., & Xu, D. (2014).

P3DB 3.0: From plant phosphorylation sites to protein networks. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 42(Database issue), D1206–D1213. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkt1135>

Yuan, P., Jauregui, E., Du, L., Tanaka, K., & Poovaiah, B. W. (2017). Calcium signatures and signaling events orchestrate plant-microbe interactions. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*, 38, 173–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2017.06.003>

Yuan, W., Wijewardane, N. K., Jenkins, S., Bai, G., Ge, Y., & Graef, G. L. (2019). Early Prediction of Soybean Traits through Color and Texture Features of Canopy RGB Imagery. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), 14089. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-50480-x>

Zavaliev, R., Mohan, R., Chen, T., & Dong, X. (2020). Formation of NPR1 condensates promotes cell survival during the plant immune response. *Cell*, 182(5), 1093–1108.

Zhang, H., Zhang, F., Yu, Y., Feng, L., Jia, J., Liu, B., Li, B., Guo, H., & Zhai, J. (2020). A Comprehensive Online Database for Exploring ~20,000 Public Arabidopsis RNA-Seq Libraries. *Molecular Plant*, 13(9), 1231–1233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molp.2020.08.001>

Zhang, H., Zhu, J., Gong, Z., & Zhu, J. K. (2022). Abiotic stress responses in plants. *Nat Rev Genet*, 23(2), 104–119. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41576-021-00413-0>

Zhao, Z., Zang, S., Zou, W., Pan, Y.-B., Yao, W., You, C., & Que, Y. (2022). Long Non-Coding RNAs: New Players in Plants. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 23(16), Article 16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms23169301>

Zheng, Z., Zhang, O., Borgs, C., Chayes, J. T., & Yaghi, O. M. (2023). ChatGPT chemistry assistant for text mining and the prediction of MOF synthesis. *Journal of the American*

*Chemical Society*, 145(32), 18048–18062.

Zhou, J.-M., & Zhang, Y. (2020). Plant Immunity: Danger Perception and Signaling. *Cell*, 181(5), 978–989. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.04.028>

Zhou, Z., Ji, Y., Li, W., Dutta, P., Davuluri, R., & Liu, H. (2024). *DNABERT-2: Efficient Foundation Model and Benchmark For Multi-Species Genome* (arXiv:2306.15006). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.15006>

Zhu, S., Gu, J., Yao, J., Li, Y., Zhang, Z., Xia, W., Wang, Z., Gui, X., Li, L., & Li, D. (2022). Liquid-liquid phase separation of RBGD2/4 is required for heat stress resistance in *Arabidopsis*. *Developmental Cell*, 57(5), 583–597.

Zipfel, C., Kunze, G., Chinchilla, D., Caniard, A., Jones, J. D. G., Boller, T., & Felix, G. (2006). Perception of the bacterial PAMP EF-Tu by the receptor EFR restricts Agrobacterium-mediated transformation. *Cell*, 125(4), 749–760.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2006.03.037>