Journal of Plant Growth Regulation (2021) 40:1836–1852
https://doi.org/10.1007/s00344-020-10234-w

Mechanistic Insights into Strigolactone Biosynthesis, Signaling, and Regulation During Plant Growth and Development

Kaiser Iqbal Wani[1] · Andleeb Zehra[1] · Sadaf Choudhary[1] · M. Naeem[1] · M. Masroor A. Khan[1] · Christian Danve M. Castroverde[2] · Tariq Aftab[1]

Received: 6 February 2020 / Accepted: 24 September 2020 / Published online: 3 October 2020
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2020

Abstract

Strigolactones (SLs) constitute a group of carotenoid-derived phytohormones with butenolide moieties. These hormones are involved in various functions, including regulation of secondary growth, shoot branching and hypocotyl elongation, and stimulation of seed germination. SLs also control hyphal branching of arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) fungi and mediate responses to both abiotic and biotic cues. Most of these functions stem from the interplay of SLs with other hormones, enabling plants to appropriately respond to changing environmental conditions. This dynamic interplay provides opportunities for phytohormones to modulate and augment one another. In this article, we review our current mechanistic understanding of SL biosynthesis, receptors, and signaling. We also highlight recent advances regarding the interaction of SLs with other hormones during developmental processes and stress conditions.

Keywords Carotenoid-derived phytohormone · Butenolide moieties · Phytohormone crosstalk · Strigolactone biosynthesis · Strigolactone receptors · Strigolactone signaling

Introduction

Strigolactones (SLs) comprise a novel class of phytohormones first discovered as germination inducers of various parasitic plant species (Cook et al. 1966; Kohlen et al. 2011). Their name originates from their role in stimulating *Striga* (parasitic witchweeds) germination and from their characteristic lactone ring structure. The first isolated *Striga* seed germination inducers were strigyl acetate and strigol from *Gossypium hirsutum* L. (Cook et al. 1966). Retrospectively, SLs were first indicated as phytohormones through their presence as unknown graft-transmissible signals that suppressed *Pisum sativum* shoot branching (Beveridge et al. 1994). Signal-deficient mutants showed a hyper branching phenotype that was independent of known phytohormones, like cytokinins and auxins (Koltai 2014).

Two research groups then independently identified SLs as new phytohormones regulating the shoot branching phenotypes (Gomez-Roldan et al. 2008; Umehara et al. 2008). Plant shoot branching is inhibited by endogenous SL production or exogenous SL application in these hyper branching mutants (Umehara et al. 2008) (Fig. 1). Root and shoot extracts of various species, including *Arabidopsis*, contain various types, combinations, and levels of SL molecules (Goldwasser et al. 2008; Koltai and Beveridge 2013; Kapulnik and Koltai. 2014; Saeed et al. 2017; Bürger and Chory 2020). To regulate shoot branching, root-derived SLs are mainly transported to shoots through the xylem (Kohlen et al. 2011; Borghi et al. 2016). Since the discovery of SLs as phytohormones, extensive research has revealed novel insights about their diversity, biosynthesis, and signaling. Because of their important roles in plant growth and development, SLs can potentially be used for crop improvement. For example, mutating the SL biosynthetic gene *HTD1/D17* increases rice yields, which contributed to the "Green Revolution" since the 1960s (Wang et al. 2020a).

SLs are characterized by their butenolide moieties – lactones with a 4-C heterocyclic ring structure (Omoarelojie et al. 2019). These hormones are at the forefront of plant science research because of their diverse biological roles,

✉ Tariq Aftab
tarik.alig@gmail.com

[1] Department of Botany, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh 202 002, India

[2] Department of Biology, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, ON, Canada



Fig. 1 Diverse roles of SLs in overall plant growth, development, and resilience

ranging from growth and development to interactions with other organisms (Agusti et al. 2011; Cook et al. 1966; Toh et al. 2012; Domagalska and Leyser 2011). The synthetic SL analog GR24 is an important tool in investigating the functions of SLs in plant physiology (Arite et al. 2009). It has been most useful in species without known SL biosynthetic/signaling mutants and its application reverses SL biosynthetic but not signaling mutant phenotypes (Gomez-Roldan et al. 2008; Umehara et al. 2008).

Although initially considered to be detrimental to plants since they enhanced parasitic plant germination (Cook et al. 1966), SLs were later considered beneficial since they also mediate arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) fungal colonization (Akiyama et al. 2005; Besserer et al. 2006). Moreover, they initiate AM fungal hyphal branching even before host root infection (Akiyama et al. 2005). SLs also interact with rhizobia and affect nodule formation in leguminous plants, reflecting their diverse roles in biotic interactions (Foo et al. 2014). Apart from their functions in regulating plant symbiotic relationships, SLs may mediate defenses against pathogens (Torres-Vera et al. 2014).

In addition, SLs can effectively alleviate various abiotic stresses (Fig. 1), such as salt and drought stresses (Ma et al. 2017; Van Ha et al. 2014; Lu et al. 2019). In *Arabidopsis thaliana*, SLs can regulate adaptive responses, such as stress-induced changes in stomatal density and closure (Van Ha et al. 2014). In their study, SL-deficient plants were hypersensitive to such stresses (Van Ha et al. 2014). Exogenous SL application rescued drought-sensitive mutant phenotypes, while it augmented the drought tolerance of wild-type (WT) plants (Van Ha et al. 2014).

Other hormones interact with SLs to regulate various physiological processes, enabling plants to respond to changing environmental factors, such as nutrient availability, shading, and temperature (Cheng et al. 2013). For example, auxins work together with SLs to control shoot branching patterns (Hayward et al. 2009; Bennett et al. 2016; Ligerot et al. 2017). SLs and abscisic acid (ABA) work together during abiotic stresses (Ren et al. 2018). Moreover, ethylene and SLs act antagonistically to control hypocotyl growth (Yu et al. 2013).

Strigolactone Biosynthesis: From Humble Pigment Beginnings

SLs and SL-like compounds have a conserved lactone structure consisting of three rings (ABC rings) connected through an enol ether bridge with a fourth methyl butenolide or furanone moiety (D ring) (Al-Babili and Bouwmeester 2015; Yoneyama et al. 2018). The region connecting the core (ABC) with the D ring acts as the bioactiphore (Zwanenburg et al. 2009). Endogenous SLs are classified into two main types (strigol and orobanchol type) based on whether the C ring is α- or β-oriented (Cui. 2014). Strigol and orobanchol are canonical SLs as both have A, B, C, and D rings (Butler. 1995); around 23 types of canonical SLs have been characterized in root exudates (Xie et al. 2010). Certain SL-like compounds are considered non-canonical, because they lack the A, B, and/or C ring; however, they still possess the D ring bonded to the rest of the molecule (Alder et al. 2012; Boyer et al. 2014; Waters et al. 2017). Non-canonical SLs include certain synthetic and natural compounds like methyl carlactonoate (MeCLA), avenaol, and Yoshimulactone Green (Abe et al. 2014; Kim et al. 2014; Tsuchiya et al. 2015). The structural diversity in canonical SLs stems from various AB ring system modifications, including epoxidation, hydroxylation, ketolation, and oxidation (Bhattacharya et al. 2009). This wide structural diversity involves many SL biosynthetic genes (Saeed et al. 2017), homologs of which

have been found in algae and bryophytes (Delaux et al. 2012).

Several studies have elucidated the molecular mechanism of SL biosynthesis. The involvement of the carotenoid pathway was reported using fluridone, an inhibitor of carotenoid biosynthesis (Matusova et al. 2005). SL biosynthesis has also been investigated using certain carotenoid catabolic mutants (Matusova et al. 2005), and different branching mutants such as *P. sativum ramosus* (*rms*) mutants (Johnson et al. 2006; Beveridge et al. 1994), *Arabidopsis max* (*more axillary growth*) mutants (Sorefan et al. 2003) and *Petunia decreased apical dominance* (*dad1, dad2, dad3*) mutants (Snowden et al. 2005). Gene cloning, reciprocal grafting experiments and mutant analysis implied that SLs are synthesized from carotenoids and are transported acropetally (Ongaro et al. 2008).

SL biosynthesis initially occurs in the chloroplasts (Alder et al. 2012; Saeed et al. 2017) involving DWARF27 (D27/β-carotene isomerase), which requires iron as a cofactor (Lin et al. 2009). D27 catalyzes β-carotene isomerization by acting on its 9th chemical bond, changing its configuration from trans-β-carotene into 9-cis-β-carotene (C-40) (Alder et al. 2012). These carotenoids have a 40-carbon skeleton with an extended conjugated double bond system (Moise et al. 2014). Downstream of D27, carotenoid cleavage dioxygenases (CCDs) convert carotenoids into apocarotenoids (Auldridge et al. 2006; Waters et al., 2012a; Hou et al. 2016), which are then modified by other CCD enzymes (Alder et al. 2008). Oxidation of various carotenoid precursors, resulting in specific double bond breakage, yields various compounds like ABA, SLs, and retinal (a conjugated chromophore) (Felemban et al. 2019). The *Arabidopsis* genome encodes about nine different CCDs (*CCD1-9*), five of which are 9-cis-epoxycarotenoid cleavage dioxygenase (NCEDs) involved in ABA biosynthesis (Tan et al. 2003). In addition, various enzymes encoded by *MAX* genes (*MAX1, MAX3 and MAX4*) regulate SL biosynthesis in *Arabidopsis* (Ruyter-Spira et al. 2013). ABA itself may also regulate SL biosynthesis, because ABA-deficient maize (*vp14*) and tomato (*notabilis*) mutants showed lower seed germination (Matusova et al. 2005).

In molecular detail, CCD-catalyzed SL biosynthesis produces intermediates that are further oxidized by cytochrome P450s (Matusova et al. 2005). Two known CCDs (CCD7 and CCD8) act progressively in the pathway; CCD7 is encoded by *MAX3* and its orthologs *RMS5* and *D17/HTD1* (Booker et al. 2004), whereas CCD8 is encoded by *MAX4* and its orthologs *RMS1*, *D10*, and *DAD1* (Arite et al. 2007). 9-cis-β-carotene is converted by CCD7 into 9-cis-β-apo-10-carotenal (C-27) and β ionone (C-13) (Waters et al. 2012a). 9-cis-β-apo-10-carotenal is then converted by CCD8 into Carlactone (CL), a possible mobile intermediate containing two rings (A and D) along with the enol ether bridge and an SL-like carbon skeleton (Alder et al. 2012; Seto et al. 2014). CL is produced by intra-molecular rearrangement of 9-cis-β-apo-10-carotenal, which suggests that each β-carotene molecule produces a single SL molecule (Alder et al. 2012; Seto et al. 2014). CL has similar properties as SLs, such as stimulating seed germination of *Striga hermonthica*, and is a putative intermediate during the biosynthesis of other SLs (Alder et al. 2012). Seto and colleagues (2014) used ^{13}C-labeled CL to detect its conversion into SLs in vivo. Conversion of exogenous CL into SL has been reported in rice, suggesting that CL is the precursor of endogenous SLs (Seto et al. 2014). Remarkably, Baz et al. (2018) reported that a new product 3-OH-carlactone is formed in vitro from 9-cis-3-OH-β-apo-10′-carotenal by the action of D27, CCD7 and CCD8. They also showed 3-OH-carlactone formation *in planta* by expressing rice and *Arabidopsis* CL biosynthetic genes in *Nicotiana benthamiana* leaves (Baz et al. 2018).

CL is subsequently transported into the cytoplasm for further processing (Al-Babili and Bouwmeester 2015). CL (with a complete D ring) acts as the common precursor of all SLs; however, it needs further modifications since it lacks the B and C rings (Alder et al. 2012). CL is then converted into carlactonoic acid (CLA) by the cytochrome P450 monooxygenase enzyme MAX1 in *Arabidopsis* (Abe et al. 2014; Zhang et al. 2014). Booker et al. (2005) demonstrated the role of MAX1 (CYP711A1) in CLA synthesis, by reciprocal grafting experiments in *A. thaliana.* In these experiments, the excessive branching phenotype of *max4* (*ccd8*) mutant scions were eventually reversed by grafting with wild-type *MAX1* root stocks (Booker et al. 2005). The conversion of CL into CLA in vitro using recombinant MAX1 protein inside yeast microsomes further clarified the function of *MAX1* (Abe et al. 2014). MAX1 catalyzes back-to-back oxidation of CL at C-19, first forming 19-hydroxy-CL and then CLA (Abe et al. 2014). CLA has been reported to accumulate in *Arabidopsis* roots, including those in *atd14* and *max2* mutants (Abe et al. 2014). Endogenous CLA has also been reported in rice plants, and exogenous CLA is converted into SLs using the *d10-2* rice mutant (Abe et al. 2014). When provided with ^{13}C-labeled CLA, *d10-2* mutant root exudates subsequently accumulated ^{13}C-labeled 5-deoxystrigol and orobanchol (Abe et al. 2014). In *Arabidopsis*, CLA is similarly converted into 5-deoxystrigol and 4-deoxyorobanchol (4DO) (Abe et al. 2014). 5-deoxystrigol is the simplest SL as it lacks hydroxyl, acetyloxyl and other oxygen-containing substituents (Awad et al. 2006; Yoneyama et al. 2008). It is found in both monocots (Awad et al. 2006) and dicots (Yoneyama et al. 2008), indicating it as the precursor of all SLs. 5-deoxystrigol then undergoes either allylic hydroxylation (to strigol or orobanchol) or homoallylic hydroxylation (to sorgomol) (Rani et al. 2008; Xie et al. 2010). Further modification of sorgomol—oxidation of its hydroxymethyl group followed by decarboxylation—results

in the formation of sorgolactone (Xie et al. 2010). CLA can also undergo methylation (through an unknown methyl transferase enzyme) and be converted into the methyl ester MeCLA (SL-LIKE1) (Seto et al. 2014). Interestingly, the conversion of CLA into MeCLA is *MAX1*-independent as confirmed by *Arabidopsis* mutant analyses (Abe et al. 2014). Another enzyme LBO (Lateral Branching Oxidoreductase) acts downstream of MAX1 to convert MeCLA into the recently identified hydroxymethyl carlactonoate involved in shoot branching (Brewer et al. 2016; Yoneyama et al. 2020).

Recently, a carotenoid-derived molecule zaxinone has been shown to negatively regulate SL (4-deoxyorobanchol) biosynthesis in rice under phosphate (Pi) limiting conditions (Wang et al. 2019). This was confirmed by increased SL content in *zaxinone synthase* (*zas*) mutant seedlings under Pi stress and enhanced *Striga* germination stimulation potential of *zas* root exudates (Wang et al. 2019). This was similarly observed in tomato root exudates under Pi-deficient conditions (López-Ráez et al. 2008). Enhanced seed germination vigor coincided with increased SL levels, which then decreased upon phosphate restoration (López-Ráez et al. 2008).

Strigolactone Signaling Cascade: A Tale of Binding, Derepression, and Hydrolysis

Phytohormone perception relies on a well-defined receptor system. Just like jasmonate, auxin, and gibberellin signaling (Schwechheimer and Willige. 2009; Dharmasiri et al. 2005; Katsir et al. 2008), SL signaling involves polyubiquitination and proteasomal degradation. The SL signaling cascade involves three important components: (1) an α/β fold hydrolase called D14 in rice (Arite et al. 2009), (2) an F-box leucine-rich protein called MAX2/D3 (Stirnberg et al. 2002; Johnson et al. 2006), and (3) a repressor protein called D53 belonging to the SMAX1-like (SMXL) protein family (Jiang et al. 2013; Stanga et al. 2013). The SL receptor protein D14 is activated after ligand binding, leading to its interaction with other molecules to form a signaling complex; hormonal signal transduction is followed by subsequent hydrolysis of the bound SL, deactivating the hormone (Marzec et al. 2016).

Various SL-insensitive mutants were analyzed to identify different SL signaling components (Seto et al. 2014). AtD14/D14/DAD2 are the orthologous SL receptors in *A. thaliana*, *Oryza sativa*, and *Petunia*, respectively (Waters et al. 2012b; Arite et al. 2009; Hamiaux et al. 2012); gene mutations result in a SL-specific phenotype that is not reversed by GR24 treatment (Arite et al. 2009). These gene orthologs encode proteins similar to the soluble gibberellic acid (GA) receptor GID1 (GIBBERELLIN-INSENSITIVE DWARF1) (Ueguchi-Tanaka et al. 2005). These receptor proteins have a conserved catalytic triad consisting of Ser, His, and Asp (Zhao et al. 2013). GR24 undergoes hydrolysis, most probably due to catalytic triad activity (Kagiyama et al. 2013). The *Petunia* receptor DAD2 loses its catalytic activity with a Ser-to-Ala substitution (DAD2:S96A) in the triad (Hamiaux et al. 2012), leading to loss of receptor interaction with the F-box protein, thereby suppressing shoot branching (Hamiaux et al. 2012; Marzec et al. 2016). GR24 undergoes very slow hydrolysis with DAD2, but the *dad2* mutant phenotype is not reversed by the resulting products (Zhao et al. 2013). This confirms DAD2 involvement in SL signaling, with the hydrolytic process being more important than the end products (Seto and Yamaguchi 2014).

In rice, the SL hormone-D14 receptor interaction results in SL cleavage and subsequent production of a “covalently linked intermediate molecule” (CLIM) bound to D14 (Bythell-Douglas et al. 2017). Unlike other phytohormones, SL signaling depends upon hormone degradation. In detail, binding of D14 with SL leads to nucleophilic attack, resulting in SL ligand dissociation into two molecules: (1) the ABC ring portion called ABC-formyltricycliclactone (ABC-FTL) and (2) the remaining part with the D ring called hydroxymethylbutenolide (HMB) (Nakamura et al. 2013). ABC-FTL is released while HMB remains covalently attached to the D14 receptor; this HMB-D14 intermediate is called CLIM (Yao et al. 2016). This reaction changes the D14 conformation, allowing it to interact with downstream signaling components (Marzec et al. 2019).

SL signaling proceeds from the interaction between the receptor D14 and F-box leucine-rich protein MAX2/D3/RMS4 (orthologs in *A. thaliana*, *Oryza sativa*, and *Petunia*, respectively) (Hamiaux et al. 2012). MAX2 forms a part of the Skp–Cullin–F-box containing (SCF) E3 ubiquitin ligase complex (Hamiaux et al. 2012; Zheng et al. 2014; Zhao et al. 2014). Mutations in these orthologs lead to SL insensitivity, confirming their crucial role in SL signaling (Marzec et al. 2016).

This SCF complex targets the D53 and D53-like SMXL repressor proteins for proteasomal degradation (Jiang et al. 2013; Zhou et al. 2013; Bennett et al. 2016). In *Arabidopsis*, *SMXL6-8* have been proposed to be *D53* orthologs, as they regulate shoot branching and other SL-controlled processes (Soundappan et al. 2015; Bennett et al. 2016; Ligerot et al. 2017). Due to its EAR motifs, D53 is expected to interact with TOPLESS-related (TPR) transcriptional corepressor proteins (Smith and Li. 2014). This D53-TPR complex may then repress SL target gene expression (Smith and Li. 2014). The D53 repressor also interacts with the D14 receptor; upon GR24 treatment, D53 undergoes SCF complex-directed degradation (Smith and Li. 2014). The ligand-induced conformational change in D14 allows the receptor to recruit SMXL7 into the SCF complex (Liang et al. 2016). SMXL7 functions both transcriptionally and non-transcriptionally,

but the molecular events after its degradation have not been clearly elucidated (Waters et al. 2017; Bythell-Douglas et al. 2017). In *O. sativa*, the major regulator of plant architecture *Ideal Plant Architecture 1* (*IPA1*) acts downstream of the D53 repressor, regulating SL-induced gene expression (Song et al. 2017). IPA1 is repressed by D53 in vitro and in vivo, which represses its transcriptional activation function (Song et al. 2017).

Several engrossing hypotheses have been proposed to explain the evolution of ligand and signaling specificity by D14 and D14-like receptor proteins. In parasitic plants, D14-like proteins—closely related to D14 proteins—act as receptors of host-exuded SLs, representing a case of convergent evolution (Tsuchiya et al. 2015; Conn and Nelson 2015). These subfamilies of D14-like proteins also include subfunctionalized proteins that respond to other ligands, such as karrikins and other D-lactone-containing compounds (Waters et al. 2012b; Saeed et al. 2017). Perception of both SLs and karrikins also requires the MAX2 F-box protein (Zhao et al. 2015). However, it is unknown how MAX2 discriminates between the two pathways to generate different responses, because F-box proteins tend to be indiscriminate when recruiting target proteins (Nelson et al. 2011; Nakamura et al. 2013). Wang et al. (2020b) proposed that in *Arabidopsis*, both SL and karrikin signaling pathways converge at SMXL2, as it acts as their common target for polyubiquitination and degradation in a D14- or KAI2-dependent manner.

Different lines of evidence support the model that SL signal transduction occurs as a result of SL binding/hydrolysis-induced conformational changes in the D14 receptor. For example, thermal destabilization of the D14 receptor is initiated by GR24, which depends on an intact D14 catalytic triad (Waters et al. 2015). GR24 also promotes the physical interaction between MAX2/D3 and D14, with MAX2/D3 further destabilizing the D14 receptor (Waters et al. 2017; Zhao et al. 2014). Interestingly, D14-D3 association in *O. sativa* is a bit more responsive to 2′R stereoisomers of SL analogs compared to 2′S stereoisomers (Zhao et al. 2015). Furthermore, there are no major structural differences between D14 and apo-D14, when associated with 5-hydroxy-3-methylbutenolide, 2, 4, 4, trihydroxy-3-methyl-3-butenal or SL (Nakamura et al. 2013).

Recently, several modes of SL–D14 interaction have been determined, but it is unclear how D14 functions with D3 in ubiquitinating the D53 repressor. D3 has a C-terminal α-helix that exists in either engaged or dislodged forms (Shabek et al. 2018). The engaged form enables D14 and D3 binding with a hydrolyzed SL intermediate, while the dislodged form recognizes unmodified D14 and prevents its enzymatic activity (Shabek et al. 2018). The D3 α-helix helps D14 in recruiting D53 in a SL-dependent manner, which then activates the hydrolase (Shabek et al. 2018). The self-induced D14 degradation by SLs (through MAX2) limits their own signaling through a negative feedback loop (Chevalier et al. 2014; Koltai 2014).

Controversially, this CLIM model has been challenged by various experimental evidence. CLIM cannot be accommodated in the D14 active site due to its very small electron density; instead, iodine (I) in the crystallization reagents is suspected to bind the active site (Carlsson et al. 2018). D14-mediated SL hydrolysis is also too sluggish after SL treatment, in sharp contrast to the rapid degradation of target proteins (D53/SMXLs) (Seto et al. 2019). Therefore, the rapid response of SLs cannot be entirely explained by this CLIM model. Instead, it has been recently reported that binding of a complete SL molecule, not a hydrolyzed one, initiates the active D14 receptor signaling; D14 then hydrolyzes SL molecules only after completing the pathway (Seto et al. 2019). Kinetic analysis of the AtD14-catalyzed hydrolysis of 5-deoxystrigol detected two hydrolytic products, ABC-FTL and HMB, as described earlier (Hamiaux et al. 2012). The K_{cat}, K_m and V_{max} values were found to be 0.12 min^{-1}, 4.9 μM, and 4.0 nmol/min/mg protein, respectively (Seto et al., 2019). In addition, 3,6′-dihydroGR24, which has a single bond instead of a double bond in the enol ether bridge, is not hydrolyzed by the SL receptors in rice and *Arabidopsis* (Umehara et al. 2015). Furthermore, D14 catalytic activity is quite low for debranones (SL analogs without the enol ether bridge), but these analogs interestingly yield the same results as GR24 (Scaffidi et al. 2014). These observations raise questions about the role of hydrolysis (by D14) in SL signaling.

Therefore, D14 has a dual function and a new mechanism of SL signaling perception could be proposed (Yao et al. 2016). In molecular detail, the D14 conformational change enlarges the catalytic pocket, allowing SL movement into this pocket and then closing the helical lid domain (Shabek et al. 2018). When a SL molecule binds to the D14 receptor protein, D14 initially attains an unstable conformation due to interruption in the catalytic triad formation (Yao et al. 2016). In this changed conformation, the D14 receptor interacts with other components to carry out the SL signaling cascade (Fig. 2). After activation, D14 (through the surface of its rearranged lid domain) interacts with the F-box protein MAX2/D3 and then D53/SMXL repressor binding occurs around the region of the Asp loop (Seto et al. 2019). After D53/SMXL degradation, the D14 catalytic triad is again reconstructed, which performs the important hydrolysis step, resulting in SL deactivation (Seto et al. 2019). This hormonal degradation mechanism is also found in other hormonal pathways (like GA) and is very important for hormone homeostasis (Yamaguchi. 2008).

The evolution of the SL signaling mechanism provides informative insights. It is believed that the initial role of SLs was AM fungal recruitment to facilitate more efficient nutrient uptake; this symbiotic association was present in land



Fig. 2 The SL biosynthetic pathway showing key enzymes and intermediates

plants about 360–450 million years ago (Waldie et al. 2014; Simon et al. 1993). Remarkably, SLs are found in algae and SL application results in rhizoid elongation—a response also reported in liverworts and mosses belonging to bryophytes (Delaux et al. 2012); however, it is most probably independent of MAX2 (Waldie et al. 2014). In higher plants, MAX2-independent SL signaling has also been reported. Minute GR24 concentrations can inhibit root growth in the *max2* mutant (Shinohara et al. 2013). In charophytes, a D14 member is more closely related to the KARRIKIN INSENSITIVE2 (KAI2) receptor than to canonical D14 proteins (Waldie et al. 2014; Waters et al. 2012b). It might be possible that SLs use this receptor instead of MAX2 to initiate their response (Waldie et al. 2014). The *D14* and *MAX2* gene clades arose quickly when land plants emerged, with *D14* probably appearing due to duplication in the clade, while another duplication within *D14* resulted in the evolution of the D14-LIKE2 group (Waters et al. 2012b; Waldie et al. 2014). These duplication events correlate with varying functions as land plants diversified. D53 protein evolution

also follows a similar pattern. The *D53*-like genes in mosses have higher similarity to *SMAX1* than to *D53/SMAXL7* clade; these clades were then subjected to further duplications (Zhou et al. 2013). Intriguingly, the entry of MAX2 into the SL pathway has not been fully elucidated. It is postulated that MAX2 was initially involved in AM colonization only and its role in SL signaling evolved later (Challis et al. 2013); this is supported by the *d3* rice mutant which cannot be colonized by AM fungi (Waldie et al. 2014).

Strigolactone Receptors: Highly Conserved in Diverse Plant Species

The SL receptors have a conserved α/β hydrolase functional domain (Bennett and Leyser 2014), which was first identified in the SL-insensitive *O. sativa d14* mutant (Arite et al. 2009). Orthologs were eventually identified in *Petunia* (Hamiaux et al. 2012), pea (de Saint Germain et al. 2016) and *Arabidopsis* (Waters et al. 2012b). According to Arite et al. (2009), *D14* homologs are found in diverse plant clades, such as *Marchantia polymorpha* (bryophytes), *Selaginella moellendorfii* (pteridophytes), and gymnosperms. These homologs belong to the D14-like subfamily, whereas angiosperm genes are grouped into the D14 subfamily of the α/β-hydrolase superfamily (Arite et al. 2009). Proteins of these subfamilies similarly possess a conserved catalytic triad, a nucleophilic residue and an acidic residue, but have quite different sequences (Nardini and Dijkstra. 1999; Arite et al. 2009). The α/β hydrolase superfamily also includes the acetylcholinesterase (AChE) enzyme (responsible for acetylcholine metabolism) and the inactive gibberellic acid receptor (Holmquist et al. 2000).

D14 (without any prefix corresponds to the *O. sativa* receptor) acts as a receptor as well as an enzyme, differentiating it from other plant hormone receptors (Hamiaux et al. 2012). It has a α/β hydrolase functional domain containing the Ser-His-Asp catalytic triad, forming its ligand binding pocket, and 4 α helices forming its cap (Kagiyama et al. 2013). It consists of 318 amino acids, and a homolog called *D14*-like is also reported in the rice genome (Arite et al. 2009. The rate of SL hydrolysis in vitro is as low as ~ 0.3 molecules per minute, suggesting that bioactive SL-derived signal production is not its primary function (Snowden and Janssen. 2016). Consistent with this, neither the intermediate molecule 2,4,4-trihydroxy-3-methyl-3-butenal nor the end products of SL hydrolysis (tricyclic lactone and HMB) act as signals for shoot branching suppression (Waters et al. 2017).

The SL receptor in *A. thaliana* (AtD14) is evolutionarily conserved (Waters et al. 2012b; Arite et al. 2009); just like the rice D14 receptor, it consists of a catalytic triad and possesses both receptor and enzyme functions (Hamiaux et al. 2012). The structure of the AtD14-D3-ASK1 complex showed a portion of the hormone covalently bonded with the receptor through two amino acids in the triad (Yao et al. 2016). When the receptor conformation changes, an α helix domain increases in length, while another α helix domain unfolds and forms a loop (Yao et al. 2016). Four α helix domains form the lid of the receptor, which probably functions in destabilizing the SL receptor upon hormone attachment (Zhao et al. 2015; Snowden and Janssen 2016). The enzymatic active site also decreases in volume resulting in closure (Fig. 3). Therefore, this indicates that D-ring separation is difficult without complex dissociation and could explain the sluggish enzyme activity (Snowden and Janssen 2016). In *Arabidopsis*, the AtD14L/KAI2 protein is 51% identical and 75.9% similar to AtD14, but is instead involved in karrikin signaling; unsurprisingly, AtD14L and AtD14 belong to different phylogenetic clades (Waters et al. 2012b).

The *Petunia* D14 receptor ortholog is DAD2 (Simons et al. 2007). Hamiaux et al. (2012) solved its structure by X-ray crystallography and its lid consists of 4 α helices, connected by a β hairpin to the core. A strongly hydrophobic cavity between the lid and the core can easily accommodate known SLs (Hamiaux et al. 2012). The authors further reported that when GR24 is present, DAD2 interacts with the F-box protein PhMAX2A (the *Petunia* MAX2 ortholog). GR24 then undergoes hydrolysis upon DAD2 interaction, but mutations in the catalytic triad lead to loss of enzymatic activity and failure to interact with PhMAX2A (Hamiaux et al. 2012). The prolific branching phenotype of *dad2* mutants has also been observed in *dad1* (*CCD8*) and *dad3* (*CCD7*) biosynthetic mutants (Napoli et al. 1996). DAD2



Fig. 3 The SL signaling mechanism showing receptor complex formation and protein modifications

locally controls shoot branching, as confirmed by grafting and genetic studies (Simons et al. 2007; Hamiaux et al. 2012). The branching phenotype of biosynthetic mutants is reversed by grafting with wild-type root stocks; however, this reversion does not occur in *dad2* mutants, suggesting that *DAD2* is not involved in SL biosynthesis (Simons et al. 2007).

The SL receptor in *Hordeum vulgare* (barley) is encoded by the *HvD14* gene, which consists of a 1055-bp coding sequence with two exons (Marzec et al. 2016). The approximately 303-amino acid HvD14 protein also contains the conserved α/β-hydrolase domain between amino acids 57 and 295 (Kagiyama et al. 2013). Unsurprisingly, it has great structural similarity, high sequence conservation, and comparable secondary domains to the rice D14 ortholog ((Marzec et al. 2016). In *hvd14.d* mutants, the Gly at position 193 is substituted by Glu (Marzec et al. 2015); this residue is present in the αD2 α-helical domain, which constitutes the cap surrounding the active site along with αD1, αD3, and αD4 (Kagiyama et al. 2013).

Zheng et al. (2016) reported that the woody perennial plant *Populus trichocarpa* has two highly identical (91.7%) and similar (95.9%) homologs *PtD14a* and *PtD14b*. They showed that *PtD14a* is 79% identical and 89.1% similar to *AtD14*, while *PtD14b* is 77.5% identical and 89.1% similar to *AtD14* (Zheng et al. 2016). The crucial Ser-His-Asp catalytic triad is conserved in both PtD14 homologs at positions 96, 246, and 217 (Zheng et al. 2016). In terms of gene expression, *PtD14a* transcript levels are higher compared to *PtD14b*, with very low co-expression between them (Zheng et al. 2016).

The probable SL receptors in parasitic weeds were more difficult to identify, because the phenotypes could not be dissected genetically (Toh et al. 2015; Tsuchiya et al. 2015). Subsequently, a group of α/β-hydrolases ShKAI2s/ShHTLs (*S. hermonthica* KARRIKIN INSENSITIVE2/ HYPOSENSITIVE TO LIGHT) were discovered to be involved in SL hydrolysis and SL-induced seed germination; these hydrolases are *D14* paralogs that act as SL receptors (Conn et al. 2015; Toh et al. 2015; Yao et al. 2017). Among them, ShHTL7 serves as the most active SL receptor in *Striga* (Conn et al. 2015; Yao et al. 2017). During CLIM formation, ShHTL7 undergoes a conformational change (like AtD14) to transduce signaling through its interaction with MAX2/ ShMAX2 (Yao et al. 2017).

Strigolactone-Phytohormone Crosstalk: Dynamic Interplay for Effective Plant Physiology

Different hormonal signaling pathways interact with one another, affecting their respective signaling components (Huot et al. 2014). These dynamic interactions regulate hormonal biosynthesis, response, and transport, thereby helping plants control their morphology and adapt to changing environmental conditions (Cheng et al. 2013). These challenging conditions include severe nutritional deficiency, abiotic stress factors (i.e., salinity, heat, cold, drought, and light stress), and harmful biotic invasions (i.e., pathogens and pests). Phytohormone crosstalk facilitates appropriate and tunable plant responses to these conditions by controlling nutrient distribution and by modulating growth, developmental, and defense processes. Plant stress responses are primarily regulated by jasmonic acid (JA), ABA, and salicylic acid (SA), whereas plant growth/ developmental processes are mainly governed by auxins, gibberellins and cytokinins (Huot et al. 2014). SLs interact with other hormones in order to exert their impact (Saeed et al. 2017; Torres-Vera et al. 2014).

Strigolactones and Auxins

SLs inhibit shoot branching by regulating auxin transport. Compared to wild-type plants, *A. thaliana max* mutants show increased auxin transport due to increased *PIN1/3/4/6* gene transcription (Bennett et al. 2006; Lin et al. 2009). Treating *Arabidopsis max* mutants and rice *dwarf* mutants with an auxin transport inhibitor, N-1-naphthylphtalamic acid, causes inhibition of bud outgrowth (Cheng et al. 2013; Lin et al. 2009). Crawford et al. (2010) reported that treatment with basal GR24 levels reduces auxin transport basipetally, as well as PIN1 accumulation in xylem parenchyma cell membranes. These observations persist in biosynthetic *max1* mutants but not signaling *max2* mutants, indicating that SLs slow down polar auxin transport stream in a MAX2-dependent manner (Crawford et al. 2010).

Studies of auxin and *max* mutants showed that SLs directly affect secondary growth activity, independent of auxin stacking (Agusti et al. 2011), by affecting interfascicular cambium activity (Ruyter-Spira et al. 2011). Based on a quantitative study, *max* mutants have a 30% decrease in interfascicular cambium-derived tissues, concomitant with lower expression levels of cambium- and cell cycle-related genes (Agusti et al. 2011). SLs regulate auxin content in the primary root tip, because the primary root lengths of SL biosynthetic and signaling mutants are

shorter compared to wild-type plants (Ruyter-Spira et al. 2011). GR24 application rescues this short root phenotype in SL-deficient mutants, but not in SL-insensitive *max2* mutants (Ruyter-Spira et al. 2011). SLs inhibit auxin efflux by controlling PIN activity, leading to auxin accumulation inside the primary root meristem cells and ultimately resulting in increased primary root length (Ruyter-Spira et al. 2011). SL–auxin interaction controls root development by adjusting or regulating intercellular auxin flow, auxin sensitivity, and shoot-to-root transport (Mayzlish-Gati et al. 2012; Omoarelojie et al. 2019). SLs also control lateral root formation by adjusting the essential auxin gradient (Omoarelojie et al. 2019). Furthermore, SL–auxin interaction regulates root hair elongation, whereby SLs increase intracellular auxin concentration by hindering auxin efflux (Koltai et al. 2010). Ligerot et al. (2017) suggested that a feedback loop exists in the auxin-SL crosstalk. Auxins upregulate SL biosynthesis in an *RMS2* (encodes PsAFB4/5 auxin receptor)-dependent manner, while SLs downregulate auxin levels in an RMS3- and RMS4-dependent manner by downregulating auxin biosynthetic gene expression (Ligerot et al. 2017).

P_i deficiency leads to increased levels of RSL4, an auxin-related transcription factor that promotes root hair elongation (Omoarelojie et al. 2019; Datta et al. 2015). In contrast to auxins, SLs inhibit adventitious root (AR) formation in *Arabidopsis* and pea (Datta et al. 2015). AR inhibition was even evident with high auxin concentration, suggesting that suppression of AR formation is not due to low auxin levels (Rasmussen et al. 2012). Auxins and SLs also play a crucial role during mycorrhization; auxins are associated with arbuscule formation, whereas SLs are associated with presymbiotic fungal growth (Guillotin et al. 2017). The authors further found that auxin content increases in roots colonized by AM fungi, and exogenous auxin application promotes the colonization process. An auxin-related gene *Sl-IAA27* positively controls mycorrhization by regulating SL biosynthesis via NSPI (transcription factor of the *D27* and *MAX1* genes) (Guillotin et al. 2017).

Strigolactones and Cytokinins

Cytokinins are adenine-derived plant hormones that stimulate cytokinesis and influence various processes, like enhancing shoot growth, limiting root growth, and influencing axillary shoot branching (Aloni et al. 2006; Werner et al. 2001). In *P. sativum* and *A. thaliana*, branching mutants with increased SLs have reduced cytokinin concentrations in the xylem sap (Morris et al. 2001; Foo et al. 2007). Decreased cytokinin sensitivity has also been reported in the buds of SL-insensitive plants (El-Showk et al. 2013). Dun et al. (2012) reported that the SL-insensitive and SL-deficient *P. sativum rms* mutants (*rms4 and rms1*) have increased expression of the cytokinin biosynthetic gene *PsIPT1* in shoot nodes and internodes. Interestingly, the *rms1* mutant was more sensitive to low cytokinin levels compared to wild type, when applied to the buds or supplied through the vasculature (Dun et al. 2012). The authors further found that bud outgrowth is higher in *rms1* mutants than wild-type plants after applying low cytokinin levels, suggesting that SLs and cytokinins play antagonistic roles. Exogenous GR24/ cytokinin application weakened the effect of cytokinins in *rms1* mutants but not in *rms4* mutants, implying that SL-cytokinin interaction converges at *RAMOSUS4 (RMS4)* (Dun et al. 2012). The cytokinin-SL antagonism is due to PsBRC1, a common target of both hormones (El-Showk et al. 2013); its gene expression negatively correlates with bud growth (Dun et al. 2012). Additionally, *PsBRC1* gene expression is enhanced by GR24 but reduced by cytokinins – a trend that persists even with cycloheximide (ribosomal translation inhibitor) treatment, suggesting that new protein synthesis is not required for this regulation (Dun et al. 2012). Both SLs and cytokinins act as negative regulators of lateral root development; the cytokinin receptors ARR1, ARR12, and AHK3 are associated with GR24-induced reduction of lateral development (Ruyter-Spira et al. 2011; Jiang et al. 2015). Genetic studies show that GR24-regulated lateral development is influenced by PIN1- and PIN7-mediated auxin polar transport; cytokinin treatment downregulates *PIN1/PIN3/PIN5* but upregulates *PIN7* expression (Jiang et al. 2015). Moreover, the *A. thaliana max2* mutants show low cytokinin catabolic gene expression (*CKX1, 2, 3*, *5*), reflecting the negative relationship between cytokinins and SLs (Banerjee et al. 2018). In *O. sativa*, Duan et al. (2019) observed enhanced cytokinin levels in shoot bases of *d53* mutants.

Some evidence suggests that SLs and cytokinins play important roles during drought adaptation (Nishiyama et al. 2011). Analyses of cytokinin-depleted *Arabidopsis* mutants (*CKX*- overexpressor), as well as signaling mutants (*arr1*, *10*, *12*), indicated that cytokinin signaling negatively regulates drought acclimation (Nguyen et al. 2016). Drought tolerance mechanisms in these mutants involve amplified stomatal closure, increased root-to-shoot ratio, enhanced cell membrane integrity, and increased ABA hypersensitivity (Nishiyama et al. 2011). Due to the undesirable role of cytokinins in drought tolerance, cytokinin biosynthesis and signaling in *A. thaliana* are suppressed during drought (Cortleven et al. 2019). Drought-induced cytokinin suppression occurs through the ABA-induced transcription factor AtMYB2, and members of the ABA-activated sucrose nonfermenting 1 (SNF1)-related protein kinase 2 family (Cortleven et al. 2019). In contrast to cytokinins, SLs positively regulate resilience to water stress conditions, as shown in studies of *Arabidopsis max1* mutants and *CCD7*-silenced tomato mutants (Visentin et al. 2016; Zhang et al. 2014).

Additionally, SLs decrease stomatal density (Van Ha et al. 2014) and stomatal opening during drought (Zhang et al. 2018). The *max* mutants also show decreased response to ABA (Van Ha et al. 2014). Overall, these observations clearly indicate the contrasting roles of SLs and cytokinins under drought stress conditions (Li et al. 2019).

Strigolactones and Gibberellins

The phytohormones SLs and gibberellins (GAs) may interact during their perception and signaling, acting together during plant growth and development (Marzec 2017). Remarkably, SL biosynthesis can be regulated by GAs (Ito et al. 2017). GAs are involved in flowering, seed production, leaf morphology, and shoot/root growth (Claeys et al. 2014). Various studies have indicated that SL and GA signaling are very similar. Rice semi-dwarf mutants in *GIBBERELLIN OXIDASE 5, 6* and *9* exhibit an extra-branched shoot phenotype similar to SL mutants (Marzec 2017). GAs control tiller number through the action of ORYZA SATIVA HOMEOBOX1 (osHB1) and TEOSINTE BRANCHED1 (osTB1) transcription factors (Lo et al. 2008). SLs promote the interaction between the D14 receptor and SLENDER1 (SLR1), a negative regulator of GA signaling (Nakamura et al. 2013). SLR1 degradation occurs in an SL-dependent manner, which parallels the GA signaling pathway, where the GID1 receptor binds GA to promote interaction between GID1 and DELLA proteins, eventually leading to DELLA degradation via the 26S proteasome (Marzec. 2017). Additionally, gene expression databases show that GA_3 treatment decreases SL biosynthetic gene expression in *O. sativa* (Ito et al. 2017). The interaction between SLs and GAs in *A. thaliana* is inconclusive; microarray data showed varying SL biosynthetic gene expression profiles upon GA_3 treatment (Marzec et al. 2015). In *O. sativa* Zou et al. (2019), found that SL biosynthetic and signaling mutants exhibit dwarfism that is rescued by GA treatment. Interestingly, these mutants have less bioactive GA and decreased GA sensitivity (Zou et al. 2019). This ultimately leads to reduced shoot length by downregulating genes involved in cell division and elongation (Zou et al. 2019).

Strigolactones and Abscisic Acid

ABA is regarded as a universal stress hormone since it regulates various abiotic stress responses. Like ABA, SLs are apocarotenoid hormones so it is possible that they could also act as stress hormones. Tomato ABA mutants have low SL biosynthetic gene expression, including *LeCCD7* and *LeCCD8*, reflecting the close harmonization between SL and ABA anabolic pathways (Banerjee et al. 2018). SL-deficient *Arabidopsis* mutants have downregulated ABA import genes, like *ABCG22* and *ABCG40*, resulting in ABA hyposensitivity (Van Ha et al. 2014). It has also been reported that mycorrhizal plants exposed to abiotic stresses have greater SL and ABA levels (Ruiz-Lozano et al. 2016). GR24 application decreased the expression of *LjNCED2* in *Lotus japonicus*, which in turn inhibited ABA accumulation during osmotic stress (Liu et al. 2015). Additionally, SL–ABA interaction is demonstrated by SLs controlling ABA-induced stomatal sensitivity (Van Ha et al. 2014). SLs promote seed germination under high temperature conditions by regulating both ABA and GAs in parasitic and non-parasitic seeds (Mostofa et al. 2018). Furthermore, SL biosynthetic and signaling genes in *Sesbania cannabina* are upregulated by ABA to cope with salt stress, while SL biosynthetic inhibitor treatment induced partial salt tolerance (Ren et al. 2018). Studies using ABA-deficient tomato mutants and CCD/NCED inhibitors suggest that SL regulates ABA biosynthesis through an unknown mechanism (López-Ráez et al. 2010).

Strigolactones and Ethylene

Certain plant growth and developmental processes involve both SL and ethylene signaling, including seed germination, leaf senescence, root hair elongation, and hypocotyl growth (Ueda and Kusaba 2015; Cheng et al. 2013; Kapulnik et al. 2011). During light treatment, SLs upregulate *HY5* expression in a MAX2-dependent fashion, inhibiting hypocotyl elongation (Jia et al. 2014). In contrast, ethylene promotes hypocotyl elongation by augmenting HY5 degradation via COP1 (Yu et al. 2013). These show the antagonistic roles of these two hormones in regulating hypocotyl growth. SL-mediated root hair elongation also depends on ethylene signaling, since ethylene signaling mutants (like *At-etr*) have reduced GR24 sensitivity (Kapulnik et al. 2011). Abolishing ethylene production totally eliminates SL-mediated root hair elongation, while GR24 enhances ethylene biosynthetic gene *ACS2* transcription (Kapulnik et al. 2011). Moreover, SLs stimulate ethylene biosynthesis in *Striga* seeds prior to germination (Sugimoto et al. 2003). During leaf senescence, SLs activate senescence signals mediated by ethylene (Ueda and Kusaba 2015).

Strigolactones and Salicylic Acid

SA is involved in plant defense responses against various pathogens, as well as tolerance to abiotic stresses (Askari and Ehsanzadeh 2015; Prodhan et al. 2018; Omoarelojie et al. 2019). SA-mediated stress tolerance is mainly due to changes in the plant's reactive oxygen species status (Omoarelojie et al. 2019). In terms of crosstalk, SA interacts with SLs during plant–fungal symbioses (Rozpadek et al. 2018). GR24 treatment results in SA build-up, whereas *max2* mutants have decreased SA concentrations, suggesting

that SLs are involved in plant defenses by inducing SA production (Rozpądek et al. 2018; Omoarelojie et al. 2019). In wheat, foliar application of SLs and SA synergistically results in lower electrolyte leakage, higher relative leaf water content, and enhanced antioxidant enzyme activities during drought stress (Sedaghat et al. 2017).

Strigolactones and Jasmonic Acid

Jasmonates are involved in secondary metabolism, wounding responses, and plant–pathogen/insect interactions (Yan et al. 2007; Yan and Xie. 2015). JA concentration and JA-dependent *PIN11* gene expression are reduced in the tomato SL biosynthetic mutant *Sl-ccd8* (Torres-Vera et al. 2014). Because *PIN11* provides resistance in *Solanum lycopersicum* against *Botrytis cinerea* (Torres-Vera et al. 2014), these observations hint at a possible interplay between these two hormones during disease resistance. Although there is no direct evidence depicting SL–JA interaction, both are involved together in several processes, like plant–microbe interactions, mesocotyl elongation, and senescence; thus, their crosstalk cannot be totally ruled out (Omoarelojie. et al. 2019). For example, Lahari et al. (2019) reported that SLs induce root-knot nematode infection in rice roots by inhibiting the JA pathway. Remarkably, SL biosynthetic mutants were less prone to infection by the root-knot nematode *Meloidogyne graminicola* (Lahari et al. 2019).

Strigolactones and Karrikins

Karrikins (from 'karrik' meaning smoke) or KARs are smoke-derived signals produced by burning vegetation; they form through the combustion of carbohydrates (Flematti et al. 2011). Although not produced *in planta*, they can stimulate germination of dormant seeds (De Cuyper et al. 2017) – an effect attributed to the butenolide pyran moiety (Flematti et al. 2007). Unlike SLs, however, KARs do not induce the germination of parasitic weeds (Conn et al. 2015). Although they have different sources and effects on plant growth and development, SLs and KARs share highly similar signaling mechanisms, which could be due to their shared butenolide structure (Morffy et al. 2016). The KAI2 receptor of KARs work in the same manner as the D14 receptor of SLs (Morffy et al. 2016). Because KAI2 and D14 are paralogs, they share the F-box protein MAX2 during signaling (De Cuyper et al. 2017). Structurally, the KAI2 receptor catalytic pocket is smaller than that of the D14 receptor, which hints at the binding of smaller cognate molecules (Guo et al. 2013). Phylogenetic studies have shown that KAI2 was present in basal land plants instead of D14 orthologs, suggesting that *KAI2* is ancestral and that *D14* probably evolved due to *KAI2* duplication (Waters et al. 2012b).

The application of KAR_1, KAR_2, as well as *rac*-GR24 inhibits hypocotyl elongation in *Arabidopsis*, with *rac*-GR24 having greater impact than KARs (Nelson et al. 2010; De Cuyper et al. 2017). This observation is supported by *max2* mutant plants that have longer hypocotyls (Stirnberg et al. 2002), a phenotype shared by mutant *kai2* seedlings (Waters et al. 2012b). In contrast, KAR_1 and *rac*-GR24 have antagonistic effects on cotyledon growth – karrikin promotes growth while *rac*-GR24 negatively impacts cotyledon growth (De Cuyper et al. 2017). Mutations in *KAI2* and *MAX2* cause skewing of *A. thaliana* roots, but this response is independent of SL perception by the D14-MAX2 complex (Swarbreck et al. 2019). Scaffidi et al. (2014) cautioned about using racemic mixtures of chemically synthesized SLs, as well as their analogs like GR24, since they can activate responses that are different from natural counterparts.

As reported by Liu et al. (2019), both SLs and KARs shape the morphology of the exodermis. They revealed that SLs positively regulate the number of hypodermal passage cells (HPC), but *d14* mutants surprisingly have higher HPCs (Liu et al. 2019). They further noted that, in contrast to *d14, max2* mutants have decreased HPC numbers (Liu et al. 2019). In *Petunia*, *KAI2* mutation also reduces HPC numbers, indicating the critical importance of the dimeric KAI2/MAX2 receptor in controlling this process (Liu et al. 2019).

Strigolactones and Nitric Oxide

There is evidence that SLs and nitric oxide (NO) possibly interact during various stress responses and developmental processes. Their interplay has mostly been studied in root systems; results suggest that NO negatively and positively regulates root SL biosynthesis and signaling, respectively, in a nutrient-dependent manner (Bharti and Bhatla. 2015). NO can modify proteins involved in SL biosynthesis and signaling, with *Arabidopsis max1-1* and *max2-1* mutants having increased NO levels in their root tips (Kolbert. 2019). These observations highlight the possible negative impact of SLs on NO biosynthesis; however, exogenous SL application increased NO production, contradicting earlier genetic studies (Kolbert. 2019). GR24 treatment results in decreased NO concentration in lateral roots but increased NO concentrations in primary root tips (Bharti and Bhatla. 2015). Furthermore, SLs and NO act as positive regulators of meristem activity thereby enhancing root elongation (Sun et al. 2016). Endogenous NO does not influence SL biosynthesis, while exogenous NO upregulates the expression of SL signaling but not biosynthetic genes in *O. sativa* (Sun et al. 2016). In addition, exogenous SLs promote accumulation of guard cell H_2O_2 and NO, leading to SLOW ANION CHANNEL-ASSOCIATED 1-mediated stomatal closure (Lv et al. 2017).

Conclusion and Future Prospects

SLs regulate plant growth, development, and stress tolerance via close crosstalk with other hormones. Mechanistically, SLs elicit their response by regulating hormone content, transport, and delivery between diverse plant organs and within plant tissues, and also by interacting with other hormone signaling cascades. Plant responses are governed by synergistic as well as antagonistic interactions of SLs with other phytohormones. Based on various physiological and molecular studies, SLs are essential for plant responses to stressful environmental conditions. Due to their utmost importance, continued research is needed to more lucidly understand the SL biosynthetic pathway, SL signaling crosstalk with other hormones, and mechanisms by which SLs regulate different stress responses, growth processes, and developmental programs. Although we have gained significant insights in understanding SL hormonal interplay at various levels of regulation, critical knowledge gaps still need to be addressed at both cellular and molecular levels. Certain functions of SLs have yet to be discovered, while further investigating the SL repressor D53 could reveal its involvement in other processes. On a translational level, studying SL hormones could help produce crop varieties with better nutrient allocation under limiting conditions. Long-term research programs could focus on developing more resilient crops, through genetic manipulation of SL quantity and response. Moreover, whether the SL receptor enzymatic activity is required for downstream SL signaling and function still needs to be elucidated. Because protein–protein interactions during SL signaling are unique, further research is required to fully understand SL crosstalk with other hormone pathways. To gain better insights and solve pressing biological problems, the next decade opens a lot of research opportunities in the exciting field of strigolactone hormone biology.

Acknowledgements Mr. Kaiser Iqbal Wani, Ms. Andleeb Zehra, and Ms. Sadaf Choudhary are thankful to the University Grants Commission (Government of India) for providing their research fellowships. Dr. Christian Danve M. Castroverde is supported by institutional research start-up funds from Wilfrid Laurier University, the Natural Sciences, and Engineering Research Council of Canada and Canada Foundation for Innovation.

Author Contributions TA conceived and designed the first draft, contributed to the revisions and was the advisor of this project. KIW, AZ and SC wrote the first draft of the manuscript with support from MN and MMAK. CDMC critically revised and edited the manuscript. All authors read and approved final version of manuscript.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare that the submitted work was not carried out in the presence of any personal, professional, or financial relationships that could potentially be constructed as a conflict of interest.

References

Abe S, Sado A, Tanaka K, Kisugi T, Asami K, Ota S, Seto Y (2014) Carlactone is converted to carlactonoic acid by MAX1 in *Arabidopsis* and its methyl ester can directly interact with AtD14 in vitro. PNAS 111:18084–18089

Agusti J, Herold S, Schwarz M, Sanchez P, Ljung K, Dun EA, Greb T (2011) Strigolactone signaling is required for auxin-dependent stimulation of secondary growth in plants. PNAS 108:20242–20247

Akiyama K, Matsuzaki KI, Hayashi H (2005) Plant sesquiterpenes induce hyphal branching in arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. Nature 435:824

Al-Babili S, Bouwmeester HJ (2015) Strigolactones, a novel carotenoid-derived plant hormone. Annu Rev Plant Biol 66:161–186

Alder A, Jamil M, Marzorati M, Bruno M, Vermathen M, Bigler P, Ghisla S, Bouwmeester H, Beyer P, Al-Babili S (2012) The path from b-carotene to carlactone, a strigolactone-like plant hormone. Science 335:1348–1351

Alder A, Holdermann I, Beyer P, Al-Babili S (2008) Carotenoid oxygenases involved in plant branching catalyse a highly specific conserved apocarotenoid cleavage reaction. Biochem J 416:289–296

Aloni R, Aloni E, Langhans M, Ullrich CI (2006) Role of cytokinin and auxin in shaping root architecture: regulating vascular differentiation, lateral root initiation, root apical dominance and root gravitropism. Ann Bot 97:883–893

Arite T, Iwata H, Ohshima K, Maekawa M, Nakajima M, Kojima M, Kyozuka J (2007) DWARF10, an RMS1/MAX4/DAD1 ortholog, controls lateral bud outgrowth in rice. Plant J 51:1019–1029

Arite T, Umehara M, Ishikawa S, Hanada A, Maekawa M, Yamaguchi S, Kyozuka J (2009) d14, a strigolactone-insensitive mutant of rice, shows an accelerated outgrowth of tillers. Plant Cell Physiol 50:1416–1424

Auldridge ME, McCarty DR, Klee HJ (2006) Plant carotenoid cleavage oxygenases and their apocarotenoid products. Curr Opin Plant Biol 9:315–321

Askari E, Ehsanzadeh P (2015) Effectiveness of exogenous salicylic acid on root and shoot growth attributes, productivity, and water use efficiency of water-deprived fennel genotypes. Hortic Environ Biotechnol 56:687–696

Awad AA, Sato D, Kusumoto D, Kamioka H, Takeuchi Y, Yoneyama K (2006) Characterization of strigolactones, germination stimulants for the root parasitic plants Striga and Orobanche, produced by maize, millet and sorghum. Plant Growth Regul 48:221

Banerjee A, Roychoudhury A (2018) Strigolactones: multi-level regulation of biosynthesis and diverse responses in plant abiotic stresses. Acta Physiol Plant 40:86

Baz L, Mori N, Mi J, Jamil M, Kountche BA, Guo X, Al-Babili S (2018) 3-Hydroxycarlactone, a novel product of the strigolactone biosynthesis core pathway. Mol Plant 11:1312–1314

Bennett T, Sieberer T, Willett B, Booker J, Luschnig C, Leyser O (2006) The Arabidopsis MAX pathway controls shoot branching by regulating auxin transport. Curr Biol 16:553–563

Bennett T, Leyser O (2014) Strigolactone signaling: standing on the shoulders of DWARFs. Curr Opin Plant Biol 22:7–13

Bennett T, Liang Y, Seale M, Ward S, Müller D, Leyser O (2016) Strigolactone regulates shoot development through a core signalling pathway. Biol Open 5:1806–1820

Besserer A, Puech-Pagès V, Kiefer P, Gomez-Roldan V, Jauneau A, Roy S, Séjalon-Delmas N (2006) Strigolactones stimulate

arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi by activating mitochondria. PLoS Biol 4(7):e226
Beveridge CA, Ross JJ, Murfet IC (1994) Branching mutant rms-2 in Pisum sativum (grafting studies and endogenous indole-3-acetic acid levels). Plant Physiol 104:953–959
Bharti N, Bhatla SC (2015) Nitric oxide mediates strigolactone signaling in auxin and ethylene-sensitive lateral root formation in sunflower seedlings. Plant Signal Behav 10:e1054087
Bhattacharya C, Bonfante P, Deagostino A, Kapulnik Y, Larini P, Occhiato EG, Venturello P (2009) A new class of conjugated strigolactone analogs with fluorescent properties: synthesis and biological activity. Org Biomol Chem 7:3413–3420
Booker J, Auldridge M, Wills S, McCarty D, Klee H, Leyser O (2004) MAX3/CCD7 is a carotenoid cleavage dioxygenase required for the synthesis of a novel plant signaling molecule. Curr Biol 14:1232–1238
Booker J et al (2005) *MAX1* encodes a cytochrome P450 family member that acts downstream of *MAX3/4* to produce a carotenoid-derived branch-inhibiting hormone. Dev Cell 8:443–449
Borghi L, Liu GW, Emonet A, Kretzschmar T, Martinoia E (2016) The importance of strigolactone transport regulation for symbiotic signaling and shoot branching. Planta 243:1351–1360
Boyer FD, de Saint GA, Pouvreau JB, Clavé G, Pillot JP, Roux A, Heugebaert TS (2014) New strigolactone analogs as plant hormones with low activities in the rhizosphere. Mol Plant 7:675–690
Brewer PB, Yoneyama K, Filardo F, Meyers E, Scaffidi A, Frickey T, Kerr SC (2016) LATERAL BRANCHING OXIDOREDUCTASE acts in the final stages of strigolactone biosynthesis in Arabidopsis. PNAS 113:6301–6306
Bürger M, Chory J (2020) The many models of strigolactone signaling. Trend Plant Sci 25:395–405
Butler LG (1995) Chemical communication between the parasitic weed Striga and its crop host: a new dimension in allelochemistry. Allelopathy Chapter 12:158–168
Bythell-Douglas R, Rothfels CJ, Stevenson DW, Graham SW, Wong GKS, Nelson DC, Bennett T (2017) The complex origins of strigolactone signalling in land plants. bioRxiv 102715
Carlsson GH, Hasse D, Cardinale F, Prandi C, Andersson I (2018) The elusive ligand complexes of the DWARF14 strigolactone receptor. J Exp Bot 69:2345–2354
Challis RJ, Hepworth J, Mouchel C, Waites R, Leyser O (2013) A role for more axillary growth1 (*MAX1*) in evolutionary diversity in strigolactone signaling upstream of *MAX2*. Plant Physiol 161:1885–1902
Cheng X, Ruyter-Spira C, Bouwmeester H (2013) The interaction between strigolactones and other plant hormones in the regulation of plant development. Front Plant Sci 4:199
Chevalier F, Nieminen K, Sánchez-Ferrero JC, Rodríguez ML, Chagoyen M, Hardtke CS, Cubas P (2014) Strigolactone promotes degradation of DWARF14, an α/β hydrolase essential for strigolactone signaling in Arabidopsis. Plant Cell 26:1134–1150
Claeys H, De Bodt S, Inzé D (2014) Gibberellins and DELLAs: central nodes in growth regulatory networks. Trends Plant Sci 19:231–239
Conn CE, Nelson DC (2015) Evidence that KARRIKIN-INSENSITIVE2 (KAI2) receptors may perceive an unknown signal that is not karrikin or strigolactone. Front Plant Sci 6:1219
Conn CE, Bythell-Douglas R, Neumann D, Yoshida S, Whittington B, Westwood JH, Nelson DC (2015) Convergent evolution of strigolactone perception enabled host detection in parasitic plants. Science 349:540–543
Cook CE, Whichard LP, Turner B, Wall ME, Egley GH (1966) Germination of witchweed (*Striga lutea Lour.*): isolation and properties of a potent stimulant. Science 154:1189–1190
Cortleven A, Leuendorf JE, Frank M, Pezzetta D, Bolt S, Schmülling T (2019) Cytokinin action in response to abiotic and biotic stresses in plants. Plant Cell Environ 42:998–1018
Crawford S, Shinohara N, Sieberer T, Williamson L, George G, Hepworth J, Leyser O (2010) Strigolactones enhance competition between shoot branches by dampening auxin transport. Development 137:2905–2913
Cui X (2014) Strigolactones, Karrikins, and more: newly discovered molecules light up plant signaling. Mol Plant 7:579–581
Datta SP, Prescott H, Dolan L (2015) Intensity of a pulse of RSL4 transcription factor synthesis determines Arabidopsis root hair cell size. Nat Plants 1:15138
De Cuyperdu C, Struk S, Braem L, Gevaert K, De Jaeger G, Goormachtig S (2017) Strigolactones, karrikins and beyond. Plant Cell Environ 40:1691–1703
de Saint GA, Clavé G, Badet-Denisot MA, Pillot JP, Cornu D, Le Caer JP, Bonhomme S (2016) An histidine covalent receptor and butenolide complex mediates strigolactone perception. Nat Chem Biol 12:787
Delaux PM, Xie X, Timme RE, Puech-Pages V, Dunand C, Lecompte E, Delwiche CF, Yoneyama K, Bécard G, Séjalon-Delmas N (2012) Origin of strigolactones in the green lineage. New Phytol 195:857–871
Dharmasiri N, Dharmasiri S, Estelle M (2005) The F-box protein TIR1 is an auxin receptor. Nature 435:441–445
Domagalska MA, Leyser O (2011) Signal integration in the control of shoot branching. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 12:211–221
Duan J, Yu H, Yuan K, Liao Z, Meng X, Jing Y, Li J (2019) Strigolactone promotes cytokinin degradation through transcriptional activation of CYTOKININ OXIDASE/DEHYDROGENASE 9 in rice. PNAS 116:14319–14324
Dun EA, de Saint GA, Rameau C, Beveridge CA (2012) Antagonistic action of strigolactone and cytokinin in bud outgrowth control. Plant physiol 158:487–498
El-Showk S, Ruonala R, Helariutta Y (2013) Crossing paths: cytokinin signalling and crosstalk. Development 140:1373–1383
Felemban A, Braguy J, Zurbriggen MD, Al-Babili S (2019) Apocarotenoids involved in plant development and stress response. Front Plant Sci 10:1168
Flematti GR, Goddard-Borger ED, Merritt DJ, Ghisalberti EL, Dixon KW, Trengove RD (2007) Preparation of 2 H-furo [2, 3-c] pyran-2-one derivatives and evaluation of their germination-promoting activity. J Agric Food Chem 55:2189–2194
Flematti GR, Scaffidi A, Dixon KW, Smith SM, Ghisalberti EL (2011) Production of the seed germination stimulant karrikinolide from combustion of simple carbohydrates. J Agric Food Chem 59:1195–1198
Foo E, Morris SE, Parmenter K, Young N, Wang H, Jones A, Beveridge CA (2007) Feedback regulation of xylem cytokinin content is conserved in pea and Arabidopsis. Plant Physiol 143:1418–1428
Foo E, Ferguson BJ, Reid JB (2014) The potential roles of strigolactones and brassinosteroids in the autoregulation of nodulation pathway. Ann Bot 113:1037–1045
Goldwasser Y, Yoneyama K, Xie X, Yoneyama K (2008) Production of strigolactones by *Arabidopsis thaliana* responsible for *Orobanche aegyptiaca* seed germination. Plant Growth Regul 55:21–28
Gomez-Roldan V, Fermas S, Brewer PB, Puech-Pagès V, Dun EA, Pillot JP, Bouwmeester H (2008) Strigolactone inhibition of shoot branching. Nature 455:189
Guillotin B, Etemadi M, Audran C, Bouzayen M, Bécard G, Combier JP (2017) Sl-IAA27 regulates strigolactone biosynthesis and mycorrhization in tomato (var. MicroTom). New Phytol 213:1124–1132

Guo Y, Zheng Z, La Clair JJ, Chory J, Noel JP (2013) Smoke-derived karrikin perception by the α/β-hydrolase KAI2 from *Arabidopsis*. PNAS 110:8284–8289

Hamiaux C, Drummond RS, Janssen BJ, Ledger SE, Cooney JM, Newcomb RD, Snowden KC (2012) DAD2 is an α/β hydrolase likely to be involved in the perception of the plant branching hormone, strigolactone. Curr Biol 22:2032–2036

Hayward A, Stirnberg P, Beveridge C, Leyser O (2009) Interactions between auxin and strigolactone in shoot branching control. Plant Physiol 151:400–412

Holmquist M (2000) Alpha beta-hydrolase fold enzymes structures, functions and mechanisms. Curr Protein Pept Sci 1:209–235

Hou X, Rivers J, Leon P, McQuinn RP, Pogson BJ (2016) Synthesis and function of apocarotenoid signals in plants. Trends Plant Sci 21:792–803

Huot B, Yao J, Montgomery BL, He SY (2014) Growth–defense tradeoffs in plants: a balancing act to optimize fitness. Mol Plant 7:1267–1287

Ito S, Yamagami D, Umehara M, Hanada A, Yoshida S, Sasaki Y, Shirasu K (2017) Regulation of strigolactone biosynthesis by gibberellin signaling. Plant Physiol 174:1250–1259

Jia KP, Luo Q, He SB, Lu XD, Yang HQ (2014) Strigolactone-regulated hypocotyl elongation is dependent on cryptochrome and phytochrome signaling pathways in Arabidopsis. Mol Plant 7:528–540

Jiang L, Liu X, Xiong G, Liu H, Chen F, Wang L, Yi W (2013) DWARF 53 acts as a repressor of strigolactone signalling in rice. Nature 504:401

Jiang L, Matthys C, Marquez-Garcia B, De Cuyper C, Smet L, De Keyser A, Goormachtig S (2015) Strigolactones spatially influence lateral root development through the cytokinin signaling network. J Exp Bot 67:379–389

Johnson X, Brcich T, Dun EA, Goussot M, Haurogné K, Beveridge CA, Rameau C (2006) Branching genes are conserved across species. Genes controlling a novel signal in pea are coregulated by other long-distance signals. Plant physiol 142:1014–1026

Kagiyama M, Hirano Y, Mori T, Kim SY, Kyozuka J, Seto Y, Yamaguchi S, Hakoshima T (2013) Structures of D14 and D14L in the strigolactone and karrikin signaling pathways. Genes Cells 18:147–160

Kapulnik Y, Resnick N, Mayzlish-Gati E, Kaplan Y, Wininger S, Hershenhorn J, Koltai H (2011) Strigolactones interact with ethylene and auxin in regulating root-hair elongation in Arabidopsis. J Exp Bot 62:2915–2924

Kapulnik Y, Koltai H (2014) Strigolactone involvement in root development, response to abiotic stress, and interactions with the biotic soil environment. Plant physiol 166:560–569

Katsir L, Chung HS, Koo AJ, Howe GA (2008) Jasmonate signaling: a conserved mechanism of hormone sensing. Curr Opin Plant Biol 11:428–435

Kim HI, Kisugi T, Khetkam P, Xie X, Yoneyama K, Uchida K, Yoneyama K (2014) Avenaol, a germination stimulant for root parasitic plants from *Avena strigosa*. Phytochemistry 103:85–88

Kohlen W, Charnikhova T, Liu Q, Bours R, Domagalska MA, Beguerie S, Ruyter-Spira C (2011) Strigolactones are transported through the xylem and play a key role in shoot architectural response to phosphate deficiency in nonarbuscular mycorrhizal host Arabidopsis. Plant Physiol 155:974–987

Kolbert Z (2019) Strigolactone-nitric oxide interplay in plants: the story has just begun. Physiol Plant 165:487–497

Koltai H, Dor E, Hershenhorn J, Joel DM, Weininger S, Lekalla S, Barg R (2010) Strigolactones effect on root growth and root-hair elongation may be mediated by auxin-efflux carriers. J Plant Growth Regul 29:129–136

Koltai H, Beveridge CA (2013) Strigolactones and the coordinated development of shoot and root. In: Long-distance systemic signaling and communication in plants. Springer, Berlin, pp 189–204

Koltai H (2014) Receptors, repressors, PINs: a playground for strigolactone signaling. Trends Plant Sci 19:727–733

Lahari Z, Ullah C, Kyndt T, Gershenzon J, Gheysen G (2019) Strigolactones enhance root-knot nematode (*Meloidogyne graminicola*) infection in rice by antagonizing the jasmonate pathway. New Phytol 224:454–465

Ligerot Y, de Saint GA, Waldie T, Troadec C, Citerne S, Kadakia N, Leyser O (2017) The pea branching RMS2 gene encodes the PsAFB4/5 auxin receptor and is involved in an auxin-strigolactone regulation loop. PLoS Genet 13:e1007089

Li W, Herrera-Estrella L, Tran LSP (2019) Do cytokinins and strigolactones crosstalk during drought adaptation? Trends Plant Sci 24:669–672

Liang Y, Ward S, Li P, Bennett T, Leyser O (2016) SMAX1-LIKE7 signals from the nucleus to regulate shoot development in Arabidopsis via partially EAR motif-independent mechanisms. Plant Cell 28:1581–1601

Lin H, Wang R, Qian Q, Yan M, Meng X, Fu Z, Yan C, Jiang B, Su Z, Li J et al (2009) DWARF27, an iron-containing protein required for the biosynthesis of strigolactones, regulates rice tiller bud outgrowth. Plant Cell 21:1512–1525

Liu J, He H, Vitali M, Visentin I, Charnikhova T, Haider I, Cardinale F (2015) Osmotic stress represses strigolactone biosynthesis in *Lotus japonicus* roots: exploring the interaction between strigolactones and ABA under abiotic stress. Planta 241:1435–1451

Liu G, Stirnemann M, Gübeli C, Egloff S, Courty PE, Aubry S, Borghi L (2019) Strigolactones play an important role in shaping exodermal morphology via a KAI2-dependent pathway. iScience 17:144–154

Lo SF, Yang SY, Chen KT, Hsing YI, Zeevaart JA, Chen LJ, Yu SM (2008) A novel class of gibberellin 2-oxidases control semidwarfism, tillering, and root development in rice. Plant Cell 20:2603–2618

López-Ráez JA, Charnikhova T, Gómez-Roldán V, Matusova R, Kohlen W, De Vos R, Bouwmeester H (2008) Tomato strigolactones are derived from carotenoids and their biosynthesis is promoted by phosphate starvation. New Phytol 178:863–874

López-Ráez JA, Kohlen W, Charnikhova T, Mulder P, Undas AK, Sergeant MJ, Bouwmeester H (2010) Does abscisic acid affect strigolactone biosynthesis? New Phytol 187:343–354

Lu T, Yu H, Li Q, Chai L, Jiang W (2019) Improving plant growth and alleviating photosynthetic inhibition and oxidative stress from low-light stress with exogenous GR24 in tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) seedlings. Front Plant Sci 10:490

Lv S, Zhang Y, Li C, Liu Z, Yang N, Pan L, Wu J, Wang J, Yang J, Lv Y, Zhang Y, Jiang W, She X, Wang G (2017) Strigolactone-triggered stomatal closure requires hydrogen peroxide synthesis and nitric oxide production in an abscisic acid-independent manner. New Phytol 217:290–304

Ma N, Hu C, Wan L, Hu Q, Xiong J, Zhang C (2017) Strigolactones improve plant growth, photosynthesis, and alleviate oxidative stress under salinity in rapeseed (*Brassica napus* L.) by regulating gene expression. Front Plant Sci 8:1671

Marzec M, Muszynska A (2015) In silico analysis of the genes encoding proteins that are involved in the biosynthesis of the RMS/MAX/D pathway revealed new roles of strigolactones in plants. Int J Mol Med 16:6757–6782

Marzec M (2017) Strigolactones and gibberellins: a new couple in the phytohormone world? Trends Plant Sci 22:813–815

Marzec M, Gruszka D, Tylec P, Szarejko I (2016) Identification and functional analysis of the *HvD14* gene involved in strigolactone signalling in *Hordeum vulgare* L. Physiol Plant 158:341–355

Marzec M, Brewer P (2019) Binding or hydrolysis? How does the strigolactone receptor work? Trends Plant Sci 24:571–574

Matusova R, Rani K, Verstappen FWA, Franssen MCR, Beale MH, Bouwmeester HJ (2005) The strigolactone germination stimulants of the plant-parasitic *Striga* and *Orobanche* spp. are derived from the carotenoid pathway. Plant Physiol 139:920–934

Mayzlish-Gati E, De-Cuyper C, Goormachtig S, Beeckman T, Vuylsteke M, Brewer PB, Wininger S (2012) Strigolactones are involved in root response to low phosphate conditions in Arabidopsis. Plant Physiol 160:1329–1341

Moise AR, Al-Babili S, Wurtzel ET (2014) Mechanistic aspects of carotenoid biosynthesis. Chem Rev 114:164–193

Morffy N, Faure L, Nelson DC (2016) Smoke and hormone mirrors: action and evolution of karrikin and strigolactone signaling. Trends Genet 32:176–188

Morris SE, Turnbull CG, Murfet IC, Beveridge CA (2001) Mutational analysis of branching in pea. Evidence That Rms1 and Rms5 regulate the same novel signal. Plant Physiol 126:1205–1213

Mostofa MG, Li W, Nguyen KH, Fujita M, Tran LP (2018) Strigolactones in plant adaptation to abiotic stresses: an emerging avenue of plant research. Plant Cell Environ 41:2227–2243

Nakamura H, Xue YL, Miyakawa T, Hou F, Qin HM, Fukui K, Miyauchi Y (2013) Molecular mechanism of strigolactone perception by DWARF14. Nat Commun 4:1–10

Napoli CA, Ruehle J (1996) New mutations affecting meristem growth and potential in *Petunia hybrida* Vilm. J Hered 87:371–377

Nardini M, Dijkstra BW (1999) α/β Hydrolase fold enzymes: the family keeps growing. Curr Opin Struct Biol 9:732–737

Nelson DC, Flematti GR, Riseborough JA, Ghisalberti EL, Dixon KW, Smith SM (2010) Karrikins enhance light responses during germination and seedling development in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. PNAS 107:7095–7100

Nelson DC, Scaffidi A, Dun EA, Waters MT, Flematti GR, Dixon KW, Smith SM (2011) F-box protein MAX2 has dual roles in karrikin and strigolactone signaling in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. PNAS 108:8897–8902

Nguyen KH, Van Ha C, Nishiyama R, Watanabe Y, Leyva-González MA, Fujita Y, Schaller GE (2016) Arabidopsis type B cytokinin response regulators ARR1, ARR10, and ARR12 negatively regulate plant responses to drought. PNAS 113:3090–3095

Nishiyama R, Watanabe Y, Fujita Y, Le DT, Kojima M, Werner T, Sakakibara H (2011) Analysis of cytokinin mutants and regulation of cytokinin metabolic genes reveals important regulatory roles of cytokinins in drought, salt and abscisic acid responses, and abscisic acid biosynthesis. Plant Cell 23:2169–2183

Omoarelojie LO, Kulkarni MG, Finnie JF, Van Staden J (2019) Strigolactones and their crosstalk with other phytohormones. Annal Bot 124:749–767

Ongaro V, Leyser O (2008) Hormonal control of shoot branching. J Exp Bot 59:67–74

Prodhan MY, Munemasa S, Nahar MNEN, Nakamura Y, Murata Y (2018) Guard cell salicylic acid signaling is integrated into abscisic acid signaling via the Ca2+/CPK-dependent pathway. Plant Physiol 178:441–450

Rani K, Zwanenburg B, Sugimoto Y, Yoneyama K, Bouwmeester HJ (2008) Biosynthetic considerations could assist the structure elucidation of host plant produced rhizosphere signalling compounds (strigolactones) for arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and parasitic plants. Plant Physiol Biochem 46:617–626

Rasmussen A, Mason MG, De Cuyper C et al (2012) Strigolactones suppress adventitious rooting in Arabidopsis and pea. Plant Physiol 158:1976–1987

Ren CG, Kong CC, Xie ZH (2018) Role of abscisic acid in strigolactone-induced salt stress tolerance in arbuscular mycorrhizal *Sesbania cannabina* seedlings. BMC Plant Biol 18:74

Rozpądek P, Domka AM, Nosek M et al (2018) The role of strigolactone in the cross-talk between *Arabidopsis thaliana* and the endophytic fungus *Mucor* sp. Front Microbiol 9:441

Ruiz-Lozano JM, Aroca R, Zamarreño ÁM, Molina S, Andreo-Jiménez B, Porcel R, López-Ráez JA (2016) Arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis induces strigolactone biosynthesis under drought and improves drought tolerance in lettuce and tomato. Plant Cell Environ 39:441–452

Ruyter-Spira C, Kohlen W, Charnikhova T, van Zeijl A, van Bezouwen L, de Ruijter N, Verstappen F (2011) Physiological effects of the synthetic strigolactone analog GR24 on root system architecture in Arabidopsis: another below ground role for strigolactones? Plant Physiol 155:721–734

Ruyter-Spira C, Al-Babili S, van der Krol S, Bouwmeester H (2013) The biology of strigolactones. Trends Plant Sci 18:72–83

Saeed W, Naseem S, Ali Z (2017) Strigolactones biosynthesis and their role in abiotic stress resilience in plants: A critical review. Front Plant Sci 8:1487

Scaffidi A, Waters MT, Sun YK, Skelton BW, Dixon KW, Ghisalberti EL, Smith SM (2014) Strigolactone hormones and their stereoisomers signal through two related receptor proteins to induce different physiological responses in Arabidopsis. Plant Physiol 165:1221–1232

Schwechheimer C, Willige BC (2009) Shedding light on gibberellic acid signalling. Curr Opin Plant Biol 12:57–62

Sedaghat M, Tahmasebi-Sarvestani Z, Emam Y, Mokhtassi-Bidgoli A (2017) Physiological and antioxidant responses of winter wheat cultivars to strigolactone and salicylic acid in drought. Plant Physiol Biochem 119:59–69

Seto Y, Yamaguchi S (2014) Strigolactone biosynthesis and perception. Curr Opin Plant Biol 21:1–6

Seto Y, Sado A, Asami K, Hanada A, Umehara M, Akiyama K, Yamaguchi S (2014) Carlactone is an endogenous biosynthetic precursor for strigolactones. PNAS 111:1640–1645

Seto Y, Yasui R, Kameoka H, Tamiru M, Cao M, Terauchi R, Umehara M (2019) Strigolactone perception and deactivation by a hydrolase receptor DWARF14. Nat Commun 10:191

Shabek N, Ticchiarelli F, Mao H, Hinds TR, Leyser O, Zheng N (2018) Structural plasticity of D3–D14 ubiquitin ligase in strigolactone signalling. Nature 563:652–656

Shinohara N, Taylor C, Leyser O (2013) Strigolactone can promote or inhibit shoot branching by triggering rapid depletion of the auxin efflux protein PIN1 from the plasma membrane. PLoS Biol 11(1):e1001474

Simon L, Levesque RC, Lalonde M (1993) Identification of endomycorrhizal fungi colonizing roots by fluorescent single-strand conformation polymorphism-polymerase chain reaction. Appl Environ Microbiol 59:4211–4215

Simons JL, Napoli CA, Janssen BJ, Plummer KM, Snowden KC (2007) Analysis of the *DECREASED APICAL DOMINANCE* genes of petunia in the control of axillary branching. Plant Physiol 143:697–706

Smith SM, Li J (2014) Signalling and responses to strigolactones and karrikins. Curr Opin Plant Biol 21:23–29

Snowden KC, Simkin AJ, Janssen BJ, Templeton KR, Loucas HM, Simons JL, Klee HJ (2005) The Decreased apical dominance1/Petunia hybrida CAROTENOID CLEAVAGE DIOXYGENASE8 gene affects branch production and plays a role in leaf senescence, root growth, and flower development. Plant Cell 17:746–759

Snowden KC, Janssen BJ (2016) Structural biology: signal locked in. Nature 536:402

Song X, Lu Z, Yu H, Shao G, Xiong J, Meng X, Yao XF (2017) IPA1 functions as a downstream transcription factor repressed by D53 in strigolactone signaling in rice. Cell Res 27:1128

Sorefan K, Booker J, Haurogné K, Goussot M, Bainbridge K, Foo E, Leyser O (2003) *MAX4* and *RMS1* are orthologous dioxygenase-like genes that regulate shoot branching in Arabidopsis and pea. Genes Dev 17:1469–1474

Soundappan I, Bennett T, Morffy N, Liang Y, Stanga JP, Abbas A et al (2015) SMAX1-LIKE/D53 family members enable distinct MAX2-dependent responses to strigolactones and karrikins in Arabidopsis. Plant Cell 27:3143–3159

Stanga JP, Smith SM, Briggs WR, Nelson DC (2013) SUPPRESSOR OF MORE AXILLARY GROWTH2 1 controls seed germination and seedling development in Arabidopsis. Plant Physiol 163:318–330

Stirnberg P, van De Sande K, Leyser HO (2002) MAX1 and MAX2 control shoot lateral branching in Arabidopsis. Development 129:1131–1141

Sugimoto Y, Ali AM, Yabuta S, Kinoshita H, Inanaga S, Itai A (2003) Germination strategy of Striga hermonthica involves regulation of ethylene biosynthesis. Physiol Plant 119:137–145

Sun H, Bi Y, Tao J, Huang S, Hou M, Xue R, Liang Z, Gu P, Yoneyama K, Xie X, Shen Q, Xu G, Zhang Y (2016) Strigolactones are required for nitric oxide to induce root elongation in response to nitrogen and phosphate deficiencies in rice. Plant Cell Environ 39:1473–1484

Swarbreck SM, Guerringue Y, Matthus E, Jamieson FJ, Davies JM (2019) Impairment in karrikin but not strigolactone sensing enhances root skewing in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Plant J 98:607–621

Tan BC, Joseph LM, Deng WT, Liu L, Li QB, Cline K, McCarty DR (2003) Molecular characterization of the Arabidopsis 9-cis epoxycarotenoid dioxygenase gene family. Plant J 35:44–56

Toh S, Kamiya Y, Kawakami N, Nambara E, McCourt P, Tsuchiya Y (2012) Thermoinhibition uncovers a role for strigolactones in Arabidopsis seed germination. Plant Cell Physiol 53:107–117

Toh S, Holbrook-Smith D, Stogios PJ, Onopriyenko O, Lumba S, Tsuchiya Y, McCourt P (2015) Structure-function analysis identifies highly sensitive strigolactone receptors in Striga. Science 350:203–207

Torres-Vera R, García JM, Pozo MJ, López-Ráez JA (2014) Do strigolactones contribute to plant defence? Mol Plant Pathol 15:211–216

Tsuchiya Y, Yoshimura M, Sato Y, Kuwata K, Toh S, Holbrook-Smith D et al (2015) Probing strigolactone receptors in *Striga hermonthica* with fluorescence. Science 349:864–868

Ueda H, Kusaba M (2015) Strigolactone regulates leaf senescence in concert with ethylene in Arabidopsis. Plant physiol 169:138–147

Ueguchi-Tanaka M, Ashikari M, Nakajima M, Itoh H, Katoh E, Kobayashi M, Chow TY, Hsing YI, Kitano H, Yamaguchi I, Matsuoka M (2005) GIBBERELLIN INSENSITIVE DWARF1 encodes a soluble receptor for gibberellin. Nature 437:693–698

Umehara M, Hanada A, Yoshida S, Akiyama K, Arite T, Takeda-Kamiya N, Magome H, Kamiya Y, Shirasu K, Yoneyama K, Kyozuka J, Yamaguchi S (2008) Inhibition of shoot branching by new terpenoid plant hormones. Nature 455:195–200

Umehara M, Cao M, Akiyama K, Akatsu T, Seto Y, Hanada A, Yamaguchi S (2015) Structural requirements of strigolactones for shoot branching inhibition in rice and Arabidopsis. Plant Cell Physiol 56:1059–1072

Van Ha C, Leyva-González MA, Osakabe Y, Tran UT, Nishiyama R, Watanabe Y, Yamaguchi-Shinozaki K (2014) Positive regulatory role of strigolactone in plant responses to drought and salt stress. PNAS 111:851–856

Visentin I, Vitali M, Ferrero M, Zhang Y, Ruyter-Spira C, Novák O, Cardinale F (2016) Low levels of strigolactones in roots as a component of the systemic signal of drought stress in tomato. New Phytol 212:954–963

Waldie T, McCulloch H, Leyser O (2014) Strigolactones and the control of plant development: lessons from shoot branching. Plant J 79:607–622

Wang JY, Haider I, Jamil M, Fiorilli V, Saito Y, Mi J, Balakrishna A (2019) The apocarotenoid metabolite zaxinone regulates growth and strigolactone biosynthesis in rice. Nat Commun 10:810

Wang Y, Shang L, Yu H, Zeng L, Hu J, Ni S, Wang L (2020) A strigolactones biosynthesis gene contributed to the Green Revolution in rice. Mol Plant 1(6):923–932

Wang L, Xu Q, Yu H, Ma H, Li X, Yang J, Li J (2020) Strigolactone and karrikin signaling pathways elicit ubiquitination and proteolysis of SMXL2 to regulate hypocotyl elongation in Arabidopsis thaliana. Plant Cell 32(7):2251–2270

Waters MT, Brewer PB, Bussell JD, Smith SM, Beveridge CA (2012) The Arabidopsis ortholog of rice *DWARF27* Acts upstream of *MAX1* in the control of plant development by strigolactones. Plant Physiol 159:1073–1085

Waters MT, Nelson DC, Scaffidi A, Flematti GR, Sun YK, Dixon KW, Smith SM (2012) Specialisation within the DWARF14 protein family confers distinct responses to karrikins and strigolactones in Arabidopsis. Development 139:1285–1295

Waters MT, Scaffidi A, Moulin SL, Sun YK, Flematti GR, Smith SM (2015) A *Selaginella moellendorffii* ortholog of KARRIKIN INSENSITIVE2 functions in Arabidopsis development but cannot mediate responses to karrikins or strigolactones. Plant Cell 27:1925–1944

Waters MT, Gutjahr C, Bennett T, Nelson D (2017) Strigolactone signalling and evolution. Annu Rev Plant Biol 68

Werner T, Motyka V, Strnad M, Schmulling T (2001) Regulation of plant growth by cytokinin. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 98:10487–10492

Xie X, Yoneyama K, Yoneyama K (2010) The strigolactone story. Annu Review Phytopathol 48:93–117

Yamaguchi S (2008) Gibberellin metabolism and its regulation. Annu Rev Plant Biol 59:225–251

Yan Y, Stolz S, Chételat A, Reymond P, Pagni M, Dubugnon L, Farmer EE (2007) A downstream mediator in the growth repression limb of the jasmonate pathway. Plant Cell 19:2470–2483

Yan C, Xie D (2015) Jasmonate in plant defence: sentinel or double agent? Plant Biotechnol J 13:1233–1240

Yao R, Ming Z, Yan L, Li S, Wang F, Ma S, Yu C, Yang M, Chen L, Chen L et al (2016) DWARF14 is a non-canonical hormone receptor for strigolactone. Nature 536:469–473

Yao R, Wang F, Ming Z, Du X, Chen L, Wang Y, Xie D (2017) ShHTL7 is a non-canonical receptor for strigolactones in root parasitic weeds. Cell Res 27:838

Yu Y, Wang J, Zhang Z et al (2013) Ethylene promotes hypocotyl growth and HY5 degradation by enhancing the movement of COP1 to the nucleus in the light. PLoS Genet 9:12

Yoneyama K, Xie X, Sekimoto H, Takeuchi Y, Ogasawara S et al (2008) Strigolactones, host recognition signals for root parasitic plants and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi, from Fabaceae plants. New Phytol 179:484–494

Yoneyama K, Xie X, Yoneyama K, Kisugi T, Nomura T, Nakatani Y, McErlean CS (2018) Which are the major players, canonical or non-canonical strigolactones? J Exp Bot 69:2231–2239

Yoneyama K, Akiyama K, Brewer PB, Mori N, Kawano-Kawada M, Haruta S, Beveridge CA (2020) Hydroxyl carlactone derivatives are predominant strigolactones in Arabidopsis. Plant Direct 4:e00219

Zhang Y, Van Dijk AD, Scaffidi A, Flematti GR, Hofmann M, Charnikhova T, Smith SM (2014) Rice cytochrome P450 MAX1 homologs catalyze distinct steps in strigolactone biosynthesis. Nat Chem Biol 10:1028

Zhang Y, Lv S, Wang G (2018) Strigolactones are common regulators in induction of stomatal closure in planta. Plant Signal Behav 13:e1444322

Zhao LH, Zhou XE, Wu ZS, Yi W, Xu Y, Li S, Xu TH, Liu Y, Chen RZ, Kovach A, Kang Y, Hou L, He Y, Xie C, Song W, Zhong

D, Xu Y, Wang Y, Li J, Zhang C, Melcher K, Xu HE (2013) Crystal structures of two phytohormone signal-transducing α/β hydrolases: karrikin-signaling KAI2 and strigolactone-signaling DWARF14. Cell Res 23:436–439

Zhao J, Wang T, Wang M, Liu Y, Yuan S, Gao Y, Wan J (2014) DWARF3 participates in an SCF complex and associates with DWARF14 to suppress rice shoot branching. Plant Cell Physiol 55:1096–1109

Zhao LH, Zhou XE, Yi W, Wu Z, Liu Y, Kang Y, Scaffidi A (2015) Destabilization of strigolactone receptor DWARF14 by binding of ligand and E3-ligase signaling effector DWARF3. Cell Res 25:1219

Zheng Z, de Saint Germain A, Chory J (2014) Unfolding the mysteries of strigolactone signaling. Mol Plant 7:934

Zheng K, Wang X, Weighill DA, Guo HB, Xie M, Yang Y, Muchero W (2016) Characterization of *DWARF14* genes in Populus. Sci Rep 6:21593

Zhou F, Lin Q, Zhu L, Ren Y, Zhou K, Shabek N, Ma W (2013) D14–SCF D3-dependent degradation of D53 regulates strigolactone signalling. Nature 504:406–410

Zou X, Wang Q, Chen P, Yin C, Lin Y (2019) Strigolactones regulate shoot elongation by mediating gibberellin metabolism and signaling in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). J Plant Physiol 237:72–79

Zwanenburg B, Mwakaboko AS, Reizelman A, Anilkumar G, Sethumadhavan D (2009) Structure and function of natural and synthetic signalling molecules in parasitic weed germination. Pest Manag Sci 65:478–491

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.