Title: Parallelism in flower evolution and development

Authors: Carolyn A. Wessinger[1] and Lena C. Hileman[2]

Affiliations:

[1]Department of Biological Sciences, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208, wessinc@mailbox.sc.edu, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3687-2559

[2]Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Kansas, Lawrence KS 66045, lhileman@ku.edu, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6116-666X

Corresponding author: Lena C. Hileman, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Kansas, Lawrence KS 66045, lhileman@ku.edu

Key words: petal fusion, flower symmetry, nectar spur, heterostyly, flower development, evolution

## ABSTRACT

Flower evolution is characterized by widespread repetition, with adaptations to pollinator environment evolving in parallel. Recent studies have expanded our understanding of the developmental basis for adaptive floral novelties—petal fusion, bilateral symmetry, heterostyly, and floral dimensions. Here we highlight patterns of trait evolution and review developmental genetic mechanisms underlying floral novelties. We discuss the diversity of mechanisms for parallel adaptation, the evidence for constraints on these mechanisms, and how constraints help explain observed macroevolutionary patterns. We describe parallel evolution resulting from similarities at multiple hierarchical levels—genetic, developmental, morphological, functional—which indicate general principles in floral evolution, including the central role of hormone signaling. An emerging pattern is mutational bias that may contribute to rapid patterns of parallel evolution, especially if the derived trait can result from simple degenerative mutations. We argue that such mutational bias may less likely govern the evolution of novelties patterned by complex developmental pathways.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Angiosperms (flowering plants) began diversifying on the order of 140 million years ago (reviewed in Sauquet and Magallón 2018), and the diversity of flower form among extant species today is breathtaking. Current floral diversity reflects evolutionary optimization of reproductive output under variable environmental conditions. Reproductive success has been optimized through shifts in mating system, including shifts in biotic (animal) and abiotic (wind, water) pollination strategies (Stebbins 1970; Barrett 2002). Since the beginning of flowering plant diversification, much of the evolution of flowers has been linked to biotic pollination (Gottsberger 2016; Hu et al. 2008), and more than 85% of current species utilize animals for pollination services (Ollerton et al. 2011). Therefore, adaptive floral evolution that facilitates shifts to available pollinators, and enhances pollen transfer when animals visit, is ubiquitous (Faegri & van der Pijl 1979; Fenster et al. 2004; Ollerton et al. 2009).

Adaptive floral evolution has resulted in massive floral trait convergence and parallelism that reveals repeated adaptive trait evolution in response to similar pollinator environments. For the most part, repeatedly-evolved traits discussed in this review are termed parallelisms (although similarity derived from different floral organs, *e.g.,* some repeated origins of nectar spurs, may be more accurately described as convergences). Parallel floral trait evolution reflects developmental changes that increase complexity from the relatively simple ancestral

angiosperm flower, followed in some cases by reversals in complexity. Highlighted in this review are patterns of parallelism and developmental processes associated with transitions towards flower complexity including sympetaly (petal fusion), bilateral flower symmetry, initiation of nectar spurs and heterostyly (pollen- and ovule-bearing reproductive organs of different length to reduce self-pollination), as well as quantitative changes that enhance pollen transfer including evolutionary change in floral tube and nectar spur lengths.

Our understanding of floral trait parallelism has been facilitated by advances in the flowering plant phylogeny onto which floral traits are now being extensively mapped, revealing patterns of parallel trait evolution (for example; Sauquet et al. 2017; Wessinger et al. 2019; Wu et al. 2018; Zhong et al. 2019). At the same time, recent work has led to an unprecedented understanding of developmental and genetic processes that shape diverse aspects of flower form (reviewed here, and recently by Kramer 2019; Moyroud & Glover 2017; Smyth 2018; Woźniak & Sicard 2018). Through integration, we can begin to identify biologically meaningful connections between patterns of trait evolution and the developmental genetic processes that shape those traits. Our goal in this review is to begin answering three fundamental questions of floral trait evolution.

*To what extent do repeatedly evolved floral traits utilize similar developmental and genetic processes?* Analogous to Abouheif's hierarchical approach for integrating morphology with development and genes when considering trait homology (Abouheif 1997), we consider trait parallelism in the same hierarchical context. Parallelism can be identified in flower function (*e.g.*, transitions to a specific pollinator), morphology (*e.g.*, transitions to similar organ dimensions), development (*e.g.*, transitions via similar cellular processes), genetic pathways, genes, and specific causal mutations. Here, we review examples where repeated floral trait evolution is coupled with parallel or divergent developmental and genetic processes, highlighting the utility of a hierarchical approach.

*What constraints direct floral trait evolution to follow parallel developmental genetic paths?* Our review of a subset of well-studied floral traits emphasizes the fact that nearly all flower diversification requires one or both of the following processes: hormone signaling (usually auxin) to initiate patterns of cell proliferation, and modifications to patterns of cell division and/or cell expansion to achieve adaptive variation in floral organ dimensions. The gene regulatory networks that affect these processes are extremely complex, and divergent genetic changes are

often employed. Yet, despite diverse, and often divergent genetic mechanisms for parallel trait evolution, we identify some similarities at the level of hormone signaling.

*Are the patterns of floral trait evolution and genetic processes underlying trait evolution reciprocally illuminating?* We discuss whether and how patterns of trait evolution are likely shaped by genetic mechanisms, such that a given pattern of trait evolution points to specific genetic mechanisms and, by extension, whether we may predict patterns of trait evolution from descriptions of genetic mechanisms. This concept seems to apply to traits produced by relatively simple genetic mechanisms. Evaluating whether this idea holds for floral traits produced through complex genetic pathways will require additional insights into both trait evolution and development.

## 2. MACROEVOLUTIONARY PATTERNS OF FLORAL TRAIT EVOLUTION

The flower itself is a complex novelty of plant evolution (Friedman 2009). The ancestral flower was likely quite simple compared to the flower complexity we see among extant species. The ancestral form is predicted to have been bisexual, with unfused sterile perianth organs of similar shape (radial symmetry) surrounding unfused reproductive organs (Sauquet et al. 2017). This represents the common ground plan that is retained in some lineages (*e.g.* the family Nymphaceae—water lilies and relatives), and on which all subsequent floral trait evolution is based (Smyth 2018). An emerging theme is the parallel evolution of a more complex floral form from this simpler ancestral condition. Many parallel transitions towards increased complexity occur at a broad taxonomic scale and characterize major flowering plant lineages. These include evolutionary transitions from free to fused floral organs, from radially to bilaterally symmetrical flowers, as well as the origins of nectar spurs and heterostyly.

Floral organ fusion has given rise to a diversity of specialized floral traits. The most elaborate of these is arguably the specialized pollinaria of orchids and milkweeds which facilitate precise pollen movement between flowers. Pollinaria are derived from fusion between stamens and pistils, two different floral organ types (adnation). Examples of fusion between the same type of floral organ (connation) are common. For example, carpel to carpel fusion, leading to a single syncarpous ovary, evolved early in diversification of eudicots and monocots. Sympetaly has evolved multiple times (Reyes et al. 2018; Stull et al. 2018; Zhong & Preston 2015) leading to corolla tubes and keel petals (Fig. 1a. b), which define major flowering plant lineages (*e.g.,*

Lamiales—snapdragon, sages and relatives; Fabaceae—peas, beans and relatives; Polygalaceae—milkworts and relatives, Zingiberales—banana, bird of paradise and relatives).

During the diversification of flowering plants, bilateral flower symmetry has evolved well over 100 times from an ancestral condition of radial symmetry (Reyes et al. 2016). These transitions represent the evolution of additional complexity, where the basic floral plan is elaborated to include distinct developmental fates for dorsal and ventral sides of flowers (Fig. 2a, b). Similar to organ fusion, the evolution of bilateral flower symmetry defines major lineages of flowering plants (*e.g.,* Fabaceae, Lamiales, Zingiberales, Orchidaceae—the orchid family).

Nectar spurs are tubular outgrowths of (usually) petal tissue that hold nectar for visiting pollinators (Fig. 3a). These novel structures represent evolutionary complexity since spurs represent a local region of differentiated petal tissue with a novel developmental fate. Unlike sympetaly and symmetry, nectar spurs do not define major lineages, but they have evolved many times during flowering plant diversification and are well studied in multiple groups, for example, *Aquilegia* (columbine)*, Delphinium* (larkspur)*, Linaria* (toadflax)*,* and *Pelargonium* (Cullen et al. 2018; Hodges 1997; Jabbour & Renner 2012; Puzey et al. 2012; Tsai et al. 2018).

Sympetaly, bilateral symmetry and nectar spurs each function to filter pollinators with specific morphologies, and improve conspecific pollen transfer efficiency (Armbruster 2014; Endress 2001; Fenster et al. 2004; Stebbins 1970; Thomson & Wilson 2008). Therefore, each of these traits is considered to be an adaptation to maximize outcross mating success. The advantages of outcrossing include the maintenance of heterozygosity, often associated with increased relative fitness, and the avoidance of inbreeding depression (Darwin 1876; Husband & Schemske 1996).

Other evolutionary trends toward greater floral complexity involve the evolution of developmental polymorphisms, where alternative developmental fates, controlled by genetic polymorphism, are expressed in different individuals. Examples include the evolution of heterostyly and dioecy (separate sexes). In heterostyly, genotypic variation at causal loci controls alternate spatial arrangements of anthers and stigmas that reduce self-pollination and reinforce outcrossing (Fig. 4). Heterostyly occurs in at least 28 families, and is thought to have arisen at least 23 independent times (Barrett 2002; Barrett et al. 2009; Naiki 2012). Reciprocal placement of reproductive organs in heterostyly functions to promote outcrossing through

segregated pollen deposition on pollinators' bodies (Kohn & Barrett 1992; Simon-Porcar et al. 2015; Zhou et al. 2015).

Following origins of floral complexity, reverse transitions towards simpler ancestral forms do occur, and are often clustered within lineages. Evolutionary patterns of gain and loss for these complexity traits represent the superimposition of these two processes. Reversals toward ancestral forms appear to occur on a more rapid timescale than gains. For example, a single origin of sympetaly in the ancestor of Lamianae (Lamiales, Solanales and allied orders) has been followed by at least five reversals to free petals (Stull et al. 2018). In Lamiales a single origin of bilateral symmetry has been followed by at least eight reversals to radial symmetry (Zhong et al. 2017). Likewise in Malpighiaceae, bilateral symmetry is a shared ancestral trait and at least four lineages have independently reverted to radial symmetry (Zhang et al. 2013). Once gained, nectar spurs can be lost (Ballerini et al. 2019; Fernández-Mazuecos et al. 2019; Hodges 1997), but assessment of the relative rate of gain versus loss requires further investigation. Losses of heterostyly are extremely common within heterostylous lineages and reflect selection for a highly selfing mating strategy. For example, a single origin of heterostyly in *Primula* is followed by several independent losses across the genus (de Vos et al. 2014; Mast et al. 2006; Zhong et al. 2019). A selfing strategy associated with loss of heterostyly can be favored when pollinators are rare or unreliable, and when inbreeding depression is minimal, allowing the transmission advantage associated with selfing to be realized (reviewed in Busch & Delph 2012).

Not all floral parallelisms involve qualitative changes in complexity like those described above. Evolutionary transitions between quantitative aspects of floral organ dimensions (size and shape) are common. Changes in petal size, corolla tube and nectar spur length occur even within genera (Fig. 5a-c) and are frequently evolutionarily labile in multiple directions, without a clear bias in directionality. For example, in *Linaria* there have been repeated evolutionary transitions between narrow and wide corolla tubes and between shorter and longer nectar spurs (Cullen et al. 2018). Evolutionary changes in corolla tube, reproductive organ or nectar spur dimensions can facilitate pollen placement on co-adapted pollinators while excluding others, thereby promoting pollinator specialization as a mechanism to maximize outcross mating success. However, transitions to very small flowers reflect selection for a highly selfing mating strategy, and transitions to small selfing flowers are often asymmetric, with transitions back to large outcrossing flowers unlikely (*e.g.*, Baldwin et al. 2011).

## 3. DEVELOPMENTAL TRANSITIONS TOWARDS FLOWER COMPLEXITY

### 3a. The developmental basis of sympetaly

Petal primordia initiate either in a spiral arrangement (*e.g.*, magnolia flowers) or in the whorled arrangement common to most eudicot and monocot species. Sympetaly, forming corolla tubes or keeled petals, occurs on a floral ground plan in which petal primordia initiate in a whorled arrangement such that lateral petal boundaries are adjacent to one another, facilitating petal to petal fusion (Fig. 1). The initiation of flower organs, including petals, in either a spiral or whorled arrangement results from positional information established by early auxin foci on the floral meristem, reinforced by cytokinin signaling leading to localized cell proliferation (reviewed in Rast & Simon 2008; Smyth 2018). But exactly how evolutionary transitions between spiral and whorled arrangements occur remains largely a mystery.

Sympetaly occurs by two primary processes—congenital and postgenital fusion (reviewed in Specht & Howarth 2015; Verbeke 1992; Zhong & Preston 2015). Petal primordia that undergo congenital fusion (*e.g.,* Lamiales; Fig. 1a) are united through the connection and extension of a meristematic region underlying the already initiated petal primordia. In postgenital fusion (*e.g.,* Fabaceae; Fig. 1b), petals develop from distinct primordia that merge through a process of epidermal union. Given these divergent processes, non-parallel genetic mechanisms may underlie independent transitions to sympetaly. Determining the genetic basis for petal fusion has largely focused on model species in the Lamiales and Solanales that show congenital fusion (*e.g., Antirrhinum, Mimulus, Petunia*), and emerging insights are beginning to suggest parallel genetic mechanisms.

Characterization of *Mimulus lewisii* mutants with loss of petal fusion led Ding et al. (2018) to propose a compelling model for congenital sympetaly. The model centers on regulation of auxin at the inter-petal primordia boundaries (Fig. 1c). In species with free petals, auxin levels are low between initiating petal primordia (Heisler et al. 2005; Reinhardt et al. 2003), where an organ boundary genetic program that maintains distinction between adjacent petals is upregulated (reviewed in Rast & Simon 2008). In *M. lewisii,* formation of the corolla tube is associated with high levels of auxin between petal primordia, consistent with cell proliferation in the inter petal-primordia region.

The *M. lewisii* loss-of-fusion mutants suggest that evolutionary changes in the organ polarity program lead to elevated auxin between petal primordia, resulting in corolla tube growth. The organ polarity program determines adaxial/abaxial (top/bottom) identity of laminar organs (*e.g.,* leaves and petals) and regulates auxin for laminar growth. Within this program, AUXIN RESPONSE FACTOR (ARF) proteins, specifically *Arabidopsis* ARF3, are known to repress auxin accumulation (Simonini et al. 2017). In *M. lewisii*, negative regulation of ARFs by trans-acting small-interfering RNAs (tasiRNAs) is associated with high levels of inter-petal auxin (Fig. 1c). Mutants defective for tasiRNA processing have elevated ARF expression levels, reduced auxin levels between petal primordia, and reduced petal fusion (Ding et al. 2018). The hypothesis of Ding *et al.*, that changes to inter-petal auxin levels mediated by the polarity program determine sympetaly, is consistent with petal loss-of-fusion mutants in *Ipomoea* (*feathered*; Iwasaki & Nitasaka 2006) and *Petunia* (*maewest*; Vandenbussche et al. 2009). Both these mutations occur in genes that are components of the adaxial/abaxial polarity program.

Elevated auxin levels are hypothesized to negatively regulate the organ boundary program (Furutani et al. 2004; Vernoux et al. 2000; and reviewed in Rast & Simon 2008) allowing confluence between developing *M. lewisii* petals. The model postulating upregulation of auxin between petal primordia, leading to downregulation of the organ boundary program (Fig. 1c), is in line with results from *Antirrhinum majus* (snapdragon), which clearly show that where the corolla tube develops, the organ boundary gene *CUPULIFORMIS* (*CUP*) is downregulated (Rebocho et al. 2017). The *CUP* homolog in *Petunia*, *NO APICAL MERISTEM* (*NAM*), along with an additional organ boundary gene, *HANABA TARATSU* (*HAN*)*,* has also been implicated in the development of fused petals (Preston et al. 2019; Souer et al. 1996; Zhong et al. 2016). However, recent results demonstrate a role for *NAM* and *HAN* in promoting organ fusion, not maintaining organ boundaries (Preston et al. 2019; Zhong et al. 2016).

Because sympetaly has evolved multiple times, employing divergent developmental mechanisms (*i.e.,* congenital and postgenital fusion), at first glance it would seem unlikely that parallel changes to auxin accumulation mediated by the polarity program evolve repeatedly. Tantalizingly, the tasiRNA-ARF pathway is implicated in formation of the legume keel (Yan et al. 2010; Zhou et al. 2013), derived from postgenital fusion of two petals (Crozier & Thomas 1993; Fig. 1b). How the tasiRNA-ARF pathway affects the organ boundary pathway at late stages of petal development, after petal organ boundaries have been established, remains unknown. Still,

these studies from Lamiales/Solanales and Fabaceae point to parallel developmental genetic mechanisms leading to divergent forms of sympetaly.

**3b. The developmental basis of flower symmetry**

Breaking radial symmetry requires the evolution of distinct developmental trajectories on the dorsal versus ventral side of a developing flower (Fig. 2). Our understanding of the genetic control of dorsal and ventral identity in bilateral flower symmetry comes primarily from work in snapdragon (Lamiales). Early in snapdragon flower development, even before flower organ primordia are visible, the flower symmetry genes *CYCLOIDEA* (*CYC*) and *DICHOTOMA* (*DICH*) are expressed on the dorsal side of the developing flower meristem. This pattern of early dorsal-restricted expression has been identified in some, but not all species with radially symmetrical flowers (Busch *et al.* 2011; Cubas *at al.* 2001; Zhong and Kellogg 2015) leaving it unclear whether restricted expression predates the evolution of bilateral flower symmetry. In snapdragon flowers, expression persists in the developing dorsal organs through later stages of maturation (Luo et al. 1996; Luo, Da et al. 1999). Their dorsal-restricted expression sets in motion a cascade of genetic interactions (Fig. 2c) that lead to differential development of flower organs along the dorso-ventral flower axis affecting the petal, stamen and carpel whorls.

*CYC* and *DICH* belong to the Class II lineage of TCP family transcription factors (Martín-Trillo & Cubas 2010) and are paralogs resulting from a gene duplication event that occurred much more recently than the origin of bilateral flower symmetry in the snapdragon lineage (Gübitz et al. 2003; Hileman & Baum 2003). *CYC* and *DICH* positively regulate *RADIALIS* (*RAD*), a MYB family transcription factor. Like *CYC* and *DICH, RAD* expression is restricted to the dorsal flower meristem and developing dorsal organs (Corley et al. 2005). A key regulator of ventral petal identity is *DIVARICATA* (*DIV*) (Galego & Almeida 2002). *DIV* and *RAD* are paralogs of one another. *DIV* is expressed both ventrally and dorsally, but in order to exclude ventral identity from the dorsal side of the flower, dorsal-restricted RAD protein competitively excludes DIV protein interactions required for DIV function (Raimundo et al. 2013).

Symmetry genes in snapdragon determine dorsal and ventral fates by affecting patterns of cell division and/or cell expansion (Cui et al. 2010; Green et al. 2010). TCP family genes are known to broadly affect patterns of cell division, expansion and differentiation (Martín-Trillo & Cubas 2010) therefore *CYC* and *DICH* may determine dorsal patterns of division/expansion directly or indirectly via *RAD*. Recent work has begun to elucidate mechanisms for complex shape

formation of the snapdragon ventral lip (Fig. 2c). During stages of development when the ventral petal undergoes sharp curvature through localized cell proliferation, the following genes are expressed at the site of curvature: *DIV* (Galego & Almeida 2002), *CUPULIFORMIS* (*CUP*), *YUCCA1* (Rebocho et al. 2017), and *AINTEGUMENTA* (*ANT*) (Delgado-Benarroch et al. 2009). *YUCCA1* is an auxin biosynthetic gene associated with auxin accumulation and initiation of localized cell proliferation. *ANT* belongs to the *AINTEGUMENTA-LIKE/PLETHORA* (*AIL/PLT*) gene family, known to be auxin responsive (Krizek 2011), potentially placing *ANT* downstream of *YUCCA1.* Rebocho et al. (2017) provide compelling evidence that *YUCCA1* is positively regulated by CUP, and that *CUP* in turn is positively regulated by DIV. Together, these analyses begin to shed light on how symmetry genes may shape floral organ development across the dorso-ventral axis by affecting regulators of cell proliferation via auxin signaling.

Functional data from across eudicots support parallel recruitment of a *CYC*-dependent program in multiple origins of bilateral flower symmetry. In the sunflower family (Asteraceae), bilaterally symmetrical ray flowers have evolved more than once (Panero & Funk 2008) and different *CYC-like* paralogs appear to have been recruited independently to direct ray flower development (Broholm et al. 2008; Chapman et al. 2012; Fambrini et al. 2011, 2018; Garcês et al. 2016; Kim et al. 2008). In papilionoid legumes, three *CYC*-like genes are responsible for dorso-ventral flower patterning. In *Lotus japonicus,CYC1* and *SQUARE PETALS* (*SQU*) function redundantly to pattern the dorsal banner petal while *KEELED WINGS IN LOTUS* (*KEW*) primarily functions to maintain identity of the lateral petals distinct from the ventral keel petals (Feng et al. 2006; Wang et al. 2008, 2010; Xu et al. 2013) (banner, lateral and keel petals of *Pisum sativum*, a close relative of *Lotus japonicus,* are labeled in Fig. 1b). In the Brassicaceae, a close relative of *Arabidopsis*, *Iberis amara*, develops bilaterally symmetrical flowers and the differential growth of dorsal compared to ventral petals results from dorsal-specific petal expression of the *CYC-like* gene, *TCP1* (Busch & Zachgo 2007). In addition to these functional studies, research focusing on the spatial distribution of *CYC-like* gene expression in both monocots and eudicots supports independent recruitment of a *CYC*-dependent program for bilateral flower symmetry (*e.g.,* Bartlett & Specht 2011; Citerne et al. 2017; Howarth et al. 2011; Jabbour et al. 2014; Preston & Hileman 2012; Zhang et al. 2010; Zhao et al. 2018).

Independent recruitment of a *CYC*-dependent program to shape bilateral flower symmetry requires the program to be regulated such that *CYC-like* gene expression is restricted to the dorsal (or ventral) side of the developing flower. How *CYC-like* genes evolve restricted

expression along the dorso-ventral axis is not well understood. Only in snapdragon, through characterization of the *backpetals* mutant, do we know that *CYC* expression would be continuous across the flower except for a regulatory sequence in its promoter that negatively regulates *CYC* on the ventral side of the developing flower (Luo, Da et al. 1999). Whether similar mechanisms explain independent origins of restricted *CYC-like* expression remains unknown.

Across multiple eudicots, genetic studies point to loss of dorsal-restricted *CYC-like* gene expression in independent reversals to radial flower symmetry. In *Plantago, Callicarpa, Mentha,* and *Tengia* (Lamiales), *Microsteria, Psychopterys* (Malpighiaceae), and *Cadia* (Fabaceae), reversals to radial symmetry are associated with expanded expression of *CYC-like* genes across the dorso-ventral floral axis (Citerne et al. 2006; Pang et al. 2010; Preston et al. 2011; Zhang et al. 2013; Zhong et al. 2017). In *Callicarpa* and *Mentha*, this is accompanied by expanded or absent *RAD-like* gene expression, respectively (Zhong et al. 2017). A few additional independent reversals to radial symmetry in Malpighiaceae, as well as *Bournea* and *Lycopus* (Lamiales) are associated with conservation of dorsal-restricted *CYC-like* gene expression (Zhang et al. 2012, 2013; Zhong et al. 2017; Zhou et al. 2008). This suggests potentially more complicated mechanisms than simple loss of dorsal-specific regulation (reviewed in Hileman 2014). In *Lycopus,* radially symmetrical flowers seem to have evolved through loss of *RAD-like* gene expression (Zhou et al. 2008).

**3c. The developmental initiation of nectar spurs**

In their multiple origins, nectar spurs derive from a variety of floral tissues (Endress 2001). In *Aquilegia* (columbines, Ranunculaceae; Fig. 5c)*, Centranthus* (Caprifoliaceae)*,* and *Linaria* (Plantaginaceae), nectar spurs develop as tubular outgrowths from the laminar petal or corolla tube surface (Cullen et al. 2018; Damerval & Becker 2017; Mack & Davis 2015; Fig. 3). In *Delphinium*, nectar spurs are uniquely integrated into both inner and outer whorl sepals and petals (Jabbour & Renner 2012). Even in closely related *Aquilegia*, which has evolved nectar spurs independently from those in *Delphinium,* nectar spurs develop in just the inner whorl petals. *Impatiens* (Balsaminaceae) develops nectar spurs from outer whorl sepals (Young 2008). Interestingly, in *Pelargonium* (Geraniaceae), nectar spurs develop from intercalary growth within the receptacle resulting in a long cavity that appears to be (but is not) a sepal-derived spur fused to the pedicel (Tsai et al. 2018). The Initiation of tubular outgrowths requires a new signal on the laminar surface (*e.g.,* developing petal or sepal) that leads to a focused

area of cell division (Fig. 3b). Once a nascent spur initiates, spur elongation may occur through processes of additional cell division and/or cell expansion. Variation in early cell division or late cell expansion may contribute to interspecific variation in spur length (see discussion below). Research focussed on a few model species representing independent origins of nectar spurs points to divergent developmental mechanisms.

In *Aquilegia,* auxin signaling is implicated in the initiation of a discrete cell proliferation zone on the developing petal laminar surface that results in an out-pocket or cup, forming the nascent spur (Ballerini et al. 2019; Yant et al. 2015). Evidence supporting this model comes from gene expression studies showing that an *Aquilegia* homolog of a gene implicated in auxin biosynthesis, *CYTOCHROME P450 FAMILY71A* (*CYP71A*), is significantly upregulated at the earliest stages of localized spur initiation within the petal field. In addition, genes downstream in auxin signaling, including *ARF3/ETTIN*, *ARF8*, and *SMALL AUXIN UPREGULATED RNA* (*SAUR*), are upregulated at these same early stages. Notably, *SAUR* is implicated in promotion of cell expansion (Spartz et al. 2012), and cell expansion may be critical for spur elongation in *Aquilegia* (Puzey et al. 2012).

Another group of genes implicated in spur development are *KNOX* genes. These genes are not upregulated in the *Aquilegia* spur, but instead appear to be important for nectar spur development in relatives of snapdragons. Snapdragon flowers do not develop nectar spurs, but do produce a nectar sac (gibba) at the proximal end of the ventral corolla tube. In close relatives (*e.g. Linaria*), the gibba develops into a nectar spur. Snapdragon mutants constitutively overexpressing *STM-like class I KNOX* genes produce a tubular outgrowth on the ventral petal that is reminiscent of *Linaria* spurs (Golz et al. 2002). These ectopic tubular outgrowths can be interpreted as a duplicated corolla tube or a spur-like structure, but either way suggest a divergent mechanism for spur initiation. This divergent mechanism requires ectopic expression on the already developing petal surface of a novel meristematic region from which spur outgrowth is organized, presumably initiated by a novel pattern of *KNOX* expression. In *Linaria*, homologs of these *KNOX* genes show a surprisingly broad pattern of expression in the differentiating dorsal and ventral petals, not perfectly, but somewhat overlapping with the zone of nectar spur development. In snapdragon on the other hand, *KNOX* genes exhibit the canonical expression pattern restricted to undifferentiated meristematic tissues (Box et al. 2011; Golz et al. 2002).

This class of *KNOX* genes has been recruited for compound leaf development (reviewed in Nikolov et al. 2019) indicating the potential for *KNOX*-driven developmental complexity outside of meristems. Notably, *KNOX* genes are not upregulated in the developing *Aquilegia* spur (Yant et al. 2015). That auxin-responsive proteins function to downregulate *KNOX* genes at meristem edges in order for differentiation to occur (Heisler et al. 2005) further supports the hypothesis that auxin-driven spur development (in *Aquilegia*) and *KNOX*-driven spur development (in *Linaria*) represent divergent developmental genetic mechanisms. While nectar spurs can be lost (*e.g.,* in *Aquilegia* and *Antirrhineae*, the tribe in which *Linaria* belongs; Ballerini et al. 2019; Fernández-Mazuecos et al. 2019), the developmental basis for spur loss has not been extensively studied.

## 4. DEVELOPMENTAL TRANSITIONS IN FLOWER DIMENSIONS WITH SHIFTS IN MATING SYSTEM AND PRIMARY POLLINATOR

### 4a. Hormone-responsive pathways control floral organ size and shape

Similar to the initiation of a petal lip or nectar spur, floral organ dimensions result from two primary phases of organ growth: an initial period of cell division, followed by a period of cell expansion. Whereas the *initiation* of floral organs centrally involves auxin signaling, the two phases of organ growth are influenced by multiple plant hormones, including auxin, and diverse genes in regulatory networks acting downstream of hormones (Fig. 5d). Details of these networks and candidate genes identified in the model species *Arabidopsis* and *Antirrhinum* have recently been extensively reviewed (*e.g.,* Krizek & Anderson 2013; Moyroud & Glover 2017). It is clear that many genetic interactions contribute to the duration and rate of cell division and to the degree of cell expansion; therefore variation floral dimensions may often be polygenic.

A few major themes emerge from genetic studies of floral organ size control. First, organ size is influenced by the intersection of several different plant hormones that, in combination, affect development (Fig. 5d). An illustrative case is the gene regulatory network involving *ANT*, which promotes cell division by positively regulating cell cyclin genes in *Arabidopsis* (Mizukami & Fischer 2000). Multiple regulators of *ANT* have been described, including *AUXIN-REGULATED GENE INVOLVED IN ORGAN SIZE* (*ARGOS*; Krizek 1999; Mizukami & Fischer 2000), *ORGAN SIZE RELATED 1* (*OSR1*; Feng et al. 2011), and *ARF2*; Vert et al. 2008). Importantly, these *ANT* regulators are themselves regulated by diverse hormones: *ARGOS* is upregulated by auxin and cytokinin (Hu et al. 2003), *OSR1* is upregulated by ethylene (Feng et al. 2011), and *ARF2* is likely sensitive to brassinosteroids (BR) and auxin signals (Vert et al. 2008). This points to the

importance of flexible co-regulation of a single network by a variety of plant hormones during flower development. Second, specific hormones can be involved in both cell division and cell expansion processes, through different regulatory pathways. This is true at least for ethylene (Feng et al. 2011; van Es et al. 2018) and BR (Hu et al. 2006; Vert et al. 2008). Third, there are individual genes that affect both cell division and expansion processes (Fig. 5d; Feng et al. 2011; Varaud et al. 2011; Xu & Li 2011). Finally, important mechanisms for limiting organ size include ubiquitin-mediated degradation of positive growth factors (Disch et al. 2006; Li et al. 2008) or the action of TCP-family transcription factors that promote cell differentiation (Huang & Irish 2015).

**4b. The developmental basis for flower size transitions with selfing**

A model for studying developmental changes responsible for reduced flower size associated with self-pollination is *Capsella rubella* (Brassicaeae; Fig. 5a). This species has evolved flowers that are five-fold smaller than its outcrossing sister species, *Capsella grandiflora*, largely through reduced cell division in floral organs (Sicard et al. 2011). Fine-mapping of QTL in the interspecific cross has identified causal mutations at two loci contributing to differences in cell division. The first is a petal-specific enhancer of *STERILE APETALA* (*SAP*) which encodes an F-box protein component of an E3 ubiquitin ligase (Sicard et al. 2016). This ubiquitin ligase promotes cell division by targeting *negative* regulators of cell proliferation (Wang et al. 2016). *Capsella rubella* has acquired mutations to this enhancer that reduce *SAP* gene expression, resulting in reduced flower size. The second locus is *CYP724A1*, a gene in the BR-synthesis pathway (Fujikura et al. 2018). The *C. rubella CYP724A1* allele has mutations conferring greater splicing efficiency resulting in higher gene expression, which in turn increases BR levels. This results in high BR levels that inhibit cell division and result in smaller flowers (Fujikura et al. 2018). These data point to the precise regulation of cell division and cell expansion by hormones. Depending on the context, hormone increases may promote or inhibit cellular processes. The quantitative genetic basis of changes in overall size has also been studied in other species (*e.g., Mimulus guttatus*; Kelly and Mojica 2011), however the underlying developmental pathways have not yet been identified.

**4c. The developmental basis for flower dimension transitions with pollinator shifts**

The developmental basis of floral evolution associated with pollinator transitions has been investigated in several genera. In *Petunia,* flower shape evolution associated with adaptation to hawkmoth and hummingbird pollinators has occurred through changes to both cell division and

462 expansion. Hawkmoth-pollinated *P. axillaris* has evolved increased corolla tube length relative
463 to bee-pollinated *P. integrifolia* through increased cell division and cell expansion (Stuurman et
464 al. 2004). Elongated stamen filaments and styles in hummingbird-pollinated *P. exserta* have
465 primarily involved cell division (Hermann et al. 2015). In *Saltugilia* (Fig. 5b), flower size variation
466 associated with adaptation to different pollinators results primarily from differences in cell
467 expansion (Landis et al. 2016), whereas in *Lithospermum*, flower size variation primarily
468 involves changes to cell division (Cohen 2016). Candidate genes for these pollinator-associated
469 evolutionary transitions have not been reported.
470
471 Similar to corolla tube length, spur length evolves in response to specific pollinators. For
472 example, hummingbird- and hawkmoth-pollinated species have longer spurs compared to bee-
473 pollinated relatives. Studies in different lineages point to divergent mechanisms underlying spur
474 length differences among closely related species. Among closely related *Linaria* species,
475 differences in cell division early in spur patterning explain most interspecific spur length variation
476 (Cullen et al. 2018). However, among closely related *Aquilegia* species (Fig. 5c), differences in
477 cell expansion at later stages of differentiation explain most interspecific variation in spur length
478 (Puzey et al. 2012). In the unique spurs of *Pelargonium*, both cell division and cell expansion
479 processes jointly determine interspecific spur length differences (Tsai et al. 2018). Given the
480 developmental complexity of cell division and expansion networks in floral tissue (Fig. 5d), there
481 are many target loci that could, in theory, generate adaptive variation in spur length. One
482 appealing candidate for spur length variation due to cell expansion is the *SAUR*-dependent
483 pathway, implicated in *Aquilegia* spur cell elongation (Yant et al. 2015).
484
485 **4d. The developmental and genetic basis of heterostyly**
486 Evolution of heterostyly requires complete linkage of major effect alleles causing reciprocal
487 differences in reproductive organ length (Fig. 4). For example, with distyly, a major effect allele
488 causing short styles is linked to a major effect allele at a second locus causing long stamen
489 filaments. Often these loci are also linked to a self-incompatibility locus. The set of linked loci is
490 termed the S-locus supergene and high linkage disequilibrium is maintained by suppressed
491 recombination (Barrett & Shore 2008; Charlesworth 2016). In multiple genera, suppressed
492 recombination results from S-locus hemizygosity, with S-locus genes present in one morph and
493 completely absent in the other (Cocker et al. 2018; Kappel et al. 2017; Shore et al. 2019;
494 Ushijima et al. 2012; Yasui et al. 2012).
495

In theory, major effect alleles for organ length polymorphism could arise in any of the diverse networks that affect floral organ cell division or cell expansion, as long as mutations can specifically affect a single floral whorl (*e.g.*, styles but not stamen filaments). Only a small number of loci responsible for style and/or stamen length in heterostylous taxa have been identified, yet it is already clear that diverse loci are recruited into S-locus supergenes. In *Primula,* allelic differences causing style length variation via changes in cell expansion are caused by presence/absence of a *CYP734A50* homolog in the S-locus (Huu et al. 2016; Li et al. 2015; Nowak et al. 2015). *CYP734A50* is known to function in BR degradation. Individuals with the S-locus haplotype containing *CYP734A50* have short styles due to increased BR degradation causing reduced cell expansion in style tissue (Huu et al. 2016; Nowak et al. 2015). It is not yet known how this locus influences organ length in the style only. In *Turnera*, variation in style length is caused by the presence/absence of a *BAHD* acyltransferase homolog that likely functions to inactivate BRs (Shore et al. 2019). Interestingly, *Primula* and *Turnera* have functionally converged on BR-dependent mechanisms for style length polymorphism, albeit through distinct components of BR regulation. The loci affecting stamen length in *Primula* and *Turnera* have been identified as homologs of the B class organ identity gene *GLOBOSA* (Nowak et al. 2015) and of *S-PROTEIN HOMOLOG 1* (Shore et al. 2019), respectively. However, it is currently unclear how allelic variation at these loci determines stamen length.

Reversals from heterostyly to homostyly associated with transitions to selfing occur relatively rapidly (*e.g.,* de Vos et al. 2014; Mast et al. 2006; Zhong et al. 2019). Homostyly can be caused by loss-of-function mutations to one or more genes in the hemizygous S-locus. In both *Primula* and *Turnera*, loss-of-function mutations at the style length loci (*CYP734A50* or *BAHD*, respectively) inactivate their repressive effects, resulting in “long homostyle” phenotypes where style length is similar to stamen length (Huu et al. 2016; Shore et al. 2019). Accordingly, short homostyle mutants in these two systems result from loss-of-function mutations to the filament length loci (*GLOBOSA* or *SPH1*) (Li et al. 2016; Shore et al. 2019).

## 5. CONSTRAINTS SHAPING PARALLEL AND DIVERGENT PROCESSES

The floral traits reviewed here exhibit evolutionary parallelisms in the context of function, but often involve non-parallel changes to organ-level development. For example, sympetaly can be congenital or postgenital; bilateral flower symmetry can derive from developmental differences in the perianth, the stamen whorl, or both; and nectar spurs can be derived from different floral

organ tissues. In most cases, these novel traits require a signal establishing new patterns of cell proliferation. Sympetaly requires initiation of cell proliferation between otherwise distinct organs; spur development requires focused cell proliferation within a laminar surface. Data point to a parallel process of novel auxin foci as an initiating signal. This is not surprising since auxin accumulation is a primary mechanism by which organ out-growth occurs in plants and likely represents a significant constraint on patterning mechanisms.

Once localized cell division is patterned, the input and interplay between cell division and cell expansion required to shape developing organs is complex (Fig. 5d). It is not surprising that studies point to multiple components of this pathway affecting organ dimensions. Which loci are the target of selection is likely constrained by potential pleiotropy, with genes already acting in an organ-specific manner reducing off-target effects (*e.g.,* a *GLOBOSA* homolog in stamen-length variation). However, many genetic changes channel response through the BR hormone pathway (*e.g.,* petal size in *Capsella*; style length in *Primula* and *Turnera*). BR-dependent pathways may be particularly flexible targets for adaptive evolution of decreased floral organ length. Aside from being implicated in both cell division and expansion, BR-dependent mechanisms seem to be tightly controlled by hormone concentrations: either an increase or decrease in BR concentration inhibits organ growth (Fujikura et al. 2018). Therefore, multiple genetic mechanisms may result in reduced organ growth by disturbing BR levels away from levels that maximize cell division or expansion. Genes involved in the degradation of growth-promoting factors (including BR) show a pattern of parallel recruitment, again pointing to the importance of the levels of critical growth-promoting factors.

## 6. RECIPROCAL ILLUMINATION BETWEEN PHYLOGENETIC PATTERNS AND GENETIC MECHANISMS

Adaptive transitions in floral traits are ultimately limited by the availability of suitable mutations. This can cause genetic constraints that shape patterns of trait evolution if mutations causing certain traits arise much more frequently than mutations causing transitions to other traits or reversals to the ancestral state. Such mutational biases may help explain the tempo and relative reversibility of parallel transitions. We see this relationship for two well-studied traits, each with a relatively simple genetic basis. First, the parallel evolution of self-compatible (SC) from self-incompatible (SI) mating systems; second, the parallel evolution of red flowers from bluish ancestors associated with transitions from bee to hummingbird pollination. In both cases, we find lineages where parallel evolution in the forward direction (to SC or red flowers) is

564 significantly more common than reversals to the ancestral condition (SI or blue; Igic & Busch
565 2013; Wessinger et al. 2019). SC and red flowers are often produced through loss-of-function
566 (LOF) mutations to SI genes and anthocyanin pathway genes, respectively (reviewed in Shimizu
567 & Tsuchimatsu 2015; Wessinger & Rausher 2012). The target size for mutations that disrupt
568 gene function is much larger compared to mutations that can restore gene function to a
569 degraded gene or pathway. Therefore, genetic constraints may contribute to the extreme
570 asymmetry in transition rates between SI and SC, and between blue and red flowers. These
571 represent additional constraints beyond those clearly imposed by selection from pollinator
572 environment.
573
574 It is less apparent that mutational biases, in addition to selective processes, contribute to
575 phylogenetic patterns in floral traits reviewed here. These morphological traits are generated
576 through developmental pathways that can be substantially more complex than for SI and flower
577 color. With this additional complexity, we lack a clear expectation that certain transitions more
578 reliably involve frequently-arising LOF mutations, or other types of mutations with relatively large
579 target size. Naively, we might assume that, following the origins of additional morphological
580 complexity (*e.g.,* sympetaly, bilateral symmetry, or spurs), secondary reversals to the ancestral
581 condition might involve LOF mutations that dismantle developmental complexity. We currently
582 have limited information that this is the case.
583
584 Reversals from bilateral to radial flower symmetry are common and may be coupled to LOF
585 mutations at *CYC* regulatory sequences that eliminate dorsal-restricted expression, analogous
586 to snapdragon *backpetals* (Luo, Da et al. 1999). However, some reversals rely on other genetic
587 mechanisms that do not mimic *backpetals*, but may also have large target size (*e.g.,* loss of
588 floral *RAD* expression in *Lycopus*). Transitions between unfused and fused corollas, as well as
589 spurred and unspurred flowers, seem to occur with appreciable frequency in certain angiosperm
590 lineages (Ballerini et al. 2019; Hodges 1997; Reyes et al. 2018; Stull et al. 2018). However, we
591 have a limited picture of phylogenetic patterns for these traits, making an assessment of relative
592 reversibility difficult. In addition, we have scant information on the developmental bases for
593 reverse transitions. Additional data on developmental mechanisms and macroevolutionary
594 patterns for sympetaly and nectar spurs will allow further insights into the relationship between
595 pattern and process.
596

For evolutionary transitions in floral dimension traits (*e.g.,* flower and organ size), we expect minimal effects of mutational bias on patterns of trait evolution. Given the extremely complex regulatory networks involving both promotive and repressive pathways (Fig. 5d), frequently arising LOF mutations could lead to either increases or decreases in size. Thus, we expect any asymmetries in the rates of transitioning between different flower dimensions to be shaped primarily by selective constraints. For example, transitions towards, but not away from longer nectar spurs in *Aquilegia* are hypothesized to involve selective constraints imposed by moth pollinators (Whittall & Hodges 2007). An exception is the reversal from heterostyly to homostyly involving LOF mutations to hemizygous genes at the S-locus (Huu et al. 2016; Li et al. 2016; Shore et al. 2019). In this case, the evolution of a hemizygous S-locus in heterostyly acts as a simple genetic locus, easily disrupted by mutation, echoing the mechanism for transitions from SI to SC. These LOF mutations help explain the relatively rapid pace of transitions from heterostyly to homostyly and may generate a genetic constraint on reversals, helping to explain the asymmetric pattern of parallel transitions.

## 7. SUMMARY

Approaching parallel trait evolution through the hierarchical lens has proven useful for understanding which levels of organization and patterning exhibit similarity. While we identified examples of both parallel and divergent mechanisms from function through tissues to molecular changes, most revealing has been the central role of hormones in floral trait evolution. We see this both in the repeated establishment of novel floral traits and in evolutionary modifications associated with transitions to selfing and between pollinators. Traditionally, floral evo-devo research has focused on conservation and diversification of gene expression and function. Of course, identifying causal mutations for trait evolution is the holy grail, but the synthesis here suggests that research focused on the role of hormones in trait novelty will provide critical and novel insights. Genetic constraints not only shape the paths through which development proceeds, but also the macroevolutionary patterns of trait evolution. Traits with a simple genetic basis and that derive through LOF mutations provide a clear opportunity for reciprocal illumination. Whether these insights extent to more complex developmental patterning is less clear. What is clear is that when, as in the case of heterostyly, complex trait development is traced to simple genetic mechanisms, analogous to those underlying flower pigment evolution or the loss of self-incompatibility, reciprocal illumination is possible.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Adrien Sicard, Jacob Landis and Evangeline Ballerini for flower images of *Capsella, Slatugilia* and *Aquilegia,* respectively. We thank Douglas Futuyma for helpful comments on the manuscript. We acknowledge funding from the National Science Foundation (DEB-1542402 to LCH and CAW and IOS-1555418 to LCH) and the Benjamin D. Hall, PhD & Margaret B. Hall Fund through the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Research Excellence Initiative at the University of Kansas.

## LITERATURE CITED

Abouheif E. 1997. Developmental genetics and homology: a hierarchical approach. *Trends Ecol. & Evol*. 12(10):405–8

Armbruster WS. 2014. Floral specialization and angiosperm diversity: phenotypic divergence, fitness trade-offs and realized pollination accuracy. *Aob Plants*. 6:plu003

Baldwin BG, Kalisz S, Armbruster WS. 2011. Phylogenetic perspectives on diversification, biogeography, and floral evolution of *Collinsia* and *Tonella* (Plantaginaceae). *Am. J. Bot.* 98(4):731–53

Ballerini ES, Kramer EM, Hodges SA. 2019. Comparative transcriptomics of early petal development across four diverse species of *Aquilegia* reveal few genes consistently associated with nectar spur development. *BMC Genomics*. 20(1):668

Barrett SCH. 2002. The evolution of plant sexual diversity. *Nat Rev Genet*. 3(4):274–84

Barrett SCH, Ness RW, Vallejo-Marin M. 2009. Evolutionary pathways to self-fertilization in a tristylous plant species. *New Phytol.* 183(3):546–56

Barrett SCH, Shore JS. 2008. New insights on heterostyly: comparative biology, ecology and genetics. In *Self-Incompatibility in Flowering Plants: Evolution, Diversity, and Mechanisms*, ed. VE Franklin-Tong, pp. 3–32. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer

Bartlett ME, Specht CD. 2011. Changes in expression pattern of the teosinte branched1-like genes in the Zingiberales provide a mechanism for evolutionary shifts in symmetry across the order. *Am. J. Bot*. 98(2):227–43

Box MS, Dodsworth S, Rudall PJ, Bateman RM, Glover BJ. 2011. Characterization of *Linaria* KNOX genes suggests a role in petal-spur development. *Plant J*. 68(4):703–14

660 Broholm SK, Tähtiharju S, Laitinen RAE, Albert VA, Teeri TH, Elomaa P. 2008. A TCP domain
661 transcription factor controls flower type specification along the radial axis of the
662 *Gerbera* (Asteraceae) inflorescence. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A*. 105(26):9117–22
663 Busch A, Zachgo S. 2007. Control of corolla monosymmetry in the Brassicaceae *Iberis amara*.
664 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A*. 104(42):16714–19
665 Busch A, Horn S, Mühlhausen A, Mummenhoff K, Zachgo S. 2011. Corolla monosymmetry:
666 evolution of a morphological novelty in the Brassicaceae family. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*
667 29(4):1241-1254
668 Busch JW, Delph LF. 2012. The relative importance of reproductive assurance and automatic
669 selection as hypotheses for the evolution of self-fertilization. *Ann. Bot.* 109(3):553–62
670 Chapman MA, Tang S, Draeger D, Nambeesan S, Shaffer H, et al. 2012. Genetic analysis of floral
671 symmetry in Van Gogh's sunflowers reveals independent recruitment of *CYCLOIDEA*
672 genes in the Asteraceae. *PLOS Genetics*. 8(3):e1002628
673 Charlesworth D. 2016. The status of supergenes in the 21st century: recombination suppression
674 in Batesian mimicry and sex chromosomes and other complex adaptations. *Evol. Appl*.
675 9(1):74–90
676 Citerne HL, Reyes E, Le Guilloux M, Delannoy E, Simonnet F, et al. 2017. Characterization of
677 *CYCLOIDEA*-like genes in Proteaceae, a basal eudicot family with multiple shifts in floral
678 symmetry. *Ann Bot*. 119(3):367–78
679 Cocker JM, Wright J, Li J, Swarbreck D, Dyer S, et al. 2018. *Primula vulgaris* (primrose) genome
680 assembly, annotation and gene expression, with comparative genomics on the
681 heterostyly supergene. *Sci. Rep*. 8(1):1–13
682 Cohen JI. 2016. Floral evolution in *Lithospermum* (Boraginaceae): independent origins of similar
683 flower types. *Bot. J. Linnean Soc.* 180(2):213–28
684 Corley SB, Carpenter R, Copsey L, Coen E. 2005. Floral asymmetry involves an interplay between
685 TCP and MYB transcription factors in *Antirrhinum*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. of Sci. U.S.A*.
686 102(14):5068–73
687 Crozier TS, Thomas JF. 1993. Normal floral ontogeny and cool temperature-induced aberrant
688 floral development in *Glycine max* (Fabaceae). *Am. J. Bot.* 80(4):429–48

689 Cubas P, Coen E, Martinez Zapater JM. 2001. Ancient asymmetries in the evolution of flowers.
690 *Curr. Biol.* 11:1050-1052
691 Cui M-L, Copsey L, Green AA, Bangham JA, Coen E. 2010. Quantitative control of organ shape by
692 combinatorial gene activity. *PLoS Biol*. 8(11):e1000538
693 Cullen E, Fernández-Mazuecos M, Glover BJ. 2018. Evolution of nectar spur length in a clade of
694 *Linaria* reflects changes in cell division rather than in cell expansion. *Ann. Bot*.
695 122(5):801–9
696 Damerval C, Becker A. 2017. Genetics of flower development in Ranunculales – a new, basal
697 eudicot model order for studying flower evolution. *New Phytol*. 216(2):361–66
698 Darwin CR. The effects of cross and self-fertilization in the vegetable kingdom. John Murray,
699 London.
700 de Vos JM, Wueest RO, Conti E. 2014. Small and ugly? Phylogenetic analyses of the "selfing
701 syndrome" reveal complex evolutionary fates of monomorphic primrose flowers. *Evol*.
702 68(4):1042–57
703 Delgado-Benarroch L, Causier B, Weiss J, Egea-Cortines M. 2009. FORMOSA controls cell
704 division and expansion during floral development in *Antirrhinum majus*. *Planta*.
705 229(6):1219–29
706 Ding B, Xia R, Lin Q, Gurung V, Sagawa JM, et al. 2018. Developmental genetics of corolla tube
707 formation: role of the tasiRNA-ARF pathway and a conceptual model. *bioRxiv*. 253112
708 Disch S, Anastasiou E, Sharma VK, Laux T, Fletcher JC, Lenhard M. 2006. The E3 ubiquitin ligase
709 BIG BROTHER controls *Arabidopsis* organ size in a dosage-dependent manner. *Curr. Biol.*
710 16(3):272–79
711 Endress PK. 2001. Origins of flower morphology. *J. Exp. Zool*. 291(2):105–15
712 Faegri K, van der Pijl L. 1979. *The Principles of Pollination Ecology*. Oxford, England: Pergamon
713 Press Ltd. 3rd ed.
714 Fambrini M, Bellanca M, Muñoz MC, Usai G, Cavallini A, Pugliesi C. 2018. Ligulate inflorescence
715 of *Helianthus × multiflorus*, cv. Soleil d'Or, correlates with a mis-regulation of a
716 *CYCLOIDEA* gene characterised by insertion of a transposable element. *Plant Biol*.
717 20(6):956–67

718 Fambrini M, Salvini M, Pugliesi C. 2011. A transposon-mediate inactivation of a *CYCLOIDEA*-like
719 gene originates polysymmetric and androgynous ray flowers in *Helianthus annuus*.
720 *Genetica*. 139(11):1521–29
721 Feng G, Qin Z, Yan J, Zhang X, Hu Y. 2011. *Arabidopsis* ORGAN SIZE RELATED1 regulates organ
722 growth and final organ size in orchestration with ARGOS and ARL. *New Phytol.*
723 191(3):635–46
724 Feng X, Zhao Z, Tian Z, Xu S, Luo Y, et al. 2006. Control of petal shape and floral zygomorphy in
725 *Lotus japonicus*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A*. 103(13):4970–75
726 Fenster CB, Armbruster WS, Wilson P, Dudash MR, Thomson JD. 2004. Pollination syndromes
727 and floral specialization. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst*. 35(1):375–403
728 Fernández-Mazuecos M, Blanco-Pastor JL, Juan A, Carnicero P, Forrest A, et al. 2019.
729 Macroevolutionary dynamics of nectar spurs, a key evolutionary innovation. *New Phytol*.
730 222(2):1123–38
731 Friedman WE. 2009. The meaning of Darwin's "abominable mystery." *Am. J. Bot*. 96(1):5–21
732 Fujikura U, Jing R, Hanada A, Takebayashi Y, Sakakibara H, et al. 2018. Variation in splicing
733 efficiency underlies morphological evolution in *Capsella*. *Dev. Cell*. 44(2):192-203
734 Furutani M, Vernoux T, Traas J, Kato T, Tasaka M, Aida M. 2004. PIN-FORMED1 and PINOID
735 regulate boundary formation and cotyledon development in *Arabidopsis*
736 embryogenesis. *Development*. 131(20):5021–30
737 Galego L, Almeida J. 2002. Role of DIVARICATA in the control of dorsoventral asymmetry in
738 *Antirrhinum* flowers. *Genes Dev.* 16(7):880–91
739 Garcês HMP, Spencer VMR, Kim M. 2016. Control of floret symmetry by *RAY3, SvDIV1B* , and
740 *SvRAD* in the capitulum of *Senecio vulgaris*. *Plant Physiol.* 171(3):2055–68
741 Golz JF, Keck EJ, Hudson A. 2002. Spontaneous mutations in *KNOX* genes give rise to a novel
742 floral structure in *Antirrhinum*. *Curr. Biol*. 12(7):515–22
743 Gottsberger G. 2016. Generalist and specialist pollination in basal angiosperms (ANITA grade,
744 basal monocots, magnoliids, Chloranthaceae and Ceratophyllaceae): what we know
745 now. *Plant Div. Evol*. 131:263–362

746 Green AA, Kennaway JR, Hanna AI, Bangham JA, Coen E. 2010. Genetic control of organ shape
747 and tissue polarity. *PLOS Biology*. 8(11):e1000537
748 Gübitz T, Caldwell A, Hudson A. 2003. Rapid molecular evolution of *CYCLOIDEA*-like genes in
749 *Antirrhinum* and Its relatives. *Mol. Biol. Evol*. 20(9):1537–44
750 Heisler MG, Ohno C, Das P, Sieber P, Reddy GV, et al. 2005. Patterns of auxin transport and
751 gene expression during primordium development revealed by live imaging of the
752 *Arabidopsis* inflorescence meristem. *Curr. Biol*. 15(21):1899–1911
753 Hermann K, Klahre U, Venail J, Brandenburg A, Kuhlemeier C. 2015. The genetics of
754 reproductive organ morphology in two *Petunia* species with contrasting pollination
755 syndromes. *Planta*. 241(5):1241–54
756 Hileman LC. 2014. Trends in flower symmetry evolution revealed through phylogenetic and
757 developmental genetic advances. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*. 369(1648):20130348
758 Hileman LC, Baum DA. 2003. Why do paralogs persist? Molecular evolution of *CYCLOIDEA* and
759 related floral symmetry genes in *Antirrhineae* (Veronicaceae). *Mol. Biol. Evol*. 20(4):591–
760 600
761 Hodges SA. 1997. Floral nectar spurs and diversification. *Int. J. Plant Sci*. 158(6):S81–88
762 Howarth DG, Martins T, Chimney E, Donoghue MJ. 2011. Diversification of *CYCLOIDEA*
763 expression in the evolution of bilateral flower symmetry in *Caprifoliaceae* and *Lonicera*
764 (Dipsacales). *Ann. Bot*. 107(9):1521–32
765 Hu S, Dilcher DL, Jarzen DM, Taylor DW. 2008. Early steps of angiosperm–pollinator
766 coevolution. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A*. 105(1):240–45
767 Hu Y, Poh HM, Chua N-H. 2006. The *Arabidopsis ARGOS-LIKE* gene regulates cell expansion
768 during organ growth. *Plant J.* 47(1):1–9
769 Hu YX, Xie O, Chua NH. 2003. The *Arabidopsis* auxin-inducible gene *ARGOS* controls lateral
770 organ size. *Plant Cell*. 15(9):1951–61
771 Huang T, Irish VF. 2015. Temporal control of plant organ growth by TCP transcription factors.
772 *Curr. Biol.* 25(13):1765–70
773 Husband BC, Schemske DW. 1996. Evolution of the magnitude and timing of inbreeding
774 depression in plants. *Evol*. 50(1):54–70

775 Huu CN, Kappel C, Keller B, Sicard A, Takebayashi Y, et al. 2016. Presence versus absence of
776 *CYP734A50* underlies the style-length dimorphism in primroses. *eLife*. 5:e17956
777 Igic B, Busch JW. 2013. Is self-fertilization an evolutionary dead end? *New Phytol.* 198(2):386–
778 97
779 Iwasaki M, Nitasaka E. 2006. The *FEATHERED* gene is required for polarity establishment in
780 lateral organs especially flowers of the Japanese morning glory (*Ipomoea nil*). *Plant Mol.*
781 *Biol*. 62(6):913–25
782 Jabbour F, Cossard G, Le Guilloux M, Sannier J, Nadot S, Damerval C. 2014. Specific duplication
783 and dorsoventrally asymmetric expression patterns of *Cycloidea-Like* genes in
784 zygomorphic species of Ranunculaceae. *PLoS ONE*. 9(4):e95727
785 Jabbour F, Renner SS. 2012. Spurs in a spur: perianth evolution in the Delphinieae
786 (Ranunculaceae). *Int. J. Plant Sci*. 173(9):1036–54
787 Kappel C, Huu CN, Lenhard M. 2017. A short story gets longer: recent insights into the
788 molecular basis of heterostyly. *J. Exp. Bot.* 68(21–22):5719–30
789 Kelly JK, Mojica JP. Interactions among flower-size QTL of *Mimulus guttatus* are abundant but
790 highly variable in nature. *Genetics* 189:1461-71.
791 Kim M, Cui M-L, Cubas P, Gillies A, Lee K, et al. 2008. Regulatory genes control a key
792 morphological and ecological trait transferred between species. *Science*.
793 322(5904):1116–19
794 Kohn J, Barrett S. 1992. Experimental studies on the functional significance of heterostyly. *Evol*.
795 46(1):43–55
796 Kramer EM. 2019. Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose: The developmental evolution of
797 flowers. In *Current Topics in Developmental Biology*, Vol. 131, ed. U Grossniklaus, pp.
798 211–38. Academic Press
799 Krizek BA. 1999. Ectopic expression of *AINTEGUMENTA* in *Arabidopsis* plants results in
800 increased growth of floral organs. *Dev. Genet.* 25(3):224–36
801 Krizek BA. 2011. Auxin regulation of *Arabidopsis* flower development involves members of the
802 AINTEGUMENTA-LIKE/PLETHORA (AIL/PLT) family. *J. of Exp. Bot*. 62(10):3311–19
803 Krizek BA, Anderson JT. 2013. Control of flower size. *J. Exp. Bot.* 64(6):1427–37

804 Landis JB, O'Toole RD, Ventura KL, Gitzendanner MA, Oppenheimer DG, et al. 2016. The
805 phenotypic and genetic underpinnings of flower size in Polemoniaceae. *Front. Plant Sci.*
806 6:1144
807 Li J, Cocker JM, Wright J, Webster MA, McMullan M, et al. 2016. Genetic architecture and
808 evolution of the *S* locus supergene in *Primula vulgaris*. *Nat. Plants*. 2(12):16188
809 Li J, Webster MA, Wright J, Cocker JM, Smith MC, et al. 2015. Integration of genetic and physical
810 maps of the *Primula vulgaris S* locus and localization by chromosome *in situ*
811 hybridization. *New Phytol.* 208(1):137–48
812 Li Y, Zheng L, Corke F, Smith C, Bevan MW. 2008. Control of final seed and organ size by the
813 *DA1* gene family in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Genes Dev.* 22(10):1331–36
814 Luo D, Carpenter R, Vincent C, Copsey L, Coen E. 1996. Origin of floral asymmetry in
815 *Antirrhinum*. *Nature*. 383(6603):794–99
816 Luo D, Carpenter R, Copsey L, Vincent C, Clark J, Coen E. 1999. Control of organ asymmetry in
817 flowers of *Antirrhinum*. *Cell*. 99(4):367–76
818 Mack J-LK, Davis AR. 2015. The relationship between cell division and elongation during
819 development of the nectar-yielding petal spur in *Centranthus ruber* (Valerianaceae).
820 *Ann. Bot*. 115(4):641–49
821 Martín-Trillo M, Cubas P. 2010. *TCP* genes: a family snapshot ten years later. *Trends Plant Sci*.
822 15(1):31–39
823 Mast AR, Kelso S, Conti E. 2006. Are any primroses (*Primula*) primitively monomorphic? *New*
824 *Phytol.* 171(3):605–16
825 Mizukami Y, Fischer RL. 2000. Plant organ size control: AINTEGUMENTA regulates growth and
826 cell numbers during organogenesis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 97(2):942–47
827 Moyroud E, Glover BJ. 2017. The evolution of diverse floral morphologies. *Curr. Biol*.
828 27(17):R941–51
829 Naiki A. 2012. Heterostyly and the possibility of its breakdown by polyploidization. *Plant Spec.*
830 *Biol.* 27(1):3–29

831 Nikolov LA, Runions A, Das Gupta M, Tsiantis M. 2019. Leaf development and evolution. In
832 *Current Topics in Developmental Biology*, Vol. 131, ed. U Grossniklaus, pp. 109–39.
833 Academic Press
834 Nowak MD, Russo G, Schlapbach R, Huu CN, Lenhard M, Conti E. 2015. The draft genome of
835 *Primula veris* yields insights into the molecular basis of heterostyly. *Genome Biol.* 16:12
836 Ollerton J, Alarcón R, Waser NM, Price MV, Watts S, et al. 2009. A global test of the pollination
837 syndrome hypothesis. *Ann Bot*. 103(9):1471–80
838 Ollerton J, Winfree R, Tarrant S. 2011. How many flowering plants are pollinated by animals?
839 *Oikos*. 120(3):321–26
840 Panero JL, Funk VA. 2008. The value of sampling anomalous taxa in phylogenetic studies: Major
841 clades of the Asteraceae revealed. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 47(2):757–82
842 Preston JC, Hileman LC. 2012. Parallel evolution of *TCP* and *B*-class genes in Commelinaceae
843 flower bilateral symmetry. *EvoDevo*. 3(1):6
844 Preston JC, Powers B, Kostyun JL, Driscoll H, Zhang F, Zhong J. 2019. Implications of region-
845 specific gene expression for development of the partially fused petunia corolla. *Plant J*.
846 100(1):158–75
847 Puzey JR, Gerbode SJ, Hodges SA, Kramer EM, Mahadevan L. 2012. Evolution of spur-length
848 diversity in *Aquilegia* petals is achieved solely through cell-shape anisotropy. *Proc. R.*
849 *Soc. B*. 279(1733):1640–45
850 Raimundo J, Sobral R, Bailey P, Azevedo H, Galego L, et al. 2013. A subcellular tug of war
851 involving three MYB-like proteins underlies a molecular antagonism in *Antirrhinum*
852 flower asymmetry. *Plant J*. 75(4):527–38
853 Rast MI, Simon R. 2008. The meristem-to-organ boundary: more than an extremity of anything.
854 *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev*. 18(4):287–94
855 Rebocho AB, Kennaway JR, Bangham JA, Coen E. 2017. Formation and shaping of the
856 *Antirrhinum* flower through modulation of the *CUP* boundary gene. *Curr. Biol.*
857 27(17):2610-2622.e3
858 Reinhardt D, Pesce E-R, Stieger P, Mandel T, al et. 2003. Regulation of phyllotaxis by polar auxin
859 transport. *Nature*. 426(6964):255–60

860 Reyes E, Nadot S, Balthazar M von, Schönenberger J, Sauquet H. 2018. Testing the impact of
861 morphological rate heterogeneity on ancestral state reconstruction of five floral traits in
862 angiosperms. *Sci. Rep*. 8(1):1–12
863 Reyes E, Sauquet H, Nadot S. 2016. Perianth symmetry changed at least 199 times in
864 angiosperm evolution. *TAXON*. 65(5):945–64
865 Sauquet H, von Balthazar M, Magallón S, Doyle JA, Endress PK, et al. 2017. The ancestral flower
866 of angiosperms and its early diversification. *Nature Commun*. 8(1):1–10
867 Shimizu KK, Tsuchimatsu T. 2015. Evolution of selfing: recurrent patterns in molecular
868 adaptation. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst* 46:593–622.
869 Shore JS, Hamam HJ, Chafe PDJ, Labonne JDJ, Henning PM, McCubbin AG. 2019. The long and
870 short of the *S*-locus in *Turnera* (Passifloraceae). *New Phytol.* 224(3):1316–29
871 Sicard A, Kappel C, Lee YW, Wozniak NJ, Marona C, et al. 2016. Standing genetic variation in a
872 tissue-specific enhancer underlies selfing-syndrome evolution in Capsella. *Proc. Natl.*
873 *Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 113(48):13911–16
874 Sicard A, Stacey N, Hermann K, Dessoly J, Neuffer B, et al. 2011. Genetics, evolution, and
875 adaptive significance of the selfing syndrome in the genus *Capsella*. *Plant Cell*.
876 23(9):3156–71
877 Simonini S, Bencivenga S, Trick M, Østergaard L. 2017. Auxin-induced modulation of ETTIN
878 activity orchestrates gene expression in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell*. 29(8):1864–82
879 Simon-Porcar VI, Meagher TR, Arroyo J. 2015. Disassortative mating prevails in style-dimorphic
880 *Narcissus papyraceus* despite low reciprocity and compatibility of morphs. *Evol*.
881 69(9):2276–88
882 Smyth DR. 2018. Evolution and genetic control of the floral ground plan. *New Phytol*. 220(1):70–
883 86
884 Souer E, van Houwelingen A, Kloos D, Mol J, Koes R. 1996. The *No Apical Meristem* gene of
885 *Petunia* is required for pattern formation in embryos and flowers and is expressed at
886 meristem and primordia boundaries. *Cell*. 85(2):159–70
887 Spartz AK, Lee SH, Wenger JP, Gonzalez N, Itoh H, et al. 2012. The *SAUR19* subfamily of *SMALL*
888 *AUXIN UP RNA* genes promote cell expansion. *Plant J*. 70(6):978–90

889 Specht CD, Howarth DG. 2015. Adaptation in flower form: a comparative evodevo approach.
890 *New Phytol*. 206(1):74–90
891 Stebbins GL. 1970. Adaptive radiation of reproductive characteristics in angiosperms, I:
892 Pollination Mechanisms. *Ann. Rev.of Ecol. Syst*. 1(1):307–26
893 Stull GW, Schori M, Soltis DE, Soltis PS. 2018. Character evolution and missing (morphological)
894 data across Asteridae. *Am. J. Bot*. 105(3):470–79
895 Stuurman J, Hoballah ME, Broger L, Moore J, Basten C, Kuhlemeier C. 2004. Dissection of floral
896 pollination syndromes in *Petunia*. *Genetics*. 168(3):1585–99
897 Thomson JD, Wilson P. 2008. Explaining evolutionary shifts between bee and hummingbird
898 pollination: convergence, divergence, and directionality. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* 169(1):23–38
899 Tsai T, Diggle PK, Frye HA, Jones CS. 2018. Contrasting lengths of *Pelargonium* floral nectar
900 tubes result from late differences in rate and duration of growth. *Ann. Bot*. 121(3):549–
901 60
902 Ushijima K, Nakano R, Bando M, Shigezane Y, Ikeda K, et al. 2012. Isolation of the floral morph-
903 related genes in heterostylous flax (*Linum grandiflorum*): the genetic polymorphism and
904 the transcriptional and post-transcriptional regulations of the *S* locus. *Plant J.* 69(2):317–
905 31
906 van Es SW, Silveira SR, Rocha DI, Bimbo A, Martinelli AP, et al. 2018. Novel functions of the
907 *Arabidopsis* transcription factor TCP5 in petal development and ethylene biosynthesis.
908 *Plant J.* 94(5):867–79
909 Vandenbussche M, Horstman A, Zethof J, Koes R, Rijpkema AS, Gerats T. 2009. Differential
910 recruitment of *WOX* transcription factors for lateral development and organ fusion in
911 *Petunia* and *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell*. 21(8):2269–83
912 Varaud E, Brioudes F, Szecsi J, Leroux J, Brown S, et al. 2011. AUXIN RESPONSE FACTOR8
913 regulates *Arabidopsis* petal growth by interacting with the bHLH transcription factor
914 BIGPETALp. *Plant Cell*. 23(3):973–83
915 Verbeke JA. 1992. Fusion events during floral morphogenesis. *Ann. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant*
916 *Mol. Biol*. 43(1):583–98

Vernoux T, Kronenberger J, Grandjean O, Laufs P, Traas J. 2000. PIN-FORMED 1 regulates cell fate at the periphery of the shoot apical meristem. *Development*. 127(23):5157–65

Vert G, Walcher CL, Chory J, Nemhauser JL. 2008. Integration of auxin and brassinosteroid pathways by Auxin Response Factor 2. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 105(28):9829–34

Wang J, Wang Y, Luo D. 2010. *LjCYC* genes constitute floral dorsoventral asymmetry in *Lotus japonicus*. *J. Integr. Plant Biol*. 52(11):959–70

Wang Z, Li N, Jiang S, Gonzalez N, Huang X, et al. 2016. SCFSAP controls organ size by targeting PPD proteins for degradation in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Nat. Commun.* 7:11192

Wang Z, Luo Y, Li X, Wang L, Xu S, et al. 2008. Genetic control of floral zygomorphy in pea (*Pisum sativum* L.). *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A*. 105(30):10414–19

Wessinger CA, Rausher MD. 2012. Lessons from flower colour evolution on targets of selection. *J. Exp. Bot.* 63(16):5741–49

Wessinger CA, Rausher MD, Hileman LC. 2019. Adaptation to hummingbird pollination is associated with reduced diversification in *Penstemon*. *Evol. Letters*. 3(5):521–33

Whittall JB, Hodges SA. 2007. Pollinator shifts drive increasingly long nectar spurs in columbine flowers. *Nature*. 447(7145):706-U12

Woźniak NJ, Sicard A. 2018. Evolvability of flower geometry: convergence in pollinator-driven morphological evolution of flowers. *Semin. in Cell Dev. Biol*. 79:3–15

Wu M, Kostyun JL, Hahn MW, Moyle LC. 2018. Dissecting the basis of novel trait evolution in a radiation with widespread phylogenetic discordance. *Mol. Ecol*. 27(16):3301–16

Xu R, Li Y. 2011. Control of final organ size by Mediator complex subunit 25 in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Development*. 138(20):4545–54

Xu S, Luo Y, Cai Z, Cao X, Hu X, et al. 2013. Functional diversity of CYCLOIDEA-like TCP genes in the control of zygomorphic flower development in *Lotus japonicus*. *J. Integr. Plant Biol*. 55(3):221–31

Yan J, Cai X, Luo J, Sato S, Jiang Q, et al. 2010. The *REDUCED LEAFLET* genes encode key components of the trans-acting small interfering RNA pathway and regulate compound leaf and flower development in *Lotus japonicus*. *Plant Physiol*. 152(2):797–807

945 Yant L, Collani S, Puzey J, Levy C, Kramer EM. 2015. Molecular basis for three-dimensional
946 elaboration of the *Aquilegia* petal spur. *Proc. R. Soc. B*. 282(1803):20142778
947 Yasui Y, Mori M, Aii J, Abe T, Matsumoto D, et al. 2012. S-LOCUS EARLY FLOWERING 3 is
948 exclusively present in the genomes of short-styled buckwheat plants that exhibit
949 heteromorphic self-incompatibility. *PLoS One*. 7(2):e31264
950 Young HJ. 2008. Selection on spur shape in *Impatiens capensis*. *Oecologia*. 156(3):535–43
951 Zhang W, Kramer EM, Davis CC. 2010. Floral symmetry genes and the origin and maintenance of
952 zygomorphy in a plant-pollinator mutualism. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci*. *U.S.A.* 107(14):6388–
953 93
954 Zhang W, Kramer EM, Davis CC. 2012. Similar genetic mechanisms underlie the parallel
955 evolution of floral phenotypes. *PLOS ONE*. 7(4):e36033
956 Zhang W, Steinmann VW, Nikolov L, Kramer EM, Davis C. 2013. Divergent genetic mechanisms
957 underlie reversals to radial floral symmetry from diverse zygomorphic flowered
958 ancestors. *Front. Plant Sci.* 4:302
959 Zhao Y, Pfannebecker K, Dommes AB, Hidalgo O, Becker A, Elomaa P. 2018. Evolutionary
960 diversification of *CYC/TB1-like* TCP homologs and their recruitment for the control of
961 branching and floral morphology in Papaveraceae (basal eudicots). *New Phytol*.
962 220(1):317–31
963 Zhong J, Kellogg EA. 2015. Stepwise evolution of corolla symmetry in *CYCLOIDEA2*-like and
964 *RADIALIS*-like gene expression patterns in Lamiales. *Am. J. Bot.* 102(8):1260-1267
965 Zhong J, Powell S, Preston JC. 2016. Organ boundary NAC-domain transcription factors are
966 implicated in the evolution of petal fusion. *Plant Biol*. 18(6):893–902
967 Zhong J, Preston JC. 2015. Bridging the gaps: evolution and development of perianth fusion.
968 *New Phytol*. 208(2):330–35
969 Zhong J, Preston JC, Hileman LC, Kellogg EA. 2017. Repeated and diverse losses of corolla
970 bilateral symmetry in the Lamiaceae. *Ann. Bot.* 119(7):1211–23
971 Zhong L, Barrett SCH, Wang X-J, Wu Z-K, Sun H-Y, et al. 2019. Phylogenomic analysis reveals
972 multiple evolutionary origins of selfing from outcrossing in a lineage of heterostylous
973 plants. *New Phytol*. 224(3):1290–1303

974 Zhou C, Han L, Fu C, Wen J, Cheng X, et al. 2013. The trans-acting short interfering RNA3
975 pathway and NO APICAL MERISTEM antagonistically regulate leaf margin development
976 and lateral organ separation, as revealed by analysis of an *argonaute7/lobed leaflet1*
977 mutant in *Medicago truncatula*. *Plant Cell*. 25(12):4845–62
978 Zhou W, Barrett SCH, Wang H, Li D-Z. 2015. Reciprocal herkogamy promotes disassortative
979 mating in a distylous species with intramorph compatibility. *New Phytol.* 206(4):1503–12
980 Zhou X-R, Wang Y-Z, Smith JF, Chen R. 2008. Altered expression patterns of *TCP* and *MYB* genes
981 relating to the floral developmental transition from initial zygomorphy to actinomorphy
982 in *Bournea* (Gesneriaceae). *New Phytol*. 178(3):532–43
983
984

Figure 1 Examples and hypothesized developmental basis of sympetaly. (*a*) *Mimulus lewisii* flower with corolla tube formed by congenital petal fusion (*white arrowhead*). (*b*) *Pisum sativum* flower with keeled ventral petals formed by postgenital fusion (*blue arrowhead*). (*c*) A model for the developmental basis of petal fusion (Ding et al. 2018), whereby variation in regulation of the organ polarity program [e.g., *AUXIN RESPONSE FACTOR* (*ARF*)] regulated by *trans*-acting small interfering RNAs (tasiRNAs) affects interpetal levels of auxin (*high levels in green*, *low levels in blue*). High auxin levels are hypothesized to promote interpetal cell proliferation and negatively regulate the organ boundary genetic program [e.g., *CUPULIFORMIS* (*CUP*)].

Figure 2 Examples of flower symmetry and developmental basis of bilateral symmetry in *Antirrhinum majus* (snapdragon). (*a*) Radially symmetrical flower of *Crassula exilis*. (*b*) Bilaterally symmetrical flower of *Penstemon virgatus*. (*c*) The developmental program that regulates bilateral symmetry in snapdragon. *CYCLOIDEA* (*CYC*), *DICHOTOMA* (*DICH*), and *RADIALIS* (*RAD*) determine dorsal flower development. *DIVARICATA* (*DIV*) determines ventral flower development. Ventral identity is precluded from the dorsal side by RAD protein competitively excluding DIV from interacting with DIVARICATA RADIALIS INTERACTING FACTORs (DRIFs). *DIV* specifically affects ventral lip development by putatively altering cell proliferation at the site of curvature through regulation of *CUPULIFORMIS* (*CUP*), *YUCCA* (*YUC*), and *AINTEGUMENTA* (*ANT*).

Figure 3 Nectar spur initiation. (*a*) *Pinguicula* sp. (butterwort) with a petal-derived spur (*arrowhead*). (*b*) Nectar spurs, regardless of tissue origin, require a localized zone of cell proliferation to initiate outgrowth (*red area*). Elevated auxin and meristem identity have each been implicated in establishing a focal region of cell proliferation.

Figure 4 Heterostyly dimorphism. Allelic variation across tightly linked genes at a single locus determine stamen and style length dimorphism in heterostylous species. (*a*) L-morph flowers have long styles and short stamens. (*b*) S-morph flowers have short styles and long stamens. These alternative arrangements of reproductive organs (L- and S-morphs) promote outcrossing and reduces self-pollination.

Figure 5 Evolution of flower dimensions through changes in cell proliferation and/or expansion. (*a*) (*top*) *Capsella grandiflora* and (*bottom*) *Capsella rubella* differ in flower size as a result of selection for selfing in *C. rubella*. (*b*) (*top*) *Saltugilia australis* and (*bottom*) *Saltugilia splendens* differ in corolla tube length (and petal size) as a result of selection imposed by flower–pollinator interactions. (*c*) (*top*) *Aquilegia brevistyla* and (*bottom*) *Aquilegia chrysantha* differ in nectar spur length as a result of selection imposed by flower–pollinator interactions. (*d*) The genetic programs regulating the balance between cell proliferation and cell expansion are complex and rely on hormone regulation. Some genes jointly affect both cell proliferation and cell expansion (e.g., *ARF8/BPEp* and *MED25*). Hormones are in bold; genes and hormones discussed in this review are in red. Abbreviations: *ANT*, *AINTEGUMENTA*; *ARL*, *ARGOS-LIKE*; *ARF*, *AUXIN RESPONSE FACTOR*; *BPE*, *BIG PETAL*; BR, brassinosteroid; *MED*, *Mediator of RNA polymerase II*; tasiRNAs, *trans*-acting small interfering RNAs. Photographs courtesy of (*a*) Adrien Sicard, (*b*) Jacob Landis, and (*c*) Evangeline Ballerini.