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In many species, Suc en route out of the leaf migrates from photosynthetically active mesophyll cells into the phloem down its concentration gradient via plasmodesmata, i.e. symplastically. In some of these plants, the process is entirely passive, but in others phloem Suc is actively converted into larger sugars, raffinose and stachyose, and segregated (trapped), thus raising total phloem sugar concentration to a level higher than in the mesophyll. Questions remain regarding the mechanisms and selective advantages conferred by both of these symplastic-loading processes. Here, we present an integrated model— including local and global transport and kinetics of polymerization—for passive and active symplastic loading. We also propose a physical model of transport through the plasmodesmata. With these models, we predict that (1) relative to passive loading, polymerization of Suc in the phloem, even in the absence of segregation, lowers the sugar content in the leaf required to achieve a given export rate and accelerates export for a given concentration of Suc in the mesophyll and (2) segregation of oligomers and the inverted gradient of total sugar content can be achieved for physiologically reasonable parameter values, but even higher export rates can be accessed in scenarios in which polymers are allowed to diffuse back into the mesophyll. We discuss these predictions in relation to further studies aimed at the clarification of loading mechanisms, fitness of active and passive symplastic loading, and potential targets for engineering improved rates of export.

Vascular plants export sugars and other nutrients from leaves through a living vascular tissue, the phloem. This transport process drives photosynthetic products to remote tissues (sinks) for growth and storage, coupling synthesis, and intercellular transport processes in the leaves and sink tissues to global, hydraulic transport through the phloem sieve tubes and xylem vessels. Significant uncertainties remain regarding the structure, chemistry, and transport phenomena governing these processes (Knoblauch and Peters, 2010; Turgeon, 2010a, 2010b). Improved models of export will inform our understanding of whole-plant physiology and open opportunities to engineer sugar concentrations and transport processes to improve growth and yield (Schroeder et al., 2013; Giraldo et al., 2014).

Insights into these transport processes may also suggest ways to design efficient synthetic systems to control chemical processes (Strook et al., 2014; Comtet et al., 2017).

Particular outstanding questions relate to the mechanisms by which plants transfer Suc, and in some cases sugar alcohols, from the photosynthetically active mesophyll to the transport phloem (phloem loading) in the subset of species in which this loading step occurs symplastically, i.e. through the open channels of plasmodesmata (Fu et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2014; Fig. 1A). In most symplastic loaders, there is no buildup of sugars in the phloem, as shown in Figure 1B; this distribution of sugars suggests passive transfer from mesophyll to phloem, as postulated by Münch (1930). In a second symplastic loading mechanism, Suc passes from mesophyll cells into bundle sheath cells and from the bundle sheath into specialized phloem companion cells in the minor veins known as intermediary cells through specialized plasmodesmata (Fig. 1A). In the intermediary cells, the Suc is converted, in an energetically active polymerization process, to raffinose family oligosaccharides (RFOs; principally raffinose and stachyose). Transfer of RFOs back into the mesophyll does not appear to occur, and one observes elevated total concentrations of sugars in the phloem relative to the mesophyll (Fig. 1B; Voitsekhovskaja et al., 2006; Haritatos et al., 1996; Fisher 1986). This inversion of the total concentration gradient of sugars depends on the polymerization reaction (McCaskill and Turgeon, 2007).
and correlates with lower concentration of sugars in the mesophyll, and hence in the whole leaf, relative to plants that load passively (Rennie and Turgeon, 2009; Fig. 1C). In these two characteristics (inverted total concentration gradient of sugars and lower total sugar content in leaves), active symplastic loaders, also known as polymer trappers, match the characteristics of apoplastic loaders in which photoassimilate is actively pumped into the phloem (Fig. 1C; Haritatos et al., 1996; Voitsekhovskaja et al., 2006; Rennie and Turgeon, 2009). In this paper, we refer to RFO accumulation in the phloem as “segregation” and the elevated total concentration of sugars in the phloem relative to the mesophyll as “gradient inversion.”

The observation of strong segregation of sugars in the phloem (Fig. 1B) and low levels of whole-leaf osmolality (Fig. 1C) in polymer trap plants provokes a number of questions. First, what mechanisms permit passive transport of Suc through these apparently open pores from mesophyll to minor vein phloem, while simultaneously preventing the passage of larger RFOs in the opposite direction? One possibility is that the plasmodesmatal properties, some of the RFO can diffuse back to the mesophyll cells. Suc and RFO are then exported via bulk flow in the transport phloem. E, Circuit diagram of model in D. Hydraulic interfaces are characterized by hydraulic permeabilities ($L$ [m s$^{-1}$ Pa$^{-1}$]) and reflection coefficients ($\sigma$ [–]) ($\sigma = 1$ for osmotic membranes); the plasmodesmatal interface is further characterized by a diffusive mass transfer coefficient ($k$ [m s$^{-1}$]). Volumetric fluxes of water (Q [m s$^{-1}$], blue arrows) and molar fluxes of solute ($f$ [mole m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$], red arrows) pass through the circuit from the xylem at pressure, $P_X$ [Pa] to tissue sinks for the sugars at a pressure, $P_S$ [Pa]. In the MV-phloem, $n$ Suc are polymerized to form one RFO at a rate $f_{pol}$ [mole m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$]. See Table I for values of all parameters used.
RESULTS

A Globally Coupled Model of Symplastic Loading with Polymerization

Figure 1D is a schematic cross section of a leaf minor vein in symplastic loaders (either passive or active; electron micrograph in Supplemental Fig. S1) presenting the hypothesized transport processes: Photosynthetic products (Fig. 1D, red circles; Suc in all plants and also sugar alcohols in some) diffuse and advect through plasmodesmata (cross-sectional view in Figure 1A) down their concentration gradient from the mesophyll (site of synthesis) to the phloem (site of advective evacuation). Suc is then polymerized into RFOs in the phloem (green double circles in Figure 1D). Elevated osmolarity in the mesophyll and phloem recruits water from the xylem (Fig. 1D, blue arrows) to drive convection along this pathway. Water and sugars are subsequently exported by advection through the transport phloem (T-phloem) to sinks (Fig. 1D, blue and red downward arrows, respectively). Figure 1E presents a circuit representation of steady fluxes of water \((Q_w \text{ [m s}^{-1}]\), blue arrows) and sugars \((\phi_l \text{ [mole m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}]\), red arrows) from xylem to the mesophyll \((Q_{XM})\) and to the MV-phloem \((Q_{MP})\), from mesophyll to the MV-phloem \((Q_{MP}; \phi_{MP}^{\text{RFO}}; \phi_{MP}^{\text{Suc}})\), and through the phloem to sink tissues \((Q_S; \phi_S^{\text{RFO}}; \phi_S^{\text{Suc}})\). All fluxes are defined with respect to the exchange surface area of MV-phloem through which Suc loading occurs. The zig-zag black lines in Figure 1E represent available paths for water and sugar transfer. Each path presents a hydraulic conductance \((L \text{ [m s}^{-1} \text{ Pa}^{-1}]\) for water flow. The interface between the mesophyll and phloem partially reflects sugars \((0 \leq \sigma_{MP} \leq 1)\) and allows for diffusive transfer of sugars \((k_{MP} \geq 0)\); we explore details of plasmodesmatal transport processes in Figure 2. The transport phloem allows water flow and free advective transfer of sugars \((\sigma_P = 0)\), and we neglect diffusion of sugars \((k_P = 0)\). We consider Michaelis-Menten kinetics for polymerization of \(n\) Suc into one RFO at rate \(\phi_{pol} = \frac{k_{pol} \sigma_{MP} \phi_{MP}^{\text{Suc}}}{K_{M} + \phi_{MP}^{\text{Suc}}}\) with \(k_{pol}\) the maximal polymerization rate and \(K_M\) the Michaelis-Menten constant. With \(\phi_{pol}^{\text{Suc}} = 0\), the system models passive symplastic loading. See “Materials and Methods” and Supplemental Information S1 for details.

Nondimensional Parameters That Characterize Loading

In the model of active symplastic loading described above (Fig. 1, D and E), diffusive loading of Suc from mesophyll to phloem and advective export of sugars within the phloem occur simultaneously. We expect that the relative magnitudes of these fluxes should play an important role in defining distinct regimes of the predicted behavior, i.e. advection-limited (greater diffusive Suc loading compared to advective export of sugars) versus diffusion-limited (minimal diffusive loading of Suc compared to advective export of sugars). Here, we identify the characteristic magnitude of these rates and normalize the global advection of sugars within the transport phloem by the diffusive component of transport through plasmodesmata. We call the resulting nondimensional ratio the flushing number \((f)\) and show, in the following sections and in a separate study (Comtet et al., 2017), that it provides a useful parameterization of the predicted behavior, even when we consider both advective and diffusive transport inside the plasmodesmata (see Supplemental Information S2).

First, we identify the characteristic net driving force, \(\Delta P_c\), for water flow from leaf to sink as the mesophyll osmotic pressure minus the negative pressure difference between leaf xylem and the unloading zone in the transport phloem:

\[
\Delta P_c = RT_c \sigma_{MP}^{\text{Suc}} + P_X - P_S .
\]

Second, analysis of the hydraulic network gives a total conductance for the leaf in series with the transport phloem:

\[
L_{\text{tot}} = \frac{1}{L_{\text{leaf}} + \frac{1}{L_{XP}}}
\]

where \(L_{\text{leaf}} = 1/(1/L_{XM} + 1/L_{MP}) + L_{XP}\) is the effective conductance of the leaf \((L_{XP} \text{ is in parallel with } L_{XM} \text{ and } L_{MP} \text{ which are in series})\). We assume here that water can enter the leaf from xylem to mesophyll, or from xylem to phloem. Together, Equations 1 and 2 define the characteristic water flux through the phloem:
transfer and Suc diffusion from the mesophyll through the plasmodesmata interface. We approximate this diffusive loading flux as \( \frac{Q_{\text{f}}^{\text{Suc}}}{M_{\text{MP}}} = \left( \frac{C_{\text{suc}}^{\text{MP}} - C_{\text{suc}}^{\text{IPM}}}{P_{\text{suc}}} \right) \approx k_{\text{suc}}^{\text{MP}} \), where \( k_{\text{suc}}^{\text{MP}} \) [m s\(^{-1}\)] is the diffusive mass transfer coefficient of Suc through the plasmodesmatal interface.

To characterize this competition, we propose the following nondimensional ratio of global advection out of the transport phloem and local diffusion through plasmodesmata:

\[
f = \frac{\text{advection}}{\text{diffusion}} = \frac{Q_{\text{f}}^{\text{Suc}}}{k_{\text{MP}}^{\text{suc}}} = \frac{Q_{\text{f}}^{\text{Suc}}}{k_{\text{MP}}^{\text{Suc}}}
\]

\[
= \frac{L_{\text{tot}} \left[ RT c_{\text{MP}}^{\text{suc}} + P_X - P_S \right]}{k_{\text{MP}}^{\text{suc}}}
\]

For large values of this flushing number, \( f \), phloem loading is diffusion limited and the concentration of phloem sugars will be low because sugars are flushed out of the MV-phloem more quickly than they can diffuse in; gradient inversion (elevated total concentration of sugars in MV-phloem; Fig. 1, B and C) is suppressed in this regime. For small values of \( f \), loading is convective limited and sugar concentration in the MV-phloem is high, favoring gradient inversion. This number is relevant for both passive and active symplastic loaders (Comtet et al., 2017).

**Physiology of the Plasmodesmata**

Although segregation of RFOs based on a size exclusion mechanism has been proposed (Turgeon, 1991; Dölger et al., 2014), discrimination based only on hydrodynamic radii seems difficult considering that stachyose is only 40% larger than Suc (Liesche and Schulz, 2013), and raffinose is even smaller than stachyose. Even if the RFOs mass transfer coefficient is reduced by steric interaction with plasmodesmatal channels (Turgeon and Gowan, 1990; Dölger et al., 2014), back diffusion and leakage of RFOs into the mesophyll will eventually occur. Dölger et al. (2014) presented a physical model of hindered transport of Suc through the plasmodesmata interface, concluding that the reentry of raffinose in the mesophyll could not be prevented by advective sweeping due to water flow through plasmodesmata. Here, we present an explicit model of advection and diffusion within the plasmodesmata (Fig. 2) coupled with our global model of symplastic transport (Fig. 1E) to reexamine the mechanism of RFO segregation.

**Pore-Scale Model of Plasmodesmata Transport**

Figure 2A presents an electron micrograph of a plasmodesma in transverse section. Sugar molecules are thought to pass through the space between the desmotubule (Fig. 2A, "DW") and the plasma membrane, i.e. the "cytoplasmic sleeve," (Fig. 2A, "IPM"). One common, idealized interpretation of the...
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Eqs. S18–(Deen, 1987; Dechadilok and Deen, 2006; Supplemental is the cytoplasmic sleeve is that of a series of nanochannels created by regularly arranged proteins within the cytoplasmic sleeve (Fig. 2A, “a”; Ding et al., 1992; Terry and Robards, 1987). In Figure 2B, we model each plasmodesma as a bundle of nine pores of equivalent radius \( r_{\text{pore}} \) and length \( l \) (Terry and Robards 1987). In Figure 2C, we follow Deen (1987) and consider hindered transport of spherical solute molecules in cylindrical pores, accounting for steric interactions of solute molecules with the pore wall. In following this approach, we adopt a confinement parameter, the ratio of pore radius to sugar molecule radius, \( \gamma_i = \frac{r_{\text{pe}}}{r} \geq 1 \), where \( i \) is either Suc or RFOs; this parameter controls the partial rejection of sugar species \( i \) due to steric interactions with the pore, such that the flux of Suc and RFOs from mesophyll to phloem can be expressed as

\[
\phi_{\text{MP}}^i = [1 - \sigma_{\text{MP}}^i(\gamma_i)] Q_{\text{MP}} \left[ c_i^M - c_i^p \exp(P_{\text{eff}} - 1) \right] \quad (\text{Eq. 5})
\]

where \( \sigma_{\text{MP}}^i(\gamma_i) \) is the reflection coefficient that depends only on the ratio \( \gamma_i \), \( P_{\text{eff}} = [1 - \sigma_{\text{MP}}^i(\gamma_i)] Q_{\text{MP}} / k_{\text{MP}}^i \) is the Péclet number characterizing the ratio of hindered advection to hindered diffusion in the pore, \( k_{\text{MP}}^i \) is the mass transfer coefficient that accounts for hindered diffusion of solute, and \( Q_{\text{MP}} \) is the flux of water between mesophyll and phloem (Deen, 1987; Dechadilok and Deen, 2006; Supplemental Eqs. S18–S21). In the limit of low Péclet number, \( P_{\text{eff}} \ll 1 \), Equation 5 simplifies to \( \phi_{\text{MP}}^i = k_{\text{MP}}^i \left[ c_i^M - c_i^p \right] + [1 - \sigma_{\text{MP}}^i(\gamma_i)] Q_{\text{MP}} c_i^M \) for which diffusive and advective flux through plasmodesmata are completely decoupled (Supplemental Eq. S24). This limit, for which advective effects are weak, was used by Dölger et al. (2014) in their model of plasmodesmal transport.

For clarity, we emphasize that the relative strength of advection and diffusion captured by the Péclet number relates to local transport processes within the pores of the plasmodesmata. On the other hand, the flushing number defined in Equation 4 is the ratio of global advection of sugars within the transport phloem to the diffusive component of transport through the plasmodesmata, from mesophyll to phloem. In Supplemental Information S5, we provide a further discussion of the relationship between these nondimensional parameters.

**Steric Hindrance and Advection Can Inhibit Back Diffusion of RFOs**

To what degree do diffusion and hindered advection affect flux of Suc and RFO through plasmodesmata? In Figure 2D, we focus on the transport of these solutes across the plasmodesmatal interface. We plot the molar fluxes [mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)] of Suc (Fig. 2D, red) and RFO (Fig. 2D, green) through a model pore (Fig. 2C) as a function of the confinement parameter \( \gamma_i = \frac{r_{\text{pe}}}{r} \) (Eq. 5). We normalize the total sugar flux \( \phi_{\text{MP}}^i \) by its diffusive component, \( k_{\text{MP}}^i | \Delta c | > 0 \). Positive flux corresponds to net transfer from mesophyll (Fig. 2C, left) to phloem (Fig. 2C, right). The upper axis of Figure 2D represents the reflection coefficient, \( \sigma_{\text{MP}}^i(\gamma) \) (Dechadilok and Deen, 2006) for a given confinement parameter (Supplemental Eq. S21). For these calculations, we impose a fixed effective pressure difference \( \Delta P_{\text{eff}} = \Delta P - \sigma_{\text{SUC}}^i RT \Delta c_{\text{SUC}} - \sigma_{\text{RFO}}^i RT \Delta c_{\text{RFO}} = 0.2 \) bar driving a water flow between mesophyll and phloem, with \( P_{\text{eff}}^i = P_{\text{eff}} \) (Supplemental Eqs. S5a-b and S15; Supplemental Information S3). This effective difference in pressure represents the combined effect of the difference in mechanical pressure and the differences in concentration of the two solutes and depends on plasmodesmatal interface reflection coefficients for Suc and RFOs (Katchalsky and Curran, 1965). With this driving force fixed (to isolate the effect of the plasmodesmatal interface), we evaluate the rate of transfer of sugars by combined hindered advection and diffusion in the presence of flow using Equation 5.

For all degrees of confinement, we predict forward flux of Suc (red curve always above zero in Fig. 2D), as expected given the downhill gradient of both effective pressure and Suc concentration. For RFO, the predicted behavior is more complicated: In the limit of strong confinement (\( \gamma \rightarrow 1 \)), we predict forward flux of RFO (red line in Fig. 2D), such that no transfer of RFO back from phloem to mesophyll occurs, despite a higher RFO concentration in the phloem. The RFO will be segregated in the phloem. This effect arises because the pore wall impedes more strongly solute diffusion than solute advection. As \( \gamma \rightarrow 1 \), hindrance of diffusive transport occurs due to the increase in the viscous drag experienced by solute particles, while advection of solute is less hindered, as steric interactions restrict solute to the zone of maximum flow in the center of the pore, where advection is strongest (Fig. 2C; Dechadilok and Deen, 2006). At intermediate degrees of confinement (1.2 < \( \gamma \), in this example), net backward transfer of RFOs from phloem to mesophyll can occur, as back diffusion outstrips advection with the forward-moving flow. For larger pores (\( \gamma \geq 8 \) in this example), we again predict forward flux of RFO and thus its segregation in the phloem, because advection dominates again in this limit.

In summary, we predict that advection of water can inhibit back diffusion of RFO from phloem to mesophyll in the limits of both strong (\( \gamma \rightarrow 1 \)) and weak (\( \gamma \geq 1 \)) confinement within the plasmodesmata. The conclusion of Dölger et al. (2014) that water flow cannot prevent back diffusion of RFO should thus be reevaluated by considering transport over the entire range of Péclet number, as in Equation 5. The small Péclet number limit assumed in their analysis underestimated the effect that advective water flow from mesophyll to phloem has on retarding the movement of RFOs in the opposite direction. In other words, their analysis predicted that an unrealistically large bulk flow was necessary to prevent back diffusion of RFO, compared to
our predictions with the more complete expression in Equation 5. Our analysis thus predicts that advection through the plasmodesmata can aid in creating the segregation and gradient inversion that one observes in active symplastic loaders (Fig. 1B). Thus, one does not need to invoke chemical selectivity within the plasmodesmata in order to explain these observations.

Whole-Plant Transport and Plasmodesmatal Selectivity

Figure 3 presents predictions of our global water transport model (Fig. 1, D and E) with the hindered transport model presented in Figure 2. See Table I for the parameter values used in the model. Figure 3 presents distributions of sugars (Fig. 3A) and carbon export rate (Fig. 3B) with respect to the strength of global convection versus advection (flushing number; \( f \)) and confinement parameters (\( \gamma_{RFO} = r_{pore}/r_{RFO} \) on left axis; \( \gamma_{Suc} = r_{pore}/r_{Suc} \) on right axis) for a typical polymerization rate (see “Materials and Methods”). We use parameters for stachyose to represent RFO species, with degree of polymerization \( n = 2 \). We assume here that the permeabilities of the xylem-phloem and xylem-mesophyll interfaces have similar values: \( L_{XP} = L_{XM} = 5 \times 10^{-14} \text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1} \text{Pa}^{-1} \). Note that we find qualitatively similar results—gradient inversion can occur—when taking smaller permeabilities (down to \( 5 \times 10^{-16} \text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1} \text{Pa}^{-1} \)) for either one or the other interface (see Supplemental Information S4).

The charts in Figure 3C present the calculated concentrations of RFO (green) and Suc (red) in the mesophyll cells (M) and phloem (P) at three points of differing convection (varied by changing transport resistance) and hindrance (varied by changing plasmodesmatal radius). In Figure 3, D to F, we explore trends with polymerization rate and present additional trends for pressure, water potential, and effective pressure difference in Supplemental Information S3 (see Table I for parameter values).
Table I. Table of parameters (see Supplemental Information S5 for parameter estimation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Typical Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$c^{\text{Suc}}_\text{M}$</td>
<td>Sucrose concentration in the mesophylls</td>
<td>200 mmol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c^{\text{RFO}}_\text{M}$</td>
<td>RFO concentration in the mesophylls</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c^{\text{Suc}}_\text{P}$</td>
<td>Sucrose concentration in the minor vein phloem</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c^{\text{RFO}}_\text{P}$</td>
<td>RFO concentration in the minor vein phloem</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c^{\text{tot}}_\text{M}$</td>
<td>Total concentration of sugars in the mesophylls</td>
<td>$c^{\text{tot}}<em>\text{M} = c^{\text{Suc}}</em>\text{M} + c^{\text{RFO}}_\text{M}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c^{\text{tot}}_\text{P}$</td>
<td>Total concentration of sugars in the minor vein phloem</td>
<td>$c^{\text{tot}}<em>\text{P} = c^{\text{Suc}}</em>\text{P} + c^{\text{RFO}}_\text{P}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_{\text{leaf}}$</td>
<td>Average concentration of sugars in the leaf</td>
<td>$(c^{\text{tot}}<em>\text{M} + c^{\text{tot}}</em>\text{P})$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concentrations, $c$ [mmol]**

**Permeabilities, $L$ [m/s/Pa]**

- $L_{\text{XM}}$: Xylem/mesophyll permeability (Jensen et al., 2011) $5 \times 10^{-14}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$ Pa$^{-1}$
- $L_{\text{XP}}$: Xylem/phloem permeability (Jensen et al., 2011) $5 \times 10^{-14}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$ Pa$^{-1}$
- $L_{\text{MP}}$: Mesophyll/phloem plasmodesmatal permeability $10^{-13}$ to $5 \times 10^{-12}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$ Pa$^{-1}$
- $L_{\text{P}}$: Transport phloem equivalent permeability $10^{-10}$ to $10^{-16}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$ Pa$^{-1}$

**Pressures and water potentials, $P$ [bar]**

- $P_{\text{X}}$: Xylem water pressure $–$ 1 bar
- $P_{\text{S}}$: Sink (roots) water pressure $–$ 0 bar
- $P_{\text{M}}$: Mesophyll hydrostatic pressure $–$
- $P_{\text{P}}$: Minor veins hydrostatic pressure $–$

**Water flux, $Q$ [m/s]**

- $Q_{\text{XM}}$: Water flux from xylem to mesophylls $–$
- $Q_{\text{XP}}$: Water flux from xylem to minor vein phloem $–$
- $Q_{\text{MP}}$: Plasmodesmatal water flux from mesophylls to phloem $–$
- $Q_{\text{P}}$: Water flux through the transport phloem $–$

**Sugar flux through plasmodesmata, $f$ [mmol/m$^2$/s]**

- $f^{\text{Suc}}_{\text{MP}}$: Sucrose flux through the plasmodesmata $–$
- $f^{\text{RFO}}_{\text{MP}}$: RFO flux through the plasmodesmata $–$
- $f^{\text{carbon}}$: Carbon flux transported through the phloem (Eq. 6) $10.8 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$
- $f^{\text{syn}}_{\text{carbon}}$: Photosynthetic synthetic rate in the mesophyll, equal to the carbon flux exported through the phloem at steady-state (Schmitz et al., 1987) $10.8 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$

**Enzyme kinetics**

- $\phi^{\text{pol}}_{\text{Suc}}$: Polymerization rate of sucrose into RFO [mol/m$^2$/s] $–$
- $\phi^{\text{pol}}_{\text{Suc}}$: Michaelis-Menten maximal rate [mol/m$^2$/s] $900 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$
- $K_{\text{M}}$: Michaelis-Menten constant $50 \text{ mmol}$

**Plasmodesmatal transport parameters**

- $D^{\text{Suc}}$: Cytosolic sucrose diffusion coefficient [m$^2$/s] (Henrion, 1964) $2.3 \times 10^{-10}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$
- $D^{\text{RFO}}$: Cytosolic RFO diffusion coefficient [m$^2$/s] (Craig and Pulley, 1962) $1.9 \times 10^{-10}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$
- $K^{\text{Suc/RFO}}$: Sucrose/RFO plasmodesmatal mass transfer coefficient [m/s] $1$–$10$
- $\alpha^{\text{Suc/RFO}}$: Sucrose/RFO reflection coefficient $[–]$ $0$–$1$
- $H_{\text{Suc/RFO}}$: Sucrose/RFO diffusive hindrance $[–]$ $0$–$1$
- $W_{\text{Suc/RFO}}$: Sucrose/RFO convective hindrance $[W=1–H]$ $[–]$ $0$–$1$
- $\rho$: Plasmodesmatal density [m$^2$] (Gamalei, 1991; Schmitz et al., 1987) $50 \mu\text{m}^{-2}$
- $N$: Number of pores per plasmodesmata (Terry and Robards, 1987) $9$
- $r_{\text{pore}}$: pore radius [m] (Schmitz et al., 1987) $0.7$–$1.5 \mu\text{m}$
- $l_{\text{pore}}$: pore length [m] (Liesche and Schulz, 2013) $140 \text{ nm}$
- $r_{\text{Suc}}$: sucrose radius [m] (Liesche and Schulz, 2013) $0.42 \text{ nm}$
- $r_{\text{RFO}}$: Stachyose/RFO radius [m] (Liesche and Schulz, 2013) $0.6 \text{ nm}$
- $\gamma_{\text{Suc}} = r_{\text{pore}}/r_{\text{Suc}}$: Sucrose confinement parameter $1$–$10$ in Fig. 2
- $\gamma_{\text{RFO}} = r_{\text{pore}}/r_{\text{RFO}}$: RFO confinement parameter $1$–$10$ in Fig. 2
- $\gamma_{\text{RFO}} = r_{\text{pore}}/r_{\text{RFO}}$: RFO confinement parameter $1$–$1.4$ in Fig. 3
- $\eta_{\text{s}}$: Effective phloem sap viscosity including the effects for sieve plates (Jensen et al., 2012) $5 \text{ cPs}$
- $\eta_{\text{c}}$: Typical cytoplasmic viscosity $2 \text{ cPs}$

**Global physiological parameters**

- $v_{\text{M}}$: Volume fraction of mesophyll is the leaf (Adams et al., 2013) $97\%$
- $v_{\text{P}}$: Volume fraction of phloem in the leaf (Adams et al., 2013) $3\%$
- $a$: Sieve tube radius [m] $5$–$20 \mu\text{m}$
- $l_{\text{load}}$: Length of the loading zone (leaf length) [m] $1$–$50 \text{ cm}$
- $h$: Length of the transport zone (plant height) [m] $0.1$–$10 \text{ m}$
**Gradient Inversion without Chemically Selective Plasmodesmata**

The solid red line in Figure 3A ("1:1") represents the boundary between the states that show gradient inversion and those that do not: Below this curve, for lower $\gamma_{\text{RFO}}$ and $\gamma_{\text{suc}}$ (more restricted motion of sugars within the plasmodesmata) and lower flushing number (i.e. weak global convection and low transport phloem permeability), the total concentration of sugars in the phloem is higher than in the mesophyll. The other curves represent states with excess concentrations of sugar in the phloem relative to the mesophyll. Importantly, for parameters within the physiological range (Fig. 3A, unshaded area), we predict that inversion can occur, with magnitudes of excess concentration in the phloem (Fig. 3A, 50%–100%, point 1 on the diagram) that match those observed in active symplastic loaders (Rennie and Turgeon, 2009). This gradient inversion depends on two conditions: (1) strong geometric confinement within the plasmodesmata ($\gamma_{\text{RFO}} < 1.3$; i.e. small plasmodesmatal radius), for which advection of RFO in the plasmodesmata from mesophyll to phloem tends to overcome its back diffusion, corresponding to the limit of $\gamma \rightarrow 1$ on the solid green curve in Figure 2B; and (2) weak advection through the phloem (low $f_i$, i.e. low transport phloem permeability). If either of these conditions is violated, gradient inversion fails to occur. With strong hindrance and strong global advection (Fig. 3A, point 2), segregation of RFO occurs (green bars in Fig. 3C, point 2), but sugars are flushed out of the phloem, prohibiting gradient inversion. With weak hindrance and weak advection (Fig. 3A, point 3), segregation of RFO does not occur and the gradient between the mesophyll and the phloem tends to zero (Fig. 3C, point 3).

In Figure 3D, we plot the ratio of the total concentrations of sugar ($c_{\text{M}}^{\text{tot}} = c_{\text{M}}^{\text{tot}} + c_{\text{M}}^{\text{RFO}}$) in the phloem and mesophyll for a fixed mesophyll Suc concentration. We associate values of $c_{\text{M}}^{\text{RFO}} / c_{\text{M}}^{\text{tot}} > 1$ with gradient inversion (above the dashed line in Figure 3D). We see that, for weak global advection (low $f_i$, i.e. low transport phloem permeability) and hindered transport through plasmodesmata ($\gamma_{\text{RFO}} \rightarrow 1$, i.e. small plasmodesmatal radius; point 1, blue curve in Fig. 3D), the strength of gradient inversion grows monotonically with polymerization rate, confirming that an increase in diffusive flux created by the Suc depletion in the phloem increases phloem osmolarity, despite the loss of particles through polymerization. For flushing numbers greater than one (Fig. 3D, point 2, red curve) or weak segregation (Fig. 3D, point 3, yellow curve) gradient inversion is never obtained, even for large polymerization rates.

**Export Rates Are Compatible with Those Observed Experimentally**

We now track the flux of carbon out of leaves expressed, no matter its chemical form, as total moles of carbon ($\phi_{\text{carbon}}$). Based on the predictions in Figure 3A, the experimentally observed degree of gradient inversion (higher sugar concentration in the phloem) requires strongly hindered transport through the plasmodesmata (small $\gamma_{\text{RFO}}$ as at point 1). To assess the consequences of hindrance on sugar flux, in Figure 3B we plot the total carbon export rate, $\phi_{\text{carbon}}$, over the same domain as in Figure 3A.

$$\phi_{\text{carbon}} = 12 \cdot Q_{\text{P}} \left( c_{\text{M}}^{\text{tot}} + n c_{\text{RFO}}^{\text{RFO}} \right)$$ (6)

Note that this flux equals the flux of Suc through the plasmodesmatal interface times the carbon content of one Suc molecule. The green curve in Figure 3B is the isoline for an export rate, $\phi_{\text{syn}} = 10.8 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ corresponding to a typical flux through minor veins (Schmitz et al., 1987; Haritatos et al., 1996). Importantly, the model is consistent with experiments in that strong gradient inversion occurs in a regime that provides physiologically reasonable export rates (as at point 1, Fig. 3B). However, maintaining gradient inversion significantly constrains export rates compared to those given by larger plasmodesmatal pores (point 3, Fig. 3B). This supports the concept that the elevated density of plasmodesmata observed in active symplastic loaders relative to passive ones evolved to accommodate the limitation on flux imposed by the narrow pores required for gradient inversion (Haritatos and Turgeon, 1995; Slewinski et al., 2013). Moreover, the fact that the export rate isoline (green line, Fig. 3B) crosses domains corresponding to various levels of segregation and to the absence of segregation (left and right of the 1:1 isoline, Fig. 3A) suggests that segregation of RFOs and gradient inversion do not provide a direct advantage with respect to export rates, compared to the situation where RFOs leak back to the mesophyll cells.

**Polymerization Lowers the Required Concentration of Sugars in the Leaf**

We now explore the impact of polymerization on total sugar concentration in the leaf for a fixed rate of synthesis in the mesophyll, $\phi_{\text{carbon}}$, or total carbon export through the phloem (these rates are equal in moles of carbon at steady state). In Figure 3E, we track the average concentration of sugars in the leaf, $c_{\text{leaf}} = v_M c_{\text{M}}^{\text{tot}} + v_P c_{\text{P}}^{\text{tot}}$ as a function of the rate of polymerization, $\phi_{\text{P}}$, for the three cases highlighted in Figure 3, A to C. In the definition of $c_{\text{leaf}}$, $v_M$ and $v_P$ are the volume fractions of mesophyll and phloem in a typical leaf. The values of $c_{\text{leaf}}$ in the absence of polymerization ($\phi_{\text{pol}} = 0$) correspond to passive loading. Importantly, Figure 3E shows that the average concentration of leaf sugars required to drive export always decreases with increasing polymerization rate in the MV-phloem. To maintain a given carbon flux, the difference in Suc concentration must be maintained at a fixed value to drive diffusion; increasing the rate of polymerization lowers the phloem Suc concentration and allows the concentration in the mesophyll to drop while maintaining a fixed gradient. Due to the
Increased Polymerization and Phloem Advection Increase Export Rate

We now ask how polymerization and advection in the phloem impact export rate with a fixed concentration of Suc in the mesophyll. For a fixed mesophyll Suc concentration, the exported carbon flux (Eq. 6) always increases with polymerization rate in the MV-phloem (Fig. 3F). This effect is due to the increased gradient in Suc concentration created by Suc depletion in the phloem by polymerization. Figure 3F also shows that export rate increases with decreasing transport phloem resistance, leading to increasing convection (higher f, comparing point 1, blue curve, and point 2, red curve). We note that the favorable dependence of translocation rate on polymerization holds only if RFO synthesis is spatially confined to the phloem, because the reaction must selectively decrease the concentration of Suc in the phloem to increase the gradient between the two cellular domains. Also note that the localization of the polymerization reactions within the MV-phloem should not be confused with the spatial localization of the RFO products, which we refer to as “segregation.” Confinement of the polymerization reaction enzymes to the companion (intermediary) cells of the phloem has been reported for active symplastic loaders (Holthaus and Schmitz 1991; Beebe and Turgeon 1992).

Polymerization and Segregation Minimize Leaf Sugar Content

We now explore the possible advantages derived from the polymer trap phenomenon (Fig. 3, D–F). Note that an increased rate of polymerization lowers the total sugar concentration in the leaf (c_{leaf}; Fig. 3E) and increases the total carbon export out of the leaf (\phi_{carbon}; Fig. 3F) regardless of the degree of gradient inversion (Fig. 3D). The notable distinction of the strongly hindered case (point 1, blue curves in Fig. 3, D–F) is that it displays both strong gradient inversion and a rapid decay of c_{leaf} with \phi_{pol}; in leaves operating under these conditions, a small expenditure of metabolic activity dedicated to polymerization will dramatically decrease its load of sugar. This trend suggests that maintaining low sugar content in leaves provides a selective advantage for the evolution of specialized plasmodesmata that enable segregation and gradient inversion in active symplastic loaders.

DISCUSSION

The physical and chemical mechanisms that lead to segregation of RFOs in the phloem of “polymer trap” species are still matters of debate, as are the adaptive advantages of this segregation. To shed light on these topics and on symplastic loading more generally, we have introduced a model that couples local and global transport processes with the polymerization kinetics of Suc into RFOs.

Our predictions indicate that, regardless of global hydraulic conditions, localized polymerization of Suc into RFOs in the MV-phloem decreases the total concentration of sugars required in the leaf to export Suc at a fixed rate (Fig. 3E) and increases the rate of export for a fixed concentration of Suc in the mesophyll (Fig. 3F); both of these trends could be beneficial to the plant and provide a basis for a selective pressure toward this metabolically active reaction (Turgeon, 2010a). With the introduction of a simple but complete model of hindered advection and diffusion within the plasmodesmata, we find that the conditions required to provide segregation and gradient inversion lead to physiologically reasonable rates of export, if account is taken for a larger reduction of sugar concentration in the mesophyll as the strongly segregated case (Fig. 3E).

Taken together, our observations are consistent with the hypothesis that the specialized plasmodesmata found in active symplastic loaders—with high density per unit area and nanometer-scale effective pore radii—evolved to provide an adequate export rate (e.g., a value limited by photosynthetic rates) under the additional constraint of minimizing the total sugar content of leaves (Fig. 1C; Rennie and Turgeon, 2009). It has been argued that reducing total carbohydrate concentration in leaves could increase growth potential and limit herbivory (Turgeon, 2010a). We also note that minimizing total sugar concentration in the mesophyll could minimize possible inhibition of photosynthesis (Adams et al., 2013). A clear prediction of the model is that, if selectivity is the result of hindered plasmodesmal transport, reducing convective flow through plasmodesmata between the bundle sheath and intermediary cells (mesophyll/phloem interface) will impede segregation, leading to accumulation of RFOs in the mesophyll. Along with dye-coupling approaches (Liesche and Schulz, 2012), experiments decreasing the flushing number (by applying cold or girdling the
transport phloem), could give additional insight into potential RFO segregation mechanisms.

Interestingly, most, if not all, symplastic loaders polymerize some Suc into RFOs whether or not they display the gradient inversion associated with polymer trapping (Slewinski et al., 2013). Our model provides a possible rational for this observation: With or without segregation and gradient inversion, localized reduction of Suc in the phloem by polymerization increases export rates relative to the completely passive case (as for points 2 and 3 in Fig. 3F). While trapping species appear to use segregation to prioritize low concentrations in the mesophyll, other symplastic loaders may be exploiting this effect to a lesser degree, prioritizing export rate over the minimization of concentration. In other words, we suggest that polymerization may represent an active loading process in a much larger fraction of symplastic loaders than has been previously appreciated. It would be interesting to confirm the predicted relation between polymerization and translocation experimentally by genetically enhancing or inhibiting polymerization rates in both symplastic loaders that show gradient inversion and those that do not (Cao et al., 2013; McCaskill and Turgeon, 2007). Such techniques could potentially play a role in improving phloem export rates and yields in symplastic loaders.

Finally, we note that apoplastic loading could theoretically occur in parallel with active and passive symplastic loading mechanisms, either in the same or in different cells. However, available evidence does not support the presence of complementary apoplastic and symplastic mechanisms in intermediary cells: The Suc transporter does not immunolocalize to the intermediary cell plasma membrane (Voitsekhovskaja et al., 2009). It is possible, even likely, that apoplastic loading occurs in other companion cells in RFO plants (those that do not express the RFO pathway), but if so this contribution is apparently minimal since blocking the Suc transporter chemically (Turgeon and Gowan, 1990) or by RNAi (Zhang and Turgeon, 2009) does not noticeably inhibit growth. Nonetheless, the effect of additional Suc flux at the mesophyll/phloem interface due to apoplastic loading could be implemented in the model. These issues will be addressed in future studies.

Our study allowed us to characterize the flow patterns arising from coupled water and solute transport in leaf phloem, when water is allowed to flow through plasmodesmata. Importantly, in the presence of gradient inversion, we found that water always flows advectively from mesophyll to phloem, even when there exists an adverse gradient in both hydrostatic pressure and water potential (Supplemental Information S3; gradient inversion leads to larger pressure and water potential in the phloem than in the mesophyll). This effect arises due to the properties of the plasmodesmal interface—partially reflective to both Suc and RFOs—for which an effective pressure difference, \( \Delta P_{eff} = \Delta P_{MP} - RT(\sigma_{Suc} \Delta_{Suc} + \sigma_{RFO} \Delta_{RFO}) \), provides the driving force for advective water flow, \( Q_{MP} \) (Katchalsky and Curran, 1965). We note that this pressure difference is distinct from either the differences in water potential or in hydrostatic pressure. Indeed, because the small dimensions of the plasmodesmatal channels lead to a larger reflection coefficient for RFOs than for Suc, the uphill gradient of RFOs ultimately provides the dominant force that induces advective water flow from mesophyll to phloem.

Our model of transport through plasmodesmata shows that both segregation of RFOs in the phloem and gradient inversion can occur without strict steric exclusion or chemical selectivity (Fig. 3A). We conclude that convective sweeping of RFOs downstream in the plasmodesmata (from mesophyll to phloem) plays a critical role in driving these effects, in contrast to the conclusions of a recent study (Dölger et al., 2014). We do not exclude the possibility that molecular mechanisms (e.g. due to molecularly specific steric or chemical effects in the pores) could impact the selectivity for transfer of Suc relative to RFOs. We also allow that, as noted by Liesche and Schulz (2013), stachyose diffusing into the mesophyll could be hydrolyzed back into Suc and monosaccharides by the \( \alpha \)-galactosidase present in mature leaves, preventing stachyose accumulation in the mesophyll. To clarify this mechanism further will require additional information on sugar gradients, hydraulic coupling between mesophyll and phloem (Voitsekhovskaja et al., 2006), and the structure and biochemistry of the pore spaces within plasmodesmata; additionally, more detailed models of molecular transport under strong confinement should be employed (Bosi et al., 2012). Our model provides a framework in which to evaluate the impact of these details on the global characteristics of the loading process.

In conclusion, our study highlights the impact of system-scale coupling on the dynamics of symplastic loading and sheds light on the possible selective advantages derived from the polymerization and segregation that are observed in polymer trap species. We propose that evolutionary drivers other than increased export rate should be sought to explain sugar segregation in active symplastic loaders and that up-regulation of the enzymatic pathways that synthesize RFO could lead to improved export rates in passive symplastic loaders. In conjunction with future experiments, refinements of this model could provide a basis for directing the design of engineered plants with more efficient translocation of sugars, faster growth, and higher yields.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Boundary Condition for Mesophyll Suc**

Photosynthesized carbohydrates can selectively be stored as starch or Suc. This partitioning led us to consider, in Figure 3, two extreme boundary conditions for the export and concentration of mesophyll Suc. When photosynthesis is not limiting, we consider Suc concentration to be fixed at 200 mM in the mesophyll (Fig. 3, A–D and F). For limiting photosynthesis, all sugars are exported and a fixed carbon flux \( \Phi_{carbon} = 10.8 \mu mol \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \) has to be
accommodated through the phloem (Schmitz et al., 1987; Haritatos et al., 1996; Fig. 3E; see Supplemental Information S1 and Supplemental Eq. S11 for more details).

Coupling to the Xylem

Windt et al. (2006) showed experimentally that the impact of phloem flow on xylem water status is weak. We thus take fixed water pressure in the xylem, $P_x = -0.1\, \text{MPa}$, to represent leaves at moderate stress. Change in xylem water potential would simply shift the flushing number $f$. Mesophyll cells and minor veins are surrounded by cell walls, which, as part of the apoplast, can lead to direct hydraulic coupling to the xylem. Due to differences in water potential, water from the xylem can enter these cells via osmosis through membrane aquaporins (Fig. 1, D and E, blue arrows; Patrick et al., 2001). In Figure 3, we take the equivalent water permeability of these interfaces to be $L_{XG} = L_{XM} = 5 \times 10^{-12}\, \text{m}^2\, \text{s}^{-1}\, \text{Pa}^{-1}$ (Thompson and Holbrook, 2003; the effect of different permeabilities is presented in Supplemental Information S4).

**Enzyme Kinetics**

We assume segregation of the enzymes in the minor veins and assume that the enzyme-mediated polymerization follows Michaelis-Menten kinetics with a maximal polymerization rate $\phi_{\text{pol}}^{\text{max}}$ (Fig. 3, E and F), and $K_m = 50\, \text{mmol}$ (Supplemental Eq. S16). In Figure 3, A and B, we take $\phi_{\text{pol}} = 900\, \text{mmol}\, \text{m}^{-2}\, \text{s}^{-1}$ (the typical export rate of Suc in polymer traps; Schmitz et al., 1987).

**Sink Kinetics**

We take pressure in the phloem sap at the sinks, $P_b = 0\, \text{MPa}$; this choice is equivalent to neglecting rate limitations at the unloading step, but variations of the unloading rate can be accounted for by varying the conductance of the transport phloem, $L_p$.

**Plasmodesmatal Interface and Sugar Filtering**

We assume a density of 50 plasmodesmata/$\mu$m² of cell wall at the bundle sheath-intermediary cells interface (Schmitz et al., 1987; Gamalei, 1991). We correspond to the length of the branch of the plasmodesma, as this section of the passage is more constricted and will thus dominate both hydraulic resistance and transport selectivity. We treat each plasmodesma as a bundle of $n = 9$ pores (Fig. 2A; Terry and Robards, 1987). For solute hydrodynamic radius, we calculated values from 3D hydrated models of Suc (rSuc = 0.42 nm) and stachyose (rStac = 0.6 nm; Liesche and Schulz, 2013). We vary plasmodesmata pore size between $f_{\text{pol}} = 0.6\, \text{nm}$ and 0.84 nm in Figure 3.

**General Modeling Hypothesis**

We assume throughout our model that all the supracellular compartments are well mixed. Phloem sap viscosity can be affected by the relative sugar content and concentration (Hölttä et al., 2006; Lang, 1978; Jensen et al., 2013), but we neglect this effect by considering a hydraulic permeability $L_p$ independent of sap composition. The physiological values above and in Table I are of the right order of magnitude and provide a basis for exploring trends, via changes of the sap composition. The physiological values above and in Table I are of the right order of magnitude and provide a basis for exploring trends, via changes of the sap composition.

**Supplemental Data**

The following supplemental materials are available.

**Supplemental Figure S1.** Labeled electron micrograph corresponding to the model of Figure 1D.

**Supplemental Figure S2.** Concentration profile inside the plasmodesmatal pore.

**Supplemental Figure S3.** Effect of xylem to phloem and xylem to mesophyll permeabilities on segregation levels.

**Supplemental Figure S4.** Details of hydrostatic pressures, water potentials, and effective pressure differences for the three scenarios of Figure 3.

**Supplemental Figure S5.** Ratio of RFO and sucrose Fedcet numbers as a function of the confinement parameter and plasmodesmatal pore radius.

**Supplemental Information S1.** Mathematical treatment.

**Supplemental Information S2.** Relationship between local plasmodesmatal transport and flushing number.

**Supplemental Information S3.** Pressure, water potential, and effective pressure difference in mesophyll and phloem.

**Supplemental Information S4.** An alternative scenario for water transport.

**Supplemental Information S5.** Parameter estimation.
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