

FOCUSED REVIEW

To infinity and beyond: recent progress, bottlenecks, and potential of clonal seeds by apomixis

Bas Heidemann^{1,†}, Elias Primetis^{1,2,†}, Iris E. Zahn^{1,†} and Charles J. Underwood^{1,2,*}

¹Department of Plant & Animal Biology, Radboud Institute for Biological and Environmental Sciences, Radboud University, Nijmegen, the Netherlands, and

²Department of Chromosome Biology, Max Planck Institute for Plant Breeding Research, Carl-von-Linné-Weg 10, 50829 Cologne, Germany

Received 31 October 2024; revised 30 January 2025; accepted 7 February 2025. *For correspondence (e-mail charles.underwood@ru.nl). ¹These authors contributed equally to this work.

SUMMARY

Apomixis – clonal seed production in plants – is a rare yet phylogenetically widespread trait that has recurrently evolved in plants to fix hybrid genotypes over generations. Apomixis is absent from major crop species and has been seen as a holy grail of plant breeding due to its potential to propagate hybrid vigor in perpetuity. Here we exhaustively review recent progress, bottlenecks, and potential in the individual components of gametophytic apomixis (avoidance of meiosis, skipping fertilization by parthenogenesis, autonomous endosperm development), and sporophytic apomixis. The *Mitosis instead of Meiosis* system has now been successfully set up in three species (*Arabidopsis*, rice, and tomato), yet significant hurdles remain for universal bioengineering of clonal gametes. Parthenogenesis has been engineered in even more species, yet incomplete penetrance still remains an issue; we discuss the choice of parthenogenesis genes (*BABY BOOM, PARTHENOGENESIS, WUSCHEL*) and also how to drive egg cell-specific expression. The identification of pathways to engineer autonomous endosperm development would allow fully autonomous seed production, yet here significant challenges remain. The recent achievements in the engineering of synthetic apomixis in rice at high penetrance show great potential and the remaining obstacles toward implementation in this crop are addressed. Overall, the recent practical examples of synthetic apomixis suggest the field is flourishing and implementation in agricultural systems could soon take place.

Keywords: clonal seeds, apomixis, meiosis, parthenogenesis, endosperm, hybrid vigor, plant breeding.

INTRODUCTION

Apomixis – asexual seed production – is an alternative strategy to sexual reproduction that is employed in about 400 plant species (Ozias-Akins & Van Dijk, 2007; Wang & Underwood, 2023). Although relatively rare (less than 0.1% of plant species are apomictic), it is present in phylogenetically diverse plant species, indicating the likely recurrent evolution of apomixis (Hojsgaard et al., 2014). Based on cytological observations of apomixis in divergent species it has been concluded that several different types of apomixis exist, further substantiating apomixis is a recurrently evolving trait (Koltunow & Grossniklaus, 2003). The introduction of apomixis into sexual crops has revolutionary potential in agriculture to fix hybrid genotypes through seeds and thereby fundamentally change the supply and

availability of hybrid seeds worldwide (Underwood & Mercier, 2022).

To comprehend the intricacies of apomixis it is insightful to consider the two defining features of flowering plant sexual reproduction: meiosis and double fertilization (Dresselhaus et al., 2016; Mercier et al., 2015) (Figure 1). Meiosis, a conserved cell division in the reproduction of eukaryotes, takes place in plants in the male and female floral organs. In cells with a meiotic destiny, a pre-meiotic S phase leads to the replication of chromosomes. Distinct to mitosis, during the first meiotic prophase programmed DNA double-strand breaks are made, homologous chromosomes pair, and homologous recombination takes place. Subsequently, homologous chromosomes segregate and only in the second meiotic division

which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.





Sexual reproduction in tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*) is depicted in the top half of the figure and apomictic reproduction in dandelion (*Taraxacum officinale*) is depicted in the bottom half of the figure. In sexual reproduction in tomato, the chromosomes replicate in the megaspore mother cell and subsequently meiosis takes place. This leads to the production of four recombinant, haploid cells (the megaspores), three of which degenerate, while one survives and enters gametogenesis (three rounds of mitotic division). The mature female gametophyte encompasses one haploid egg cell, one diploid central cell, three haploid antipodals (not shown) and two haploid synergids (not shown). The process of double fertilization of the egg cell and central cell leads to a diploid embryo and a triploid endosperm (not shown). In apomictic reproduction in dandelion, the chromosomes replicate in the megaspore mother cell and subsequently a diplospory apomeiosis division takes place. This leads to the production of two non-recombinant, triploid cells (the megaspores). One megaspore degenerates and one enters gametogenesis. The mature female gametophyte encompasses one triploid egg cell, one hexaploid central cell, three triploid antipodals (not shown) and two triploid synergids (not shown). The gametophyte encompasses one triploid egg cell, one hexaploid central cell, three triploid antipodals (not shown) and two triploid synergids (not shown). The egg cell enters embryogenesis by parthenogenesis (triggered by the *ToPAR* gene) giving rise to a triploid embryo while the central cell autonomously begins endosperm development giving rise to a hexaploid endosperm (not shown). Created in Biorender. Underwood, C. (2025) https://Biorender.com/a96z426

do the sister chromatids segregate. As a result, haploid, recombinant cells are produced that may enter gametogenesis to generate two sperms (encased in the pollen) on the male side, and a central cell and an egg cell (encased in the female gametophyte) on the female side. During double fertilization, one sperm fertilizes the egg, giving rise to the embryo, while the fertilization of the central cell gives rise to the endosperm (a nourishing tissue for the embryo). The developing embryo and endosperm are surrounded by a maternal-derived seed coat. Ultimately, for clonal seed production by apomixis to evolve, the processes of meiosis and egg cell fertilization must be avoided (Underwood & Mercier, 2022). One route to this is sporophytic apomixis (also referred to as adventive embryony and nucellar embryony) which is the formation of a somatic embryo from a non-gametic lineage that co-occupies the seed with a sexual embryo (Lakshmanan & Ambegaokar, 1984). Sporophytic apomixis occurs naturally in *Citrus* and *Mangifera* (commonly referred to as mango) and leads to multiple embryos within a single seed

 so-called polyembryony (Lakshmanan & Ambegaokar, 1984). Alternatively, gametophytic apomixis requires the modification and/or skipping of the sexual processes (female meiosis and double fertilization) themselves (Nogler, 1984).

Among many other genera, gametophytic apomixis occurs naturally in the wild grass genera Cenchrus/Pennisetum and the Asteraceae family genera Taraxacum, Hieracium, and Pilosella (Ozias-Akins & Van Dijk, 2007). Broadly speaking there are two natural routes to skip female meiosis, namely, apospory and diplospory (Koltunow & Grossniklaus, 2003). Apospory is the development of the female gametophyte from the sporophyte (i.e., somatic cells of the ovule) without the formation of spores and occurs naturally in Pennisetum and Pilosella (Bicknell et al., 2023; Huo et al., 2009). On the other hand, a diplospory division leads to the production of two clonal spores, one of which enters gametogenesis, and occurs naturally in Taraxacum (by meiotic diplospory) (Figure 1) and Hieracium (by mitotic diplospory) (Bicknell et al., 2023; Cornaro et al., 2024; Dijk & Bakx-Schotman, 2004). In all cases of gametophytic apomixis, a cell with egg cell fate inside the female gametophyte must then be triggered to enter embryogenesis by a process known as parthenogenesis (Underwood & Mercier, 2022). The genetic basis of parthenogenesis has been identified in Pennisetum and Taraxacum (Conner et al., 2015; Underwood et al., 2022). To support embryo development, most apomictic species initiate the formation of the endosperm by fertilization of the central cell by a sperm (known as pseudogamy) (Nogler, 1984). However, in some species, including dandelion (Taraxacum officinale), the requirement of central cell fertilization to trigger endosperm development has been lost. Through this autonomous endosperm development, these species can reproduce completely independent of fertilization (Hands et al., 2016).

Engineering of apomixis has long been considered as a holy grail for the propagation of hybrid genotypes in crop plants (Jefferson, 1994; Spillane et al., 2004; Underwood & Mercier, 2022). Besides the engineering of complete synthetic apomixis systems in crops, individual components of apomixis could have applications in crop breeding. For example, the skipping of meiosis alone can be used to generate non-recombinant double-cross hybrid seed which can be used for polyploid genome design (Wang et al., 2024). In addition, the skipping of fertilization by parthenogenesis can be used as a double haploid technology to rapidly fix recombinant haplotypes (Jacquier et al., 2020; Quiroz et al., 2024), while autonomous endosperm could be used as a strategy to ensure grain filling in harsh environmental conditions (Hands et al., 2016).

Natural and synthetic apomixis have been extensively reviewed (Goeckeritz et al., 2024; Khanday & Sundaresan, 2021; Mahlandt et al., 2023; Qu et al., 2024; Underwood &

Box 1. Review summary

- Apomixis is a complex multigenic trait that cannot be introduced into sexual crops with a single straightforward mutation.
- Discovery and functional analysis of more natural apomixis genes will aid future engineering of apomeiosis, parthenogenesis, and autonomous endosperm in crops.
- Mitosis instead of Meiosis (MiMe) leads to clonal male and female gametes in Arabidopsis, rice, and tomato, yet application in other crops is not straightforward due to complex genetics of skipping the second meiotic division.
- Three independent insertions in *PARTHENOGENE-SIS* gene promoters and three independent insertions in *RWP* gene promoters appear to cause the evolution of apomixis in natural apomicts.
- Although high clonal seed rates and almost normal fertility have been achieved in rice, combining these two traits in a dicot plant is still challenging.

Mercier, 2022; Vijverberg et al., 2019; Xiong et al., 2023; Yin et al., 2022), so here we specifically focus on significant advances related to apomixis in the last 3 years (from January 2022 until January 2025) and bottlenecks, possible solutions and potential applications for the future (see Box 1 for a summary of the key review contents).

RECENT ADVANCES IN SYNTHETIC APOMIXIS (JANUARY 2022–JANUARY 2025)

The recent advances in synthetic apomixis are classified into four categories: (1) skipping of meiosis, skipping fertilization by (2) parthenogenesis or (3) sporophytic apomixis, and (4) autonomous endosperm development. In recent years, several studies in rice (*Oryza* sativa) have combined multiple elements of apomixis to engineer synthetic apomixis systems that facilitate clonal seed production, which will be further elaborated upon independently in a fifth section. An overview of major developments in apomixis research is shown in Figure 2.

Skipping meiosis

The *MiMe* system, standing for *Mitosis instead of Meiosis*, was first developed in *Arabidopsis* in 2009 using a combination of mutations in *SPORULATION 11–1* (*AtSPO11-1*), *RECOMBINATION 8* (*AtREC8*) and *OMISSION OF SECOND DIVISION 1* (*AtOSD1*). The *Atspo11-1 Atrec8 Atosd1* triple mutant generates clonal male and female gametes at high penetrance (D'Erfurth et al., 2009). *MiMe* relies upon the consecutive elimination of meiotic recombination initiation (*Atspo11-1*), sister chromatid cohesion/monopolar

^{© 2025} The Author(s). *The Plant Journal* published by Society for Experimental Biology and John Wiley & Sons Ltd.,

The Plant Journal, (2025), doi: 10.1111/tpj.70054

4 of 22 Bas Heidemann et al.



Figure 2. Milestones in synthetic apomixis research.

Timeline of milestones in apomeiosis research (blue), parthenogenesis and haploid induction (HI) (yellow), which are combined in studies that bioengineer clonal seeds (green). The different height of the green markers is for esthetic purposes and has no meaning.

orientation of kinetochores (*Atrec8*), and the second meiotic division (*Atosd1*). Since the work in *Arabidopsis*, a *MiMe* system has been developed in rice with the mutant combination *Ospair1 Osrec8 Ososd1* which modifies the same three aspects of meiosis (Mieulet et al., 2016). The combination of *MiMe* in rice with maternal haploid induction (Liu et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2019) or parthenogenesis (Dan et al., 2024; Huang, Meng, et al., 2024; Khanday et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2022; Song, Wang, Ji, et al., 2024; Vernet et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2023), has resulted in the first crop synthetic apomixis systems.

A recent study led to the development of a MiMe system in tomato (Solanum lycopersicum); the first MiMe system in a vegetable and a dicot crop. In this MiMe system, mutations of the SISPO11-1, SIREC8, and TARDY ASYNCHRONOUS MEIOSIS (SITAM) genes were combined, resulting in male and female unreduced clonal gametes (Wang et al., 2024). The system was first established in the Micro-Tom background and later applied in three hybrid tomato genotypes; a Moneyberg-TMV × Micro-Tom (MbTMV-MT) model hybrid, a 'Funtelle' date-tomato commercial hybrid, and a 'Maxeza' truss tomato commercial hybrid (Wang et al., 2024). Selfing of the diploid MiMe plants leads to tetraploid offspring at high penetrance (93%) and the absence of meiotic recombination which was demonstrated by whole genome sequencing (Wang et al., 2024). However, in some cases, likely due to SPO11-1-independent DNA double-strand breaks, chromosome truncations were observed in offspring plants indicating the tomato MiMe system could be further improved (Wang et al., 2024). Additionally, by hybridizing MiMe plants generated in two different hybrid backgrounds, a new breeding paradigm called polypoid genome design was

developed. Through the fusion of a clonal sperm from one hybrid parent with the clonal egg of another hybrid parent, '4-haplotype' plants (non-recombinant double-cross hybrid plants) were developed that contained the complete genetic information of both parents – the first report in a plant or animal (Wang et al., 2024). In summary, this is the first study in which the *MiMe* system was successfully applied in a dicot crop and demonstrated that hybrid organisms that produce clonal gametes can be harnessed to perform precise polyploid genome engineering (Awan et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024).

Parthenogenesis

Skipping egg cell fertilization by parthenogenesis initiates the development of an embryo directly from an unfertilized egg cell, thereby bypassing the need for a male gamete for embryogenesis. To date, Pennisetum squamulatum APOSPORYSPECIFIC GENOMIC REGION-BABYBOOM-LIKE (PsASGR-BBML) and dandelion PARTHENOGENESIS (ToPAR) are the only identified natural parthenogenesis genes (Conner et al., 2015; Underwood et al., 2022). BABY BOOM (BBM), an APETALA 2 (AP2)/ETHYLENE RESPON-SIVE FACTOR (ERF) domain transcription factor, had been known as an embryogenic factor for many years before its role in parthenogenesis (Boutilier et al., 2002). However, no role for ToPAR, a K2-2 zinc finger domain protein with an EAR motif, in embryogenesis was previously known (Underwood et al., 2022). Two particularly sensational developments in recent years in rice include the combination of MiMe with egg cell expression of OsBBM1 or ToPAR for synthetic apomixis and clonal seed production (Khanday et al., 2019; Song, Wang, Ji, et al., 2024). In addition, WUSCHEL (WUS) has recently been demonstrated to induce parthenogenesis in rice (Huang, Meng, et al., 2024). In contrast to *BBM* and *PAR*, *WUS* is not a factor cloned from a natural parthenogenesis system, yet is known to be involved in several aspects of plant development, including the induction of somatic embryogenesis and embryo development (Jha & Kumar, 2018; Zuo et al., 2002). An exhaustive overview of parthenogenesis factors investigated in a variety of species is presented in Table 1.

A recent study by Chen et al. (2022) has explored the roles of AtBBM (AtPLT4) and its homolog (AtPLT2) in Arabidopsis seed development and applied the Brassica napus BBM (BnBBM1) gene to engineer parthenogenesis in Arabidopsis, Brassica napus, and tomato (Chen et al., 2022). In the zygote and endosperm, AtBBM and AtPLT2 promote embryo progression and viability, as well as endosperm proliferation and cellularization, which is a critical developmental shift for embryo survival. In contrast, single mutants of these genes display accelerated embryo development, indicating that AtBBM and AtPLT2 can also independently control the progression of embryo development. Additionally, this study shows that ectopic expression of BnBBM1 in the egg cell can activate the development of haploid embryos in Arabidopsis, Brassica napus, and tomato, which could be used as a component of synthetic apomixis in those species. However, the ectopic expression constructs could not cause highly penetrant embryo induction, suggesting that finetuning of BnBBM1 expression in seeds is necessary for successful parthenogenesis. Moreover, the diverse rates of abortion and aberrant embryo development of different constructs can be explained by the lack of endosperm development (Chen et al., 2022).

Interestingly, Chen et al. (2022) used BnBBM1 rather than the native AtBBM gene to induce parthenogenesis in Arabidopsis to prevent potential gene silencing. Indeed, when aiming to express AtBBM in the Arabidopsis egg cell, expression was inhibited, thereby strongly reducing the occurrence of parthenogenesis (Liu, Han, et al., 2024). This inhibition was shown to be partially due to an RWP-RK domain-containing (RKD) transcription factor, AtRKD5, which recognizes the 3' end of AtBBM and reduces AtBBM expression. To overcome this limitation, Liu, Han, et al. (2024) generated a codon-optimized version of AtBBM and chimeric genes of the Arabidopsis and rice homologs, which increased the haploid induction rate up to 5% (Liu, Han, et al., 2024). Nevertheless, the BnBBM1 gene still appears to be more functional for parthenogenesis in Arabidopsis and outperforms the engineered BBM versions (see also Table 1). Together, these studies suggest that context matters and that using native genes does not necessarily result in the strongest induction of parthenogenesis.

Building on earlier work in rice and maize (*Zea mays*) (Conner et al., 2017; Khanday et al., 2019) and the

expression of *ZmBBM1* in maize egg cells have recently been shown to trigger the formation of haploid plants at high penetrance (65%) (Skinner et al., 2023). For this purpose, *ZmBBM1* was driven by the *Arabidopsis EGG CELL 1.2* (*AtEC1.2*) promoter (*AT2G21740*, also known as *DOWN-REGULATED IN DIF1 45* (*AtDD45*)) (Skinner et al., 2023). In contrast to the findings in dicots (Chen et al., 2022; Liu, Han, et al., 2024), the studies in monocots indicate a benefit of utilizing native genes rather than foreign genes, potentially due to the interplay of BBM protein structure with target binding sequences, which may be a result of evolutionary constraint (Conner et al., 2017; Khanday et al., 2019; Skinner et al., 2023).

Related to the above approach in maize, Ye et al. (2024) developed a novel parthenogenetic double haploid approach by combining egg cell expression of *ZmBBM2* with CYCLIN DELTA-2 (ZmCycd2). Specifically, ectopic co-expression of ZmBBM2 and ZmCycd2 in unfertilized egg cells via a Panicum virgatum egg cell promoter (PvEC) resulted in maternally derived diploid embryos. This in vivo approach, in conjunction with gene editing, allows for the creation of mature seeds from a maternally derived, gene-edited diploid embryo without the need for colchicine-based doubling or in vitro tissue culture. In conclusion, this is a novel method for producing gene-edited maize double haploid populations with both natural and de novo phenotypic variation, which can expedite genetic gain per breeding cycle (Ye et al., 2024).

Prior research established rice parthenogenesis by using the EC1.2 egg-cell-specific promoter to drive OsBBM1 expression leading to a line that gives rise to 29% haploid progeny (Khanday et al., 2019). As OsBBM1 is a paternally expressed gene it raised the possibility that additional paternally expressed genes could contribute to the initiation of embryogenesis following fertilization. Accordingly, Ren et al. (2024) found the WOX-family transcription factor gene DWARF TILLER1 (OsDWT1)/WUSCHEL-LIKE HOMEO-DOMAIN 9 (OsWOX9A) is paternally expressed in zygotes and is a strong enhancer of embryo initiation by OsBBM1. When those two genes are co-expressed in egg cells, using the EC1.2 egg-cell-specific promoter, a parthenogenesis rate of 86-91% results, representing a 4- to 15-fold increase over OsBBM1 alone (Ren et al., 2024). The increased frequencies of haploid progeny are stably propagated through multiple generations (Ren et al., 2024). However, egg-cell-specific expression of OsWOX9A alone showed no production of haploid progeny, indicating it is not a parthenogenetic factor itself (Ren et al., 2024). Additionally, twin rice plants arose from single seeds derived from plants that co-express OsBBM1 and OsWOX9A in egg cells at a much greater rate than in previous reports, yet the origin of such twin seedlings remains unknown (Ren et al., 2024; Skinner et al., 2023; Vernet et al., 2022). Summarizing, OsWOX9A can operate as an enhancing factor of OsBBM1 to increase

The Plant Journal published by Society for Experimental Biology and John Wiley & Sons Ltd.,

The Plant Journal, (2025), doi: 10.1111/tpj.70054

the likelihood of establishing a zygotic state in rice (Ren et al., 2024).

The ToPAR gene cloned from apomictic dandelion is an alternative to BBM for parthenogenesis engineering. Large genetic deletions of the LOSS OF PARTHENOGENE-SIS (LOP) locus, and targeted CRISPR mutants of the ToPAR gene, in polyploid apomictic dandelion are sufficient for loss of apomixis and complete absence of viable seed production, the latter of which can be restored by pollination (Underwood et al., 2022). Only the dominant ToPAR allele is expressed in apomictic egg cells which is likely triggered by a miniature inverted-repeat transposable element (MITE) insertion in the promoter (Underwood et al., 2022). Dandelion LOP mutants were complemented by driving the expression of the homologous lettuce (Lactuca sativa) gene, so-called Lssex, with the MITE-containing promoter indicating the regulatory sequence can act as a controlling element of reproductive mode. In addition, heterologous expression of ToPAR in lettuce egg cells leads to embryo-like structures in the absence of fertilization (Underwood et al., 2022). In sexual species, PAR homologs are highly expressed in sperm cells, leading to a model where PAR transcripts and/or PAR proteins are delivered during fertilization to trigger embryogenesis. In contrast, in apomictic dandelion PAR is expressed in egg cells without fertilization, which causes cell division without gamete fusion (Underwood et al., 2022).

Beyond Taraxacum, the PAR gene appears to have been a target of convergent evolution of apomixis in two other Asteraceae genera: Pilosella and Hieracium (Bicknell et al., 2023; Underwood et al., 2022). In Pilosella, a LOP locus was independently identified and fully sequenced (Bicknell et al., 2023; Underwood et al., 2022). Surprisingly, the Pilosella LOP locus was syntenic to the dandelion locus and contained a ToPAR homolog that specifically on the dominant allele has a similar, yet different, MITE insertion in the promoter to that found in dandelion (Underwood et al., 2022). Extending these insights Bicknell et al. (2023) identified in apomictic Hieracium, a third insertion of a transposable element (TE) in the dominant PAR allele has occurred 154 bp upstream of the PAR start codon (Bicknell et al., 2023). The three transposon insertions are different in terms of length, location, terminal repeats, and internal sequences suggesting the existence of three separate ancestral alterations of the PAR locus (Bicknell et al., 2023; Underwood et al., 2022). Finally, the transfer of dominant wild-type Pilosella PAR alleles through egg cells is only possible when they are transmitted together with a recessive sexual allele - haploid transfer was never detected through pollen or egg cells. While the functional role of dominant alleles is clear, the recessive ones may also play a role in Pilosella reproduction due to the requirement for their inheritance for successful reproduction (Bicknell et al., 2023).

In addition to the initial proof-of-principle of transferring ToPAR to lettuce (Underwood et al., 2022), it was recently demonstrated that the ToPAR gene from dandelion itself can surprisingly lead to parthenogenesis in monocot plants like foxtail millet and rice (Huang, Liang, et al., 2024; Song, Wang, Ji, et al., 2024). In foxtail millet, this was achieved by developing a vector expressing the ToPAR gene under the AtEC1.2 promoter. In six of the 11 lines containing the vector haploid induction was observed at rates between 1.4% and 10.2%. Moreover, these plants exhibited a wide range of morphological variations including height and panicle length, while the seed setting rate significantly declined (Huang, Liang, et al., 2024). Overall, the studies in lettuce, foxtail millet, and rice lay an important foundation for future synthetic apomixis engineering using the ToPAR gene (Huang, Liang, et al., 2024; Song, Wang, Ji, et al., 2024; Underwood et al., 2022).

Sporophytic apomixis

Complementary to the parthenogenetics factors, *BBM* and *PAR* are a class of *RWP* genes, encoding RWP-RK domain-containing proteins, which have been identified as factors involved in sporophytic apomixis in *Citrus, Fortu-nella*, and *Mangifera* (Nakano et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2022; Yadav et al., 2023). The *Citrus RWP* gene (*CitRWP*) was initially identified by a GWAS study of 45 polyembryonic apomicts and 63 monoembryonic fully sexual *Citrus* cultivars. A genetic marker of the *CitRWP* gene was further analyzed in 213 polyembryonic and 537 monoembryonic varieties which showed that the presence of a MITE insertion in the *CitRWP* gene promoter perfectly correlated with sporophytic apomixis in *Citrus* (Wang et al., 2017).

The genetic basis of sporophytic apomixis in the Citrinae has been further expanded by a recent study that developed genomic data and analyzed the presence of sporophytic apomixis in samples from the closely related Poncirus, Fortunella, and Citrus genera (Wang et al., 2022). This study demonstrated that apomixis is present in species from all three genera and concluded that introgression of a single CitRWP haplotype is not the main cause of apomixis across divergent Citrus and Fortunella accessions. Through the hybridization of sexual and apomictic Fortunella hindsii accessions, generation of a segregating population and QTL mapping, it was shown that the same locus controls apomixis in Fortunella as in Citrus (Wang et al., 2022). However, the FhRWP and CitRWP haplotypes are different: the Fortunella haplotype is 596 bp and contains three similar MITE insertions while the Citrus haplotype is 424 bp and contains two different MITE insertions. The genetic basis of apomixis in Poncirus, however, does not seem to be related to insertions in the RWP promoter. Overall, it appears that convergent evolution of apomixis has occurred within the Citrinae, much like in the Asteraceae genera *Taraxacum*, *Pilosella*, and *Hieracium*, and strikingly has relied on the insertion of TEs in five independent cases (Bicknell et al., 2023; Underwood et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022).

Despite the pinpointing of the CitRWP in 2017 (Wang et al., 2017), only recently functional genetic validation was attempted in Fortunella (Song, Wang, Zhou, et al., 2024). Reduced expression level of FhRWP resulting from RNAi experiments led to decreased polyembryony and seed incidence (Song, Wang, Zhou, et al., 2024). However, CRISPR/Cas9-based knockout of FhRWP led to growth and developmental defects that hindered blooming and fruit set, prevented seed production, and made it impossible to quantify polyembryony. In gain-of-function experiments constitutive expression of FhRWP was induced by agrobacterium-mediated transformation of monoembryonic Fortunella epicotyl stem segments. This led to highly proliferative embryogenic callus, indicating the gene may facilitate somatic embryogenesis, yet no true transgenic plants could be regenerated (Song, Wang, Zhou, et al., 2024). In conclusion, the molecular genetic exploration of the RWP gene in Fortunella appears to be difficult due to pleiotropy and warrants further investigation.

On a mechanistic level, the insertion of a MITE transposon in the FhRWP promoter appears to increase chromatin accessibility at that locus and the role of other factors (FhARID and Citrus sinensis ZINC FINGER PROTEIN 7 (CsZFP7)) in polyembryony have been explored (Jia et al., 2023; Song, Wang, Zhou, et al., 2024). Through ATACseq, more than 40 000 and 45 000 accessible chromatin regions in monoembryonic and polyembryonic ovules were identified, respectively (Song, Wang, Zhou, et al., 2024). This indicated the presence of the MITE in the apomictic allele appears to make the chromatin more accessible and the MITE is thought to be a FhARID1 binding site based on a previous yeast one-hybrid screen (Song, Wang, Zhou, et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2022). Two other studies explored the role of C2H2 type zinc finger genes based on their expression patterns in polyembryonic and monoembryonic accessions and their possible role in nucellar embryogenesis (Jia et al., 2021; Jia et al., 2023). The knock down of one of these genes, CsZFP7, described as a homolog of dandelion ToPAR, increases the proportion of monoembryonic seeds in the T1 generation of mini-citrus, even though not all the seeds became monoembryonic in the transgenic lines. This may be the result of the abundant expression of CsZFP7 in polyembryonic ovules and the weak suppressive effect of RNAi transgene on CsZFP7 expression (Jia et al., 2023). As a result, the upstream regulatory genes, such as CitRWP, which genetically controls polyembryony in citrus, may influence the expression of CsZFP7 in polyembryony ovules (Wang et al., 2017). Summarizing, more research will hopefully resolve the molecular roles of CitRWP/FhRWP, FhARID1, and CsZFP7 in polyembryony (Jia et al., 2023).

Outside of the Citrinae, a recent breakthrough in sporophytic apomixis was the fine-mapping of the mango (Mangifera indica) locus for polyembryony and the further demonstration of convergent evolution of apomixis through a chloroplast DNA insertion in the promoter of the mango CitRWP homolog (MiRWP) (Yadav et al., 2023). Through the phenotyping of 93 polyembryonic accessions and 107 monoembryonic accessions, combined with sequence- and marker-based genotyping, the mango polyembryony locus was mapped to a region containing only six predicted genes including MiRWP. Gene expression analysis in the early stages of seed fruit development demonstrated that *MiRWP* expression is higher in polyembryonic varieties compared with monoembryonic varieties. The authors propose that a chloroplast DNA insertion occurred after a whole genome duplication and show most of the polyembryonic accessions are heterozygous for the MiRWP allele, similar to the case in Citrus. This heterozygous state may be most common due to a substantial selection against homozygous genotypes (Yadav et al., 2023). In summary, in Citrus, Fortunella, and Mangifera, three independent promoter insertion events in a RWP gene promoter lead to the convergent evolution of nucellar embryogenesis and polyembryony (Wang et al., 2022; Yadav et al., 2023).

Autonomous endosperm development

In most natural apomixis systems, endosperm formation is sexual (i.e., relying on the fertilization of the central cell by a sperm cell), however autonomous endosperm formation could be a useful trait in grass and bean species to ensure seed filling. Significant progress in this area has revolved around the FERTILIZATION-INDEPENDENT SEED (FIS) class Arabidopsis mutants where an autonomous endosperm develops up to the stage of cellularization where it fails (Hands et al., 2016). These FIS class mutants are characterized by mutations in several POLYCOMB REPRESSIVE COMPLEX 2 (PRC2) genes (e.g., medea (mea), fertilization-independent endosperm (fie), fis2, and multicopy suppressor of ira1 (msi1)) (Grossniklaus et al., 1998; Guitton et al., 2004; Kiyosue et al., 1999; Köhler et al., 2003; Luo et al., 2011; Ohad et al., 1999). More recently, active expression of YUCCA 10 (YUC10), an auxin biosynthetic gene that is directly repressed by PRC2, in the central cell largely recreates the phenotype of the FIS class mutants many divisions of the central cell but no true endosperm formation (Figueiredo et al., 2015).

A recent step toward autonomous endosperm engineering was the finding that expression of a usual sperm cell-specific cyclin D gene (*AtCYCD7;1*) in the central cell led to the development of endosperm-like structures (Simonini et al., 2024). The proliferation of the central cell is related to the degradation of RETINOBLASTOMA RELATED 1 (RBR1), which is an effective inhibitor of the progression of the S phase and G2 phase entry that is conserved through

© 2025 The Author(s).

The Plant Journal published by Society for Experimental Biology and John Wiley & Sons Ltd., The Plant Journal, (2025), doi: 10.1111/tpj.70054

evolution (Avni et al., 2003; Knudsen et al., 2000; Weinberg, 1995). As a result, RBR1 is a key player in ensuring maternal and paternal genomes commence endosperm development in a synchronized manner (Johnston et al., 2008; Simonini et al., 2024). The main component in the RBR1 degradation upon fertilization is CYCD7;1, which is only found in the sperm nuclei of mature pollen (Simonini et al., 2024). Consistent with previous research (Sornay et al., 2015), central cell-specific or ubiquitous ectopic expression of CYCD7;1 enhances the development of endosperm-like structures in unfertilized ovules (Simonini et al., 2024). The RBR1-CYCD7;1 interaction is mediated by a Leu-x-Cys-x-Glu motif (Lee et al., 1998; Matos et al., 2014), and CYCD7;1 variant lacking this motif are not capable of causing endosperm proliferation in unfertilized ovules, indicating that the RBR1-CYCD7;1 interaction is essential for the progression of S phase in the central cell upon fertilization (Simonini et al., 2024). In summary, modulation of CYCD7;1 expression could be an important route to the development of autonomous endosperm.

Due to its function in the FIS-PRC2 complex in Arabidopsis, mutation of FIE leads to autonomous initiation of endosperm development. Investigations into the rice homologs OsFIE1 and OsFIE2 however have led to some contradictory results. Studies by Li et al. (2014) and Cheng et al. (2020) found autonomous initiation of endosperm development in OsFIE2-RNAi, Osfie2^{+/-}, and Osfie1^{-/-} $Osfie2^{+/-}$ mutant genotypes, whereas a study by Nallamilli et al. (2013) did not find an autonomous endosperm phenotype for an OsFIE2-RNAi line. A new study by Wu et al. (2023) revealed a novel function of OsFIE1 and OsFIE2 in repressing egg cell division in the embryo sac in the absence of fertilization. During this study, Wu et al. (2023) found that in addition to autonomous endosperm, the Osfie1^{-/-} Osfie2^{+/-} mutant also initiated asexual embryo formation. The formation of asexual embryos was also observed to a lower degree in the $Osfie2^{+/-}$ mutant but not in Osfiel single mutants. In this study, it was not clear if asexual embryos originated from the egg cell or synergid cells. However, the observance of degraded synergid cells, intact egg cells, and autonomous endosperm shortly after emasculation, together with the increase of asexual embryos at later timepoints, would suggest that the asexual embryos originate from the egg cell. For both the Osfie single mutants no autonomous endosperm was observed therefore suggesting that they act redundantly in repressing central cell division. Thus, this study indicates that the rice FIS-PRC2 complex plays an important role in suppressing cell division in the embryo sac (Wu et al., 2023).

Synthetic apomixis in rice

The development of synthetic apomixis systems in rice has rapidly advanced in recent years. This work was inspired by work on synthetic clonal seed production in *Arabidopsis* where clonal egg cells from a *MiMe* plant (*Atspo11 Atrec8 Atosd1*) were induced to form clonal embryos by maternal haploid inducer crosses with the *CENH3* tailswap line (Marimuthu et al., 2011). In rice, the combination of *MiMe* (*Ospair1 Osrec8 Ososd1*) and maternal haploid induction by the *Osmt1* mutant has also been shown to lead to clonal seeds (Wang et al., 2019). The application of haploid inducers like *CENH3* tailswap, *mtl/pla1/nld*, and *dmp* in synthetic apomixis studies usually leads to low penetrance clonal seed formation (Chen et al., 2024; Gilles et al., 2017; Kelliher et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2017; Marimuthu et al., 2011; Ravi & Chan, 2010; Wang et al., 2019; Zhong et al., 2019); therefore here we largely focus on combinations of *MiMe* with parthenogenesis in rice.

A recent major advance in synthetic apomixis combined the induction of MiMe mutations and egg cell expression of OsBBM1 in a single construct in F1 hybrid rice (Vernet et al., 2022). This approach is similar to an earlier approach from Khanday et al. (2019), however by combining both traits on one construct, the efficiency of clonal seed production was increased from ${\sim}30\%$ to up to 95%clonal seed production across multiple generations. No major differences in vegetative development were observed between apomictic lines and control F1 hybrid plants, although apomictic plants have decreased fertility. Interestingly, higher clonal seed rates seem to be associated with lower panicle fertility. This is exemplified by 80%-100% clonal seeds with a panicle fertility of 33%, in contrast to 55%-84% clonal seeds with a panicle fertility of 81% in another line (more examples are shown in Table 1). Furthermore, the consistent propagation of hybrid traits over two generations of clonal reproduction without obvious negative effects indicates that heterosis is predominantly genetically controlled in rice. This demonstrates that parental effects do not restrict the utility of synthetic apomixis for rice hybrids and possibly for other sexually reproducing crop plants. Taken together, this study showed that a high frequency of synthetic apomixis, stable across generations, in crop species is possible (Vernet et al., 2022).

Using a similar apomictic construct as Vernet et al. (2022), Song, Li, Chen, et al. (2024) also achieved high cloning efficiency and they went on to modify the system in an effort to increase the fertility of *MiMe-OsBBM1* plants. In this research, two different promoters, the *EC1.2* from *Arabidopsis* and the *ECA1.1* from rice were used to drive *OsBBM1* expression and combined with *MiMe* gene mutagenesis to generate two apomixis inducing constructs (Song, Li, Chen, et al., 2024). As in previous studies, the authors found higher cloning efficiencies (more than 80% diploid offspring) that typically led to reduced fertility compared with wild-type controls (Song, Li, Chen, et al., 2024). Subsequently, the apomixis systems were modified by

| | Female | - - | Female parent construct ^b | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| Species | accession/ cultivar | remale mutation status ^a | Promoter ^c | Gene ^d | Male parent ^e | Phenotype ^f | Reference |
| Arabidopsis thaliana | Col-0 | WT | AtEC1.2 | PsASGR- | * | No haploid seed production | Conner |
| | Col-0 | TW | AtEC1.2 | PSASGR-BBML | * | uerected No haploid seed production | Conner |
| | | | | | | detected | et al. (2017) |
| | Col-0 | WT | AtEC1.2en-AtEC1.1:AMV | BnBBM1 | × | 1.5% parthenogenic embryo formation; 0.4% haploid seed | Chen et al. (2022) |
| | Col-0 | WT | AtEC1.2en-AtEC1.1:AMV | BnBBM1-GR | * | production 5.4% parthenogenic embryo | Chen et al. (2022) |
| | Col-0 | WT | Atrps5A:AMV | BnBBM1 | * | 6.2% parthenogenic embryo formation; 0% haploid seed | Chen et al. (2022) |
| | | MT. | A+E/C 1 - 3 | AtRRMano- | * | production No transcene expression in the | lii. Han |
| | | | | GFP | | egg cell, no parthenogenesis | et al. (2024) |
| | Col-0 | WT | AtEC1.2 | AtBBM-GFP | * | Weak transgene expression in egg | Liu, Han, |
| | | WT. | A+FC1 3 | OcRM1rano- | * | cell, no parthenogenesis Evaraccion of transcrene in eaco | et al. (2024) Liu Han |
| | | | | RFP | | cell, but no parthenogenesis | et al. (2024) |
| | Col-0 | WT | AtEC1.2 | OsBBM1-RFP | * | Expression of transgene in egg | Liu, Han, |
| | | | | | | cell, but no parthenogenesis | et al. (2024) |
| | Col-0 | MT | AtEC1.2 | AtBBM codon | * | 1.98% parthenogenic embryo | Liu, Han, |
| | Col-O | МТ | A+FC1 2 | optimized 4+RRM-OcBRM1 | * | Two-cell parthenorgenic embryos | et al. (2024) Liu Han |
| | | - | | chimera | | can be observed, not quantified | et al. (2024) |
| | Col-0 | Atms1 Atms1 | AtEC1.2en-AtEC1.1:AMV AtEC1 2en-AtEC1 1:AMV | BnBBM1 BnBBM1 | Col-0 FAST-Red in | 0.1%-1.0% haploid progeny | Chen et al. (2022) Chen et al. (2022) |
| | | | | | Col-0 | | |
| | Col-0 | Atms1 | AtEC1.2en-AtEC1.1:AMV | BnBBM1 | Atdmp8/9; FAST-Red | 3.7% haploid progeny | Chen et al. (2022) |
| | Col-0 | WT | AtEC1.2en-AtEC1.1:AMV | BnBBM1 | Atdmp8/9; FAST-Red | 5.9%–8.6% haploid progeny | Chen et al. (2022) |
| | Col-0 | WT | AtEC1.2 | AtBBM | Atdmp8/9 | 1.80% haploid progeny | Liu, Han, et al (2024) |
| | Col-0 | Atrkd5-3 | AtEC1.2 | AtBBM | Atdmp8/9 | 2.44% haploid progeny | Liu, Han, |
| | Col-0 | Atdad1 | AtEC1.2 | AtBBM codon | Atdmp8/9 | 2.17% haploid progeny | Elu, Han, |
| | Col-0 | Atdad1 | AtEC1.2 | opurnized AtBBM-OsBBM1 chimera | Atdmp8/9 | 5.09% haploid progeny | et al. (2024) Liu, Han, et al. (2024) |

To infinity and beyond: recent progress, bottlenecks, and potential of clonal seeds by apomixis 9 of 22

Table 1 Promoters and genes to induce parthenogenesis

© 2025 The Author(s). *The Plant Journal* published by Society for Experimental Biology and John Wiley & Sons Ltd., *The Plant Journal*, (2025), doi: 10.1111/tpj.70054

(continued)

| | Female | | Female parent construct ^b | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Species | accession/ cultivar | Female mutation status ^a | Promoter ^c | Gene ^d | Male parent ^e | Phenotype ^f | Reference |
| | Col-0 | Atrkd5-3 | AtEC1.2 | AtBBM | Atrkd5-3 | 60% parthenogenic zygote formation; 0% mature parthenogenic seeds | Liu, Han, et al. (2024) |
| Brassica napus | DH12075 | WT | AtEC1.2en-EC1.1:AMV | BnBBM1 | RPS5A:AMV: GEP | 0.1% haploid progeny | Chen et al. (2022) |
| | DH12075 | WT | AtEC1.2en-EC1.1:AMV | BnBBM1 | Bndmp; FAST-Red | 1.8%–2.0% haploid progeny | Chen et al. (2022) |
| Pennisetum glaucum | IA4X | WT | PsASGR-BBML | PsASGR- BBMLgeno | * | 35%-36% haploid embryo formation; decreased dermination rate and seet set | Conner et al. (2015) |
| Nicotiana tabacum | Xanthi NN | WT | AtEC1.2 | PsASGR-BBML | * | <pre></pre> | Zhang et al. (2020) |
| | Xanthi NN | WT | AtRKD2 | PsASGR-BBML | * | 9.3% haploid progeny in T1 and 2.7%-27.3% haploid progeny in T2 | Zhang et al. (2020) |
| Solanum Ivcopersicum | Microtom | WT | AtEC1.2en-EC1.1:AMV | BnBBM1 | * | 1.4% haploid progeny | Chen et al. (2022) |
| - | Microtom | WT WT | AtEC1.2en-EC1.1:AMV AtEC1.2en-EC1.1:AMV | BnBBM1 BnBBM1 | Sldmp Sldmp; FAST-Red | 1.5%–5.9% haploid progeny 18% haploid progeny | Chen et al. (2022) Chen et al. (2022) |
| Taraxacum officinale | A68 | LoP mutant | ToPAR | rssex | * | 4/8 lines complement loss-of- parthenogenesis (LoP) mutant phenotype | Underwood et al. (2022) |
| | A68 | LoP mutant | AtEC1.1 | ToPAR | * | 5/9 lines complement <i>LoP</i> mutant phenotype | Underwood et al. (2022) |
| Lactuca sativa | Legacy (iceberg tvpe) | WT | AtEC1.1 | ToPAR | * | 7/7 lines produce parthenogenic embrvo-like structures | Underwood et al. (2022) |
| Setaria italica | Ci846 | WT | AtEC1.2 | ToPAR | * | 1.4%-10.2% haploid progeny | Huang, Liang, et al. (2024) |
| Oryza sativa | Nipponbare | WT | PsASGR-BBML | PsASGR- RRMI cano | * | 87% of transgenic lines produce | Conner et al (2017) |
| | Nipponbare | WT | PsASGR-BBML | PsASGR-BBML | * | 25% of transgenic lines produce | Conner |
| | Nipponbare | WT | AtEC1.2 | PsASGR- RRMI gang | * | 89% of transgenic lines produce banking embryos | Conner conner |
| | Kitaake | WT | AtEC1.2 | OsBBM1 | * | 12% of ovules produce | Khanday et al (2019) |

© 2025 The Author(s). The Plant Journal published by Society for Experimental Biology and John Wiley & Sons Ltd., The Plant Journal, (2025), doi: 10.1111/tpj.70054

10 of 22 Bas Heidemann et al.

(continued)

| Species Female mutation accession/ CY84 Female mutation wt Fromoter ⁶ Gene ⁶ CY84 WT AtEC1.2 0sBB CY84 0sCA 0sBB CY84 0sCA 0sBB CY84 0sCA 0sBB CY84 0sCA 0sBB CY84 0sCA 0sBB CY84 0sCA 0sCA 0sBB CY84 0sCA 0sCA 0sCA 0sCA 0sCA 0sCA 0sCA <td< th=""><th>Gene^d CSBBN CSBBN CSBBN CSBBN CSBBN CSBBN CSBBN CSBBN CSBBN</th><th>Male pa 42 * * 43 * * 44 * * 73 * * X9A * 71; * 2X9A * 71 *</th><th>ent^e Phenotype^f structures; 5.8%–10.5% haploid progeny in T1 No parthenogenesis observed No parthenogenesis observed a.2% haploid progeny with a seed set of 21.1%–82.6% 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 3.7%–48.21% haploid progeny in hamivurout T1.8%–0.4%</th><th>Reference Wei et al. (2023) Wei et al. (2023) Wei et al. (2023) Vernet et al. (2022) Ren et al. (2024) Ren et al. (2024)</th></td<> | Gene ^d CSBBN CSBBN CSBBN CSBBN CSBBN CSBBN CSBBN CSBBN CSBBN | Male pa 42 * * 43 * * 44 * * 73 * * X9A * 71; * 2X9A * 71 * | ent ^e Phenotype ^f structures; 5.8%–10.5% haploid progeny in T1 No parthenogenesis observed No parthenogenesis observed a.2% haploid progeny with a seed set of 21.1%–82.6% 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 3.7%–48.21% haploid progeny in hamivurout T1.8%–0.4% | Reference Wei et al. (2023) Wei et al. (2023) Wei et al. (2023) Vernet et al. (2022) Ren et al. (2024) Ren et al. (2024) |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| CY84WTATEC1.2058BCY84WTATEC1.2058BCY84WTATEC1.2058BKitaakeWT05ECA1058BKitaakeWTATEC1.2058BKitaakeWTATEC1.2058BKitaakeWTATEC1.2058BKitaakeWTATEC1.2058BKitaakeWTATEC1.2058BKitaakeWTATEC1.2058BKitaakeWTATEC1.2058BKitaakeWTATEC1.2058BStrata059air 1 05rec805ECA1058BXS134059air 1 05rec805ECA1058BYY1538059air 1 05rec805ECA1058BYY1538059air 1 05rec805ECA1058BYY1538059air 1 05rec805ECA1058BYY1538059air 1 05rec805ECA1058BYY1538059air 1 05rec805ECA1058BYY1538059air 1 05rec805ECA1058BYY1434059air 1 05rec805ECA1 | OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN | 12 13 14 11 X9A 11; X9A 11; X9A 11; X9A | structures; 5.8%–10.5% haploid progeny in T1 No parthenogenesis observed No parthenogenesis observed 3.2% haploid progeny with a seed set of 21.1%–82.6% 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 10%–29% haploid progeny 10%–29% haploid progeny in progeny 2.7,%–48.21% haploid progeny in hamivrorut T1.86%–01% | Wei et al. (2023) Wei et al. (2023) Wei et al. (2023) Vernet et al. (2022) Ren et al. (2024) Ren et al. (2024) |
| CY84 CY84 Kitaake KitaakeWT WT AfEC1.2AfEC1.2 AfEC1.2Cs8B Os8B CS8BKitaake KitaakeWTAfEC1.2 AfEC1.2Os8B Os8BKitaake KitaakeWTAfEC1.2 AfEC1.2Os8B Os8BKitaake KitaakeWTAfEC1.2 AfEC1.2Os8B Os8BKitaake KitaakeWTAfEC1.2 AfEC1.2Os8B Os8BKitaake Ossod1WTAfEC1.2 AfEC1.2Os8B Os8BBRS-CIRAD 302 Ossod1Ospair 1 Osrec8 Ossod1OsECA1 Ossod1Os8B Ossod1Y1538 Ossod1 Ossod1 Ossod1 Ossed1 Ossod1 Ossed1 Ossed1 Ossod1 Ossed1 Os | OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN | 12 13 14 11 X9A 11; X9A 11; * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * | No parthenogenesis observed No parthenogenesis observed No parthenogenesis observed 3.2% haploid progeny with a seed set of 21.1%–82.6% 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 3.70%–48.21% haploid progeny in hamivrorus T1.86%–01% | Wei et al. (2023) Wei et al. (2023) Wei et al. (2023) Vernet et al. (2022) Ren et al. (2024) Ren et al. (2024) |
| CYB4 WT AECULA COBD Kitaake WT AECULA 058B Kitaake WT OSECA1 058B Kitaake WT AECULA 058B BRS-CIRAD 302 05pair 1 0srec8 0scCA1 058B ST34 0spair 1 0srec8 0sECA1 058B Y1538 0spair 1 0srec8 0SECA1 0SBB Y14949 0sosd1 0ssd1 0SECA1 0SBB Y14949 0sosd1 0ssec8 0SECA1 0SBB Y14949 0sosd1 0ssec8 0SECA1 0SBB Y14949 0sosd1 0ssec8 0SECA1 0SBB Y14949 0ssec41 0ssec8 0SECA1 0SBB Y14949 </td <td>AtEC1.2 OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN</td> <td>11 12 14 11 11; 11; 11; 11; 11 12; 11 12; 11 12; 11 12; 11 12; 12;</td> <td>No partnenogenesis observed No parthenogenesis observed 3.2% haploid progeny with a seed set of 21.1%–82.6% 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 3.70%–48.21% haploid progeny in hamivrorus T1.86%–01%</td> <td>wei et al. (2023) Wei et al. (2023) Wernet et al. (2022) Ren et al. (2024) Ren et al. (2024)</td> | AtEC1.2 OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN | 11 12 14 11 11; 11; 11; 11; 11 12; 11 12; 11 12; 11 12; 11 12; 12; | No partnenogenesis observed No parthenogenesis observed 3.2% haploid progeny with a seed set of 21.1%–82.6% 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 3.70%–48.21% haploid progeny in hamivrorus T1.86%–01% | wei et al. (2023) Wei et al. (2023) Wernet et al. (2022) Ren et al. (2024) Ren et al. (2024) |
| CV84WTAEC1.2C08BKitaakeWTOsECA1058BKitaakeWTAtEC1.2058BKitaakeWTAtEC1.2058BKitaakeWTAtEC1.2058BKitaakeWTAtEC1.2058BKitaakeWTAtEC1.2058BKitaakeWTAtEC1.2058BSitaakeWTAtEC1.2058BSitaakeOsoad1056CA1058BSitaakeOsoad1056CA1058BXS134Osoad1056CA1058BYV1538Osoad1056CA1058BYV1538Ospair1 Osrec805ECA1058BYV1538Ospair1 Osrec805ECA1058BYV3499Osoad1 Ossd1056CA1058BYV3499Ospair1 Osrec805ECA1-10×GCN4058BYV3499Ospair1 Osrec805ECA1-3ZP1-10×GCN4058BYV3499Ospair1 Osrec805ECA1-3ZP1-10×GCN4058BYV3499Ospair1 Osrec805ECA1-3ZP1-10×GCN4058BYV3499Ospair1 Osrec805ECA1-3ZP1-10×GCN4058B | AtEC1.2 OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN OSBBN | 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 | 3.2% haptic operates ouserved set of 21.1%–82.6% 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 10%–29% haploid progeny 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny in 3.70%–48.21% haploid progeny in hamivurout T1.86%–01% | Wei et al. (2023) Wei et al. (2023) Vernet et al. (2022) Ren et al. (2024) Ren et al. (2024) |
| Kitaake WT OsECA1 OsEB Kitaake WT AtEC1.2 OsBB BRS-CIRAD 302 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB Kitaake Osoad1 OseCA1 OsBB XS134 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YV1538 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YV1538 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YV1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YV1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YV1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YV1949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YV4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YV4949 Ososd1 Ossd1 OseCA1 OsBB YV4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YV4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB | occon OSBBN OSBBN OSBNO OSBBN OSBBN | 11 11 11 11; 11; 11 11 11 11 11 | set of 21.1%-82.6% set of 21.1%-82.6% 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 10%-29% haploid progeny 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny in 3.70%-48.21% haploid progeny in hamivrorus T1.86%-01% | Vernet Vernet et al. (2022) Ren et al. (2024) Ren et al. (2024) |
| KitaakeWTOSECA1OSBBKitaakeWTAtEC1.2OSBBKitaakeWTAtEC1.2OSBBKitaakeWTAtEC1.2; AtEC1.2OSBBKitaakeWTAtEC1.2; AtEC1.2OSBBBRS-CIRAD 302Ospair 1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBSr134Osoad1Ossed1OSECA1OSBBYY1538Ospair 1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY1538Ospair 1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY499Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSECA1OSBBYY499Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSECA1OSBBYY499Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSECA1OSBBYY499Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSECA1OSBBYY499Ospair1 | 08BBN 08BBN 08BN 08BBN 08BBN 08BBN | 11 * 11 * X9A * 11; * DX9A * 11 | 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 10%-29% haploid progeny 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny in 3.70%-48.21% haploid progeny in hamivrorus T1.86%-01% | Vernet et al. (2022) Ren et al. (2024) Ren et al. (2024) |
| KitaakeWTAtEC1.20.58BKitaakeWTAtEC1.2; AtEC1.20.58BKitaakeWTAtEC1.2; AtEC1.20.58BBRS-CIRAD 3020spair 1 0srec80 secCA10.58BBRS-CIRAD 3120spair 1 0srec80 secCA10.58BXS1340spair 1 0srec80 secCA10.58BYV19380spair 1 0srec80 secCA10.58BYV15380spair 1 0srec80 secCA10.58BYV19490spair 1 0srec80 secCA10.58BYV49490spair 1 0srec80 secCA10.58BYV49490spair 1 0srec80 secCA10.58BYV49490spair 1 0srec80 secCA10.58BYV49490spair 1 0srec80 secCA1.AZP1-10 x GCN40.58BYV49490spair 1 0srec80 secCA1.AZP1-10 x GCN40.58BYV49490spair 1 0srec80 secCA1.AZP1-10 x GCN40.58BYV49490spair 1 0srec80 secCA1.AZP1-10 x GCN40.58B | OSBBN OSWO) AtEC1.2 OSBBN OSWC | 11 ** X9A * 11; * 2X9A * 11 * | progeny 10%-29% haploid progeny 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 3.70%-48.21% haploid progeny in hamivrorus T1.86%-01% | et al. (2022) Ren et al. (2024) Ren et al. (2024) |
| KitaakeWTAtEC1.205BBKitaakeWTAtEC1.205BBKitaakeWTAtEC1.2; AtEC1.205BBBRS-CIRAD 3020spair 1 Osrec80sECA105BBSraake0sosd10sosd10sBBYY49490spair 1 Osrec80sECA10sBBOsosd10sosd10srec80sECA10sBBYY49490spair1 Osrec80sECA10sBBOsosd1 Osrec80sec41 Osrec80sECA10sBBYY15380spair1 Osrec80sECA10sBBYY15380spair1 Osrec80sECA10sBBYY15380spair1 Osrec80sECA10sBBYY15380spair1 Osrec80sECA10sBBYY15380spair1 Osrec80sECA10sBBYY49490spair1 Osrec80sECA10sBBYY49490spair1 Osrec80sECA10sBBYY49490spair1 Osrec80sECA10sBBYY49490spair1 Osrec80sECA10sBBYY49490spair1 Osrec80sECA10sBBYY49490spair1 Osrec80sECA1-10x GCN40sBBYY49490spair1 Osrec80seCA1-32P1-10x GCN40sBB | 05BBM 05WO) 05BBM 05WC 05WC | 11 * X9A * 11; * 2X9A * | 10%-29% haploid progeny 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 3.70%-48.21% haploid progeny in hemivrorus T1.86%-01% | Ren et al. (2024) Ren et al. (2024) |
| KitaakeWTAtEC1.2OsWCKitaakeWTAtEC1.2; AtEC1.2OsBBKitaakeWTAtEC1.2; AtEC1.2OsBBBRS-CIRAD 302Ospair 1 Osrec8OsECA1OsBBStateOspair 1 Osrec8OsECA1OsBBXS134Ospair 1 Osrec8OsECA1OsBBXS134Ospair 1 Osrec8OsECA1OsBBY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1OsBBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1OsBBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1OsBBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1OsBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1:Osrec8OsECA1YY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1:AZP1-10 x GCN4OsBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1:AZP1-10 x GCN4OsBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1:AZP1-10 x GCN4OsBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1:AZP1-10 x GCN4OsBB | OSWO) AtEC1.2 OSBBN OSWC OSBBN | X9A * 11; * 2X9A * 11 * | 0% parthenogenic haploid progeny 3.70%-48.21% haploid progeny in hemivrorus T1.86%-01% | Ren et al. (2024) |
| KitaakeWTAtEC1.2; AtEC1.205BBBRS-CIRAD 302Ospair 1 Osrec8OseCA105BBBRS-CIRAD 302Ospair 1 Osrec8OseCA105BBKitaakeOspair 1 Osrec8OseCA105BBXS134Ospair 1 Osrec8OseCA105BBXS134Ospair 1 Osrec8OseCA105BBY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OseCA105BBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OseCA105BBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OseCA105BBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OseCA105BBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OseCA1:AZP1-10 × GCN405BBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OseCA1:AZP1-10 × GCN405BBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OseCA1:AZP1-10 × GCN405BBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OseCA1:AZP1-10 × GCN405BB | AtEC1.2 OSBBN OSWC OSBBN | 11; * 2X9A * 11 * | progeny 3.70%-48.21% haploid progeny in hemizvroue T1. 86%-91% | |
| Kitaake WT AtEC1.2; AtEC1.2 05BB BRS-CIRAD 302 Ospair 1 Osrec8 0sECA1 0sBB BRS-CIRAD 302 Ospair 1 Osrec8 0sECA1 0sBB Kitaake Ospair 1 Osrec8 0sECA1 0sBB XS134 Ospair 1 Osrec8 0sECA1 0sBB XS134 Ospair 1 Osrec8 0sECA1 0sBB YY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 0sECA1 0sBB YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 0sECA1 0sBB YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 0sECA1 0sBB XS134 Ospair1 Osrec8 0sECA1 0sBB YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 0sECA1 0sBB YY4949 Ossod1 Ossod1 0sECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 0sBB YY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 0sECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 0sBB | ATEC1.2 OSBBM OSWC OSBBM | 11; * X9A × 11 * 11 | 3.70%–48.21% haploid progeny in hemizynous T1: 86%–91% | |
| USW BRS-CIRAD 302 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OSECA1 05BB Soosd1 Soosd1 Soca1 05BB Soosd1 Osrec8 OSECA1 05BB Ososd1 Osrec8 OSECA1 05BB Ososd1 Osrec8 OSECA1 05BB Ososd1 Osrec8 05ECA1 05BB | Oswo OsBBN | 11 * | | Ren et al. (2024) |
| BRS-CIRAD 302Ospair 1 Osrec8OSECA1OsBBBRS-CIRAD 302Ososd1Ososd1OSECA1OSBBStaakeOsosd1Osrec8OSECA1OSBBXS134Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSBBOSBBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSECA1OSBBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1OSECA1OSBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4OSBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OSECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4OSBB | OsBBN | 41 * | hanloid fragmancy in | |
| BRS-CIRAD 302 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB Ososd1 Ososd1 OseCA1 OsBB Kitaake Ospair 1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB XS134 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB XS134 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB XS134 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YY4949 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YY1538 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YY1538 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB XS134 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YY1538 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YY4949 Ososd1 Ossd1 OseCA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB YY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB | OsBBN | 11 × | haptora hequency in homozygous T2 | |
| Ososd1 Ososd1 OsECA1 OsBB Kitaake Ospair 1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OsBB XS134 Ospair1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OSBB XY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OSBB YY4349 Ospair1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OSBB YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OSBB Ossod1 Ossd1 OSrec8 OSECA1 OSBB YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OSBB XS134 Ospair1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OSBB YY4349 Ospair1 Osrec8 OSECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OSBB YY4349 Ospair1 Osrec8 OSECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OSBB | | | 83%-100% diploid clonal progeny | Vernet |
| KitaakeOspair 1 Osrec8OsECA1OsBBSosd1Ossod1OseCA1OsECA1OsBBXS134Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1OsBBOsBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1OsBBOsBBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1OsBBOsBBYY1538Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1OsBBOsBBXS134Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1OsBBOsBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4OsBBYY4949Ospair1 Osrec8OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4OsBB | | | in T1, with a panicle fertility of | et al. (2022) |
| Kitaake Ospair 1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OSBB XS134 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OSBB XS134 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OSBB XY4949 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OSBB YY4349 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OSBB YY1538 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OSBB YY1538 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OSBB XS134 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OSBB XS134 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OSECA1 OSBB YY4949 Ospair 1 Osrec8 OSECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OSBB | | | 33%35% | |
| Ososd1 Ososd1 XS134 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB XS134 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB XS134 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB YY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB | OsBBN | 41 * | 55–84% clonal progeny in T1, with | Vernet |
| XS134 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB. YY4949 Ososd1 Ossd1 Oseca1 Ossd1 OsBB. YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB. YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB. YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB. XS134 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB. XS134 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB. YY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB. | | | a panicle fertility of 59–82% | et al. (2022) |
| Ososaf1 Ossaf1 Ossaf1 Ossaf1 YY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB. YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB. YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB. YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB. XS134 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB. YY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB. | OsBBN | 41 * | 5.9%–97.1% clonal progeny in T1, | Song, Li, Chen, |
| YY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB. YY1538 Ososd1 Ossd1 OseCA1 OsBB. YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB. XS134 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB. XS134 Ospair1 Osrec8 OseCA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB. YY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OseCA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB. | | | with a seed set of 13.9%–51.0% | et al. (2024) |
| Ososd1 Ossd1 YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1 OsBB Ososd1 Ossd1 XS134 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB Ososd1 Ossd1 YY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OSBB | OsBBN | 41 * | 5.7%-88.2% clonal progeny in T1, | Song, Li, Chen, |
| YY1538 Ospairl Osrec& OsECA1 OsBB Ososd1 Ossd1 XS134 Ospairl Osrec& OsECA1:AZP1-10 x GCN4 OsBB Ososd1 Ososd1 YY4949 Ospairl Osrec& OsECA1:AZP1-10 x GCN4 OSBB | | | with a seed set of 5.7%-88.2% | et al. (2024) |
| XS134 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB Ososd1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB YY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBB | OsBBN | * 1/ | 17.1%-85.4% clonal progeny in T1, with a sood set of 17.1% at 1% | Song, Li, Chen, |
| Ososd1 Ososd1 Ososd1 YY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 x GCN4 OSBB | ZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBBN | 41 * | 3.6%-95.1% clonal progenv in T1 | Sona. Li. Chen. |
| YY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP1-10 x GCN4 OsBB | | | | et al. (2024) |
| | ZP1-10 × GCN4 OsBBN | 41 * | 7.4%–91.2% clonal progeny in T1 | Song, Li, Chen, |
| Ososd1 Ososd1 | | | | et al. (2024) |
| XS134 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP2-10 x GCN4 OsBB | ZP2-10 × GCN4 OsBBM | 41 * | 4.7%–100% clonal progeny in T1, | Song, Li, Chen, |
| Ososd1 Ososd1 | | | with a seed set of 18.6%–91.2% | et al. (2024) |
| YY4949 Ospair1 Osrec8 OsECA1:AZP2-10 x GCN4 OsBB | ZP2-10 × GCN4 OsBBM | 41 * | 4.1%-100% clonal progeny in T1, | Song, Li, Chen, |
| Ososd1 Ososd1 | | | with a seed set of 11.3%-83.4% | et al. (2024) |
| YY1538 Ospair1 Osrec8 OSECA1:AZP2-10 x GCN4 OSBB | ZP2-10 × GCN4 OsBBM | 41 * | 73.1%-100% clonal progeny in T1, | Song, Li, Chen, |

To infinity and beyond: recent progress, bottlenecks, and potential of clonal seeds by apomixis 11 of 22

© 2025 The Author(s). *The Plant Journal* published by Society for Experimental Biology and John Wiley & Sons Ltd., *The Plant Journal*, (2025), doi: 10.1111/tpj.70054

(continued)

| | Female | | Female parent construct ^b | | | | |
|----------|------------------------|--|---|---------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| Species | accession/ cultivar | Female mutation status ^a | Promoter ^c | Gene ^d | Male parent ^e | Phenotype ^f | Reference |
| | Kitaake | Ospair 1 Osrec8 Ososd1 | AtEC1.2 | OsBBM1 | * | 11.1%-29.2% clonal progeny in T1 | Khanday et al. (2019) |
| | BRS-CIRAD 302 | Ospair 1 Osrec8 Ososd1 | AtEC1.2 | OsBBM1 | * | 80%-100% clonal progeny in T1, with a panicle fertility of 27%- 33% | Vernet et al. (2022) |
| | Kitaake | Ospair 1 Osrec8 Ososd1 | AtEC1.2 | OsBBM1 | * | 55%-84% clonal progeny in T1, with a panicle fertility of 74%- 81% | Vernet et al. (2022) |
| | YY4 | Ospair 1 Osrec8 Ososd1 | AtEC1.2 | OsBBM1 | × | 90%-96% clonal progeny with a seed set of 44%-51% | Dan et al. (2024 |
| | XS134 | Ospair1 Osrec8 | AtEC1.2 | OsBBM1 | * | 1.0%-96.2% clonal progeny in T1, with a sead set of 11 0% an 0% | Song, Li, Chen |
| | ΥΥ4 | Ospair 1 Osrec8 | AtEC1.2; | OsBBM1; | * | 66%-97% clonal progeny with a | et al. (2024) Dan et al. (2024 |
| | | Ososd1 | AtMYB98_AtDD1_OsECA1- like1 | AtWUS | | seed set of 33%–68% | |
| | CY84 | Ospair 1 Osrec8 Ososd1 | AtEC1.2 | OsBBM4 | * | 1.67% clonal progeny, with a seed set of 80% | Wei et al. (202 |
| | CY84 | Ospair 1 Osrec8 | AtEC1.2 | OsWUSgeno | * | 0.5%–21.7% clonal progeny, with a | Huang, Liang, |
| | JHY7245 | Ospair 1 Osrec8 | AtEC1.1 | ToPAR | * | 42%–67% apomictic progeny in T1, | Song, Wang, |
| | JFY2 | Ososd1 Ospair 1 Osrec8 | AtEC1.1 | ToPAR | * | with a seed set of 74%–82% 43%–62% apomictic progeny in T1, | et al. (2024) Song, Wang, J |
| | JFY2 | Ospair 1 Osrec8 Ospair 1 Osrec8 Ososd1 Oshc1 | AtEC1.1 | ToPAR | * | with a seed set of 07.0-74.7% 56% apomictic progeny in T1, with a seed set 73% | et al. (2024) Song, Wang, . et al. (2024) |
| | JFY2 | Ospair1 Osrec8 Ososd1 Ossd1 | AtEC1.1 | ToPAR | * | 42% apomictic progeny in T1, with a seed set 78% | Song, Wang, . et al. (2024) |
| Zea mays | Hi Type II hybrid | WT | PsASGR-BBML | PsASGR- BBMLgeno | * | 47% of transgenic lines produce haploid embryos; strongly decreased nollen viability | Conner et al. (2017) |
| | Hi Type II hybrid | WT | AtEC1.2 | PsASGR- BBMLgeno | * | 80% of transgenic lines produce haploid embryos; strongly decreased pollen viability | Conner et al. (2017) |
| | ZC01 | WT | CRISPRa using VP64 and p65-HSF directed to ZmBBM2 | ZmBBM2 | * | 0.4%3.55% haploid seeds | Oi et al. (2023) |

12 of 22 Bas Heidemann et al.

thor(s).

1365313x, 2025, 4, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/tpj.70054 by MPJ 328 Plant Breeding Research, Wiley Online Library on [06:052025]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/ems-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; 0A articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

(continued)

| | Female | | Female parent construct ^b | | 1 | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Species | accession/ cultivar | Female mutation status ^a | Promoter ^c | Gene ^d | Male parent ^e | Phenotype ^f | Reference |
| | B104 | WT | AtEC1.2 | ZmBBM1 | * | 65% haploid progeny in T1 | Skinner |
| | X08D492 | WT | ZmEC | ZmBBM2 | PH1V69-CFP | 9.3% parthenogenic haploid | et al. (2023) Ye et al. (2024) |
| | X08D492 | WT | PVEC | ZmBBM2 | PH1V69-CFP | 17.3% parthenogenic haploid | Ye et al. (2024) |
| | PHR03/PH184C | WT | PVEC | ZmBBM2 | PH1V69-CFP | 18.4%-18.9% parthenogenic | Ye et al. (2024) |
| | PHR03/PH184C | WT | PVEC;PVEC | ZmBBM2; ZmCYCD2 | PH1V69-CFP | napioid induction 24.6% parthenogenic haploid induction | Ye et al. (2024) |
| <i>Note:</i> Combinations ^a The column "Femal <i>MiMe</i> genotype in rid ^b The column "Femal ^b The parthenogenesi dandelion <i>PAR</i> . ^e The male parent des tion of haploid proge fFor allotetraploid Ni <i>AtEC1.2</i> , and $2n = 4x$ | of promoters and given that the second status x_{i} is that produces close parent construct x_{i} is used promoters are is-inducing genes rescribes the genotype inv. = 48 when using A_{i} | anes investigated to inc describes any genetic n nal gametes. describes any parthenc e <i>EGG CELL 1.1 (AtEC1</i> efer to their coding sequ of the pollen, which ei \$8), haploid indicates t <i>tfDK2</i> due to spontanes | duce parthenogenesis, with 1 mutations present in the bac ogenesis-inducing element th 1.1, AT1G76750) and <i>AtEC1.2</i> uences, unless indicated oth ither is identical to the moth ither is identical to the ger ous chromosome doubling. | their respective phen kground of female p hat has been used, w (AT2G21740, also re nervise (i.e., "geno" er (selfing, indicated nome size of the ma | otypes. arent; for example hich consists of a ferred to as <i>DOW</i> for genomic sequ by *), or a haploic iternal parent. Th | , the triple mutant <i>Ospair1 Osrec8</i> (promoter and a parthenogenesis fat <i>NREGULATED IN DIF1 45</i> (<i>DD45</i>). ences); note that the lettuce <i>Lssex</i> g i inducer line, or fluorescent marker ese "haploid" ploidy levels are $1n$ = | <i>isosd1</i> represents the tor. tor. ane is the ortholog of line to facilitate selec- 2x = 24 when using |

introducing a SunTag gene activation system (Papikian et al., 2019) to enhance OsBBM1 expression in the MiMe-EC1.1::OsBBM1 and MiMe-ECA1.1::OsBBM1 systems (Song, Li, Chen, et al., 2024). Following promising results with a small scale transformation of the enhanced MiMe-ECA1.1::OsBBM1 system (the so-called "MiMe-ECA1-AZP2" system), the authors generated 307 fertile transgenic events. Within these plants, they identified 10 lines that gave rise to 95.3%-100.0% diploid progeny and exhibited seed setting rates between 80.7% and 86.7% (where wild-type controls had 87.8% seed setting) (Song, Li, Chen, et al., 2024). The apomictic plants were investigated through the generations (T1-T3), showing a stable cloning rate and fertility (Song, Li, Chen, et al., 2024). This study demonstrates that the combination of enhancing OsBBM1 expression and screening of a huge number of transgenic events can facilitate the selection of apomictic lines with superior fertility traits (Song, Li, Chen, et al., 2024).

Stability of plant phenotypes in clonal hybrids has also been addressed in another study up to the fourth transgenic generation (Liu et al., 2023). In this work, a previously described Fix system (Ospair1 Osrec8 Ososd1 Osmtl) combining MiMe and maternal haploid induction is exploited (Wang et al., 2019). In this Fix system, the clonal seed rate remained unaltered over multiple generations and was between 3.7% and 4.3% (Liu et al., 2023). Despite being low, the seed set of Fix plants (5.7%-7%) remained consistent across clonal generations compared with the control line (75.9%). Various other results supported the efficiency and stability of this apomixis system across generations including the genetically identical whole genomes and the relatively low proportion of differentially methylated regions between Fix and wild-type plants across generations. Similarly, the transcriptome analysis showed that only 0.5% of the genes were differentially expressed between different clonal generations of Fix plants. In conclusion, Fix plants can stably clone themselves over multiple generations (Liu et al., 2023).

Several recent studies have concentrated on identifying and testing alternative parthenogenetic factors to *OsBBM1* for engineering synthetic apomixis in rice in combination with the *MiMe* system described above (Dan et al., 2024; Huang, Meng, et al., 2024; Song, Wang, Ji, et al., 2024; Wei et al., 2023). Wei et al. (2023) attempted to use *OsBBM2, OsBBM3, and OsBBM4* driven by *AtEC1.2*, for parthenogenesis engineering in hybrid rice. Transgenic plants containing the respective genes have similar vegetative development and morphology, but only *OsBBM4* was able to induce parthenogenesis and trigger haploids in hybrid rice at a haploid induction rate of 3.2%. In addition, the combination of *OsBBM4* egg cell expression with the *MiMe* system in so-called "*Fix2* plants" led to clonal reproduction at a rate of 1.7% in hybrid rice, while still maintaining a high seed setting rate that was comparable to wild-type controls (Wei et al., 2023).

In contrast, Menggui Song et al. (2024) heterologously expressed ToPAR in combination with the rice MiMe system, resulting in synthetic apomixis at a maximal cloning rate of 67%. This study represented the first demonstration that the dandelion ToPAR protein could function in a monocot species - a remarkable finding given the monocotyledonous and dicotyledonous plants diverged more than 200 million years ago. Rice MiMe-ToPAR plants did not have any significant differences from wild-type controls in terms of physiology and seed set (Song, Wang, Ji, et al., 2024). Also, consistent with the study of Wei et al. (2023), the heterozygosity was retained, and clonal propagation was fixed indicating this system can also cause highly fertile synthetic apomixis in hybrid rice, supporting the propagation of hybrids. Additionally in this study, the synthetic apomixis approach is also combined with improved agronomic traits through the mutation of genes relating to brittle culm and semi-dwarfism, further demonstrating the possibilities of biotechnological apomixis breeding (Song, Wang, Ji, et al., 2024).

In another study, the rice MiMe system was combined with the expression of endogenous rice gene OsWUS driven by the AtEC1.2 promoter, leading to a maximal cloning rate of 22% in hybrid rice (Huang, Meng, et al., 2024). The seed setting rate of the so-called "Fix3 plants" (80.8%) was as high as wild-type controls (80.1%). The "Fix3 plants" have normal development and vegetative morphology, and at partial penetrance, egg cell fertilization is not required due to ectopic expression of OsWUS. Similarly to the previous studies, the above characteristics propagated through generations while the heterozygosity was maintained suggesting that hybrid vigor, including high fertility was heritable (Huang, Meng, et al., 2024). Finally, Dan et al. (2024) combined the MiMe system with OsBBM1, expressed under the AtEC1.2 promoter, and with AtWUS, expressed under the OsMYB98 and OsECA1 promoters, resulting in the production of high-efficacy clonal seeds in hybrid rice. However, the fertility of those two lines varied significantly, with the highest seed setting of those being comparable with the wild-type (Dan et al., 2024). Moreover, the clonal seed rate was higher in the OsBBM1-MiMe construct compared with OsBBM1- and AtWUS-containing ones (Dan et al., 2024). Summarizing, since the Khanday et al. (2019) study, several alternatives to OsBBM1, including OsBBM4, ToPAR, and OsWUS have been successfully shown to be compatible with MiMe to engineer synthetic apomixis in rice.

BOTTLENECKS FOR ENGINEERING SYNTHETIC APOMIXIS

Despite the recent advances in our understanding of plant reproduction, there are still several bottlenecks in synthetic apomixis to generate clonal seeds in crop species. These

^{© 2025} The Author(s). The Plant Journal published by Society for Experimental Biology and John Wiley & Sons Ltd., The Plant Journal, (2025), doi: 10.1111/tpj.70054

To infinity and beyond: recent progress, bottlenecks, and potential of clonal seeds by apomixis 15 of 22



Bottlenecks of synthetic apomixis

Schematic representation of the major bottlenecks of clonal seed production through synthetic apomixis.

bottlenecks reside in the consecutive steps of apomixis, being altered meiosis, parthenogenesis, and endosperm development. An overview of major bottlenecks in engineering synthetic apomixis are shown in Figure 3, and a related set of open questions are listed in Box 2.

Skipping meiosis

The first step in synthetic apomixis is the production of clonal gametes. Until today, no natural apomeiosis gene has been identified and successfully transferred to another plant species. This is therefore a major bottleneck and there is a need for the genetic identification and functional validation of natural apomeiosis genes which can be applied in crop species.

How to translate the MiMe genotype to a wide variety of crops?

Currently, clonal gametes are usually engineered through *MiMe*, which requires the modification of multiple genes to alter different aspects of meiosis. The *MiMe* system has only been set up in a limited number of species – *Arabidopsis*, rice and tomato – but still needs to be explored in other angiosperms (Cifuentes et al., 2016; D'Erfurth et al., 2009; D'Erfurth et al., 2010; Khanday et al., 2019;

Box 2. Open questions

- What is the genetic basis of apomeiosis and autonomous endosperm in naturally apomictic plants?
- Is there a species-universal highly penetrant mutation, which abolishes the second meiotic division?
- Which gene, or combination of genes, has the greatest potential to induce parthenogenesis, in any given species?
- How can suitable spatiotemporal expression of parthenogenesis genes be engineered by design?
- Is autonomous endosperm development necessary for high-penetrance, high-fertility synthetic apomixis?

Mieulet et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2024). Due to different evolutionary trajectories and thereby variable histories of polyploidy, the process of establishing *MiMe* in different crops is quite complex and timeconsuming, as it is likely for each crop different mutant combinations must be tested. This difficulty is illustrated by the attempt to engineer *MiMe* in cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*), in which the selected mutations all led to infertility (Qian et al., 2024). Alternatives to *MiMe*, although less applicable still, do exist and have been reviewed by Underwood and Mercier (2022).

To translate the existing MiMe systems to other species, an expansion of our toolbox of meiotic cell-cycle control genes is required. A large number of genes involved in meiosis in plants have been identified (Mercier et al., 2015). The genes playing a role in the first two building blocks of MiMe (abolishing meiotic recombination and separating the sister chromatids) are strongly conserved (Underwood & Mercier, 2022); therefore, identification of homologous genes is feasible. The bottleneck is the third building block, the skipping of the second meiotic division, which is crucial to generate unreduced gametes, and novel mutants that skip this process are of high interest. It is important that this step is engineered with a high penetrance. Mutations in the first two building blocks only (i.e., in SPO11-1 and REC8) are lethal due to unbalanced distributions of chromosomes, thus, viable gametes can only be obtained if also the second meiotic division is omitted (D'Erfurth et al., 2009).

In Arabidopsis, skipping meiosis II is most effective by mutating AtOSD1, having a higher penetrance than mutating its alternatives THREE-DIVISION MUTANT 1 (AtTDM1) or AtTAM (Cifuentes et al., 2016; D'Erfurth et al., 2009; D'Erfurth et al., 2010). For other species than Arabidopsis, this step is a bottleneck, as exemplified in tomato and watermelon (*Citrullus Ianatus*). Importantly, AtOSD1 acts partially redundantly with its paralog UV-B-INSENSITIVE 4 (AtUVI4) in Arabidopsis and the double mutant Atosd1 Atuvi4 displays aberrant nuclear divisions during gametogenesis, leading to embryo lethality (lwata et al., 2011).

Figure 3. Bottlenecks of synthetic apomixis.

^{© 2025} The Author(s).

However, many species, including tomato and watermelon, have a single, likely essential OSD1-like gene. Only the Brassicaceae and few specific other species (including soybean, cassava, rice, and maize) have more than one OSD1like genes arisen from independent duplication events (Mieulet et al., 2016; Pang et al., 2024). In tomato, no viable null diploid Slosd1 mutants could be obtained (Di et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2024). Instead, the partially penetrant Sltam mutation was used, resulting in MiMe plants with reduced seed set (Wang et al., 2024). In diploid watermelon, CIOSD1 likely functions not only in meiosis, but also in mitosis of somatic cells (Pang et al., 2024). The watermelon Closd1 mutants are proposed to undergo somatic genome doubling as all regenerated Closd1 mutants were tetraploid and no null diploids were found (Pang et al., 2024). Despite this Closd1 mutants do skip the second meiotic division and thus their gametes are tetraploid (Pang et al., 2024). These examples illustrate that skipping meiosis Il through OSD1 gene mutation is not straightforward in multiple crops. Thus, for most crops, a highly penetrant yet viable and specific mutation to abort the second meiotic division is still lacking and for each new crop system, the meiotic cell-cycle control needs to be investigated.

Highly penetrant MiMe mutations are desired to obtain fertile MiMe plants. In Arabidopsis, a fully penetrant apomeiosis phenotype can be induced, resulting in a viability of pollen and ovules similar to wild-type levels (D'Erfurth et al., 2009). In contrast, lower penetrance may lead to an increased proportion of gametes with unbalanced chromosome distributions, thereby reducing fertility. Such reduced fertility is reflected in lower pollen viability, which reflects male fertility only, or in reduced seed set, due to reduced male and/or female fertility. This has been exemplified by tomato MiMe plants, in which both pollen viability and seed set were decreased due to incomplete penetrance of the MiMe genotype (Wang et al., 2024). Partial penetrance of a MiMe system could also reduce seed set due to ploidy mismatches between the pollen and endosperm (Mieulet et al., 2016), which is another bottleneck discussed below.

Parthenogenesis

The second step in apomixis is the induction of the egg cell development into an embryo without fertilization by parthenogenesis. Despite progress with *BBM* (Chen et al., 2022; Dan et al., 2024; Qi et al., 2023; Ren et al., 2024; Song, Li, Chen, et al., 2024; Vernet et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2023; Ye et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2020), *PAR* (Huang, Liang, et al., 2024; Song, Wang, Ji, et al., 2024; Underwood et al., 2022), and *WUS* (Dan et al., 2024; Huang, Meng, et al., 2024), significant bottlenecks must be overcome to establish fully penetrant synthetic apomixis in both dicot and monocot crop species. Since synthetic parthenogenesis is a relatively recent innovation and the difficulties in

studying the female gametophyte due to its embedded position within the ovule, there is little knowledge on the molecular basis of synthetic parthenogenesis, so here we speculate about the potential bottlenecks.

Which gene(s) in which crop?

Determining the suitable parthenogenic factor or combination of factors for individual crops remains a bottleneck. In all crops, high penetrance of clonal reproduction is required as a mixture of sexual and clonal seeds is not desirable as seed lots will be a mixture of clonal and recombinant offspring. In addition, for grain crops, high fertility and grain filling is required as this is the final product on the farm, whereas in vegetable crops, this is of relatively minor significance.

By far the greatest progress in synthetic apomixis has been made in rice using OsBBM1, ToPAR, or OsWUS which have been reported to have maximal clonal rates of >95%, 67%, and 22% respectively (Table 1) (Dan et al., 2024; Huang, Meng, et al., 2024; Song, Li, Chen, et al., 2024; Song, Wang, Ji, et al., 2024; Vernet et al., 2022). Despite these impressive clonal rates, typically, lower fertility is found which represents a strong bottleneck for engineering synthetic apomixis since high efficiency and a good yield will be required on the field. The reports of these two newly discovered parthenogenic factors (ToPAR and OsWUS) now provide the opportunity to express multiple factors at once in the egg cell (Huang, Liang, et al., 2024; Underwood et al., 2022). Even though, for now, only single parthenogenic factors have been reported in apomictic plants, those apomictic species might have also evolved optimizations (i.e., epistatic interactions) in their embryogenic pathways to make those individual factors more efficient and thereby not require additional paternal factors (RNA and/or proteins delivered by the sperm cell, or genes expressed from the paternal genome in the zygote) for embryogenesis to occur (Conner et al., 2015; Underwood et al., 2022). Therefore, to convert sexual plants into apomicts multiple paternal factors might be required to induce efficient parthenogenesis.

Even though few paternal factors have been identified to date, the potential importance of them is exemplified by OsWOX9A in rice (Ren et al., 2024), as has been extensively described in the section Synthetic apomixis in rice. The combination of co-expressing OsWOX9A together with OsBBM1 to increase parthenogenesis by 4-15-fold is a classical example of genetic enhancement (Ren et al., 2024). Other factors that could be important paternal factors are SHORT SUSPENSOR (AtSSP) and the PAR homologs DUO1-ACTIVATED ZINC FINGER 3 (AtDAZ3) and TRANSCRIPTIONAL REPRESSOR OF EIN3-DEPENDENT EHTYLENE-RESPONSE 1 (AtTREE1) which have been reported to be paternally derived in Arabidopsis (Bayer et al., 2009; Cheng et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2021). AtSSP is expressed in the pollen but only gets translated once the sperm cell has fused with the egg cell. If *AtSSP* is absent, zygote patterning is not properly established which subsequently results in a malformed suspensor (Bayer et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2021). Similarly, *AtDAZ3* AND *AtTREE1* in the zygote are sperm cell-derived and double mutants of both genes lead to altered cell division patterns in early-globular-stage embryos (Cheng et al., 2024).

The identification of more natural parthenogenesis factors will increase the potential for engineering efficient and fertile synthetic parthenogenesis in diverse crop plants. Since the genes responsible for parthenogenesis in Pennisetum and Taraxacum differ, it is reasonable to suspect that apomictic species in the genera Boechera, Rubus, Erigeron, and others might also possess novel parthenogenesis genes, thus providing opportunities for identifying novel parthenogenic factors (Conner et al., 2015; Underwood et al., 2022). In addition to new parthenogenesis factors, sporophytic apomixis genes responsible for nucellar embryony like RWP from Citrus and Mangifera hold promise (Wang et al., 2022; Yadav et al., 2023). Since these genes trigger spontaneous embryo formation from nucellar tissue, they may also have the capacity to initiate parthenogenesis if expressed in egg cells.

Which promoter is most suitable to drive parthenogenesis genes?

Since parthenogenic efficiency represents a strong bottleneck, it is essential to consider also the regulatory elements that are being used to express parthenogenic factors. Partially penetrant clonal reproduction means that in some egg cells, the parthenogenic factor is not able to trigger parthenogenesis, therefore suggesting either unsuitable expression level (either too high or too low) of the parthenogenic factor, mistiming of expression or expression in the wrong cell type. Ideally, the promoter used will have egg cell-specific expression and sufficient expression to induce parthenogenesis. It is possible that expression levels that are too high trigger uncontrolled cell division (Conner et al., 2015; Underwood et al., 2022). To achieve egg cell-specific expression most current studies have employed the Arabidopsis EC1.1 or EC1.2 promoters. However, they may not be optimal and further promoter discovery could identify more suitable promoters of parthenogenesis engineering. This is supported by results of Song, Li, Chen, et al. (2024) whom observed an improvement in apomictic offspring after utilizing the SunTag gene activation system to enhance the expression of the rice ECA1.1 promoter (Song, Li, Chen, et al., 2024).

How to engineer parthenogenesis without genetic modification?

Besides biological constraints regarding the efficacy of the selected promoters and genes, the requirement for a GMO approach and the regulation associated therewith is

another bottleneck in the application of parthenogenesis and synthetic apomixis in agriculture. The current induction of parthenogenesis is achieved by introducing an expression cassette for egg cell-directed expression of one or multiple parthenogenesis factor(s) (Table 1). This thus requires a GMO approach, potentially making such parthenogenesis systems less attractive for breeding organizations due to the prohibitive GMO regulatory processes in many countries worldwide.

A solution for engineering GMO-free parthenogenic plants may be found in the natural properties of TEs. TEs are important drivers of evolution and naturally change their location in the genome, thereby activating or repressing nearby genes (Castanera et al., 2023). A major difference between sexual and asexual reproductive modes in Taraxacum, Pilosella, Hieracium, Fortunella, and Citrus species is the insertion of TEs/repetitive elements in their apomixis gene promoters (Nakano et al., 2012; Underwood et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022). Such insertions are thought to cause expression in female reproductive cells. Often TEs are epigenetically silenced and it will be enlightening to understand whether these TE insertions exert control through purely genetic or a combination of genetic and epigenetic mechanisms. Thus, the complete regulatory control of PAR and RWP alleles has not been completely unraveled yet, but it illustrates that in nature, TE insertions can act as controlling elements of genes involved in reproductive mode (McClintock, 1956; Nakano et al., 2012; Underwood et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022).

Activated transposition of TEs could be used to integrate TEs in the promoter of PAR, RWP, or homologous genes, either randomly (GMO-free) or in a targeted manner (by gene editing). In a GMO-free approach, the increased mobilization of TEs under stress conditions could be used. Under normal conditions, TEs are under epigenetic control to silence the expression of TE-encoded genes required for transposition (Nozawa et al., 2021). The transposition of TEs is inhibited by a plethora of interlinked silencing pathways which are initiated by RNAdirected DNA methylation (RdDM) (Matzke & Mosher, 2014). RdDM, involving to different extents the RNA Polymerases II, IV, and V and a plethora of other factors, may be reduced in some stress situations which can lead to TE mobilization (Matzke & Mosher, 2014). Retrotransposons, the largest class of TEs in plants, can be activated and mobilized by heat stress, an RNA Pol II inhibitor (aamanitin), and a DNA methyltransferase (zebularine) in Arabidopsis and rice, leading to higher copy numbers of TEs (Thieme et al., 2017). This combination allows for increased TE activity, which could potentially be utilized in large forward genetic screenings to find TE insertions near apomixis genes leading to ectopic expression, thereby inducing embryo development without fertilization in a potentially GMO-free fashion.

The Plant Journal, (2025), doi: 10.1111/tpj.70054

^{© 2025} The Author(s). *The Plant Journal* published by Society for Experimental Biology and John Wiley & Sons Ltd.,

By using gene editing, complete promoters or only a specific TE can be inserted in a sequence-specific target site in the genome. Several approaches for this have been developed, of which the recent transposase-assisted target site integration (TATSI) method shows the highest integration efficiency (Liu, Panda, et al., 2024). This system combines the specificity of CRISPR-Cas targeting with the seamless integration of TEs in the genome to insert sequences at specific genomic locations. In short, the donor sequence needs to be flanked by an *mPing* element, which is recognized for excision from the genome by the *Pong* transposase and then directed to a specific genomic location for integration by a gRNA (Liu, Panda, et al., 2024). Potentially, this TATSI system can be used to insert a TE or other egg cell-specific elements in the promoter of an apomixis gene thereby activating expression in female reproductive cells.

Nourishing the embryo

Autonomous endosperm development might offer some significant advantages over sexual endosperm (produced by pseudogamy) for engineering apomictic crops and especially for seed crops, as it avoids the problem of complementary timing/fertilization of embryo and endosperm development.

Sexual endosperm – Is it a problem?

Current studies on synthetic apomixis rely on sexual endosperm development for seed set. However, in many of these studies, the seed set of the synthetic apomictic crops has been found to be variable. In some studies, the seed set is close to wild-type, but in others, seed set of the synthetic apomictic crops is significantly reduced (Dan et al., 2024; Liu, Wang, et al., 2024; Song, Wang, Ji, et al., 2024; Vernet et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2019; Wei et al., 2023). Due to the MiMe genotype generating unreduced male and female gametes, the ploidy of the endosperm will be modified. For example, in the rice MiMe system, the 4n central cell is fertilized by a 2n sperm cell to give rise to a hexaploid endosperm that maintains the 2:1 maternal-to-paternal ratio which is important for endosperm development (Mieulet et al., 2016). Despite the hexaploid endosperm seemingly not being a major bottleneck in rice - as several studies have successfully introduced MiMe in rice with high seed set - it might explain the variation in seed set between studies and could prove to be a bottleneck when introducing MiMe into other crops. As pointed out by Vernet et al. (2022), the introduction of parthenogenesis might block the fertilization of the central cell because fertilization depends on the secretion of EC1 proteins by the egg cell (Sprunck et al., 2012). Therefore, early initiation of parthenogenesis might block fertilization of the central cell if not enough EC1 proteins are present. In the study of Vernet et al. (2022), this seems

not to be a major problem since their *MiMe* and *MiMe-OsBBM1* lines have a similar seed set. Despite this, the synchronization of egg cell parthenogenesis and central cell fertilization could prove to be a bottleneck when engineering apomixis in other crops.

Autonomous endosperm – How to make it?

Autonomous endosperm might solve the potential issues above associated with pseudogamy if embryo and endosperm development can be triggered simultaneously at complete penetrance. However, the evolution of autonomous endosperm is relatively rare in apomictic plant species (Noyes, 2007). This suggests that either it is a complex trait to evolve, or the negatives outweigh the benefits for most apomictic species. In the few species like dandelion and hawkweed that did acquire this trait, there is little knowledge on the loci that are responsible for it (Rojek & Ohad, 2023; Van Dijk et al., 2020). Nevertheless, investigation into factors that control endosperm development in non-apomictic species has provided some insights that might eventually lead to synthetic engineering of autonomous endosperm development. These factors include the FIS-PRC2 complex, RBR1, CYCD7, and YUC10; and these have been discussed above in the recent advances (Chaudhury et al., 1997; Figueiredo et al., 2015; Grossniklaus et al., 1998; Kiyosue et al., 1999; Köhler et al., 2003; Ohad et al., 1996; Simonini et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2023). However, modulation of these factors fail to lead to complete endosperm development possibly due to an imbalance in the 2:1 maternal-to-paternal ratio, and are therefore likely not enough to engineer autonomous endosperm in crops. More knowledge on the downstream factors that are modified by these mutants will provide more insights on why development fails. In addition, further understanding of the bi-directional signaling between endosperm development and seed coat development may be a further source of leads for engineering autonomous endosperm. Finally, exploring the molecular basis of autonomous endosperm in apomictic species like dandelion and Hieracium holds opportunities to find new factors responsible for endosperm development. In both these species, the autonomous endosperm trait is not linked together with apomeiosis and parthenogenesis (Henderson et al., 2017; Van Dijk et al., 2020).

Besides overcoming possible fertility issues related to synthetic apomixis, autonomous endosperm might provide other benefits when introduced into crop species. If autonomous endosperm is used in the context of synthetic apomixis, it effectively abandons the need for fertilization and thus creates plants that are completely autonomous. This is particularly interesting in crops that are grown for fruits and seeds, in which the development of the male gametophyte is significantly affected by heat stress. Often in these crops heat waves can lead to a significant lowering of pollen viability that subsequently results in unsuccessful pollination and therefore leads to yield loses. The non-reliance of autonomous apomicts on pollen would allow the plants to set seed and thus fruit under heat stress conditions. Autonomous apomictic crops could also reduce some of the concerns with potential gene flow into wild relatives of GM-crops. If these GM-crops would reproduce completely autonomously; male sterility could be introduced and thus eliminating the risk of outcrossing to wild relatives through pollen.

THE POTENTIAL OF CLONAL SEEDS

Apomixis is considered the holy grail in plant breeding because it facilitates the generation of clonal seeds and thereby the stable inheritance of hybrid vigor (Jefferson, 1994; Spillane et al., 2004; Underwood & Mercier, 2022). In this review, we have highlighted the recent advances in the understanding and engineering of apomixis and elaborated on the current bottlenecks of generating clonal seeds. The above bottlenecks all affect plant fertility, which is the major limiting factor in synthetic apomixis. So far, impressive progress has been made in generating clonal rice grains. In rice and other seed crops, both a high percentage of clonal seeds and a high seed set is desired, but generally, high clonal seed rates are associated with decreased fertility (see Table 1). As fertility directly relates to seed set and thereby grain yield, even marginally reduced fertility is a major bottle neck to agricultural application in grain crops.

Synthetic apomicts in rice have been obtained by combining the Ospair1 Osrec8 Ososd1 mutations with ectopic expression of a BBM-like gene (Dan et al., 2024; Khanday et al., 2019; Vernet et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2023), ToPAR (Song, Wang, Ji, et al., 2024), or OsWUS (Huang, Meng, et al., 2024). Up to 95% of clonal offspring can be obtained, but the seed set of these plants is often reduced and highly variable (15%-88%) (Dan et al., 2024; Vernet et al., 2022), although the recent report of Song, Li, Chen, et al. (2024) indicates there may be ways to overcome this (Song, Li, Chen, et al., 2024). In contrast to grain crops, in fruit and vegetable crops, high seed set is less essential because it does not (directly) influence crop yield. Although synthetic apomixis has not yet been demonstrated in these crops, its building blocks MiMe and parthenogenesis have been established in tomato (Chen et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2024). Thus, while reduced fertility of synthetic apomicts is still a major concern in grain crops, this approach offers great potential for fruit and vegetable crops, in which synthetic apomixis has not yet been fully explored.

As such apomixis in fruit and vegetable crops is a promising field for future research. First, a functional *MiMe* system in the important vegetable/fruit crop tomato has been developed and despite fertility issues, they are of relatively less importance compared with

grain crops. Second, apomixis may facilitate the fixing of genotypes in species with high genomic heterozygosity, such as potato. Potato cultivars are classically tetraploid and obligatory outcrossing; thus, favorable genotypes cannot be fixed in seeds and are generally clonally propagated by tubers. While it is possible to inbreed diploid potatoes toward the generation of stable diploid parental lines, this process is highly complex due to inbreeding depression and the generation of fully homozygous elite parents has proved difficult (Zhang et al., 2021). Therefore, the introduction of apomixis in potato, and other crops with heterozygous genomes, may be an alternative to generate stable, high-performing, hybrid genotypes through clonal seeds.

The most exciting prospect of clonal seed production is the fixing of hybrid genotypes, especially of those displaying hybrid vigor, as frequently mentioned in synthetic apomixis studies (a.o. (Huang, Meng, et al., 2024; Khanday et al., 2019; Underwood et al., 2022; Vernet et al., 2022)). On top of increases in plant performance, clonal seed production will ease the generation of large quantities of hybrid seeds from such high-performing genotypes. This would allow for increased variation in the current monoculture system, with more varieties per crop, thereby increasing the robustness of agricultural systems (Dijk et al., 2016). To conclude, the improvement of crops by humans has taken place since the dawn of modern civilization and must continue if we as a global community are to overcome the problems of high disease pressure and climate change. A natural extension of thousands of years of man-made selections is to harness modern technologies including genomic selection, genome engineering and synthetic apomixis to expedite the improvement of hybrid crops to infinity and beyond.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors appreciate the comments of Rita Bastos Lima and Yazhong Wang on this review.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

CJU is listed as an inventor on two patent applications related to the contents of this review: "Gene for Parthenogenesis", WO2020239984, owned by KeyGene N.V.; "Unreduced Clonal Gamete Formation and Polyploid Genome Design in the Solanaceae", WO2024256682, owned by the Max-Planck-Gesellschaft.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

REFERENCES

Avni, D., Yang, H., Martelli, F., Hofmann, F., ElShamy, W.M., Ganesan, S. et al. (2003) Active localization of the retinoblastoma protein in chromatin and its Response to S phase DNA damage. *Molecular Cell*, **12**, 735–746.

^{© 2025} The Author(s). The Plant Journal published by Society for Experimental Biology and John Wiley & Sons Ltd., The Plant Journal, (2025), doi: 10.1111/tpj.70054

20 of 22 Bas Heidemann et al.

- Awan, M.J.A., Amin, I., Hensel, G. & Mansoor, S. (2024) Clonal gametemediated polyploid genome design for stacking genomes. *Trends in Plant Science*, 29, 1285–1287.
- Bayer, M., Nawy, T., Giglione, C., Galli, M., Meinnel, T. & Lukowitz, W. (2009) Paternal control of embryonic patterning in Arabidopsis thaliana. *Science*. 323, 1485–1488.
- Bicknell, R., Gaillard, M., Catanach, A., McGee, R., Erasmuson, S., Fulton, B. et al. (2023) Genetic mapping of the LOSS OF PARTHENOGENESIS locus in Pilosella piloselloides and the evolution of apomixis in the Lactuceae. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 14, 1239191. Available from: https://doi.org/10. 3389/fpls.2023.1239191
- Boutilier, K., Offringa, R., Sharma, V.K., Kieft, H., Ouellet, T., Zhang, L. et al. (2002) Ectopic expression of BABY BOOM triggers a conversion from vegetative to embryonic growth. *Plant Cell*, **14**, 1737–1749.
- Castanera, R., Morales-Díaz, N., Gupta, S., Purugganan, M. & Casacuberta, J.M. (2023) Transposons are important contributors to gene expression variability under selection in rice populations. *eLife*, **12**, RP86324.
- Chaudhury, A.M., Ming, L., Miller, C., Craig, S., Dennis, E.S. & Peacock, W.J. (1997) Fertilization-independent seed development in Arabidopsis thaliana. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 94, 4223–4228.
- Chen, B., Maas, L., Figueiredo, D., Zhong, Y., Reis, R., Li, M. et al. (2022) BABY BOOM regulates early embryo and endosperm development. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 119, e2201761119.
- Chen, W.-Q., Xu, L., Rao, Y., Liu, C., Hong, Z., Lu, H. et al. (2024) Selfpropagated clonal seed production in dicotyledonous Arabidopsis. Science Bulletin, S2095-9273(24)00886-7. Online ahead of print.
- Cheng, T., Liu, Z., Li, H., Huang, X., Wang, W., Shi, C. et al. (2024) Spermorigin paternal effects on root stem cell niche differentiation. Nature, 634, 220–227.
- Cheng, X., Pan, M., E, Z., Zhou, Y., Niu, B. & Chen, C. (2020) Functional divergence of two duplicated fertilization independent endosperm genes in rice with respect to seed development. *The Plant Journal*, **104**, 124– 137.
- Cifuentes, M., Jolivet, S., Cromer, L., Harashima, H., Bulankova, P., Renne, C. et al. (2016) TDM1 regulation determines the number of meiotic divisions. PLoS Genetics, 12, e1005856.
- Conner, J.A., Mookkan, M., Huo, H., Chae, K. & Ozias-Akins, P. (2015) A parthenogenesis gene of apomict origin elicits embryo formation from unfertilized eggs in a sexual plant. *Proceedings of the National Academy* of Sciences of the United States of America, **112**, 11205–11210.
- Conner, J.A., Podio, M. & Ozias-Akins, P. (2017) Haploid embryo production in rice and maize induced by PsASGR-BBML transgenes. *Plant Reproduction*, 30, 41–52.
- Cornaro, L., Banfi, C., Cavalleri, A., Dijk, P.J., Radoeva, T., Cucinotta, M. et al. (2024) Apomixis at a high resolution: unravelling diplospory in Asteraceae. Journal of Experimental Botany, erae477. Online ahead of print.
- Dan, J., Xia, Y., Wang, Y., Zhan, Y., Tian, J., Tang, N. et al. (2024) One-line hybrid rice with high-efficiency synthetic apomixis and near-normal fertility. Plant Cell Reports, 43, 79.
- D'Erfurth, I., Cromer, L., Jolivet, S., Girard, C., Horlow, C., Sun, Y. et al. (2010) The CYCLIN-A CYCA1;2/TAM is required for the meiosis I to meiosis II transition and cooperates with OSD1 for the prophase to first meiotic division transition. *PLoS Genetics*, 6, e1000989.
- D'Erfurth, I., Jolivet, S., Froger, N., Catrice, O., Novatchkova, M. & Mercier, R. (2009) Turning meiosis into mitosis. *PLoS Biology*, 7, e1000124.
- Di, S., Zhang, P., Zhang, J., Liu, G., Wang, G., Shi, Q. et al. (2022) Tomato UVI4 homologue modulates cell expansion to participate heat-stimulated hypocotyl elongation. Environmental and Experimental Botany, 201, 104963.
- Van Dijk, P.J. & Bakx-Schotman, J.M.T. (2004) Formation of unreduced megaspores (Diplospory) in apomictic dandelions (Taraxacum officinale, s.l.) is controlled by a sex-specific dominant locus. *Genetics*, **166**, 483– 492.
- Van Dijk, P.J., Rigola, D. & Schauer, S.E. (2016) Plant breeding: surprisingly, less sex is better. *Current Biology*, 26, R122–R124.
- Dresselhaus, T., Sprunck, S. & Wessel, G.M. (2016) Fertilization mechanisms in flowering plants. *Current Biology*, 26, R125–R139.
- Figueiredo, D.D., Batista, R.A., Roszak, P.J. & Köhler, C. (2015) Auxin production couples endosperm development to fertilization. *Nature Plants*, 1, 1–6.

- Gilles, L.M., Khaled, A., Laffaire, J., Chaignon, S., Gendrot, G., Laplaige, J. et al. (2017) Loss of pollen-specific phospholipase NOT LIKE DAD triggers gynogenesis in maize. *The EMBO Journal*, 36, 707–717.
- Goeckeritz, C.Z., Zheng, X., Harkess, A. & Dresselhaus, T. (2024) Widespread application of apomixis in agriculture requires further study of natural apomicts. *iScience*, 27, 110720.
- Grossniklaus, U., Vielle-Calzada, J.-P., Hoeppner, M.A. & Gagliano, W.B. (1998) Maternal control of embryogenesis by MEDEA, a Polycomb group gene in Arabidopsis. *Science*, 280, 446–450.
- Guitton, A.-E., Page, D.R., Chambrier, P., Lionnet, C., Faure, J.-E., Grossniklaus, U. et al. (2004) Identification of new members of fertilisation independent seed Polycomb group pathway involved in the control of seed development in Arabidopsis thaliana. Development, 131, 2971–2981.
- Hands, P., Rabiger, D.S. & Koltunow, A. (2016) Mechanisms of endosperm initiation. *Plant Reproduction*, 29, 215–225.
- Henderson, S.T., Johnson, S.D., Eichmann, J. & Koltunow, A.M.G. (2017) Genetic analyses of the inheritance and expressivity of autonomous endosperm formation in Hieracium with different modes of embryo sac and seed formation. *Annals of Botany*, **119**, 1001–1010.
- Hojsgaard, D., Klatt, S., Baier, R., Carman, J.G. & Hörandl, E. (2014) Taxonomy and biogeography of apomixis in angiosperms and associated biodiversity characteristics. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences*, 33, 414–427.
- Huang, Y., Liang, Y., Xie, Y., Rao, Y., Xiong, J., Liu, C. et al. (2024) Efficient haploid induction via egg cell expression of dandelion PARTHENOGENE-SIS in foxtail millet (Setaria italica). Plant Biotechnology Journal, 22, 1797–1799.
- Huang, Y., Meng, X., Rao, Y., Xie, Y., Sun, T., Chen, W. et al. (2024) OsWUSdriven synthetic apomixis in hybrid rice. *Plant Communications*, 6, 101136.
- Huo, H., Conner, J.A. & Ozias-Akins, P. (2009) Genetic mapping of the apospory-specific genomic region in Pennisetum squamulatum using retrotransposon-based molecular markers. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics*, **119**, 199–212.
- Iwata, E., Ikeda, S., Matsunaga, S., Kurata, M., Yoshioka, Y., Criqui, M.-C. et al. (2011) GIGAS CELL1, a novel negative regulator of the anaphasepromoting complex/Cyclosome, is required for proper mitotic progression and CELL fate determination in *Arabidopsis*. The Plant Cell, 23, 4382–4393.
- Jacquier, N.M.A., Gilles, L.M., Pyott, D.E., Martinant, J.-P., Rogowsky, P.M. & Widiez, T. (2020) Puzzling out plant reproduction by haploid induction for innovations in plant breeding. *Nature Plants*, 6, 610–619.
- Jefferson, R. (1994) Apomixis: a social revolution for agriculture? Biotechnology and Development Monitor, 14–16.
- Jha, P. & Kumar, V. (2018) BABY BOOM (BBM): a candidate transcription factor gene in plant biotechnology. *Biotechnology Letters*, 40, 1467–1475.
- Jia, H.-H., Xu, Y.-T., Yin, Z.-J., Qing, M., Xie, K.-D., Guo, W.-W. et al. (2023) Genome-wide identification of the C2H2-zinc finger gene family and functional validation of CsZFP7 in citrus nucellar embryogenesis. *Plant Reproduction*, 36, 287–300.
- Jia, H.-H., Xu, Y.-T., Yin, Z.-P., Wu, X.-M., Qing, M., Fan, Y.-J. et al. (2021) Transcriptomes and DNA methylomes in apomictic cells delineate nucellar embryogenesis initiation in citrus. DNA Research, 28, dsab014.
- Johnston, A.J., Matveeva, E., Kirioukhova, O., Grossniklaus, U. & Gruissem, W. (2008) A dynamic reciprocal RBR-PRC2 regulatory circuit controls Arabidopsis gametophyte development. *Current Biology*, **18**, 1680–1686.
- Kelliher, T., Starr, D., Richbourg, L., Chintamanani, S., Delzer, B., Nuccio, M.L. et al. (2017) MATRILINEAL, a sperm-specific phospholipase, triggers maize haploid induction. Nature, 542, 105–109.
- Khanday, I., Skinner, D., Yang, B., Mercier, R. & Sundaresan, V. (2019) A male-expressed rice embryogenic trigger redirected for asexual propagation through seeds. *Nature*, 565, 91–95.
- Khanday, I. & Sundaresan, V. (2021) Plant zygote development: recent insights and applications to clonal seeds. *Current Opinion in Plant Biol*ogy, 59, 101993.
- Kiyosue, T., Ohad, N., Yadegari, R., Hannon, M., Dinneny, J., Wells, D. et al. (1999) Control of fertilization-independent endosperm development by the MEDEA polycomb gene in Arabidopsis. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 96, 4186–4191.
- Knudsen, K.E., Booth, D., Naderi, S., Sever-Chroneos, Z., Fribourg, A.F., Hunton, I.C. et al. (2000) RB-Dependent S-phase Response to DNA damage. Molecular and Cellular Biology, 20, 7751–7763.

To infinity and beyond: recent progress, bottlenecks, and potential of clonal seeds by apomixis 21 of 22

- Köhler, C., Hennig, L., Bouveret, R., Gheyselinck, J., Grossniklaus, U. & Gruissem, W. (2003) Arabidopsis MSI1 is a component of the MEA/FIE Polycomb group complex and required for seed development. *The EMBO Journal*, 22, 4804–4814.
- Koltunow, A.M. & Grossniklaus, U. (2003) Apomixis: a developmental perspective. Annual Review of Plant Biology, 54, 547–574.
- Lakshmanan, K.K. & Ambegaokar, K.B. (1984) Polyembryony. In: Johri, B.M. (Ed.) Embryology of Angiosperms. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 445– 474. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-69302-1_9
- Lee, J.-O., Russo, A.A. & Pavletich, N.P. (1998) Structure of the retinoblastoma tumour-suppressor pocket domain bound to a peptide from HPV E7. Nature, 391, 859–865.
- Li, S., Zhou, B., Peng, X., Kuang, Q., Huang, X., Yao, J. et al. (2014) OsFIE2 plays an essential role in the regulation of rice vegetative and reproductive development. New Phytologist, 201, 66–79.
- Liu, C., He, Z., Zhang, Y., Hu, F., Li, M., Liu, Q. et al. (2023) Synthetic apomixis enables stable transgenerational transmission of heterotic phenotypes in hybrid rice. Plant Communications, 4, 100470.
- Liu, C., Li, X., Meng, D., Zhong, Y., Chen, C., Dong, X. et al. (2017) A 4-bp insertion at ZmPLA1 encoding a putative phospholipase a generates haploid induction in maize. *Molecular Plant*, **10**, 520–522.
- Liu, C., Wang, J., Lu, H., Huang, Y., Yan, H., Liang, H. et al. (2024) Engineering synthetic apomixis in different hybrid rice varieties using the *fix* strategy. New Crops, 1, 100003.
- Liu, P., Panda, K., Edwards, S.A., Swanson, R., Yi, H., Pandesha, P. et al. (2024) Transposase-assisted target-site integration for efficient plant genome engineering. *Nature*, 631, 593–600.
- Liu, Q., Han, D., Cheng, D., Chen, J., Tian, S., Wang, J. et al. (2024) AtRKD5 inhibits the parthenogenic potential mediated by AtBBM. *Journal of Inte*grative Plant Biology, 66, 1517–1531.
- Luo, M., Taylor, J.M., Spriggs, A., Zhang, H., Wu, X., Russell, S. et al. (2011) A genome-wide survey of imprinted genes in Rice seeds reveals imprinting primarily occurs in the endosperm T. Kakutani, ed. PLoS Genetics, 7, e1002125.
- Mahlandt, A., Singh, D.K. & Mercier, R. (2023) Engineering apomixis in crops. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics*, **136**, 131.
- Marimuthu, M.P.A., Jolivet, S., Ravi, M., Pereira, L., Davda, J.N., Cromer, L. et al. (2011) Synthetic clonal reproduction through seeds. *Science*, 331, 876.
- Matos, J.L., Lau, O.S., Hachez, C., Cruz-Ramírez, A., Scheres, B. & Bergmann, D.C. (2014) Irreversible fate commitment in the Arabidopsis stomatal lineage requires a FAMA and RETINOBLASTOMA-RELATED module. *eLife*, 3, e03271.
- Matzke, M.A. & Mosher, R.A. (2014) RNA-directed DNA methylation: an epigenetic pathway of increasing complexity. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 15, 394–408.
- McClintock, B. (1956) Controlling elements and the gene. Cold Spring Harbor Symposia on Quantitative Biology, 21, 197–216.
- Mercier, R., Mézard, C., Jenczewski, E., Macaisne, N. & Grelon, M. (2015) The molecular biology of meiosis in plants. *Annual Review of Plant Biol*ogy, 66, 297–327.
- Mieulet, D., Jolivet, S., Rivard, M., Cromer, L., Vernet, A., Mayonove, P. et al. (2016) Turning rice meiosis into mitosis. *Cell Research*, 26, 1242– 1254.
- Nakano, M., Shimada, T., Endo, T., Fujii, H., Nesumi, H., Kita, M. et al. (2012) Characterization of genomic sequence showing strong association with polyembryony among diverse citrus species and cultivars, and its synteny with Vitis and Populus. *Plant Science*, **183**, 131–142.
- Nallamilli, B.R.R., Zhang, J., Mujahid, H., Malone, B.M., Bridges, S.M. & Peng, Z. (2013) Polycomb group gene OsFIE2 regulates Rice (Oryza sativa) seed development and grain filling via a mechanism distinct from Arabidopsis. *PLoS Genetics*, 9, e1003322.
- Nogler, G.A. (1984) Gametophytic Apomixis. In: Johri, B.M. (Ed.) Embryology of Angiosperms. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 475–518. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-69302-1_10
- Noyes, R.D. (2007) Apomixis in the Asteraceae: diamonds in the rough. Functional Plant Science and Biotechnology, 1, 207–222.
- Nozawa, K., Chen, J., Jiang, J., Leichter, S.M., Yamada, M., Suzuki, T. et al. (2021) DNA methyltransferase CHROMOMETHYLASE3 prevents ONSEN transposon silencing under heat stress N. M. Springer, ed. *PLoS Genetics*, 17, e1009710.

- Ohad, N., Margossian, L., Hsu, Y.C., Williams, C., Repetti, P. & Fischer, R.L. (1996) A mutation that allows endosperm development without fertilization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **93**, 5319–5324.
- Ohad, N., Yadegari, R., Margossian, L., Hannon, M., Michaeli, D., Harada, J.J. et al. (1999) Mutations in FIE, a WD Polycomb group gene, allow endosperm development without fertilization. *The Plant Cell*, **11**, 407– 415.
- Ozias-Akins, P. & Van Dijk, P.J. (2007) Mendelian genetics of apomixis in plants. *Annual Review of Genetics*, **41**, 509–537.
- Pang, W., He, W., Liang, J., Wang, Q., Hou, S., Luo, X. et al. (2024) Disruption of CIOSD1 leads to both somatic and gametic ploidy doubling in watermelon. *Horticulture Research*, 12(1), uhae288. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/hr/uhae288
- Papikian, A., Liu, W., Gallego-Bartolomé, J. & Jacobsen, S.E. (2019) Sitespecific manipulation of Arabidopsis loci using CRISPR-Cas9 SunTag systems. *Nature Communications*, **10**, 729.
- Qi, X., Gao, H., Lv, R., Mao, W., Zhu, J., Liu, C. et al. (2023) CRISPR/dCas-mediated gene activation toolkit development and its application for parthenogenesis induction in maize. *Plant Communications*, 4, 100449.
- Qian, H., Guo, J. & Shi, H. (2024) Genetic manipulation of the genes for clonal seeds results in sterility in cotton. BMC Plant Biology, 24, 946.
- Qu, Y., Fernie, A.R., Liu, J. & Yan, J. (2024) Doubled haploid technology and synthetic apomixis: recent advances and applications in future crop breeding. *Molecular Plant*, 17, 1005–1018.
- Quiroz, L.F., Gondalia, N., Brychkova, G., McKeown, P.C. & Spillane, C. (2024) Haploid rhapsody: the molecular and cellular orchestra of *in vivo* haploid induction in plants. *New Phytologist*, 241, 1936–1949.
- Ravi, M. & Chan, S.W.L. (2010) Haploid plants produced by centromeremediated genome elimination. *Nature*, 464, 615–618.
- Ren, H., Shankle, K., Cho, M.-J., Tjahjadi, M., Khanday, I. & Sundaresan, V. (2024) Synergistic induction of fertilization-independent embryogenesis in rice egg cells by paternal-genome-expressed transcription factors. *Nature Plants*, **10**, 1892–1899.
- Rojek, J. & Ohad, N. (2023) The phenomenon of autonomous endosperm in sexual and apomictic plants. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 74, 4324– 4348.
- Simonini, S., Bencivenga, S. & Grossniklaus, U. (2024) A paternal signal induces endosperm proliferation upon fertilization in Arabidopsis. *Science*, 383, 646–653.
- Skinner, D.J., Mallari, M.D., Zafar, K., Cho, M.-J. & Sundaresan, V. (2023) Efficient parthenogenesis via egg cell expression of maize BABY BOOM 1: a step toward synthetic apomixis. *Plant Physiology*, **193**, 2278–2281.
- Song, M., Wang, W., Ji, C., Li, S., Liu, W., Hu, X. et al. (2024) Simultaneous production of high-frequency synthetic apomixis with high fertility and improved agronomic traits in hybrid rice. *Molecular Plant*, 17, 4–7.
- Song, M., Li, F., Chen, Z., Hou, H., Wang, Y., Liu, H. et al. (2024) Engineering high-frequency apomixis with normal seed production in hybrid rice. *iScience*, 27, 111479.
- Song, X., Wang, N., Zhou, Y., Tian, X., Xie, Z., Chai, L. et al. (2024) Adventitious embryonic causal gene FhRWP regulates multiple developmental phenotypes in citrus reproduction. *The Plant Journal*, **119**, 1494–1507.
- Sornay, E., Forzani, C., Forero-Vargas, M., Dewitte, W. & Murray, J.A.H. (2015) Activation of CYCD 7;1 in the central cell and early endosperm overcomes cell-cycle arrest in the Arabidopsis female gametophyte, and promotes early endosperm and embryo development. The Plant Journal, 84, 41–55.
- Spillane, C., Curtis, M.D. & Grossniklaus, U. (2004) Apomixis technology development—virgin births in farmers' fields? *Nature Biotechnology*, 22, 687–691.
- Sprunck, S., Rademacher, S., Vogler, F., Gheyselinck, J., Grossniklaus, U. & Dresselhaus, T. (2012) Egg cell-secreted EC1 triggers sperm cell activation during double fertilization. *Science*, 338, 1093–1097.
- Thieme, M., Lanciano, S., Balzergue, S., Daccord, N., Mirouze, M. & Bucher, E. (2017) Inhibition of RNA polymerase II allows controlled mobilisation of retrotransposons for plant breeding. *Genome Biology*, 18, 134.
- Underwood, C.J. & Mercier, R. (2022) Engineering apomixis: clonal seeds approaching the fields. Annual Review of Plant Biology, 73, 201–225.
- Underwood, C.J., Vijverberg, K., Rigola, D., Okamoto, S., Oplaat, C., den Camp, R.H.M.O. et al. (2022) A PARTHENOGENESIS allele from

© 2025 The Author(s).

apomictic dandelion can induce egg cell division without fertilization in lettuce. *Nature Genetics*, **54**, 84–93.

- Van Dijk, P.J., Op den Camp, R. & Schauer, S.E. (2020) Genetic dissection of apomixis in dandelions identifies a dominant parthenogenesis locus and highlights the complexity of autonomous endosperm formation. *Genes*, 11, 961.
- Vernet, A., Meynard, D., Lian, Q., Mieulet, D., Gibert, O., Bissah, M. et al. (2022) High-frequency synthetic apomixis in hybrid rice. *Nature Communications*, **13**(1), 7963. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-35679-3
- Vijverberg, K., Ozias-Akins, P. & Schranz, M.E. (2019) Identifying and engineering genes for parthenogenesis in plants. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, **10**, 128. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2019. 00128
- Wang, C., Liu, Q., Shen, Y., Hua, Y., Wang, J., Lin, J. et al. (2019) Clonal seeds from hybrid rice by simultaneous genome engineering of meiosis and fertilization genes. *Nature Biotechnology*, **37**, 283–286.
- Wang, K., Chen, H., Ortega-Perez, M., Miao, Y., Ma, Y., Henschen, A. et al. (2021) Independent parental contributions initiate zygote polarization in Arabidopsis thaliana. Current Biology, 31, 4810–4816.e5.
- Wang, N., Song, X., Ye, J., Zhang, S., Cao, Z., Zhu, C. et al. (2022) Structural variation and parallel evolution of apomixis in citrus during domestication and diversification. *National Science Review*, 9, nwac114. https://doi. org/10.1093/nsr/nwac114.
- Wang, X., Xu, Y., Zhang, S., Cao, L., Huang, Y., Cheng, J. et al. (2017) Genomic analyses of primitive, wild and cultivated citrus provide insights into asexual reproduction. Nature Genetics, 49, 765–772.
- Wang, Y., Fuentes, R.R., Van Rengs, W.M.J., Effgen, S., Zaidan, M.W.A.M., Franzen, R. et al. (2024) Harnessing clonal gametes in hybrid crops to engineer polyploid genomes. Nature Genetics, 56, 1075–1079.
- Wang, Y. & Underwood, C.J. (2023) Apomixis. Current Biology, 33, R293– R295.

- Wei, X., Liu, C., Chen, X., Lu, H., Wang, J., Yang, S. et al. (2023) Synthetic apomixis with normal hybrid rice seed production. *Molecular Plant*, 16, 489–492.
- Weinberg, R.A. (1995) The retinoblastoma protein and cell cycle control. *Cell*, 81, 323–330.
- Wu, X., Xie, L., Sun, X., Wang, N., Finnegan, E.J., Helliwell, C. et al. (2023) Mutation in Polycomb repressive complex 2 gene OsFIE2 promotes asexual embryo formation in rice. Nature Plants, 9, 1848–1861.
- Xiong, J., Hu, F., Ren, J., Huang, Y., Liu, C. & Wang, K. (2023) Synthetic apomixis: the beginning of a new era. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 79, 102877.
- Yadav, C.B., Rozen, A., Eshed, R., Ish-Shalom, M., Faigenboim, A., Dillon, N. et al. (2023) Promoter insertion leads to polyembryony in mango — a case of convergent evolution with citrus. *Horticulture Research*, 10, uhad227.
- Ye, H., Louden, M. & Reinders, J.A.T. (2024) A novel in vivo genome editing doubled haploid system for Zea mays L. *Nature Plants*, 10, 1493–1501.
- Yin, P.P., Tang, L.P., Zhang, X.S. & Su, Y.H. (2022) Options for engineering apomixis in plants. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, **13**, 864987. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2022.864987
- Zhang, C., Yang, Z., Tang, D., Zhu, Y., Wang, P., Li, D. *et al.* (2021) Genome design of hybrid potato. *Cell*, **184**, 3873–3883.e12.
- Zhang, Z., Conner, J., Guo, Y. & Ozias-Akins, P. (2020) Haploidy in tobacco induced by PsASGR-BBML transgenes via parthenogenesis. *Genes*, 11, 1072.
- Zhong, Y., Liu, C., Qi, X., Jiao, Y., Wang, D., Wang, Y. et al. (2019) Mutation of ZmDMP enhances haploid induction in maize. *Nature Plants*, 5, 575– 580.
- Zuo, J., Niu, Q., Frugis, G. & Chua, N. (2002) The WUSCHEL gene promotes vegetative-to-embryonic transition in Arabidopsis. The Plant Journal, 30, 349–359.