Carbohydrate Polymers 252 (2021) 117022

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Carbohydrate Polymers

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/carbpol

Review

A historical perspective on the regulation of cellulose biosynthesis

Holly Allen, Donghui Wei, Ying Gu, Shundai Li *

Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, 16802, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Cell wall
Cellulose synthase complexes
Microtubules
Trafficking
Arabidopsis thaliana

ABSTRACT

Cellulose is a β-1,4 linked glucose polymer that is synthesized by higher plants, algae and even by some bacteria and animals, making it the most abundant polymer on earth. As the major load bearing structure of the plant cell wall, it is hugely important in terms of plant growth and development, and in recent years it has gained interest for its biotechnological applications. Naturally, there has been a large concerted research effort to uncover the regulatory mechanisms underpinning cellulose synthesis. During the last century, several major breakthroughs in our understanding of cellulose synthesis in algae, bacteria, and plants have been pivotal in advancing the field of cellulose research, improving the likelihood that cellulose synthesis could be feasibly adapted for sustainable purposes. In this review, we will summarize the major hypotheses and advancements made during the last century on the regulation of cellulose biosynthesis, focussing on *Arabidopsis thaliana.*

1. Introduction

For centuries, cellulose has been widely recognized in terms of its economic potential and biological influence. Cellulose is an essential multi-purpose resource that is heavily used in construction, paper manufacturing, textile production, and as a source of fuel. More recently, cellulose has been recognized as a potential feedstock for renewable biofuels and other sustainable products. All plant cells deposit cell walls that contain cellulose. As a result, cellulose is the most abundant organic polymer on earth, contributing between 150–170 billion tons of carbon to the biosphere per year through carbon sequestration (Engelhardt, 1995). During growth, plant cells develop a primary cell wall that consists of three main polymers: cellulose, hemicellulose (typically xyloglucan), and pectin, contained within an aqueous matrix (Cosgrove & Jarvis, 2012). Once cells cease expanding, specialized cell types can deposit a thicker, stronger secondary cell wall that is reinforced by the hydrophobic polymer lignin. Cellulose tends to be more abundant in secondary cell walls that are comprised of up to 50 % cellulose (Meents, Watanabe, & Samuels, 2018).

Despite its huge importance, cellulose research consisted of a relatively finite, insignificant field a hundred years ago. Since the 1950s, several major breakthroughs in our understanding of cellulose synthesis and regulation have turned this on its head and it is now a thriving field of research. Studies historically focussed on characterizing the structure of cellulose microfibrils and synthetic mechanisms in cellulose-rich unicellular organisms, including the green algae, *Valonia* and *Oocystis* and the bacteria *Acetobacter xylinum*. In addition, fibers from *Gossypium* (Cotton) and *Boehmeria* (Ramie) were also used. Ground-breaking findings from these organisms were applied to higher plants on the basis that the intrinsic properties of cellulose were shared, igniting the study of cellulose synthesis in higher plants. The development of the herbaceous species, *Arabidopsis thaliana,* as a model plant for genetic research in the 1980s caused a noticeable shift from studying the biophysical aspects of cellulose to a genetic and cell biology led approach, especially regarding the dynamics of the cellulose synthase complex (CSC). In *Arabidopsis*, significant advancements have been somewhat restricted to the primary cell wall, since *Arabidopsis* undergoes limited secondary growth, though some notable contributions have been made (Strabala & Macmillan, 2013). Poplar became a genetic model for studying cellulose in secondary cell walls and is frequently used to validate assumptions made from *Arabidopsis,* and other species, regarding secondary cell wall formation. Poplar can also produce a gelatinous, 'G-layer' that is composed almost entirely of cellulose during tension wood formation, which has greatly supplemented studies of cellulose synthesis (Felten & Sundberg, 2013).

The increasing availability of biological tools combined with the development of highly sensitive techniques have been largely responsible for the significant progress made in the study of cellulose synthesis in higher plants. Together these have confirmed many of the original hypotheses made and answered, at least partially, many of the outstanding questions regarding cellulose synthesis. In this review, we will focus on how our understanding of the regulation of cellulose

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: hea5112@psu.edu (H. Allen), dxw608@psu.edu (D. Wei), yug13@psu.edu (Y. Gu), sul38@psu.edu (S. Li).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.carbpol.2020.117022
Received 28 June 2020; Received in revised form 25 August 2020; Accepted 25 August 2020
Available online 3 September 2020

synthesis has developed during the last century, with particular focus on i) how cellulose is synthesized?; ii) when it is synthesized?; iii) CSC trafficking; and iv) how it is regulated? We will cover the main hypotheses regarding cellulose synthesis, and the significant advancements that have been made to support these in *Arabidopsis,* though contributions from other species will be included where relevant. We regret that due to space limitations we cannot cover every aspect of cellulose synthesis, but some excellent reviews are widely available (Brown & Saxena, 2000; Delmer, 1999; Guerriero, Fugelstad, & Bulone, 2010; Haigler & Roberts, 2018; Lampugnani et al., 2019; Li, Bashline, Lei, & Gu, 2014; Somerville, 2006; Wolf, Hematy, & Hofte, 2012).

2. How is cellulose synthesized?

The long-standing use of cellulose as a feedstock for the pulping and energy industries naturally called for a more thorough understanding of the physical structure, biochemistry, and synthesis of microfibrils. Early studies on the physical aspects of cell walls and cellulose crystallinity relied on a combination of polarizing microscopy, transmission electron microscopy (TEM) and X-ray diffraction analysis of algae and bacteria. Even with the limited resources available, many of these assumptions were held to be true in higher plants when they were later reinforced by genetics.

2.1. Structure of cellulose

While cellulose was first described as a polymer in the 1920s, the crystal structure of cellulose was not resolved until fifty years later. X-ray diffraction analysis of cellulose from ramie fibers and the algae, *Valonia ventricosa*, revealed that cellulose is a crystalline β-1,4 linked glucose polymer (Gardner & Blackwell, 1974). More specifically, cellulose is a two-fold helical structure of alternating cellobiose units, as β-1,4 glycosidic linkages require a 180° rotation of consecutive molecules (Hermans, de Booys, & Maan, 1943). The 120° rotation of β-1,4 bonds is thought to facilitate the inversion of glucose molecules during synthesis (Delmer, 1999). Multiple isoforms of cellulose exist (I—IV), although the most labile form, cellulose I, is produced almost exclusively in nature (Delmer, 1999). Physical and chemical deformations of cellulose I can produce cellulose II—IV isoforms that are inherently more stable.

The idea of the microfibril was first coined by Preston, Nicolai, and Millard (1948) who observed in electron micrographs and X-ray diffraction analyses of *V. ventricosa* that cellulose consists of multiple glucan chains bound together. Characterizing the structure of cellulose I was initially problematic and diverse X-ray diffraction patterns of cellulose I were reported amongst research groups (Preston, 1974). Assessing the structure more intricately with solid-state nuclear magnetic resonance (ssNMR) revealed that cellulose I exists as two distinct forms, Iα and Iβ, (Atalla & Vanderhart, 1984). Cellulose Iα exhibits a triclinic structure composed of one chain and cellulose Iβ contains two parallel chains within a monoclinic structure. Cellulose Iα microfibrils predominate in algae and bacteria, whereas in higher plants and tunicates, cellulose Iβ- tends to be more abundant, though microfibrils are often comprised of both forms. Within the microfibril, parallel glucan chains are stabilized by intra- and inter-molecular hydrogen bonds. Hydrophobic van der Waals forces can also form between glucan sheets, particularly in aqueous environments (Cousins & Brown, 1997) and so are perhaps more relevant in primary cell walls that have a high water content. In secondary cell walls, cellulose is held together by a higher degree of intra-molecular hydrogen bonding, creating a rigid, crystalline polymer that invokes strong structural support to the cell. In tension wood, cellulose is almost purely crystalline, which is likely related to the production of wood under high tensile stress (Foston et al., 2011).

The properties of cellulose can be measured in terms of its crystallinity; width; degree of polymerization; and cross-sectional shape, to name a few variables. Unsurprisingly, considerable variation in cellulosic properties exists between species, cell types, and even within the microfibril itself. Variations in the width of cellulose microfibrils have been interpreted as differences in the number of glucan chains, the extent of bundling and interactions with non-cellulosic polysaccharides. Measuring microfibrils with a diversity of techniques, including atomic force microscopy (AFM), small-angle neutron scattering (SANS) and wide-angle X-ray scattering (WAXS), have demonstrated that individual microfibrils are consistently 3–4 nm wide, across different species and cell wall types (Fernandes et al., 2011; Song, Zhao, Shen, Collings, & Ding, 2020; Zhang, Zheng, & Cosgrove, 2016). Close microfibril spacing can cause neighbouring microfibrils to associate into larger bundles, that span up to 50 nm in width in secondary cell walls (Fernandes et al., 2011; Song et al., 2020; Thomas et al., 2013; Zhang, Zheng et al., 2016). Detailed examination of microfibrils with AFM has revealed the sheer extent of bundling, particularly in onion primary cell wells where up to $^{2}/_{3}$ of the microfibril length coalesces with other microfibrils (Zhang, Zheng et al., 2016). Wide cellulose microfibrils also tend to accompany a higher degree of polymerization (DP).In primary cell walls, cellulose DP can range from 500–8,000 and in cotton secondary cell walls, cellulose DP can exceed 15,000 (Brett, 2000). Far longer microfibrils of up to 23,000 DP have been observed in algae that secrete cellulose outside of the cell (Brown, 1996), indicating that microfibril elongation may be partially restricted by the biophysical and spatial constraints of cell walls. An important caveat is that these estimates of cellulose DP have not yet been verified in the intact cell wall, and so may not be representative of true microfibril DPs. The biological significance of DP and what triggers the termination of chain elongation is unknown, but chain length is likely to be an important determinant of cell wall function and architecture (Somerville, 2006).

Uncovering the structure of cellulose microfibrils formed the building block for all future studies on cellulose, as it can be used as a tool to make logical inferences about the underlying synthetic mechanisms and architecture of cell walls. In particular, the width and cross-sectional shape of cellulose microfibrils has been used to predict the size and arrangement of synthetic complexes and the orientation of microfibrils has informed models of cell expansion. While it has been firmly established that these features of cellulose are highly influential, how many of these cellulosic properties are determined remains an open question.

2.2. Cellulose synthase complexes (CSCs) - Structure

Once the structure of cellulose microfibrils was largely characterized, the next main focus was to identify the protein complex responsible for cellulose synthesis. Uncovering the structure of the synthetic complex was a major breakthrough in cellulose research (Table 1). Twenty years after Roelofsen (1958) correctly predicted that microfibrils extend from the growing tip by large enzyme complexes, linear structures matching that description were identified in the plasma membrane of the algae, *Oocystis apiculate* by freeze-fracture TEM (Brown & Montezinos, 1976). As they were situated at the base of microfibril imprints they were referred to as 'terminal complexes'. This was arguably the first indication that cellulose synthesis was highly distinct from other polysaccharides that are synthesized in the Golgi, emphasizing that the production of cellulose in such close proximity to the cell wall has functional significance.

Terminal complexes were subsequently identified in a whole host of different species, including bacteria, higher plants and tunicates (Kimura & Itoh, 1996). However, they were not uniform in their shape, abundance, or organization (Tsekos, 1999). In contrast to the linear complexes described in *O. apiculate,* freeze-fractured membranes of maize and pine seedlings revealed that terminal complexes in higher plants consist of rosette-shaped particles with six-fold symmetry (Haigler & Brown, 1986; Mueller & Brown, 1980). Re-examination of rosettes in the moss, *Physcomitrella patens*, has suggested that rosette lobes can be triangular and the six-fold symmetry can be lost due to unequal spacing between lobes (Nixon et al., 2016). SIn tobacco BY-2 cells the

Table 1
A summary of the major hypotheses made regarding the regulation of cellulose synthesis.

Original hypothesis	Studies	Current status	Studies
1. Cellulose is synthesized by a terminal complex in the plasma membrane	Observational (Roelofsen, 1958)	**Widely accepted**	Freeze-fracture TEM of *Oocystis apiculate,* maize and pine (Brown & Montezinos, 1976; Haigler & Brown, 1986; Mueller & Brown, 1980)
2. Terminal complex arrangement facilitates the coalescence of glucan chains	TEM of green algae cell walls (Giddings et al., 1980; Herth, 1983)	Partially confirmed: Conflicting evidence	Live-cell imaging of *Arabidopsis* cell walls and *in vitro* studies of cellulose synthesis (Cho et al., 2017; Li et al., 2016; Purushotham et al., 2016; Watanabe et al., 2015)
3. Cellulose is synthesized from terminal complexes	Sequencing analysis of the *Bcs* operon in *Acetobacter xylinum* and *CESA* genes in cotton (Pear et al., 1996; Saxena et al., 1990; Wong et al., 1990)	**Widely accepted**	Immunolabelling of CESA proteins in freeze fractured azuki bean complexes (Kimura et al., 1999)
4. CSCs are composed of a 'hexamer of hexamers' that synthesize cellulose microfibrils containing 36 chains	Hypothesis based on TEM structure (Herth, 1983)	Modified: Microfibrils consist of 18−24 chains. More evidence suggests the CSC is a hexamer of trimers, synthesizing an 18-chain microfibril	Physical studies of microfibril widths in mung bean, freeze fracture of *Physcomitrella patens,* stoichiometry of *Arabidopsis* and *in vitro* trimer formation in poplar (Gonneau et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2014; Newman & Hemmingson, 1990; Nixon et al., 2016; Vandavasi et al., 2016)
5. Each CESA protein synthesizes one glucan chain	CSC crystallography in *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* (Morgan et al., 2013)	Recent evidence:In *PttCesa8*homotrimers, each CESA particle associates with a single glucan molecule	Cryogenic-EM structure of *PttCesa8* homotrimers produced *in vitro* (Purushotham et al., 2020)
6. Three distinct CESA isoforms are required for cellulose synthesis	CESA mutant analysis in *Arabidopsis* (Desprez et al., 2007; Taylor et al., 2003)	Modified: Some cross-over between isoforms	Functional complementation in *Arabidopsis* (Carroll et al., 2012; Li et al., 2013)
7. CESA proteins have 8 transmembrane domains	Sequencing analysis of *A. xylinum* and cotton (Pear et al., 1996; Saxena et al., 1990; Wong et al., 1990)	Modified: CESA proteins have 7 transmembrane domains	Mutational analysis and functional complementation in *Arabidopsis* and *P. patens* and structural analysis of *PttCESA8*homotrimers (Slabaugh et al., 2016; Purushotham et al., 2020)
8. CESA transmembrane domains form a channel for glucan chain release	CSC crystallography in *R.sphaeroides* (Morgan et al., 2013)	Recent evidence:In *PttCesa8*homotrimers, the transmembrane domains of each CESA particle forms a channel	Cryogenic-EM structure of *PttCesa8* homotrimers produced *in vitro*(Purushotham et al., 2020)
9. Cellulose microfibrils are extended by the stepwise addition of glucose	CSC crystallography in R. RRR. *sphaeroides* (Morgan et al., 2013)	*Not confirmed in plants*	
10. Microfibrils are simultaneously crystallized and polymerized	Calcofluor white interference in *A. xylinum* (Benziman et al., 1980)	**Accepted with limited further study**	
11. The rosette structure promotes the crystallization of glucan chains	Hypothesis based on TEM structure (Herth, 1983)	**Accepted on little empirical evidence**	Mutational studies in *Arabidopsis* and poplar (Arioli et al., 1998; Harris et al., 2012; Purushotham et al., 2016)
12. Polymerization drives CSC movement	Observational (Herth, 1983)	**Widely accepted**	Live-cell imaging and biophysical modelling in *Arabidopsis* (Diotallevi & Mulder, 2007; Paredez et al., 2006)
13. Multi-net growth hypothesis	TEM of *Nitella* and *Tradescantia* (Roelofsen & Houwink, 1951)	*Not universally accepted*: Cannot explain anisotropy in all tissue types	AFM and FESEM in *Arabidopsis* (Marga, Grandbois, Cosgrove, & Baskin, 2005; Wiedemeier et al., 2002; Xin et al., 2020)
14. Alignment hypothesis	TEM and polarizing microscopy (Green, 1962; Ledbetter & Porter, 1963)	Partially confirmed: Not representative of all tissue types	Live-cell imaging in *Arabidopsis* (Himmelspach et al., 2003; Paredez et al., 2006; Sugimoto et al., 2003)
15. Direct-guidance model	TEM and live-cell imaging in *Arabidopsis* (Heath, 1974; Paredez et al., 2006)	Updated: *CSI1/POM2* links CSCs with microtubules in primary cell walls	Y2H and *csi1/pom2* mutant analysis in *Arabidopsis* (Bringmann et al., 2012; Gu et al., 2010)
16. CSCs are assembled in the Golgi	TEM and freeze fracture of *Zinnia elegans* (Haigler & Brown, 1986)	In question: ER assembly has been proposed but evidence is scarce	Live-cell imaging in *Arabidopsis* (Gardiner et al., 2003; Paredez et al., 2006; Park et al., 2019)
17. Microtubules define CSC delivery	TEM of *Coleus* and *Z. elegans* (Haigler & Brown, 1986; Hepler & Newcomb, 1964)	Updated: Microtubules coincide with Golgi pausing events and the insertion of SmaCC/ MASCs	Live-cell imaging in *Arabidopsis* (Crowell et al., 2009; Gutierrez et al., 2009)
18. CSCs are recycled	Live-cell imaging and mutagenesis in *Arabidopsis* (Bashline et al., 2013, 2015)	Partially confirmed: Evidence of CME, but it is not known if they are recycled	

transmembrane region spans 25 nm, similar to measurements made by Mueller and Brown (1980), and the cytosolic region is twice as wide, ranging between 45–50 nm (Bowling & Brown, 2008).

Many researchers have repeatedly suggested that differences in the morphology of terminal complexes may be responsible for the diversity in microfibril architecture. In particular, the arrangement of terminal complexes has been linked with the extent of crystallization and microfibril bundling in different types of cell wall (Tsekos, 1999) (Table 1). Octagonal arrays and linear rows of rosette complexes in the secondary cell walls of *Micrasteria denticulata* and *Spirogyra* respectively, produce microfibril bundles consisting of more glucan chains than a single rosette in primary cell walls (Giddings, Brower, & Staehelin, 1980Herth, 1983). The closer arrangement of multiple terminal complexes in secondary cell walls may be necessary to facilitate a higher degree of inter-molecular hydrogen bonding between chains. Indeed, in *Arabidopsis*, dispersed complexes produce widely spaced cellulose microfibrils in primary cell walls, whereas in secondary cell walls, dense regions of complexes synthesize highly aggregated crystalline microfibrils (Li et al., 2016). Interestingly, *in vitro* studies of cellulose synthesis have suggested that adjacent microfibrils can spontaneously coalesce to form thicker microfibril bundles in the absence of a rosette complex. Although this indicates that microfibrils may self-assemble in the cell wall, whether these microfibrils resemble *in vivo* structures was not quantified (Cho et al., 2017; Purushotham et al., 2016) and so more rigorous assessment is required to draw this conclusion with great certainty.

The location of terminal complexes at the ends of microfibrils and the high density of rosettes in areas undergoing secondary cell wall

deposition (Herth, 1985) made terminal complexes primary candidates for cellulose biosynthesis, however, this evidence was purely circumstantial. Fifteen years after terminal complexes were first visualized in green algae, genes with cellulose synthetic ability were cloned from the bacteria, *A. xylinum* (Saxena, Lin, & Brown, 1990; Wong et al., 1990). The bacterial operon encodes four bacterial cellulose synthase (*Bcs*) genes, *BcsA/B/C/D*, that are members of the glycosyltransferase 2 (GT2) family. Homologs in higher plants were found by screening a cotton cDNA library for sequence similarities with *A. xylinum* (Pear, Kawagoe, Schreckengost, Delmer, & Stalker, 1996). Although the genes from cotton exhibited low sequence homology with *A. xylinum*, as these proteins could bind to UDP-glucose *in vitro* they were putatively named cellulose synthase (CESA) genes. Immuno-labelling of freeze-fractured terminal complexes in azuki beans with CESA-specific antibodies, made the vital connection between cellulose synthesis and terminal complexes and identified CESAs as a component of the terminal complexes (Kimura et al., 1999) (Table 1). As a result, terminal complexes are commonly referred to as cellulose synthase complexes (CSCs).

The exact number of CESA proteins that occur in CSCs has been widely debated and is still an outstanding question in the field (Table 1). Originally, it was speculated that each rosette subunit contains a hexamer of CESA proteins that each synthesize a single chain, producing a 36-chain microfibril (Herth, 1983). Each CESA protein is still proposed to synthesize a single glucan chain, based on strong homology between the catalytic domain of cotton *CESA* proteins and the *Bcs* complex of *Rhodobacter sphaeroides,* that produces a single chain (Morgan, Strumillo, & Zimmer, 2013; Sethaphong et al., 2013). Recent evidence corroborates this hypothesis, as single CESA isoforms purified from rice and poplar arecapable of synthesizing cellulose *in vitro* (Olek et al., 2014; Purushotham et al., 2016). However, the 36-chain model has been widely rejected as 3 nm wide microfibrils are simply too narrow to accommodate 36 chains (Fernandes et al., 2011; Newman, Hill, & Harris, 2013; Thomas et al., 2013), and 45–50 nm wide cytoplasmic domains of CSCs are predicted to contain a maximum of four CESA proteins per rosette subunit (Bowling & Brown, 2008).

Updated models now predict that CSCs that are composed of a hexamer of trimers or tetramers, producing 18- or 24-chain microfibrils, respectively (Table 1). SANS, WAXS and ssNMR examination of secondary cell walls in spruce and primary cell walls in celery collenchyma are consistent with a 24-chain model (Fernandes et al., 2011; Thomas et al., 2013) whereas an 18-chain model is favored in mung bean primary cell walls (Newman et al., 2013). Assuming all CESA proteins within a CSC are active, evidence from studies of *Arabidopsis* leans towards an 18-chain model, as equimolar concentrations of CESA proteins (Gonneau, Desprez, Guillot, Vernhettes, & Hofte, 2014; Hill, Hammudi, & Tien, 2014) and the formation of *CESA1* homotrimers in solution are both incompatible with a 24-chain model (Vandavasi et al., 2016). In *Arabidopsis*, models predict that CSCs composed of 18 CESA proteins contain either hetero or homo-trimers. Each lobe contains either three distinct or identical CESA isoforms, based on the 1:1:1 stoichiometry of CESA proteins, the formation of homotrimers *in vitro* and the requirement of three CESA isoforms for a functioning CSC *in vivo* (Fig. 1A, B).

Due to the range of techniques, species and cell wall types adopted by different studies, it is hardly surprising that there is no consensus amongst research groups. It is also plausible that both the 18- and 24-chain model are correct under different circumstances, since microfibril diameters can vary (Martinez-Sanz, Pettolino, Flanagan, Gidley, & Gilbert, 2017). For example, in poplar tension wood, individual microfibrils are twice as wide in the G-layer compared to the adjacent secondary cell wall layers (Müller, Burghammer, & Sugiyama, 2006) and in fruit tissues, the microfibril diameter can be as low as 1 nm (Niimura, Yokoyama, Kimura, Matsumoto, & Kuga, 2009). Measuring the width of microfibrils and estimating the number of CESA proteins as a proxy for the number of glucan chains is not ideal, as microfibrils frequently interact with other matrix components and CESA proteins are not necessarily all active within a rosette. However, deciphering accurate CSC compositions in different cell walls and species may not be possible until CSCs and CESAs can be examined at higher resolution.

2.3. CSCs – architecture

Discovering CESA proteins hugely expanded our capabilities for studying cellulose synthesis, as it became possible to identify CESA homologs by sequencing analysis in species where the complex had not been visualized. During this time, *Arabidopsis* had gained popularity as a molecular model and so became the preferred study system for cellulose synthesis. CESA homologs were successfully identified in *Arabidopsis* by screening mutant populations for cellulose deficiencies. CESA proteins were first described in the primary cell walls of the *radial swelling mutant*, *rsw1* (Arioli et al., 1998), which exhibited stunted growth and reduced cellulose content at 31 °C and in three *irregular xylem mutants*, *irx1/3/5,* exhibiting deformed secondary cell walls in vessels (Turner & Somerville, 1997). After the *Arabidopsis* genome was sequenced, a total of 10 CESA genes (*CESA1-10*) were identified (Richmond, 2000).

With the identification of multiple CESAs, it was soon realized that CSCs were not made up of a homogenous population of CESA proteins. CESA proteins can be divided into two distinct families depending on the type of cell wall. In *Arabidopsis*, *CESA1*, *CESA3* and *CESA6/CESA6*-like proteins (*CESA2, CESA5, CESA9*) are required in the primary cell wall (Persson et al., 2007) and in secondary cell walls, *CESA4*, *CESA7* and *CESA8* are indispensable for plant growth (Taylor, Howells, Huttly, Vickers, & Turner, 2003). Three distinct isoforms are required to form a



Fig. 1. Predicted arrangement of CESA proteins within the CSC. In *Arabidopsis* primary cell walls, CESA proteins exist as either (**A**) homotrimers or (**B**) heterotrimers within the CSC (Hill et al., 2014). (**C**) Models of CSCs in the secondary cell walls of *Arabidopsis* and spruce predict that CESA proteins have a 1:1:1 stoichiometry (Zhang, Dominguez et al., 2018). In the secondary cell walls of poplar, CSCs have a (**D**) 3:2:1 stoichiometry of *CESA8:4:7* in normal wood, and a (**E**) 8:3:1 stoichiometry in tension wood (Zhang, Dominguez et al., 2018). Models of CSCs in *Physcomitrella patens* predict a h (**F**) homo-oligomer composition of *PpCESA5* in primary cell walls (Goss, Brockmann, Bushoven, & Roberts, 2012) and a (**G**) hetero-trimer composition in secondary cell walls (Norris et al., 2017; Scavuzzo-Duggan et al., 2018).

functioning complex as individually mutating each of these CESA isoforms causes severe defects in cell wall synthesis (Desprez et al., 2007; Taylor et al., 2003). *CESA1* and *CESA3* are essential for primary cell wall synthesis because *cesa1* and *cesa3* mutants are gamete lethal, whereas *cesa6* mutants can still function due to partial redundancy with *CESA6*-like proteins, though they still exhibit a severe lack of cellulose and growth defects (Persson et al., 2007). Recent genetic work has shed uncertainty on the rigid distinction between primary and secondary cell wall CESAs, since primary cell wall CESAs can form functional complexes with secondary cell wall CESAs in both poplar and *Arabidopsis* (Carroll et al., 2012; Li, Lei, & Gu, 2013; Song, Shen, & Li, 2010). Furthermore, primary cell wall CESAs can interact with secondary cell wall CESAs both *in vitro* and *in vivo*, and *pCESA7*::*CESA1* can partially rescue *cesa8* knock-outs (Carroll et al., 2012). *CESA6*-like proteins are also important in synthesizing specialized secondary cell walls, as cellulose defects are apparent in the seed coat of *cesa2*, *cesa5*, *cesa9* mutants and in the mucilage of *cesa5* mutants (Mendu et al., 2011). As cellulose synthesis is vital for plant growth, some promiscuity between *CESA* binding may exist to ensure cellulose production is maintained. Mixed complexes may represent 'intermediates' that facilitate the rapid changeover between primary and secondary cell wall synthesis. Whether functional compatibility between CESA isoforms is merely due to the high conservation between CESA catalytic domains is uncertain, as currently there is no evidence these mixed complexes are formed *in vivo*.

It is not known why the composition of CESAs in the CSC differs between primary and secondary cell walls, but it must be essential to warrant such a significant energy investment in the changeover of CESA isoforms between cell wall types. The ability of single CESA isoforms to synthesize cellulose causes further confusion as to why multiple isoforms are needed (Purushotham et al., 2016). Only 25 % of the microfibrils produced *in vitro* are crystalline, so perhaps microfibrils synthesized in the absence of other CESAs are structurally defective. Differences between the composition of the CSC in primary and secondary cell walls is ultimately driven by evolution, since the common ancestor of moss and seed plants exhibited a rosette-CSC comprised of a single CESA isoform (Roberts & Bushoven, 2007). Both moss and seed plants evolved two classes of CESA proteins independently, stressing that a variety of isoforms evolved to fulfil separate functions in different cellular environments and under different regulatory pathways. In *P. patens*, *PpCESA5* is required for primary cell wall formation in leaf gametophores (Fig. 1F), whereas *PpCESA3/8* and *PpCESA6/7* are required for secondary cell wall deposition in stereids that resemble tracheary elements (Fig. 1G). Convergent evolution of hetero-oligomeric CSCs suggests that the specialization of CESA was a fundamental requirement for synthesizing cellulose under different *in vivo* conditions (Li et al., 2019)

Attempts to tease apart the different functions of CESA by systematic mutagenesis have demonstrated that while their precise functions are not fully understood, CESAs clearly impart unequal roles in cellulose synthesis. Mutating catalytic motifs in different CESA proteins differentially impacts cellulose synthesis indicating CESA proteins vary in their catalytic ability. For instance, a *cesa8* mutant exhibits severe reductions in cellulose content, whereas only mild decreases are reported for *cesa4* (Kumar, Atanassov, & Turner, 2017). A popular hypothesis is that CESA isoforms may determine crystallinity, because cellulose contains a higher proportion of crystalline cellulose than primary cell walls. In particular, *CESA8* may be fundamental for mediating crystallinity, as not only does is it appear more catalytically active than other isoforms in the CSC (Kumar et al., 2017), but it is more abundant than *CESA4* and *CESA7* in poplar secondary cell walls that have a high degree of crystallinity (Zhang, Dominguez et al., 2018). In *Arabidopsis* and Norway spruce, CESA proteins are expressed in equimolar concentrations with a stoichiometry of 1:1:1 (Fig. 1C). However, in poplar the stoichiometry of *CESA8:4:7* is 3:2:1 (Fig. 1D) (Zhang, Dominguez et al., 2018). In poplar tension wood, a significant increase in *PtCESA8b* mRNA transcripts produces a more exaggerated shift in stoichiometry of 8:3:1 that coincides with cellulose that is almost completely crystalline (Fig. 1E) (Zhang, Dominguez et al., 2018). Interestingly, *PtCESA7* transcripts do not change in abundance and *PtCESA4* and *PtCESA8a* decreases, indicating different CESA isoforms confer different roles in tension wood.

In higher plants, CESA proteins have 8 transmembrane domains separated by a large catalytic cytosolic loop between the 2nd and 3rd domain. The 8 transmembrane domain model has recently been challenged by Slabaugh et al. (2016) who proposed that the 5th domain is an interfacial helix, making CESA a 7 transmembrane domain protein (Table 1). The absence of this transmembrane domain relocates a loop with a conserved FxVTxK motif to the cytoplasm. Here, it might assist in substrate binding as it does in its bacterial counterpart. Based on the crystal structure of the BcsA-BcsB complex, the transmembrane domains of CESA proteins are predicted to form a channel through which newly synthesized glucan chains are released (Morgan et al., 2013). Recent structural analysis of *PttCESA8* homotrimers indicates that the transmembrane domains of each CESA forms a continuous channel across the membrane, similar to the bacterial complex (Purushotham, Ho, & Zimmer, 2020). Furthermore, these channels appear to converge in the center of the trimer to facilitate the secretion and coalescence of nascent glucan chains, suggesting higher plant CESAs and the BcsA-BcsB complex share a common mechanism for cellulose synthesis.

In CESA proteins, the catalytic domain contains the highly conserved motifs (D, D, DxxD and QxxRW) common to all GT2 enzymes (Sethaphong et al., 2013). Point mutations in these motifs in *Arabidopsis*and cotton have verified that they perform distinct roles in catalysis and substrate binding. The first two aspartates (D, D) are involved in the binding of UDP-glucose substrates, DxxD acts as a base for glucan chain extension and the QxxRW motif as a binding site for the final glucan residues in the chain (Saxena et al., 2001). Within the catalytic loop there is a plant-conserved region (P-CR) between D and DxxD and a hypervariable region (HVR) at the other end of the domain (Pear et al., 1996). The HVR contains a class-specific region (CSR) specific to each isoform, that is widely homologous between different species, yet highly diverse amongst different isoforms (Vergara & Carpita, 2001). Intuitively, the CSR is thought to determine CESA isoform specificity. However, chimeric studies in *Arabidopsis* and moss have firmly established that the CSR is largely interchangeable between different CESA isoforms. Swapping domains between different CESA proteins does not compromise catalytic ability and chimeric CESA proteins can successfully rescue the corresponding mutants, indicating that class specificity is neither restricted, nor defined by these regions (Hill, Hill, Roberts, Haigler, & Tien, 2018; Kumar et al., 2017; Scavuzzo-Duggan et al., 2018; Sethaphong et al., 2016; Wang, Howles, Cork, Birch, & Williamson, 2006).

Alternatively, the CSR and P-CR are speculated to mediate CESA interactions, CESA positioning in the CSC and rosette formation, since both these regions are absent from bacteria that do not form rosettes. Indeed, when CSR and P-CR regions are included in structural models of the CESA catalytic domain, they diverge significantly from the structure of *Bcs* (Olek et al., 2014; Purushotham et al., 2016). Studies combining mathematical modelling with low-resolution SANS and SAXS analysis provide conflicting evidence for the roles of P-CR and CSR in CSC formation. In rice, the CSR region is predicted to assist in *OsCESA8* dimerization and the P-CR region is implicated in dimer-dimer interactions (Olek et al., 2014), whereas in *Arabidopsis*, the P-CR region of *AtCESA1* is predicted to recruit non-CESA proteins and the CSR is implicated in trimer-trimer assembly (Vandavasi et al., 2016). Resolving the crystal structure of the P-CR region in *OsCESA8* revealed that it consists of two α-helices linked by a large extended loop (Rushton et al., 2017). Incorporating the crystal structure into previous SAXS-based models predicts that the P-CR is located in the catalytic core close to the active site (Rushton et al., 2017), which is easily reconciled with the dimerization of CESA proteins (Olek et al., 2014). Discrepancy between dimer- and trimer-models is likely caused by a low homology of CSR

between different isoforms and the purification of CESA isoforms under different experimental conditions. As these studies report the formation of homodimers and homotrimers from single CESA isoforms *in vitro*, it cannot be discounted that hetero-dimers and -trimers may be formed in the presence of other CESA proteins *in vivo* due to the high conservation of catalytic domains. While the precise role of P-CR and CSR in CSC assembly is ambiguous, it can be concluded that these regions mediate CESA interactions in different capacities.

The N-terminal contains a zinc-finger domain that can dimerize with the same or different CESA proteins under redox conditions in cotton (Kurek, Kawagoe, Jacob-Wilk, Doblin, & Delmer, 2002)., A recent study of the *Arabidopsis* acylome revealed that the zinc-finger is likely to be inactive in *CESA4* and *CESA8* since the acylation of key cysteine residues compromise its ability for metal ion binding (Kumar, Carr, & Turner, 2020). On the contrary, mutating key cysteines in the zinc-finger of *CESA7* greatly impairs its function, suggesting *CESA7* may be essential for maintaining the integrity of the CSC (Kumar et al., 2020). With more intricate examination of CESA structures, the exact functions of CESA domains and individual CESA isoforms in the CSC are starting to unravel.

Continuing advancements in sequencing technology have facilitated the identification of CESA homologs in a huge diversity of eukaryotes and prokaryotes. Assigning function to CESA homologs represents the rate-limiting step as functional genetic analysis can take years in some species, particularly trees. Expression analysis has been used as an indirect indicator of CESA function in various tissues and points of development. However functional genomics is needed to definitively assign function to these orthologs. So far this has been achieved in several commercially important species such as rice, maize, poplar and eucalyptus. Further quantification is needed, particularly in woody species that have multiple copies of CESA isoforms that presumably have distinct roles in wood formation (Zhang, Dominguez et al., 2018).

2.4. Crystallization and polymerization

Due to the lability of cellulose I, it was reasoned that crystallization and polymerization must be co-ordinated for cellulose I to acquire stability in the cell wall (Saxena & Brown, 2005). Inhibiting crystallization with Calcofluor white in *A. xylinum* increases the rate of polymerization by four-fold, suggesting that not only are these processes tightly coupled, but that crystallization limits polymerization (Benziman, Haigler, Brown, White, & Cooper, 1980). In *R. sphaeroides,* newly synthesized glucan chains are elongated by the stepwise addition of glucose units (Morgan et al., 2016) - a mechanism thought to be shared with plants (Table 1). In higher plants, the close proximity of rosette subunits likely facilitates simultaneous crystallization with the coalescence of glucan chains (Table 1), since the loss of CSC organization is often concurrent with an increase in amorphous cellulose. For example, mutating the catalytic subunit or transmembrane domains of *AtCESA*s decreases crystalline cellulose (Arioli et al., 1998; Harris et al., 2012) and removing the zinc-finger domain in *pttcesa8* mutants produces amorphous cellulose exclusively, reinforcing that the structure of the rosette is mandatory for crystallization (Purushotham et al., 2016).

Continuous chain elongation was predicted to drive the movement of CSCs through the plasma membrane (Herth, 1983) (Table 1). A later study also suggested that the continuous synthesis of cellulose from CSCs generates the driving force to propel its movement, based on the migration of *YFP::CESA6* in the plasma membrane observed with spinning disc confocal microscopy (Paredez, Somerville, & Ehrhardt, 2006). Biophysical modelling of CSC movement based on crystallization and polymerization alone, predicted that the CSC could move in the plasma membrane at a speed of 10^{-9}–10^{-8} m s^{-1} (Diotallevi & Mulder, 2007), similar to reported values of $5-8 \times 10^{-9}$ m s^{-1} (Paredez et al., 2006).

2.5. Non-catalytic genes involved in cellulose synthesis

Identifying non-catalytic genes essential for cellulose synthesis was relatively straightforward in bacterial genomes, where functionally related genes often cluster together. For plants that have more complex genomes, candidates were initially identified using forward genetic screens with cellulose biosynthesis inhibitors. One of the first non-CESA genes to be identified was the putative membrane-spanning endo-1,4 β-D-glucanase, *KORRIGAN* (*KOR1*) (Nicol et al., 1998). Determining the precise role of *KOR1* has not been possible, because mutating *KOR1* causes a range of phenotypes including reduced crystalline cellulose (Maloney & Mansfield, 2010); altered CSC velocity (Vain et al., 2014); and perturbed microfibril orientation (Lei et al., 2014). Since the evolution of *KOR1* pre-dates the appearance of CESA in green algae, *KOR1* may have been fully responsible for synthesizing cellulose in primitive life forms (Lampugnani et al., 2019). As *KOR1* is still functional in higher plants it must have had a selective advantage, possibly by assisting with cellulose synthesis in conjunction with CESA proteins. With the exception of *CESA7*, *KOR1* can bind to all cell wall CESA proteins in yeast two hybrid (Y2H) assays (Mansoori et al., 2014) and fluorescent tagging of *KOR1* revealed that it associates with CSCs in the Golgi, TGN, secretory vesicles and the plasma membrane (Lei et al., 2014; Vain et al., 2014). Together, this strongly indicates that *KOR1* is a permanent resident of the CSC that modulates CSC function throughout its lifespan. Due to its tight association with the CSC, defects observed in *kor1* mutants may be an indirect consequence of gene perturbation, further complicating the assignment of *KOR1* function. Another early non-CESA gene identified was the glycosyl-phosphatidyl inositol–anchored protein, *COBRA (COB)* (Benfey et al., 1993; Roudier et al., 2005). *COB* has been described as a 'scaffold' for maintaining microfibril orientation and binding in *Arabidopsis* (Roudier et al., 2005). *COB* evolved alongside CESA, coinciding with the shift in linear arrays to rosette-shaped CSCs (Lampugnani et al., 2019), and therefore may be important in synthesizing glucan chains in close proximity to one another.

Significant advancements in genetic techniques have now made it possible to identify genetic candidates based on their physical interactions with CSC machinery. Many CESA-interacting proteins have been discovered from Y2H assays, GFP-TRAP, co-immunoprecipitation combined with mass-spectrometry, *in vitro* pull downs and biomolecular fluorescence complementation (BiFC). In particular, key proteins integral for maintaining the relationship between CSC and underlying microtubules have been described including, *CELLULOSE SYNTHASE MICROTUBULE UNCOUPLING PROTEIN* (*CMU*) that prevents the lateral displacement of microtubules from the hypothesized pressure generated by CSC migration (Liu et al., 2016); *CELLULOSE-SYNTHASE INTERACTIVE PROTEIN 1* (*CSI1/POM2*) that links CSCs with microtubules and marks regions for CSC exocytosis (Bringmann et al., 2012; Gu et al., 2010; Zhu, Li, Pan, Xin, & Gu, 2018); and *COMPANION OF CELLULOSE SYNTHASE* (*CC*) that promotes microtubule dynamics for CSC localization under specific stress conditions (Endler et al., 2015). *CMU, CSI1* and *CC* were some of the most recent cellulose-related genes to evolve, appearing in a group of *Charophyceae* algae known as *Zygnematophyrae* (Lampugnani et al., 2019). The evolution of a specialized microtubule band involved in cytokinesis in *Zygnematophyrae* strongly suggests that *CMU*, *CSI1* and *CC* evolved for the succinct co-ordination of microfibrils and microtubules – a feature that was retained by higher plants (Lampugnani et al., 2019).

In general, the roles of non-catalytic proteins in cellulose synthesis have been described in the context of primary cell walls. However, there is increasing evidence that many of these genes have reciprocal or divergent functions in secondary cell walls. For instance, *kor1* mutants exhibit defects in vessel secondary cell wall formation in *Arabidopsis* (Szyjanowicz et al., 2004) and *KOR1* can physically interact with secondary cell wall CESAs (Mansoori et al., 2014; Vain et al., 2014). The role of *CSI1* in secondary cell walls is disputed (Zhu, Xin, & Gu, 2019). No cellulose defects are apparent in *csi1* mutants (Gu et al., 2010), yet it

is abundant in induced *Arabidopsis* tracheary elements (Derbyshire et al., 2015) and in *pom2-4* mutants, xylem vessels have irregular wall patterns and *CESA7* is mis-aligned with microtubules (Schneider et al., 2017). An alternative isoform of *COB, COBL4,* may be specifically involved in producing highly crystalline cellulose in secondary cell walls. *COBL4* is upregulated in secondary cell walls (Brown, Zeef, Ellis, Goodacre, & Turner, 2005) and tension wood (Andersson-Gunnerås et al., 2006) and the *COBL4* homolog in rice, *BRITTLE CULM1 (bcl),* can bind to crystalline microfibrils (Liu et al., 2013). As many non-catalytic genes clearly participate in various aspects of both primary and secondary cell wall formation, perhaps assigning precise functions is not possible or biologically accurate.

2.6. Biochemistry of cellulose synthesis

Studying the biochemical aspects of cellulose synthesis has been notoriously problematic over the last 30 years. A persistent problem has been that β-1,3 linked callose was preferentially synthesized over β-1,4 linked cellulose from plant membrane extracts, hampering efficient cellulose production (Amor et al., 1995). Moderate improvements were achieved from *in vitro* cultures of hybrid aspen that produced almost 50 % cellulose (Ohlsson et al., 2006) and microsome preparations of blackberries that yielded up to 1 mg cellulose (Lai-Kee-Him et al., 2002), but poor yields and callose contamination were still major concerns. Significant advances have recently been achieved from the heterologous expression of CESA isoforms from poplar and *P. patens* in yeast (Cho et al., 2017; Purushotham et al., 2016). Reconstituting *PttCESA8* and *PpCESA5* in proteoliposomes that mimic the lipid bi-layer environment proved essential for successful synthesis, as disrupting the bilayer with detergent eliminated catalytic activity. Radio-active tracing of UDP-[^{3}H]-Glc, determined that catalysis was maintained for 90−150 min, a considerable improvement from previous *in vitro* reactions that terminated after 10 min (Amor et al., 1995). Whether these cellulose microfibrils are representative of microfibrils *invivo* presents the next major challenge.

Despite significant advancements in the synthesis of cellulose *in vitro*, the purification and reconstitution of the entire CSC has so far not been possible and remains a major research priority. Biochemical inferences of CESAs have been made from low resolution SAXS analysis that does not depend on protein crystallization and comparisons with the crystal structure of the BcsA-BcsB complex. Recent structural analysis of a *PttCESA8*homotrimer with cryogenic-EM suggested that plants and bacteria share a common mechanism for synthesizing cellulose (Purushotham et al., 2020). However, this mechanism may not be entirely indicative of CSC function in higher plants since it has not been established if these homotrimers exist *in vivo*. Furthermore, the cellulose microfibrils produced by recombinant *PttCESA8*homotrimers expressed in insect cells, do not resemblemicrofibrils produced by previous *in vitro*assays or microfibrils synthesized *in vivo*. Microfibrils were 4 times narrower (10-15 Å) than the 4.3 and 4.8 nm wide microfibrils produced by re-constituted *PttCESA8*and *PpCESA5*proteoliposomes (Cho et al., 2017; Purushotham et al., 2016), and microfibrils were amorphous, contrary to higher plants that contain a high proportion of crystalline cellulose. Whilst heterologous expression of CESAs in different systems may be the cause of this discrepancy, inconsistencies in the *in vitro*-cellulose production of *PttCESA8*casts some doubt on the proposed mechanism of *PttCESA8*homotrimers. Nonetheless, the ability to study the structure of purified CESAs with cryogenic-EM, represents a major breakthrough in the study of CSC structure (Table 1) that will facilitate a more complete understanding of cellulose synthesis in the future.

3. When is cellulose synthesized?

Plant growth and shape is achieved predominately by cell expansion as opposed to cell division (McFarlane, Doring, & Persson, 2014). Cell expansion is permitted by internal stresses generated by turgor pressure and the slow yielding of the primary cell wall (Cosgrove, 2016). Unsurprisingly, the organization of cellulose microfibrils and the cell wall architecture is tightly linked with cell expansion. Early hypotheses regarding the role of cellulose microfibrils in cell expansion were developed solely from TEM-based observations. While TEM is a useful tool for visualizing the cell wall architecture in its entirety, sample preparation can disrupt native cell wall structures. Developing techniques that preserve the cell wall architecture with higher fidelity, such as field emission scanning electron microscopy (FESEM) and AFM, meant that these predictions could be more rigorously scrutinized, but only in the innermost cell wall layer. Cell expansion studies have been fairly limited to cell-types with thin cell walls, which lend themselves to high resolution imaging, particularly the epidermal tissues from onion (Suslov, Verbelen, & Vissenberg, 2009) and the dark-grown hypocotyl and root elongation zone from *Arabidopsis*.

3.1. Cell elongation and expansion

Directional growth in plant cells is achieved by anisotropic expansion, whereby cells stretch longitudinally and undergo minimal lateral expansion. As the load bearing structure, cellulose microfibrils are important in generating differential resistance to turgor pressure and determining the direction of growth. Consequently, anisotropic expansion is highly reliant on efficient cellulose biosynthesis. In fact, many cellulosic biosynthetic genes were initially identified from mutants exhibiting abnormal cell elongation, such as *cesa1^{rsw1}* (Arioli et al., 1998); *cesa6$^{prc1\text{-}1}$* (Fagard et al., 2000); *cob* (Benfey et al., 1993); *kor1* (Nicol et al., 1998); and *pom1/2* (Hauser, Morikami, & Benfey, 1995). For some mutants, including *cesa6$^{prc1\text{-}1}$* and *pom1*, the microfibril deposition is not altered (Baskin, 2005; Pagant et al., 2002; Refregier, Pelletier, Jaillard, & Hofte, 2004) meaning these defects in anisotropic expansion may be a knock-on effect of cellulose perturbation caused by hormonal changes or compensational responses of other cell wall components.

Cellulose microfibrils was first connected with anisotropic growth from TEM-based observations of the primary cell walls of *Tradescantia* stamen hairs (Roelofsen & Houwink, 1951). In the newly formed central lamellae, cellulose microfibrils were deposited perpendicular to the direction of cell growth, whereas new lamellae deposited towards the outside of the cell tended to have a longitudinal orientation, parallel to the growth axis. Changes in microfibril orientation led to the concept of 'multi-net growth' (Table 1). Under the multi-net growth hypothesis, the progressive re-alignment of microfibrils towards the outer cell layers causes the cell to elongate (Roelofsen & Houwink, 1953). Identical observations were subsequently reported in algae (Tsekos, 1999) and *Arabidopsis* (Anderson et al., 2010). The transverse orientation of microfibrils was predicted to generate differential resistance to turgor pressure by physically restricting lateral expansion and promoting rapid longitudinal elongation (Green1962, Green, 1960).

The multi-net growth hypothesis is one of the longest standing hypotheses in cellulose biosynthesis, but it has lost considerable backing as many of the conditions required by the multi-net growth hypothesis are no longer satisfied when complex tissues of higher plants are considered (Table 1). This is particularly true of cross polylamellate walls in the epidermis of hypocotyls, stems and coleoptiles that exhibit parallel microfibrils that alternate by 30−90° between successive lamellae (Chan et al., 2010; Zhang, Zheng et al., 2016). Furthermore, transverse microfibril orientation does not consistently induce anisotropy (Wiedemeier et al., 2002; Xin et al., 2020) and expansion can be achieved without the passive reorientation of microfibrils (Bashline, Lei, Li, & Gu, 2014; Marga, Grandbois, Cosgrove, & Baskin, 2005). In the stem and hypocotyl epidermis, cell elongation is achieved despite having longitudinally or randomly orientated microfibrils. To explain this discrepancy, it has been suggested that the inner cell layers control the direction of expansion by imparting the necessary axial force to the outer epidermis (Baskin, 2005), or by generating sufficient anisotropic

expansion than negates the isotropic expansion of the epidermis (Fujita et al., 2011). Indeed, examining the innermost cell wall layer of etiolated *Arabidopsis* hypocotyls with FESEM demonstrated that the transverse microfibril orientation of the inner regions could induce growth anisotropy of the outer epidermal layers (Chan et al., 2011; Crowell et al., 2011). Additionally, Baskin (2005) discovered that anisotropic expansion was reduced when microfibril alignment was not uniform within tissues, suggesting that the net alignment of microfibrils between cells is more crucial than within cells for determining the degree of anisotropic expansion. It is important to note that hypotheses regarding cell expansion are predominately tested in model systems and are unlikely to be representative of other cell types and developmental stages that differ in their extent of expansion, due to differences in turgor pressure and microfibril orientation.

3.2. Relationship with microtubules

In early studies of cellulose synthesis, one of the most frequent observations made was the relationship between cellulose microfibril orientation and cortical microtubules patterns (Hepler & Newcomb, 1964). 'Cortical cytoplasmic elements', later realized to be microtubules, were proposed to guide the positioning of nascent cellulose microfibrils (Green, 1962). Based on the parallel alignments of cortical microtubules with cellulose microfibrils, the 'alignment hypothesis' was developed (Ledbetter & Porter, 1963) (Table 1). The complementary association between microtubules and microfibrils was initially confirmed in TEM studies of green algae (Tsekos, 1999), and later by confocal microscopy, where *YFP::CESA6* and *RFP::TUA6* signals co-localized in the plasma membrane of *Arabidopsis* primary cell walls (Li et al., 2016; Paredez et al., 2006). Early studies showed that disrupting microtubule dynamics prevented cell elongation, providing a direct link between microfibril orientation and microtubules (Morejohn, 1991). Live-cell imaging provided further confirmation that CSCs are directly guided by underlying cortical microtubules, by demonstrating that the trajectories of CSCs and newly synthesized microfibrils were re-orientated to align with new patterns of microtubules, following microtubule disruption (Paredez et al., 2006).

Whilst many studies largely support the alignment model, there are some notable inconsistencies. It was soon realized that the relationship is not as simple as when first proposed since microtubules are not ubiquitously required for the alignment of CSCs and microfibrils (Chan & Coen, 2020; Mizuta & Okuda, 1987). In the innermost layers of the root and hypocotyl epidermis, the parallel trajectories of CSCs and the transverse orientations of cellulose microfibrils are maintained in the absence or disorder of microtubules (Himmelspach, Williamson, & Wasteneys, 2003; Sugimoto, Himmelspach, Williamson, & Wasteneys, 2003; Xin et al., 2020), suggesting that microfibril assembly is not reliant on microtubules. Under these circumstances, CSCs that are not linked with underlying microtubules may maintain their alignments by tracking previous microtubule trajectories, as observed with light microscopy (Chan & Coen, 2020). Alternatively, microtubules may influence cell expansion and cellulose synthesis by determining the extent of cellulose crystallinity. When cell expansion is stimulated at 29 °C, the proportion of crystalline cellulose simultaneously decreases, however when the abundance of microtubules is reduced in the temperature-sensitive *mor1-1* mutant, cells can no longer expand and cellulose crystallinity content does not change at 29 °C (Fujita et al., 2011). Microtubules may modulate crystallinity by controlling the fluidity of the plasma membrane or the interaction with non-cellulosic components (Fujita, Lechner, Barton, Overall, & Wasteneys, 2012). It is also true that cellulose microfibrils may determine the distribution of cortical microtubules. Tobacco BY2 cells and *Arabidopsis* roots treated with cellulose biosynthesis inhibitors exhibit a dispersed, unordered microtubule array (Fisher & Cyr, 1998; Himmelspach et al., 2003) and in *cesa2* and *cesa6* mutants' cortical microtubules have a distorted alignment (Chu et al., 2007; Paredez, Persson, Ehrhardt, & Somerville, 2008). A bi-directional interaction between microtubules and microfibrils is not necessarily incompatible with the alignment hypothesis, but it indicates that revisions need to be made. A more suitable model may be the 'cellulose-constraint' model proposed by Giddings and Staehelin (1991) whereby cortical microtubules constrain paths for CSC movement and cellulose microfibrils exert biophysical forces on cortical microtubules as part of a self-reinforcing feedback loop.

The next step in understanding the relationship between microtubules and microfibrils was to establish the basis of their association. Whilst live-cell imaging confirms that their trajectories are correlated, it does not indicate whether CSC and microtubules are in direct contact, or if other factors are involved. Heath (1974) proposed the popular 'direct guidance model', whereby CSCs directly interact with microtubules (Table 1). Genetic evidence now supports that CSCs indirectly interact with microtubules through a linker protein known as *CSI1* (Gu et al., 2010; Li, Lei, Yingling, & Gu, 2015). *CSI1* interacts with both microtubules and the catalytic domain of CESA proteins *in vitro* and *RFP::CSI1* co-localizes with *YFP::CESA6 in vivo* (Bringmann et al., 2012; Gu et al., 2010; Li, Lei, Somerville, & Gu, 2012). In *csi1-1* mutants, CSC trajectories are uncoupled from microtubules and CSC velocity is slower (Gu et al., 2010; Li et al., 2012), although when microtubules are removed, CSCs can maintain ordered trajectories. This may be explained if *CSI1* is essential for the initial alignment of microtubules with CSCs, after which the trajectory does not depend on microtubule presence (Schneider et al., 2017). *CC1*also directly interacts with microtubules and the CSC. Mutating two tyrosine residues essential for microtubule-binding in the *CC1*gene, disrupts the parallel alignment between CSCs and microtubules, suggesting *CC1*has an important role in maintaining the relationship between CSCs and microtubules (Kesten, 2019). A wealth of studies has convincingly demonstrated that CSCs and microtubules are co-dependent and both are important for cell anisotropy. Ultimately our ideas match those originally proposed by Green (1962), but the relationship is clearly more nuanced than first proposed and so these early hypotheses have been more rigorously scrutinized.

4. CSC trafficking

A huge breakthrough that facilitated the study of CSC trafficking was the development of live-cell imaging that allowed CSC dynamics to be visualized within the cell. Functional complementation of the non-lethal *cesa6*$^{prc1\text{-}1}$ mutant, with fluorescently tagged *CESA6* proteins, enabled CSC movements in primary cell walls to be traced with confocal microscopy (Paredez et al., 2006). Studies are preferentially performed on dark-grown *Arabidopsis* hypocotyls, due to the high abundance of CSCs coupled with thin primary cell walls that enhance imaging resolution. On the other hand, high quality imaging of CSC movements in secondary cell walls, which can be deeply embedded within tissues, has been a much greater challenge. With the development of inducible lines, it is now possible to visualize tracheary elements with greater resolution (Yamaguchi et al., 2010). Together with live-cell imaging, proteomic analysis has been ground-breaking in identifying key proteins that interact with CSCs during trafficking.

4.1. CSC assembly

Terminal complex assembly was hypothesized to occur in either the ER or the Golgi, before being transported to the plasma membrane (Table 1). Evidence for Golgi assembly was first indicated from TEM-based observations of fully formed terminal complexes embedded in the Golgi, TGN and post-Golgi vesicles in algae (Brown, Franke, Kleinig, Falk, & Sitte, 1970; Giddings et al., 1980). For algal species that produce large linear complexes, such as *Erthyrocladia* and *Vaucheria*, assembly is partially completed at the membrane as vesicles containing single particles, multi-subunits and precursor-complexes all fuse with the membrane (Mizuta & Brown, 1992; Tsekos, 1999). In multicellular organisms, rosettes were first observed in the TGN and post-Golgi

vesicles in differentiating tracheary elements of *Zinnia elegans* mesophyll cells (Haigler & Brown, 1986).

Little progress has been made in uncovering how the CSC assembles, due to the difficulties in visualizing pre-Golgi processes, particularly in the ER. During live-cell imaging, *YFP::CESA* fluorescence is either very weak or undetectable in the ER (Crowell et al., 2009; Gutierrez, Lindeboom, Paredez, Emons, & Ehrhardt, 2009; Paredez et al., 2006), presumably due to the quenching of fluorescence deeper in the cell. In the *cesa6*^{D395N} mutant, diffuse signals of *YFP::CESA6* below the Golgi was interpreted as the retention of malformed CSCs in the ER (Park, Song, Shen, & Ding, 2019). However, as no ER marker was used, and the distribution of *CESA1* and *CESA3* was not examined in conjunction with *CESA6,* it is not possible to differentiate whether the entire CSC or single *CESA6* proteins are retained in the ER (Park et al., 2019). In secondary cell walls, the co-localization of *GFP::CESA4* and *GFP::CESA8* with the ER binding protein, BiP, in *cesa7*^{irx3} mutants further supports the idea that incomplete CSCs cannot be transported from the ER (Gardiner, Taylor, & Turner, 2003). Despite the limited evidence, it is generally accepted that CSCs are assembled in the ER where they would undergo quality control (Strasser, 2018). Dissecting specific molecular partners in CSC assembly in the ER is problematic, as ER-secreted proteins rely on a set of shared molecular chaperons for folding, so mutating these genes will likely exert pleiotropic effects unrelated to cellulose synthesis.

Assembled CSCs are assumed to be transported *via* direct streaming or in COPII vesicles to the Golgi where they are then modified before export (Neumann, Brandizzi, & Hawes, 2003). One study on *Arabidopsis* has indicated that CSCs may assemble in the Golgi with the assistance of Golgi-localized *STELLO*(*STL1/2*) proteins that have a glycosyltransferase (GT) domain. In *stl1 stl2* double mutants, primary and secondary CSCs were less abundant, CSC delivery rates were reduced and *CESA3* distribution was altered in the Golgi (Zhang, Nikolovski et al., 2016), which are all phenotypes consistent with defective Golgi assembly. Split-ubiquitin and BiFC assays confirmed that *STL1* and *STL2* could bind to all primary and secondary cell wall CESAs, but whether the precise interactions involve the *STELLO* GT domain was not tested (Zhang, Nikolovski et al., 2016). CSC assembly may also be facilitated by



Fig. 2. A model of CSC trafficking in primary cell walls. CSC assembly is predicted to occur in the Golgi, with the help of Golgi-localized *STELLO* (*STLs*) proteins. CSCs are then transported from the TGN/EE and the Golgi *via* secretory vesicles (SV) and are delivered to specific sites on the plasma membrane that are marked by *CSI1* proteins linked to microtubules. Myosin XI may also help deliver SV containing CSCs to the plasma membrane along actin filaments. Physical interactions between *PATROL1* (*PTL1*) and the exocyst complex with SVs are required for the insertion of CSCs into the plasma membrane. *SHOU4/4 L* negatively regulates CSC delivery. Various non-CESA proteins are required for optimal cellulose biosynthesis, including *COB* and *CC* that associate with CSCs at the plasma membrane and *KOR1* that additionally associates with the CSC during trafficking. Intact or degraded CSCs can be internalized into clathrin-coated vesicles (CCV) and undergo clathrin-mediated endocytosis (CME). Various CME components, such as the adaptor protein 2 complex (AP2), TPLATE complex (TPC) are essential for CME. Interna Internalized CSCs can be recycled back to the plasma membrane *via* SmaCCs/MASCs.

KOR1 and *COB* that co-localize with CESA proteins in the Golgi (Lei et al., 2014; Roudier et al., 2005; Vain et al., 2014), however, this has not been functionally assessed. Identifying how CESA proteins interact with accessory proteins in the Golgi or ER will fill in some of the crucial gaps in our understanding of CSC assembly.

4.2. CSC delivery

Although progress on CSC assembly has been slow, considerable knowledge has been gained in the trafficking of CSCs to the plasma membrane (Fig. 2). Early observations of intact CSCs in the Golgi and TGN/EE (Giddings et al., 1980; Haigler & Brown, 1986) were later reinforced by live-cell imaging of fluorescent CESA particles in the Golgi and TGN/EE (Crowell et al., 2009; Paredez et al., 2006). Therefore, trafficking of the CSC to the plasma membrane may occur from the Golgi *via* the TGN, or independently from the Golgi. The main route for CSC delivery is thought to occur *via* the Golgi, as various TGN markers, *VHA-a1* and *SYP61,* do not co-localize with CSC membrane insertion events (Crowell et al., 2009). However, confirming this is problematic since the TGN/EE acts as both a secretory and recycling organelle, harbouring populations of both newly synthesized and recycled CSCs (Viotti et al., 2010). Two types of CSC trafficking vesicles have been identified depending on their microtubule associations: small cellulose synthase compartments (SmaCCs) (Gutierrez et al., 2009) and microtubule associated SmaCCs (MASCs) (Crowell et al., 2009). Partial co-localization of SmaCCs/MASCs with TGN/EE molecular markers implicates SmaCCs/MASCs in both the secretion of *de novo* synthesized CSCs, and CSC internalization. In general, SmaCCs/MASCs are regarded as endocytotic vesicles, though it has become evident that they confer multiple roles in CSC trafficking, complicating their study.

CSC delivery was observed in early TEM observations whereby vesicles containing terminal complexes frequently coincided with cortical microtubules underlying cell wall thickenings (Haigler & Brown, 1986; Hepler & Newcomb, 1964). Live-cell imaging of *CESA3* and *CESA6* with tubulin further corroborated the tight overlap between cortical microtubules and CSC delivery events in primary cell walls (Crowell et al., 2009; Gutierrez et al., 2009). Microtubules mark specific sites for CSC delivery as disrupting intact microtubules networks causes the random insertion of SmaCCs/MASCs into the membrane (Gutierrez et al., 2009; Paredez et al., 2006), and newly delivered CSCs track microtubule arrays after photo bleaching (Crowell et al., 2009). CSC insertion into the plasma membrane also coincides with Golgi pausing events immediately beneath sites of cortical microtubules (Crowell et al., 2009), implicating the Golgi in mediating CSC delivery. Although microtubule distribution also coincides with sites of secondary cell wall deposition in developing vessels, removing microtubules does not influence Golgi pausing events in the delivery of *CESA7* (Wightman & Turner, 2008). Instead, transverse actin defines CSC delivery sites and actin cables indirectly transport CSCs to the plasma membrane, since actin depolymerization prevents CSC delivery and halts Golgi movement of CSCs (Wightman & Turner, 2008). While actin is not required for CSC insertion in primary cell walls (Sampathkumar et al., 2013), it may play a role in delivering CSCs to the membrane, as disrupting actin polymerization causes *CESA3* and *CESA6* Golgi bodies to aggregate beneath the membrane (Crowell et al., 2009; Gutierrez et al., 2009). Microtubules and actin involvement in CSC delivery may be spatially separated because subcortical SmaCCs have reduced velocity when actin cables were disrupted (Gutierrez et al., 2009). In the subcortical regions, actin may be responsible for the movement of the Golgi to sites of microtubules in the cell cortex that define domains for secretion. Recently, the actin-based motor protein, myosin *XI*, was implicated in the trafficking of CSCs in primary cell walls (Fig. 2). In triple *xi1 xi2 xi3* mutants and wild-type plants treated with myosin inhibitors, CSC delivery is reduced and vesicles containing CSC vesicles accumulate below the membrane (Zhang, Cai, & Staiger, 2019). Failed delivery was attributed to defective vesicle tethering and fusion due to the overlap of *XI* with *CESA6* fluorescent signals near the membrane. Whether this is an indirect effect of defective Golgi pausing is unclear.

Trafficking of any protein complex relies on four key phases - vesicle budding, cytosolic transport, tethering and ultimately fusion with the destination membrane. From studies on bacteria, yeast and animals it is obvious that delivery is co-ordinated by a complex interplay of proteins. Key players that have been identified include, Rab GTPases that target vesicles towards the destination membrane and mediate the fusion of the two membranes; tethering factors such as soluble *N*-ethylmaleimide-sensitive factor attachment protein receptor (SNAREs) that assist with fusion; and the exocyst complex. Identifying candidates specific for CSC trafficking has been challenging due to the vast genetic redundancies of these families in *Arabidopsis,* combined with the fact that Rab GTPases and SNAREs associate with multiple cargoes (Uemura et al., 2012; Vernoud, Horton, Yang, & Nielsen, 2003). Some candidates have been identified, including the Golgi-localized Rab-H1B, whereby *CESA6* has reduced motility and impaired exocytosis in loss of function mutants (He et al., 2018). However, their direct involvement in CSC trafficking has not been clear. Co-purification of *CESA6* with the syntaxin *SYP61,* a sub-family of SNAREs, implicated *SYP61* vesicles in the tethering of *CESA6* to the membrane (Drakakaki et al., 2012). However, as *SYP61* is a major component of post-Golgi vesicles it is unlikely to be specific for CSC trafficking. Ideally the purification of CESA specific compartments such as SmaCCs/MASCs would provide more insight into CSC delivery. However, due to their small size and low fluorescence signal this may prove difficult unless aggregated populations are extracted. Furthermore, extracting SmaCCs/MASCs during different points of CSC trafficking may be informative of the different genetic components involved in recycling and delivery, allowing the identification of specific markers of these processes.

Unsurprisingly, the precise temporal and spatial insertion of CSCs into the membrane is under tight genetic control. Co-immunoprecipitation of *CSI1* identified several genetic components that assist with CSC delivery in primary cell walls (Fig. 2), including *PATROL 1* (*PTL1*) and the exocyst subunits, *SEC5B* and *SEC10* (Zhu et al., 2018). Mutagenesis combined with *in vitro* pull downs demonstrated that CSC delivery relies on intricate physical interactions between *CESA6, CSI1*, *PTL1* and exocyst subunits. A model was developed for CSC delivery by carefully examining the temporal and spatial localization of these proteins during a live-cell imaging time-course (Zhu et al., 2018). *CSI1* defines the domain in the plasma membrane for delivery and possibly acts as a direct tether of SmaCCs to the membrane, since SmaCC formation is reliant on the interaction between *CSI1* and microtubules (Lei et al., 2015). After *CSI1* interacts with the vesicle, *PTL1* primes the vesicle for fusion by subunits of the exocyst complex, *SEC5B* and *SEC10*, that complete fusion. The association of *PTL1* is fleeting but essential, as delivery rates are slower in *ptl1,* and *ptl1 csi1* double mutants have an additive phenotype. Whether this mechanism is shared by secondary cell walls has not yet been established, although the accumulation of exocyst subunits and *CSI1* during secondary cell wall deposition indicates that this could be a strong possibility (Derbyshire et al., 2015). Recently, *SHOU4* proteins were identified as negatively regulators of CSC exocytosis (Polko et al., 2018). In *shou4 shou4l* double mutants enhanced CSC delivery is evident from an elevated density of *CESA6* at the plasma membrane and an increase in amorphous cellulose content (Polko et al., 2018). Direct binding of the cytoplasmic domain of *SHOU4* proteins with the catalytic domains of primary cell wall CESAs may cause the retention of CSCs in the cytoplasm, though this is speculative at present.

4.3. CSC endocytosis and recycling

The population of CSCs at the plasma membrane at any given time is determined by a balance between exocytosis and endocytosis and is often used as a proxy for the rate of cellulose synthesis. How this interplay is regulated is unknown, but it is possible that the plasma

membrane can monitor the density of CSC and subsequently mediate CSC delivery and recycling as part of a self-regulating feedback system. Supporting evidence has been provided from *rabh1b* CSC trafficking mutants that are defective in both exocytosis and endocytosis, suggesting that the two processes are inter-dependent (He et al., 2018). CSC recycling is inherently difficult to quantify, but it is widely believed to be a dominant process for several reasons. Firstly, CSCs have an average longevity of 30 min (Jacob-Wilk, Kurek, Hogan, & Delmer, 2006), yet typically, CSC membrane lifespan is only 7–8 min (Sampathkumar et al., 2013) suggesting CSC may be recycled several times before they are degraded. Secondly, as CSCs are large protein complexes, repeatedly constructing CSCs every 7 min would exert huge energetic costs on the cell. Finally, SmaCC/MASC populations tend to accumulate in cells not actively synthesizing cellulose, or cells under osmotic stress (Crowell et al., 2009; Gutierrez et al., 2009). In adverse conditions, SmaCCs/-MASCs may accumulate underneath the membrane as a 'temporary store' of CSCs that are rapidly recycled back once stress is alleviated. Furthermore, when protein and cellulose synthesis is inhibited, *CESA3* accumulates in MASCs within 7 min suggesting internalization is more likely than *de novo* secretion (Gutierrez et al., 2009).

Clathrin-mediated endocytosis (CME) is a dominant process in Eukaryotes but it is only in the last two decades that its importance has been appreciated in plants (Holstein, 2002; Reynolds, Wang, Pan, & Bednarek, 2018). Clathrin coated vesicles were first observed in the TGN in the 1980s (Coleman, Evans, & Hawes, 1988) and 30 years later they were shown to be integral for CSC internalization (Fig. 2). Two components of CME machinery, *AP2M* and *TWD40-2*, have been implicated in CSC endocytosis (Bashline, Li, Anderson, Lei, & Gu, 2013; Bashline, Li, Zhu, & Gu, 2015). *AP2M* is homologous with a medium subunit of the adaptor protein complex 2 (*AP2*) that assists with docking and recruiting CME machinery (Bashline et al., 2013) and *TWD40-2* is a potential member of a TPLATE complex (TPC) that is unique to plants (Gadeyne et al., 2014). In *ap2m* and *twd40-2* mutants, reductions in endocytosis were inversely correlated with a higher density of CSC at the membrane (Bashline et al., 2013, 2015). Co-operation of *TWD40-2* with *AP2M* is required for CME, as not only do they directly interact, but reductions in endocytosis and cellulose content are exacerbated in *ap2m twd40-2*double mutants (Bashline et al., 2015). However, they may confer distinct roles in CME, since hypocotyls exhibit reduced elongation in *twd40-2* but have increased elongation in *ap2m*. *TWD40-2* also has a much longer lifespan than *AP2M* during CME so it may be involved in scission from the membrane or quality control. Another TPC subunit, *TML*, can also interact with *CESA6* catalytic units. *tml* knock-down lines exhibit similar decreases in cellulose content and an increased population of CSC at the membrane that is not attributable to increased delivery rates (Sanchez-Rodriguez et al., 2018). CME represents one route of CSC endocytosis, as SmaCCs/MASCs abundance is reduced, but not completely abolished in *ap2m* mutants (Lei et al., 2015). The TPLATE may have evolved to specifically tailor CME in plants or mediate endocytosis independently, so continued study of this complex will be revealing about CSC endocytosis.

CESAs have been described as *AP2M* cargo because *AP2M* can bind to *CESA6* and *CESA3* in split-ubiquitin assays and *in vitro* pull downs, and *mCHERRY::CESA6* patterns overlap with *YFP::AP2M* (Bashline et al., 2013). But discrepancies in their physical dimensions questions whether CSC can be internalized by CME, as the catalytic core of CSCs is 50 % wider than the lumen of typical CME particles (Bashline, Li, & Gu, 2014; Li et al., 2014). De-constructed complexes may be internalized as an increased number of CSC particles at the membrane coupled with decreased cellulose content in *twd40-2* mutants indicates CSC breakdown may start prior to internalization (Bashline et al., 2015). CSCs readily form monomers, dimers and trimers in solution under a range of conditions suggesting that CSCs may be easily broken down *in vivo* by local alterations in the membrane environment (Atanassov, Pittman, & Turner, 2009; Olek et al., 2014; Vandavasi et al., 2016). Alternatively, CSCs may appear larger if it is bound to other components that may be released prior to endocytosis.

Whether endocytosed CSCs destined for proteolysis are trafficked to the vacuole directly or go *via* the TGN/EE is unclear, as both seem plausible (Crowell et al., 2009). Likewise, it is not known whether SmaCCs go to the TGN/EE before re-inserting CSCs into the membrane or bypass the TGN/EE altogether. At least some recycled CSCs pass through the TGN/EE as poor acidification of the TGN/EE in *det3* mutants causes defects in both secretion and recycling (Luo et al., 2015). As the TGN/EE is a sorting hub it would be convenient if all internalized CSCs travelled to the TGN/EE and were then exported for either recycling or degradation. Differentiating between populations of newly synthesized and recycled proteins that cross-over at the TGN/EE is a taxing question and has impeded research in this area. Determining the protein composition of vesicles involved at each stage of CSC trafficking may reveal markers that signify the destination of the vesicle, alleviating this problem. During the rapid changeover between primary and secondary cell wall synthesis, CSC exocytosis and endocytosis are temporally separated briefly, so could be probed to answer some of these outstanding questions. At the onset of secondary cell wall deposition in inducible *VND7* tracheary elements, the *tdTomato::CESA6* signal decreases in the membrane and increases at the Golgi, representing recently endocytosed primary cell wall CSCs. Once *YFP::CESA7* starts appearing at the Golgi, the *tdTomato::CESA6* signal disappears from the Golgi and a diffuse signal re-appears in the vacuole, indicating that the recently endocytosed *tdTomato::CESA6* are transported to the vacuole during secondary cell wall deposition (Watanabe et al., 2018).

5. How is cellulose synthesis regulated?

Probing the molecular regulation of cellulose synthesis has only been possible in the last 20 years, due to significant advances in the generation of genetic mutants, genetic constructs, and next generation sequencing technologies. High-throughput sequencing has been used to explore the regulation of cellulose synthesis at multiple aspects including, genomic (DNA), transcriptional (mRNA), translational (proteins), and post translational processes (metabolites and small RNA), causing a marked shift in research focus from structural to molecular studies.

5.1. Transcriptional regulation

Since all cells have a primary cell wall and cells are continuously made throughout development, genes involved in primary cell wall synthesis are ubiquitously expressed (Hamann et al., 2004). As such, transcriptional regulators are likely to be housekeeping genes that are not specific for cellulose synthesis. Potential candidates have been identified in the *ETHYLENE-RESPONSE-FACTOR* (*ERF*) IIId and IIIe transcription factor family. Overexpressing *ERF35*produces thick cell walls with a primary cell wall composition in *nst1 nst3* mutants that lack secondary cell walls Sakamoto, Somssich, & Mitsuda, 2018. Since many *ERF* transcription factors are co-expressed with *CESA1, CESA3*and *CESA6,*and *ERF34-ERF43* can physically bind to the promoters of primary cell wall CESA genes, the *ERF*transcription factor family may have a central role in regulating cellulose deposition in primary cell walls (Saelim et al., 2019; Sakamoto et al., 2018). Additionally, a brassinosteroid responsive transcription factor, *BES1,* can increase CESA expression by binding to the E-box (CANNTG) element in the promoters of *CESA1*, *CESA3* and *CESA6* (Xie, Yang, & Wang, 2011). However, *BES1* is unlikely to be a specific activator of primary CESAs, as *BES1* can simultaneously induce *CESA4* and *CESA8* expression.

In contrast to primary cell walls, the transcriptional network responsible for regulating cellulose synthesis during secondary cell wall formation has been extensively characterized in *Arabidopsis* (Yamaguchi et al., 2010; Zhong, Lee, Zhou, McCarthy, & Ye, 2008) and it is functionally conserved in woody species (Zhang, Xie, Tuskan, Muchero, & Chen, 2018) and grasses (Rao & Dixon, 2018). Two main transcription

factor families containing either NAC- or MYB domains, co-ordinate the expression of CESA biosynthetic genes. The NAC transcription factors, *NAC SECONDARY WALL THICKENING PROMOTING FACTORS (NST1/2)* and *SECONDARY WALL-ASSOCIATED NAC DOMAIN PROTEIN (SND1)* can activate cellulose synthesis in fibers, with *snd1 nst1* double mutants exhibiting reduced cellulose content and impaired secondary cell wall formation (Zhong, Richardson, & Ye, 2007). NAC-domain transcription factors activate two downstream, transcription factors, *MYB46* and *MYB83*, which are functionally redundant and *MYB103* (Zhong et al., 2008). *MYB103* can activate the expression of GUS reporter genes driven by the *CESA8* promoter, implicating *MYB103* as a specific regulator of cellulose deposition (Zhong et al., 2008). In cellulose-rich cotton fibers, *MYB103* is one of the first transcription factors that is expressed during the changeover between primary and secondary cell wall deposition, providing further support that it is an important regulator of cellulose synthesis (MacMillan et al., 2017). Overexpressing *MYB46* and *MYB83* causes an increase in *CESA* expression that is accompanied by excessive cellulose deposition in ectopic cell walls, implicating *MYB46/83* as direct activators of cellulose synthesis (Ko, Kim, & Han, 2009; McCarthy, Zhong, & Ye, 2009). *MYB46* can specifically regulate CESA expression by binding to 8-bp *MYB46*-responsive *cis* regulatory elements (M46RE) in CESA promoters (Kim, Ko et al., 2013). Introducing CESA genes with point mutations in the M46RE into *cesa* mutants could not restore cellulose synthesis, demonstrating that *MYB46* binding is crucial for regulating cellulose synthesis in *Arabidopsis* (Kim, Kim, Ko, Kim, & Han, 2013). Other direct targets of *MYB46* include the CCCH zinc finger genes, *C3H14* and *C3H15* (Ko et al., 2009), which cause ectopic deposition of cellulose and upregulate CESA genes when overexpressed (Chai et al., 2015). More recently other transcription factor families have been implicated in cellulose synthesis regulation, such as *WRKY* and *ERF*. Cellulose deposition is stimulated in *wrky12* mutants (Wang et al., 2010) or when the *ERF* transcription factor, *PdSHINE2*, is overexpressed in tobacco (Liu et al., 2017).

5.2. Post-translational regulation

Constitutive expression of CESA genes in primary cell walls implies that post-transcriptional regulation may be more important for regulating cellulose synthesis (Hamann et al., 2004). Arguably, the best studied form of post-translational regulation is phosphorylation (Speicher, Li, & Wallace, 2018). Phosphoproteomic analysis of primary CESA proteins demonstrated that many sites in the N-terminus and HVR of the central loop contain conserved serine (S) and threonine (T) residues that have the potential to be phosphorylated (Durek, Schudoma, Weckwerth, Selbig, & Walther, 2009; Nuhse, Stensballe, Jensen, & Peck, 2004). The effects of phosphorylation were first examined by mutating S and T sites to alanine (A) that eliminates phosphorylation, or glutamine (E) that mimics phosphorylation. Inhibiting phosphorylation at $T^{166}A$, $S^{686}A$ and $S^{688}A$ residues in the HVR of *cesa1*^{rsw1} mutants produced a variety of cellulose defective phenotypes, including reduced cellulose content, poor anisotropic cell expansion, reduced CSC velocity and the loss of bi-directional movement, which were all rescued when phosphorylation was restored (Chen, Ehrhardt, & Somerville, 2010). In contrast, permitting phosphorylation at $S^{162}E$, $T^{165}E$ and $S^{167}E$ in *cesa1*^{rsw1} mutants caused cellulose defective phenotypes, indicating that a balance between de-phosphorylation and phosphorylation finely tunes the regulation of *CESA1* (Chen et al., 2010). Removing microtubules with oryzalin rescued the velocity and bi-directional movement of *CESA1* at the membrane, supporting the idea that the phosphorylation of CESA proteins may modulate microfibril synthesis and anisotropic growth by its interaction with microtubules (Chen et al., 2010). Similar studies on *CESA3* and *CESA5* have reinforced that phosphorylation is critical for cellulose synthesis regulation in primary cell walls. For example, phosphorylation of $S^{211}A$ and de-phosphorylation of $T^{212}E$ of *CESA3* is crucial for maintaining anisotropy, deposition, bundling and bi-directional microtubule-based motility at the membrane (Chen et al., 2016) and phosphorylating *CESA5* alters the migration of CSC in a phytochrome dependent manner (Bischoff et al., 2011). Phosphorylation may also be important for mediating CESA endocytosis in the secondary cell wall since *in vitro* phosphorylation of *CESA7* causes its degradation *via* the proteosome (Taylor and Turner, 2007). Identifying the corresponding protein kinases that activate phosphorylation has proved troublesome, with conflicting evidence in the literature and large genetic redundancies in kinase families (McFarlane et al., 2014). In Arabidopsis, the protein kinase *BRASSINOSTEROID INSENSITIVE 2 (BIN2)* can phosphorylate a *CESA1* peptide, *CESA1*^{T157}, *in vitro* (Sanchez-Rodriguez et al., 2017). In *cesa1 bin2-1* double mutants, the CSC moves significantly faster at the membrane, implicating *BIN2* as a negative regulator of cellulose synthesis in the primary cell wall (Sanchez-Rodriguez et al., 2017). *BIN2* phosphorylation impacts the activity of the entire CSC, even though it cannot phosphorylate *CESA3* or *CESA6* peptides, demonstrating the importance of phosphorylation as a regulatory mechanism.

More recently it was revealed that secondary cell wall CESAs are heavily modified by the attachment of the fatty acid palmitate at conserved cysteine residues, also known as S-acylation. Mutating four cysteines in the VR2 and two cysteines in the C-terminal domain of *CESA7* prevented the trafficking of *CESA7* to the plasma membrane from the Golgi (Kumar et al., 2016). The role of S-acylation may be broadened to include other aspects of cellulose biosynthesis, since many important non-CESA proteins such as *KOR1; CMU; CC; SHOU; PTL1;* and CME components are also acylated (Kumar et al., 2020). Furthermore, heavy S-acylation of *CESA3* and *CSI1* suggests S-acylation may function in primary cell walls (Kumar et al., 2016, 2020). Although many of these assumptions have not been yet been functionally tested, it is probable that S-acylation is a dominant regulator of post-translational processes that we have only just begun to understand.

6. Significant achievements and future directions

Remarkably, many of the original hypotheses that were based on simple TEM observations and X-ray diffraction patterns in bacteria and algae, have stood the test of time and have been verified in higher plants by using a range of more accurate techniques (Table 1). Although revisiting other long-standing hypotheses with more sensitive techniques has revealed that some concepts are too simplistic to account for the diversity in cell wall architecture. Most notably the multi-net growth hypothesis is insufficient to explain anisotropy in all conditions and the relationship between CSCs and microtubules is not universally coupled. Significant progress in our capacities to study cellulose synthesis *in vivo* with live-cell imaging, AFM, FESEM and molecular genetics has resulted in some drastic changes in our understanding of some key aspects of cellulose synthesis, and in some cases has divided research groups. In the last 10 years, the 36-glucan chain model has been disregarded in favor of an 18−24 chain model, new models of cell elongation have been proposed and even the classic 8 transmembrane CESA-model has been brought into question (Table 1). While *Arabidopsis* has proved an invaluable model for enhancing our understanding of cellulose synthesis, these results need to be approached with caution as this system may not be representative of higher plants in general. Broadening the sample types may help settle variable findings between research groups and will strengthen the validity of hypotheses across higher plants. With many unanswered or modified hypotheses still requiring verification (Table 1), we can expect many great discoveries and changes in the field during this century. Adopting multidisciplinary strategies that link together the biophysical and biochemical properties of cellulose with underlying genetics and cell wall architecture, will be fundamental for this venture. Successful purification of CSCs, imaging the entire CSC *in situ* and assigning functions to microfibril properties are arguably the next major breakthroughs on the agenda in order to advance the study of cellulose synthesis, as such fundamental knowledge will be critical to eventually manipulate cellulose synthesis for desired use.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Holly Allen: Conceptualization, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Donghui Wei:** Conceptualization, Visualization, Writing - review & editing. **Ying Gu:** Conceptualization, Writing - review & editing, Funding acquisition. **Shundai Li:** Conceptualization, Project administration, Writing - review & editing.

Acknowledgements

H.A. and Y.G. were supported by National Science Foundation Grant 1951007. D.W. was supported by the Center for LignoCellulose Structure and Formation, an Energy Frontier Research Center funded by the Department of Energy, Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences under Award DESC0001090. S.L. was supported by startup funds from the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology at Pennsylvania State University.

References

Amor, Y., Haigler, C. H., Johnson, S., Wainscott, M., & Delmer, D. P. (1995). A membrane-associated form of sucrose synthase and its potential role in synthesis of cellulose and callose in plants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 92*(20), 9353–9357. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.92.20.9353

Anderson, C. T., Carroll, A., Akhmetova, L., & Somerville, C. (2010). Real-time imaging of cellulose reorientation during cell wall expansion in Arabidopsis roots. *Plant Physiology, 152*(2), 787–796. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.109.150128

Andersson-Gunneråas, S., Mellerowicz, E., Love, J., Segerman, B., Ohmiya, Y., Coutinho, P., & Sundberg, B. (2006). Biosynthesis of cellulose-enriched tension wood in *Populus*: Global analysis of transcripts and metabolites identifies biochemical and developmental regulators in secondary wall biosynthesis. *The Plant Journal, 45*(2), 144–165. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-313X.2005.02584.x

Arioli, T., Peng, L., Betzner, A. S., Burn, J., Wittke, W., Herth, W., & Williamson, R. E. (1998). Molecular analysis of cellulose biosynthesis in Arabidopsis. *Science, 279*(5351), 717–720. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.279.5351.717

Atalla, R. H., & Vanderhart, D. L. (1984). Native cellulose: A composite of two distinct crystalline forms. *Science, 223*(4633), 283–285. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.223.4633.283

Atanassov, I. I., Pittman, J. K., & Turner, S. R. (2009). Elucidating the mechanisms of assembly and subunit interaction of the cellulose synthase complex of Arabidopsis secondary cell walls. *The Journal of Biological Chemistry, 284*(6), 3833–3841. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M807456200

Bashline, L., Li, S., Anderson, C. T., Lei, L., & Gu, Y. (2013). The endocytosis of cellulose synthase in Arabidopsis is dependent on mu2, a clathrin-mediated endocytosis adaptin. *Plant Physiology, 163*(1), 150–160. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.113.221234

Bashline, L., Li, S., Zhu, X., & Gu, Y. (2015). The TWD40-2 protein and the AP2 complex cooperate in the clathrin-mediated endocytosis of cellulose synthase to regulate cellulose biosynthesis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 112*(41), 12870–12875. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1509292112

Bashline, L., Lei, L., Li, S., & Gu, Y. (2014). Cell wall, cytoskeleton, and cell expansion in higher plants. *Molecular Plant, 7*(4), 586–600. https://doi.org/10.1093/mp/ssu018

Bashline, L., Li, S., & Gu, Y. (2014). The trafficking of the cellulose synthase complex in higher plants. *Annals of Botany, 114*(6), 1059–1067. https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcu040

Baskin, T. I. (2005). Anisotropic expansion of the plant cell wall. *Annual Review of Cell and Developmental Biology, 21*, 203–222. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.cellbio.20.082503.103053

Benfey, P. N., Linstead, P. J., Roberts, K., Schiefelbein, J. W., Hauser, M. T., & Aeschbacher, R. A. (1993). Root development in Arabidopsis: Four mutants with dramatically altered root morphogenesis. *Development, 119*(1), 57–70.

Benziman, M., Haigler, C. H., Brown, R. M., White, A. R., & Cooper, K. M. (1980). Cellulose biogenesis: Polymerization and crystallization are coupled processes in *Acetobacter xylinum*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 77*(11), 6678–6682. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.77.11.6678

Bischoff, V., Desprez, T., Mouille, G., Vernhettes, S., Gonneau, M., & Hofte, H. (2011). Phytochrome regulation of cellulose synthesis in Arabidopsis. *Current Biology, 21*(21), 1822–1827. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2011.09.026

Bowling, A. J., & Brown, R. M., Jr. (2008). The cytoplasmic domain of the cellulose-synthesizing complex in vascular plants. *Protoplasma, 233*(1–2), 115–127. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00709-008-0302-2

Brett, C. (2000). Cellulose microfibrils in plants: biosynthesis, deposition, and integration into the cell wall. *International Review of Cytology, 199*, 161–199. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0074-7696(00)99004-1

Bringmann, M., Li, E., Sampathkumar, A., Kocabek, T., Hauser, M. T., & Persson, S. (2012). POM-POM2/cellulose synthase interacting1 is essential for the functional association of cellulose synthase and microtubules in Arabidopsis. *The Plant Cell, 24*(1), 163–177. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.111.093575

Brown, R. (1996). The biosynthesis of cellulose. *Journal of Macromolecular Science – Pure and Applied Chemistry, 33*(10), 1345–1373. https://doi.org/10.1080/10601329608014912

Brown, R., & Montezinos, D. (1976). Cellulose microfibrils: Visualization of biosynthetic and orienting complexes in association with the plasma membrane. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 73*(1), 143–147. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.73.1.143

Brown, R. M. J., & Saxena, I. M. (2000). Cellulose biosynthesis: A model for understanding the assembly of biopolymers. *Plant Physiology and Biochemistry, 38*(1–2), 57–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0981-9428(00)00168-6

Brown, D. M., Zeef, L., Ellis, J., Goodacre, R., & Turner, S. (2005). Identification of novel genes in Arabidopsis involved in secondary cell wall formation using expression profiling and reverse genetics. *The Plant Cell, 17*(8), 2281–2295. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.105.031542

Brown, R. J., Franke, W. W., Kleinig, H., Falk, H., & Sitte, P. (1970). Scale formation in chrysophycean algae. I. Cellulosic and noncellulosic wall components made by the Golgi apparatus. *The Journal of Cell Biology, 45*(2), 246–271. https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.45.2.246

Carroll, A., Mansoori, N., Li, S., Lei, L., Vernhettes, S., Visser, R. G., & Trindade, L. M. (2012). Complexes with mixed primary and secondary cellulose synthases are functional in Arabidopsis plants. *Plant Physiology, 160*(2), 726–737. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.112.199208

Chai, G. H., Kong, Y. Z., Zhu, M., Yu, L., Qi, G., Tang, X. F., & Zhou, G. K. (2015). Arabidopsis C3H14 and C3H15 have overlapping roles in the regulation of secondary wall thickening and anther development. *Journal of Experimental Botany, 66*(9), 2595–2609. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erv060

Chan, J., & Coen, E. (2020). Interaction between autonomous and microtubule guidance systems controls cellulose synthase trajectories. *Current Biology, 30*(5), 941–947. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2019.12.066. e942.

Chan, J., Crowell, E., Eder, M., Calder, G., Bunnewell, S., Findlay, K., & Lloyd, C. (2010). The rotation of cellulose synthase trajectories is microtubule dependent and influences the texture of epidermal cell walls in Arabidopsis hypocotyls. *Journal of Cell Science, 123*(Pt 20), 3490–3495. https://doi.org/10.1242/jcs.074641

Chan, J., Eder, M., Crowell, E. F., Hampson, J., Calder, G., & Lloyd, C. (2011). Microtubules and CESA tracks at the inner epidermal wall align independently of those on the outer wall of light-grown Arabidopsis hypocotyls. *Journal of Cell Science, 124*(Pt 7), 1088–1094. https://doi.org/10.1242/jcs.086702

Chen, S., Ehrhardt, D. W., & Somerville, C. R. (2010). Mutations of cellulose synthase (CESA1) phosphorylation sites modulate anisotropic cell expansion and bidirectional mobility of cellulose synthase. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 107*(40), 17188–17193. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1012348107

Chen, S., Jia, H., Zhao, H., Liu, D., Liu, Y., Liu, B., & Somerville, C. R. (2016). Anisotropic cell expansion is affected through the bidirectional mobility of cellulose synthase complexes and phosphorylation at two critical residues on CESA3. *Plant Physiology, 171*(1), 242–250. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.15.01874

Cho, S. H., Purushotham, P., Fang, C., Maranas, C., Diaz-Moreno, S. M., Bulone, V., & Nixon, B. T. (2017). Synthesis and self-assembly of cellulose microfibrils from reconstituted cellulose synthase. *Plant Physiology, 175*(1), 146–156. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.17.00619

Chu, Z., Chen, H., Zhang, Y., Zhang, Z., Zheng, N., Yin, B., & Xie, Q. (2007). Knockout of the AtCESA2 gene affects microtubule orientation and causes abnormal cell expansion in Arabidopsis. *Plant Physiology, 143*(1), 213–224. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.106.088393

Coleman, J., Evans, D., & Hawes, C. (1988). Plant coated vesicles. *Plant, Cell & Environment, 11*(8), 669–684. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.1988.tb01150.x

Cosgrove, D. J. (2016). Plant cell wall extensibility: Connecting plant cell growth with cell wall structure, mechanics, and the action of wall-modifying enzymes. *Journal of Experimental Botany, 67*(2), 463–476. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erv511

Cosgrove, D. J., & Jarvis, M. C. (2012). Comparative structure and biomechanics of plant primary and secondary cell walls. *Frontiers in Plant Science, 3*, 204. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2012.00204

Cousins, S. K., & Brown, R. M. (1997). X-Ray diffraction and ultrastructural analyses of dye-altered celluloses support van der Waals forces as the initial step in cellulose crystallization. *Polymer, 38*(4), 897–902. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0032-3861(96)00589-7

Crowell, E. F., Bischoff, V., Desprez, T., Rolland, A., Stierhof, Y. D., Schumacher, K., & Vernhettes, S. (2009). Pausing of Golgi bodies on microtubules regulates secretion of cellulose synthase complexes in Arabidopsis. *The Plant Cell, 21*(4), 1141–1154. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.108.065334

Crowell, E. F., Timpano, H., Desprez, T., Franssen-Verheijen, T., Emons, A. M., Hofte, H., … Vernhettes, S. (2011). Differential regulation of cellulose orientation at the inner and outer face of epidermal cells in the Arabidopsis hypocotyl. *The Plant Cell, 23*(7), 2592–2605. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.111.087338

Delmer, D. P. (1999). CELLULOSE BIOSYNTHESIS: Exciting times for a difficult field of study. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology, 50*, 245–276. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.arplant.50.1.245

Derbyshire, P., Menard, D., Green, P., Saalbach, G., Buschmann, H., Lloyd, C. W., … Pesquet, E. (2015). Proteomic analysis of microtubule interacting proteins over the course of xylem tracheary element formation in Arabidopsis. *The Plant Cell, 27*(10), 2709–2726. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.15.00314

Desprez, T., Juraniec, M., Crowell, E. F., Jouy, H., Pochylova, Z., Parcy, F., & Vernhettes, S. (2007). Organization of cellulose synthase complexes involved in primary cell wall synthesis in Arabidopsis thaliana. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 104*(39), 15572–15577. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0706569104

Diotallevi, F., & Mulder, B. (2007). The cellulose synthase complex: A polymerization driven supramolecular motor. *Biophysical Journal, 92*(8), 2666–2673. https://doi.org/10.1529/biophysj.106.099473

Drakakaki, G., van de Ven, W., Pan, S., Miao, Y., Wang, J., Keinath, N. F., & Raikhel, N. (2012). Isolation and proteomic analysis of the SYP61 compartment reveal its role in exocytic trafficking in Arabidopsis. *Cell Research, 22*(2), 413–424. https://doi.org/10.1038/cr.2011.129

Durek, P., Schudoma, C., Weckwerth, W., Selbig, J., & Walther, D. (2009). Detection and characterization of 3D-signature phosphorylation site motifs and their contribution towards improved phosphorylation site prediction in proteins. *BMC Bioinformatics, 10*, 117. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-10-117

Endler, A., Kesten, C., Schneider, R., Zhang, Y., Ivakov, A., Froehlich, A., & Persson, S. (2015). A mechanism for sustained cellulose synthesis during salt stress. *Cell, 162*(6), 1353–1364. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2015.08.028

Engelhardt, J. (1995). Sources, industrial derivatives and commercial applications of cellulose. *Carbohydrates in Europe, 12*, 5–14.

Fagard, M., Desnos, T., Desprez, T., Goubet, F., Refregier, G., Mouille, G., & Hofte, H. (2000). PROCUSTE1 encodes a cellulose synthase required for normal cell elongation specifically in roots and dark-grown hypocotyls of Arabidopsis. *The Plant Cell, 12*(12), 2409–2424. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.12.12.2409

Felten, J., & Sundberg, B. (2013). Biology, chemistry and structure of tension Wood. In J. Fromm (Ed.), *Cellular aspects of wood formation* (pp. 203–224). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36491-4_8. #Springer-Verlag.

Fernandes, A. N., Thomas, L. H., Altaner, C. M., Callow, P., Forsyth, V. T., Apperley, D. C., & Jarvis, M. C. (2011). Nanostructure of cellulose microfibrils in spruce wood. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 108*(47), E1195–E1203. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1108942108

Fisher, D. D., & Cyr, R. J. (1998). Extending the microtubule/microfibril paradigm. Cellulose synthesis is required for normal cortical microtubule alignment in elongating cells. *Plant Physiology, 116*(3), 1043–1051. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.116.3.1043

Foston, M., Hubbell, C. A., Samuel, R., Jung, S., Fan, H., Ding, S., & Ragauskas, J. (2011). Chemical, ultrastructural and supramolecular analysis of tension wood in *Populus tremula* x *alba* as a model substrate for reduced recalcitrance. *Energy & Environmental Science, 4*, 4962–4971.

Fujita, M., Himmelspach, R., Hocart, C. H., Williamson, R. E., Mansfield, S. D., & Wasteneys, G. O. (2011). Cortical microtubules optimize cell-wall crystallinity to drive unidirectional growth in Arabidopsis. *The Plant Journal, 66*(6), 915–928. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-313X.2011.04552.x

Fujita, M., Lechner, B., Barton, D. A., Overall, R. L., & Wasteneys, G. O. (2012). The missing link: do cortical microtubules define plasma membrane nanodomains that modulate cellulose biosynthesis? *Protoplasma, 249*(Suppl 1), S59–67. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00709-011-0332-z

Gadeyne, A., Sanchez-Rodriguez, C., Vanneste, S., Di Rubbo, S., Zauber, H., Vanneste, K., & Van Damme, D. (2014). The TPLATE adaptor complex drives clathrin-mediated endocytosis in plants. *Cell, 156*(4), 691–704. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2014.01.039

Gardiner, J. C., Taylor, N. G., & Turner, S. R. (2003). Control of cellulose synthase complex localization in developing xylem. *The Plant Cell, 15*(8), 1740–1748. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.012815

Gardner, K. H., & Blackwell, J. (1974). The structure of native cellulose. *Biopolymers, 13*(10), 1975–2001. https://doi.org/10.1002/bip.1974.360131005

Giddings, T. H., Jr., & Staehelin, L. A. (1991). Microtubule-mediated control of microfibril deposition: A re-examination of the hypothesis. In C. W. Lloyd (Ed.), *The cytoskeletal basis of plant growth and form* (pp. 85–100). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Giddings, T. H., Jr., Brower, D. L., & Staehelin, L. A. (1980). Visualization of particle complexes in the plasma membrane of Micrasterias denticulata associated with the formation of cellulose fibrils in primary and secondary cell walls. *The Journal of Cell Biology, 84*(2), 327–339. https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.84.2.327

Gonneau, M., Desprez, T., Guillot, A., Vernhettes, S., & Hofte, H. (2014). Catalytic subunit stoichiometry within the cellulose synthase complex. *Plant Physiology, 166*(4), 1709–1712. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.114.250159

Goss, C. A., Brockmann, D. J., Bushoven, J. T., & Roberts, A. W. (2012). A CELLULOSE SYNTHASE (CESA) gene essential for gametophore morphogenesis in the moss Physcomitrella patens. *Planta, 235*(6), 1355–1367. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00425-011-1579-5

Green, P. B. (1960). Multinet growth in the cell wall of Nitella. *The Journal of Biophysical and Biochemical Cytology, 7*, 289–296. https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.7.2.289

Green, P. B. (1962). Mechanism for plant cellular morphogenesis. *Science, 138*(3548), 1404–1405. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.138.3548.1404

Gu, Y., Kaplinsky, N., Bringmann, M., Cobb, A., Carroll, A., Sampathkumar, A., & Somerville, C. R. (2010). Identification of a cellulose synthase-associated protein required for cellulose biosynthesis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 107*(29), 12866–12871. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1007092107

Guerriero, G., Fugelstad, J., & Bulone, V. (2010). What do we really know about cellulose biosynthesis in higher plants? *Journal of Integrative Plant Biology, 52*(2), 161–175. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7909.2010.00935.x

Gutierrez, R., Lindeboom, J. J., Paredez, A. R., Emons, A. M., & Ehrhardt, D. W. (2009). Arabidopsis cortical microtubules position cellulose synthase delivery to the plasma membrane and interact with cellulose synthase trafficking compartments. *Nature Cell Biology, 11*(7), 797–806. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncb1886

Haigler, C. H., & Brown, R. M. (1986). Transport of rosettes from the golgi apparatus to the plasma membrane in isolated mesophyll cells of Zinnia elegans during differentiation to tracheary elements in suspension culture. *Protoplasma, 134*(2–3), 111–120. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01275709

Haigler, C. H., & Roberts, A. W. (2018). Structure/function relationships in the rosette cellulose synthesis complex illuminated by an evolutionary perspective. *Cellulose, 26*(1), 227–247. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10570-018-2157-9

Hamann, T., Osborne, E., Youngs, H. L., Misson, J., Nussaume, L., & Somerville, C. (2004). Global expression analysis of CESA and CSL genes in Arabidopsis. *Cellulose, 11*(3/4), 279–286. https://doi.org/10.1023/b:Cell.0000046340.99925.57

Harris, D. M., Corbin, K., Wang, T., Gutierrez, R., Bertolo, A. L., Petti, C., & Debolt, S. (2012). Cellulose microfibril crystallinity is reduced by mutating C-terminal transmembrane region residues CESA1A903V and CESA3T942I of cellulose synthase. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 109*(11), 4098–4103. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1200352109

Hauser, M. T., Morikami, A., & Benfey, P. N. (1995). Conditional root expansion mutants of *Arabidopsis*. *Development, 121*, 1237–1252.

He, M., Lan, M., Zhang, B., Zhou, Y., Wang, Y., Zhu, L., & Fu, Y. (2018). Rab-H1b is essential for trafficking of cellulose synthase and for hypocotyl growth in Arabidopsis thaliana. *Journal of Integrative Plant Biology, 60*(11), 1051–1069. https://doi.org/10.1111/jipb.12694

Heath, I. B. (1974). A unified hypothesis for the role of membrane bound enzyme complexes and microtubules in plant cell wall synthesis. *Journal of Theoretical Biology, 48*(2), 445–449. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-5193(74)80011-1

Hepler, P. K., & Newcomb, E. H. (1964). Microtubules and fibrils in the cytoplasm of coleus cells undergoing secondary wall deposition. *The Journal of Cell Biology, 20*, 529–532. https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.20.3.529

Hermans, P., de Booys, J., & Maan, C. (1943). Form and mobility of cellulose molecules. *Kolloid-Z, 102*, 169.

Herth, W. (1983). Arrays of plasma-membrane "rosettes" involved in cellulose microfibril formation of Spirogyra. *Planta, 159*(4), 347–356. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00393174

Herth, W. (1985). Plasma-membrane rosettes involved in localized wall thickening during xylem vessel formation of Lepidium sativum L. *Planta, 164*(1), 12–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00391020

Hill, J. L., Jr., Hammudi, M. B., & Tien, M. (2014). The Arabidopsis cellulose synthase complex: A proposed hexamer of CESA trimers in an equimolar stoichiometry. *The Plant Cell, 26*(12), 4834–4842. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.114.131193

Hill, J. L., Jr., Hill, A. N., Roberts, A. W., Haigler, C. H., & Tien, M. (2018). Domain swaps of Arabidopsis secondary wall cellulose synthases to elucidate their class specificity. *Plant Direct, 2*(7), e00061. https://doi.org/10.1002/pld3.61

Himmelspach, R., Williamson, R. E., & Wasteneys, G. O. (2003). Cellulose microfibril alignment recovers from DCB-induced disruption despite microtubule disorganization. *The Plant Journal, 36*(4), 565–575. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-313x.2003.01906.x

Holstein, S. E. (2002). Clathrin and plant endocytosis. *Traffic, 3*(9), 614–620. https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0854.2002.30903.x

Jacob-Wilk, D., Kurek, I., Hogan, P., & Delmer, D. P. (2006). The cotton fiber zinc-binding domain of cellulose synthase A1 from Gossypium hirsutum displays rapid turnover in vitro and in vivo. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 103*(32), 12191–12196. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0605098103

Kesten, C., et al. (2019). The companion of cellulose synthase 1 confers salt tolerance through a Tau-like mechanism in plants. *Nat Commun, 10*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-08780-3

Kim, W. C., Kim, J. Y., Ko, J. H., Kim, J., & Han, K. H. (2013). Transcription factor MYB46 is an obligate component of the transcriptional regulatory complex for functional expression of secondary wall-associated cellulose synthases in Arabidopsis thaliana. *Journal of Plant Physiology, 170*(15), 1374–1378. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jplph.2013.04.012

Kim, W. C., Ko, J. H., Kim, J. Y., Kim, J., Bae, H. J., & Han, K. H. (2013). MYB46 directly regulates the gene expression of secondary wall-associated cellulose synthases in Arabidopsis. *The Plant Journal, 73*(1), 26–36. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-313x.2012.05124

Kimura, S., & Itoh, T. (1996). New cellulose synthesizing complexes (terminal complexes) involved in animal cellulose biosynthesis in the tunicate *Metandrocarpa uedai*. *Protoplasma, 194*, 151–163. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01882023

Kimura, S., Laosinchai, W., Itoh, T., Cui, X., Linder, C. R., & Brown, R. M., Jr. (1999). Immunogold labeling of rosette terminal cellulose-synthesizing complexes in the vascular plant Vigna angularis. *The Plant Cell, 11*(11), 2075–2086. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.11.11.2075

Ko, J. H., Kim, W. C., & Han, K. H. (2009). Ectopic expression of MYB46 identifies transcriptional regulatory genes involved in secondary wall biosynthesis in Arabidopsis. *The Plant Journal, 60*(4), 649–665. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-313X.2009.03989.x

Kumar, M., Atanassov, I., & Turner, S. (2017). Functional analysis of cellulose synthase (CESA) protein class specificity. *Plant Physiology, 173*(2), 970–983. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.16.01642

Kumar, M., Carr, P., & Turner, S., 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.12.090415.

Kumar, M., Wightman, R., Atanassov, I., Gupta, A., Hurst, C. H., Hemsley, P. A., … Turner, S. (2016). S-Acylation of the cellulose synthase complex is essential for its plasma membrane localization. *Science, 353*(6295), 166–169. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf4009

Kurek, I., Kawagoe, Y., Jacob-Wilk, D., Doblin, M., & Delmer, D. (2002). Dimerization of cotton fiber cellulose synthase catalytic subunits occurs via oxidation of the zinc-binding domains. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 99*(17), 11109–11114. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.162077099

Lai-Kee-Him, J., Chanzy, H., Muller, M., Putaux, J. L., Imai, T., & Bulone, V. (2002). In vitro versus in vivo cellulose microfibrils from plant primary wall synthases: Structural differences. *The Journal of Biological Chemistry, 277*(40), 36931–36939. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M203530200

Lampugnani, E. R., Flores-Sandoval, E., Tan, Q. W., Mutwil, M., Bowman, J. L., & Persson, S. (2019). Cellulose synthesis - central components and their evolutionary relationships. *Trends in Plant Science, 24*(5), 402–412. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2019.02.011

Ledbetter, M. C., & Porter, K. R. (1963). A "Microtubule" in plant cell fine structure. *The Journal of Cell Biology, 19*(1), 239–250. https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.19.1.239

Lei, L., Singh, A., Bashline, L., Li, S., Yingling, Y. G., & Gu, Y. (2015). CELLULOSE SYNTHASE INTERACTIVE1 is required for fast recycling of cellulose synthase complexes to the plasma membrane in Arabidopsis. *The Plant Cell, 27*(10), 2926–2940. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.15.00442

Lei, L., Zhang, T., Strasser, R., Lee, C. M., Gonneau, M., Mach, L., & Gu, Y. (2014). The jiaoyao1 mutant is an Allele of korrigan1 that abolishes endoglucanase activity and affects the organization of both cellulose microfibrils and microtubules in Arabidopsis. *The Plant Cell, 26*(6), 2601–2616. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.114.126193

Li, S., Bashline, L., Lei, L., & Gu, Y. (2014). Cellulose synthesis and its regulation. *The Arabidopsis Book, 12*, e0169. https://doi.org/10.1199/tab.0169

Li, S., Bashline, L., Zheng, Y., Xin, X., Huang, S., Kong, Z., & Gu, Y. (2016). Cellulose synthase complexes act in a concerted fashion to synthesize highly aggregated cellulose in secondary cell walls of plants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 113*(40), 11348–11353. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1613273113

Li, S., Lei, L., & Gu, Y. (2013). Functional analysis of complexes with mixed primary and secondary cellulose synthases. *Plant Signaling & Behavior, 8*(3), e23179. https://doi.org/10.4161/psb.23179

Li, S., Lei, L., Somerville, C. R., & Gu, Y. (2012). Cellulose synthase interactive protein 1 (CSI1) links microtubules and cellulose synthase complexes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 109*(1), 185–190. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1118560109

Li, S., Lei, L., Yingling, Y. G., & Gu, Y. (2015). Microtubules and cellulose biosynthesis: The emergence of new players. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology, 28*, 76–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2015.09.002

Li, X., Speicher, T. L., Dees, D., Mansoori, N., McManus, J. B., Tien, M., & Roberts, A. W. (2019). Convergent evolution of hetero-oligomeric cellulose synthesis complexes in mosses and seed plants. *The Plant Journal, 99*(5), 862–876. https://doi.org/10.1111/tpj.14366

Liu, L., Shang-Guan, K., Zhang, B., Liu, X., Yan, M., Zhang, L., & Zhou, Y. (2013). Brittle Culm1, a COBRA-like protein, functions in cellulose assembly through binding cellulose microfibrils. *PLoS Genetics, 9*(8), e1003704. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1003704

Liu, Y., Wei, M., Hou, C., Lu, T., Liu, L., Wei, H., … Wei, Z. (2017). Functional characterization of populus PsnSHN2 in coordinated regulation of secondary wall components in tobacco. *Scientific Reports, 7*(1), 42. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-00093-z

Liu, Z., Schneider, R., Kesten, C., Zhang, Y., Somssich, M., Zhang, Y., … Persson, S. (2016). Cellulose-microtubule uncoupling proteins prevent lateral displacement of microtubules during cellulose synthesis in Arabidopsis. *Developmental Cell, 38*(3), 305–315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.devcel.2016.06.032

Luo, Y., Scholl, S., Doering, A., Zhang, Y., Irani, N. G., Rubbo, S. D., & Russinova, E. (2015). V-ATPase activity in the TGN/EE is required for exocytosis and recycling in Arabidopsis. *Nature Plants, 1*, 15094. https://doi.org/10.1038/nplants.2015.94

MacMillan, C. P., Birke, H., Chuah, A., Brill, E., Tsuji, Y., Ralph, J., & Pettolino, F. A. (2017). Tissue and cell-specific transcriptomes in cotton reveal the subtleties of gene regulation underlying the diversity of plant secondary cell walls. *BMC Genomics, 18*(1), 539. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-017-3902-4

Maloney, V. J., & Mansfield, S. D. (2010). Characterization and varied expression of a membrane-bound endo-beta-1,4-glucanase in hybrid poplar. *Plant Biotechnology Journal, 8*(3), 294–307. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7652.2009.00483.x

Mansoori, N., Timmers, J., Desprez, T., Alvim-Kamei, C. L., Dees, D. C., Vincken, J. P., & Trindade, L. M. (2014). KORRIGAN1 interacts specifically with integral components of the cellulose synthase machinery. *PLoS One, 9*(11), e112387. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0112387

Marga, F., Grandbois, M., Cosgrove, D. J., & Baskin, T. I. (2005). Cell wall extension results in the coordinate separation of parallel microfibrils: Evidence from scanning electron microscopy and atomic force microscopy. *The Plant Journal, 43*(2), 181–190. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-313X.2005.02447.x

Martinez-Sanz, M., Pettolino, F., Flanagan, B., Gidley, M. J., & Gilbert, E. P. (2017). Structure of cellulose microfibrils in mature cotton fibres. *Carbohydrate Polymers, 175*, 450–463. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.carbpol.2017.07.090

McCarthy, R. L., Zhong, R. Q., & Ye, Z. H. (2009). MYB83 is a direct target of SND1 and acts redundantly with MYB46 in the regulation of secondary cell wall biosynthesis in Arabidopsis. *Plant & Cell Physiology, 50*(11), 1950–1964. https://doi.org/10.1093/pcp/pcp139

McFarlane, H. E., Doring, A., & Persson, S. (2014). The cell biology of cellulose synthesis. *Annual Review of Plant Biology, 65*, 69–94. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-050213-040240

Meents, M. J., Watanabe, Y., & Samuels, A. L. (2018). The cell biology of secondary cell wall biosynthesis. *Annals of Botany, 121*(6), 1107–1125. https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcy005

Mendu, V., Griffiths, J. S., Persson, S., Stork, J., Downie, A. B., Voiniciuc, C., & DeBolt, S. (2011). Subfunctionalization of cellulose synthases in seed coat epidermal cells mediates secondary radial wall synthesis and mucilage attachment. *Plant Physiology, 157*(1), 441–453. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.111.179069

Mizuta, S., & Brown, R. M. (1992). High resolution analysis of the formation of cellulose synthesizing complexes in Vaucheria hamata. *Protoplasma, 166*(3–4), 187–199. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01322781

Mizuta, S., & Okuda, K. (1987). Boodlea cell wall microfibril orientation unrelated to cortical microtubule arrangement. *Botanical Gazette, 148*(3), 297–307.

Morejohn, L. (1991). The molecular pharmacology of plant tubulin and microtubules. In C. W. Lloyd (Ed.), *The cytoskeletal basis of plant growth and form* (pp. 29–44). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Morgan, J. L., McNamara, J. T., Fischer, M., Rich, J., Chen, H. M., Withers, S. G., … Zimmer, J. (2016). Observing cellulose biosynthesis and membrane translocation in crystallo. *Nature, 531*(7594), 329–334. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16966

Morgan, J. L., Strumillo, J., & Zimmer, J. (2013). Crystallographic snapshot of cellulose synthesis and membrane translocation. *Nature, 493*(7431), 181–186. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11744

Mueller, S. C., & Brown, R. M., Jr. (1980). Evidence for an intramembrane component associated with a cellulose microfibril-synthesizing complex in higher plants. *The Journal of Cell Biology, 84*(2), 315–326. https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.84.2.315

Müller, M., Burghammer, M., & Sugiyama, J. (2006). Direct investigation of the structural properties of tension wood cellulose microfibrils using microbeam X-ray fibre diffraction. *Holzforschung, 60*(5), 474–479. https://doi.org/10.1515/hf.2006.078

Neumann, U., Brandizzi, F., & Hawes, C. (2003). Protein transport in plant cells: In and out of the Golgi. *Annals of Botany, 92*(2), 167–180. https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcg134

Newman, R., & Hemmingson, J. (1990). Determination of the degree of cellulose crystallinity in wood by carbon-13 nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy. *Holzforschung, 44*(5), 351–355.

Newman, R. H., Hill, S. J., & Harris, P. J. (2013). Wide-angle x-ray scattering and solid-state nuclear magnetic resonance data combined to test models for cellulose microfibrils in mung bean cell walls. *Plant Physiology, 163*(4), 1558–1567. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.113.228262

Nicol, F., His, I., Jauneau, A., Vernhettes, S., Canut, H., & Hofte, H. (1998). A plasma membrane-bound putative endo-1,4-beta-D-glucanase is required for normal wall assembly and cell elongation in Arabidopsis. *The EMBO Journal, 17*(19), 5563–5576. https://doi.org/10.1093/emboj/17.19.5563

Niimura, H., Yokoyama, T., Kimura, S., Matsumoto, Y., & Kuga, S. (2009). AFM observation of ultrathin microfibrils in fruit tissues. *Cellulose, 17*(1), 13–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10570-009-9361-6

Nixon, B. T., Mansouri, K., Singh, A., Du, J., Davis, J. K., Lee, J. G., … Haigler, C. H. (2016). Comparative structural and computational analysis supports eighteen cellulose synthases in the plant cellulose synthesis complex. *Scientific Reports, 6*, 28696. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep28696

Norris, J. H., Li, X., Huang, S., Van de Meene, A. M. L., Tran, M. L., Killeavy, E., … Roberts, A. W. (2017). Functional specialization of cellulose synthase isoforms in a moss shows parallels with seed plants. *Plant Physiology, 175*(1), 210–222. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.17.00885

Nuhse, T. S., Stensballe, A., Jensen, O. N., & Peck, S. C. (2004). Phosphoproteomics of the Arabidopsis plasma membrane and a new phosphorylation site database. *The Plant Cell, 16*(9), 2394–2405. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.104.023150

Ohlsson, A. B., Djerbi, S., Winzell, A., Bessueille, L., Staldal, V., Li, X., & Berglund, T. (2006). Cell suspension cultures of Populus tremula x P. tremuloides exhibit a high level of cellulose synthase gene expression that coincides with increased in vitro cellulose synthase activity. *Protoplasma, 228*(4), 221–229. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00709-006-0156-4

Olek, A. T., Rayon, C., Makowski, L., Kim, H. R., Ciesielski, P., Badger, J., … Carpita, N. C. (2014). The structure of the catalytic domain of a plant cellulose synthase and its assembly into dimers. *The Plant Cell, 26*(7), 2996–3009. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.114.126862

Pagant, S., Bichet, A., Sugimoto, K., Lerouxel, O., Desprez, T., McCann, M., & Hofte, H. (2002). KOBITO1 encodes a novel plasma membrane protein necessary for normal synthesis of cellulose during cell expansion in Arabidopsis. *The Plant Cell, 14*(9), 2001–2013. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.002873

Paredez, A. R., Persson, S., Ehrhardt, D. W., & Somerville, C. R. (2008). Genetic evidence that cellulose synthase activity influences microtubule cortical array organization. *Plant Physiology, 147*(4), 1723–1734. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.108.120196

Paredez, A. R., Somerville, C. R., & Ehrhardt, D. W. (2006). Visualization of cellulose synthase demonstrates functional association with microtubules. *Science, 312*(5779), 1491–1495. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1126551

Park, S., Song, B., Shen, W., & Ding, S. Y. (2019). A mutation in the catalytic domain of cellulose synthase 6 halts its transport to the Golgi apparatus. *Journal of Experimental Botany, 70*(21), 6071–6083. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erz369

Pear, J. R., Kawagoe, Y., Schreckengost, W. E., Delmer, D. P., & Stalker, D. M. (1996). Higher plants contain homologs of the bacterial celA genes encoding the catalytic subunit of cellulose synthase. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 93*(22), 12637–12642. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.93.22.12637

Persson, S., Paredez, A., Carroll, A., Palsdottir, H., Doblin, M., Poindexter, P., & Somerville, C. R. (2007). Genetic evidence for three unique components in primary cell-wall cellulose synthase complexes in Arabidopsis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 104*(39), 15566–15571. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0706592104

Polko, J. K., Barnes, W. J., Voiniciuc, C., Doctor, S., Steinwand, B., Hill, J. L., Jr., & Kieber, J. J. (2018). SHOU4 proteins regulate trafficking of cellulose synthase

complexes to the plasma membrane. *Current Biology, 28*(19), 3174–3182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2018.07.076. e3176.
Preston, R. D. (1974). *The physical biology of plant cell walls*.
Preston, R. D., Nicolai, E. R., & Millard, A. (1948). An electron microscope study of cellulose in the wall of *Valonia ventricosa*. *Nature, 162*(4121), 665–667. https://doi.org/10.1038/162665a0
Purushotham, P., Cho, S. H., Diaz-Moreno, S. M., Kumar, M., Nixon, B. T., Bulone, V., … Zimmer, J. (2016). A single heterologously expressed plant cellulose synthase isoform is sufficient for cellulose microfibril formation in vitro. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 113*(40), 11360–11365. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1606210113
Purushotham, P., Ho, R., & Zimmer, R. (2020). Architecture of a catalytically active homotrimeric plant cellulose synthase complex. *Science*. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb2978
Rao, X., & Dixon, R. A. (2018). Current models for transcriptional regulation of secondary cell wall biosynthesis in grasses. *Frontiers in Plant Science, 9*, 399. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.00399
Refregier, G., Pelletier, S., Jaillard, D., & Hofte, H. (2004). Interaction between wall deposition and cell elongation in dark-grown hypocotyl cells in Arabidopsis. *Plant Physiology, 135*(2), 959–968. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.104.038711
Reynolds, G. D., Wang, C., Pan, J., & Bednarek, S. Y. (2018). Inroads into internalization: Five years of endocytic exploration. *Plant Physiology, 176*(1), 208–218. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.17.01117
Richmond, T. (2000). Higher plant cellulose synthases. *Genome Biology, 1*(4). https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2000-1-4-reviews3001. REVIEWS3001.
Roberts, A. W., & Bushoven, J. T. (2007). The cellulose synthase (CESA) gene superfamily of the moss Physcomitrella patens. *Plant Molecular Biology, 63*(2), 207–219. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11103-006-9083-1
Roelofsen, P. A. (1958). Cell-wall structure as related to surface growth some supplementary remarks on multinet growth. *Acta Botanica Neerlandica, 7*(1), 77–89. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1438-8677.1958.tb00609.x
Roelofsen, P. A., & Houwink, A. L. (1951). Cell wall structure of staminal hairs of Tradescantia virginica and its relation with growth. *Protoplasma, 40*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01247932
Roelofsen, P. A., & Houwink, A. L. (1953). Architecture and growth of the primary cell wall in some plant hairs and in the Phycomyces sporangiophore. *Acta Botanica Neerlandica, 2*(2), 218–225. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1438-8677.1953.tb00272.x
Roudier, F., Fernandez, A. G., Fujita, M., Himmelspach, R., Borner, G. H., Schindelman, G., & Benfey, P. N. (2005). COBRA, an Arabidopsis extracellular glycosyl-phosphatidyl inositol-anchored protein, specifically controls highly anisotropic expansion through its involvement in cellulose microfibril orientation. *The Plant Cell, 17*(6), 1749–1763. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.105.031732
Rushton, P. S., Olek, A. T., Makowski, L., Badger, J., Steussy, C. N., Carpita, N. C., … Stauffacher, C. V. (2017). Rice cellulose synthaseA8 plant-conserved region is a coiled-coil at the catalytic core entrance. *Plant Physiology, 173*(1), 482–494. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.16.00739
Saelim, L., Akiyoshi, N., Tan, T. T., Ihara, A., Yamaguchi, M., Hirano, K., & Ohtani, M. (2019). Arabidopsis Group IIId ERF proteins positively regulate primary cell wall-type CESA genes. *Journal of Plant Research, 132*(1), 117–129. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10265-018-1074-1
Sakamoto, S., Somssich, M., Mitsuda, N., et al. (2018). Complete substitution of a secondary cell wall with a primary cell wall in Arabidopsis. *Nature Plants*, 777–783. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41477-018-0260-4
Sampathkumar, A., Gutierrez, R., McFarlane, H. E., Bringmann, M., Lindeboom, J., Emons, A. M., & Persson, S. (2013). Patterning and lifetime of plasma membrane-localized cellulose synthase is dependent on actin organization in Arabidopsis interphase cells. *Plant Physiology, 162*(2), 675–688. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.113.215277
Sanchez-Rodriguez, C., Ketelaar, K., Schneider, R., Villalobos, J. A., Somerville, C. R., Persson, S., … Wallace, I. S. (2017). BRASSINOSTEROID INSENSITIVE2 negatively regulates cellulose synthesis in Arabidopsis by phosphorylating cellulose synthase 1. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 114*(13), 3533–3538. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1615005114
Sanchez-Rodriguez, C., Shi, Y., Kesten, C., Zhang, D., Sancho-Andres, G., Ivakov, A., & Persson, S. (2018). The cellulose synthases are cargo of the TPLATE adaptor complex. *Molecular Plant, 11*(2), 346–349. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molp.2017.11.012
Saxena, I. M., & Brown, R. M., Jr. (2005). Cellulose biosynthesis: Current views and evolving concepts. *Annals of Botany, 96*(1), 9–21. https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mci155
Saxena, I. M., Brown, R. M., Jr., & Dandekar, T. (2001). Structure—Function characterization of cellulose synthase: Relationship to other glycosyltransferases. *Phytochemistry, 57*(7), 1135–1148. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0031-9422(01)00048-6
Saxena, I. M., Lin, F. C., & Brown, R. M., Jr. (1990). Cloning and sequencing of the cellulose synthase catalytic subunit gene of Acetobacter xylinum. *Plant Molecular Biology, 15*(5), 673–683. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00016118
Scavuzzo-Duggan, T. R., Chaves, A. M., Singh, A., Sethaphong, L., Slabaugh, E., Yingling, Y. G., & Roberts, A. W. (2018). Cellulose synthase "class specific regions" are intrinsically disordered and functionally undifferentiated. *Journal of Integrative Plant Biology, 60*(6), 481–497. https://doi.org/10.1111/jipb.12637
Schneider, R., Tang, L., Lampugnani, E. R., Barkwill, S., Lathe, R., Zhang, Y., & Persson, S. (2017). Two complementary mechanisms underpin cell wall patterning during xylem vessel development. *The Plant Cell, 29*(10), 2433–2449. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.17.00309
Sethaphong, L., Davis, J. K., Slabaugh, E., Singh, A., Haigler, C. H., & Yingling, Y. G. (2016). Prediction of the structures of the plant-specific regions of vascular plant cellulose synthases and correlated functional analysis. *Cellulose, 23*(1), 145–161. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10570-015-0789-6
Sethaphong, L., Haigler, C. H., Kubicki, J. D., Zimmer, J., Bonetta, D., DeBolt, S., … Yingling, Y. G. (2013). Tertiary model of a plant cellulose synthase. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 110*(18), 7512–7517. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1301027110
Slabaugh, E., Scavuzzo-Duggan, T., Chaves, A., Wilson, L., Wilson, C., Davis, J. K., & Haigler, C. H. (2016). The valine and lysine residues in the conserved FxVTxK motif are important for the function of phylogenetically distant plant cellulose synthase. *Glycobiology, 26*(5), 509–519. https://doi.org/10.1093/glycob/cwv118
Somerville, C. (2006). Cellulose synthesis in higher plants. *Annual Review of Cell and Developmental Biology, 22*, 53–78. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.cellbio.22.022206.160206
Song, B., Zhao, S., Shen, W., Collings, C., & Ding, S. Y. (2020). Direct measurement of plant cellulose microfibril and bundles in native cell walls. *Frontiers in Plant Science, 11*, 479. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.00479
Song, D., Shen, J., & Li, L. (2010). Characterization of cellulose synthase complexes in Populus xylem differentiation. *The New Phytologist, 187*(3), 777–790. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2010.03315.x
Speicher, T. L., Li, P. Z., & Wallace, I. S. (2018). Phosphoregulation of the plant cellulose synthase complex and cellulose synthase-like proteins. *Plants (Basel), 7*(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/plants7030052
Strabala, T. J., & Macmillan, C. P. (2013). The Arabidopsis wood model-the case for the inflorescence stem. *Plant Science, 210*, 193–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plantsci.2013.05.007
Strasser, R. (2018). Protein quality control in the endoplasmic reticulum of plants. *Annual Review of Plant Biology, 69*, 147–172. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-042817-040331
Sugimoto, K., Himmelspach, R., Williamson, R. E., & Wasteneys, G. O. (2003). Mutation or drug-dependent microtubule disruption causes radial swelling without altering parallel cellulose microfibril deposition in Arabidopsis root cells. *The Plant Cell, 15*(6), 1414–1429. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.011593
Suslov, D., Verbelen, J. P., & Vissenberg, K. (2009). Onion epidermis as a new model to study the control of growth anisotropy in higher plants. *Journal of Experimental Botany, 60*(14), 4175–4187. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erp251
Szyjanowicz, P. M., McKinnon, I., Taylor, N. G., Gardiner, J., Jarvis, M. C., & Turner, S. R. (2004). The irregular xylem 2 mutant is an allele of korrigan that affects the secondary cell wall of Arabidopsis thaliana. *The Plant Journal, 37*(5), 730–740. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-313x.2003.02000.x
Taylor, N. G., & Turner, S. (2007). Cellulose synthesis in the Arabidopsis secondary cell wall. In D. M. Brown, & I. M. Saxena (Eds.), *Cellulose: Molecular and structural biology*. Netherlands: Springer.
Taylor, N. G., Howells, R. M., Huttly, A. K., Vickers, K., & Turner, S. R. (2003). Interactions among three distinct CesA proteins essential for cellulose synthesis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 100*(3), 1450–1455. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0337628100
Thomas, L. H., Forsyth, V. T., Sturcova, A., Kennedy, C. J., May, R. P., Altaner, C. M., & Jarvis, M. C. (2013). Structure of cellulose microfibrils in primary cell walls from collenchyma. *Plant Physiology, 161*(1), 465–476. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.112.206359
Tsekos, I. (1999). The sites of cellulose synthesis in algae: Diversity and evolution of cellulose-synthesizing enzyme complexes. *Journal of Phycology, 35*(4), 635–655. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1529-8817.1999.3540635.x
Turner, S. R., & Somerville, C. R. (1997). Collapsed xylem phenotype of Arabidopsis identifies mutants deficient in cellulose deposition in the secondary cell wall. *The Plant Cell, 9*(5), 689–701. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.9.5.689
Uemura, T., Kim, H., Saito, C., Ebine, K., Ueda, T., Schulze-Lefert, P., … Nakano, A. (2012). Qa-SNAREs localized to the trans-Golgi network regulate multiple transport pathways and extracellular disease resistance in plants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 109*(5), 1784–1789. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1115146109
Vain, T., Crowell, E. F., Timpano, H., Biot, E., Desprez, T., Mansoori, N., & Vernhettes, S. (2014). The cellulase KORRIGAN Is Part of the Cellulose Synthase Complex. *Plant Physiology, 165*(4), 1521–1532. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.114.241216
Vandavasi, V. G., Putnam, D. K., Zhang, Q., Petridis, L., Heller, W. T., Nixon, B. T., & O'Neill, H. (2016). A structural study of CESA1 catalytic domain of Arabidopsis cellulose synthesis complex: Evidence for CESA trimers. *Plant Physiology, 170*(1), 123–135. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.15.01356
Vergara, C. E., & Carpita, N. C. (2001). Beta-D-glycan synthases and the CesA gene family: Lessons to be learned from the mixed-linkage (1–>3), (1–>4)beta-D-glucan synthase. *Plant Molecular Biology, 47*, 145–160.
Vernoud, V., Horton, A. C., Yang, Z., & Nielsen, E. (2003). Analysis of the small GTPase gene superfamily of Arabidopsis. *Plant Physiology, 131*(3), 1191–1208. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.013052
Viotti, C., Bubeck, J., Stierhof, Y. D., Krebs, M., Langhans, M., van den Berg, W., & Schumacher, K. (2010). Endocytic and secretory traffic in Arabidopsis merge in the trans-Golgi network/early endosome, an independent and highly dynamic organelle. *The Plant Cell, 22*(4), 1344–1357. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.109.072637
Wang, H., Avci, U., Nakashima, J., Hahn, M. G., Chen, F., & Dixon, R. A. (2010). Mutation of WRKY transcription factors initiates pith secondary wall formation and increases stem biomass in dicotyledonous plants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 107*(51), 22338–22343. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1016436107

Wang, J., Howles, P. A., Cork, A. H., Birch, R. J., & Williamson, R. E. (2006). Chimeric proteins suggest that the catalytic and/or C-terminal domains give CesA1 and CesA3 access to their specific sites in the cellulose synthase of primary walls. *Plant Physiology, 142*(2), 685–695. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.106.084004

Watanabe, Y., Meents, M. J., McDonnell, L. M., Barkwill, S., Sampathkumar, A., Cartwright, H. N., & Mansfield, S. D. (2015). Visualization of cellulose synthases in Arabidopsis secondary cell walls. *Science, 350*(6257), 198–203. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac7446

Watanabe, Y., Schneider, R., Barkwill, S., Gonzales-Vigil, E., Hill, J. L., Jr., Samuels, A. L., & Mansfield, S. D. (2018). Cellulose synthase complexes display distinct dynamic behaviors during xylem trans differentiation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 115*(27), E6366–E6374. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1802113115

Wiedemeier, A. M. D., Judy-March, J. E., Hocart, C. H., Wasteneys, G. O., Williamson, R. E., & Baskin, T. I. (2002). Mutant alleles of *Arabidopsis RADIALLY SWOLLEN 4* and *7* reduce growth anisotropy without altering the transverse orientation of cortical microtubules or cellulose microfibrils. *Development, 129*, 4821–4830.

Wightman, R., & Turner, S. R. (2008). The roles of the cytoskeleton during cellulose deposition at the secondary cell wall. *The Plant Journal, 54*(5), 794–805. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-313X.2008.03444.x

Wolf, S., Hematy, K., & Hofte, H. (2012). Growth control and cell wall signaling in plants. *Annual Review of Plant Biology, 63*, 381–407. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-042811-105449

Wong, H. C., Fear, A. L., Calhoon, R. D., Eichinger, G. H., Mayer, R., Amikam, D., & Tal, R. (1990). Genetic organization of the cellulose synthase operon in Acetobacter xylinum. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 87*(20), 8130–8134. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.87.20.8130

Xie, L., Yang, C., & Wang, X. (2011). Brassinosteroids can regulate cellulose biosynthesis by controlling the expression of CESA genes in Arabidopsis. *Journal of Experimental Botany, 62*(13), 4495–4506. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/err164

Xin, X., Lei, L., Zheng, Y., Zhang, T., Pingali, S. V., O'Neill, H., & Gu, Y. (2020). CELLULOSE SYNTHASE INTERACTIVE1 and Microtubule-Dependent Cell Wall Architecture Is Required for Acid Growth in Arabidopsis Hypocotyls. *Journal of Experimental Botany*. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/eraa063

Yamaguchi, M., Goue, N., Igarashi, H., Ohtani, M., Nakano, Y., Mortimer, J. C., & Demura, T. (2010). VASCULAR-RELATED NAC-DOMAIN6 and VASCULAR-RELATED NAC-DOMAIN7 effectively induce trans differentiation into xylem vessel elements under control of an induction system. *Plant Physiology, 153*(3), 906–914. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.110.154013

Zhang, W., Cai, C., & Staiger, C. J. (2019). Myosins XI are involved in exocytosis of cellulose synthase complexes. *Plant Physiology, 179*(4), 1537–1555. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.19.00018

Zhang, X., Dominguez, P. G., Kumar, M., Bygdell, J., Miroshnichenko, S., Sundberg, B., & Niittyla. (2018). Cellulose synthase stoichiometry in aspen differs from Arabidopsis and Norway spruce. *Plant Physiology, 177*(3), 1096–1107. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.18.00394

Zhang, Y., Nikolovski, N., Sorieul, M., Vellosillo, T., McFarlane, H. E., Dupree, R., & Dupree, P. (2016). Golgi-localized STELLO proteins regulate the assembly and trafficking of cellulose synthase complexes in Arabidopsis. *Nature Communications, 7*, 11656. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms11656

Zhang, J., Xie, M., Tuskan, G. A., Muchero, W., & Chen, J. G. (2018). Recent advances in the transcriptional regulation of secondary cell wall biosynthesis in the woody plants. *Frontiers in Plant Science, 9*, 1535. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.01535

Zhang, T., Zheng, Y., & Cosgrove, D. J. (2016). Spatial organization of cellulose microfibrils and matrix polysaccharides in primary plant cell walls as imaged by multichannel atomic force microscopy. *The Plant Journal, 85*(2), 179–192. https://doi.org/10.1111/tpj.13102

Zhong, R., Lee, C., Zhou, J., McCarthy, R. L., & Ye, Z. H. (2008). A battery of transcription factors involved in the regulation of secondary cell wall biosynthesis in Arabidopsis. *The Plant Cell, 20*(10), 2763–2782. https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.108.061325

Zhong, R., Richardson, E. A., & Ye, Z. H. (2007). Two NAC domain transcription factors, SND1 and NST1, function redundantly in regulation of secondary wall synthesis in fibers of Arabidopsis. *Planta, 225*(6), 1603–1611. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00425-007-0498-y

Zhu, X., Li, S., Pan, S., Xin, X., & Gu, Y. (2018). CSI1, PATROL1, and exocyst complex cooperate in delivery of cellulose synthase complexes to the plasma membrane. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 115*(15), E3578–E3587. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1800182115

Zhu, X., Xin, X., & Gu, Y. (2019). Cellulose and hemicellulose synthesis and their regulation in plant cells. In E. Cohen, & H. Merzendorfer (Eds.), *Extracellular sugar-based biopolymers matrices. Biologically-inspired system* (Vol. 12). Cham: Springer.