

# Ethylene Modulates the Role of NONEXPRESSOR OF PATHOGENESIS-RELATED GENES1 in Cross Talk between Salicylate and Jasmonate Signaling<sup>1[W][OA]</sup>

Antonio Leon-Reyes, Steven H. Spoel<sup>2</sup>, Elvira S. De Lange<sup>3</sup>, Hiroshi Abe, Masatomo Kobayashi, Shinya Tsuda, Frank F. Millenaar<sup>4</sup>, Rob A.M. Welschen, Tita Ritsema, and Corné M.J. Pieterse\*

Plant-Microbe Interactions, Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Utrecht University, 3508 TB Utrecht, The Netherlands (A.L.-R., E.S.D.L., T.R., C.M.J.P.); Centre for BioSystems Genomics, 6700 AB Wageningen, The Netherlands (C.M.J.P.); Department of Biology, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708-1000 (S.H.S.); Department of Biological Systems, RIKEN BioResource Center, Tsukuba 305-0074, Japan (H.A., M.K.); Department of Plant Pathology, National Agricultural Research Center, Tsukuba 305-8666, Japan (S.T.); and Plant Ecophysiology, Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Utrecht University, 3508 TB Utrecht, The Netherlands (F.F.M., R.A.M.W.)

The plant hormones salicylic acid (SA), jasmonic acid (JA), and ethylene (ET) play crucial roles in the signaling network that regulates induced defense responses against biotic stresses. Antagonism between SA and JA operates as a mechanism to fine-tune defenses that are activated in response to multiple attackers. In *Arabidopsis* (*Arabidopsis thaliana*), NONEXPRESSOR OF PATHOGENESIS-RELATED GENES1 (NPR1) was demonstrated to be required for SA-mediated suppression of JA-dependent defenses. Because ET is known to enhance SA/NPR1-dependent defense responses, we investigated the role of ET in the SA-JA signal interaction. Pharmacological experiments with gaseous ET and the ET precursor 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic acid showed that ET potentiated SA/NPR1-dependent *PATHOGENESIS-RELATED1* transcription, while it rendered the antagonistic effect of SA on methyl jasmonate-induced *PDF1.2* and *VSP2* expression NPR1 independent. This overriding effect of ET on NPR1 function in SA-JA cross talk was absent in the *npr1-1/ein2-1* double mutant, demonstrating that it is mediated via ET signaling. Abiotic and biotic induction of the ET response similarly abolished the NPR1 dependency of the SA-JA signal interaction. Furthermore, JA-dependent resistance against biotic attackers was antagonized by SA in an NPR1-dependent fashion only when the plant-attacker combination did not result in the production of high levels of endogenous ET. Hence, the interaction between ET and NPR1 plays an important modulating role in the fine tuning of the defense signaling network that is activated upon pathogen and insect attack. Our results suggest a model in which ET modulates the NPR1 dependency of SA-JA antagonism, possibly to compensate for enhanced allocation of NPR1 to function in SA-dependent activation of *PR* genes.

Plants have a broad spectrum of mechanisms to cope with adverse conditions such as abiotic stress (e.g. flooding and drought) and biotic stress (e.g. pathogen

and insect attack). With regard to biotic stress, plants possess both physical and chemical barriers to prevent harmful attackers from causing damage. When these constitutively active layers of defense are overcome, inducible defense systems are recruited to counteract the attacker (Walters et al., 2007). The phytohormones salicylic acid (SA), jasmonic acid (JA), and ethylene (ET) have emerged as key players in regulating the activation of the induced defense responses involved (Dong, 1998; Howe, 2004; Pozo et al., 2004; Grant and Lamb, 2006; Van Loon et al., 2006; Von Dahl and Baldwin, 2007; Vlot et al., 2008). Their production varies greatly, depending on the nature of the attacking pathogen or insect. The quantity, composition, and timing of the hormonal blend produced results in the activation of a specific set of defense-related genes that eventually determines the nature of the defense response that is triggered by the attacker encountered (De Vos et al., 2005; Mur et al., 2006). Other plant hormones, including abscisic acid (Mauch-Mani and Mauch, 2005; de Torres-Zabala et al., 2007; Asselbergh et al., 2008), brassinosteroids (Nakashita et al., 2003), gibberellins (Navarro et al., 2008), and auxins (Navarro

<sup>1</sup> This work was supported by the Netherlands Organization of Scientific Research (VICI grant no. 865.04.002 to C.M.J.P.) and by the National Institutes of Health (grant no. 1R01 GM-69594 to Dr. Xinnian Dong, who supported S.H.S.).

<sup>2</sup> Present address: Institute of Molecular Plant Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Mayfield Road, Edinburgh EH9 3JR, United Kingdom.

<sup>3</sup> Present address: Institute of Zoology, University of Neuchâtel, Emile-Argand 11, Neuchâtel, Switzerland.

<sup>4</sup> Present address: De Ruiter Seeds, Leeuwenhoekweg 52, 2660 BB Bergschenhoek, The Netherlands.

\* Corresponding author; e-mail c.m.j.pieterse@uu.nl.

The author responsible for distribution of materials integral to the findings presented in this article in accordance with the policy described in the Instructions for Authors ([www.plantphysiol.org](http://www.plantphysiol.org)) is: Corné M.J. Pieterse (c.m.j.pieterse@uu.nl).

<sup>[W]</sup> The online version of this article contains Web-only data.

<sup>[OA]</sup> Open Access articles can be viewed online without a subscription.

[www.plantphysiol.org/cgi/doi/10.1104/pp.108.133926](http://www.plantphysiol.org/cgi/doi/10.1104/pp.108.133926)

et al., 2006; Wang et al., 2007), have also been reported to play a role in the plant's immune response, but their significance is less well studied.

In *Arabidopsis* (*Arabidopsis thaliana*), it was shown that SA-, JA-, and ET-dependent pathways regulate defense responses that are differentially effective against specific types of attackers (Thomma et al., 2001; Glazebrook, 2005; Thatcher et al., 2005). Pathogens with a biotrophic lifestyle, such as *Pseudomonas syringae* and *Hyaloperonospora arabidopsidis*, are generally more sensitive to SA-dependent responses, whereas necrotrophic pathogens, such as *Botrytis cinerea* and *Alternaria brassicicola*, and herbivorous insects, such as *Pieris rapae* (small cabbage white) and *Frankliniella occidentalis* (western flower thrips), are commonly deterred by JA- and/or ET-dependent defenses (Thomma et al., 1998; Kessler and Baldwin, 2002; Ton et al., 2002; De Vos et al., 2006; Abe et al., 2008). In nature, plants often deal with simultaneous or subsequent invasion by multiple aggressors, which can influence the primary induced defense response of the host plant (Van der Putten et al., 2001; Bezemer and Van Dam, 2005; Stout et al., 2006; Poelman et al., 2008). Activation of plant defense mechanisms is associated with ecological fitness costs (Heil and Baldwin, 2002; Heidel et al., 2004; Van Hulst et al., 2006). Hence, plants need regulatory mechanisms to effectively and efficiently adapt to changes in their complex hostile environment. Cross talk between induced defense signaling pathways provides the plant with such a powerful regulatory potential (Reymond and Farmer, 1998; Koornneef and Pieterse, 2008; Spoel and Dong, 2008). Signaling interactions can be either (mutually) antagonistic or synergistic, resulting in negative or positive functional outcomes. Cross talk helps the plant to minimize fitness costs and create a flexible signaling network that allows the plant to fine-tune its defense response to the invaders encountered (Reymond and Farmer, 1998; Pieterse et al., 2001; Kunkel and Brooks, 2002; Bostock, 2005). Yet, it seems that insect herbivores and pathogens have also evolved to manipulate plants for their own benefit by suppressing induced defenses through modulation of the plant's defense signaling network (Pieterse and Dicke, 2007; Robert-Seilaniantz et al., 2007; Walling, 2008).

One of the best studied examples of defense-related signal cross talk is the interaction between the SA and the JA response pathways (Kunkel and Brooks, 2002; Thaler et al., 2002; Glazebrook et al., 2003; Beckers and Spoel, 2006; Koornneef and Pieterse, 2008; Spoel and Dong, 2008). Many studies have demonstrated that endogenously accumulating SA antagonizes JA-dependent defenses, thereby prioritizing SA-dependent defenses over JA-dependent ones (Doherty et al., 1988; Peña-Cortés et al., 1993; Gupta et al., 2000; Spoel et al., 2003). As a result of the negative interaction between SA and JA signaling, activation of the SA response should render a plant more susceptible to attackers that are resisted via JA-dependent defenses and vice versa. Indeed, many examples of trade-offs between SA-dependent resistance

against biotrophic pathogens and JA-dependent defense against insect herbivory and necrotrophic pathogens have been reported (Pieterse et al., 2001; Bostock, 2005; Stout et al., 2006). In *Arabidopsis*, Spoel et al. (2007) showed that SA-mediated defenses that are triggered upon infection by a virulent strain of the hemibiotrophic pathogen *P. syringae* rendered infected tissues more susceptible to infection by the necrotrophic pathogen *A. brassicicola* by suppressing the JA signaling pathway. Similarly, infection by the biotrophic pathogen *H. arabidopsidis* strongly suppressed JA-mediated defenses that were activated upon feeding by caterpillars of the small cabbage white *P. rapae* (Koornneef et al., 2008). Conversely, JA signaling can act antagonistically on SA-dependent defenses. For instance, *P. syringae* produces the phytotoxin coronatine, which functions as a JA mimic and suppresses effectual SA-dependent defenses, thereby promoting susceptibility of the plant to this pathogen (Zhao et al., 2003; Brooks et al., 2005; Cui et al., 2005; Nomura et al., 2005; Uppalapati et al., 2007). Although many reports describe an antagonistic interaction between SA- and JA-dependent signaling, synergistic interactions have been described as well (Schenk et al., 2000; Van Wees et al., 2000; Mur et al., 2006). For example, application of low concentrations of both SA and JA (10–100  $\mu\text{M}$ ) led to enhanced JA/ET response in the combination treatment compared with JA alone, suggesting that hormone concentration is important for the final output during plant-microbe interactions (Mur et al., 2006).

Pharmacological experiments with *Arabidopsis* revealed that transcription of JA-responsive marker genes, such as *PDF1.2* and *VSP1*, is highly sensitive to suppression by exogenous application of SA. This SA-mediated suppression of JA-responsive gene expression (hereafter referred to as SA-JA cross talk) was observed in a large number of *Arabidopsis* accessions, highlighting the potential significance of this phenomenon in the regulation of induced plant defenses in nature (Koornneef et al., 2008). Several lines of evidence point to a role for SA-mediated redox changes in the regulation of SA-JA cross talk (Ndamukong et al., 2007; Koornneef et al., 2008). In *Arabidopsis*, the redox-sensitive protein NPR1 (for NONEXPRESSOR OF PATHOGENESIS-RELATED GENES1), an important transducer of SA-induced redox changes (Mou et al., 2003; Dong, 2004; Pieterse and Van Loon, 2004; Tada et al., 2008), was shown to be a key regulator of SA-mediated suppression of JA signaling (Spoel et al., 2003). Induction of the SA response, either by pathogen infection or by exogenous application of SA, strongly suppressed JA-responsive genes, such as *PDF1.2* and *VSP2*. However, in mutant *npr1-1* plants, this antagonistic effect was completely abolished (Spoel et al., 2003). The *npr1-1* mutant shows enhanced resistance against *Trichoplusia ni* (Cabbage looper) and *Spodoptera littoralis* (Egyptian cotton worm; Cui et al., 2002; Stotz et al., 2002), indicating that blocking the NPR1-dependent SA signaling pathway resulted in enhanced JA-dependent defenses against these insect

herbivores. Nuclear localization of NPR1, which is essential for SA-mediated defense gene expression (Kinkema et al., 2000), is not required for the suppression of JA-responsive genes, indicating that the antagonistic effect of SA on JA signaling is modulated through a function of NPR1 in the cytosol (Spoel et al., 2003). In rice (*Oryza sativa*), a similar cytosolic function of NPR1 in SA-JA cross talk was reported (Yuan et al., 2007): overexpression of cytosolic *OsNPR1* suppressed JA-responsive gene transcription and enhanced the level of susceptibility to insect herbivory, whereas NPR1-mediated suppression of the JA response was no longer present in plants expressing *OsNPR1* that was constitutively targeted to the nucleus.

Besides SA and JA, ET has also been demonstrated to play an important role in the plant's defense response to pathogen and insect attack (Broekaert et al., 2006; Van Loon et al., 2006; Adie et al., 2007; Von Dahl and Baldwin, 2007). In addition to effects on the level of pathogen or insect resistance, ET was shown to function as an important modulator of the plant's response to other hormones, such as JA, SA, and abscisic acid (Adie et al., 2007). For instance, ET enhanced the response of Arabidopsis to SA, resulting in a potentiated expression of the SA-responsive marker gene *PATHOGENESIS-RELATED1* (*PR-1*; Lawton et al., 1994; De Vos et al., 2006). Moreover, in tobacco (*Nicotiana tabacum*), ET was shown to be essential for the onset of SA-dependent systemic acquired resistance (SAR) against *Tobacco mosaic virus* (Verberne et al., 2003). Also, the synergistic interaction between ET and JA has been well established. Many defense-related genes, such as *PDF1.2*, are regulated via a signaling pathway that requires both ET and JA (Penninckx et al., 1998; Broekaert et al., 2006; Adie et al., 2007). Similarly, the corequirement of ET and JA has been demonstrated for the onset of broad-spectrum induced systemic resistance, which is triggered after colonization of plant roots by beneficial microorganisms (Pieterse et al., 1998; Van der Ent et al., 2008; Van Wees et al., 2008), highlighting the important modulating role of ET in plant defense.

In many plant-attacker interactions, ET is part of the signal signature that is produced upon pathogen or insect attack (De Vos et al., 2005). The established role of ET in modulating SA- and JA-dependent defense responses prompted us to investigate the effect of ET on the interaction between SA and JA signaling. Here, we demonstrate that ET bypasses the NPR1 dependency of the SA-mediated antagonistic effect on JA signaling, thereby shaping the final outcome of the plant defense signaling network that is activated upon pathogen or insect attack.


## RESULTS

### ET Modulates the NPR1 Dependency of the SA-JA Signal Interaction

In Arabidopsis, pharmacological experiments revealed that SA can antagonize the expression of JA-

responsive genes, such as *PDF1.2* and *VSP2* (Spoel et al., 2003; Koornneef et al., 2008). To investigate whether ET affects this SA-JA cross talk, we analyzed the effect of the ET precursor 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic acid (ACC) on SA- and NPR1-dependent suppression of JA-responsive gene expression. To this end, we made use of the mutant *npr1-1*, which contains a missense mutation that alters a key ankyrin repeat in the NPR1 protein and disrupts NPR1-dependent regulation of both SA- and JA-dependent genes (Cao et al., 1997; Glazebrook et al., 2003). Twelve-day-old seedlings of wild-type accession Columbia (Col-0) and mutant *npr1-1* plants were grown on Murashige and Skoog (MS) agar medium (Murashige and Skoog, 1962) with or without increasing concentrations of ACC and 0.5 mM SA, 0.02 mM methyl jasmonate (MeJA), or a combination of both chemicals. Two days later, the expression of the SA-responsive marker gene *PR-1* and the JA-responsive marker gene *PDF1.2* was analyzed by northern-blot analysis (Fig. 1). In the absence of ACC, the single treatments of Col-0 with SA or MeJA activated *PR-1* and *PDF1.2*, respectively. In addition, the combination treatments with SA and MeJA resulted in effective SA-mediated suppression of MeJA-induced *PDF1.2* expression. As expected, neither *PR-1* induction nor *PDF1.2* suppression was apparent in the *npr1-1* mutant, supporting previous findings that SA-JA cross talk is dependent upon wild-type NPR1 function (Spoel et al., 2003). However, addition of ACC into the medium at different concentrations resulted in effective SA-mediated suppression of MeJA-induced *PDF1.2* expression in both Col-0 and *npr1-1* plants, suggesting that ET relieved the NPR1 dependency of the SA-JA signal interaction. Similar results were obtained with the JA-responsive gene *VSP2* (Supplemental Fig. S1).

In order to corroborate our observation with medium-grown seedlings that ET overrules the NPR1 dependency of SA-JA cross talk, we investigated the effect of ET on SA-JA cross talk in 5-week-old, soil-grown plants using both ACC and gaseous ET. The plants were treated with 1 mM SA, 0.1 mM MeJA, or a combination of both chemicals and either 0.1 mM ACC or gaseous ET ( $2 \mu\text{L L}^{-1}$ ) and harvested 6 h later for northern-blot analysis. As reported previously (Lawton et al., 1994; De Vos et al., 2006), ACC and ET both enhanced the SA-induced expression of *PR-1* in adult wild-type plants (Fig. 2). However, these chemicals failed to restore *PR-1* expression in the *npr1-1* mutant, suggesting that ET stimulates SA signaling through the wild-type function of NPR1. In addition, Figure 2 shows that in the absence of ACC or ET, MeJA-induced *PDF1.2* gene expression was effectively suppressed by SA in SA/MeJA-treated Col-0 plants but not in mutant *npr1-1* plants. However, as observed in seedlings, addition of ACC (Fig. 2A) or gaseous ET (Fig. 2B) into the SA/MeJA treatment resulted in a partial restoration of SA-mediated suppression of MeJA-induced *PDF1.2* gene expression in the *npr1-1* background. Together, these results indicate



**Figure 1.** ACC modulates the NPR1 dependency of SA-JA cross talk in *Arabidopsis* seedlings. Northern-blot analysis of *PR-1* and *PDF1.2* mRNA levels in Col-0 and *npr1-1* seedlings that were treated with SA, MeJA, or a combination of both chemicals in the absence or presence of the ET precursor ACC. Pharmacological assays were performed with seedlings that were grown for 12 d on MS medium, after which they were transferred to fresh MS medium supplemented with increasing concentrations of ACC and 0.5 mM SA, 0.02 mM MeJA, or a combination of both chemicals. Seedlings were harvested after 2 d for RNA extraction. rRNA is presented as a loading control.

that ET affects the dependency of SA-mediated suppression of JA-responsive gene expression on wild-type NPR1 function. The observation that neither ACC nor ET treatment bypassed the NPR1 dependency of SA-induced *PR-1* expression (Figs. 1 and 2) indicates that NPR1 has a dual role in the suppression of JA-dependent genes on the one hand and in the activation of SA-dependent gene expression on the other.


#### Modulation of the NPR1 Dependency of SA-JA Cross Talk by ET Is EIN2 Dependent

To test if the modulation of the NPR1 dependency of SA-JA cross talk by ET is governed by the ET signaling pathway, we performed cross talk experiments with an *npr1-1/ein2-1* double mutant (Clarke et al., 2000). Because the *ein2-1* mutation completely blocks the ET signaling pathway (Alonso et al., 1999) and *PDF1.2* expression requires an intact response to both JA and ET (Penninckx et al., 1998), we performed these ex-

periments with the JA-responsive marker gene *VSP2*, which is similarly sensitive to the antagonistic effect of SA (Spoel et al., 2003; Koornneef et al., 2008). Five-week-old Col-0, *ein2-1*, *npr1-1*, and *npr1-1/ein2-1* plants were treated with SA, MeJA, or a combination of both chemicals in the absence or presence of ACC. In the absence of ACC, MeJA-induced expression of *VSP2* was effectively suppressed by SA in Col-0 and *ein2-1* but not in the *npr1-1* and *npr1-1/ein2-1* backgrounds (Fig. 3), confirming the critical role of wild-type NPR1 in SA-JA cross talk under low-ET conditions. In ACC-treated plants, the NPR1 dependency of SA-JA cross talk was again relieved, as demonstrated by the SA-mediated suppression of MeJA-induced *VSP2* expression in the *npr1-1* background. Compared with *npr1-1* plants, however, SA-JA cross talk remained blocked upon ACC treatment of the *npr1-1/ein2-1* double mutant. These data indicate that the modulation of the NPR1 dependency of SA-JA cross talk by ET is dependent upon EIN2 and is thus regulated by the ET signaling pathway.

#### Abiotic Induction of Endogenous ET Relieves the NPR1 Dependency of SA-JA Cross Talk

To test the biological relevance of the effect of ET on the role of NPR1 in SA-JA cross talk, we performed SA-JA cross talk experiments under abiotic conditions in which *Arabidopsis* produces enhanced levels of ET. To this end, 5-week-old plants were placed in trays with open or closed lids. As shown in Figure 4A, Col-0 and *npr1-1* plants grown in trays with closed lids showed a typical hyponastic response, which is a phenomenon demonstrated to be mediated by ET (Millenaar et al., 2005). Mutant *ein2-1* did not display this hyponastic response, confirming the ET dependency of this phenomenon. Besides the ET-dependent hyponastic response, plants grown in trays with closed lids produced more ET (Fig. 4B) and accumulated enhanced transcript levels of the ET-responsive genes *ERS2* and *EBF2* (Fig. 4C; Millenaar et al., 2005; Van der Ent et al., 2008), indicating that growth of the plants in closed trays results in enhanced ET signaling. To investigate the effect of endogenously produced ET on the NPR1 dependency of SA-JA cross talk, plants grown in trays with open or closed lids were treated with SA, MeJA, or a combination of both chemicals and harvested 24 h later for northern-blot analysis of *PR-1* and *PDF1.2* gene expression. Figure 4D shows that the antagonistic effect of SA on MeJA-induced expression of *PDF1.2* is blocked in *npr1-1* mutant plants when grown in trays with open lids (basal ET signaling). However, when the cross talk experiment was performed with plants grown in trays with closed lids (enhanced ET signaling), the level of SA-mediated suppression of *PDF1.2* in *npr1-1* plants was similar to that observed in Col-0 plants. Hence, abiotic induction of the ET response relieves the dependency of SA-JA cross talk on wild-type NPR1 function.



**Figure 2.** ACC and gaseous ET enable SA-JA cross talk in the absence of NPR1 in 5-week-old *Arabidopsis* plants. Northern-blot analysis of *PR-1* and *PDF1.2* transcript levels in 5-week-old Col-0 and *npr1-1* plants that were treated with 1 mM SA, 0.1 mM MeJA, or a combination of both chemicals in the absence (–) or presence (+) of 0.1 mM ACC (A) or 2  $\mu\text{L L}^{-1}$  (v/v) gaseous ET (B). Leaf tissue was harvested 6 h after chemical treatment for RNA analysis. Equal loading of RNA samples was checked using a probe for 18S rRNA. Signal intensities of the depicted northern blots were quantified using a phosphor imager (right panels). *PDF1.2* transcript levels in the single MeJA treatments were set to 100%.

### Attacker-Induced ET Enables NPR1-Independent SA-JA Cross Talk

Next, we wanted to investigate whether ET produced during a plant-attacker interaction affects the NPR1 dependency of SA-JA cross talk. To this end, we made use of two JA-inducing attackers: the necrotrophic fungal pathogen *A. brassicicola* and the herbivorous insect *F. occidentalis*. *A. brassicicola* stimulates the biosynthesis of both JA and ET, while *F. occidentalis* induces only JA production (De Vos et al., 2005). Inoculation of Col-0 and *npr1-1* plants with *A. brassicicola* indeed resulted in a strong increase in the production of ET, whereas infestation with thrips had no effect (Fig. 5A).


To investigate the NPR1 dependency of SA-mediated suppression of JA-responsive gene expression during both *Arabidopsis*-attacker combinations, Col-0 and *npr1-1* plants were infested with *F. occidentalis* or infected with *A. brassicicola* 24 h prior to SA treatment. Twenty-four hours later, leaf material was harvested for northern-blot analysis of *PR-1* and *PDF1.2* transcript levels. Figure 5B shows that *F. occidentalis* and *A. brassicicola* both induced the expression of *PDF1.2* and that this expression was strongly suppressed by SA in Col-0 plants. In the *npr1-1* mutant, this SA-mediated suppression of *PDF1.2* transcription was not observed when the JA response was activated by the non-ET-inducer *F. occidentalis*, indicating that in this plant-attacker combination SA-JA cross talk is NPR1

dependent. However, when the JA response was activated by the JA- and ET-inducer *A. brassicicola*, *PDF1.2* transcription was suppressed in the *npr1-1* mutant background. These results indicate that attacker-induced ET largely overrules the NPR1 dependency of SA-JA cross talk and hence potentially affects the outcome of the defense response that is induced upon attack by multiple invaders.

### NPR1 Is Not Required for SA-Mediated Suppression of JA-Dependent Resistance against ET-Inducing Attackers

In *Arabidopsis*, resistance against *F. occidentalis* and *A. brassicicola* has been demonstrated to be mediated by the JA response pathway (Thomma et al., 1998; Abe et al., 2008). To investigate the role of NPR1 in the antagonistic effect of SA on the JA-dependent resistance against these attackers, we performed resistance assays in Col-0 and *npr1-1* plants. We hypothesized that the antagonistic effect of SA on JA-dependent resistance against ET-noninducing thrips would be NPR1 dependent, while the negative effect of SA on JA-dependent resistance against the ET-inducing fungal pathogen would function independently of NPR1.

In the thrips resistance assays, Col-0 and *npr1-1* plants were pretreated with 1 mM SA, 0.1 mM MeJA, or a combination of both. Twenty-four hours later, leaf discs from this material were taken and infested with *F. occidentalis*. Two days later, the level of thrips



**Figure 3.** NPR1-independent SA-JA cross talk facilitated by ET is EIN2 dependent. Northern-blot analysis of *PR-1* and *VSP2* transcript levels in 5-week-old Col-0, *ein2-1*, *npr1-1*, and *npr1-1/ein2-1* plants that were treated with 1 mM SA, 0.1 mM MeJA, or a combination of both chemicals in the absence (–) or presence (+) of 0.1 mM ACC. Leaf tissue was harvested 6 h after treatment for RNA analysis. Equal loading of RNA samples was checked using a probe for *18S*rRNA. Signal intensities of the depicted northern blots were quantified using a phosphor imager (right panels). *VSP2* transcript levels in the single MeJA treatments were set to 100%.

resistance was determined by measuring the level of feeding scar damage that was inflicted by thrips feeding (Abe et al., 2008). As shown in Figure 6A, SA treatment had no significant effect on the basal level of thrips resistance in Col-0 plants. However, MeJA-treated Col-0 plants showed a significantly reduced area of feeding scars, indicating that MeJA treatment enhanced the level of resistance to thrips feeding. Col-0 plants treated with both SA and MeJA showed a basal level of thrips resistance that was not significantly different from that in control plants, suggesting that SA suppressed the level of MeJA-induced resistance against thrips feeding. In mutant *npr1-1* plants, MeJA and SA/MeJA treatments both led to a significant increase in the level of thrips resistance, indicating that the SA-mediated suppression of MeJA-induced resistance to *F. occidentalis* is controlled by NPR1.


Wild-type Col-0 plants are highly resistant to *A. brassicicola* infection, but this resistance is lost in JA-insensitive *coi1-1* mutant plants (Thomma et al., 1998), indicating that JA is an important regulator of basal resistance against this pathogen. Previously, Spoel et al. (2007) demonstrated that SA suppresses this JA-dependent resistance against *A. brassicicola*, resulting in enhanced susceptibility of Col-0 plants to *A.*

*brassicicola* infection. Indeed, exogenous application of SA to Col-0 plants broke the JA-dependent resistance to *A. brassicicola* (Fig. 6B). However, treatment of *npr1-1* plants with SA only moderately reduced the level of JA-dependent resistance against this pathogen. These results suggest that the SA-mediated suppression of JA-dependent resistance against *A. brassicicola* is functioning, at least partly, independently of NPR1. Since *A. brassicicola*-infected tissues produced high levels of ET and thrips-infested tissues did not (Fig. 5A), it is likely that the regulatory role of NPR1 in the antagonism between SA and JA is determined by the presence or absence of ET in the signal signature of the plant-attacker combination.

**DISCUSSION**


**ET Modulates the Role of NPR1 in Cross Talk between SA and JA Signaling**

Cross talk between defense signaling pathways is thought to play an important role in the regulation and fine-tuning of the defense responses that are activated upon pathogen and insect attack. The antagonism between SA and JA signaling emerged as one of the



**Figure 4.** Abiotic induction of ET relieves the NPR1 dependency of SA-JA cross talk. To enhance the ET response in Arabidopsis plants in a biological manner, 5-week-old plants were placed in trays with the lids open (low ET) or closed (high ET). A, Arabidopsis Col-0 and *npr1-1* plants grown for 24 h under high-ET conditions displayed a hyponastic response, whereas the ET-signaling mutant *ein2-1* did not. B, ET production by Col-0 plants incubated for 6, 24, and 32 h in trays with open or closed lids. FW, Fresh weight. C, Quantitative real-time PCR analysis of the ET-responsive genes *ERS2* and *EBF2* in Col-0 plants incubated for 6, 24, and 32 h in trays with open or closed lids. D, Northern-blot analysis of *PR-1* and *PDF1.2* transcript levels in Col-0 and *npr1-1* plants that were treated with SA, MeJA, or a combination of both chemicals and incubated for 24 h in trays with open lids (low ET) or closed lids (high ET). Chemical treatments were performed by dipping the leaves into a solution of 0.015% (v/v) Silwet L77 containing 1 mM SA, 0.1 mM MeJA, or a combination of these chemicals. Leaf tissue was harvested 24 h after chemical treatment. Equal loading of RNA samples was checked using a probe for *18S* rRNA. Signal intensities of the depicted northern blots were quantified using a phosphor imager (right panels). *PDF1.2* transcript levels in the single MeJA treatments were set to 100%.


**Figure 5.** Attacker-induced ET enables NPR1-independent SA-JA cross talk. A, ET production in Col-0 and *npr1-1* after infection with the necrotrophic fungus *A. brassicicola* or infestation with larvae of the western flower thrips *F. occidentalis*. FW, Fresh weight. B, Northern-blot analysis of *PR-1* and *PDF1.2* transcript levels in Col-0 and *npr1-1* plants that were infested with *F. occidentalis* or inoculated with *A. brassicicola* and treated (+) or not (-) with 1 mM SA. Leaf tissue was harvested for RNA analysis 24 h after application of SA. Equal loading of RNA samples was checked using a probe for *18S* rRNA. Signal intensities of the depicted northern blots were quantified using a phosphor imager (right panels). *PDF1.2* transcript levels in the single MeJA treatments were set to 100%.



most prominent of all signal interactions studied to date (Koornneef and Pieterse, 2008; Spoel and Dong, 2008). Pharmacological experiments revealed that the suppression of JA-responsive genes such as *PDF1.2*, *VSP2*, and *LOX2* by SA is regulated by NPR1 (Spoel et al., 2003). Following a whole-genome transcript profiling approach to identify Arabidopsis genes that are sensitive to SA-JA cross talk, we recently identified 258 MeJA-responsive genes of which the expression was significantly affected by SA (A. Koornneef and C.M.J. Pieterse, unpublished data). Sixty percent of the JA-responsive genes that were suppressed by SA displayed this suppression in an NPR1-dependent manner, demonstrating that NPR1 is involved in the SA-mediated down-regulation of a large number of MeJA-responsive genes. Because ET is an important modulator of plant defense and a major constituent of the blend of defense signals that is produced during many plant-attacker interactions (Broekaert et al., 2006; Van Loon et al., 2006; Adie et al., 2007; Von Dahl and Baldwin, 2007), we investigated the effect of ET on the SA-JA signal interaction. Here, we demonstrate that ET strongly affects the requirement of wild-

type NPR1 in the antagonistic effect of SA on JA-dependent defenses. Exogenous application of the ET precursor ACC or gaseous ET (Figs. 1–3), as well as endogenously produced ET during induction of the hyponastic response (Fig. 4) or pathogen attack (Fig. 5), bypassed the NPR1 dependency of SA-JA cross talk. Experiments in the mutant *ein2-1* background showed that this ET effect is EIN2 dependent and thus mediated through the ET signaling pathway (Fig. 3). These findings indicate that the final outcome of the SA-JA signal interaction during the complex interaction of plants with their attackers can be shaped by ET. Indeed, the antagonistic effect of SA on MeJA-induced resistance against feeding by ET-noninducing thrips was controlled by NPR1. By contrast, SA-mediated suppression of JA-dependent resistance against the JA- and ET-inducing necrotroph *A. brassicicola* functioned independently of NPR1 (Fig. 6), highlighting the modulating role of ET in the SA-JA signal interaction. In Figure 7, we present a schematic model of the interplay between SA, JA, ET, and NPR1 in the Arabidopsis-attacker interactions studied.






**Figure 6.** Antagonistic effect of SA on JA-dependent resistance against *F. occidentalis* and *A. brassicicola* in Col-0 and *npr1-1*. A, *F. occidentalis* resistance assay with 3-week-old Col-0 and *npr1-1* plants that were pretreated for 24 h with 1 mM SA, 0.1 mM MeJA, or a combination of both chemicals. Presented are means  $\pm$  SD ( $n = 10$ ) of the relative area of feeding scars (control treatment is set to 1) on Col-0 and *npr1-1* leaf discs after 2 d of thrips feeding. Different letters indicate statistically significant differences between treatments (Tukey-Kramer honestly significant difference test;  $P < 0.05$ ). B, *A. brassicicola* resistance assay with 5-week-old Col-0 and *npr1-1* plants that were treated or not with 1 mM SA. Data represent the percentage of leaves ( $n = 80$ ) that developed spreading lesions after inoculation with *A. brassicicola*.

### Dual Role of NPR1

NPR1 is a regulatory protein that was originally identified in *Arabidopsis* through several genetic screens for SAR-compromised mutants (Cao et al., 1994; Delaney et al., 1995; Glazebrook et al., 1996; Shah et al., 1997). Mutant *npr1-1* plants are not only compromised in SAR but also in basal resistance against many types of pathogens that are sensitive to SA-dependent defenses (Dong, 2004). In addition, mutant *npr1-1* plants appeared to be blocked in the activation of induced systemic resistance by beneficial rhizobacteria, an induced defense response that requires regulators of ET and JA signaling (Pieterse et al., 1998; Van Wees et al., 2008). Moreover, NPR1 has been implicated in JA- and ET-dependent resistance against the soil-borne fungus *Verticillium longisporum* (Johansson et al., 2006). The fact that NPR1 also functions as an important regulator of SA-JA cross talk (Spoel et al., 2003; Yuan et al., 2007) demonstrates that NPR1 plays a central role in the induced defense signaling network that is controlled by SA, JA, and ET (Dong, 2004; Pieterse and Van Loon, 2004). Our finding that the requirement of NPR1 in SA-JA cross talk is bypassed under conditions in which ET production is induced provides a direct link between ET and NPR1 function.

In this study, we demonstrate that ET bypasses the need for NPR1 in SA-JA cross talk, while it enhances NPR1-dependent, SA-responsive *PR-1* expression. This clearly indicates that NPR1 plays a dual role in regulating SA-mediated suppression of JA-responsive gene expression on the one hand and SA-mediated activation of SA-responsive *PR* gene expression on the other hand. This raises the question: how does ET signaling differentially affect the NPR1 dependency of these two SA-dependent cellular responses? The differential effect of ET on NPR1 function may be caused by the fact that the role of NPR1 in SA-JA antagonism is mediated by a cytosolic function of NPR1 (Spoel et al., 2003; Yuan et al., 2007), whereas the role of NPR1

as a coactivator of SA-responsive *PR* gene expression is exerted in the nucleus (Kinkema et al., 2000; Dong, 2004). Previously, Glazebrook et al. (2003) demonstrated that two different alleles of the *npr1* mutant (*npr1-1* and *npr1-3*) behaved differently in terms of transcriptome changes upon infection by *P. syringae*. The *npr1-1* mutant, which has a mutation in a key ankyrin-repeat domain, was affected in the expression of SA-dependent as well as JA- and ET-dependent genes. However, the *npr1-3* mutant, which produces a truncated cytoplasmically localized NPR1 protein



**Figure 7.** Working model illustrating the role of ET in modulating the NPR1 dependency of SA-JA cross talk. Attack of *Arabidopsis* by the necrotrophic fungus *A. brassicicola* and the herbivorous insect *F. occidentalis* results in the biosynthesis of JA and the activation of the JA signaling pathway in which the E3 ubiquitin ligase SCF<sup>CO11</sup> and jasmonate ZIM-domain (JAZ) proteins that repress the transcription of JA-responsive genes are central components (Chini et al., 2007; Thines et al., 2007). Activation of the JA signaling cascade leads to the activation of JA-responsive genes such as *PDF1.2* and *VSP2*. SA suppresses JA-responsive gene expression in an NPR1-dependent manner. However, when ET signaling is stimulated, such as upon infection by the ET-inducer *A. brassicicola*, the NPR1 dependency of SA-JA cross talk is bypassed, resulting in wild-type levels of suppression of JA signaling in the *npr1-1* mutant background.

that misses the C-terminal domain with the nuclear localization signal (Dong, 2004), was only affected in SA-dependent gene expression, suggesting that the cytoplasmic function of NPR1 plays a role in the control of JA- and ET-dependent responses. In agreement with this, the antagonistic effect of SA on JA-responsive gene expression was much less affected in *npr1-3* than in *npr1-1* (Supplemental Fig. S2). These results suggest a model in which the cytosolic function of NPR1 plays a role in SA-JA cross talk and can be bypassed by ET and in which the nuclear function of NPR1 plays a role in the activation of SA-responsive genes and can be stimulated by ET.

Previously, the glutaredoxin GRX480 and the transcription factor WRKY70 were identified as important players in SA/NPR1-dependent suppression of JA-responsive gene expression (Li et al., 2004; Ndamukong et al., 2007). In wild-type plants, transcription of GRX480 and WRKY70 was activated by SA in an NPR1-dependent manner, indicating that the roles of GRX480 and WRKY70 in the suppression of JA-responsive genes are downstream of the NPR1-dependent induction of GRX480 and WRKY70 by SA. However, the fact that SA/NPR1-dependent gene expression is hampered in mutant *npr1-3*, while SA/NPR1-dependent suppression of JA-responsive gene expression is still intact in this mutant, suggests that the antagonistic effect of SA on JA signaling can function independently of GRX480 or WRKY70. This is corroborated by previous findings that *grx480* and *wrky70* knockout mutants showed wild-type levels of SA-mediated suppression of MeJA-induced PDF1.2 gene expression (Ndamukong et al., 2007; A. Leon-Reyes and C.M.J. Pieterse, unpublished data).

### Interaction between ET and NPR1

NPR1 is an important transducer of the SA signal. In uninduced cells, NPR1 is present as an oligomer formed through intermolecular disulfide bonds (Mou et al., 2003). SA mediates a change in the cellular redox potential, resulting in the reduction of the NPR1 oligomer to its active monomeric form. Monomeric NPR1 is then translocated into the nucleus, where it functions as a coactivator of SA-responsive genes, such as *PR-1*, by enhancing the binding of TGA transcription factors to SA-responsive promoter elements (Després et al., 2003; Mou et al., 2003; Rochon et al., 2006; Tada et al., 2008). Recently, we demonstrated that SA-mediated redox modulation also plays an important role in the SA-mediated attenuation of the JA signaling pathway (Koornneef et al., 2008). Hence, it is plausible that the cytosolic function of NPR1 in SA-JA cross talk is controlled by active NPR1 monomers that are produced upon SA-mediated changes in the redox state.

With our current knowledge of NPR1 function, we can only speculate on how ET affects the NPR1 dependency of the SA-JA signal interaction. On the one

hand, ET potentiates the NPR1-dependent expression of the SA-responsive marker gene *PR-1* in Arabidopsis (Figs. 2 and 3; Lawton et al., 1994; De Vos et al., 2006). On the other hand, our study clearly shows that ET bypasses the need for NPR1 in SA-JA cross talk. These results suggest a model in which ET modulates the allocation of NPR1's positive and negative functions. Since SA-activated NPR1 functions in the nucleus to activate *PR* genes and in the cytosol to suppress JA-responsive genes, it is tempting to speculate that ET signaling allocates more NPR1 to the nucleus to support SA signaling, thereby making less NPR1 available in the cytosol for SA-JA cross talk. At the same time, possible negative effects of this trade-off on SA-JA cross talk are compensated, because in combination with ET, SA can suppress JA-responsive gene expression in an NPR1-independent manner.

So how could ET modulate the NPR1 dependency of SA-JA cross talk? In the absence of ET, SA-activated NPR1 monomers may bind a positive regulator of JA-responsive gene expression in the cytosol, which is then prevented from entering the nucleus, resulting in the suppression of JA-responsive gene expression. Alternatively, NPR1 may activate a negative regulator of the JA pathway. A simple explanation for the role of ET in these scenarios may be that ET signaling results in a similar effect on the putative positive or negative regulator, rendering the function of NPR1 redundant in SA-JA cross talk. However, other scenarios are plausible as well. For instance, various genetic screens revealed mutations that restored the SAR-compromised phenotype of the *npr1-1* mutant. Mutations in genes such as *SNI1*, *SSI1*, and *CPR6* were demonstrated to restore SA-mediated *PR* gene expression and SAR in the absence of a functional NPR1 protein (Clarke et al., 1998; Li et al., 1999; Shah et al., 1999; Durrant et al., 2007). This clearly indicates that the NPR1 dependency of important SA-mediated cellular responses can be bypassed by inactivation of proteins such as *SNI1*, *SSI1*, and *CPR6*. Future research will be focused on elucidating the targets of ET through which this hormone is able to affect NPR1 function during SA-JA cross talk.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Plant Material

Seeds of Arabidopsis (*Arabidopsis thaliana* accession Col-0), mutants *npr1-1*, *npr1-3* (Cao et al., 1994), *ein2-1* (Alonso et al., 1999), and double mutant *npr1-1/ein2-1* (Clarke et al., 2000) were sown in quartz sand. After 2 weeks, seedlings were transferred to 60-mL pots containing a sand/potting soil mixture that was autoclaved twice for 20 min (Pieterse et al., 1998). Plants were cultivated in a growth chamber with an 8-h-day (24°C)/16-h-night (20°C) cycle at 70% relative humidity for another 3 weeks. Plants were watered every other day and received half-strength Hoagland nutrient solution (Hoagland and Arnon, 1938) containing 10 mM Sequestreen (CIBA-Geigy) once per week. For experiments with in vitro-grown plants, seedlings were grown on plates containing MS medium, pH 5.7, supplemented with 20 g L<sup>-1</sup> Suc and 0.8% (w/v) plant agar. In all experiments, 5-week-old plants were used, except in the experiment presented in Figure 1, in which 12-d-old seedlings grown on MS agar medium were used, as described by Spoel et al. (2003).

## *Alternaria brassicicola* Assays

For induction of JA-responsive gene expression and ET production, Col-0 plants were inoculated with *Alternaria brassicicola* strain MUCL 20297 as described previously (De Vos et al., 2005). Briefly, the fungus was grown on potato dextrose agar for 2 to 3 weeks at 22°C. Spores were collected as described by Broekaert et al. (1990). Five-week-old plants were inoculated with 5- $\mu$ L drops of 50% potato dextrose broth containing  $5 \times 10^5$  spores mL<sup>-1</sup>. For assessing the effect of SA on the level of resistance against *A. brassicicola*, leaves of 5-week-old plants were pressure infiltrated with a solution of 10 mM MgSO<sub>4</sub> supplemented with or without 1 mM SA (Spoel et al., 2007). After 24 h, the treated leaves were inoculated with *A. brassicicola* by applying a 3- $\mu$ L drop of 50% potato dextrose broth containing  $1 \times 10^6$  spores mL<sup>-1</sup>. At 4 d after inoculation, the percentage of leaves with spreading lesions was assessed.

## *Frankliniella occidentalis* Assays

For induction of JA-responsive gene expression, thrips infestations were performed on 5-week-old plants by transferring 20 larvae of *Frankliniella occidentalis* to each plant using a fine paintbrush (De Vos et al., 2005). For determination of thrips resistance, the leaf disc assay described by Abe et al. (2008) was used. Briefly, isolated leaf discs from 3-week-old plants that were pretreated for 24 h with 1 mM SA, 0.1 mM MeJA, or a combination of both chemicals (see below) were floated on 1.5 mL of distilled water in wells of a white 1.5-mL sample tube stand. A single adult female that had been starved for 2 to 3 h was placed on a single leaf disc. Thrips were allowed to feed for 1 or 2 d at 22°C. The area of thrips feeding scars on the surface of each leaf disc was measured by ImageJ software (Abramoff et al., 2004) on digitized images.

## Chemical Treatments

Plants were treated with SA, MeJA, and/or ACC by dipping the leaves into a solution of 0.015% (v/v) Silwet L77 (Van Meeuwen Chemicals) containing 1 mM SA (Mallinckrodt Baker), 0.1 mM MeJA (Serva, Brunswick Chemie), 0.1 mM ACC (Sigma), or a combination of these chemicals as described previously (Spoel et al., 2003; Koornneef et al., 2008). Control treatments were dipped into a solution containing 0.015% (v/v) Silwet L77. Chemical induction of plants grown on MS medium was performed by transferring 12-d-old seedlings to fresh MS medium supplemented with 0.5 mM SA, 0.02 mM MeJA, 0.1 to 10  $\mu$ M ACC, or a combination of these chemicals (Spoel et al., 2003). MeJA was added to the solutions from a 1,000-fold-concentrated stock in 96% ethanol. To the solutions without MeJA, a similar volume of 96% ethanol was added.

Application of gaseous ET to the plants was performed as described by Millenaar et al. (2005). In brief, gaseous ET (100  $\mu$ L L<sup>-1</sup>; Hoek Loos) and air (70% relative humidity) were mixed using flow meters (Brooks Instruments) to generate an output concentration of 2  $\mu$ L L<sup>-1</sup> ET, which was flushed continuously through glass cuvettes (13.5  $\times$  16.0  $\times$  29.0 cm) at a flow rate of 75 L h<sup>-1</sup> and then vented to the outside of the building. The concentration of ET in the air flow was verified using gas chromatography as described by Millenaar et al. (2005). For the duration of the gaseous ET treatment, 5-week-old plants were placed in the cuvette, which were placed under climate chamber conditions as described above. Control plants were treated in a similar manner but without ET in the air flow.

## ET Measurements

To measure ET production in plants challenged with either *A. brassicicola* or *F. occidentalis*, rosettes of inoculated or infested plants were detached from the roots, weighed, and placed individually in 35-mL gas-tight serum flasks ( $n = 10$ ) that were subsequently incubated under climate chamber conditions. At different time intervals, 1-mL gas samples were withdrawn through the rubber seal. The concentration of ET was measured by gas chromatography as described by De Laat and Van Loon (1982).

To measure the ET production by plants grown in trays with open and closed lids, plants were removed from the trays and whole rosettes of about 300 mg were immediately transferred into a syringe with a volume of 1.5 mL. ET was allowed to accumulate in the syringe for 15 min, after which the head space was analyzed for ET levels using gas chromatography as described by Millenaar et al. (2005).

## RNA Extraction and Northern-Blot Analysis

For RNA extraction, at least five plants per treatment were harvested at the time points indicated. RNA isolation was performed as described previously by Van Wees et al. (2000). For RNA-blot analysis, 15 mg of RNA was denatured using glyoxal and dimethyl sulfoxide (Sambrook et al., 1989), electrophoretically separated on a 1.5% agarose gel, and blotted onto Hybond-N<sup>+</sup> membranes (Amersham) by capillary transfer. The buffers used for electrophoresis and blotting were 10 and 25 mM sodium phosphate (pH 7.0), respectively. RNA blots were hybridized with probes for *PR-1*, *PDF1.2*, and *VSP2* as described previously by Pieterse et al. (1998). To check for equal loading, ribosomal RNA (rRNA) bands were stained with ethidium bromide or the blots were stripped and hybridized with a probe for 18S ribosomal RNA. The Arabidopsis Genome Initiative numbers for the genes studied are At2g14610 (*PR-1*), At5g44420 (*PDF1.2*), and At5g24770 (*VSP2*). After hybridization with [ $\alpha$ -<sup>32</sup>P]dCTP-labeled probes, blots were exposed for autoradiography. Signal intensities of *PDF1.2* or *VSP2* mRNA on the northern blots were quantified using a Bio-Rad Molecular Imager FX with Quantity One software (Bio-Rad). The *PDF1.2* and *VSP2* mRNA levels of the MeJA treatment were set to 100% and compared with *PDF1.2* and *VSP2* mRNA levels of the rest of the treatments. All gene expression analyses were repeated with similar results.

## Quantitative Real-Time PCR

Quantitative real-time PCR analysis was basically performed as described previously (Czechowski et al., 2004; Van der Ent et al., 2008). Gene-specific primers for the ET-responsive genes *EBF2* (Guo and Ecker 2003; At5g25350; *EBF2-FOR* [5'-CTTTCACGGTGTCTGGAAT-3'] and *EBF2-REV* [5'-GTG-GGCAGCTCCTGATAGAG-3']) and *ERS2* (Hua et al., 1998; At1g04310; *ERS2-FOR* [5'-ACGCTTGCCAAAACATTGTA-3'] and *ERS2-REV* [5'-TGAGACGC-TTTTACCAAAC-3']) were designed and checked as described (Czechowski et al., 2004; Millenaar et al., 2005).

## Supplemental Data

The following materials are available in the online version of this article.

**Supplemental Figure S1.** ACC modulates the NPR1 dependency of SA-mediated suppression of MeJA-induced *VSP2* expression in Arabidopsis seedlings.

**Supplemental Figure S2.** Differential effects of SA-mediated suppression of MeJA-responsive *PDF1.2* expression in mutants *npr1-1* and *npr1-3*.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Ruth Joosten, Hans van Pelt, Ingrid van den Berg, Johanna Schild, Kelly Goris, Demetri Demirel, and Robert de Zeeuw for their technical assistance and Marcel Dicke and Dick Peeters for facilitating *Frankliniella occidentalis* experiments. This project was carried out within the research program of the Centre of BioSystems Genomics, which is part of the Netherlands Genomics Initiative/Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research.

Received December 9, 2008; accepted January 25, 2009; published January 28, 2009.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Abe H, Ohnishi J, Narusaka M, Seo S, Narusaka Y, Tsuda S, Kobayashi M (2008) Function of jasmonate in response and tolerance of Arabidopsis to thrips feeding. *Plant Cell Physiol* **49**: 68–80
- Abramoff MD, Magelhaes PJ, Ram SJ (2004) Image processing with ImageJ. *Biophotonics International* **11**: 36–42
- Adie B, Chico JM, Rubio-Somoza I, Solano R (2007) Modulation of plant defenses by ethylene. *J Plant Growth Regul* **26**: 160–177
- Alonso JM, Hirayama T, Roman G, Nourizadeh S, Ecker JR (1999) *EIN2*, a bifunctional transducer of ethylene and stress responses in Arabidopsis. *Science* **284**: 2148–2152
- Asselbergh B, De Vleeschauwer D, Höfte M (2008) Global switches and

- fine-tuning: ABA modulates plant pathogen defense. *Mol Plant Microbe Interact* **21**: 709–719
- Beckers GJM, Spoel SH** (2006) Fine-tuning plant defence signalling: salicylate versus jasmonate. *Plant Biol* **8**: 1–10
- Bezemer TM, Van Dam NM** (2005) Linking aboveground and belowground interactions via induced plant defenses. *Trends Ecol Evol* **20**: 617–624
- Bostock RM** (2005) Signal crosstalk and induced resistance: straddling the line between cost and benefit. *Annu Rev Phytopathol* **43**: 545–580
- Broekaert WF, Delaure SL, De Bolle MFC, Cammuel BPA** (2006) The role of ethylene in host-pathogen interactions. *Annu Rev Phytopathol* **44**: 393–416
- Broekaert WF, Terras FRG, Cammue BPA, Vanderleyden J** (1990) An automated quantitative assay for fungal growth. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* **69**: 55–60
- Brooks DM, Bender CL, Kunkel BN** (2005) The *Pseudomonas syringae* phytotoxin coronatine promotes virulence by overcoming salicylic acid-dependent defences in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Mol Plant Pathol* **6**: 629–639
- Cao H, Bowling SA, Gordon AS, Dong X** (1994) Characterization of an *Arabidopsis* mutant that is nonresponsive to inducers of systemic acquired resistance. *Plant Cell* **6**: 1583–1592
- Cao H, Glazebrook J, Clarke JD, Volko S, Dong X** (1997) The *Arabidopsis NPR1* gene that controls systemic acquired resistance encodes a novel protein containing ankyrin repeats. *Cell* **88**: 57–63
- Chini A, Fonseca S, Fernandez G, Adie B, Chico JM, Lorenzo O, Garcia-Casado G, Lopez-Vidriero I, Lozano FM, Ponce MR, et al** (2007) The JAZ family of repressors is the missing link in jasmonate signalling. *Nature* **448**: 666–671
- Clarke JD, Liu Y, Klessig DE, Dong X** (1998) Uncoupling *PR* gene expression from NPR1 and bacterial resistance: characterization of the dominant *Arabidopsis cpr6-1* mutant. *Plant Cell* **10**: 557–569
- Clarke JD, Volko SM, Ledford H, Ausubel FM, Dong X** (2000) Roles of salicylic acid, jasmonic acid, and ethylene in *cpr*-induced resistance in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell* **12**: 2175–2190
- Cui J, Bahrami AK, Pringle EG, Hernandez-Guzman G, Bender CL, Pierce NE, Ausubel FM** (2005) *Pseudomonas syringae* manipulates systemic plant defenses against pathogens and herbivores. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **102**: 1791–1796
- Cui J, Jander G, Racki LR, Kim PD, Pierce NE, Ausubel FM** (2002) Signals involved in *Arabidopsis* resistance to *Trichoplusia ni* caterpillars induced by virulent and avirulent strains of the phytopathogen *Pseudomonas syringae*. *Plant Physiol* **129**: 551–564
- Czechowski T, Bari RP, Stitt M, Scheible WR, Udvardi MK** (2004) Real-time RT-PCR profiling of over 1400 *Arabidopsis* transcription factors: unprecendented sensitivity reveals novel root- and shoot-specific genes. *Plant J* **38**: 366–379
- De Laat AMM, Van Loon LC** (1982) Regulation of ethylene biosynthesis in virus-infected tobacco leaves. II. Time course of levels of intermediates and *in vivo* conversion rates. *Plant Physiol* **69**: 240–245
- Delaney TP, Friedrich L, Ryals JA** (1995) *Arabidopsis* signal transduction mutant defective in chemically and biologically induced disease resistance. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **92**: 6602–6606
- Després C, Chubak C, Rochon A, Clark R, Bethune T, Desveaux D, Fobert PR** (2003) The *Arabidopsis* NPR1 disease resistance protein is a novel cofactor that confers redox regulation of DNA binding activity to the basic domain/leucine zipper transcription factor TGA1. *Plant Cell* **15**: 2181–2191
- de Torres-Zabala M, Truman W, Bennett MH, Lafforgue G, Mansfield JW, Egea PR, Bogre L, Grant M** (2007) *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *tomato* hijacks the *Arabidopsis* abscisic acid signalling pathway to cause disease. *EMBO J* **26**: 1434–1443
- De Vos M, Van Oosten VR, Van Poecke RMP, Van Pelt JA, Pozo MJ, Mueller MJ, Buchala AJ, Métraux JP, Van Loon LC, Dicke M, et al** (2005) Signal signature and transcriptome changes of *Arabidopsis* during pathogen and insect attack. *Mol Plant Microbe Interact* **18**: 923–937
- De Vos M, Van Zaanen W, Koornneef A, Korzelius JP, Dicke M, Van Loon LC, Pieterse CMJ** (2006) Herbivore-induced resistance against microbial pathogens in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Physiol* **142**: 352–363
- Doherty HM, Selvendran RR, Bowles DJ** (1988) The wound response of tomato plants can be inhibited by aspirin and related hydroxy-benzoic acids. *Physiol Mol Plant Pathol* **33**: 377–384
- Dong X** (1998) SA, JA, ethylene, and disease resistance in plants. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* **1**: 316–323
- Dong X** (2004) NPR1, all things considered. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* **7**: 547–552
- Durrant WE, Wang S, Dong X** (2007) *Arabidopsis* SN1I and RAD51D regulate both gene transcription and DNA recombination during the defense response. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **104**: 4223–4227
- Glazebrook J** (2005) Contrasting mechanisms of defense against biotrophic and necrotrophic pathogens. *Annu Rev Phytopathol* **43**: 205–227
- Glazebrook J, Chen W, Estes B, Chang HS, Nawrath C, Métraux JP, Zhu T, Katagiri F** (2003) Topology of the network integrating salicylate and jasmonate signal transduction derived from global expression phenotyping. *Plant J* **34**: 217–228
- Glazebrook J, Rogers EE, Ausubel FM** (1996) Isolation of *Arabidopsis* mutants with enhanced disease susceptibility by direct screening. *Genetics* **143**: 973–982
- Grant M, Lamb C** (2006) Systemic immunity. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* **9**: 414–420
- Guo HW, Ecker JR** (2003) Plant responses to ethylene gas are mediated by SCF (EBF1/EBF2)-dependent proteolysis of EIN3 transcription factor. *Cell* **115**: 667–677
- Gupta V, Willits MG, Glazebrook J** (2000) *Arabidopsis thaliana* EDS4 contributes to salicylic acid (SA)-dependent expression of defense responses: evidence for inhibition of jasmonic acid signaling by SA. *Mol Plant Microbe Interact* **13**: 503–511
- Heidel AJ, Clarke JD, Antonovics J, Dong X** (2004) Fitness costs of mutations affecting the systemic acquired resistance pathway in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Genetics* **168**: 2197–2206
- Heil M, Baldwin IT** (2002) Fitness costs of induced resistance: emerging experimental support for a slippery concept. *Trends Plant Sci* **7**: 61–67
- Hoagland DR, Arnon DI** (1938) The water culture method for growing plants without soil. *Calif Agric Exp Stn Bull* **347**: 36–39
- Howe GA** (2004) Jasmonates as signals in the wound response. *J Plant Growth Regul* **23**: 223–237
- Hua J, Sakai H, Nourizadeh S, Chen QG, Bleecker AB, Ecker JR, Meyerowitz EM** (1998) EIN4 and ERS2 are members of the putative ethylene receptor gene family in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell* **10**: 1321–1332
- Johansson A, Staal J, Dixelius C** (2006) Early responses in the *Arabidopsis-Verticillium longisporium* pathosystem are dependent on NDR1, JA- and ET-associated signals via cytosolic NPR1 and RFO1. *Mol Plant Microbe Interact* **19**: 958–969
- Kessler A, Baldwin IT** (2002) Plant responses to insect herbivory: the emerging molecular analysis. *Annu Rev Plant Biol* **53**: 299–328
- Kinkema M, Fan W, Dong X** (2000) Nuclear localization of NPR1 is required for activation of *PR* gene expression. *Plant Cell* **12**: 2339–2350
- Koornneef A, Leon-Reyes A, Ritsema T, Verhage A, Den Otter FC, Van Loon LC, Pieterse CMJ** (2008) Kinetics of salicylate-mediated suppression of jasmonate signaling reveal a role for redox modulation. *Plant Physiol* **147**: 1358–1368
- Koornneef A, Pieterse CMJ** (2008) Cross-talk in defense signaling. *Plant Physiol* **146**: 839–844
- Kunkel BN, Brooks DM** (2002) Cross talk between signaling pathways in pathogen defense. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* **5**: 325–331
- Lawton KA, Potter SL, Uknes S, Ryals J** (1994) Acquired resistance signal transduction in *Arabidopsis* is ethylene independent. *Plant Cell* **6**: 581–588
- Li J, Brader G, Palva ET** (2004) The WRKY70 transcription factor: a node of convergence for jasmonate-mediated and salicylate-mediated signals in plant defense. *Plant Cell* **16**: 319–331
- Li X, Zhang Y, Clarke JD, Li Y, Dong X** (1999) Identification and cloning of a negative regulator of systemic acquired resistance, SN1I, through a screen for suppressors of *npr1-1*. *Cell* **98**: 329–339
- Mauch-Mani B, Mauch F** (2005) The role of abscisic acid in plant-pathogen interactions. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* **8**: 409–414
- Millenaar FF, Cox MCH, van Berkel YEM, Welschen RAM, Pierik R, Voeselek LACJ, Peeters AJM** (2005) Ethylene-induced differential growth of petioles in *Arabidopsis*: analyzing natural variation, response kinetics, and regulation. *Plant Physiol* **137**: 998–1008
- Mou Z, Fan WH, Dong XN** (2003) Inducers of plant systemic acquired resistance regulate NPR1 function through redox changes. *Cell* **113**: 935–944
- Mur LAJ, Kenton P, Atzorn R, Miersch O, Wasternack C** (2006) The outcomes of concentration-specific interactions between salicylate and jasmonate signaling include synergy, antagonism, and oxidative stress leading to cell death. *Plant Physiol* **140**: 249–262
- Murashige T, Skoog F** (1962) A revised medium for rapid growth and bioassays with tobacco tissue culture. *Physiol Plant* **15**: 473–497

- Nakashita H, Yasuda M, Nitta T, Asami T, Fujioka S, Arai Y, Sekimata K, Takatsuto S, Yamaguchi I, Yoshida S (2003) Brassinosteroid functions in a broad range of disease resistance in tobacco and rice. *Plant J* **33**: 887–898
- Navarro L, Bari R, Achard P, Lison P, Nemri A, Harberd NP, Jones JDG (2008) DELLAs control plant immune responses by modulating the balance of jasmonic acid and salicylic acid signaling. *Curr Biol* **18**: 650–655
- Navarro L, Dunoyer P, Jay F, Arnold B, Dharmasiri N, Estelle M, Voinnet O, Jones JDG (2006) A plant miRNA contributes to antibacterial resistance by repressing auxin signaling. *Science* **312**: 436–439
- Ndamukong I, Abdallat AA, Thurow C, Fode B, Zander M, Weigel R, Gatz C (2007) SA-inducible Arabidopsis glutaredoxin interacts with TGA factors and suppresses JA-responsive *PDF1.2* transcription. *Plant J* **50**: 128–139
- Nomura K, Melotto M, He SY (2005) Suppression of host defense in compatible plant-*Pseudomonas syringae* interactions. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* **8**: 361–368
- Peña-Cortés H, Albrecht T, Prat S, Weiler EW, Willmitzer L (1993) Aspirin prevents wound-induced gene expression in tomato leaves by blocking jasmonic acid biosynthesis. *Planta* **191**: 123–128
- Penninckx IAMA, Thomma BPHJ, Buchala A, Métraux JP, Broekaert WF (1998) Concomitant activation of jasmonate and ethylene response pathways is required for induction of a plant defensin gene in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell* **10**: 2103–2113
- Pieterse CMJ, Dicke M (2007) Plant interactions with microbes and insects: from molecular mechanisms to ecology. *Trends Plant Sci* **12**: 564–569
- Pieterse CMJ, Ton J, Van Loon LC (2001) Cross-talk between plant defence signalling pathways: boost or burden? *AgBiotechNet* **3**: ABN 068
- Pieterse CMJ, Van Loon LC (2004) NPR1: the spider in the web of induced resistance signaling pathways. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* **7**: 456–464
- Pieterse CMJ, Van Wees SCM, Van Pelt JA, Knoester M, Laan R, Gerrits H, Weisbeek PJ, Van Loon LC (1998) A novel signaling pathway controlling induced systemic resistance in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell* **10**: 1571–1580
- Poelman EH, Broekgaarden C, Van Loon JJA, Dicke M (2008) Early season herbivore differentially affects plant defence responses to subsequently colonizing herbivores and their abundance in the field. *Mol Ecol* **17**: 3352–3365
- Pozo MJ, Van Loon LC, Pieterse CMJ (2004) Jasmonates: signals in plant-microbe interactions. *J Plant Growth Regul* **23**: 211–222
- Reymond P, Farmer EE (1998) Jasmonate and salicylate as global signals for defense gene expression. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* **1**: 404–411
- Robert-Seilantiantz A, Navarro L, Bari R, Jones JDG (2007) Pathological hormone imbalances. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* **10**: 372–379
- Rochon A, Boyle P, Wignes T, Fobert PR, Després C (2006) The coactivator function of *Arabidopsis* NPR1 requires the core of its BTB/POZ domain and the oxidation of C-terminal cysteines. *Plant Cell* **18**: 3670–3685
- Sambrook J, Fritsch EF, Maniatis T (1989) *Molecular Cloning: A Laboratory Manual*, Ed 2. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, Cold Spring Harbor, NY
- Schenk PM, Kazan K, Wilson I, Anderson JP, Richmond T, Somerville SC, Manners JM (2000) Coordinated plant defense responses in *Arabidopsis* revealed by microarray analysis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **97**: 11655–11660
- Shah J, Kachroo P, Klessig DF (1999) The *Arabidopsis ssi1* mutation restores pathogenesis-related gene expression in *npr1* plants and renders defensin gene expression salicylic acid dependent. *Plant Cell* **11**: 191–206
- Shah J, Tsui F, Klessig DF (1997) Characterization of a salicylic acid-insensitive mutant (*sai1*) of *Arabidopsis thaliana*, identified in a selective screen utilizing the SA-inducible expression of the *tms2* gene. *Mol Plant Microbe Interact* **10**: 69–78
- Spoel SH, Dong X (2008) Making sense of hormone crosstalk during plant immune responses. *Cell Host Microbe* **3**: 348–351
- Spoel SH, Johnson JS, Dong X (2007) Regulation of tradeoffs between plant defenses against pathogens with different lifestyles. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **104**: 18842–18847
- Spoel SH, Koornneef A, Claessens SMC, Korzelius JP, Van Pelt JA, Mueller MJ, Buchala AJ, Métraux JP, Brown R, Kazan K, et al (2003) NPR1 modulates cross talk between salicylate- and jasmonate-dependent defense pathways through a novel function in the cytosol. *Plant Cell* **15**: 760–770
- Stotz HU, Koch T, Biedermann A, Weniger K, Boland W, Mitchell-Olds T (2002) Evidence for regulation of resistance in *Arabidopsis* to Egyptian cotton worm by salicylic and jasmonic acid signaling pathways. *Planta* **214**: 648–652
- Stout MJ, Thaler JS, Thomma BPHJ (2006) Plant-mediated interactions between pathogenic microorganisms and herbivorous arthropods. *Annu Rev Entomol* **51**: 663–689
- Tada Y, Spoel SH, Pajerowska-Mukhtar K, Mou Z, Song J, Wang C, Zuo J, Dong X (2008) Plant immunity requires conformational changes of NPR1 via S-nitrosylation and thioredoxins. *Science* **321**: 952–956
- Thaler JS, Karban R, Ullman DE, Boege K, Bostock RM (2002) Cross-talk between jasmonate and salicylate plant defense pathways: effects on several plant parasites. *Oecologia* **131**: 227–235
- Thatcher LF, Anderson JP, Singh KB (2005) Plant defence responses: what have we learnt from *Arabidopsis*? *Funct Plant Biol* **32**: 1–19
- Thines B, Katsir L, Melotto M, Niu Y, Mandaokar A, Liu GH, Nomura K, He SY, Howe GA, Browse J (2007) JAZ repressor proteins are targets of the SCF<sup>CO1</sup> complex during jasmonate signalling. *Nature* **448**: 661–665
- Thomma BPHJ, Eggermont K, Penninckx IAMA, Mauch-Mani B, Vogelsang R, Cammue BPA, Broekaert WF (1998) Separate jasmonate-dependent and salicylate-dependent defense-response pathways in *Arabidopsis* are essential for resistance to distinct microbial pathogens. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **95**: 15107–15111
- Thomma BPHJ, Penninckx IAMA, Broekaert WF, Cammue BPA (2001) The complexity of disease signaling in *Arabidopsis*. *Curr Opin Immunol* **13**: 63–68
- Ton J, Van Pelt JA, Van Loon LC, Pieterse CMJ (2002) Differential effectiveness of salicylate-dependent and jasmonate/ethylene-dependent induced resistance in *Arabidopsis*. *Mol Plant Microbe Interact* **15**: 27–34
- Uppalapati SR, Ishiga Y, Wangdi T, Kunkel BN, Anand A, Mysore KS, Bender CL (2007) The phytotoxin coronatine contributes to pathogen fitness and is required for suppression of salicylic acid accumulation in tomato inoculated with *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *tomato* DC3000. *Mol Plant Microbe Interact* **20**: 955–965
- Van der Ent S, Verhagen BWM, Van Doorn R, Bakker D, Verlaan MG, Pel MJC, Joosten RG, Proveniers MCG, Van Loon LC, Ton J, et al (2008) MYB72 is required in early signaling steps of rhizobacteria-induced systemic resistance in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Physiol* **146**: 1293–1304
- Van der Putten WH, Vet LEM, Harvey JA, Wäckers FL (2001) Linking above- and belowground multitrophic interactions of plants, herbivores, pathogens, and their antagonists. *Trends Ecol Evol* **16**: 547–554
- Van Hulst M, Pelsler M, Van Loon LC, Pieterse CMJ, Ton J (2006) Costs and benefits of priming for defense in *Arabidopsis*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **103**: 5602–5607
- Van Loon LC, Geraats BPJ, Linthorst HJM (2006) Ethylene as a modulator of disease resistance in plants. *Trends Plant Sci* **11**: 184–191
- Van Wees SCM, De Swart EAM, Van Pelt JA, Van Loon LC, Pieterse CMJ (2000) Enhancement of induced disease resistance by simultaneous activation of salicylate- and jasmonate-dependent defense pathways in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **97**: 8711–8716
- Van Wees SCM, Van der Ent S, Pieterse CMJ (2008) Plant immune responses triggered by beneficial microbes. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* **11**: 443–448
- Verberne MC, Hoekstra J, Bol JF, Linthorst HJM (2003) Signaling of systemic acquired resistance in tobacco depends on ethylene perception. *Plant J* **35**: 27–32
- Vlot AC, Klessig DF, Park SW (2008) Systemic acquired resistance: the elusive signal(s). *Curr Opin Plant Biol* **11**: 436–442
- Von Dahl CC, Baldwin IT (2007) Deciphering the role of ethylene in plant-herbivore interactions. *J Plant Growth Regul* **26**: 201–209
- Walling LL (2008) Avoiding effective defenses: strategies employed by phloem-feeding insects. *Plant Physiol* **146**: 859–866
- Walters D, Newton A, Lyon G (2007) *Induced Resistance for Plant Defence: A Sustainable Approach to Crop Protection*. Blackwell, Oxford
- Wang D, Pajerowska-Mukhtar K, Hendrickson Culler A, Dong X (2007) Salicylic acid inhibits pathogen growth in plants through repression of the auxin signaling pathway. *Curr Biol* **17**: 1784–1790
- Yuan Y, Zhong S, Li Q, Zhu Z, Lou Y, Wang L, Wang J, Wang M, Li Q, Yang D, et al (2007) Functional analysis of rice *NPR1*-like genes reveals that *OsNPR1/NHI* is the rice orthologue conferring disease resistance with enhanced herbivore susceptibility. *Plant Biotechnol J* **5**: 313–324
- Zhao Y, Thilmony R, Bender CL, Schaller A, He SY, Howe GA (2003) Virulence systems of *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *tomato* promote bacterial speck disease in tomato by targeting the jasmonate signaling pathway. *Plant J* **36**: 485–499