

 Open access • Journal Article • DOI:10.1111/J.1365-313X.2010.04200.X

Insect eggs suppress plant defence against chewing herbivores — [Source link](#)

Friederike Bruessow, Caroline Gouhier-Darimont, Antony Buchala, Jean-Pierre Métraux ...+1 more authors

Institutions: University of Lausanne, University of Fribourg

Published on: 01 Jun 2010 - Plant Journal (Blackwell Publishing Ltd)

Topics: Jasmonic acid, Pieris brassicae and Spodoptera littoralis

Related papers:

- [Plant Immunity to Insect Herbivores](#)
- [Oviposition by pierid butterflies triggers defense responses in Arabidopsis.](#)
- [Silverleaf Whitefly Induces Salicylic Acid Defenses and Suppresses Effectual Jasmonic Acid Defenses](#)
- [Different Lepidopteran Elicitors Account for Cross-Talk in Herbivory-Induced Phytohormone Signaling](#)
- [Perception, signaling and molecular basis of oviposition-mediated plant responses](#)

Share this paper:    

View more about this paper here: <https://typeset.io/papers/insect-eggs-suppress-plant-defence-against-chewing-2g8ha99pv1>

Serveur Académique Lausannois SERVAL serval.unil.ch

Author Manuscript

Faculty of Biology and Medicine Publication

This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Published in final edited form as:

Title: Insect eggs suppress plant defence against chewing herbivores.

Authors: Bruessow F, Gouhier-Darimont C, Buchala A, Metraux JP, Reymond P

Journal: The Plant journal : for cell and molecular biology

Year: 2010 Jun 1

Issue: 62

Volume: 5

Pages: 876-85

DOI: [10.1111/j.1365-3113X.2010.04200.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3113X.2010.04200.x)

In the absence of a copyright statement, users should assume that standard copyright protection applies, unless the article contains an explicit statement to the contrary. In case of doubt, contact the journal publisher to verify the copyright status of an article.

*the plant journal***Insect eggs suppress plant defence against chewing herbivores**

Journal:	<i>The Plant Journal</i>
Manuscript ID:	TPJ-00011-2010.R1
Manuscript Type:	Full Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	
Complete List of Authors:	Bruessow, Friederike; University of Lausanne, Department of Plant Molecular Biology Gouhier-Darimont, Caroline; University of Lausanne, Department of Plant Molecular Biology Buchala, Antony; University of Fribourg, Department of Biology Metraux, Jean-Pierre; Universite de Fribourg, Departement de Biologie Reymond, Philippe; University of Lausanne, Department of Plant Molecular Biology
Key Words:	oviposition, salicylic acid, jasmonic acid, cross-talk, herbivory, plant defence



1
2
3
4
5 1 Running title: insect eggs and plant defence
6

7 2

8
9 3 **Insect eggs suppress plant defence against chewing herbivores.**
10

11 4

12
13
14 5 **Friederike Bruessow¹, Caroline Gouhier-Darimont¹, Antony Buchala², Jean-Pierre**

15
16 6 **Metraux² and Philippe Reymond^{1,*}**

17
18 7 *¹Department of Plant Molecular Biology, University of Lausanne, CH-1015 Lausanne,*

19
20 8 *Switzerland, and*

21
22 9 *²Department of Biology, University of Fribourg, CH-1700 Fribourg, Switzerland*
23

24
25
26 10

27
28 11 *For correspondence (tel +41 21 692 42 29; fax +41 21 692 41 95; e-mail

29
30 12 philippe.reymond@unil.ch)

31
32 13 e-mail addresses: friederike.bruessow@unil.ch, Caroline.Darimont-Nicolau@unil.ch,

33
34 14 antony.buchala@unifr.ch, jean-pierre.metraux@unifr.ch, philippe.reymond@unil.ch
35

36
37 15

38
39 16 keywords: oviposition, salicylic acid, jasmonic acid, cross-talk, herbivory, plant defence
40

41
42 17

43
44 18 Word count:

45
46 19 Total: 5340

47
48 20 Summary: 236 Introduction: 860 Results: 1385 Discussion: 1867

49
50 21 Experimental procedures: 852 Acknowledgements: 37 Figure legends: 657

51
52 22 References: 1926
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 **SUMMARY**
5

6
7 Plants activate direct and indirect defences in response to insect egg deposition. However,
8
9 whether eggs can manipulate plant defence is unknown. In *Arabidopsis thaliana*,
10
11 oviposition by the butterfly *Pieris brassicae* triggers cellular and molecular changes that are
12
13 similar to the changes caused by biotrophic pathogens. In the present study, we found that
14
15 the plant defence signal salicylic acid (SA) accumulates at the site of oviposition. This is
16
17 unexpected since the SA pathway controls the defence against fungal and bacterial
18
19 pathogens whereas it negatively interacts with the jasmonic acid (JA) pathway, which is
20
21 crucial for the defence against herbivores. Application of *P. brassicae* or *Spodoptera*
22
23 *littoralis* egg extract onto leaves reduced the induction of insect-responsive genes after
24
25 challenge with caterpillars, suggesting that egg-derived elicitors suppress plant defence.
26
27 Consequently, larval growth of the generalist herbivore *S. littoralis*, but not of the specialist
28
29 *P. brassicae*, was significantly higher on plants treated with egg extract than on control
30
31 plants. In contrast, suppression of gene induction and enhanced *S. littoralis* performance
32
33 were not found in the SA-deficient mutant *sid2-1*, indicating that SA mediates this
34
35 phenomenon. These data reveal an intriguing facet of the cross-talk between SA- and JA-
36
37 signalling pathways and suggest that insects have evolved a way to suppress the induction
38
39 of defence genes by laying eggs that release elicitors. We show here that egg-induced SA
40
41 accumulation negatively interferes with the JA pathway and provides an advantage to
42
43 generalist herbivores.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Plants attacked by herbivorous insects develop various defence strategies (Howe and Jander
3 2008). In addition to the pre-existing physical and chemical barriers consisting of
4 trichomes, thick secondary cell walls and toxic metabolites, plants deploy defences that are
5 induced upon recognition of the enemy. As a sophisticated indirect mechanism, they emit
6 volatiles to recruit predators of the attacker. This is superimposed on the production of
7 antinutritive compounds, poisons, and defensive proteins that directly affect the
8 performance of the herbivore (Howe and Jander 2008, Walling 2000). At the molecular
9 level, herbivores trigger massive transcriptional changes that are mainly controlled by the
10 JA pathway (De Vos *et al.* 2005, Kempema *et al.* 2007, Reymond *et al.* 2004).
11 Accordingly, *Arabidopsis* mutants impaired in the JA response are more susceptible to
12 insect feeding (Bodenhausen and Reymond 2007, McConn *et al.* 1997, Reymond *et al.*
13 2004, Dicke and Farmer 2004, Stotz *et al.* 2002).

14 Insect eggs are apparently a passive stage of herbivores but they nevertheless
15 represent a real threat for the plant as they give rise to the feeding larvae. Direct and
16 indirect responses to oviposition have been reported (Hilker and Meiners 2006). Direct
17 defences include the growth of undifferentiated cells on pea pods, which elevate and thus
18 increase the risk of desiccation and predation of weevil eggs (Doss *et al.* 2000), the
19 production of the ovicidal substance benzyl benzoate in rice in response to eggs of white-
20 backed plant hopper (Seino *et al.* 1996), or the development of a necrotic zone at the site of
21 egg deposition in *Brassica nigra* and potato, which results in egg desiccation and mortality
22 (Balbyshev and Lorenzen 1997, Shapiro and Devay 1987). Another direct defence is the
23 production of oviposition deterrents that prevent female butterflies to lay more eggs on the

1 host (De Vos *et al.* 2008). Indirect defences comprise the emission of volatiles (mono- and
2 sesquiterpenes) or the modification of the plant surface chemistry in response to
3 oviposition, resulting in the attraction of egg parasitoids. These tri-trophic interactions have
4 been observed in several species and with different predators (Fatouros *et al.* 2005, Hilker
5 *et al.* 2002, Meiners and Hilker 2000).

6 There is thus evidence that plants can perceive egg deposition but the knowledge on
7 the nature of the elicitors and on the cellular and molecular responses to oviposition is still
8 limited. The only characterized elicitors of a direct defence are those responsible for the
9 formation of tumour-like structures on pea pods. They are long-chain fatty-acid derived
10 molecules called bruchins that are found in eggs and adults of bruchid beetles (Doss *et al.*
11 2000). Elicitors triggering the release of volatiles have not yet been identified but some are
12 present in the oviduct secretions coating the egg (Hilker *et al.* 2005). For leaf surface
13 changes that attract egg parasitoids, the elicitor is the anti-aphrodisiac male pheromone
14 benzyl cyanide that is contained in the accessory gland secretion released by mated female
15 butterflies (Fatouros *et al.* 2008). Some egg predators can even exploit this sexual signal to
16 attach themselves to the mated female butterflies and locate the host plant (Huigens *et al.*
17 2009).

18 In response to oviposition, plants reduce their photosynthetic activity (Schroder *et*
19 *al.* 2005) and the emission of ethylene (Schroder *et al.* 2007). Recently, we analysed the
20 expression profile of *Arabidopsis* leaves after oviposition by two species of pierid
21 butterflies. Eggs laid by the Large Cabbage White *Pieris brassicae* modified the expression
22 of hundreds of genes, including defence and stress-related genes that are induced in plants
23 undergoing programmed cell death. Furthermore, callose deposition, hydrogen peroxide

1 production and cell death occurred at the site of egg deposition and we showed that egg-
2 derived elicitors triggered these events (Little *et al.* 2007). Moreover, necrotic zones were
3 observed at the oviposition site in plants related to *Arabidopsis* (Bruessow and Reymond
4 2007).

5 The genes induced by oviposition include several known targets of SA. This
6 signalling molecule is a potent inducer of pathogenesis-related genes and is involved in the
7 resistance against biotrophic pathogens (Glazebrook 2005). Interestingly, it is known that
8 SA- and JA-signalling pathways interact antagonistically (Beckers and Spoel 2006,
9 Koornneef and Pieterse 2008). For example, there is evidence that SA can suppress JA-
10 dependent defence responses (Cipollini *et al.* 2004, Doares *et al.* 1995, Gupta *et al.* 2000,
11 Koornneef *et al.* 2008, Spoel *et al.* 2007, Spoel *et al.* 2003). The activation of the SA
12 pathway weakens the plant response to attackers that are resisted through the JA-pathway,
13 as nicely shown with a necrotrophic fungus (Spoel *et al.* 2007) or a chewing herbivore
14 (Cipollini *et al.* 2004). This raised the question whether eggs trigger an accumulation of SA
15 and whether this could in turn inhibit the defence responses against insect herbivores. We
16 show here that SA levels increase at the site of oviposition and that the induction of
17 herbivore-responsive genes is compromised after a further attack by chewing insects.
18 Moreover, larvae of a generalist herbivore grow better on plants treated with egg extract,
19 suggesting that eggs can manipulate plant defence signalling by interfering with the
20 response to herbivores. These data unravel an intriguing phenomenon whereby insects may
21 indirectly protect their offspring by releasing as yet unknown egg elicitors that target the
22 defensive mechanism of the plant.

1 RESULTS

2 Elicitors are present in eggs of different insects

3 We recently reported that *P. brassicae* eggs activate the expression of hundreds of genes in
4 *Arabidopsis* (Little *et al.* 2007). Using an *Arabidopsis* transgenic line containing the
5 promoter of the defence gene *PR1* coupled to the β -glucuronidase (GUS) reporter gene, we
6 showed that this activation was localized to the site of oviposition and could be mimicked
7 by the application of soluble *P. brassicae* egg extracts (Little *et al.* 2007). To test whether
8 this phenomenon also occurred with eggs of other insects we monitored the response of
9 *Arabidopsis* GUS reporter lines to egg extract application. In addition to *PR1* we selected
10 three other genes strongly induced by oviposition, a gene encoding a trypsin inhibitor (*TI*),
11 a chitinase gene (*CHIT*), and a senescence-associated gene (*SAG13*). A strong and localized
12 GUS staining was observed for all marker genes in response to egg extracts from the
13 specialist *P. brassicae*, the generalist *Spodoptera littoralis*, and the non-herbivore
14 *Drosophila melanogaster* (Figure 1a). In addition, we found that extracts of bacteria
15 recovered from *P. brassicae* eggshells and extracts from the yeast *Saccharomyces*
16 *cerevisiae* did not activate the marker genes (F. Bruessow, unpublished results). These
17 results indicate that *Arabidopsis* recognizes one or several generic elicitors present in eggs
18 of distantly related insects and that these molecules are probably insect-specific.

19 We then carried out an initial characterization of the egg-derived elicitor(s).
20 Application of empty eggshells of freshly hatched *P. brassicae* larvae onto *PR1::GUS*
21 plants for 72 hr did not cause a GUS staining, suggesting that the gene-induction activity
22 resides within the embryo (Figure 1b). GUS staining was enhanced by a proteinase K

1
2
3
4 1 treatment of the egg extract and was conserved after filtration of the soluble fraction
5
6
7 2 through a 3-kDa filter, indicating that the elicitor is a small molecule without enzymatic
8
9
10 3 activity (Figure 1b). Finally, we found that the eliciting activity is enriched in the fraction
11
12 4 containing total egg lipids (Figure 1b).
13
14
15

16 **SA accumulates in the oviposited leaf**

17
18
19 7 The SA pathway activates numerous genes that are induced in the oviposited leaf (Little *et*
20
21 8 *al.* 2007). Furthermore *ICS1*, which encodes the key enzyme required for SA biosynthesis
22
23 9 (Wildermuth *et al.* 2001), is strongly upregulated by oviposition (Little *et al.* 2007). We
24
25
26 10 thus quantified SA in leaf discs underneath the eggs and in distal *Arabidopsis* leaves in
27
28
29 11 response to oviposition by *P. brassicae* butterflies. The SA levels increased gradually in
30
31 12 oviposited leaves during four days after oviposition, whereas these levels stayed almost
32
33 13 constant in non-oviposited leaves. After four days, SA levels were more than 10-fold higher
34
35 14 in oviposited leaves than in control leaves before oviposition, reaching ca. 21 $\mu\text{g/g}$ FW
36
37
38 15 (Figure 2a). Similarly, leaf discs from plants treated with *P. brassicae* egg extract
39
40 16 accumulated high amounts of SA compared to untreated leaves, indicating that the
41
42
43 17 treatment was mimicking the response to oviposition (Figure 2b). Given that SA-responsive
44
45 18 genes are still induced in tissue adjacent to the oviposition sites (Little *et al.* 2007) and that
46
47 19 considerable amounts of SA are found underneath the eggs, we can postulate that
48
49
50 20 oviposited leaves contain significant levels of SA in the whole leaf.
51

52 21 SA has been detected in eggs of lepidopteran insects (Tooker and De Moraes 2007)
53
54 22 and therefore this could be the source of the levels found in oviposited leaves. We
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 quantified SA in *P. brassicae* eggs laid on *Arabidopsis* leaves. SA levels did not change
2 during 4 days after oviposition, averaging ca. 0.5 µg/g FW, which is about 25% of the basal
3 levels of untreated *Arabidopsis* leaves (Figure S1). Since SA levels that accumulate in the
4 leaves in response to oviposition are much higher than those founds in eggs, a simple
5 transfer of SA from the egg to the plant cannot account for the observed accumulation. An
6 alternative explanation is that a small amount of SA from the egg can induce the synthesis
7 of SA in the plant. This is unlikely since SA does not regulate the expression of *ICSI*
8 (Wildermuth *et al.* 2001). Thus, SA accumulation in response to oviposition likely results
9 from *de novo* synthesis in the leaf.

10

11 **Egg extract suppresses herbivore-induced gene expression**

12 Since SA accumulated in the oviposited leaf and since the SA pathway is known to
13 interfere with JA-dependent defence against insects, we tested the effect of a treatment with
14 egg extract on the expression of insect-responsive genes. For that purpose, we selected 10
15 genes (Table S1) that are strongly induced in response to chewing herbivores and
16 controlled by the JA pathway (Little *et al.* 2007, Reymond *et al.* 2004), and measured their
17 expression by quantitative real-time PCR. Plants were treated for 5 days with *P. brassicae*
18 egg extract and were then infested for 2 days with newly hatched larvae of the specialist *P.*
19 *brassicae* or the generalist *S. littoralis*. As expected, all the selected genes were strongly
20 induced after challenge with either *P. brassicae* or *S. littoralis* larvae in control plants that
21 were not treated with egg extract. However, this induction was markedly reduced in leaves
22 that had been pre-treated with egg-extract (Figure 3a,b). For example, the known anti-

1 herbivore gene *VSP2* showed a ca. 60-fold higher induction in untreated plants than in
2 plants treated with egg extract. Overall, a similar suppression of gene expression was
3 observed with either *P. brassicae* or *S. littoralis* larvae. This suppression was only observed
4 in treated leaves. In distal leaves the induction of insect-responsive genes was similar,
5 whether or not the plants were treated with egg extract (Figure S2). Furthermore, treatment
6 with *S. littoralis* egg extract also suppressed defence gene expression in response to
7 subsequent challenge with *S. littoralis* larvae, indicating that this phenomenon was
8 conserved between two distantly related insects (Figure S3).

9 Interestingly, the suppression of insect-responsive genes was almost completely
10 abolished in the SA-deficient mutant *sid2-1*. The large majority of the genes were equally
11 induced by infestation with *S. littoralis* larvae in treated and untreated plants (Figure 3c).
12 Thus, our data indicate that the suppression of defence gene expression in response to egg
13 elicitors occurs locally and is largely controlled by SA.

14 To assess whether the SA-mediated suppression of insect-induced genes was only
15 targeting the JA pathway, we monitored the expression of 5 JA-independent genes
16 (Reymond *et al.* 2004) in plants challenged with *S. littoralis*. These genes were induced
17 both by a treatment with egg extract or by *S. littoralis* feeding. However, a treatment with
18 egg extract followed by a subsequent attack by insect larvae did not suppress their
19 induction (Figure S4). These data suggest that egg-induced SA accumulation leads to a
20 preferential inhibition of JA-dependent defence gene expression.

21
22 **Plants treated with egg extract are more susceptible to *S. littoralis* larvae**

1 To test whether the suppression of insect-responsive genes had a consequence on insect
2 performance, we measured the weight of larvae feeding on plants treated with *P. brassicae*
3 egg extract. Plants were treated for 5 days with *P. brassicae* egg extract and were
4 subsequently challenged for 8 days with newly hatched *P. brassicae* larvae. Surprisingly,
5 the weight of larvae fed on treated or untreated plants did not differ significantly (Figure
6 4a). In contrast, larvae of the generalist herbivore *S. littoralis* gained significantly more
7 weight on egg extract-treated plants than on untreated plants (Figure 4b). The enhanced
8 susceptibility of egg extract-treated Col-0 plants was abolished in the *sid2-1* mutant.
9 Indeed, *S. littoralis* larvae reached the same weight after 8 days of feeding on treated or
10 untreated *sid2-1* plants (Figure 4c). We thus show here that treatment with egg extract
11 triggers a potent, SA-mediated, suppression of defence against a generalist herbivore.

12 **Suppression of plant defences by egg extract does not depend on NPR1**

13 Studies with pathogens have shown that the regulatory protein NPR1 plays a crucial role in
14 the inhibitory action of SA on the JA-dependent defences (Leon-Reyes *et al.* 2009, Spoel *et*
15 *al.* 2007, Spoel *et al.* 2003). Therefore, we analysed whether NPR1 is also involved in the
16 inhibition of insect-induced responses by egg-derived elicitors. When *npr1-1* mutants were
17 challenged with *S. littoralis* larvae, insect-responsive genes were strongly upregulated.
18 However, a pre-treatment with egg extract inhibited this induction significantly, similarly to
19 Col-0 plants (Figure 5a). Accordingly, *npr1-1* plants pre-treated with egg extract were more
20 susceptible to feeding by *S. littoralis* than untreated plants (Figure 5b). Collectively, our
21 data thus indicate that the suppression of insect defences by egg extract requires the
22 accumulation of SA but is independent of NPR1.

1 DISCUSSION

2 Our data provide strong evidence that egg-derived elicitors trigger the suppression of
3 defences against chewing herbivores in *Arabidopsis*. This process is mediated by SA, as
4 evidenced by the lack of gene suppression and the absence of enhanced insect susceptibility
5 in *sid2-1* mutants. Several observations indicate that application of egg extract mimics the
6 actual oviposition by *P. brassicae*. 1) PR1::GUS is activated similarly by oviposition and
7 by application of egg extract (Little et al. 2007 and Figure 1, this work); 2) oviposition and
8 egg extract treatment lead to a local accumulation of SA, with similar kinetics (Figure 2);
9 and 3) whole-genome analysis of gene expression in response to oviposition and egg
10 extract treatment yields overlapping transcript profiles (data not shown).

11 The observation that egg extracts from distantly related insect species activate the
12 same marker genes, along with the finding that egg extracts from both a specialist and a
13 generalist insect are effective in suppressing defence gene expression, is an indication that
14 some generic molecules are recognized by the plant and induce a conserved response. This
15 is analogous to the detection of microbe-associated molecular patterns (MAMPs) by the
16 innate immune system of the plant (Boller and Felix 2009) and potentially broadens the list
17 of exogenous cues that are recognized by this surveillance mechanism. Further purification
18 and characterization of the *P. brassicae* elicitor(s) should shed light on the identity of these
19 molecules.

20 It is remarkable that this egg elicitor-recognition system is used by the herbivore for
21 its own benefit. Generally, plants have evolved mechanisms to detect MAMPs as a defense
22 strategy and there is yet no example where the attacker obtains a benefit to be recognized.
23 If egg detection is similar to MAMP-triggered immunity, we have to postulate that the egg

1 recognition by a MAMP/receptor pair evolved first as a defense mechanism for the plant
2 and was subsequently hijacked by the herbivore for its own advantage.

3 We found that plants treated with egg extract were more susceptible to chewing
4 larvae of the generalist herbivore *S. littoralis* but not to larvae of the specialist *P. brassicae*.
5 The most straightforward explanation is that *P. brassicae*, a specialist of Brassicaceae
6 species, is adapted to the defences of these plants. For example, larvae of several
7 lepidopteran species including *P. rapae* and *P. brassicae* contain a nitrile-specifier gut
8 protein that detoxifies the breakdown products of the glucosinolates, which are the major
9 insect deterrents in *Arabidopsis* (Wittstock et al. 2004, Wheat et al. 2007). Moreover, we
10 recently showed that larvae of the specialist *P. brassicae* performed equally well on wild-
11 type *Arabidopsis* plants than on mutants that either lacked glucosinolates or that were
12 impaired in the JA-pathway, whereas larvae of the generalist *S. littoralis* were much larger
13 when feeding on the mutant plants (Schlaeppli et al. 2008). Alternatively, *P. brassicae*
14 regurgitant might contain factors that suppress plant defenses. Hence, the oviposition-
15 induced inhibition of JA-dependent defenses would be redundant with this activity and may
16 explain why *P. brassicae* larvae perform equally well on treated and untreated plants.

17 It is intriguing that *P. brassicae* eggs have kept the ability to suppress herbivore
18 defences without a significant increased performance of their own progeny. One reason
19 could be that this trait preceded the acquisition of tolerance to induced defences, and
20 therefore would have provided an advantage to the larvae early in evolution, before
21 specialization and adaptation to its current host plants. Alternatively, the suppression of
22 defences could still be beneficial for the larvae in less favourable conditions, for instance
23 when the detoxification of defence compounds is less efficient due to high yields of toxins

1 produced in some Brassicaceae species. Finally, in addition to its role in the inhibition of
2 the JA pathway, the egg-triggered accumulation of SA might have another, non-exclusive,
3 role in facilitating the development of the larvae. Since the SA pathway is involved in the
4 defence against microbial and fungal pathogens, it could be advantageous for the hatching
5 larvae to stimulate SA production and therefore generate an uninfected leaf area that retains
6 its full nutritive value. Interestingly, the SA levels measured in the oviposited leaves are in
7 the same range as those that are found in leaves infected with bacterial, fungal, and
8 oomycete biotrophs (Roetschi *et al.* 2001, Summermatter *et al.* 1995, Wildermuth *et al.*
9 2001). The combined accumulation of SA (this work) and the up-regulation of many
10 pathogenesis-related genes at the site of oviposition (Little *et al.* 2007) support this
11 hypothesis.

12 Our data show that eggs hijack the SA pathway for the benefit of the hatching
13 larvae, but raise the question if SA accumulation is of direct benefit for the plant? Several
14 SA-responsive genes might be involved in the control of the programmed cell death that is
15 observed at the site of oviposition (Little *et al.* 2007). In some species, this response is
16 exacerbated and results in death or falling of the eggs from the leaf surface (Balbyshev and
17 Lorenzen 1997, Shapiro and Devay 1987). Other SA-induced genes might play a direct as
18 yet unknown defensive role against the eggs. In addition, SA might be converted to the
19 volatile methyl salicylate (MeSA), which has been shown to inhibit oviposition of the
20 cabbage moth *Mamestra brassicae* (Ulland *et al.* 2008). It would be interesting to test
21 whether oviposited *Arabidopsis* plants emit MeSA and whether this subsequently reduces
22 further oviposition by *P. brassicae* butterflies.

1 By using *sid2-1* plants we found that SA accumulation is required for the
2 suppression of insect-induced defences but we have previously shown that the majority of
3 egg-induced genes are still induced in *sid2-1* three days after oviposition (Little *et al.*
4 2007). This apparent discrepancy is nevertheless explained by the fact that the target genes
5 are not the same. On one hand, oviposition directly controls the expression of hundreds of
6 genes that include SA- and programmed cell death-related genes. On the other hand,
7 oviposition is followed by an accumulation of SA that indirectly interferes with the
8 induction of genes that are not induced by eggs but by chewing larvae.

9 We provide here strong evidence that egg-induced accumulation of endogenous SA
10 suppresses JA-mediated defences against a generalist herbivore. Cross-talk between JA and
11 SA signalling has been described in response to different attackers (Beckers and Spoel
12 2006, Koornneef and Pieterse 2008, Stout *et al.* 2006). Plants challenged with microbial
13 pathogens, treated with SA, or treated with inducers of the SA pathway were more
14 susceptible to herbivorous insects or to necrotrophic pathogens (Cipollini *et al.* 2004, Cui *et*
15 *al.* 2005, Leon-Reyes *et al.* 2009, Spoel *et al.* 2007, Thaler *et al.* 1999). Wild tobacco and
16 *Arabidopsis* mutants with elevated SA levels were more susceptible to feeding by *S. exigua*
17 and *Trichoplusia ni* larvae, respectively (Cui *et al.* 2002, Rayapuram and Baldwin 2007).
18 Infection with tobacco mosaic virus stimulated SA signalling in tobacco and consequently
19 increased feeding by the hornworm *Manduca sexta* (Preston *et al.* 1999). At the molecular
20 level, exogenous treatments with SA and JA have shown that SA inhibits the JA-induced
21 expression of several defence genes (Doares *et al.* 1995, Niki *et al.* 1998) including the
22 well-known JA markers *VSP2*, *PDF1.2*, and *LOX2* in *Arabidopsis* (Koornneef *et al.* 2008,
23 Spoel *et al.* 2003).

1 The role of the antagonistic effect of SA on the JA-pathway is not fully understood
2 but is thought to help the plant to optimize its response to aggressors of different lifestyles
3 (Spoel and Dong 2008). Indeed, by inhibiting an inappropriate defence pathway, the plant
4 could allocate more energy for an effective defence against a particular attacker. Our
5 finding that egg-derived elicitors suppress plant defence against insects by activating the
6 SA-JA cross-talk illustrates another modulation of the defence signalling network, but this
7 time for the benefit of the attacker. Indeed, eggs are manipulating the plant to indirectly
8 lower the defences against feeding larvae. A similar phenomenon has been reported for the
9 phloem-feeding silverleaf whitefly (*Bemisia tabaci*). Nymph feeding on *Arabidopsis*
10 induced SA-responsive genes and repressed JA-responsive genes. In addition, mutants that
11 activated the SA pathway or were impaired in JA signalling allowed a faster nymph
12 development (Zarate *et al.* 2007). It was proposed that nymphs suppressed JA defences via
13 SA-JA cross-talk but endogenous SA levels were not measured. In another example,
14 sorghum plants attacked by greenbug aphids activated SA-regulated genes although it was
15 shown that JA-regulated defences were effective against aphids. Again, the SA-JA cross-
16 talk was evoked to explain these intriguing results, albeit without experimental evidence
17 (Zhu-Salzman *et al.* 2004). Other studies indicate that components in insect oral secretions
18 (OS) can suppress plant defences (Kahl *et al.* 2000, Lawrence *et al.* 2007, Musser *et al.*
19 2002). *Arabidopsis* plants had higher levels of JA-dependent defences in response to *S.*
20 *exigua* caterpillars with impaired salivary secretions compared to intact caterpillars (Weech
21 *et al.* 2008). Interestingly, this suppression of defence responses was abolished in mutants
22 unable to mount a systemic acquired resistance and might indicate that SA is involved in
23 this phenomenon. In support of this hypothesis, treatment with *S. exigua* OS stimulated SA

1 accumulation in *N. attenuata* (Diezel *et al.* 2009). There is thus emerging evidence that
2 insects or insect-derived cues (eggs or OS) are able to manipulate the SA-JA cross-talk to
3 their advantage.

4 The molecular mechanisms of cross-talk between SA- and JA-pathways are not
5 fully understood. The regulatory protein NPR1 was identified as a key component in the
6 inhibitory action of SA on the JA-dependent defences (Spoel *et al.* 2003). NPR1 is active in
7 the nucleus to regulate PR-gene expression (Spoel *et al.* 2009) but has an additional role in
8 the cytosol where it is proposed to negatively interact with several components of the JA-
9 pathway (Beckers and Spoel 2006, Spoel *et al.* 2003). Moreover, ethylene signalling was
10 found to override the function of NPR1 in the SA-JA cross-talk (Leon-Reyes *et al.* 2009,
11 Leon-Reyes *et al.* 2010). In addition, the transcriptional activator WRKY70 (Li *et al.*
12 2004), glutaredoxin (Ndamukong *et al.* 2007), and the fatty acid desaturase SSI2 (Kachroo
13 *et al.* 2001) are important modulators of SA-JA cross-talk in *Arabidopsis*. In this study, we
14 found that egg-induced defence suppression against a generalist herbivore is independent of
15 NPR1. This finding confirms earlier studies with *Arabidopsis* that showed that the
16 inhibition of JA-induced resistance to chewing insects still occurred in *npr1-1* plants treated
17 with SA or with virulent bacterial pathogens (Cipollini *et al.* 2004, Cui *et al.* 2002). In
18 addition, SA inhibited the induction of leaf trichomes, another component of resistance to
19 herbivores, in an NPR1-independent way (Traw and Bergelson 2003). There is thus
20 emerging evidence that the negative SA/JA cross-talk is controlled differently depending
21 on the type of aggressor triggering the JA pathway. It will be interesting to elucidate the
22 precise molecular mechanism of the suppression of insect-induced responses. We have
23 found that the inhibition of JA-induced genes by egg extract was still observed after a

1
2
3
4 1 treatment with MeJA, suggesting that the negative SA/JA cross-talk operates downstream
5
6
7 2 of JA biosynthesis (data not shown).
8

9 3 In summary, we present here an intriguing facet of the arms race between plants and
10
11 4 insect herbivores in which an apparent inert stage of the insect, the egg, hijacks the SA-
12
13 5 signalling pathway for the benefit of its progeny. It will be fascinating to see whether this
14
15 6 phenomenon is widely distributed in nature and has evolved as a potent way of
16
17 7 circumventing the defences of the plants.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES**

2 **Plants and insects**

3 *Arabidopsis thaliana* (Col-0), PR1::GUS (gift from Dr Allan Shapiro, Florida Gulf Coast
4 University), the mutants *sid2-1* (gift from Dr Christiane Nawrath, University of Lausanne)
5 and *npr1-1* (Nottingham Arabidopsis Stock Center, <http://arabidopsis.info>) in the Col-0
6 background were grown as described previously (Reymond *et al.* 2004). For GUS reporter
7 lines, the promoter region of *TI* (At1g73260), *CHIT* (At2g43570), and *SAG13* (At2g29350)
8 was amplified by PCR (for primer sequences, see Table S1), cloned into the GATEWAY
9 donor vector pDONR/Zeo (Invitrogen, <http://www.invitrogen.com>), recombined into the
10 destination vector pMDC162 cassette A (Curtis and Grossniklaus 2003), and the plasmids
11 transferred to *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* strain pGV3101 (pMP90). Transgenic plants
12 were obtained by floral dipping and selection of the seeds on 100 µg/ml hygromycin.

13 Rearing of *Pieris brassicae* (large white butterfly) was done on cabbage (*Brassica*
14 *oleracea*) (Reymond *et al.* 2004). *Spodoptera littoralis* (Egyptian cotton worm) eggs were
15 obtained from Syngenta (Stein, Switzerland). *Drosophila melanogaster* eggs were obtained
16 from Dr Tadeusz Kawecki (University of Lausanne).

17

18 **SA measurements**

19 SA was quantified in excised leaf discs by HPLC as described previously (Garcion *et al.*
20 2008). Analyses were carried out on triplicate samples with good reproducibility and the
21 results given are mean values. For each biological replicate, ca. 15 leaf discs of 10 mm
22 diameter were collected on oviposited/treated or non-oviposited/untreated leaves from 10

1 plants. Fifteen egg batches (30-35 eggs/batch) from the same plants were analysed
2 similarly.
3

4 **Treatments with egg extracts**

5 *P. brassicae* eggs laid on cabbage leaves were crushed with a pestle in Eppendorf tubes.
6 After centrifugation (15'000 g, 3 min), the supernatant ("egg extract") was stored at -20°C.
7 Egg extracts from *S. littoralis* and *D. melanogaster* were prepared similarly. For GUS
8 activity, 2 µl of egg extract, corresponding to one egg batch of ca. 20-30 eggs, was spotted
9 onto each leaf for 72 h. The extract was then gently removed with a paint brush and GUS
10 staining was performed as described previously (Little *et al.* 2007). For protease treatment,
11 50 U of proteinase K immobilized on eupergit C beads (Fluka,
12 <http://www.sigmaaldrich.com>) was added to 1 ml of egg extract. The sample was incubated
13 for 20 min at 30°C with agitation at 600 rpm in a thermomixer (Eppendorf,
14 <http://www.eppendorf.com>). The beads were then spun down and the promoter:GUS plants
15 treated with 2 µl of the supernatant. For filtration, 100 µl of egg extract was placed in a 3
16 kDa-microcon filter (Millipore, <http://www.millipore.com>) and centrifuged for 60 minutes
17 at 14'000 rpm at 20°C. Two µl of flow-through were applied onto the promoter:GUS
18 plants. For total lipids extraction, 20 ml of chloroform/ethanol (1/1) was added drop wise to
19 1 ml of egg extract in an Erlenmeyer and incubated 1 hour at room temperature on a shaker.
20 The clear supernatant was transferred to a beaker and the solvent evaporated to dryness on
21 a steam bath. The extract was dissolved in pure chloroform and filtered through a funnel
22 packed with cotton. Chloroform was evaporated under nitrogen and the lipid extract was

1 applied to promoter:GUS plants. Remaining eggshells of freshly hatched *P. brassicae*
2 larvae were collected and mixed with distilled water before application onto promoter:GUS
3 plants with a spatula.

4 For expression analyses and bioassays, two spots of 2 μ l of egg extract were applied
5 onto each leaf. In total, two leaves of 20 plants were treated. After 5 days, the egg extract
6 was gently removed with a paint brush and one freshly hatched *P. brassicae* or two freshly
7 hatched *S. littoralis* larvae were placed onto each plant. Plants were placed in Plexiglas
8 boxes in a growth room as previously described (Bodenhausen and Reymond 2007). After
9 two days of feeding, local and distal leaves from four plants were harvested for RNA
10 analysis and the 16 remaining plants were left for another 6 days with the larvae. At the end
11 of the experiment, larvae were collected and weighed. Controls consisted of untreated
12 and/or uninfested plants.

14 **Quantitative Real-Time PCR (qRT-PCR)**

15 Total RNA was extracted using the RNeasy® Plant Mini Kit (Qiagen,
16 <http://www.qiagen.com>). For cDNA synthesis, 1 μ g of total RNA was reverse-transcribed
17 using M-MLV reverse transcriptase (Invitrogen, <http://www.invitrogen.com>) in a final
18 volume of 25 μ L. Each cDNA sample was generated in triplicate from each RNA and
19 diluted 4-fold with water. Gene specific primers (Table S1) were designed to give
20 amplicons between 70 and 200 bp in the 3' end of the cDNA strand. Primer efficiencies
21 were assessed doing a 5 step dilution regression. qRT-CR analysis was performed in a final
22 volume of 25 μ l containing 2.5 μ l of cDNA, 0.1 μ M of each primer, 0.03 μ M of reference

1
2
3
4 dye, and 2X Brilliant II Fast SYBR® Green QPCR Master Mix (Agilent,
5
6
7 <http://www.agilent.com>). Reactions were generated in a real-time PCR machine
8
9 (Mx3000P™, Agilent, <http://www.agilent.com>) with the following program: 95°C for 10
10
11 min; then 40 cycles comprising 10 s at 95°C, 20 s at 55°C and 17 s at 60°C. Relative
12
13 mRNA abundance was normalized to the reference gene *At2g28390* (*Arabidopsis* SAND
14
15 family protein), which has been shown to be a superior reference gene for qRT-PCR
16
17 (Czechowski *et al.* 2005), and expressed relative to the control sample. Values in Fig. 3 are
18
19
20
21 the mean of three independent biological replicates.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 **1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**
5

6
7 2 We thank Roland Reist for providing *S. littoralis* eggs, Dr Tadeusz Kawecki for providing
8
9 3 *D. melanogaster* eggs, and Blaise Tissot for help in growing plants. The Swiss SNF (grant
10
11 4 3100A0_118421 to P. R.) supported this work.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 REFERENCES

- 2 **Balbyshev, N.F. and Lorenzen, J.H.** (1997) Hypersensitivity and egg drop: A novel
3 mechanism of host plant resistance to Colorado potato beetle (Coleoptera:
4 Chrysomelidae). *J. Econ. Entomol.* **90**, 652-657.
- 5 **Beckers, G.J.M. and Spoel, S.H.** (2006) Fine-tuning plant defence signalling: Salicylate
6 versus jasmonate. *Plant Biology*, **8**, 1-10.
- 7 **Bodenhause, N. and Reymond, P.** (2007) Signaling pathways controlling induced
8 resistance to insect herbivores in Arabidopsis. *Mol. Plant Microbe Interact.* **20**,
9 1406-1420.
- 10 **Boller, T. and Felix, G.** (2009) A renaissance of elicitors: perception of microbe-
11 associated molecular patterns and danger signals by pattern-recognition receptors.
12 *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.* **60**, 379-406.
- 13 **Bruessow, F. and Reymond, P.** (2007) Oviposition-induced changes in Arabidopsis
14 genome expression. Anticipating your enemy? *Plant Sig. & Behav.* **2**, 164-166.
- 15 **Cipollini, D., Enright, S., Traw, M.B. and Bergelson, J.** (2004) Salicylic acid inhibits
16 jasmonic acid-induced resistance of *Arabidopsis thaliana* to *Spodoptera exigua*.
17 *Molecular Ecology*, **13**, 1643-1653.
- 18 **Cui, J., Bahrami, A.K., Pringle, E.G., Hernandez-Guzman, G., Bender, C.L., Pierce,
19 N.E. and Ausubel, F.M.** (2005) *Pseudomonas syringae* manipulates systemic plant
20 defenses against pathogens and herbivores. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **102**, 1791-
21 1796.
- 22 **Cui, J.P., Jander, G., Racki, L.R., Kim, P.D., Pierce, N.E. and Ausubel, F.M.** (2002)
23 Signals involved in Arabidopsis resistance to *Trichoplusia ni* caterpillars induced by
24 virulent and avirulent strains of the phytopathogen *Pseudomonas syringae*. *Plant
25 Physiol.* **129**, 551-564.
- 26 **Curtis, M.D. and Grossniklaus, U.** (2003) A gateway cloning vector set for high-
27 throughput functional analysis of genes in planta. *Plant Physiol*, **133**, 462-469.
- 28 **Czechowski, T., Stitt, M., Altmann, T., Udvardi, M.K. and Scheible, W.R.** (2005)
29 Genome-wide identification and testing of superior reference genes for transcript
30 normalization in Arabidopsis. *Plant Physiol.* **139**, 5-17.
- 31 **De Vos, M., Kriksunov, K.L. and Jander, G.** (2008) Indole-3-acetonitrile production
32 from indole glucosinolates deters oviposition by *Pieris rapae*. *Plant Physiol.* **146**,
33 916-926.
- 34 **De Vos, M., Van Oosten, V.R., Van Poecke, R.M.P., Van Pelt, J.A., Pozo, M.J.,
35 Mueller, M.J., Buchala, A.J., Metraux, J.P., Van Loon, L.C., Dicke, M. and
36 Pieterse, C.M.J.** (2005) Signal signature and transcriptome changes of Arabidopsis
37 during pathogen and insect attack. *Mol. Plant Microbe Interact.* **18**, 923-937.
- 38 **Diezel, C., von Dahl, C.C., Gaquerel, E. and Baldwin, I.T.** (2009) Different lepidopteran
39 elicitors account for cross-talk in herbivory-induced phytohormone signaling. *Plant
40 Physiol.* **150**, 1576-1586.
- 41 **Doares, S.H., Narvaes-Vasquez, J., Conconi, A. and Ryan, C.A.** (1995) Salicylic acid
42 inhibits synthesis of proteinase inhibitors in tomato leaves induced by systemin and
43 jasmonic acid. *Plant Physiol.* **108**, 1741-1746.

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 Doss, R.P., Oliver, J.E., Proebsting, W.M., Potter, S.W., Kuy, S.R., Clement, S.L.,
6 2 Williamson, R.T., Carney, J.R. and DeVilbiss, E.D. (2000) Bruchins: Insect-
7 3 derived plant regulators that stimulate neoplasm formation. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.*
8 4 *USA*, **97**, 6218-6223.
- 9 5 Fatouros, N.E., Broekgaarden, C., Bukovinszky, G., van Loon, J.J.A., Mumm,
10 6 R., Huigens, M.E., Dicke, M. and Hilker, M. (2008) Male-derived butterfly anti-
11 7 aphrodisiac mediates induced indirect plant defense. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*,
12 8 **105**, 10033-10038.
- 13 9 Fatouros, N.E., Bukovinszky, G., Kalkers, L.A., Gamborena, R.S., Dicke, M.
14 10 and Hilker, M. (2005) Oviposition-induced plant cues: do they arrest
15 11 Trichogramma wasps during host location? *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* **115**, 207-215.
- 16 12 Garcion, C., Lohmann, A., Lamodièrre, E., Catinot, J., Buchala, A., Doermann, P. and
17 13 Mettraux, J.P. (2008) Characterization and biological function of the
18 14 *ISOCHORISMATE SYNTHASE2* gene of Arabidopsis. *Plant Physiol.* **147**, 1279-
19 15 1287.
- 20 16 Glazebrook, J. (2005) Contrasting mechanisms of defense against biotrophic and
21 17 necrotrophic pathogens. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* **43**, 205-227.
- 22 18 Gupta, V., Willits, M.G. and Glazebrook, J. (2000) Arabidopsis thaliana EDS4
23 19 contributes to salicylic acid (SA)-dependent expression of defense responses:
24 20 Evidence for inhibition of jasmonic acid signaling by SA. *Mol. Plant Microbe*
25 21 *Interact.* **13**, 503-511.
- 26 22 Hilker, M., Kobs, C., Varma, M. and Schrank, K. (2002) Insect egg deposition induces
27 23 *Pinus sylvestris* to attract egg parasitoids. *J. Exp. Biol.* **205**, 455-461.
- 28 24 Hilker, M. and Meiners, T. (2006) Early herbivore alert: Insect eggs induce plant defense.
29 25 *J. Chem. Ecol.* **32**, 1379-1397.
- 30 26 Hilker, M., Stein, C., Schroder, R., Varama, M. and Mumm, R. (2005) Insect egg
31 27 deposition induces defence responses in *Pinus sylvestris*: characterisation of the
32 28 elicitor. *J. Exp. Biol.* **208**, 1849-1854.
- 33 29 Howe, G.A. and Jander, G. (2008) Plant immunity to insect herbivores. *Annu. Rev. Plant*
34 30 *Biol.* **59**, 41-66.
- 35 31 Huigens, M.E., Pashalidou, F.G., Qian, M.H., Bukovinszky, T., Smid, H.M., van Loon,
36 32 J.J.A., Dicke, M. and Fatouros, N.E. (2009) Hitch-hiking parasitic wasp learns to
37 33 exploit butterfly antiaphrodisiac. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **106**, 820-825.
- 38 34 Kachroo, P., Shanklin, J., Shah, J., Whittle, E.J. and Klessig, D.F. (2001) A fatty acid
39 35 desaturase modulates the activation of defense signaling pathways in plants. *Proc.*
40 36 *Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **98**, 9448-9453.
- 41 37 Kahl, J., Siemens, D.H., Aerts, R.J., Gabler, R., Kuhnemann, F., Preston, C.A. and
42 38 Baldwin, I.T. (2000) Herbivore-induced ethylene suppresses a direct defense but
43 39 not a putative indirect defense against an adapted herbivore. *Planta*, **210**, 336-342.
- 44 40 Kempema, L.A., Cui, X.P., Holzer, F.M. and Walling, L.L. (2007) Arabidopsis
45 41 transcriptome changes in response to phloem-feeding silverleaf whitefly nymphs.
46 42 Similarities and distinctions in responses to aphids. *Plant Physiol.* **143**, 849-865.
- 47 43 Koornneef, A., Leon-Reyes, A., Ritsema, T., Verhage, A., Den Otter, F.C., Van Loon,
48 44 L.C. and Pieterse, C.M.J. (2008) Kinetics of salicylate-mediated suppression of

- jasmonate signaling reveal a role for redox modulation. *Plant Physiol.* **147**, 1358-1368.
- Koornneef, A. and Pieterse, C.M.J.** (2008) Cross talk in defense signaling. *Plant Physiol.* **146**, 839-844.
- Lawrence, S.D., Novak, N.G. and Blackburn, M.B.** (2007) Inhibition of proteinase inhibitor transcripts by *Leptinotarsa decemlineata* regurgitant in *Solanum lycopersicum*. *J. Chem. Ecol.* **33**, 1041-1048.
- Leon-Reyes, A., Du, Y., Koornneef, A., Proietti, S., Körbes, A.P., Memelink, J., Pieterse, C.M. and Ritsema, T.** (2010) Ethylene signaling renders the jasmonate response of Arabidopsis insensitive to future suppression by salicylic acid. *Mol. Plant-Microbe Interact.*, **23**, 187-197.
- Leon-Reyes, A., Spoel, S.H., De Lange, E.S., Abe, H., Kobayashi, M., Tsuda, S., Millenaar, F.F., Welschen, R.A.M., Ritsema, T. and Pieterse, C.M.J.** (2009) Ethylene modulates the role of NONEXPRESSOR OF PATHOGENESIS-RELATED GENES1 in cross talk between salicylate and jasmonate signaling. *Plant Physiol.* **149**, 1797-1809.
- Li, J., Brader, G. and Palva, E.T.** (2004) The WRKY70 transcription factor: A node of convergence for jasmonate-mediated and salicylate-mediated signals in plant defense. *Plant Cell*, **16**, 319-331.
- Little, D., Gouhier-Darimont, C., Bruessow, F. and Reymond, P.** (2007) Oviposition by pierid butterflies triggers defense responses in Arabidopsis. *Plant Physiol.* **143**, 784-800.
- McConn, M., Creelman, R.A., Bell, E., Mullet, J.E. and Browse, J.** (1997) Jasmonate is essential for insect defense in Arabidopsis. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **94**, 5473-5477.
- Meiners, T. and Hilker, M.** (2000) Induction of plant synomones by oviposition of a phytophagous insect. *J. Chem. Ecol.* **26**, 221-232.
- Musser, R.O., Hum-Musser, S.M., Eichenseer, H., Peiffer, M., Ervin, G., Murphy, J.B. and Felton, G.W.** (2002) Herbivory: caterpillar saliva beats plant defences. *Nature*, **416**, 599-600.
- Ndamukong, I., Al Abdallat, A., Thurow, C., Fode, B., Zander, M., Weigel, R. and Gatz, C.** (2007) SA-inducible Arabidopsis glutaredoxin interacts with TGA factors and suppresses JA-responsive *PDF1.2* transcription. *Plant J.* **50**, 128-139.
- Niki, T., Mitsuhashi, I., Seo, S., Ohtsubo, N. and Ohashi, Y.** (1998) Antagonistic effect of salicylic acid and jasmonic acid on the expression of pathogenesis-related (PR) protein genes in wounded mature tobacco leaves. *Plant Cell Physiol.* **39**, 500-507.
- Preston, C.A., Lewandowski, C., Enyedi, A.J. and Baldwin, I.T.** (1999) Tobacco mosaic virus inoculation inhibits wound-induced jasmonic acid-mediated responses within but not between plants. *Planta*, **209**, 87-95.
- Rayapuram, C. and Baldwin, I.T.** (2007) Increased SA in NPR1-silenced plants antagonizes JA and JA-dependent direct and indirect defenses in herbivore-attacked *Nicotiana attenuata* in nature. *Plant J.* **52**, 700-715.
- Reymond, P., Bodenhausen, N., Van Poecke, R.M., Krishnamurthy, V., Dicke, M. and Farmer, E.E.** (2004) A conserved transcript pattern in response to a specialist and a generalist herbivore. *Plant Cell*, **16**, 3132-3147.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 1 **Roetschi, A., Si-Ammour, A., Belbahri, L., Mauch, F. and Mauch-Mani, B.** (2001)
2 Characterization of an Arabidopsis-Phytophthora pathosystem: resistance requires a
3 functional *PAD2* gene and is independent of salicylic acid, ethylene and jasmonic
4 acid signalling. *Plant J.* **28**, 293-305.
- 5 **Schlaeppli, K., Bodenhausen, N., Buchala, A., Mauch, F. and Reymond, P.** (2008) The
6 glutathione-deficient mutant *pad2-1* accumulates lower amounts of glucosinolates
7 and is more susceptible to the insect herbivore *Spodoptera littoralis*. *Plant J.* **55**,
8 774-786.
- 9 **Schroder, R., Cristescu, S.M., Harren, F.J.M. and Hilker, M.** (2007) Reduction of
10 ethylene emission from Scots pine elicited by insect egg secretion. *J. Exp. Bot.* **58**,
11 1835-1842.
- 12 **Schroder, R., Forstreuter, M. and Hilker, M.** (2005) A plant notices insect egg
13 deposition and changes its rate of photosynthesis. *Plant Physiol.* **138**, 470-477.
- 14 **Seino, Y., Suzuki, Y. and Sogawa, K.** (1996) An ovicidal substance produced by rice
15 plants in response to oviposition by the whitebacked planthopper, *Sogatella*
16 *furcifera* (HORVATH) (Homoptera: Delphacidae). *Appl. Entomol. Zool.* **31**, 467-
17 473.
- 18 **Shapiro, A.M. and Devay, J.E.** (1987) Hypersensitivity reaction of *Brassica nigra* L
19 (Cruciferae) kills eggs of *Pieris* butterflies (Lepidoptera, Pieridae). *Oecologia*, **71**,
20 631-632.
- 21 **Spoel, S.H. and Dong, X.N.** (2008) Making sense of hormone crosstalk during plant
22 immune responses. *Cell Host & Microbe*, **3**, 348-351.
- 23 **Spoel, S.H., Johnson, J.S. and Dong, X.** (2007) Regulation of tradeoffs between plant
24 defenses against pathogens with different lifestyles. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **104**,
25 18842-18847.
- 26 **Spoel, S.H., Koornneef, A., Claessens, S.M., Korzelius, J.P., Van Pelt, J.A., Mueller,
27 M.J., Buchala, A.J., Metraux, J.P., Brown, R., Kazan, K., Van Loon, L.C.,
28 Dong, X. and Pieterse, C.M.** (2003) NPR1 modulates cross-talk between
29 salicylate- and jasmonate-dependent defense pathways through a novel function in
30 the cytosol. *Plant Cell*, **15**, 760-770.
- 31 **Spoel, S.H., Mou, Z.L., Tada, Y., Spivey, N.W., Genschik, P. and Dong, X.N.A.** (2009)
32 Proteasome-mediated turnover of the transcription coactivator NPR1 plays dual
33 roles in regulating plant immunity. *Cell*, **137**, 860-872.
- 34 **Stotz, H.U., Koch, T., Biedermann, A., Weniger, K., Boland, W. and Mitchell-Olds, T.**
35 (2002) Evidence for regulation of resistance in Arabidopsis to Egyptian cotton
36 worm by salicylic and jasmonic acid signaling pathways. *Planta*, **214**, 648-652.
- 37 **Stout, M.J., Thaler, J.S. and Thomma, B.** (2006) Plant-mediated interactions between
38 pathogenic microorganisms and herbivorous arthropods. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **51**,
39 663-689.
- 40 **Summermatter, K., Sticher, L. and Metraux, J.P.** (1995) Systemic responses in
41 *Arabidopsis thaliana* infected and challenged with *Pseudomonas syringae* pv.
42 *syringae*. *Plant Physiol.* **108**, 1379-1385.
- 43 **Thaler, J.S., Fidantsef, A.L., Duffey, S.S. and Bostock, R.M.** (1999) Trade-offs in plant
44 defense against pathogens and herbivores: A field demonstration of chemical
45 elicitors of induced resistance. *J. Chem. Ecol.* **25**, 1597-1609.

- 1
2
3
4
5 1 **Tooker, J.F. and De Moraes, C.M.** (2007) Jasmonate, salicylate, and benzoate in insect
6 2 eggs. *J. Chem. Ecol.* **33**, 331-343.
- 7 3 **Traw, M.B. and Bergelson, J.** (2003) Interactive effects of jasmonic acid, salicylic acid,
8 4 and gibberellin on induction of trichomes in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Physiol.* **133**, 1367-
9 5 1375.
- 10 6 **Ulland, S., Ian, E., Mozuraitis, R., Borg-Karlson, A.K., Meadow, R. and Mustaparta,**
11 7 **H.** (2008) Methyl salicylate, identified as primary odorant of a specific receptor
12 8 neuron type, inhibits oviposition by the moth *Mamestra brassicae* L. (Lepidoptera,
13 9 Noctuidae). *Chem. Senses*, **33**, 35-46.
- 14 10 **Walling, L.L.** (2000) The myriad plant responses to herbivores. *J. Plant Growth Reg.* **19**,
15 11 195-216.
- 16 12 **Weech, M.-H., Chapleau, M., Pan, L., Ide, C. and Bede, J.C.** (2008) Caterpillar saliva
17 13 interferes with induced *Arabidopsis thaliana* defence responses via the systemic
18 14 acquired resistance pathway. *J. Exp. Bot.* **59**, 2437-2448.
- 19 15 **Wheat, C.W., Vogel, H., Wittstock, U., Braby, M.F., Underwood, D. and Mitchell-**
20 16 **Olds, T.** (2007) The genetic basis of a plant-insect coevolutionary key innovation.
21 17 *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **104**, 20427-20431.
- 22 18 **Wildermuth, M.C., Dewdney, J., Wu, G. and Ausubel, F.M.** (2001) Isochorismate
23 19 synthase is required to synthesize salicylic acid for plant defence. *Nature*, **414**, 562-
24 20 571.
- 25 21 **Wittstock, U., Agerbirk, N., Stauber, E.J., Olsen, C.E., Hippler, M., Mitchell-Olds, T.,**
26 22 **Gershenson, J. and Vogel, H.** (2004) Successful herbivore attack due to metabolic
27 23 diversion of a plant chemical defense. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **101**, 4859-4864.
- 28 24 **Zarate, S.I., Kempema, L.A. and Walling, L.L.** (2007) Silverleaf whitefly induces
29 25 salicylic acid defenses and suppresses effectual jasmonic acid defenses. *Plant*
30 26 *Physiol.* **143**, 866-875.
- 31 27 **Zhu-Salzman, K., Salzman, R.A., Ahn, J.E. and Koiwa, H.** (2004) Transcriptional
32 28 regulation of sorghum defense determinants against a phloem-feeding aphid. *Plant*
33 29 *Physiol.* **134**, 420-431.
- 34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 **1 SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

5
6
7 **2 Figure S1.** SA levels in *P. brassicae* eggs.

8
9
10 **3 Figure S2.** Expression of insect-induced genes in distal leaves.

11
12 **4 Figure S3.** Suppression of insect-induced genes in response to treatment with *S. littoralis*
13
14 egg-extract.

15
16 **6 Figure S4.** Treatment with egg extract does not suppress the expression of JA-independent
17
18 genes.

19
20
21 **8 Table S1.** List of primers used for real-time PCR and promoter:GUS constructs.
22

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

9
10
11
12 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

13
14 **Figure 1.** Egg-derived elicitors activate the expression of reporter genes.

15 (a) Application of 2 µl of egg extracts from different insect species onto leaves of
16 *Arabidopsis* promoter:GUS lines. GUS expression was analysed by histochemical staining
17 72 h after treatment. *PR1*, *TI*, *CHIT*, and *SAG13* are egg-inducible genes. The top left panel
18 is a photograph of an entire leaf, whereas the other panels are close-up views of the spotted
19 area. *P. b.*, *Pieris brassicae*; *S. l.*, *Spodoptera littoralis*; *D. m.*, *Drosophila melanogaster*.

20 (b) Activation of the *PR1* promoter in response to application of eggshell preparation, egg
21 extract treated with proteinase K, lipids extracted from the eggs, and egg extract filtered
22 through a 3-kDa filter. GUS staining was performed 72 h after each treatment.

1

2
3
4
5
6
7 **Figure 2.** SA accumulates in response to oviposition by *P. brassicae*.

8
9 (a) SA was quantified in *Arabidopsis* leaves during four days after oviposition. Black bars
10 indicate oviposited leaves and white bars indicate non-oviposited leaves. For each
11 biological replicate, ca. 15 leaf discs of 10 mm diameter were collected on oviposited or
12 non-oviposited leaves from 10 plants. Each oviposited leaf contained a batch of 30-35 eggs.
13
14 Values (\pm SE) are the mean of three biological replicates.

15
16 (b) SA was quantified in *Arabidopsis* leaves during four days after application of 2 μ l of *P.*
17 *brassicae* egg extract. For each biological replicate, ca. 15 leaf discs of 10 mm diameter
18 were collected. Black bars indicate treated leaves and white bars indicate non-treated
19 leaves. Values (\pm SE) are the mean of three biological replicates.

20

21
22
23 **Figure 3.** Treatment with egg extract suppresses insect-induced genes.

24 (a, b) Col-0 *Arabidopsis* plants were treated for 5 days with *P. brassicae* egg extract and
25 subsequently challenged for 48 h with *P. brassicae* larvae (a) or with *S. littoralis* larvae (b).
26
27 (c) *Arabidopsis sid2-1* plants treated with *P. brassicae* egg extract and challenged with *S.*
28 *littoralis* larvae.

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 **Figure 4.** Treatment with egg extract increases plant susceptibility to a generalist herbivore.
2 Freshly hatched larvae of the specialist *P. brassicae* (a) and of the generalist *S. littoralis* (b,
3 c) were placed on *Arabidopsis* plants and larval weight was measured after eight days of
4 feeding. (c) *sid2-1* plants were challenged with *S. littoralis* larvae.
5 White bars indicate untreated control plants challenged with insects. Black bars indicate
6 plants treated with *P. brassicae* egg extract 5 days before insect challenge. The number of
7 larvae used in each experiment is shown in the bars. Error bars indicate SE. Asterisks
8 indicate statistically significant differences compared to the control (Student's *t* test, $\alpha =$
9 0.001). n. s., not significant. Similar results were observed in several independent replicate
10 experiments.

11
12 **Figure 5.** Suppression of defences by egg extract is NPR1-independent.
13 (a) *npr1-1* plants were treated for 5 days with *P. brassicae* egg extract and subsequently
14 challenged for 48 h with *S. littoralis* larvae. Expression of insect-responsive genes was
15 measured by real-time PCR. Values are normalized to the reference gene and expressed
16 relative to unchallenged control samples. White bars indicate untreated plants. Black bars
17 indicate plants treated with egg extract. Values (\pm SE) are the mean of three biological
18 replicates. Control experiments with Col-0 are in Figure 3b.
19 (b) Freshly hatched *S. littoralis* larvae were placed on *npr1-1* plants and larval weight was
20 measured after eight days of feeding. White bars indicate untreated control plants
21 challenged with insects. Black bars indicate plants treated with *P. brassicae* egg extract 5
22 days before insect challenge. The number of larvae used in each experiment is shown in the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 bars. Error bars indicate SE. Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences compared
2 to the control (Student's *t* test, $\alpha = 0.001$). Similar results were observed in several
3 independent replicate experiments. Control experiment with Col-0 is in Figure 4b.




Figure 1
79x96mm (600 x 600 DPI)




Figure 2
80x119mm (600 x 600 DPI)




Figure 3
79x138mm (600 x 600 DPI)




Figure 4
78x127mm (600 x 600 DPI)




Figure 5
80x109mm (600 x 600 DPI)