Tree Physiology review

Uncovering the defence responses of *Eucalyptus* to pests and pathogens in the genomics age

Sanushka Naidoo[1,3], Carsten Külheim[2], Lizahn Zwart[1], Ronishree Mangwanda[1], Caryn N. Oates[1], Erik A. Visser[1], Febé E. Wilken[1], Thandekile B. Mamni[1] and Alexander A. Myburg[1]

[1]Department of Genetics, Genomics Research Institute (GRI), Forestry and Agricultural Biotechnology Institute (FABI), University of Pretoria, Private Bag X20, Pretoria 0028, South Africa; [2]Research School of Biology, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia; [3]Corresponding author (sanushka.naidoo@fabi.up.ac.za)

Long-lived tree species are subject to attack by various pests and pathogens during their lifetime. This problem is exacerbated by climate change, which may increase the host range for pathogens and extend the period of infestation by pests. Plant defences may involve preformed barriers or induced resistance mechanisms based on recognition of the invader, complex signalling cascades, hormone signalling, activation of transcription factors and production of pathogenesis-related (PR) proteins with direct antimicrobial or anti-insect activity. Trees have evolved some unique defence mechanisms compared with well-studied model plants, which are mostly herbaceous annuals. The genome sequence of *Eucalyptus grandis* W. Hill ex Maiden has recently become available and provides a resource to extend our understanding of defence in large woody perennials. This review synthesizes existing knowledge of defence mechanisms in model plants and tree species and features mechanisms that may be important for defence in *Eucalyptus*, such as anatomical variants and the role of chemicals and proteins. Based on the *E. grandis* genome sequence, we have identified putative PR proteins based on sequence identity to the previously described plant PR proteins. Putative orthologues for PR-1, PR-2, PR-4, PR-5, PR-6, PR-7, PR-8, PR-9, PR-10, PR-12, PR-14, PR-15 and PR-17 have been identified and compared with their orthologues in *Populus trichocarpa* Torr. & A. Gray ex Hook and *Arabidopsis thaliana* (L.) Heynh. The survey of PR genes in *Eucalyptus* provides a first step in identifying defence gene targets that may be employed for protection of the species in future. Genomic resources available for *Eucalyptus* are discussed and approaches for improving resistance in these hardwood trees, earmarked as a bioenergy source in future, are considered.

Keywords: anatomical defences, biotechnology, breeding, genomic resources, phytohormone, plant immunity, terpenoid, transcriptomics.

Introduction

Eucalyptus species and hybrids form the basis of a global hardwood forestry industry. These fast-growing species are cultivated in tropical, subtropical and temperate regions, and are the largest hardwood plantation crop in the world, estimated to occupy over 20 million hectares (www.git-forestry.com). *Eucalyptus* trees are sourced for wood, paper and pulp products and have also been recognized as a potential source of biofuels (Hinchee et al. 2011). The use of woody biomass as a biofuel feedstock is an attractive alternative to starch and sugar-based feedstocks, since it would avoid competition with food production. Another advantage is that trees can be harvested year round, efficiently transported and potentially have a higher biomass production capacity than seasonal biofuel crops.

Eucalyptus species are endemic to Australia and neighbouring islands, but are planted as exotics in many tropical and subtropical regions due to their fast growth rate, short

rotation time, high productivity and adaptability to a broad range of environments (Eldridge et al. 1993). Despite the success that eucalypts have shown as plantation species, these trees do succumb to pests and pathogens that may originate from their native or introduced environments. Host shifts from native Myrtacea to *Eucalyptus* plantations have previously been reported (Slippers et al. 2005). Examples of pests and pathogens currently posing a threat to *Eucalyptus* include the myrtle rust pathogen *Puccinia psidii*, the stem canker pathogen *Chrysoporthe austroafricana*, the root rot pathogen *Phytophthora cinnamomi* and the insect pest *Leptocybe invasa* (reviewed in Wingfield et al. (2008)). These threats are managed by planting tolerant *Eucalyptus* genotypes (hybrids) or, in the case of *L. invasa*, the use of biological control as part of an integrated management system to curb losses (B. Slippers, FABI, personal communication). While resistance against pests and pathogens in forest trees can be ascribed to a combination of stochastic genetic variation (Yanchuk et al. 1988), evolved immunity (Liu and Ekramoddoullah 2004), plasticity and interaction with environmental conditions (Cruickshank et al. 2010), climate change is predicted to make environments more favourable for pests and pathogens in future (reviewed in Sturrock et al. (2011)). A single insect or pathogen threat could have devastating consequences for *Eucalyptus* plantations, especially since *Eucalyptus* is increasingly being clonally propagated. The loss of entire clonal genotypes due to specific pathogen or pest genotypes poses a serious threat to plantation forestry. Forest disease management and pest management have recognized the need for the development of resistant plant varieties as part of an integrative approach to curb disease incidence (reviewed in Wingfield et al. (2013)). This will require an understanding of the defence responses to these pests and pathogens in *Eucalyptus*. The increasing availability of genomic tools is expected to accelerate this type of research and the development of new strategies to enhance resistance to pests and pathogens. This review describes our current knowledge of plant defence, garnered from model systems, and explores the recent advances in this area within the genus *Eucalyptus*.

Eucalyptus genomic resources

One of the most significant milestones in *Eucalyptus* genomics is the recent sequencing of the *Eucalyptus grandis* W. Hill ex Maiden genome (www.phytozome.net) by the United States Department of Energy Joint Genome Institute (Myburg et al. 2014). Additionally, the *Eucalyptus* research community has produced extensive genomic and transcriptomic data from various sources that provide opportunities for genome mining. Most of these studies focused on understanding and improving growth and wood properties for commercial applications (reviewed in Grattapaglia et al. (2012)).

Rengel et al. (2009) developed the EUCAWOOD database as a resource for functional genomics studies investigating wood formation and molecular breeding. In 2010, Rosa et al. used the *Eucalyptus* expressed sequence tags (ESTs) Genome Project (FORESTs) transcriptome data to identify *Eucalyptus* ESTs that were induced by various stress agents. A number of known defence-associated genes were identified and various mechanisms of defence against abiotic and biotic factors were described (Rosa et al. 2010). Much of the data produced from these studies is publicly available and has been used to describe various aspects of *Eucalyptus* biology. In addition, a number of studies have used expression-based data from Suppressive Subtractive Hybridization studies, EST libraries and microarrays to infer defence responses in *Eucalyptus* (Duplessis et al. 2005, Rosa et al. 2010, Feng et al. 2012). The *Eucalyptus* Genome Network (EUCAGEN, web.up.ac.za/eucagen/) is a consortium of researchers aimed at the development of *Eucalyptus* genomic resources and provides links to various useful sites and tools for this field. For example, the *Eucalyptus* Genome Integrative Explorer (EucGenIE, www.eucgenie.org) is an online resource for *Eucalyptus* genomics and transcriptomics that provides access to several RNA sequencing (RNA-Seq) datasets, including those described by Mizrachi et al. (2010), that were produced from a range of healthy developing tissues. Analysis of the *Eucalyptus* transcriptome during pest or pathogen challenge is a more direct approach to obtaining a genome-wide view of defence responses (Padovan et al. 2013), and gene discovery within important *Eucalyptus* defence signalling pathways in these studies is facilitated by novel, high-throughput technologies such as Illumina® RNA-Seq.

These resources may be instrumental in obtaining a better understanding of the defensive capabilities of these economically important trees, which will certainly be of key interest in the future (Wingfield et al. 2013). Although a number of studies have been conducted in this field, much of the understanding of the defensive capabilities is dependent on inferences from other, better-studied plants such as *Arabidopsis thaliana* (L.) Heynh. (thale cress).

Plant defence systems: preformed defences

Plants have to defend themselves against a multitude of pathogens and pests during their lifetime. Pathogens may be viral, bacterial, oomycete or fungal and can adopt a biotrophic, hemibiotrophic or necrotrophic lifestyle. Biotrophs feed on living cells, maintaining host cell viability, while necrotrophs rely on dead tissues as a source of nutrients. Hemibiotrophs have an early, transient biotrophic phase followed by a necrotrophic phase. Pests may be specialists (small host range) or generalists (broad host range), and include chewing, piercing and sucking, mining, boring and galling insects (Wylie and Speight

2012). In addition to the virulence determinants of the invading agent and environmental factors, the outcome of the host–pest or –pathogen interaction also depends on the plant's constitutive and induced defences.

The first line of defence against biotic invaders in plants is preformed. Plants can possess anatomical variants correlated with levels of disease resistance (Fahn 1988). Some of these anatomical features include mechanical barriers to pest or pathogen invasion, such as the bark, the pectin and lignin components of plant cell walls, and the leaf cuticle. Other anatomical features associated with defence include secretory cells, glands and ducts that produce and transport defensive substances. These anatomical characteristics can be constitutive or induced by injury or exposure to invading agents (Fahn 1988, Eyles et al. 2004, Franceschi et al. 2005, Kovalchuk et al. 2013). Other preformed defences include the production of antimicrobial peptides and toxic secondary metabolites that are released upon insect or pathogen attack (recently reviewed in Kovalchuk et al. (2013)).

In addition to being a passive barrier to pathogen invasion, plant cell walls are actively modified at the sites of interaction with fungi and bacteria, and become reinforced by the deposition of cell wall appositions, referred to as papillae. In the event of successful fungal penetration, cell wall-associated structures, such as haustorial encasements, collars or neck bands, are formed to halt pathogen spread (reviewed in Micali et al. (2011), Underwood (2012)). In the event of oviposition by insects, some host plants are able to produce neoplasms (tumour-like growth of undifferentiated cells) beneath the egg, halting larval entry (Doss et al. 2000). Other preformed defences may involve stored chemicals that are released upon attack.

Vascular plants can have single cells, cavities, ducts or glandular trichomes that secrete substances such as terpenes, waxes and flavonoids. In ducts and cavities, the innermost epidermal cell layer secretes most of these substances, but the other layers may also become involved. The outermost cell layer may become thickened and act as a protective sheath surrounding the cavity (Fahn 1988). In *Eucalyptus* leaves, the essential oils are produced and stored in sub-dermal secretory cavities. These oil glands can also occur in the bark, pith, phloem, roots, petiole and midrib, and the number and location of secretory cavities and ducts, as well as the age at which they are most abundant, differ widely between eucalypt species (Carr and Carr 1970). It was recently shown that the secretory cavities of several species of *Eucalyptus* contain not only essential oils, but also a resinous substance of unknown function (Goodger et al. 2009).

An interesting non-specific response to wounding or infection in *Eucalyptus* and many other woody plants is the formation of barrier zones or reaction zones in the new tissue produced by the vascular cambium (Tippett and Shigo 1981, Wilkes

1986). These zones appear to protect the healthy sapwood from damage by separating it from the adjacent damaged tissue. Reaction zones formed after inoculation of *Eucalyptus nitens* H. Deane et Maiden with decay fungi are visually distinct from healthy sapwood. They also have a lower pH and moisture content than the adjacent sapwood and are enriched with phenolics, hydrolysable tannins and tyloses (Barry et al. 2000, Barry et al. 2001). In *Eucalyptus globulus* Labill. and *E. nitens*, barrier zones that form after wounding can contain dark extractives and occasionally, kino (gum) veins (Eyles and Mohammed 2002b). In another study, it was shown that the degree of kino vein formation in response to treatment with the ethylene-releasing compound 2-chloroethyl phosphonic acid differs between species, and that kino veins may occur in different tissues depending on the age of the tree (Eyles and Mohammed 2002a). The new tissue formed at the wound site, referred to as wound wood, contains both callus and altered wood and is morphologically variable. The presence of dark extractives in this tissue, which consist of various secondary metabolites, could be unique to eucalypts (Eyles et al. 2003c). This suggests the involvement of reaction zones in chemical and mechanical defence against damage and invading agents in *Eucalyptus*. Similarly, the bark-wounding response usually involves the formation of a ligno-suberized boundary zone directly adjacent to the wound site (Biggs 1985, Woodward and Pearce 1988, Woodward and Pocock 1996). The cells adjacent to the boundary zone de-differentiate, forming a wound periderm, and phenolic and terpene compounds have been found in the lesion margin. A wound periderm layer was formed in *E. globulus* naturally infected with stem canker fungi in the genus *Cytonaema* (Eyles et al. 2003a). This wound periderm appears to separate the necrotic and healthy tissues, possibly preventing the spread of infection. A complete or a partial wound periderm layer was formed in superficially infected plants, while traumatic oil glands with suberized cell walls were present in the newly synthesized phloem following more-severe infection resulting in the destruction of the vascular cambium. The lesion margin contained a number of compounds that were absent from the healthy phloem, and several constituents of the essential oil also differed in relative abundance between these tissues (Eyles et al. 2003a). Mechanical wounding also results in the formation of traumatic oil glands and changes in oil composition within the new phloem (Eyles et al. 2004). Very few studies have focused on identifying the anatomical variants associated with disease resistance in eucalypts.

If preformed defences are breached, a pathogen or pest would encounter inducible defence responses. Induced responses rely on the plant's ability to distinguish self from non-self, which is analogous to that seen in animal immunity (Jones and Dangl 2006). However, in contrast to animals, plants lack an adaptive immune system involving somatic recombination of genes, and

have no circulating immune cells. Therefore, they rely on the innate defences of each cell to respond to microbial or pest attack. This requires recognition, subsequent signalling and production of defensive products. Figure 1 depicts the recognition and induced defence events that follow pest or pathogen challenge.

Recognition of non-self relies on the perception of general elicitors called pathogen-associated molecular patterns, microbe-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs or MAMPs; Figure 1) or in the case of insect pests, damage-associated molecular patterns (DAMPs; Heil 2009) or herbivore-associated molecular patterns (HAMPs; Mithöfer and Boland 2008). These molecular patterns are perceived by pattern recognition receptors (PRRs; Figure 1; Dardick and Ronald 2006), and recognition leads to the relatively weak, non-specific immune response termed pattern-triggered immunity (PTI). These general elicitors are usually molecules that are essential for the invader's life cycle (reviewed in Nurnberger and Lipka (2005), van Loon

(2009)). Interestingly, the expression of the *Arabidopsis* PRR known as the EF-Tu receptor that recognizes the bacterial elongation factor Tu, or EF-Tu in *Nicotiana benthamiana* Domin (tobacco) and *Solanum lycopersicum* L. (tomato) enhanced broad-spectrum resistance to various phytopathogenic bacteria (Lacombe et al. 2010). There is evidence that cross-species PRRs could potentially be used to improve resistance and could be attractive targets for manipulation in *Eucalyptus*.

Some pathogens are able to suppress PTI by delivering specific effector proteins to the plant cells. This is known as effector-triggered susceptibility (Jones and Dangl 2006). Recent evidence suggests that diverse pathogens have shared similar effector targets within the host (Dou and Zhou 2012). Various levels of plant defence are targeted by effectors, including penetration resistance, recognition by PRRs, phytohormone levels and signalling pathways, host secretory pathways, plant cell death (Dou and Zhou 2012) and suppression of cell wall modifications (Truman et al. 2006). Downstream of PTI, effectors


Figure 1. Simplified schematic representing induced responses in host cells to pests and pathogens. PAMPs, HAMPs or DAMPs from pest or pathogen attack are perceived by PRRs in the plasma membrane. Recognition may alternatively involve the detection of avirulence (*Avr*) genes by *R* genes. This results in the production of ROS and reactive nitrogen species (RNS) which contributes to the formation of the HR. Following recognition, a MAPK signalling cascade is initiated and various hormones are also involved in amplifying the defence signal. Perception of the pathogen also leads to the activation of nucleotidyl cyclase, giving rise to an increase in cyclic nucleotide concentration. Cyclic nucleotide-gated ion channels (CNGCs) are activated, leading to an increase in cytosolic calcium levels. More calcium binds to calmodulin, and this interaction leads to the regulation of NO and H_2O_2, essential for the HR. Secondary metabolites are produced that may result in volatile production, alerting neighbouring cells to the threat. Various TFs are produced that activate *PR* genes which may have direct antibacterial, antifungal or anti-insect activity. Systemic signals prime neighbouring cells and distal tissue for subsequent attack.

can directly target aspects of the mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) cascade (Zhang et al. 2007, 2010, Wang et al. 2010). In another example, an RXLR effector from the potato blight fungus *Phytophthora infestans* can target the host immune secretory pathway by inhibiting the secretion of C14, a papain cysteine protease (Bozkurt et al. 2011). Apart from effectors, it has also recently been demonstrated that small fungal RNAs are able to hijack the host's RNA interference pathway by binding to Argonaute 1 and silencing the genes involved in plant defence (Weiberg et al. 2013). Based on these examples, it seems highly likely that host targets are actively suppressed in *Eucalyptus* pest or pathogen interactions as well. As a first step towards testing this hypothesis, the genome sequence data that are available for pests or pathogens of *Eucalyptus* can be used to identify orthologues of the above-mentioned effectors alongside potential targets encoded in the host genome.

The second type of pest or pathogen perception involves the recognition of effectors by plant resistance (R) proteins (Jones and Dangl 2006, Dodds and Rathjen 2010; Figure 1). Several classes of *R* genes have been identified and the majority contain nucleotide-binding site and leucine-rich repeat domains (Dodds and Rathjen 2010). R protein-mediated recognition leads to a more specific, rapid and usually effective defence response that is termed effector-triggered immunity. This response involves mechanisms such as the oxidative burst and the hypersensitive response (HR, a type of programmed cell death which serves to restrict the spread of the pathogen) and is associated with extensive changes in gene expression (Jones and Dangl 2006, Dodds and Rathjen 2010). *R* genes have been exploited in a number of crop species as an apparently effective part of strategies to control various pests and pathogens (Dodds and Rathjen 2010, Stuart et al. 2012) mostly through introgression of *R* genes from resistance sources. An *R* gene locus for resistance against *P. psidii* (*Ppr1*) has been discovered in *E. grandis* (Junghans et al. 2003) and identified as a target for marker-assisted introgression into susceptible backgrounds. This approach will be greatly facilitated by new genomic resources such as a high-density single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) array (EucHIP60K.BR) developed for *Eucalyptus* (Faria 2014). Gene expression analysis suggested that an HR may also be involved in conferring resistance to this pathogen (Moon et al. 2007).

Defence signals following pathogen and pest recognition

The oxidative burst is one of the most immediate pathogen-induced defence responses and is characterized by the rapid and transient production of large amounts of reactive oxygen species (ROS) at the site of attempted pathogen invasion (Wojtaszek 1997; Figure 1). Reactive oxygen species act as signals for the activation of plant defence responses and are able to diffuse across membranes, reaching locations distal to the initial site of production (Wojtaszek 1997). The generation of ROS promotes the accumulation of salicylic acid (SA) and pathogenesis-related (*PR*) gene transcripts (Chen et al. 1995, Maleck and Dietrich 1999). The oxidative burst is directly harmful to invading pathogens and also contributes to cell death, since ROS generated via the oxidative burst play a central role in the development of an HR (Lamb and Dixon 1997, Grant and Loake 2000, Lecourieux et al. 2002). Nitric oxide (NO) is also a key player in the development of HR (Figure 1; Delledonne et al. 2001). While the HR is efficient in curbing the spread of biotrophic pathogens, it contributes to the virulence of necrotrophic pathogens because it involves cell death (Mengiste 2012). Therefore, it is crucial for the host to be able to adjust its responses to the type of invading pathogen.

Calcium (Ca^{2+}) is another important secondary messenger in plant defence. Specific changes in spatial and temporal cytosolic calcium concentrations brought about by various signalling pathways are referred to as 'calcium signatures,' which are thought to encode stimulus-specific information (reviewed in Lecourieux et al. (2006)). However, elicitors (substances that stimulate plant defence) are able to induce increases in both cytosolic and nuclear Ca^{2+} concentrations, which suggests that the levels of nuclear Ca^{2+} are also important during defence (Lecourieux et al. 2006). Interestingly, it has been suggested that these prolonged increases in cytosolic Ca^{2+} concentration induce similar defence responses irrespective of the elicitor (Ma and Berkowitz 2007; Figure 1). Although it is not yet clear exactly how changes in calcium concentration enhance defence responses, some potential mechanisms have been proposed. For example, changes in cytosolic calcium levels also affect the expression of *PR* genes, phytoalexin accumulation (Mithöfer et al. 1999, Blume et al. 2000) and HR-related cell death (Grant and Loake 2000, Lecourieux et al. 2002). The importance of calcium signalling during morphogenesis has been demonstrated in *Eucalyptus urophylla* S. T. Blake callus tissue (Arruda et al. 2000), while Ramos et al. (2009) showed that colonization of *E. globulus* roots by an ectomycorrhizal fungus alters calcium ion flux. However, the role of calcium signalling during defence in *Eucalyptus* has not, to our knowledge, been studied.

Once a pathogen has been detected, MAPKs translate the extracellular signal, which is perceived by a plasma membrane receptor via a phospho-relay of three types of reversibly phosphorylated kinases: MAPK, MAPK kinase (MAPKK) and MAPKK kinase (MAPKKK). This leads to the phosphorylation of substrate proteins, effecting a range of responses involving subcellular remodelling, which occurs shortly after signal transduction, and gene expression, which occurs at later stages of the defence response (reviewed in Rodriguez et al. (2010), Samajova et al. (2013); Figure 1). MAPKs may target various effector proteins in the cytoplasm or nucleus, such as other kinases, enzymes and transcription factors (TFs, Rodriguez et al. (2010)).

Various phytohormones are involved in amplifying the initial defence signal, including jasmonic acid (JA), ethylene (ET) and SA (Figure 1). A large number of studies conducted in various hosts have shown that an antagonistic relationship exists between SA and JA (Pieterse et al. 2012). In *Arabidopsis*, this antagonism is partially controlled by ET, and is dependent on the concentration of each of the hormones (Pre et al. 2008, Leon-Reyes et al. 2010). The antagonistic relationship between SA and JA has also been observed in *Eucalyptus* (Naidoo et al. 2013), but the role of ET in this antagonism remains to be investigated. It has also been shown that treatment with an ethylene-releasing compound results in defence-related anatomical and chemical responses in *E. globulus*, *E. nitens* and *Eucalyptus obliqua* L'Herit. (Eyles and Mohammed 2002a). Interestingly, in a recent study where the foliar defences of different *Eucalyptus* clones were compared, treatment with methyl jasmonate did not induce a significant change in either terpene and formylated phloroglucinol compound (FPC) production or herbivore performance. Instead, differences between clones suggested that constitutive expression of secondary metabolites may be more important in herbivore defences (Henery et al. 2008).

In *Arabidopsis*, SA is required for hemi- and biotrophic disease resistance, while JA and ET are essential for defences against necrotrophs (Glazebrook 2005, Mengiste 2012, Pieterse et al. 2012). While this holds true for the majority of plant–pathogen interactions, some exceptions have been identified in tree species. In *Populus* (poplar), JA and ET are required for defence against biotrophic rust fungi in the genus *Melampsora* (Azaiez et al. 2009). Similarly, SA is required for defence against the suspected fungal necrotroph *C. austroafricana* in *Eucalyptus* (Naidoo et al. 2013). It is plausible that the relationships between the phytohormones and the balance required for maintaining an effective defence response may be more complex in woody tree species than in the non-woody model plant *Arabidopsis*. Furthermore, evidence that suggests the involvement of other phytohormones, such as brassinosteroids, auxins, cytokinins, gibberelins (GAs) and abscisic acid, in maintaining homoeostasis between signalling pathways during defence is emerging. Further exploration will be required to define the defence-related functions of these hormones more precisely (Bari and Jones 2009, Denancé et al. 2013). Pathogens are also able to target the components of the host signalling pathways in order to evade host defences. For example, an ectomycorrhizal fungus antagonizes the activity of *Eucalyptus* signalling molecules such as indole-3-acetic acid (IAA) and ET (Ditengou and Lapeyrie 2000), possibly by inhibiting the IAA-dependent superoxide production of plant peroxidases (Kawano et al. 2001).

Apart from local responses to threats and pathogens, plants are able to activate three main signalling pathways that induce resistance in tissues distal to the primary site of attack (Eyles et al. 2010, Spoel and Dong 2012). The pathways that lead to induced resistance in plants are systemic acquired resistance (SAR), induced systemic resistance (ISR) and systemic induced resistance (SIR; Eyles et al. 2010). Systemic acquired resistance arises mainly from SA signalling pathways during the HR (Ryals et al. 1996, Mishina and Zeier 2007). Systemic acquired resistance and SA-related defence responses are traditionally associated with defence against biotrophic pathogens. Even so, a recent study by Naidoo et al. (2013) showed the induction of SA-related *PR* genes in response to *C. austroafricana* infection, indicating that infection by this suspected necrotroph could also induce SAR in *E. grandis*. Induced systemic resistance is established and maintained through JA/ET signalling pathways which are induced by non-pathogenic rhizobacteria and fungi that promote plant growth or certain necrotizing pathogens (Thatcher et al. 2005, van Loon 2007, van Wees et al. 2008). The siderophore pseudobactin from fluorescent *Pseudomonas* bacteria causes ISR against the bacterial wilt pathogen, *Ralstonia solanacearum*, in *Eucalyptus urophylla* (Ran et al. 2005). Systemic induced resistance differs from ISR mainly because it is induced by both biotic wounding (for example, by herbivores) and abiotic (mechanical) wounding, while ISR is not induced by abiotic wounding (Gurr and Rushton 2005, van Loon 2007). Systemic acquired resistance, ISR and SIR all result in priming, the phenomenon by which appropriate stimuli induce cellular defence responses in tissues distal to the point of stimulation as well as in neighbouring plants (Pozo et al. 2008). Since this priming effect could be exploited for disease protection, the effects of various biotic and abiotic inducers have been investigated in a wide range of crop species (reviewed in Walters et al. (2013)). Many of these inducers remain to be tested on long-lived species such as eucalypts.

Pathogenesis-related proteins are another important part of the plant immune system (Figure 1). There are 17 currently known PR protein families (PR-1 through -17) in plants (reviewed in van Loon (2009)) and a possible PR-18 family in *Helianthus annuus* L. (sunflower) and *Amaranthus caudatus* L. (foxtail amaranth) (Custers et al. 2004; van Loon et al. 2006). The expression of genes encoding the PR families PR-1, PR-2, PR-3, PR-5, PR-9, PR-10 and PR-12 is induced by pathogens in different forest tree species (Veluthakkal and Dasgupta 2010). Rosa et al. (2010) also detected the expression of putative *PR-1* through *PR-10* orthologues based on EST sequences from *Eucalyptus*. Based on the recent availability of the *E. grandis* reference genome assembly (www.phytozome.net), we have determined the repertoire of *PR* genes in the *E. grandis* genome. Genes were either annotated as *PR* genes in the *E. grandis* v1.1 genome sequence available on Phytozome, or the putative orthologues were determined based on sequence similarity to the type sequences listed by van Loon (2009) (BLASTP; $e < 10^{-50}$). Figure 2 shows the number of genes within the PR-gene family in the *E. grandis* genome alongside

Figure 2. Number of genes in each PR gene family in the *E. grandis* (black), *P. trichocarpa* (grey) and *A. thaliana* (white) genomes.

the number identified in *Populus trichocarpa* Torr. & A. Gray ex Hook and *A. thaliana* (Duplessis et al. 2009). The *PR-1*, *PR-5* and *PR-9* gene families in particular seem to be expanded in *Eucalyptus*. PR-1, originally described in tobacco, has antifungal activity against *P. infestans* (Niderman et al. 1995). The PR-1 gene is often used as a diagnostic marker of the onset of SA signalling. In *Arabidopsis*, the acidic isoform is induced by SA treatment whereas the basic isoform is suppressed (Selitrennikoff 2001). Expression profiling studies in *Eucalyptus* are required to determine under which conditions the putative PR-1 orthologues are expressed. There are twice as many *PR-5* genes in *E. grandis* as in *P. trichocarpa* and almost three times more compared with *A. thaliana*. PR-5 proteins, which are part of the large thaumatin-like protein family, have previously been shown to have activity against fungal and oomycete pathogens. For example, over-expression of a thaumatin-like protein from *Camellia sinensis* (Linnaeus) O. Kuntze (tea plant) provided enhanced tolerance to *P. infestans* in potato (Acharya et al. 2013), and expression of *PdPR5* in *Prunus domestica* L. (European plum) facilitated resistance to brown rot caused by the necrotrophic fungus *Monilinia fructicola* (El-kereamy et al. 2011). There are twice as many *PR-9* genes in *E. grandis* as in *A. thaliana*. PR-9 proteins are peroxidases, which are involved in the cross-linking of polysaccharides and extension of phenylpropanoid monomers during cell wall reinforcement (Passardi et al. 2004). Some members of this group, such as AtPRX33, are also involved in PTI. While no PR-7, PR-8, PR-15 and PR-17 orthologs have been identified in *P. trichocarpa* or *A. thaliana*, putative homologs of their type members (Sels et al. 2008) were identified in the *E. grandis* genome. PR-7

proteins are similar to those within the PR-6 family and are considered proteinase inhibitors, which are important for defence against insects (Ryan 1990). PR-8 proteins (like PR-3, PR-4 and PR-11 proteins) are chitinases that hydrolyse the β-1,4-linkage between *N*-acetylglucosamine residues of fungal chitin (van Loon 2009). PR-15 proteins are involved in the production of hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2), which is toxic to pests and pathogens (van Loon 2009). PR-17 proteins from *Hordeum vulgare* L. (barley) have antifungal activity against the powdery mildew pathogen *Blumeria graminis* (Christensen et al. 2002). Similarly, the PR-17 protein NtPRp27 from tobacco accumulates in response to viral infection (Okushima et al. 2000), while WCI-5 from wheat accumulates in response to fungal infection (Görlach et al. 1996). While the putative *PR* genes identified in *E. grandis* remain to be functionally characterized, an exciting next step would be to uncover and characterize *PR* family members unique to *Eucalyptus* that could serve as novel targets to improve defence in this woody host.

Regulation of gene expression during defence responses

Plant defence is costly to the host and therefore the plant invests in mechanisms to fine-tune its responses to effectively control the spread of pests and pathogens while conserving cellular resources. Transcription factors play an important role in these mechanisms by coordinating the expression of defence-related genes in response to invasion (Figure 1). Functional studies on TFs that mediate defence responses in *Eucalyptus* are limited, but future research could be modelled

on recent studies of TF function during wood formation (Botha et al. 2011, Hussey et al. 2011, Creux et al. 2013). Epigenetic modifications add another level of complexity to the regulation of host defences (Berr et al. 2012). Epigenetic regulation of gene expression during various tree physiological processes has been reported in pine (Boyko and Kovalchuk 2011) as well as in poplar (Conde et al. 2013) and was recently reviewed (Bräutigam et al. 2013). However, the majority of studies pertaining to epigenetic gene regulation in plants have focused on model organisms, herbaceous plants (Holeski et al. 2012) or abiotic stress responses (Bräutigam et al. 2013). The role of epigenetics in *Eucalyptus* defence responses has not been studied. Understanding the regulation of gene expression during defence responses could lead to the identification of powerful targets for coordinate manipulation of entire cascades of defence events.

Eucalyptus oils in defence

Eucalypts are well known for their essential oils, which are typically stored in the sub-dermal secretory cavities of mature leaves. These oils are a complex mixture of monoterpenes, sesquiterpenes and FPCs (reviewed in Keszei et al. (2008)). Significant quantitative and qualitative variations of essential oil components have been observed within and between species, but also within populations and even within individuals, with strong implications for plant–herbivore and plant–pathogen interactions (Padovan et al. 2013). Stored oils function as preformed chemical defences against defoliating animals such as *Trichosurus vulpecula* (common brush-tailed possum), *Phascolarctos cinereus* (koala) as well as leaf-chewing insects (Lawler et al. 1999, Chen et al. 2002). The defensive action of essential oils can be direct, through toxicity (McLean et al. 1993), but we know from other plant species that some volatile organic compounds (VOCs) that are released upon chewing act as specific cues to attract parasitoids (Giamakis et al. 2001). While many individual compounds are toxic to herbivores, others act as antifungal, antibacterial or allelopathic agents, or for priming of systemic defences in both the host and neighbouring plants (Eyles et al. 2003b, Alves et al. 2004, Zulak and Bohlmann 2010). Other VOCs include three important phytohormones involved in plant defence: SA, JA and ET. These phytohormones form part of the phenylpropanoid, fatty acid degradation product and amino acid derivative classes, respectively. Synthesis of certain *A. thaliana* sesquiterpenes, including β-caryophyllene, is induced by both GA and JA and involves the TF MYC2, which is repressed by DELLA proteins. This indicates that the production of these sesquiterpenes is integrated with the GA and JA signalling pathways (Hong et al. 2012). The biosynthesis and functions of plant VOCs have been reviewed (Nagegowda 2010, Maffei et al. 2011).

It has been shown that leaves of individual eucalypts contain over 100 different terpenes and more than a dozen FPCs. While this is only a small fraction of the more than 20,000 characterized terpene structures in plants (Degenhardt and Gershenzon 2003), it allows for a very large number of combinations. Because of this large number of combinations and dosage effects of individual compounds, the combined effects of different terpenes have hardly been evaluated. Most published work on *Eucalyptus* essential oils has focused on the constitutively stored compounds in leaves, and their exact function is still unknown. C. Külheim, A. Padovan, C. Hefer, S. T. Krause, T. G. Köllner, A. A. Myburg, J. Degenhardt, W. J. Foley (unpublished) showed that of the 113 terpene synthases (TPSs) in the *E. grandis* genome—the largest number of *TPS* genes found in any plant to date—about one-third are expressed in the roots and a smaller fraction in the phloem and xylem. The role of terpenes in these tissues is also unknown, but could involve defence. A recent study tentatively identified >40 *Eucalyptus* VOCs that can potentially be used as disease biomarkers once proper models have been established, allowing diagnosis within hours of sample collection that is robust against age differences in the harvested tissue (Hantao et al. 2013).

Converting defence gene discovery to application in *Eucalyptus* production

The characterization of a gene discovered through genomic studies is no easy task. A survey of databases and comparative transcriptome analyses involving other plant–pathogen interactions can provide information on the priority of candidate genes for functional characterization. For example, overrepresentation of Gene Ontology (GO) terms in a particular dataset, which can be analysed with tools such as BiNGO (Biological Networks Gene Ontology), may indicate which defence signalling pathways are important for a particular host–pathogen interaction (Maere et al. 2005). Genevestigator V3 is a functional annotation tool that enables the integrative analysis of transcriptome data from different organisms and treatments (Hruz et al. 2008). Systems biology approaches are increasingly being used to uncover candidate genes for enhanced resistance in plant–pathogen interaction studies (Pritchard and Birch 2011, Windram et al. 2014). In *Eucalyptus*, functional characterization could involve interaction studies that make use of techniques such as yeast one-hybrid and yeast two-hybrid assays, which can identify interactions between two proteins or between a protein and a DNA sequence (Brady et al. 2011, Gaudinier et al. 2011).

Researchers also rely on in planta methods for functional studies, which were initially conducted with *Arabidopsis* or tobacco as models (Unver et al. 2013), and more recently in poplar and *Eucalyptus*. Different methods have been developed for introducing DNA into eucalypts, with varying degrees of success in different genotypes (reviewed in Deepika et al.

2011, Girijashankar 2011). In an attempt to produce trees for enhanced biofuel production, the biotechnology company FuturaGene© successfully generated transgenic *Eucalyptus* trees (Abramson et al. 2011). Gene stacking is an interesting approach that has the potential to produce trees with enhanced resistance to various pests and pathogens (Chan et al. 2005) while retaining their valuable wood properties. However, long regeneration cycles and subsequently, growth cycles pose a serious limitation to multigene approaches with serial transformation, suggesting that multigene constructs will be a requirement.

A novel approach to gene manipulation in planta involves the use of transcription activator-like effectors (TALEs) combined with nucleases (TALENs) to knock out a gene or modify its sequence (Pennisi 2013). This technology has been applied to rice, where TALEs were used to activate genes targeted by the bacterial blight pathogen *Xanthomonas oryzae* pv. *oryzae* (Li et al. 2013). This approach to genome editing is expected to be more acceptable to regulatory bodies and society than conventional methods of genetic modification and are comparable to radiation mutagens in plants. The Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats (CRISPR) system from bacteria can also be used to edit host-specific targets and requires the attachment of nucleases to target-specific RNAs (Jinek et al. 2012, Belhaj et al. 2013). The CRISPR technology is being refined for various applications, including host–pathogen interaction studies, and could therefore be applied to *Eucalyptus* in the future.

Translating information about the defence responses in *Eucalyptus* to field applications is not limited to the production of transgenic material. The knowledge garnered by studying hormone responses in *Eucalyptus* could be applied by treating plants with a suitable phytohormone prior to pathogen challenge to enhance resistance. For example, Naidoo et al. (2013) showed that SA treatment of more susceptible *Eucalyptus* plants prior to inoculation with *C. austroafricana* increases their disease tolerance to levels comparable to those of the more tolerant genotype.

Marker-assisted breeding is an important application of *Eucalyptus* genomic variation data, since markers linked to resistance can be identified in segregating populations. For example, Freeman et al. (2008) described important Quantitative Trait Loci (QTLs) for resistance against the leaf blight fungus *Mycosphaerella cryptica* in *E. globulus*, and Junghans et al. (2003) identified QTLs in *E. grandis* that are associated with resistance to the fungal rust pathogen *P. psidii*. The sequencing of various eucalypt genomes (Grattapaglia et al. 2012) facilitates the discovery of single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), which can be genotyped in segregating populations. This results in denser marker coverage of the genome and more efficient identification of loci linked to disease resistance. In addition, expression abundance QTLs (eQTLs) can be determined based on transcriptomic changes in gene expression during pest or pathogen challenge, and groups of co-regulated genes linked to defence mechanisms can be identified. This is a powerful approach, termed systems genetics, to dissect complex traits such as resistance. Not only does it yield markers linked to disease resistance, it also provides more insight into the molecular mechanisms underlying the biology. This approach has been proposed for studying wood properties in *Eucalyptus* (Mizrachi et al. 2012), but has not yet been applied to studies of defence responses in these organisms.

Conclusion and future prospects

In order to understand the defence mechanisms underlying pest and pathogen interactions in *Eucalyptus*, reliable pest or pathosystems have to be developed so that the molecular mechanisms involved in these interactions can be investigated. The genome sequences of different pests and pathogens are also becoming available, and this provides a unique opportunity to formulate hypotheses about defence response mechanisms at the molecular level. Comparative transcriptome analyses of *Eucalyptus* under various biotic challenges will enable the identification of specific and tailored defence mechanisms, which will reveal potential targets for enhancing defence. In summary, the genomic resources that are available for studying *Eucalyptus* and the pests and pathogens that threaten it provide a platform to improve our understanding of the plant defence responses in these long-lived tree species and to test the established dogmas based on studies involving model organisms directly in the *Eucalyptus* host. The discovery of candidate genes for disease resistance based on these studies, coupled with advancements in breeding and transgenic technology, is expected to enhance defence responses in commercially propagated *Eucalyptus* in the future. These tree-improvement strategies form an essential part of a multidisciplinary approach to circumvent losses brought about by existing pests and pathogens, and may inform strategies to prevent new diseases that *Eucalyptus* has yet to encounter.

Conflict of interest

None declared.

Funding

References

Abramson M, Shoseyov O, Shani Z (2011) A novel approach to increase cell wall saccharification for efficient biofuel production. In: BMC Proceedings. BioMed Central Ltd, Arraial d'Ajuda, Bahia, Brazil, p 104.

Acharya K, Pal AK, Gulati A, Kumar S, Singh AK, Ahuja PS (2013) Overexpression of *Camellia sinensis* thaumatin-like protein, CsTLP in potato confers enhanced resistance to *Macrophomina phaseolina* and *Phytophthora infestans* infection. Mol Biotechnol 54:609–622.

Alves MdCS, Medeiros Filho S, Innecco R, Torres SB (2004) Allelopathy of plant volatile extracts on seed germination and radicle length of lettuce. Pesqui Agropecu Bras 39:1083–1086.

Arruda S, Souza G, Almeida M, Gonçalves A (2000) Anatomical and biochemical characterization of the calcium effect on *Eucalyptus urophylla* callus morphogenesis *in vitro*. Plant Cell Tissue Org Cult 63:142–154.

Azaiez A, Boyle B, Levee V, Seguin A (2009) Transcriptome profiling in hybrid poplar following interactions with *Melampsora* rust fungi. Mol Plant Microbe Interact 22:190–200.

Bari R, Jones JD (2009) Role of plant hormones in plant defence responses. Plant Mol Biol 69:473–488.

Barry KM, Pearce RB, Mohammed CM (2000) Properties of reaction zones associated with decay from pruning wounds in plantation-grown *Eucalyptus nitens*. For Pathol 30:233–245.

Barry KM, Davies NW, Mohammed CL (2001) Identification of hydrolysable tannins in the reaction zone of *Eucalyptus nitens* wood by high performance liquid chromatography–electrospray ionisation mass spectrometry. Phytochem Anal 12:120–127.

Belhaj K, Chaparro-Garcia A, Kamoun S, Nekrasov V (2013) Plant genome editing made easy: targeted mutagenesis in model and crop plants using the CRISPR/Cas system. Plant Methods 9:39.

Berr A, Menard R, Heitz T, Shen WH (2012) Chromatin modification and remodelling: a regulatory landscape for the control of *Arabidopsis* defence responses upon pathogen attack. Cell Microbiol 14:829–839.

Biggs A (1985) Suberized boundary zones and the chronology of wound response in tree bark. Phytopathology 75:1191–1195.

Blume B, Nürnberger T, Nass N, Scheel D (2000) Receptor-mediated increase in cytoplasmic free calcium required for activation of pathogen defense in parsley. Plant Cell 12:1425–1440.

Botha J, Pinard D, Creux N, Hussey S, Maritz-Olivier C, Spokevicius A, Bossinger G, Mizrachi E, Myburg A (2011) Characterising the role of the *Eucalyptus grandis* SND2 promoter in secondary cell wall biosynthesis. In: BMC Proceedings. BioMed Central Ltd, Arraial d'Ajuda, Bahia, Brazil, p 105.

Boyko A, Kovalchuk I (2011) Genome instability and epigenetic modification-heritable responses to environmental stress? Curr Opin Plant Biol 14:260–266.

Bozkurt TO, Schornack S, Win J et al. (2011) *Phytophthora infestans* effector AVRblb2 prevents secretion of a plant immune protease at the haustorial interface. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 108:20832–20837.

Brady SM, Zhang L, Megraw M et al. (2011) A stele-enriched gene regulatory network in the Arabidopsis root. Mol Syst Biol 7:459–468.

Bräutigam K, Vining KJ, Lafon-Placette C et al. (2013) Epigenetic regulation of adaptive responses of forest tree species to the environment. Ecol Evol 3:399–415.

Carr DJ, Carr SGM (1970) Oil glands and ducts in *Eucalyptus* L'Hérit. II. Development and structure of oil glands in the embryo. Aust J Bot 18:191–212.

Chan Y-L, Lin K-H, Liao L-J, Chen W-H, Chan M-T (2005) Gene stacking in *Phalaenopsis* orchid enhances dual tolerance to pathogen attack. Transgenic Res 14:279–288.

Chen Z, Malamy J, Henning J, Conrath U, Sanchez-Casas P, Silva H, Ricigliano J, Klessig DK (1995) Induction, modification, and transduction of the salicylic acid signal in plant defense responses. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 92:4134–4137.

Chen Z, Kolb TE, Clancy KM (2002) The role of monoterpenes in resistance of Douglas fir to Western spruce budworm defoliation. J Chem Ecol 28:897–920.

Christensen AB, Cho BH, Naesby M, Gregersen PL, Brandt J, Madriz-Ordeñana K, Collinge DB, Thordal-Christensen H (2002) The molecular characterization of two barley proteins establishes the novel PR-17 family of pathogenesis-related proteins. Mol Plant Pathol 3:135–144.

Conde D, González-Melendi P, Allona I (2013) Poplar stems show opposite epigenetic patterns during winter dormancy and vegetative growth. Trees 27:311–320.

Creux NM, Bossinger G, Myburg AA, Spokevicius AV (2013) Induced somatic sector analysis of cellulose synthase (CesA) promoter regions in woody stem tissues. Planta 237:799–812.

Cruickshank M, Jaquish B, Nemec A (2010) Resistance of half-sib interior Douglas-fir families to *Armillaria ostoyae* in British Columbia following artificial inoculation. Can J For Res 40:155–166.

Custers JHHV, Harrison SJ, Sela-Buurlage MB et al. (2004) Isolation and characterisation of a class of carbohydrate oxidases from higher plants, with a role in active defence. Plant J 39:147–160.

Dardick C, Ronald P (2006) Plant and animal pathogen recognition receptors signal through non-RD kinases. PLoS Pathog 2:14–28.

Deepika R, Veale A, Ma C, Strauss SH, Myburg AA (2011) Optimization of a plant regeneration and genetic transformation protocol for Eucalyptus clonal genotypes. In: BMC Proceedings. BioMed Central Ltd, Arraial d'Ajuda, Bahia, Brazi, p 132.

Degenhardt J, Gershenzon J (2003) Terpenoids. In: Brian T, Murphy D, Murray B (eds) Encyclopedia of applied plant sciences. Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp 500–504.

Delledonne M, Zeier J, Marocco A, Lamb C (2001) Signal interactions between nitric oxide and reactive oxygen intermediates in the plant hypersensitive disease resistance response. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 98:13454–13459.

Denancé N, Sánchez-Vallet A, Goffner D, Molina A (2013) Disease resistance or growth: the role of plant hormones in balancing immune responses and fitness costs. Front Plant Sci 4:155.

Ditengou FA, Lapeyrie F (2000) Hypaphorine from the ectomycorrhizal fungus *Pisolithus tinctorius* counteracts activities of indole-3-acetic acid and ethylene but not synthetic auxins in eucalypt seedlings. Mol Plant Microbe Interact 13:151–158.

Dodds PN, Rathjen JP (2010) Plant immunity: towards an integrated view of plant–pathogen interactions. Nat Rev Genet 11:539–548.

Doss RP, Oliver JE, Proebsting WM, Potter SW, Kuy S, Clement SL, Williamson RT, Carney JR, DeVilbiss ED (2000) Bruchins: insect-derived plant regulators that stimulate neoplasm formation. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 97:6218–6223.

Dou D, Zhou J-M (2012) Phytopathogen effectors subverting host immunity: different foes, similar battleground. Cell Host Microbe 12:484–495.

Duplessis S, Courty PE, Tagu D, Martin F (2005) Transcript patterns associated with ectomycorrhiza development in *Eucalyptus globulus* and *Pisolithus microcarpus*. New Phytol 165:599–611.

Duplessis S, Major I, Martin F, Séguin A (2009) Poplar and pathogen interactions: insights from *Populus* genome-wide analyses of resistance and defense gene families and gene expression profiling. Crit Rev Plant Sci 28:309–334.

Eldridge KG, Davidson J, Harwood C, Wyk Gv (1993) Eucalypt domestication and breeding. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

El-kereamy A, El-sharkawy I, Ramamoorthy R, Taheri A, Errampalli D, Kumar P, Jayasankar S (2011) *Prunus domestica* pathogenesis-related protein-5 activates the defense response pathway and enhances the resistance to fungal infection. PLoS ONE 6:1–11.

Eyles A, Mohammed C (2002*a*) Comparison of CEPA (2-chloroethyl phosphonic acid) induced responses in juvenile *Eucalyptus nitens*,

E. globulus and *E. obliqua*: a histochemical and anatomical study. IAWA J 23:419–430.

Eyles A, Mohammed C (2002*b*) Kino vein formation in *Eucalyptus globulus* and *E. nitens*. Aust For 66:206–212.

Eyles A, Davies N, Yuan Z, Mohammed C (2003*a*) Host responses to natural infection by *Cytonaema* sp. in the aerial bark of *Eucalyptus globulus*. For Pathol 33:317–331.

Eyles A, Davies NW, Mohammed C (2003*b*) Novel detection of formylated phloroglucinol compounds (FPCs) in the wound wood of *Eucalyptus globulus* and *E. nitens*. J Chem Ecol 29:881–898.

Eyles A, Davies NW, Mohammed C (2003*c*) Wound wood formation in *Eucalyptus globulus* and *Eucalyptus nitens*: anatomy and chemistry. Can J For Res 33:2331–2339.

Eyles A, Davies NW, Mohammed CM (2004) Traumatic oil glands induced by pruning in the wound-associated phloem of *Eucalyptus globulus*: chemistry and histology. Trees 18:204–210.

Eyles A, Bonello P, Ganley R, Mohammed C (2010) Induced resistance to pests and pathogens in trees. New Phytol 185:893–908.

Fahn A (1988) Secretory tissues in vascular plants. New Phytol 108:229–257.

Faria DA (2014) Performance and applications of the 'EucHIP60K. BR' for high throughput genotyping across thirteen species of *Eucalyptus*. In: Plant and Animal Genome XXII Conference. Plant and Animal Genome, San Diego, CA.

Feng L-Z, Guo W-S, Xie W-F, Chen Q-Z, Ye X-Z (2012) Construction and analysis of a SSH cDNA library of *Eucalyptus grandis* × *Eucalyptus urophylla* 9224 induced by *Cylindrocladium quinqueseptatum*. Botany 90:1277–1283.

Franceschi VR, Krokene P, Christiansen E, Krekling T (2005) Anatomical and chemical defenses of conifer bark against bark beetles and other pests. New Phytol 167:353–376.

Freeman JS, Potts BM, Vaillancourt RE (2008) Few Mendelian genes underlie the quantitative response of a forest tree, *Eucalyptus globulus*, to a natural fungal epidemic. Genetics 178:563–571.

Gaudinier A, Zhang L, Reece-Hoyes JS et al. (2011) Enhanced Y1H assays for Arabidopsis. Nat Methods 8:1053–1055.

Giamakis A, Kretsi O, Chinou I, Spyropoulos CG (2001) *Eucalyptus camaldulensis*: volatiles from immature flowers and high production of 1,8-cineole and beta-pinene by in vitro cultures. Phytochemistry 58:351–355.

Girijashankar V (2011) Genetic transformation of *Eucalyptus*. Physiol Mol Biol Plant 17:9–23.

Glazebrook J (2005) Contrasting mechanisms of defense against biotrophic and necrotrophic pathogens. Annu Rev Phytopathol 43:205–227.

Goodger JQD, Cao B, Jayadi I, Williams SJ, Woodrow IE (2009) Non-volatile components of the essential oil secretory cavities of *Eucalyptus* leaves: discovery of two glucose monoterpene esters, cuniloside B and froggattiside A. Phytochemistry 70:1187–1194.

Görlach J, Volrath S, Knauf-Beiter G et al. (1996) Benzothiadiazole, a novel class of inducers of systemic acquired resistance, activates gene expression and disease resistance in wheat. Plant Cell 8:629–643.

Grant JJ, Loake GJ (2000) Role of reactive oxygen intermediates and cognate redox signaling in disease resistance. Plant Physiol 124:21–29.

Grattapaglia D, Vaillancourt R, Shepherd M, Thumma B, Foley W, Külheim C, Potts B, Myburg A (2012) Progress in Myrtaceae genetics and genomics: *Eucalyptus* as the pivotal genus. Tree Genet Genomes 8:463–508.

Gurr SJ, Rushton PJ (2005) Engineering plants with increased disease resistance: what are we going to express? Trends Biotechnol 23:275–282.

Hantao LW, Aleme HG, Passador MM, Furtado EL, Ribeiro FA, Poppi RJ, Augusto F (2013) Determination of disease biomarkers in *Eucalyptus* by comprehensive two-dimensional gas chromatography and multivariate data analysis. J Chromatogr A 1279:86–91.

Heil M (2009) Damaged-self recognition in plant herbivore defence. Trends Plant Sci 14:356–363.

Henery M, Wallis I, Stone C, Foley W (2008) Methyl jasmonate does not induce changes in *Eucalyptus grandis* leaves that alter the effect of constitutive defences on larvae of a specialist herbivore. Oecologia 156:847–859.

Hinchee M, Zhang C, Chang S, Cunningham M, Hammond W, Nehra N (2011) Biotech *Eucalyptus* can sustainably address society's need for wood: the example of freeze tolerant *Eucalyptus* in the southeastern U.S. In: BMC Proceedings, 5. BioMed Central Ltd, Arraial d'Ajuda, Bahia, Brazil, p I24.

Holeski LM, Jander G, Agrawal AA (2012) Transgenerational defense induction and epigenetic inheritance in plants. Trends Ecol Evol 27:618–626.

Hong GJ, Xue XY, Mao YB, Wang LJ, Chen XY (2012) *Arabidopsis* MYC2 interacts with DELLA proteins in regulating sesquiterpene synthase gene expression. Plant Cell 24:2635–2648.

Hruz T, Laule O, Szabo G, Wessendorp F, Bleuler S, Oertle L, Widmayer P, Gruissem W, Zimmermann P (2008) Genevestigator V3: a reference expression database for the meta-analysis of transcriptomes. Adv Bioinformatics 2008:420747.

Hussey SG, Mizrachi E, Spokevicius AV, Bossinger G, Berger DK, Myburg AA (2011) SND2, a NAC transcription factor gene, regulates genes involved in secondary cell wall development in *Arabidopsis* fibres and increases fibre cell area in *Eucalyptus*. BMC Plant Biol 11:173.

Jinek M, Chylinski K, Fonfara I, Hauer M, Doudna JA, Charpentier E (2012) A programmable dual-RNA-guided DNA endonuclease in adaptive bacterial immunity. Science 337:816–821.

Jones JD, Dangl JL (2006) The plant immune system. Nature 444:323–329.

Junghans DT, Alfenas AC, Brommonschenkel SH, Oda S, Mello EJ, Grattapaglia D (2003) Resistance to rust (*Puccinia psidii* Winter) in *Eucalyptus*: mode of inheritance and mapping of a major gene with RAPD markers. Theor Appl Genet 108:175–180.

Kawano T, Kawano N, Hosoya H, Lapeyrie F (2001) Fungal auxin antagonist hypaphorine competitively inhibits indole-3-acetic acid-dependent superoxide generation by horseradish peroxidase. Biochem Biophys Res Commun 288:546–551.

Keszei A, Brubaker CL, Foley WJ (2008) A molecular perspective on terpene variation in Australian Myrtaceae. Aust J Bot 56:197–213.

Kovalchuk A, Keriö S, Oghenekaro AO, Jaber E, Raffaello T, Asiegbu FO (2013) Antimicrobial defenses and resistance in forest trees: challenges and perspectives in a genomic era. Annu Rev Phytopathol 51:221–244.

Lacombe S, Rougon-Cardoso A, Sherwood E et al. (2010) Interfamily transfer of a plant pattern-recognition receptor confers broad-spectrum bacterial resistance. Nat Biotechnol 28:365–369.

Lamb C, Dixon RA (1997) The oxidative burst in plant disease resistance. Annu Rev Plant Physiol Plant Mol Biol 48:251–275.

Lawler IR, Stapley J, Foley WJ, Eschler BM (1999) Ecological example of conditioned flavor aversion in plant–herbivore interactions: effect of terpenes of *Eucalyptus* leaves on feeding by common ringtail and brushtail possums. J Chem Ecol 25:401–415.

Lecourieux D, Mazars C, Pauly N, Ranjeva R, Pugin A (2002) Analysis and effects of cytosolic free calcium increases in response to elicitors in *Nicotiana plumbaginifolia* cells. Plant Cell 14:2627–2641.

Lecourieux D, Ranjeva R, Pugin A (2006) Calcium in plant defence-signalling pathways. New Phytol 171:249–269.

Leon-Reyes A, Du Y, Koornneef A, Proietti S, Korbes AP, Memelink J, Pieterse CM, 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.

Li T, Huang S, Zhou J, Yang B (2013) Designer TAL effectors induce disease susceptibility and resistance to *Xanthomonas oryzae* pv. *oryzae* in rice. Mol Plant 6:781–789.

Liu J-J, Ekramoddoullah A (2004) Isolation, genetic variation and expression of TIR-NBS-LRR resistance gene analogs from western white pine (*Pinus monticola* Dougl. ex. D. Don.). Mol Genet Genomics 270:432–441.

Ma W, Berkowitz GA (2007) The grateful dead: calcium and cell death in plant innate immunity. Cell Microbiol 9:2571–2585.

Maere S, Heymans K, Kuiper M (2005) BiNGO: a Cytoscape plugin to assess overrepresentation of gene ontology categories in biological networks. Bioinformatics 21:3448–3449.

Maffei ME, Gertsch J, Appendino G (2011) Plant volatiles: production, function and pharmacology. Nat Prod Rep 28:1359–1380.

Maleck K, Dietrich RA (1999) Defense on multiple fronts: how do plants cope with diverse enemies? Trends Plant Sci 4:215–219.

McLean S, Foley WJ, Davies NW, Brandon S, Duo L, Blackman AJ (1993) Metabolic fate of dietary terpenes from *Eucalyptus radiata* in common ringtail possum (*Pseudocheirus peregrinus*). J Chem Ecol 19:1625–1643.

Mengiste T (2012) Plant immunity to necrotrophs. Annu Rev Phytopathol 50:267–294.

Micali CO, Neumann U, Grunewald D, Panstruga R, O'Connell R (2011) Biogenesis of a specialized plant–fungal interface during host cell internalization of *Golovinomyces orontii* haustoria. Cell Microbiol 13:210–226.

Mishina TE, Zeier J (2007) Pathogen-associated molecular pattern recognition rather than development of tissue necrosis contributes to bacterial induction of systemic acquired resistance in *Arabidopsis*. Plant J 50:500–513.

Mithöfer A, Boland W (2008) Recognition of herbivory-associated molecular patterns. Plant Physiol 146:825–831.

Mithöfer A, Ebel J, Bhagwat AA, Boller T, Neuhaus-Url G (1999) Transgenic aequorin monitors cytosolic calcium transients in soybean cells challenged with β-glucan or chitin elicitors. Planta 207:566–574.

Mizrachi E, Hefer CA, Ranik M, Joubert F, Myburg AA (2010) De novo assembled expressed gene catalog of a fast-growing *Eucalyptus* tree produced by Illumina mRNA-Seq. BMC Genomics 11:681.

Mizrachi E, Mansfield SD, Myburg AA (2012) Cellulose factories: advancing bioenergy production from forest trees. New Phytol 194:54–62.

Moon DH, Salvatierra GR, Caldas DG, de Carvalho MCG, Carneiro RT, Franceschini LM, Oda S, Labate CA (2007) Comparison of the expression profiles of susceptible and resistant *Eucalyptus grandis* exposed to *Puccinia psidii* Winter using SAGE. Funct Plant Biol 34:1010–1018.

Myburg AA, Grattapaglia D, Tuskan GA et al. (2014) The genome of *Eucalyptus grandis*. Nature 510:356–362.

Nagegowda DA (2010) Plant volatile terpenoid metabolism: biosynthetic genes, transcriptional regulation and subcellular compartmentation. FEBS Lett 584:2965–2973.

Naidoo R, Ferreira L, Berger DK, Myburg AA, Naidoo S (2013) The identification and differential expression of *Eucalyptus grandis* pathogenesis-related genes in response to salicylic acid and methyl jasmonate. Front Plant Sci 4:43.

Niderman T, Genetet I, Bruyere T, Gees R, Stintzi A, Legrand M, Fritig B, Mosinger E (1995) Pathogenesis-related PR-1 proteins are antifungal (isolation and characterization of three 14-kilodalton proteins of tomato and of a basic PR-1 of tobacco with inhibitory activity against *Phytophthora infestans*). Plant Physiol 108:17–27.

Nurnberger T, Lipka V (2005) Non-host resistance in plants: new insights into an old phenomenon. Mol Plant Pathol 6:335–345.

Okushima Y, Koizumi N, Kusano T, Sano H (2000) Secreted proteins of tobacco cultured BY2 cells: identification of a new member of pathogenesis-related proteins. Plant Mol Biol 42:479–488.

Padovan A, Keszei A, Foley WJ, Kulheim C (2013) Differences in gene expression within a striking phenotypic mosaic *Eucalyptus* tree that varies in susceptibility to herbivory. BMC Plant Biol 13:29.

Passardi F, Penel C, Dunand C (2004) Performing the paradoxical: how plant peroxidases modify the cell wall. Trends Plant Sci 9:534–540.

Pennisi E (2013) The Tale of the TALEs. Science 338:1408–1411.

Pieterse CM, van der Does D, Zamioudis C, Leon-Reyes A, van Wees SC (2012) Hormonal modulation of plant immunity. Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol 28:489–521.

Pozo MJ, Van Der Ent S, Van Loon LC, Pieterse CM (2008) Transcription factor MYC2 is involved in priming for enhanced defense during rhizobacteria-induced systemic resistance in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. New Phytol 180:511–523.

Pre M, Atallah M, Champion A, De Vos M, Pieterse CM, Memelink J (2008) The AP2/ERF domain transcription factor ORA59 integrates jasmonic acid and ethylene signals in plant defense. Plant Physiol 147:1347–1357.

Pritchard L, Birch P (2011) A systems biology perspective on plant–microbe interactions: biochemical and structural targets of pathogen effectors. Plant Sci 180:584–603.

Ramos AC, Lima PT, Dias PN, Kasuya MCM, Feijó JA (2009) A pH signaling mechanism involved in the spatial distribution of calcium and anion fluxes in ectomycorrhizal roots. New Phytol 181:448–462.

Ran LX, Li ZN, Wu GJ, Loon LC, Bakker PAM (2005) Induction of systemic resistance against bacterial wilt in *Eucalyptus urophylla* by fluorescent *Pseudomonas* spp. Eur J Plant Pathol 113:59–70.

Rengel D, San Clemente H, Servant F, Ladouce N, Paux E, Wincker P, Couloux A, Sivadon P, Grima-Pettenati J (2009) A new genomic resource dedicated to wood formation in *Eucalyptus*. BMC Plant Biol 9:36.

Rodriguez MC, Petersen M, Mundy J (2010) Mitogen-activated protein kinase signaling in plants. Annu Rev Plant Biol 61:621–649.

Rosa DD, Furtado EL, Boava LP, Marino CL, Mori ES, Guerrini IA, Veline ED, Wilcken CF (2010) *Eucalyptus* ESTs involved in mechanisms against plant pathogens and environmental stresses. Summa Phytopathol 36:282–290.

Ryals JA, Neuenschwander UH, Willits MG, Molina A, Steiner H-Y, Hunt MD (1996) Systemic acquired resistance. Plant Cell 8:1809.

Ryan CA (1990) Protease inhibitors in plants: genes for improving defenses against insects and pathogens. Annu Rev Phytopathol 28:425–449.

Samajova O, Komis G, Samaj J (2013) Emerging topics in the cell biology of mitogen-activated protein kinases. Trends Plant Sci 18:140–148.

Selitrennikoff CP (2001) Antifungal proteins. Appl Environ Microbiol 67:2883–2894.

Sels J, Mathys J, De Coninck B, Cammue B, De Bolle MF (2008) Plant pathogenesis-related (PR) proteins: a focus on PR peptides. Plant Physiol Biochem 46:941–950.

Slippers B, Stenlid J, Wingfield MJ (2005) Emerging pathogens: fungal host jumps following anthropogenic introduction. Trends Ecol Evol 20:420–421.

Spoel SH, Dong X (2012) How do plants achieve immunity? Defence without specialized immune cells. Nat Rev Immunol 12:89–100.

Stuart JJ, Chen MS, Shukle R, Harris MO (2012) Gall midges (Hessian flies) as plant pathogens. Annu Rev Phytopathol 50:339–357.

Sturrock RN, Frankel SJ, Brown AV, Hennon PE, Kliejunas JT, Lewis KJ, Worrall JJ, Woods AJ (2011) Climate change and forest diseases. Plant Pathol 60:133–149.

Thatcher LF, Anderson JP, Singh KB (2005) Plant defence responses: what have we learnt from *Arabidopsis*? Funct Plant Biol 32:1–19.

Tippett JT, Shigo AL (1981) Barrier zone formation: a mechanism of tree defense against vascular pathogens. IAWA Bull 2:163–168.

Truman W, de Zabala MT, Grant M (2006) Type III effectors orchestrate a complex interplay between transcriptional networks to modify basal defence responses during pathogenesis and resistance. Plant J 46:14–33.

Underwood W (2012) The plant cell wall: a dynamic barrier against pathogen invasion. Front Plant Sci 3:85.

Unver T, Turktas M, Budak H (2013) In planta evidence for the involvement of a ubiquitin conjugating enzyme (UBC E2 clade) in negative regulation of disease resistance. Plant Mol Biol Rep 31:323–334.

van Loon LC (2007) Plant responses to plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria. Eur J Plant Pathol 119:243–254.

van Loon LC (2009) Advances in botanical research—plant innate immunity. Elsevier, Oxford, UK.

van Loon LC, Rep M, Pieterse C (2006) Significance of inducible defense-related proteins in infected plants. Annu Rev Phytopathol 44:135–162.

van Wees SC, van der Ent S, Pieterse CM (2008) Plant immune responses triggered by beneficial microbes. Curr Opin Plant Biol 11:443–448.

Veluthakkal R, Dasgupta MG (2010) Pathogenesis-related genes and proteins in forest tree species. Trees 24:993–1006.

Walters DR, Ratsep J, Havis ND (2013) Controlling crop diseases using induced resistance: challenges for the future. J Exp Bot 64:1263–1280.

Wang Y, Li J, Hou S, Wang X, Li Y, Ren D, Chen S, Tang X, Zhou JM (2010) A *Pseudomonas syringae* ADP-ribosyltransferase inhibits *Arabidopsis* mitogen-activated protein kinase kinases. Plant Cell 22:2033–2044.

Weiberg A, Wang M, Lin FM, Zhao H, Zhang Z, Kaloshian I, Huang HD, Jin H (2013) Fungal small RNAs suppress plant immunity by hijacking host RNA interference pathways. Science 342:118–123.

Wilkes J (1986) Host attributes affecting patterns of decay in a regrowth eucalypt forest—V. Barrier zones. Holzforschung 40:37–42.

Windram G, Penfold CA, Denby KJ (2014) Network modeling to understand plant immunity. Phytopathology 52:93–111.

Wingfield MJ, Slippers B, Hurley BP, Coutinho TA, Wingfield BD, Roux J (2008) Eucalypt pests and diseases: growing threats to plantation productivity. South For 70:139–144.

Wingfield MJ, Roux J, Slippers B, Hurley BP, Garnas J, Myburg AA, Wingfield BD (2013) Established and new technologies reduce increasing pest and pathogen threats to eucalypt plantations. For Ecol Manag 301:35–42.

Wojtaszek P (1997) Oxidative burst: an early plant response to pathogen infection. Biochem J 322:681–692.

Woodward S, Pearce R (1988) Wound-associated responses in Sitka spruce root bark challenged with *Phaeolus schweinitzii*. Physiol Mol Plant Pathol 33:151–162.

Woodward S, Pocock S (1996) Formation of the ligno-suberized barrier zone and wound periderm in four species of European broad-leaved trees. Eur J For Path 26:97–105.

Wylie FR, Speight MR (2012) Insect pests in tropical forestry. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, UK.

Yanchuk AD, Yeh FC, Dancik BP (1988) Variation of stem rust resistance in a lodgepole pine provenance-family plantation. For Sci 34:1067–1075.

Zhang J, Shao F, Li Y et al. (2007) A *Pseudomonas syringae* effector inactivates MAPKs to suppress PAMP-induced immunity in plants. Cell Host Microbe 1:175–185.

Zhang J, Li W, Xiang T et al. (2010) Receptor-like cytoplasmic kinases integrate signaling from multiple plant immune receptors and are targeted by a *Pseudomonas syringae* effector. Cell Host Microbe 7:290–301.

Zulak KG, Bohlmann J (2010) Terpenoid biosynthesis and specialized vascular cells of conifer defense. J Integr Plant Biol 52:86–97.