

1 **Expression analysis of *Pisum sativum* putative defence genes**
2 **during *Orobanche crenata* infection**
3

4 José Vicente Die*¹, Belén Román¹, Salvador Nadal¹,

5 Miguel Á. Dita² and Clara I. González-Verdejo¹

6
7 ¹ IFAPA “Alameda del Obispo”, Mejora y Biotecnología. Apdo. 4084, 14080 Córdoba, Spain.

8
9 ² Embrapa Mandioca Tropical, Rua Embrapa s/n, 44380-000, Cruz das Almas, Brazil
10

11 * Corresponding author.

12 E-mail address: josev.die@juntadeandalucia.es

13
14 **Abstract**

15 The root holoparasitic angiosperm *Orobanche crenata* is a severe constraint to the
16 cultivation of legumes. Breeding for resistance is a difficult task. Understanding the
17 mechanisms underlying host resistance is a fundamental issue for the genetic
18 improvement of legumes. In this work, the temporal expression patterns of 8 defence-
19 genes known to be involved in different metabolic pathways activated during several
20 plant-pathogen interactions were investigated in *Pisum sativum*. Molecular analyses
21 were carried out using quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction during the initial
22 stages of the parasitization process in susceptible (Messire) and incomplete resistant
23 (Ps624) pea genotypes. Transcriptional changes in response to *O. crenata* revealed
24 induction of genes putatively encoding pathogenesis-related proteins, peroxidase
25 activity and dehydration stress-responsive signalling. This, combined with high
26 constitutive gene expression mediating-phenylpropanoid pathway were observed as part
27 of the defence mechanisms triggered in Ps624 genotype to restrict the growth of the
28 parasite.
29

30
31 **Keywords** : parasitic plants, plant defence, Real-Time PCR
32
33

34 **Introduction**

35 Crenate broomrape (*Orobanche crenata* Forsk.) is a holoparasitic weed that
36 seriously attacks legume crops, such as faba bean, lentils, chickpea and vetch. This
37 parasitic plant is potentially the major constraint for *Pisum sativum* cultivation in the

1 Mediterranean area and Middle East. The only minor levels of incomplete resistance
2 available in commercial cultivars and the lack of a suitable control method has relegated
3 pea cultivation in infested areas (Pérez-de-Luque *et al.* 2005a).

4 Genetic resistance remains today as one of the most desirable components in an
5 integrated control strategy. Resistance in strict sense indicates processes which prevent
6 establishment of the parasite. However, resistance to *O. crenata* in legumes is a
7 complex multicomponent event with low heritability making breeding for resistance a
8 difficult task (Rubiales 2003). A detailed knowledge of the mechanisms underlying
9 such resistance during the host-parasite interaction or the incomplete resistance that
10 reduce the negative effects of the parasite on crop yield is necessary to improve
11 breeding programmes. However, despite the enormous economic impact of this disease
12 little is known about the molecular background of this legume-parasite interaction.
13 Initial screening in pea germplasm led to the identification of valuable sources of
14 resistance (Rubiales *et al.* 2005). Histological studies have revealed lignification of host
15 endodermis and occlusion of host vessels as main mechanisms to prevent parasite
16 intrusion at early infection stages during incompatible reactions (Pérez-de-Luque *et al.*
17 2005b). But so far, studies regarding the dissection of changes in gene expression in
18 parasitized plants and the molecular bases of resistance remain at very preliminary
19 stages. Advances in the knowledge of gene expression in infected roots was initiated
20 demonstrating the specific activation of the PR-1 (pathogenesis-related) and HMGR (3-
21 hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl Coenzyme A reductase) gene promoters during the tobacco
22 defence response to *O. aegyptiaca* [Joel and Portnoy 1998; Westwood *et al.* 1998].
23 Recently *in situ* hybridization techniques have shown the expression of a peroxidase
24 and a β -glucanase involved in resistance [Pérez-de-Luque *et al.* 2006a]. The use of
25 model plants in transcriptional profiling studies is gaining insight into the molecular

1 regulation of plant-parasitic plant interactions [Vieira Dos Santos *et al.* 2003; Die *et al.*
2 2007]. Comparative mapping studies have demonstrated a high degree of synteny
3 between *Medicago truncatula* and pea [Choi *et al.* 2004]. But until now, the transfer of
4 knowledge obtained from model plants to crop legumes has been limited. Target gene
5 approaches based on the knowledge gained from these systems allow the identification
6 of orthologous genes involved in pea defence against *Orobanche* being helpful for crop
7 improvement toward resistance.

8 Based on data obtained for the model legume plant *M. truncatula* [Die *et al.*
9 2007] and a previous related publication on pea [Pérez-de-Luque *et al.* 2006a] we
10 focused on the gene expression pattern in roots during the initial stages of the
11 parasitization process from the early contact with *Orobanche* radicles to the well-
12 developed parasite tubercle formation, leading to a detailed temporal expression
13 analysis of eight putative defence genes in pea. Our data is discussed and compared
14 with those previously obtained through histological and transcriptomic analysis of other
15 plant-parasitic plant systems.

16

17 **Materials and methods**

18 *Plant material and inoculation*

19 The susceptible *P. sativum* cv. Messire and incomplete resistant accession
20 Ps624, were selected based on previous experiments (Rubiales *et al.* 2005). A Petri dish
21 assay was carried out according to Pérez-de-Luque *et al.* (2005a): seeds of *P. sativum*
22 were germinated in filter paper and kept in the dark at 20°C for 5 days. Seedlings with
23 roots between 5-7 cm were placed in squared Petri dishes (12cm x 12cm) containing a
24 sheet of glass-fibre filter paper (GFFP; Whatman International, Kent, UK), and perlite
25 as substrate. When seedlings presented at least one true leaf, they were inoculated with

1 *O. crenata* seeds at a density of ~ 50 seeds cm^{-2} , collected from infested faba bean fields
2 in Córdoba. The synthetic germination stimulant GR24 was applied by adding 3 mL of
3 a 10 ppm solution. *O. crenata* seeds had previously been surface-sterilized (González-
4 Verdejo *et al.* 2005) and stored in the dark at 20 °C during 8 days to promote
5 conditioning. Dishes were sealed with parafilm, covered with aluminium foil and stored
6 vertically in trays with Hoagland nutrient solution (Hoagland and Arnon, 1950). The
7 plants were maintained in a growing chamber at 20°C, 14 h photoperiod and irradiance
8 of 200 $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$. Two serial experiments using thirty plants per experiment and
9 genotype were performed. Fifteen plants were infected and the other 15 used as non-
10 infected controls.

11

12 *Sample collection and nucleic acids isolation*

13 Observations on host-parasite development were taken every week by using a
14 binocular microscope (Nikon SMZ1000; Nikon Europe BV, The Netherlands). Samples
15 from control and infected *P. sativum* whole roots were harvested at: 15 days post-
16 inoculation (dpi), the *O. crenata* radicles contact with the host roots before the
17 attachment; 21dpi, initial stage of tubercle formation once the vascular systems of the
18 two plants are connected; 35dpi, prior to necrosis of most of the developed tubercles in
19 Ps624 genotype. In order to avoid contamination with parasite tissues, host roots were
20 abundantly washed with distilled water and blot dried with filter paper. The most of
21 parasite tubercles from root samples collected at 21 and 35 dpi were carefully removed
22 with a scalpel. Collected samples were frozen in liquid nitrogen. Total RNA samples
23 were isolated from roots (0.1 g) using TRIZOL reagent (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, USA)
24 according to manufacture's protocols from different pools of five plants in order to
25 minimize variation in gene expression among individual plants in both, infected and

1 non-infected control samples. The integrity of total RNA was checked on 2% (w/v)
2 agarose gels and its quantity as well as purity was determined by an optical density at
3 260nm and A_{260}/A_{280} absorption ratio using the BioPhotomer (Eppendorf, Germany).
4 Genomic DNA from plants was isolated according to Torres *et al.* (2005) and used for
5 PCR amplification with degenerated primers.

6

7 *Sequence information and primer design*

8 First, to identify *P. sativum* orthologous of *M. truncatula* defence-related genes,
9 we queried pea ESTs database from the GenBank. Second, specific peroxidase and
10 glucanase primers were derived from *P. sativum* peroxidase (GenBank accession no.
11 AF396465) and *P. sativum* glucanase (Chang *et al.* 1992). Third, since no pea cellulose
12 synthase sequence was available in databases, a degenerated primer-based strategy was
13 used. The design of the degenerated primers was based on five putative cellulose
14 synthase cDNAs from *M. truncatula*, *Arabidopsis thaliana*, *Eucalyptus grandis*, *Vitis*
15 *vinifera* and *Gossypium hirsutum*. Polymerase chain reaction was performed with
16 primers Cells1 5'-GNTGAYCCNYTNAARGARCC-3' and Cells2 5'-
17 TTRCARAANGGANCCCCAYTT- 3' in a reaction volume of 25 μ l using a template 1
18 μ l of genomic DNA. The cycling conditions were: 94 °C for 35 s, 59 °C for 35 s and 72
19 °C for 1 min for 40 cycles. The amplified 179 bp fragment was cloned into the pGEM-T
20 vector system (Promega, USA), sequenced and submitted to the GenBank database
21 under accession no. EU681279.

22 Finally, the gene-specific primer sets used for real-time reverse transcription
23 (RT)-PCR were designed with a calculated T_m of 60 ± 0.5 °C, GC% between 20% and
24 80% and amplification products not larger than 100 bp (Table 1). An orthologous of the
25 *M. truncatula* elongation factor-1 α (*ef-1 α* , TC106845, The Institute for Genomic

1 Research; TIGR) was used as constitutively expressed gene for transcript normalization
2 with primers *efal* 5'-AAGCTAGGAGGTATTGACAAG-3' and *efa2* 5'-
3 ACTGTGCAGTAGTACTTGGTG-3'.

4

5 *Two step real-time RT-PCR*

6 Total RNA (1µg) was reverse-transcribed using the QuantiTec Reverse
7 Transcription Kit (Quiagen, Germany), according to the manufacturer's instructions.
8 Genomic DNA was eliminated during this procedure by RNase-free DNase I treatment.
9 In order to ensure equal starting cDNA amounts, real-time PCR amplification of *ef-1α*
10 was run for all different templates and depending on the C_T (threshold cycle), three-fold
11 to ten-fold serial dilutions of cDNA were prepared to obtain similar C_T values for
12 products due to equal starting amounts of cDNA, before initiating real-time PCR
13 experiments. Polymerase chain reactions were performed in a 96-well plate with a
14 Mx3000P Real-Time PCR System (Stratagene, USA), using SYBR Green to monitor
15 dsDNA synthesis. Reactions contained 0.5 µl 50x SYBR Green Solution, 12.5 µl 2x
16 SensiMix (dT) (Quantace, London), 2.5 µl of cDNA and 200 nM of each gene-specific
17 primer in a final volume of 25 µl. The following standard thermal profile was used for
18 all PCR reactions: polymerase activation (95 °C for 10 min), amplification and
19 quantification cycles repeated 40 times (95°C for 1min, 60°C for 1min). Each
20 measurement was performed in triplicate and the C_T was determined.

21

22 *Verification of amplified products*

23 Specificity of the primer amplicons was checked by melting-curve analysis
24 performed by the PCR machine after 40 amplification cycles (60 to 95 °C with one

1 fluorescence read every 0.6 °C). All investigated RT-PCR products that showed only
2 single peaks and no primer-dimer peaks or artifacts were considered for further analysis.
3 In order to confirm the plant origin of the transcripts, amplification products were
4 checked on 2% (w/v) agarose gel using cDNA from Messire infected roots (21dpi) and
5 cDNA from *Orobanche* nodules (21dpi) developed in Messire plants. A primer pair was
6 used as *Orobanche* expressed control gene *ocr1* 5'-GTCTGCAGTAGTATGTTGCAT-
7 3' and *ocr2* 5'-GACAAATTCCTCAAAATCTTC-3'.

8

9 *Data analysis*

10 Data were analysed using the Mx3000P analysis software version 3.00
11 (Stratagene, USA). All amplification plots were analysed with an R_n threshold of 0.035
12 to obtain C_T values for each gene-cDNA combination. The PCR efficiency (E) of each
13 primer pair in each individual reaction was estimated from the data obtained from the
14 exponential phase of each individual amplification plot and the equation $(1+E)=10^{\text{slope}}$
15 (Ramakers *et al.* 2003). Primer efficiency values with an R^2 value less than 0.997 were
16 ignored. The expression levels of the gene of interest (GOI) relative to the *ef-1 α* were
17 calculated for each cDNA sample using the equation: relative ratio $GOI/ef-1\alpha = (E_{GOI}^{-C_{TGOI}})$
18 $(E_{ef-1\alpha}^{-C_{Tef-1\alpha}})$. The values of six infected and six control samples (from the two
19 independent experiments) were used in a Student's *t* test to calculate probabilities of
20 distinct induction or repression and the average ratio of these values was used to
21 determine the fold change in transcript level in infected samples compared with non-
22 infected control plants as described by McGrath *et al.* (2005).

1

2 **Results**

3 The susceptible *P. sativum* cv. Messire and the incomplete resistant accession
4 Ps624 were selected and used to monitor the transcript accumulation of genes encoding
5 several defence-related proteins assayed by real-time reverse transcription (RT)-PCR
6 strategy. Real-time PCR reactions resulted in a single product with the specific
7 temperature shown in Table 1. Amplification products were obtained using cDNA from
8 pea root tissues but no products were detected using cDNA from *O. crenata* nodules,
9 proving that the gene expression observed was transcribed in roots of *P. sativum* (Fig.
10 1). The different mechanisms of resistance to *O. crenata* in Ps624 accession were
11 reflected by a low number of established tubercles per plant that presented a delay in
12 tubercle development in accordance with previously characterized differences in
13 resistance to broomrape (Castillejo *et al.* 2004; Pérez-de-Luque *et al.* 2005a). Moreover,
14 most of the tubercles formed became necrotic (Table 2) and died 35 days after
15 inoculation (Fig. 2).

16

17 *Gene expression patterns in susceptible pea genotype*

18 The penetration of *O. crenata* radicles, parasite attachment and further
19 development of tubercles into host roots led to a transient induced of selected genes
20 during the three time-points addressed shown in Table 3. The induction of a gene
21 encoding a dehydrin-like protein (*dhl*) exhibited a 1302.92-fold difference in expression
22 level in infected Messire roots at 35dpi compared with the corresponding controls,
23 which was the highest difference expression level measured in this study. A remarkable
24 higher level of glutathione S-transferase gene (*gst*) was detected during the initial

1 contacts with the *Orobanche* radicles (15dpi) and the developed tubercles stage (35dpi)
2 in infected Messire plants when compared to infected Ps624 plants (Fig. 3).

3

4 *Gene expression patterns in incomplete resistant pea genotype*

5 Significant induction in Ps624 accession ranged from at least two-fold and up
6 to 22-fold difference in expression level between infected and control plants. Genes
7 identified more than 2-fold change relative expression in resistant compared with
8 susceptible genotype were tentatively classified as associated with the molecular
9 resistant response. A distribution of the ratios [(Ps624 infected/*ef-1α*)/(Messire
10 infected/*ef-1α*)] using the 2-fold cutoff is shown in Fig. 3. Expression levels were higher
11 in Ps624 for all transcripts analysed at least in one of the time points studied except for
12 glutathione S-transferase gene (*gst*) which showed remarkable higher level in Messire
13 plants 15 and 35dpi and the hypersensitive reaction 203J gene (*hsr203J*) which was
14 4.73-fold difference 35dpi in infected Messire compared to infected Ps624 plants.

15 Interestingly the highest comparative expression level detected in Messire
16 genotype for the *dhl* gene (1302.92-fold difference between infected and non-infected
17 plants) did not reach the relative level observed in Ps624 that showed a 22.39-fold
18 change up-regulation in infected plants. Thus, in spite of this high up-regulation in both
19 genotypes, the *dhl* gene was induced finally to similar levels in both infected genotypes
20 (Fig. 3).

21

22 **Discussion**

23 In the present work, a molecular approach to compare the expression patterns
24 of some defence-related genes known to be expressed in response to parasitic plants
25 infection was addressed by RT-PCR strategy. Two pea genotypes differing in their

1 sensitivity to *O. crenata* were selected and used to monitor the gene expression patterns
2 from the earliest contact with *Orobanchae* radicles to the well-developed parasite
3 tubercle.

4 The role of hypersensitive-like reaction (HR) in resistance of legumes to *O.*
5 *crenata* has been debated in the past on the basis of the appearance of necrotic lesions
6 during the interaction with vetch (Goldwasser *et al.* 1997) or chickpea (Rubiales *et al.*
7 2003). Pérez-de-Luque *et al.* (2005b), have shown that unsuccessful penetration of *O.*
8 *crenata* seedlings during the initial steps in the interaction and the necrosis of the
9 established tubercles cannot be attributed to cell death in the host. In this study, we
10 evaluated transcript accumulation of *hsr203J* gene, usually employed as molecular
11 marker of the hypersensitive response (Gopalan *et al.* 1996; Pontier *et al.* 2001).
12 Induction of *hsr203J* was detected in both infected genotypes at 15dpi during the first
13 contacts between host and parasite. However, the up-regulation was maintained
14 throughout all the experiment only in Messire infected plants when no significant death
15 or darkened tubercles were observed. This, casts doubt on the active role of *hsr203J* as a
16 resistance mechanism. In this sense, some authors have suggested that *hsr203J* would
17 be a negative regulator of the HR (Tronchet *et al.* 2001; Nasir *et al.* 2005). This protein
18 might function as a scavenger for ROS-derived compounds (Tronchet *et al.* 2001)
19 produced by an oxidative burst following parasite penetration into host roots. Oxidative
20 stress, in the absence of HR, has already been shown during the interaction *A. thaliana*-
21 *O. ramosa* (Vieira Dos Santos *et al.* 2003). It may be hypothesized that oxidative stress
22 is induced by the penetration of *Orobanchae*, generated upon the cell-wall degradation of
23 the host cells during the compatible reaction. According to this model, Messire responds
24 probably to the infection by both, a detoxification mechanism involving *gst* and
25 induction of *hsr203J* implicated in cell protection.

1 However, comparative analysis of regulated genes revealed quantitative and
2 qualitative differences in the gene expression profiles between the two infected
3 genotypes (Fig. 3). Genes identified more than 2-fold change expression in resistant
4 compared with susceptible genotype were tentatively classified as associated with the
5 molecular resistant response. An early induction 15dpi was detected for a ripening-
6 related protein with a domain for Bet v I allergen belonging to a group of protein family
7 including pathogenesis-related protein of the PR-10 group (Moiseyev *et al.* 1997).
8 Inducible expression, RNase activity and ligand-binding activities have linked Bet v I
9 allergen to plant defence as well as to abiotic stress (Samac and Graham 2007). A recent
10 work, using a proteomic approach to investigate the *M. truncatula*–*O. crenata*
11 interaction, led to the identification of Bet v I allergen associated to resistance (MA
12 Castillejo, unpublished data). Another observation from 15dpi was the accumulation of
13 peroxidase transcripts which persisted at 21dpi. There is strong evidence supporting the
14 implication of peroxidases in plant resistance to parasitic plant (Goldwasser *et al.* 1999;
15 Vieira Dos Santos *et al.* 2003; Castillejo *et al.* 2004). The formation of protein cross-
16 links of the cortical cell walls have been suggested to be involved in resistance
17 (Echevarría-Zomeño *et al.* 2006; Pérez-de-Luque *et al.* 2006a). Thus, the peroxidase
18 activity induction observed is likely to be implicated in cell wall reinforcement
19 through oxidative cross-linking of structural proteins conferring mechanical barriers to
20 the invading parasite.

21 Combined with the physical barriers, the induction of several genes mediating
22 other mechanisms of resistance takes place after the vascular connections have been
23 established. Since *Orobancha* must overcome such activated barriers, this could explain
24 first, the delayed development of the few established individuals and finally, the death
25 of the tubercles. In this sense, there was a notably up-regulation of *dhl* gene in Ps624

1 (11.34-fold induced, the most strongly *Orobanche*-induced gene in this genotype at
2 21dpi). Dehydrins are members of a protein family expressed during dehydration-stress
3 and have been identified in a range of species including pea (Robertson and Chadler
4 1992). Although their specific role remains challenging areas for further study, this
5 protein might comprise part of the alterations in host metabolism necessary to overcome
6 the water deficiency caused by the parasite.

7 However, the accumulation of *dhl* transcripts cannot explain the necrosis of *O.*
8 *crenata* tubercles. Two main factors have been suggested to be involved in resistance :
9 vessel occlusion (Pérez-de-Luque *et al.* 2005b; Pérez-de-Luque *et al.* 2006b) and/or
10 accumulation of toxic compounds such as phenolics (Serghini *et al.* 2001; Echevarría-
11 Zomeño *et al.* 2006). Peroxidases are known to be involved in the cell wall modification
12 discussed above but also appear to be implicated in this late resistance form. The
13 peroxidases polymerize polysaccharides and polyphenols to produce stable vascular
14 occluding gels (Crews *et al.* 2003). Recent reports have related vessel occlusion in pea
15 resistance to high peroxidase activity (Pérez-de-Luque *et al.* 2005a; Mabrouk *et al.*
16 2007). The increase in abundance of transcript for peroxidase 21dpi (11.88-fold
17 difference, the most strong difference between infected genotypes at this time-point)
18 seems to highlight the important role that this enzyme plays in defence against
19 *Orobanche*. Curiously three genes not up-regulated in the resistant genotype showed
20 higher relative expression values in Ps624 when the two genotypes were compared.
21 Chalcone synthase is located in the phenylpropanoid pathway leading to synthesis of
22 phenolic compounds or phytoalexins production. The derived products may confer
23 mechanical and chemical barriers to *Orobanche* suggesting the important role of the
24 phenylpropanoid pathway in the elicited defence (Griffitts *et al.* 2004, Pérez-de-Luque
25 *et al.* 2006a; Echevarría Zomeño *et al.* 2006; Lozano *et al.* 2007). Cellulose synthases

1 are responsible for the biosynthesis of one of the principal polysaccharides of the cell
2 wall and the role in defence of β -glucanases has been pointed out by releasing
3 oligosaccharides elicitors (Esquerré-Tugayé *et al.* 2000). Increased levels of cellulose
4 synthase and β -glucanase have been detected in *Medicago* and pea resistant to *O.*
5 *crenata*, respectively (MA Dita, pers. comm.; Castillejo *et al.* 2004). Although no up-
6 regulation was observed in infected plants, high expression levels in Ps624 might
7 suggest that a higher constitutive level for some transcripts expression in the incomplete
8 resistant genotype could help the plant in priming defence reactions against pathogens
9 more rapidly.

10 All these mechanisms are based on the assumption that the host recognizes the
11 pathogen and reacts against it. The induction of *dhl* or *gst* genes as early as 15dpi in the
12 susceptible genotype demonstrates that the parasite is apparently detected and defensive
13 mechanisms are activated. But this raises the question as such a response is too slow or
14 ineffective to prevent the *Orobanchae* development. It has been related a delayed
15 response to reduced input into the plant signal recognition system (Tao *et al.* 2003) or
16 an active process of defence genes suppression (Caldo *et al.* 2004). So far, there is no
17 convincing evidence that parasitic plants suppress the response of the host. The
18 perceived signal input is greater in incompatible reactions (unsuccessful attachment-
19 penetration and darkening of established tubercles) and therefore the output signal is
20 greater. The observation that gene activation in the host does not mount an effective
21 defence against *Orobanchae* might indicate that the invasion is recognized only partially.

22

23 **Conclusion and remarks**

24 This work describes a first transcriptomic approach with the aim to study gene
25 expression patterns in *P. sativum* after infection with the parasitic plant *O. crenata*. The

1 complexity of resistance to parasitic plants in legumes is a consequence of the
2 coordinated induction of several mechanisms. Following invasion of *P. sativum* tissues
3 by *O. crenata*, a range of defence mechanisms are triggered to restrict their growth.
4 Induction of defence genes in host plants is underlying the perception of the parasite by
5 the host, even in the case of compatible reaction. But gene activation in this case is not
6 sufficient to result in host resistance. If the transcript inductions observed are expressed
7 as functional proteins, the defence response comprises reinforcement of cell walls,
8 activation of pathogenesis-related proteins and phenylpropanoid pathway. Upregulation
9 of genes involved in this mechanisms combined with high constitutive expression
10 values determines a more effective defence against the parasite. Further experiments
11 have to be done to understand the biological function of genes involved in the basic
12 mechanisms governing resistance to parasitic plants. Understanding the function of
13 genes plays an essential role in the characterization of disease processes and this will be
14 of great importance in directing pea breeding programmes and developing resistant
15 crops.

16

17 **Acknowledgments**

18 The authors acknowledge the financial support provided by the Spanish project
19 INIA2007-0009.

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 **References**

2 Caldo RA, Nettleton D, Wise RP (2004) Interaction-dependent gene expression in *Mla*-
3 specified response to barley powdery mildew. *Plant Cell* **16**, 2514-2528.

4

5 Castillejo MA, Amieur N, Dumas-Gaudot E, Rubiales D, Jorrín J (2004) A proteomic
6 approach to studying plant response to crenate broomrape (*Orobanche crenata*) in pea
7 (*Pisum sativum*). *Phytochemistry* **65**, 1817-1828.

8

9 Chang MM, Hadwiger LA, Horovitz D (1992) Molecular characterization of a beta 1,3-
10 glucanase induced by *Fusarium solani* and chitosan challenge. *Plant Molecular Biology*
11 **20**, 609-618.

12

13 Choi HK, Mun JH, Kim DJ, Uhm T, Zhu H, Baek JM, Mudge J, Roe B, Ellis N, Doyle
14 J, Kiss GB, Young ND, Cook DR (2004) Estimating genome conservation between crop
15 and model legume species. *Proceedings National Academy Sciences USA* **101**, 15289-
16 15294.

17

18 Crews LJ, McCully ME, Canny MJ (2003) Mucilage production by wounded xylem
19 tissue of maize roots-time course and stimulus. *Functional Plant Biology* **30**, 755-766.

20

21 Die JV, Dita MA, Krajinski F, González-Verdejo CI, Rubiales D, Moreno MT, Roman
22 B (2007) Identification by suppression subtractive hybridization and expression analysis
23 of *Medicago truncatula* putative defence genes in response to *Orobanche crenata*
24 parasitization. *Physiological and Molecular Plant Pathology* **70**, 49-59.

25

26 Echevarría-Zomeño S, Pérez-de-Luque A, Jorrín J, Maldonado SM (2006) Pre-
27 haustorial resistance to broomrape (*Orobanche cumana*) in sunflower (*Helianthus*
28 *annuus*): cytochemical studies. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **57**, 4189-4200.

29

30 Esquerré-Tugayé MT, Boudard G, Dumas B (2000) Cell wall degrading enzyme,
31 inhibitory proteins, and oligosaccharides participate in the molecular dialogue between
32 plants and pathogens. *Plant Physiology and Biochemistry* **38**, 157-163.

33

- 1 Goldwasser Y, Kleifeld Y, Plakhine D, Rubin B (1997) Variation in vetch (*Vicia* spp.)
2 response to *Orobanche aegyptiaca*. *Weed Science* **45**, 756-762.
- 3
- 4 Goldwasser Y, Hershenhorn J, Plakhine D, Kleifeld Y, Rubin B (1999) Biochemical
5 factors involved in vetch resistance to *Orobanche aegyptiaca*. *Physiological and*
6 *Molecular Plant Pathology* **54**, 87–96.
- 7
- 8 González-Verdejo CI, Barandiaran X, Moreno MT, Cubero JI, Di Pietro A (2005) An
9 improved axenic system for studying pre-infection development of the parasitic plant
10 *Orobanche ramosa*. *Annals of Botany* **96**, 1121-1127.
- 11
- 12 Gopalan S, Wei W, He SY (1996) *hrp* gene-dependent induction of *hinI*: a plant gene
13 activated rapidly by both harpins and the *avrPto* gene-mediated signal. *Plant Journal*
14 **10**, 591-600.
- 15
- 16 Griffiths AA, Cramer CL, Westwood JH, (2004) Host gene expression in response to
17 Egyptian broomrape (*Orobanche aegyptiaca*). *Weed Science* **52**, 697-703.
- 18
- 19 Hoagland DR, Arnon DI (1950) The water-culture method for growing plants without
20 soil. *Univ. California Agric. Exp. Stn. Circ.* **347**.
- 21
- 22 Joel DM and Portnoy VH (1998) The angiospermous root parasite *Orobanche* L.
23 (*Orobanchaceae*) induces expression of a pathogenesis related (PR) gene in susceptible
24 tobacco roots. *Annals of Botany* **81**, 779-781.
- 25
- 26 Lozano-Baena MD, Moreno MT, Rubiales D, Pérez-de-Luque A (2007). *Medicago*
27 *truncatula* as a model for non-host resistance in legume-parasitic plant interactions.
28 *Plant Physiology* **145**, 437-449.
- 29
- 30 Mabrouk Y, Zourgui L, Sifi B, Delavault P, Simier P, Belhadi O (2007) Some
31 compatible *Rhizobium leguminosarum* strains in peas decrease infections when
32 parasitized by *Orobanche crenata*. *Weed Research* **47**, 44-53.
- 33
- 34 McGrath KC, Dombrecht B, Manners JM, Schenk PM, Edgar CI, Maclean DJ, Scheible

1 WR, Udvardi MK, Kazan K (2005). Repressor- and activator-type ethylene response
2 factors functioning in jasmonate signaling and disease resistance identified via a
3 genome-wide screen of *Arabidopsis* transcription factor gene expression. *Plant*
4 *Physiology* **139**, 949-959.

5

6 Moiseyev GP, Fedoreyeva LI, Zhuravlev YN, Yasnetskaya E, Jekel P, Beintema JJ
7 (1997) Primary structures of two ribonucleases from ginseng calluses. New members of
8 the PR-10 family of intracellular pathogenesis-related plant proteins. *FEBS Letters* **407**,
9 207–210.

10

11 Nasir KHB, Takahashi Y, Ito A, Saitoh H, Matsumura H, Kanzaki H, Shimizu T, Ito M,
12 Fujisawa S, Sharma PC, Ohme-Takagi M, Kamoun S, Terauchi R (2005) High-
13 throughput in planta expression screening identifies a class II ethylene-responsive
14 element binding factor-like protein that regulates plant cell death and non-host
15 resistance. *Plant Journal* **43**, 491–450.

16

17 Pérez-de-Luque A, Jorrín J, Cubero JI, Rubiales D (2005a) *Orobanche crenata*
18 resistance and avoidance in pea (*Pisum* spp.) operate at different developmental stages
19 of the parasite. *Weed Research* **45**, 379-387.

20

21 Pérez-de-Luque A, Rubiales D, Cubero JI, Press MC, Scholes J, Yoneyama K,
22 Takeuchi Y, Plakhine D, Joel DM (2005b) Interaction between *Orobanche crenata* and
23 its host legumes: unsuccessful haustorial penetration and necrosis of the developing
24 parasite. *Annals of Botany* **95**, 935-942.

25

26 Pérez-de-Luque A, González-Verdejo CI, Lozano MD, Dita MA, Cubero JI, González-
27 Melendi P, Risueño MC, Rubiales D (2006a) Protein cross-linking, peroxidase and β -
28 1,3-endoglucanase involved in resistance of pea against *Orobanche crenata*. *Journal of*
29 *Experimental Botany* **57**, 1461-1469.

30

31 Pérez-de-Luque A, Lozano MD, Cubero JI, González-Melendi P, Risueño MC,
32 Rubiales D (2006b) Mucilage production during the incompatible interaction between
33 *Orobanche crenata* and *Vicia sativa*. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **57**, 931-942.

34

- 1 Pontier D, Balagué C, Bezombes-Marion I, Tronchet M, Deslandes L, Roby D (2001)
2 Identification of a novel pathogen-responsive element in the promoter of the tobacco
3 gene HSR203J, a molecular marker of the hypersensitive response. *Plant Journal* **26**,
4 495-507.
- 5
- 6 Ramakers C, Ruijter JM, Deprez RH, Moorman AF (2003) Assumption-free analysis of
7 quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction (PCR) data. *Neuroscience Letters* **13**,
8 62-66.
- 9
- 10 Roberton M, Chandler PM (1992) Pea dehydrins: identification, characterization and
11 expression. *Plant Molecular Biology* **19**, 1031-1044.
- 12
- 13 Rubiales D (2003) Parasitic plants, wild relatives and the nature of resistance. *New*
14 *Phytologist* **160**, 459-461.
- 15
- 16 Rubiales D, Pérez-De-Luque A, Joel DM, Alcántara C, Sillero JC (2003)
17 Characterization of resistance in chickpea to crenata broomrape (*Orobanche crenata*).
18 *Weed Science* **51**, 702-707.
- 19
- 20 Rubiales D, Moreno MT, Sillero JC (2005) Search for resistance to crenate broomrape
21 (*Orobanche crenata* Forsk.) in pea germplasm. *Genetic Resources and Crop Evolution*
22 **52**, 853-861.
- 23
- 24 Samac DA, Graham MA (2007) Recent advances in legume-microbe interactions:
25 recognition, defense response, and symbiosis from a genomic perspective. *Plant*
26 *Physiology* **144**, 582–587.
- 27
- 28 Sherghini K, Pérez-de-Luque A, Castejón-Muñoz M, García-Torres L, Jorrín JV (2001)
29 Sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) response to broomrape (*Orobanche cernua* Loefl.)
30 parasitism: induced synthesis and excretion of 7-hydroxylated simple coumarins.
31 *Journal of Experimental Botany* **52**, 2227-2234.
- 32
- 33 Tao Y, Zhiyi X, Chen W, Glazebrook J, Chang HS, Han B, Zhu T, Zou G, Katagiri F
34 (2003) Quantitative nature of Arabidopsis responses during compatible and

1 incompatible interactions with the bacterial pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae*. *Plant Cell*
2 **15**, 317-330.
3
4 ter Borg SJ, Willemsen A, Khalil SA, Saber HA, Verkleij JAC, Pieterse AH (1994)
5 Field study of the interaction between *Orobanche crenata* Forsk. and some new lines of
6 *Vicia faba* L. in Egypt. *Crop Protection* **13**, 611-616.
7
8 Torres AM, Weeden NF, Martín A (1993) Linkage among isozyme, RFLP and RAPD
9 markers in *Vicia faba*. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* **85**, 937-945.
10
11 Tronchet M, Ranty B, Marco Y, Roby D (2001) HSR203 antisense suppression in
12 tobacco accelerates development of hypersensitive cell death. *Plant Journal* **27**, 115–
13 127.
14
15 Vieira Dos Santos C, Delavault P, Letousey P, Thalouarn P (2003) Identification by
16 suppression subtractive hybridization and expression analysis of *Arabidopsis thaliana*
17 putative defence genes during *Orobanche ramosa* infection. *Physiological and*
18 *Molecular Plant Pathology* **62**, 297-303.
19
20 Westwood JH, Yu X, Foy CL, Cramer CL (1998) Expression of a defense-related 3-
21 hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl CoA reductase gene in response to parasitization by
22 *Orobanche* spp. *Molecular Plant Microbe Interaction* **11**, 530-536.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

1 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

2 **Fig. 1.** Transcript accumulation of (1) cellulose synthase, (2) hsr203J, (3) peroxidase, (4)
3 glutathione S-transferase, (5) chalcone synthase, (6) dehydrin-like protein, (7) β -glucanase and
4 (8) ripening-related protein genes in cDNA from *P. sativum* infected roots and *O. crenata*
5 nodules. A control *O. crenata* expressed gene (9) was used. No amplification products
6 appeared using cDNA from *O. crenata* demonstrating that transcripts detected are of *P. sativum*
7 origin.

8
9 **Fig. 2.** Parasitization process in the dish system. **(A)** Radicles (r_d) of germinated *O. crenata*
10 seeds (s) contacting with susceptible Messire roots (h) 15dpi. **(B)** Initial stages of tubercle
11 formation (t_i) in Messire roots 21dpi. **(C)** Developed *O. crenata* tubercles (t) in Messire roots
12 showing (f) initial floral spike formation 35dpi. **(D)** Necrotic *Orobanche* tubercle in incomplete
13 resistant Ps624 roots (h) 35dpi.

14
15 **Fig. 3.** Transcriptional changes in parasitized *P. sativum* roots. A distribution of the normalized
16 expression (Ps624 inoculated/*ef-1 α*) vs. (Messire inoculated/*ef-1 α*) is shown. Ratios between the
17 two infected genotypes statistically significant ($P \leq 0.05$) are presented.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

1 **TABLE LEGENDS**

2 **Table 1.**

3 **Primer sequences used in real-time PCR for amplifying defence-related genes in *Pisum***
4 ***sativum*.**

5
6 ^a unique sequence for primer design
7

8 **Table 2.**

9 **Tubercle number and % necrotic tubercles of *O. crenata* on pea roots at 35 days post**
10 **inoculation in Petri dish assays.** Data shown as mean ± SE. Values are mean of 10 replicates
11 in two independent experiments.

12
13 ^a Included the S2 (crown-roots start to develop), S3 (bud <1 cm) and S4 (first development of floral
14 spike) developmental stages according to ter Borg *et al.* (1994).
15
16
17

18 **Table 3.**

19 **Gene expression patterns in *P. sativum* roots on the basis of real-time RT-PCR**
20 **experiments.** Values shown indicate average relative expression ratio to control (average
21 data from two independent experiments with three technical replicates). Bold text indicates
22 statistically significant induction ($P \leq 0.05$).
23

24
25 n.d. = no products detected using cDNA of non-infected or infected roots.
26
27
28
29