



Published in final edited form as:

*Plant J.* 2010 March ; 61(6): 1053–1066. doi:10.1111/j.1365-313X.2010.04131.x.

## Arabidopsis and the Plant Immune System

Marc T. Nishimura<sup>a</sup> and Jeffery L. Dangl<sup>a,b,c,d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Biology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA

<sup>b</sup> Curriculum in Genetics and Molecular Biology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA

<sup>c</sup> Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA

<sup>d</sup> Carolina Center for Genome Sciences, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA

### I. Overview

The ability to sequence entire genomes has revolutionized biology. Since the sequencing of *Haemophilus influenzae* in 1995, hundreds of prokaryotes and dozens of eukaryotes have been sequenced (Chain *et al.* 2009). One of the first eukaryotes to have its genome sequenced was *Arabidopsis thaliana*, at the time, a relatively young model organism originally promoted for its power as a genetic system in the 1980s (Estelle and Somerville 1986, Rédei 1975). That original reference genome sequence of *Arabidopsis* accession Col-0 (AGI 2000) has proven to be a key enabling factor in the acceleration of essentially all aspects of plant biology. Here, to mark the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the sequencing of the *Arabidopsis* genome, we discuss highlights from the relatively short history of *Arabidopsis*-pathogen interactions.

In the mid-1980s as *Arabidopsis* gained momentum as a model plant species, it was not an obvious system to study plant pathogen interactions. The accepted wisdom of the time was that *Arabidopsis* had no pathogens. Originally, *Arabidopsis* was considered by some to be “contrived” with “largely contrived pathogens” (Keen 1990). Progress in plant pathology as a discipline in the decades preceding the 1980s was diffused across crop plant species with a disease-by-disease approach to systems that lacked the basic tools that *Arabidopsis* researchers today take for granted. With the benefit of 20 years hindsight, it is clear that *Arabidopsis* has been an excellent model for answering fundamental questions in molecular plant-microbe interactions. Over that time, a focus on *Arabidopsis* has contributed immensely to explaining the evolution and underlying mechanisms of disease resistance and susceptibility. As with all good models, much of what we have learned studying *Arabidopsis* pathology has been generalizable to plant pathosystems of nearly all kinds. Yet, *Arabidopsis* is not a perfect model for studying all host-microbe interactions. For example, there are no rust causing fungal pathogens identified to date, and these are very important pathogens of crops. In this regard, while traditional plant pathology studies perhaps lacked the concerted research effort required to define molecular generalities, those traditional efforts did generate a fabulous wealth of both host genetic diversity and pathogen isolates, and an understanding of the genetics governing their interactions. These provide a rich resource for application of the generalities derived from a focus on *Arabidopsis*.

We hope to illuminate in this review some of the key findings made using Arabidopsis, with reference to other systems where appropriate. We hope to convince the reader that after 20 years of determined effort, our understanding of the plant immune system is now detailed enough to contemplate rational deployment of it to combat disease in a sustainable manner. The examples highlighted here are by no means exhaustive and reflect the authors' interests to some degree; we refer to recent reviews to guide deeper reading.

## II. Arabidopsis emerges as a plant-pathogen model

One of the first challenges to studying plant-pathogen interactions in Arabidopsis was the misperception that there 'weren't any pathogens' of this weed. Early attempts to falsify this dogma relied on testing pathogens that were known to infect cruciferous relatives of Arabidopsis. Cauliflower Mosaic Virus and the bacterial pathogen *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *campestris* were among the first pathogens found to infect Arabidopsis (Balazs and Lebeurier 1981, Tsuji and Somerville 1988). In 1991, researchers began assaying different inbred accessions of Arabidopsis and found considerable variation in disease resistance and susceptibility among them following inoculation with strains of the bacterial pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae* (Debener *et al.* 1991, Dong *et al.* 1991, Whalen *et al.* 1991). Importantly, they found that some of this variation was due to the recognition of specific bacterial avirulence genes, *avrRpt2* and *avrRpm1*, which were capable of restricting the growth of an otherwise virulent *P. syringae* isolate. This was the first step in identifying *avr-R* gene pairs in Arabidopsis and opened the door to using the strengths of Arabidopsis to dissect the key genetic paradigm in plant pathology, the gene-for-gene hypothesis (Flor 1947).

Early researchers also went to the field and found that there were, in fact, pathogens capable of infecting Arabidopsis in the wild (Holub 2001, Holub 2006, Koch and Slusarenko 1990). The two resulting pathosystems are built around the co-adapted oomycete parasites *Hyaloperonospora arabidopsidis* and *Albugo candida*. Finally, another Arabidopsis pathosystem was discovered fortuitously. The first strain of powdery mildew found to infect Arabidopsis (*Erysiphe cichoracearum*, UCSC) blew into a greenhouse at UC Santa Cruz (Adam and Somerville 1996). These organisms are obligate biotrophs that cannot be axenically cultured. As such, they are host-adapted to a large extent. It has proven important to compare their modes of pathogenesis to broader host range pathogens (Schulze-Lefert and Panstruga 2003). Of particular note, it may be the case that evolutionary pressure particular to obligate, co-evolved biotrophic pathogens have driven a different mode of recognition than that operating against broader host range pathogens (Dodds *et al.* 2006a). The application of genomics era tools to a focused effort using Arabidopsis to study disease and disease resistance has spilled over into an enlightening unraveling of the genomes of all of its pathogens, and their relatives that infect a range of crop species. A natural expansion of the development of Arabidopsis as a model for studying plant disease resistance has been the application of genomics and evolutionary biology tools to the study of its oomycete parasites, along with investigation of related pathogens like the late blight oomycete *Phytophthora infestans* (Haas *et al.* 2009).

The early emphasis on establishing these pathosystems in Arabidopsis focused on inter-accession variation, in particular the identification of resistant and susceptible inbreds, and the use of inter-accession F2 populations to map resistance. The pre-genome (and post-) era of Arabidopsis biology was, of course, powered by forward genetics. Both were driven by the need to define genetically tractable systems as a prelude to positional cloning of the causal alleles of genes required for disease resistance. Interestingly, the early focus on natural variation in the analyses of disease resistance foreshadowed one of the current trends in studying plant-pathogen interactions, the use of natural variation to understand the

evolution and potential fitness costs of particular immune system alleles (Bomblies *et al.* 2007, Jeuken *et al.* 2009, Nordborg *et al.* 2005, Stahl *et al.* 1999, Todesco *et al.* in press). It goes perhaps without saying that all of the breakthroughs alluded to in the preceding two paragraphs were driven by advances in high-throughput sequencing, using techniques unimaginable to researchers in the 1980's.

The biggest accomplishment of these early projects was the positional cloning of several disease resistance, or *R*-genes, as defined by Flor. The first positionally cloned *R*-gene, *Pto*, was isolated from tomato in 1993. *Pto* encodes a cytoplasmic, membrane tethered, serine-threonine kinase (Martin *et al.* 1993). In hindsight, based on the structure of the many subsequently cloned *R*-genes, it appears that *Pto* is not a stereotypical disease resistance protein. Researchers soon cloned the Arabidopsis *R*-genes *RPS2* and *RPM1* (Bent *et al.* 1994, Grant *et al.* 1995, Mindrinos *et al.* 1994), and the tobacco *N* and flax *L* genes (Lawrence *et al.* 1995, Whitham *et al.* 1994). The deduced proteins defined a structurally related class called NB-LRR after their characteristic Nucleotide-Binding and Leucine-Rich Repeat domains (Staskawicz *et al.* 1995). NB-LRR proteins have since been found to be ubiquitous in seed-bearing plants as well as mosses (Akita and Valkonen 2002). Furthermore, it was quickly established, mostly via analysis of chimeric NB-LRR genes from the flax-flax-rust pathosystem, that the LRR domains conferred recognition specificity (Ellis *et al.* 1999). Researchers soon identified genes required for the function of these *R*-genes, the first being *NDR1*, which encodes a novel plasma membrane-localized protein required for *avrB*-triggered resistance. *NDR1* was shown to be required for *R*-genes recognizing both bacteria and oomycetes, indicating a conserved signaling mechanism existed for at least some *R*-genes (Century *et al.* 1997). Subsequently, *PAD4* and *EDS1*, genes with sequence similarity to lipases, were also identified as being required for multiple *R*-gene pathways (Falk *et al.* 1999, Jirage *et al.* 1999). Thus, by the late 1990s, a focus on Arabidopsis, along with development of tools for the study of disease resistance in other reasonably tractable crop species that additionally benefited from superb plant disease resistance genetics resources (e.g. flax and tomato) had led to the first major conceptual breakthrough in molecular plant-pathology: that disease resistance to all classes of microbial plant pathogens and insects, could be conferred by a related set of NB-LRR proteins that acted as molecular receptors. Even at these early stages, with the gene-for-gene hypothesis largely validated, subtleties within the system were beginning to become evident. For example, the surprising fact that the *R*-gene *RPM1* could identify at least two sequence unrelated *avr* genes would have to be explained (Grant, *et al.* 1995).

NB-LRR proteins were predicted to be intracellular, and have since been found to reside in a variety of pre-stimulation compartments, including the plasma membrane (Boyes *et al.* 1998). Separated by the cell wall and plasma membrane, it was unclear how a NB-LRR protein might recognize pathogen molecules to trigger disease resistance. In 1996, researchers showed that bacterial virulence factors, termed effector proteins, acted inside host cells and could be recognized there (as so-called avirulence proteins) by the NB-LRR proteins (Gopalan *et al.* 1996, Leister *et al.* 1996, Van den Ackerveken *et al.* 1996). It later became clear that most bacterial effectors function within the plant cell and are translocated by a conserved molecular mechanism, the type-III secretion system (TTSS) (He *et al.* 2004). An understanding of the co-regulation of effectors with the TTSS system (Huynh *et al.* 1989) led to the high-throughput identification of many bacterial type III effectors (Chang *et al.* 2005). More recently, it has become clear that many fungal and oomycete effectors also function within the cell (Allen *et al.* 2004, Win *et al.* 2007). In contrast to TTSS-delivery of bacterial effectors, effectors from fungal and oomycete pathogens are likely to be delivered by entirely different mechanisms, one surprisingly, is related to the delivery of malarial effectors into mammalian cells (reviewed by) (Kamoun 2006, Panstruga and Dodds 2009). Defining the mechanism(s) by which fungal and oomycete effectors are trafficked through

the haustorial matrix and into the host cell remains one of the most important problems in the field.

Collectively, the effector suites deployed by a pathogen to specific sites of action inside the host cell contribute significantly to that pathogen's virulence. Pathogen effectors are directed to many host cell compartments where they presumably act on one or more targets to dampen, delay and impede host defense responses. By contrast, if only one of the many effectors delivered by a given pathogen into the host is recognized by the action of an NB-LRR protein, then the host triggers a rapid and high amplitude output response that stops pathogen growth. Hence, recognition of pathogen effectors inside the host cell, mediated by NB-LRR proteins leads to effector triggered immunity, or ETI (Chisholm *et al.* 2006, Dangl and Jones 2001, Jones and Dangl 2006).

Plants also can recognize the presence of conserved pathogen molecules collectively termed PAMPs/MAMPs (pathogen or microbial associated molecular patterns). Recognition of these elicitors is mediated by high affinity cell surface receptors. In 2000, FLS2 a LRR-RLK was identified as a PRR (pattern recognition receptor) for a peptide fragment derived from the bacterial protein flagellin (flg22) through a forward genetic screen (Gomez-Gomez and Boller 2000). This was a critical finding as it placed into context decades of research on elicitors that are not highly variable across pathogen strains. The activation of a largely overlapping set of defense genes following treatment of Arabidopsis cells with different PAMPs/MAMPs (Navarro *et al.* 2004) and the demonstrable disease resistance mediated by PRRs (Boller and He 2009, Zipfel 2008) led to the concept that PAMP-triggered Immunity (PTI) was a first line of defense in all plants that acted against the majority of microbes (Chisholm, *et al.* 2006, Dangl and Jones 2001, Jones and Dangl 2006). The machinery that generates PTI presents the major line of targets for pathogen effectors. Hence, plants apparently evolved specific NB-LRR-mediated ETI as a counter against virulence mechanisms that weakened PTI to a point that allowed pathogenicity.

Thus, three major conceptual breakthroughs were in place at about the time the reference Arabidopsis Col-0 genome was finished: 1) at least some of the very large LRR-RLK protein family in Arabidopsis serve as specific PAMP receptors, while others serve as cell-cell communication receptors; 2) pathogens deliver virulence factors to the inside of eukaryotic host cells; and 3) NB-LRR proteins are a dedicated class of intracellular receptors, though the issue of whether they detected pathogen molecules directly or indirectly was not clear. There were then, and are still, no other credible loss of function NB-LRR phenotypes except loss of specific, effector triggered disease resistance (ETI).

### III. An immediate impact of the Arabidopsis genome sequence (2000)

The reference Col-0 genome sequence enabled a gene inventory related to plant defense against pathogens. In contrast to the other sequenced genomes of the day (*H. influenzae*, Yeast, *Drosophila* and *C. elegans*), Arabidopsis stood out for the relatively high proportion of genes in gene-families (AGI 2000). One of the larger gene families in Arabidopsis encoded the NB-LRR proteins. What emerged was a clear picture of the diversity and distribution of NB-LRR genes throughout the Arabidopsis genome. There are ~150 NB-LRR proteins in Arabidopsis, many of which are distributed in clusters (Meyers *et al.* 2003), as had been predicted from mapping the inter-accession variability in disease resistance responses to *Hyaloperonospora* (Holub and Beynon 1996). The availability of the sequences of NB-LRR clusters in Arabidopsis, tomato and, through the use of degenerate PCR markers, a variety of additional plants paved the way for several studies that demonstrated how these key molecules of the plant immune system evolve. In essence, examples of all the tricks of DNA sequence recombination were discerned: unequal meiotic crossovers to

generate duplications and contractions in gene family number, gene conversion tracts within particular NB-LRR genes with donor sequences from paralogous gene family members, and intra- and inter-NB-LRR recombination events were all observed (Kuang *et al.* 2008, Meyers, *et al.* 2003). The most important findings from these studies showed that NB-LRR genes are undergoing diversifying selection at specific amino acid residues throughout the LRR domains, consistent with the notion that the LRR determines specificity (Michelmore and Meyers 1998).

Potentially revealing oddities were also noted in the Col-0 genome. For example, the discovery of an NB-LRR protein with an additional WRKY TF domain provided a testable Rosetta hypothesis, linking NB-LRR receptor activity to a pathology-related TF family involved in the transcriptional reprogramming that accompanies defense responses (AGI 2000, Pandey and Somssich 2009). The NB-LRR-WRKY protein called RRS1 was, in fact, shown to mediate naturally variable disease resistance to *Ralstonia* (Deslandes *et al.* 2002), and works in concert with a canonical TIR-NB-LRR protein called RPS4 to mediate disease resistance to a fungal pathogen (Narusaka *et al.* 2009). Consistent with the Rosetta hypothesis posed by RRS1, other NB-LRR proteins have been shown to translocate into the nucleus, where at least one of them interacts with a WRKY TF to regulate defense responses (Burch-Smith *et al.* 2007, Garcia and Parker 2009, Shen *et al.* 2007b, Wirthmueller *et al.* 2007).

Many of the other previously identified defense proteins were found to be members of gene families in the Col-0 genome. It was immediately obvious that LRR-transmembrane Ser/Thr kinases were another large and diverse gene family in the Arabidopsis genome (Shiu and Bleecker 2001). At the time only FLS2 had been shown to have a role in defense as a PAMP receptor (see above); since then EFR1 and CERK1 (a LysM-transmembrane kinase) have also been shown to be required for the response to the presence of specific pathogen molecules, an EF-Tu derived peptide and chitin, respectively (Miya *et al.* 2007, Zipfel *et al.* 2006).

Other gene families noted at the time of the Col-0 genome release included homologs of pathology-related genes in other species such as the 7-transmembrane protein MLO of Barley, the PTO kinase from tomato, and the reactive oxygen producing NADPH-oxidases. Later work would demonstrate that many of these genes have important roles in defense in Arabidopsis (Consonni *et al.* 2006) (Torres *et al.* 2005). In contrast, another interesting observation was the lack of clear homologs of many of the mammalian cell death-related genes such as the Bcl2/Bax family and Caspases. This was an indication that at the least the process of cell death in plants was driven by different types of proteins. Subsequent studies have focused on potential metacaspases (Uren *et al.* 2000), proteases with caspase-like activity (Elbaz *et al.* 2002, Hatsugai *et al.* 2009, Hatsugai *et al.* 2004) and conserved proteins required for autophagy as means of cell death regulation in Arabidopsis and other plants (Hofius *et al.* 2009).

Phenotypic dissection of disease resistance using the genome was, of course, hugely facilitated by the other functional genomics tools developed within the US National Science Foundation's Arabidopsis 2010 project and other programs like it around the world. The major tool enabled by the genome sequence was the high-throughput production of an essentially saturating collection of location-verified T-DNA insertion lines (Alonso *et al.* 2003). It is difficult to underestimate the importance of this mutant collection, and others like it that are now the backbone of biological process dissection in Arabidopsis. While the frequency of cases of functional overlap (commonly mis-identified as 'redundancy') in essentially all processes studied were underestimated before the completion of the Col-0 genome, it is still plausible to make multi-mutants to knock out entire gene families of



branches thereof, in order to reveal a mutant phenotype (Hua and Meyerowitz 1998). One useful response to functional overlap was to engineer constitutive promoters reading outward from T-DNA borders to identify gain of function and loss of function phenotypes (Weigel and Nordborg 2005). Here, the rapidity with which transgenic *Arabidopsis* can be made, and their sites of insertion sequenced, renders technically feasible solutions to many defense related problems.

High-throughput, microarray based analysis of gene expression was invented just prior to the sequencing of the *Arabidopsis* genome (Schena *et al.* 1995). With the sequencing of the Col-0 genome, arrays expanded from small-scale boutique cDNA arrays into a whole-genome technology from Affymetrix based on photolithography (Lipshutz *et al.* 1999). These technologies enabled diverse studies including defining the transcriptome during systemic acquired resistance (Maleck *et al.* 2000), assigning putative functions for stress-responsive transcription factors (Chen *et al.* 2002), and for exploring the quantitative nature of responses to both virulent and avirulent bacteria (Tao *et al.* 2003). The widespread use of Affymetrix whole genome microarrays as a community standard has resulted in a huge amount of publicly available, directly comparable data. Community tools like Genevestigator (Zimmermann *et al.* 2004) allow third parties to leverage old data into new hypotheses. Examining gene expression across different treatments, tissues types or mutant backgrounds has been a productive way to exploit this massive data pool.

The technical impacts of the Col-0 reference genome sequence, and tools generated to exploit it, are hard to overstate. Before the genome sequence, the final step of a forward genetic screen was typically a laborious positional cloning, often plagued by problems such as chimeric YAC clones or myriad other problems. Positional cloning of genes with robust loss of function phenotypes in *Arabidopsis* (at least in the sequenced accession Col-0) became trivial with the release of the genome sequence (Lukowitz *et al.* 2000). and the release of a large number of SNPs between Col-0 and the common mapping partner Ler (Jander *et al.* 2002). This facilitated mapping and prefigured the depth of ecotypic sequence variation that would soon be available in the next few years when a re-sequencing project provided tens of thousands of SNPs across 20 commonly used and naturally diverse ecotypes (Clark *et al.* 2007). These tools foreshadow the use of increasingly cheap DNA sequencing technologies to perform association mapping relevant to disease resistance (Weigel and Mott 2009). As stated above, the rate limiting step now becomes high throughput, robust, disease phenotyping. This is critical as new sequencing techniques now provide the ability to isolate mutations of interest by whole genome sequencing of mutants and/or segregating F2 mapping populations (Cuperus *et al.* in press, Schneeberger *et al.* 2009). Hence, it will now become even more feasible to design and carry out deep forward genetic screens and then to simply sequence the resulting mutants to identify causal genes.

#### IV. *Arabidopsis* pathology in the Modern Era (2000-present)

The number of papers published about *Arabidopsis* plant pathology has skyrocketed since the late 1990s (figure 1). Thus any discussion of the impact of the genome sequence on this field will be incomplete. Some of the more important stories, such as anti-viral small-RNA systems will be covered in depth elsewhere in this issue. We have chosen to highlight a few examples where a combination of previous genetics, a finished genome and orthogonal knowledge from traditionally studied plant-microbe interaction systems was particularly helpful in opening new research doors and answering previously unresolved questions.

##### Understanding PAMP receptor biology

As noted above, plants can respond to many purified pathogen molecules, PAMPs/MAMPs. Following the identification of FLS2 as a flagellin peptide receptor (Gomez-Gomez and

Boller 2000), a compelling speculation was that at least a subset of the large LRR-RLK class of proteins could encode a variety of PAMP receptors. A good example of using genomic resources to tackle a problem is the cloning of the PAMP receptor EFR1 (Zipfel, et al. 2006). These authors found that EF-Tu, another bacteria-derived elicitor, elicited similar defense responses as flg22 when measured either biochemically or by whole-genome microarray. Intriguingly, flg22 treatment increased the number of binding sites for EF-Tu, while EF-Tu did the same for FLS2. Hypothesizing that the putative EF-Tu receptor should share many characteristics with FLS2, the authors narrowed their search to LRR-RLKs similar to FLS2. The microarray experiments indicated that FLS2 and the EF-Tu receptor triggered transcription of a shared set of roughly 100 of the 610 RLKs in the Col-0 genome. The authors collected homozygous insertion mutants for this set of RLKs and tested them for EF-Tu-based growth inhibition. The *fls2* mutant and all of the T-DNA lines tested, except one, were responsive to EF-Tu. The non-responsive mutant has an insertion in an RLK gene responsible for the perception of EF-Tu, termed *EFR1*. One would assume that this approach will be generally applicable to the identification of the receptors responsible for recognizing orphan PAMPs/MAMPs.

FLS2 has structural similarity to BRI1, another LRR-RLK identified as a receptor for the plant hormone brassinolide. Intriguingly, the coreceptor for BRI1, BAK1 is also required for PAMP perception by FLS2. FLS2 and BAK1 form an elicitor-dependent complex in both *Arabidopsis* and *N. benthamiana* (Heese *et al.* 2007). It appears that BAK1 may be required for the perception of many LRR-RLK-sensed signals. Consistent with a central function in PAMP perception, multiple bacterial effectors target BAK1 and are able to disrupt the formation of the FLS2/BAK1 complex (Shan *et al.* 2008). CERK1, a chitin co-receptor (see above) is also targeted by a bacterial effector (Gimenez-Ibanez *et al.* 2009). The genome sequence will now enable reverse genetic dissection of PAMP/MAMP receptor function by designing and using a functional testing matrix of LRR-kinase mutants and candidate PAMPs/MAMPs from a wide spectrum of microbial pathogens.

### Refining our understanding of NB-LRR function

Much of the basic genetic framework for how NB-LRR mediated recognition of pathogen effectors shapes plant-pathogen interactions remains unchanged since the original gene-for-gene hypothesis (Flor 1947). The idea that NB-LRRs act as intracellular receptors for the classically defined ‘avirulence factors’ is generally accepted. However, the way we think about the perceived signal has changed. Early models typically proposed that avirulence proteins were ligands that were directly bound by *R*-encoded receptors. It was unclear at the time what the primary function of avirulence genes: “we generally do not understand the function of avirulence genes in pathogens that harbor them, but their role in recognition by plants is likely gratuitous” (Keen 1990). Subsequently, several direct Avr-NB-LRR interactions have indeed been found (Dodds *et al.* 2006b, Jia *et al.* 2000, Tang *et al.* 1996), however direct interactions are difficult or impossible to detect in several other cases.

A new hypothesis was proposed whereby the molecular outcome of these virulence functions could be ‘monitored’ by NB-LRR proteins and that pathogen effector manipulation of host targets generated ‘modified self’ signals that were subsequently responsible for induction of NB-LRR dependent defense responses. This idea was first proposed as an explanation for the apparent oddity of the AvrPto-Pto gene-for-gene system (van der Biezen and Jones 1998). Several important predictions were subsequently proposed to formalize the Guard Hypothesis (Dangl and Jones 2001, Jones and Dangl 2006). The first was that indirect perception could explain a scenario where a relatively small number of NB-LRR-genes (~150) in *Arabidopsis* must ostensibly protect the plant from all possible relevant pathogen-encoded molecules. By comparison, a receptor system based on direct recognition of a single ligand (as predicted by Flor) would likely need to be much larger to

'cover' the structural space available to pathogen-encoded molecules. Thus, in the extended Guard Hypothesis, the effective NB-LRR number could be limited to, in essence, the number of possible host targets of effector action. One consequence of this prediction was that a single NB-LRR protein could recognize the presence of multiple, un-related effectors if those effectors targeted and modified the same host target. This is the case, for example, with the RPM1 NB-LRR protein which 'guards' RIN4 when the latter is targeted by either AvrB and AvrRpm1 (Mackey *et al.* 2002). A second prediction is that multiple NB-LRR proteins might evolve to monitor the integrity of the same host target of effector action. This is true as well, since RPS2 is activated by effector-dependent manipulation of RIN4, in this case cleavage of RIN4 by AvrRpt2 (Axtell and Staskawicz 2003, Mackey *et al.* 2003). Hence, at least three sequence unrelated effectors from *P. syringae* (and maybe more; see (Luo *et al.* 2009)) target RIN4. A third prediction is that divergent pathogens should evolve effectors that target critical host machinery, consistent with data demonstrating that a non-canonical tomato R protein, called Cf-2, and its associated effector target, Rcr3, can be targeted by both fungal and oomycete effectors (Kruger *et al.* 2002, Song *et al.* 2009).

A further extension of the Guard Hypothesis has recently been presented as the Decoy Model (van der Hoorn and Kamoun 2008). Under the Decoy Model, a host protein which mimics the real virulence target of an effector can act as a decoy to titrate effector function away from productive targets. A critical, and as yet untested, aspect of this model with respect to effector-triggered immunity is that a true 'decoy' should have no additional cellular function in the absence of its co-functional NB-LRR protein. Hence since RIN4, for example, has a NB-LRR independent function in PAMP-triggered immunity (Kim *et al.* 2005), it cannot be merely a decoy. As more cases of R protein and associated host targets of effector action are defined, this debate will likely become more interesting.

### **Zig-zag, zig: a unifying conceptual summation**

The zig-zag model, a product of years of work by many labs, attempts to synthesize PAMP perception, PAMP-triggered immunity (PTI), effector/virulence factor function and NB-LRR-based disease resistance (Jones and Dangl 2006). The outcome of any plant-pathogen interaction lies on a continuum between susceptibility and resistance. In the zig-zag model, PAMP perception initiates PTI, which is the primary defense response limiting pathogen growth. This is the first "zig" towards resistance. PTI acts as a generic, broad-range defense response since it is triggered by conserved microbial elicitors. In an effort to suppress PTI, pathogens of all types have evolved effector/virulence proteins that act to block PAMP/MAMP-triggered signaling and/or defense output. This effector-triggered susceptibility (ETS) pushes the interaction towards host susceptibility (the "zag"). In response to the ETS, plants have evolved effector-triggered immunity (ETI), a largely NB-LRR-based recognition of the 'modified-self' by-products of ETS (another "zig"). This attack-and-response can conceptually occur iteratively with multiple rounds of ETS followed by recognition, resulting in ETI. The final outcome of the interaction then depends on the sum total of  $([PTI - ETS]) + ETI$ .

### **Arabidopsis enables comparisons with other plant systems**

Arabidopsis has been an exemplary tool with which to test hypotheses about defense responses in other plant species. Even before the Col-0 genome was sequenced it was clear that NB-LRR proteins are ubiquitous in land plants. Immediately after the sequencing of the Col-0 genome, researchers realized that Arabidopsis could serve a useful purpose, for example, in tomato functional genomics (Mysore *et al.* 2001). Arabidopsis is useful for trans-species functional assays, much in the way that *Agrobacterium*-mediated transient gene expression assays in *Nicotiana benthamiana* are used as a complement to Arabidopsis transgenic plants. Synteny is observed between Arabidopsis, Medicago and Soybean



(Mudge *et al.* 2005). The genome sequencing of Rice demonstrates that a large percentage of Rice genes (~70%) have a close relative in Arabidopsis (Paterson *et al.* 2005). However, it seems that NB-LRR proteins be structurally divergent between species. For example, the monocot genomes don't contain TIR-NB-LRRs, which are common in Arabidopsis, but rather contain exclusively non-TIR-NB-LRRs such as CC-NB-LRR proteins (Bai *et al.* 2002, Monosi *et al.* 2004).

Important genes in plant defense that were laboriously identified in less-tractable species have also been found to have orthologous functions in Arabidopsis. Barley has long been a model for studies of resistance to the obligate fungal pathogen powdery mildew (Schulze-Lefert and Panstruga 2003). The *rar1* mutant was originally identified in 1988 because many of the NB-LRR *Mla* genes are functionally *RAR1*-dependent (Jørgensen 1988). *RAR1* was positionally cloned from Barley in 1999 in a technical tour de force, and a homolog in Arabidopsis was immediately apparent (Shirasu *et al.* 1999). Genetic screens (Muskett *et al.* 2002, Tornero *et al.* 2002) in Arabidopsis identified *rar1* null mutants and most of the downstream mechanistic experiments has been performed in Arabidopsis (Azevedo *et al.* 2002, Holt *et al.* 2005, Hubert *et al.* 2009). The domain structure of *RAR1* allowed a prediction to be made that it would work together with *SGT1* (Azevedo, *et al.* 2002). Subsequent analyses support the hypothesis that *RAR1*, *SGT1b* and cytosolic *HSP90* proteins operate together as a cytosolic co-chaperone for NB-LRR function (Schulze-Lefert 2004, Shirasu 2008). It is clear in this case that a focus on Arabidopsis as a model, combined with judicious use of available genetic material from other species, led to an important generalization regarding the need for cytosolic co-chaperones to fine tune NB-LRR function. Moreover, this work in plant innate immunity explicitly guided subsequent studies in the mammalian innate immune system (see below).

A pair of genetic screens looked at the interaction of Arabidopsis and powdery mildew. The first screen defined genes that were required for the compatible interaction between Arabidopsis and the powdery mildew, *Erysiphe cichoracearum* (Vogel and Somerville 2000). The mutants recovered reflect generalities of the plant immune system, and its manipulation by pathogens. Powdery Mildew Resistant 2 (*PMR2*) was identified as a member for the MLO-family of seven transmembrane proteins originally described in Barley (Consonni, *et al.* 2006). Barley *mlo* mutants confer recessive and durable disease resistance to all isolates of barley powdery mildew, *Blumeria graminis* f. sp. *hordei*. Hence, it is likely that MLO encodes a protein required by an ancient powdery mildew fungus virulence mechanism. A second Arabidopsis locus identified in this screen, *PMR4* encodes the callose synthase responsible for pathogen-induced callose response, a ubiquitous plant defense response at sites of attempted penetration. Unexpectedly, loss of function alleles of *PMR4* result in disease resistance due to the activation of SA-dependent defense responses (Nishimura *et al.* 2003).

The second screen (for *pen*, or 'penetration' mutants) identified loci required for non-host resistance to *Blumeria graminis* f. sp. *hordei*. This screen uncovered a set of proteins acting together in the secretion of antimicrobial compounds that are also conserved across the Barley-Arabidopsis divergence. *PEN1* encodes a PM-resident SNARE protein (*SYP121*) that mediates the fusion of vesicles to secrete a set of undefined antimicrobials (Collins *et al.* 2003). A related SNARE, *SYP132*, has been shown to be required in tobacco for resistance to bacterial pathogens (Kalde *et al.* 2007). *PEN2* is a glucosyl hydrolase that is involved in the synthesis of glucosinolate-derived secondary metabolites (Bednarek *et al.* 2009). The anti-fungal activity of these compounds indicate that glucosinolates have a broader defense role beyond their well established role as anti-herbivory agents. The third mutant from this screen, *PEN3*, encodes an ABC-transporter of unknown specificity (Stein *et al.* 2006). It is intriguing to speculate that *PEN3* is responsible for the export of *PEN2*-derived

antimicrobial compounds. Consistent with this idea, cell death in the *pen3* mutant observed upon infection with a compatible powdery mildew is suppressed by the *pen2* mutant (Stein, et al. 2006). This putative PEN2/PEN3 pathway is distinct from the PEN1 pathway, given the additive double mutant phenotype (Lipka *et al.* 2005). The PEN proteins, and PMR4-synthesized callose, all localize to sites of penetration by powdery mildew (Meyer *et al.* 2009), intriguingly, this localization may be through diverse mechanisms (Underwood and Somerville 2008).

Many of the proteins identified from the PMR/PEN screens point to the importance of secretion in defense, which is predictable based on the extracellular nature of most plant pathogens. The definition of the defense secretome is still ongoing, using a variety of approaches. There is a huge up-regulation of the secretory pathway in response to infection. The NPR1 protein has been extensively characterized as a master regulator of pathogenesis-related (PR) protein expression and it is strictly required for the systemic defense response known as SAR (Dong 2004). By looking for direct targets of NPR1, Dong et al demonstrated that many ER-resident, secretion related genes are up-regulated as part of SAR, presumably to handle increased traffic of the co-regulated and secreted PR genes (Wang *et al.* 2005). Mutation of these secretory genes resulted in both a defect in defense secretion after induction (assayed by the marker protein PR1) and an impairment in resistance against a bacterial pathogen (Wang, et al. 2005). Complementary approaches have used proteomics to define both the secretory defense output and to define how pathogens can modify that output, presumably contributing to pathogen growth (Kaffarnik *et al.* 2009). Although secreted pathogenesis-induced proteins were first identified decades ago (Van Loon and Van Kammen 1970), the contents, mechanism and specificity of the defense secretome remain largely mysterious.

### Plant Hormones and Defense

The interaction between plant hormone signaling and plant pathology is complex and intertwined. Genetic screens in *Arabidopsis* have defined many of the pathways involved in the synthesis, perception and effect of plant hormones (reviewed in (Santner and Estelle 2009)). Many of these hormones were initially recognized for their (often complicated) effects on growth and development, however it has become clear that plant hormone signaling plays a major role in determining the outcome of plant pathogen interactions (Grant and Jones 2009). The best characterized defense hormones include salicylic acid (SA), jasmonic acid (JA) and ethylene. Critical components of the SA pathway were revealed via genetic screens in *Arabidopsis* using pathology-based reporter genes or screens for enhanced disease susceptibility (Cao *et al.* 1994, Dewdney *et al.* 2000). *Arabidopsis* genetics has proven invaluable both for dissecting the SAR pathway at the NPR1 node, as discussed above, and in directly testing hypotheses about the nature of systemic signaling in other plant systems (Attaran *et al.* 2009). These pathways interact in a complex manner demonstrated by the antagonism of SA and JA, as well as the synergism between JA and Ethylene (Glazebrook 2005).

The importance of hormone signaling pathways to defense is underscored by the efforts that pathogens undertake to modulate plant hormone pathways or to produce phytohormones. Critical components of the JA signaling pathway were defined by isolation of mutants insensitive to the pathogen-derived phytohormone coronatine (Feys *et al.* 1994). Coronatine is a major virulence factor for some bacterial phytopathogens and is implicated in the opening of stomates to allow entry into the mesophyll (Melotto 2006). The JA receptor was recently identified to be COI1, an F-box protein required for response to both coronatine and JA (Katsir 2008, Yan 2009). The structural similarity between coronatine and jasmonic acid has long been noted, but more recently it became clear that coronatine is actually a structural mimic of JA-isoleucine, the active form of JA (Staswick *et al.* 2002). JA-isoleucine

mediates a physical interaction between COI1 and the JAZ family of transcriptional repressors, leading to ubiquitination of JAZ, followed by its degradation and the de-repression of JA-responsive genes (Katsir 2008, Yan 2009). This mechanism is, in essence, shared with the Auxin receptor TIR and the Aux/IAA transcription factors: the hormone mediates the ubiquitination, and resulting degradation, of a transcriptional repressor (Dharmasiri *et al.* 2005).

PAMP-triggered immunity has unexpected links to hormone biology. ABA, traditionally described as the abiotic stress hormone, is required for stomatal closure in response to drought stress. Melotto *et al.* found that as part of the PTI response to flagellin, plants close their stomata to prevent entry of bacteria into the leaf apoplast. This aspect of PTI requires ABA, an ABA-responsive kinase and the production of nitric oxide (Melotto 2006). This response is disabled by coronatine, and bacteria that lack coronatine have a reduced ability to colonize the mesophyll. The bacterial effector HopAM1 has been shown to induce hypersensitivity to ABA, so it is possible that bacterial effectors and toxins are working together to regulate ABA biology in the plant (Goel 2008). Auxin has also been implicated in PAMP-triggered responses to bacterial pathogens. As part of PTI, the perception of flagellin leads to the induction of a specific small RNA called mir393 (Navarro 2006). The target of mir393 is the auxin receptor TIR, resulting in the inability to express auxin-responsive genes and increased resistance to pathogens (Navarro 2006). Intriguingly, many bacteria produce auxin, potentially to promote pathogenesis. Fungal plant pathogens also make plant hormones to influence their hosts. The plant hormone Gibberellic acid (GA) was originally isolated from the fungal plant necrotroph *Gibberella fujikuroi*, the cause of the “foolish seedling” disease of rice where infected plants undergo excessive growth (Bomke 2009). GA has also recently been shown to regulate defenses to *Pseudomonas* via degradation of the DELLA plant growth repressors (Navarro *et al.* 2008). These stories appear to have no end, so pathogen evolution continues to provide a deep toolbox with which to dissect basic plant processes.

## V. The plant immune system and human immunology inform each other

Mammalian and plant innate immune systems share several features, at least some of which are driven by convergent evolution (Ausubel 2005). Mammalian analogs of plant NB-LRR proteins, known as NLR proteins, are important intracellular innate immune receptors (Franchi *et al.* 2009). The mammalian NLR proteins are structurally similar to plant NB-LRR proteins: they contain a central nucleotide binding domain (NB) and a C-terminal leucine rich repeat domain (LRR). Other related receptors such as Apaf-1 contain a C-terminal WD-40 domain rather than an LRR domain. The N-terminus of some NLR proteins contains a caspase activating and recruitment domain (CARD), which potentially links them to processes of caspase-mediated cell death. The N-terminus of NLR proteins is modular and is found attached to Pyrin and Bir domains in other family members. NB-LRR and NLR proteins both require the same set of chaperones (SGT1 and HSP90), indicative of either common evolutionary history, convergence onto a common mechanistic constraint, or both (da Silva Correia *et al.* 2007, Mayor *et al.* 2007). Mutations in NLR proteins are associated with auto-immune disorders, such as Crohn’s disease (Hugot *et al.* 2001).

The function of mammalian NLRs as intracellular receptors is analogous to plant NB-LRR proteins. Some NLR proteins recognize bacterial peptidoglycan elicitors, while others recognize indirect effects of immune signals such as uric acid. Upon activation by elicitor, negative regulation by the LRR is relaxed and the proteins oligomerize through their NB domain. This oligomerization can result in the activation of molecules recruited to the N-terminal domain (Ting *et al.* 2006). In the case of NALP1, oligomerization was shown to result in the activation of caspase-1 (Faustin *et al.* 2007). By analogy, protein activity

regulated by oligomerization may also occur in plant NB-LRRs. Domains of the CC-NB-LRR protein RPS5 have been shown to make homo- and hetero-multimers before activation (Ade *et al.* 2007). Similar multimers are seen with different domains of the NB-LRR protein Rx, and these are disrupted by the addition of elicitor (Moffett *et al.* 2002). On an intermolecular scale, oligomerization of the TIR-NB-LRR N protein has been shown to occur in the presence of elicitor (Mestre and Baulcombe 2006). At this point it is unclear if the N-termini of plant NB-LRRs are also functioning as adaptors to bring together and activate other proteins. Defining the precise mechanism(s) of NB-LRR activation is a major current challenge.

## VI. The bright future of Arabidopsis as reference species for plant-pathogen interactions

The study of plant-microbe interactions (and plant biology more generally) is poised to enter a new multigenome era. This is driven by rapid improvements in inexpensive high-throughput sequencing and is, importantly, occurring on ‘both sides’ of several Arabidopsis pathology systems. On the host side, the 1001 genomes project promises an expanding view of the allelic diversity and population structure of key protein families, like NB-LRRs and PRRs (described in this issue by Weigel). High density SNP mapping is already allowing association mapping to identify disease resistance related loci (Aranzana *et al.* 2005). On the pathogen side, there is an ongoing explosion of bacterial, fungal and oomycete genomes (Collmer *et al.* 2009, Haas, *et al.* 2009, Kamper *et al.* 2006). Once exclusively the domain of large genomics labs, bacterial genomes are now being sequenced and assembled by relatively small groups (Reinhardt *et al.* 2009, Studholme *et al.* 2009). We can anticipate that several strains of all of the major bacterial, fungal, and oomycete pathogens of Arabidopsis are sequenced, or will be within the next year. As well, it is expected that most major fungal pathogens of crops will also be sequenced. This will drive a new era in the identification of a vast repertoire of effectors and their host targets, and a detailed knowledge of virulence mechanisms, across all of plant biology.

At this point, the rate limiting step for exploiting the flood of genomic sequences is, as noted above, the ability to perform high-throughput pathology-related phenotyping. The traditional method of quantifying plant-pathogen interactions has been measuring *in planta* growth of the pathogen through laborious coring, grinding and dilution plating. Fan *et al.* provided one useful solution to this problem by generating recombinant *P. syringae* DC3000 that contains a chromosomal copy of the *luxCDABE* operon from *Photobacterium luminescens* (Fan *et al.* 2008). The resulting strain is constitutively bioluminescent and requires no exogenous substrate. The authors screened the *P. syringae*-derived luminescence of 100 ecotypes of Arabidopsis and identified 2 QTLs associated with basal resistance. This sort of high-throughput phenotyping will soon be linked to association mapping to identify novel loci required to restrict bacterial growth.

As always, important unanswered questions remain. While many of the important players have been identified through forward genetic screens, there are basic events about which we know surprisingly little. Much of the signaling and many of the actual signal transduction players for both PTI and ETI remain unknown. It appears that there are many orphan RLKs; how many PAMPs are plants able to sense? What are the outputs of PTI? Can we catalog the contents of the vesicle-based defense response? Are there vesicles loaded for an anti-fungal response and a different set loaded for anti-bacterial defense?

Mechanistically, it is still unclear how NB-LRR-mediated recognition of pathogens leads to the downstream activation of hypersensitive cell death. Do NB-LRR proteins function in, or connect directly to, PTI machinery? Will NB-LRR activation in plants be accompanied by

generalizable changes in oligomerization? Will certain NB-LRR proteins exhibit ligand-dependent oligomerization while others display ligand-dependent disruption of resting state heteromers? Are unknown players recruited to an oligomerized NB-LRR plant resistosome as is seen with animal NLR proteins? Further downstream of recognition, what are the critical events that lead to transcriptional reprogramming and host cell death? Are these two phenomena spatially separated within the cell? How is pathogen growth stopped?

At a higher level, there are also many questions about the evolution of these interactions. It's clear that looking within a given interaction there is a history of attack and response. It appears that many different pathogen effectors can target the same host proteins. How common is this trend and how generalizable are these foci to other plants? We predict that many of the signaling nodes targeted by pathogen effectors are shared across plant evolution. As with PAMP receptors, there is also a surplus of orphan NB-LRRs, how many of them have novel guardees?

Exploitation of Arabidopsis to advance our understanding of the plant immune system has come a long way in a short time. Arabidopsis was chosen as a model organism mainly for its benefits as a genetic tool, not for a history as a pathology model. Despite this lack of history, and because of its genetic power, Arabidopsis research has transformed plant pathology. Most of the basic knowledge that we have about PAMP perception and PTI, NB-LRR-based disease resistance and ETI, vesicle transport and polarized cellular defense responses, transcriptional output networks, and the interplay between disease resistance and hormone pathway signaling have all been greatly accelerated by the power of Arabidopsis forward genetics and genomic resources. It is probably fair to say that the cream has been skimmed from this model system and that major breakthroughs in molecular plant-pathology will now be harder won. This is as it should be when successful fields mature. It is also likely fair to say that some of next great frontiers in molecular plant pathology will be the deployment of paradigms and molecules gleaned from the application of Arabidopsis to plant pathology over the last 20 years into crop systems. And it is certainly important to say emphatically that continued focus on Arabidopsis, from exploitation of its natural diversity to more sophisticated, deep forward genetic screens, will continue to drive our overall mechanistic understanding of how the plant immune system works and how pathogen virulence mechanisms combat it.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Tim Eitas, Tatiana Mucyn and Erin Osborne for critical reading. Supported by grants from the NSF, NIH and DOE to JLD

## References

- Adam L, Somerville SC. Genetic characterization of five powdery mildew disease resistance loci in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Plant J.* 1996; 9:341–356. [PubMed: 8919911]
- Ade J, DeYoung BJ, Golstein C, Innes RW. Indirect activation of a plant nucleotide binding site-leucine-rich repeat protein by a bacterial protease. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2007; 104:2531–2536. [PubMed: 17277084]
- AGI. Analysis of the genome sequence of the flowering plant *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Nature.* 2000; 408:796–815. [PubMed: 11130711]
- Akita M, Valkonen JPT. A novel gene family in moss (*Physcomitrella patens*) shows sequence homology and a phylogenetic relationship with the TIR-NBS class of plant disease resistance genes. *Journal of Molecular Evolution.* 2002; 55:595–605. [PubMed: 12399933]
- Allen RL, Bittner-Eddy PD, Grenville-Briggs LJ, Meitz JC, Rehmany AP, Rose LE, Beynon JL. Host-parasite coevolutionary conflict between *Arabidopsis* and downy mildew. *Science.* 2004; 306:1957–1960. [PubMed: 15591208]



- Alonso JM, Stepanova AN, Leisse TJ, Kim CJ, Chen H, Shinn P, Stevenson DK, Zimmerman J, Barajas P, Cheuk R, Gadrinab C, Heller C, Jeske A, Koesema E, Meyers CC, Parker H, Prednis L, Ansari Y, Choy N, Deen H, Geralt M, Hazari N, Hom E, Karnes M, Mulholland C, Ndubaku R, Schmidt I, Guzman P, Aguilar-Henonin L, Schmid M, Weigel D, Carter DE, Marchand T, Risseuw E, Brogden D, Zeko A, Crosby WL, Berry CC, Ecker JR. Genome-wide insertional mutagenesis of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Science*. 2003; 301:653–657. [PubMed: 12893945]
- Aranzana MJ, Kim S, Zhao K, Bakker E, Horton M, Jakob K, Lister C, Molitor J, Shindo C, Tang C, Toomajian C, Traw B, Zheng H, Bergelson J, Dean C, Marjoram P, Nordborg M. Genome-wide association mapping in *Arabidopsis* identifies previously known flowering time and pathogen resistance genes. *PLoS Genet*. 2005; 1:e60. [PubMed: 16292355]
- Attaran E, Zeier TE, Griebel T, Zeier J. Methyl Salicylate Production and Jasmonate Signaling Are Not Essential for Systemic Acquired Resistance in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell*. 2009
- Ausubel FM. Are innate immune signaling pathways in plants and animals conserved? *Nat Immunol*. 2005; 6:973–979. [PubMed: 16177805]
- Axtell MJ, Staskawicz BJ. Initiation of *RPS2*-specified disease resistance in *Arabidopsis* is coupled to the AvrRpt2-directed elimination of RIN4. *Cell*. 2003; 112:369–377. [PubMed: 12581526]
- Azevedo C, Sadanandom A, Kitagawa K, Freialdenhoven A, Shirasu K, Schulze-Lefert P. The RAR1 interactor SGT1, an essential component of R gene-triggered disease resistance. *Science*. 2002; 295:2073–2076. [PubMed: 11847307]
- Bai J, Pennill LA, Ning J, Lee SW, Ramalingam J, Webb CA, Zhao B, Sun Q, Nelson JC, Leach JE, Hulbert SH. Diversity in nucleotide binding site-leucine-rich repeat genes in cereals. *Genome Res*. 2002; 12:1871–1884. [PubMed: 12466291]
- Balazs E, Lebeurier G. *Arabidopsis* is a host of cauliflower mosaic virus. *Arabidopsis Newsl*. 1981; 18:130–134.
- Bednarek P, Pislewska-Bednarek M, Svatos A, Schneider B, Doudsky J, Mansurova M, Humphry M, Consonni C, Panstruga R, Sanchez-Vallet A, Molina A, Schulze-Lefert P. A glucosinolate metabolism pathway in living plant cells mediates broad-spectrum antifungal defense. *Science*. 2009; 323:101–106. [PubMed: 19095900]
- Bent AF, Kunkel BN, Dahlbeck D, Brown KL, Schmidt R, Giraudat J, Leung J, Staskawicz BJ. *RPS2* of *Arabidopsis thaliana*: a leucine-rich repeat class of plant disease resistance genes. *Science*. 1994; 265:1856–1860. [PubMed: 8091210]
- Biffen RH. Studies on the inheritance of disease resistance. *J Agric Sci*. 1907; 2:109–128.
- Blattner FR, Plunkett G 3rd, Bloch CA, Perna NT, Burland V, Riley M, Collado-Vides J, Glasner JD, Rode CK, Mayhew GF, Gregor J, Davis NW, Kirkpatrick HA, Goeden MA, Rose DJ, Mau B, Shao Y. The complete genome sequence of *Escherichia coli* K-12. *Science*. 1997; 277:1453–1462. [PubMed: 9278503]
- Boller T, He SY. Innate immunity in plants: an arms race between pattern recognition receptors in plants and effectors in microbial pathogens. *Science*. 2009; 324:742–744. [PubMed: 19423812]
- Bomblies K, Lempe J, Epple P, Warthmann N, Lanz C, Dangl JL, Weigel D. Autoimmune response as a mechanism for a Dobzhansky-Muller-type incompatibility syndrome in plants. *PLoS Biol*. 2007; 5:e236. [PubMed: 17803357]
- Bomke C, Tudzynski B. Diversity, regulation, and evolution of the gibberellin biosynthetic pathway in fungi compared to plants and bacteria. *Phytochemistry*. 2009; 70:1876–1893. [PubMed: 19560174]
- Boyes DC, Nam J, Dangl JL. The *Arabidopsis thaliana* *RPM1* disease resistance gene product is a peripheral plasma membrane protein that is degraded coincident with the hypersensitive response. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 1998; 95:15849–15854. [PubMed: 9861059]
- Brown TA, Jones MK, Powell W, Allaby RG. The complex origins of domesticated crops in the Fertile Crescent. *Trends Ecol Evol*. 2009; 24:103–109. [PubMed: 19100651]
- Buell CR, Joardar V, Lindeberg M, Selengut J, Paulsen IT, Gwinn ML, Dodson RJ, Deboy RT, Durkin AS, Kolonay JF, Madupu R, Daugherty S, Brinkac L, Beanan MJ, Haft DH, Nelson WC, Davidsen T, Zafar N, Zhou L, Liu J, Yuan Q, Khouri H, Fedorova N, Tran B, Russell D, Berry K, Utterback T, Van Aken SE, Feldblyum TV, D'Ascenzo M, Deng WL, Ramos AR, Alfano JR, Cartinhour S, Chatterjee AK, Delaney TP, Lazarowitz SG, Martin GB, Schneider DJ, Tang X,

- Bender CL, White O, Fraser CM, Collmer A. The complete genome sequence of the Arabidopsis and tomato pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. tomato DC3000. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2003; 100:10181–10186. [PubMed: 12928499]
- Burch-Smith TM, Schiff M, Caplan JL, Tsao J, Czymbek K, Dinesh-Kumar SP. A novel role for the TIR domain in association with pathogen-derived elicitors. *PLoS Biol*. 2007; 5:e68. [PubMed: 17298188]
- Cao H, Bowling SA, Gordon S, Dong X. Characterization of an Arabidopsis mutant that is non-responsive to inducers of systemic acquired resistance. *Plant Cell*. 1994; 6:1583–1592. [PubMed: 12244227]
- Century KS, Shapiro AD, Repetti PP, Dahlbeck D, Holub E, Staskawicz BJ. NDR1, a pathogen-induced component required for Arabidopsis disease resistance. *Science*. 1997; 278:1963–1965. [PubMed: 9395402]
- Chain PS, Grafham DV, Fulton RS, Fitzgerald MG, Hostetler J, Muzny D, Ali J, Birren B, Bruce DC, Buhay C, Cole JR, Ding Y, Dugan S, Field D, Garrity GM, Gibbs R, Graves T, Han CS, Harrison SH, Highlander S, Hugenholtz P, Khouri HM, Kodira CD, Kolker E, Kyrpides NC, Lang D, Lapidus A, Malfatti SA, Markowitz V, Metha T, Nelson KE, Parkhill J, Pitluck S, Qin X, Read TD, Schmutz J, Sozhamannan S, Sterk P, Strausberg RL, Sutton G, Thomson NR, Tiedje JM, Weinstock G, Wollam A, Detter JC. Genomics. Genome project standards in a new era of sequencing. *Science*. 2009; 326:236–237. [PubMed: 19815760]
- Chang JH, Urbach JM, Law TF, Arnold LW, Hu A, Gombar S, Grant SR, Ausubel FM, Dangl JL. A high-throughput, near-saturating screen for type III effector genes from *Pseudomonas syringae*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2005; 102:2549–2554. [PubMed: 15701698]
- Chen W, Provart N, Glazebrook J, Katagiri F, Chang HS, Eulgem T, Mauch F, Luan S, Zou G, Whitham S, Budworth P, Tao Y, Xie Z, Chen X, Lam S, Kreps J, Harper J, Si-Ammour A, Mauch-Mani B, Heinlein M, Kobayashi K, Hohn T, Dangl JL, Wang X, TZ. Expression profile matrices of Arabidopsis transcription factor genes predict their putative functions in response to environmental stresses. *Plant Cell*. 2002; 14:559–574. [PubMed: 11910004]
- Chisholm ST, Coaker G, Day B, Staskawicz BJ. Host-Microbe Interactions: Shaping the Evolution of the Plant Immune Response. *Cell*. 2006; 124:803–814. [PubMed: 16497589]
- Clark RM, Schweikert G, Toomajian C, Ossowski S, Zeller G, Shinn P, Warthmann N, Hu TT, Fu G, Hinds DA, Chen H, Frazer KA, Huson DH, Scholkopf B, Nordborg M, Ratsch G, Ecker JR, Weigel D. Common sequence polymorphisms shaping genetic diversity in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Science*. 2007; 317:338–342. [PubMed: 17641193]
- Collins NC, Thordal-Christensen H, Lipka V, Bau S, Kombrink E, Qiu JL, Huckelhoven R, Stein M, Freialdenhoven A, Somerville SC, Schulze-Lefert P. SNARE-protein-mediated disease resistance at the plant cell wall. *Nature*. 2003; 425:973–977. [PubMed: 14586469]
- Collmer A, Schneider DJ, Lindeberg M. Lifestyles of the effector rich: genome-enabled characterization of bacterial plant pathogens. *Plant Physiol*. 2009; 150:1623–1630. [PubMed: 19515788]
- Consonni C, Humphry ME, Hartmann HA, Livaja M, Durner J, Westphal L, Vogel J, Lipka V, Kemmerling B, Schulze-Lefert P, Somerville SC, Panstruga R. Conserved requirement for a plant host cell protein in powdery mildew pathogenesis. *Nat Genet*. 2006; 38:716–720. [PubMed: 16732289]
- Cuperus JT, Montgomery TA, Fahlgren N, Burke RT, Townsend T, Sullivan CM, Carrington JC. Identification of MIR390a Precursor Processing-Defective Mutants in Arabidopsis by Direct Genome Sequencing. *PNAS*. in press.
- da Silva Correia J, Miranda Y, Leonard N, Ulevitch R. SGT1 is essential for Nod1 activation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2007
- Dangl JL, Jones JDG. Plant pathogens and integrated defence responses to infection. *Nature*. 2001; 411:826–833. [PubMed: 11459065]
- Debener T, Lehnackers H, Arnold M, Dangl JL. Identification and molecular mapping of a single *Arabidopsis thaliana* locus determining resistance to a phytopathogenic *Pseudomonas syringae* isolate. *Plant J*. 1991; 1:289–302.

- Deslandes L, Olivier J, Theulieries F, Hirsch J, Feng DX, Bittner-Eddy P, Beynon J, Marco Y. Resistance to *Ralstonia solanacearum* in *Arabidopsis thaliana* is conferred by the recessive RRS1-R gene, a member of a novel family of resistance genes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2002; 99:2404–2409. [PubMed: 11842188]
- Dewdney J, Reuber TL, Wildermuth MC, Devoto A, Cui J, Stutius LM, Drummond EP, Ausubel FM. Three unique mutants of *Arabidopsis* identify eds loci required for limiting growth of a biotrophic fungal pathogen. *Plant J*. 2000; 24:205–218. [PubMed: 11069695]
- Dharmasiri N, Dharmasiri S, Estelle M. The F-box protein TIR1 is an auxin receptor. 2005; 435:441–445.
- Dodds PN, Lawrence GJ, Catanzariti AM, Teh T, Wang CIA, Ayliffe MA, Kobe B, Ellis JG. Direct protein interaction underlies gene-for-gene specificity and coevolution of the flax resistance genes and flax rust avirulence genes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2006a; 103:8888–8893. [PubMed: 16731621]
- Dodds PN, Lawrence GJ, Catanzariti AM, Teh T, Wang CI, Ayliffe MA, Kobe B, Ellis JG. Direct protein interaction underlies gene-for-gene specificity and coevolution of the flax resistance genes and flax rust avirulence genes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2006b; 103:8888–8893. [PubMed: 16731621]
- Dong X, Mindrinos M, Davis KR, Ausubel FM. Induction of *Arabidopsis* Defense Genes by Virulent and Avirulent *Pseudomonas syringae* Strains and by a Cloned Avirulence Gene. *Plant Cell*. 1991; 3:61–72. [PubMed: 1824335]
- Dong XN. NPR1, all things considered. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*. 2004; 7:547–552. [PubMed: 15337097]
- Elbaz M, Avni A, Weil M. Constitutive caspase-like machinery executes programmed cell death in plant cells. *Cell Death Differ*. 2002; 9:726–733. [PubMed: 12058273]
- Ellis JG, Lawrence GJ, Luck JE, Dodds PN. Identification of regions in alleles of the flax rust resistance gene *L* that determine differences in gene-for-gene specificity. *Plant Cell*. 1999; 11:495–506. [PubMed: 10072407]
- Estelle MA, Somerville CR. The mutants of *Arabidopsis*. *Trends in Genetics*. 1986:89–93.
- Falk A, Feys B, Frost LN, Jones JDG, Daniels MJ, Parker JE. *EDS1*, an essential component of *R* gene-mediated disease resistance in *Arabidopsis* has homology to eukaryotic lipases. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 1999; 96:3292–3297. [PubMed: 10077677]
- Fan J, Crooks C, Lamb C. High-throughput quantitative luminescence assay of the growth in planta of *Pseudomonas syringae* chromosomally tagged with *Photobacterium luminescens luxCDABE*. *Plant J*. 2008; 53:393–399. [PubMed: 17971037]
- Faustin B, Lartigue L, Bruey JM, Luciano F, Sergienko E, Bailly-Maitre B, Volkmann N, Hanein D, Rouiller I, Reed JC. Reconstituted NALP1 inflammasome reveals two-step mechanism of caspase-1 activation. *Mol Cell*. 2007; 25:713–724. [PubMed: 17349957]
- Feys B, Benedetti CE, Penfold CN, Turner JG. *Arabidopsis* Mutants Selected for Resistance to the Phytotoxin Coronatine Are Male Sterile, Insensitive to Methyl Jasmonate, and Resistant to a Bacterial Pathogen. *Plant Cell*. 1994; 6:751–759. [PubMed: 12244256]
- Feys BJ, Wiermer M, Bhat RA, Moisan LJ, Medina-Escobar N, Neu C, Cabral A, Parker JE. *Arabidopsis* SENESCENCE-ASSOCIATED GENE101 Stabilizes and Signals within an ENHANCED DISEASE SUSCEPTIBILITY1 Complex in Plant Innate Immunity. *Plant Cell*. 2005; 17:2601–2613. [PubMed: 16040633]
- Flor HH. Inheritance of reaction to rust in flax. *J Agric Res*. 1947; 74:241–262.
- Franchi L, Warner N, Viani K, Nunez G. Function of Nod-like receptors in microbial recognition and host defense. *Immunol Rev*. 2009; 227:106–128. [PubMed: 19120480]
- Garcia AV, Parker JE. Heaven's Gate: nuclear accessibility and activities of plant immune regulators. *Trends Plant Sci*. 2009; 14:479–487. [PubMed: 19716748]
- Gimenez-Ibanez S, Hann DR, Ntoukakis V, Petutschnig E, Lipka V, Rathjen JP. AvrPtoB targets the LysM receptor kinase CERK1 to promote bacterial virulence on plants. *Curr Biol*. 2009; 19:423–429. [PubMed: 19249211]
- Glazebrook J. Contrasting mechanisms of defense against biotrophic and necrotrophic pathogens. *Annu Rev Phytopathol*. 2005; 43:205–227. [PubMed: 16078883]

- Glazebrook J, Rogers EE, Ausubel FM. Isolation of *Arabidopsis* mutants with enhanced disease susceptibility by direct screening. *Genetics*. 1996; 143:973–982. [PubMed: 8725243]
- Goel AK, Lundberg D, Torres MA, Matthews R, Akimoto-Tomiyama C, Farmer L, Dangl JL, Grant SR. The *Pseudomonas syringae* type III effector HopAM1 enhances virulence on water-stressed plants. *Mol Plant Microbe Interact*. 2008; 21:361–370. [PubMed: 18257685]
- Gomez-Gomez L, Boller T. FLS2: an LRR receptor-like kinase involved in the perception of the bacterial elicitor flagellin in *Arabidopsis*. *Mol Cell*. 2000; 5:1003–1011. [PubMed: 10911994]
- Gopalan S, Bauer DW, Alfano JR, Lonllo AO, He SY, Collmer A. Expression of the *Pseudomonas syringae* avirulence protein AvrB in plant cells alleviates its dependence on the hypersensitive response and pathogenicity (Hrp) secretion system in eliciting genotype-specific hypersensitive cell death. *Plant Cell*. 1996; 8:1095–1105. [PubMed: 8768370]
- Grant MR, Godiard L, Straube E, Ashfield T, Lewald J, Sattler A, Innes RW, Dangl JL. Structure of the *Arabidopsis* RPM1 gene enabling dual specificity disease resistance. *Science*. 1995; 269:843–846. [PubMed: 7638602]
- Grant MR, Jones JD. Hormone (dis)harmony moulds plant health and disease. *Science*. 2009; 324:750–752. [PubMed: 19423816]
- Haas BJ, Kamoun S, Zody MC, Jiang RHY, Handsaker RE, Cano LM, Grabherr M, Kodira CD, Raffaele S, Torto-Alalibo T, Bozkurt TO, Ah-Fong AMV, Alvarado L, Anderson VL, Armstrong MR, Avrova A, Baxter L, Beynon J, Boevink PC, Bollmann SR, Bos JIB, Bulone V, Cai GH, Cakir C, Carrington JC, Chawner M, Conti L, Costanzo S, Ewan R, Fahlgren N, Fischbach MA, Fugelstad J, Gilroy EM, Gnerre S, Green PJ, Grenville-Briggs LJ, Griffith J, Grunwald NJ, Horn K, Horner NR, Hu CH, Huitema E, Jeong DH, Jones AME, Jones JDG, Jones RW, Karlsson EK, Kunjeti SG, Lamour K, Liu ZY, Ma LJ, MacLean D, Chibucos MC, McDonald H, McWalters J, Meijer HJG, Morgan W, Morris PF, Munro CA, O'Neill K, Ospina-Giraldo M, Pinzon A, Pritchard L, Ramsahoye B, Ren QH, Restrepo S, Roy S, Sadanandom A, Savidor A, Schornack S, Schwartz DC, Schumann UD, Schwessinger B, Seyer L, Sharpe T, Silvar C, Song J, Studholme DJ, Sykes S, Thines M, van de Vondervoort PJI, Phuntumart V, Wawra S, Weide R, Win J, Young C, Zhou SG, Fry W, Meyers BC, van West P, Ristaino J, Govers F, Birch PRJ, Whisson SC, Judelson HS, Nussbaum C. Genome sequence and analysis of the Irish potato famine pathogen *Phytophthora infestans*. *Nature*. 2009; 461:393–398. [PubMed: 19741609]
- Hatsugai N, Iwasaki S, Tamura K, Kondo M, Fuji K, Ogasawara K, Nishimura M, Hara-Nishimura I. A novel membrane fusion-mediated plant immunity against bacterial pathogens. *Genes Dev*. 2009; 23:2496–2506. [PubMed: 19833761]
- Hatsugai N, Kuroyanagi M, Yamada K, Meshi T, Tsuda S, Kondo M, Nishimura M, Hara-Nishimura I. A plant vacuolar protease, VPE, mediates virus-induced hypersensitive cell death. *Science*. 2004; 305:855–858. [PubMed: 15297671]
- Hauck P, Thilmony R, He SY. A *Pseudomonas syringae* type III effector suppresses cell wall-based extracellular defense in susceptible *Arabidopsis* plants. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2003; 100:8577–8582. [PubMed: 12817082]
- He SY, Nomura K, Whittam TS. Type III protein secretion mechanism in mammalian and plant pathogens. *Biochim Biophys Acta*. 2004; 1694:181–206. [PubMed: 15546666]
- Heese A, Hann DR, Gimenez-Ibanez S, Jones AM, He K, Li J, Schroeder JI, Peck SC, Rathjen JP. The receptor-like kinase SERK3/BAK1 is a central regulator of innate immunity in plants. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2007; 104:12217–12222. [PubMed: 17626179]
- Hofius D, Schultz-Larsen T, Joensen J, Tsitsigiannis DI, Petersen NH, Mattsson O, Jorgensen LB, Jones JD, Mundy J, Petersen M. Autophagic components contribute to hypersensitive cell death in *Arabidopsis*. *Cell*. 2009; 137:773–783. [PubMed: 19450522]
- Holt BF 3rd, Belkhadir Y, Dangl JL. Antagonistic control of disease resistance protein stability in the plant immune system. *Science*. 2005; 309:929–932. [PubMed: 15976272]
- Holub EB. The arms race is ancient history in *Arabidopsis*, the wildflower. *Nat Rev Genet*. 2001; 2:1–12.
- Holub, EB. Evolution of parasitic symbioses between plants and filamentous microorganisms. In: Osbourn, Anne; Yang, He Sheng, editors. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology Biotic interactions*. Vol. 9. 2006. p. 397-405.

- Holub EB, Beynon JL. Symbiology of Mouse Ear Cress (*Arabidopsis thaliana*) and oomycetes. *Adv Bot Res.* 1996; 24:228–273.
- Hua J, Meyerowitz EM. Ethylene responses are negatively regulated by a receptor gene family in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Cell.* 1998; 94:261–271. [PubMed: 9695954]
- Hubert DA, He Y, McNulty BC, Tornero P, Dangl JL. Specific *Arabidopsis* HSP90.2 alleles recapitulate RAR1 cochaperone function in plant NB-LRR disease resistance protein regulation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2009; 106:9556–9563. [PubMed: 19487680]
- Hugot JP, Chamaillard M, Zouali H, Lesage S, Cezard JP, Belaiche J, Almer S, Tysk C, O’Morain CA, Gassull M, Binder V, Finkel Y, Cortot A, Modigliani R, Laurent-Puig P, Gower-Rousseau C, Macry J, Colombel JF, Sahbatou M, Thomas G. Association of NOD2 leucine-rich repeat variants with susceptibility to Crohn’s disease. *Nature.* 2001; 411:599–603. [PubMed: 11385576]
- Huynh TV, Dahlbeck D, Staskawicz BJ. Bacterial blight of soybean: Regulation of a pathogen gene determining host cultivar specificity. *Science.* 1989; 245:1374–1377. [PubMed: 2781284]
- Jander G, Norris SR, Rounsley SD, Bush DF, Levin IM, Last RL. *Arabidopsis* map-based cloning in the post-genome era. *Plant Physiol.* 2002; 129:440–450. [PubMed: 12068090]
- Jeuken MJ, Zhang NW, McHale LK, Pelgrom K, den Boer E, Lindhout P, Michelmore RW, Visser RG, Niks RE. Rin4 Causes Hybrid Necrosis and Race-Specific Resistance in an Interspecific Lettuce Hybrid. *Plant Cell.* 2009
- Jia Y, McAdams SA, Bryan GT, Hershey HP, Valent B. Direct interaction of resistance gene and avirulence gene products confers rice blast resistance. *EMBO J.* 2000; 19:4004–4014. [PubMed: 10921881]
- Jirage D, Tootle TL, Reuber TL, Frost LN, Feys BJ, Parker JE, Ausubel FM, Glazebrook J. *Arabidopsis thaliana* PAD4 encodes a lipase-like gene that is important for salicylic acid signaling. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 1999; 96:135883–135888.
- Jones JD, Dangl JL. The plant immune system. *Nature.* 2006; 444:323–329. [PubMed: 17108957]
- Jørgensen JH. Genetic analysis of barley mutants with modifications of powdery mildew resistance gene MI-a12. *Genome.* 1988; 30:129–132.
- Kaffarnik FA, Jones AM, Rathjen JP, Peck SC. Effector proteins of the bacterial pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae* alter the extracellular proteome of the host plant, *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Mol Cell Proteomics.* 2009; 8:145–156. [PubMed: 18716313]
- Kalde M, Nuhse TS, Findlay K, Peck SC. The syntaxin SYP132 contributes to plant resistance against bacteria and secretion of pathogenesis-related protein 1. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2007; 104:11850–11855. [PubMed: 17592123]
- Kamoun S. A catalogue of the effector secretome of plant pathogenic oomycetes. *Annu Rev Phytopathol.* 2006; 44:41–60. [PubMed: 16448329]
- Kamper J, Kahmann R, Bolker M, Ma LJ, Brefort T, Saville BJ, Banuett F, Kronstad JW, Gold SE, Muller O, Perlin MH, Wosten HA, de Vries R, Ruiz-Herrera J, Reynaga-Pena CG, Snetselaar K, McCann M, Perez-Martin J, Feldbrugge M, Basse CW, Steinberg G, Ibeas JJ, Holloman W, Guzman P, Farman M, Stajich JE, Sentandreu R, Gonzalez-Prieto JM, Kennell JC, Molina L, Schirawski J, Mendoza-Mendoza A, Greilinger D, Munch K, Rossel N, Scherer M, Vranes M, Ladendorf O, Vincon V, Fuchs U, Sandrock B, Meng S, Ho EC, Cahill MJ, Boyce KJ, Klose J, Klosterman SJ, Deelstra HJ, Ortiz-Castellanos L, Li W, Sanchez-Alonso P, Schreier PH, Hauser-Hahn I, Vaupel M, Koopmann E, Friedrich G, Voss H, Schluter T, Margolis J, Platt D, Swimmer C, Gnirke A, Chen F, Vysotskaia V, Mannhaupt G, Guldener U, Munsterkötter M, Haase D, Oesterheld M, Mewes HW, Mauceli EW, DeCaprio D, Wade CM, Butler J, Young S, Jaffe DB, Calvo S, Nusbaum C, Galagan J, Birren BW. Insights from the genome of the biotrophic fungal plant pathogen *Ustilago maydis*. *Nature.* 2006; 444:97–101. [PubMed: 17080091]
- Katsir L, Schilmiller AL, Staswick PE, He SY, Howe GA. COI1 is a critical component of a receptor for jasmonate and the bacterial virulence factor coronatine. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2008; 105:7100–7105. [PubMed: 18458331]
- Kearney B, Staskawicz BJ. Widespread Distribution and Fitness Contribution of *Xanthomonas-Campestris* Avirulence Gene AvrBs2. *Nature.* 1990; 346:385–386. [PubMed: 2374611]
- Keen N. Gene-for-gene complementarity in plant-pathogen interactions. *Annu Rev Genet.* 1990; 24:447–463. [PubMed: 2088175]



- Kim MG, da Cunha L, Belkhadir Y, DebRoy S, Dangl JL, Mackey D. Two *Pseudomonas syringae* type III effectors inhibit RIN4-regulated basal defense in *Arabidopsis*. *Cell*. 2005; 121:749–759. [PubMed: 15935761]
- Koch E, Slusarenko AJ. *Arabidopsis* is susceptible to infection by a downy mildew fungus. *Plant Cell*. 1990; 2:437–445. [PubMed: 2152169]
- Kruger J, Thomas CM, Golstein C, Dixon MS, Smoker M, Tang S, Mulder L, Jones JD. A tomato cysteine protease required for Cf-2-dependent disease resistance and suppression of autonecrosis. *Science*. 2002; 296:744–747. [PubMed: 11976458]
- Kuang H, Caldwell KS, Meyers BC, Michelmore RW. Frequent sequence exchanges between homologs of RPP8 in *Arabidopsis* are not necessarily associated with genomic proximity. *Plant Journal*. 2008; 54:69–80. [PubMed: 18182023]
- Lawrence GJ, Finnegan EJ, Ayliffe MA, Ellis JG. The *L6* gene for flax rust resistance is related to the *Arabidopsis* bacterial resistance gene *RPS2* and the tobacco viral resistance gene. *N Plant Cell*. 1995; 7:1195–1206.
- Leister RT, Ausubel FM, Katagiri F. Molecular recognition of pathogen attack occurs inside of plant cells in plant disease resistance specified by the *Arabidopsis* genes *RPS2* and *RPM1*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 1996; 93:15497–15502. [PubMed: 8986840]
- Lipka V, Dittgen J, Bednarek P, Bhat R, Wiermer M, Stein M, Landtag J, Brandt W, Rosahl S, Scheel D, Llorente F, Molina A, Parker J, Somerville S, Schulze-Lefert P. Pre- and Postinvasion Defenses Both Contribute to Nonhost Resistance in *Arabidopsis*. *10.1126/science.1119409*. *Science*. 2005; 310:1180–1183. [PubMed: 16293760]
- Lipshutz RJ, Fodor SP, Gingeras TR, Lockhart DJ. High density synthetic oligonucleotide arrays. *Nat Genet*. 1999; 21:20–24. [PubMed: 9915496]
- Lloyd AM, Barnason AR, Rogers SG, Byrne MC, Fraley RT, Horsch RB. Transformation of *Arabidopsis thaliana* with *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*. *Science*. 1986; 234:464–466. [PubMed: 17792019]
- Lukowitz W, Gillmor CS, Scheible WR. Positional cloning in *Arabidopsis*. Why it feels good to have a genome initiative working for you. *Plant Physiol*. 2000; 123:795–805. [PubMed: 10889228]
- Luo Y, Caldwell KS, Wroblewski T, Wright ME, Michelmore RW. Proteolysis of a Negative Regulator of Innate Immunity Is Dependent on Resistance Genes in Tomato and *Nicotiana benthamiana* and Induced by Multiple Bacterial Effectors. *Plant Cell*. 2009; 21:2458–2472. [PubMed: 19671880]
- Mackey D, Belkhadir Y, Alonso JM, Ecker JR, Dangl JL. *Arabidopsis* RIN4 is a target of the type III virulence effector AvrRpt2 and modulates RPS2-mediated resistance. *Cell*. 2003; 112:379–389. [PubMed: 12581527]
- Mackey D, Holt BF III, Wiig A, Dangl JL. RIN4 interacts with *Pseudomonas syringae* Type III effector molecules and is required for RPM1-mediated disease resistance in *Arabidopsis*. *Cell*. 2002; 108:743–754. [PubMed: 11955429]
- Maleck K, Levine A, Eulgem T, Morgan A, Schmid J, Lawton KA, Dangl JL, Dietrich RA. The transcriptome of *Arabidopsis thaliana* during systemic acquired resistance. *Nat Genet*. 2000; 26:403–410. [PubMed: 11101835]
- Martin GB, Brommonschenkel SH, Chunwongse J, Frary A, Ganai MW, Spivey R, Wu T, Earle ED, Tanksley SD. Map-based cloning of a protein kinase gene conferring disease resistance in tomato. *Science*. 1993; 262:1432–1436. [PubMed: 7902614]
- Mayor A, Martinon F, De Smedt T, Petrilli V, Tschopp J. A crucial function of SGT1 and HSP90 in inflammasome activity links mammalian and plant innate immune responses. *Nat Immunol*. 2007; 8:497–503. [PubMed: 17435760]
- Melotto M, Underwood W, Koczan J, Nomura K, He SY. Plant Stomata Function in Innate Immunity against Bacterial Invasion. *Cell*. 2006; 126:969–980. [PubMed: 16959575]
- Mestre P, Baulcombe DC. Elicitor-mediated oligomerization of the tobacco N disease resistance protein. *Plant Cell*. 2006; 18:491–501. [PubMed: 16387833]
- Meyer D, Pajonk S, Micali C, O'Connell R, Schulze-Lefert P. Extracellular transport and integration of plant secretory proteins into pathogen-induced cell wall compartments. *Plant Journal*. 2009; 57:986–999. [PubMed: 19000165]


- Meyers BC, Kozik A, Griego A, Kuang H, Michelmore RW. Genome-Wide Analysis of NBS-LRR-Encoding Genes in Arabidopsis. *Plant Cell*. 2003; 15:809–834. [PubMed: 12671079]
- Michelmore RW, Meyers BC. Clusters of resistance genes in plants evolve by divergent selection and a birth-and-death process. *Genome Res*. 1998; 8:1113–1130. [PubMed: 9847076]
- Mindrinis M, Katagiri F, Yu GL, Ausubel FM. The *A. thaliana* disease resistance gene RPS2 encodes a protein containing a nucleotide-binding site and leucine-rich repeats. *Cell*. 1994; 78:1089–1099. [PubMed: 7923358]
- Miya A, Albert P, Shinya T, Desaki Y, Ichimura K, Shirasu K, Narusaka Y, Kawakami N, Kaku H, Shibuya N. CERK1, a LysM receptor kinase, is essential for chitin elicitor signaling in Arabidopsis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2007; 104:19613–19618. [PubMed: 18042724]
- Moffett P, Farnham G, Peart J, Baulcombe DC. Interaction between domains of a plant NBS-LRR protein in disease resistance-related cell death. *Embo J*. 2002; 21:4511–4519. [PubMed: 12198153]
- Monosi B, Wisser RJ, Pennill L, Hulbert SH. Full-genome analysis of resistance gene homologues in rice. *Theor Appl Genet*. 2004; 109:1434–1447. [PubMed: 15309302]
- Mudge J, Cannon SB, Kalo P, Oldroyd GE, Roe BA, Town CD, Young ND. Highly syntenic regions in the genomes of soybean, *Medicago truncatula*, and Arabidopsis thaliana. *BMC Plant Biol*. 2005; 5:15. [PubMed: 16102170]
- Muskett PR, Kahn K, Austin MJ, Moisan LJ, Sadanandom A, Shirasu K, Jones JD, Parker JE. Arabidopsis RAR1 exerts rate-limiting control of R gene-mediated defenses against multiple pathogens. *Plant Cell*. 2002; 14:979–992. [PubMed: 12034891]
- Mysore KS, Tuori RP, Martin GB. Arabidopsis genome sequence as a tool for functional genomics in tomato. *Genome Biol*. 2001; 2:REVIEWS1003. [PubMed: 11178283]
- Narusaka M, Shirasu K, Noutoshi Y, Kubo Y, Shiraiishi T, Iwabuchi M, Narusaka Y. RRS1 and RPS4 provide a dual Resistance-gene system against fungal and bacterial pathogens. *Plant J*. 2009; 60:218–226. [PubMed: 19519800]
- Navarro L, Bari R, Achard P, Lison P, Nemri A, Harberd NP, Jones JD. DELLAs control plant immune responses by modulating the balance of jasmonic acid and salicylic acid signaling. *Curr Biol*. 2008; 18:650–655. [PubMed: 18450451]
- Navarro L, Dunoyer P, Jay F, Arnold B, Dharmasiri N, Estelle M, Voinnet O, Jones JD. A plant miRNA contributes to antibacterial resistance by repressing auxin signaling. *Science*. 2006; 312:436–439. [PubMed: 16627744]
- Navarro L, Zipfel C, Rowland O, Keller I, Robatzek S, Boller T, Jones JDG. The Transcriptional Innate Immune Response to flg22. Interplay and Overlap with Avr Gene-Dependent Defense Responses and Bacterial Pathogenesis. *Plant Physiol*. 2004; 135:1113–1128. [PubMed: 15181213]
- Nishimura MT, Stein M, Hou BH, Vogel JP, Edwards H, Somerville SC. Loss of a callose synthase results in salicylic Acid-dependent disease resistance. *Science*. 2003; 301:969–972. [PubMed: 12920300]
- Nordborg M, Hu TT, Ishino Y, Jhaveri J, Toomajian C, Zheng H, Bakker E, Calabrese P, Gladstone J, Goyal R, Jakobsson M, Kim S, Morozov Y, Padhukasahasram B, Plagnol V, Rosenberg NA, Shah C, Wall JD, Wang J, Zhao K, Kalbfleisch T, Schulz V, Kreitman M, Bergelson J. The pattern of polymorphism in Arabidopsis thaliana. *PLoS Biol*. 2005; 3:e196. [PubMed: 15907155]
- Pandey SP, Somssich IE. The role of WRKY transcription factors in plant immunity. *Plant Physiol*. 2009; 150:1648–1655. [PubMed: 19420325]
- Panstruga R, Dodds PN. Terrific protein traffic: the mystery of effector protein delivery by filamentous plant pathogens. *Science*. 2009; 324:748–750. [PubMed: 19423815]
- Paterson AH, Freeling M, Sasaki T. Grains of knowledge: genomics of model cereals. *Genome Res*. 2005; 15:1643–1650. [PubMed: 16339361]
- Petersen M, Brodersen P, Naested H, Andreasson E, Lindhart U, Johansen B, Nielsen HB, Lacy M, Austin MJ, Parker JE, Sharma SB, Klessig DF, Martienssen R, Mattsson O, Jensen AB, Mundy J. Arabidopsis map kinase 4 negatively regulates systemic acquired resistance. *Cell*. 2000; 103:1111–1120. [PubMed: 11163186]

- Rédei GP. *Arabidopsis* as a genetic tool. *Annu Rev Genet.* 1975; 9:111–127. [PubMed: 1108762]
- Reinhardt JA, Baltrus DA, Nishimura MT, Jeck WR, Jones CD, Dangel JL. De novo assembly using low-coverage short read sequence data from the rice pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *oryzae*. *Genome Res.* 2009; 19:294–305. [PubMed: 19015323]
- Santner A, Estelle M. Recent advances and emerging trends in plant hormone signalling. *Nature.* 2009; 459:1071–1078. [PubMed: 19553990]
- Schena M, Shalon D, Davis RW, Brown PO. Quantitative monitoring of gene expression patterns with a complementary DNA microarray. *Science.* 1995; 270:467–470. [PubMed: 7569999]
- Schneeberger K, Ossowski S, Lanz C, Juul T, Petersen AH, Nielsen KL, Jorgensen JE, Weigel D, Andersen SU. SHOREmap: simultaneous mapping and mutation identification by deep sequencing. *Nat Methods.* 2009; 6:550–551. [PubMed: 19644454]
- Schulze-Lefert P. Plant immunity: the origami of receptor activation. *Curr Biol.* 2004; 14:R22–24. [PubMed: 14711430]
- Schulze-Lefert P, Panstruga R. Establishment of biotrophy by parasitic fungi and reprogramming of host cells for disease resistance. *Annu Rev Phytopathol.* 2003; 41:641–667. [PubMed: 14527335]
- Shan L, He P, Li J, Heese A, Peck SC, Nurnberger T, Martin GB, Sheen J. Bacterial effectors target the common signaling partner BAK1 to disrupt multiple MAMP receptor-signaling complexes and impede plant immunity. *Cell host & microbe.* 2008; 4:17–27. [PubMed: 18621007]
- Shao F, Golstein C, Ade J, Stoutemyer M, Dixon JE, Innes RW. Cleavage of *Arabidopsis* PBS1 by a bacterial type III effector. *Science.* 2003; 301:1230–1233. [PubMed: 12947197]
- Shen QH, Saijo Y, Mauch S, Biskup C, Bieri S, Keller B, Seki H, Ulker B, Somssich IE, Schulze-Lefert P. Nuclear Activity of MLA Immune Receptors Links Isolate-Specific and Basal Disease-Resistance Responses 10.1126/science.1136372. *Science.* 2007a; 315:1098–1103. [PubMed: 17185563]
- Shen QH, Saijo Y, Mauch S, Biskup C, Bieri S, Keller B, Seki H, Ulker B, Somssich IE, Schulze-Lefert P. Nuclear activity of MLA immune receptors links isolate-specific and basal disease-resistance responses. *Science.* 2007b; 315:1098–1103. [PubMed: 17185563]
- Shirasu K. The HSP90-SGT1 Chaperone Complex for NLR Immune Sensors. *Annual review of plant biology.* 2008
- Shirasu K, Lahaye T, Tan MW, Zhou F, Azevedo C, Schulze-Lefert P. A Novel Class of Eukaryotic Zinc-Binding Proteins Is Required for Disease Resistance Signaling in Barley and Development in *C. elegans*. *Cell.* 1999; 99:355–366. [PubMed: 10571178]
- Shiu SH, Bleeker AB. Plant receptor-like kinase gene family: diversity, function, and signaling. *Sci STKE.* 2001; 2001:RE22. [PubMed: 11752632]
- Simpson AJ, Reinach FC, Arruda P, Abreu FA, Acencio M, Alvarenga R, Alves LM, Araya JE, Baia GS, Baptista CS, Barros MH, Bonaccorsi ED, Bordin S, Bove JM, Briones MR, Bueno MR, Camargo AA, Camargo LE, Carraro DM, Carrer H, Colauto NB, Colombo C, Costa FF, Costa MC, Costa-Neto CM, Coutinho LL, Cristofani M, Dias-Neto E, Docena C, El-Dorry H, Facincani AP, Ferreira AJ, Ferreira VC, Ferro JA, Fraga JS, Franca SC, Franco MC, Frohme M, Furlan LR, Garnier M, Goldman GH, Goldman MH, Gomes SL, Gruber A, Ho PL, Hoheisel JD, Junqueira ML, Kemper EL, Kitajima JP, Krieger JE, Kuramae EE, Laigret F, Lambais MR, Leite LC, Lemos EG, Lemos MV, Lopes SA, Lopes CR, Machado JA, Machado MA, Madeira AM, Madeira HM, Marino CL, Marques MV, Martins EA, Martins EM, Matsukuma AY, Menck CF, Miracca EC, Miyaki CY, Monteriro-Vitorello CB, Moon DH, Nagai MA, Nascimento AL, Netto LE, Nhani A Jr, Nobrega FG, Nunes LR, Oliveira MA, de Oliveira MC, de Oliveira RC, Palmieri DA, Paris A, Peixoto BR, Pereira GA, Pereira HA Jr, Pesquero JB, Quaggio RB, Roberto PG, Rodrigues V, de MRAJ, de Rosa VE Jr, de Sa RG, Santelli RV, Sawasaki HE, da Silva AC, da Silva AM, da Silva FR, da Silva WA Jr, da Silveira JF, Silvestri ML, Siqueira WJ, de Souza AA, de Souza AP, Terenzi MF, Truffi D, Tsai SM, Tshako MH, Vallada H, Van Sluys MA, Verjovski-Almeida S, Vettore AL, Zago MA, Zatz M, Meidanis J, Setubal JC. The genome sequence of the plant pathogen *Xylella fastidiosa*. The *Xylella fastidiosa* Consortium of the Organization for Nucleotide Sequencing and Analysis. *Nature.* 2000; 406:151–159. [PubMed: 10910347]

- Song J, Win J, Tian M, Schornack S, Kaschani F, Ilyas M, Hoorn RA, Kamoun S. Apoplastic effectors secreted by two unrelated eukaryotic plant pathogens target the tomato defense protease Rcr3. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2009
- Stahl EA, Dwyer G, Mauricio R, Kreitman M, Bergelson J. Dynamics of disease resistance polymorphism at the *RPM1* locus of *Arabidopsis*. *Nature*. 1999; 400:667–671. [PubMed: 10458161]
- Staskawicz BJ, Ausubel FM, Baker BJ, Ellis J, Jones JDG. Molecular genetics of plant disease resistance. *Science*. 1995; 268:661–667. [PubMed: 7732374]
- Staskawicz BJ, Dahlbeck D, Keen NT. Cloned Avirulence Gene of *Pseudomonas-Syringae* Pv *Glycinea* Determines Race-Specific Incompatibility on *Glycine-Max* (L) Merr. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America-Biological Sciences*. 1984; 81:6024–6028.
- Staswick PE, Tiryaki I, Rowe ML. Jasmonate response locus *JAR1* and several related *Arabidopsis* genes encode enzymes of the firefly luciferase superfamily that show activity on jasmonic, salicylic, and indole-3-acetic acids in an assay for adenylation. *Plant Cell*. 2002; 14:1405–1415. [PubMed: 12084835]
- Stein M, Dittgen J, Sanchez-Rodriguez C, Hou BH, Molina A, Schulze-Lefert P, Lipka V, Somerville S. *Arabidopsis* PEN3/PDR8, an ATP Binding Cassette Transporter, Contributes to Nonhost Resistance to Inappropriate Pathogens That Enter by Direct Penetration 10.1105/tpc.105.038372. *Plant Cell*. 2006; 18:731–746. [PubMed: 16473969]
- Studholme DJ, Ibanez SG, MacLean D, Dangl JL, Chang JH, Rathjen JP. A draft genome sequence and functional screen reveals the repertoire of type III secreted proteins of *Pseudomonas syringae* pathovar *tabaci* 11528. *BMC Genomics*. 2009; 10:395. [PubMed: 19703286]
- Swiderski MR, Innes RW. The *Arabidopsis* *PBS1* resistance gene encodes a member of a novel protein kinase subfamily. *Plant J*. 2001; 26:101–112. [PubMed: 11359614]
- Tang X, Frederick RD, Zhou J, Halterman DA, Jia Y, Martin GB. Initiation of Plant Disease Resistance by Physical Interaction of AvrPto and Pto Kinase. *Science*. 1996; 274:2060–2063. [PubMed: 8953033]
- Tao Y, Xie Z, Chen W, Glazebrook J, Chang HS, Han B, Zhu T, Zou G, Katagiri F. Quantitative nature of *Arabidopsis* responses during compatible and incompatible interactions with the bacterial pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae*. *Plant Cell*. 2003; 15:317–330. [PubMed: 12566575]
- Ting JP, Kastner DL, Hoffman HM. CATERPILLERS, pyrin and hereditary immunological disorders. *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2006; 6:183–195. [PubMed: 16498449]
- Todesco M, Balasubramanian S, Hu TT, Traw MB, Horton M, Epple P, Kuhns C, Sureshkumar S, Schwartz C, Lanz C, Laitinen RAE, Chory J, Lipka V, Borevitz JO, Dangl JL, Bergelson J, Nordborg M, Weigel D. Natural allelic variation underlying a major fitness tradeoff in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Nature*. in press.
- Tornero P, Merritt P, Sadanandom A, Shirasu K, Innes RW, Dangl JL. *RARI* and *NDRI* contribute quantitatively to disease resistance in *Arabidopsis* and their relative contributions are dependent on the *R* gene assayed. *Plant Cell*. 2002; 14:1005–1015. [PubMed: 12034893]
- Torres MA, Jones JD, Dangl JL. Pathogen-induced, NADPH oxidase-derived reactive oxygen intermediates suppress spread of cell death in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Nat Genet*. 2005; 37:1130–1134. [PubMed: 16170317]
- Tsuji J, Somerville SC. *Xanthomonas-Campestris* Pathovar *Campestris*-Induced Chlorosis in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *ARABIDOPSIS INFORMATION SERVICE*. 1988; 26:1.
- Underwood W, Somerville SC. Focal accumulation of defences at sites of fungal pathogen attack. *Journal of Experimental Botany*. 2008; 59:3501–3508. [PubMed: 18703493]
- Uren AG, O'Rourke K, Aravind LA, Pisabarro MT, Seshagiri S, Koonin EV, Dixit VM. Identification of paracaspases and metacaspases: two ancient families of caspase-like proteins, one of which plays a key role in MALT lymphoma. *Mol Cell*. 2000; 6:961–967. [PubMed: 11090634]
- Van den Ackerveken G, Marois E, Bonas U. Recognition of the bacterial AvrBs3 protein occurs inside the plant cell. *Cell*. 1996; 87:1307–1316. [PubMed: 8980236]
- van der Biezen EA, Jones JDG. Plant disease resistance proteins and the “gene-for-gene” concept. *Trends Biochem Sci*. 1998; 23:454–456. [PubMed: 9868361]

- van der Hoorn RA, Kamoun S. From Guard to Decoy: a new model for perception of plant pathogen effectors. *Plant Cell*. 2008; 20:2009–2017. [PubMed: 18723576]
- Van Loon LC, Van Kammen A. Polyacrylamide disc electrophoresis of the soluble leaf proteins from *Nicotiana tabacum* var. [']Samsun' and [']Samsun NN': II. Changes in protein constitution after infection with tobacco mosaic virus. *Virology*. 1970; 40:199–211.
- Vogel J, Somerville S. Isolation and characterization of powdery mildew-resistant *Arabidopsis* mutants. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2000; 97:1897–1902. [PubMed: 10677553]
- Wang D, Weaver ND, Kesarwani M, Dong XN. Induction of protein secretory pathway is required for systemic acquired resistance. *Science*. 2005; 308:1036–1040. [PubMed: 15890886]
- Weigel D, Mott R. The 1001 genomes project for *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Genome Biol*. 2009; 10:107. [PubMed: 19519932]
- Weigel D, Nordborg M. Natural variation in *Arabidopsis*. How do we find the causal genes? *Plant Physiol*. 2005; 138:567–568. [PubMed: 15955918]
- Whalen MC, Innes RW, Bent AF, Staskawicz BJ. Identification of *Pseudomonas syringae* pathogens of *Arabidopsis* and a bacterial locus determining avirulence on both *Arabidopsis* and soybean. *Plant Cell*. 1991; 3:49–59. [PubMed: 1824334]
- Whitham S, Dinesh-Kumar SP, Choi D, Hehl R, Corr C, Baker B. The product of the Tobacco Mosaic Virus resistance gene *N*: similarity to Toll and the Interleukin-1 receptor. *Cell*. 1994; 78:1101–1115. [PubMed: 7923359]
- Win J, Morgan W, Bos J, Krasileva KV, Cano LM, Chaparro-Garcia A, Ammar R, Staskawicz BJ, Kamoun S. Adaptive evolution has targeted the C-terminal domain of the RXLR effectors of plant pathogenic oomycetes. *Plant Cell*. 2007; 19:2349–2369. [PubMed: 17675403]
- Wirthmueller L, Zhang Y, Jones JDG, Parker JE. Nuclear accumulation of the *Arabidopsis* immune receptor RPS4 is necessary for triggering EDS1-dependent defense. *Current Biology*. 2007; 17:2023–2029. [PubMed: 17997306]
- Yan J, Zhang C, Gu M, Bai Z, Zhang W, Qi T, Cheng Z, Peng W, Luo H, Nan F, Wang Z, Xie D. The *Arabidopsis* CORONATINE INSENSITIVE1 Protein Is a Jasmonate Receptor. *Plant Cell*. 2009; 21:2220–2236. [PubMed: 19717617]
- Zimmermann P, Hirsch-Hoffmann M, Hennig L, Gruissem W. GENEVESTIGATOR. *Arabidopsis* microarray database and analysis toolbox. *Plant Physiol*. 2004; 136:2621–2632. [PubMed: 15375207]
- Zipfel C. Pattern-recognition receptors in plant innate immunity. *Curr Opin Immunol*. 2008; 20:10–16. [PubMed: 18206360]
- Zipfel C, Kunze G, Chinchilla D, Caniard A, Jones JD, Boller T, Felix G. Perception of the bacterial PAMP EF-Tu by the receptor EFR restricts *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation. *Cell*. 2006; 125:749–760. [PubMed: 16713565]





**Figure 1. Use of Arabidopsis to study plant-pathogen interactions has rapidly expanded since the sequencing of the Arabidopsis genome**

Data retrieved from Medline using the search: (“YEAR”[Publication date]) AND (arabidopsis) AND (defense or disease or pathology).

**Table 1****A timeline of important events in plant pathology**


---

-10,000 BP - Domestication of crops, first agricultural pathogen (Brown <i>et al.</i> 2009)
1846 - Irish potato famine
1884 - Koch's postulates
1907 - Disease resistance can be inherited as dominant, Mendelian genes (Biffen 1907)
1942 - Gene for gene hypothesis (Flor 1947)
1975 - "Arabidopsis as a Genetic Tool" published (Rédei 1975)
1981 - Arabidopsis as a viral host (Balazs and Lebeurier 1981)
1984 - Cloning of the first avirulence gene from bacteria (Staskawicz <i>et al.</i> 1984)
1986 - Transformation of Arabidopsis (Lloyd <i>et al.</i> 1986)
1986 - "The mutants of Arabidopsis" published (Estelle and Somerville 1986)
1988 - Arabidopsis as a bacterial host (Tsuji and Somerville 1988)
1990 - Arabidopsis as a fungal host (Koch and Slusarenko 1990)
1990 - Arabidopsis Genome project started
1990 - Avirulence genes can promote virulence (Kearney and Staskawicz 1990)
1993 - First <i>R</i> -gene cloned, <i>Pto</i> of tomato (Martin, <i>et al.</i> 1993)
1994 - <i>RPS2</i> cloned - first Arabidopsis <i>R</i> -gene (Bent, <i>et al.</i> 1994, Mindrinos, <i>et al.</i> 1994)
1994 - <i>NPR1</i> described, molecular dissection of SAR begins (Cao, <i>et al.</i> 1994)
1996 - Enhanced Disease Susceptibility genetic screen (Glazebrook <i>et al.</i> 1996)
1996 - Type III effectors act inside the plant cell (Gopalan, <i>et al.</i> 1996, Leister, <i>et al.</i> 1996, Van den Ackerveken, <i>et al.</i> 1996)
1997 - <i>Escherichia coli</i> genome sequenced (Blattner <i>et al.</i> 1997)
1997 - <i>NDR1</i> , a gene required for <i>R</i> -gene function cloned (Century, <i>et al.</i> 1997)
1998 - <i>RPM1</i> on the PM; first localization of a NB-LRR (Boyes, <i>et al.</i> 1998)
1999 - <i>RAR1</i> , a gene required for <i>R</i> -gene function cloned (Shirasu, <i>et al.</i> 1999)
1999 - Fitness costs associated with NB-LRR function (Stahl, <i>et al.</i> 1999)
1999 - <i>PAD4</i> and <i>EDS1</i> , genes required for <i>R</i> -gene function cloned (Falk, <i>et al.</i> 1999, Jirage, <i>et al.</i> 1999)
2000 - First plant pathogenic bacterium sequenced - <i>Xylella</i> (Simpson <i>et al.</i> 2000)
2000 - Human genome sequenced
<b>2000 - Arabidopsis genome sequenced (AGI 2000)</b>
2000 - 2010 project begins
2000 - MAP kinases regulate defenses - <i>MPK4</i> cloned (Petersen <i>et al.</i> 2000)
2000 - PAMP receptors - <i>FLS2</i> cloned (Gomez-Gomez and Boller 2000)
2001 - Details and mechanistic expectations of Guard Hypothesis published.
2001 - <i>SID2/EDS16</i> cloned
2001 - Characterization of <i>WRKY</i> gene family in Arabidopsis begins
2001 - <i>PBS1</i> cloned, proposal for its effects on RPS5 consistent with the Guard Hypothesis (Swiderski and Innes 2001)
2002 - <i>RIN4</i> cloned; proposal for its effects on RPM1 consistent with Guard Hypothesis (Mackey, <i>et al.</i> 2002)
2003 - support for Guard Hypothesis - RIN4 cleaved by AvrRpt2 (Mackey, <i>et al.</i> 2003)
2003 - Non-host mutant screens (Collins, <i>et al.</i> 2003)
2003 - PBS1 is cleaved by AvrPphB; recognition of modified self (Shao <i>et al.</i> 2003)
2003 <i>P. syringae</i> DC3000 genome is sequenced (Buell <i>et al.</i> 2003)

- 2003 - Effectors can suppress basal resistance (Hauck *et al.* 2003)
- 2003–2004 – NB-LRRs require a co-chaperone complex (Schulze-Lefert 2004)
- 2005 - EDS1/PAD4/SAG101 complexes (Feys *et al.* 2005)
- 2005 - Secretory pathway required for SAR (Wang, *et al.* 2005)
- 2006 - Small RNAs involved in bacterial defense (Navarro 2006)
- 2007 - 20 Arabidopsis strains re-sequenced (Clark, *et al.* 2007)
- 2007 - NB-LRRs can function in the nucleus (Burch-Smith, *et al.* 2007, Shen *et al.* 2007a, Wirthmueller, *et al.* 2007)
- 2007 - Immune system incompatibility as a means to reproductive isolation (Bomblies, *et al.* 2007)
- 2009 - Sequencing of 1001 Arabidopsis Genomes announced (Weigel and Mott 2009)
- 2009 - Phytophthora genome sequenced (Irish potato famine) (Haas, *et al.* 2009)
- 2010 - last 2010 projects to be funded
-